



PRESS RELEASE

For Immediate Release
August 26, 2014

Contact: Monte Edwards, 202-543-3504

**C100 Asks Council to Stop CSX Tunnel
Until DC Rail Study Completed**

The Committee on the Federal City (C100) is asking the DC Council to pass legislation to prohibit the issuance of any permits for the new, expanded CSX Tunnel in southeast until the Council completes its DC Rail Plan and DDOT and FHWA issue a Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement (SEIS) that takes the analysis into account.

“The C100 makes this request for legislation after carefully considering a whole string of problematic actions and inactions by the District Department of Transportation,” said Monte Edwards, Vice Chair of the C100 and spokesperson on the CSX Tunnel. The request is the key part of the C100 testimony on the CSX Tunnel before the DC Council on Tuesday, August 26, in a hearing jointly chaired by Chairman Phil Mendelson and Ward 3 Councilmember Mary Cheh.

“We can’t let CSX bulldoze its will through the District’s regulations and harm DC residents,” said Edwards. “We need the Council’s Rail Study to inform the District’s rail policy decisions and the Council must act to preserve its authority. CSX cannot make our transportation decisions for us.”

“DDOT has cavalierly ignored both the safety implications of the expanded tunnel, especially for the DC residents who live near the proposed project,” Edwards stated. He also reminded the councilmembers of the C100’s long-standing objection to the way CSX and the EIS completely disregard how the expanded CSX Tunnel will create a huge bottleneck in southwest where four tracks –two from Union Station and two from Virginia Avenue Tunnel -- flow into three tracks, thus preempting the planned expansion of passenger and commuter rail service. This will mean more cars on DC roads and more air pollution.

“In addition, DDOT apparently prejudged the outcome of its CSX Tunnel analysis when the agency accepted more than \$4 million dollars from CSX in 2010 to reconfigure the 11th Street Bridge for what is now, four years later, the “Preferred Alternative” in the current Environmental Impact Statement,” Edwards said. “This discredits the entire environmental review process.”
