
Horton Township Board of Supervisors

P.O. Box 216, Brockport, Pennsylvania 15823
Phone (814) 265-1622
Fax (814) 265-1622

310769

Chief of Case Administration
Office of Chief Counsel
Surface Transportation Board
395 E Street S.W.
Washington, DC 20423-0001

ENTERED
Office of Chief Counsel
January 21, 2026
Part of
Public Record

January 21, 2026

Ref: Docket No. FD 36833

Dear Sir or Madame:

We are the supervisors of Horton Township, Elk County, PA, writing to you in regard to Docket No. FD 36833. This letter serves three purposes.

1. We object to the petition by Lampwrights, LLC (Lampwrights) for exemption from the prior approval requirements of 49 U.S.C. § 10901 in their bid to construct and operate a new rail line in Elk and Jefferson Counties, PA. The project is not appropriate for the exemption process. It is imperative that Lampwrights fulfill the Public Convenience Necessity test and complete an Environmental Assessment

Numerous landowners within Horton Township have approached our board in public meetings contending, in certain cases, that the proposed rail line crosses private property and/or would be built through or within several feet of existing structures, and in other cases that their property values have decreased because of the nature of this project. The citizens who have approached us have expressed that they have received no word from Lampwrights on how Lampwrights intends to resolve property disputes or compensate property devaluation. Until these matters are clarified, we cannot determine whether Lampwrights fulfills the Public Convenience and Necessity test.

If Lampwrights does not have agreements in place or own the property on the proposed railroad, they would have to go around those properties and not use the "existing railbed." Would that not mean that STB lacks jurisdiction over the project?

Until this matter is clarified, we cannot determine whether Lampwrights fulfills the Public Convenience and Necessity test.

Further, the Brockway Sewage Authority has included a filing that states they will not permit a rail line within 10 feet of their sewer line (Filing 310730), which runs under the rail bed. How can the STB exempt Lampwrights from a Public Convenience Necessity test when it has not been determined whether Lampwrights can even use the existing rail line?

Numerous citizens have expressed a desire to remove from their property given the proximity to trash transportation. We not yet have not heard of a plan to compensate the township for the enormous tax revenue loss this would cost, much less the negative impact the project will have on economic development in this community. This needs to be weighed against the Public Convenience Necessity test.

Further, we have no assurance that the project will serve any broader need than the single proposed project, and if it will provide additional opportunities for rail transport, the project does not cite what other shippers would use it. Our board of supervisors has no way of knowing whether other shippers would be detrimental to the health and safety of our community.

The project does not have transportation merits. The project will, as we are told by Lampwrights, transport out-of-state trash through our township. The premise is that it is necessary to haul this trash across one or more states. It should not be assumed that it is necessary and efficient that a private business accept trash from other states. The STB should look at whether the trash needs transported that far anyway, as it would be exponentially more efficient for the states transporting their trash to dispose of it in their own states.

2. We call to your attention our comprehensive letter, Filing ID 310468, dated 12/9/2025, which highlights the enormous safety, quality of life, and economic impact this project would have. We request that numerous points of confusion and unanswered questions about this project and its danger to our community cited in this letter also be consulted in denying Lampwright's petition for the exemption.
3. Because of the many unanswered questions above, we request an extension for this filing. We received our copy of the extension request less than a month before the deadline to comment. Between the time of the request and its deadline, we had several major holidays. It took our board of three part-time supervisors weeks just to learn from the STB the meaning of this extension. Now, understanding what this is all

about and that the STB may give an exemption, we have been advised by our solicitor that it is in the best interest of our community to hire specialized legal counsel. We are bound by the Sunshine law to explain to our community the immense costs it will be forced to incur because of this. We cannot engage legal counsel unless we publicly move to do so, and we do not meet again until February 11, 2026. It would be an unfair burden on our community not to have the opportunity to engage legal counsel to help us identify important objections.

We respectfully request your consideration of these issues in your deliberation of Lampwrights' petition for exemption.

Sincerely,



PJ Piccirillo
Supervisor, Chair



Tim Hutchins
Supervisor, Vice Chair



Kim Faulk
Supervisor

CC: Party of Record

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I certify that on January 21, 2026, I caused to be served a copy of the foregoing Motion for Extension of Time and other matters upon all parties of record in this proceeding by email.

Patrick J. Piccirillo
Dated: January 21, 2026

