

**DETROIT INTERMODAL FREIGHT TERMINAL PROJECT**  
**Local Advisory Council Meeting**  
**May 12, 2004**  
**Notes**

**Purpose:** To review the progress of the Detroit Intermodal Freight Terminal Project with members of the Local Advisory Council.

**Attendance:** See attached.

**Discussion:**

**Meeting Conduct Procedures**

Mohammed Alghurabi asked those in attendance to introduce themselves. He then indicated that the meeting conduct procedures would allow LAC members to first ask questions/make comments. Then, the observers in attendance would have their items discussed during the “public comment” section of the meeting.

**Review of Notes**

Mohammed Alghurabi asked if there were any comments or changes on the meeting notes. Olga Savic indicated that the notes should reflect that she requested a list of those people/groups that had been contacted for an interview in the social/cultural analysis process.

Chuck Goedert indicated the notes should reflect that he attended the March 24<sup>th</sup> LAC meeting.

**Air Quality Issues**

Joe Corradino referred to the packet of information provided to those in attendance and referenced a letter between Dr. Robbins of the University of Michigan/Community Action Against Asthma (CAAA) and John Polacek of MDOT. John Polacek had earlier written a letter to Dr. Robbins indicating that MDOT was interested in receiving information from CAAA that would enhance the understanding of the air quality issues in southwest Detroit. Joe Corradino indicated that the letter from Dr. Robbins to John Polacek reflected that those data were not available at this time.

Joe Corradino then reviewed a handout provided at the April 22<sup>nd</sup> public meeting held by CAAA and a letter from Mohammed Alghurabi to Kathy Edgren of CAAA requesting substantiation of the CAAA claims of tons of pollution created by the DIFT, the DIFT effects on property values,

and the health effects of Detroit Intermodal Freight Terminal's activities. Joe Corradino indicated that knowing the source of that information is important.

Kathryn Savoie stated that the reference in the handout to which Joe Corradino was directing attention that deals with the DIFT EIS considering environmental justice concerns has been corrected by CAAA. Joe Corradino responded that he appreciated knowing that but a written response to that and other issues in the flyer was important.

### **FHWA Letter**

Joe Corradino referred to a letter dated April 16<sup>th</sup> from the Federal Highway Administration indicating that there would be no change in the DIFT Air Quality Protocol and that the use of MOBILE6.2 was appropriate in the DIFT air quality analysis. Chuck Goedert requested a copy of the letter be provided to the LAC to which FHWA was responding. Mohammed Alghurabi indicated that letter would be made available.

### **Las Vegas Court Ruling**

Joe Corradino referred to LEXIS/NEXIS documentation on the federal court ruling on the lawsuit brought by the Sierra Club against the Federal Highway Administration on a roadway project in Las Vegas. He noted that the documentation includes FHWA's position that there are no reliable methods to determine health risks dealing with air pollutants. He also noted that the ruling by the federal court agreed with FHWA on this matter and on all other claims brought by the Sierra Club. In highlighting other items in the court's ruling, Joe Corradino directed the LAC's attention to page 49 where the federal judge indicated that FHWA, while meeting the letter of the law in using an open house format for its public hearings, should review that matter in favor of a town hall-type meeting which, the judge felt, best meets Congressional intent.

### **Ozone Rule**

Joe Corradino referred to material in the agenda packet dealing with the application of an 8-hour ozone standard by EPA for determining an area's air quality conformity. He also noted that within the last few days, the Environmental Protection Agency issued new rules for the sulfur content of off-road diesel fuel as well as the engines that are to be installed by 2014 on all new off-road diesel vehicles. Off-road vehicles include construction equipment such as bulldozers as well as locomotives.

Carmine Palombo indicated that SEMCOG has a task force dealing with application of EPA standards. The next meeting of that group will be May 19<sup>th</sup>. It will address regional air quality conformity issues including the 8-hour standard for ozone and issues related to particulate matter (PM<sub>2.5</sub>). He noted that the region is in violation of the new 8-hour ozone standard by a very small measure. Nevertheless, it is SEMCOG's responsibility, in cooperation with the state and EPA, to define ways that conformity will be achieved. He indicated that the area to which the standards would apply would likely go beyond the typical seven counties in SEMCOG and extend to Lenawee County.

Carmine Palombo indicated that the region has certain goals that must be met which will affect both stationary sources and mobile sources of pollution. The conformity issue that SEMCOG deals with is addressed on a regional basis but reflects the input from projects such as the DIFT. If regional conformity cannot be achieved when a project is added to other pollution generators, then federal funding can be denied.

In response to a question from Olga Savic, Carmine Palombo elaborated on the conformity process that is applied to transportation projects like the DIFT. In response to a question by Bill Schrader on the potential pollution that might be associated with truck traffic in an area such as a railroad terminal, Carmine Palombo indicated that strategies may have to be developed to address that issue, if conformity is to be achieved.

Joe Corradino indicated that a project like the DIFT must go through conformity determinations for two analysis years: the year of opening and the horizon year. For the DIFT, they are 2015 and 2025, respectively.

Olga Savic asked for more explanation of who was responsible for determining conformity. Carmine Palombo responded that individual project information, such as for the DIFT, is to be provided by the project sponsor to SEMCOG. The project sponsor must use models and input data consistent with that prescribed by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. Once those data are provided to SEMCOG, then SEMCOG adds that project to the analysis of pollution generators to determine how overall regional conformity might be affected by the proposed project.

Joe Corradino indicated that the conformity determination will not be conducted for the DIFT until there is a recommended alternative which will be defined in the FEIS, not the DEIS. Carmine Palombo indicated that the DIFT FEIS cannot be signed unless the conformity determination is positive. Further, Carmine Palombo noted that adequate funding must be defined to implement the project before the FEIS can be issued.

Olga Savic asked if detailed cost estimates would be available to define the financial requirement of the DIFT. Joe Corradino indicated a preliminary cost estimate is now available.

Father Redican asked if there are cost estimates for each of the alternatives. Joe Corradino indicated that there are.

Olga Savic inquired how the timing of projects affects conformity and, specifically, the relationship between the DIFT and the International Border Crossing. Carmine Palombo responded that the project that reaches the FEIS stage first will be considered for entry into the long-range transportation plan, if the conformity analysis and funding issues are addressed. Then, the project that comes next is subject to a greater challenge as a result of the earlier project's inclusion in the SEMCOG long-range plan.

Olga Savic asked who establishes the baseline of the projects included in the long-range plan. Carmine Palombo responded that SEMCOG has two people dedicated to that activity.

Kathryn Savoie asked if it were correct that conformity must be established before an FEIS can be issued. Carmine Palombo indicated it was correct. Kathryn Savoie then asked, when there is no preferred alternative, if conformity could be examined for multiple alternatives. Carmine Palombo indicated that can be done, but SEMCOG prefers that the project sponsor define the preferred alternative. He indicated there are projects documented on Draft Environmental Impact Statements that have sat idle for years. So, it is not very productive to run conformity analysis when projects are not advancing to the FEIS stage.

Kathryn Savoie asked if there could be a long period of time between completion of the DEIS and the conformity analysis. Carmine Palombo responded yes.

Joe Corradino asked Carmine Palombo to comment on the length of time between EPA's defining an attainment area and when the official conformity analysis for that pollutant would be conducted. Carmine Palombo responded that EPA is expected to designate areas for non-attainment for PM<sub>2.5</sub> in December 2004. It could be several years between that point and the final determination of processes to conduct conformity for PM<sub>2.5</sub>.

Olga Savic asked who mandates when the conformity analysis must be conducted for a pollutant such as PM<sub>2.5</sub>. Carmine Palombo stated that it is EPA.

Chuck Goedert asked is it correct that SEMCOG cannot perform the conformity analysis until the project's sponsor provides the pollutant information of that project. Carmine Palombo indicated that is correct.

Joe Corradino stressed that Carmine Palombo's analysis for conformity will be on a regional basis. Therefore, while there will be a local effect around a terminal, there is also, because of the diversion of freight from truck to intermodal rail, a regional effect which will lessen some pollutants.

### **CSX Gate**

Joe Corradino indicated it was his understanding that a permit for the construction of the CSX gate at Waterman/Dix/Vernor was issued the previous Friday.

Olga Savic stated that Representative Tobocman had received a letter from MDOT Director Gloria Jeff but more information is needed. She indicated that she would discuss the matter with Mohammed Alghurabi following the meeting.

Joe Corradino indicated that the information provided in March at the DIFT public meetings for Alternative 4: The Composite Option, included an error: the number of residential properties possibly relocated is not 13 but 31.

Joe Corradino noted that discussions with the railroads in the last several weeks have advanced the development of a Memorandum of Understanding. The core of that discussion is now between the MDOT Project Team and representatives of CSX and NS. Those two railroads

control the ability for CP or CN to have a terminal in the Livernois-Junction Yard area. Therefore, it is the MDOT Project Team's approach to resolve the core items of the Memorandum of Understanding with CSX and NS and then advance the discussions with CN and CP.

Joe Corradino also mentioned that Norfolk Southern's Triple Crown operation was experiencing significant increases in business. As a result, it is reopening its terminal at Willow Run, where it will accommodate intermodal traffic for Ford Motor Company moving between Detroit and Minneapolis. Norfolk Southern has requested MDOT consider, as soon as possible, whether/how it can assist the consolidation of all Triple Crown intermodal activity in Michigan at the Livernois-Junction Yard. Joe Corradino noted that as a result of that NS request, further refinements of the intermodal terminal layout south of John Kronk are being examined with CSX, NS and Conrail so Triple Crown can be located on the west side of the Livernois Yard. Olga Savic asked if there were a change in the terminal layout so that Triple Crown would be located at the western part of the yard. Joe Corradino indicated that relocating Triple Crown in the terminal layout to not affect gate locations may cause some adjustment in the traffic patterns for trucks entering/exiting those gates. Olga Savic asked at what point would the community receive information on the proposal to adjust the terminal layout. Joe Corradino indicated that information would likely be available at the July meeting of the LAC.

Olga Savic asked if the boundary of the terminal on the south side of John Kronk going to change because of the possible Triple Crown move. Joe Corradino indicated that it would not.

Father Redican asked if this movement of Triple Crown would prejudice the selection of an alternative. Joe Corradino responded that it would not. Father Redican asked if the Memorandum of Understanding would be signed by all four railroads. Joe Corradino indicated that each railroad would be asked to sign a Memorandum of Understanding. It is too early to know whether all four railroads would sign one document.

Bill Schrader asked if re-defining the terminal on the south side of John Kronk would have any effect on the CP/Oak terminal. Joe Corradino indicated it would not.

Father Redican stated that, at some point in this DIFT process, the community or the city needs to speak with MDOT and its representatives with respect to improvements/benefits for the community. He asked when that could happen. Joe Corradino indicated that it could happen at any time, but would be best if it paralleled the discussions with the railroads of a Memorandum of Understanding.

Father Redican then asked the point at which it would be fruitless for the community to enter those discussions. Joe Corradino responded that, politically speaking, it probably is never too late. Technically speaking, once the FEIS is signed, the project can go forward.

Paul Nye stated that Joe Corradino's comments indicate that the Willow Run terminal is being reopened as a result of Ford business. He stressed that is not the case. Joe Corradino responded his comments addressed the issue of the growth in Triple Crown's business to such an extent it will have to reopen the Willow Run terminal and one of the reasons is a new contract with Ford Motor Company.

Paul Nye stated that Ford Motor Company has not increased its use of intermodal. Ford does not now, or in the future, acknowledge any incremental growth in intermodal transportation. The statement that Triple Crown must relocate its operations because of Ford's needs is inaccurate. Ford has no contract for the service that Joe Corradino described and wanted to reiterate clearly that the Willow Run terminal is not being reopened because of Ford.

Marc Higginbotham indicated that Norfolk Southern has advised MDOT that Triple Crown's terminal needs go beyond that which can be handled in Melvindale. Therefore, it is reopening the Willow Run terminal. NS has advised MDOT that it would prefer to consolidate the Triple Crown business at the Melvindale and Willow Run terminals at the Livernois-Junction Yard. Marc noted that he believes there is a contract between Norfolk Southern and Ford to provide intermodal services between Minneapolis and Chicago. Eventually it will connect to Detroit at Willow Run. Marc further indicated that NS has contracts with companies other than Ford that has caused its Triple Crown business to grow. Norfolk Southern has asked that MDOT consider redesigning the intermodal terminal layout to accommodate Triple Crown on the western side of the Livernois Yard.

Marc Higginbotham noted that several months ago, Triple Crown advised MDOT there were several constraints facing its business. If they could not be addressed in southeastern Michigan at the Livernois Yard, then other options that Norfolk Southern/Triple Crown would consider included moving the business to Toledo. Triple Crown's preference is to maintain its business in Michigan.

Paul Nye indicated that he wanted it to be clear that the intermodal decisions of Norfolk Southern and Triple Crown are not being driven by Ford Motor Company.

Joe Corradino indicated that Triple Crown was experiencing an increase in business which was causing it to reopen the Willow Run terminal and that increased business includes Ford Motor Company's intermodal service between Detroit and Minneapolis.

Paul Nye reiterated that, while Ford understands Norfolk Southern's growth, he objected to the statements that only mentioned Ford Motor Company related to Triple Crown business. Joe Corradino responded by saying that he understood Paul Nye's comments in the past to indicate that Ford does not use intermodal. Paul Nye said that Ford uses intermodal but there is no incremental need for additional intermodal.

Father Redican asked is there no intermodal growth for Ford Motor Company, then what is the general outlook for Ford in Michigan. Paul Nye responded that Ford Motor Company continues to want to grow in southeastern Michigan. Its focus is on just-in-time delivery of products and intermodal will not be a primary method in that system.

Greg Gorno indicated that a lot of companies that thought they would never use intermodal now do because of its reliability. Joe Corradino noted that a recent *Traffic World* article cited intermodal growth since 2000 at 55 percent for the Livernois Yard.

Chuck Goedert, in reviewing an article in the agenda packet about Canadian National's service to Ford Motor Company, inquired if that affects the CN/Moterm terminal in Ferndale. Paul Nye said that it does not.

Paul Nye indicated that he was the key person in the redesign of the Ford Rouge plant. In that effort, Ford presented its plans and responded to the community's input.

Chuck Goedert returned to the issue of whether Ford's relationship with Canadian National to move its finished product was going to have an effect on the Moterm terminal. Paul Nye indicated that finished products are being shipped at Flat Rock.

Marc Higginbotham noted it is important to differentiate between intermodal service which, in the auto business involves the movement of parts, and the shipment of finished auto products which is not handled by intermodal.

Chuck Goedert indicated that statements had been made by the MDOT Project Team that Canadian National was more comfortable staying at Moterm than moving to a consolidated yard. He wanted to be sure that situation was not associated with Ford Motor Company's business. Joe Corradino responded by saying that Chuck Goedert was correct.

Bill Schrader stated that it did not appear to him that the DIFT project will be affected by whether Ford is involved in it or not. He noted that all the data he has seen indicate that intermodal shipping continues to increase and that it will be used more and more. He concluded by saying that it does not matter who wants to "put their name on it." Further, future EPA requirements will cause a continuing shift from truck to rail.

Paul Nye responded that Ford's position is not some "public relations ploy." Ford Motor Company is encouraging its suppliers and shippers to move closer to its plants so it doesn't need trains. Ford's objective is to reduce/eliminate transportation costs.

Bill Schrader responded that the suppliers Ford is trying to move closer to its automobile plants are still going to need intermodal to get their product. Paul Nye indicated that this was too simplistic an outlook. Bill Schrader responded that even if Ford Motor Company is "out of the picture," intermodal is still going to grow in the area.

Greg Gorno noted that it is his experience that circumstances will cause Ford to use intermodal in the future. Olga Savic indicated that it seemed inappropriate to continue second-guessing

Ford's position. She suggested that the LAC move to the next agenda item. Greg Gorno responded that the intermodal industry is experiencing increased growth in southeastern Michigan and that growth needs to be addressed.

### **Social/Cultural Update**

Joe Corradino distributed a list of over 90 organizations with which contact had been attempted in order to conduct an interview for the social/cultural analysis. Over 30 of those organizations had participated to date. Olga Savic asked to whom she might refer further comments and suggestions as they relate to the social/cultural interviews. Joe Corradino indicated that Harvey Santana was leading the interview effort. Olga Savic asked what the deadline would be for conducting the interviews. Joe Corradino indicated mid-June.

### **Other**

Bill Schrader indicated that at one of the DIFT public meetings, a concern had been raised about security matters in the terminal area. He suggested that the terminal designs that the DIFT Project Team were developing should reflect high-level security that protects the areas around the intermodal yards, particularly if the terminals will be handling valuable or sensitive products, such as military equipment.

Father Redican asked what would happen to the CP/Oak terminal in Alternative 4: The Composite Option. Joe Corradino indicated that CP/Oak's container activity would be transferred to the Livernois-Junction Yard area. The terminal would continue to handle other freight. Olga Savic asked if improvements would be made to the CP/Oak area under Alternative 4. Joe Corradino indicated that they would not be made through the DIFT project but could be made by the railroads.

### **Public Comments**

Maria Anita Salinas commented that the letter in the agenda packet addressed from Mohammed Alghurabi to Kathy Edgren had not been received by Kathy Edgren. She indicated that CAAA would provide responses to all the issues raised in that "draft" letter. Maria Salinas also stated that a representative of Corradino was at the April 22<sup>nd</sup> CAAA meeting but left early. Had he stayed, then each of the answers to his questions would have been provided.

Father Redican indicated that the CAAA had distributed a flyer for which an oral response did not seem appropriate. A written response was in order.

Discussion then ensued about a CAAA presentation to the LAC. It was indicated that that was anticipated during the June meeting.

An individual from the Ferndale area asked where the SEMCOG meeting was to be held on May 19<sup>th</sup> dealing with air quality issues. Carmine Palombo indicated that it would be held on the 3<sup>rd</sup> floor of the Buhl Building.

With that, the meeting adjourned at 9:00 p.m.

*L:\Projects\2846-A\WP\notes\LocalAdvisory\May12.doc*

# DETROIT INTERMODAL FREIGHT TERMINAL PROJECT

## Local Advisory Council Meeting

May 12, 2004

### Attendance

#### LAC Members

Name	Representing
Chuck Goedert	City of Ferndale
Greg Gorno	Gorno Transportation
Marc Higginbotham	Norfolk Southern
Kimberly James	Detroit Planning Commission
Paul Nye	Ford Motor Company
Carmine Palombo	SEMCOG
Fr. Joe Redican	Holy Redeemer Schools
Olga Savic	Representative Tobocman
Kathryn Savoie	CBRA
William Schrader	Jeffries-Southfield

#### LAC Observers

Name	Representing
Kim Anderson	
Mohammed Alghurabi	MDOT
Micky Blashfield	Centra
Scott Bradford	Green Acres/I-CARE
Chris Brayman	Dearborn Police Department
Byna Camden	Green Acres/I-CARE
Vicki Chavez	SW Detroit homeowner
Marty Connour	MARS Industries
Joe Corradino	The Corradino Group
Jeff Edwards	MDOT
John Edwards	Grandmont resident
Mario Ferini	Ferini Contracting
Lisa Goldstein	SDEV
Ga Grier	
Jim Hartman	The Corradino Group
Christine Iler	SW Detroit homeowner
Tim Jenkins	Michigan State Fairgrounds
Ken Kucel	Wayne County DPS-Engineering
John Kyriacopoulos	Detroit resident
Jason Maciejewski	Wayne County Executive's Office
Amy MacDonald	
Janet Narich	I-CARE
Brenda Peek	MDOT Metro Region
Sherry Piacenti	MDOT
Dorothy Pierce	Green Acres/I-CARE
Josephine Powell	Wayne County Department of Environment
Maria Anita Salinas	Community Action Against Asthma
Harvey Santana	The Corradino Group
Linda Cathy Schneider	
Chuck Tucker	City of Ferndale
Lauren Zajac	