

Mr. Navecky,

The 200 foot wide easement that is being requested for the proposed rail has me concerned about many things:

- Currently railroads in our area spray the unused portion of the right-of-ways with some potent chemicals to kill vegetation and trees along the track. These poisons end up in our groundwater, the water we consume daily. There are many bee keepers in our area, these chemicals are detrimental to them, as well as to all the other pollinators.
- A 200 foot wide "dead zone" would be created for all the 278 miles proposed, this negatively impacts the environment and the air we breathe. It will be bare soil prone to wash outs.
- The hundreds of newly created at-grade public and private crossings become more dangerous with each additional track constructed. A 200 foot wide easement allows for several tracks. The dangers of crossing a 200 foot wide area at a farm field crossing with large and slow farm implements cannot be ignored.
- Pastures divided by the track pose a great inconvenience, danger and management issue for farmers and their livestock. How will they get their animals safely across this wide area?
- Who will construct and maintain the fences required to keep livestock off the track? Railroads around here do not have a great record as far as maintaining things. What guarantees will there be that GLB will assume responsibility for construction, maintenance, liability issues? How timely will they respond. Words now are great, and Mr. Patton talks smoothly as if all will be well, but those are just words. It does not tell us what will happen if GLB gets sold or if it fails. Where is the fine print on all this?
- Currently in Rock County only one track is proposed, which makes me wonder if that is truly needed. We have plenty of rail in Rock County already and it is not used heavily. So why build new here and why a 200 foot wide easement?
- The 50 feet for the utility easement is of great concern. We are left completely in the dark as to the need of that. GLB states on their website that it is a possible source of revenue. How can we comment on that, how can the EIS evaluate and research this? We have no clue as to what is really planned. Furthermore, if it is for some unspecified utilities why is it in the proposal currently before the Surface Transportation Board?
- 200 foot wide overpasses are enormous! They require the destruction of additional farm land for the fill that will be needed. They will raise havoc with water flow, they will require maintenance, from maintaining the embankments, to cleaning culverts etc. Here again, I have no confidence in the railroad doing these things in a timely manner. These are the type of things that local townships and landowners will end up having to fight for and perhaps even pay for. These are the things that will be cut out first to improve the bottom line for GLB and its private investors.

- This list is not complete because there is insufficient information available to the public. To meaningful and thorough comment on the proposed project is impossible. The public has not been provided with details, with a definite route, with definite plans.

My request is that all above concerns be evaluated for their immediate and cumulative impacts on communities and individuals in the 60 mile swath that the STB is scoping for this project.

Lastly, I will not accept the environmental impact study for the GLB project as legitimate or valid. The reasons for which I have given in a previous letter. In short, not enough information is available to the public, Mr. Patton has made contradictory statements and the public did not get adequate notification.

I oppose the proposed GLB project and request that the STB stop the approval process.

Mirjam Melin