

**From:** Gendron, Maggie (Leahy) [Maggie\_Gendron@leahy.senate.gov]  
**Sent:** Monday, July 18, 2016 3:44 PM  
**To:** Searles, Brian  
**CC:** Kunin, Lisa  
**Subject:** RE: Preclearance Conference Call

**Follow Up Flag:** Follow up  
**Flag Status:** Flagged

Thank you Brian – and yes – this is something I have also heard.

The cost recovery is a sensitive issue with very polarized views of what is the best cost structure to have in place. I also understand the hesitancy around passage of U.S. legislation, and I would be too. Again, I am hopeful because Senator Leahy secured the preclearance language in an underlying bill that has to move this fall, but I don't know what will happen this fall when we get back around appropriations (omnibus or continuing resolution have different outcomes for preclearance). However, what I disagree with on both sides of the border is the inability for projects to plan or move forward because of the insistence to wait for legislation to pass. These kinds of transportation projects, like preclearance for all modes of transportation, are very fluid and complex and do not move in a linear fashion. But – given the focus on a need for legislation, that is where I have focused my efforts. I will redirect my focus once that goal has been accomplished.

Be well, and thank you for the updates. I very much appreciate it.

Maggie

---

**From:** Searles, Brian [mailto:Brian.Searles@vermont.gov]  
**Sent:** Monday, July 18, 2016 3:34 PM  
**To:** Gendron, Maggie (Leahy) <Maggie\_Gendron@leahy.senate.gov>  
**Cc:** Kunin, Lisa <Lisa.Kunin@vermont.gov>  
**Subject:** Preclearance Conference Call

Hi Maggie:

I have been monitoring a conference call today from Vancouver concerning their preclearance facility for the Vancouver-Seattle-Eugene service and other proposed marine and rail terminal facilities. Call conducted by Transport Canada and transportation folks from the western US and Canada we're on along with Amtrak and New York DOT. Two things emerged that I wanted to share:

1. They are wary of our process for passing necessary legislation in the US and Transport Canada will not "turn the switch on" for preclearance until our bill passes. They are not concerned about their legislation passing.

2. They are upset about the "cost recovery" piece of the agreement between Public Safety Canada and our DHS. Their comments on the call, such as "do they think we're doing them a big favor by facilitating travel?", and others indicated to me a significant level of resentment that will continue to rear it's head.

This is probably not news to you but just further examples that I wanted you to know about.

Brian