CSX Corporation

2025 CDP Corporate Questionnaire 2025

Important: this export excludes unanswered questions
This document is an export of your organization's CDP questionnaire response. It contains all data points for questions that are answered or in progress. There may be questions or data points that you have been requested to provide, which are missing from this document because they are currently unanswered. Please note that it is your responsibility to verify that your questionnaire response is complete prior to submission. CDP will not be liable for any failure to do so.
Read full terms of disclosure

Contents

C1. Introduction 7
(1.1) In which language are you submitting your response? 7
(1.2) Select the currency used for all financial information disclosed throughout your response. 7
(1.3) Provide an overview and introduction to your organization. 7
(1.4) State the end date of the year for which you are reporting data. For emissions data, indicate whether you will be providing emissions data for past reporting years. 7
(1.4.1) What is your organization's annual revenue for the reporting period? 8
(1.5) Provide details on your reporting boundary. 8
(1.6) Does your organization have an ISIN code or another unique identifier (e.g., Ticker, CUSIP, etc.)? 8
(1.7) Select the countries/areas in which you operate. 9
(1.21) For which transport modes will you be providing data? 10
(1.24) Has your organization mapped its value chain? 10
(1.24.1) Have you mapped where in your direct operations or elsewhere in your value chain plastics are produced, commercialized, used, and/or disposed of? 10

C2. Identification, assessment, and management of dependencies, impacts, risks, and opportunities 10
(2.1) How does your organization define short-, medium-, and long-term time horizons in relation to the identification, assessment, and management of your environmental dependencies, impacts, risks, and opportunities? 10
(2.2) Does your organization have a process for identifying, assessing, and managing environmental dependencies and/or impacts? 11
(2.2.1) Does your organization have a process for identifying, assessing, and managing environmental risks and/or opportunities? 12
(2.2.2) Provide details of your organization's process for identifying, assessing, and managing environmental dependencies, impacts, risks, and/or opportunities. 12
(2.2.7) Are the interconnections between environmental dependencies, impacts, risks and/or opportunities assessed? 15
(2.3) Have you identified priority locations across your value chain? 16
(2.4) How does your organization define substantive effects on your organization? 16

C3. Disclosure of risks and opportunities 18
(3.1) Have you identified any environmental risks which have had a substantive effect on your organization in the reporting year, or are anticipated to have a substantive effect on your organization in the future? 18

(3.1.1) Provide details of the environmental risks identified which have had a substantive effect on your organization in the reporting year, or are anticipated to have a substantive effect on your organization in the future. 18

(3.1.2) Provide the amount and proportion of your financial metrics from the reporting year that are vulnerable to the substantive effects of environmental risks. 24

(3.5) Are any of your operations or activities regulated by a carbon pricing system (i.e. ETS, Cap & Trade or Carbon Tax)? 26

(3.6) Have you identified any environmental opportunities which have had a substantive effect on your organization in the reporting year, or are anticipated to have a substantive effect on your organization in the future? 26

(3.6.1) Provide details of the environmental opportunities identified which have had a substantive effect on your organization in the reporting year, or are anticipated to have a substantive effect on your organization in the future. 27

(3.6.2) Provide the amount and proportion of your financial metrics in the reporting year that are aligned with the substantive effects of environmental opportunities. 33

C4. Governance 33

(4.1) Does your organization have a board of directors or an equivalent governing body? 33

(4.1.1) Is there board-level oversight of environmental issues within your organization? 34

(4.1.2) Identify the positions (do not include any names) of the individuals or committees on the board with accountability for environmental issues and provide details of the board's oversight of environmental issues. 34

(4.2) Does your organization's board have competency on environmental issues? 36

(4.3) Is there management-level responsibility for environmental issues within your organization? 36

(4.3.1) Provide the highest senior management-level positions or committees with responsibility for environmental issues (do not include the names of individuals). 37

(4.5) Do you provide monetary incentives for the management of environmental issues, including the attainment of targets? 40

(4.5.1) Provide further details on the monetary incentives provided for the management of environmental issues (do not include the names of individuals). 41

(4.6) Does your organization have an environmental policy that addresses environmental issues? 43

(4.6.1) Provide details of your environmental policies. 44

(4.10) Are you a signatory or member of any environmental collaborative frameworks or initiatives? 45

(4.11) In the reporting year, did your organization engage in activities that could directly or indirectly influence policy, law, or regulation that may (positively or negatively) impact the environment? 45

(4.11.1) On what policies, laws, or regulations that may (positively or negatively) impact the environment has your organization been engaging directly with policy makers in the reporting year? 46

(4.11.2) Provide details of your indirect engagement on policy, law, or regulation that may (positively or negatively) impact the environment through trade associations or other intermediary organizations or individuals in the reporting year. 47

(4.12) Have you published information about your organization's response to environmental issues for this reporting year in places other than your CDP response? 49

(4.12.1) Provide details on the information published about your organization's response to environmental issues for this reporting year in places other than your CDP response. Please attach the publication. 49

C5. Business strategy 50

(5.1) Does your organization use scenario analysis to identify environmental outcomes? 50

(5.1.1) Provide details of the scenarios used in your organization's scenario analysis. 50

(5.1.2) Provide details of the outcomes of your organization's scenario analysis. 53

(5.2) Does your organization's strategy include a climate transition plan? 54

(5.3) Have environmental risks and opportunities affected your strategy and/or financial planning? 56

(5.3.1) Describe where and how environmental risks and opportunities have affected your strategy. 56

(5.3.2) Describe where and how environmental risks and opportunities have affected your financial planning. 58

(5.4) In your organization's financial accounting, do you identify spending/revenue that is aligned with your organization's climate transition? 59

(5.4.1) Quantify the amount and percentage share of your spending/revenue that is aligned with your organization's climate transition. 59

(5.5) Does your organization invest in research and development (R&D) of low-carbon products or services related to your sector activities? 60

(5.5.8) Provide details of your organization's investments in low-carbon R&D for transport-related activities over the last three years. 61

(5.10) Does your organization use an internal price on environmental externalities? 61

(5.11) Do you engage with your value chain on environmental issues? 62

(5.11.1) Does your organization assess and classify suppliers according to their dependencies and/or impacts on the environment? 62

(5.11.2) Does your organization prioritize which suppliers to engage with on environmental issues? 63

(5.11.5) Do your suppliers have to meet environmental requirements as part of your organization's purchasing process? 64

(5.11.6) Provide details of the environmental requirements that suppliers have to meet as part of your organization's purchasing process, and the compliance measures in place. 64

(5.11.7) Provide further details of your organization's supplier engagement on environmental issues. 65

(5.11.9) Provide details of any environmental engagement activity with other stakeholders in the value chain. 66

(5.12) Indicate any mutually beneficial environmental initiatives you could collaborate on with specific CDP Supply Chain members. 67

(5.13) Has your organization already implemented any mutually beneficial environmental initiatives due to CDP Supply Chain member engagement? 68

C6. Environmental Performance - Consolidation Approach 68
(6.1) Provide details on your chosen consolidation approach for the calculation of environmental performance data. 68

C7. Environmental performance - Climate Change 69
(7.1) Is this your first year of reporting emissions data to CDP? 69
(7.1.1) Has your organization undergone any structural changes in the reporting year, or are any previous structural changes being accounted for in this disclosure of emissions data? 69
(7.1.2) Has your emissions accounting methodology, boundary, and/or reporting year definition changed in the reporting year? 69
(7.2) Select the name of the standard, protocol, or methodology you have used to collect activity data and calculate emissions. 69
(7.3) Describe your organization's approach to reporting Scope 2 emissions. 70
(7.4) Are there any sources (e.g. facilities, specific GHGs, activities, geographies, etc.) of Scope 1, Scope 2 or Scope 3 emissions that are within your selected reporting boundary which are not included in your disclosure? 70
(7.5) Provide your base year and base year emissions. 70
(7.6) What were your organization's gross global Scope 1 emissions in metric tons CO2e? 75
(7.7) What were your organization's gross global Scope 2 emissions in metric tons CO2e? 75
(7.8) Account for your organization's gross global Scope 3 emissions, disclosing and explaining any exclusions. 75
(7.8.1) Disclose or restate your Scope 3 emissions data for previous years. 81
(7.9) Indicate the verification/assurance status that applies to your reported emissions. 83
(7.9.1) Provide further details of the verification/assurance undertaken for your Scope 1 emissions, and attach the relevant statements. 83
(7.9.2) Provide further details of the verification/assurance undertaken for your Scope 2 emissions and attach the relevant statements. 84
(7.9.3) Provide further details of the verification/assurance undertaken for your Scope 3 emissions and attach the relevant statements. 85
(7.10) How do your gross global emissions (Scope 1 and 2 combined) for the reporting year compare to those of the previous reporting year? 86
(7.10.1) Identify the reasons for any change in your gross global emissions (Scope 1 and 2 combined), and for each of them specify how your emissions compare to the previous year. 86
(7.10.2) Are your emissions performance calculations in 7.10 and 7.10.1 based on a location-based Scope 2 emissions figure or a market-based Scope 2 emissions figure? 87
(7.12) Are carbon dioxide emissions from biogenic carbon relevant to your organization? 87
(7.12.1) Provide the emissions from biogenic carbon relevant to your organization in metric tons CO2. 87
(7.15) Does your organization break down its Scope 1 emissions by greenhouse gas type? 87

(7.15.1) Break down your total gross global Scope 1 emissions by greenhouse gas type and provide the source of each used global warming potential (GWP). 87
(7.16) Break down your total gross global Scope 1 and 2 emissions by country/area. 87
(7.17) Indicate which gross global Scope 1 emissions breakdowns you are able to provide. 88
(7.17.3) Break down your total gross global Scope 1 emissions by business activity. 88
(7.19) Break down your organization's total gross global Scope 1 emissions by sector production activity in metric tons CO2e. 88
(7.20) Indicate which gross global Scope 2 emissions breakdowns you are able to provide. 88
(7.20.3) Break down your total gross global Scope 2 emissions by business activity. 89
(7.21) Break down your organization's total gross global Scope 2 emissions by sector production activity in metric tons CO2e. 89
(7.22) Break down your gross Scope 1 and Scope 2 emissions between your consolidated accounting group and other entities included in your response. 89
(7.23) Is your organization able to break down your emissions data for any of the subsidiaries included in your CDP response? 90
(7.26) Allocate your emissions to your customers listed below according to the goods or services you have sold them in this reporting period. 90
(7.27) What are the challenges in allocating emissions to different customers, and what would help you to overcome these challenges? 91
(7.28) Do you plan to develop your capabilities to allocate emissions to your customers in the future? 91
(7.29) What percentage of your total operational spend in the reporting year was on energy? 91
(7.30) Select which energy-related activities your organization has undertaken. 91
(7.30.1) Report your organization's energy consumption totals (excluding feedstocks) in MWh. 92
(7.30.6) Select the applications of your organization's consumption of fuel. 93
(7.30.7) State how much fuel in MWh your organization has consumed (excluding feedstocks) by fuel type. 94
(7.30.14) Provide details on the electricity, heat, steam, and/or cooling amounts that were accounted for at a zero or near-zero emission factor in the market-based Scope 2 figure reported in 7.7. 96
(7.30.15) Provide details on the average emission factor used for all transport movements per mode that directly source energy from the grid. 97
(7.30.16) Provide a breakdown by country/area of your electricity/heat/steam/cooling consumption in the reporting year. 98
(7.36) Provide any efficiency metrics that are appropriate for your organization's transport products and/or services. 99
(7.45) Describe your gross global combined Scope 1 and 2 emissions for the reporting year in metric tons CO2e per unit currency total revenue and provide any additional intensity metrics that are appropriate to your business operations. 100
(7.51) What are your primary intensity (activity-based) metrics that are appropriate to your emissions from transport activities in Scope 1, 2, and 3? 101
(7.53) Did you have an emissions target that was active in the reporting year? 102

(7.53.1) Provide details of your absolute emissions targets and progress made against those targets. 102
(7.53.2) Provide details of your emissions intensity targets and progress made against those targets. 106
(7.54) Did you have any other climate-related targets that were active in the reporting year? 109
(7.54.1) Provide details of your targets to increase or maintain low-carbon energy consumption or production. 109
(7.55) Did you have emissions reduction initiatives that were active within the reporting year? Note that this can include those in the planning and/or implementation phases. 111
(7.55.1) Identify the total number of initiatives at each stage of development, and for those in the implementation stages, the estimated CO2e savings 111
(7.55.2) Provide details on the initiatives implemented in the reporting year in the table below. 111
(7.55.3) What methods do you use to drive investment in emissions reduction activities? 116
(7.73) Are you providing product level data for your organization's goods or services? 117
(7.74) Do you classify any of your existing goods and/or services as low-carbon products? 117
(7.74.1) Provide details of your products and/or services that you classify as low-carbon products. 117
(7.75) Provide tracking metrics for the implementation of low-carbon transport technology over the reporting year. 119
(7.79) Has your organization retired any project-based carbon credits within the reporting year? 120

C11. Environmental performance - Biodiversity 120
(11.2) What actions has your organization taken in the reporting year to progress your biodiversity-related commitments? 120
(11.3) Does your organization use biodiversity indicators to monitor performance across its activities? 120
(11.4) Does your organization have activities located in or near to areas important for biodiversity in the reporting year? 120

C13. Further information & sign off 121
(13.1) Indicate if any environmental information included in your CDP response (not already reported in 7.9.1/2/3, 8.9.1/2/3/4, and 9.3.2) is verified and/or assured by a third party? 121
(13.1.1) Which data points within your CDP response are verified and/or assured by a third party, and which standards were used? 121
(13.3) Provide the following information for the person that has signed off (approved) your CDP response. 122

C1. Introduction

(1.1) In which language are you submitting your response?

☑ English

(1.2) Select the currency used for all financial information disclosed throughout your response.

☑ USD

(1.3) Provide an overview and introduction to your organization.

(1.3.2) Organization type

☑ Publicly traded organization

(1.3.3) Description of organization

Based in Jacksonville, Florida, CSX Corporation (CSX) -- along with its subsidiaries -- is a premier transportation company. It provides rail-based transportation services including traditional rail service, rail-to-truck transloading services, and the transport of intermodal containers and trailers. CSX's principal operating subsidiary, CSX Transportation, Inc. (CSXT), provides an important link to the transportation supply chain through its nearly 20,000 route mile network, which serves major population centers in 26 states east of the Mississippi River, the District of Columbia, and the Canadian provinces of Ontario and Quebec. CSXT has access to more than 70 ocean, river, and lake port terminals along the Atlantic and Gulf Coasts, the Mississippi River, the Great Lakes, and the St. Lawrence Seaway. The company's intermodal business links customers to railroads via trucks and terminals. CSX also serves thousands of production and distribution facilities through track connections to approximately 240 short-line and regional railroads. In addition to CSXT, the Company's subsidiaries include Quality Carriers, Inc. ("Quality Carriers"), CSX Intermodal Terminals, Inc. ("CSX Intermodal Terminals"), Total Distribution Services, Inc. ("TDSI"), Transflo Terminal Services, Inc. ("Transflo"), CSX Technology, Inc. ("CSX Technology") and other subsidiaries. On June 1, 2022, CSX completed its acquisition of Pan Am Systems, Inc. ("Pan Am") which is the parent company of Pan Am Railways, Inc. CSX Intermodal Terminals owns and operates a system of intermodal terminals, predominantly in the eastern United States, and performs drayage services (the pickup and delivery of intermodal shipments) for certain CSX customers and trucking dispatch operations. TDSI serves the automotive industry with a network of world-class vehicle distribution centers and storage locations. TRANSFLO connects non-rail served customers to the many benefits of rail by transferring products between rail and trucks. CSX Technology and other subsidiaries provide support services for the company. CSX's other holdings include a CSXT group responsible for the company's real estate sales, leasing, acquisition and management and development activities. The primary reporting company for purposes of the CDP is CSXT, which is the principal operating subsidiary of CSX. To increase transparency, CSX has included all major subsidiaries in its greenhouse gas inventory and CDP response since 2012; this includes CSX Intermodal Terminals, TDSI, CSX Technology, TRANSFLO, Quality Carriers, and Pan Am in addition to CSXT.

(1.4) State the end date of the year for which you are reporting data. For emissions data, indicate whether you will be providing emissions data for past reporting years.

(1.4.1) End date of reporting year

12/31/2024

(1.4.2) Alignment of this reporting period with your financial reporting period

☑ Yes

(1.4.3) Indicate if you are providing emissions data for past reporting years

☑ Yes

(1.4.4) Number of past reporting years you will be providing Scope 1 emissions data for

☑ Not providing past emissions data for Scope 1

(1.4.5) Number of past reporting years you will be providing Scope 2 emissions data for

☑ Not providing past emissions data for Scope 2

(1.4.6) Number of past reporting years you will be providing Scope 3 emissions data for

☑ 1 year

(1.4.1) What is your organization's annual revenue for the reporting period?

$14,540,000,000

(1.5) Provide details on your reporting boundary.

	Is your reporting boundary for your CDP disclosure the same as that used in your financial statements?
	☑ Yes

(1.6) Does your organization have an ISIN code or another unique identifier (e.g., Ticker, CUSIP, etc.)?

ISIN code - bond

(1.6.1) Does your organization use this unique identifier?

☑ No

ISIN code - equity

(1.6.1) Does your organization use this unique identifier?

☑ No

CUSIP number

(1.6.1) Does your organization use this unique identifier?

☑ No

Ticker symbol

(1.6.1) Does your organization use this unique identifier?

☑ Yes

(1.6.2) Provide your unique identifier

CSX

SEDOL code

(1.6.1) Does your organization use this unique identifier?

☑ No

LEI number

(1.6.1) Does your organization use this unique identifier?

☑ No

D-U-N-S number

(1.6.1) Does your organization use this unique identifier?

☑ Yes

(1.6.2) Provide your unique identifier

039775119

Other unique identifier

(1.6.1) Does your organization use this unique identifier?

☑ No

(1.7) Select the countries/areas in which you operate.

☑ Canada

☑ United States of America

(1.21) For which transport modes will you be providing data?

☑ Rail

(1.24) Has your organization mapped its value chain?

(1.24.1) Value chain mapped

☑ No, but we plan to do so within the next two years

(1.24.4) Highest supplier tier known but not mapped

☑ Tier 1 suppliers

(1.24.8) Primary reason for not mapping your upstream value chain or any value chain stages

☑ Not an immediate strategic priority

(1.24.9) Explain why your organization has not mapped its upstream value chain or any value chain stages

Not an immediate strategic priority.

(1.24.1) Have you mapped where in your direct operations or elsewhere in your value chain plastics are produced, commercialized, used, and/or disposed of?

	Plastics mapping	Primary reason for not mapping plastics in your value chain	Explain why your organization has not mapped plastics in your value chain
	☑ No, and we do not plan to within the next two years	☑ Judged to be unimportant or not relevant	*Judged to be not relevant to our value chain.*

C2. Identification, assessment, and management of dependencies, impacts, risks, and opportunities

(2.1) How does your organization define short-, medium-, and long-term time horizons in relation to the identification, assessment, and management of your environmental dependencies, impacts, risks, and opportunities?

Short-term

(2.1.1) From (years)

0

(2.1.3) To (years)

5

(2.1.4) How this time horizon is linked to strategic and/or financial planning

The short-term horizon (2025–2030) aligns with CSX's capital expenditure cycles, typically planned on a 3-year basis.

Medium-term

(2.1.1) From (years)

6

(2.1.3) To (years)

15

(2.1.4) How this time horizon is linked to strategic and/or financial planning

The medium-term horizon (2031–2040) reflects the timeframe for major infrastructure and facility investments, such as locating, constructing, or consolidating rail assets.

Long-term

(2.1.1) From (years)

16

(2.1.2) Is your long-term time horizon open ended?

☑ No

(2.1.3) To (years)

25

(2.1.4) How this time horizon is linked to strategic and/or financial planning

The long-term horizon (2041–2050) is tied to strategic growth planning, technological development, and asset lifecycle forecasts, particularly as they relate to decarbonization and fleet modernization. These time horizons are integrated into the company's scenario analysis, risk assessments, and investment decision-making. This structured approach ensures that environmental risks and opportunities are evaluated over timescales relevant to CSX's asset base and financial planning, enabling alignment with long-term business strategy and resilience in a transitioning economy.

(2.2) Does your organization have a process for identifying, assessing, and managing environmental dependencies and/or impacts?

	Process in place	Dependencies and/or impacts evaluated in this process
	Select from: ☑ Yes	*Select from:* ☑ Both dependencies and impacts

[Fixed row]

(2.2.1) Does your organization have a process for identifying, assessing, and managing environmental risks and/or opportunities?

	Process in place	Risks and/or opportunities evaluated in this process	Is this process informed by the dependencies and/or impacts process?
	Select from: ☑ Yes	*Select from:* ☑ Both risks and opportunities	*Select from:* ☑ Yes

(2.2.2) Provide details of your organization's process for identifying, assessing, and managing environmental dependencies, impacts, risks, and/or opportunities.

Row 1

(2.2.2.1) Environmental issue

☑ Climate change

(2.2.2.2) Indicate which of dependencies, impacts, risks, and opportunities are covered by the process for this environmental issue

☑ Dependencies

☑ Impacts

☑ Risks

☑ Opportunities

(2.2.2.3) Value chain stages covered

☑ Direct operations

☑ Upstream value chain

☑ Downstream value chain

(2.2.2.4) Coverage

☑ Full

(2.2.2.5) Supplier tiers covered

☑ Tier 1 suppliers

(2.2.2.7) Type of assessment

☑ Qualitative and quantitative

(2.2.2.8) Frequency of assessment

☑ More than once a year

(2.2.2.9) Time horizons covered

☑ Short-term

☑ Medium-term

☑ Long-term

(2.2.2.10) Integration of risk management process

☑ Integrated into multi-disciplinary organization-wide risk management process

(2.2.2.11) Location-specificity used

☑ Not location specific

(2.2.2.12) Tools and methods used

Enterprise Risk Management

☑ Enterprise Risk Management

☑ Risk models

Other

☑ External consultants

☑ Scenario analysis

(2.2.2.13) Risk types and criteria considered

Acute physical

☑ Landslide

☑ Wildfires

☑ Heat waves

☑ Cold wave/frost

☑ Cyclones, hurricanes, typhoons

☑ Heavy precipitation (rain, hail, snow/ice)

☑ Flood (coastal, fluvial, pluvial, ground water)

☑ Storm (including blizzards, dust, and sandstorms)

Chronic physical

☑ Changing temperature (air, freshwater, marine water)

☑ Heat stress

☑ Increased severity of extreme weather events

☑ Sea level rise

Policy

☑ Changes to national legislation

☑ Other policy, please specify :Emerging regulation

Market

☑ Availability and/or increased cost of raw materials

☑ Changing customer behavior

☑ Uncertainty in the market signals

Reputation

☑ Increased partner and stakeholder concern and partner and stakeholder negative feedback

Technology

☑ Transition to lower emissions technology and products

(2.2.2.14) Partners and stakeholders considered

☑ Customers

☑ Employees

☑ Local communities

☑ Investors

☑ Suppliers

☑ Regulators

(2.2.2.15) Has this process changed since the previous reporting year?

☑ No

(2.2.2.16) Further details of process

CSX uses an integrated, multi-disciplinary, company-wide risk management process which defines risks and opportunities as strategic, external, or compliance based. The process used at CSX to determine which risks and opportunities have a substantial or strategic impact involves determining those risks having a material adverse effect on the Company's financial condition, results of operations or liquidity, and could cause those results to differ materially from those expressed or implied in the Company's forward-looking statements, resulting in the potential for customer or shareholder concern. This process is applied to all stages of the value chain and time horizons. In the case of costs that exceed the Company's regular forecasts, CSX often provides its shareholders with an estimate of the financial impact a weather-related event may have had on the Company. Business leaders are engaged in the identification and assessment of risk in addition to the communication of the various types of risk to the executive leadership and the Board of Directors. Business risk factors are identified and described in the company's Annual Report, and these factors influence the strategic planning process. Environmental risks and opportunities include those associated with new technologies, availability of fuel sources, reputational risks and opportunities, anticipated regulatory changes, and potential shifts in our customers' businesses as a result of climate change. At an asset level, risks and opportunities are defined on the department level using a compliance-based approach. Risks and opportunities at the asset level are impacted in scope by geography. Most pertinent to asset level risk and opportunity identification are physical parameters such as localized changes in weather or storm frequency. A case study of a transitional risk includes the decreased demand for coal as the planet moves toward less carbon-intensive fuel sources. The CSX Coal Sales and Marketing group routinely interacts with coal producers, buyers, and traders to monitor projections and fluctuations for coal demand. Demand for coal has significantly declined since 2015 with the US moving to alternative fuel sources and new technologies. Recognizing the decline, CSX has selectively stored coal railcars, reduced the locomotives in use for the movement of coal, and strategically sold and/or abandoned certain rail lines. Despite new technologies, coal will continue to be mined and consumed for the foreseeable future if the world continues manufacturing steel. Continued growth in Asia should more than offset lost demand for metallurgical coal in Europe, keeping US coal exports viable. The increased demand for power to supply data centers will also keep coal afloat on the domestic front. The impact of coal market changes continued through 2024 with a full-year coal volume on a declining trend (736,000 carloads of coal in 2024 vs. 755,000 carloads in 2023 and 843,000 in 2019), a significant decline from 2015 (1.063 million carloads of coal delivered in 2015). This decline represents a loss of approximately 280 million in revenue, pushing losses in CSX's coal revenue since 2011 to more than 2 billion. The coal business shipped 736 thousand carloads (12% of volume) and generated 2.2 billion in revenue (15% of revenue) in 2024.

(2.2.7) Are the interconnections between environmental dependencies, impacts, risks and/or opportunities assessed?

(2.2.7.1) Interconnections between environmental dependencies, impacts, risks and/or opportunities assessed

☑ Yes

(2.2.7.2) Description of how interconnections are assessed

CSX integrates the assessment of environmental dependencies, impacts, risks, and opportunities through a structured, enterprise-wide scenario analysis and risk management framework aligned with CDP guidance and the TCFD recommendations. This framework is designed to ensure these elements are not evaluated in isolation, but as interconnected components influencing strategic and financial planning. CSX's methodology includes a company-wide climate sensitivity workshop and transition scenario analysis based on NGFS frameworks (Delayed Transition and Hot House World/NDCs scenarios). These scenarios help assess how environmental dependencies—such as the availability of low-carbon fuels, renewable energy, and critical minerals—interact with climate-related risks (e.g., policy, legal, market, and technology) and opportunities (e.g., shifting customer demand, energy diversification). The analysis considers these factors across defined time horizons (short: 2025–2030, medium: 2031–2040, long: 2041–2050), aligned with asset lifecycles, particularly for locomotives. This interconnection analysis is embedded within the process disclosed in 2.2.2, where identified transition risks and opportunities are mapped to CSX's Enterprise Risk Management (ERM) register. Risks and opportunities are evaluated using criteria for impact, likelihood, vulnerability/readiness, and time horizon. Interdependencies are documented in a matrix format and discussed across risk categories to capture synergies, trade-offs, and cascading effects. For example, the assessment identified that reliance on diesel fuel is both a dependency and a transition risk due to rising carbon costs and emerging regulations. In parallel, investments in battery-electric and hydrogen locomotives represent both a mitigation strategy (impact reduction) and an opportunity to gain competitive advantage as customer demand shifts toward low-emissions freight solutions. These interconnections are analyzed jointly, not in silos, to inform capital allocation and technology investments. Similarly, the availability of sustainable fuels is linked to market risk (price volatility), policy risk (compliance requirements), and operational impact (fleet efficiency). This connection informs both procurement strategies and infrastructure planning, ensuring CSX remains resilient under multiple policy and market futures. While the integration of all interconnections into a single holistic model remains complex, particularly due to data variability across value chain segments, CSX has made significant progress by aligning ERM processes, internal governance, and scenario planning tools. This approach enhances the company's ability to respond proactively to climate-related challenges and to embed environmental considerations across business functions

(2.3) Have you identified priority locations across your value chain?

	Identification of priority locations	Explain why you do not identify priority locations
	Select from: ☑ No, and we do not plan to within the next two years	*Currently no standard procedure or identified risk to operations.*

(2.4) How does your organization define substantive effects on your organization?

Risks

(2.4.1) Type of definition

☑ Qualitative

☑ Quantitative

(2.4.2) Indicator used to define substantive effect

☑ Other, please specify :earnings per share

(2.4.3) Change to indicator

☑ % decrease

(2.4.4) % change to indicator

☑ 1-10

(2.4.6) Metrics considered in definition

☑ Likelihood of effect occurring

(2.4.7) Application of definition

When evaluating whether something is material to the financial statements, CSX uses a mix of qualitative and quantitative factors but generally uses a standard financial audit metric of 5% of pre-tax earnings as a starting point to approximate of what would be material to investors or other financial statement users. To allow for aggregated impacts, this number is then reduced by 50% to arrive at the starting point for what would be considered substantive for an individual line on the financial statements. For 2024, this would approximate 114 million (calculated as 5% of pre-tax earnings divided by 2 and then rounded). CSX could reach a conclusion that a higher or lower dollar amount was substantive, however, depending on the unique factors (both qualitative and quantitative) of the situation. As an example, if a hurricane increased operating expenses in a single year by 114 million it would likely be considered to have a substantive impact, but it would likely not be considered substantive if it caused a balance sheet-only fixed asset impairment of the same amount.

Opportunities

(2.4.1) Type of definition

☑ Qualitative

☑ Quantitative

(2.4.2) Indicator used to define substantive effect

☑ Other, please specify :earnings per share

(2.4.3) Change to indicator

☑ % increase

(2.4.4) % change to indicator

☑ 1-10

(2.4.6) Metrics considered in definition

☑ Likelihood of effect occurring

(2.4.7) Application of definition

When evaluating whether something is material to the financial statements, CSX uses a mix of qualitative and quantitative factors but generally uses a standard financial audit metric of 5% of pre-tax earnings as a starting point to approximate of what would be material to investors or other financial statement users. To allow for aggregated impacts, this number is then reduced by 50% to arrive at the starting point for what would be considered substantive for an individual line on the financial statements. For 2024, this would approximate 114 million (calculated as 5% of pre-tax earnings divided by 2 and then rounded). CSX could reach a conclusion that a higher or lower dollar amount was substantive, however, depending on the unique factors (both qualitative and quantitative) of the situation. As an example, if a hurricane increased operating expenses in a single year by 114 million it would likely be considered to have a substantive impact, but it would likely not be considered substantive if it caused a balance sheet-only fixed asset impairment of the same amount.

C3. Disclosure of risks and opportunities

(3.1) Have you identified any environmental risks which have had a substantive effect on your organization in the reporting year, or are anticipated to have a substantive effect on your organization in the future?

Climate change

(3.1.1) Environmental risks identified

☑ Yes, both in direct operations and upstream/downstream value chain

Plastics

(3.1.1) Environmental risks identified

☑ No

(3.1.2) Primary reason why your organization does not consider itself to have environmental risks in your direct operations and/or upstream/downstream value chain

☑ Environmental risks exist, but none with the potential to have a substantive effect on our organization

(3.1.3) Please explain

Judged to not be relevant to our value chain.

(3.1.1) Provide details of the environmental risks identified which have had a substantive effect on your organization in the reporting year, or are anticipated to have a substantive effect on your organization in the future.

Climate change

(3.1.1.1) Risk identifier

☑ Risk1

(3.1.1.3) Risk types and primary environmental risk driver

Policy

☑ Changes to regulation of existing products and services

(3.1.1.4) Value chain stage where the risk occurs

☑ Direct operations

(3.1.1.6) Country/area where the risk occurs

☑ Canada

☑ United States of America

(3.1.1.9) Organization-specific description of risk

CSX must stay abreast of emerging emissions regulations regarding the equipment we operate in and territories we do not serve in, such as California. Failing to do so could present a material risk to our ability to operate profitably and within our current service areas. Meeting current and emerging regulations may have a substantive financial impact on the company. There may also be a risk of viable technology needed to comply with the regulations. CSX defines viability as the reliability of the manufacturer, operations, maintenance costs, and the equipment's residual value. CSX proactively manages the risk of emerging regulations in our Enterprise Risk Management (ERM) business function. The narrow focus of the ERM program ensures that CSX can 1) physically operate the railroad, (2) maintain technology systems that resist cyber threats and operate reliably and resiliently, (3) maintain compliance with applicable laws, and (4) continue to access the public equity and credit markets.

(3.1.1.11) Primary financial effect of the risk

☑ Increased indirect [operating] costs

(3.1.1.12) Time horizon over which the risk is anticipated to have a substantive effect on the organization

☑ Medium-term

(3.1.1.13) Likelihood of the risk having an effect within the anticipated time horizon

☑ Likely

(3.1.1.14) Magnitude

☑ Medium-high

(3.1.1.16) Anticipated effect of the risk on the financial position, financial performance and cash flows of the organization in the selected future time horizons

CSX may face increased capital and operating costs, as well as potential write-offs or the early retirement of assets. Additionally, compliance with regulatory requirements can drive up expenses, while fluctuations in fuel and carbon prices may result in pass-through costs to customers. These factors collectively have the potential to affect market competitiveness.

(3.1.1.17) Are you able to quantify the financial effect of the risk?

☑ Yes

(3.1.1.21) Anticipated financial effect figure in the medium-term – minimum (currency)

0

(3.1.1.22) Anticipated financial effect figure in the medium-term – maximum (currency)

$800,000,000

(3.1.1.25) Explanation of financial effect figure

Due to the nature of fleet replacement lifecycle, CSX would accrue substantial fines to continue operations as well as considerable losses associated with ROI-C for locomotives replaced before 25-year lifecycle. AAR estimates that CARB-like compliance costs could impact railroads as much as $800 million per year. (Reference https://www.aar.org/issue/carb/). Additional financial impact could result from the failure to implement CSX's SBT, primarily due to increased carbon pricing. Our analysis, using carbon pricing data from the REMIND-MAgPIE Model via the NGFS data portal, indicates these costs could be roughly 30% higher than the projected mitigated costs.

(3.1.1.26) Primary response to risk

Infrastructure, technology and spending

☑ Increase investment in R&D

(3.1.1.27) Cost of response to risk

$37,935,000

(3.1.1.28) Explanation of cost calculation

*Since 2000, CSX has invested capital expenditure (capex) in idle-reduction and other efficiency-enhancing technologies. Each year, approximately 1.5% of our total capex is allocated to these initiatives. In 2024, total CAPEX is $2.529 billion. $2.529 billion * 1.5% = $37.935 million.*

(3.1.1.29) Description of response

CSX works with industry partners and Original Equipment Manufacturers (OEMs) to test alternative fuels for our locomotives that could substantially reduce CO2 emissions. These collaborations improve the knowledge base, improve the CSX engine fleet, and meet carbon intensity reduction goals. In addition to alternative fuels, CSX is supporting the pilot of alternative propulsion technologies, such as hydrogen fuel-cell locomotives. Hydrogen presents a promising alternative to fossil fuels, offering greater efficiency and zero emissions. Unlike traditional diesel engines, hydrogen-powered locomotives emit only water vapor. In partnership with CPKC, we are manufacturing hydrogen fuel cell locomotives in our Huntington, West Virginia locomotive shops and have three hydrogen fuel cell locomotives manufactured and in service as of May 2025.

Climate change

(3.1.1.1) Risk identifier

☑ Risk2

(3.1.1.3) Risk types and primary environmental risk driver

Liability

☑ Exposure to sanctions and litigation

(3.1.1.4) Value chain stage where the risk occurs

Select from:

☑ Direct operations

(3.1.1.6) Country/area where the risk occurs

☑ Canada

☑ United States of America

(3.1.1.9) Organization-specific description of risk

Legal risks are associated with increased climate-related legal disputes and/or violations and ESG disclosure requirements that an entity may face. Federal climate disclosure rules such as the SEC's rule on the Enhancement and Standardization of Climate-Related Disclosures for Investors and the Federal Supplier Climate Risks and Resilience Proposed Rule and other emerging state-level ruling can significantly impact our company's regulatory compliance and strategy and progress toward ESG targets. We considered two potential federal-level climate-related rulings, namely SEC Climate-Related Disclosures and Federal Supplier Climate Proposed Rules. These rulings are heavily influenced by national and international climate regulations, especially with the emergence of Europe's Corporate Sustainability Reporting Directive (CSRD) potentially impacting reporting landscapes as voluntary systems adapt to comply with evolving questionnaires. The US SEC rule was developed with input from organizations like CDP, TCFD, and the GHG Protocol could bring further evolution to standards, hence, even with the impending changes in the future new Administration, the standards and organization that have supported the development will remain relevant to CSX.

(3.1.1.11) Primary financial effect of the risk

☑ Increased indirect [operating] costs

(3.1.1.12) Time horizon over which the risk is anticipated to have a substantive effect on the organization

☑ Medium-term

(3.1.1.13) Likelihood of the risk having an effect within the anticipated time horizon

☑ Likely

(3.1.1.14) Magnitude

☑ Medium

(3.1.1.16) Anticipated effect of the risk on the financial position, financial performance and cash flows of the organization in the selected future time horizons

Potential consequences from this risk include increased costs from fines or fees due to noncompliance, and reduced access to capital.

(3.1.1.17) Are you able to quantify the financial effect of the risk?

☑ Yes

(3.1.1.21) Anticipated financial effect figure in the medium-term – minimum (currency)

0

(3.1.1.22) Anticipated financial effect figure in the medium-term – maximum (currency)

$550,000

(3.1.1.25) Explanation of financial effect figure

The cost of risk in this analysis is estimated by referencing the potential penalties for non-compliance with California's climate disclosure regulations, specifically $500,000 under Senate Bill 231 (SB 231) and $50,000 under Senate Bill 261 (SB 261). While CSX does not currently operate within California, these figures serve as a prudent benchmark for assessing the potential financial exposure associated with climate-related disclosure requirements, particularly as other states are increasingly considering or actively developing similar regulatory frameworks.

(3.1.1.26) Primary response to risk

Compliance, monitoring and targets

☑ Greater compliance with regulatory requirements

(3.1.1.27) Cost of response to risk

0

(3.1.1.28) Explanation of cost calculation

Currently not specified

(3.1.1.29) Description of response

CSX with the help of external consultant is closely monitoring emerging climate-related regulations in the region which we operate. Previously, we have conducted a SEC Rule readiness assessment which demonstrates our current mitigating factors including robust GHG emission analyses, GHG targets, completion of scenario analysis and opportunity identification, renewable energy credits, and quick response to shareholder inquires.

Climate change

(3.1.1.1) Risk identifier

☑ Risk3

(3.1.1.3) Risk types and primary environmental risk driver

Market

☑ Lack of availability and/or increased cost of certified sustainable material

(3.1.1.4) Value chain stage where the risk occurs

☑ Direct operations

(3.1.1.6) Country/area where the risk occurs

☑ Canada

☑ United States of America

(3.1.1.9) Organization-specific description of risk

Market and technology risks focus on the availability and viability of zero-emission locomotives and low-carbon fuels and the reduced availability of key raw/synthetic materials. Numerous emerging solutions exist, and original equipment manufacturers (OEMs) are leading the market in clean locomotive or low-emission fuel technology. There are a potential imbalance of low-carbon technologies and their materials availability.

(3.1.1.11) Primary financial effect of the risk

☑ Increased capital expenditures

(3.1.1.12) Time horizon over which the risk is anticipated to have a substantive effect on the organization

☑ Medium-term

(3.1.1.13) Likelihood of the risk having an effect within the anticipated time horizon

☑ More likely than not

(3.1.1.14) Magnitude

☑ Medium-high

(3.1.1.16) Anticipated effect of the risk on the financial position, financial performance and cash flows of the organization in the selected future time horizons

Potential financial impacts include substantial capital investments required for the purchase of zero-emission locomotives and the development of necessary charging infrastructure. In addition, ongoing operational costs are expected to increase due to higher energy consumption, elevated insurance premiums, and more complex

maintenance needs associated with new technologies. As a result, some of these increased expenditures may be passed through to customers in the form of higher service charges.

(3.1.1.17) Are you able to quantify the financial effect of the risk?

☑ Yes

(3.1.1.21) Anticipated financial effect figure in the medium-term – minimum (currency)

0

(3.1.1.22) Anticipated financial effect figure in the medium-term – maximum (currency)

$800,000,000

(3.1.1.25) Explanation of financial effect figure

Due to the nature of fleet replacement lifecycle, CSX would accrue substantial fines to continue operations as well as considerable losses associated with ROI-C for locomotives replaced before 25-year lifecycle. AAR estimates that CARB-like policies for additional operational territories could impact railroads as much as $800 million per year. (Reference https://www.aar.org/issue/carb/)

(3.1.1.26) Primary response to risk

Infrastructure, technology and spending

☑ Increase investment in R&D

(3.1.1.27) Cost of response to risk

$37,935,000

(3.1.1.28) Explanation of cost calculation

*Since 2000, CSX has invested capital expenditure (capex) in idle-reduction and other efficiency-enhancing technologies. Each year, approximately 1.5% of our total capex is allocated to these initiatives. In 2024, total CAPEX is $2.529 billion. $2.529 billion * 1.5% = $37.935 million.*

(3.1.1.29) Description of response

CSX works with industry partners and Original Equipment Manufacturers (OEMs) to test alternative fuels for our locomotives that could substantially reduce CO2 emissions. These collaborations improve the knowledge base, improve the CSX engine fleet, and meet carbon intensity reduction goals. In addition to alternative fuels, CSX is supporting the pilot of alternative propulsion technologies, such as hydrogen fuel-cell locomotives. Hydrogen presents a promising alternative to fossil fuels, offering greater efficiency and zero emissions. Unlike traditional diesel engines, hydrogen-powered locomotives emit only water vapor. In partnership with CPKC, we are manufacturing hydrogen fuel cell locomotives in our Huntington, West Virginia locomotive shops and have three hydrogen fuel cell locomotives manufactured and in service as of May 2025.

(3.1.2) Provide the amount and proportion of your financial metrics from the reporting year that are vulnerable to the substantive effects of environmental risks.

Climate change

(3.1.2.1) Financial metric

☑ CAPEX

(3.1.2.2) Amount of financial metric vulnerable to transition risks for this environmental issue (unit currency as selected in 1.2)

$37,935,000

(3.1.2.3) % of total financial metric vulnerable to transition risks for this environmental issue

☑ 1-10%

(3.1.2.4) Amount of financial metric vulnerable to physical risks for this environmental issue (unit currency as selected in 1.2)

0

(3.1.2.5) % of total financial metric vulnerable to physical risks for this environmental issue

☑ Less than 1%

(3.1.2.6) Amount of CAPEX in the reporting year deployed towards risks related to this environmental issue

$37,935,000

(3.1.2.7) Explanation of financial figures

*Since 2000, CSX has invested capital expenditure (capex) in idle-reduction and other efficiency-enhancing technologies. Each year, approximately 1.5% of our total capex is allocated to these initiatives. In 2024, total CAPEX is $2.529 billion. $2.529 billion * 1.5% = $37.935 million.*

Climate change

(3.1.2.1) Financial metric

☑ Assets

(3.1.2.2) Amount of financial metric vulnerable to transition risks for this environmental issue (unit currency as selected in 1.2)

0

(3.1.2.3) % of total financial metric vulnerable to transition risks for this environmental issue

☑ Less than 1%

(3.1.2.4) Amount of financial metric vulnerable to physical risks for this environmental issue (unit currency as selected in 1.2)

$358,000,000

(3.1.2.5) % of total financial metric vulnerable to physical risks for this environmental issue

☑ Less than 1%

(3.1.2.7) Explanation of financial figures

Our physical climate risk assessment estimates that annual expected asset losses from climate-related hazards amount to $358 million, which represents approximately 0.9% of the assumed total asset value of $23.5 billion.

Climate change

(3.1.2.1) Financial metric

OPEX

(3.1.2.2) Amount of financial metric vulnerable to transition risks for this environmental issue (unit currency as selected in 1.2)

0

(3.1.2.3) % of total financial metric vulnerable to transition risks for this environmental issue

☑ Less than 1%

(3.1.2.4) Amount of financial metric vulnerable to physical risks for this environmental issue (unit currency as selected in 1.2)

$171,000,000

(3.1.2.5) % of total financial metric vulnerable to physical risks for this environmental issue

☑ Less than 1%

(3.1.2.7) Explanation of financial figures

Our physical climate risk assessment estimates that operational disruption risk is comparatively lower, with expected annual losses totaling $171 million, representing approximately 0.3% of the assumed annual operational value.

(3.5) Are any of your operations or activities regulated by a carbon pricing system (i.e. ETS, Cap & Trade or Carbon Tax)?

☑ No, and we do not anticipate being regulated in the next three years

(3.6) Have you identified any environmental opportunities which have had a substantive effect on your organization in the reporting year, or are anticipated to have a substantive effect on your organization in the future?

	Environmental opportunities identified
Climate change	*Select from:* ☑ Yes, we have identified opportunities, and some/all are being realized

(3.6.1) Provide details of the environmental opportunities identified which have had a substantive effect on your organization in the reporting year, or are anticipated to have a substantive effect on your organization in the future.

Climate change

(3.6.1.1) Opportunity identifier

☑ Opp1

(3.6.1.3) Opportunity type and primary environmental opportunity driver

Markets

☑ Expansion into new markets

(3.6.1.4) Value chain stage where the opportunity occurs

☑ Downstream value chain

(3.6.1.5) Country/area where the opportunity occurs

☑ Canada

☑ United States of America

(3.6.1.8) Organization specific description

As climate changes, businesses may look to relocate to different parts of the United States. For example, companies may move sensitive manufacturing facilities farther inland to reduce risks associated with rising sea levels. In addition, as climate changes begin to impact growing seasons, agricultural centers may shift, and companies may have to adjust how they move their products to market. This represents an opportunity for CSX because with a nearly 20,000-mile network throughout the entire East Coast of the United States and access to 70 ocean, lake, and river ports, CSX is well positioned to help companies adjust to a need to move facilities or modify how they move product to market. Rather than building new track to reach these relocated facilities, CSX is able to expand business by increasing access to the existing rail network with intermodal operations. The company's intermodal business links customers to railroads via trucks and terminals. CSXT also serves thousands of production and distribution facilities through track connections with other Class I railroads and approximately 230 short-line and regional railroads. The intermodal business shipped 2.9 million units (46% of volume) and generated 2.0 billion in revenue (14% of revenue) in 2024.

(3.6.1.9) Primary financial effect of the opportunity

☑ Increased revenues through access to new and emerging markets

(3.6.1.10) Time horizon over which the opportunity is anticipated to have a substantive effect on the organization

☑ Short-term

(3.6.1.11) Likelihood of the opportunity having an effect within the anticipated time horizon

☑ Very likely (90–100%)

(3.6.1.12) Magnitude

☑ Medium

(3.6.1.14) Anticipated effect of the opportunity on the financial position, financial performance and cash flows of the organization in the selected future time horizons

Potential financial impacts for CSX include increased revenue driven by rising demand for lower-emissions products and services, as well as an enhanced competitive position that reflects shifting consumer preferences toward sustainability.

(3.6.1.15) Are you able to quantify the financial effects of the opportunity?

☑ Yes

(3.6.1.17) Anticipated financial effect figure in the short-term - minimum (currency)

$100,000,000

(3.6.1.18) Anticipated financial effect figure in the short-term – maximum (currency)

$2,030,000,000

(3.6.1.23) Explanation of financial effect figures

CSX expects to be able to support most customers that choose to relocate their business or warehouse operations from ports and coastlines to the interior US resulting in a positive financial opportunity CSX cannot specifically quantify the amount of that opportunity due to restrictions governing public disclosure of sensitive forward looking financial information therefore CSX is estimating the opportunity to be more than $100 million and up to $2.03 billion which represents 14% of the total 14.5 billion in revenue for 2024 CSX made this range estimation using the intermodal business revenue which accounted for 14% of the 14.5 billion in revenue in 2024

(3.6.1.24) Cost to realize opportunity

$100,000,000

(3.6.1.25) Explanation of cost calculation

CSX expects to be able to support most customers that choose to relocate their business or warehouse operations from ports and coastlines to the interior US resulting in a positive financial opportunity CSX cannot quantify the amount of that opportunity due to restrictions governing public disclosure of sensitive forward looking financial information therefore CSX is estimating the cost to realize the opportunity to be more than $100 million

(3.6.1.26) Strategy to realize opportunity

CSX is well positioned to assist customers with potential facility relocations, expansions, or modifications with how they move product to market with no additional material investment. To support customer expansion, CSX is continuing to expand and enhance its Select Sites certification program. This program reviews potential manufacturing and distribution sites through a thorough evaluation of site due diligence with the goal of recruiting manufacturers who wish to take advantage of the inherently environmentally friendly rail transportation network (instead of relying on trucks, since rail is four times more fuel efficient). There are currently 59 Select Site locations throughout CSX's geographic area listed on CSX's website. CSX Select Sites are the first, premium certified rail-served sites for industrial development and expansion. Select Sites certification provides certainty for companies seeking industrial property for manufacturing operations and allows for increased speed to market and reduce development risk. Select Site certification criteria include size, access to rail services, proximity to highways, workforce availability, natural gas, electricity, water, and wastewater, environmental and geo-technical standards. Since 2000, CSX customers have invested more than $51 billion in rail-served facilities, creating more than 70,000 jobs at those plants, distribution centers and other enterprises across CSX's 26-state network. In 2022, Manna Beverages & Ventures —a minority-owned business enterprise—chose a CSX Select Site in Montgomery, Alabama, to develop a $600 million beverage complex with an emphasis on production and supply chain sustainability. It is expected to create 280 full-time jobs when it opens in 2025. CSX cannot quantify the amount of that opportunity due to restrictions governing public disclosure of sensitive forward-looking financial information; therefore, CSX is estimating the cost to realize the opportunity to be more than $1. Generally, the cost to realize these opportunities typically might include a cost to acquire, cost to build infrastructure, cost to expand network, and cost for providing service.

Climate change

(3.6.1.1) Opportunity identifier

☑ Opp2

(3.6.1.3) Opportunity type and primary environmental opportunity driver

Resource efficiency

☑ Use of new technologies

(3.6.1.4) Value chain stage where the opportunity occurs

☑ Direct operations

(3.6.1.5) Country/area where the opportunity occurs

☑ Canada

☑ United States of America

(3.6.1.8) Organization specific description

Over the years, CSX has invested in new technologies, such as automation, trip optimizer technology, idle reducing technology, fuel efficiency technologies, and currently exploring low-carbon locomotives. This investment reduces our fuel consumption and subsequently carbon emissions but also position CSX to capture market share from less sustainable transport providers.

(3.6.1.9) Primary financial effect of the opportunity

☑ Reduced indirect (operating) costs

(3.6.1.10) Time horizon over which the opportunity is anticipated to have a substantive effect on the organization

☑ Medium-term

(3.6.1.11) Likelihood of the opportunity having an effect within the anticipated time horizon

☑ Very likely (90–100%)

(3.6.1.12) Magnitude

☑ Medium

(3.6.1.14) Anticipated effect of the opportunity on the financial position, financial performance and cash flows of the organization in the selected future time horizons

Potential financial impacts for CSX include increase in fuel efficiency and decrease operating costs. There is potential increase in market share as new costumers transitioning to low-carbon transportation solutions.

(3.6.1.15) Are you able to quantify the financial effects of the opportunity?

☑ Yes

(3.6.1.19) Anticipated financial effect figure in the medium-term - minimum (currency)

0

(3.6.1.20) Anticipated financial effect figure in the medium-term - maximum (currency)

$59,300,000

(3.6.1.23) Explanation of financial effect figures

In 2023, locomotive fuel efficiency was 1.02 gallons per 1,000 gross ton-miles. In 2024, CSX moved 384.4 billion gross ton-miles. Had CSX operated at the 2023 efficiency level, this would have required approximately 392.1 million gallons of locomotive fuel. Due to improved efficiency in 2024, CSX reduced fuel consumption and saved approximately $59.3 million in fuel costs (at $3.76 per gallon) compared to 2023 performance.

(3.6.1.24) Cost to realize opportunity

$37,935,000

(3.6.1.25) Explanation of cost calculation

*Since 2000, CSX has invested capital expenditure (capex) in idle-reduction and other efficiency-enhancing technologies. Each year, approximately 1.5% of our total capex is allocated to these initiatives. In 2024, total capex is $2.45 billion. $2.529 billion * 1.5% = $37.935 million*

(3.6.1.26) Strategy to realize opportunity

Since 2000, CSX has invested over $50 million in idle-reducing technologies such as Automated Engine Start Stop (AESS), which alone saved approximately 1 million gallons of fuel in 2024. In addition to these efforts, CSX has also invested in automation and other energy efficiency technologies that further enhance overall fuel efficiency across its operations.

Climate change

(3.6.1.1) Opportunity identifier

☑ Opp3

(3.6.1.3) Opportunity type and primary environmental opportunity driver

Energy source

☑ Use of low-carbon energy sources

(3.6.1.4) Value chain stage where the opportunity occurs

☑ Direct operations

(3.6.1.5) Country/area where the opportunity occurs

☑ Canada

☑ United States of America

(3.6.1.8) Organization specific description

Energy source opportunities include carbon market participation and cost avoidance from transitioning to low-carbon emission operations services and meeting our company's climate targets. As stated by the International Energy Agency (IEA), achieving global emission reduction targets requires countries to shift a substantial portion of their energy production to low-emission options, including wind, solar, wave, tidal, hydro, geothermal, nuclear, biofuels, and carbon capture and storage. Renewable energy investments have outpaced fossil fuel generation for the fifth consecutive year, reflecting a global movement towards decentralized, clean energy solutions. The decreasing costs, enhanced storage capacities, and widespread adoption of these technologies are key drivers. Organizations that transition their energy consumption to low-emission sources can potentially realize significant savings on annual energy expenditures.

(3.6.1.9) Primary financial effect of the opportunity

☑ Reduced indirect (operating) costs

(3.6.1.10) Time horizon over which the opportunity is anticipated to have a substantive effect on the organization

☑ Medium-term

(3.6.1.11) Likelihood of the opportunity having an effect within the anticipated time horizon

☑ Likely (66–100%)

(3.6.1.12) Magnitude

☑ Medium

(3.6.1.14) Anticipated effect of the opportunity on the financial position, financial performance and cash flows of the organization in the selected future time horizons

Transition to lower carbon energy can lead to significant financial benefits, including reduced operating costs and lower exposure to fluctuations in fossil fuel prices. By decreasing overall greenhouse gas emissions, CSX also become less sensitive to changes in carbon pricing and regulatory requirements related to emissions.

(3.6.1.15) Are you able to quantify the financial effects of the opportunity?

☑ Yes

(3.6.1.19) Anticipated financial effect figure in the medium-term - minimum (currency)

0

(3.6.1.20) Anticipated financial effect figure in the medium-term - maximum (currency)

$7,200,000,000

(3.6.1.23) Explanation of financial effect figures

Significant potential cost avoidance if CSX meets its emission reduction targets due to potential high carbon price projections under this scenario estimated at $7.2 billion peaking at $681,000,000 in 2050 ($US2010). This cost avoidance is a high-level estimation assuming a 0.5% YOY organic growth rate.

(3.6.1.24) Cost to realize opportunity

$27,200

(3.6.1.25) Explanation of cost calculation

This figure is taken based on CSX's 2024 RECs purchase, which is $27,200 for 34,000 MWh.

(3.6.1.26) Strategy to realize opportunity

In its transition to lower carbon energy, CSX is taking a two-pronged approach: annually purchasing approximately 34,000 MWh of Renewable Energy Certificates (RECs) and investing in the development of electric and hydrogen locomotives. Recognizing that not all technologies needed to achieve long-term sustainability goals exist today, CSX is fostering innovation and collaboration among its engineers, technicians, and industry partners to advance solutions like battery-electric and hydrogen-powered

locomotives. For example, CSX has secured federal grants to acquire three battery-electric, zero-emissions locomotives—expected to reduce annual emissions by 1,530 tons of carbon dioxide and 71 tons of nitrogen oxides, and to lower noise levels by about 70%. These locomotives are planned for integration into the Baltimore fleet and should be operational by 2026. Additionally, through a partnership with CPKC, CSX is manufacturing hydrogen fuel cell locomotives at its Huntington, West Virginia shops, with three units already in service as of May 2025. Hydrogen technology offers a promising, zero-emission alternative to diesel, emitting only water vapor and supporting CSX's commitment to sustainable rail transport.

(3.6.2) Provide the amount and proportion of your financial metrics in the reporting year that are aligned with the substantive effects of environmental opportunities.

Climate change

(3.6.2.1) Financial metric

☑ OPEX

(3.6.2.2) Amount of financial metric aligned with opportunities for this environmental issue (unit currency as selected in 1.2)

$61,700,000

(3.6.2.3) % of total financial metric aligned with opportunities for this environmental issue

☑ Less than 1%

(3.6.2.4) Explanation of financial figures

In 2023, locomotive fuel efficiency was 1.02 gallons per 1,000 gross ton-miles. In 2024, fuel efficiency improved to 0.98 gallons per 1,000 gross ton-miles (2024 10-k, pg 37) and CSX moved 410.3 billion gross ton-miles (2024 R-1, Schedule 755, line 104). If CSX operated at the 2023 efficiency level, this would have required approximately 16.4 million additional gallons of locomotive fuel. Due to improved efficiency in 2024, CSX reduced fuel consumption and saved approximately 16.4 million gallons of locomotive fuel and $61.7 million in fuel costs ($3.76 per gallon) compared to 2023 performance. Total positive impact to OPEX was approximately 0.66% (from total operating expenses of $9.295 billion in 2024)

C4. Governance

(4.1) Does your organization have a board of directors or an equivalent governing body?

(4.1.1) Board of directors or equivalent governing body

☑ Yes

(4.1.2) Frequency with which the board or equivalent meets

☑ More frequently than quarterly

(4.1.3) Types of directors your board or equivalent is comprised of

☑ Executive directors or equivalent

(4.1.4) Board diversity and inclusion policy

☑ Yes, and it is publicly available

(4.1.5) Briefly describe what the policy covers

The Governance and Sustainability Committee recognizes the importance of developing and maintaining a Board with a broad scope of backgrounds and expertise that will expand the views and experiences available to the Board in its deliberations. Many factors are taken into account when evaluating director nominees, including experience, skills, education, background, gender, race, ethnicity, age and other qualities and personal attributes. The Governance and Sustainability Committee strongly feels that candidates representing variability across these factors add to the overall diversity and viewpoints of the Board. Moreover, over the past years, the Board has prioritized ensuring that committee chair positions are held by gender and racially/ethnically diverse Board members. To ensure that our ongoing commitment to diversity is reflected in our director qualifications and selection policy, in 2023, the Board adopted a "Rooney Rule" in connection with director candidates, which states "Individuals who self-identify as female and/or a racial or ethnic minority must be included in the initial pool of candidates when selecting new director nominees". The Governance and Sustainability Committee ensures diversity in director nominations by requiring that third-party search firms include candidates with diverse backgrounds, experiences, skills, and demographics—including gender, race, and ethnicity—in the pool of potential nominees. The Board also prioritizes diverse representation.

(4.1.1) Is there board-level oversight of environmental issues within your organization?

	Board-level oversight of this environmental issue	Primary reason for no board-level oversight of this environmental issue	Explain why your organization does not have board-level oversight of this environmental issue
Climate change	☑ Yes	*Select from:*	*Rich text input [must be under 2500 characters]*
Biodiversity	☑ No, and we do not plan to within the next two years	☑ Not an immediate strategic priority	*Not an immediate strategic priority.*

(4.1.2) Identify the positions (do not include any names) of the individuals or committees on the board with accountability for environmental issues and provide details of the board's oversight of environmental issues.

Climate change

(4.1.2.1) Positions of individuals or committees with accountability for this environmental issue

☑ Board-level committee

(4.1.2.2) Positions' accountability for this environmental issue is outlined in policies applicable to the board

☑ Yes

(4.1.2.3) Policies which outline the positions' accountability for this environmental issue

☑ Individual role descriptions

(4.1.2.4) Frequency with which this environmental issue is a scheduled agenda item

☑ Scheduled agenda item in some board meetings – at least annually

(4.1.2.5) Governance mechanisms into which this environmental issue is integrated

☑ Reviewing and guiding annual budgets

☑ Overseeing the setting of corporate targets

☑ Monitoring progress towards corporate targets

☑ Overseeing and guiding public policy engagement

☑ Reviewing and guiding innovation/R&D priorities

☑ Approving and/or overseeing employee incentives

☑ Overseeing and guiding the development of a business strategy

☑ Overseeing and guiding acquisitions, mergers, and divestitures

☑ Overseeing and guiding the development of a climate transition plan

☑ Other, please specify **:Reviewing and guiding major plans of action, Reviewing and guiding business plans, Monitoring implementation and performance of objectives, Monitoring and overseeing progress against goals and targets for addressing climate-related issues**

(4.1.2.7) Please explain

The 12-member Board of Directors is composed of a diverse group of business professionals responsible for climate-related issues. The Board oversees management decisions to support the company's long-term growth, both financially and administratively. The Committee shall periodically review the Corporation's sustainability policies, strategies, and programs, including but not limited to, material environmental, social, and governance trends, and their related long- and short-term impacts on the Corporation, particularly regarding climate-related issues such as carbon emissions reduction initiatives and climate action targets. The Governance and Sustainability Committee of the Board holds responsibility for risk oversight and evaluation, including risks associated with energy and environmental policy. All business risks, including those related to climate, are presented to the Board for consideration. Committees receive input from the departments most competent in the specific risk under consideration. CSX's Vice President of Stakeholder Engagement and Sustainability has primary responsibility for working with the leadership team on Company sustainability strategy which includes the Climate Transition Plan. This work is completed in close partnership with the company's ERM Risk Leaders and Executive Committee Members to manage environmental dependencies, impacts, risks, and opportunities. The Board and its committees systematically assess potential risks by coordinating with management departments and considering input from various stakeholders. An example of a climate-related decision made by the Governance and Sustainability Committee is the review and approval of the Climate Transition Plan in 2025 prior to publication. A second example of a climate-related decision made by the Governance and Sustainability Committee is the review and approval of the Science-Based Target (SBT) in 2019. CSX set an ambitious, well-below 2-degree Celsius scenario target, approved by the Science Based Target Initiative (SBTi), to reduce its GHG emission intensity by 37.3% by year-end 2029 from a 2014 base year. The Governance and Sustainability Committee also reviews and approves initiatives aligned with achieving this ambitious goal.

(4.2) Does your organization's board have competency on environmental issues?

Climate change

(4.2.1) Board-level competency on this environmental issue

☑ Yes

(4.2.2) Mechanisms to maintain an environmentally competent board

☑ Consulting regularly with an internal, permanent, subject-expert working group

☑ Engaging regularly with external stakeholders and experts on environmental issues

☑ Integrating knowledge of environmental issues into board nominating process

☑ Regular training for directors on environmental issues, industry best practice, and standards (e.g., TCFD, SBTi)

☑ Having at least one board member with expertise on this environmental issue

(4.2.3) Environmental expertise of the board member

Experience

☑ Executive-level experience in a role focused on environmental issues

☑ Management-level experience in a role focused on environmental issues

☑ Staff-level experience in a role focused on environmental issues

☑ Active member of an environmental committee or organization

(4.3) Is there management-level responsibility for environmental issues within your organization?

	Management-level responsibility for this environmental issue	Primary reason for no management-level responsibility for environmental issues	Explain why your organization does not have management-level responsibility for environmental issues
Climate change	*Select from:* ☑ Yes	*Select from:*	*Rich text input [must be under 2500 characters]*
Biodiversity	*Select from:* ☑ No, and we do not plan to within the next two years	*Select from:* ☑ Not an immediate strategic priority	*Not an immediate strategic priority.*

(4.3.1) Provide the highest senior management-level positions or committees with responsibility for environmental issues (do not include the names of individuals).

Climate change

(4.3.1.1) Position of individual or committee with responsibility

Executive level
☑ Chief Operating Officer (COO)

(4.3.1.2) Environmental responsibilities of this position

Strategy and financial planning
☑ Managing annual budgets related to environmental issues

☑ Managing environmental reporting, audit, and verification processes

☑ Managing major capital and/or operational expenditures relating to environmental issues

☑ Managing priorities related to innovation/low-environmental impact products or services (including R&D)

(4.3.1.4) Reporting line

☑ Reports to the board directly

(4.3.1.5) Frequency of reporting to the board on environmental issues

☑ Annually

(4.3.1.6) Please explain

The COO manages major capital and/or operational expenditures related to low-carbon products or services (including R&D).

Climate change

(4.3.1.1) Position of individual or committee with responsibility

Executive level
☑ Chief Financial Officer (CFO)

(4.3.1.2) Environmental responsibilities of this position

Strategy and financial planning
☑ Managing major capital and/or operational expenditures relating to environmental issues

(4.3.1.4) Reporting line

☑ Reports to the board directly

(4.3.1.5) Frequency of reporting to the board on environmental issues

☑ Annually

(4.3.1.6) Please explain

The CFO manages major capital and/or operational expenditures related to low-carbon products or services (including R&D).

Climate change

(4.3.1.1) Position of individual or committee with responsibility

Committee
☑ Sustainability committee

(4.3.1.2) Environmental responsibilities of this position

Engagement
☑ Managing public policy engagement related to environmental issues

Policies, commitments, and targets
☑ Measuring progress towards environmental corporate targets

☑ Setting corporate environmental targets

Strategy and financial planning
☑ Developing a climate transition plan

☑ Implementing a climate transition plan

Other
☑ Providing employee incentives related to environmental performance

(4.3.1.4) Reporting line

☑ Reports to the board directly

(4.3.1.5) Frequency of reporting to the board on environmental issues

☑ Annually

(4.3.1.6) Please explain

All business risks, including climate-related, are presented to the Board and risk committees for consideration. The committees are provided input from those departments competent in the risk. The flow path of climate-related issues between the VP Stakeholder Engagement & Sustainability to the Governance and Sustainability Committee of the Board to the Board is an efficient method for monitoring climate-related risks and implementing strategies to address issues.

Climate change

(4.3.1.1) Position of individual or committee with responsibility

Executive level

☑ Other C-Suite Officer, please specify :Senior VP, Chief Legal Officer and Corporate Secretary

(4.3.1.2) Environmental responsibilities of this position

Dependencies, impacts, risks and opportunities

☑ Assessing environmental dependencies, impacts, risks, and opportunities

☑ Managing environmental dependencies, impacts, risks, and opportunities

Strategy and financial planning

☑ Managing environmental reporting, audit, and verification processes

(4.3.1.4) Reporting line

☑ Reports to the board directly

(4.3.1.5) Frequency of reporting to the board on environmental issues

☑ Quarterly

(4.3.1.6) Please explain

The Senior Vice President, Chief Legal Officer (CLO) and Corporate Secretary has responsibility to report to CEO and the board, including the Governance and Sustainability Committee. The CLO's responsibilities include the company's legal affairs, government relations, risk management, environmental, audit functions, and communication with the Board on issues within their purview. The CLO role holds responsibility for climate-related issues because they are the leader of environmental strategy and have the authority, influence and resources to act on climate- related risks and opportunities in alignment with corporate strategy. All business risks, including climate-related, are presented to the Board and risk committees for consideration. The committees are provided input from those departments competent in the risk. The structured flow of climate-related issues, from the CLO to the Governance and Sustainability Committee, and ultimately to the Board provides clear accountability and effective oversight. Executive Team (including the CLO) and Board of Directors leads CSX corporate governance practices. They understand the business opportunities and challenges and make decisions that support long-term growth and success. CSX uses an ERM process whereby during the budget planning process, business leaders are expected to identify and define risks and opportunities as strategic, external, or compliance based and communicate the risk and opportunity types to the EL and the Board. The Annual Report described business risk factors, and these factors influence the strategic planning process.

Climate change

(4.3.1.1) Position of individual or committee with responsibility

Other

☑ Other, please specify :VP Stakeholder Engagement & Sustainability

(4.3.1.2) Environmental responsibilities of this position

Engagement

☑ Managing engagement in landscapes and/or jurisdictions

Policies, commitments, and targets

☑ Measuring progress towards environmental corporate targets

☑ Measuring progress towards environmental science-based targets

☑ Setting corporate environmental policies and/or commitments

Strategy and financial planning

☑ Conducting environmental scenario analysis

☑ Developing a climate transition plan

(4.3.1.4) Reporting line

☑ Reports to the Chief Executive Officer (CEO)

(4.3.1.5) Frequency of reporting to the board on environmental issues

☑ Quarterly

(4.3.1.6) Please explain

CSX's Vice President of Stakeholder Engagement & Sustainability reports to the CEO and has primary responsibility for working with the leadership team on Company strategy around sustainability. This includes collaborating with the senior leaders to leverage individual successes in various areas of the business with increased focus and alignment of work to further support our strategy and sustainability progress. Our cross-functional team is supporting these efforts by setting strategy, managing and coordinating day-to-day activities, measuring and monitoring progress against key performance indicators, and reviewing and applying stakeholder feedback and insights. The flow pathway for climate-related issues between the VP Stakeholder Engagement & Sustainability to CEO and to the Governance and Sustainability Committee of the Board to the Board is an efficient method for monitoring climate-related risks and implementing strategies to address issues.

(4.5) Do you provide monetary incentives for the management of environmental issues, including the attainment of targets?

Climate change

(4.5.1) Provision of monetary incentives related to this environmental issue

☑ Yes

(4.5.2) % of total C-suite and board-level monetary incentives linked to the management of this environmental issue

10

(4.5.3) Please explain

CSX provides monetary incentives to managers for achieving Emissions Reduction Target Energy Reduction Target and Efficiency Target Award based on meeting corporate goal of locomotive productivity and active fleet management which includes optimizing the fleet for best fuel and network efficiency Progress toward these corporate goals has set CSX on track to meet its 2030 emissions target Locomotive fuel accounts for approximately 88% of CSXs Scope 1 and 2 GHG emissions therefore fuel efficiency targets are directly correlated to emissions intensity reductions. CSX Management Incentive Compensation Plan (MICP) targets include 10% for Fuel Efficiency performance (as stated in 2025 Proxy). Fuel efficiency improved from 1.02 to 0.98 gallons per 1,000 gross ton miles, from 2023 to 2024. As of 2024, CSX had reduced emission intensity by 11.38 from base year 2014 CSX has an established target with the SBTi to reduce GHG emissions intensity 37.3 by end of 2029 from a 2014 base year

(4.5.1) Provide further details on the monetary incentives provided for the management of environmental issues (do not include the names of individuals).

Climate change

(4.5.1.1) Position entitled to monetary incentive

Board or executive level

☑ Chief Operating Officer (COO)

(4.5.1.2) Incentives

☑ Bonus - % of salary

(4.5.1.3) Performance metrics

Targets

☑ Progress towards environmental targets

☑ Reduction in absolute emissions in line with net-zero target

Emission reduction

☑ Implementation of an emissions reduction initiative

Resource use and efficiency

☑ Energy efficiency improvement

(4.5.1.4) Incentive plan the incentives are linked to

☑ Both Short-Term and Long-Term Incentive Plan, or equivalent

(4.5.1.5) Further details of incentives

The 2024 Management Incentive Compensation Plan (MICP) was structured to reward executives and eligible employees for driving Company performance over a one- year period. It's primary objective is to implement short and long-term incentive compensation plans with stretch targets that drive strong financial results in achieving sustainable growth and take into account ESG expectations of shareholders. 2024 MICP targets include 10% for Fuel Efficiency performance (as stated in 2025 Proxy). Fuel efficiency improved from 1.02 to 0.98 gallons per 1,000 gross ton miles, from 2023 to 2024.

(4.5.1.6) How the position's incentives contribute to the achievement of your environmental commitments and/or climate transition plan

Energy reduction and efficiency targets are incentivized Award is based on meeting corporate goals of locomotive productivity and active fleet management which include optimizing the fleet for best fuel and network efficiency. Progress toward these corporate goals has enabled CSX to achieve 42 of its 15 year target in the first 7 years. As of 2024, CSX had reduced emission intensity by 11.38% from base year 2014. Locomotive fuel accounts for approximately 88% of CSXs Scope 1 and 2 GHG emissions, therefore fuel efficiency targets are directly correlated to emissions intensity reductions. CSX has established a target with the SBTi to reduce GHG emissions intensity 37% by end of 2029 from a 2014 base year.

Climate change

(4.5.1.1) Position entitled to monetary incentive

Facility/Unit/Site management
☑ Business unit manager

(4.5.1.2) Incentives

☑ Bonus - % of salary

(4.5.1.3) Performance metrics

Targets
☑ Progress towards environmental targets

(4.5.1.4) Incentive plan the incentives are linked to

☑ Both Short-Term and Long-Term Incentive Plan, or equivalent

(4.5.1.5) Further details of incentives

The 2024 Management Incentive Compensation Plan (MICP) was structured to reward executives and eligible employees for driving Company performance over a one- year period. It's primary objective is to implement short and long-term incentive compensation plans with stretch targets that drive strong financial results in achieving sustainable

growth and take into account ESG expectations of shareholders. 2024 MICP targets include 10% for Fuel Efficiency performance (as stated in 2025 Proxy). Fuel efficiency improved from 1.02 to 0.98 gallons per 1,000 gross ton miles, from 2023 to 2024.

(4.5.1.6) How the position's incentives contribute to the achievement of your environmental commitments and/or climate transition plan

Energy reduction and efficiency targets are incentivized. Business unit managers' annual performance goals are linked to optimizing fleet performance. Since locomotive fuel use represents approximately 88% of the company's Scope 1 and Scope 2 GHG emissions, fuel efficiency targets are directly related to emission intensity reductions.

Climate change

(4.5.1.1) Position entitled to monetary incentive

Senior-mid management

☑ Process operation manager

(4.5.1.2) Incentives

☑ Bonus - % of salary

(4.5.1.3) Performance metrics

Targets

☑ Progress towards environmental targets

(4.5.1.4) Incentive plan the incentives are linked to

☑ Both Short-Term and Long-Term Incentive Plan, or equivalent

(4.5.1.5) Further details of incentives

The 2024 Management Incentive Compensation Plan (MICP) was structured to reward executives and eligible employees for driving Company performance over a one- year period. It's primary objective is to implement short and long-term incentive compensation plans with stretch targets that drive strong financial results in achieving sustainable growth and take into account ESG expectations of shareholders. 2024 MICP targets include 10% for Fuel Efficiency performance (as stated in 2025 Proxy). Fuel efficiency improved from 1.02 to 0.98 gallons per 1,000 gross ton miles, from 2023 to 2024.

(4.5.1.6) How the position's incentives contribute to the achievement of your environmental commitments and/or climate transition plan

Energy reduction and efficiency targets are incentivized. Process operations managers' annual performance goals are linked to optimizing fleet performance. Since locomotive fuel use represents approximately 88% of the company's Scope 1 and Scope 2 GHG emissions, fuel efficiency targets are directly related to emission intensity reductions.

(4.6) Does your organization have an environmental policy that addresses environmental issues?

	Does your organization have any environmental policies?
	Select from: ☑ Yes

(4.6.1) Provide details of your environmental policies.

Row 1

(4.6.1.1) Environmental issues covered

☑ Climate change

(4.6.1.2) Level of coverage

☑ Organization-wide

(4.6.1.3) Value chain stages covered

☑ Direct operations

☑ Upstream value chain

(4.6.1.4) Explain the coverage

CSX is committed to environmental compliance and strives to protect the environment and the safety and health of the public, customers, and employees in all aspects of the company's operations. On top of that, CSX understands that improving energy efficiency and maximizing clean and affordable domestic energy resources are crucial to continued economic growth, improved quality of life and environmental stewardship. Furthermore, this can help address the complex global challenge of climate change concerns. Fuel efficiency gains from rail allow for cleaner air, help our country reduce its dependence on foreign oil and increase jobs associated with domestic sourcing. CSX is taking steps – going beyond our legal requirements – to reduce locomotive air and greenhouse gas emissions and fuel use. This brings multi-faceted benefits to our business, our customers and the country. We are committed to continual improvement, and CSX expects our suppliers and vendors to do the same.

(4.6.1.5) Environmental policy content

Environmental commitments

☑ Commitment to comply with regulations and mandatory standards

☑ Other environmental commitment, please specify :Minimizing impacts on the environment and communities

Climate-specific commitments

☑ Other climate-related commitment, please specify :commitment to reduction of GHG emissions

(4.6.1.6) Indicate whether your environmental policy is in line with global environmental treaties or policy goals

☑ Yes, in line with the Paris Agreement

(4.6.1.7) Public availability

☑ Publicly available

(4.6.1.8) Attach the policy

Environmental Policy - CSX.pdf

(4.10) Are you a signatory or member of any environmental collaborative frameworks or initiatives?

	Are you a signatory or member of any environmental collaborative frameworks or initiatives?
	Select from: ☑ No, but we plan to within the next two years

(4.11) In the reporting year, did your organization engage in activities that could directly or indirectly influence policy, law, or regulation that may (positively or negatively) impact the environment?

(4.11.1) External engagement activities that could directly or indirectly influence policy, law, or regulation that may impact the environment

☑ Yes, we engaged directly with policy makers

☑ Yes, we engaged indirectly through, and/or provided financial or in-kind support to a trade association or other intermediary organization or individual whose activities could influence policy, law, or regulation

(4.11.2) Indicate whether your organization has a public commitment or position statement to conduct your engagement activities in line with global environmental treaties or policy goals

☑ Yes, we have a public commitment or position statement in line with global environmental treaties or policy goals

(4.11.3) Global environmental treaties or policy goals in line with public commitment or position statement

☑ Paris Agreement

(4.11.4) Attach commitment or position statement

CSX-Industry-Association-and-Climate-Review-final.pdf

(4.11.5) Indicate whether your organization is registered on a transparency register

☑ Unknown

(4.11.8) Describe the process your organization has in place to ensure that your external engagement activities are consistent with your environmental commitments and/or transition plan

For this report we evaluated the alignment of the lobbying efforts of our trade associations with the goals of the Paris Agreement. These goals include limiting the rise in global average temperatures this century to well below 2C above preindustrial levels. CSX is committed to the ongoing evaluation of our climate policy related efforts and to progressive action in our operations to reduce our impact on the environment. Just as there are numerous factors that impact the climate and our environment, CSX has many issues before Congress, in state legislatures, and under consideration by government agencies that could affect our business and our stakeholders. Direct engagement with policymakers at the local state and federal levels helps to build awareness of the environmental advantages of rail

(4.11.1) On what policies, laws, or regulations that may (positively or negatively) impact the environment has your organization been engaging directly with policy makers in the reporting year?

Row 1

(4.11.1.1) Specify the policy, law, or regulation on which your organization is engaging with policy makers

Minimum energy efficiency requirements

(4.11.1.2) Environmental issues the policy, law, or regulation relates to

☑ Climate change

(4.11.1.3) Focus area of policy, law, or regulation that may impact the environment

Low-impact production and innovation
☑ Low environmental impact innovation and R&D

☑ Technology requirements

(4.11.1.4) Geographic coverage of policy, law, or regulation

☑ National

(4.11.1.5) Country/area/region the policy, law, or regulation applies to

☑ Canada

☑ United States of America

(4.11.1.6) Your organization's position on the policy, law, or regulation

☑ Support with no exceptions

(4.11.1.8) Type of direct engagement with policy makers on this policy, law, or regulation

☑ Other, please specify :Together, CSX and its public partners are investing approximately $850 million to extend the environmental advantages of rail by improving intermodal capacity in key high-traffic corridors

(4.11.1.9) Funding figure your organization provided to policy makers in the reporting year relevant to this policy, law, or regulation (currency)

$850,000,000

(4.11.1.10) Explain the relevance of this policy, law, or regulation to the achievement of your environmental commitments and/or transition plan, how this has informed your engagement, and how you measure the success of your engagement

Together, CSX and its public partners are investing approximately $850 million to extend the environmental advantages of rail by improving intermodal capacity in key high-traffic corridors via more efficient double-stack intermodal operations. By improving the efficiency of intermodal transport, the project will decrease fuel consumption by nearly 2 billion gallons and reduce carbon dioxide emissions by 20 million tons in the project's first 30 years of operation.

(4.11.1.11) Indicate if you have evaluated whether your organization's engagement on this policy, law, or regulation is aligned with global environmental treaties or policy goals

☑ Yes, we have evaluated, and it is aligned

(4.11.1.12) Global environmental treaties or policy goals aligned with your organization's engagement on this policy, law or regulation

☑ Paris Agreement

(4.11.2) Provide details of your indirect engagement on policy, law, or regulation that may (positively or negatively) impact the environment through trade associations or other intermediary organizations or individuals in the reporting year.

Row 1

(4.11.2.1) Type of indirect engagement

☑ Indirect engagement via a trade association

(4.11.2.4) Trade association

North America

☑ Other trade association in North America, please specify : Association of American railroads

(4.11.2.5) Environmental issues relevant to the policies, laws, or regulations on which the organization or individual has taken a position

☑ Climate change

(4.11.2.6) Indicate whether your organization's position is consistent with the organization or individual you engage with

☑ Consistent

(4.11.2.7) Indicate whether your organization attempted to influence the organization or individual's position in the reporting year

☑ No, we did not attempt to influence their position

(4.11.2.8) Describe how your organization's position is consistent with or differs from the organization or individual's position, and any actions taken to influence their position

The Association of American Railroads AAR is the standard setting organization for North Americas railroads. Americas freight railroads operate the safest most efficient cost effective and environmentally sound freight transportation system in the world. As Congress considers legislation to limit emissions of carbon dioxide and other greenhouse gases it should consider the environmental friendliness of freight railroading. Climate legislation offers an opportunity for policymakers to encourage the movement of freight by environmentally friendly rail and spur the development of carbon capture and storage technology. CSXs position on climate legislation is consistent with AAR. CSX understands that improving energy efficiency and maximizing clean and affordable domestic energy resources are crucial to continued economic growth, improved quality of life, and environmental stewardship. Furthermore, this can help address the complex global challenge of climate concerns. Railroads, including CSX, are essential to moving these objectives forward through efficient transportation solutions offering a decreased emissions impact compared to trucks; on average rail is three to four times more efficient than highway transportation. In a recent report, Freight Railroads Climate Change, available on its website, the AAR states if action is not taken, climate change will have significant repercussions for the planet, our economies, our society, and even day to day railroad operations. The AAR released a series of policy proposals on its website for effectively combatting climate change and reducing GHG emissions. The AAR has not explicitly stated support for the goal of the Paris Agreement, however, it acknowledges its members efforts to voluntarily set emissions reduction targets in line with SBTi. CSX believes we can continue to support the goal of the Paris Agreement while maintaining our membership with the AAR and demonstrating best practices to other members. We will continue to engage with the AAR and monitor alignment on climate related topics.

(4.11.2.9) Funding figure your organization provided to this organization or individual in the reporting year (currency)

$897,732.78

(4.11.2.10) Describe the aim of this funding and how it could influence policy, law or regulation that may impact the environment

AAR supports railroad research and lobbying efforts in regard to safety and sustainability.

(4.11.2.11) Indicate if you have evaluated whether your organization's engagement is aligned with global environmental treaties or policy goals

☑ Yes, we have evaluated, and it is aligned

(4.11.2.12) Global environmental treaties or policy goals aligned with your organization's engagement on policy, law or regulation

☑ Paris Agreement

(4.12) Have you published information about your organization's response to environmental issues for this reporting year in places other than your CDP response?

☑ Yes

(4.12.1) Provide details on the information published about your organization's response to environmental issues for this reporting year in places other than your CDP response. Please attach the publication.

Row 1

(4.12.1.1) Publication

☑ In mainstream reports, in line with environmental disclosure standards or frameworks

(4.12.1.2) Standard or framework the report is in line with

☑ GRI

☑ TCFD

☑ Other, please specify :SASB

(4.12.1.3) Environmental issues covered in publication

☑ Climate change

(4.12.1.4) Status of the publication

☑ Complete

(4.12.1.5) Content elements

☑ Governance

☑ Risks & Opportunities

☑ Strategy

☑ Emissions figures

☑ Emission targets

(4.12.1.6) Page/section reference

CSX's 2024 ESG Performance is presented on 2024 Sustainability Report and Data Supplement on pages 62-63 of the publication, highlighting on GHG emissions and Energy & Material usage.70-75. IFRS index on page 75. Governance and Strategy page 47-48 and 37-38, 43. Risk and Opportunities page 37. Metrics & Targets page 38, and 62-63

(4.12.1.7) Attach the relevant publication

CSX 2024 Sustainability Report Combined.pdf

CSX 2024 Sustainability Report

CSX 2024 Sustainability Data Supplement

(4.12.1.8) Comment

2024 Sustainability Report and 2024 Data Supplement Report in a combined file

C5. Business strategy

(5.1) Does your organization use scenario analysis to identify environmental outcomes?

Climate change

(5.1.1) Use of scenario analysis

☑ Yes

(5.1.2) Frequency of analysis

☑ Annually

(5.1.1) Provide details of the scenarios used in your organization's scenario analysis.

Climate change

(5.1.1.1) Scenario used

Climate transition scenarios

☑ NGFS scenarios framework, please specify :Disorderly: Delayed Transition and Hot House World: Nationally Determined Contributions (NDCs)

(5.1.1.3) Approach to scenario

☑ Qualitative

(5.1.1.4) Scenario coverage

☑ Organization-wide

(5.1.1.5) Risk types considered in scenario

☑ Market

(5.1.1.6) Temperature alignment of scenario

☑ 1.5°C or lower

(5.1.1.7) Reference year

2020

(5.1.1.8) Timeframes covered

☑ 2030

☑ 2050

(5.1.1.9) Driving forces in scenario

Local ecosystem asset interactions, dependencies and impacts

☑ Climate change (one of five drivers of nature change)

Finance and insurance

☑ Cost of capital

Stakeholder and customer demands

☑ Consumer attention to impact

Regulators, legal and policy regimes

☑ Other regulators, legal and policy regimes driving forces, please specify :emerging regulations on the environment in regional policy

(5.1.1.10) Assumptions, uncertainties and constraints in scenario

CSX performed a scenario analysis using the Network for Greening the Financial Sector (NGFS) Disorderly: Delayed Transition and Hot House World: Nationally Determined Contributions (NDCs) to evaluate the impact of emerging regulations. This scenario assumes high variation in regional policy and delayed policy start. Delayed Transition assumes policy uncertainty leads to higher investment premiums lasting two years, 2030-2031. The assumption is suppliers provide zero- emission locomotives and low-carbon fuels demand will increase significantly. Slow to fast changes in demand for low-emission technology are a higher risk in a delayed transition. NDCs scenario focuses on decarbonizing the energy sector and passenger transportation. Existing mandates stay within a steady state with a push for decarbonization where possible. Considering these two scenarios, CSX evaluated the rigor of existing management methods to mitigate emerging regulations risks and concluded that CSX is adequately prepared to manage the risk of mandates and regulations on locomotive transportation and the availability of locomotive technology. Extensive biofuel research and infrastructure development, biofuel locomotive testing, and battery electric locomotive testing demonstrate CSX's commitment to meeting SBT emission reductions and incorporating collaboration and innovation. Assumptions: Delayed Transition scenario assumptions anticipated a shift from low to high carbon price implications between 2030 and 2050, with aggressive policy implementation starting in 2030 reflecting the need to decarbonize. This will result in an increase in demand for biofuel or biofuel blends, increasing CSX's operational costs. NDCs scenario assumptions had low carbon price implications with moderate regional policy variation. NDCs focus on passenger transportation and thus do not have a direct impact on CSX operations; however, the increase in demand for alternative fuels, low emission fuels, or zero emission transportation will result in a

surge price in alternative fuels and battery propulsion locomotives, resulting in higher capital costs. Analytical choices involved short-term (0-2 years), medium-term (2-5 years), and long-term time horizons (5-20 years, focusing on 10-year risks), with a financial impact defined as any activity affecting net revenue.

(5.1.1.11) Rationale for choice of scenario

CSX performed a scenario analysis using the Network for Greening the Financial Sector (NGFS) Disorderly Delayed Transition and Hot House World Nationally Determined Contributions (NDCs) to evaluate the impact of emerging regulations. Through this analysis, we evaluate potential scenarios where climate change and other disruptions may impact our business across short-, medium-, and long-term scenarios. CSX chose this scenario because it supports our ambition of aligning with the 1.5C pathway and represents the rapid decarbonization needed to avoid the worst impacts of climate change. In this scenario, the effects of transitioning to a low-carbon economy are likely to be most impactful as governments worldwide commit to driving down emissions, which will drive cost of compliance.

Climate change

(5.1.1.1) Scenario used

Physical climate scenarios

☑ RCP 8.5

(5.1.1.2) Scenario used SSPs used in conjunction with scenario

☑ SSP5

(5.1.1.3) Approach to scenario

☑ Qualitative and quantitative

(5.1.1.4) Scenario coverage

☑ Organization-wide

(5.1.1.5) Risk types considered in scenario

☑ Acute physical

☑ Chronic physical

(5.1.1.6) Temperature alignment of scenario

☑ 4.0°C and above

(5.1.1.7) Reference year

2024

(5.1.1.8) Timeframes covered

☑ 2030

☑ 2060

☑ 2100

(5.1.1.9) Driving forces in scenario

Local ecosystem asset interactions, dependencies and impacts

☑ Climate change (one of five drivers of nature change)

Finance and insurance

☑ Cost of capital

Stakeholder and customer demands

☑ Consumer attention to impact

Regulators, legal and policy regimes

☑ Other regulators, legal and policy regimes driving forces, please specify :minimal climate policy under this scenario

(5.1.1.10) Assumptions, uncertainties and constraints in scenario

CSX conducted physical scenario analysis using SSP5-8.5 model. SSP5-8.5 is a "high emissions" scenario, which assumes rapid economic growth driven by fossil fuels, limited global efforts to mitigate greenhouse gas emissions, high energy consumption and carbon-intensive industries, and minimal focus on climate change policies. Constraints include limited data resolution, modeling limitations, and exclusion of broader economic or social changes affecting rail operations. Additionally, this analysis used climate data input from Jupiter Intelligence (Jupiter), under the assumption that Jupiter provides the most consistent and reliable multi-hazard data across present and future scenarios. It also assumes the accuracy of CSX's asset data inputs and the relevance of damage functions developed for each CSX Archetype, which quantify impacts at specific climate hazard exposure levels. However, the analysis is constrained by a cap of 2,000 locations for data extraction and pre-defined peril thresholds, which may not suit all asset types or capture the full granularity needed for detailed analysis.

(5.1.1.11) Rationale for choice of scenario

The SSP5-8.5 scenario was chosen for CSX's climate risk assessment due to its representation of a high-emissions, worst-case climate change trajectory, which characterized by ongoing reliance on fossil fuels and minimal mitigation efforts. This scenario assumes heavy reliance on fossil fuels, which helps CSX understand the worst-case risks to their assets and operations due to the impact if changing climate, such as sea level rise, flooding, and extreme weather events, over the next several decades.

(5.1.2) Provide details of the outcomes of your organization’s scenario analysis.

Climate change

(5.1.2.1) Business processes influenced by your analysis of the reported scenarios

☑ Risk and opportunities identification, assessment and management

☑ Strategy and financial planning

☑ Target setting and transition planning

(5.1.2.2) Coverage of analysis

☑ Organization-wide

(5.1.2.3) Summarize the outcomes of the scenario analysis and any implications for other environmental issues

To evaluate the impact of emerging regulations in more detail, CSX performed a scenario analysis using the Network for Greening the Financial Sector (NGFS) Disorderly: Delayed Transition and Hot House World: Nationally Determined Contributions. The Disorderly: Delayed Transition scenario assumes a high variation in regional policy and delayed policy start. Disorderly Delayed Transition assumes that policy uncertainty leads to a higher investment premium that lasts for two years, 2030-2031. The assumption is that suppliers could provide zero-emission locomotives, and there will be a significant increase in demand for low-carbon fuels. Slow to fast changes in demand for low-emission technology are a higher risk in a delayed transition. Hot House World: NDCs scenario focuses on decarbonizing the energy sector and passenger transportation. As a result, existing mandates stay within a steady state with a push for decarbonization where possible. Considering these two scenarios, CSX evaluated the rigor of our existing management methods to mitigate the risk of emerging regulations and concluded that CSX is adequately prepared to manage the risk of mandates and regulations on locomotive transportation and the availability of locomotive technology. The extensive biofuel research and infrastructure development, Biofuel locomotive testing, and battery electric locomotive testing demonstrate CSX's commitment to meeting the emission reductions of the SBT and incorporating collaboration and innovation engagements.

(5.2) Does your organization’s strategy include a climate transition plan?

(5.2.1) Transition plan

☑ Yes, we have a climate transition plan which aligns with a 1.5°C world

(5.2.3) Publicly available climate transition plan

☑ Yes

(5.2.4) Plan explicitly commits to cease all spending on, and revenue generation from, activities that contribute to fossil fuel expansion

☑ No, and we do not plan to add an explicit commitment within the next two years

(5.2.6) Explain why your organization does not explicitly commit to cease all spending on and revenue generation from activities that contribute to fossil fuel expansion

CSX recognizes the critical role railroads play in the movement of goods across the economy, including sectors tied to fossil fuels, while also being one of the most fuel-efficient transportation modes. Railroads are significantly more energy-efficient than trucks, emitting up to 75% less greenhouse gas emissions per ton-mile of freight moved.

By continuing to serve industries that rely on fossil fuels, we help reduce the overall environmental footprint of transporting these goods compared to alternative modes. At the same time, we are continuing our work in sustainability and supporting the transition to a low-carbon economy. This includes investing in technologies to improve fuel efficiency, reduce emissions, and explore alternative fuels like renewable diesel and hydrogen fuel-cell locomotives. While ceasing all spending or revenue generation from fossil fuel-related activities may not be feasible in the near term, we are actively working to align our operations with climate goals and collaborate with stakeholders to reduce emissions across the supply chain. Our focus is on making meaningful progress toward our science-based target while continuing to fulfill our role in the economy

(5.2.7) Mechanism by which feedback is collected from shareholders on your climate transition plan

☑ We have a different feedback mechanism in place

(5.2.8) Description of feedback mechanism

CSX has implemented robust feedback mechanisms to ensure accountability and effective implementation of strategies. Climate-related issues are managed through structured communication flows from the Vice President of Stakeholder Engagement and Sustainability to the Governance and Sustainability Committee and the Board of Directors. This process ensures executive accountability and aligns the company's actions with sustainability goals. The Board of Directors, along with specific committees, provides oversight and feedback to executive management, with regular performance reviews aligning incentive plans with sustainability goals. The Governance and Sustainability Committee oversees sustainability policies and performance, ensuring progress toward targets and continuous improvement. Stakeholder engagement and compliance checks are integral to refining strategies and enhancing CSX's leadership in driving sustainable growth and environmental stewardship.

(5.2.9) Frequency of feedback collection

☑ Annually

(5.2.10) Description of key assumptions and dependencies on which the transition plan relies

CSX's Climate Transition Plan (CTP) was developed based on transition scenario analysis using two scenarios: the NGFS Disorderly- Delayed Transition and Hot House World - Nationally Determined Contributions (NDCs) scenarios, which relies on key assumptions such as delayed implementation of stringent climate policies, potential market disruptions, the pace of technological innovation, and economic impacts across sectors. It is dependent on factors like the regulatory environment, stakeholder collaboration, financial market access, technological advancements, and shifts in consumer behavior. - NGFS Disorderly - Delayed Transition: This scenario assumes that climate policies are not implemented until late 2020s, leading to a need for more abrupt and costly measures to meet climate targets. It takes into account potential market disruptions and economic impacts due to the sudden change. - Hot House World - NDCs: This scenario is based on current nationally determined contributions, which are insufficient to limit global warming to below 2°C. It assumes a world where policies are not strengthened, leading to higher physical risks from climate change. CSX's CTP is developed under these assumptions and dependencies, aiming to mitigate risks and leverage opportunities in the evolving climate landscape.

(5.2.11) Description of progress against transition plan disclosed in current or previous reporting period

No substantial progress yet as the Climate Transition Plan was developed in 2024 and published in 2025

(5.2.12) Attach any relevant documents which detail your climate transition plan (optional)

CSX-Climate-Transition-Plan.pdf

(5.2.13) Other environmental issues that your climate transition plan considers

☑ No other environmental issue considered

(5.3) Have environmental risks and opportunities affected your strategy and/or financial planning?

(5.3.1) Environmental risks and/or opportunities have affected your strategy and/or financial planning

☑ Yes, both strategy and financial planning

(5.3.2) Business areas where environmental risks and/or opportunities have affected your strategy

☑ Products and services

☑ Upstream/downstream value chain

☑ Investment in R&D

☑ Operations

(5.3.1) Describe where and how environmental risks and opportunities have affected your strategy.

Products and services

(5.3.1.1) Effect type

☑ Risks

☑ Opportunities

(5.3.1.2) Environmental issues relevant to the risks and/or opportunities that have affected your strategy in this area

☑ Climate change

(5.3.1.3) Describe how environmental risks and/or opportunities have affected your strategy in this area

In response to climate-related risks and opportunities, shippers are increasingly seeking low-carbon freight haul options. This trend positions CSX rail services to gain a competitive edge over less efficient modes of freight transportation. In the short-term, the scheduled railroading strategy focuses on optimizing asset utilization and schedule-based trains, leading to reduced idle time for locomotives, fewer locomotives in operation, longer trains, and on-time product delivery—all contributing to lower GHG emissions. On average, CSX rail services are three to four times more fuel-efficient and emit approximately 75% less GHG emissions than highway transport. Consequently, CSX has made a strategic decision to emphasize intermodal freight haul in future planning and to partner with trucking companies, using train services for long-haul transport and truck services for local delivery. This approach is estimated to help CSX customers avoid approximately 10 million metric tons of CO2e emissions in 2024. This calculation is based on the percentage of merchandise and intermodal freight that could be transported by either highway or rail, combined with the EPA's determination that

rail is about four times more fuel-efficient than highway transport. Any carbon-constraining regulation could prompt customers to shift their business to rail, providing financial advantages for CSX. The potential impact could be as high as 73% of revenue, equivalent to the revenue from the merchandise and intermodal business lines in 2023. Changes in the availability of natural resources, such as domestic natural gas, have also created opportunities for CSX to demonstrate agility in responding to new and evolving markets and geographies. Although low natural gas prices have decreased demand for coal, this shift in the energy market represents a significant opportunity for CSX to support the development of alternative fuel sources. Specifically, given CSX's proximity to the Marcellus-Utica shale region and several East Coast refineries, the company is well-positioned to support the expansion into new forms of energy. These advantages are made possible by CSX's nearly 20,000-mile network and access to 70 ocean, lake, and river ports—providing energy customers with a competitive edge and access to key areas of energy consumption in the US.

Upstream/downstream value chain

(5.3.1.1) Effect type

☑ Risks

☑ Opportunities

(5.3.1.2) Environmental issues relevant to the risks and/or opportunities that have affected your strategy in this area

☑ Climate change

(5.3.1.3) Describe how environmental risks and/or opportunities have affected your strategy in this area

CSX's long-term value chain strategy has been shaped by climate risks, particularly recognizing that air pollution limits can directly impact CSX's customers. In recent years, coal-fired energy generation continued to decline as utility providers faced regulatory pressures, depressed domestic demand, and volatility in the global market. In response to the shrinking coal market, CSX made a significant strategic decision to adjust its business plan. This included streamlining the workforce, redirecting resources away from the Appalachian region, improving productivity within the coal business, and investing in other areas such as the intermodal business. A key example of CSX's long-term value chain strategy is the advancement of strategic investments and partnerships in intermodal operations to offset declining coal revenues. Over the past eight years, CSX has invested more than $1 billion to enhance its intermodal network. As a result, the intermodal business line has grown by 5% over the last seven years, increasing from 40% of volume in 2014 to 46% in 2024.

Investment in R&D

(5.3.1.1) Effect type

☑ Risks

☑ Opportunities

(5.3.1.2) Environmental issues relevant to the risks and/or opportunities that have affected your strategy in this area

☑ Climate change

(5.3.1.3) Describe how environmental risks and/or opportunities have affected your strategy in this area

CSX's long-term investment in R&D strategy has been shaped by climate risks, particularly considering CSX's reliance on diesel-powered locomotives, a carbon-intensive fuel, for hauling freight. A typical locomotive has a service life of 30 to 50 years and costs approximately $3 million each. The CSX active locomotive fleet consists of around 3,500 diesel-powered units. Additionally, the infrastructure to fuel these diesel locomotives, such as diesel storage tanks and fueling platforms, spans the entire CSX network. Since diesel fuel combustion accounts for approximately 91% of CSX's Scope 1 GHG emissions and diesel fuel usage is a major operating cost, transitioning to a lower-carbon option, would significantly impact both GHG emissions and fuel expenses. However, the investment required to make this shift in assets, practices, and processes is substantial. Retrofitting the entire CSX fleet to use a non-diesel, lower-carbon energy source, along with establishing the necessary infrastructure to switch from diesel to non-diesel fuel delivery systems across the network, represents a significant and costly change. CSX is collaborating with locomotive manufacturers to test biodiesel blends in its fleet for viability and EPA certification. The use of biodiesel and renewable diesel would directly contribute to carbon reductions.

Operations

(5.3.1.1) Effect type

☑ Risks

☑ Opportunities

(5.3.1.2) Environmental issues relevant to the risks and/or opportunities that have affected your strategy in this area

☑ Climate change

(5.3.1.3) Describe how environmental risks and/or opportunities have affected your strategy in this area

CSX's short-term operations strategy has been influenced by climate risks, recognizing that severe weather and other extreme events resulting from climate change could lead to significant business interruptions and expenses exceeding available insurance coverage. The company's operations may be affected by external factors such as severe weather and natural occurrences, including floods, fires, and hurricanes. As a result, the rail network may sustain damage, the workforce may be displaced, fuel costs may increase, and substantial business interruptions could occur. To mitigate the physical risks posed by extreme weather, CSX has established comprehensive business continuity plans designed to ensure the continuity of train operations across its nearly 20,000-mile network, even in the face of extreme weather events. CSX is continually reinvesting in infrastructure, with $1.7 billion invested in 2023 and $1.8 billion in 2024. A case study example highlights CSX's review of historical recovery and response actions to extreme weather events over the past 10 years. During this period, CSX spent over $231million responding to and recovering from the effects of hurricanes, tropical storms, and floods. These responses include Tropical Storm Isaac in 2012 ($31.2 million), the South Carolina floods in 2015 ($39.5 million), Hurricane Matthew in 2016 ($25 million), Hurricane Irma in 2017 ($26.8 million), Hurricane Florence in 2018 ($29.4 million), and Hurricane Ida in 2021 and 2022 ($29.1 million) and Hurricane Helene in 2024 ($50+ million). These financial impacts resulted from various expenses, including labor and materials for infrastructure repair, loss of business, environmental clean-up and disposal, service disruptions, and reroutes. As a result of this case study, CSX made a significant strategic decision to reinforce and harden infrastructure in Jacksonville, Florida, and coastal areas within its annual capital expenditure budget.

(5.3.2) Describe where and how environmental risks and opportunities have affected your financial planning.

Row 1

(5.3.2.1) Financial planning elements that have been affected

☑ Revenues

☑ Capital expenditures

(5.3.2.2) Effect type

☑ Risks

☑ Opportunities

(5.3.2.3) Environmental issues relevant to the risks and/or opportunities that have affected these financial planning elements

☑ Climate change

(5.3.2.4) Describe how environmental risks and/or opportunities have affected these financial planning elements

CSX applies an internal methodology to evaluate potential scenarios where climate change and other types of disruption may impact operations and safety, and that information is used to plan for business continuity. As part of that process, both short- and long-term impacts are considered, and action is taken. For example, scenarios analyzing short term effects like the likelihood and extent of flooding along the Gulf Coast resulted in decisions to use capital expenditures to harden tracks and raise critical equipment off the ground in preparation for forecasted severe weather. The potential for hurricane-induced wind damage is considered when implementing strategies and capital expenditures to reinforce/harden infrastructure in the Jacksonville, Florida and coastal areas. Long-term effect scenario analyses include topics like rising temperatures and sea levels that may result in decisions to possibly relocate infrastructure and assets along coastal cities and ports to more inland locations. A case study example of how climate risks have influenced our financial planning process includes analyzing historical climate related expenditures due to extreme weather events. In the case of costs that exceed the company's regular forecasts, CSX often provides its shareholders with an estimate of the financial impact a weather-related event may have had on the company. These financial impacts result from multiple expense types, including labor and materials to repair infrastructure, loss of business, environmental clean-up and disposal, service disruptions, and reroutes. Analyzing historic financial impacts and disclosing this information to shareholders on financial impacts of weather-related events led to CSX investing billions into the company over the past five years.

(5.4) In your organization’s financial accounting, do you identify spending/revenue that is aligned with your organization’s climate transition?

	Identification of spending/revenue that is aligned with your organization’s climate transition	Methodology or framework used to assess alignment with your organization’s climate transition
	Select from: ☑ Yes	*Select all that apply* ☑ Other methodology or framework

(5.4.1) Quantify the amount and percentage share of your spending/revenue that is aligned with your organization’s climate transition.

Row 1

(5.4.1.1) Methodology or framework used to assess alignment

☑ Other, please specify :a self-assessment of our financial planning on capex investment towards low-carbon technologies

(5.4.1.5) Financial metric

☑ CAPEX

(5.4.1.6) Amount of selected financial metric that is aligned in the reporting year (currency)

$37,935,000

(5.4.1.7) Percentage share of selected financial metric aligned in the reporting year (%)

1.5

(5.4.1.8) Percentage share of selected financial metric planned to align in 2025 (%)

1.5

(5.4.1.9) Percentage share of selected financial metric planned to align in 2030 (%)

1.5

(5.4.1.12) Details of the methodology or framework used to assess alignment with your organization's climate transition

CSX uses a bespoke methodology to assess financial planning alignment with our climate transition goals. This approach involves a self-assessment of our financial planning processes, with a particular focus on identifying capex spending towards investment related to energy efficiency improvement technologies.

(5.5) Does your organization invest in research and development (R&D) of low-carbon products or services related to your sector activities?

(5.5.1) Investment in low-carbon R&D

☑ Yes

(5.5.2) Comment

At CSX, we believe that fuel efficiency is key to GHG reduction and have invested in the development of the next generation of fuels and propulsion technology. To demonstrate our commitment to innovation and environmental stewardship, we are testing the effectiveness of alternative fuels in locomotives using cutting-edge, fuel-saving technologies in our pilot programs. For example, as part of our biofuel use in locomotives, we tested ten locomotives with biodiesel serving Tampa, Florida that resulted in a nearly 20 percent reduction in GHG emissions for these engines. Furthermore, CSX is conducting research and collaborating on innovative solutions that will define the next generation of locomotive power. Incremental improvements with engine rebuild help improve fuel efficiency, which creates sustainable performance regardless of fuel burned. We recognize the locomotive technology landscape is evolving continuously and with it, we are actively exploring and implementing engine alternatives including hydrogen fuel cell, tier 4 engines, and battery electric locomotives. Besides advancement in alternative fuels, we are enhancing sustainability and efficiency through various automation

technologies, initiatives, and process changes. These improvements benefit our operations regardless of the fuel we use, and we consider it part of our innovation strategy to reach our emission reduction targets. CSX continues to invest in distributed power (DP), enabling longer trains and more efficient movement for over 1,300 upgraded locomotives. Since 2000, CSX has invested in automated engine start-stop systems and other technologies aimed at reducing locomotive idle time and boosting fuel efficiency, which have shown to effectively decrease fuel consumption per gross ton mile and related emissions intensity.

(5.5.8) Provide details of your organization's investments in low-carbon R&D for transport-related activities over the last three years.

Row 1

(5.5.8.1) Activity

☑ Rail

(5.5.8.2) Technology area

☑ Other, please specify :smart system

(5.5.8.3) Stage of development in the reporting year

☑ Pilot demonstration

(5.5.8.4) Average % of total R&D investment over the last 3 years

20

(5.5.8.6) Average % of total R&D investment planned over the next 5 years

20

(5.5.8.7) Explain how your R&D investment in this technology area is aligned with your climate commitments and/or climate transition plan

Technology investments include fuel efficiency improvements and alternative fuels. Fuel efficiency is key to GHG reduction and CSX has invested in the development of the next generation of fuels and propulsion technology. In 2024, this effort achieved a 4% improvement year over year, with locomotive fuel consumption reduced from 1.02 to 0.98 gallons per 1,000 gross ton-miles. Implementation of Trip Optimizer is estimated to have saved over 42 million gallons of diesel fuel in 2024. CSX is testing the effectiveness of alternative fuels in locomotives using cutting-edge, fuel-saving technologies in our pilot programs. Biodiesel fuel blends are being tested in ten locomotives to demonstrate performance and confirm emission requirements. CSX is conducting research and collaborating on innovative solutions that will define the next generation of locomotive power. Incremental improvements with engine rebuilds help improve fuel efficiency, which creates sustainable performance regardless of fuel burned. We recognize the locomotive technology landscape is evolving continuously, we are actively exploring and implementing engine alternatives including: Tier 4 engine repower; hydrogen fuel cell locomotives; and battery-electric locomotives.

(5.10) Does your organization use an internal price on environmental externalities?

	Use of internal pricing of environmental externalities	Primary reason for not pricing environmental externalities	Explain why your organization does not price environmental externalities
	Select from: ☑ No, and we do not plan to in the next two years	*Select from:* ☑ No standardized procedure	*In development*

[Fixed row]

(5.11) Do you engage with your value chain on environmental issues?

	Engaging with this stakeholder on environmental issues	Environmental issues covered
Suppliers	*Select from:* ☑ Yes	*Select all that apply* ☑ Climate change
Customers	*Select from:* ☑ Yes	*Select all that apply* ☑ Climate change
Investors and shareholders	*Select from:* ☑ Yes	*Select all that apply* ☑ Climate change
Other value chain stakeholders	*Select from:* ☑ Yes	*Select all that apply* ☑ Climate change

(5.11.1) Does your organization assess and classify suppliers according to their dependencies and/or impacts on the environment?

Climate change

(5.11.1.1) Assessment of supplier dependencies and/or impacts on the environment

☑ Yes, we assess the dependencies and/or impacts of our suppliers

(5.11.1.2) Criteria for assessing supplier dependencies and/or impacts on the environment

☑ Contribution to supplier-related Scope 3 emissions

☑ Dependence on ecosystem services/environmental assets

☑ Impact on pollution levels

(5.11.1.3) % Tier 1 suppliers assessed

☑ 51-75%

(5.11.1.4) Define a threshold for classifying suppliers as having substantive dependencies and/or impacts on the environment

CSX assesses the top 50% of suppliers by spend through the CDP Supply Chain to evaluate contribution of supplier-related scope 3 emissions and CSX currently evaluates suppliers who must access and work on CSX property through ISNetworld questionnaire. CSX has high expectations of all suppliers in areas of ethics, compliance, and environmental stewardship including engagement on GHG emissions reductions, and risks and opportunities around climate change.

(5.11.1.5) % Tier 1 suppliers meeting the threshold for substantive dependencies and/or impacts on the environment

Select from:

☑ 26-50%

(5.11.1.6) Number of Tier 1 suppliers meeting the thresholds for substantive dependencies and/or impacts on the environment

192

(5.11.2) Does your organization prioritize which suppliers to engage with on environmental issues?

Climate change

(5.11.2.1) Supplier engagement prioritization on this environmental issue

☑ Yes, we prioritize which suppliers to engage with on this environmental issue

(5.11.2.2) Criteria informing which suppliers are prioritized for engagement on this environmental issue

☑ Procurement spend

☑ Other, please specify **:Dependence on ecosystem services/environmental assets, contribution to supplier-related Scope 3 emissions, Impact on pollution levels**

☑ Regulatory compliance

☑ Reputation management

☑ Business risk mitigation

☑ Supplier performance improvement

(5.11.2.4) Please explain

CSX utilizes IS Networld (ISN) as a tool to verify qualifications and access for vendors and contractors operating on CSX property. ISN provides visibility into vendor and contractor companies, as well as the employees these companies deploy on our premises. Contractors undergo evaluation based on their environmental training, qualifications, and performance, as well as, past safety records. Those receiving a grade of C or lower are required to meet with the department lead responsible for hiring as a group to develop a variance plan.

(5.11.5) Do your suppliers have to meet environmental requirements as part of your organization's purchasing process?

Climate change

(5.11.5.1) Suppliers have to meet specific environmental requirements related to this environmental issue as part of the purchasing process

☑ Yes, suppliers have to meet environmental requirements related to this environmental issue, but they are not included in our supplier contracts

(5.11.5.2) Policy in place for addressing supplier non-compliance

☑ Yes, we have a policy in place for addressing non-compliance

(5.11.5.3) Comment

CSX utilizes IS Networld (ISN) as a tool to verify qualifications and access for vendors and contractors operating on CSX property. ISN provides visibility into vendor and contractor companies, as well as the employees these companies deploy on our premises. Contractors undergo evaluation based on their environmental training, qualifications, and performance, as well as, past safety records. Those receiving a grade of C or lower are required to meet with the department lead responsible for hiring as a group to develop a variance plan.

(5.11.6) Provide details of the environmental requirements that suppliers have to meet as part of your organization's purchasing process, and the compliance measures in place.

Climate change

(5.11.6.1) Environmental requirement

☑ Adoption of the UN International Labour Organization Principles

(5.11.6.2) Mechanisms for monitoring compliance with this environmental requirement

☑ Grievance mechanism/ Whistleblowing hotline

☑ Other, please specify :All CSX contractors and suppliers are required to comply with the Human Rights Policy and Code of Ethics. We encourage anyone who believes that this policy has been violated to report his or her concerns via the CSX Helpline at 800-737-1663.

(5.11.6.3) % tier 1 suppliers by procurement spend required to comply with this environmental requirement

☑ 100%

(5.11.6.4) % tier 1 suppliers by procurement spend in compliance with this environmental requirement

☑ 100%

(5.11.6.7) % tier 1 supplier-related scope 3 emissions attributable to the suppliers required to comply with this environmental requirement

☑ 100%

(5.11.6.8) % tier 1 supplier-related scope 3 emissions attributable to the suppliers in compliance with this environmental requirement

☑ 100%

(5.11.6.12) Comment

All CSX contractors and suppliers are required to comply with the policies outlined on the CSX Suppliers website including the Human Rights Policy and Code of Ethics. The Human Rights Policy includes CSX's commitment to operating its business in a manner consistent with international human rights principles, including those contained in the United Nations Universal Declaration of Human Rights and Global Compact and the International Labour Organization's Declaration on Fundamental Principles and Rights at Work. We encourage anyone who believes that these or any policies has been violated to report his or her concerns via the CSX Helpline at 800-737-1663.

(5.11.7) Provide further details of your organization's supplier engagement on environmental issues.

Climate change

(5.11.7.2) Action driven by supplier engagement

☑ Other, please specify :Information collection (understanding supplier behavior)

(5.11.7.3) Type and details of engagement

Capacity building

☑ Provide training, support and best practices on how to measure GHG emissions

Information collection

☑ Collect environmental risk and opportunity information at least annually from suppliers

Innovation and collaboration

☑ Collaborate with suppliers on innovations to reduce environmental impacts in products and services

(5.11.7.4) Upstream value chain coverage

☑ Tier 1 suppliers

(5.11.7.5) % of tier 1 suppliers by procurement spend covered by engagement

☑ 100%

(5.11.7.6) % of tier 1 supplier-related scope 3 emissions covered by engagement

☑ 1-25%

(5.11.7.9) Describe the engagement and explain the effect of your engagement on the selected environmental action

CSX's suppliers are seen as an extension of the company and as such, are expected to adhere to our Code of Ethics and standards of business conduct. We also require all subcontractors or suppliers that work on CSX property to participate in ISN, FRA Training, and CSX-specific health, safety, and environmental training. Since recommitting to CDP's Supply Chain program, we have been working to find synergies and advance ESG practices on an ongoing basis with our suppliers. in 2024, CSX requested Tier 1 suppliers to report environmental data through CDP Supply Chain questionnaires including the proportion of their GHG emissions that they can attribute to business with CSX. In addition, we request they provide company-wide sustainable practices to help us better understand our supply chain footprint. CSX and CDP held a supplier training to review best practices and priorities for reporting data. In 2024, we engaged with over 190 suppliers representing 75 percent of total spend and engaged them to better glean insight into their emissions reduction goals and ESG initiatives. CSX and CDP held a supplier training to review best practices and priorities for reporting data. Moving forward, CSX will continue to work with our Tier 1 suppliers and through the direct engagement to drive climate action across supply chain. CSX further engages with Tier 1 suppliers using the ISNetworld questionnaire. Success is measured with increasing engagement either with CDP Supply Chain response or with having 100% participation in the ISNetworld questionnaire as applicable. CSX currently evaluates suppliers who must access and work on CSX property, according to safety, compliance, quality and sustainability metrics and makes recommendations for future improvements. CSX has high expectations of all suppliers in areas of ethics, compliance, and environmental stewardship. Engagement on GHG emissions and risks and opportunities around climate change is an extension of that expectation and provides a method for CSX to evaluate risk within the supply chain. Because CSX offers a mode of land transportation that is, on average, three to four times more fuel efficient than trucks, the company is well positioned to expand services to companies that are looking to reduce the emissions associated with their upstream and downstream transportation.

(5.11.7.10) Engagement is helping your tier 1 suppliers meet an environmental requirement related to this environmental issue

☑ No, this engagement is unrelated to meeting an environmental requirement

(5.11.7.11) Engagement is helping your tier 1 suppliers engage with their own suppliers on the selected action

☑ Unknown

(5.11.9) Provide details of any environmental engagement activity with other stakeholders in the value chain.

Climate change

(5.11.9.1) Type of stakeholder

☑ Customers

(5.11.9.2) Type and details of engagement

Education/Information sharing

☑ Run an engagement campaign to educate stakeholders about the environmental impacts about your products, goods and/or services

(5.11.9.3) % of stakeholder type engaged

☑ 100%

(5.11.9.4) % stakeholder-associated scope 3 emissions

☑ 1-25%

(5.11.9.5) Rationale for engaging these stakeholders and scope of engagement

CSX actively engages investors, shareholders, suppliers, and customers as part of its comprehensive stakeholder engagement strategy. The Board believes that engagement with shareholders is invaluable for understanding their perspectives and gaining insights into the topics most important to them. Supported by management, Board members—including the Chairs of the Governance and Sustainability Committee and the Compensation and Talent Management Committee—regularly participate in shareholder engagement meetings with representatives from numerous institutional shareholders and, periodically, proxy advisory firms to discuss CSX's business strategy, corporate governance practices, executive compensation, and sustainability matters. Beyond these structured outreach efforts, CSX engages with shareholders and other interested parties through participation in industry and investment community conferences, investor road shows, and analyst meetings. In 2024 alone, CSX hosted meetings with more than 250 unique investment firms, representing over $37 trillion in assets under management, and has recently expanded its international outreach to investors in Europe, Latin America, Asia, and Australia. Comprehensive detail on these outreach efforts and our policies is provided in the 2025 Proxy Statement (page 50). In addition, CSX conducted a full-scale materiality assessment in 2020 that included both internal and external stakeholders to identify issues most material to the company (with updates in 2021 and 2023). The results have guided the evolution of CSX's ESG strategy, ensuring alignment with stakeholder expectations. To further engage customers, CSX offers an online Carbon Calculator to help them assess the environmental benefits of rail and calculate carbon dioxide emissions savings compared to other transport options. By making the Carbon Calculator public, CSX ensures broad customer participation and supports collaborative problem-solving around logistics and sustainability. CSX also responds to customer requests for emissions data related to their shipments and recognizes significant customer contributions to emissions reductions through the CSX Customer Environmental Excellence Awards. Through these actions, CSX demonstrates robust engagement across its value chain, supporting its ESG strategy and driving continuous environmental improvement.

(5.11.9.6) Effect of engagement and measures of success

CSX works with customers to shift their freight transport from highway to rail, and continually strives to increase the value customers receive by shipping their goods with CSX. Potential customers are selected by the sales and marketing team if the general transport is more than 500 miles and a certain tonnage threshold depending on the commodity. This criterion makes sense for a switch from truck to rail for the customer and for CSX to gain a price advantage. CSX defines the measure of success as increased intermodal business and carload volumes. Between 2018 and 2024, intermodal volume was maintained at 46% of freight volume and held steady at 14% of generated revenue. A typical intermodal freight train can carry the load of more than 280 trucks and equates to about 75% reduction in transportation related CO2e emissions when shippers switch from highway to rail. The impact for CSX customers is avoided emissions estimated to be more than 10 million metric tons CO2e annually. The basis for this calculation is the percentage of merchandise and intermodal freight transportation that could move by either highway or rail, and the EPA determination that rail is three to four times more fuel efficient than moving freight by highway. CSX's has been recognized on the Dow Jones Sustainability Index (DJSI) for thirteen years for high performance in supply chain management as well as environmental management, corporate governance, and corporate citizenship and philanthropy.

(5.12) Indicate any mutually beneficial environmental initiatives you could collaborate on with specific CDP Supply Chain members.

[NOTE – details for CSX customers have been redacted from this document.]

(5.12.1) Requesting member

(5.12.2) Environmental issues the initiative relates to

☑ Climate change

(5.12.4) Initiative category and type

Logistical change

☑ Change transportation mode (e.g., switch from aviation to rail)

(5.12.5) Details of initiative

We offer low-carbon services and adopt innovative technologies to improve efficiency for our customer. Our enhanced Carbon Emissions Reduction Calculator enables customers to measure fuel savings and environmental impact when switching to rail, using a methodology based on modal shift and carbon emissions avoidance. Using this tool, customer can make an informed decisions about switching to rail.

(5.12.6) Expected benefits

☑ Reduction of downstream value chain emissions (own scope 3)

(5.12.11) Please explain

CSX's fuel efficiency advantage vs trucks customer to gain a 75% lifetime reduction in transportation related CO2e emissions when shippers switch from highway to rail.

(5.13) Has your organization already implemented any mutually beneficial environmental initiatives due to CDP Supply Chain member engagement?

	Environmental initiatives implemented due to CDP Supply Chain member engagement	Primary reason for not implementing environmental initiatives	Explain why your organization has not implemented any environmental initiatives
	Select from: ☑ No, and we do not plan to within the next two years	*Select from:* ☑ Not an immediate strategic priority	*Not an immediate strategic priority*

C6. Environmental Performance - Consolidation Approach

(6.1) Provide details on your chosen consolidation approach for the calculation of environmental performance data.

Climate change

(6.1.1) Consolidation approach used

☑ Operational control

(6.1.2) Provide the rationale for the choice of consolidation approach

This consolidation approach aligns with CSX's approach for consolidating our GHG inventory. Each CSX subsidiary is a wholly owned operating company of CSX and has operational control of all aspects of its operation. CSX chose operational control as their choice of consolidation approach to ensure that consistent tracking of emissions reduction initiatives and facilitates accountability for corporate environmental performance.

C7. Environmental performance - Climate Change

(7.1) Is this your first year of reporting emissions data to CDP?

☑ No

(7.1.1) Has your organization undergone any structural changes in the reporting year, or are any previous structural changes being accounted for in this disclosure of emissions data?

	Has there been a structural change?
	Select all that apply ☑ No

[Fixed row]

(7.1.2) Has your emissions accounting methodology, boundary, and/or reporting year definition changed in the reporting year?

	Change(s) in methodology, boundary, and/or reporting year definition?
	Select all that apply ☑ No

(7.2) Select the name of the standard, protocol, or methodology you have used to collect activity data and calculate emissions.

☑ The Greenhouse Gas Protocol: Scope 2 Guidance

☑ US EPA Emissions & Generation Resource Integrated Database (eGRID)

☑ The Greenhouse Gas Protocol: A Corporate Accounting and Reporting Standard (Revised Edition)

☑ US EPA Center for Corporate Climate Leadership: Indirect Emissions From Purchased Electricity

☑ US EPA Center for Corporate Climate Leadership: Direct Emissions from Mobile Combustion Sources

☑ US EPA Center for Corporate Climate Leadership: Direct Emissions from Stationary Combustion Sources

(7.3) Describe your organization's approach to reporting Scope 2 emissions.

☑ We are reporting a Scope 2, location-based figure

(7.3.2) Scope 2, market-based

☑ We are reporting a Scope 2, market-based figure

(7.3.3) Comment

CSX's Scope 2 location-based CO2, N2O, and CH4 emissions from electricity are quantified by multiplying the annual electricity usage by average emission rates. Annual electricity usage in kilowatt-hours (kWh) and total annual spending on electricity are obtained from a service provider hired by CSX to manage utilities. The electricity usage data provided by this service provider includes all CSX companies. Emission factors for US locations are obtained from the US EPA's Emissions Generation Resource Integrated Database (eGRID2022). The market-based emission factors are obtained from Green-e Energy Residual Mix Emissions Rates 2023.

(7.4) Are there any sources (e.g. facilities, specific GHGs, activities, geographies, etc.) of Scope 1, Scope 2 or Scope 3 emissions that are within your selected reporting boundary which are not included in your disclosure?

☑ No

(7.5) Provide your base year and base year emissions.

Scope 1

(7.5.1) Base year end

12/31/2014

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

5,512,593.0

(7.5.3) Methodological details

Emission factors for Scope 1 emission were obtained from EPA EF Hub (2013). Methodology was aligned with the GHG Protocol Corporate Standard.

Scope 2 (location-based)

(7.5.1) Base year end

12/31/2014

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

327,528

(7.5.3) Methodological details

Emission factors for purchased electricity were obtained from the U.S. EPA's Emissions and Generation Resource Integrated Database (eGRID2010).

Scope 2 (market-based)

(7.5.1) Base year end

12/31/2017

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

174,598.0

(7.5.3) Methodological details

Emission factors for Scope 2 market-based electricity were obtained from Green-e Energy Residual Mix Emission Rates (2021). CSX did not begin tracking or calculating market-based electricity until 2017. CSX uses location-based Scope2 emissions in the current SBT to reduce GHG emission intensity by 37.3 percent by end of 2029 as compared to base year 2014.

Scope 3 category 1: Purchased goods and services

(7.5.1) Base year end

12/31/2014

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

423,668.0

(7.5.3) Methodological details

Scope3 Category 1 and 2 emissions were estimated using the WRI/WBCSD GHG Protocol Scope 3 Evaluator Tool. CSX continues to work to understand emission sources in the supply chain. Scope 3 Category 1 & 2 data are rough approximations based on simplified approaches so not included in the SBT emissions intensity goal.

Scope 3 category 2: Capital goods

(7.5.1) Base year end

12/31/2014

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

1,860,121.0

(7.5.3) Methodological details

Scope3 Category 1 and 2 emissions were estimated using the WRI/WBCSD GHG Protocol Scope 3 Evaluator Tool. CSX continues to work to understand emission sources in the supply chain. Scope3 Category 1 & 2 data are rough approximations based on simplified approaches so not included in the SBT emissions intensity goal.

Scope 3 category 3: Fuel-and-energy-related activities (not included in Scope 1 or 2)

(7.5.1) Base year end

12/31/2014

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

1,243,314.0

(7.5.3) Methodological details

Fuel-based method

Scope 3 category 4: Upstream transportation and distribution

(7.5.1) Base year end

12/31/2016

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

11,056.0

(7.5.3) Methodological details

Distance-based method

Scope 3 category 5: Waste generated in operations

(7.5.1) Base year end

12/31/2014

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

53,795.0

(7.5.3) Methodological details

Average data method

Scope 3 category 6: Business travel

(7.5.1) Base year end

12/31/2014

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

54,942.0

(7.5.3) Methodological details

Distance-based method

Scope 3 category 7: Employee commuting

(7.5.1) Base year end

12/31/2014

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

114,910.0

(7.5.3) Methodological details

Average-data method

Scope 3 category 8: Upstream leased assets

(7.5.3) Methodological details

Not relevant. While CSX occasionally leases properties from third parties, this represents a very limited emissions source. Emissions from these properties would mainly be attributable to purchased electricity for an office environment.

Scope 3 category 9: Downstream transportation and distribution

(7.5.3) Methodological details

Not relevant. CSX is a transportation company in the business of hauling freight. There are no downstream "sold" products for transportation and distribution.

Scope 3 category 10: Processing of sold products

(7.5.3) Methodological details

Not relevant. CSX is a transportation company providing transportation services for others. CSX does not manufacture or process products for sale.

Scope 3 category 11: Use of sold products

(7.5.3) Methodological details

Not relevant. CSX is a transportation company providing transportation services for others. CSX does not manufacture products for use by others.

Scope 3 category 12: End of life treatment of sold products

(7.5.3) Methodological details

Not relevant. CSX is a transportation company providing transportation services for others. CSX does not manufacture products; therefore, "end of life treatment of sold products" is not relevant to CSX business activities.

Scope 3 category 13: Downstream leased assets

(7.5.3) Methodological details

Not relevant. While CSX occasionally leases owned properties to third parties, this represents an insignificant source of emissions in comparison to the overall CSX GHG emissions profile.

Scope 3 category 14: Franchises

(7.5.3) Methodological details

Not relevant. CSX does not have any franchises.

Scope 3 category 15: Investments

(7.5.3) Methodological details

Not relevant. Based on the definition of "investment" provided in the Guidance for Calculating Scope 3 emissions, this category is not relevant. This category is applicable to investors and companies that provide financial services. CSX does not provide financial services.

Scope 3: Other (upstream)

(7.5.3) Methodological details

None

Scope 3: Other (downstream)

(7.5.3) Methodological details

None

(7.6) What were your organization's gross global Scope 1 emissions in metric tons CO2e?

Reporting year

(7.6.1) Gross global Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

4,259,842

(7.6.3) Methodological details

This number was produced based on the guidance of the US EPA in relations to internal mobile combustion. For our Scope 1 emissions assessment, we followed the operational control approach to measure emissions from sources directly managed by CSX, including mobile, stationary, and fugitive sources. Our calculations utilized emissions factors from the Greenhouse Gas Protocol and specific data inputs from the US EPA Center for Corporate Climate Leadership resources. Assumptions on process efficiency and fuel types were incorporated where necessary, ensuring a thorough and standardized approach aligned with industry's best practices in our reporting. Emission Factors for Greenhouse gases Inventories (January 2025) was used as emission factors reference.

(7.7) What were your organization's gross global Scope 2 emissions in metric tons CO2e?

Reporting year

(7.7.1) Gross global Scope 2, location-based emissions (metric tons CO2e)

169,571

(7.7.2) Gross global Scope 2, market-based emissions (metric tons CO2e)

138,968

(7.7.4) Methodological details

Emission factors for purchased electricity were obtained from the U.S. EPA's Emissions and Generation Resource Integrated Database (eGRID2023). Emission factors for Scope 2 market-based electricity were obtained from Green-e Energy Residual Mix Emission Rates (2023).

(7.8) Account for your organization's gross global Scope 3 emissions, disclosing and explaining any exclusions.

Purchased goods and services

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

☑ Relevant, calculated

(7.8.2) Emissions in reporting year (metric tons CO2e)

666,665

(7.8.3) Emissions calculation methodology

☑ Hybrid method

(7.8.4) Percentage of emissions calculated using data obtained from suppliers or value chain partners

14

(7.8.5) Please explain

Scope 3 Category 1 and 2 emissions were calculated using a hybrid approach. In 2024, 14% of this number were obtained through CDP supply chain whereas the rest of it were calculated using spend-based approach. For the spend-based approach, we obtained procurement data categorized by supplier activity and then we mapped each of the category to the 6 digits NAICS code. We multiplied the spend with US EEIO emission factor, with inflation adjustment to 2024 value.

Capital goods

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

☑ Relevant, calculated

(7.8.2) Emissions in reporting year (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.8.3) Emissions calculation methodology

☑ Hybrid method

(7.8.4) Percentage of emissions calculated using data obtained from suppliers or value chain partners

0

(7.8.5) Please explain

Scope 3 Cat 2 value is combined with Scope 3 Cat 1. Please refer to that number instead.

Fuel-and-energy-related activities (not included in Scope 1 or 2)

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

☑ Relevant, calculated

(7.8.2) Emissions in reporting year (metric tons CO2e)

908127

(7.8.3) Emissions calculation methodology

☑ Fuel-based method

(7.8.4) Percentage of emissions calculated using data obtained from suppliers or value chain partners

0

(7.8.5) Please explain

Scope 3 FERA was calculated using the T&D loss and upstream emission factor from NIR Factors 2024 (yr 2022) and IEA 2024. T&D Loss: Calculated loss % and then backed into T&D factor; for Upstream: Back calculated the ratio of upstream to generation (scope 2) from IEA 2024 Upstream and IEA 2024 (16% for Canada) to NIR province factors to create Upstream factor.

Upstream transportation and distribution

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

☑ Relevant, calculated

(7.8.2) Emissions in reporting year (metric tons CO2e)

6,655

(7.8.3) Emissions calculation methodology

☑ Distance-based method

(7.8.4) Percentage of emissions calculated using data obtained from suppliers or value chain partners

100

(7.8.5) Please explain

Scope 3 Upstream T&D was calculated using the emission factor from EPA EF Hub (2025)

Waste generated in operations

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

☑ Relevant, calculated

(7.8.2) Emissions in reporting year (metric tons CO2e)

122,621

(7.8.3) Emissions calculation methodology

☑ Average data method

(7.8.4) Percentage of emissions calculated using data obtained from suppliers or value chain partners

100

(7.8.5) Please explain

Scope 3 Waste was calculated using the emission factor from EPA EF Hub (2025)

Business travel

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

☑ Relevant, calculated

(7.8.2) Emissions in reporting year (metric tons CO2e)

87,268

(7.8.3) Emissions calculation methodology

Select all that apply

☑ Distance-based method

(7.8.4) Percentage of emissions calculated using data obtained from suppliers or value chain partners

50

(7.8.5) Please explain

Scope 3 Business Travel and Employee Commuting was calculated using the emission factor from EPA EF Hub (2025)

Employee commuting

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

☑ Relevant, calculated

(7.8.2) Emissions in reporting year (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.8.3) Emissions calculation methodology

☑ Distance-based method

(7.8.4) Percentage of emissions calculated using data obtained from suppliers or value chain partners

0

(7.8.5) Please explain

We reported Employee Commuting and Business Travel together. Please refer to the above number instead.

Upstream leased assets

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

☑ Not relevant, explanation provided

(7.8.5) Please explain

Not relevant. While CSX occasionally leases properties from third parties, this represents a very limited emissions source. Emissions from these properties would mainly be attributable to purchased electricity for an office environment.

Downstream transportation and distribution

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

☑ Not relevant, explanation provided

(7.8.5) Please explain

Not relevant. CSX is a transportation company in the business of hauling freight. There are no downstream "sold" products for transportation and distribution.

Processing of sold products

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

☑ Not relevant, explanation provided

(7.8.5) Please explain

Not relevant. CSX is a transportation company providing transportation services for others. CSX does not manufacture or process products for sale.

Use of sold products

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

☑ Not relevant, explanation provided

(7.8.5) Please explain

Not relevant. CSX is a transportation company providing transportation services for others. CSX does not manufacture products for use by others.

End of life treatment of sold products

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

☑ Not relevant, explanation provided

(7.8.5) Please explain

Not relevant. CSX is a transportation company providing transportation services for others. CSX does not manufacture products; therefore, "end of life treatment of sold products" is not relevant to CSX business activities.

Downstream leased assets

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

☑ Not relevant, explanation provided

(7.8.5) Please explain

Not relevant. While CSX occasionally leases owned properties to third parties, this represents an insignificant source of emissions in comparison to the overall CSX GHG emissions profile

Franchises

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

☑ Not relevant, explanation provided

(7.8.5) Please explain

Not relevant. CSX does not have any franchises.

Investments

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

☑ Not relevant, explanation provided

(7.8.5) Please explain

Not relevant. Based on the definition of "investment" provided in the Guidance for Calculating Scope 3 emissions, this category is not relevant. This category is applicable to investors and companies that provide financial services. CSX does not provide financial services.

Other (upstream)

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

☑ Not relevant, explanation provided

(7.8.5) Please explain

None

Other (downstream)

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☑ Not relevant, explanation provided

(7.8.5) Please explain

None

(7.8.1) Disclose or restate your Scope 3 emissions data for previous years.

Past year 1

(7.8.1.1) End date

12/31/2023

(7.8.1.2) Scope 3: Purchased goods and services (metric tons CO2e)

974,894

(7.8.1.3) Scope 3: Capital goods (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.8.1.4) Scope 3: Fuel and energy-related activities (not included in Scopes 1 or 2) (metric tons CO2e)

983,137

(7.8.1.5) Scope 3: Upstream transportation and distribution (metric tons CO2e)

8,757

(7.8.1.6) Scope 3: Waste generated in operations (metric tons CO2e)

45,691

(7.8.1.7) Scope 3: Business travel (metric tons CO2e)

95,079

(7.8.1.8) Scope 3: Employee commuting (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.8.1.9) Scope 3: Upstream leased assets (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.8.1.10) Scope 3: Downstream transportation and distribution (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.8.1.11) Scope 3: Processing of sold products (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.8.1.12) Scope 3: Use of sold products (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.8.1.13) Scope 3: End of life treatment of sold products (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.8.1.14) Scope 3: Downstream leased assets (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.8.1.15) Scope 3: Franchises (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.8.1.16) Scope 3: Investments (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.8.1.17) Scope 3: Other (upstream) (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.8.1.18) Scope 3: Other (downstream) (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.8.1.19) Comment

Scope 3, Category 3 Restatement –In 2024, we enhanced GHG emissions reporting by adding locomotive diesel fuel to Scope 3, Category 3 (Fuel-and-Energy-Related Activities). We also recalculated and restated the 2023 Scope 3 data for comparison.

(7.9) Indicate the verification/assurance status that applies to your reported emissions.

	Verification/assurance status
Scope 1	*Select from:* ☑ Third-party verification or assurance process in place
Scope 2 (location-based or market-based)	*Select from:* ☑ Third-party verification or assurance process in place
Scope 3	*Select from:* ☑ Third-party verification or assurance process in place

(7.9.1) Provide further details of the verification/assurance undertaken for your Scope 1 emissions, and attach the relevant statements.

Row 1

(7.9.1.1) Verification or assurance cycle in place

☑ Annual process

(7.9.1.2) Status in the current reporting year

☑ Complete

(7.9.1.3) Type of verification or assurance

☑ Reasonable assurance

(7.9.1.4) Attach the statement

CSX 2024 Audit Statement.pdf

(7.9.1.5) Page/section reference

Section 7

(7.9.1.6) Relevant standard

☑ ISO14064-3

(7.9.1.7) Proportion of reported emissions verified (%)

100

(7.9.2) Provide further details of the verification/assurance undertaken for your Scope 2 emissions and attach the relevant statements.

Row 1

(7.9.2.1) Scope 2 approach

☑ Scope 2 market-based

(7.9.2.2) Verification or assurance cycle in place

☑ Annual process

(7.9.2.3) Status in the current reporting year

☑ Complete

(7.9.2.4) Type of verification or assurance

☑ Reasonable assurance

(7.9.2.5) Attach the statement

CSX 2024 Audit Statement.pdf

2024-CSX-Sustainability Data Supplement – page 9

(7.9.2.6) Page/ section reference

Page 1, Section 7.3

(7.9.2.7) Relevant standard

☑ ISO14064-3

(7.9.2.8) Proportion of reported emissions verified (%)

100

(7.9.3) Provide further details of the verification/assurance undertaken for your Scope 3 emissions and attach the relevant statements.

Row 1

(7.9.3.1) Scope 3 category

☑ Scope 3: Capital goods

☑ Scope 3: Business travel

☑ Scope 3: Employee commuting

☑ Scope 3: Purchased goods and services

☑ Scope 3: Waste generated in operations

☑ Scope 3: Upstream transportation and distribution

☑ Scope 3: Fuel and energy-related activities (not included in Scopes 1 or 2)

(7.9.3.2) Verification or assurance cycle in place

☑ Annual process

(7.9.3.3) Status in the current reporting year

☑ Complete

(7.9.3.4) Type of verification or assurance

☑ Reasonable assurance

(7.9.3.5) Attach the statement

CSX 2024 Audit Statement.pdf

2024-CSX-Sustainability Data Supplement – page 9

(7.9.3.6) Page/section reference

Page 1, section 7.3

(7.9.3.7) Relevant standard

☑ ISO14064-3

(7.9.3.8) Proportion of reported emissions verified (%)

100

(7.10) How do your gross global emissions (Scope 1 and 2 combined) for the reporting year compare to those of the previous reporting year?

☑ Increased

(7.10.1) Identify the reasons for any change in your gross global emissions (Scope 1 and 2 combined), and for each of them specify how your emissions compare to the previous year.

Change in renewable energy consumption

(7.10.1.1) Change in emissions (metric tons CO2e)

16808.8

(7.10.1.2) Direction of change in emissions

☑ Increased

(7.10.1.3) Emissions value (percentage)

13

(7.10.1.4) Please explain calculation

*In 2024, we purchased 34,000 MWh of RECs, which is 50,000 MWh less than we have in 2023 towards market-based scope 2. (Emissions savings from purchased RECs)/(Previous year Scope 2 market-based emissions)*100% = (16,808/127,320)*100% = 13% decrease*

Other

(7.10.1.1) Change in emissions (metric tons CO2e)

16,808.8

(7.10.1.2) Direction of change in emissions

☑ Increased

(7.10.1.3) Emissions value (percentage)

13

(7.10.1.4) Please explain calculation

*In 2024, we purchased 34,000 MWh of RECs, which is 50,000 MWh less than we have in 2023 towards market-based scope 2. (Emissions savings from purchased RECs)/(Previous year Scope 2 market-based emissions)*100% (16,808/127,320)*100% 13% decrease*

(7.10.2) Are your emissions performance calculations in 7.10 and 7.10.1 based on a location-based Scope 2 emissions figure or a market-based Scope 2 emissions figure?

☑ Market-based

(7.12) Are carbon dioxide emissions from biogenic carbon relevant to your organization?

☑ Yes

(7.12.1) Provide the emissions from biogenic carbon relevant to your organization in metric tons CO2.

(7.12.1.1) CO2 emissions from biogenic carbon (metric tons CO2)

25239

(7.12.1.2) Comment

Scope 1 emissions exclude direct biogenic CO2 emissions from the combustion of biofuels. Direct biogenic CO2 emissions are reported in a separate line item. Similarly, the removals which are in balance with the biogenic CO2 are also excluded from the Scope 3 category 3 and reported as a separate line item. The Greenhouse Gas (GHG) Protocol requires separate reporting of biogenic emissions and removals. The Science Based Targets Initiative (SBTi) requires both biogenic emissions and removals to be included within the target boundary. Given that the biofuel CO2 combustion emissions are equivalent to the removals from harvesting and regrowth of biomass, these numbers balance out to zero, therefore have no impact on the total emissions.

(7.15) Does your organization break down its Scope 1 emissions by greenhouse gas type?

☑ Yes

(7.15.1) Break down your total gross global Scope 1 emissions by greenhouse gas type and provide the source of each used global warming potential (GWP).

Row 1

(7.15.1.1) Greenhouse gas

☑ CO2

(7.15.1.2) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons of CO2e)

4,279,524

(7.15.1.3) GWP Reference

☑ IPCC Fifth Assessment Report (AR5 – 100 year)

(7.16) Break down your total gross global Scope 1 and 2 emissions by country/area.

	Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)	Scope 2, location-based (metric tons CO2e)	Scope 2, market-based (metric tons CO2e)
Canada	*14,218*	*7.8*	*57*
United States of America	*4,245,624*	*169,571*	*138,911*

(7.17) Indicate which gross global Scope 1 emissions breakdowns you are able to provide.

☑ By activity

(7.17.3) Break down your total gross global Scope 1 emissions by business activity.

	Activity	Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)
Row 1	*Refrigerants (Losses)*	*608*
Row 2	*Mobile Combustion Sources*	*4,212,013*
Row 3	*Oil/Water Separators*	*1,076*
Row 4	*Stationary Combustion Sources*	*43,497*
Row 5	*Landfills*	*2,647*

(7.19) Break down your organization's total gross global Scope 1 emissions by sector production activity in metric tons CO2e.

Transport services activities

(7.19.1) Gross Scope 1 emissions, metric tons CO2e

3,872,209

(7.19.3) Comment

Since this question seeks to compare transport services sector as relates to freight haul services, this value is for emissions from locomotives only and does not reflect the total scope 1 emissions as reported in the CSX Corporate GHG Inventory which includes stationary and other mobile sources.

(7.20) Indicate which gross global Scope 2 emissions breakdowns you are able to provide.

☑ By activity

(7.20.3) Break down your total gross global Scope 2 emissions by business activity.

	Activity	Scope 2, location-based (metric tons CO2e)	Scope 2, market-based (metric tons CO2e)
Row 1	*Purchased Electricity*	*169571*	*138968*

(7.21) Break down your organization's total gross global Scope 2 emissions by sector production activity in metric tons CO2e.

Transport services activities

(7.21.1) Scope 2, location-based, metric tons CO2e

0

(7.21.2) Scope 2, market-based (if applicable), metric tons CO2e

0

(7.21.3) Comment

Scope 2 location-based emissions for the entire CSX Corporation GHG Inventory including facilities and other uses of electricity is 169,571 metric tons CO2e. Transport services activities (i.e. freight haul) utilize diesel-powered locomotives which do not contribute to scope 2 emissions.

(7.22) Break down your gross Scope 1 and Scope 2 emissions between your consolidated accounting group and other entities included in your response.

Consolidated accounting group

(7.22.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

4,259,842

(7.22.2) Scope 2, location-based emissions (metric tons CO2e)

169,571

(7.22.3) Scope 2, market-based emissions (metric tons CO2e)

138,968

(7.22.4) Please explain

CSX currently calculates its GHG emissions as a consolidated entity, incorporating all of our subsidiaries (Transflo, Intermodal, Quality Carriers, Technology, TDSI, Pan Am, and CSXT)

All other entities

(7.22.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.22.2) Scope 2, location-based emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.22.3) Scope 2, market-based emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.22.4) Please explain

Emissions related to all other entities are already included in our consolidated group emissions.

(7.23) Is your organization able to break down your emissions data for any of the subsidiaries included in your CDP response?

☑ No

(7.26) Allocate your emissions to your customers listed below according to the goods or services you have sold them in this reporting period.

Note – detailed allocation data is reported to customers only

(7.26.13) Please explain how you have identified the GHG source, including major limitations to this process and assumptions made

CSX uses the operational control approach to report Scope 1, 2 and 3 emissions. Approximately 90+% of CSX's carbon footprint (considering Scope 1 and 2 emissions) is attributed to locomotive diesel fuel consumed in the transportation of freight. The service we provide our customers is the transportation of their freight, therefore the major emission source attributable to our customers is locomotive diesel fuel consumption.

(7.26.14) Where published information has been used, please provide a reference

CSX uses its annual average freight train fuel efficiency in conjunction with specific customer data (revenue ton-miles (RTM) shipped) to allocate emissions to that customer. CSX's average fuel efficiency for 2024 was 528 RTM/gallon diesel fuel consumed. CSX uses a measure called RTM to normalize annual GHG emissions and determine GHG emission intensity. An RTM or Lading Ton Mile is a calculation of tons of lading x miles it moves. For example, if you move 10 tons 20 miles you would have 200 RTMs (10 tons x 20 miles = 200 RTMs). Because CSX is able to track revenue ton miles by customer, this information can be used to allocate emissions to a customer. CSX uses emission factors and Global Warming Potentials from the EPA Center for Corporate Climate Leadership Emission Factors Hub (2025) for CO2, N2O, and CH4 to determine total metric tons of CO2-equivalents allocated to a specific customer. For example, if a customer shipped 1 million RTM with CSX in 2024, then 1,000,000 RTM/(528 RTM/gallon) = 1,894 gallons of diesel fuel consumption. By multiplying emission factors and GWPs by fuel consumption we are able to allocated GHG emissions to the

customer. Emission Factors CO2 EF = 10.21 kg CO2 per gallon diesel N2O EF (locomotives) = 0.26 grams N2O per gallon diesel CH4 EF (locomotives) = 0.8 grams CH4 per gallon diesel GWPs 1 metric ton CO2 = 1 1 metric ton N2O = 265 1 metric ton CH4 = 28 Reference for EFs and GWPs: EPA Center for Corporate Climate Leadership GHG Emission Factors Hub (January 2025): https://www.epa.gov/climateleadership/ghg-emission-factors-hub CSX data reference: https://www.csx.com/index.cfm/about-us/the-csx-advantage/fuel-efficiency/

(7.27) What are the challenges in allocating emissions to different customers, and what would help you to overcome these challenges?

Row 1

(7.27.1) Allocation challenges

☑ We face no challenges

(7.27.2) Please explain what would help you overcome these challenges

CSX currently uses the described method of allocating carbon to individual customers based on emissions per revenue ton mile, published references from the EPA Center for Corporate Climate Leadership GHG Emission Factors Hub (January 2025), and the individual customers Revenue Ton Miles.

(7.28) Do you plan to develop your capabilities to allocate emissions to your customers in the future?

(7.28.1) Do you plan to develop your capabilities to allocate emissions to your customers in the future?

☑ Yes

(7.28.2) Describe how you plan to develop your capabilities

CSX currently uses the described method of allocating carbon to individual customers based on emissions per revenue ton mile, published references from the EPA Center for Corporate Climate Leadership GHG Emission Factors Hub (January 2025), and the individual customers Revenue Ton Miles. In the future, CSX is working to develop tracking to generate efficiency values on a per commodity and per shipment basis.

(7.29) What percentage of your total operational spend in the reporting year was on energy?

☑ More than 10% but less than or equal to 15%

(7.30) Select which energy-related activities your organization has undertaken.

	Indicate whether your organization undertook this energy-related activity in the reporting year
Consumption of fuel (excluding feedstocks)	*Select from:* ☑ Yes
Consumption of purchased or acquired electricity	*Select from:* ☑ Yes
Consumption of purchased or acquired heat	*Select from:* ☑ No
Consumption of purchased or acquired steam	*Select from:* ☑ No
Consumption of purchased or acquired cooling	*Select from:* ☑ No
Generation of electricity, heat, steam, or cooling	*Select from:* ☑ No

(7.30.1) Report your organization's energy consumption totals (excluding feedstocks) in MWh.

Consumption of fuel (excluding feedstock)

(7.30.1.1) Heating value

☑ LHV (lower heating value)

(7.30.1.2) MWh from renewable sources

93,699

(7.30.1.3) MWh from non-renewable sources

16,636,848

(7.30.1.4) Total (renewable + non-renewable) MWh

16,730,547

Consumption of purchased or acquired electricity

(7.30.1.1) Heating value

☑ Unable to confirm heating value

(7.30.1.2) MWh from renewable sources

34,000

(7.30.1.3) MWh from non-renewable sources

380,491

(7.30.1.4) Total (renewable + non-renewable) MWh

414,491

Total energy consumption

(7.30.1.1) Heating value

☑ HHV (higher heating value)

(7.30.1.2) MWh from renewable sources

127,699

(7.30.1.3) MWh from non-renewable sources

17,017,339

(7.30.1.4) Total (renewable + non-renewable) MWh

17,145,038

(7.30.6) Select the applications of your organization's consumption of fuel.

	Indicate whether your organization undertakes this fuel application
Consumption of fuel for the generation of electricity	*Select from:* ☑ No

	Indicate whether your organization undertakes this fuel application
Consumption of fuel for the generation of heat	*Select from:* ☑ Yes
Consumption of fuel for the generation of steam	*Select from:* ☑ No
Consumption of fuel for the generation of cooling	*Select from:* ☑ No
Consumption of fuel for co-generation or tri-generation	*Select from:* ☑ No

(7.30.7) State how much fuel in MWh your organization has consumed (excluding feedstocks) by fuel type.

Sustainable biomass

(7.30.7.1) Heating value

☑ LHV

(7.30.7.2) Total fuel MWh consumed by the organization

93,699

(7.30.7.8) Comment

MWh consumed from the use of biodiesel (B100)

Other biomass

(7.30.7.1) Heating value

☑ Unable to confirm heating value

(7.30.7.2) Total fuel MWh consumed by the organization

0

(7.30.7.8) Comment

No other biomass consumed in 2024

Other renewable fuels (e.g. renewable hydrogen)

(7.30.7.1) Heating value

☑ Unable to confirm heating value

(7.30.7.2) Total fuel MWh consumed by the organization

0

(7.30.7.8) Comment

No other renewable fuels consumed in 2024.

Coal

(7.30.7.1) Heating value

☑ Unable to confirm heating value

(7.30.7.2) Total fuel MWh consumed by the organization

0

(7.30.7.8) Comment

No coal consumed in 2024.

Oil

(7.30.7.1) Heating value

☑ LHV

(7.30.7.2) Total fuel MWh consumed by the organization

16,348,483

(7.30.7.8) Comment

Heat energy from diesel fuel and combustion used to power locomotives, vehicles, engines, heaters, and equipment in rail yards and rail operations. Heat energy from used oil combustion used to power heaters in rail yards.

Gas

(7.30.7.1) Heating value

☑ LHV

(7.30.7.2) Total fuel MWh consumed by the organization

288,365

(7.30.7.8) Comment

Heat energy from gasoline, propane, natural gas and jet fuel combustion used to power vehicles, engines, company owned jets, heaters, and equipment in rail yards and rail operations.

Other non-renewable fuels (e.g. non-renewable hydrogen)

(7.30.7.1) Heating value

☑ Unable to confirm heating value

(7.30.7.2) Total fuel MWh consumed by the organization

0

(7.30.7.8) Comment

No other non-renewable fuels consumed in 2024.

Total fuel

(7.30.7.1) Heating value

☑ LHV

(7.30.7.2) Total fuel MWh consumed by the organization

16,730,547

(7.30.7.8) Comment

All fuels

(7.30.14) Provide details on the electricity, heat, steam, and/or cooling amounts that were accounted for at a zero or near-zero emission factor in the market-based Scope 2 figure reported in 7.7.

Row 1

(7.30.14.1) Country/area

☑ United States of America

(7.30.14.2) Sourcing method

☑ Unbundled procurement of energy attribute certificates (EACs)

(7.30.14.3) Energy carrier

☑ Electricity

(7.30.14.4) Low-carbon technology type

☑ Sustainable biomass

(7.30.14.5) Low-carbon energy consumed via selected sourcing method in the reporting year (MWh)

34,000

(7.30.14.6) Tracking instrument used

☑ I-REC

(7.30.14.7) Country/area of origin (generation) of the low-carbon energy or energy attribute

☑ United States of America

(7.30.14.8) Are you able to report the commissioning or re-powering year of the energy generation facility?

☑ Yes

(7.30.14.9) Commissioning year of the energy generation facility (e.g. date of first commercial operation or repowering)

2024

(7.30.14.10) Comment

CSX procured 34,000 Renewable Energy Certificates in 2024 which accounted for approximately 8% renewable sources in the market-based emissions. For the remaining market-based usage, CSX obtained the Weighted Grid Mix Residual Mix Emission Factor, first determine a weighting factor for each State according to the MWh usage in that State (State MWh/total MWh), next multiply the weighting factor times the residual mix emission factor for the State, finally add all the weighted amounts to get a single Weighted Grid Mix Emission Factor representative of the entire system.

(7.30.15) Provide details on the average emission factor used for all transport movements per mode that directly source energy from the grid.

Row 1

(7.30.15.1) Category

☑ Rail

(7.30.15.2) Emission factor unit

☑ gCO2e/kWh

(7.30.15.3) Average emission factor: unit value

0

(7.30.15.4) Comment

The CSX rail transport mode does not obtain energy from the grid.

(7.30.16) Provide a breakdown by country/area of your electricity/heat/steam/cooling consumption in the reporting year.

Canada

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

1,395

(7.30.16.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.4) Consumption of purchased heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.5) Consumption of self-generated heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.6) Total electricity/heat/steam/cooling energy consumption (MWh)

1,395

United States of America

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

413,096

(7.30.16.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.4) Consumption of purchased heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.5) Consumption of self-generated heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.6) Total electricity/heat/steam/cooling energy consumption (MWh)

413,096

(7.36) Provide any efficiency metrics that are appropriate for your organization's transport products and/or services.

Row 1

(7.36.1) Activity

☑ Rail

(7.36.2) Metric figure

0.0018923

(7.36.3) Metric numerator

☑ Other, please specify :Gallons of fuel

(7.36.4) Metric denominator

☑ Revenue-ton.mile

(7.36.5) Metric numerator: Unit total

375,093,414

(7.36.6) Metric denominator: Unit total

198,219,894,000

(7.36.7) % change from last year

4.49

(7.36.8) Please explain

A common freight haul efficiency metric used by U.S. Class 1 Rail companies is "Revenue Ton-Mile per gallon of diesel (RTM/gal)." This measures the ability of a freight train to trans-port one U.S. short ton of freight a certain distance (miles) per gallon of diesel fuel. For this metric, bigger is better. Sometimes this ratio is inverted to "gallons of fuel per RTM". For this metric, smaller is better since it represents the gallons of fuel needed to move one ton of freight a distance of one mile. In 2024, CSX moved one ton of freight 528 miles on a single gallon of diesel fuel which was an efficiency improvement from 2023

(7.45) Describe your gross global combined Scope 1 and 2 emissions for the reporting year in metric tons CO2e per unit currency total revenue and provide any additional intensity metrics that are appropriate to your business operations.

Row 1

(7.45.1) Intensity figure

0.00030253

(7.45.2) Metric numerator (Gross global combined Scope 1 and 2 emissions, metric tons CO2e)

4,398,810

(7.45.3) Metric denominator

☑ unit total revenue

(7.45.4) Metric denominator: Unit total

14,540,000,000

(7.45.5) Scope 2 figure used

☑ Market-based

(7.45.6) % change from previous year

1.8

(7.45.7) Direction of change

☑ Increased

(7.45.8) Reasons for change

☑ Change in renewable energy consumption

☑ Change in revenue

(7.45.9) Please explain

CSX had a relatively steady volume of business with slight increase in scope 1 emissions. Scope 2 emissions have slightly increase due to reduction of RECs compared to 2023. Our 2024 revenue decreased by 1% compared to 2023.

(7.51) What are your primary intensity (activity-based) metrics that are appropriate to your emissions from transport activities in Scope 1, 2, and 3?

Rail

(7.51.1) Scopes used for calculation of intensities

☑ Report just Scope 1

(7.51.2) Intensity figure

0.00002149

(7.51.3) Metric numerator: emissions in metric tons CO2e

4,259,842

(7.51.4) Metric denominator: unit

☑ t.mile

(7.51.5) Metric denominator: unit total

198,219,894,000

(7.51.6) % change from previous year

4.9

(7.51.7) Please explain any exclusions in your coverage of transport emissions in selected category, and reasons for change in emissions intensity.

The Scope 1 value (numerator) for this emission intensity calculation uses the locomotive emissions associated with freight haul. The denominator (t.mile or RTM - revenue ton mile) is an indicator of the volume of freight haul. CSX does not use electric locomotives to haul freight, so Scope 2 emissions are not included in this emission intensity calculation. The increase in the Emission Intensity metric results from a 2.22% increase in locomotive emissions. As a result, the higher YoY Scope 1 emissions figure drove the increase in the overall emissions intensity.

ALL

(7.51.1) Scopes used for calculation of intensities

☑ Report just Scope 1

(7.51.2) Intensity figure

0.00002149

(7.51.3) Metric numerator: emissions in metric tons CO2e

4,259,842

(7.51.4) Metric denominator: unit

☑ t.mile

(7.51.5) Metric denominator: unit total

198,219,894,000

(7.51.6) % change from previous year

4.9

(7.51.7) Please explain any exclusions in your coverage of transport emissions in selected category, and reasons for change in emissions intensity.

The Scope 1 value (numerator) for this emission intensity calculation uses the locomotive emissions associated with freight haul. The denominator (t.mile or RTM - revenue ton mile) is an indicator of the volume of freight haul. CSX does not use electric locomotives to haul freight, so Scope 2 emissions are not included in this emission intensity calculation. The increase in the Emission Intensity metric results from a 2.22% increase in locomotive emissions. As a result, the higher YoY Scope 1 emissions figure drove the increase in the overall emissions intensity.

(7.53) Did you have an emissions target that was active in the reporting year?

☑ Absolute target

☑ Intensity target

(7.53.1) Provide details of your absolute emissions targets and progress made against those targets.

Row 1

(7.53.1.1) Target reference number

☑ Abs 1

(7.53.1.2) Is this a science-based target?

☑ Yes, we consider this a science-based target, and the target is currently being reviewed by the Science Based Targets initiative

(7.53.1.4) Target ambition

☑ 1.5°C aligned

(7.53.1.5) Date target was set

07/31/2025

(7.53.1.6) Target coverage

☑ Organization-wide

(7.53.1.7) Greenhouse gases covered by target

☑ Carbon dioxide (CO2)

☑ Methane (CH4)

☑ Nitrous oxide (N2O)

☑ Hydrofluorocarbons (HFCs)

(7.53.1.8) Scopes

☑ Scope 1

☑ Scope 2

☑ Scope 3

(7.53.1.9) Scope 2 accounting method

☑ Market-based

(7.53.1.10) Scope 3 categories

☑ Scope 3, Category 3 – Fuel- and energy- related activities (not included in Scope 1 or 2)

(7.53.1.11) End date of base year

12/31/2023

(7.53.1.12) Base year Scope 1 emissions covered by target (metric tons CO2e)

4,232,847

(7.53.1.13) Base year Scope 2 emissions covered by target (metric tons CO2e)

127,320

(7.53.1.16) Base year Scope 3, Category 3: Fuel-and-energy-related activities (not included in Scopes 1 or 2) emissions covered by target (metric tons CO2e)

983,174

(7.53.1.31) Base year total Scope 3 emissions covered by target (metric tons CO2e)

983,174.

(7.53.1.32) Total base year emissions covered by target in all selected Scopes (metric tons CO2e)

5,343,341.000

(7.53.1.33) Base year Scope 1 emissions covered by target as % of total base year emissions in Scope 1

100

(7.53.1.34) Base year Scope 2 emissions covered by target as % of total base year emissions in Scope 2

100

(7.53.1.37) Base year Scope 3, Category 3: Fuel-and-energy-related activities (not included in Scopes 1 or 2) emissions covered by target as % of total base year emissions in Scope 3, Category 3: Fuel-and-energy-related activities (not included in Scopes 1 or 2) (metric tons CO2e)

95

(7.53.1.52) Base year total Scope 3 emissions covered by target as % of total base year emissions in Scope 3 (in all Scope 3 categories)

48

(7.53.1.53) Base year emissions covered by target in all selected Scopes as % of total base year emissions in all selected Scopes

99

(7.53.1.54) End date of target

12/31/2024

(7.53.1.55) Targeted reduction from base year (%)

42

(7.53.1.56) Total emissions at end date of target covered by target in all selected Scopes (metric tons CO2e)

3,099,137.780

(7.53.1.57) Scope 1 emissions in reporting year covered by target (metric tons CO2e)

4,259,842

(7.53.1.58) Scope 2 emissions in reporting year covered by target (metric tons CO2e)

138,968

(7.53.1.61) Scope 3, Category 3: Fuel-and-energy-related activities (not included in Scopes 1 or 2) emissions in reporting year covered by target (metric tons CO2e)

908,127

(7.53.1.76) Total Scope 3 emissions in reporting year covered by target (metric tons CO2e)

862,721

(7.53.1.77) Total emissions in reporting year covered by target in all selected scopes (metric tons CO2e)

5,222,889

(7.53.1.78) Land-related emissions covered by target

☑ No, it does not cover any land-related emissions (e.g. non-FLAG SBT)

(7.53.1.79) % of target achieved relative to base year

5.37

(7.53.1.80) Target status in reporting year

☑ New

(7.53.1.82) Explain target coverage and identify any exclusions

CSX is currently going through the process of submitting our new target for SBTi's review and final targets may be subject to change pending the outcome of the verification process*. In 2025, CSX is revalidating its near-term targets to align with a 1.5°C business ambition, consistent with the goals of the Paris Agreement. As part of this updated commitment, we are setting a more ambitious target: a 42 percent absolute reduction in Scope 1, 2, and 3 emissions by 2034, with a focus on fuel- and energy-related activities compared to the 2023 base year. Moving forward, we will closely monitor and report our progress towards this target.*

(7.53.1.83) Target objective

CSX is currently going through the process of submitting our new target for SBTi's review and final targets may be subject to change pending the outcome of the verification process*. The target objective for CSX is to significantly reduce greenhouse gas (GHG) absolute emissions by 42%, compared to the 2023 base year levels. This goal aligns with a 1.5 Celsius scenario, as validated by the Science Based Target Initiative. The company aims to achieve this reduction through various initiatives, including improving fuel efficiency, exploring alternative fuels such as biodiesel and hydrogen, and investing in advanced technologies like hybrid locomotives and hydrogen conversion kits. This comprehensive approach is designed to meet long-term carbon reduction targets and provide environmentally friendly transportation solutions.*

(7.53.1.84) Plan for achieving target, and progress made to the end of the reporting year

CSX is currently going through the process of submitting our new target for SBTi's review and final targets may be subject to change pending the outcome of the verification process. *CSX's climate strategy extends beyond fuel efficiency to include a focus on renewable energy adoption and increasing energy efficiency across our operations. This includes exploring renewable and resilient energy sources to power facilities, aligning with our goal to reduce Scope 2 emissions. Energy efficiency upgrades,*

such as retrofitting facilities with LED lighting and improving building systems, are integral to this effort as well, ensuring that CSX minimizes its environmental footprint beyond rail operations.

(7.53.1.85) Target derived using a sectoral decarbonization approach

☑ No

(7.53.2) Provide details of your emissions intensity targets and progress made against those targets.

Row 1

(7.53.2.1) Target reference number

☑ Int 1

(7.53.2.2) Is this a science-based target?

☑ Yes, and this target has been approved by the Science Based Targets initiative

(7.53.2.3) Science Based Targets initiative official validation letter

CSXC-USA-002-OFF Target Validation Decision Letter.pdf

(7.53.2.4) Target ambition

☑ Well-below 2°C aligned

(7.53.2.5) Date target was set

12/31/2019

(7.53.2.6) Target coverage

☑ Organization-wide

(7.53.2.7) Greenhouse gases covered by target

☑ Carbon dioxide (CO2)

☑ Methane (CH4)

☑ Nitrous oxide (N2O)

☑ Hydrofluorocarbons (HFCs)

(7.53.2.8) Scopes

☑ Scope 1

☑ Scope 2

(7.53.2.9) Scope 2 accounting method

☑ Market-based

(7.53.2.11) Intensity metric

☑ Other, please specify :Metric tons CO2e per million gross ton-miles (MGTM)

(7.53.2.12) End date of base year

12/31/2014

(7.53.2.13) Intensity figure in base year for Scope 1

11.42

(7.53.2.14) Intensity figure in base year for Scope 2

0.68

(7.53.2.33) Intensity figure in base year for all selected Scopes

12.1000000000

(7.53.2.34) % of total base year emissions in Scope 1 covered by this Scope 1 intensity figure

100

(7.53.2.35) % of total base year emissions in Scope 2 covered by this Scope 2 intensity figure

100

(7.53.2.54) % of total base year emissions in all selected Scopes covered by this intensity figure

100

(7.53.2.55) End date of target

12/31/2029

(7.53.2.56) Targeted reduction from base year (%)

37

(7.53.2.57) Intensity figure at end date of target for all selected Scopes

7.6230000000

(7.53.2.58) % change anticipated in absolute Scope 1+2 emissions

-22.9

(7.53.2.60) Intensity figure in reporting year for Scope 1

10.38

(7.53.2.61) Intensity figure in reporting year for Scope 2

0.34

(7.53.2.80) Intensity figure in reporting year for all selected Scopes

10.7200000000

(7.53.2.81) Land-related emissions covered by target

☑ No, it does not cover any land-related emissions (e.g. non-FLAG SBT)

(7.53.2.82) % of target achieved relative to base year

30.82

(7.53.2.83) Target status in reporting year

☑ Underway

(7.53.2.85) Explain target coverage and identify any exclusions

2024 GHG emissions intensity is 10.72 metric tons CO2e/million gross ton-miles (MGTM), as compared to the 2023 value of 10.68 metric tons CO2e/MGTM. The 2024 value represents an increase of approximately 0.37% since last year. This increase in emissions intensity is primarily due to changes in output and operational conditions. CSX set a Science Based Target, validated by the Science Based Target Initiative, in line with a well below 2-degree Celsius scenario committing to reduce GHG emission intensity (Scope 1 Scope 2) by 37% by 2029 as compared to base year 2014. Thus far, CSX is underway with this target in 2024 with efforts focusing on improving locomotive fuel efficiency and other sustainability measures. For reporting year 2024, as compared to base year 2014, absolute Scope 1 emissions have seen changes influenced by operational adjustments and external factors. These changes are managed through investments in employee training, technological advancements, programmatic efforts, and locomotive upgrades.

(7.53.2.86) Target objective

The target objective for CSX is to significantly reduce greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions intensity by 37% by 2029, compared to the 2014 base year levels. This goal aligns with a "well below 2-degree Celsius" scenario, as validated by the Science Based Target Initiative. The company aims to achieve this reduction through various initiatives,

including improving fuel efficiency, exploring alternative fuels such as biodiesel and hydrogen, and investing in advanced technologies like hybrid locomotives and hydrogen conversion kits. This comprehensive approach is designed to meet long-term carbon reduction targets and provide environmentally friendly transportation solutions.

(7.53.2.87) Plan for achieving target, and progress made to the end of the reporting year

To continue our emissions reduction trajectory, we are evaluating alternative fuels and power sources as well as emissions reduction efforts spanning operations management and technology. CSX's initiatives, improvements, and investments across these categories include reducing asset intensity, dwell time, and idling. We are also focused on eliminating unnecessary stops linked to fuel burn and dedicating efforts to our fuel conservation desk to identify efficiencies. Strict scrutiny of practices to eliminate waste, improving company culture, and continuing the implementation of fuel management technology such as Trip Optimizer, Automatic Engine Start-Stop (AESS) and Meet Pass Plan technology are also key components of our strategy. Partnering with Wabtec, we began a pilot test program of a 20 percent biodiesel fuel blend (B20) in 10 rebuilt FDL Advantage locomotives with a new high-pressure common rail fuel system. Originating in our Tampa, Florida rail yard, the 10 locomotives are being tested in a controlled service area, which benefits Mosaic, our local customer. We are testing to understand the impact on engine components, maintenance, and performance. CSX is also testing hybrid locomotives, which are particularly well-suited to capitalize on the efficiencies provided by the rolling hills of the East Coast. When passing through a city, hybrid engines can turn off, potentially delivering targeted emissions reductions. CSX and Canadian Pacific Kansas City (CPKC) have announced their intent to enter into a joint venture to build and deploy hydrogen locomotive conversion kits for diesel electric locomotives. CSX is planning to convert one of its diesel locomotives with a hydrogen conversion kit developed by CPKC at the Huntington, WV locomotive shop. This collaboration with CPKC demonstrates CSX's commitment to implementing alternative fuel solutions that could further improve our emissions reduction and offer our customers an even more environmentally friendly transportation solution. This initiative will help CSX and the rail industry achieve long-term carbon reduction targets with zero-emission locomotives. From 2014 through 2024, we have improved fuel efficiency by 14.2 percent, reducing emissions intensity by 11.38 percent towards the goal.

(7.53.2.88) Target derived using a sectoral decarbonization approach

☑ No

(7.54) Did you have any other climate-related targets that were active in the reporting year?

☑ Targets to increase or maintain low-carbon energy consumption or production

(7.54.1) Provide details of your targets to increase or maintain low-carbon energy consumption or production.

Row 1

(7.54.1.1) Target reference number

☑ Low 1

(7.54.1.2) Date target was set

12/31/2019

(7.54.1.3) Target coverage

☑ Organization-wide

(7.54.1.4) Target type: energy carrier

☑ Electricity

(7.54.1.5) Target type: activity

☑ Consumption

(7.54.1.6) Target type: energy source

☑ Renewable energy source(s) only

(7.54.1.7) End date of base year

12/31/2014

(7.54.1.8) Consumption or production of selected energy carrier in base year (MWh)

592117

(7.54.1.9) % share of low-carbon or renewable energy in base year

0

(7.54.1.10) End date of target

12/31/2029

(7.54.1.11) % share of low-carbon or renewable energy at end date of target

50

(7.54.1.12) % share of low-carbon or renewable energy in reporting year

2.5

(7.54.1.13) % of target achieved relative to base year

5.00

(7.54.1.14) Target status in reporting year

☑ Underway

(7.54.1.16) Is this target part of an emissions target?

Yes, achieving 50% scope 2 emissions by purchasing Renewable Energy Certificates (RECs) is part of Int 1 target in 7.53.

(7.54.1.17) Is this target part of an overarching initiative?

☑ Science Based Targets initiative

(7.54.1.18) Science Based Targets initiative official validation letter

CSXC-USA-002-OFF Target Validation Decision Letter.pdf

(7.54.1.19) Explain target coverage and identify any exclusions

CSX has a company-wide target to reduce scope 2 emissions 50% by year end 2029 from a 2014 base year, to meet the science-based target set in 2020.

(7.54.1.20) Target objective

CSX has a company-wide target to reduce scope 2 emissions 50% by year end 2029 from a2014 base year, to meet the science-based target set in 2020.

(7.54.1.21) Plan for achieving target, and progress made to the end of the reporting year

CSX plans to achieve this target through procuring renewable energy certificates (RECs), power purchase agreements (PPAs), or procuring green products/tariffs. CSX procured 34,000 RECs accounting for 8% of electricity consumption in 2024.

(7.55) Did you have emissions reduction initiatives that were active within the reporting year? Note that this can include those in the planning and/or implementation phases.

☑ Yes

(7.55.1) Identify the total number of initiatives at each stage of development, and for those in the implementation stages, the estimated CO2e savings.

	Number of initiatives	Total estimated annual CO2e savings in metric tonnes CO2e
Under investigation	*0*	*`Numeric input*
To be implemented	*1*	*1,530*
Implementation commenced	*0*	*0*
Implemented	*5*	*123,994*
Not to be implemented	*0*	*`Numeric input*

(7.55.2) Provide details on the initiatives implemented in the reporting year in the table below.

Row 1

(7.55.2.1) Initiative category & Initiative type

Energy efficiency in production processes
☑ Automation

(7.55.2.2) Estimated annual CO2e savings (metric tonnes CO2e)

9,300

(7.55.2.3) Scope(s) or Scope 3 category(ies) where emissions savings occur

☑ Scope 1

(7.55.2.4) Voluntary/Mandatory

☑ Voluntary

(7.55.2.5) Annual monetary savings (unit currency – as specified in 1.2)

2,010,000

(7.55.2.6) Investment required (unit currency – as specified in 1.2)

7,081,200

(7.55.2.7) Payback period

☑ 4-10 years

(7.55.2.8) Estimated lifetime of the initiative

☑ 21-30 years

(7.55.2.9) Comment

Idle Reducing Technology. To reduce fuel consumption and Scope 1 emissions during idling, CSX has invested more than $50 million since 2000 in idle reducing technologies including Automated Engine Start Stop (AESS). AESS automatically shuts down the locomotive when not in use and automatically starts it when needed. CSX also trains its employees on proper locomotive shutdown rules to eliminate unnecessary idling. CSX saved approximately 1 million gallons of fuel and related air emissions annually as a result of this program where a locomotive engine burns approximately 57 gallons/hour. Idle reducing technology is typically operable for the life of the locomotive. Typical locomotive life is 30 years. CSX estimates 1.5% of its capital expenditure each year is focused on fuel efficient technologies and processes. In 2024, capital expenditure totaled 2,529 billion therefore CSX focused approximately $37.9 million in in fuel efficiencies. As an estimate, AESS accounted for approximately 2% of the focus.

Row 2

(7.55.2.1) Initiative category & Initiative type

Low-carbon energy consumption
☑ Low-carbon electricity mix

(7.55.2.2) Estimated annual CO2e savings (metric tonnes CO2e)

15,844

(7.55.2.3) Scope(s) or Scope 3 category(ies) where emissions savings occur

☑ Scope 2 (market-based)

(7.55.2.4) Voluntary/Mandatory

☑ Voluntary

(7.55.2.5) Annual monetary savings (unit currency – as specified in 1.2)

0

(7.55.2.6) Investment required (unit currency – as specified in 1.2)

27,200

(7.55.2.7) Payback period

☑ No payback

(7.55.2.8) Estimated lifetime of the initiative

☑ Ongoing

(7.55.2.9) Comment

CSX began renewable energy generation initiatives in 2020 and maintains a commitment to renewable energy use through the purchase and production of RECs To help reduce our overall emissions we derive approximately 10% of energy from renewable sources. CSX partnered with third parties and negotiated PPA agreements which allowed us to retain the RECs associated with the biomass energy generated therefore there is no payback period.

Row 3

(7.55.2.1) Initiative category & Initiative type

Energy efficiency in production processes
☑ Process optimization

(7.55.2.2) Estimated annual CO2e savings (metric tonnes CO2e)

25,900

(7.55.2.3) Scope(s) or Scope 3 category(ies) where emissions savings occur

☑ Scope 1

(7.55.2.4) Voluntary/Mandatory

☑ Voluntary

(7.55.2.5) Annual monetary savings (unit currency – as specified in 1.2)

5,880,000

(7.55.2.6) Investment required (unit currency – as specified in 1.2)

16,000,000

(7.55.2.7) Payback period

☑ 4-10 years

(7.55.2.8) Estimated lifetime of the initiative

☑ Ongoing

(7.55.2.9) Comment

Distributed Power (DP): DP locomotives are more efficient as they distribute forces acting on the locomotive throughout the train allowing for a larger train build and thus movement of more freight with less fuel. In 2024 we upgraded approximately 85 of our locomotives to DP bringing our total to nearly 1,300. This change in technology and operations allows trains to be longer and reduces necessary horsepower per ton and allows train to be more fuel efficient Approximately 1% total fuel savings are realized with the implementation of DP across the locomotive fleet

Row 4

(7.55.2.1) Initiative category & Initiative type

Company policy or behavioral change
☑ Resource efficiency

(7.55.2.2) Estimated annual CO2e savings (metric tonnes CO2e)

39,100

(7.55.2.3) Scope(s) or Scope 3 category(ies) where emissions savings occur

☑ Scope 1

(7.55.2.4) Voluntary/Mandatory

☑ Voluntary

(7.55.2.5) Annual monetary savings (unit currency – as specified in 1.2)

8,474,000

(7.55.2.6) Investment required (unit currency – as specified in 1.2)

20,920,954

(7.55.2.7) Payback period

☑ 4-10 years

(7.55.2.8) Estimated lifetime of the initiative

☑ Ongoing

(7.55.2.9) Comment

Employee Training. CSX provides locomotive operating employees with training education and feedback to help them operate locomotives in the most fuelefficient manner possible to reduce Scope 1 emissions. CSX uses locomotive Event Recorder Automated Download (ERAD) technology to monitor and record train operations data and provide feedback to the engineers on how to adjust their locomotive operation to improve fuel efficiency. CSX locomotive engineers are also trained on locomotive simulators developing best practices and improving their awareness of fuel efficient train handling. In 2024, CSX saved approximately 38 million gallons of fuel as a result of these programs. Employee training is repeated periodically benefits are expected for the extent of the career of each trained engineer CSX estimates 14% of its capital expenditure each year is focused on fuel efficient technologies and processes. In 2024, capital expenditure totaled 2,529 billion therefore CSX focused approximately 354 million in fuel efficiencies. As an estimate AESS accounted for approximately 2% of the focus.

Row 5

(7.55.2.1) Initiative category & Initiative type

Energy efficiency in production processes
☑ Automation

(7.55.2.2) Estimated annual CO2e savings (metric tonnes CO2e)

33,800

(7.55.2.3) Scope(s) or Scope 3 category(ies) where emissions savings occur

Select all that apply

☑ Scope 1

(7.55.2.4) Voluntary/Mandatory

Select from:

☑ Voluntary

(7.55.2.5) Annual monetary savings (unit currency – as specified in 1.2)

1,030,000

(7.55.2.6) Investment required (unit currency – as specified in 1.2)

71,500,000

(7.55.2.7) Payback period

Select from:

☑ 4-10 years

(7.55.2.8) Estimated lifetime of the initiative

Select from:

☑ Ongoing

(7.55.2.9) Comment

***Trip Optimizer Technology**. CSX has implemented a plan to install Trip Optimizer technology on approximately 3100 mainline fleet locomotives to reduce Scope 1 emissions. The Trip Optimizer is an automated locomotive cruise control device that helps drivers achieve optimal fuel burn by automatically controlling locomotive speed and acceleration in real-time reducing driver fluctuations for increased fuel efficiency. In 2024, CSX saved nearly 42 million gallons of fuel or an average savings of 1.4 gallons of fuel per auto mile as a result of this program. Trip Optimizer technology is operable for the life of the locomotive which is typically 30 years. CSX tracks the investment in Trip Optimizer on an annual basis.*

(7.55.3) What methods do you use to drive investment in emissions reduction activities?

Row 1

(7.55.3.1) Method

Select from:

☑ Internal incentives/recognition programs

(7.55.3.2) Comment

CSX provides monetary incentives to management for achieving emissions reduction targets, energy reduction target, and efficiency targets. Award based on meeting corporate goal of locomotive productivity and active fleet management which includes optimizing the fleet for best fuel and network efficiency. Locomotive fuel accounts for approximately 91% of CSX's Scope 1 GHG emissions; therefore, fuel efficiency targets are directly correlated to emissions intensity reductions. Diesel fuel is one of the largest expenses CSX incurs therefore increased fuel efficiency also decreases the Company operating expenses.

(7.73) Are you providing product level data for your organization's goods or services?

Select from:

☑ No, I am not providing data

(7.74) Do you classify any of your existing goods and/or services as low-carbon products?

Select from:

☑ Yes

(7.74.1) Provide details of your products and/or services that you classify as low-carbon products.

Row 1

(7.74.1.1) Level of aggregation

Select from:

☑ Product or service

(7.74.1.2) Taxonomy used to classify product(s) or service(s) as low-carbon

Select from:

☑ Other, please specify :Taxonomy used is based off the avoided emissions, see "Methodology used to calculate avoided emissions" for more information.

(7.74.1.3) Type of product(s) or service(s)

Other

☑ Other, please specify :Fuel-efficient freight and intermodal transportation

(7.74.1.4) Description of product(s) or service(s)

A typical CSX freight train is on average three to four times more fuel efficient than highway freight transportation. A typical intermodal train can carry the cargo load of 280 trucks. As a result of this efficiency, CSX allows customers to avoid and/or reduce GHG emissions that would otherwise be generated from more carbon-intensive modes of transportation. This equates to a 75% reduction in transportation related CO2e emissions when shippers switch from highway to rail.

(7.74.1.5) Have you estimated the avoided emissions of this low-carbon product(s) or service(s)

Select from:

☑ Yes

(7.74.1.6) Methodology used to calculate avoided emissions

Select from:

☑ Other, please specify :Avoided Emissions (Association of American Railroads (AAR)

(7.74.1.7) Life cycle stage(s) covered for the low-carbon product(s) or services(s)

Select from:

☑ Cradle-to-grave

(7.74.1.8) Functional unit used

Revenue Ton-Miles (RTM) and Revenue Ton-Mile per gallon of diesel (RTM/gal) are used as freight haul efficiency metrics in the railroad sector. RTM/gal measures a freight train's efficiency in transporting one short ton of freight a distance (miles) per gallon of diesel fuel. For this metric, the higher the more efficient. For the inversion of this ratio 'gallons of fuel per RTM,' less is better and represents fuel consumed to move one freight ton one mile.

(7.74.1.9) Reference product/service or baseline scenario used

The references used were the RTM and RTM/gal metrics for freight hauling if the transport mode were a heavy duty diesel semi-truck, which is the other primary surface transport mode for freight hauling. The types of freight volumes analyzed in this metric were merchandise and intermodal and excludes coal, due to regulatory restrictions related to hauling coal.

(7.74.1.10) Life cycle stage(s) covered for the reference product/service or baseline scenario

Select from:

☑ Cradle-to-grave

(7.74.1.11) Estimated avoided emissions (metric tons CO2e per functional unit) compared to reference product/service or baseline scenario

10,119,126

(7.74.1.12) Explain your calculation of avoided emissions, including any assumptions

Considering the volume of freight CSX hauled in 2024, merchandise (42%) and intermodal (46%) freight could move by either highway or rail. If the freight CSX hauled in the merchandise and intermodal business had been moved via truck instead of by rail, those trucks would have emitted an over 10 million metric tonnes CO2e (as compared to the emissions from CSX's locomotives). The basis for this calculation is the percentage of merchandise (42%) and intermodal (46%) freight as a percentage of revenue ton-miles and related diesel fuel consumed. Considering the revenue of freight CSX hauled in 2024, 61% of the total revenue is attributable to the merchandise traffic and 14% revenue for intermodal - this represents 75% of the freight revenue that could have been moved by either truck or rail.

(7.74.1.13) Revenue generated from low-carbon product(s) or service(s) as % of total revenue in the reporting year

75

(7.75) Provide tracking metrics for the implementation of low-carbon transport technology over the reporting year.

Row 1

(7.75.1) Activity

Select from:

☑ Rail

(7.75.2) Metric

Select from:

☑ Other, please specify :Avoided emissions

(7.75.3) Technology

Select from:

☑ Other, please specify :More efficient mode of transportation

(7.75.4) Metric figure

10,000,000

(7.75.5) Metric unit

Select from:

☑ Other, please specify :metric tons CO2

(7.75.6) Explanation

According to EPA, a typical CSX freight train is approximately four times more fuel efficient than highway freight transportation. A typical train can carry the cargo load of 280 trucks. As a result of this efficiency, CSX enables customers to avoid and/or reduce GHG emissions that would otherwise be generated from more carbon-intensive modes of transportation. Avoided emissions for CSX customers are estimated to be approximately 10 million metric tons of CO2 in 2024. The basis for this calculation is the percentage

of merchandise (42%) and intermodal (46%) freight transportation that could move by either highway or rail as a percentage of revenue ton-miles and related diesel fuel consumed. Fuel-saving technologies and processes include: (1) scheduled railroading - implemented in 2017, scheduled railroading changed the CSX operations model from a hub- and-spoke system to a leaner point-to-point system, which implements more direct routes, optimizes assets, and reduces fuel use; (2) CSX deploys distributed power on certain trains - this involves placing locomotive power at intermediate points throughout the train. The distributed locomotives are remotely operated by the lead locomotive. Distributed power reduces draft forces thus reducing fuel consumption and increasing train efficiency; (3) CSX has implemented a plan to install Trip Optimizer technology on approximately 2,100 locomotives. The Trip Optimizer is an automated locomotive cruise control device that helps drivers achieve optimal fuel burn by automatically controlling locomotive speed and acceleration in real-time and reducing driver fluctuations for increased fuel efficiency. EPA estimates Trip Optimizer improves fuel efficiency by 10%; (4) Trailing Unit Shutdown is an operational change rather than a technology enhancement. By shutting down unnecessary backup locomotives behind the lead locomotive, significant fuel savings have been achieved without any cost to velocity or reliability.

(7.79) Has your organization retired any project-based carbon credits within the reporting year?

☑ No

C11. Environmental performance - Biodiversity

(11.2) What actions has your organization taken in the reporting year to progress your biodiversity-related commitments?

	Actions taken in the reporting period to progress your biodiversity-related commitments
	Select from: ☑ No, and we do not plan to undertake any biodiversity-related actions

(11.3) Does your organization use biodiversity indicators to monitor performance across its activities?

	Does your organization use indicators to monitor biodiversity performance?
	Select from: ☑ No, we do not use indicators, but plan to within the next two years

(11.4) Does your organization have activities located in or near to areas important for biodiversity in the reporting year?

	Indicate whether any of your organization's activities are located in or near to this type of area important for biodiversity	Comment
Legally protected areas	*Select from:* ☑ Not assessed	*N/A*
UNESCO World Heritage sites	*Select from:* ☑ Not assessed	*N/A*
UNESCO Man and the Biosphere Reserves	*Select from:* ☑ Not assessed	*N/A*
Ramsar sites	*Select from:* ☑ Not assessed	*N/A*
Key Biodiversity Areas	*Select from:* ☑ Not assessed	*N/A*
Other areas important for biodiversity	*Select from:* ☑ Not assessed	*N/A*

C13. Further information & sign off

(13.1) Indicate if any environmental information included in your CDP response (not already reported in 7.9.1/2/3, 8.9.1/2/3/4, and 9.3.2) is verified and/or assured by a third party?

	Other environmental information included in your CDP response is verified and/or assured by a third party
	Select from: ☑ Yes

(13.1.1) Which data points within your CDP response are verified and/or assured by a third party, and which standards were used?

Row 1

(13.1.1.1) Environmental issue for which data has been verified and/or assured

☑ Climate change

(13.1.1.2) Disclosure module and data verified and/or assured

Environmental performance – Climate change
☑ Target-setting methodology

☑ Other data point in module 7, please specify :year on year emissions intensity figure

(13.1.1.3) Verification/assurance standard

Climate change-related standards
☑ ISO 14064-3

(13.1.1.4) Further details of the third-party verification/assurance process

Emissions intensity figures are verified during the third-party verification of the annual GHG inventory

(13.1.1.5) Attach verification/assurance evidence/report (optional)

CSX 2024 Audit Statement.pdf

2024-CSX-Sustainability Data Supplement – page 9

(13.3) Provide the following information for the person that has signed off (approved) your CDP response.

(13.3.1) Job title

Vice President Stakeholder Engagement and Sustainability. CSX's reporting structure includes this position reporting directly to the CEO and the Board as an equivalent reporting position to the CSO.

(13.3.2) Corresponding job category

Select from:

☑ Chief Sustainability Officer (CSO)