

Draft EIS for the R.J. Corman
Railroad/Pennsylvania Lines, Inc.
Construction and Operation Exemption

* * * * *

BEFORE: Lynne Singer
Kevin Starner
Danielle Gosselin, Esquire

HEARING: Tuesday, September 14,
2010
6:09 p.m.

LOCATION: Philipsburg Area High
School
502 Philips Street
Philipsburg, PA 16866

Reporter: Sarah Wendorf

Any reproduction of this transcript
is prohibited without authorization
by the certifying agency.

WITNESSES

Ed Peters

Maryann Williams

Michelle Barbin

Trilby Mayes

Daniel Pytel

Harry Pionke

Jenn Shufra

Patrick Coutoriaux

J. Alan Stewart

Lon E. Ward

Art Beveridge

Phil Glass

Mitch Harvey

Sharon Josefik

Michael Savage

Rodger Carbright

Ronn Brouman

Ernie Degrasse

I N D E X

OPENING REMARKS

By Ms. Singer 6 - 10

By Attorney Gosselin 10 - 14

PRESENTATION

By Mr. Starner 14 - 35

PUBLIC COMMENT

By Mr. Stewart 36 - 39

By Mr. Ward 40 - 42

By Mr. Beveridge 42 - 44

By Mr. Glass 45 - 47

By Mr. Harvey 47 - 48

By Ms. Josefik 48 - 49

By Mr. Savage 50 - 52

By Mr. Peters 53 - 54

By Ms. Williams 54 - 57

By Ms. Barbin 57 - 61

By Ms. Mayes 61 - 63

By Mr. Pionko 64 - 67

By Ms. Shufran 67 - 70

By Mr. Carbright 70 - 72

By Ms. Shufran 73 - 76

By Mr. Savage 76 - 77

By Mr. Coutoriaux 78 - 80

I N D E X (c o n t .)

P U B L I C C O M M E N T

By Mr. Brouman 80 - 84

C L O S I N G S T A T E M E N T

By Ms. Singer 84 - 85

P U B L I C C O M M E N T

By Mr. Degrasse 86

C E R T I F I C A T E 87

E X H I B I T S

Page

<u>Number</u>	<u>Description</u>	<u>Offered</u>
---------------	--------------------	----------------

NONE OFFERED

P R O C E E D I N G S

MS. SINGER:

Welcome. We're very happy to see all of you who took the time out of your busy night to come and join us. My name is Lynne Singer, and I'm from Skelly & Loy. We served as environmental consultants for this project. And the purpose of this meeting tonight is to give you an opportunity to provide comments on the draft environmental impact statement, EIS, for the R.J. Corman Railroad Company/Pennsylvania Lines construction and operation exemption. That's our official title for today.

The Draft EIS has been out for a while. I hope that many of you had an opportunity to visit your local library or

1 municipal offices to review it.
2 But if not, we still welcome
3 your comments tonight. All
4 comments will become part of
5 the public record, and they
6 will be considered during
7 preparation of the final
8 environmental impact statement.

9 Now, there are going to
10 be three parts to this meeting
11 tonight. First of all, we're
12 going to hear an overview of
13 the process that the Surface
14 Transportation Board uses for
15 preparing environmental impact
16 statements. Second, you're
17 going to have an overview of
18 the environmental studies that
19 went on for this process, and
20 third, you will have an
21 opportunity to comment on this.
22 The bulk of the meeting is
23 going to be your comments,
24 because that's the purpose of
25 the meeting tonight.

1 Now, anyone who wants to
2 present testimony tonight,
3 would you please go to the
4 sign-in table in the back out
5 in the hallway if you haven't
6 already signed in. I think
7 most of you have, but just in
8 case, because I'm going to be
9 calling your names and I have
10 to get your name off of the
11 list.

12 This is a comment period
13 tonight. This is not a
14 question and answer period.
15 You will have a presentation.
16 Your comments will be addressed
17 in the final environmental
18 impact statement. Now, if you
19 are not presenting, if you're
20 not going to give oral comments
21 but you want to write down some
22 questions, you want to write
23 down comments, we have comment
24 forms and you can either put
25 them in the comment boxes out

1 in the hallway, or you can mail
2 them in. The address is right
3 on the comment forms.

4 The process that we're
5 going to use for comments is
6 I'm going to call a name off of
7 the list for everyone who
8 signed up and I'd like you to
9 come up to the microphone,
10 state your name and spell your
11 name for our court reporter so
12 she can make an accurate
13 recording of everything. And
14 then we have a timer here. Can
15 everyone see this timer back
16 there? Well, you'll be
17 standing in the aisle talking
18 and we have a timer here, I'm
19 going to set it, you have three
20 minutes. The green light will
21 go on when you start and that
22 will give you two minutes. And
23 as you're speaking the yellow
24 light will come on,
25 unfortunately, and that means

1 you have one minute left to
2 speak. And then when the red
3 light comes on, that's it.
4 That means please take your
5 comments and sit down again.
6 The reason we have to do this
7 is we want to make sure that
8 everyone gets an opportunity to
9 present comments that wants to
10 present them. And I'll be here
11 to keep an eye on the lights
12 and probably to bug you a
13 little bit about, you know,
14 when it turns red.

15 So I want to start by
16 introducing Danielle Gosselin.
17 Danielle is from the Surface
18 Transportation Board. And
19 she's going to give you an
20 overview of the EIS process
21 that they use. Danielle?

22 ATTORNEY GOSSELIN:

23 Thanks, Lynne. As Lynne
24 said my name is Danielle
25 Gosselin, and I'm an attorney

1 from the Office of
2 Environmental Analysis at the
3 Surface Transportation Board.
4 I'm pleased to be here with you
5 and I appreciate this
6 opportunity to hear your
7 thoughts on the Draft
8 Environmental Impact Statement,
9 or Draft EIS.

10 In May 2008, R.J. Corman
11 Railroad Company, or RJCP,
12 filed a petition with the Board
13 to construct and reactivate
14 approximately 20 miles of rail
15 line. This started two process
16 of the Board. Review of the
17 transportation merits of the
18 proposal and the environmental
19 review process. These two
20 processes proceed
21 simultaneously until the Board
22 makes a final decision.

23 As part of the
24 environmental review process,
25 the Board's Office of

1 Environmental Analysis, or OEA,
2 has prepared this Draft EIS.
3 The Draft EIS does a number of
4 things. It identifies and
5 evaluates potential
6 environmental impacts of RJCP's
7 proposed rail line and
8 alternatives, including the
9 no-build alternative. It
10 informs federal, state and
11 local agencies, affected
12 communities, and the general
13 public about the potential
14 environmental impacts of the
15 proposed rail line. And it
16 sets forth OEA's preliminary
17 conclusions and recommended
18 mitigation regarding potential
19 environmental impacts.

20 OEA is providing a
21 60-day comment period on this
22 Draft EIS. The comments are
23 due on September 28th.

24 After the close of the
25 public comment period, a Final

1 EIS will be prepared to reflect
2 further environmental analysis
3 and consultation, as
4 appropriate, and to respond to
5 the comments received on the
6 Draft EIS. The Board will then
7 issue a final decision, based
8 on the transportation merits
9 and the entire environmental
10 record, including the Draft
11 EIS, the Final EIS, and all
12 agency and public comments
13 received. In its final
14 decision, the Board will
15 determine whether to give final
16 approval to the project, and if
17 so, whether to impose
18 environmental mitigation.

19 Because our purpose this
20 evening is to hear your
21 comments and thoughts on the
22 Draft EIS, I'll conclude my
23 remarks now and introduce Kevin
24 Starner from Skelly & Loy, who
25 will give an overview of the

1 project. Thank you. And I
2 look forward to your comments.

3 MR. STARNER:

4 Good evening. My name
5 is Kevin Starnier. I work for
6 Skelly & Loy out of Harrisburg,
7 Pennsylvania. Skelly & Loy
8 serves as the independent
9 third-party contractor to the
10 STB to prepare the
11 Environmental Impact Study. So
12 what I'd like to do, very
13 briefly, I'm only going to talk
14 about five, ten minutes. I
15 just want to walk you through
16 that EIS process.

17 If you could pull our
18 first slide up. We had a
19 public meeting back in February
20 2009. Many of you may have
21 been at that public meeting.
22 And what you saw at that public
23 meeting was an alternative that
24 R.J. Corman approached the STB
25 with, that they wanted to

1 reactivate approximately 20
2 miles of rail line here in
3 Clearfield and Centre Counties.
4 This map should look very
5 familiar to you if you were at
6 that public meeting. This is
7 what we showed that night.
8 This is what we referred to in
9 the draft EIS as the proposed
10 action. It's the proposed
11 action because that's what the
12 R.J. Corman proposed that the
13 STB do.

14 So as to orient you very
15 quickly to this map, this area
16 right here is Wallaceton
17 Borough. This is where the
18 proposed action, or the
19 proposed rail line would start.
20 We would essentially Y off of
21 R.J. Corman's existing rail
22 line here called the Wallaceton
23 subdivision line. This green
24 line is an active railroad line
25 currently owned and operated by

1 R.J. Corman. They would Y off
2 of that in Wallaceton, proceed
3 through Morris Township through
4 Morrisdale, Allport to Munson
5 parallel to Moshannon Creek
6 over to Winburne. At that
7 point we cross into what we
8 refer to as the eastern
9 segment. I'll get to that in a
10 minute. And then we would
11 enter --- or parallel to
12 Moshannon Creek enter Moshannon
13 State Forest for about a mile.
14 It's actually 4,400 feet that
15 we would be in the section of
16 the Moshannon State Forest,
17 cross over Moshannon again and
18 continue north and east all the
19 way over to Gorton. Again,
20 that was the original proposed
21 action.

22 Now, if you recall,
23 either from looking at the EIS
24 or from having been at our
25 public meeting, we essentially

1 broke that 20-mile railroad
2 line into two separate
3 sections. The western segment,
4 which goes from Wallacetown over
5 to Winburne and then an eastern
6 segment, which is the remainder
7 that goes from Winburne all the
8 way over to Gorton. It's
9 actually about 9.3 miles on the
10 eastern segment and about 10.7
11 on the west, and it's roughly
12 about split.

13 There's one primary
14 reason as to why the project is
15 split between the eastern and
16 western segment like that, and
17 it has to do with the legal
18 issues associated with the
19 status of the railroad line.
20 And I'm sure many of you are
21 aware that the eastern segment,
22 that 9.3 section is what's
23 known as the Snow Shoe Multiuse
24 Rail Trail. It's a rail trail,
25 which means the trail --- the

1 rail is not actually abandoned,
2 but it was allowed to have an
3 interim use of trail, or
4 recreational uses and the Snow
5 Shoe Rail Trail does exist on
6 that 9.3 mile eastern segment.

7 The difference, however,
8 on the western segment, that
9 being from Wallaceton to
10 Winburne, is this ten-mile
11 section of line was actually
12 abandoned. There are sections
13 that are still owned by R.J.
14 Corman, but some of them have
15 reverted back to adjacent
16 ownership. This section does
17 not operate as a rail trail.
18 It was not rail line. It was
19 not used for official
20 recreation purposes.

21 So I have a couple
22 slides here just to walk you
23 through some of the visuals of
24 what this looks like. This
25 photograph was taken right in

1 Wallaceton Borough. And right
2 here is actually the old
3 railroad bed that we would be
4 proposing to reactivate the
5 proposed action. You can see
6 it is indeed adjacent to some
7 homes in Wallaceton Borough.

8 Next slide, please.

9 This photograph is also taken
10 in the western segment of the
11 proposed action. I think I'm
12 in the area of Winburne when I
13 took this. But again, you can
14 see there are some homes
15 adjacent to this rail line.
16 And then you will see into the
17 eastern segment, and the
18 eastern segment takes on a
19 totally different appearance.
20 If the western segment had
21 homes and road crossings and
22 people next to it, the eastern
23 segment, which is rail bank,
24 does not have any of that.
25 There's no railroad crossings,

1 there's no buildings adjacent
2 to the 9.3 mile eastern
3 segment. And you can see this
4 is pretty rural out here.
5 Well-maintained, obviously,
6 because it's used by the
7 four-wheelers as part of the
8 Snow Shoe Rail Trail.

9 There are a couple
10 distinguishing features on that
11 eastern segment, one of which
12 is the Moshannon Creak viaduct,
13 a very large structure that
14 carries the railroad line over
15 Moshannon Creek.

16 The next slide, please.
17 The second element that we have
18 up there is the Peale Tunnel.
19 Again, these are some pretty
20 significant features of that
21 eastern segment. The presence
22 of these features are one of
23 the reasons --- not the only
24 reasons, but one of the reasons
25 that that entire railroad line

1 has been identified as a
2 National Registered Historic
3 Places eligible rail line. In
4 other words, it's a historic
5 railroad route.

6 Next slide. Now, at
7 that February 2009 public
8 meeting that we had, we
9 received a bunch of comments
10 that evening. Some of those
11 comments were related to a
12 potential alternative route for
13 a portion of that western
14 segment.

15 And again, I'll just
16 orient you to the map here.
17 The Borough of Wallaceton,
18 which is where our proposed
19 action was proceeded through
20 Morrisdale all the way up to
21 Munson. That's what we showed
22 that night at the public
23 meeting. Like I said, after
24 the public meeting we had
25 comments that there is this

1 other route. This other route
2 is what we're referring to as
3 the modified proposed action.
4 And that modified proposed
5 action uses an alternate route
6 to Munson. It's another way to
7 get to Munson. And
8 essentially, what that route
9 entails --- it does involve the
10 use of another historic
11 abandoned railroad line. We
12 would build, approximately, a
13 4,000 foot connection in
14 Decatur Township down there.
15 Again, that connection would
16 connect to the R.J. Corman
17 existing Wallaceton subdivision
18 line. We would then proceed up
19 this old --- this other old
20 railroad line, which is
21 referred to back in the day as
22 the Philipsburg industrial. We
23 would be adjacent to Troy and
24 53 here up towards Hawk Run,
25 and then parallel Moshannon all

1 the way up to Munson.

2 From Munson eastward to
3 Winburne and all the way over
4 to Gorton, the alternatives
5 stayed the same. So nothing
6 changed from Munson eastward.

7 Next slide, please. I
8 have a photograph of what this
9 corridor looks like. The
10 modified proposed action using
11 this alternate route to Munson,
12 this photograph was taken right
13 in the area of Hawk Run. And
14 you can see this does look
15 somewhat similar to that
16 eastern segment that's used for
17 the rail trail.

18 Now, in this particular
19 vicinity, although it's not
20 necessarily legal or proposed
21 to do so, you can see this is
22 open and that's kept down by
23 the four-wheelers. This does
24 receive a lot of four-wheeler
25 use out here. So it does look

1 very similar to that eastern
2 segment.

3 Next slide, please. In
4 addition to that modified
5 proposed action, we also
6 evaluated another alternative,
7 and that being the use of the
8 local roads. If, for some
9 reason, the STB would not
10 approve the proposed action or
11 the modified proposed action,
12 resource recovery and the end
13 users would probably struck
14 their commodities into their
15 property.

16 So essentially we
17 evaluated an improvement to the
18 local rail system using Route
19 53 from the Kylertown
20 Interchange north into
21 Moshannon. And we also looked
22 at 144 from the Snow Shoe exit
23 through Snow Shoe Borough into
24 Moshannon and then Gorton Road
25 down. This local road

1 alternative, it's not just
2 using the roads that are there
3 as they exist today, it's doing
4 improvements to those roads.
5 So essentially Route 53 and
6 Route 144 would be the
7 widening, reconstructing that
8 to accommodate the anticipated
9 level of truck traffic as well
10 as complete paving and
11 reconstruction of Gorton Road
12 from Moshannon down into the
13 resource recovery property.

14 Next slide, please. So
15 essentially what we end up with
16 is a very large project study
17 area. A project study area
18 that includes both railroad
19 alternatives and highway or
20 roadway alternatives. And you
21 can see that project study area
22 stretches from Wallaceton in
23 the west all the way over to
24 the Snow Shoe Interchange in
25 Interstate 80 in the east. So

1 again, we're covering large
2 areas of two counties.

3 Next slide, please. As
4 we went through the EIS
5 process, once we had our
6 alternatives identified, we had
7 to evaluate a number of
8 environmental resources in that
9 EIS. And I have a list of what
10 some of those resources are.
11 We actually looked at 12
12 different things. You see the
13 first one there is
14 transportation and safety.
15 Obviously reactivating the rail
16 line is going to involve
17 reinstating some grade
18 crossings and local railroads
19 out there. So we evaluated
20 where they were, what the
21 traffic impact would be at
22 those grade crossings.

23 Land use, we identified
24 what the impact would be on
25 existing and adjacent land uses

1 as well as compatibility with
2 land use planning documents in
3 the region. We primarily
4 focused on evaluating
5 comprehensive plans and what
6 those local comprehensive plans
7 say about this area.

8 We looked at energy
9 resources. Obviously, either
10 running the trains or operating
11 trucks is going to require a
12 certain commitment of energy
13 resources and that would be in
14 the form of fuel. If you're
15 burning fuel to operate a train
16 or fuel truck, that's going to
17 result in air quality impacts,
18 because burning fuel puts out
19 emissions. So we evaluated
20 what that impact would be to
21 air quality.

22 We also looked at noise
23 and vibration. Same thing. If
24 you're operating trains or
25 running trucks on the local

1 road, that puts out noise and
2 vibration in the air, so we
3 evaluated that category in the
4 EIS.

5 We also evaluated
6 biological resources, that's
7 the bugs and bunnies. That's
8 wildlife habitat, threatening
9 endangered species. For this
10 particular project, because of
11 comments we received at the
12 February meeting, we also
13 evaluated potential increase in
14 vermin or vectors for disease
15 associated with the transport
16 of municipal solid waste, so
17 that all fell under the
18 biological resources category.

19 Water resources, exactly
20 what you think it would mean.
21 Wetland, streams, surface
22 water. We also looked at
23 potential impacts to
24 groundwater as well as
25 regulatory hundred year flood

1 plans mapped by FEMA.

2 Socioeconomics. If all these
3 first categories are impacts to
4 the natural environment.

5 Socioeconomics could
6 best be defined as the impact
7 to people. How would this
8 project affect people? And we
9 looked at a couple different
10 categories there. We looked at
11 would it displace any homes?
12 How many homes are adjacent to
13 this proposed action? How
14 would we impact the community
15 facilities and services out
16 here? The police, fire,
17 ambulance, what would be the
18 impact to those types of
19 features.

20 Socioeconomics also
21 covers art and recreational
22 facilities. As I already
23 mentioned, we go through about
24 4,400 foot section of Moshannon
25 State Forest, obviously a

1 recreational area, as well as
2 the 9.3 miles of Snow Shoe Rail
3 Trail. So we evaluated that in
4 the EIS.

5 The next topic there,
6 environmental justice.
7 Environmental justice is a
8 federal requirement that we
9 need to evaluate that
10 particular category. And what
11 that refers to is what would
12 the project have an impact to
13 minority or low-income
14 populations. So we looked at
15 that down to the block group
16 level, very detailed in all the
17 municipalities. And we didn't
18 find that there was significant
19 concentrations of minority
20 individuals in this part of
21 Clearfield and Centre County.
22 But we did find that there was
23 some concentrations of
24 low-income individuals based on
25 different census statistics

1 that we evaluated. So we
2 evaluated what would that
3 impact be to concentrations of
4 low-income individuals. That's
5 what environmental justice is.

6 Geology and soils,
7 pretty self-explanatory.
8 Hazardous waste sites and
9 materials transport. Hazardous
10 waste sites are sites that
11 already exist. That's what we
12 mean by that. For example, it
13 could be an automotive repair
14 place, just as an example, like
15 underground storage tanks or a
16 gas station or any kind of
17 industrial facility that has
18 contaminated groundwater that
19 contaminated soil. Those are
20 the kinds of facilities we
21 evaluated.

22 There's a process we go
23 through to identify places like
24 that and then find out what is
25 their proximity to the rail

1 line. Additionally, hazardous
2 materials transport, what is
3 this project going to be
4 hauling? Are we hauling
5 hazardous materials? So that's
6 what we look at in that
7 category.

8 Finally our last
9 environmental category is
10 historic and cultural
11 resources, and I already
12 mentioned that the 20-mile rail
13 line, the old Beech Creek
14 Railroad, as it's referred to,
15 we did identify that as being a
16 national register element
17 historic railroad on it, so we
18 had to assess what would be the
19 effect of this project on that
20 rail line. So those are the
21 environmental resource
22 categories that we worked
23 through in the EIS.

24 Next slide, please.

25 When we worked through all that

1 --- and I don't expect you to
2 be able to see this. This is
3 our environmental impact
4 summary table. It's also on
5 the board right over here.
6 It's also in chapters two and
7 four of the Draft EIS.

8 Essentially what we did,
9 we took all of those
10 environmental resource
11 categories and evaluated them
12 across the board. How would
13 the proposed action affect all
14 those, the modified proposed
15 action, the local road,
16 improving the local road
17 alternative, as well as a
18 no-action alternative. No
19 action is exactly what you
20 think it is, doing nothing at
21 all. Nothing at all gets done.

22 And when we evaluated
23 all of these alternatives and
24 all of these resource
25 categories, apart from the

1 no-action alternative, which
2 doesn't necessarily meet the
3 need what we identified is that
4 the modified proposed action,
5 that alternate route from
6 Philipsburg to Munson, we
7 identify that as the
8 environmentally preferable
9 alternative in this draft EIS.

10 And very quickly, one of
11 the main reasons that we
12 identified that alternative,
13 that modified proposed action
14 as the environmental preferable
15 alternative is because of this
16 comparative analysis and the
17 proposed action, when we look
18 at the number of adjacent homes
19 as well as the number of public
20 road and private driveway
21 crossings, the modified
22 proposed action has
23 significantly less homes
24 adjacent to it and
25 significantly fewer public road

1 and private driveway crossings.

2 Next slide, please. So
3 essentially that's the EIS
4 process. That's what we did.
5 And we're here to hear your
6 testimony on that EIS. So with
7 that, we're going to turn it
8 back over to Lynne, and we'll
9 get started with the comment.

10 MS. SINGER:

11 Thanks, Kevin. I know
12 that three minutes is not a
13 real long time to talk. For
14 those of you that had prepared
15 comments longer than three
16 minutes, you can submit them
17 and they will be entered into
18 the public record in their
19 entirety, and they will be
20 considered during the
21 preparation of the Final EIS.
22 So it's not like you prepared
23 something for naught. You
24 know, just turn it in submit it
25 to us, and it will be reviewed.

1 Here's our procedure ---
2 now, this is also on the
3 handout that you have. Again,
4 it's pretty straightforward.
5 I'm going to call your name.
6 And in the order in which you
7 signed up --- and you can come
8 up and take a microphone, state
9 your name and preferably the
10 group that you are affiliated
11 with. If you are just a
12 private citizen, that's fine,
13 just say that you're
14 representing yourself. And
15 spell your name, please. And
16 then we'll have our little
17 light timer go for you.

18 And Alan Stewart, I
19 believe, is our first
20 presenter.

21 MR. STEWART:

22 Alan Stewart,
23 S-T-E-W-A-R-T. I am a chairman
24 of the Headwater Charitable
25 Trust. The Trust is the

1 organization, Snow Shoe Rails
2 to Trails trail system. The
3 Trust has invested years of
4 effort and hundreds of
5 thousands of dollars into the
6 development, improvement and
7 maintenance of the Snow Shoe
8 Rails and Trails System. The
9 Trust --- this trail system is
10 one of our greatest successes
11 for the following three
12 reasons.

13 First, the trail system
14 has become a major recreational
15 asset to the local communities
16 and a regional asset, drawing
17 users from a much larger area
18 including Pennsylvania and
19 surrounding states. Second,
20 the trail system is estimated
21 to bring at least \$8 million
22 annually to the surrounding
23 local communities. Third, the
24 trail system provides an
25 important recreational link

1 between communities.

2 Further, this rail
3 section is a vital link in
4 approximately 95 miles of other
5 trail system and creates a 126
6 mile connected trail system.

7 A condition to replace
8 --- or a replacement of a
9 suitable trail is imperative
10 for the recreational, economic
11 and community link aspects that
12 this trail system provides.

13 Additionally,
14 Headwater's Charitable Trust
15 has spent \$555,000 in costs to
16 repair the Peale Tunnel, which
17 was in a state of collapse. If
18 the --- if the Rails to Trails
19 System is reactivated, the
20 Trust is required to repay
21 \$550,000 of transportation
22 enhancement funds, which were
23 spent on the Peale Tunnel work.

24 The Trust does not
25 oppose or support the

1 reactivation of the 9.3 mile
2 section, rather we request that
3 if the surface Transportation
4 Board should rule to reactivate
5 a 9.3 section as part of the
6 ruling, the Surface
7 Transportation Board should
8 require their new trail users
9 to do two things. One, replace
10 the trail taken with a suitable
11 trail to reconnect the
12 otherwise 126 mile trail
13 system. And second, repay the
14 trust \$550,000 so that we can
15 meet our obligations to repay
16 the Transportation Enhancement
17 funding.

18 MS. SINGER:

19 Thank you, Alan.

20 MR. STEWART:

21 Thank you for the
22 opportunity to speak.

23 MS. SINGER:

24 Thank you. I forgot to
25 mention you need to turn off

1 cell phones. Okay. Now, you
2 know, correct me if I
3 mispronounce your name also,
4 but this one seems pretty easy.
5 Lonnn Ward.

6 MR. WARD:

7 Thank you. And you got
8 it right. I'm not representing
9 anybody. L-O-N W-A-R-D. Well,
10 I'm here to express my support
11 for the reactivation and
12 construction of the Beech
13 Creek. I wrote to the
14 Transportation and the Surface
15 Transportation Board over two
16 years ago in support of the
17 project, and I haven't changed
18 my mind.

19 As noted in previous
20 documentation, the right to
21 activate and reuse these lines
22 is well-documented and legal.
23 These laws are established
24 after the bankruptcy. These
25 are future rail uses.

1 What wasn't clear or
2 thought about was the need to
3 make the environmental impacts
4 of these restored lines. The
5 draft of our impact statement
6 has studied in great detail
7 these potential impacts. I ask
8 that you detail and require
9 steps must occur. Whether it
10 is remediation, mitigation,
11 replacement or abandon, not
12 drag this process out any
13 longer.

14 The potential local
15 economic benefits in this
16 action would include jobs which
17 we desperately need and would
18 also increase the local tax
19 base. This structure whereby
20 abandoned and unused sitings to
21 tie into this line can be
22 utilized as well in the
23 industry.

24 Lastly, please remember
25 it removes over four truck from

1 the highway and the community
2 train removes approximately 430
3 trucks from our highway system.
4 Thank you.

5 MS. SINGER:

6 Thank you, Lon. Art
7 Beveridge. And please spell
8 your name and tell us your
9 affiliation.

10 MR. BEVERIDGE:

11 Is Art Beveridge,
12 B-E-V-E-R-I-D-G-E. Moshannon
13 Creek Watershed Coalition. I
14 am here tonight representing
15 the Moshannon Water Coalition.
16 We intend to submit a detailed
17 written testimony but would
18 like to emphasize the following
19 verbal comments.

20 The Moshannon Creek
21 Watershed Coalition has great
22 concerns about the impacts of
23 this proposed activity to good
24 quality local streams. The
25 proposed rail alignment will

1 traverse a large portion of the
2 Moshannon Creek watershed,
3 which will cross several
4 headwater streams. We cite the
5 example of the Norfolk Southern
6 Railroad accident that spilled
7 \$42,000 gallons of hydrogen ---
8 sodium hydrogen that killed
9 every living organism for
10 several miles in the Portage
11 Creek and Driftwood Branch of
12 the Sinnemahoning Creek in
13 2006.

14 The rail alignment will
15 be crossing over or near high
16 quality trout streams, such as
17 Laurel Run, Black Bear Run, Six
18 Mile Run and Black Moshannon
19 Creek that are precious natural
20 resources in our community.
21 High quality streams that are
22 not affected by acid mine
23 drainage are rare in this area.
24 Streams such as Emigh Run have
25 been restored through

1 reclamation and treatment
2 activities. We ask that any
3 decision carefully consider the
4 impacts of a spill of just one
5 rail car carrying frac water or
6 other chemicals such as
7 peroxide.

8 A spill of this nature
9 has the potential to create
10 irreversible harm to these
11 streams. While such accidents
12 are rare, the 2006 spill showed
13 that these accidents can
14 happen. We ask that the
15 impacts to local streams be
16 avoided.

17 The EIS states that no
18 hazardous waste will be shipped
19 on the line, and we ask that a
20 hazardous waste problem will be
21 a requirement for the use of
22 the line. We thank you.

23 MS. SINGER:

24 Thank you, Art. Phil
25 Glass.

1 MR. GLASS:

2 Good evening, ladies and
3 gentlemen. I'm Phil Glass.
4 I'm a member of Railways to
5 Yesterday, Incorporated. I
6 won't keep you in suspense
7 about my feeling about this.
8 I'm in favor of the rail line.
9 I've been a rail
10 preservationist, have been a
11 for a long time, 50 years or
12 so. I'm a retired professor of
13 engineering physics, a couple
14 of universities you've never
15 heard of, but we won't get into
16 that.

17 But the issue I would
18 like to bring before you in my
19 allotted three minutes is this.
20 No matter what people say or
21 feel or get animated about
22 concerning the environmental
23 impacts of this issue,
24 understand that if we use the
25 alternate suggestion route from

1 Philippsburg up to Munson
2 through Gorton, 97 percent or
3 more of the environmental
4 impacts have already been
5 incurred. These rail lines
6 were built in the 1880s.
7 That's 120 years ago. And the
8 fish have gotten used to it and
9 so have the birds and so have
10 the people, their ancestors
11 participated in the
12 construction of this system.

13 A rail is painfully
14 efficient in terms of using a
15 minimum amount of real estate
16 and producing a maximum amount
17 of transportation for a gallon
18 of fuel per unit of
19 aggregation.

20 So it is my proposal
21 that no matter what is the
22 consequence to one particular
23 fish or one particular fowl,
24 nearly all 97 percent of it has
25 already been incurred. The

1 rail lines have already exist,
2 and many of them existed into
3 the 1970 and '80s. So there
4 isn't terribly much yet to be
5 worried about in my humble
6 opinion. But you've heard my
7 humble opinion. Thank you very
8 much.

9 MS. SINGER:

10 Thank you, Phil. Mitch
11 Harvey.

12 MR. HARVEY:

13 Thank you. M-I-T-C-H
14 H-A-R-V-E-Y. I represent RES
15 Coal. We're principally in
16 Clearfield and Centre Counties.
17 We have about 55 employees and
18 about 30,000 loads a month, and
19 we ship coal by rail and by
20 truck. The rail lines is, as I
21 see it proposed in drawings
22 here, travels through some of
23 our active line mining area and
24 also into areas where we had to
25 look for coal, so we would like

1 to support the project.
2 Certainly, it has been
3 mentioned, could add jobs and
4 all that stuff, but it
5 definitely would add to help,
6 transportation advantages and
7 mining for our coal. Thank
8 you.

9 MS. SINGER:

10 Thank you, Mitch.
11 Sharon Josefik. Did I
12 pronounce that right?

13 MS. JOSEFIK:

14 Good evening. My name
15 is Sharon Josefik, S-H-A-R-O-N
16 J-O-S-E-F-I-K. I represent
17 Central Counties Concerned
18 Sportsmen. I am their
19 secretary, and I am their
20 co-chairman of public
21 relations. We entail over
22 10,000 members. Of that 10,000
23 members, approximately 92
24 percent of them I am
25 representing tonight.

1 The area in question for
2 the train route are areas that
3 are natural Cranberry wild,
4 wildlife that we hunt. The
5 wildlife that we hunt brings in
6 people who buy camps, people
7 who purchase products at the
8 local area and people who end
9 up staying and living with us.

10 They also impact the
11 area called Black Bear Run,
12 which I have the things were
13 impacted there that is strange.
14 That means it has never been
15 impacted by anything at any
16 time in any place. That is the
17 type of water we are not
18 preserving. That is the only
19 one we have left. And that
20 fellow that mentioned it
21 doesn't matter, it doesn't
22 matter, I don't want Pittsburgh
23 water. Thank you very much.

24 MS. SINGER:

25 Thank you, Sharon.

1 Michael Savage. Michael?

2 MR. SAVAGE:

3 Good evening. My name
4 is Michael Savage. I'm here as
5 a private citizen M-I-C-H-A-E-L
6 S-A-V-A-G-E. I feel like the
7 unwelcome person at the family
8 reunion, because my comments
9 are pretty negative. I'm very
10 disappointed. Much of it is
11 based on incomplete or outdated
12 information. For example, the
13 assertions made that the U.S.
14 Corps of Engineers and the
15 Federal Highway Administration,
16 along with the STB have, quote,
17 unquote, prepared the EIS.
18 However, there is no
19 documentation in the EIS to
20 support this degree of
21 involvement. In fact, the
22 Corps of Engineers has advised
23 the STB that the USCOE has
24 withdrawn as a cooperating
25 agency for the EIS, and the

1 Federal Highway Administration
2 will probably limit its
3 comments to highway matters.

4 The STB refuses to
5 recognize that the potential
6 environmental impacts of the
7 rail reactivation and proposed
8 uses are connected actions.
9 This view is not supported by
10 many of the other federal
11 agencies, and I'm confident
12 that several will make this
13 point in their comments. Who
14 really believes that the
15 railroad is going to be built
16 has not heard of the uses.

17 To support its analysis,
18 the EIS treats the proposed
19 uses as though they are set in
20 stone. On page one it says,
21 these facilities are currently
22 being developed. In fact, as
23 recently as August 31st, The
24 Centre Daily Times reported
25 that the developer who had

1 proposed building a landfill in
2 Rush Township said the project
3 has changed direction, and the
4 company is now working on plans
5 for a waste to ethanol plant.
6 Further, the water plant to
7 keep frac water mentioned in
8 the draft EIS has never been
9 permitted, although the EIS
10 indicates that up to 99
11 railroad cars full of frac
12 water could be transported
13 daily.

14 This brings up another
15 point. No mention is made in
16 the Draft EIS of the
17 possibility of gas well
18 drilling on the site. Yet
19 several wells are either
20 planned or operating in the
21 vicinity. As we all know,
22 mountain hydrology is not an
23 exact science. Possible spills
24 could create environmental
25 disasters. Thank you.

1 MS. SINGER:

2 Thank you, Michael.

3 Okay. Ed Peters.

4 MR. PETERS:

5 My name is Ed Peters,
6 E-D P-E-T-E-R-S. I'm here
7 tonight representing myself.
8 And I don't know technical
9 jargon, but what I find in my
10 experience with dealing in
11 these environmental matters is
12 it's usually the standards are
13 far above what --- below what's
14 comfortable living. And I find
15 a lot of times even those
16 things are improved, they're
17 difficult to live around.

18 And I don't have so much
19 comments as I do a series of
20 questions. One, will the train
21 sit on the track at any point
22 along this proposed rail and
23 also, will it be going through
24 woodland and swells. These are
25 two communities that are going

1 to be impacted heavily, and
2 they're not even mentioned in
3 this. Third, we'll be running
4 early in the morning and late
5 at night? With the noise at
6 hours when people are trying to
7 sleep. Will the train be
8 closed or open? Basically this
9 boils down to is it going to be
10 sealed? I feel that the cars
11 should be sealed tight. And
12 will the horn be sounding at
13 private crossings as well as
14 public crossings, especially if
15 it's early in the morning. And
16 that's all the comments I have.
17 Thank you.

18 MS. SINGER:

19 Thank you, Ed. Maryann
20 Williams.

21 MS. WILLIAMS:

22 Yes. My name is Maryann
23 Williams. I'm a private
24 citizen, and I'm member of a
25 certain group, but I'm not

1 speaking for them. But as a
2 member of a group I'm
3 expressing concerns. Okay. My
4 comments are directed at trash
5 trains throughout our region,
6 homes and businesses and our
7 recreational attractions. What
8 exactly will the train
9 transport? It won't be
10 anything that as the little
11 engine that could. Not lumber,
12 not coal, not animals, no
13 packages.

14 Every fellow, even an
15 empty garbage truck on the hot
16 day, imagine how 17,000 pounds
17 of toxic waste will be
18 permeated with odors. Train
19 cars do leak fluids, do jump
20 tracks, do cause evacuation.

21 I note that the
22 Pennsylvania Bureau of Forestry
23 and EC&R have current warnings
24 on camping firewood due to
25 invasive insect problems. I'm

1 not saying out-of-state trash
2 is a good idea also.

3 Also the trains ramble
4 --- as the trains ramble from
5 the Boston area to Philipsburg,
6 what --- how many rail
7 crossings will be near Route 53
8 and the Ninth Street Bridge
9 above the Old Burke and Spice
10 Shop (phonetic).

11 However, mass or not,
12 route specific at this point
13 but should be public. Consider
14 the decimal of train and the
15 speed of the train and possible
16 stalling of train for an
17 extended period along the
18 already congested Route 53.
19 And as a train meanders
20 through, Cooper Township will
21 be impacted. Some mitigations
22 have been offered, such an
23 installing fences. No,
24 everyone should watch the
25 upcoming moving Unstoppable,

1 which is filmed not far from
2 here and made it a good
3 precursor.

4 Recreation, as a member
5 of a hiking group as a mountain
6 hiker, what would the trash
7 train create? One major
8 recreational impact we won't
9 mention here would be the
10 Pennsylvania famous 49 mile
11 Allegheny Front Trail, which
12 would impact the transmitting
13 of out-of-state hikers as well
14 as local hikers. The trail is
15 basically surrounding Black
16 Moshannon State Park, has many
17 harmful visitors, one of which
18 is the train from the Allegheny
19 company. Am I up?

20 MS. SINGER:

21 Thank you, Maryann.

22 Your name?

23 MS. BARBIN:

24 Michelle Barbin. Good
25 evening. I'm not used to being

1 so freely ---. Okay. It's
2 clear the purpose of this rail
3 line is to run trash trains
4 from New York and New Jersey
5 City to a giant manhole as part
6 of Resource Recovery. The
7 funding source of this rail
8 line is Resource Recovery. In
9 fact, without Resource Recovery
10 initiatives and funding, there
11 would be no STB position.

12 This strategy was a
13 backdoor approach to Resource
14 Recovery successive attempts to
15 get this proposed landfill
16 permitted by the Pennsylvania
17 Department of Environmental
18 Protection. From 2004, when
19 Resource Recovery first
20 announced plans for a landfill,
21 trash delivery to be by road.

22 To achieve this,
23 Resource Recovery proposed to
24 fund and build a dedicated a
25 plan in the community of

1 Gorton. Resource Recovery
2 failed to get the approval from
3 the Centre County Commissioners
4 Planning Office, MPO and the
5 Federal Highway Administration
6 among others. As a result DEP
7 suspended the application in
8 October 2006 until Resource
9 Recovery consulted and verified
10 their railroad issue.

11 Without this rail line,
12 Resource Recovery's chances for
13 a landfill permit of any
14 significant amount of tonnage
15 are virtually nil. Resource
16 Recovery augmented their STB
17 petition with letters from
18 potential rail line users, they
19 hoped to convince the Surface
20 Transportation Board to get a
21 rail line would justify the
22 massive landfill being a
23 customer. Although most of
24 these letters of endorsement
25 may be well intentioned, they

1 are at best minor uses of the
2 rail line.

3 The result is, by law,
4 Surface Transportation Board
5 analyses must assess the
6 impacts, must affect the rail
7 line system which directly
8 links. The rail line cannot be
9 used as separate single action
10 which would allow the
11 environmental impact of the
12 rail line construction and
13 operation and exclude the
14 impacts of the landfill and
15 cargo. Instead, as
16 appropriate, the Surface
17 Transportation Board's only
18 regulations, the rail line
19 construction operations haul
20 and full range of landfill
21 operations must be viewed as an
22 independent connection action
23 because the rail line purpose
24 and justification is to service
25 the landfill, the only

1 significant shipper of record
2 in the Draft EIS.

3 MS. SINGER:

4 Trilby Mayes.

5 MS. MAYES:

6 T-R-I-L-B-Y M-A-Y-E-S.

7 I'm representing the Snow Shoe
8 Rails to Trails, and I'm also a
9 Centre County Solid Waste
10 Authority board member, and I
11 was part of the committee for
12 Centre County.

13 We are the managers of
14 the of the trail. Our
15 membership grew from 85 members
16 our first year to over 3,000
17 cardholders this past year. We
18 think that we're doing a very
19 good service for the community.
20 We are providing an area where
21 families could come and relax
22 and enjoy nature with their
23 family. And we have doctors,
24 lawyers, all walks of life are
25 with our trail. And we have

1 --- bring in economic dollars
2 which is desperately needed.
3 We have over 40 corporate
4 sponsors. We have businesses
5 that are calling us nightly to
6 become a corporate sponsor.

7 In 2006 we lost 900
8 acres to Black Moshannon
9 Forest, and we were promised an
10 expansion of our trail on this
11 western edge in which we refer
12 to as the eastern end, to us
13 it's the western end. We want
14 to connect from town to town to
15 provide economic impact in
16 these areas for our people who
17 are looking for places to eat
18 and to stay overnight. So 15
19 to 20 more miles were promised
20 to us after we put \$11,000 of
21 our membership money into the
22 Blackberry Trail.

23 We're optimistic that
24 this business connection can be
25 made to provide more in this

1 area and get the ATVs off where
2 they shouldn't be riding.

3 It's been mentioned many
4 times about annual fundraisers.
5 The presence of a Sheriff's ---
6 Centre County Sheriff's Office
7 with our trail, with our safety
8 patrol has been a welcome
9 presence. And we bring them
10 with us in whatever area we
11 come into. We also would like
12 to say that we feel that our
13 trail is of historic
14 significance and people using
15 it feel that this is historical
16 significance. It's all of
17 these proposals completely
18 dismiss our trail.

19 MS. SINGER:

20 Okay. Daniel Pytel.

21 MR. PYTEL:

22 My name is Daniel
23 P-Y-T-E-L. I just want to say
24 that in the Centre region area,
25 I'm from over there, it seems

1 like the FPO, whether it be
2 local people, everybody has
3 been opposing to this. And we
4 keep on, but against it is even
5 with the alternative that
6 they're looking at putting in,
7 the best alternative is going
8 to take 550 trucks off the
9 road. How many is that going
10 to leave on the roads? Is that
11 going to be a lot of roads, a
12 lot of trucks, a lot of added
13 air quality --- we're talking
14 about a lot of problems that
15 could be created throughout the
16 area, and I just want to say
17 that I am opposed to this
18 coming in. Thank you.

19 MS. SINGER:

20 Thank you. Harry
21 Pionko.

22 MR. PIONKE:

23 Harry Pionko, P a s i n
24 P a u l I - O - N - K - E. And speaking
25 for myself, I will compare the

1 assessments of the 12
2 environmental impacts as a
3 group with the assessment of
4 demand or need for the
5 railroad. Both key --- these
6 are key pieces of the EIS. The
7 assessments of the
8 environmental impacts tend
9 toward objective quantitative
10 and fact-based analysis not
11 without flaws however.

12 Nevertheless, assessments of
13 the environmental impact are
14 far stronger than the
15 assessment of demand or need
16 for the railroad.

17 And second, instead the
18 railroad need and demand
19 assessment are subjective
20 unsubstantiated and
21 undocumented except for a few
22 non-committal testimonial
23 letters, and one minor
24 exploratory quarry permit.

25 There are no existing

1 contracts, and otherwise no
2 permits. Much of this
3 supporting argument depends on
4 establishment of RRLLC's
5 landfill and affiliated
6 facilities, which they presume
7 to be pretty much a done deal.
8 It isn't.

9 Consider this fact,
10 RRLLC formally submitted their
11 landfill application May 5th,
12 2006 with construction to be
13 completed by 2008, and
14 operations to be started by
15 2009. They not only never
16 accomplished those goals, but
17 are starting over, which means
18 they have gone backwards.
19 Because RRLLC's projections
20 have been proved not to be
21 credible, why would anyone base
22 the railroad demands and need
23 assessment primarily on their
24 projections?

25 MS. SINGER:

1 Time .

2 MR. PIONKO:

3 I'm sorry?

4 MS. SINGER:

5 Time .

6 MR. PIONKE:

7 Oh, I'm sorry. Give me
8 a second. Because the
9 environmental assessment has
10 value, and the railroad demand
11 and need assessment does not,
12 it changes the EIS and
13 fundamental ways. One of them
14 hurts this assessment more
15 towards sales pitch, albeit an
16 indefensible one. Two, the
17 logically deduced best option
18 is the no action because this
19 causes the least adverse
20 environmental impact as shown
21 on summary tables 2-2 and 4-1.
22 Thus it argues for disapproval
23 of the petition.

24 MS. SINGER:

25 Thank you. Jenn

1 Shufran.

2 MS. SHUFRAN:

3 My name's Jen Shufran.

4 I'm representing myself. And

5 Shufran is S-H-U-F-R-A-N.

6 Sarah Palin and her bridge to

7 nowhere have nothing on this

8 project. Her paragraph one ---

9 of open letter to you, Dear

10 Reader, the Draft EIS states

11 that the proposed rail line is

12 suffering and industrial park

13 currently being developed by

14 RRLLC. Let's take a look at

15 what the status of these three

16 projects being developed means.

17 To date, there's no such

18 quarry and there is not even an

19 application filed with DEP for

20 a quarry. Application 141010

21 filed appropriated is for

22 quarry, which means the

23 applicant intends to use a

24 small area to remove a little

25 material, not ship material.

1 Earlier this year, and there
2 was an exploratory permit on
3 the RRLLC site. When the
4 exploratory work didn't reveal
5 quality stone, the area was
6 closed.

7 At this point the
8 current documentation did not
9 support the applicant's claim
10 of the quarry. The landfill
11 has been in the development
12 phase for over four years, and
13 not one permit has been issued.
14 The landfill application of the
15 DEP has been suspended as of
16 October 2006. Permit
17 applications necessary to
18 support a landfill permitting
19 process have been withdrawn or
20 denied as follows.

21 The sewage plan module
22 was submitted and withdrawn.
23 The wetlands permit was
24 submitted and withdrawn. The
25 Highway Occupancy permit and

1 federal highway approval was
2 denied on the federal highway.
3 In the past four years the
4 access issues with developing
5 this remote RRLLC site have
6 presented challenges. When the
7 use of local roads didn't fly
8 the access then is going to be
9 a new interchange. Now that
10 the interchange isn't flying
11 the access is going to be a
12 rail line. RRLLC never tried
13 to the Federal Highway
14 Administration that the
15 interchange was not a
16 connective action to the
17 proposed landfill. Without the
18 proposed landfill there would
19 never have been a proposed
20 interchange. And just as with
21 the interchange, if it were not
22 for the proposed landfill there
23 would be no proposed rail line.

24 MS. SINGER:

25 Thank you. Rodger

1 Carbright.

2 MR. CARBRIGHT:

3 Rodger Carbright,
4 R-O-D-G-E-R C-A-R-B-R-I-G-H-T.
5 I've been a lifelong resident
6 of Rush Township. I've lived
7 on 3502 Run Pike. I've also
8 been a past supervisor of Rush
9 Township for 12 years. I've
10 also served on Centre County
11 Waste Authority and now act on
12 Central Pennsylvania Community
13 Action and also Central
14 Pennsylvania Development
15 Corporation.

16 I come here --- and
17 basically I'm in favor of the
18 proposal that they have as long
19 as all of the Is are dotted and
20 the Ts are crossed. I'm for
21 progress, and I think that our
22 area needs something more than
23 just everybody turns these
24 factories down and plants,
25 roads as we have them today. I

1 always remind people watch what
2 you wish for. It's not going
3 to come. All we need is more
4 people to get down to
5 Harrisburg and legislation so
6 that those are done properly
7 and not --- but this trip is
8 years ago, but that's one
9 reason that that the trail is
10 out there is because of the
11 stripping it was there years
12 ago and now the rail is gone.

13 Where I live we used to
14 have a railroad going through
15 our town, that's been gone.
16 I'd like to see it come back.
17 I go to Tyrone --- I hear that
18 train whistle blowing over
19 there and people are working,
20 people are moving. And this is
21 for the progress of Rush
22 Township and making very good
23 money to support the township
24 and keep our taxes as they are.
25 And I think that's a good idea

1 to continue to get this rail
2 still. Thank you.

3 MS. SINGER:

4 Thank you.

5 MR. STARNER:

6 The timer is set up
7 according to what we were told.
8 It should be showing two
9 minutes for green. One minute
10 for yellow, but it definitely
11 was running short the last
12 lady. We'll certainly
13 accommodate that.

14 MS. SINGER:

15 Do you want to finish?
16 And then we have a few more
17 people after you. And anyone
18 else that wants to maybe finish
19 theirs that got cut off.

20 MR. STARNER:

21 We're scheduled to be
22 here until 9:00, and it's only
23 ten after 7:00. We will open
24 the floor again.

25 MS. SHUFRAN:

1 Okay. I left off with
2 were it not for the proposed
3 landfill there would be to
4 repair draft treats the two
5 projects as connected the
6 entire document under what
7 technicality is the STB making
8 a decision that the two
9 projects are not connected and
10 should not be evaluated as a
11 connected action. How can our
12 governmental agencies justify
13 setting in these very connected
14 projects to tree connected and
15 evaluated the impact for both?

16 To this dear reader of
17 the Draft EIS, these projects
18 are clearly connected. All one
19 needs to ask is if there isn't
20 a landfill, do we need rail
21 service to this area.
22 Obviously not, because this
23 area hasn't had rail service
24 for years.

25 The only reason this is

1 coming up is because the
2 proposed landfill remains
3 unpermitted. In fact, our
4 RRLLC is changing the
5 definition of what the rail
6 line will serve. Although the
7 original landfill permit has
8 not been withdrawn, RRLLC is
9 now stating that the use for
10 site and trash and ethanol
11 project, which is experimental
12 at best. Are they trying to
13 put a stick on the pig? Is the
14 STB really prepared to approve
15 a rail to nowhere, unpermitted
16 moving target of a project?

17 The mythical industrial
18 park, which does not show up on
19 any RRLLC to permit agencies or
20 a municipality to date. The
21 coming industrial park but not
22 on paper in anywhere. If RRLLC
23 has some industry they need to
24 speak to the development
25 director about locating the

1 already 322 where there are
2 lots of interspaces with brand
3 new infrastructure just waiting
4 for use.

5 The bottom line for all
6 are no permits, there are no
7 contracts and there is no need
8 for this rail line in any of
9 the impact such activation
10 would bring to the area. Thank
11 you.

12 MR. SAVAGE:

13 Okay. Now, I'm going
14 into overtime. As I was just
15 saying, no mention has been
16 made in the Draft EIS of the
17 possibility of gas well
18 drilling on site. As many of
19 you know, several wells are
20 either planned or operating in
21 the vicinity. As we all know,
22 mountain hydrology is not an
23 exact science. Possible spills
24 of frac water, piercing of
25 underground aquifers all point

1 to the possibility of
2 unmitigated disasters.

3 These potential adverse
4 consequences are not addressed
5 in the EIS. I repeat these
6 potential adverse consequences
7 are not addressed in the EIS.
8 I looked many times today under
9 water resources, which I
10 believe is the correct place.
11 I could not find any reference
12 at all to the possibility of
13 poisoning aquifers. Moshannon
14 Lake is only three miles from
15 the proposed site and the
16 municipal water supply is
17 close. By giving all of the
18 unknowns, how can the EIS
19 include in their own the
20 environmental impacts?

21 I urge the STB staff to
22 take these issues into
23 consideration before issuing
24 the final EIS. Thank you.

25 MS. SINGER:

1 Mike Bloom. Mike Bloom
2 from Centre County? Nope.
3 Joyce --- Patrick Coutoriaux.

4 MR. COUTORIAUX:

5 Patrick. I don't have
6 too much. Okay. I was born
7 and raised in Rush Township in
8 the Moshannon Valley. I've
9 hailed into these railroads and
10 all these different whole clean
11 plants and temples all up and
12 down the Moshannon Valley
13 including Winburne, Hawk Run.
14 I've been a township supervisor
15 now for 25 years. And I've
16 seen trucking business. I've
17 seen wholes coming back. This
18 isn't just about the landfills,
19 it's about everything. We need
20 the jobs in the area. We need
21 the jobs.

22 And I'm glad that this
23 is a win-win situation for
24 everybody in Moshannon Valley.
25 And I feel we need this and we

1 need it bad. With the economy
2 the way it is and the high
3 prices of fuel, we need the
4 railroad back. We need it
5 back. You got to have
6 transportation if you are ---
7 if you want jobs.

8 I've lived in this area,
9 and right now we're going
10 through some pretty tough
11 times. And I'll stress over
12 and over we need the jobs, and
13 I'm just hoping that we can get
14 this rail line in. And I heard
15 somebody say nobody gaining
16 here on this in Rush Township.
17 Rush Township's received over
18 \$350,000 so far off of Resource
19 Recovery. Our tax millage in
20 this township is zero for Rush
21 Township.

22 These people moved here,
23 most of them are foreigners
24 that moved into the township,
25 and now they're going to come

1 in here and tell us what to do.
2 But what did they move here for
3 to begin with? I've lived here
4 all my life. I like the place
5 and I want to create as many
6 jobs as I can. Thank you. My
7 last name is
8 C-O-U-T-O-R-I-A-U-X.

9 MS. SINGER:

10 Okay. Ron Brouman.

11 MR. BROURMAN:

12 Thank you. Ron
13 B-R-O-U-R-M-A-N. From State
14 College Pennsylvania, and I'm
15 representing the Sierra Club.
16 First I would like to say I'm a
17 hunter, and that was said
18 earlier the Allegheny French
19 Trail follows a very seedy
20 section of the Moshannon Creek.
21 Hikers, bikers, hunters and
22 fisherman all are appalled with
23 this site and smells of total
24 destruction of the serenity of
25 our forestland. Keystone Trail

1 Association has expressed their
2 written concern for this
3 threat.

4 Also I'd like to say
5 that Resource Recovery, their
6 plans would destroy almost 11
7 acres of wetlands for their
8 proposed 350 acre landfill
9 footprint. Areas proposed
10 quarries and others seem
11 strangely absent from RRLLC's
12 wetland survey conducted in
13 November of 2004. And of these
14 11 acres, 3.6 are regulated
15 wetland, the remaining during
16 this November 2004 survey fall
17 under the jurisdiction of the
18 Department of Environmental
19 Protection.

20 No other Pennsylvania
21 landfill permit applicant has
22 ever proposed to destroy such a
23 large amount of wetland acres.
24 To put this in perspective, did
25 you know that in 1988 only

1 13.69 acres of wetlands were
2 sacrificed in the State of
3 Pennsylvania for all new
4 landfill and expansions?

5 I'd like to say this
6 rail line --- this is a rail
7 line to nowhere without the
8 proposed landfill. Any wetland
9 must be included in the
10 current, although incomplete
11 inventory, even accumulative
12 effect. So let's add these up.
13 What seems to be federal
14 wetlands in this Draft EIS,
15 25,000 feet of is water course
16 flood plain impact for the,
17 quote, unquote, preferred
18 alternative.

19 Now, to destroy more
20 wetlands for the proposed
21 landfill in whatever forms
22 being suggested this week, that
23 all the Pennsylvania since when
24 the beginning of the Regan
25 Administration. This is a rail

1 line to nowhere. There are no
2 significant permits to date
3 that justifies this, and even
4 then it would be highly
5 questionable.

6 And lastly, I would like
7 to say that the
8 industrialization of this acres
9 has costs not addressed.

10 MS. SINGER:

11 Just about time.

12 MR. BROURMAN:

13 Just a few sentences, if
14 I could. The recommendation of
15 a significant factor of the
16 local economy, the loss of
17 about half the Snow Shoe Rail
18 Trail and the revenues that it
19 generates for local business as
20 a travel destination are not
21 addressed objectively in the
22 least.

23 Since 2004, membership
24 in the Snow Shoe has increased
25 about threefold. These are for

1 visitors as well as volunteers
2 who help improve the local
3 economy. And in fact, the
4 resource of the potential
5 western activity --- and it
6 will have an undeniable
7 long-term impact on the
8 viability of this trail as a
9 destination and as local
10 businesses that cater through
11 there. Thank you.

12 MS. SINGER:

13 Thank you, Ron. Now, I
14 do want to remind you that if
15 you have additional comments,
16 we have comment forms that are
17 available on the table out
18 there. If you care to fill
19 them out here tonight, you can
20 leave them in the boxes outside
21 or you can take them home, take
22 your time to fill them out and
23 send them into Danielle.
24 There's an address also on the
25 comment forms. So you don't

1 have to write it down.

2 You can also submit
3 comments online at the Surface
4 Transportation Board website,
5 which is up there, but it's
6 also on your handout that you
7 received tonight. Do you have
8 more comments, Tom? Do you
9 have any more comments,
10 Danielle or Kevin? We thank
11 you all for coming tonight. We
12 really appreciate ---.

13 MR. STARNER:

14 Lynne, is that all that
15 signed up?

16 MS. SINGER:

17 Yes.

18 MR. STARNER:

19 I apologize for the
20 light situation. We'll be here
21 as long as you want to speak.
22 If anyone has anything to say.
23 Do you want to add anything or
24 anyone who hasn't had an
25 opportunity to speak wants to

1 come up and say something? No
2 more comments. One more. Here
3 we go.

4 MR. DEGRASSE:

5 My name is my name is
6 Ernie Degrasse,
7 D-E-G-R-A-S-S-E. And on the
8 new proposed rail line that
9 crosses Ninth Street adding a
10 railroad crossing to an already
11 dangerous intersection that has
12 many accidents per year should
13 be looked at and an alternate
14 route should be found. Thank
15 you.

16 MS. SINGER:

17 Thank you. Anybody
18 else? Thank you very much for
19 joining us tonight. We look
20 forward to any additional
21 comments that you care to
22 submit.

23 * * * * *

24 HEARING CONCLUDED AT 7:30 P.M.

25 * * * * *

CERTIFICATE

I hereby certify, as the
stenographic reporter, that the
foregoing proceedings were taken
stenographically by me, and thereafter
reduced to typewriting by me or under
my direction; and that this transcript
is a true and accurate record to the
best of my ability.

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read "Sarah West". The signature is written in dark ink and is positioned to the right of the main text block.