

September 1, 2025

Ms. Danielle Gosselin
Acting Director, Office of Environmental Assessment
Surface Transportation Board
395 E Street, S.W.
Washington, DC 20423
Danielle.Gosselin@stb.gov

Ms. Elizabeth Webster
Project Manager
Surface Transportation Board
395 E Street S.W.
Washington, DC 20423
Elizabeth.Webster@stb.gov

Ms. Karen Stevens
Environmental Protection Specialist
Surface Transportation Board
395 E Street, S.W.
Washington, DC 20423
Karen.Stevens@stb.gov

Dear Ms. Gosselin, Ms. Webster and Ms. Stevens:

I am writing in regards to your letter of July 8, 2025 to Justin Marks at Clark Hill, concerning the “trash train” that is trying to run through my property at 5375 Route 219 in Brockport, Pennsylvania.

In particular, my questions address paragraph (2) describing a portion of your justification as to why the OEA was granting Lampwrights LLC request for the project to be considered utilizing an Environmental Assessment, as opposed to a thorough Environmental Impact Statement:

2. OEA visited the project site on June 17, 2025 (at the northern end of the proposed project in the vicinity of Route 153) to understand the existing conditions in the project area. Most of the proposed line would be within former railway roadbed,

reducing the potential for construction-related disturbance to environmental or cultural resources.

My questions:

1. In addition to the area visited at the northern end by Route 153, was the entire length of the proposed rail line construction inspected during that site visit? I am the owner of several parcels that encompass the original railbed. I am wondering if my property was inspected on that day as part of the site visit. I have previously filed an environmental comment, and I am seriously concerned about the environmental impact on the parcels of land I own, as well as the impact on land owned by others in the community.
2. When the OEA conducts site visits, does it notify property owners of its intended presence?
3. While some of the proposed new construction may lie along the former railbed, a substantial portion of the proposed construction does not (the green line on Lampwrights map showing the proposed landfill track in the vicinity of Route 153). I am particularly bewildered at how a conclusion could be made that there will be an acceptable level of environmental impact from new construction for this segment of the proposed project, considering the flood plain, wetlands, beaver dam, well-stocked trout creek, native trout tributaries, just in this one location north of the proposed right-of-way near Route 153.
4. In regards to the environmental assessment for the entire project, and not just the site visit conducted on June 17th, what consideration has been given to the fact that the proposed right of way/easement for the proposed new construction is slated to be 100 feet, while the right of way/easement for the existing railbed averages 30-50 feet, with select locations where it is 60 feet? The current proposal would generally double or triple the existing right of way/easement, that involves the same: flood plain, wetlands, etc.

From your letter of July 8: OEA visited the project site on June 17, 2025 (at the northern end of the proposed project in the vicinity of Route 153) to understand the existing conditions in the project area. **Most of the proposed line would be within former railway roadbed,** reducing the

potential for construction-related disturbance to environmental or cultural resources.

The statement in bold italics, underlined, is not accurate. The green line track would all be newly constructed and there is no existing rail bed. Even for the portion of the line that would run where the former right-of-way existed, take note, in the paragraph above, that the right-of-way under the proposal would double or triple the prior right-of-way.

I am asking the two questions below (#5 and #6) because neither I or any of my neighbors or other property owners I am aware of were informed of your planned visit on June 17th. The lack of communication from the OEA has led myself and others to have concerns about the identities of those making decisions based on the site visit and their qualifications and credentials. I have the same concern about who will be making the final environmental recommendations to the STB Board and their qualifications and credentials. It seems that Professional Environmental Assessors would clearly see and recognize the tremendous effect this will have on this community.

According to your letter of July 8, 2025 to Justin Marks of Clark Hill, it is stated in the second paragraph:

“Pursuant to 49 C.F.R. 1105.6 (d), the Surface Transportation Board’s (Board) Office of Environmental Assessment (OEA) is granting your request. Based on the information available to date, OEA believes the potential impacts would not be significant, and any impacts could most likely be addressed through appropriate mitigation measures. Therefore, OEA has determined that the preparation of an EA is appropriation in this case for the following reasons:”

Therefore:

5. Who were the individuals conducting the site visit, who made the determination that the potential for construction-related disturbance to environmental resources was “reduced”, and what are the qualifications and credentials of those who rendered that decision? See below:

From your letter of July 8: OEA visited the project site on June 17, 2025 (at the northern end of the proposed project in the vicinity of Route 153) to understand the existing conditions in the project area. Most of the proposed line would be within former railway roadbed, **reducing the potential for construction-related disturbance to environmental or cultural resources.**

6. What are the qualifications and credentials of the OEA staff who evaluate and render decisions on the environmental impact of the entire project, not just those who were involved in the June 17th visit?

I/we would request an additional opinion from other sources to verify that proper and accurate assessments are being done, as we are being “left in the dark” as to the truth in this serious matter.

Also, many are experiencing mental and emotional stress due to the actions in this matter.

Public opinion is needed, but as Professional Environmental Assessors, it is your responsibility to present accurate truth about the hazards and harm that will surely happen in the approximately 5 mile stretch of railroad right-of-way. More evidence of the flood plain issues, wetlands, dredging, contamination and public harm will be made available upon receiving your answers to said questions.

Thank you in advance for your consideration of my questions. I sincerely appreciate and look forward to a response from you at your earliest opportunity.

You may also contact me by email at jwisor@windstream.net or at 814-590-3898.

Respectfully,

Bishop Jack Wisor

Cc: Congressman Glenn Thompson
State Senator Cris Dush
State Representative Mike Armanini
State Representative Brian Smith
Elk County Commissioner Matthew Quesenberry
Elk County Commissioner Gregory Gebauer
Elk County Commissioner Fritz Lecker