

FINAL ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT

DOCKET NO. FD 36727

CSX Transportation, Inc.—Acquisition and Operation—Rail Line of Meridian & Bigbee Railroad, L.L.C.

DOCKET NO. FD 36732

Canadian Pacific Kansas City Limited and the Kansas City Southern Railway Company, D/B/A CPKC – Acquisition and Operation – Certain Rail Line of Meridian & Bigbee Railroad, L.L.C.

in Montgomery, Lowndes, Dallas, Wilcox, Marengo and Choctaw Counties, Alabama and Lauderdale County, Mississippi.



Information Contacts:

Diana Wood & Elizabeth Webster

Surface Transportation Board
Office of Environmental Analysis
395 E St SW
Washington, D.C. 20423
202.934.0388/202.360.0742



This page intentionally left blank



Washington, DC 20423
Office of Environmental Analysis

May 3, 2024

Re: **Docket No. FD 36727**, CSX Transportation, Inc.—Acquisition and Operation—Rail Line of Meridian & Bigbee Railroad, L.L.C.

Docket No. FD 36732, Canadian Pacific Kansas City Limited – Acquisition and Operation – Rail Line of Meridian & Bigbee Railroad, L.L.C; **Issuance of Final Environmental Assessment**

Dear Reader:

The Surface Transportation Board's (Board) Office of Environmental Analysis (OEA) is pleased to provide you with this Final Environmental Assessment (EA) consisting of an Errata and a Response to Comments on the Draft EA. The EA assesses the potential environmental impacts of CSX Transportation Inc.'s (CSXT) request to acquire and operate the assets comprising the rail line of Meridian & Bigbee Railroad, L.L.C. (MNBR) that runs approximately 93.7 miles between Burkville, Alabama, and Myrtlewood, Alabama, in Lowndes, Dallas, Wilcox and Marengo Counties and Canadian Pacific Kansas City Limited's (CPKC) request to acquire from MNBR and to operate approximately 50.4 miles of rail line between Meridian, Mississippi, and Myrtlewood (collectively, Proposed Transactions). According to CSXT and CPKC, authorization and implementation of the Proposed Transactions would create a direct interchange between CSXT and CPKC at Myrtlewood that would expand shipping options for CSXT and CPKC for intermodal, automotive, and other traffic moving between the Southeastern United States and the Southwestern United States or Mexico.

OEA prepared one EA under the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) (42 U.S.C. §§ 4321-4370m-11) and related environmental laws for both the CSXT and CPKC transactions and the CSXT-owned Burkville to Montgomery segment. The Final EA addresses the one comment received on the Draft EA, clarifies the recommended mitigation in the Draft EA, and sets forth OEA's final mitigation recommendations to the Board.

Issuance of the Final EA completes the environmental review in these proceedings. The Board will now issue final decisions on whether to authorize the Proposed Transactions.¹ In

¹ According to CPKC, its acquisition of the Western Line is contingent on CSXT's acquisition of the Eastern Line, and the CPKC transaction would only proceed if CSXT's transaction is authorized by the Board. If CSXT's transaction is authorized but CPKC's transaction is not, an environmental review of the Eastern Line would not be required.

making its final decisions, the Board will consider the entire record, including the information presented on the transportation merits, the Draft EA, Final EA, and all public and agency comments received. If the Board decides to authorize the Proposed Transactions, the Board may impose conditions on CSXT and CPKC as part of those decisions, including environmental mitigation conditions.

The Final EA is available for viewing and downloading on the Board's website at www.stb.gov. All information that has been filed with the Board can be found on the Board's website for both the CSXT and the CPKC transactions (Docket Nos. FD 36727 and FD 36732). OEA appreciates the efforts of all interested parties who have participated in this environmental review.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Danielle Gosselin". The signature is written in a cursive, flowing style.

Danielle Gosselin
Director
Office of Environmental Analysis

1. Introduction to Final EA

In Docket No. FD 36727, CSX Transportation, Inc. (CSXT) filed an application under 49 U.S.C. § 11323 with the Board to acquire and operate the assets comprising the rail line of Meridian & Bigbee Railroad, L.L.C. (MNBR) that runs approximately 93.7 miles between the cities of Burkville, Alabama, and Myrtlewood, Alabama, in Lowndes, Dallas, Wilcox and Marengo Counties (Eastern Line). In Docket No. FD 36732, Canadian Pacific Kansas City Limited on behalf of itself and its wholly owned subsidiary, The Kansas City Southern Railway Company (KCS) d/b/a CPKC (CPKC) filed an application under 49 U.S.C. § 11323 with the Board on the same day to acquire from MNBR and to operate approximately 50.4 miles of rail line between Meridian, Mississippi, and Myrtlewood (Western Line) (collectively, Proposed Transactions). CSXT and CPKC are collectively referred to as Applicants in this document.

On November 3, 2023, the Board accepted both applications for consideration in separate decisions.¹ In its decisions, the Board found that each of the Proposed Transactions are “minor” transactions under 49 C.F.R. § 1180.2, (c). The Board stated that, for expediency and efficiency, its Office of Environmental Analysis (OEA) would prepare one EA under the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) (42 U.S.C. §§ 4321-4370m-11) and related environmental laws for both the CSXT and CPKC Transactions. The Board explained that these transactions involve contiguous sections of the same rail line, that CPKC and CSXT each provided volume forecasts showing exceedance of the Board's thresholds for environmental review based on the scenario in which both transactions are authorized and implemented, the environmental impacts from both transactions are otherwise expected to be similar, and both applications were filed at the same time, allowing the environmental review of the two transactions to proceed simultaneously.²

OEA issued the Draft EA on March 18, 2024, for a 30-day public comment period. Typically, OEA issues a Final EA following the public comment period that considers and responds to all comments received on the Draft EA and makes any modifications necessary to the existing environmental analysis and the recommended mitigation. However, CEQ regulations contemplate that a Final EA can consist of an

¹ See CSX Transp., Inc.—Acquis. & Operation—Rail Line of Meridian & Bigbee R.R., (Decision No. 1), FD 36727 et al. (STB served Nov. 3, 2023) and Can. Pac. Kan. City Ltd.—Acquis. & Operation—Certain Rail Line of Meridian & Bigbee R.R. in Lauderdale Cnty., Miss. & Choctaw & Marengo Cntys., Ala., (Decision No. 1), FD 36732 et al. (STB served Nov. 3, 2023). The applications and decisions in these proceedings are available on the Board’s website at www.stb.gov.

² See Decision No. 1, FD 36727 et al., slip op. at 2-4,13; Decision No. 1, FD 36732 et al., slip op. at 2-4, 13.

errata where comments on the Draft EA are minor and make only factual corrections. See 40 C.F.R. § 1503.4 (addressing the use of errata where an EIS is prepared).

In this case, OEA received one comment from CSXT on the Draft EA requesting a change to OEA's recommended noise mitigation for the Eastern Line based on a clarification of the projected CSXT train traffic forecast on one mile of the White Hall to Burkville segment. Specifically, CSXT explained that 2.00 trains per day would run past receptor 30 in White Hall under the Proposed Transaction, rather than the originally projected 3.43 trains per day. Based on 3.43 trains per day, OEA had found receptor 30 to be severely impacted by noise (see Draft EA *Section 3.4.3*) and had included receptor 30 in recommended noise mitigation condition **MM Noise-01a**.

After receiving CSXT's comment, OEA re-ran its noise analysis and found that based on the current 2.00 trains per day traffic projection, there would be no noise impacts to receptor 30. Therefore, OEA has removed receptor 30 from recommended mitigation measure **MM-Noise-01a** in this Final EA.

Unrelated to CSXT's comment, OEA also made other clarifying changes to recommended mitigation measures **MM-Noise-01a** and **b** as discussed in more detail in the errata.

Because OEA only received one comment that led to factual changes to the Draft EA described above, OEA's Final EA consists of the attached errata sheet and response to CSXT's comment. The errata and the response to CSXT's comment should be read in conjunction with the Draft EA.

2. Errata to Draft EA

This errata sheet shows changes to the March 2024 Draft Environmental Assessment (Draft EA) based on CSXT’s comment and other clarifying changes. Deletions of text in the Draft EA are marked in red strikethrough and additions are marked in blue. Descriptions of the revisions to the Draft EA sections are underlined in the table below and the errata should be viewed in conjunction with the Draft EA.

Section/Table	Page(s)	Revision
<p>Table S-1 and Table 2.4-1</p>	<p>S-6, S-7 and 2-11, 2-12</p>	<p><u>OEA revised portions of the table in the Summary and in Chapter 2 describing the impacts of the Proposed Transactions to reflect updated results of the noise analysis and the environmental justice analysis based on CSXT’s comment:</u></p> <p><i>Noise and Vibration</i></p> <p style="text-align: center;">Proposed Transactions</p> <p>Number of receptors severely affected by noise: 11¹² Number of receptors moderately affected by noise: 162¹ OEA anticipates that noise from Proposed Transactions-related operations would severely impact a total of 121¹¹ noise receptors (5⁴ on the Eastern Line and 7 on the Western Line).</p> <p><i>Environmental Justice</i></p> <p style="text-align: center;">Proposed Transactions</p> <p>Percentage of adversely affected receptors in EJ populations census block groups 36⁴⁴% Percentage of adversely affected receptors in non-EJ populations census block groups 64⁵⁶% Based on OEA’s analysis ... more than half of the receptors that would experience adverse noise impacts are not in EJ block groups (approximately 64⁵⁶ percent).</p>
3.1.3	3-9	<p><u>OEA revised Section 3.1.3 in Chapter 3 of the Draft EA to reflect updated results of the grade crossing delay analysis based on CSXT’s comment:</u></p> <p>For 64⁶⁵ of the 96 grade crossings in the study area, average gate down time would increase as a result of the Proposed Transactions because the average length of trains would increase.</p>
3.4.1	3-26	<p><u>OEA revised Section 3.4.1 in Chapter 3 of the Draft EA to reflect updated results of the noise analysis based on CSXT’s comment:</u></p> <p>This resulted in recommended mitigation for a total of 12¹¹ receptors (5⁴ for CSXT and 7 for CPKC).</p>

Section/Table	Page(s)	Revision									
3.4.3, Table 3.4-2	3-32	<p><u>OEA revised portions of Section 3.4.3 and Table 3.4-2 in Chapter 3 of the Draft EA to reflect updated results of the noise analysis based on CSXT’s comment:</u></p> <p>Overall, there are 27³³ receptors that would be adversely impacted by horn noise resulting from the Proposed Transactions of which 4¹⁰ are on the Eastern Line and 23 are on the Western Line.</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="443 428 1551 639"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="443 428 814 480">Rail Segment</th> <th data-bbox="814 428 1184 480">Moderate Impact</th> <th data-bbox="1184 428 1551 480">Severe Impact</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="443 480 814 565">Burkville, AL to White Hall, AL (Eastern Line)</td> <td data-bbox="814 480 1184 565">Residence: 4 Place of Worship: 1</td> <td data-bbox="1184 480 1551 565">Residence: 4⁵</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="443 565 814 639">Totals</td> <td data-bbox="814 565 1184 639">Residence: 16²⁰ Place of Worship: 1</td> <td data-bbox="1184 565 1551 639">Residence: 11²</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>The data in Table 3.4-2 shows that 27³³ receptors would be exposed to 65 DNL associated with the Proposed Transactions as well as with an increase of 3 dBA or greater. These receptors would be adversely impacted by the Proposed Transactions. Of those 27³³ receptors, 11² (4⁵ for CSXT and 7 for CPKC) would experience severe noise impacts based on FTA classifications.</p>	Rail Segment	Moderate Impact	Severe Impact	Burkville, AL to White Hall, AL (Eastern Line)	Residence: 4 Place of Worship: 1	Residence: 4 ⁵	Totals	Residence: 16 ²⁰ Place of Worship: 1	Residence: 11 ²
Rail Segment	Moderate Impact	Severe Impact									
Burkville, AL to White Hall, AL (Eastern Line)	Residence: 4 Place of Worship: 1	Residence: 4 ⁵									
Totals	Residence: 16 ²⁰ Place of Worship: 1	Residence: 11 ²									
3.4.3 and 4.5.1	3-33 and 4-2, 4-3	<p><u>OEA revised references in Sections 3.4.3 and 4.5.1 of Chapters 3 and 4 in the Draft EA to recommended mitigation measure MM-Noise-01a to reflect changes based on CSXT’s comment:</u></p> <p>MM-Noise-01a. CSXT shall install appropriate building sound insulation (upgraded acoustical windows and doors) on the 4⁵ receptors OEA identified that would experience severe noise impacts. See receptors 30 and³³⁻³⁶ in Attachment 1 to Appendix E. CSXT shall begin implementing the required building sound insulation mitigation within one month of the Board’s authorization of the CSXT transaction.</p>									
3.4.4	3-35	<p><u>OEA revised Section 3.4.4 in Chapter 3 of the Draft EA to reflect updated results of the noise analysis based on CSXT’s comment:</u></p> <p>OEA anticipates that noise from Proposed Transactions-related operations would severely impact a total of 5¹¹ noise receptors (5⁴ on the Eastern Line and 7 on the Western Line).</p>									

Section/Table	Page(s)	Revision
3.5.1	3-36	<p data-bbox="443 233 1976 305"><u>OEA revised Section 3.5.1 in Chapter 3 of the Draft EA to reflect updated results of the noise analysis based on CSXT's comment:</u></p> <p data-bbox="443 342 2011 446">As discussed in Section 3.4, Noise and Vibration, OEA found that within the noise study area, 33²⁷ noise-sensitive receptors, including all of which are³² residences and 1 place of worship, would experience an adverse noise impact under the Proposed Transactions.</p>

Section/Table	Page(s)	Revision
3.5.3	3-41, 3-42	<p data-bbox="443 237 1997 302"><u>OEA revised portions of Section 3.5.3 of Chapter 3 in the Draft EA to reflect updated results of the noise analysis and the environmental justice analysis based on CSXT’s comment:</u></p> <p data-bbox="443 345 2011 557">As discussed in Section 3.4, Noise and Vibration, OEA expects that the Proposed Transactions would result in an adverse noise impact on a total of 3327 receptors. The predominant sources of noise under the Proposed Transactions are locomotive warning horns sounded near roadway/rail at-grade crossings and, to a lesser extent, wayside noise generated by the operation of the locomotive engine and wheel/rail sound. Wayside noise would not exceed the Board’s thresholds for adverse noise impacts on any of the Eastern or Western Line rail segments. Rather, the adverse noise impacts to the 3327 receptors would occur as a result of the sounding of train horns at grade crossings.</p> <p data-bbox="443 599 2032 704">Further, out of the 3327 total receptors that would experience adverse noise impacts under the Proposed Transactions, 12 (or approximately 3644 percent) are located within block groups with potential EJ populations, while 2115 (or approximately 6456 percent) are in non-EJ block groups.</p> <p data-bbox="443 747 2011 1068">OEA also examined the distribution of receptors that would experience adverse noise impacts under the Proposed Transactions at the community scale. OEA identified two incorporated areas within the EJ study area (the Towns of Pennington and White Hall, Alabama) and then determined the percentage of adversely affected receptors in each of those two communities that were located within EJ block groups. Table F-3 in Appendix F provides a table showing the two communities with receptors subject to adverse noise impacts under the Proposed Transactions and the distribution of adversely affected receptors within each community in EJ and non-EJ block groups. As shown in Table F-3, the four adversely affected receptors in the Town of Pennington are in EJ block groups while the six adversely affected receptors in the Town of White Hall are in non-EJ block groups. Therefore, most receptors at the community scale (60 percent) are in non-EJ block groups.</p> <p data-bbox="443 1076 1997 1109">⁴⁶Incorporated areas were the unit of analysis for this community-based analysis; unincorporated areas were not included</p> <p data-bbox="443 1151 2011 1287">Based on the distribution of adverse noise impacts throughout the study area, OEA concludes that adverse noise impacts would not be borne disproportionately by EJ populations. Most of the block groups in which adverse noise impacts would occur were not identified as potential EJ populations (60 percent), and most of the receptors that would experience adverse noise impacts are not in EJ block groups (approximately 6456 percent).</p>

Section/Table	Page(s)	Revision
4.5.1	4-2, 4-3	<p>OEA revised recommended mitigation measure MM-Noise-01a in Section 4.5.1 of Chapter 4 in the Draft EA to read as follows:</p> <p>MM-Noise-01a. CSXT shall install, appropriate building sound insulation (upgraded acoustical windows and doors) on the 45 receptors OEA identified that would experience severe noise impacts. See receptors 30 and 33-36 in Attachment 1 to Appendix E. CSXT should begin implementing the required building sound insulation mitigation within one month of the Board’s authorization of the CSXT transaction. Specifically, CSXT shall do the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CSXT shall meet with and communicate with the residents and owners of the 5 receptors that would experience severe noise impacts to discuss implementation of the required building sound insulation. • Using industry standard loudspeaker testing, the existing building sound insulation performance shall be determined in accordance with ASTM 966-90, Standard Guide for Field Measurements of Airborne Sound Insulation of Building Facades and Façade Elements by a qualified acoustics consultant. The qualifications for the acoustic consultant shall include at least 5 years of experience with major transportation noise projects, and board certification membership with the Institute of Noise Control Engineering or registration as a Professional Engineer in Mechanical Engineering or Civil Engineering. • The design goal for the sound insulation shall be a 10 dBA noise reduction. The calculated Noise Level Reduction (NLR) improvement shall be at least 5 dBA. If the calculated NLR associated with acoustical replacement windows and doors is less than 5 dBA, no additional mitigation shall be required since the improvement would be minor and likely not noticeable. The overall goal of the required sound insulation analysis is to demonstrate that interior noise levels (under the CSXT Transaction) at severely impacted receptors would be 45 DNL or lower, and to implement sound insulation to result in an NLR improvement of 5 dBA or more, where feasible and reasonable based on the characteristics of each property. CSXT shall provide written documentation to OEA that a 5 dBA reduction has been achieved or specify the reasons why this reduction would not be achievable based on the characteristics of the property and the test results from the qualified acoustics consultant. upon successful completion of the required building sound insulation to demonstrate compliance with this mitigation measure. CSXT shall also provide written documentation to OEA in the event that a homeowner declines any mitigation.

Section/Table	Page(s)	Revision
4.5.1	4-3, 4-4	<p>OEA revised recommended mitigation measure MM-Noise-01b in Section 4.5.1 of Chapter 4 in the Draft EA to read as follows:</p> <p>MM-Noise-01b. CPKC shall install, appropriate building sound insulation (upgraded acoustical windows and doors) on the 7 receptors OEA identified that would experience severe noise impacts. See receptors 3, 6, 8, 9, 10, 14 and 19 in Attachment 1 to Appendix E. CPKC should begin implementing the required building sound insulation mitigation within one month of the Board’s authorization of the CPKC transaction. Specifically, CPKC shall do the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CPKC shall meet with and communicate with the residents and owners of the 5 receptors that would experience severe noise impacts to discuss implementation of the required building sound insulation. • Using industry standard loudspeaker testing, the existing building sound insulation performance shall be determined in accordance with ASTM 966-90, Standard Guide for Field Measurements of Airborne Sound Insulation of Building Facades and Façade Elements by a qualified acoustics consultant. The qualifications for the acoustic consultant shall include at least 5 years of experience with major transportation noise projects, and board certification membership with the Institute of Noise Control Engineering or registration as a Professional Engineer in Mechanical Engineering or Civil Engineering. • The design goal for the sound insulation shall be a 10 dBA noise reduction. The calculated Noise Level Reduction (NLR) improvement shall be at least 5 dBA. If the calculated NLR associated with acoustical replacement windows and doors is less than 5 dBA, no additional mitigation shall be required since the improvement would be minor and likely not noticeable. The overall goal of the required sound insulation analysis is to demonstrate that interior noise levels (under the CPKC Transaction) at severely impacted receptors would be 45 DNL or lower, and to implement sound insulation to result in an NLR improvement of 5 dBA or more, where feasible and reasonable based on the characteristics of each property. CPKC shall provide written documentation to OEA that a 5 dBA reduction has been achieved or specify the reasons why this reduction would not be achievable based on the characteristics of the property and the test results from the qualified acoustics consultant. upon successful completion of the required building sound insulation to demonstrate compliance with this mitigation measure. CPKC shall also provide written documentation to OEA in the event that a homeowner declines any mitigation.

Section/Table	Page(s)	Revision																														
Table C-2	C-8	<p>OEA revised Table C-2 in Appendix C of the Draft EA to reflect updated results of the grade crossing delay analysis at Pine Street in Lowndesboro based on CSXT's comment.</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="443 342 1780 922"> <thead> <tr> <th colspan="3"></th> <th colspan="2">Proposed Transactions</th> <th colspan="2">Alternative Route</th> <th colspan="3">Proposed Transactions-related Change in Delay</th> </tr> <tr> <th>State/ City</th> <th>Street</th> <th>Crossing ID</th> <th>Train Length (feet)</th> <th>Gate Down Time (minutes)</th> <th>Grade Separated (Yes/No)</th> <th>Distance (miles)</th> <th>Total Delay per Day (seconds)</th> <th>Average Delay per Delayed Vehicle (seconds)</th> <th>Total Gate Down Time per Day (minutes)</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>LOWND-ESBORO</td> <td>PINE ST</td> <td>831366H</td> <td>5505 8530</td> <td>3.1 4.5</td> <td>no</td> <td>17.3</td> <td>24 36</td> <td>6 30</td> <td>5.8 3.9</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>				Proposed Transactions		Alternative Route		Proposed Transactions-related Change in Delay			State/ City	Street	Crossing ID	Train Length (feet)	Gate Down Time (minutes)	Grade Separated (Yes/No)	Distance (miles)	Total Delay per Day (seconds)	Average Delay per Delayed Vehicle (seconds)	Total Gate Down Time per Day (minutes)	LOWND-ESBORO	PINE ST	831366H	5505 8530	3.1 4.5	no	17.3	24 36	6 30	5.8 3.9
			Proposed Transactions		Alternative Route		Proposed Transactions-related Change in Delay																									
State/ City	Street	Crossing ID	Train Length (feet)	Gate Down Time (minutes)	Grade Separated (Yes/No)	Distance (miles)	Total Delay per Day (seconds)	Average Delay per Delayed Vehicle (seconds)	Total Gate Down Time per Day (minutes)																							
LOWND-ESBORO	PINE ST	831366H	5505 8530	3.1 4.5	no	17.3	24 36	6 30	5.8 3.9																							
C.1.1.2	C-11	<p>OEA corrected an error in Section C.1.1.2 of Appendix C of the Draft EA regarding the overall total gate down time per day and the overall average delay per vehicle. Those numbers were further updated based on CSXT's comment:</p> <p>Comparing the Proposed Transactions to the No-Action Alternative for the 96 grade crossings, the total gate down time per day is expected to remain the same with an average of 0.0 increase by 3.2 3.1 minutes per grade crossing and the average delay per delayed vehicle is expected to increase by 0.2 2.4 2.8 seconds.</p>																														

Section/Table	Page(s)	Revision																																																																								
Table D-6 and Table D-7	D-13 and D-14	<p><u>OEA revised portions of Table D-6 and Table D-7 in Appendix D of the Draft EA to reflect updated results in the air quality analysis based on CSXT’s comment:</u></p> <p>Dallas County, Alabama (FIPS 01047)</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th colspan="7">Transactions-Related Criteria Emissions (tons/year)</th> <th>Acquisition-Related HAP Emissions (tons/year)</th> </tr> <tr> <th>Source</th> <th>NOX</th> <th>VOC</th> <th>PM10</th> <th>PM2.5</th> <th>SO2</th> <th>CO</th> <th>CO2e</th> <th>Acetaldehyde</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Rail Segment</td> <td>-26.2 -25.8</td> <td>-1.5</td> <td>-1.0 -0.9</td> <td>-0.9</td> <td>0.0</td> <td>0.7</td> <td>282.4 282.6</td> <td>-0.12 -0.11</td> </tr> <tr> <td>County Total</td> <td>-25.77</td> <td>-1.47</td> <td>-0.96 -0.94</td> <td>-0.93 -0.91</td> <td>0.00</td> <td>0.73</td> <td>282.48 282.68</td> <td>-0.12 -0.11</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>Lowndes County, Alabama (FIPS 01085)</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th colspan="7">Transactions-Related Criteria Emissions (tons/year)</th> <th>Acquisition-Related HAP Emissions (tons/year)</th> </tr> <tr> <th>Source</th> <th>NOX</th> <th>VOC</th> <th>PM10</th> <th>PM2.5</th> <th>SO2</th> <th>CO</th> <th>CO2e</th> <th>Formaldehyde</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Rail Segment</td> <td>-18.0 -18.5</td> <td>-1.0</td> <td>-0.6</td> <td>-0.6</td> <td>0.0</td> <td>-0.1</td> <td>-26.8 -27.0</td> <td>-0.22 -0.23</td> </tr> <tr> <td>County Total</td> <td>-18.01 -18.45</td> <td>-0.99 -1.01</td> <td>-0.63 -0.65</td> <td>-0.63</td> <td>0.00</td> <td>-0.07</td> <td>-26.83 -27.03</td> <td>-0.22 -0.23</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		Transactions-Related Criteria Emissions (tons/year)							Acquisition-Related HAP Emissions (tons/year)	Source	NOX	VOC	PM10	PM2.5	SO2	CO	CO2e	Acetaldehyde	Rail Segment	-26.2 -25.8	-1.5	-1.0 -0.9	-0.9	0.0	0.7	282.4 282.6	-0.12 -0.11	County Total	-25.77	-1.47	-0.96 -0.94	-0.93 -0.91	0.00	0.73	282.48 282.68	-0.12 -0.11		Transactions-Related Criteria Emissions (tons/year)							Acquisition-Related HAP Emissions (tons/year)	Source	NOX	VOC	PM10	PM2.5	SO2	CO	CO2e	Formaldehyde	Rail Segment	-18.0 -18.5	-1.0	-0.6	-0.6	0.0	-0.1	-26.8 -27.0	-0.22 -0.23	County Total	-18.01 -18.45	-0.99 -1.01	-0.63 -0.65	-0.63	0.00	-0.07	-26.83 -27.03	-0.22 -0.23
	Transactions-Related Criteria Emissions (tons/year)							Acquisition-Related HAP Emissions (tons/year)																																																																		
Source	NOX	VOC	PM10	PM2.5	SO2	CO	CO2e	Acetaldehyde																																																																		
Rail Segment	-26.2 -25.8	-1.5	-1.0 -0.9	-0.9	0.0	0.7	282.4 282.6	-0.12 -0.11																																																																		
County Total	-25.77	-1.47	-0.96 -0.94	-0.93 -0.91	0.00	0.73	282.48 282.68	-0.12 -0.11																																																																		
	Transactions-Related Criteria Emissions (tons/year)							Acquisition-Related HAP Emissions (tons/year)																																																																		
Source	NOX	VOC	PM10	PM2.5	SO2	CO	CO2e	Formaldehyde																																																																		
Rail Segment	-18.0 -18.5	-1.0	-0.6	-0.6	0.0	-0.1	-26.8 -27.0	-0.22 -0.23																																																																		
County Total	-18.01 -18.45	-0.99 -1.01	-0.63 -0.65	-0.63	0.00	-0.07	-26.83 -27.03	-0.22 -0.23																																																																		
E.5	E-5	<p><u>OEA revised Section E.5 in Appendix E of the Draft EA to reflect updated results of the noise analysis based on CSXT’s comment:</u></p> <p>As described in <i>Section 3.4 Noise and Vibration</i>, 2733 receptors could be adversely impacted, 112 severely and 16 21 moderately, by freight train operations if both Proposed Transactions are approved. Of those 2733, 23 receptors are located on the Western Line, seven of which are severe, and 104 receptors are located on the Eastern Line, five all of which are severe.</p>																																																																								
Appendix E – Attachment 1	144	<u>OEA deleted page 144 in Attachment 1 to Appendix E of the Draft EA because the updated noise analysis shows that there would be no adverse impacts to receptors 27-32.</u>																																																																								

Section/Table	Page(s)	Revision																																			
F.2	F-6	<p data-bbox="443 250 1927 358"><u>OEA deleted Section F.2 in Appendix F of the Draft EA because, since there is now only one U.S. Census-defined incorporated area in the study area that contains adversely impacted receptors, there is no basis to compare impacted receptors between different incorporated communities as a result of CSXT’s comment:</u></p> <p data-bbox="443 415 764 444">F.2 Community Analysis</p> <p data-bbox="443 488 2028 813">OEA also examined the distribution of receptors that would experience adverse noise impacts as a result of the Proposed Transactions at the community scale. OEA identified two incorporated areas within the EJ study area (the Towns of Pennington and White Hall, Alabama) and then determined the percentage of adversely affected receptors in each of those two communities that were located within EJ block groups. Table F-3 provides a table showing the two communities with receptors subject to adverse noise impacts under the Proposed Transactions and the distribution of adversely affected receptors within each community in EJ and non-EJ block groups. As shown in Table F-3, the four adversely affected receptors in the Town of Pennington are in EJ block groups while the six adversely affected receptors in the Town of White Hall are in non-EJ block groups. Therefore, most receptors at the community scale (60 percent) are in non-EJ block groups.² Incorporated areas were the unit of analysis in this community-based analysis; unincorporated areas were not included.</p> <p data-bbox="443 854 1955 919">Table F-3. Communities in the Study Area with Receptors Subject to Adverse Noise Impacts (65 dBA Ldn and 3 dBA Increase) under the Proposed Transactions</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="443 922 1528 1260"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="443 922 684 1036">Community</th> <th data-bbox="684 922 894 1036">TOTAL</th> <th data-bbox="894 922 1104 1036">Within EJ Block Groups</th> <th data-bbox="1104 922 1314 1036">Outside EJ Block Groups</th> <th data-bbox="1314 922 1528 1036">Percent Within EJ Block Groups</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="443 1036 684 1073">ALABAMA</td> <td data-bbox="684 1036 894 1073">22</td> <td data-bbox="894 1036 1104 1073">12</td> <td data-bbox="1104 1036 1314 1073">10</td> <td data-bbox="1314 1036 1528 1073">55%</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="443 1073 684 1110">Unincorporated</td> <td data-bbox="684 1073 894 1110">12</td> <td data-bbox="894 1073 1104 1110">8</td> <td data-bbox="1104 1073 1314 1110">4</td> <td data-bbox="1314 1073 1528 1110">67%</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="443 1110 684 1148">Pennington</td> <td data-bbox="684 1110 894 1148">4</td> <td data-bbox="894 1110 1104 1148">4</td> <td data-bbox="1104 1110 1314 1148">0</td> <td data-bbox="1314 1110 1528 1148">100%</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="443 1148 684 1185">White Hall</td> <td data-bbox="684 1148 894 1185">6</td> <td data-bbox="894 1148 1104 1185">0</td> <td data-bbox="1104 1148 1314 1185">6</td> <td data-bbox="1314 1148 1528 1185">0%</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="443 1185 684 1222">MISSISSIPPI</td> <td data-bbox="684 1185 894 1222">11</td> <td data-bbox="894 1185 1104 1222">0</td> <td data-bbox="1104 1185 1314 1222">11</td> <td data-bbox="1314 1185 1528 1222">0%</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="443 1222 684 1260">Unincorporated</td> <td data-bbox="684 1222 894 1260">11</td> <td data-bbox="894 1222 1104 1260">0</td> <td data-bbox="1104 1222 1314 1260">11</td> <td data-bbox="1314 1222 1528 1260">0%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Community	TOTAL	Within EJ Block Groups	Outside EJ Block Groups	Percent Within EJ Block Groups	ALABAMA	22	12	10	55%	Unincorporated	12	8	4	67%	Pennington	4	4	0	100%	White Hall	6	0	6	0%	MISSISSIPPI	11	0	11	0%	Unincorporated	11	0	11	0%
Community	TOTAL	Within EJ Block Groups	Outside EJ Block Groups	Percent Within EJ Block Groups																																	
ALABAMA	22	12	10	55%																																	
Unincorporated	12	8	4	67%																																	
Pennington	4	4	0	100%																																	
White Hall	6	0	6	0%																																	
MISSISSIPPI	11	0	11	0%																																	
Unincorporated	11	0	11	0%																																	

This page intentionally left blank

3. Response to Comments on the Draft EA

Introduction

The Surface Transportation Board's (Board) Office of Environmental Analysis (OEA) received one comment from CSXT Transportation, Inc. (CSXT) on the Draft Environmental Assessment (Draft EA). Changes to the Draft EA in response to CSXT's comment are set forth in the errata sheet above, which references the modified sections of the Draft EA.

Approach

The following bullets describe the approach OEA used to respond to CSXT's comment on the Draft EA:

- The full text of CSXT's comment can be found on the Board's website (www.stb.gov) by searching "Environmental Comments" for the docket number of CSXT's petition (Docket No. FD 36727).
- OEA verified CSXT's comment and updated the noise and vibration, grade crossing delay, air quality, and environmental justice analyses as appropriate.
- When CSXT's comment resulted in a revision (addition, deletion, correction, etc.) to the Draft EA, OEA's comment response states that OEA made a change and directs the reader to the location of the edited text in the errata, which references sections of the Draft EA.

Comment and Response

Letter from CSX Transportation, Inc. (EI-33419):

CSXT's comment letter states: "The Draft EA notes that 'CSXT would run an average of 1.43 local Montgomery trains per day (one roundtrip (two trains) five days per week) between Montgomery and White Hall if both Proposed Transactions are authorized.' Draft EA at 2-4 (emphasis added). White Hall station is identified in the MNBR time table as MP 134.0. The Draft EA apparently contemplated that the CSXT Montgomery local train would run westward to MP 134.0 and then turn around and run eastward back to Montgomery. However, as depicted in the map attached as Exhibit A, CSXT plans for the Montgomery local train to serve a customer facility located just east of White Hall at approximately MP 135.0, and then turn around and return to Montgomery.

The Draft EA identifies five receptors on the Eastern Line—receptors 30, 33, 34, 35, and 36—that would experience severe noise impacts as a result of the Proposed Transactions. See *id.* at App’x E, Attach. Based on the map provided in the Draft EA, CSXT does not plan for the Montgomery local train to run past Receptor 30 because Receptor 30 is located west of the customer facility referenced above. Therefore, 2.00 trains per day would run past Receptor 30 under the Proposed Transaction, rather than 3.43 trains per day. See Draft EA at 3-31, Table 3.4-1.”

Comment Response

In the errata sheet above, OEA has updated the Draft EA to reflect the comment from CSXT. CSXT’s comment provided a revised projected train traffic forecast on one mile of the White Hall to Burkville segment between milepost 134.00 and 135.00. CSXT explained that 2.00 trains per day would operate on the mile of track between these mileposts rather than the originally projected 3.43 trains per day. Therefore, the change in trains per day between the No-Action Alternative and the Proposed Transactions would be an increase of 0.57 rather than of 2.00. CSXT did not provide any changes to projected train traffic forecasts on any other rail segment. Updates to the analyses in the Draft EA based on CSXT’s comment are shown in the errata and described below in greater detail.

Noise and Vibration

OEA’s update to the noise and vibration analysis in the Draft EA shows that with the updated train forecast provided by CSXT, receptor 30, which is located between milepost 134.00 and 135.00 of the Burkville to White Hall segment, would not be impacted by noise. Additionally, adjacent receptors 27-29, 31 and 32 would not be impacted. The horn and wayside noise increases resulting from 2.00 trains per day (including an increase of 0.57) under the Proposed Transactions would be 1.5 dBA and 0.4 dBA respectively, compared to 3.8 dBA and 2.4 dBA as previously found in the Draft EA, which was based on 3.43 trains per day. As a result, there would be no impacts and no mitigation would be warranted for receptor 30 or any adjacent receptors. Based on CSXT’s comment and OEA’s updated analysis, OEA removed receptor 30 from recommended mitigation measure **MM-Noise-01a**.

Environmental Justice

OEA revised the environmental justice (EJ) analysis in the Draft EA based on the updated results of the noise and vibration analysis described above, which show that there would be no adverse impacts to receptors 27-32. The updated analysis shows that 55.6 percent of all receptors would be in non-EJ block groups and 44.4 percent would be in EJ block groups. The Draft EA previously had found that adverse impacts to receptors 27-32 resulted in 63.6 percent of receptors located in non-EJ block groups and 36.4 percent in EJ block groups.

Additionally, the community analysis in the EJ section of Chapter 3 (Draft EA Section 3.5.3 and Appendix F Section F.2) has been deleted since, in the updated noise analysis, there is now only one U.S. Census-defined incorporated area within the revised study area that contains adversely impacted receptors (four receptors in

the Town of Pennington). The updated noise analysis results in no adverse impacts to the six receptors (receptor numbers 27-32) within the Town of White Hall boundary. Therefore, there is no basis to compare impacted receptors between different incorporated communities.

Air Quality

OEA's update to the air quality analysis in the Draft EA based on CSXT's comment found that there are now slightly more emissions in Dallas County and slightly less emissions in Lowndes County. However, overall emissions remain unchanged.

Grade Crossing Delay

OEA's update to the grade crossing delay analysis in the Draft EA based on CSXT's comment shows that results would change at the one public crossing located between milepost 134.00 and 135.00 where there would be 2.00 trains per day rather than 3.43. The results show that total gate down time per day would decrease because there would be fewer short trains but the average delay per delayed vehicle would increase because only the longer through-trains would pass Pine Street.

Additionally, OEA corrected an error in Appendix C – Grade Crossing Delay, as noted in the errata. The Draft EA stated that the total gate down time per day is expected to remain the same with an average of 0.0 minutes per grade crossing and the average delay per delayed vehicle is expected to increase by 0.2 seconds. Those numbers should have been 3.2 minutes and 2.4 seconds, respectively. Those numbers were further updated based on CSXT's comment to 3.1 minutes and 2.8 seconds, respectively.