

From: [Whitfield, Peter](#)
To: [Wood, Diana](#)
Cc: [Thornhill, Steve](#); [Hildebrandt, Brooklyn](#)
Subject: RE: CN question on train number increase on one line segment
Date: Thursday, September 22, 2022 6:17:34 PM
Attachments: [OEA - Springfield and Other Lines 07.07.2022 - Revised.xlsx](#)

Diana,

The issue was as expected – one that was geography based. We apologize for not making the issue regarding the Cockrell location clearer in our filing and we are submitting a revised spreadsheet that should help.

The issue arises from an error in the Primary Applicants’ initial description of the east end of the Springfield Line. That description indicated that the line extended from Murrayville to Springfield, and then from Springfield to Cockrell. In reality, however, the line extends from Murrayville through Cockrell and on to Springfield.

We attempted to clarify this at pages 2-4 of its CN’s September 6, 2022 submission, with a description of the issue on page 3. It is also why Line 4 of the Attachment 2 spreadsheet to that submission (designated as “Springfield IL – Cockrell IL”) contains no data – that segment is subsumed within the “Murrayville IL – Springfield IL” segment on Line 3.

The first tab of CN’s earlier July 7, 2022 spreadsheet, however, confusingly included partial data on Line 12, the “Springfield (Other)” segment from Springfield to Cockrell, even though that segment was likewise already covered by Line 11, the “Murrayville, IL – Springfield, IL” segment. That spreadsheet also gave an incorrect mileage under “CN Considered Mileage” for the Murrayville-Springfield segment on Line 11 (cell L11). The attached revised spreadsheet corrects these items, with revised information indicated by yellow highlighting.

Finally, we note that there is a milepost equation on the Springfield Line at Murrayville, where MP 221.7 = MP 226.7. This is why Lines 10 and 11 of the July 7, 2022 spreadsheet appear to show a five-mile gap at Murrayville (compare cells G10 and G11).

We hope this explanation addresses your question. We are available at your convenience to discuss these matters further if that would be helpful. Thank you.

PETER WHITFIELD

SIDLEY AUSTIN LLP

1501 K Street, N.W.

Washington, DC 20005

Cell 202.669.2160 (Please use to contact)

+1 202 736 8531

pwhitfield@sidley.com

www.sidley.com

From: Wood, Diana <Diana.Wood@stb.gov>
Sent: Monday, September 19, 2022 2:18 PM
To: Whitfield, Peter <pwhitfield@sidley.com>
Cc: Thornhill, Steve <sthornh@burnsmcd.com>
Subject: RE: CN question on train number increase on one line segment

And it's also missing in spreadsheet 1 from your responses to Information Request 1.

From: Wood, Diana <Diana.Wood@stb.gov>
Sent: Monday, September 19, 2022 2:11 PM
To: Whitfield, Peter <pwhitfield@sidley.com>
Cc: Thornhill, Steve <sthornh@burnsmcd.com>
Subject: CN question on train number increase on one line segment

Peter,

In the 7-7-2022 Excel spreadsheet you submitted, the 2027 increase in the number of CN trains per day is missing for the 10.3 mile segment between Cockrell and Springfield, and the updated map is also not clear. But the 540% GMT increase shown in the spreadsheet clearly shows that this line segment is above OEA thresholds for analysis (as you have confirmed in your response to Info Request #1).

Hoping you can provide that one piece of missing information.

Thanks,
Diana

Diana F. Wood
Office of Environmental Analysis
Surface Transportation Board
395 E Street SW, 11th Floor
Washington, DC 20423
202-245-0302

This e-mail is sent by a law firm and may contain information that is privileged or confidential.

If you are not the intended recipient, please delete the e-mail and any attachments and notify us immediately.

