

Bishop Jack Wisor

5375 Route 219; Brockport, PA 15823

Bishop (814) 590-3898

Church (814) 265-0323

jwisor@windstream.net



First Apostles' Doctrine Church

Bishop Jack Wisor Ministries

Heaven's Acres Homesteading

IRA Ministry Publications

Pittsburgh Outreach to Homeless

All Welcomed / Non-Denominational

2021

310702

January 12, 2025

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 12, 2026

Part of

Public Record

Re: STB Docket No. FD 36833 Lampwrights LLC– Construction and Operation Exemption–In Elk and Jefferson Counties, PA

Dear Chief of Case Administration:

I am writing to make the Board aware of a serious environmental concern and a question that I have posed before, and to which no response has ever been received.

The following is taken verbatim from Lampwrights' response letter to the OEA of September 19, 2025.

4. Alternatives Considered

Provide details on any other rail alignments considered and dismissed. Include a description of any other alignments considered with location maps and the reason for dismissing the alignment.

(Response)

"No other rail alignments have been considered because Lampwrights is utilizing an abandoned rail bed. One additional railyard site was considered because of its proximity to the landfill site. But Lampwrights decided against it because the proposed railyard adversely impacted waterways and wetlands and its location resulted in increased haul distances for landfill activities."

I, and many others have raised this issue:

"Since Lampwrights chose an alternative railyard site because of the presence of wetlands in their location of first choice, why did Lampwrights not consider alternative routes for the rail line, since wetlands are extensively present throughout the land owned by private citizens where a rail bed and right of way once existed, but reverted to private ownership of the citizens. (**Elk County Court of Common Pleas Ruling of March 2, 1990,**

No.7 89-163). There is no abandoned rail bed as Lampwrights claimed in its statement to the OEA. Also, the area that Lampwrights is proposing for the rail line is historically subject to major flooding.”

“Furthermore, while the OEA conducted a site visit of the proposed project area on June 17, 2025, and the extensive existence of wetlands would have been clearly evident on the citizens’ land that was at one time a rail bed, how and why could the OEA have granted Lampwrights an Environmental Impact Statement Waiver on July 8, 2025, and instead, allowed the project to be reviewed under an abbreviated Environmental Assessment?”
“Additionally, during the environmental comment period, there were multiple property owners who provided evidence to the OEA, including pictures, of the major flooding that has occurred in the area of Lampwrights’ proposed rail line.”

On September 25, 2025, along with Tom Parolari, I met with Todd Hill (Environmental Services Manager for VHB, the 3rd party consultant retained by the OEA and Lampwrights to assist the OEA in its environmental review of the project) while he was in his truck in the parking lot by PA Route 153.

I asked Todd Hill why Lampwrights rejected a site for a railyard because it was not suitable because of wetlands issues and the impact on waterways – but Lampwrights did not reject the site for the main line of the track along the former right of way, “the citizens’ properties”, in spite of extensive wetlands (which he confirmed to be true). He said he would look into it.

I have attempted to contact Todd Hill three times since this initial discussion, but he has not returned any of the messages or provided any information about why this inconsistency in Lampwrights’ approach was allowed.

In a conversation that Tom Parolari and Carl Colson had with Todd Hill, Mr. Hill acknowledged that “this is all wetlands here” – referring to the one-time rail bed where the proposed rail line would need to be constructed.

To summarize the two key points/unanswered questions:

1. Why did Lampwrights not consider alternative routes for the proposed rail line in spite of extensive existence of wetlands and a history of major flood events on the private lands that the line would need to run through?
2. Why did the OEA grant a waiver of the Environmental Impact Statement, with its knowledge of the extensive existence of wetlands and a history of major flood events throughout the proposed project area?

I respectfully request your consideration of these seriously concerning unanswered questions in your deliberation of Lampwrights’ petition for exemption.

Sincerely,

Bishop Jack Wisor

Cc: All parties of record