REGIONAL ISSUES
High-speed rail: 8 firms supply letter of interest.
SLR: Intermodal traffic up significantly.
FTR: B&A still looking at proposals; possible Tappan rail tunnel.

CONNECTICUT
Transportation Strategy Board: No funds for immediate rail or port projects.

MAINE
Federal: US Representative Baldacci has plans for the House subcommittee on railroads.

CONNECTICUT
EOTC: Property management contract.
HRRC: Berkshire Scenic update.
MBTA: Weymouth and Scituate ownership.
Readville Yard not moving to Boston Food Market.

NEW HAMPSHIRE
NHN: Fuel depot on northern section, looking for traffic on southern section in April.
TSRD: embargo.
FTR: NHDOT trucking out ties.

RHODE ISLAND
[No report.]

VERMONT
Amtrak: ABRR update, including Hoosick work.
GRS: No access to competitors' data.
Lamoille Valley: RFPs out by 20 February.
FTR: Moving Burlington and Rutland yards.

MARITIMES/QUÉBEC
[No report]

ATLANTIC NORTHEAST PORTS
Connecticut ports: ConnDOT barge feeder study.

Bridgeport: Barge feeder study
New Haven: Barge feeder study, funds sought, Tomlinson bridge, highway access, moving tank farms.
New London: CN pier, barge feeder study.
Halifax: port expansion plans
Canso: regional infrastructure task force.
Sydney: To buy federal wharf.
Montreal: Annual traffic.

PEOPLE, POSITIONS, EVENTS
Bruce van Note, Bob Bentley. Hub looking for people.

E-issue improvements
Those of you getting this in Adobe will note that the headers in the table of contents are set up as hyperlinks. Just click on the link to take you to that place in the newsletter.

I used the links to good effect in laying out the newsletter, but do any readers enjoy them? Please let me know.

Chop Hardenbergh

REGIONAL ISSUES
HIGH-SPEED RAIL CONTRACT
29 January, Montpelier. THE FOLLOWING FIRMS PROVIDED A LETTER OF INTEREST in response to VAOT’s call on the high-speed rail Montreal-Boston corridor:

Clough, Harbour & Associates
Edwards & Kelcey, Inc.
The Louis Berger Group, Inc.

Parsons Brinckerhoff Quade & Douglas, Inc.
Parsons Transportation Group, Inc.
The Seneca Group
Systra Consulting, Inc.
Wilbur Smith Associates

Contract Administration will schedule the consultant selection meeting, which will determine what firms will be on the short list. ‘We anticipate a decision to be made within three weeks.’ {e-mail to ANR&P from Edna Martineau in Contract Administration 1.Feb.01}

SLR - QUARTERLY REPORT
8 February, York PA. FOR ITS SECOND FISCAL QUARTER, EMONS OPERATING REVENUES increased 2.4% to $6.54 million.

Robert Grossman, chair and president, commented, "I am particularly pleased with the increase in revenues and earnings for the current quarter and six-month period, despite softening in the economy and significant increases in diesel fuel prices experienced by the Company this past year. Even though business was soft in certain segments, our overall revenues improved due to our successful marketing programs, including our intermodal operations."

Specific results
For all Emons railroads, Grossman reported, "Freight revenues, excluding intermodal, were down 2.2% for the second quarter of fiscal 2001, as compared to the previous year's quarter. Carloads decreased 2.8% for the second quarter to 16,300 carloads from 16,750 carloads in the comparable fiscal 2000 quarter.

"Intermodal [all on SLR - editor] freight and handling revenues increased 45% to $435,000, up from $300,000 in the prior year's quarter, largely due to a 42% increase in intermodal units handled for the quarter to 3,650 units from 2,550 units in the prior year's quarter."

Grossman concluded, "The third quarter has begun on a strong note with carloads in January up from the previous month. We are hopeful that our results for the remainder of fiscal 2001 will remain strong because of the many marketing initiatives under way. Expansion of our intermodal terminal was largely complete before winter and will be finished in the spring. This will provide us with the ability to better handle increased volumes of containers and trailers. We are also pursuing opportunities to reduce our costs, especially with respect to our locomotive fleet. We remain optimistic for the balance of the fiscal year, provided the economy does not significantly weaken from the current level."

Change in CN service design
'Additionally, other operating revenues increased $187,000 because we recovered $127,000 from the Canadian National Railway ("CN") in conjunction with increased costs of operations due to changes in CN's service design last year.'

In a later discussion, Grossman said that when CN first changed its service, going from two trains a day to one, “expenses went way up. CN compensated us for some increased expenses at that point.” SLR had already received one payment prior to this. Costs have not gone completely back to the level before the service was changed, said Grossman, but the train service is now better coordinated and costs are lower than at the initiation of the design change.

A new president yet?
“We’re still looking for the right person to take the SLR to new heights,” said Grossman. In the meantime, “the guys [at SLR] are doing good work, I’m spending a lot of time up there myself. We’re not under any pressure to hire someone.” {ANR&P discussion 9.Feb.01}

FOR THE RECORD: REGION
THE B&A HAS TWO ACTIVE PROPOSALS ON THE TABLE [about a sale or capital infusion] and they do not have deadlines, although people always want [the seller] to move because of the risk of their losing out to a better proposal coming in. In addition, we are nurturing two/three other proposals.’ {e-mail to ANR&P from IRR President Bob Schmidt 5.Feb.01}

******
A RAIL-ROAD TUNNEL AT TAPPAN might provide the long-sought restoration of a mid-Hudson rail link into New England. The tunnel would purportedly cost less than replacing the Tappan Zee Bridge, which the New York State Thruway Authority wants to do. {Judy Rife in The Times Herald-Record 31.Jan.01}

CONNECTICUT RRs

GENERAL ASSEMBLY
1 February. THE TRANSPORTATION STRATEGY BOARD PRESENTED ITS RECOMMENDATIONS [see 12 January issue]. While it did not fund any port or freight rail projects, it did point the state in their direction. Among $200 million of recommendations for spending from the current budget surplus, the state should spend $40 million next year on projects, $10 million on continuing the board and invest $150 million as a down payment for the $6 billion long-term costs of congestion mitigation.

Those long-term costs include using waterways and railroads more. {Ken Dixon in Connecticut Post 30.Jan.01}

7 February. GOVERNOR JOHN ROWLAND AGREED TO CONTINUE THE TRANSPORTATION STRATEGY BOARD. In his budget address to the General Assembly, he said: “Last week you received the report of the Transportation Strategy Board. I have asked the strategy board to continue its work to evaluate and prioritize future transportation projects. I propose setting aside $50 million from the surplus for projects that are ready to proceed on
a fast track.’

The Governor’s budget allots roughly $10 million out of the expected $531 million FY2001 surplus to the operations of a permanent Board through 2003. The remaining $40 million would fund programs identified by the Board as implementable in one to two years. These projects include the construction of additional New Haven Line rail maintenance facilities, more rail station commuter shuttle service in Westport, Greenwich, and Stamford, and expanded bus routes and service in Fairfield County and the Hartford area. In addition, the Board report recommends studies for a new commuter rail service between New Haven and Springfield, MA [recommended by the Connecticut Public Transportation Commission--see 12 January issue] and a new rail station in either Orange or West Haven.

House Speaker Moira Lyons (D-Stanford) and other lawmakers told newspapers they would push to earmark even more of the surplus for fast-track transportation projects. The Transportation Strategy Board urged that at least $150 million be set aside this year and warned that serious transportation reform across the state over the next ten to fifteen years would require a multi-billion dollar investment. {Moving the Region 12.Feb.01}

Responses to the CPTC recommendations?
While according to state law [see 3 March 2000 issue] the commissioner of transportation is required to respond to the CPTC recommendations [see 12 January issue] by 1 February, he has not. Fred Riese, interim chair, expects the recommendations before the next meeting. {ANR&P discussion 6.Feb.01}

MAINE RAILROADS

FEDERAL ROLE
7 February, DC. US REPRESENTATIVE JOHN BALDACCI WILL SERVE ON THE HOUSE SUBCOMMITTEE ON RAILROADS. Representative Don Young of Alaska, the new chair of the House Transportation and Infrastructure Committee, said he would split the former subcommittee on ground transportation into a highways & transit subcommittee, and a railroads subcommittee, chaired by Jack Quinn (R, NY). {Rail Business 12.Feb.01}

Foci for Baldacci
A press release on the appointment noted: ‘The Subcommittee is expected to review the U.S. Department of Transportation’s implementation of rail infrastructure programs authorized in the Transportation Equity Act for the 21st Century -- including Title V Railroad Infrastructure Finance (RRIF) direct and guaranteed loan program for rail and rail-intermodal infrastructure improvements. The Subcommittee will also examine reauthorization of the Swift Rail Development Act. The current authorization for this general fund grant program for pre-construction high-speed rail corridor planning and technology development expires at the end of FY 2001. Additionally, the Subcommittee will review and evaluate the Fiscal Year 2002 and Fiscal Year 2003 budget proposals for the Federal Railroad Administration, Amtrak, and the Surface Transportation Board. It will also work on Amtrak reauthorization issues and reauthorization of rail safety programs.’

Baldacci hopes the state will look to assist in keeping the Bangor & Aroostook System in operation, and the state will “find alternatives” if the railroad cannot make it [see Regional]. Baldacci will help in this effort. “The importance is that [B&A] accesses the ports and the transportation of goods from Northern Maine to the Boston markets [Hey, John, you need some tutoring!].

Baldacci will also follow Amtrak. “This subcommittee gives Maine a voice on the decisions that involve Amtrak,” Baldacci said, indicating that improving rail beds and increasing safety are two issues he wants to probe.

Baldacci said he sought the assignment — along with a seat on the Aviation Subcommittee — because Maine faces problems of isolation if its transportation infrastructure isn’t maintained.

He said that he’ll work to support an expanded rail line from Bangor to Acadia National Park as part of a state-driven effort to expand tourism promotion. {Baldacci press release; Myron Struck of State News Service in Bangor Daily News 10.Feb.01}

AMTRAK - MAINE
9 February, Portland. PLANS FOR STARTUP CONTINUE. NNEPRA will run an inaugural train carrying the governors of Massachusetts, New Hampshire, and Maine (King will board at Wells) from Boston to Portland

Crew qualification
Amtrak still needs to draw up crew assignments and do qualification runs, as well as appoint a hostler crew to run the train from North Station to Southampton Street for servicing. This must be done by 15 March to meet the proposed startup date of 1 May. {George Chiasson in NERAILS e-group 8.Feb.01}

Station leases and Portland servicing
These issues are still not resolved, though NNEPRA and Amtrak continue to negotiate with Guilford [see 30 January issue]. {ANR&P discussion with NNEPRA’s Mike Murray 9.Feb.01}

GRS - MAINE
8 February. INTERNATIONAL PAPER WILL SHUT TWO LUMBER MILL SHIPPERS on GRS’ line between Bangor and Mattawamkeag: a stud mill in Passadumkeag (milepost 25.02) and a stud mill (milepost ~40.4) just west of Costigan West in the Town of Milford. Both became property of International Paper in June 2000 when IP bought Champion Paper; IP announced it would formally close the mills in mid-April because their product was no
longer profitable due to Canadian imports.

Traffic loss
Estimates from two rail observers show that Guilford will lose about 60-80 outbound boxcars a month from the two plants combined. [e-mails to ANR&P from Fred Hirsch and Craig Newton 9.Feb.01]

MASSACHUSETTS RRs

EOTC ASSET MANAGEMENT
15 December 2000. AN UPDATE ON EOTC MANAGEMENT OF RAIL PROPERTIES [see 28 July 2000 issue]. Clare Conley, principal of Asset Performance Management, noted her company in June 2000 was awarded a two-year contract to help EOTC manage its railroad properties and related operating and property agreements.

‘APM and its team support EOTC decision-making by advising on a variety of railroad operations and other matters. We are also working with EOTC to design and implement management systems to help staff continue to effectively manage the railroad properties.

‘On the operations side, APM and its consultants Indus Rail and Rekola Engineers are helping EOTC to evaluate operating agreements with active railroads, and have undertaken inspections of track and right of way to develop a more informed understanding of the properties' physical condition.

‘APM has also reviewed and evaluated over 100 active property agreements, and has developed a revenue budget for the agency's railroad properties. APM is also working with EOTC to establish standard procedures and documents, review new easement requests, and determine the appropriate charges for proposed transactions. In the coming months, we expect to work with EOTC to deal with various compliance issues (including encroachments) and to make sure that EOTC properties are well used and appropriately maintained.’ [e-mail to ANR&P]

What about some current controversies on rail properties?
Under APM’s contract, it handles neither MBTA property, nor state assistance to private railroads. Thus, the MBTA’s proposed taking of the Boston Food Market [see below] for rail use is not a concern of APM, nor is the ongoing effort by Berkshire Scenic to obtain some EOTC funding for HRRC track upgrade [see below].

HOUSATONIC RAILROAD
2February, Lenox. HRRC OFFICIALS HAVE CONCLUDED THAT EOTC WILL NOT ASSIST the effort to improve HRRC’s tracks so that the Berkshire Scenic can run outside its compound here. EOTC thinks otherwise: spokesperson John Carlisle said his agency is moving ahead.

Background
In 1998, the legislature appropriated $1.4 million over four years to fund the track upgrade [see 22 October 1998 issue.]

HRRC and BSRM already have an operating agreement, which only needs a signature. The two are waiting on EOTC funding.

In spring 2000, consultant Brett Rekola examined the 17 miles of HRRC track between Pittsfield and Stockbridge the BSRM would like to use. [See 26 May 2000 issue. His fee: under $10,000–see 2 May 2000 issue]. EOTC wrote to the HRRC on 30 August 2000, including a copy of Rekola’s report. The agency made a general proposal of a certain amount of financial assistance, less than the $8.5 million Rekola estimated necessary to bring the track to Class II conditions, with welded rail, resurfacing with stone instead of cinders, tie replacements, and passing sidings.

HRRC replied on 5 September, saying what was suggested was not workable, nor consistent with the consultants’ report. "We said we would be willing to proceed with a passenger operation if we receive a proposal that addresses the rehabilitation and improvements the consultant said are necessary," Rodriguez said [see 20 October 2000 issue].

Cost of upgrading the tracks
The Legislature in the late 1980s set aside $2.5 million for the project, which would leave a $6 million funding gap, if the consultant's estimates are accurate. [I could not reconcile the difference between $1.4 million and $2.5 million by press time. Editor]

Current status: EOTC perspective
Although Rodriguez expressed pessimism, EOTC spokesperson Carlisle said officials from his department met with BSRM officials just last week. The state’s annual budget for railroad improvements—the Rail Freight Fund—is $12 million. Transportation officials are trying to find a source of funding in order to "not take away from other projects across the state."

EOTC transportation officials deemed Rekola’s number inflated. "That figure is not written in stone. We might want to bring that down" without minimizing the improvements, Carlisle said.

Current plans of HRRC
The railroad is planning to upgrade the 17-mile scenic railway stretch at its own cost, which would take significantly longer than if the state funded it. The railroad operates it at this time as excepted track (no passenger trains or hazardous material, train speed under 10 miles per hour). If Housatonic does upgrade the railroad, the company plans to do it without welded rails and the sidings (the sidings would permit BSRM locomotives to change directions at stations). [Erik Arvidson in Berkshire Eagle 3.Feb.01; ANR&P discussion with Rodriguez 12.Feb.01]
MBTA - GREENBUSH
7 February. THE T WILL PURCHASE THE RIGHT-OF-WAY FROM TWO TOWNS in order to restart rail service between Braintree and Scituate.

Both Cohasset and Scituate acquired the former Penn-Central (nee Old Colony, then New Haven) right-of-way out of the Penn-Central bankruptcy in the early 1970s. Tracks were removed in 1962, three years after the line through those two towns was put out of service. {ANR&P discussion with Tom Gruber 9.Feb.01; Rail Lines of Southern New England, Ronald Dale Karr, 1995}

MBTA - READVILLE YARD
9 February. THE MBTA MAY NOT KICK THE NEW BOSTON FOOD MARKET OUT, said Boston Mayor Thomas Menino. The T’s lawyers had earlier notified the owners of the Food Market, which occupies a prime piece of land adjacent to the T’s tracks near South Station, of the T’s intent to survey and assess the property, prelude to possible eminent domain action. The T would move the activities now taking place in the Readville Yard to the Food Market, as well as provide needed space for the new trains it will run when the Greenbush line starts service.

The T reverses
"The mayor has made his position very clear, and given his deep objections we'll regroup and see if there's another site that will be suitable to everyone," MBTA General Manager Robert H. Prince Jr. said shortly after talking with Menino on 8 February.

The meatpackers and fish processors at the food market - many working at companies handed down from father to son - feared that with no place in the city to relocate, they would end up dispersed throughout the suburbs.

Massachusetts Bay Transportation Authority officials complain Boston has too few industrial sites that are large enough to accommodate the dozen-plus commuter trains that must be stored before making return trips to the suburbs each night. "It's a very small city, and trying to find a place to locate a train yard is not easy," Prince said.

Menino in the past has lobbied the MBTA to move its current train storage yard out of Readville, not far from the mayor's Hyde Park home. "The trains are in my backyard," Menino said. "Of course I'd like to get them out. But you can't just muscle in and say you're going to put a train garage out there when you've got more than 900 workers [to consider]." {Steve Wilmsen in Boston Globe 9.Feb.01}

NEW HAMPSHIRE GENERAL COURT
Bills for the 2001-2002 legislative session

- HB258 Task force for the Manchester-Lawrence and Northern lines. The House has already passed this bill.

- HB320 Leasing portions of railroad corridors. This bill restricts eligibility for certain leases of state-owned railroad properties, and increases the cost of such leases from $5 to $10 per running foot per year. Transportation Committee, hearing 6 February.

- Morgan said this addresses the leasing of private crossings so that property owners may have access to docks, and in some cases the docks lie on state railroad property. This bill makes the fee something realistic.

- HB 352 Limiting passenger liability. Sets the limit at $75 million. A hearing on 7 February at the Judiciary Committee.

- HB413 Permitting NHDOT to deed over rail properties to municipalities. A hearing on 14 February before the Public Works and Highways. Morgan said this clarified when NHDOT may dispose of railroad property. Currently the department must retain title. [Interestingly, rail-to-trail advocates have just convinced the MBTA to stop selling unused rail corridors to municipalities. Editor]


NEW HAMPSHIRE CENTRAL
3 February, North Stratford. NHC IS STILL ACTIVELY MARKETING ITS TRACK NORTH OF COLUMBIA, said owner Ed Jeffrey. “We put 3800 ties between Columbia Sand and Gravel and Colebrook in 1997, and we sprayed the weeds last year. We’d have to do some brushcutting and maintenance, but hopefully, something will happen up there.”

MacIntyre fuel depot
Under construction since last autumn, Jeffrey said, “They’re shooting for fuel in the tanks by the end of February.” The North Stratford site, which MacIntyre Fuels leased from NHC [who in turn leases the entire corridor from NHDOT - editor], will contain three fuel tanks and a new 500-foot siding.

Local oil dealers wondered whether someone would approach them to use the facility, but that has not yet happened. Roch MacIntyre said his company has not yet begun to market the facility. “We’ll be putting fuel through that terminal that will be owned and marketed by a large wholesaler, Sprague. They’ll be doing the marketing when this thing is ready to rock and roll.” The fuel will come from Sprague’s South Portland facility [see 15 December 2000 Ports] and will move via the Safe Handling oil transload site in the East Deering section of Portland by SLR train.

NH RAILROADS
7 February, **UPDATE ON THE SOUTHERN SECTION** (that leased from NHDOT in January, formerly the NHVT):

- No STB filing by New Hampshire Central yet, said Kit Morgan. NHC needs to switch the operating rights from NHVT before it can begin service. {ANR&P discussion 7.Feb.01}

- Since no traffic is expected before spring, NHC’s Ed Jeffery let the tracks become a snowmobile trail from 1 January to 31 March. {Edith Tucker in Coos County Democrat 20.Dec.00}

**TWIN STATE RAILROAD**

1 February. **GUILFORD EMBARGOED THE ENTIRE LINE** effective 2 February, to all traffic from St.Johnsbury to Whitefield, because of track conditions. {AAR website, Consecutive Sheet 19}

[While TSRD holds the operating rights to the GRS-owned line, all traffic moves under GRS tariffs, and therefore GRS must act to embargo the traffic. *Editor]*

**FOR THE RECORD:**

**NEW HAMPSHIRE**

NHDOT has a big pile of ties to dispose of. Morgan said the department will not save them for the proposed Whitefield plant [see 15 December 2000].

“They’re not going to be ready soon enough; they still don’t have permits, and may not get them.” NHDOT promised to get move them out of Bartlett, and does not want to just move the unsightly pile to Whitefield to await construction of the disposal facility.

The department will pay Alternative Energy Inc, to take them away by truck. “We tried to move them by rail to Pennsylvania, but that became a logistical nightmare.” {ANR&P discussion Kit Morgan 7.Feb.01}

**VERMONT RAILROADS**

**AMTRAK - VERMONT**

**ALBANY-BENNINGTON-RUTLAND-BURLINGTON**

? February, Hoosick Branch. **AN UPDATE ON THE ABRB SERVICE** was provided by Sue Compton, VAOT’s rail program manager who is handling this project. On 31 January, VAOT, VRS, and Amtrak met to discuss this and other issues. Guilford was invited but did not attend.

Amtrak is tweaking its model times between Albany and Manchester.

**Speed of train**

Amtrak’s **Vermont Western Corridor Study - Phase II Engineering Report** looked at operating over 60 miles per hour, but concluded that improving the track to operate at higher speeds was not cost effective, due to the overall topography.

Amtrak concluded that schedule time would come to 112 minutes to run from Schenectady to Manchester, the stretch planned for inaugural service.

Eventually the service will reach Rutland, and then Burlington. Currently Amtrak’s **Ethan Allen** takes two hours and 17 minutes to run from Schenectady to Rutland. Service via the Hoosick branch would, Amtrak calculated, take two hours and 33 minutes.

**Cost of infrastructure improvements**

Amtrak figured improving Glenville Junction-Mechanicville would cost $0.96 million, Mechanicville to Hoosick Junction $3.90 million, Hoosick Junction-North Bennington $6.16 million, North Bennington to Manchester $11.85 million, and Manchester-Rutland $16.76 million.

**Use of D&H track**

[Amtrak already has trackage rights over the Schenectady-Glenville Junction section. It will need rights over the Glenville Junction-CPF478 section. *Editor.]*

**Use of Guilford track/Operating agreement**

Guilford and Amtrak do not yet have an operating agreement. However, the AOT-GRS agreement reached in late winter 2000 [see 21 March 2000 issue] permits Amtrak to start up right away, on the existing tracks between Schenectady and Hoosick Junction. AOT will spend up to $500,000 to repair the switch at Hoosick Junction.

Compton said the agreement envisions that during the initial period of operation the parties will conduct additional discussions about what is needed to improve the track.
PROPOSED ROUTE FOR ABRB
The service plans to use one trainset which would otherwise lay over in Albany for the day. The train would proceed west from Albany to Schenectady. Thereafter:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Track owned by</th>
<th>RRs using track</th>
<th>Existing track speed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Schenectady-Glenville Junction</td>
<td>CP (D&amp;H)</td>
<td>CP/Amtrak¹</td>
<td>30-50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glenville Junction - CPF478</td>
<td>CP (D&amp;H)</td>
<td>CP/GRS/NS/Amtrak²</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPF478 - Mechanicville</td>
<td>GRS/CP (D&amp;H)³</td>
<td>CP/GRS/NS</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mechanicville - Hoosick Junction</td>
<td>GRS (B&amp;M)</td>
<td>GRS</td>
<td>30-40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hoosick Junction - North Bennington</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>(³VRS)</td>
<td>OOS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Bennington - Manchester</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>VRS</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Improvement of Hoosick branch
Compton is currently handling the agreement for track upgrades this summer. In summer 2000 ties were installed and the rail is being delivered to the site over the winter. This construction season, AOT hopes to install the rail and get the ballast down. In addition, bridge work and signal work at the crossings will get done. {ANR&P discussion Susan Compton 7.Feb.01}

GRS - VERMONT
31 January, Montpelier. Guilford lost a Freedom of Information Complaint before the Superior Court of Washington County. According to the decision, GRS requested from VAOT the financial information its competitors had furnished when bidding in 2000 to operate the Wells River-White River section of track. Apparently several of the competitors intervened in this action, to request that AOT not be required to release the information.

The judge, Matthew Katz, noted: ‘Plaintiff railroad refused to submit its own financial information in responding to the Agency of Transportation’s request for proposal.’ The judge asked AOT to outline what information from the competitors it held, and AOT listed corporate financial data such as balance sheets, cash flow statements, revenue histories, assets and liabilities, and retained earnings. ‘For at least one of the competitors, the data included names of shippers, stockholder information, letters of reference including from shippers, staff and supervision information, potential shippers, target commodities, and plans for the Wells River White River junction service which was the reason for the request for proposal.’

Looking to Vermont’s Access to Public Records statute, the judge noted it had an exception for trade secrets, ‘including any compilation of information...known only to certain individuals within a commercial concern, and which gives its user or owner an opportunity to obtain business advantage over competitors who do not know it or use it....’

He decided that the information from competitors fell ‘comfortably within the concept of “compilation of information”, and dismissed Guilford’s complaint. ‘Were that not the conclusion, Vermont would be in a precarious position to request such information, and would therefore jeopardize its ability either to properly analyze responses to future requests for proposals, or to even obtain responses.’ {text of decision}

Both CDAC and GMRC provided sensitive financial information in support of their proposals. {e-mail to ANR&P from John Dunleavy, assistant attorney general at VAOT}

LAMOILLE VALLEY
8 February, Montpelier. The Vermont Rail Council Heard an Update on the RFPs. Catherine Dimitruk, executive director of the Northwest Regional Planning Commission in St. Albans, said the Mountain Valley Consortium, heading the effort to establish usage of the rail corridor, has agreed with AOT’s Contract Administration Division to get the RFP out by 20 February. Contract Administration will receive the replies and pass them on to the Consortium.

The Consortium will then make its recommendation to AOT within 45 days [first week in May?], assuming that it has the information it needs to make a decision.

¹ Amtrak already uses this section for its Adirondack service to Montreal.
² GRS uses this section to reach Mohawk Yard. To reach Rotterdam Junction from CPF478, GRS uses its own track.
³ GRS and CP (D&H) co-own this section.
⁴ VRS leases this section from the state, but is not yet running trains. VRS has no current plans to run freight trains, and would use the line only to maintain it for Amtrak service.
Senate Transportation Committee
During a January presentation to the Committee by Brad Worthen, of the Vermont Rail Link which wants to restart rail, committee members stated they wanted the recommendation before the General Assembly session ends in the spring so that they could play a role, if necessary, in the selection.

Dimitruk said the Consortium would do what it could to meet that deadline. “However, we are not going to lessen the process to meet that goal.” {ANR&P discussion 12.Feb.01}

FOR THE RECORD:
VERMONT

MOVING BURLINGTON RAIL YARD. According to Sue Compton, AOT’s rail program manager, consultant VHB has been asked to look at options to move the yard. No site has yet been chosen. 

******

MOVING THE RUTLAND RAIL YARD. The city has a preferred site, just south of the existing site. The city redevelopment office has the lead for the project, and has received $120,000 to move to the next phase, Compton said. {ANR&P discussion 7.Feb.01}

ATLANTIC NORTHEAST PORTS

CONNECTICUT PORTS - OVERALL
8 February. ConnDOT IS DOING A REGIONAL STUDY ON THE BARGE FEEDER FACILITY which would handle containers from New York Harbor, said Gerald Jennings, who handles the Office of Intermodal Planning. Bridgeport, New Haven, and New London are each getting studies done by consultants through their Metropolitan Planning Organizations [see below].

The state study has reached draft form, and is undergoing internal review. The study should show where one facility would best be located from a regional, feasibility perspective. Jennings expected the study done by 15 March, when ConnDOT would submit it to the legislature. {ANR&P discussion}

BRIDGEPORT
The study on the barge feeder service by Transport Management Associates is done, under the auspices of the Greater Bridgeport Regional Planning Agency. James Wong of the agency has the report. [It did not reach your editor in time to supply details for this issue.]

NEW HAVEN
The effort to reconstruct rail access to the port is enmeshed with several other planning efforts: a reconfiguration of vehicle traffic flows, the rebuild of the Q (I-95) bridge, the rebuild of the Tomlinson (US Route One) Bridge, the study of barging containers from New York to a Connecticut port, the re-use of a city parcel in the port area, access to the East Shore Park, and the possible elimination of the power transmission towers.

OVERALL PORT COORDINATION
8 February, New Haven. ALL THE PIECES ARE COMING TOGETHER TOWARD A MAJOR PORT IMPROVEMENT. The city’s Henry Fernandez III, economic development administrator, has the lead in ensuring that the pieces make sense. Karen Gilvarg AIA, executive director of the City of New Haven Planning Office, is also working on the pieces as ‘more of a project coordinator’ and described the situation thus:

‘This is a very exciting time for the Port of New Haven. The City and the other government entities involved in transportation planning, the SCRCOG and the State DOT have been in almost daily communication with the various port land owners and services. We are all trying to maximize the opportunities presented by the major re-building of the I-95 corridor through New Haven. Our port is a truly multi-modal center at the nexus of Interstates, deep-water berths, and rail lines. The port operators have really stepped up to the plate in terms of giving very generously of their time and expertise and have spoken with candor about their constraints and concerns.’

The City Plan Department recently submitted an application for a federal grant (TSCP) to look at some of the longer-range port issues. {e-mail to ANR&P from Gilvarg}

BARGE FEEDER SERVICE
23 February. A FINAL MEETING ON THE BARGE FEEDER STUDY is scheduled for this day, according to Judy Gott, executive director for the South Central Council of Governments (SCCOG). Her organization, composed of the municipalities in the New Haven region, as well as the federal and state government, sponsored the consultant study by Frederic G. Harris of New York.

Preliminary results
The draft of the study indicated that a barge feeder service could take 20,000 trucks off I-95 between Stamford and New Haven in the first year, and 50,000 by the third year.

The potential schedule called for a daily barge of 160 containers in each direction five days a week, with the trip taking 11 hours. At full usage, that would move 83,200 containers a year, with the split 41,600 loaded northbound, 12,500 loaded southbound, and 29,100 empty southbound.

A subsidy would get the service going. Consultant Frederic Harris figured that at a volume of 5,000 per year, each container on barge would cost $1,280. Each truck move costs $680 now. But at a volume of 25,000, the barge move costs only $600/container. To reach the level of 25,000 containers in five years would require an operating subsidy of $5 million.

Necessary startup costs
Harris proposed acquiring six yard tractors, two harbor cranes, 4 reach stackers, and 100 chassis at an estimated cost of $2 million. [That amount of equipment sounded high to me, but according to Jack Humeniuk of P&O Ports in Portland, would be
The idea put forward by Marty Tristine of Logistec and studied by Q-BRIDGE: ACCESS TO PORT in the summer of 2001. {www.I95newhaven.com} analysis and preliminary design. Final design is scheduled to start completion due 2010. Now undergoing environmental impact Q-BRIDGE ITSELF.

The company now has a warehouse there it is New Haven Terminal’s North Yard for the seven-acre container storage site. The company now has a warehouse there it is considering selling [see 00#21]. {www.I95newhaven.com} Rebuild of the Route 1 bridge over the same river (the Tomlinson Bridge itself). Dredging will most likely be required.”

What’s next Following the meeting on 23 February, and approval by the board of SCRCOG, the barge recommendation will go forward to state government. Gott said COG will seek the $8 million in the next round of funding.

“That money will fund the pilot project. If container barge service is successful, at the end of three years we will need to make more improvements to enlarge the land area as well as the docking area. Dredging will most likely be required.”

How does this fit in with the other projects? Adding a container facility to the port must fit in with the other projects affecting it, mostly involving the reconstruction of the I-95 bridge over the Quinnipiac River (the Q-bridge project) and the rebuild of the Route 1 bridge over the same river (the Tomlinson Bridge project).

Gott said, “All the pieces are coming together. The city and property owners are meeting and making progress. Our organization, the federal government, and the state are holding meetings regarding rail access. We’re meeting with the Department of Environmental Protection about new dredging areas, and so forth.” {ANR&P discussion with Judy Gott  8.Feb.01}

One possible site Marty Tristine, head of Logistec Connecticut, said he is advocating New Haven Terminal’s North Yard for the seven-acre container storage site. The company now has a warehouse there it is considering selling [see 00#21]. {ANR&P discussion 9.Feb.01}

Q-BRIDGE ITSELF Completion due 2010. Now undergoing environmental impact analysis and preliminary design. Final design is scheduled to start the summer of 2001. {www.I95newhaven.com}

Q-BRIDGE: ACCESS TO PORT The stakeholders are endorsing the idea put forward by Marty Tristine of Logistec and studied by Greiner to redo the access road for the port off I-95 [see 00#21]. Greiner accepted the new location of the access road, but not the idea of eliminating through traffic on Waterfront Street.

Q-BRIDGE: RESITING SUPPORT PIERS Karen Gilvarg suggested re-siting the eastern piers of the Q-bridge to provide some working space underneath. At this point, the space under the bridge is given over to access roads.

Tristine commented: “We would elevate the roadway higher than initially planned, back as far as Stiles Street [the existing Stiles Street southbound on-ramp would close]. The use of land would go to Gateway rather than Logistec,” but Tristine was not envious. “Land infrastructure is critical for improving the port.” The land could be used for port purposes or tank farm purposes (but not for storing anything flammable).

The elevation would cost about $10 million additionally, but Tristine characterized that as not large within the context of the current Q-bridge project.

MOVING TANK FARMS OFF THE WATERFRONT In the long-term, New Haven is looking at moving the tank farms off the waterfront. [See 00#21.]

New Haven Terminals inland tank farm Tristine related that New Haven Terminals has a 65-acre facility 1.25 miles away on I-95 near exit 51. The site already contains tanks holding 1.7 million barrels and served by two 16-inch pipelines, and could easily hold many more. “I don’t know if we could site every storage tank now in the port area, but we could easily move there the tanks now on New Haven Terminal’s waterfront site.”

So why not do that right now and get some additional handling space? “Putting a warehouse where the tanks now sit would make our operation much more cost-effective, and by reducing our costs make Connecticut shippers more competitive.” He’s now looking for funding to move the terminals, though he does not anticipate that happening in the near future.

New Haven Terminals sees one possible hitch: the potential need for environmental remediation. “We don’t know about pollution, but getting the site evaluated could cost $100,000.” Even if the current tank site is polluted, putting a warehouse on it would be a good use. “But we can’t go ahead and do that without the OK from [the Connecticut Department of Environmental Protection].” {ANR&P discussion Marty Tristine 9.Feb.01}

TOMLINSON BRIDGE ITSELF The original bridge carrying US Route One, since removed, provided rail as well as highway access to the port. The bridge rebuilding includes a transloading facility to the west of the Tomlinson Bridge [not often used -editor]. The project is paying for trucking to the transloading facility where the truck cargo is loaded onto rail cars. {http://www.fhwa.dot.gov/hep10/freight/lop.html]
Rail back next year

According to John Hanifin, project engineer for design at ConnDOT, the completion date slipped when the contractor changed, from 1999 to 30 June 2002 for entire project. Rail will return in much the same configuration. Single rail will run across the structure north of the roadbed on the same plane as the road, extending about 500 feet past the end of the bridge. ConnDOT will then emplace a switch for the spur down Waterfront Street and run track about 100 feet down that street. The ‘main line’ will continue along Forbes Avenue (Route One) about 300 feet, permitting restoration of rail to the North Yard as well. {ANR&P discussion 13.Feb.01}

PORT OWNERSHIP CHANGES

The Greiner study described some possible ownership changes. ‘The parcels of land now designated [by the city - editor] for the East Shore Parkway’ may be acquired by Logistec. The Westchester Motor Lines parcel may be acquired by Gateway Terminal. Additionally, a portion of the United Illuminating parcel may be sold to Transenergie, a subsidiary of Hydro Quebec.’

RAIL ACCESS

The rail line formerly ran down Waterfront Street. The City of New Haven had begun looking at where to relocate it, when Marty Tristine and others suggested redoing the entire traffic access for the port. Tristine wanted to end vehicle traffic on Waterfront Street and turn it over to rail use, Greiner suggested moving the rail line out to the proposed section of Stiles Street to be abandoned as soon as the line turns south. This would obviate the need to move the power transmission towers, and the need to take two pieces of private property.

The rail line could continue under I-95 and then turn south, but that would impact the highway overhead structures. {Greiner}

Lisa Bardon, city engineer, said the city is now looking at a track alignment along the lines of Greiner’s preferred option. {ANR&P discussion 8.Feb.01}

NEW LONDON

7 February. ConnDOT CONTINUES TO WANT THE CN PIER here [see 00#22]. Alan Stevens, the department’s maritime coordinator, said that a “review of the property by DOT led us to find it appropriate for acquisition, a good asset for water transportation.” ConnDOT must evaluate the question of any environmental remediation, and decide what a fair price is. The department has some leeway in the negotiation of terms of transaction.

Barge feeder study

While consultant Transportation Management Associates has completed the Bridgeport study [see above], and the consultant had the New London study as an add-on to the Bridgeport study, the New London study is not expected until 15 March. {ANR&P discussion Alan Stevens February 7, 2001}

HALIFAX

8 February. THE PORT AUTHORITY UNVEILED A DRAFT LONG-TERM LAND USE PLAN. Both the public hearing which took place this day, and the plan itself, are required by the Canada Marine Act. The plan shows the authority’s objectives and policies for property development and takes into account relevant social, economic, zoning, and environmental matters. The draft was prepared by the SGE Group of Halifax in conjunction with The Hardman Group of Halifax.

Expansion of Ceres, building of new terminal

“The major project we intend to undertake is the expansion of the Fairview Cove Terminal, and the building of a new terminal,” said Dennis Creamer, the authority’s vice-president of finance and administration. Fairview would expand north into land formerly occupied by the city dump.

As expected, the Port Authority hopes to build the new terminal at Rockingham Shores, adjacent to the CN rail yard there [see map in 1 December 2000 issue]. Creamer said although the authority had not yet approached CN formally, it hopes to acquire the waterfront property in the next year or two. CN might become a partner in the construction as CN did with the Halifax International Container Terminal.

Mark Hallman, spokesperson for CN, said his company would like to see another common-user terminal in Halifax, “but before we get to that stage there are various productivity measures that should be taken to maximize...the capacity of the existing terminals [see 12 January issue]. Changes in terms of operation, labour, things of that nature.” CN could also make changes to its train operations.

Other points

The plan envisions relinquishing the authority’s management responsibility for the North West Arm; and the acquisition of waterfront and other property at Shearwater CFB as it becomes available.

Next step

Under the Marine Act, the public has 60 days following public notice (which occurred in January) to comment on the plan. Creamer said any revision of, and the date of approval by the board of, the plan would depend on public input. “We hope to approve the plan in March.” {Tom Peters in Halifax Herald 9.Feb.01}

STRAIT OF CANSO

8 February. A TASK FORCE ON REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION HAS BEGUN to look at future needs, under the coordination of the Straits-Highland Regional Development Agency. Phil Macdonald, the executive director, linked the meeting to the existing and potential growth of industry associated with the natural gas and petroleum discoveries off Newfoundland and Nova Scotia.
The task force believes the Strait area has lots to offer industrial development: a location near the off-shore petroleum fields, large heavy-industry parks (1500 acres on east side of the strait, and 14,000 acres in the Melford Industrial Reserve on the west side), deep water in the harbor (92 feet limiting depth), and salt domes for storage. If industry locates in the region, it will want some transportation; the task force is looking at what is currently available, and what might be added.

Next steps
The task force has 13 different representatives:
- Cheryl Gallant, Exec. Director, Strait Area Chamber of Commerce
- Phil Macdonald, Exec. Director, Strait-Highlands RDA
- John Parker, Executive Director, Antigonish RDA
- Dan Gillis, Exec. Director, Guysborough County Develop. Agency
- Peter Touesnard, General Manager, CBCN
- Earl Williams, Manager, Port Hawkesbury Regional Airport
- Sam Murray, CAO, Town of Mulgrave Economic Development
- Alan Macdonald, Sr. Dev. Officer, Richmond Econ. Development
- Robert Carroll, Construction Manager, NSDOT
- Al England, Development Manager, Enterprise Cape Breton
- Albert Leblanc, Dev. Officer, Nova Scotia Dept. Econ. Development
- Bob Morgan, Dev. Officer, NS Comm. College, Strait Campus

It has decided on terms of reference, and tentatively selected a consultant: CBCL Limited Consulting Engineers and Project Managers, which has offices in Sydney, Halifax, and Port Hawkesbury. [www.cbcl.ca]

MacDonald believed that CBCL would start in a couple weeks. The province has already committed to some funding, as has the private sector. “We’re still looking for a federal contribution.”

The task force wants CBCL to respond in three months with a report which will establish some regional priorities for infrastructure development: “What is to be done, who is to do it” in road, rail, marine, and air over the long-term. CBCL will get input from private sector and industry people.

The task force will provide the report to the government. [ANR&P discussion 8.Feb.01]

SYDNEY
22 January. THE MUNICIPALITY MUST DECIDE WHETHER TO BUY the government wharf (Sydney Marine Terminal) here by the end of this month, said John MacDonald, chair of the Sydney Board of Trade’s transportation committee. Without a decision, Transport Canada, the current owner of the wharf, may decide to seek another buyer.

MacDonald believes Transport Canada is asking too high a price at $1.5 million, and not offering transition funds, as it did with the Strait of Canso [see above] and other facilities.

But Transport Canada spokesperson Paul Doucet described the wharf as in good repair. “The Sydney Marine Terminal has produced an average annual profit of $160,000 over the past three years.” [Tom Peters in Halifax Herald 23 Jan.01]