

April 30, 2018

Via Electronic Filing

245608

Ms. Cynthia T. Brown
Chief, Section of Administration
Office of Proceedings
Surface Transportation Board
395 E Street, SW
Washington, DC 20423-0001

ENTERED
Office of Proceedings
April 30,, 2018
Part of
Public Record

Re: Docket No. FD 36171 - *Commuter Rail Division of the Regional Transportation Authority and Northeast Illinois Regional Commuter Railroad Corporation (Metra) - Petition for Declaratory Order - Status of Chicago Union Station*

Dear Ms. Brown:

I represent the National Railroad Passenger Corporation (Amtrak) in the above-referenced matter. On April 26, 2018, counsel for the Maryland Transit Administration (MTA) filed a letter with the Board requesting entry of a procedural schedule “to ensure there is an adequate opportunity to MTA and its stakeholders to participate.” Just after MTA filed that letter, Amtrak filed its Reply to Metra’s Petition. As such, Amtrak did not have an opportunity to address MTA’s letter in its Reply.

MTA has offered no valid basis for delaying this proceeding. First, MTA has no interest in this proceeding, which relates to access to and services at Chicago Union Station. In its Petition, Metra argues that the Board has jurisdiction over some disputes arising from Amtrak’s operation of Chicago Union Station because that facility used to be owned by Chicago Union Station Company (CUSCO), a former Amtrak subsidiary that has since been merged into Amtrak. According to Metra, the fact that it used to have an agreement with CUSCO regarding Chicago Union Station now gives the Board unique jurisdiction over Amtrak (with respect to prospective contract negotiations with Amtrak) that the Board otherwise would not have.

MTA claims that it has an interest here because it sits in an analogous position with respect to the Washington Terminal Company (WTCO), which operates Washington Union

Ms. Cynthia T. Brown
April 30, 2018
Page 2

Station. But as MTA acknowledges, it does not have a contract with WTCO, which is still an independent, wholly-owned subsidiary of Amtrak. MTA has a contract with Amtrak. Metra's arguments in its Petition have no application to MTA.

Second, MTA has the opportunity to weigh in within the time limits set by the Board's rules. For the reasons stated in its Reply to the Petition, Amtrak believes the Board has all necessary information and that a quick resolution to this proceeding is appropriate. There is certainly no reason to delay resolution for MTA where MTA has no actual interest at stake.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Respectfully,



Thomas R. Waskom
*Counsel for National Railroad Passenger
Corporation (Amtrak)*

cc: Thomas J. Litwiler, Esq.
Stephen A. MacIsaac, Esq.
Charles A. Spitunik, Esq.