

**Appendix B: Procedural Schedule**

- May 16, 1997 Preliminary Environmental Report filed.
- June 23, 1997 Primary application and related filings filed. Environmental Report filed.
- July 23, 1997 Publication in the **Federal Register**, by this date, of: notice of acceptance of primary application and related filings; and notice of the five related abandonment filings.
- August 6, 1997 Comments on the draft scope of the Environmental Impact Statement due.<sup>39</sup>
- August 7, 1997 Notice of intent to participate in proceeding due.
- August 22, 1997 Description of anticipated responsive (including inconsistent) applications due; petitions for waiver or clarification due with respect to such applications.
- September 5, 1997 Preliminary Draft Environmental Assessments for the construction projects referenced in Decision No. 9 due.
- October 1, 1997 Responsive Environmental Report and Environmental Verified Statements of responsive (including inconsistent) applicants due.
- October 21, 1997 Responsive (including inconsistent) applications due. All comments, protests, and requests for conditions, and any other opposition evidence and argument, due.<sup>40</sup> Comments of the U.S. Secretary of Transportation and the U.S. Attorney General due. With respect to all related abandonments: opposition submissions, requests for public use conditions, and Trails Act requests due.
- November 20, 1997 Notice of acceptance (if required) of responsive (including inconsistent) applications published in the **Federal Register**.
- December 15, 1997 Response to responsive (including inconsistent) applications due. Response to

- comments, protests, requested conditions, and other opposition evidence and argument due. Rebuttal in support of primary application and related filings due. With respect to all related abandonments: rebuttal due; and responses to requests for public use and Trails Act conditions due.
- January 14, 1998 Rebuttal in support of responsive (including inconsistent) applications due.
- February 23, 1998 Briefs due, all parties (not to exceed 50 pages).
- April 9, 1998 Oral argument (close of record).
- April 14, 1998 Voting conference (at Board's discretion).
- June 8, 1998 Date of service of final decision. With respect to any exempted abandonments: offers of financial assistance may be filed no later than 10 days after the date of service of the final decision.

**Notes:** Immediately upon each evidentiary filing, the filing party will place all documents relevant to the filing (other than documents that are privileged or otherwise protected from discovery) in a depository open to all parties, and will make its witnesses available for discovery depositions. Access to documents, subject to protective order, will be appropriately restricted. Parties seeking discovery depositions may proceed by agreement. Discovery on responsive (including inconsistent) applications will begin immediately upon their filing.

[FR Doc. 97-19372 Filed 7-22-97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4915-00-P

**DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION****Surface Transportation Board**

[STB Finance Docket No. 33388 (Sub-No. 3)]

**CSX Transportation, Inc.—  
Construction and Operation  
Exemption—Connection Tracks at  
Greenwich, OH**

**AGENCY:** Surface Transportation Board (Board).

**ACTION:** Notice of exemption; request for comments.

**SUMMARY:** On June 23, 1997, CSX Transportation, Inc. (CSXT) and Consolidated Rail Corporation (CRC), pursuant to 49 U.S.C. 10502, filed a petition for exemption from the prior approval requirements of 49 U.S.C. 10901 to construct and operate a connection track at Greenwich, OH.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> This proceeding is related to STB Finance Docket No. 33388, CSX Corporation and CSX Transportation, Inc., Norfolk Southern Corporation and Norfolk Southern Railway Company—Control and Operating Leases/Agreements—Conrail Inc. and Consolidated Rail Corporation (CSX/NS/CR). In CSX/NS/CR, Decision No. 9, served June 12, 1997, we granted a petition for waiver that would allow

The Board seeks comments from interested persons respecting the exemption criteria and any other non-environmental concerns<sup>2</sup> involved in our approval of the construction and operation of CSXT's and CRC's Greenwich construction project sought in STB Finance Docket No. 33388 (Sub-No. 3).

**DATES:** Written comments must be filed with the Board by August 22, 1997. Replies may be filed by CSX and CRC on or before September 11, 1997.

**ADDRESSES:** An original and 25 copies of all documents must refer to STB Finance Docket No. 33388 (Sub-No. 3) and must be sent to the Office of the Secretary, Case Control Unit, ATTN: STB Finance Docket No. 33388 (Sub-No. 3), Surface Transportation Board, 1925 K Street, N.W., Washington, DC 20423-0001.<sup>3</sup> In addition, one copy of all documents in this proceeding must be sent to Administrative Law Judge Jacob Leventhal, Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, 888 First Street, N.E., Suite 11F, Washington, DC 20426 [(202) 219-2538; FAX: (202) 219-3289] and to petitioners' representatives: Charles M. Rosenberger, 500 Water Street—J150, Jacksonville, FL 32202; and John J. Paylor, 2001 Market Street-16A, Philadelphia, PA 19101. Parties to STB Finance Docket No. 33388 will not be automatically placed on the service list for this proceeding.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Julia M. Farr, (202) 565-1613. [TDD for the hearing impaired: (202) 565-1695.]

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** On June 23, 1997, CSX Corporation (CSXC), CSXT, Norfolk Southern Corporation (NSC), Norfolk Southern Railway

CSXT and CRC to seek approval for construction of four construction projects, including this proposed construction at Greenwich, following the completion of our environmental review of the construction projects, and our issuance of further decisions exempting or approving the proposals, but prior to our approval of the primary application.

<sup>2</sup> The handling of environmental issues will be discussed below.

<sup>3</sup> In addition to submitting an original and 25 copies of all documents filed with the Board, the parties are encouraged to submit all pleadings and attachments as computer data contained on a 3.5-inch floppy diskette formatted for WordPerfect 7.0 (or formatted so that it can be converted into WordPerfect 7.0) and clearly labeled with the identification acronym and number of the pleading contained on the diskette. See 49 CFR 1180.4(a)(2). The computer data contained on the computer diskettes submitted to the Board will be subject to the protective order granted in Decision No. 1, served April 16, 1997 (as modified in Decision No. 4, served May 2, 1997), and is for the exclusive use of Board employees reviewing substantive and/or procedural matters in this proceeding. The flexibility provided by such computer data will facilitate timely review by the Board and its staff.

<sup>39</sup> See the notice served July 3, 1997, and published in the **Federal Register** on July 7, 1997, at 62 FR 36332. As indicated in that notice, slip op. at 3, 62 FR at 36333, it is not necessary to be a party of record to file comments on the draft scope of the EIS and/or to participate in the environmental review process.

<sup>40</sup> As indicated in the notice published in the **Federal Register** on July 11, 1997 (62 FR 37331), petitions for reconsideration with respect to the physical construction of the Crestline connection track, as proposed in the STB Finance Docket No. 33388 (Sub-No. 1) embraced docket, and/or operation thereover by CSXT, are due by July 31, 1997. As indicated in the notices published in the **Federal Register** concurrently herewith, comments respecting the physical construction of the Willow Creek, Greenwich, Sidney Junction, Sidney, Alexandria, and Bucyrus connection tracks, as proposed in the STB Finance Docket No. 33388 (Sub-Nos. 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, and 7) embraced dockets, respectively, and/or operation thereover by applicants, are due by August 22, 1997.

Company (NSR), Conrail Inc. (CRR), and CRC<sup>4</sup> filed their primary application in the CSX/NS/CR proceeding seeking our authorization for: (a) the acquisition by CSX and NS of control of Conrail; and (b) division of Conrail's assets by and between CSX and NS. In Decision No. 9 in that proceeding, we granted the requests by applicants, with respect to four CSX construction projects and three NS construction projects, for waivers of our otherwise applicable "everything goes together" rule.<sup>5</sup> The waivers would allow CSX and NS to begin the physical construction following the completion of our environmental review of the construction projects, and our issuance of further decisions exempting or approving the proposals, but prior to our approval of the primary application. This petition for exemption for the construction at Greenwich, OH, concerns one of the seven construction projects. By this notice, we are inviting comments on whether the proposed transaction meets the applicable exemption criteria and on any other non-environmental concerns regarding the construction and operation of this particular project.

Pursuant to 49 U.S.C. 10502, CSXT and CRC have filed a petition for exemption from the prior approval provisions of 49 U.S.C. 10901 to construct and operate connection tracks in Greenwich, OH.<sup>6</sup> CSXT and CRC cross each other at Greenwich. CSXT and CRC propose to construct connection tracks in the northwest and southeast quadrants between CSXT's main line and CRC's main line at

Greenwich. The connection in the northwest quadrant will extend approximately 4,600 feet between approximately milepost BG-193.1 on CSXT's main line between Chicago, IL, and Pittsburgh, PA, and approximately milepost 54.1 on CRC's main line between Cleveland and Cincinnati, OH. A portion of this connection in the northwest quadrant will be constructed on the existing trackage and/or right-of-way of the Wheeling & Lake Erie Railway Company. The connection in the southeast quadrant will extend approximately 1,044 feet between approximately milepost BG-192.5 on CSXT's main line and approximately milepost 54.6 on CRC's main line. CSXT anticipates that it must acquire approximately 0.4 acres of right-of-way to construct these connections. A map showing the proposed connections at Greenwich is attached as Exhibit A to CSXT's petition.<sup>7</sup>

Under 49 U.S.C. 10901, a railroad may: (1) Construct an extension to any of its railroad lines; (2) construct an additional railroad line; or (3) provide transportation over an extended or additional railroad line, only if the Board issues a certificate authorizing such activity. However, under 49 U.S.C. 10502, the Board shall exempt a rail transaction from regulation when it finds that: (1) Application of the pertinent statutory provisions is not necessary to carry out the rail transportation policy of 49 U.S.C. 10101; and (2) either the transaction is of limited scope, or regulation is not needed to protect shippers from the abuse of market power.

CSXT and CRC contend that exemption of its proposed construction and operation at Greenwich meets all of the elements of the rail transportation policy. Petitioners maintain that, by minimizing the regulatory expense and time inherent in a full application under the provisions of section 10901, exemption will expedite regulatory decisions and reduce regulatory barriers to entry into the industry. They state that exemption will also foster efficient management and promote a safe and efficient rail system. They also indicate that, if the Board approves the primary application, one of CSXT's most important service lanes will be its Northeastern Gateway route extending from Chicago to Albany, NY, with branches eastward to Boston and

southward to Newark, NJ. This service lane will combine CSXT's current main line route from Chicago to Greenwich, and CRC's line between Greenwich and Albany. The lines comprising this service lane currently contain some of the most heavily traveled track on the proposed CSXT combined system. CSXT anticipates that traffic on this corridor will be as high as 50 trains per day within the next 3 years.

CSXT and CRC state that the proposed connections at Greenwich are of paramount importance if CSXT's Northeastern Gateway service lane is to operate as anticipated. The connection track to be constructed in the northwest quadrant will connect these two main lines and allow the traffic to flow between Chicago and points in the East. CSXT anticipates that an average of 35 trains per day will operate over this connection.

To compete effectively for traffic moving to and from Chicago and points in the East, CSXT intends to establish a second auxiliary route from the East into Chicago. This service lane will be created from the existing NS line between Chicago and Fort Wayne, which CSXT will operate, and CRC's existing lines between Fort Wayne and Crestline, and between Crestline and Greenwich. CSXT states that this auxiliary route will handle primarily bulk traffic that is less time sensitive. The connection track to be constructed in the southeast quadrant at Greenwich will allow this traffic to be routed through Crestline. CSXT anticipates that an average of 9 trains per day will operate over this connection. Petitioners maintain that, without these two connections, CSXT cannot physically handle traffic between its current rail line to Chicago and the CRC lines CSXT will operate.

Petitioners state that the exemption will promote effective competition among rail carriers and with other modes, and meet the needs of the shipping public. According to petitioners, the creation of two competitive rail routes between the Northeast and Chicago is one of the most important public benefits of the proposed division of Conrail's assets. CSXT states that, by improving its operation in the Chicago area, the connections at Greenwich will assist CSXT in its competition with NSR and other modes of transportation.

The environmental report covering the proposed construction and operation of the connection tracks at Greenwich is contained in the Environmental Report filed with the Board in STB Finance Docket No. 33388. In addition, as we required in

<sup>4</sup> CSXC and CSXT are referred to collectively as CSX. NSC and NSR are referred to collectively as NS. CRR and CRC are referred to collectively as Conrail. CSX, NS, and Conrail are referred to collectively as applicants.

<sup>5</sup> See 49 CFR 1180.4(c)(2)(vi).

<sup>6</sup> CSXT filed a petition for exemption to construct and operate connection tracks in Greenwich, OH, as a related filing in Volume 5 of the primary application filed on June 23, 1997, in the CSX/NS/CR proceeding. See CSX/NS-22 (Volume 5) at 114. CSXT and CRC concurrently filed a slightly modified version of the petition for exemption for construction of connection tracks in Greenwich (CSX-7). We will consider both filings together here. As we stated in CSX/NS/CR, Decision No. 9, at 6-7:

\* \* \* in reviewing these projects separately, we will consider the regulatory and environmental aspects of these proposed constructions and applicants' proposed operations over these lines together in the context of whether to approve each individual physical construction project. The operational implications of the merger as a whole, including operations over \* \* \* the seven construction projects, will be examined in the context of the [Environmental Impact Statement] EIS that we are preparing for the overall merger.

\* \* \* No rail operations can begin over these seven segments until completion of the EIS process and issuance of a further decision.

<sup>7</sup> The parties indicate that they do not propose to operate over the connection at this time, and acknowledge that operation over this connection is related to, and contingent upon, the proposed control of Conrail by CSX and NS, approval of which is being sought in STB Finance Docket No. 33388.

CSX/NS/CR, Decision No. 9, CSX must submit, no later than September 5, 1997 (Day F+75), a preliminary draft environmental assessment (PDEA) for each individual construction project covered by our waiver decision. Each PDEA must comply with all of the requirements for environmental reports contained in our environmental rules at 49 CFR 1105.7. Also, the PDEA must be based on consultations with our Section of Environmental Analysis (SEA) and the federal, state, and local agencies set forth in 49 CFR 1105.7(b), as well as other appropriate parties. If a PDEA is insufficient, we may require additional environmental information or reject the document. See CSX/NS/CR, Decision No. 9, at 8.

As part of the environmental review process, SEA will independently verify the information contained in each PDEA, conduct further independent analysis, as necessary, and develop appropriate environmental mitigation measures. For each project, SEA plans to prepare an EA, which will be served on the public for review and comment. The public will have 20 days to comment on the EA, including the proposed environmental mitigation measures. After the close of the public comment period, SEA will prepare Post Environmental Assessments (Post EAs) containing SEA's final recommendations, including appropriate environmental mitigation. Therefore, in deciding whether to grant petitioners' exemption request, we will consider the entire environmental record, including all public comments, the EA, and the Post EA. *Id.* at 8.

Should we determine that the Greenwich construction project could potentially cause, or contribute to, significant environmental impacts, then the project will be incorporated into the EIS for the proposed control transaction in STB Finance Docket No. 33388. *Id.* at 8. As we have previously emphasized, our consideration of the seven construction projects does not, and will not, in any way, constitute approval of, or even indicate any consideration on our part respecting approval of, the primary application in STB Finance Docket No. 33388. See CSX/NS/CR, Decision No. 9, at 6; and Decision No. 5, served and published in the **Federal Register** on May 13, 1997, 62 FR 26352, slip op. at 3. If we grant any exemptions for these seven construction projects, applicants will not be allowed to argue that, because we have granted an exemption and applicants may have expended resources to construct a connection track, we should approve the primary application. Applicants have willingly assumed the risk that we

may deny the primary application, or approve it subject to conditions unacceptable to applicants, or approve the primary application but deny an applicant's request to operate over any or all of the seven connections. *Id.*

This action will not significantly affect either the quality of the human environment or the conservation of energy resources.

It is ordered:

1. Comments on whether the proposed transaction meets the exemption criteria of 49 U.S.C. 10502 and on any other non-environmental concerns regarding the construction and operation of the connection tracks in Greenwich are due August 22, 1997.

2. Replies are due September 11, 1997.

3. This decision is effective on the date of service.

Decided: July 16, 1997.

By the Board, Chairman Morgan and Vice Chairman Owen.

**Vernon A. Williams,**  
*Secretary.*

[FR Doc. 97-19376 Filed 7-22-97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4915-00-P

## DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

### Surface Transportation Board

[STB Finance Docket No. 33388 (Sub-No. 2)]

#### CSX Transportation, Inc.; Construction and Operation Exemption; Connection Track at Willow Creek, IN

**AGENCY:** Surface Transportation Board (Board).

**ACTION:** Notice of exemption; request for comments.

**SUMMARY:** On June 23, 1997, CSX Transportation, Inc. (CSXT) and Consolidated Rail Corporation (CRC), pursuant to 49 U.S.C. 10502, filed a petition for exemption from the prior approval requirements of 49 U.S.C. 10901 to construct and operate a connection track at Willow Creek, IN.<sup>1</sup> The Board seeks comments from

interested persons respecting the exemption criteria and any other non-environmental concerns<sup>2</sup> involved in our approval of the construction and operation of CSXT's and CRC's Willow Creek construction project sought in STB Finance Docket No. 33388 (Sub-No. 2).

**DATES:** Written comments must be filed with the Board by August 22, 1997. Replies may be filed by CSX and CRC on or before September 11, 1997.

**ADDRESSES:** An original and 25 copies of all documents must refer to STB Finance Docket No. 33388 (Sub-No. 2) and must be sent to the Office of the Secretary, Case Control Unit, ATTN: STB Finance Docket No. 33388 (Sub-No. 2), Surface Transportation Board, 1925 K Street, N.W., Washington, DC 20423-0001<sup>3</sup> In addition, one copy of all documents in this proceeding must be sent to Administrative Law Judge Jacob Leventhal, Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, 888 First Street, N.E., Suite 11F, Washington, DC 20426 [(202) 219-2538; FAX: (202) 219-3289] and to petitioners' representatives: Charles M. Rosenberger, 500 Water Street—J150, Jacksonville, FL 32202; and John J. Paylor, 2001 Market Street—16A, Philadelphia, PA 19101. Parties to STB Finance Docket No. 33388 will not be automatically placed on the service list for this proceeding.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Julia M. Farr, (202) 565-1613. [TDD for the hearing impaired: (202) 565-1695.]

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** On June 23, 1997, CSX Corporation (CSXC), CSXT, Norfolk Southern Corporation (NSC), Norfolk Southern Railway Company (NSR), Conrail Inc. (CRR), and CRC<sup>4</sup> filed their primary application in the CSX/NS/CR proceeding seeking our authorization for: (a) The acquisition by CSX and NS of control of Conrail; and

<sup>2</sup> The handling of environmental issues will be discussed below.

<sup>3</sup> In addition to submitting an original and 25 copies of all documents filed with the Board, the parties are encouraged to submit all pleadings and attachments as computer data contained on a 3.5-inch floppy diskette formatted for WordPerfect 7.0 (or formatted so that it can be converted into WordPerfect 7.0) and clearly labeled with the identification acronym and number of the pleading contained on the diskette. See 49 CFR 1180.4(a)(2). The computer data contained on the computer diskettes submitted to the Board will be subject to the protective order granted in Decision No. 1, served April 16, 1997 (as modified in Decision No. 4, served May 2, 1997), and is for the exclusive use of Board employees reviewing substantive and/or procedural matters in this proceeding. The flexibility provided by such computer data will facilitate timely review by the Board and its staff.

<sup>4</sup> CSXC and CSXT are referred to collectively as CSX. NSC and NSR are referred to collectively as NS. CRR and CRC are referred to collectively as Conrail. CSX, NS, and Conrail are referred to collectively as applicants.

<sup>1</sup> This proceeding is related to STB Finance Docket No. 33388, *CSX Corporation and CSX Transportation, Inc., Norfolk Southern Corporation and Norfolk Southern Railway Company—Control and Operating Leases/Agreements—Conrail Inc. and Consolidated Rail Corporation (CSX/NS/CR)*. In CSX/NS/CR, Decision No. 9, served June 12, 1997, we granted a petition for waiver that would allow CSXT and CRC to seek approval for construction of four construction projects, including this proposed construction at Willow Creek, following the completion of our environmental review of the construction projects, and our issuance of further decisions exempting or approving the proposals, but prior to our approval of the primary application.