VENABLE LLP

600 MASSACHUSETTS AVE., NW WASHINGTON, DC 20001
T 202.344.4000 F 202.344.8300 www.Venable.com

November 16, 2026

Jay C. Johnson

T 202.344.4698
jcjohnson@venable.com

Danielle Gosselin
Director
Office of Environmental Analysis
Surface Transportation Board
395 E Street, SW
Washington, DC 20423

Re: Docket No. FD 36873 – Union Pacific Corp. & Union Pacific R.R. – Control – Norfolk Southern Corp. & Norfolk Southern Ry. – UP-NS Response to Information Request No. 4 – Maximum Train Lengths and UP-NS Revised Application

Dear Ms. Gosselin:

As CPKC prepares to comment on the scope of the Environmental Impact Statement in this docket, we have been reviewing the responses to information requests that have already been submitted, along with the relevant filings in the merits docket. That process has raised a question about maximum train lengths that we wanted to be sure you knew about.

In Information Request No. 4, OEA asked the applicants to estimate, for all segments that exceed the Board's thresholds for environmental review, the "maximum total lengths (in feet) of trains pre- and post-acquisition." The applicants responded with a spreadsheet that purports to list these maximum lengths for over 200 segments. The longest maximum length on that spreadsheet was 11,135 feet.

This spreadsheet caught CPKC's attention because it seemed to be inconsistent with other statements the applicants have made. For instance, UP's CEO said on an earnings call in 2025 that "we don't run 10,000-foot trains. We run our intermodal package because we have built a system to be able to do that somewhere between 14,000 and 18,000 feet."[1] UP's most recent earnings presentation similarly highlighted an average system train lengths of 9,969 feet (up

[1] Union Pacific Corporation, Q4 2025 Earnings Call Transcript (https://investor.unionpacific.com/events/event-details/q4-2025-earnings-release).

2% from the previous quarter).[2] It made no sense to CPKC that UP would be running so many long trains and yet not report a maximum length above 11,135 feet anywhere in its response to Information Request No. 4.

But the applicants' response to Information Request No. 4 is not the only place in the record where they estimate maximum train lengths. The applicants' operating plan (Exhibit 13 to the April 30, 2026 Revised Application) lists maximum train lengths for specific trains. And when CPKC compared some of the maximum train lengths in that operating plan to the maximum lengths given in response to Information Request No. 4, it could not reconcile them.

Here are some examples to show what we mean.

East Palestine, OH (Segment 10082)

The applicants' response to Information Request No. 4 says that the maximum train length on segment 10082, which runs through East Palestine, OH on the Fort Wayne Line, would go from 8,505 feet before the merger to 8,354 feet after—a slight decrease in maximum length. Average length also drops. But the applicants' operating plan lists six trains with maximum lengths above 8,354 feet that would use this segment:

MNPCW – Max Length 14,227'
MCWAL – Max Length 9,626'
ZLTCX – Max Length 11,097'
ZCXLT – Max Length 10,396'
ZCICX – Max Length 14,533'
ZCXCI – Max Length 13,013'

CPKC cannot understand how these maximum lengths from the operating plan and those provided in response to Information Request No. 4 could both be true. And if the operating plan is right that the trains moving over segment 10082 could exceed 14,000 feet, it would surely increase that segment's average train length. Such

[2] Union Pacific Corporation, Third Quarter 2026 Earnings at 14 (https://investor.unionpacific.com/static-files/be7edc8a-147d-4650-84e5-94b8f9ded2ac).

changes in maximum and average train lengths would affect (at least) emergency response delay, grade crossing delay, noise and vibration, and air quality.

Logansport, IN (Segment 10138)

Similar inconsistencies appear for segment 10138, which passes through Logansport, IN. The applicants' response to Information Request No. 4 says that the post-acquisition maximum train length on this segment would be 7,758 feet. But their operating plan lists far higher maximum train lengths for four trains that will operate on the segment:

ZCICX – Max Length 14,533'
ZCXCI – Max Length 13,013'
ZLCDT – Max Length 15,256'
ZDTLC – Max Length 12,931'

One of these trains—ZLCDT—lists a maximum length that is close to double the maximum length given for segment 10138 in response to Information Request No. 4. Again, if the lengths in the operating plan are accurate for segment 10138, it would make a difference to several environmental and community-impact issues.

We also noticed that the applicants' capital improvement plan identifies multiple projects in the Kansas City-to-Butler corridor—which includes Logansport—that are meant to "allow operations consistent with the combined company's train-length strategy." Turner V.S. ¶ 90. Those projects include four sidings (Vance, Coburn, Hannel, and Griggsville) that would increase to 15,000 feet long. Increasing sidings to 15,000 feet to support a "train-length strategy" makes sense only if the operating plan is accurate, and the entire corridor can expect maximum train lengths in that 15,000-foot range.

Birmingham, AL (Segment 10033)

The applicants' response to Information Request No. 4 claims that the maximum post-acquisition train length on segment 10033 in Birmingham, AL would be 6,154 feet. Again, their operating plan says something else, listing six trains with operations on segment 10033 whose maximum length would exceed the number given in response to Information Request No. 4:

ZIEJX – Max Length 10,905'
ZCTLB – Max Length 10,715'
ZMXCX – Max Length 11,762'
ZCXMX – Max Length 11,332'
ZHOAT – Max Length 9,394'
ZATHO – Max Length 9,739'

CPKC cannot see how these numbers from the operating plan can fit with the maximum length listed for segment 10033 in response to Information Request No. 4. And if the maximum train lengths from the operating plan are inaccurate, the environmental review could be inaccurate.

The applicants' capital improvement plan also identifies six 15,000-foot siding extensions in the New Orleans-to-Atlanta corridor (which includes Birmingham), as well as one new 14,000-foot siding. Again, these planned physical changes seem more consistent with the maximum lengths in the operating plan than the maximum length for segment 10033 given in response to Information Request No. 4.

Other Examples

CPKC has identified at least four other segments with similar mismatches between the maximum train length given in response to Information Request No. 4 and the maximum lengths of trains that the operating plan says will be operating on those segments.

- Kinder, LA (segment 10503) lists a maximum length of 7,609' in response to Information Request No. 4, even though the operating plan shows that six trains that would run on that segment (ZMXCX, ZCXMX, ZHOAT, ZATHO, MCTEW, and MBHEW) would have greater maximum lengths, with the longest being 11,762'.

- Monroe, LA (segment 12304) lists a maximum length of 5,681' in response to Information Request No. 4, even though the operating plan shows that three trains that would run on that segment (ZLBAT, ZIEJX, and ZCTLB) would have greater maximum lengths, with the longest being 11,068'.

- Tuscon, AZ (segment 10556) lists a maximum length of 9,086' in response to Information Request No. 4, even though the operating plan shows that seven trains that would run on that segment (ZLBAT, ZCICX, ZCXCI, ZLCDT, ZDTLC, ZIEJX, and ZCTLB) would have greater maximum lengths, with the longest being 15,256'.

- Harrisburg, PA (segment 10123) lists a maximum length of 7,179' in response to Information Request No. 4, even though the operating plan shows that seven trains that would run on that segment (ZLCCX, ZLTCX, ZCXLT, ZCICX, ZCXCI, ZMXCX, and ZCXMX) would have greater maximum lengths, with the longest being 14,533'.

None of these discrepancies is small. And CPKC has seen nothing in the record that explains them. Nor has CPKC performed a full audit of the applicants' responses; this letter includes just what CPKC has uncovered so far.

If the Board—and the people living in these communities—want to understand how the proposed acquisition will affect emergency response delay, grade crossing delay, noise and vibration, and air quality, OEA's analysis of those effects must be based on accurate train lengths. As far as CPKC can see, at least for the segments discussed in this letter, OEA has not yet been provided with such accurate information. The Board is in a better position to judge whether the applicants' other responses to Information Request No. 4 are accurate. But without consistent and accurate information, it is impossible for any stakeholder to respond properly.

Finally, given the crossover between this comment and issues being raised in the merits docket, CPKC has also filed this letter in the merits docket and served all parties to the proceeding.

As always, please contact me if you have any questions.

Sincerely,



Jay C. Johnson

cc: Elizabeth Webster
Joe Van Humbeck
Glen Wilson
Alan Summerville
Waymon Peer
Merits Docket Service List

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that on this 11th day of November, 2026, I caused a copy of the foregoing to be served by email or by first-class mail, postage prepaid, on all parties of record in this proceeding, the Secretary of Transportation, the Attorney General of the United States, and Administrative Law Judge Jennifer Soulikias.

/s/ Jay C. Johnson
Jay C. Johnson