



GEORGE G. GENTILE – Chairman

THOMAS HOWARD – Vice Chairman

TOM BOYHAN – Secretary/Treasurer

MICHAEL MARTINEZ

PATRICIA WALKER

MICHAEL J. GRELLA
Executive Director
mgrella@jupiterinletdistrict.org

NIKKI A. COSTANZO
Administrative Assistant
ncostanzo@jupiterinletdistrict.org

October 16, 2014

John Winkle
Transportation Industry Analyst
Office of Railroad Policy and Development
Federal Railroad Administration
1200 New Jersey Avenue, SE
Washington, D.C. 20590

Re: All Aboard Florida Draft Environmental Impact Statement

Dear Mr.Winkle:

I have several questions I am hopeful the United States Coast Guard (USCG) can answer for me:

1. At a stakeholder's meeting held October 7, 2014, in Jupiter, Florida, I asked All Aboard Florida (AAF) representatives if I might see the analysis and "numbers" showing how the average bridge cycle length would be reduced from 20 minutes for the No-Action Alternative, to 12 minutes " with Project". It was suggested I have a look at the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS), that the data could be found there. I have reviewed Chapters 5 and 7 for the DEIS, as well as Appendix 4.1.3.C, and Chapters 5, 7, and 8 of the AMEC Report, but was unable to find any of the inputs or assumptions that show how AAF arrived at the eight minute reduction in cycle length.

I have been unable to download Appendices A, C, and F of the AMEC Report. Perhaps they contain the data I am looking for and, if so, might you forward me a copy? I assume the methodology is based on the Rail Traffic Controller (RTC) model developed by Berkeley Simulation Software?

2. I assume the marine traffic data was collected by Florida East Coast (FEC) for incorporation into the Discrete-Event Simulation Model? Where can the marine traffic data and model formula(s) be found?
3. Are the definitions for “minor”, “minimal”, or “no impact” based on USCG protocol?
4. What is the basis for the economic impacts, “in dollars and cents”, shown in Chapter 7.1 of the AMEC Report?

Seeing the data inputs and how All Aboard Florida arrived at its conclusions based on the modeling results and, particularly, if they could be replicated, would greatly help the Jupiter Inlet District understand the extent to which the Project does (or does not) meet the requirements of C.F.R. 116.10 and 117.299.

Thank you for your consideration.

Michael Grella, AICP, CDM
Executive Director, Jupiter Inlet District

cc: Jupiter Inlet District Board of Commissioners
William Broome, P.A.
Kim Delaney, Strategic Development Coordinator,
Treasure Coast Regional Planning Council
Andy Lukasik, Town Manager, Town of Jupiter
Michael Lieberum, USCG District Seven, Bridge Administration
Gene Stratton, USCG District Seven, Bridge Administration
Evelyn Smart, USCG District Seven, Bridge Administration