

**Exhibit No. ____ (KH-1)
Dockets TR-100127,
TR-100128, TR-100129, and
TR-100131 (*consolidated*)
Witness: Kathy Hunter**

BEFORE THE WASHINGTON UTILITIES AND TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION

**WASHINGTON STATE DEPARTMENT
OF TRANSPORTATION,**

Petitioner,

v.

**CENTRAL PUGET SOUND REGIONAL
TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY
AND THE CITIES OF LAKEWOOD
AND DUPONT,**

Respondents.

**DOCKETS TR-100127,
TR-100128, TR-100129 and
TR-100131 (*consolidated*)**

TESTIMONY OF

KATHY HUNTER

STAFF OF

**WASHINGTON UTILITIES AND
TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION**

May 7, 2010

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. INTRODUCTION 1

II. DIAGNOSTIC REVIEWS OF THE POINT DEFIANCE
BYPASS PROJECT CROSSING 3

III. UTC CONSIDERATION OF PETITIONS TO MODIFY
CROSSINGS ASSOCIATED WITH THE POINT
DEFIANCE BYPASS PROJECT..... 11

IV. UTC CONSIDERATION OF TRAIN SPEED 15

V. GRADE SEPARATION..... 20

VI. CONCLUSION..... 22

1 **I. INTRODUCTION**

2

3 **Q. Please state your name and business address.**

4 A. My name is Kathy Hunter and my business address is 1300 South Evergreen Park
5 Drive Southwest, Olympia, Washington 98504-7250.

6

7 **Q. Where do you work?**

8 A. I work for the Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC).

9

10 **Q. How long have you worked for the UTC?**

11 A. I have worked for the UTC for 21 years.

12

13 **Q. What is your current title?**

14 A. I am the Deputy Assistant Director, Transportation Safety.

15

16 **Q. What is your work history at the UTC?**

17 A. I began my career working in agency-wide administration and management. I did
18 that for 12 years. In July 2001, I was promoted to a manager position that included
19 work in Transportation Safety. In June 2006, I transferred to a management position
20 that focused exclusively on Transportation Safety, including a workload of rail safety
21 dockets. My workload included petitions for crossing modifications. In November
22 2008, I was promoted to my current position of Deputy Assistant Director,

1 Transportation Safety. Since that time, I have been responsible for supervision of the
2 rail safety staff and for all rail safety dockets.

3

4 **Q. How do your job duties relate to rail safety?**

5 A. I have worked on rail safety matters since June 2006. My work in railroad safety has
6 involved a combination of field work, policy work, and supervision. I conduct field
7 visits to existing and potential crossing locations, high pedestrian trespass areas,
8 locations of potential quiet zones, and any other location that may affect the safety of
9 the railroad or the general public. I review the conditions at the location and make
10 recommendations to improve safety, generally by conducting a diagnostic review.

11 My policy work includes policy development and analysis performed at the direction
12 of the Director of Safety and Consumer Protection and the Assistant Director for
13 Transportation Safety. It generally involves research and analysis, including drafting
14 white papers or memorandums, regarding rail safety issues such as conditions of
15 crossings, crossing consolidations, and similar issues. I also conduct policy work in
16 evaluating applications for grade crossing safety grant money. I directly supervise
17 six railroad safety professionals. These positions include four Federal Railroad
18 Administration (FRA) certified inspectors, a Program Specialist 5, and a
19 Transportation Specialist 2.

20

21 **Q. Do you have any special training in rail safety?**

22 A. Yes.

23

1 **Q. What is that training?**

2 A. I have attended several courses offered by the University of Wisconsin, Railroad
3 Engineering and Highway Rail Grade Crossing Safety. I have also attended about
4 six national conferences related to railroad safety, as well as a course on
5 Interconnection of Highway Rail Grade Crossing Warning Signals and Highway
6 Traffic Signals. Annually, I attend the Association of State Rail Safety Managers'
7 conference sponsored by the Federal Railroad Administration.

8

9 **Q. How does your experience directly apply to these dockets?**

10 A. Since June 2006, I have been the lead investigator on 206 rail petitions and have
11 participated in 223 diagnostic reviews.

12

13 **Q. What is the purpose of your testimony?**

14 A. The purpose of my testimony is to make a recommendation on the proposed
15 modifications outlined in the petitions in these consolidated dockets.

16

17 **II. DIAGNOSTIC REVIEWS OF THE POINT DEFIANCE**
18 **BYPASS PROJECT CROSSING**

19

20 **Q. What four crossings does this proceeding encompass?**

21 A. The crossings and associated United States Department of Transportation crossing
22 numbers are:

23 1. Clover Creek Drive SW, City of Lakewood, USDOT number 085822W

24 2. Berkeley Street SW, City of Lakewood, USDOT number 085829U

1 3. North Thorne Lane SW, City of Lakewood, USDOT number 085828M

2 4. Barksdale Avenue, City of DuPont, USDOT number 085836E

3

4 **Q. Does the UTC keep inventory records for highway-rail crossings?**

5 A. Yes. UTC staff manages inventory records for public highway-rail grade crossings
6 located in the State of Washington.

7

8 **Q. How does the UTC get the information that is contained in the inventory
9 records?**

10 A. UTC staff receives updates to the inventory through several channels. For example,
11 staff performs routine inspections of all public crossings every three years. If a
12 change is noted as part of this inspection process, the inventory is updated. If the
13 UTC approves the opening, closing or reconfiguration of a crossing, the inventory is
14 updated. Also, if there is an accident at the crossing, that information is added to the
15 inventory. Finally, railroads may notify UTC directly about a change at a crossing.

16

17 **Q. Do you have current UTC inventory records for each crossing involved in this
18 proceeding?**

19 A. Yes, I do. Exhibit No. ____ (KH-2) is a copy of the UTC inventory records for the
20 four crossings involved in this proceeding.

21

1 **Q. Do you have photographs of each of the crossings involved in these dockets?**

2 A. Yes, I do. Exhibit No. ____ (KH-3) is eight photographs of the Clover Creek Drive
3 SW crossing. Exhibit No. ____ (KH-4) is eight photographs of the Berkeley Street
4 SW crossing. Exhibit No. ____ (KH-5) is eight photographs of the Thorne Lane SW
5 crossing. Exhibit No. ____ (KH-6) is 11 photographs of the Barksdale Avenue
6 crossing.

7
8 **Q. Who took the photographs in Exhibit Nos. ____ (KH-3) through (KH-6)?**

9 A. UTC staff, Robert Johnston.
10

11 **Q. Does Mr. Johnston work for you?**

12 A. Yes, I am Mr. Johnston's supervisor.
13

14 **Q. Did you ask Mr. Johnston to take the photographs?**

15 A. Yes.
16

17 **Q. When were the photographs in Exhibit Nos. ____ (KH-3) through (KH-6) taken?**

18 A. April 27, 2010.
19

20 **Q. Have you visited the crossings at issue in these dockets?**

21 A. Yes.
22

1 **Q. When did you do that?**

2 A. June 12, 2008.

3

4 **Q. Do the photographs in Exhibit Nos. ____ (KH-3) through (KH-6) accurately**
5 **depict the conditions at the crossings as you recall them?**

6 A. Yes.

7

8 **Q. When did UTC staff first become aware of the Point Defiance Bypass Project?**

9 A. In 2006, we were asked to participate in a diagnostic review to look at all of the
10 crossings encompassed by the Project.

11

12 **Q. What, specifically, is a diagnostic review?**

13 A. A diagnostic review is when a team of experienced and knowledgeable individuals
14 from interested agencies meet on-site at a crossing to review the current conditions
15 and make observations and recommendations to determine whether a specific
16 proposed modification is warranted and whether measures can be taken to maintain
17 or improve safety at the crossing. Generally, the team consists of the local or state
18 road authority, the agency making the proposal, UTC staff, and the railroad. The
19 team considers a number of factors, including the crossing configuration and
20 physical characteristics, vehicle and train traffic patterns and operations at the
21 crossing, the crossing approach zone, and traffic control devices such as pavement
22 markings and signs or signals.

23

1 **Q. Are you familiar with a publication called the “Railroad-Highway Grade**
2 **Crossing Handbook?”**

3 A. Yes, I use it often. It is published by the United States Department of
4 Transportation, Federal Highway Administration. I understand that it is available on
5 the internet at http://safety.fhwa.dot.gov/xings/com_roaduser/07010/.

6

7 **Q. Does the Railroad-Highway Grade Crossing Handbook contain any**
8 **recommendations about diagnostic reviews?**

9 A. Yes. Section III.C, which begins at page 62, recommends the diagnostic review
10 approach to examining conditions at crossings, including an assessment of existing
11 and potential hazards. The UTC follows that recommendation.

12

13 **Q. Did the UTC participate in the diagnostic review in 2006?**

14 A. While we did not participate directly, we ensured that our interests were represented
15 in a diagnostic review at the sites in 2006. Specifically, on September 20, 2006, a
16 number of individuals met at the crossings to conduct diagnostic reviews.

17 Unfortunately, due to scheduling conflicts, no current UTC staff person was able to
18 attend. However, we coordinated with Ahmer Nizam, a Washington State
19 Department of Transportation (WSDOT) employee, to represent the interests of UTC
20 staff in the diagnostic review. Mr. Nizam was employed by UTC in the Rail Safety
21 section for almost six years before he left in July 2005, to work for the rail section at
22 WSDOT. While employed at the UTC, Mr. Nizam was assigned the lead
23 investigator for all crossing modification petitions. As the lead, he regularly

1 conducted diagnostic reviews at railroad crossings. Mr. Nizam agreed to represent
2 the interests of UTC staff at the diagnostic review in 2006.

3

4 **Q. Did any participant make notes of the meeting on September 20, 2006, and**
5 **share those with UTC?**

6 A. Yes. Exhibit No. ____ (KH-7), "Point Defiance Bypass Project Grade Crossing
7 Diagnostic Meeting Notes," is a copy of those notes.

8

9 **Q. Based on your experience and in participating in diagnostic reviews, do you**
10 **have an opinion on the quality of the 2006 diagnostic review?**

11 A. Yes, I do.

12

13 **Q. What is that opinion?**

14 A. The diagnostic review and resulting team notes made as a result of the 2006 site visit
15 are comprehensive, thorough, and one of the most inclusive reviews I have seen. For
16 each crossing, the team identified the crossing by location, included a photograph of
17 the crossing, and explained both current and proposed crossing conditions.

18

19 **Q. Did the diagnostic review and resulting meeting notes cover only those crossings**
20 **that are the subject of the petitions in these dockets?**

21 A. No. The diagnostic review and resulting meeting notes covered more than just these
22 four crossings.

23

1 **Q. Please explain.**

2 A. The diagnostic review and resulting meeting notes included ten crossings—the four
3 crossings listed in the petitions in these dockets and the following six crossings:

4 1. South 74th Street

5 2. Steilacoom Boulevard SW

6 3. 100th Street SW

7 4. 108th Street SW

8 5. Bridgeport Way SW

9 6. 41st Division Drive

10

11 **Q. Why did the team conduct a diagnostic review at all of these crossings?**

12 A. The team took a systems approach to the diagnostic review and included all
13 crossings in the Lakeview Subdivision Rail Corridor. Exhibit No. ____ (KH-8) is a
14 map that shows all of the crossings along the corridor, including grade-separated as
15 well as at-grade crossings.

16

17 **Q. Is the information on Exhibit No. ____ (KH-8) consistent with the UTC inventory
18 records?**

19 A. Yes.

20

21 **Q. Are all of the at-grade railroad crossings shown on Exhibit No. ____ (KH-8)
22 subject to UTC jurisdiction?**

23 A. No. Nine of them are, but one is not.

1 **Q. Which one is that?**

2 A. The UTC does not have jurisdiction over the South 74th Street crossing, which is
3 located within the city limits of Tacoma. Tacoma has accepted jurisdiction under
4 RCW 81.53.291 at the South 74th Street crossing.

5
6 **Q. Was the city of Lakewood present at the 2006 diagnostic review?**

7 A. Yes. According to the notes, John Howe and Don Carney, both representing the city
8 of Lakewood, were present at the diagnostic review.

9
10 **Q. Was the city of DuPont present at this diagnostic review?**

11 A. No. According to the notes, there was no representative from the city of DuPont.

12
13 **Q. Do you believe the notes are an accurate representation of the current
14 conditions at the crossings at the time of the diagnostic review?**

15 A. Yes.

16
17 **Q. Did anyone from the UTC conduct any follow-up diagnostic review?**

18 A. Yes. On June 12, 2008, I visited the crossings, along with Paul Curl, UTC
19 transportation safety policy specialist.

20
21 **Q. What documents did you use in conducting the 2008 diagnostic review?**

22 A. After the 2006 diagnostic review, HDR Engineering, Inc., the engineering firm hired
23 by WSDOT to help with this proposal, took the 2006 meeting notes and, using the

1 “Proposed Conditions” section, drafted design drawings for each crossing. We used
2 those design drawings during the 2008 diagnostic review.

3

4 **Q. What did you consider during the 2008 diagnostic review and what were the**
5 **results?**

6 A. We compared the design drawings for the proposed changes to the actual crossing
7 configuration and characteristics to determine whether the drawings were consistent
8 with the recommendations of the 2006 diagnostic review and resulting meeting
9 notes. We determined that they were. We also discussed minor improvements that
10 could be made to enhance safety at the crossings.

11

12 **III. UTC CONSIDERATION OF PETITIONS TO MODIFY**
13 **CROSSINGS ASSOCIATED WITH THE POINT DEFIANCE**
14 **BYPASS PROJECT**

15

16 **Q. Before 2010, did WSDOT submit any petitions to the UTC to modify highway-**
17 **rail crossings along the Lakeview Subdivision Rail Corridor?**

18 A. Yes. In July 2008, WSDOT submitted petitions to modify the crossings at
19 Steilacoom Boulevard SW, 108th Street SW, Bridgeport Way SW, and 100th Street
20 SW. The UTC assigned docket numbers TR-081229, TR-081230, TR-081231, and
21 TR-081232 to those petitions.

22

23 **Q. Did you review the petitions that WSDOT submitted in July 2008?**

24 A. Yes, I did.

1 **Q. Did you use the meeting notes from the 2006 diagnostic review and your own**
2 **experience at the June 2008 diagnostic review in analyzing the proposals**
3 **WSDOT submitted in 2008?**

4 A. Yes, I did.

5
6 **Q. What did you recommend after you had completed that analysis?**

7 A. I recommended that the petitions be granted.

8
9 **Q. Where they granted?**

10 A. Yes.

11
12 **Q. Aside from the four 2008 petitions and the four petitions that are involved in**
13 **these dockets, has WSDOT submitted any other petitions to the UTC to modify**
14 **highway-rail crossings along the Lakeview Subdivision Rail Corridor?**

15 A. Yes. In January 2010, when WSDOT submitted the four petitions that are involved
16 in these dockets, WSDOT also submitted a petition to modify the crossing at 41st
17 Division Drive. The UTC assigned docket number TR-100130 to that petition.

18
19 **Q. Where is 41st Division Drive?**

20 A. It is within Joint Base Lewis-McChord, between Lakewood and DuPont.

21

1 **Q. Did you use the meeting notes from the 2006 diagnostic review and your own**
2 **experience at the June 2008 diagnostic review in analyzing the proposal**
3 **WSDOT submitted for the 41st Division Drive crossing?**

4 A. Yes, I did.

5
6 **Q. What did you recommend after you had completed that analysis?**

7 A. I recommended that the petition be granted.

8
9 **Q. Was it granted?**

10 A. Yes.

11
12 **Q. Let's return to the four petitions involved in these dockets. Did you use the**
13 **meeting notes from the 2006 diagnostic review and your own experience at the**
14 **2008 diagnostic review in analyzing the WSDOT proposals for the crossings at**
15 **issue in these 2010 dockets?**

16 A. Yes, I did.

17
18 **Q. WSDOT submitted design drawings for each crossing in these dockets. Did you**
19 **review those drawings in analyzing the proposals in these dockets?**

20 A. Yes, I did.

21

1 **Q. Did you review the testimony filed in this docket on April 16, 2010, by witnesses**
2 **Eugene “Buzz” Berger, Kevin Jeffers, Ronald Poulsen, and Cary Stewart in**
3 **analyzing the proposals in these dockets?**

4 A. Yes, I did.

5
6 **Q. Did you use any other resource or reference materials in analyzing the proposal**
7 **in these dockets?**

8 A. Yes, I did. I used the following resource or reference materials:

9 1. Revised Code of Washington (RCW) 81.53.261. See Exhibit No. ____ (KH-
10 9).

11 2. “Guidance on Traffic Control Devices at Highway-Rail Grade Crossings”
12 published by the United States Department of Transportation, Federal
13 Highway Administration, pages 25, 30, and 31. See Exhibit No. ____ (KH-
14 10).

15 3. “Railroad-Highway Grade Crossing Handbook” published by the United
16 States Department of Transportation, Federal Highway Administration, pages
17 77 and 151. See Exhibit No. ____ (KH-11).

18 4. Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices, published by the United States
19 Department of Transportation, Federal Highway Administration, Part 8,
20 Chapter 8A. See Exhibit No. ____ (KH-12).

21

1 IV. UTC CONSIDERATION OF TRAIN SPEED

2

3 **Q. In Order 02 in these consolidated dockets, the commission directed that, “the**
4 **main focus of the evidentiary hearing shall be on the requirements of public**
5 **safety at the subject crossings when higher speed passenger rail service is**
6 **introduced.” To your knowledge, has the commission conducted proceedings in**
7 **the past where the safety at crossings and higher speed passenger rail service**
8 **was the main focus?**

9 A. Yes, the commission has conducted such proceedings.

10

11 **Q. Did you consider those proceedings in analyzing the proposals in these dockets?**

12 A. Yes, I did.

13

14 **Q. What proceedings did you consider?**

15 A. Although there were a number of such proceedings, those most relevant to these
16 dockets are:

17 1. BNSF and the city of Puyallup, Docket TR-990656. See Exhibit No. ____

18 (KH-13).

19 2. BNSF and the city of Kent, Docket TR-990653. See Exhibit No. ____ (KH-

20 14).

21 3. BNSF and the city of Marysville, Docket TR-940309. See Exhibit No. ____

22 (KH-15).

23

1 **Q. Why are those proceedings relevant to these dockets?**

2 A. In each case, the railroad proposed to run passenger trains through the city at speeds
3 up to 79 miles per hour. The commission approved the proposals, but ordered safety
4 improvements before the passenger trains could run at the high speed. Specifically:

- 5 • In Docket TR-990653, the commission ordered that passenger trains be
6 allowed to operate up to 79 miles per hour through the city of Puyallup,
7 consistent with an agreement reached between BNSF and the city. The
8 agreement included installation of specific safety improvements, as follows:
 - 9 ○ The agreement required installation of median barriers where
10 appropriate.
 - 11 ○ The agreement required upgrading existing lights and gates at several
12 crossings.
 - 13 ○ The agreement required installation of repeater signals and
14 preemption circuitry.
- 15 • In Docket TR-990653, the commission ordered that passenger trains be
16 allowed to operate up to 79 miles per hour through the city of Kent. The
17 commission also ordered that specific safety improvements be made, as
18 follows:
 - 19 ○ The commission noted that the crossings already included lights and
20 gates.
 - 21 ○ The commission ordered median barriers and preemptive circuitry
22 where appropriate.

- 1 • In Docket TR-940309, the commission ordered that passenger trains be
2 allowed to operate up to 79 miles per hour through the city of Marysville.
3 The commission also ordered that specific safety improvements be made, as
4 follows:
- 5 ○ The commission noted that most of the crossings already included
6 lights and gates, and ordered lights and gates at the one crossing
7 where there were none.
 - 8 ○ The commission ordered signage at all crossings to warn motorists
9 not to stop on the tracks.

10

11 **Q. In conducting your analysis for the crossings at issue in this proceeding, did you**
12 **review the files for the three prior dockets you just described?**

13 A. Yes. I reviewed the available documents in each of the three prior dockets I
14 mentioned.

15

16 **Q. In any of those three prior dockets, did the commission consider grade**
17 **separation in conjunction with high-speed passenger train service?**

18 A. No. The commission did not.

19

20 **Q. In any of those three prior dockets, did any person suggest to the commission**
21 **that it should consider grade separation in conjunction with high-speed**
22 **passenger train service?**

1 A. I saw no indication that any person had suggested grade separation at the crossings
2 that were at issue in those three prior dockets.

3

4 **Q. When you reviewed the documents in those three prior dockets, did you see any**
5 **information that would suggest that grade separation should be considered in**
6 **conjunction with high-speed passenger train service?**

7 A. No. I did not see any information like that.

8

9 **Q. The purpose of the current petitions is to modify crossings. Did those three**
10 **prior petitions have that same purpose?**

11 A. No, they did not. The purpose of the prior petitions was to increase train speeds.
12 The commission ordered modifications at the crossings so that they would be safe
13 with faster train speeds.

14

15 **Q. Have there been any changes in state law that would affect the commission's**
16 **authority to set train speeds since those dockets were filed in the mid-1990s?**

17 A. Yes. In 2006, the state legislature adopted changes to RCW 81.48.040 that limited
18 the commission's authority to set train speeds.

19

20 **Q. Please explain the limitations.**

21 A. Under RCW 81.48.040(3), any railroad that wishes to increase train speeds must
22 notify the UTC and the local jurisdiction at least 60 days in advance of the proposed
23 increase. The UTC may investigate and, only if it finds an essentially local safety

1 hazard consistent with Public Law 91-458, Section 205 (49 USC Section 20106),
2 may it limit a train speed.

3

4 **Q. Have you done any comparison between the four crossings that are at issue in**
5 **these consolidated dockets and those in other cities that are along the Amtrak**
6 **Cascades route?**

7 A. I have compared these four crossings with the circumstances in a few other locations
8 along the Amtrak Cascades route.

9

10 **Q. Where are they?**

11 A. They are in the cities of Puyallup, Kent, and Marysville.

12

13 **Q. What did you conclude?**

14 A. I concluded that the tracks, traffic, and proposed train traffic through the cities of
15 Lakewood and DuPont are similar to those currently within the cities of Puyallup,
16 Kent, and Marysville.

17

18 **Q. The city of Lakewood, in its filings within these dockets, states that one of the**
19 **problems with the proposal is the fact that passenger trains would run through**
20 **the city, yet there is no station at which it needs to stop. The city argues it will**
21 **receive no benefit from the passenger train. Are you aware of the city's**
22 **assertion?**

23 A. Yes, I am.

1 **Q. Are there other cities in Washington where passenger trains run through the**
2 **city, yet do not stop at a station?**

3 A. Yes, there are. Examples include the three cities in the dockets I discussed earlier –
4 Puyallup, Kent, and Marysville – as well as Sumner, Auburn, and Ferndale, among
5 others.

6

7

V. GRADE SEPARATION

8

9 **Q. Did you consider a grade separation in analyzing the proposals in these**
10 **dockets?**

11 A. No, I did not.

12

13 **Q. Why not?**

14 A. The proposal in these dockets is to modify four individual grade crossings.
15 Generally, the proposal would upgrade existing lights and gates or install new lights
16 and gates, upgrade railroad detection circuitry, and upgrade interconnections
17 between the grade crossing and the traffic lights. The UTC receives similar petitions
18 on a regular basis. We received 24 such petitions in 2008 and 25 in 2009. Under
19 RCW 81.53.261, the commission is required to receive petitions to upgrade crossings
20 and to act on them. See Exhibit No. ____ (KH-9). The UTC is required, under RCW
21 81.53.020, to consider grade separations only when a new crossing is constructed.
22 See Exhibit No. ____ (KH-16). These petitions did not seek to construct new
23 crossings; but only to update existing crossings. The commission does not, as a

1 matter of course, consider grade separations when presented with petitions to
2 upgrade existing crossings.

3

4 **Q. If UTC staff do not consider a grade separation when analyzing a petition for a**
5 **crossing modification, then why do you include the question, “Is it feasible to**
6 **construct an over-crossing or under-crossing at the proposed location as an**
7 **alternative to an at-grade crossing,” on the form petitioners must complete to**
8 **modify a grade crossing?**

9 A. If you look at the form, this question is number 5 in Section 7. See Exhibit No. ____
10 (KH-17). Section 7 is labeled “Alternatives to the Proposed Modifications.” The
11 entire section deals with ways to avoid having an at-grade crossing. For example,
12 we ask if a safer location for a crossing exists and whether there other crossings in
13 the vicinity. We ask these questions so that we can collect information to use in our
14 administration of the rail safety program as a whole. We are especially interested in
15 consolidating crossings so that we can close at-grade crossings where it makes sense
16 to do so. These questions allow us to help identify data that could inform our
17 crossing consolidation efforts.

18

19 **Q. How long have UTC staff been collecting this information from this particular**
20 **form?**

21 A. For about three years.

22

23 **Q. Have UTC staff found this information useful?**

1 A. Not really. As a matter of fact, we are considering deleting the entire Section 7 from
2 the form. It seems to provide us little benefit and, apparently, only serves to confuse
3 others regarding the purpose of the questions.
4

5 **VI. CONCLUSION**
6

7 **Q. You stated earlier that you reviewed the testimony filed in these dockets on**
8 **April 16, 2010, by witnesses Eugene “Buzz” Berger, Kevin Jeffers, Ronald**
9 **Poulsen, and Cary Stewart. Is that correct?**

10 A. Yes.
11

12 **Q. Do you believe the conditions described by these witnesses in their testimony at**
13 **each of the four crossings under consideration in these dockets is accurate?**

14 A. Yes, I do.
15

16 **Q. Do you believe the proposals as described by these witnesses in their testimony**
17 **at each of the four crossings under consideration in these dockets is accurate?**

18 A. Yes, I do.
19

20 **Q. Based on your analysis of these dockets and all related site visits, materials,**
21 **documents, and information, do you have a recommendation as to whether the**
22 **UTC should grant the petitions in this docket as filed?**

23 A. Yes, I do.

1 **Q. What is that recommendation?**

2 A. I recommend the UTC grant the modifications sought by the petitioner in these
3 dockets for each of the four crossings under consideration.

4 **Q. Does that conclude your testimony?**

5 A. Yes, it does.

6

7

8

9