

ENTERED  
Office of Proceedings  
January 12, 2021  
Part of  
Public Record

January 12, 2021

E-FILED

Cynthia Brown

Chief, Section of Administration Surface Transportation Board Office of Proceedings

395 E Street, SW

Washington DC 20423

Re: Docket No. 36470, Rio Grande Pacific Corporation – continuance In Control Exemption – Colorado, Midland & Pacific Railway Company

Ms. Brown:

The sounds of the gentle whistle of a train in the distance seems so romantic to those who have not experienced the reality of living near a rail line. My family has owned property within 100 feet of the railroad tracks for many years. While it was initially purchased as an occasional weekend getaway, it is now the full-time residence of our father. We remember how awful the vibrations of dozens of rail cars passing by multiple times of the day and night, the noise of the train on the tracks, the whistles at crossings, and the pollution from the engine and the dirt and debris kicked up each time the trains passed. We reveled in the end of the use of the tracks and are unable to find any redeeming reason for re-activation of the tracks.

Property values will fall for many homeowners with reactivation of the tracks. The noise and vibrations are detrimental to the environment, humans and wildlife. Studies have shown an increase in cancer in those who live near rail lines. A derailment will create environmental damage to the waters, plant life and fish in the river, along with destroying the water source for thousands of animals that depend on the river for water. It would be catastrophic. The damage and costs, both financial and environmental, would be astronomic.

And what would the benefit be to the communities it runs through?

- Some think it would improve road safety by decreasing truck traffic on Hwy 50. However, it is highly doubtful the movement of the oil via truck would happen on Colorado Highway 50. Hwy 50 is a curvy two-lane mountain road. This road was not designed to handle large volumes of traffic. It is not a direct route and could never handle the same volume of oil of even a single oil train a day.
- Some think we would see an increase in tourist and visitor money with the potential of tourist trains going through the area.
  - If there were passenger trains, which I believe is highly doubtful, the reality is those trains will only make limited stops and only stay for a limited time when they do stop. The vast majority of residents impacted by the trains will see no financial benefit of increased visitors.
  - There aren't any "destination" locations here that would bring in a volume of visitors for multiple day stays to justify the costs to build the infrastructure that would be needed. There is no infrastructure to accommodate movement of tourists around the area.

There aren't train depots, or local public transportation options for people if passenger trains were to stop in a community.

- Train travel is expensive, making it only viable for a very small segment of travelers.

Many bought their property in the area to get away from the sounds of commerce, like multiple trains rumbling through the canyon on a regular basis. They wished to be in an area where they can see wildlife that has not been frightened off by the noises of trains or the inability to get to the river for water.

The re-opening of the rails through the Arkansas River canyon benefits the oil and railway companies moving the oil at great cost to our environment and the residents, both human and wildlife, along the route.

The reactivation of the rail line would have a negative effect on the public and should not be approved.

Respectfully,

Becky Dunn

63 Mustang Trail,  
Howard CO 81233

[beckydunn@bellsouth.net](mailto:beckydunn@bellsouth.net)

cc: Parties of Record