determined that it would be appropriate to explore strategic alternatives available to Emons, including a strategic acquisition or merger, a going private transaction, a sale of part or all of Emons, or repurchases of Common Stock.

The Board of Directors authorized management to engage Ferris, Baker Watts, Inc. (FBW) as Emons' financial advisor and to explore strategic alternatives with third parties. In November 1999, after GWI's expression of interest in acquiring Emons, Emons and GWI executed a confidentiality agreement to allow GWI to undertake due diligence activities regarding our business and operations. After conducting its initial due diligence, GWI made an oral offer to purchase all outstanding Common Stock at a proposed price of $4.10 per share in cash in December 1999.

After careful consideration of the proposal by our Board of Directors, management was authorized to negotiate an acquisition agreement with GWI. In February 2000, citing concern that an acquisition at the proposed purchase price would negatively affect GWI's stock price, GWI discontinued acquisition discussions with us.

In March 2000, the Board of Directors approved a stock repurchase program for Common Stock. From March 2000 through January 2001, we repurchased approximately 862,000 shares of Common Stock and warrants to purchase up to 50,000 shares of Common Stock under the program.

In November 2000, the Board of Directors again considered the strategic alternatives available to Emons and authorized FBW to explore such alternatives with selected railroad companies. FBW and management initiated contact with seven companies between November 2000 and March 2001.

In February 2001, as a result of these contacts, we received from a senior officer of a publicly traded American short line railroad company (Company A) an oral indication of interest to acquire all outstanding Common Stock at $2.26 per share to be paid in restricted stock of Company A. [Possibly Rail America. Editor]

After careful consideration of the proposal and consultation with FBW on various matters affecting the determination of a fair price, the Board of Directors directed management to advise Company A that we were prepared to have further discussions only if Company A was willing to offer consideration of cash or registered common stock at a higher price. Company A thereafter discontinued discussions with us.

In March 2001, also as a result of the contacts initiated by

---
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management and FBW, we received from the principal of a privately owned American short line railroad and railroad services company (Company B) an oral indication of interest to acquire all outstanding stock of our operating subsidiaries at an estimated net price to stockholders in the range of $3.36 to $3.83 per share. [I tentatively identify this as Progress Rail, which because of its substantial investment in the B&A System would consider Emons. Editor]

After careful consideration of the proposal and consultation with FBW, the Board of Directors authorized management to proceed with negotiations with Company B. Citing the reallocation of acquisition funds to another transaction, in April 2001, Company B discontinued acquisition discussions with us. [Possibly the B&A? Editor]

In August 2001, the president and chief executive officer of a privately-owned Canadian railroad company (Company C) contacted Robert Grossman, chair of the Board, president and chief executive officer of Emons, with an oral indication of interest to acquire all outstanding Common Stock at a price in the range of $1.48 to $2.04 per share in cash. [I tentatively identify Company C as CFQ, meaning Serge Belzile contacted Grossman. Editor] After management’s consideration of the proposal, Mr. Grossman advised Company C that we would be prepared to have further discussions if Company C was prepared to offer at least $3.00 per share.

In late August 2001, an Executive Vice President of GWI contacted FBW, indicating that GWI was again interested in discussing an acquisition of Emons. On October 18, 2001, Mr. Grossman, Scott F. Ziegler, Senior Vice President and Chief Financial Officer of Emons, and a representative of FBW met with the executive vice-president [Mark Hastings, executive vice-president for corporate development], the president [Charlie Marshall] and the chief financial officer [John Hellman] of GWI to continue discussions, and on that date we entered into a confidentiality agreement to allow GWI to undertake due diligence activities.

On October 23, 2001, the chief financial officer of GWI communicated to FBW an oral offer to acquire all outstanding Common Stock at $2.40 per share payable in cash and common stock of GWI. After consultation with FBW regarding various matters affecting the determination of a fair price, Mr. Grossman communicated to the chief financial officer of GWI that we were prepared to have further discussions if GWI was prepared to offer $2.50 to $3.00 per share in cash to acquire Emons.

On November 9, 2001, Mr. Grossman and Mr. Ziegler met with the chair of the board and chief executive officer [Mortimer Fuller III] and the chief financial officer of GWI, at which time such management of GWI offered to acquire Emons at $2.50 per share in cash. GWI’s management indicated that it had a substantial revolving credit facility through which it planned to finance the acquisition. In addition, GWI’s management indicated that it would require approximately one week to conduct due diligence of our business and operations and two weeks to prepare a definitive acquisition agreement.

On November 11, 2001, the president and chief executive officer of Company C [probably Serge Belzile - editor] made an oral indication of interest to acquire all outstanding Common Stock at a price in the range of $2.50 to $3.00 per share in cash. On November 14, 2001, after negotiations with us, the president and chief executive officer of Company C communicated to Mr. Grossman an offer to acquire Emons at $2.54 per share in cash in a transaction that would be subject to Company C’s ability to obtain financing and that would require at least one month for due diligence and preparation of a definitive acquisition agreement.

On November 15, 2001, the Board of Directors met to review and discuss the status of management’s discussions with GWI and Company C and the benefits and potential risks of remaining independent. In reviewing information with respect to remaining independent, the Board considered, based in part on the analyses of FBW presented at the meeting via teleconference, a range of possible values to stockholders that could potentially be achieved by remaining independent and realizing possible future earnings. In this regard, the Board considered the risks of remaining independent that could affect our ability to realize future earnings, including, but not limited to, volatility in the capital markets affecting our stock price, limited economic prospects for small, independent, short line railroads, management’s opinion that Common Stock was undervalued notwithstanding our stock repurchase program, and lack of capital to pursue other strategic alternatives.

Based on its review of these factors, the Board of Directors determined that the best interests of our stockholders would be served by selling Emons. 7 On November 19, 2001, the Board of Directors met via teleconference to review and discuss the substance of the two proposals. In reviewing information with respect to the two proposals, the Board considered factors affecting the value represented by the merger, including, but not limited to, the analyses and assessments of the proposals presented by FBW, the contingency relating to Company C’s ability to secure financing for the transaction, the proposed due diligence periods of GWI and Company C and the effect of each on our operations, and the request of GWI that our directors sign an agreement to vote all shares of Common Stock beneficially owned by them in favor of the merger.

Based on its review and consideration of these factors, the Board of Directors determined that the best interests of our stockholders would be served by entering into an acquisition transaction with GWI at the price of $2.50 per share, subject to preparation of an acceptable definitive acquisition agreement. Representatives of Emons and GWI met via teleconference from November 20 through November 30, 2001 to negotiate and prepare a definitive acquisition agreement.

On the evening of December 2, 2001, the Board of Directors met via teleconference to consider a final form of the definitive acquisition agreement. At this meeting, the Board of Directors received the written opinion of FBW that as of that date the consideration to be received in the proposed merger with GWI was fair, from a financial point of view, to the holders of Common Stock. The Board considered this and the terms of the definitive acquisition agreement, including those terms that increased the likelihood that the transaction could close but that would otherwise discourage an offer by a third party, if any, that might be interested in acquiring Emons at a higher price, the fact that the transaction would be taxable to our stockholders, and the
economic interests in the transaction of Mr. Grossman and Mr. Ziegler, who are also directors of Emons.

After consideration of all these factors, the outside members of the Board of Directors unanimously approved the proposed merger and the definitive acquisition agreement and related matters, finding the proposed transaction to be in the best interests of Emons and its stockholders. Mr. Grossman and Mr. Ziegler recused themselves from the Board’s consideration of the merger and approval of the merger agreement because of their possible future employment with GWI and their entitlement to severance payments upon consummation of the merger. In addition, six of the seven directors signed the voting agreement as requested by GWI. See "THE MERGER-Interests of Certain Persons in the Merger." Emons and GWI executed the definitive acquisition agreement on December 3, 2001 and publicly announced the transaction.

The full text of the FBW opinion, which sets forth the assumptions made, procedures followed, matters considered and limits on the review undertaken, is attached as appendix c to the proxy and may be viewed on Emons’ website in the ‘Investors’ section.

Grossman and Ziegler get termination payments and employment contracts
Subject to further discussions and negotiation following the close of the merger, Robert Grossman, chair of the board, president and chief executive officer of Emons, may enter into an employment arrangement with GWI whereby Mr. Grossman would become an employee of GWI in an executive capacity. Also, subject to further discussions and negotiation following the close of the merger, Scott F. Ziegler, Senior Vice President and Chief Financial Officer of Emons, may enter into an employment arrangement with GWI whereby Mr. Ziegler would become an employee of GWI in a financial management capacity.

In addition, upon consummation of the merger, GWI has agreed to guarantee a payment to each of Mr. Grossman and Mr. Ziegler in the amount provided for in Emons’ employment agreement with Mr. Grossman and Emons’ change in control agreement with Mr. Ziegler, which they would have otherwise been entitled to receive upon their termination of employment following a change of control of Emons. Pursuant to the merger agreement, GWI is also obligated to provide certain indemnification to the present and former directors and officers of Emons and to maintain, subject to specified limitations, the directors’ and officers’ liability insurance policies currently maintained by Emons. See “THE MERGER-Interests of Certain Persons in the Merger.” {text of proxy from Emons website}

PROPANE BY RAIL
10 January. PRICING OF PROPANE FROM SARNIA HAS Affected RAILCAR DELIVERY for some distributors, but not for others.

The pricing change
Up until 2001, Canadian suppliers in the Sarnia market used US prices, which employ “Mont Belvieu pricing”, named for the propane in Mont Belvieu, Texas. The Sarnia suppliers now use their own posted prices for the railcar shipments.

Because the Mont Belvieu prices have a futures market, but the Sarnia prices do not, propane distributors could not limit their risk. The change meant a good deal of contracted supply out of Canada had to be replaced as retailers in the Northeast and Mid-Atlantic states, who in the past relied on Canadian railcars for a portion of their supply, had to find other sources for their propane. Because of the increase in price, the Sarnia market is really now a secondary supply source based on spot sales rather than contract deals. {Pete Ottman in BPN Online Magazine 11.01}

The sourcing change
When contracts were written for the upcoming year (propane contracts typically last a year), some distributors declined to use Sarnia deliveries because they could not limit their risk, and switched to imported propane.

For example, the Eastern Propane facility in Rochester, NH, which had received propane from Sarnia via the New Hampshire North Coast Railroad, is now getting imported propane via the Sea-3 facility in Portsmouth, New Hampshire.

Not everyone has switched
Tom Long, a spokesperson for Duke Energy [see 24 October 2001 issue], said deliveries to its distribution facilities in New England continued to come from Sarnia. Duke does not own any production at Sarnia, but does rank as a large producer there. “The price change created enough uncertainty that some people looked to other sources. But at the end of the day a lot are going back to their original sources, because of better economics.”

Ed Foley of SLR, which hosts one of the Duke distribution facilities, confirmed that his facility had seen no dramatic falloff in railcar deliveries. “They’re still coming from Sarnia.” And Jon Lasko, head man at PVRR, which hosts another Duke propane facility, said he had seen no drop either.

Moreover, Rymes Heating Oils facility in Claremont NH has not suffered either [see New Hampshire].

But more gas comes by sea
Michael Tracey, vice-president of marketing at Sea-3, said the pricing change meant marketers and dealers had used the other sources of supply: his terminal, the Texas Eastern Products Pipeline Company (TEPPCO) head at Selkirk, New York, or the Duke Energy Terminal in Providence, Rhode Island.

Sea-3 imports from Norway and Algeria, and has had an
increase in traffic, an increase which the terminal has the capacity to absorb. It also receives gas from Sarnia via rail—"some, not a lot" said Tracey—in the summer when prices are low. All deliveries—with a "very, very rare exception" of rail—are made by truck.

"This may all change in the next contract," cautioned Tracey. Sarnia suppliers could return to the Mont Belvieu system, for example.

Is traffic increasing at Providence?
Long said he could not tell because Duke only began using the Providence facility in May. It belongs to, and is operated by, TEPPCO. In 2001, TEPPCO put the use of the facility out to bid. Duke won the use; Amerigas had used the facility prior to May 2001.

Duke facilities
Duke recently began using its newest New England facility, on NECR in the wye at Montpelier Junction [see 24 October 2001 issue]. Originally the Montpelier facility, Duke changed the name to Berlin facility, since it actually lies in the Town of Berlin. It can hold 120,000 gallons.

Long said that Duke used many facilities across New England so that the customer (a distributor, usually) did not need to drive long distances, or could drive from one facility to the next in a circuit. "We have improved the distribution, and our customers can respond by lowering the price."

{ANR&P discussions 9.Jan.02}

CONNECTICUT

CONNECTICUT PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION
31 December, Hartford. SIX RECOMMENDATIONS FOR RAIL IMPROVEMENT were submitted to the governor and the legislature's Joint Standing Committee on Transportation by the Connecticut Public Transportation Commission [CPTC], out of a total of 12 recommendations. The CPTC is required by statute to submit such recommendations annually to the governor and legislature [see 12 January 2001 issue].

Commuter rail. The Commission repeated (3) its 2001 recommendation ‘that ConnDOT pursue the implementation of commuter rail service between New Haven, Hartford, and Springfield to meet the needs of commuters and other travelers in Connecticut's central corridor.’ CPTC applauded the Transportation Strategy Board for authorizing $2 million for a study of the commuter service. ‘A 12-18 month schedule is anticipated, with the study commencing in early 2002 and study results to be finalized in early to mid-2003.’

The CPTC also added three new commuter recommendations: (1) base the selection of a new commuter stop in West Haven or Orange on comprehensive analysis; (4) commending ConnDOT on its study of electrification of the Danbury branch; and (6) improve cleaning of Metro-North and Shore Line East passenger

Sidings to be constructed at Guilford
The FRA required that Amtrak, when building its high-speed Acela service, construct sidings at various locations along the Northeast Corridor to mitigate impacts to other Corridor users. Amtrak has delayed construction of one such siding, at Guilford CT, beyond the current date of 20 June 2001. In recommendation (2), CPTC again asked the FRA to urge Amtrak to use some unexpended funds to build these sidings. [See more detail in 2001 recommendations.]

Participation in the Mid-Atlantic Rail Operations Study
A group of five states (Virginia, Maryland, Pennsylvania, Delaware, and New Jersey), three railroads (Amtrak, NS, and CSX), and the I-95 coalition recently put together ‘Briefing Paper v2.2’ which recommends spending $5.7 billion over the next twenty years to improve freight rail operations. CPTC recommended (5) that Connecticut participate in this study ‘without further delay.’

CPTC became aware of this Study through Commission member Richard Carpenter, who sits on the East of Hudson Rail Freight Task Force, chaired by US Representative Jerrold Nadler (D, NY).

Rail people on the Commission
GRS executive vice-president David Fink and former Connecticut Central president Russell St.John belong, as well as rail commuter Eric Bosch. {CPTC 2001 Annual Report and Recommendations}

Next step
The commissioner of transportation is required to provide written responses to these recommendations by 1 February.

MASSACHUSETTS

BOSTON
10 January. THE FIRST SHIP OF THE COSCO ALLIANCE WILL CALL IN MARCH [see 19 November 2001 issue]. Yang Ming, COSCO, and "K" Line will begin operate the weekly service using a dozen 3,800-TEU ships that will operate in pendulum service between Asia, the U.S. East Coast and the Mediterranean.

"Both Yang Ming's U.S. East Coast scope and our transit times will be significantly enhanced with this newest service. Boston to Valencia will now take only eight days, and Hong Kong to Boston only 28 days," said Spring C.C. Wu, president of Solar International, Yang Ming's U.S. general agent.

Port rotation for the new service is: Shanghai, Yantian, Hong
Kong, Charleston, Norfolk, New York, Boston, Valencia, Naples, Genoa, Barcelona, New York, Norfolk, Charleston, Tokyo, Qingdao and Shanghai [rotation differs slightly from that issued in November - editor]. {Chris Dupin in Joc Online 10.Jan.02}

**Boston statement**

Michael Leone, Massport maritime director, wrote: ‘The first COSCO ship, the Zhen He Voyage 101 E will arrive in Boston on March 21 from its last Asian port, Hong Kong. The transit time from Hong Kong to Boston will be 27 days, an extremely competitive transit time, and a good alternative to rail landbridge. COSCO, Yang Ming, and K Line are now taking bookings for inbound and outbound sailings. Because of vessel time constraints, COSCO, Yang Ming and “K” Line will not be able to offer inbound service to Boston from the Mediterranean.

In addition to its weekly inbound service from Asia, COSCO, Yang Ming and K Line will offer weekly outbound service to the Mediterranean. From the Mediterranean, COSCO will offer relay service to Singapore, Hong Kong, Shanghai and other Southeast Asia and China ports; Piraeus, Salonika, Istanbul, Izmir, Haifa, and Ashdod.; and Livorno, La Spezia, Fos, Lagos, Tema, and Abidjan. {Massport letter to customers 10.Jan.02}

**PROVIDENCE & WORCESTER**


Purchase of a 75,000-square-foot former wire mill on nine acres off Dana Road in Oxford plus an adjacent 25 acres has been completed at a cost of $2.5 million, according to Norman D. Sirk and Richard A. Seder, TI Logistics principals. The project will cost a total of $12 million. The warehouses will have 50 trailer-truck bays and 12 rail docks, served by PW’s line from Worcester to Groton.

**Financing**

Webster Five Cents Savings Bank, TI Logistics’ lender, is financing the project, Sirk said. Oxford is part of the South Central Economic Target Area, so the project is eligible for tax increment financing and a 5% investment tax credit from the state, which the company will seek.

**Current rail use**

TI Logistics operates three businesses at 66 Atlas Street (east of downtown at Lake Quinsigamond) in Worcester: SonS Transportation Co. Inc., with 80 tractors and 250 trailers, which Sirk heads; Sack Storage Corporation, a 175,000-square-foot warehouse along a CSX rail spur, which Seder heads, and Transportation Concepts Inc., a transportation services business. Sack’s 40 warehouse and trucking customers are dominated by container and paper makers. Seder said the company does about 1500 carloads a year.

**New rail site**

The Oxford site, located south of the Massachusetts Turnpike between I-395 and Route 12 on Dana Road, will have a PW spur once the facility is completed in 2003. TI Logistics will have 550,000 square feet of warehouse space and 100 employees within five years. Sales are projected to rise from $16 million to $20-22 million, Sirk said.

The Oxford expansion will give TI Logistics more room and new potential markets, such as beer and wine, food, wire, and consumer products, the men hope, as they sell warehouse and trucking services to companies in Connecticut and Rhode Island that like the convenience of rail and want to outsource their transportation and warehouse needs. According to Sirk: “We believe we can gain market share, and we are. There are a lot of potential customers who are manufacturers, and in this environment they want to outsource warehousing and distribution and management of their transportation. That is where the growth is: getting customers to use third-party logistics to get their goods to market on time.” {Andi Eposito in WorcesterTelegram 11.Jan.02}

Seder said on 15 January that PW was “very proactively involved” in creating the new site. It had no public warehouses on line in Connecticut, and hopes to capture some business now coming by truck, and some not yet happening. Potential customers, in Canada and elsewhere, had told the railroad that they would like to do business with PW if it had a transload for Connecticut business. **{ANR&P discussion}**
NEW HAMPSHIRE

NHDOT - SALT CONTRACTS

19 October, Concord. THE DEPARTMENT BIDS SALT CONTRACTS IN SIX DISTRICTS, and for both rock salt and solar salt (evaporated salt) in each district. All salt arrives via ship to Portsmouth or Newington.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District</th>
<th>rock salt provider</th>
<th>rock salt pile location</th>
<th>solar salt</th>
<th>solar salt pile</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Northern NH</td>
<td>Granite State Minerals</td>
<td>Portsmouth proprietary</td>
<td>Eastern</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Granite State Minerals</td>
<td>Granite State</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Granite State Minerals</td>
<td>Morton</td>
<td>Newington*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>International Salt</td>
<td>Portsmouth Marine Terminal</td>
<td>Granite State</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5#</td>
<td>Granite State Minerals</td>
<td>Portsmouth proprietary</td>
<td>Morton</td>
<td>Newington*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Southern NH#</td>
<td>International Salt</td>
<td>Portsmouth Marine Terminal</td>
<td>Morton</td>
<td>Newington*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*This pile is operated by Sprague.

# District five bid applies to central Turnpike locations, and District six bid to eastern Turnpike locations.

Prices for rock salt ranged from $39.31 in district one to $30.97 in district six, for solar salt $41.75 in district one to $32.18 in district six.

{ANR&P discussion with Steve Gray, NHDOT Highway Maintenance}

Past salt deliveries

Until five years ago, New England Southern Railroad delivered salt to a facility in Bow, now used by Ciment Québec. Peter Dearness, NEGS principal, said his railroad began receiving salt from International Salt and then Akso-Nobel, a supply which peaked at about 1500 cars before the mine in New York collapse [see American Rock Salt in 6 December 2001 issue]. Barrett operated the Bow facility, which had about 100 carloads left (belonging to Cargill) when Ciment bought it. {ANR&P discussion 14.Jan.02}

In northern New Hampshire, SLR delivered salt to West Milan up until 1999-2000, peaking at about 1000 carloads [see 7 November 2001 issue].

RHODE ISLAND

QUONSET POINT/DAVISVILLE

11 January. GOVERNOR ALMOND FILED FOR PERMITS TO DEVELOP A CONTAINER PORT HERE. His cover letter stated in part: ‘Container terminal development at Quonset Davisville has been considered by the State for over 25 years. Now is the appropriate time to utilize the full, fair, and open process of the regulatory offices of the federal and state government to manage the development of the scope of issues to be examined and the impact resulting from the comparison of the appropriate alternatives to be considered in this process.

‘We believe that the consideration of a compact container terminal development at Quonset Davisville, with a footprint of under 200 acres, can be economically feasible and accomplished within the numerous development principles that have been considered by the State and interested parties over the years. Accordingly, the applications and the supporting documentation show that a compact container terminal at Quonset Davisville will generate economic benefits which fulfill a variety of needs of the
State and the region, while the preparation of the channel and waterfront infrastructure appears to have manageable impacts on the environment.'

Environmental Impact Statement Process
The press release continued: ‘The State’s application to the Department of the Army seeks permits under three programs: the Marine Protection Research and Sanctuaries Act, the Clean Water Act, and the Rivers and Harbors Act, which will trigger the need for an EIS (Environmental Impact Statement) under a provision of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA).

The EIS must evaluate 1) the purpose and need of a proposed project, including economic feasibility and a cost/benefit analysis; 2) the environmental impacts of the proposed action; 3) any adverse environmental effects that cannot be avoided should the proposal be implemented; 4) alternatives to the proposed action that must include use and location alternatives and 5) any irreversible and retrievable commitments of resources (human and natural environmental) which would be involved should the project be implemented, including consideration of mitigation.

The EIS process includes:

Scoping – a process which commences only after a widely-distributed notice. The scoping process identifies all of the issues to be analyzed during the EIS process and occurs with broad public participation.

Draft EIS – a draft study is released for extensive public comment, after extensive public notice.

Final EIS – a final document is issued after considering the public comment on the draft.

Record of decision - record of decision is published to memorialize the government’s acceptance of the EIS.’

Development Alternatives
‘Section Four of the application support document sets forth the state’s proposed action which is a compact container terminal of approximately 200 acres. The state suggests two alternative locations for the proposed terminal – at Quonset or at Davisville, on either side of Fry’s Cove without filling it. Either the Quonset Alternative or the Davisville Alternative would require a channel depth of 50 feet, handle up to 1.2 million containers annually, and provide 11,700 in induced and direct jobs.

‘Section Six of the application discusses alternatives to port development and notes that with the exception of the no-build alternative, each proposal would require some degree of channel/turning basin improvements and attendant dredging. Since many of the alternatives contain similar port developmental ideas, the 18 port developmental alternatives are grouped into four categories: No Commercial Port; Regional/Niche Port; Small/Efficient Container Port; and Large/Mega Ports. [These were earlier laid out in consultant work–see 26 February 1999 issue.]

‘In addition to the Quonset and Davisville proposed action alternatives, the application also recommends that the regulators analyze a revised North Kingstown Omni Port alternative.

‘Section 14 identifies economic benefits to the state, in addition to jobs, including lease payments, income and property taxes, and transportation savings.

‘The State of Rhode Island’s application to the Army Corps of Engineers and CRMC is available on the Governor’s website, http://www.gov.state.ri.us/ .

Still no assigned operator
[As stated in June 2001–see 15 June 2001 issue: No developer has come forward with a specific port proposal. Rather, Almond hopes to lure a developer by beginning the environmental impact statement and permit application process, thereby showing that Rhode Island is serious about a container port project. An earlier effort by developer Quonset Point Partners was rejected by Almond–see 13 March 2001 issue.]

North Kingstown Omni Port alternative
According to the permit application: ‘A revised Omni Port development alternative was presented in the Town’s October 2000 presentation. In this report the Town’s port development goals were to: (a) Maximize jobs and economic benefit from Quonet Davisville (b) Avoid, minimize, mitigate environmental impacts (c) Minimize local/state development costs.

‘This proposed port development alternative, illustrated in Figures 6-6 and 6-7, called for developing 210 acres of the existing Davisville site as the commercial port. No new berths would be built, but the existing berths at piers 1 and 2 would serve as berthing for container, break bulk, and RoRo cargoes (i.e. autos). An 80-acre area of the site would be available for container and intermodal rail storage.’ {page 85}

Opposition to the Almond move
Recently, opponents of the proposed port said Almond's administration should halt expensive [The legislature appropriated $1.5 million for the studies–see 3 July 2001 issue] studies for the project in light of the state's emerging budget crisis. "When the governor is slashing affordable housing and the budget is tight, it's folly to put any more money into trying to develop this losing proposition," Sarah Kite, conservation organizer for the Sierra Club's Rhode Island chapter said recently.

{Providence Journal 11 Jan. 02}
QUÉBEC /MARITIMES

SAINT JOHN

9 January. THE PORT HANDLES 20,000 TO 25,000 TONNES OF FISH MEAL each year. Montréal-based UM Canada’s feed ingredients division head, Murray Innes, said the fish meal is sold to fish-feed manufacturers in Charlotte County, among which could be Moore Clark in Bayside [see map in 3 November 2000 issue]. The fish feed makes up 30-50% of fish meal.

The company brings in four or five ships with about 5,000 tonnes on each load to Shed 12 on the west side of Saint John’s main harbor. Nearly all is trucked to Charlotte County, where three thousand work in salmon farming, New Brunswick’s biggest agriculture and seafood export with $200 million in annual sales.

Three times in the last two years UM Canada has loaded railcars with the fish meal for shipment to Vancouver, as shown in the December issue of Port Progress.

Containers too

Innes said that UM Canada also brings in at Halifax containers of fish meal for users in Québec and Ontario who take considerably less than the Charlotte County manufacturers. {ANR&P discussions with Saint John’s Betty MacMillan and Innes}
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