Docket Nos. TR-210809 and TR-210814 - Vol. II (Consolidated)

In the Matter of: City of Spokane Valley v. Union Pacific Railroad Company

May 10, 2022



206.287.9066 | 800.846.6989 1325 Fourth Avenue, Suite 1840, Seattle, Washington 98101 <u>www.buellrealtime.com</u> email: <u>info@buellrealtime.com</u>



Docket Nos. TR-210809 and TR-210814 - Vol. II (Consolidated) - 5/10/2022

	Pa	age 1	13				Page 15
BEFORE THE WASHIN UTILITIES AND TRANSPOR In the Matter of the Petition of)DC)and TR-2100 CITY OF SPOKANE VALLEY) To Modify Warning Devices at) Highway-Railroad Grade Crossing of Union Pacific Railroad Company (CITY OF SPOKANE VALLEY,) Complainant,) v.) UNION PACIFIC RAILROAD COM) Respondent.) UNION PACIFIC RAILROAD COM) Respondent.) EVIDENTIARY HEARING. Pages 13-151 ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUE May 10, 2022 9:30 a.m. Washington Utilities and Transpo 621 Woodland Square Loop Lacey, Washington 9850 REPORTED BY: TAYLER GARLIN Buell Realtime Reporting, LLC 1325 Fourth Avenue, Suite 1840 Seattle, Washington 98101 (206) 287-9066 Seattle (360) 534-9066 Seattle (360) 534-9066 Seattle (360) 846-6989 National www.buellrealtime.com	TATION COMMISSION OCKETS TR-210809 314)(Consolidated)))) IPANY,) VOLUME II DGE MICHAEL HOWARD Description Commission o Southeast 13			1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	EXAMINATION OF I By Ms. Foster By Ms. Reynolds By Ms. Foster	41 43 48 ROBERT LOCHMILLER 49 50 68 GLORIA MANTZ 71 72 93 ELLIS MAYS 96 97 113 117	PAGE
1 A P P E A R A N C E S 2 ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: 3 MICHAEL HOWARD 4 FOR CITY OF SPOKANE VALLE 5 FOR CITY OF SPOKANE VALLE 6 AZIZA FOSTER 7 Menke Jackson Bey 807 N. 39th Avenue 8 Yakima, Washingtor (509) 575-0313 9 zfoster@mbje.com 10 FOR UNION PACIFIC RAILROAD 11 RACHEL TALLON F 12 Lewis Brisbois Bisga 1111 Third Avenue, Seattle, Washington (206) 436-2020 14 rachel.reynolds@lev 15 FOR COMMISSION STAFF: 16 JEFF ROBERSON 0Virsion PO Box 40128 17 Office of the Attorne Utilities and Transpo Division PO Box 40128 18 Division PO Box 40128 20 jeff.roberson@utc.w 21 PEGGY YGBUHAY ROBERT LOCHMIL 23 BRETT JOHNSON GLORIA MANTZ 24 ELLIS MAYS	S) Y: er LLP 98902) CO.: REYNOLDS ard & Smith LLP Suite 2700 98101 visbrisbois.com y General rtation n 98504 a.gov	age 1	14	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	Comments RL-8X Mays Email Dec Signal Maintenance RL-9X Signed Prelimin GM-1T Direct Testimor GM-2 PowerPoint of P GM-3 City Safety Gran GM-4 STBG Grand Av GM-5 Breakdown of P GM-6 Comprehensive GM-7 Northeast Indus Ordinance SEIS GM-8T Rebuttal Testin GM-9X Petition to UTC	SION y y th Warning Devices ng Device Layout n 1A.07 and Article re: Barker ting Minutes with UPRR cember 8, 2020 Regarding e hary Engineering Agreement ny Project Phasing nt Award ward troject Funding Plan SEPA Analysis strial Area Planned Action nony	Page 16

1 (Pages 13 to 16)

		Page 17		Page 19
1	EXHIBIT INDEX (Cont.)		1	EXHIBIT INDEX (Cont.)
2 3	EXHIBITS FOR ADMISSION GM-11X Google Map of Spokane Valley, WA		2	EXHIBITS FOR ADMISSION
4	GM-12X NEPA Categorical Exclusion Documentation		3	PY-8X 2017 Construction and Maintenance Agreement
5	Form (City of Spokane Valley's Response to Union Pacific Railroad Co.'s Request for			For DOT 66256C
6	Production of Document, No. 1, Pages 73-80)		4	
7	GM-13X Widener & Associates Environmental Justice Letter (City of Spokane Valley's Response			PY-9X RCW 81.53.295
	To Union Pacific Railroad Co.'s Request		5	
8	for Production of Document, No. 1, Pages 85-89)		6	
9	GM-14X United States Department of the Interior		7	
10	11/15/2019 Letter (City of Spokane Valley's		8	
11	Response to Union Pacific Railroad Co.'s Request for Production of Document, No. 1,		10	
12	Pages 102-107)		11	
13	GM-15X Widener & Associates Environmental Justice Letter 12/30/2019 (City of Spokane Valley's		12	
	Response to Union Pacific Railroad Co.'s		13	
14	Request for Production of Document, No. 1, Pages 108-113)		14	
15	GM-16X Utility Notice 1/27/2021 (City of Spokane		15	
16	Valley's Response to Union Pacific Railroad Co.'s Request for Production of Document,		16	
17	No. 1, Page 121)		17	
18	GM-17X SEPA Checklist (City of Spokane Valley's Response to Union Pacific Railroad Co.'s		18	
19	Request for Production of Document, No. 1, Pages 161-175)		19	
20	• ,		20	
21	GM-18X WSDOT Local Agency Federal Aid Project Prospectus (City of Spokane Valley's		21	
22	Response to Union Pacific Railroad Co.'s Request for Production of Document, No. 1,		22 23	
	Pages 394-397)		23	
23 24			25	
25			23	
		Page 18		Page 20
1	EXHIBIT LIST (Cont.)		1	LACEY, WASHINGTON; MAY 10, 2022
2 3	EXHIBITS FOR ADMISSION GM-19X Risk-Based Safety Assessment (City of		2	9:30 A.M.
4	Spokane Valley's Response to Union Pacific Railroad Co.'s Request for Production of		3	000
	Document, No. 12, Page 3)		4	PROCEEDINGS
5	GM-20X Mays Email dated October 19, 2020		5	
6			6	JUDGE HOWARD: Let's be on the record. Good
7	EM-1T Direct Testimony		7	morning. Today is Tuesday, May 10th, 2022, and the time
8	EM-2 City's Website and Article re: Barker Project		8	is 9:30 a.m.
9	EM-3 Diagnostic Meeting Minutes with UPRR		9	This is a hearing in consolidated Dockets
10	Comments		10	TR-210809 and TR-210814. These dockets are captioned
11	EM-4 Mays Email dated October 19, 2020		11	respectively In the Matter of the Petition of the City
	EM-5 Mays Email December 8, 2020 Regarding		12	of Spokane Valley and City of Spokane Valley v. Union
12 13	Signal Maintenance EM-6 101 Definitions and Procedures		13	Pacific Railroad Company.
14	EM-7X Email Exchange re Construction and Maintenance Agreement		14	The City has petitioned to modify a public
15	C C		15	road crossing over Barker Road. It has also filed a
16	EM-8X Email Exchange re Signal Design		16	complaint seeking to assign maintenance costs to the
17	EM-9X RCW 81.53.295		17	Railroad.
	PY-1T Direct Testimony		18	My name is Michael Howard, and I am an
18	PY-2 Signed Preliminary Engineering Agreement		19	administrative law judge presiding over today's
19			20	proceeding.
20	PY-3 Construction and Maintenance Agreement		21	Let's take appearances from the parties, and
21	PY-4 Mays Email dated August 4, 2021		22	then we'll talk about how we're going to proceed this
	PY-5 2017 Construction and Maintenance		23	morning.
22 23	Agreement PY-6 Public Project Manual		24	Can we start with the City?
24 25	PY-7 Surface Estimate		25	MS. FOSTER: Thank you, Your Honor. Aziza

2 (Pages 17 to 20)

	Page 21		Page 23
1	Foster, A-z-i-z-a, of Menke Jackson Beyer, on behalf of	1	Railroad does Union Pacific plan to make a motion at
2	the City.	2	the start of the hearing?
3	JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you.	3	MS. REYNOLDS: The Railroad stipulated to
4	And could we have an appearance for the	4	the City's exhibits, Your Honor, and in terms of
5	Railroad?	5	responding to the City's motion, we're able to take that
6	MS. REYNOLDS: Good morning, Your Honor.	6	up now or take it up ad hoc as the examinations go on.
7	Rachel Reynolds on behalf of Union Pacific Railroad.	7	Whatever Your Honor prefers.
8	JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you.	8	JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Thank you.
9	Can we have an appearance for Staff?	9	Staff?
10	MR. ROBERSON: Good morning, Judge Howard.	10 11	MR. ROBERSON: So good morning, Judge
11 12	Jeff Roberson, AAG, for Staff.	12	Howard. Jeff Roberson for Staff. I have objections to portions of Ms. Ygbuhay's testimony, but Staff will
13	JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. Since we're doing this hearing over Zoom,	13	otherwise stipulate to the exhibits. So probably
14	I'm going to ask that the parties be aware of any	14	clearer to do that at the start, but I leave it to your
15	background noise and that you mute your microphone when	15	discretion.
16	you're not speaking. If you need to object or raise an	16	JUDGE HOWARD: All right. All right. So,
17	issue, please identify yourself when you begin to speak.	17	Ms. Foster, would you please proceed with your motion
18	And we should make an effort not to speak over each	18	regarding the evidence that you would like to make?
19	other so the court reporter can make a clear record of	19	MS. FOSTER: Thank you, Judge Howard. I
20	our hearing today.	20	think for clarity, we're technically making two motions.
21	Let's talk about our plans for today's	21	The first is objection to all exhibits attached to the
22	hearing. Because this case began with the City's	22	prefiled testimony, so of Mr. Mays and Ms. Ygbuhay.
23	petition and complaint, I'm going to ask that the City	23	The reason why is these exhibits were not
24	tender its witnesses for examination first. Union	24	properly filed with the prefiled testimony that were due
25	Pacific and Staff may then cross-examine the witnesses	25	on April 12th of 2022. As you note, Judge Howard, you
	Page 22		Daga 24
	5		Page 24
1		1	
1 2	one by one. I will then allow Union Pacific to tender	1	yourself had to call that to the Railroad's attention.
1 2 3	one by one. I will then allow Union Pacific to tender its witnesses. The City may cross those witnesses.	1 2 3	yourself had to call that to the Railroad's attention. The City was going to wait until the hearing, as we're
2	one by one. I will then allow Union Pacific to tender its witnesses. The City may cross those witnesses. We can then end the hearing by allowing each	2	yourself had to call that to the Railroad's attention. The City was going to wait until the hearing, as we're doing in this case, to object. And so that's why we're
2 3	one by one. I will then allow Union Pacific to tender its witnesses. The City may cross those witnesses.	2 3	yourself had to call that to the Railroad's attention. The City was going to wait until the hearing, as we're
2 3 4	one by one. I will then allow Union Pacific to tender its witnesses. The City may cross those witnesses. We can then end the hearing by allowing each party a chance to give a closing statement.	2 3 4	yourself had to call that to the Railroad's attention. The City was going to wait until the hearing, as we're doing in this case, to object. And so that's why we're objecting to those exhibits. They were not timely
2 3 4 5	one by one. I will then allow Union Pacific to tender its witnesses. The City may cross those witnesses. We can then end the hearing by allowing each party a chance to give a closing statement. I am not planning at the moment to provide	2 3 4 5	yourself had to call that to the Railroad's attention. The City was going to wait until the hearing, as we're doing in this case, to object. And so that's why we're objecting to those exhibits. They were not timely filed.
2 3 4 5 6	one by one. I will then allow Union Pacific to tender its witnesses. The City may cross those witnesses. We can then end the hearing by allowing each party a chance to give a closing statement. I am not planning at the moment to provide an opportunity for opening statements, but if a party is	2 3 4 5 6	yourself had to call that to the Railroad's attention. The City was going to wait until the hearing, as we're doing in this case, to object. And so that's why we're objecting to those exhibits. They were not timely filed. The City also objects to the cross-examination exhibits, all of them, that were filed by the Railroad. Once again, those exhibits were not
2 3 4 5 6 7	one by one. I will then allow Union Pacific to tender its witnesses. The City may cross those witnesses. We can then end the hearing by allowing each party a chance to give a closing statement. I am not planning at the moment to provide an opportunity for opening statements, but if a party is interested in that, we can change that plan. I have received exhibits and exhibit lists from the City and from Union Pacific. I did not receive	2 3 4 5 6 7	yourself had to call that to the Railroad's attention. The City was going to wait until the hearing, as we're doing in this case, to object. And so that's why we're objecting to those exhibits. They were not timely filed. The City also objects to the cross-examination exhibits, all of them, that were filed
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	one by one. I will then allow Union Pacific to tender its witnesses. The City may cross those witnesses. We can then end the hearing by allowing each party a chance to give a closing statement. I am not planning at the moment to provide an opportunity for opening statements, but if a party is interested in that, we can change that plan. I have received exhibits and exhibit lists from the City and from Union Pacific. I did not receive any exhibits from Staff. Since the parties could not	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	yourself had to call that to the Railroad's attention. The City was going to wait until the hearing, as we're doing in this case, to object. And so that's why we're objecting to those exhibits. They were not timely filed. The City also objects to the cross-examination exhibits, all of them, that were filed by the Railroad. Once again, those exhibits were not timely filed. Those were due at noon on May 6th. Those exhibits were submitted late. I do note that
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	one by one. I will then allow Union Pacific to tender its witnesses. The City may cross those witnesses. We can then end the hearing by allowing each party a chance to give a closing statement. I am not planning at the moment to provide an opportunity for opening statements, but if a party is interested in that, we can change that plan. I have received exhibits and exhibit lists from the City and from Union Pacific. I did not receive any exhibits from Staff. Since the parties could not stipulate before this hearing to the admission of all	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	yourself had to call that to the Railroad's attention. The City was going to wait until the hearing, as we're doing in this case, to object. And so that's why we're objecting to those exhibits. They were not timely filed. The City also objects to the cross-examination exhibits, all of them, that were filed by the Railroad. Once again, those exhibits were not timely filed. Those were due at noon on May 6th. Those exhibits were submitted late. I do note that Ms. Reynolds for the Railroad did email all parties
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	one by one. I will then allow Union Pacific to tender its witnesses. The City may cross those witnesses. We can then end the hearing by allowing each party a chance to give a closing statement. I am not planning at the moment to provide an opportunity for opening statements, but if a party is interested in that, we can change that plan. I have received exhibits and exhibit lists from the City and from Union Pacific. I did not receive any exhibits from Staff. Since the parties could not stipulate before this hearing to the admission of all prefiled exhibits, I would suggest that the parties move	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	yourself had to call that to the Railroad's attention. The City was going to wait until the hearing, as we're doing in this case, to object. And so that's why we're objecting to those exhibits. They were not timely filed. The City also objects to the cross-examination exhibits, all of them, that were filed by the Railroad. Once again, those exhibits were not timely filed. Those were due at noon on May 6th. Those exhibits were submitted late. I do note that Ms. Reynolds for the Railroad did email all parties letting them know that they were having technical
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	one by one. I will then allow Union Pacific to tender its witnesses. The City may cross those witnesses. We can then end the hearing by allowing each party a chance to give a closing statement. I am not planning at the moment to provide an opportunity for opening statements, but if a party is interested in that, we can change that plan. I have received exhibits and exhibit lists from the City and from Union Pacific. I did not receive any exhibits from Staff. Since the parties could not stipulate before this hearing to the admission of all prefiled exhibits, I would suggest that the parties move for admission of their exhibits as they use them during	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	yourself had to call that to the Railroad's attention. The City was going to wait until the hearing, as we're doing in this case, to object. And so that's why we're objecting to those exhibits. They were not timely filed. The City also objects to the cross-examination exhibits, all of them, that were filed by the Railroad. Once again, those exhibits were not timely filed. Those were due at noon on May 6th. Those exhibits were submitted late. I do note that Ms. Reynolds for the Railroad did email all parties letting them know that they were having technical difficulties; however, that email was, in fact, sent
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	one by one. I will then allow Union Pacific to tender its witnesses. The City may cross those witnesses. We can then end the hearing by allowing each party a chance to give a closing statement. I am not planning at the moment to provide an opportunity for opening statements, but if a party is interested in that, we can change that plan. I have received exhibits and exhibit lists from the City and from Union Pacific. I did not receive any exhibits from Staff. Since the parties could not stipulate before this hearing to the admission of all prefiled exhibits, I would suggest that the parties move for admission of their exhibits as they use them during their examination. The opposing counsel can object as	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	yourself had to call that to the Railroad's attention. The City was going to wait until the hearing, as we're doing in this case, to object. And so that's why we're objecting to those exhibits. They were not timely filed. The City also objects to the cross-examination exhibits, all of them, that were filed by the Railroad. Once again, those exhibits were not timely filed. Those were due at noon on May 6th. Those exhibits were submitted late. I do note that Ms. Reynolds for the Railroad did email all parties letting them know that they were having technical difficulties; however, that email was, in fact, sent after the due date. The City does not see why the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	one by one. I will then allow Union Pacific to tender its witnesses. The City may cross those witnesses. We can then end the hearing by allowing each party a chance to give a closing statement. I am not planning at the moment to provide an opportunity for opening statements, but if a party is interested in that, we can change that plan. I have received exhibits and exhibit lists from the City and from Union Pacific. I did not receive any exhibits from Staff. Since the parties could not stipulate before this hearing to the admission of all prefiled exhibits, I would suggest that the parties move for admission of their exhibits as they use them during their examination. The opposing counsel can object as needed.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	yourself had to call that to the Railroad's attention. The City was going to wait until the hearing, as we're doing in this case, to object. And so that's why we're objecting to those exhibits. They were not timely filed. The City also objects to the cross-examination exhibits, all of them, that were filed by the Railroad. Once again, those exhibits were not timely filed. Those were due at noon on May 6th. Those exhibits were submitted late. I do note that Ms. Reynolds for the Railroad did email all parties letting them know that they were having technical difficulties; however, that email was, in fact, sent after the due date. The City does not see why the Railroad could not have sent that email before the due
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	one by one. I will then allow Union Pacific to tender its witnesses. The City may cross those witnesses. We can then end the hearing by allowing each party a chance to give a closing statement. I am not planning at the moment to provide an opportunity for opening statements, but if a party is interested in that, we can change that plan. I have received exhibits and exhibit lists from the City and from Union Pacific. I did not receive any exhibits from Staff. Since the parties could not stipulate before this hearing to the admission of all prefiled exhibits, I would suggest that the parties move for admission of their exhibits as they use them during their examination. The opposing counsel can object as needed. Is this workable for the parties or would	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	yourself had to call that to the Railroad's attention. The City was going to wait until the hearing, as we're doing in this case, to object. And so that's why we're objecting to those exhibits. They were not timely filed. The City also objects to the cross-examination exhibits, all of them, that were filed by the Railroad. Once again, those exhibits were not timely filed. Those were due at noon on May 6th. Those exhibits were submitted late. I do note that Ms. Reynolds for the Railroad did email all parties letting them know that they were having technical difficulties; however, that email was, in fact, sent after the due date. The City does not see why the Railroad could not have sent that email before the due date.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	one by one. I will then allow Union Pacific to tender its witnesses. The City may cross those witnesses. We can then end the hearing by allowing each party a chance to give a closing statement. I am not planning at the moment to provide an opportunity for opening statements, but if a party is interested in that, we can change that plan. I have received exhibits and exhibit lists from the City and from Union Pacific. I did not receive any exhibits from Staff. Since the parties could not stipulate before this hearing to the admission of all prefiled exhibits, I would suggest that the parties move for admission of their exhibits as they use them during their examination. The opposing counsel can object as needed. Is this workable for the parties or would one of the parties prefer instead to make a motion at	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	yourself had to call that to the Railroad's attention. The City was going to wait until the hearing, as we're doing in this case, to object. And so that's why we're objecting to those exhibits. They were not timely filed. The City also objects to the cross-examination exhibits, all of them, that were filed by the Railroad. Once again, those exhibits were not timely filed. Those were due at noon on May 6th. Those exhibits were submitted late. I do note that Ms. Reynolds for the Railroad did email all parties letting them know that they were having technical difficulties; however, that email was, in fact, sent after the due date. The City does not see why the Railroad could not have sent that email before the due date.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	one by one. I will then allow Union Pacific to tender its witnesses. The City may cross those witnesses. We can then end the hearing by allowing each party a chance to give a closing statement. I am not planning at the moment to provide an opportunity for opening statements, but if a party is interested in that, we can change that plan. I have received exhibits and exhibit lists from the City and from Union Pacific. I did not receive any exhibits from Staff. Since the parties could not stipulate before this hearing to the admission of all prefiled exhibits, I would suggest that the parties move for admission of their exhibits as they use them during their examination. The opposing counsel can object as needed. Is this workable for the parties or would one of the parties prefer instead to make a motion at the beginning of our hearing today?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	yourself had to call that to the Railroad's attention. The City was going to wait until the hearing, as we're doing in this case, to object. And so that's why we're objecting to those exhibits. They were not timely filed. The City also objects to the cross-examination exhibits, all of them, that were filed by the Railroad. Once again, those exhibits were not timely filed. Those were due at noon on May 6th. Those exhibits were submitted late. I do note that Ms. Reynolds for the Railroad did email all parties letting them know that they were having technical difficulties; however, that email was, in fact, sent after the due date. The City does not see why the Railroad could not have sent that email before the due date. Further, this really that was the third failure by the Railroad to comply with the procedural
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	one by one. I will then allow Union Pacific to tender its witnesses. The City may cross those witnesses. We can then end the hearing by allowing each party a chance to give a closing statement. I am not planning at the moment to provide an opportunity for opening statements, but if a party is interested in that, we can change that plan. I have received exhibits and exhibit lists from the City and from Union Pacific. I did not receive any exhibits from Staff. Since the parties could not stipulate before this hearing to the admission of all prefiled exhibits, I would suggest that the parties move for admission of their exhibits as they use them during their examination. The opposing counsel can object as needed. Is this workable for the parties or would one of the parties prefer instead to make a motion at the beginning of our hearing today? MS. FOSTER: Thank you, Judge Howard. Just	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	yourself had to call that to the Railroad's attention. The City was going to wait until the hearing, as we're doing in this case, to object. And so that's why we're objecting to those exhibits. They were not timely filed. The City also objects to the cross-examination exhibits, all of them, that were filed by the Railroad. Once again, those exhibits were not timely filed. Those were due at noon on May 6th. Those exhibits were submitted late. I do note that Ms. Reynolds for the Railroad did email all parties letting them know that they were having technical difficulties; however, that email was, in fact, sent after the due date. The City does not see why the Railroad could not have sent that email before the due date.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	one by one. I will then allow Union Pacific to tender its witnesses. The City may cross those witnesses. We can then end the hearing by allowing each party a chance to give a closing statement. I am not planning at the moment to provide an opportunity for opening statements, but if a party is interested in that, we can change that plan. I have received exhibits and exhibit lists from the City and from Union Pacific. I did not receive any exhibits from Staff. Since the parties could not stipulate before this hearing to the admission of all prefiled exhibits, I would suggest that the parties move for admission of their exhibits as they use them during their examination. The opposing counsel can object as needed. Is this workable for the parties or would one of the parties prefer instead to make a motion at the beginning of our hearing today?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	yourself had to call that to the Railroad's attention. The City was going to wait until the hearing, as we're doing in this case, to object. And so that's why we're objecting to those exhibits. They were not timely filed. The City also objects to the cross-examination exhibits, all of them, that were filed by the Railroad. Once again, those exhibits were not timely filed. Those were due at noon on May 6th. Those exhibits were submitted late. I do note that Ms. Reynolds for the Railroad did email all parties letting them know that they were having technical difficulties; however, that email was, in fact, sent after the due date. The City does not see why the Railroad could not have sent that email before the due date. Further, this really that was the third failure by the Railroad to comply with the procedural schedule. Their initial response testimony, while
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	one by one. I will then allow Union Pacific to tender its witnesses. The City may cross those witnesses. We can then end the hearing by allowing each party a chance to give a closing statement. I am not planning at the moment to provide an opportunity for opening statements, but if a party is interested in that, we can change that plan. I have received exhibits and exhibit lists from the City and from Union Pacific. I did not receive any exhibits from Staff. Since the parties could not stipulate before this hearing to the admission of all prefiled exhibits, I would suggest that the parties move for admission of their exhibits as they use them during their examination. The opposing counsel can object as needed. Is this workable for the parties or would one of the parties prefer instead to make a motion at the beginning of our hearing today? MS. FOSTER: Thank you, Judge Howard. Just for the record, Aziza Foster for the City. The City	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	yourself had to call that to the Railroad's attention. The City was going to wait until the hearing, as we're doing in this case, to object. And so that's why we're objecting to those exhibits. They were not timely filed. The City also objects to the cross-examination exhibits, all of them, that were filed by the Railroad. Once again, those exhibits were not timely filed. Those were due at noon on May 6th. Those exhibits were submitted late. I do note that Ms. Reynolds for the Railroad did email all parties letting them know that they were having technical difficulties; however, that email was, in fact, sent after the due date. The City does not see why the Railroad could not have sent that email before the due date. Further, this really that was the third failure by the Railroad to comply with the procedural schedule. Their initial response testimony, while emailed to the parties the day that they were due, they
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	one by one. I will then allow Union Pacific to tender its witnesses. The City may cross those witnesses. We can then end the hearing by allowing each party a chance to give a closing statement. I am not planning at the moment to provide an opportunity for opening statements, but if a party is interested in that, we can change that plan. I have received exhibits and exhibit lists from the City and from Union Pacific. I did not receive any exhibits from Staff. Since the parties could not stipulate before this hearing to the admission of all prefiled exhibits, I would suggest that the parties move for admission of their exhibits as they use them during their examination. The opposing counsel can object as needed. Is this workable for the parties or would one of the parties prefer instead to make a motion at the beginning of our hearing today? MS. FOSTER: Thank you, Judge Howard. Just for the record, Aziza Foster for the City. The City would like to just make a motion at the beginning as the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	yourself had to call that to the Railroad's attention. The City was going to wait until the hearing, as we're doing in this case, to object. And so that's why we're objecting to those exhibits. They were not timely filed. The City also objects to the cross-examination exhibits, all of them, that were filed by the Railroad. Once again, those exhibits were not timely filed. Those were due at noon on May 6th. Those exhibits were submitted late. I do note that Ms. Reynolds for the Railroad did email all parties letting them know that they were having technical difficulties; however, that email was, in fact, sent after the due date. The City does not see why the Railroad could not have sent that email before the due date. Further, this really that was the third failure by the Railroad to comply with the procedural schedule. Their initial response testimony, while emailed to the parties the day that they were due, they were technically filed late. And as Your Honor will
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	one by one. I will then allow Union Pacific to tender its witnesses. The City may cross those witnesses. We can then end the hearing by allowing each party a chance to give a closing statement. I am not planning at the moment to provide an opportunity for opening statements, but if a party is interested in that, we can change that plan. I have received exhibits and exhibit lists from the City and from Union Pacific. I did not receive any exhibits from Staff. Since the parties could not stipulate before this hearing to the admission of all prefiled exhibits, I would suggest that the parties move for admission of their exhibits as they use them during their examination. The opposing counsel can object as needed. Is this workable for the parties or would one of the parties prefer instead to make a motion at the beginning of our hearing today? MS. FOSTER: Thank you, Judge Howard. Just for the record, Aziza Foster for the City. The City would like to just make a motion at the beginning as the City intends to object to all exhibits. And so for clarity, I think it may be easier if we proceed in that manner.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	yourself had to call that to the Railroad's attention. The City was going to wait until the hearing, as we're doing in this case, to object. And so that's why we're objecting to those exhibits. They were not timely filed. The City also objects to the cross-examination exhibits, all of them, that were filed by the Railroad. Once again, those exhibits were not timely filed. Those were due at noon on May 6th. Those exhibits were submitted late. I do note that Ms. Reynolds for the Railroad did email all parties letting them know that they were having technical difficulties; however, that email was, in fact, sent after the due date. The City does not see why the Railroad could not have sent that email before the due date. Further, this really that was the third failure by the Railroad to comply with the procedural schedule. Their initial response testimony, while emailed to the parties the day that they were due, they were technically filed late. And as Your Honor will note, there was that stricken, quote/unquote, rebuttal testimony, which was improper and untimely filed response testimony.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	one by one. I will then allow Union Pacific to tender its witnesses. The City may cross those witnesses. We can then end the hearing by allowing each party a chance to give a closing statement. I am not planning at the moment to provide an opportunity for opening statements, but if a party is interested in that, we can change that plan. I have received exhibits and exhibit lists from the City and from Union Pacific. I did not receive any exhibits from Staff. Since the parties could not stipulate before this hearing to the admission of all prefiled exhibits, I would suggest that the parties move for admission of their exhibits as they use them during their examination. The opposing counsel can object as needed. Is this workable for the parties or would one of the parties prefer instead to make a motion at the beginning of our hearing today? MS. FOSTER: Thank you, Judge Howard. Just for the record, Aziza Foster for the City. The City would like to just make a motion at the beginning as the City intends to object to all exhibits. And so for clarity, I think it may be easier if we proceed in that	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	yourself had to call that to the Railroad's attention. The City was going to wait until the hearing, as we're doing in this case, to object. And so that's why we're objecting to those exhibits. They were not timely filed. The City also objects to the cross-examination exhibits, all of them, that were filed by the Railroad. Once again, those exhibits were not timely filed. Those were due at noon on May 6th. Those exhibits were submitted late. I do note that Ms. Reynolds for the Railroad did email all parties letting them know that they were having technical difficulties; however, that email was, in fact, sent after the due date. The City does not see why the Railroad could not have sent that email before the due date. Further, this really that was the third failure by the Railroad to comply with the procedural schedule. Their initial response testimony, while emailed to the parties the day that they were due, they were technically filed late. And as Your Honor will note, there was that stricken, quote/unquote, rebuttal testimony, which was improper and untimely filed

	Page 25		Page 27
1			
1	has.	1	were ten minutes late for that.
2	JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. And I will give	2	Again, we're here on a truth-seeking
3	Union Pacific a chance to respond and Staff a chance to	3	mission. And I can go through some of the documents
4	comment as the third party here.	4	that are being objected to were actually part and parcel
5	But so just to clarify, you referred to	5	of the City's complaint. Some of them are the completed
6	there being three occasions when the Railroad filed	6	documents that should be considered pursuant to ER 104,
7	material late in this case. So would the first be the	7	the rule of completeness. Some are statutes that cannot
8	response testimony itself?	8	be in dispute. Others were listed in the City's
9	MS. FOSTER: That is correct, Your Honor.	9	cross-examination documents.
10	JUDGE HOWARD: And then the are we	10	And I could take those up individually if
11	counting the exhibits, porting it as the second	11	Your Honor would like to discuss those, but there is no
12	instance?	12	objection to the substantive information contained in
13	MS. FOSTER: No, Your Honor. The City is	13	any of these exhibits. There's no objection to the
14	technically counting the, quote/unquote, rebuttal	14	authenticity of any of these exhibits. And so pursuant
15	testimony, as the reason that the City moved to strike	15	to ER 102 and Civil Rule 1, we would submit that the
16	that testimony was that it was technically response	16	City's motion should be denied.
17	testimony filed a couple weeks too late.	17	JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Thank you.
18	JUDGE HOWARD: All right. So we have	18	Does Staff wish to give any comments on
19	response testimony filed late, we have the rebuttal	19	this? I know it doesn't pertain directly to Staff.
20	testimony filed late, was there another instance of late	20	MR. ROBERSON: Staff will stipulate to the
21	filed testimony?	21	admission of those exhibits. We have no objection to
22	MS. FOSTER: Your Honor, the third was the	22	allowing them in.
23	cross-examination exhibits themselves, which were filed	23	JUDGE HOWARD: Okay. I am going to deny the
24	after the deadline.	24	City's motion. I am concerned with the repeated
25	JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Thank you for	25	failures to meet deadlines, and that if it's repeated,
	Page 26		Page 28
1			0
	that clarification	1	that is not something that I normally take lightly
	that clarification.	1	that is not something that I normally take lightly.
2	All right. Could we have a response from	2	I am not convinced, though, that there was
2 3	All right. Could we have a response from Union Pacific?	2 3	I am not convinced, though, that there was significant prejudice or or I'm not seeing I'm not
2 3 4	All right. Could we have a response from Union Pacific? MS. REYNOLDS: Certainly, Your Honor.	2 3 4	I am not convinced, though, that there was significant prejudice or or I'm not seeing I'm not seeing the prejudice to the City from these oversights,
2 3 4 5	All right. Could we have a response from Union Pacific? MS. REYNOLDS: Certainly, Your Honor. Firstly, there are no substantive challenges to the	2 3 4 5	I am not convinced, though, that there was significant prejudice or or I'm not seeing I'm not seeing the prejudice to the City from these oversights, and it appears some of these oversights were at least
2 3 4 5 6	All right. Could we have a response from Union Pacific? MS. REYNOLDS: Certainly, Your Honor. Firstly, there are no substantive challenges to the admission of this testimony. Firstly, with the exhibits	2 3 4 5 6	I am not convinced, though, that there was significant prejudice or or I'm not seeing I'm not seeing the prejudice to the City from these oversights, and it appears some of these oversights were at least some of them were clearly unintentional. So I am going
2 3 4 5 6 7	All right. Could we have a response from Union Pacific? MS. REYNOLDS: Certainly, Your Honor. Firstly, there are no substantive challenges to the admission of this testimony. Firstly, with the exhibits that were attached to prefiled statement, my legal	2 3 4 5 6 7	I am not convinced, though, that there was significant prejudice or or I'm not seeing I'm not seeing the prejudice to the City from these oversights, and it appears some of these oversights were at least some of them were clearly unintentional. So I am going to deny the motion.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	All right. Could we have a response from Union Pacific? MS. REYNOLDS: Certainly, Your Honor. Firstly, there are no substantive challenges to the admission of this testimony. Firstly, with the exhibits that were attached to prefiled statement, my legal assistant inadvertently reattached the City's exhibits	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	I am not convinced, though, that there was significant prejudice or or I'm not seeing I'm not seeing the prejudice to the City from these oversights, and it appears some of these oversights were at least some of them were clearly unintentional. So I am going to deny the motion. Mr. Roberson, you mentioned that Staff
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	All right. Could we have a response from Union Pacific? MS. REYNOLDS: Certainly, Your Honor. Firstly, there are no substantive challenges to the admission of this testimony. Firstly, with the exhibits that were attached to prefiled statement, my legal assistant inadvertently reattached the City's exhibits to our exhibit list, and we did not note that until Your	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	I am not convinced, though, that there was significant prejudice or or I'm not seeing I'm not seeing the prejudice to the City from these oversights, and it appears some of these oversights were at least some of them were clearly unintentional. So I am going to deny the motion. Mr. Roberson, you mentioned that Staff wanted to bring a motion as well?
2 3 5 6 7 8 9 10	All right. Could we have a response from Union Pacific? MS. REYNOLDS: Certainly, Your Honor. Firstly, there are no substantive challenges to the admission of this testimony. Firstly, with the exhibits that were attached to prefiled statement, my legal assistant inadvertently reattached the City's exhibits to our exhibit list, and we did not note that until Your Honor brought that up.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	I am not convinced, though, that there was significant prejudice or or I'm not seeing I'm not seeing the prejudice to the City from these oversights, and it appears some of these oversights were at least some of them were clearly unintentional. So I am going to deny the motion. Mr. Roberson, you mentioned that Staff wanted to bring a motion as well? MR. ROBERSON: Yes. Again, for Staff, Jeff
2 3 6 7 8 9 10 11	All right. Could we have a response from Union Pacific? MS. REYNOLDS: Certainly, Your Honor. Firstly, there are no substantive challenges to the admission of this testimony. Firstly, with the exhibits that were attached to prefiled statement, my legal assistant inadvertently reattached the City's exhibits to our exhibit list, and we did not note that until Your Honor brought that up. But certainly, we are all talking about	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	I am not convinced, though, that there was significant prejudice or or I'm not seeing I'm not seeing the prejudice to the City from these oversights, and it appears some of these oversights were at least some of them were clearly unintentional. So I am going to deny the motion. Mr. Roberson, you mentioned that Staff wanted to bring a motion as well? MR. ROBERSON: Yes. Again, for Staff, Jeff Roberson. With regard to the exhibit of Ms. Ygbuhay,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	All right. Could we have a response from Union Pacific? MS. REYNOLDS: Certainly, Your Honor. Firstly, there are no substantive challenges to the admission of this testimony. Firstly, with the exhibits that were attached to prefiled statement, my legal assistant inadvertently reattached the City's exhibits to our exhibit list, and we did not note that until Your Honor brought that up. But certainly, we are all talking about issues that overlap and interrelate. And so they're	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	I am not convinced, though, that there was significant prejudice or or I'm not seeing I'm not seeing the prejudice to the City from these oversights, and it appears some of these oversights were at least some of them were clearly unintentional. So I am going to deny the motion. Mr. Roberson, you mentioned that Staff wanted to bring a motion as well? MR. ROBERSON: Yes. Again, for Staff, Jeff Roberson. With regard to the exhibit of Ms. Ygbuhay, which is PY-1T, so it's WAC 480-07-495(1) provides that
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	All right. Could we have a response from Union Pacific? MS. REYNOLDS: Certainly, Your Honor. Firstly, there are no substantive challenges to the admission of this testimony. Firstly, with the exhibits that were attached to prefiled statement, my legal assistant inadvertently reattached the City's exhibits to our exhibit list, and we did not note that until Your Honor brought that up. But certainly, we are all talking about issues that overlap and interrelate. And so they're those exhibits were listed out, and they weren't brought	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	I am not convinced, though, that there was significant prejudice or or I'm not seeing I'm not seeing the prejudice to the City from these oversights, and it appears some of these oversights were at least some of them were clearly unintentional. So I am going to deny the motion. Mr. Roberson, you mentioned that Staff wanted to bring a motion as well? MR. ROBERSON: Yes. Again, for Staff, Jeff Roberson. With regard to the exhibit of Ms. Ygbuhay, which is PY-1T, so it's WAC 480-07-495(1) provides that the presiding officer may exclude evidence that's
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	All right. Could we have a response from Union Pacific? MS. REYNOLDS: Certainly, Your Honor. Firstly, there are no substantive challenges to the admission of this testimony. Firstly, with the exhibits that were attached to prefiled statement, my legal assistant inadvertently reattached the City's exhibits to our exhibit list, and we did not note that until Your Honor brought that up. But certainly, we are all talking about issues that overlap and interrelate. And so they're those exhibits were listed out, and they weren't brought to our attention. Not that it is the requirement of the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	I am not convinced, though, that there was significant prejudice or or I'm not seeing I'm not seeing the prejudice to the City from these oversights, and it appears some of these oversights were at least some of them were clearly unintentional. So I am going to deny the motion. Mr. Roberson, you mentioned that Staff wanted to bring a motion as well? MR. ROBERSON: Yes. Again, for Staff, Jeff Roberson. With regard to the exhibit of Ms. Ygbuhay, which is PY-1T, so it's WAC 480-07-495(1) provides that the presiding officer may exclude evidence that's irrelevant. It also provides that the Commission will
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	All right. Could we have a response from Union Pacific? MS. REYNOLDS: Certainly, Your Honor. Firstly, there are no substantive challenges to the admission of this testimony. Firstly, with the exhibits that were attached to prefiled statement, my legal assistant inadvertently reattached the City's exhibits to our exhibit list, and we did not note that until Your Honor brought that up. But certainly, we are all talking about issues that overlap and interrelate. And so they're those exhibits were listed out, and they weren't brought to our attention. Not that it is the requirement of the City to bring it to our attention, but we are here on a	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	I am not convinced, though, that there was significant prejudice or or I'm not seeing I'm not seeing the prejudice to the City from these oversights, and it appears some of these oversights were at least some of them were clearly unintentional. So I am going to deny the motion. Mr. Roberson, you mentioned that Staff wanted to bring a motion as well? MR. ROBERSON: Yes. Again, for Staff, Jeff Roberson. With regard to the exhibit of Ms. Ygbuhay, which is PY-1T, so it's WAC 480-07-495(1) provides that the presiding officer may exclude evidence that's irrelevant. It also provides that the Commission will follow Washington's rules of evidence when ruling on the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	All right. Could we have a response from Union Pacific? MS. REYNOLDS: Certainly, Your Honor. Firstly, there are no substantive challenges to the admission of this testimony. Firstly, with the exhibits that were attached to prefiled statement, my legal assistant inadvertently reattached the City's exhibits to our exhibit list, and we did not note that until Your Honor brought that up. But certainly, we are all talking about issues that overlap and interrelate. And so they're those exhibits were listed out, and they weren't brought to our attention. Not that it is the requirement of the City to bring it to our attention, but we are here on a hearing to ascertain the truth and justice, and the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	I am not convinced, though, that there was significant prejudice or or I'm not seeing I'm not seeing the prejudice to the City from these oversights, and it appears some of these oversights were at least some of them were clearly unintentional. So I am going to deny the motion. Mr. Roberson, you mentioned that Staff wanted to bring a motion as well? MR. ROBERSON: Yes. Again, for Staff, Jeff Roberson. With regard to the exhibit of Ms. Ygbuhay, which is PY-1T, so it's WAC 480-07-495(1) provides that the presiding officer may exclude evidence that's irrelevant. It also provides that the Commission will follow Washington's rules of evidence when ruling on the admissibility of evidence.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	All right. Could we have a response from Union Pacific? MS. REYNOLDS: Certainly, Your Honor. Firstly, there are no substantive challenges to the admission of this testimony. Firstly, with the exhibits that were attached to prefiled statement, my legal assistant inadvertently reattached the City's exhibits to our exhibit list, and we did not note that until Your Honor brought that up. But certainly, we are all talking about issues that overlap and interrelate. And so they're those exhibits were listed out, and they weren't brought to our attention. Not that it is the requirement of the City to bring it to our attention, but we are here on a hearing to ascertain the truth and justice, and the rules of evidence in fact, ER 102 tells us that we	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	I am not convinced, though, that there was significant prejudice or or I'm not seeing I'm not seeing the prejudice to the City from these oversights, and it appears some of these oversights were at least some of them were clearly unintentional. So I am going to deny the motion. Mr. Roberson, you mentioned that Staff wanted to bring a motion as well? MR. ROBERSON: Yes. Again, for Staff, Jeff Roberson. With regard to the exhibit of Ms. Ygbuhay, which is PY-1T, so it's WAC 480-07-495(1) provides that the presiding officer may exclude evidence that's irrelevant. It also provides that the Commission will follow Washington's rules of evidence when ruling on the admissibility of evidence. ER 401 says that evidence is relevant if it
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	All right. Could we have a response from Union Pacific? MS. REYNOLDS: Certainly, Your Honor. Firstly, there are no substantive challenges to the admission of this testimony. Firstly, with the exhibits that were attached to prefiled statement, my legal assistant inadvertently reattached the City's exhibits to our exhibit list, and we did not note that until Your Honor brought that up. But certainly, we are all talking about issues that overlap and interrelate. And so they're those exhibits were listed out, and they weren't brought to our attention. Not that it is the requirement of the City to bring it to our attention, but we are here on a hearing to ascertain the truth and justice, and the rules of evidence in fact, ER 102 tells us that we should interpret the rules of evidence to ascertain the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	I am not convinced, though, that there was significant prejudice or or I'm not seeing I'm not seeing the prejudice to the City from these oversights, and it appears some of these oversights were at least some of them were clearly unintentional. So I am going to deny the motion. Mr. Roberson, you mentioned that Staff wanted to bring a motion as well? MR. ROBERSON: Yes. Again, for Staff, Jeff Roberson. With regard to the exhibit of Ms. Ygbuhay, which is PY-1T, so it's WAC 480-07-495(1) provides that the presiding officer may exclude evidence that's irrelevant. It also provides that the Commission will follow Washington's rules of evidence when ruling on the admissibility of evidence. ER 401 says that evidence is relevant if it has any tendency to make a fact of consequence more or
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	All right. Could we have a response from Union Pacific? MS. REYNOLDS: Certainly, Your Honor. Firstly, there are no substantive challenges to the admission of this testimony. Firstly, with the exhibits that were attached to prefiled statement, my legal assistant inadvertently reattached the City's exhibits to our exhibit list, and we did not note that until Your Honor brought that up. But certainly, we are all talking about issues that overlap and interrelate. And so they're those exhibits were listed out, and they weren't brought to our attention. Not that it is the requirement of the City to bring it to our attention, but we are here on a hearing to ascertain the truth and justice, and the rules of evidence in fact, ER 102 tells us that we should interpret the rules of evidence to ascertain the truth, not on procedural technicalities. And as soon as	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	I am not convinced, though, that there was significant prejudice or or I'm not seeing I'm not seeing the prejudice to the City from these oversights, and it appears some of these oversights were at least some of them were clearly unintentional. So I am going to deny the motion. Mr. Roberson, you mentioned that Staff wanted to bring a motion as well? MR. ROBERSON: Yes. Again, for Staff, Jeff Roberson. With regard to the exhibit of Ms. Ygbuhay, which is PY-1T, so it's WAC 480-07-495(1) provides that the presiding officer may exclude evidence that's irrelevant. It also provides that the Commission will follow Washington's rules of evidence when ruling on the admissibility of evidence. ER 401 says that evidence is relevant if it has any tendency to make a fact of consequence more or less likely.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	All right. Could we have a response from Union Pacific? MS. REYNOLDS: Certainly, Your Honor. Firstly, there are no substantive challenges to the admission of this testimony. Firstly, with the exhibits that were attached to prefiled statement, my legal assistant inadvertently reattached the City's exhibits to our exhibit list, and we did not note that until Your Honor brought that up. But certainly, we are all talking about issues that overlap and interrelate. And so they're those exhibits were listed out, and they weren't brought to our attention. Not that it is the requirement of the City to bring it to our attention, but we are here on a hearing to ascertain the truth and justice, and the rules of evidence in fact, ER 102 tells us that we should interpret the rules of evidence to ascertain the truth, not on procedural technicalities. And as soon as Your Honor brought that up to our attention, we did our	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	I am not convinced, though, that there was significant prejudice or or I'm not seeing I'm not seeing the prejudice to the City from these oversights, and it appears some of these oversights were at least some of them were clearly unintentional. So I am going to deny the motion. Mr. Roberson, you mentioned that Staff wanted to bring a motion as well? MR. ROBERSON: Yes. Again, for Staff, Jeff Roberson. With regard to the exhibit of Ms. Ygbuhay, which is PY-1T, so it's WAC 480-07-495(1) provides that the presiding officer may exclude evidence that's irrelevant. It also provides that the Commission will follow Washington's rules of evidence when ruling on the admissibility of evidence. ER 401 says that evidence is relevant if it has any tendency to make a fact of consequence more or less likely. As far as Staff is concerned, there are
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	All right. Could we have a response from Union Pacific? MS. REYNOLDS: Certainly, Your Honor. Firstly, there are no substantive challenges to the admission of this testimony. Firstly, with the exhibits that were attached to prefiled statement, my legal assistant inadvertently reattached the City's exhibits to our exhibit list, and we did not note that until Your Honor brought that up. But certainly, we are all talking about issues that overlap and interrelate. And so they're those exhibits were listed out, and they weren't brought to our attention. Not that it is the requirement of the City to bring it to our attention, but we are here on a hearing to ascertain the truth and justice, and the rules of evidence in fact, ER 102 tells us that we should interpret the rules of evidence to ascertain the truth, not on procedural technicalities. And as soon as Your Honor brought that up to our attention, we did our best to correct that.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	I am not convinced, though, that there was significant prejudice or or I'm not seeing I'm not seeing the prejudice to the City from these oversights, and it appears some of these oversights were at least some of them were clearly unintentional. So I am going to deny the motion. Mr. Roberson, you mentioned that Staff wanted to bring a motion as well? MR. ROBERSON: Yes. Again, for Staff, Jeff Roberson. With regard to the exhibit of Ms. Ygbuhay, which is PY-1T, so it's WAC 480-07-495(1) provides that the presiding officer may exclude evidence that's irrelevant. It also provides that the Commission will follow Washington's rules of evidence when ruling on the admissibility of evidence. ER 401 says that evidence is relevant if it has any tendency to make a fact of consequence more or less likely. As far as Staff is concerned, there are three types of facts of consequence here.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	All right. Could we have a response from Union Pacific? MS. REYNOLDS: Certainly, Your Honor. Firstly, there are no substantive challenges to the admission of this testimony. Firstly, with the exhibits that were attached to prefiled statement, my legal assistant inadvertently reattached the City's exhibits to our exhibit list, and we did not note that until Your Honor brought that up. But certainly, we are all talking about issues that overlap and interrelate. And so they're those exhibits were listed out, and they weren't brought to our attention. Not that it is the requirement of the City to bring it to our attention, but we are here on a hearing to ascertain the truth and justice, and the rules of evidence in fact, ER 102 tells us that we should interpret the rules of evidence to ascertain the truth, not on procedural technicalities. And as soon as Your Honor brought that up to our attention, we did our best to correct that. In terms of the cross-examination, I was	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	I am not convinced, though, that there was significant prejudice or or I'm not seeing I'm not seeing the prejudice to the City from these oversights, and it appears some of these oversights were at least some of them were clearly unintentional. So I am going to deny the motion. Mr. Roberson, you mentioned that Staff wanted to bring a motion as well? MR. ROBERSON: Yes. Again, for Staff, Jeff Roberson. With regard to the exhibit of Ms. Ygbuhay, which is PY-1T, so it's WAC 480-07-495(1) provides that the presiding officer may exclude evidence that's irrelevant. It also provides that the Commission will follow Washington's rules of evidence when ruling on the admissibility of evidence. ER 401 says that evidence is relevant if it has any tendency to make a fact of consequence more or less likely. As far as Staff is concerned, there are three types of facts of consequence here. The first is whether or not public safety
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	All right. Could we have a response from Union Pacific? MS. REYNOLDS: Certainly, Your Honor. Firstly, there are no substantive challenges to the admission of this testimony. Firstly, with the exhibits that were attached to prefiled statement, my legal assistant inadvertently reattached the City's exhibits to our exhibit list, and we did not note that until Your Honor brought that up. But certainly, we are all talking about issues that overlap and interrelate. And so they're those exhibits were listed out, and they weren't brought to our attention. Not that it is the requirement of the City to bring it to our attention, but we are here on a hearing to ascertain the truth and justice, and the rules of evidence in fact, ER 102 tells us that we should interpret the rules of evidence to ascertain the truth, not on procedural technicalities. And as soon as Your Honor brought that up to our attention, we did our best to correct that. In terms of the cross-examination, I was asking what the status was because we had a volume of	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	I am not convinced, though, that there was significant prejudice or or I'm not seeing I'm not seeing the prejudice to the City from these oversights, and it appears some of these oversights were at least some of them were clearly unintentional. So I am going to deny the motion. Mr. Roberson, you mentioned that Staff wanted to bring a motion as well? MR. ROBERSON: Yes. Again, for Staff, Jeff Roberson. With regard to the exhibit of Ms. Ygbuhay, which is PY-1T, so it's WAC 480-07-495(1) provides that the presiding officer may exclude evidence that's irrelevant. It also provides that the Commission will follow Washington's rules of evidence when ruling on the admissibility of evidence. ER 401 says that evidence is relevant if it has any tendency to make a fact of consequence more or less likely. As far as Staff is concerned, there are three types of facts of consequence here. The first is whether or not public safety requires the modifications to this crossing. That's
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	All right. Could we have a response from Union Pacific? MS. REYNOLDS: Certainly, Your Honor. Firstly, there are no substantive challenges to the admission of this testimony. Firstly, with the exhibits that were attached to prefiled statement, my legal assistant inadvertently reattached the City's exhibits to our exhibit list, and we did not note that until Your Honor brought that up. But certainly, we are all talking about issues that overlap and interrelate. And so they're those exhibits were listed out, and they weren't brought to our attention. Not that it is the requirement of the City to bring it to our attention, but we are here on a hearing to ascertain the truth and justice, and the rules of evidence in fact, ER 102 tells us that we should interpret the rules of evidence to ascertain the truth, not on procedural technicalities. And as soon as Your Honor brought that up to our attention, we did our best to correct that. In terms of the cross-examination, I was	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	I am not convinced, though, that there was significant prejudice or or I'm not seeing I'm not seeing the prejudice to the City from these oversights, and it appears some of these oversights were at least some of them were clearly unintentional. So I am going to deny the motion. Mr. Roberson, you mentioned that Staff wanted to bring a motion as well? MR. ROBERSON: Yes. Again, for Staff, Jeff Roberson. With regard to the exhibit of Ms. Ygbuhay, which is PY-1T, so it's WAC 480-07-495(1) provides that the presiding officer may exclude evidence that's irrelevant. It also provides that the Commission will follow Washington's rules of evidence when ruling on the admissibility of evidence. ER 401 says that evidence is relevant if it has any tendency to make a fact of consequence more or less likely. As far as Staff is concerned, there are three types of facts of consequence here. The first is whether or not public safety

4 (Pages 25 to 28)

Page 29 Page 31 1 consequence would go to how costs and maintenance are allocated. That's relevant under the statutes relevanced in 81.5.201 dealing with allocation. 1 involves a series of intereleted regulations from the state and federal government. And we cart take this particular structuon or only agreements for other crossing. FM that 7 The first set facts would be those that make it more or less likely that the City and the Railcoad agreed to an allocation because they can do that. 5 8 Portions of Ms. Ygbuhay's testimory dont go to any of these facts. Taking them in specific, Exhibit PV-f1 ta page 7. Inc - vosry, wrong gage. It's page - 1 think it's on page 6. One second. Your Honor. 6 10 POP (Ta tage 7. Inc - vosry, wrong gage. It's page - 1 think it's on page 6. One second. Your Honor. 7 11 Pop (Lis tage 2, line - 2 you said? 7 12 MR. ROBERSON. Take testimory do tass intervine to his crossing in Washington, to their second tass tast testimory about DP's agree fact of consequence any less likely. 7 12 Exhibit - or Exhibit PV-1T at lines 7 - or sory, page 7, line b through page 8, line 25, this is testimer wobot DP's agreements with entities other than testimory about DP's agreements with entities other that testimory about DP's agreements with entities other than testimory. 7 7 12 Exhibit PV-1T, at page 8, line 25, this is about more or less likely, tasts about more inals lis about they interelessif			1
2 allocatod. Thats relevant under the statutes 2 state and faderal government. And we can't take this 3 make it more call is 53.23 (delang with allocation). 2 state and faderal government. And we can't take this 4 The third set of facts would be those that 3 patientical struction in a vacuum, because there have been not only agreements for other orssings throughout the state of Washington, but there's been a pair or sing. May and the page 7. In the or sorry, wrong page. It's page 2. Into a page 1. It's that is no negage 6. One second, Your Honor. 7 And so part of the agritoment that the relevant. 11 page - I think it's on page 2. you said? 10 PUHT at page 7. Into resort, worng page 2. Into second, Your Honor. 12 Storry, I's page 2. Junes a fast of crossings in Washington. It doesn't make a fast of crossings in Washington. It doesn't make a fast of crossing is in Washington. It doesn't make a fast of crossing is in Washington. It doesn't make a fast of crossing is in Washington. It doesn't make a fast of the city of Spokane State Marcad project in a consider the City of Spokane State Road project in a consider the City of Spokane State Road project in a consider the City of Spokane State Road project in a consider the City of Spokane State Road project in a consider the City of Spokane State Road project in a consequence. 2 page 3. Jine 5. finit esc Strubit esc State and facussed a above more or less likely. Hose facts of consequence. 1 So if we were to take that and extrapolate that would hose facts of consequence.		Page 29	Page 31
3 referenced in 81:32.81 dealing with ellocation. 3 particular situation in a vacuum, because there have 4 The hird set of facts would be hows that 5 particular situation in a vacuum, because there have 5 Railroad agreed to an allocation because they can do the state of Washington, but there sheen a prior 6 Railroad agreed to an allocation because they can do the state of Washington, but there sheen a prior 7 And so part of the argument that the Railroad has is that chies cannot decide to develop 7 and so this vidence bears upon the impact economically upon the Railroad, and therefore, we would 10 PY-1T at page 7, line - or sorry, wrong page. Is 10 7 Instruction priorice share and the impact economically upon the Railroad, and therefore, we would 11 MR. ROBERSON: Yesh, sorry. Page 2, lines 11 Hink the same argument bears, Your Honor, 12 basing 7, line 4 mough page 8, line 25, this is 12 corridor when we were taking about the issue of State 13 JUDGE HOWARD, Page 2, upon page 8, line 25, this is about UP's internal policy. 13 satument there any of those facts discussed 14 testingay 7, line 4 mough page 8, line 25, this is	1	consequence would go to how costs and maintenance are	1 involves a series of interrelated regulations from the
4 The third set of facts would be those that 4 been not only agreements for other crossings throughout 6 Railroad agreed to an allocation because they can do 5 the state of Washington, but there's been a prior 7 That. Portions of Ms. Ygbuhay's testimony don't go ads op part of the argument that the 8 Portions of Ms. Ygbuhay's testimony don't go ads op part of the argument that the 9 to any of those facts. Taking them in specific, Exhibit 9 10 PV-IT at page 7, line - or sorny, wong page. Its 9 11 page - I think it's on page 2, you said? 10 12 JUDGE HOWARD: Page 2, you said? 11 13 Brough 2, you said? 11 14 Brough 2, you said? 11 15 19 besite of the argument. 11 16 crossings in Washington. It doesn't make a fact of 11 11 18 likely, and Staff would object on grounds of relevance. 12 11 consequence any less likely. 18 the city. It doesn't make any of those facts of consequence. 12 consequence any less likely. 12	2	allocated. That's relevant under the statutes	2 state and federal government. And we can't take this
5 make it more or less likely that the City and the Raiload agreed to an allocation because they can do that. b b 7 that. Portions of Ms. Ygbuhays testimony don't go to any of those facts. Taking them in specific, Exhibit PY-1T at page 7, line e - or sorry, wrong page. It's page - 1 link it's on page 6. One second, Your Honor. Raiload has is that cities cannot decide to develop construction projects that are not necessitated by the public safety and them impose costs upon railoads. And so part of the argument hears, Your Honor, Sorry, it's page 2, lines 19 through 25. That tostimony doals with othar grade crossing in Washington. It deen't make a fact of consequence with regard to this crossing more or less likely. and Staff would object on grounds of relevance. Ithink it's on page 7. If the through page 8, line 25, this is consequence any less likely. 24 Exhibit - or Exhibit PY-1T at page 9, line 26 through page 1, line 5 thesis about UP's agreements with entities of through page 9, line 5, this is about UP's internal polop. Itaking about the issue of State consequence any less likely. 25 Page 30 Page 320 26 Page 32 27 Again, it doesn't make any of those facts of consequence any less likely. 28 Line 5, this is about UP's internal polop. 29 Page 30 20 Page 30 21 Again, it doesn't make any of those facts of consequence. And then PY-1T, at page 9, line 26 through page 9, line 5 through page 9, line	3	referenced in 81.53.261 dealing with allocation.	3 particular situation in a vacuum, because there have
6 Rairoad agreed to an allocation because they can do agreement in 2017 regarding this particular crossing. 7 that. Portions of Ms. Ygbuhay's testimony don't go 9 to any of those facts. Taking them in specific, Exhibit 11 Portions of Ms. Ygbuhay's testimony don't go 12 Portions of Ms. Ygbuhay's testimony don't go 13 Difference 14 MR. ROBERSON: Yeah, sorry. Page 2, lines 15 19 through 25. That testimony data's with other grade 16 crossings in Washington. It doesn't make a fact of 17 consequence with regard to this crossing more or less 18 likely, and Staff would object on grounds of relevance. 19 Exhibit -> CT is appeg 8, line 25, this is 10 consequence with regard to this crossing more or less 11 testimony about UP's agreements with entities ofter that 12 testimony about UP's agreements with entities ofter that 13 Adais on less likely. 14 Again, it doesn't make any of those facts discussed 15 page 4, line 5, this is about UP's internal policy. 14 Again, it doesn't make any of those facts discussed 15 page 9, line 5, this is about UP's internal policy. 14 Again, it doesn't make any of those facts discussed 15 adi	4	The third set of facts would be those that	4 been not only agreements for other crossings throughout
6 Rairoad agreed to an allocation because they can do that. agreement in 2017 regarding this particular crossing. And so part of the argument that the Rairoad has is that cities cannot decide to develop construction projects that are not necessitated by the Dythis astey and the impose costs upon rairoads. 11 Pyr41 trapage 7, line - or sorry, wrong page. It's 13 JUDGE HOWARD: Page 2, you said? 14 MR. ROBERSON: Yeah, sorry. Page 2, lines 15 19 through 25. 14 MR. ROBERSON: Yeah, sorry. Page 2, lines 16 10 15 19 through 25. That testimony dais with other grade crossings in Washington. It doesn't make a fact of crossing in Washington. It doesn't make a fact of consequence with regard to this crossing more or less 11 klekly, and Staff would object on grounds of relevance. 12 16 the City, it doesn't make any of those facts of consequence with regard to this crossing surface 14 17 the City, it doesn't make any of those facts of consequence any less likely. 14 14 Again, it doesn't make any of those facts discussed abore more less likely, tose facts of consegurance. 15 16 Again, it doesn't make any of those facts discussed abore more less likely. 15 16 Again, it doesn't make any of those facts discussed abore more less likely. 16 17 far adaminetnance for the crossing surface 15 18 that's about maintenance for the crossing surface 15 19 for domes add the impose of the crossing 16 20 for were to take that a	5	make it more or less likely that the City and the	5 the state of Washington, but there's been a prior
7 that. Page 30 7 that. Page 30 8 Portions of Ms. Ygbuhay's testimory don't go Page 30 9 to any of those facts. Taking them in specific, Exhibit Page 4. lines 4 mode on the impact 10 PY-1T at page 7. line 9 mode 0. hose facts of consequence with regard to this crossing more or less Page 2. lines 19 through 25. That is crossing more or less 11 MR. ROBERSON. Yeah, sory. Page 2, lines In think its on page 7. line 9 through 25. that is crossing more or less 12 Exhibit - or Exhibit PV-1T at lines 7 - or rom sort, page 7. line 9 through page 8, line 25. this is 12 testimory about UP's agreements with entities of those facts of consequence any less likely. Corridor the City of Spokare's Barker Road project in a corridor when we were taking about the issue of State regulation of the relincasc. Particularly when our argument is that this is something that is for the 22 City's benefit, requested by the City, and that request a brow ther were taking a project in a corridor when we were taking about the issue of State regulation of the relincasc. 12 Page 30 Page 32 13 JubGe HOWARD: Can get 5, mis is about UP's internal policy. Page 32 14 Again, it doesn't make any of those facts of consequence. So if we were to take that and extrapolate that would have a massive economic impact, and certainly it wouldn't turber the federa regulation of	6		
8 Portions of Ms. Ygbuhay's testimony don't go 8 Railroad has is that cites cannot decide to develop 10 PY-1T at page 7, line - or sorry, wrong page. It's 11 11 11 11 page -1 think it's on page 6. One second, Your Honor. 12 12 12 12 12 Sorry, It's page 2, lines 19 through 25. 12 13 14 MR. ROBERSON: Yeah, sorry, Page 2, lines 1 14 14 14 14 14 16 16 17 16 17 17 18 11 16 17 16 17 16 18 18 18 18 18 18 18 18 18 18 18 18 18 18 18 18 18 18 19 16 17 16 18 17 16 18 18 18 18 18 18 19 19 18 18 18 18 18 18 18 18 19 19 18 18 18 18 18 18 18 18 18 18 18 18	7		
9 to any of those facts. Taking them in specific, Exhibit 9 10 PY-1T at page 7, line + or sorry, wrong page. It's 11 page - 1 think its on gage 6. One second, Your Honor. 12 Sorry, It's page 2, lines 19 through 25. 13 JUDGE HOWARD: Page 2, you said? 14 MR. ROBERSON: Yeah, sorry. Page 2, lines 15 19 through 25. That testimony deals with other grade 16 crossings in Washington. It doesn't make a fact of 17 crossing in Washington. It doesn't make a fact of 18 likely, and Staff would object on grounds of relevance. 19 sorry, page 7, line 4 through page 8, line 25, this is 10 sorry, page 7, line 4 through page 8, line 26, this is 10 sorry, page 7, line 4 through page 8, line 26, this is 11 testimony about UP's agreements with entities other than 12 consequence any less likely, 12 consequence any less likely. 13 JUDGE HOWARD: Can 1 get your second-to-last 14 devices. It's also irrelevant to purposes of the 15 isteff. It's not about maintenance for the crossing 16 devices. It's also irrelevant to purposes of the	8	Portions of Ms. Yabuhay's testimony don't go	
10 PY-fT at page 7, line - or sorry, wrong page. It's 10 public safety and then impose costs upon nalicoads. 11 page - I think it's on page 6. One second, Your Honr. 11 And so this evidence bears upon the impact 13 JUDGE HOWARD: Page 2, you said? 11 And so this evidence bears upon the impact 14 MR. ROBERSON: Yeah, sorry. Page 2, lines 11 It hink it's as any of the service. 15 19 through 25. That satimation of the impact of this crossing more or less 11 It hink the same argument bears, Your Honr, 16 crossings in Washington. It doesn't make a lact of 15 It was any at the average cost of maintenance. We can't 17 consequence with regard to this crossing more or less 11 Consequence with regard to this crossing more or less 18 testimory about UP's agreements with entities other than 11 consequence any less likely. 24 Exhibit P-FT, at page 8, line 26, this is consequence any less likely. 22 24 Exhibit P-FT, at page 8, line 26 through 25 page 9, line 5, this is about UP's internal policy. 23 25 page 9, line 5, this is about up's internal policy. 24 So if we were to take that and extrapolat 26 that bapt fins	9		9 construction projects that are not necessitated by the
11 And so this evidence bears upon the impact 12 Sorry, it's page 2, lines 19 through 25. 12 13 JUDGE HOWARD: Page 2, you said? 13 14 MR. ROBERSON: Yeah, sorry. Page 2, lines 1 14 15 19 through 25. That testimony deals with other grade 15 16 crossings in Washington. It doesn't make a fact of 16 17 consequence with regard to this crossing more or less 16 18 likely, and Staff would object on grounds of relevance. 18 19 proget 7, line 9 through page 8, line 25, this is 20 10 sorry, page 7, line 9 through page 8, line 25, this is 20 11 maximum tist an is a sourt UP's agreements with entities other than 16 12 testimory about UP's agreements with entities other than 21 consequence any less likely. 12 consequence any less likely. 23 is that the imposition of costs of funding a project 14 Again, it doesn't make any of those facts discussed 30 16 So if we were to take that and extrapolate 15 page 9, line 5, this is about UP's internal policy. 25 So if we were to take that and extrapolate 2			
12 Sorry, it's page 2, lines 10 through 25. 13 JUDGE HOWARD: Page 2, you said? 14 MR. ROBERSON: Yeah, sorry, Page 2, lines 15 19 through 25. That testimony deals with other grade 16 crossings in Washington. It doesn't make a fact of consequence with regard to this crossing more or less 18 likely, and Staff would object on grounds of relevance. 19 testimory about UP's agreements with entities other that 10 Exhibit -or Tsubid Pi-or Tail times 7 - or or 10 sthibit -or Tsubid Pi-or Tail times 7 - or 11 testimory about UP's agreements with entities other that 12 testimory about UP's internal policy. 12 Fage 30 12 Again, it doesn't make any of those facts discussed 13 above more or less likely, those facts discussed 14 that's about maintenance for the crossing surface 15 that's about maintenance for the crossing 16 file we any of those facts di consequence. 17 Again, it doesn't make any of those facts di consequence. 18 Adjen PI-11 tapge 30, lines 6 through 8, dise 3 through 20, lines 6 through			
13 JUDGE HOWARD: Page 2, you said? 13 Jubrit that that is relevant. 14 MR. ROBERSON: Yeah, sorry. Page 2, lines 14 Ithink the same argument bears, Your Honor, if we move to page 7 of the prefiled testimony of 15 19 through 25. That testimony deals with other grade 14 Ithink the same argument bears, Your Honor, if we move to page 7 of the prefiled testimony of 16 consequence with regard to this crossing more or less 16 Ms. Ygbuhay and the average costs of materials for type 19 consequence with regard to this crossing more or less 16 Ms. Ygbuhay and the average costs of materials for type 20 staff would object on grounds of relevance. 16 Ms. Ygbuhay and the average costs of materials for type 21 testimony about UP's agreements with entities other than 17 consequence any less likely. 18 22 consequence any less likely. 18 for the mainteance, average costs of mudine ance for the crossing thread by the City and that request 28 24 Exhibit PY-1T, at page 8, line 26 through page 9, line 5, this is about UP's internal policy. 24 14 24 Again, it doesn't make any of those facts discussed 20 50 if we were to take that and certapolate 24 above more or less likely.			
14 MR. ROBERSON: Yeah, sorry. Page 2, lines 14 I think the same argument bears, Your Honor, 15 19 through 25. That testimony deals with other grade 15 if we move to page 7 of the prefiled testimony of 16 crossings in Washington. It doesn't make a fact of 16 if we move to page 7 of the prefiled testimony of 18 likely, and Staff would object on grounds of relevance. 16 MS. rgbuhay and the average cost of maintenance. We can't 20 sorry, page 7, line 9 through page 8, line 25, this is corridor when we were talking about the issue of State 21 testimony about UP's internal policy. argument is that this is something that is for the 22 corisor of less likely. 22 Cify's benefit, requested by the City, and that request 23 that the imposition of costs of funding a project 14 24 Exhibit PY-1T, at page 8, line 26 through 25 page 9, line 5, this is about UP's internal policy. 25 24 Page 30 Page 30 Page 32 25 fudde. 26 funded. 26 that's about maintenance for the crossing surface 14 that out to other crossing throughout the state, then 36 that's not about maintenance for the crossing surface			
19 through 25. That testimony deals with other grade 15 if we move to page 7 of the prefiled testimony of 16 consequence with regard to this crossing more or less 16 Ms. Ygbuhsy and the average costs of materials for type 19 testimory about UP's agreements with entities other than 16 Ms. Ygbuhsy and the average cost of maintenance. We can't consider the City of Spokane's Barker Road project in a corridor when we were talking about the issue of State 20 sorry, page 7, line 9 through page 8, line 26, this is 17 consequence ain, less likely. 24 Exhibit PY-1T, at page 8, line 26 through 23 is that the imposition of costs of funding a project 25 page 9, line 5, this is about UP's internal policy. Page 30 Page 30 26 Again, it doesn't make any of those facts discussed 1 So if we were to take that and extrapolate 3 Additen PY-1T at page 9, lines 6 through 8, that's about maintenance for the crossing devices. It's also irrelevant for purposes of the prefiled testimony of So if we were to take that and extrapolate 3 Additen PY-1T at page 9, lines 26 and then it crossed or over to page 8? Moving to page 8, how does UP spend the 3 moneys it collects from other paties for signal maintenance, areagreements can come up is is phortanit for Yun 4 thar			
16 crossings in Washington. It doesn't make a fact of Ms. Ygbuhay and the average costs of materials for type 17 consequence with regard to this crossing more or less if all with the imposition of the railroads. Particularly when our 18 Exhibit or Exhibit PY-1T at lines 7 or consequence with regard to this crossing the exhibit PY-1T at page 8, line 25, this is 20 sorry, page 7, line 9 through page 8, line 25, this is consequence any less likely. 21 testimory about UP's agreements with entities other than the doesn't make any of those facts of 23 consequence any less likely. is that the imposition of costs of funding a project 24 Exhibit PY-1T at page 8, line 26 through is that the imposition of costs of funding a project 24 babout maintenance for the crossing funded. 25 page 9, line 5, this is about UP's internal policy. Page 30 26 Page 30 Page 32 27 Again, it doesn't make any of those facts discussed about maintenance for the crossing devices. It's also irrelevant for purposes of the 36 devices. It's also irrelevant for purposes of the petition and the City's complaint. 37 JUDGE HOWARD: Can 1 get your second-to-last funded. 38 that would have			5 , , ,
17 consequence with regard to this crossing more or less 17 of maintenance, average cost of maintenance. We can't consider the City of Spokane's Barker Road project in a consequence any list Barker Road project in a consequence is the spokane's consequence is the theo City of the City. 1 Page 30 Page 30 2 Page 30 Page 30 2 Page 10' <td></td> <td></td> <td></td>			
18 likely, and Staff would object on grounds of relevance. 18 consider the City of Spokane's Barker Road project in a corifdor when we were taiking about the issue of State response to the state of the			
19 Exhibit or Exhibit PY-1T at lines 7 or sorry, page 7, line 9 through page 8, line 25, this is sorry hage 7, line 9 through page 8, line 25, this is consequence any less likely. 19 corridor when we were talking about the issue of State regulation of the railroads. Particularly when our argument is that this is something that is for the City. It doesn't make any of those facts of consequence any less likely, those facts of consequence. 24 Exhibit PY-1T, at page 8, line 26 through page 9, line 5, this is about UP's internal policy. 20 City's benefit, requested by the City, and that request is that the imposition of costs of funding a project that happens to cross Union Pacific's railroad should be funded. Page 30 Page 30 Page 30 Page 30 Page 32 Again, it doesn't make any of those facts of consequence. Again, it doesn't make any of those facts of consequence. Again, it doesn't make any of those facts of consequence. Again, it doesn't make any of those facts of consequence. Again, it doesn't make any of those facts of consequence. Again, it doesn't make any of those facts of consequence. Again, it doesn't make any of those facts of consequence. Again, it doesn't make any of those facts of consequence. Again, it doesn't make			
20 sorry, page 7, line 9 through page 8, line 25, this is 21 testimony about UP's agreements with entities other than 21 the City. It doesn't make any of those facts of 23 consequence any less likely. 24 Exhibit PY-1T, at page 8, line 26 through 25 page 9, line 5, this is about UP's internal policy. Page 30 Page		· · · ·	
21 testimony about UP's agreements with entities other than 22 testimony about UP's agreements with entities other than 23 consequence any less likely. 24 Exhibit PY-1T, at page 8, line 26 through 25 page 9, line 5, this is about UP's internal policy. 24 Again, it doesn't make any of those facts discussed 2 above more or less likely, those facts of consequence. 3 And then PY-1T at page 9, lines 6 through 8, 4 that's about maintenance for the crossing 4 that's about maintenance for the crossing 6 devices. It's also irrelevant for purposes of the 7 petition and the City's complaint. 8 JUDGE HOWARD: Can I get your second-to-last 10 over to page 9, line 5. And that's all I have. 3 JUDGE HOWARD: Can I get your second-to-last 11 MR. ROBERSON: I have page 8, line 26 11 MR. ROBERSON: I have page 8, line 26 12 through page 9, line 5. And that's all I have. 3 JUDGE HOWARD: Can I get your second-to-last 12 MR. ROBERSON: I have page 8, line 26 14 to respont to this? 12 <td< td=""><td></td><td></td><td></td></td<>			
22 the City. It doesn't make any of those facts of consequence any less likely. 22 City's benefit, requested by the City, and that request is that the imposition of costs of funding a project that happens to cross Union Pacific's railroad should be funded. 23 Exhibit PY-1T, at page 8, line 26 through 2 23 City's benefit, requested by the City, and that request is that the imposition of costs of funding a project that happens to cross Union Pacific's railroad should be funded. 24 Exhibit PY-1T, at page 8, line 26 through 8, above more or less likely, those facts of consequence. Page 30 Page 30 2 Again, it doesn't make any of those facts discussed above more or less likely, those facts of consequence. So if we were to take that and extrapolate that would have a massive economic impact, and certainly it wouldn't further the federal regulations regarding safety allocation of costs. Page 32 3 Matter purchase and the City's complaint. SubGE HOWARD: Can I get your second-to-last 9 devices. It's also irrelevant for purposes of the petition and the City's complaint. Moving to page 8, how does UP spend the moneys it collects from other parties for signal maintenance. One of the implications - well, it's 9 actually explicitly stated in the prefiled testimony of 10 Gloria Mantz, and I believe it is also implicitly 11 MR. ROBERSON: I have page 8, line 26 through 8, here in just a moment. Mat give me a moment here and I will allow for responses here in just a moment. City case, on behalf of the Railroad because they're refusing to aceept responsibility.			
23 consequence any less likely. 23 is that the imposition of costs of funding a project 24 Exhibit PY-TT, at page 8, line 26 through 24 is that the imposition of costs of funding a project 25 page 9, line 5, this is about UP's internal policy. 25 is that the imposition of costs of funding a project 24 Exhibit PY-TT, at page 8, line 26 through 24 is that the imposition of costs of funding a project 25 page 9, line 5, this is about UP's internal policy. 25 is that the imposition of costs of funding a project 24 Again, it doesn't make any of those facts discussed 24 25 3 And then PY-1T at page 9, lines 6 through 8, that's about maintenance for the crossing 24 4 that's about maintenance for the crossing 24 34 that would have a massive economic impact, and certainly 4 that's about maintenance for the crossing 6 Moving to page 8, how does UP spend the 7 petition and the City's complaint. 7 moneys it collects from other parties for signal 8 JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Thank you. Just 8 maintenance and half delibere it is also implicitly 11 MR. ROBERSON: I have page 8, line 26 for ad so invouid			
24 Exhibit PY-1T, at page 8, line 26 through page 9, line 5, this is about UP's internal policy. 24 that happens to cross Union Pacific's railroad should be funded. 25 page 9, line 5, this is about UP's internal policy. 24 that happens to cross Union Pacific's railroad should be funded. 21 Again, it doesn't make any of those facts discussed above more or less likely, those facts of consequence. 3 Page 30 3 And then PY-1T at page 9, lines 6 through 8, that's about maintenance for the crossing surface 1 So if we were to take that and extrapolate 3 that sol about maintenance for the crossing 6 devices. It's also irrelevant for purposes of the petition and the City's complaint. 3 Moving to page 8, how does UP spend the 7 puttion page 9, line 5. And that's all pave. 10 Gloria Mantz, and I believe it is also implicitly 11 MR. ROBERSON: I have page 8, line 26 1 referenced in the prefiled testimony of Mr. Lochmiller 12 tixe to respond to this? 11 referenced in the prefiled testimony of Mr. Lochmiller 13 JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Thank you. Just 13 case, on behalf of the Railroad because they're refusing 14 tixe to respond to this? MS. REYNOLDS: Yes, Your Honor. I think it makes anse probably to take each one up individually. And so p			
25 page 9, line 5, this is about UP's internal policy. 25 funded. Page 9, line 5, this is about UP's internal policy. Page 9, line 5, this is about UP's internal policy. Page 9, line 5, this is about UP's internal policy. Page 9, line 5, this is about UP's internal policy. Page 9, line 5, this is about UP's internal policy. Page 9, line 5, this is about UP's internal policy. Page 9, line 5, this is about UP's internal policy. Addition and the OY-1T at page 9, lines 6 through 2 And then PY-1T at page 9, lines 6 through 8, that's alou traintenance for the crossing surface its also irrelevant for purposes of the petition and the City's complaint. 3 JUDGE HOWARD: Can I get your second-to-last cite again? Was it page 8, line 25 and then it crossed over to page 9? MR. ROBERSON: I have page 8, line 26 through page 9, line 5. And that's all I have. MI UDGE HOWARD: All right. Thank you. Just give me a moment here and I will allow for responses here in just a moment. MR. ROBERSON: All right. Thank you. Just give me a moment here and I will allow for responses here in just a moment. MR. REYNOLDS: Yes, Your Honor. I think it makes sense probably to take each one up individually. And so I would direct Your Honor to page 2, lines 18 through 27, the testimony about other public grade crossing, et cetra. MR ato of consequence is how maintenance costs And the that standard is n' that this is - <td></td> <td></td> <td></td>			
Page 30 Page 32 1 Again, it doesn't make any of those facts discussed above more or less likely, those facts of consequence. 1 So if we were to take that and extrapolate 2 above more or less likely, those facts of consequence. 1 So if we were to take that and extrapolate 3 And then PY-1T at page 9, lines 6 through 8, that's about maintenance for the crossing devices. It's also irrelevant for purposes of the petition and the City's complaint. 3 6 devices. It's also irrelevant for purposes of the petition and the City's complaint. 6 7 JUDGE HOWARD: Can I get your second-to-last over to page 9? 6 11 MR. ROBERSON: I have page 8, line 25 and then it crossed over to page 9? 10 12 through page 9, line 5. And that's all I have. 11 13 JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Thank you. Just 13 14 give me a moment. 11 15 here in just a moment. 12 16 All right. Would the would Union Pacific 13 18 MS. REYNOLDS: Yes, Your Honor. I think it makes sense probably to take each one up individually. 14 accept responsibility. 14 thosu I would direct Your Honor to page 2, lines 18 And so I would direct Your Honor to page 2, lines 18			
1Again, it doesn't make any of those facts discussed above more or less likely, those facts of consequence.1Again, it doesn't make any of those facts discussed above more or less likely, those facts of consequence.3And then PY-1T at page 9, lines 6 through 8, that's about maintenance for the crossing devices. It's also irrelevant for purposes of the petition and the City's complaint.6devices. It's also irrelevant for purposes of the petition and the City's complaint.7puttion and the City's complaint.8JUDGE HOWARD: Can I get your second-to-last cite again? Was it page 8, line 25 and then it crossed over to page 9?11MR. ROBERSON: I have page 8, line 26 through page 9, line 5. And that's all I have.12through page 9, line 5. And that's all I have.13JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Thank you. Just14give me a moment.15here in just a moment.16All right. Would the would Union Pacific17like to respond to this?18MS. REYNOLDS: Yes, Your Honor. I think it through 27, the testimony about other public grade crossings, et cetera.23At issue in this case, and as stated by that sale in this case, and as stated by24Staff, a fact of consequence is how maintenance costs	23	page 9, line 9, line 13 about of 3 internal policy.	
2above more or less likely, those facts of consequence.2that out to other crossings throughout the state, then3And then PY-1T at page 9, lines 6 through 8,that's about maintenance for the crossing surfacethat's about maintenance for the crossingthat's about maintenance for the crossingthat would have a massive economic impact, and certainly6devices. It's also irrelevant for purposes of themoleys it collects from other parties for signalmoneys it collects from other parties for signal8JUDGE HOWARD: Can I get your second-to-lastmoneys it collects from other parties for signalmaintenance. One of the implications well, it's9cite again? Was it page 8, line 25 and then it crossedGloria Manz, and I believe it is also implicitlymoneys it collects from other parties for signal11MR. ROBERSON: I have page 8, line 26If''''''''''''''''''''''''''''''''''''		Page 30	Page 32
2above more or less likely, those facts of consequence.2that out to other crossings throughout the state, then3And then PY-1T at page 9, lines 6 through 8,that's about maintenance for the crossing surfacethat's about maintenance for the crossingthat's about maintenance for the crossingthat would have a massive economic impact, and certainly6devices. It's also irrelevant for purposes of themoleys it collects from other parties for signalmoneys it collects from other parties for signal8JUDGE HOWARD: Can I get your second-to-lastmoneys it collects from other parties for signalmaintenance. One of the implications well, it's9cite again? Was it page 8, line 25 and then it crossedGloria Manz, and I believe it is also implicitlymoneys it collects from other parties for signal11MR. ROBERSON: I have page 8, line 26If''''''''''''''''''''''''''''''''''''	1	Again, it doesn't make any of those facts discussed	1 So if we were to take that and extrapolate
3And then PY-1T at page 9, lines 6 through 8, that's about maintenance for the crossing surface3that would have a massive economic impact, and certainly it wouldn't further the federal regulations regarding safety allocation of costs.6devices. It's also irrelevant for purposes of the devices. It's also irrelevant for purposes of the petition and the City's complaint.6Moving to page 8, how does UP spend the moneys it collects from other parties for signal maintenance. One of the implications well, it's actually explicitly stated in the prefiled testimony of Gloria Mantz, and I believe it is also implicitly10over to page 9?10Gloria Mantz, and I believe it is also implicitly referenced in the prefiled testimony of Mr. Lochmiller is also implicitly12through page 9, line 5. And that's all I have. JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Thank you. Just JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Thank you. Just13case, on behalf of the Railroad because they're refusing to accept responsibility for what the City considers14give me a moment. All right. Would the would Union Pacific I ke to respond to this?15Railroad responsibility.19makes sense probably to take each one up individually. 2019Honor to make a determination of whether cost and maintenance are allocated to the Railroad or to the city.21through 27, the testimony about other page 2, lines 18 2020And so I would direct Your Honor to page 2, lines 18 2023At issue in this case, and as stated by 2424Staff, a fact of consequence is how maintenance costs2424Staff, a fact of consequence is how maintenance costs24<			
4that's about maintenance for the crossing surface4it wouldn't further the federal regulations regarding5itself. It's not about maintenance for the crossing5safety allocation of costs.6devices. It's also irrelevant for purposes of the6Moving to page 8, how does UP spend the7petition and the City's complaint.7moneys it collects from other parties for signal8JUDGE HOWARD: Can I get your second-to-last9actually explicitly stated in the prefiled testimony of9cite again? Was it page 8, line 25 and then it crossed9actually explicitly stated in the prefiled testimony of10over to page 9?10Gloria Mantz, and I believe it is also implicitly11MR. ROBERSON: I have page 8, line 2611referenced in the prefiled testimony of Mr. Lochmiller12through page 9, line 5. And that's all I have.12is that there is some sort of nefarious delay, in this13JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Thank you. Just13case, on behalf of the Railroad because they're refusing14give me a moment.15Railroad responsibility.16All right. Would the would Union Pacific16And so providing the context for other17like to respond to this?17situations where these types of construction and18MS. REYNOLDS: Yes, Your Honor. I think it1819makes sense probably to take each one up individually.1910And so I would direct Your Honor to page 2, lines 182021through 27, the testimony			5 5 7
5itself. It's not about maintenance for the crossing devices. It's also irrelevant for purposes of the petition and the City's complaint.5safety allocation of costs.7petition and the City's complaint.7Moving to page 8, how does UP spend the moneys it collects from other parties for signal8JUDGE HOWARD: Can I get your second-to-last 99maintenance. One of the implications well, it's actually explicitly stated in the prefiled testimony of10over to page 9?10Gloria Mantz, and I believe it is also implicitly11MR. ROBERSON: I have page 8, line 2611referenced in the prefiled testimony of Mr. Lochmiller12through page 9, line 5. And that's all I have. JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Thank you. Just13case, on behalf of the Railroad because they're refusing14give me a moment here and I will allow for responses14to accept responsibility for what the City considers15here in just a moment.15Railroad responsibility.16All right. Would the would Union Pacific16And so providing the context for other17like to respond to this?17situations where these types of construction and maintenance agreements can come up is important for Your19makes sense probably to take each one up individually.19Honor to make a determination of whether cost and18MS. REYNOLDS: Yes, Your Honor. I think it through 27, the testimony about other public grade21City.21through 27, the testimony about other public grade21City.22At issue			
6devices. It's also irrelevant for purposes of the6Moving to page 8, how does UP spend the7petition and the City's complaint.7moneys it collects from other parties for signal8JUDGE HOWARD: Can I get your second-to-last9actually explicitly stated in the prefiled testimony of9cite again? Was it page 8, line 25 and then it crossed9actually explicitly stated in the prefiled testimony of10over to page 9?10Gloria Mantz, and I believe it is also implicitly11MR. ROBERSON: I have page 8, line 2611referenced in the prefiled testimony of Mr. Lochmiller12through page 9, line 5. And that's all I have.12is that there is some sort of nefarious delay, in this13JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Thank you. Just13case, on behalf of the Railroad because they're refusing14give me a moment.15Railroad responsibility for what the City considers15here in just a moment.15Railroad responsibility.16All right. Would the would Union Pacific16And so providing the context for other17like to respond to this?17situations where these types of construction and18MS. REYNOLDS: Yes, Your Honor. I think it1819maintenance are allocated to the Railroad or to the21through 27, the testimony about other public grade2022crossings, et cetera.2223At issue in this case, and as stated by2324Staff, a fact of consequence is how maintenance costs<		•	
7petition and the City's complaint.7moneys it collects from other parties for signal8JUDGE HOWARD: Can I get your second-to-last9maintenance. One of the implications well, it's9cite again? Was it page 8, line 25 and then it crossed9actually explicitly stated in the prefiled testimony of10over to page 9?10Gloria Mantz, and I believe it is also implicitly11MR. ROBERSON: I have page 8, line 2611referenced in the prefiled testimony of Mr. Lochmiller12through page 9, line 5. And that's all I have.12is that there is some sort of nefarious delay, in this13JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Thank you. Just13case, on behalf of the Railroad because they're refusing14give me a moment here and I will allow for responses14to accept responsibility.15here in just a moment.15Railroad responsibility.16All right. Would the would Union Pacific16And so providing the context for other17like to respond to this?17situations where these types of construction and18MS. REYNOLDS: Yes, Your Honor. I think it18maintenance agreements can come up is important for Your19makes sense probably to take each one up individually.19Honor to make a determination of whether cost and20And so I would direct Your Honor to page 2, lines 1820And so I would direct Your Honor to page 2, lines 1821through 27, the testimony about other public grade21City.22At issue in this case	6	<u> </u>	
8JUDGE HOWARD: Can I get your second-to-last cite again? Was it page 8, line 25 and then it crossed over to page 9?8maintenance. One of the implications well, it's actually explicitly stated in the prefiled testimony of10over to page 9?10Gloria Mantz, and I believe it is also implicitly11MR. ROBERSON: I have page 8, line 2611referenced in the prefiled testimony of Mr. Lochmiller12through page 9, line 5. And that's all I have.12is that there is some sort of nefarious delay, in this13JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Thank you. Just13case, on behalf of the Railroad because they're refusing14give me a moment here and I will allow for responses14to accept responsibility for what the City considers15here in just a moment.15Railroad responsibility.16All right. Would the would Union Pacific16And so providing the context for other17like to respond to this?17situations where these types of construction and18MS. REYNOLDS: Yes, Your Honor. I think it18maintenance agreements can come up is important for Your19makes sense probably to take each one up individually.19Honor to make a determination of whether cost and21through 27, the testimony about other public grade21City.22At issue in this case, and as stated by23directly bears on any of the facts as the Staff has set24Staff, a fact of consequence is how maintenance costs24up. The standard is whether it makes any fact of	7		
9cite again? Was it page 8, line 25 and then it crossed over to page 9?9actually explicitly stated in the prefiled testimony of Gloria Mantz, and I believe it is also implicitly11MR. ROBERSON: I have page 8, line 26 through page 9, line 5. And that's all I have.10Gloria Mantz, and I believe it is also implicitly13JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Thank you. Just give me a moment here and I will allow for responses13case, on behalf of the Railroad because they're refusing to accept responsibility for what the City considers14give me a moment.15Railroad responsibility.16All right. Would the would Union Pacific16And so providing the context for other17like to respond to this?17situations where these types of construction and maintenance agreements can come up is important for Your19makes sense probably to take each one up individually.19Honor to make a determination of whether cost and maintenance are allocated to the Railroad or to the21through 27, the testimony about other public grade crossings, et cetera.22And that the standard isn't that this is23At issue in this case, and as stated by23directly bears on any of the facts as the Staff has set24Staff, a fact of consequence is how maintenance costs24up. The standard is whether it makes any fact of			
10over to page 9?10Gloria Mantz, and I believe it is also implicitly11MR. ROBERSON: I have page 8, line 2611referenced in the prefiled testimony of Mr. Lochmiller12through page 9, line 5. And that's all I have.12is that there is some sort of nefarious delay, in this13JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Thank you. Just13case, on behalf of the Railroad because they're refusing14give me a moment here and I will allow for responses14to accept responsibility for what the City considers15here in just a moment.15Railroad responsibility.16All right. Would the would Union Pacific16And so providing the context for other17like to respond to this?17situations where these types of construction and18MS. REYNOLDS: Yes, Your Honor. I think it18maintenance agreements can come up is important for Your19makes sense probably to take each one up individually.19Honor to make a determination of whether cost and20And so I would direct Your Honor to page 2, lines 1820maintenance are allocated to the Railroad or to the21through 27, the testimony about other public grade21City.23At issue in this case, and as stated by23directly bears on any of the facts as the Staff has set24Staff, a fact of consequence is how maintenance costs24up. The standard is whether it makes any fact of	9	. .	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
11MR. ROBERSON: I have page 8, line 2611referenced in the prefiled testimony of Mr. Lochmiller12through page 9, line 5. And that's all I have.12is that there is some sort of nefarious delay, in this13JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Thank you. Just13case, on behalf of the Railroad because they're refusing14give me a moment here and I will allow for responses14to accept responsibility for what the City considers15here in just a moment.15Railroad responsibility.16All right. Would the would Union Pacific16And so providing the context for other17like to respond to this?17situations where these types of construction and18MS. REYNOLDS: Yes, Your Honor. I think it18maintenance agreements can come up is important for Your19makes sense probably to take each one up individually.19Honor to make a determination of whether cost and20And so I would direct Your Honor to page 2, lines 1820maintenance are allocated to the Railroad or to the21through 27, the testimony about other public grade22And that the standard isn't that this is23At issue in this case, and as stated by23directly bears on any of the facts as the Staff has set24Staff, a fact of consequence is how maintenance costs24up. The standard is whether it makes any fact of			
12through page 9, line 5. And that's all I have.12is that there is some sort of nefarious delay, in this13JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Thank you. Justis that there is some sort of nefarious delay, in this14give me a moment here and I will allow for responsesis that there is some sort of nefarious delay, in this15here in just a moment.1316All right. Would the would Union Pacific1617like to respond to this?1618MS. REYNOLDS: Yes, Your Honor. I think it1819makes sense probably to take each one up individually.1920And so I would direct Your Honor to page 2, lines 182021through 27, the testimony about other public grade2122Crossings, et cetera.2223At issue in this case, and as stated by2324Staff, a fact of consequence is how maintenance costs24			
13JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Thank you. Just give me a moment here and I will allow for responses here in just a moment.13case, on behalf of the Railroad because they're refusing to accept responsibility for what the City considers Railroad responsibility.16All right. Would the would Union Pacific14to accept responsibility for what the City considers17like to respond to this?16And so providing the context for other18MS. REYNOLDS: Yes, Your Honor. I think it makes sense probably to take each one up individually.18maintenance agreements can come up is important for Your20And so I would direct Your Honor to page 2, lines 18 through 27, the testimony about other public grade crossings, et cetera.20And that the standard isn't that this is23At issue in this case, and as stated by 2423directly bears on any of the facts as the Staff has set up. The standard is whether it makes any fact of			
14give me a moment here and I will allow for responses14to accept responsibility for what the City considers15here in just a moment.15Railroad responsibility.16All right. Would the would Union Pacific16And so providing the context for other17like to respond to this?16And so providing the context for other18MS. REYNOLDS: Yes, Your Honor. I think it18maintenance agreements can come up is important for Your19makes sense probably to take each one up individually.19Honor to make a determination of whether cost and20And so I would direct Your Honor to page 2, lines 1820maintenance are allocated to the Railroad or to the21through 27, the testimony about other public grade21City.23At issue in this case, and as stated by23directly bears on any of the facts as the Staff has set24Staff, a fact of consequence is how maintenance costs24up. The standard is whether it makes any fact of			
15here in just a moment.15Railroad responsibility.16All right. Would the would Union Pacific16And so providing the context for other17like to respond to this?16And so providing the context for other18MS. REYNOLDS: Yes, Your Honor. I think it18maintenance agreements can come up is important for Your19makes sense probably to take each one up individually.19Honor to make a determination of whether cost and20And so I would direct Your Honor to page 2, lines 1820maintenance are allocated to the Railroad or to the21through 27, the testimony about other public grade21City.23At issue in this case, and as stated by23directly bears on any of the facts as the Staff has set24Staff, a fact of consequence is how maintenance costs24up. The standard is whether it makes any fact of			
16All right. Would the would Union Pacific16And so providing the context for other17like to respond to this?17situations where these types of construction and18MS. REYNOLDS: Yes, Your Honor. I think it18maintenance agreements can come up is important for Your19makes sense probably to take each one up individually.19Honor to make a determination of whether cost and20And so I would direct Your Honor to page 2, lines 1820maintenance are allocated to the Railroad or to the21through 27, the testimony about other public grade21City.22At issue in this case, and as stated by23directly bears on any of the facts as the Staff has set24Staff, a fact of consequence is how maintenance costs24up. The standard is whether it makes any fact of		-	
17like to respond to this?17situations where these types of construction and18MS. REYNOLDS: Yes, Your Honor. I think it18maintenance agreements can come up is important for Your19makes sense probably to take each one up individually.19Honor to make a determination of whether cost and20And so I would direct Your Honor to page 2, lines 1820maintenance are allocated to the Railroad or to the21through 27, the testimony about other public grade21City.22crossings, et cetera.22And that the standard isn't that this is23At issue in this case, and as stated by23directly bears on any of the facts as the Staff has set24Staff, a fact of consequence is how maintenance costs24up. The standard is whether it makes any fact of		-	
18MS. REYNOLDS: Yes, Your Honor. I think it18maintenance agreements can come up is important for Your19makes sense probably to take each one up individually.18Honor to make a determination of whether cost and20And so I would direct Your Honor to page 2, lines 1820Honor to make a determination of whether cost and21through 27, the testimony about other public grade21City.22crossings, et cetera.22And that the standard isn't that this is23At issue in this case, and as stated by23directly bears on any of the facts as the Staff has set24Staff, a fact of consequence is how maintenance costs24up. The standard is whether it makes any fact of		-	
19makes sense probably to take each one up individually.19Honor to make a determination of whether cost and20And so I would direct Your Honor to page 2, lines 1820maintenance are allocated to the Railroad or to the21through 27, the testimony about other public grade21City.22crossings, et cetera.22And that the standard isn't that this is23At issue in this case, and as stated by23directly bears on any of the facts as the Staff has set24Staff, a fact of consequence is how maintenance costs24up. The standard is whether it makes any fact of		•	
20And so I would direct Your Honor to page 2, lines 1820maintenance are allocated to the Railroad or to the21through 27, the testimony about other public grade21City.22crossings, et cetera.22And that the standard isn't that this is23At issue in this case, and as stated by23directly bears on any of the facts as the Staff has set24Staff, a fact of consequence is how maintenance costs24up. The standard is whether it makes any fact of			
21through 27, the testimony about other public grade21City.22crossings, et cetera.22And that the standard isn't that this is23At issue in this case, and as stated by23directly bears on any of the facts as the Staff has set24Staff, a fact of consequence is how maintenance costs24up. The standard is whether it makes any fact of			
22crossings, et cetera.22And that the standard isn't that this is23At issue in this case, and as stated by23directly bears on any of the facts as the Staff has set24Staff, a fact of consequence is how maintenance costs24up. The standard is whether it makes any fact of	20	And so I would direct Your Honor to pade 2. lines 18	
23At issue in this case, and as stated by23directly bears on any of the facts as the Staff has set24Staff, a fact of consequence is how maintenance costs24up. The standard is whether it makes any fact of			
24 Staff, a fact of consequence is how maintenance costs 24 up. The standard is whether it makes any fact of	21	through 27, the testimony about other public grade	21 City.
	21 22	through 27, the testimony about other public grade crossings, et cetera.	21City.22And that the standard isn't that this is
	21 22 23	through 27, the testimony about other public grade crossings, et cetera. At issue in this case, and as stated by	 21 City. 22 And that the standard isn't that this is 23 directly bears on any of the facts as the Staff has set
	21 22 23 24	through 27, the testimony about other public grade crossings, et cetera. At issue in this case, and as stated by Staff, a fact of consequence is how maintenance costs	 21 City. 22 And that the standard isn't that this is 23 directly bears on any of the facts as the Staff has set 24 up. The standard is whether it makes any fact of

5 (Pages 29 to 32)

Page 331And so the standard for relevancy is2exceedingly low, and the context of all of the City's3prior agreements with this railroad and the Railroad's4activities throughout the state of Washington do bear on5the issues that are at play here.6And I think that generally addresses the7concerns that were raised by Staff unless Your Honor has8additional questions regarding specific pieces of9testimony we would submit.10JUDGE HOWARD: Would you like to respond to11I think it was the final item in the testimony that12Staff objected to, which is page 9, line 6 through 8,13the estimated cost for maintenance for the crossing	t and an ost. e
 exceedingly low, and the context of all of the City's prior agreements with this railroad and the Railroad's activities throughout the state of Washington do bear on the issues that are at play here. And I think that generally addresses the concerns that were raised by Staff unless Your Honor has additional questions regarding specific pieces of testimony we would submit. JUDGE HOWARD: Would you like to respond to I think it was the final item in the testimony that Staff objected to, which is page 9, line 6 through 8, 	t and an ost. e
 prior agreements with this railroad and the Railroad's activities throughout the state of Washington do bear on the issues that are at play here. And I think that generally addresses the concerns that were raised by Staff unless Your Honor has additional questions regarding specific pieces of testimony we would submit. JUDGE HOWARD: Would you like to respond to I think it was the final item in the testimony that Staff objected to, which is page 9, line 6 through 8, acceptance by the Railroad to undertake the of acceptance by the Railroad to undertake the of And I'm sorry, Your Honor, do you have additional questions? JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. But n additional questions regarding specific pieces of think it was the final item in the testimony that Kaff objected to, which is page 9, line 6 through 8, 	ost. e
4activities throughout the state of Washington do bear on the issues that are at play here.4And I'm sorry, Your Honor, do you hav additional questions?6And I think that generally addresses the concerns that were raised by Staff unless Your Honor has additional questions regarding specific pieces of testimony we would submit.4And I'm sorry, Your Honor, do you hav additional questions?10JUDGE HOWARD: Would you like to respond to 1110MS. FOSTER: Thank you, Judge How 1112Staff objected to, which is page 9, line 6 through 8,12Mr. Roberson in Staff's motion, but has nothin	9
5the issues that are at play here.5additional questions?6And I think that generally addresses the6JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. But n7concerns that were raised by Staff unless Your Honor has7at this time.8additional questions regarding specific pieces of8Would the City like to comment on Sta9testimony we would submit.9motion?10JUDGE HOWARD: Would you like to respond to10MS. FOSTER: Thank you, Judge How11I think it was the final item in the testimony that11Foster for the City. The City generally support12Staff objected to, which is page 9, line 6 through 8,12Mr. Roberson in Staff's motion, but has nothin	
6And I think that generally addresses the concerns that were raised by Staff unless Your Honor has additional questions regarding specific pieces of testimony we would submit.6JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. But n at this time.8additional questions regarding specific pieces of testimony we would submit.8Would the City like to comment on Sta motion?10JUDGE HOWARD: Would you like to respond to 1110MS. FOSTER: Thank you, Judge How 1112Staff objected to, which is page 9, line 6 through 8,12Mr. Roberson in Staff's motion, but has nothin	o, I do not
 concerns that were raised by Staff unless Your Honor has additional questions regarding specific pieces of testimony we would submit. JUDGE HOWARD: Would you like to respond to I think it was the final item in the testimony that Staff objected to, which is page 9, line 6 through 8, additional questions regarding specific pieces of this time. additional questions regarding specific pieces of this time. Would the City like to comment on Sta motion? MS. FOSTER: Thank you, Judge How Foster for the City. The City generally support Mr. Roberson in Staff's motion, but has nothin 	o, I do not
8 additional questions regarding specific pieces of 8 Would the City like to comment on State 9 testimony we would submit. 9 motion? 10 JUDGE HOWARD: Would you like to respond to 10 MS. FOSTER: Thank you, Judge How 11 I think it was the final item in the testimony that 11 Foster for the City. The City generally support 12 Staff objected to, which is page 9, line 6 through 8, 12 Mr. Roberson in Staff's motion, but has nothin	
9testimony we would submit.9motion?10JUDGE HOWARD: Would you like to respond to10MS. FOSTER: Thank you, Judge How11I think it was the final item in the testimony that11Foster for the City. The City generally support12Staff objected to, which is page 9, line 6 through 8,12Mr. Roberson in Staff's motion, but has nothin	
10JUDGE HOWARD: Would you like to respond to10MS. FOSTER: Thank you, Judge How11I think it was the final item in the testimony that11Foster for the City. The City generally support12Staff objected to, which is page 9, line 6 through 8,12Mr. Roberson in Staff's motion, but has nothin	f's
11I think it was the final item in the testimony that11Foster for the City. The City generally support12Staff objected to, which is page 9, line 6 through 8,12Mr. Roberson in Staff's motion, but has nothin	
12 Staff objected to, which is page 9, line 6 through 8, 12 Mr. Roberson in Staff's motion, but has nothin	
$\perp 3$ the estimated cost for maintenance for the crossing $\mid \perp 3$ to confinent. Thank you.	g specific
6	just to be
	-
15 MS. REYNOLDS: Yes, Your Honor. I think 15 clear, the second item of testimony that your not that this bears upon the issues in this case because 16 that this bears upon the issues in this case because 16 focused on was page 7, line 9 to page 8, line 2	
1611810 <td></td>	
18 surface crossing. And there are agreements wherein the 18 Howard.	ge
19 parties, including the City of Spokane Valley and Union 19 JUDGE HOWARD: All right. I am goin	na to
20 Pacific Railroad, have entered into agreements 20 deny Staff's motion in part and I'm going to gra	-
21 consistent with the statute, RCW 81.53.261, which 21 part. I am granting Staff's motion with respect	
22 specifically allows the parties to negotiate out 22 7, line 9 through page 8, line 25 of the testimo	
 23 contracts. 23 contracts. 23 contracts. 23 contracts. 	.,
And it's also important when there's a 24 Railroad's practice in other jurisdictions, and the functional statement of the sta	nis
25 presumption and an implication throughout the prefiled 25 does not appear relevant for our proceeding h	
Page 34	Page 36
1 testimony of the City's witnesses that the Railroad has 1 I'm otherwise denying Staff's motion be	ecause
2 in some way failed to uphold its obligations under prior 2 it appears that this material may be relevant o	· may
3 practices and conduct, as specifically stated by the 3 provide background information, but if if it tu	rns
4 City when there are costs that are being paid and that 4 out that this is not relevant later in the proceed	ling,
5 are that had been discussed previously. In other 5 then I may entertain another objection particul	arly with
6 words, the suggestion from the City is that somehow 6 regards to page 9, lines 6 through 8.	
7 Union Pacific has well, they've explicitly alleged in 7 All right. Are there any other motions	
8 their complaint harmed the public by failing to enter 8 or or questions that we should address befo	re we
9 into a construction and maintenance agreement in the 9 begin with cross-examination of witnesses?	
10time that's requested by the City and for the funding10MR. ROBERSON: Staff has one. It's	
11 that's requested by the City. 11 procedural. At the prehearing conference, we	
12 And so the estimated cost to UP for a 12 placeholder on the schedule for post-hearing l	0
13 different aspect is important for this court's 13 It wasn't clear that Judge Pearson was going t	
14 consideration. 14 Given the large record and some of the legal i	
15 JUDGE HOWARD: Is it the Railroad's position 15 are presented by what the parties are discussion 16 that the 2017 agreement that you mentioned that 16 would prefer to have briefing in lieu of a closin	-
16that the 2017 agreement that you mentioned that16would prefer to have briefing in lieu of a closin17addresses the maintenance cost for the crossing service17statement. Whether that's one or two rounds	
-	
18 also applies to the signals and other safety devices? 18 depend on what would be most helpful for your	
18 also applies to the signals and other safety devices? 18 depend on what would be most helpful for you 19 MS_REYNOLDS: No the it is 19 would like to at least submit one round of brief	
19 MS. REYNOLDS: No, the it's the it is 19 would like to at least submit one round of brief	•
19MS. REYNOLDS: No, the it's the it is19would like to at least submit one round of brief20indicative and illustrative. So the 2017 agreement, A,20JUDGE HOWARD: I I think I would	be
19MS. REYNOLDS: No, the it's the it is19would like to at least submit one round of brief20indicative and illustrative. So the 2017 agreement, A,20JUDGE HOWARD: I I think I would21talked about the surface grading, and it's important for21hesitant to do two rounds of briefing in this cast	be se, but
19MS. REYNOLDS: No, the it's the it is19would like to at least submit one round of brief20indicative and illustrative. So the 2017 agreement, A,20JUDGE HOWARD: I I think I would21talked about the surface grading, and it's important for21hesitant to do two rounds of briefing in this cast22our discussion here today because it allocated all costs22I think considering one round of post-hearing brief	be se, but
19MS. REYNOLDS: No, the it's the it is19would like to at least submit one round of brief20indicative and illustrative. So the 2017 agreement, A,20JUDGE HOWARD: I I think I would21talked about the surface grading, and it's important for21hesitant to do two rounds of briefing in this cast22our discussion here today because it allocated all costs22I think considering one round of post-hearing b23to the City of Spokane Valley. And it specifically23may be a valid approach.	be se, but
19MS. REYNOLDS: No, the it's the it is19would like to at least submit one round of brief20indicative and illustrative. So the 2017 agreement, A,20JUDGE HOWARD: I I think I would21talked about the surface grading, and it's important for21hesitant to do two rounds of briefing in this cast22our discussion here today because it allocated all costs22I think considering one round of post-hearing b23to the City of Spokane Valley. And it specifically23may be a valid approach.	be se, but priefing

6 (Pages 33 to 36)

	Page 37	Page 39
1	regarding one round of post-hearing briefing would	1 and foundation.
2	likely be beneficial to all parties.	2 JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Let me let me
3	JUDGE HOWARD: How about Union Pacific?	³ open the right document here. All right. So please
4	MS. REYNOLDS: Your Honor, Union Pacific	4 proceed with your your objection.
5	agrees with one round of briefing and agrees with both	5 MS. REYNOLDS: Thank you, Your Honor. This
6	Staff and the City that that would be helpful. We would	6 is referencing Exhibit RL-1T direct testimony. And I'm
7	like the opportunity today to do a brief oral summary or	7 specifically referring to page 3, beginning at line 28
8	closing statement for Your Honor's consideration in	8 and continuing onto page 4, line line 5.
9	addition to that.	9 There is a statement here about Union
10	JUDGE HOWARD: Do any of the parties have	10 Pacific concerns about traffic safety as there had been,
11	concerns with Union's Union Pacific's request for a	11 according to this statement, nine blocked crossing, 18
12	brief closing statement today in addition?	12 unsafe motorists, and one vehicle on the tracks reported
13	MS. FOSTER: The City does not, Your Honor,	13 at this location. And there is no basis that is set
14	and, in fact, the City would join with Union Pacific in	14 forth for where this evidence came from, what any of
15	requesting a brief closing statement.	15 this information means, and there's no documentary
16	JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Why don't we put	16 evidence that underscores this.
17	a date on the calendar for the one round of post-hearing	17 And so it appears to be some sort of hearsay
18	briefing, simultaneous submissions from the parties.	18 or lacking foundation.
19	What are we looking at so today's May 10th. Should	19JUDGE HOWARD: Would the City like to
20	we say three weeks out, May 31st?	20 respond?
21	MR. ROBERSON: That works for Staff.	21 MS. FOSTER: Yes, thank you, Judge Howard.
22	MS. FOSTER: That works for the City as	22 In regards to whether or not this is hearsay, these, I
23	well.	23 would say data, it came from Mr. Mays, and so that's a
24	MS. REYNOLDS: And that also works for Union	24 statement of a party opponent as he is a representative
25	Pacific.	25 of UP.
	Page 38	Page 40
1	JUDGE HOWARD: Okav. Great. Thank vou.	1 Further Judge, I would direct you to Exhibit
1 2	JUDGE HOWARD: Okay. Great. Thank you. And would any of the parties be concerned if	5 · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
	And would any of the parties be concerned if	2 EM-3, in which these are the diagnosis meeting minutes
2		2 EM-3, in which these are the diagnosis meeting minutes
2 3	And would any of the parties be concerned if I set a page limit of 30 pages?	 EM-3, in which these are the diagnosis meeting minutes with specifically Union Pacific's comments. And you
2 3 4	And would any of the parties be concerned if I set a page limit of 30 pages? MS. FOSTER: The City is not concerned,	 EM-3, in which these are the diagnosis meeting minutes with specifically Union Pacific's comments. And you will note in the comments that there are reports of nine
2 3 4 5	And would any of the parties be concerned if I set a page limit of 30 pages? MS. FOSTER: The City is not concerned, Judge Howard.	 EM-3, in which these are the diagnosis meeting minutes with specifically Union Pacific's comments. And you will note in the comments that there are reports of nine blocked crossings, 18 unsafe motorist, and one vehicle
2 3 4 5 6	And would any of the parties be concerned if I set a page limit of 30 pages? MS. FOSTER: The City is not concerned, Judge Howard. MS. REYNOLDS: The Railroad is not	 EM-3, in which these are the diagnosis meeting minutes with specifically Union Pacific's comments. And you will note in the comments that there are reports of nine blocked crossings, 18 unsafe motorist, and one vehicle on the track reported. And so the foundation is Union
2 3 4 5 6 7	And would any of the parties be concerned if I set a page limit of 30 pages? MS. FOSTER: The City is not concerned, Judge Howard. MS. REYNOLDS: The Railroad is not concerned, Judge Howard.	 EM-3, in which these are the diagnosis meeting minutes with specifically Union Pacific's comments. And you will note in the comments that there are reports of nine blocked crossings, 18 unsafe motorist, and one vehicle on the track reported. And so the foundation is Union Pacific itself. Thank you.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	And would any of the parties be concerned if I set a page limit of 30 pages? MS. FOSTER: The City is not concerned, Judge Howard. MS. REYNOLDS: The Railroad is not concerned, Judge Howard. MR. ROBERSON: Nor is Staff.	 EM-3, in which these are the diagnosis meeting minutes with specifically Union Pacific's comments. And you will note in the comments that there are reports of nine blocked crossings, 18 unsafe motorist, and one vehicle on the track reported. And so the foundation is Union Pacific itself. Thank you. JUDGE HOWARD: All right. I am going to
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	And would any of the parties be concerned if I set a page limit of 30 pages? MS. FOSTER: The City is not concerned, Judge Howard. MS. REYNOLDS: The Railroad is not concerned, Judge Howard. MR. ROBERSON: Nor is Staff. JUDGE HOWARD: Okay. Great. Thank you.	 EM-3, in which these are the diagnosis meeting minutes with specifically Union Pacific's comments. And you will note in the comments that there are reports of nine blocked crossings, 18 unsafe motorist, and one vehicle on the track reported. And so the foundation is Union Pacific itself. Thank you. JUDGE HOWARD: All right. I am going to deny the motion. Generally, hearsay rules do not
2 3 5 6 7 8 9 10	And would any of the parties be concerned if I set a page limit of 30 pages? MS. FOSTER: The City is not concerned, Judge Howard. MS. REYNOLDS: The Railroad is not concerned, Judge Howard. MR. ROBERSON: Nor is Staff. JUDGE HOWARD: Okay. Great. Thank you. Then the single round of post-hearing briefs will be due May 31st. There will be a 30-page limit. And before we turn to examinations, since we	 EM-3, in which these are the diagnosis meeting minutes with specifically Union Pacific's comments. And you will note in the comments that there are reports of nine blocked crossings, 18 unsafe motorist, and one vehicle on the track reported. And so the foundation is Union Pacific itself. Thank you. JUDGE HOWARD: All right. I am going to deny the motion. Generally, hearsay rules do not precisely apply before the Commission. And furthermore,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	And would any of the parties be concerned if I set a page limit of 30 pages? MS. FOSTER: The City is not concerned, Judge Howard. MS. REYNOLDS: The Railroad is not concerned, Judge Howard. MR. ROBERSON: Nor is Staff. JUDGE HOWARD: Okay. Great. Thank you. Then the single round of post-hearing briefs will be due May 31st. There will be a 30-page limit. And before we turn to examinations, since we just had motions regarding the evidence, and I have	 EM-3, in which these are the diagnosis meeting minutes with specifically Union Pacific's comments. And you will note in the comments that there are reports of nine blocked crossings, 18 unsafe motorist, and one vehicle on the track reported. And so the foundation is Union Pacific itself. Thank you. JUDGE HOWARD: All right. I am going to deny the motion. Generally, hearsay rules do not precisely apply before the Commission. And furthermore, it does appear that there is some evidence corroborating
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	And would any of the parties be concerned if I set a page limit of 30 pages? MS. FOSTER: The City is not concerned, Judge Howard. MS. REYNOLDS: The Railroad is not concerned, Judge Howard. MR. ROBERSON: Nor is Staff. JUDGE HOWARD: Okay. Great. Thank you. Then the single round of post-hearing briefs will be due May 31st. There will be a 30-page limit. And before we turn to examinations, since we just had motions regarding the evidence, and I have denied the City's motion, I have granted Staff's motion	 EM-3, in which these are the diagnosis meeting minutes with specifically Union Pacific's comments. And you will note in the comments that there are reports of nine blocked crossings, 18 unsafe motorist, and one vehicle on the track reported. And so the foundation is Union Pacific itself. Thank you. JUDGE HOWARD: All right. I am going to deny the motion. Generally, hearsay rules do not precisely apply before the Commission. And furthermore, it does appear that there is some evidence corroborating this. But, of course, Union Pacific may feel free to cross-examine the witness on regarding this statement.
2 3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	And would any of the parties be concerned if I set a page limit of 30 pages? MS. FOSTER: The City is not concerned, Judge Howard. MS. REYNOLDS: The Railroad is not concerned, Judge Howard. MR. ROBERSON: Nor is Staff. JUDGE HOWARD: Okay. Great. Thank you. Then the single round of post-hearing briefs will be due May 31st. There will be a 30-page limit. And before we turn to examinations, since we just had motions regarding the evidence, and I have denied the City's motion, I have granted Staff's motion in part just with respect to a portion of the testimony	 EM-3, in which these are the diagnosis meeting minutes with specifically Union Pacific's comments. And you will note in the comments that there are reports of nine blocked crossings, 18 unsafe motorist, and one vehicle on the track reported. And so the foundation is Union Pacific itself. Thank you. JUDGE HOWARD: All right. I am going to deny the motion. Generally, hearsay rules do not precisely apply before the Commission. And furthermore, it does appear that there is some evidence corroborating this. But, of course, Union Pacific may feel free to cross-examine the witness on regarding this statement. Okay. So if that if that is the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	And would any of the parties be concerned if I set a page limit of 30 pages? MS. FOSTER: The City is not concerned, Judge Howard. MS. REYNOLDS: The Railroad is not concerned, Judge Howard. MR. ROBERSON: Nor is Staff. JUDGE HOWARD: Okay. Great. Thank you. Then the single round of post-hearing briefs will be due May 31st. There will be a 30-page limit. And before we turn to examinations, since we just had motions regarding the evidence, and I have denied the City's motion, I have granted Staff's motion in part just with respect to a portion of the testimony as I've already discussed. Do the parties anticipate	 EM-3, in which these are the diagnosis meeting minutes with specifically Union Pacific's comments. And you will note in the comments that there are reports of nine blocked crossings, 18 unsafe motorist, and one vehicle on the track reported. And so the foundation is Union Pacific itself. Thank you. JUDGE HOWARD: All right. I am going to deny the motion. Generally, hearsay rules do not precisely apply before the Commission. And furthermore, it does appear that there is some evidence corroborating this. But, of course, Union Pacific may feel free to cross-examine the witness on regarding this statement. Okay. So if that if that is the remaining objection to the prefiled testimony, setting
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	And would any of the parties be concerned if I set a page limit of 30 pages? MS. FOSTER: The City is not concerned, Judge Howard. MS. REYNOLDS: The Railroad is not concerned, Judge Howard. MR. ROBERSON: Nor is Staff. JUDGE HOWARD: Okay. Great. Thank you. Then the single round of post-hearing briefs will be due May 31st. There will be a 30-page limit. And before we turn to examinations, since we just had motions regarding the evidence, and I have denied the City's motion, I have granted Staff's motion in part just with respect to a portion of the testimony as I've already discussed. Do the parties anticipate any further objections to the to the prefiled	 EM-3, in which these are the diagnosis meeting minutes with specifically Union Pacific's comments. And you will note in the comments that there are reports of nine blocked crossings, 18 unsafe motorist, and one vehicle on the track reported. And so the foundation is Union Pacific itself. Thank you. JUDGE HOWARD: All right. I am going to deny the motion. Generally, hearsay rules do not precisely apply before the Commission. And furthermore, it does appear that there is some evidence corroborating this. But, of course, Union Pacific may feel free to cross-examine the witness on regarding this statement. Okay. So if that if that is the remaining objection to the prefiled testimony, setting again again, setting aside the supporting exhibits,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	And would any of the parties be concerned if I set a page limit of 30 pages? MS. FOSTER: The City is not concerned, Judge Howard. MS. REYNOLDS: The Railroad is not concerned, Judge Howard. MR. ROBERSON: Nor is Staff. JUDGE HOWARD: Okay. Great. Thank you. Then the single round of post-hearing briefs will be due May 31st. There will be a 30-page limit. And before we turn to examinations, since we just had motions regarding the evidence, and I have denied the City's motion, I have granted Staff's motion in part just with respect to a portion of the testimony as I've already discussed. Do the parties anticipate any further objections to the to the prefiled testimony itself? So the the direct testimony, the	 EM-3, in which these are the diagnosis meeting minutes with specifically Union Pacific's comments. And you will note in the comments that there are reports of nine blocked crossings, 18 unsafe motorist, and one vehicle on the track reported. And so the foundation is Union Pacific itself. Thank you. JUDGE HOWARD: All right. I am going to deny the motion. Generally, hearsay rules do not precisely apply before the Commission. And furthermore, it does appear that there is some evidence corroborating this. But, of course, Union Pacific may feel free to cross-examine the witness on regarding this statement. Okay. So if that if that is the remaining objection to the prefiled testimony, setting again again, setting aside the supporting exhibits, then I would deem Exhibits BJ-1T, RL-1T, GM-1T, GM-8T,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	And would any of the parties be concerned if I set a page limit of 30 pages? MS. FOSTER: The City is not concerned, Judge Howard. MS. REYNOLDS: The Railroad is not concerned, Judge Howard. MR. ROBERSON: Nor is Staff. JUDGE HOWARD: Okay. Great. Thank you. Then the single round of post-hearing briefs will be due May 31st. There will be a 30-page limit. And before we turn to examinations, since we just had motions regarding the evidence, and I have denied the City's motion, I have granted Staff's motion in part just with respect to a portion of the testimony as I've already discussed. Do the parties anticipate any further objections to the to the prefiled testimony itself? So the the direct testimony, the response testimony, and the rebuttal testimony from the	 EM-3, in which these are the diagnosis meeting minutes with specifically Union Pacific's comments. And you will note in the comments that there are reports of nine blocked crossings, 18 unsafe motorist, and one vehicle on the track reported. And so the foundation is Union Pacific itself. Thank you. JUDGE HOWARD: All right. I am going to deny the motion. Generally, hearsay rules do not precisely apply before the Commission. And furthermore, it does appear that there is some evidence corroborating this. But, of course, Union Pacific may feel free to cross-examine the witness on regarding this statement. Okay. So if that if that is the remaining objection to the prefiled testimony, setting again again, setting aside the supporting exhibits, then I would deem Exhibits BJ-1T, RL-1T, GM-1T, GM-8T, EM-1T all admitted in their entirety and Exhibit PY-1T
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	And would any of the parties be concerned if I set a page limit of 30 pages? MS. FOSTER: The City is not concerned, Judge Howard. MS. REYNOLDS: The Railroad is not concerned, Judge Howard. MR. ROBERSON: Nor is Staff. JUDGE HOWARD: Okay. Great. Thank you. Then the single round of post-hearing briefs will be due May 31st. There will be a 30-page limit. And before we turn to examinations, since we just had motions regarding the evidence, and I have denied the City's motion, I have granted Staff's motion in part just with respect to a portion of the testimony as I've already discussed. Do the parties anticipate any further objections to the to the prefiled testimony itself? So the the direct testimony, the response testimony, and the rebuttal testimony from the City setting aside the supporting exhibits?	 EM-3, in which these are the diagnosis meeting minutes with specifically Union Pacific's comments. And you will note in the comments that there are reports of nine blocked crossings, 18 unsafe motorist, and one vehicle on the track reported. And so the foundation is Union Pacific itself. Thank you. JUDGE HOWARD: All right. I am going to deny the motion. Generally, hearsay rules do not precisely apply before the Commission. And furthermore, it does appear that there is some evidence corroborating this. But, of course, Union Pacific may feel free to cross-examine the witness on regarding this statement. Okay. So if that if that is the remaining objection to the prefiled testimony, setting again again, setting aside the supporting exhibits, then I would deem Exhibits BJ-1T, RL-1T, GM-1T, GM-8T, EM-1T all admitted in their entirety and Exhibit PY-1T admitted with the exception of lines page 7, line 9
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	And would any of the parties be concerned if I set a page limit of 30 pages? MS. FOSTER: The City is not concerned, Judge Howard. MS. REYNOLDS: The Railroad is not concerned, Judge Howard. MR. ROBERSON: Nor is Staff. JUDGE HOWARD: Okay. Great. Thank you. Then the single round of post-hearing briefs will be due May 31st. There will be a 30-page limit. And before we turn to examinations, since we just had motions regarding the evidence, and I have denied the City's motion, I have granted Staff's motion in part just with respect to a portion of the testimony as I've already discussed. Do the parties anticipate any further objections to the to the prefiled testimony itself? So the the direct testimony, the response testimony, and the rebuttal testimony from the City setting aside the supporting exhibits? MS. FOSTER: The City does not have any	 EM-3, in which these are the diagnosis meeting minutes with specifically Union Pacific's comments. And you will note in the comments that there are reports of nine blocked crossings, 18 unsafe motorist, and one vehicle on the track reported. And so the foundation is Union Pacific itself. Thank you. JUDGE HOWARD: All right. I am going to deny the motion. Generally, hearsay rules do not precisely apply before the Commission. And furthermore, it does appear that there is some evidence corroborating this. But, of course, Union Pacific may feel free to cross-examine the witness on regarding this statement. Okay. So if that if that is the remaining objection to the prefiled testimony, setting again again, setting aside the supporting exhibits, then I would deem Exhibits BJ-1T, RL-1T, GM-1T, GM-8T, EM-1T all admitted in their entirety and Exhibit PY-1T admitted with the exception of lines page 7, line 9 to page 8, line 25. And then we will address the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	And would any of the parties be concerned if I set a page limit of 30 pages? MS. FOSTER: The City is not concerned, Judge Howard. MS. REYNOLDS: The Railroad is not concerned, Judge Howard. MR. ROBERSON: Nor is Staff. JUDGE HOWARD: Okay. Great. Thank you. Then the single round of post-hearing briefs will be due May 31st. There will be a 30-page limit. And before we turn to examinations, since we just had motions regarding the evidence, and I have denied the City's motion, I have granted Staff's motion in part just with respect to a portion of the testimony as I've already discussed. Do the parties anticipate any further objections to the to the prefiled testimony itself? So the the direct testimony, the response testimony, and the rebuttal testimony from the City setting aside the supporting exhibits? MS. FOSTER: The City does not have any further objections, Judge Howard.	 EM-3, in which these are the diagnosis meeting minutes with specifically Union Pacific's comments. And you will note in the comments that there are reports of nine blocked crossings, 18 unsafe motorist, and one vehicle on the track reported. And so the foundation is Union Pacific itself. Thank you. JUDGE HOWARD: All right. I am going to deny the motion. Generally, hearsay rules do not precisely apply before the Commission. And furthermore, it does appear that there is some evidence corroborating this. But, of course, Union Pacific may feel free to cross-examine the witness on regarding this statement. Okay. So if that if that is the remaining objection to the prefiled testimony, setting again again, setting aside the supporting exhibits, then I would deem Exhibits BJ-1T, RL-1T, GM-1T, GM-8T, EM-1T all admitted in their entirety and Exhibit PY-1T admitted with the exception of lines page 7, line 9 to page 8, line 25. And then we will address the supporting exhibits and move those into evidence as we
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	And would any of the parties be concerned if I set a page limit of 30 pages? MS. FOSTER: The City is not concerned, Judge Howard. MS. REYNOLDS: The Railroad is not concerned, Judge Howard. MR. ROBERSON: Nor is Staff. JUDGE HOWARD: Okay. Great. Thank you. Then the single round of post-hearing briefs will be due May 31st. There will be a 30-page limit. And before we turn to examinations, since we just had motions regarding the evidence, and I have denied the City's motion, I have granted Staff's motion in part just with respect to a portion of the testimony as I've already discussed. Do the parties anticipate any further objections to the to the prefiled testimony itself? So the the direct testimony, the response testimony, and the rebuttal testimony from the City setting aside the supporting exhibits? MS. FOSTER: The City does not have any further objections, Judge Howard. MS. REYNOLDS: Judge, we would like to raise	 EM-3, in which these are the diagnosis meeting minutes with specifically Union Pacific's comments. And you will note in the comments that there are reports of nine blocked crossings, 18 unsafe motorist, and one vehicle on the track reported. And so the foundation is Union Pacific itself. Thank you. JUDGE HOWARD: All right. I am going to deny the motion. Generally, hearsay rules do not precisely apply before the Commission. And furthermore, it does appear that there is some evidence corroborating this. But, of course, Union Pacific may feel free to cross-examine the witness on regarding this statement. Okay. So if that if that is the remaining objection to the prefiled testimony, setting again again, setting aside the supporting exhibits, then I would deem Exhibits BJ-1T, RL-1T, GM-1T, GM-8T, EM-1T all admitted in their entirety and Exhibit PY-1T admitted with the exception of lines page 7, line 9 to page 8, line 25. And then we will address the supporting exhibits and move those into evidence as we proceed with the hearing.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	And would any of the parties be concerned if I set a page limit of 30 pages? MS. FOSTER: The City is not concerned, Judge Howard. MS. REYNOLDS: The Railroad is not concerned, Judge Howard. MR. ROBERSON: Nor is Staff. JUDGE HOWARD: Okay. Great. Thank you. Then the single round of post-hearing briefs will be due May 31st. There will be a 30-page limit. And before we turn to examinations, since we just had motions regarding the evidence, and I have denied the City's motion, I have granted Staff's motion in part just with respect to a portion of the testimony as I've already discussed. Do the parties anticipate any further objections to the to the prefiled testimony itself? So the the direct testimony, the response testimony, and the rebuttal testimony from the City setting aside the supporting exhibits? MS. FOSTER: The City does not have any further objections, Judge Howard. MS. REYNOLDS: Judge, we would like to raise one objection to the testimony, the prefiled testimony	 EM-3, in which these are the diagnosis meeting minutes with specifically Union Pacific's comments. And you will note in the comments that there are reports of nine blocked crossings, 18 unsafe motorist, and one vehicle on the track reported. And so the foundation is Union Pacific itself. Thank you. JUDGE HOWARD: All right. I am going to deny the motion. Generally, hearsay rules do not precisely apply before the Commission. And furthermore, it does appear that there is some evidence corroborating this. But, of course, Union Pacific may feel free to cross-examine the witness on regarding this statement. Okay. So if that if that is the remaining objection to the prefiled testimony, setting again again, setting aside the supporting exhibits, then I would deem Exhibits BJ-1T, RL-1T, GM-1T, GM-8T, EM-1T all admitted in their entirety and Exhibit PY-1T admitted with the exception of lines page 7, line 9 to page 8, line 25. And then we will address the supporting exhibits and move those into evidence as we proceed with the hearing. (Exhibits BJ-1T, RL-1T, GM-1T, GM-8T,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	And would any of the parties be concerned if I set a page limit of 30 pages? MS. FOSTER: The City is not concerned, Judge Howard. MS. REYNOLDS: The Railroad is not concerned, Judge Howard. MR. ROBERSON: Nor is Staff. JUDGE HOWARD: Okay. Great. Thank you. Then the single round of post-hearing briefs will be due May 31st. There will be a 30-page limit. And before we turn to examinations, since we just had motions regarding the evidence, and I have denied the City's motion, I have granted Staff's motion in part just with respect to a portion of the testimony as I've already discussed. Do the parties anticipate any further objections to the to the prefiled testimony itself? So the the direct testimony, the response testimony, and the rebuttal testimony from the City setting aside the supporting exhibits? MS. FOSTER: The City does not have any further objections, Judge Howard. MS. REYNOLDS: Judge, we would like to raise	 EM-3, in which these are the diagnosis meeting minutes with specifically Union Pacific's comments. And you will note in the comments that there are reports of nine blocked crossings, 18 unsafe motorist, and one vehicle on the track reported. And so the foundation is Union Pacific itself. Thank you. JUDGE HOWARD: All right. I am going to deny the motion. Generally, hearsay rules do not precisely apply before the Commission. And furthermore, it does appear that there is some evidence corroborating this. But, of course, Union Pacific may feel free to cross-examine the witness on regarding this statement. Okay. So if that if that is the remaining objection to the prefiled testimony, setting again again, setting aside the supporting exhibits, then I would deem Exhibits BJ-1T, RL-1T, GM-1T, GM-8T, EM-1T all admitted in their entirety and Exhibit PY-1T admitted with the exception of lines page 7, line 9 to page 8, line 25. And then we will address the supporting exhibits and move those into evidence as we proceed with the hearing.

7 (Pages 37 to 40)

	Page 41	Page 43
1	JUDGE HOWARD: All right. With that, the	1 CROSS-EXAMINATION
2	City may introduce its first witness and tender them for	2 BY MS. REYNOLDS:
3	cross-examination.	3 Q. Good morning, Mr. Johnson. Can you hear me?
4	MS. FOSTER: Thank you, Judge Howard. The	4 A. Yes, I can.
5	first witness the City would like to call is	5 Q. All right. I'd like to ask you just a few
6	Mr. Johnson.	6 questions about your involvement with the Barker Road
7	Mr. Johnson, can you please turn on your	7 crossing and specifically the funding, all right?
8	camera. Maybe Brett, are you on the line?	8 A. Okay.
9	THE WITNESS: Yes, I am.	9 Q. Does the Barker Road crossing involve the
10	MS. FOSTER: Thank you. Do you have the	10 installation of a new grade crossing protective device?
11	ability to turn on your camera?	11 A. I guess I guess I don't understand that
12	THE WITNESS: Yes, just a minute here.	12 question exactly. You know, I believe
13		13 MS. FOSTER: Aziza Foster for the City.
14	EXAMINATION	14 We'll object to this question. This is outside the
15	BY MS. FOSTER:	15 scope of Mr. Johnson's knowledge and his testimony.
16	Q. How are you doing, Mr. Johnson?	16 He's specifically testifying to the federal funds, not
17	A. Doing well.	17 the actual grade crossing itself.
18	Q. Thank you.	18 JUDGE HOWARD: Would Union Pacific like to
19	Can you please state your name and occupation	19 respond to that?
20	for the record?	20 MS. REYNOLDS: Yes, Your Honor. RCW
21	A. I'm Brett Johnson. I'm assistant local programs	21 81.53.295 specifically contemplates federal funding for
22	engineer for DOT.	2.2 the installation of new grade crossing protective
23	Q. Thank you.	23 devices. That's straight from the statute. And
24	And how long have you been in your position?	24 Mr. Johnson's prefiled testimony reads, Are federal
25	A. Just shy of five years.	²⁵ funds being used to upgrade the UPRR railroad crossing?
	Page 42	Page 44
1	Page 42 JUDGE HOWARD: Let me let's swear in the	
1 2		
	JUDGE HOWARD: Let me let's swear in the	1 And the answer is, Yes, with explanation.
2	JUDGE HOWARD: Let me let's swear in the witness before we I imagine you're about to tender	1And the answer is, Yes, with explanation.2JUDGE HOWARD: I will deny the objection.
2 3	JUDGE HOWARD: Let me let's swear in the witness before we I imagine you're about to tender him for cross, but	 And the answer is, Yes, with explanation. JUDGE HOWARD: I will deny the objection. I'll allow the question. You may need to repeat the
2 3 4 5 6	JUDGE HOWARD: Let me let's swear in the witness before we I imagine you're about to tender him for cross, but (Brett Johnson sworn.) JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Thank you. You may proceed.	 And the answer is, Yes, with explanation. JUDGE HOWARD: I will deny the objection. I'll allow the question. You may need to repeat the question for him. MS. REYNOLDS: Yes, Your Honor, thank you. BY MS. REYNOLDS:
2 3 4 5 6 7	JUDGE HOWARD: Let me let's swear in the witness before we I imagine you're about to tender him for cross, but (Brett Johnson sworn.) JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Thank you. You may proceed. MS. FOSTER: Thank you, Judge Howard.	 And the answer is, Yes, with explanation. JUDGE HOWARD: I will deny the objection. I'll allow the question. You may need to repeat the question for him. MS. REYNOLDS: Yes, Your Honor, thank you. BY MS. REYNOLDS: Q. Sir, I will ask again.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	JUDGE HOWARD: Let me let's swear in the witness before we I imagine you're about to tender him for cross, but (Brett Johnson sworn.) JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Thank you. You may proceed. MS. FOSTER: Thank you, Judge Howard. BY MS. FOSTER:	 And the answer is, Yes, with explanation. JUDGE HOWARD: I will deny the objection. I'll allow the question. You may need to repeat the question for him. MS. REYNOLDS: Yes, Your Honor, thank you. BY MS. REYNOLDS: Q. Sir, I will ask again. Boes the Barker Road crossing involve
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	JUDGE HOWARD: Let me let's swear in the witness before we I imagine you're about to tender him for cross, but (Brett Johnson sworn.) JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Thank you. You may proceed. MS. FOSTER: Thank you, Judge Howard. BY MS. FOSTER: Q. Mr. Johnson, I would ask that you either pull up	 And the answer is, Yes, with explanation. JUDGE HOWARD: I will deny the objection. I'll allow the question. You may need to repeat the question for him. MS. REYNOLDS: Yes, Your Honor, thank you. BY MS. REYNOLDS: Q. Sir, I will ask again. Does the Barker Road crossing involve installation of a new grade crossing protective device?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	JUDGE HOWARD: Let me let's swear in the witness before we I imagine you're about to tender him for cross, but (Brett Johnson sworn.) JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Thank you. You may proceed. MS. FOSTER: Thank you, Judge Howard. BY MS. FOSTER: Q. Mr. Johnson, I would ask that you either pull up or have your prefiled testimony in front of you. This	 And the answer is, Yes, with explanation. JUDGE HOWARD: I will deny the objection. I'll allow the question. You may need to repeat the question for him. MS. REYNOLDS: Yes, Your Honor, thank you. BY MS. REYNOLDS: Q. Sir, I will ask again. Does the Barker Road crossing involve installation of a new grade crossing protective device? A. Yes, yes, there will be crossing arms installed
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	JUDGE HOWARD: Let me let's swear in the witness before we I imagine you're about to tender him for cross, but (Brett Johnson sworn.) JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Thank you. You may proceed. MS. FOSTER: Thank you, Judge Howard. BY MS. FOSTER: Q. Mr. Johnson, I would ask that you either pull up or have your prefiled testimony in front of you. This has been designated as BJ-1T.	 And the answer is, Yes, with explanation. JUDGE HOWARD: I will deny the objection. I'll allow the question. You may need to repeat the question for him. MS. REYNOLDS: Yes, Your Honor, thank you. BY MS. REYNOLDS: Q. Sir, I will ask again. Does the Barker Road crossing involve installation of a new grade crossing protective device? A. Yes, yes, there will be crossing arms installed there with this with this project. That is within
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	JUDGE HOWARD: Let me let's swear in the witness before we I imagine you're about to tender him for cross, but (Brett Johnson sworn.) JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Thank you. You may proceed. MS. FOSTER: Thank you, Judge Howard. BY MS. FOSTER: Q. Mr. Johnson, I would ask that you either pull up or have your prefiled testimony in front of you. This has been designated as BJ-1T. A. Yes, it's in front of me.	 And the answer is, Yes, with explanation. JUDGE HOWARD: I will deny the objection. I'll allow the question. You may need to repeat the question for him. MS. REYNOLDS: Yes, Your Honor, thank you. BY MS. REYNOLDS: Q. Sir, I will ask again. Does the Barker Road crossing involve installation of a new grade crossing protective device? A. Yes, yes, there will be crossing arms installed there with this with this project. That is within the scope of the project, yes.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	JUDGE HOWARD: Let me let's swear in the witness before we I imagine you're about to tender him for cross, but (Brett Johnson sworn.) JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Thank you. You may proceed. MS. FOSTER: Thank you, Judge Howard. BY MS. FOSTER: Q. Mr. Johnson, I would ask that you either pull up or have your prefiled testimony in front of you. This has been designated as BJ-1T. A. Yes, it's in front of me. Q. Thank you.	 And the answer is, Yes, with explanation. JUDGE HOWARD: I will deny the objection. I'll allow the question. You may need to repeat the question for him. MS. REYNOLDS: Yes, Your Honor, thank you. BY MS. REYNOLDS: Q. Sir, I will ask again. Does the Barker Road crossing involve installation of a new grade crossing protective device? A. Yes, yes, there will be crossing arms installed there with this with this project. That is within the scope of the project, yes. Q. What type of highway funds are being [Zoom
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	JUDGE HOWARD: Let me let's swear in the witness before we I imagine you're about to tender him for cross, but (Brett Johnson sworn.) JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Thank you. You may proceed. MS. FOSTER: Thank you, Judge Howard. BY MS. FOSTER: Q. Mr. Johnson, I would ask that you either pull up or have your prefiled testimony in front of you. This has been designated as BJ-1T. A. Yes, it's in front of me. Q. Thank you. Can you just please quickly review that?	 And the answer is, Yes, with explanation. JUDGE HOWARD: I will deny the objection. I'll allow the question. You may need to repeat the question for him. MS. REYNOLDS: Yes, Your Honor, thank you. BY MS. REYNOLDS: Q. Sir, I will ask again. Does the Barker Road crossing involve installation of a new grade crossing protective device? A. Yes, yes, there will be crossing arms installed there with this with this project. That is within the scope of the project, yes. Q. What type of highway funds are being [Zoom interference] installing the grade crossing protective
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	JUDGE HOWARD: Let me let's swear in the witness before we I imagine you're about to tender him for cross, but (Brett Johnson sworn.) JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Thank you. You may proceed. MS. FOSTER: Thank you, Judge Howard. BY MS. FOSTER: Q. Mr. Johnson, I would ask that you either pull up or have your prefiled testimony in front of you. This has been designated as BJ-1T. A. Yes, it's in front of me. Q. Thank you. Can you just please quickly review that? A. Okay.	 And the answer is, Yes, with explanation. JUDGE HOWARD: I will deny the objection. I'll allow the question. You may need to repeat the question for him. MS. REYNOLDS: Yes, Your Honor, thank you. BY MS. REYNOLDS: Q. Sir, I will ask again. Does the Barker Road crossing involve installation of a new grade crossing protective device? A. Yes, yes, there will be crossing arms installed there with this with this project. That is within the scope of the project, yes. Q. What type of highway funds are being [Zoom interference] installing the grade crossing protective device?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	JUDGE HOWARD: Let me let's swear in the witness before we I imagine you're about to tender him for cross, but (Brett Johnson sworn.) JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Thank you. You may proceed. MS. FOSTER: Thank you, Judge Howard. BY MS. FOSTER: Q. Mr. Johnson, I would ask that you either pull up or have your prefiled testimony in front of you. This has been designated as BJ-1T. A. Yes, it's in front of me. Q. Thank you. Can you just please quickly review that? A. Okay. Q. Thank you.	 And the answer is, Yes, with explanation. JUDGE HOWARD: I will deny the objection. I'll allow the question. You may need to repeat the question for him. MS. REYNOLDS: Yes, Your Honor, thank you. BY MS. REYNOLDS: Q. Sir, I will ask again. Does the Barker Road crossing involve installation of a new grade crossing protective device? A. Yes, yes, there will be crossing arms installed there with this with this project. That is within the scope of the project, yes. Q. What type of highway funds are being [Zoom interference] installing the grade crossing protective device? THE COURT REPORTER: Ms. Reynolds, I'm
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	JUDGE HOWARD: Let me let's swear in the witness before we I imagine you're about to tender him for cross, but (Brett Johnson sworn.) JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Thank you. You may proceed. MS. FOSTER: Thank you, Judge Howard. BY MS. FOSTER: Q. Mr. Johnson, I would ask that you either pull up or have your prefiled testimony in front of you. This has been designated as BJ-1T. A. Yes, it's in front of me. Q. Thank you. Can you just please quickly review that? A. Okay. Q. Thank you. Is that your testimony in this matter?	 And the answer is, Yes, with explanation. JUDGE HOWARD: I will deny the objection. I'll allow the question. You may need to repeat the question for him. MS. REYNOLDS: Yes, Your Honor, thank you. BY MS. REYNOLDS: Q. Sir, I will ask again. Does the Barker Road crossing involve installation of a new grade crossing protective device? A. Yes, yes, there will be crossing arms installed there with this with this project. That is within the scope of the project, yes. Q. What type of highway funds are being [Zoom interference] installing the grade crossing protective device? THE COURT REPORTER: Ms. Reynolds, I'm sorry, this is the court reporter. Can you please
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	JUDGE HOWARD: Let me let's swear in the witness before we I imagine you're about to tender him for cross, but (Brett Johnson sworn.) JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Thank you. You may proceed. MS. FOSTER: Thank you, Judge Howard. BY MS. FOSTER: Q. Mr. Johnson, I would ask that you either pull up or have your prefiled testimony in front of you. This has been designated as BJ-1T. A. Yes, it's in front of me. Q. Thank you. Can you just please quickly review that? A. Okay. Q. Thank you. Is that your testimony in this matter? A. Yes, it is.	 And the answer is, Yes, with explanation. JUDGE HOWARD: I will deny the objection. I'll allow the question. You may need to repeat the question for him. MS. REYNOLDS: Yes, Your Honor, thank you. BY MS. REYNOLDS: Q. Sir, I will ask again. Does the Barker Road crossing involve installation of a new grade crossing protective device? A. Yes, yes, there will be crossing arms installed there with this with this project. That is within the scope of the project, yes. Q. What type of highway funds are being [Zoom interference] installing the grade crossing protective device? THE COURT REPORTER: Ms. Reynolds, I'm sorry, this is the court reporter. Can you please repeat that? It kind of cut out.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	JUDGE HOWARD: Let me let's swear in the witness before we I imagine you're about to tender him for cross, but (Brett Johnson sworn.) JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Thank you. You may proceed. MS. FOSTER: Thank you, Judge Howard. BY MS. FOSTER: Q. Mr. Johnson, I would ask that you either pull up or have your prefiled testimony in front of you. This has been designated as BJ-1T. A. Yes, it's in front of me. Q. Thank you. Can you just please quickly review that? A. Okay. Q. Thank you. Is that your testimony in this matter? A. Yes, it is. Q. Okay. Thank you.	 And the answer is, Yes, with explanation. JUDGE HOWARD: I will deny the objection. I'll allow the question. You may need to repeat the question for him. MS. REYNOLDS: Yes, Your Honor, thank you. BY MS. REYNOLDS: Q. Sir, I will ask again. Does the Barker Road crossing involve installation of a new grade crossing protective device? A. Yes, yes, there will be crossing arms installed there with this with this project. That is within the scope of the project, yes. Q. What type of highway funds are being [Zoom interference] installing the grade crossing protective device? THE COURT REPORTER: Ms. Reynolds, I'm sorry, this is the court reporter. Can you please repeat that? I kind of cut out. MS. REYNOLDS: Yes, my apologies.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	JUDGE HOWARD: Let me let's swear in the witness before we I imagine you're about to tender him for cross, but (Brett Johnson sworn.) JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Thank you. You may proceed. MS. FOSTER: Thank you, Judge Howard. BY MS. FOSTER: Q. Mr. Johnson, I would ask that you either pull up or have your prefiled testimony in front of you. This has been designated as BJ-1T. A. Yes, it's in front of me. Q. Thank you. Can you just please quickly review that? A. Okay. Q. Thank you. Is that your testimony in this matter? A. Yes, it is. Q. Okay. Thank you. MS. FOSTER: That is all I have. I believe	1And the answer is, Yes, with explanation.2JUDGE HOWARD: I will deny the objection.3I'll allow the question. You may need to repeat the4question for him.5MS. REYNOLDS: Yes, Your Honor, thank you.6BY MS. REYNOLDS:7Q. Sir, I will ask again.8Does the Barker Road crossing involve9installation of a new grade crossing protective device?10A. Yes, yes, there will be crossing arms installed11there with this with this project. That is within12the scope of the project, yes.13Q. What type of highway funds are being [Zoom14interference] installing the grade crossing protective15device?16THE COURT REPORTER: Ms. Reynolds, I'm17sorry, this is the court reporter. Can you please18repeat that? It kind of cut out.19MS. REYNOLDS: Yes, my apologies.20BY MS. REYNOLDS:
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	JUDGE HOWARD: Let me let's swear in the witness before we I imagine you're about to tender him for cross, but (Brett Johnson sworn.) JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Thank you. You may proceed. MS. FOSTER: Thank you, Judge Howard. BY MS. FOSTER: Q. Mr. Johnson, I would ask that you either pull up or have your prefiled testimony in front of you. This has been designated as BJ-1T. A. Yes, it's in front of me. Q. Thank you. Can you just please quickly review that? A. Okay. Q. Thank you. Is that your testimony in this matter? A. Yes, it is. Q. Okay. Thank you. MS. FOSTER: That is all I have. I believe I will now be turning it over to Ms. Reynolds for cross.	 And the answer is, Yes, with explanation. JUDGE HOWARD: I will deny the objection. I'll allow the question. You may need to repeat the question for him. MS. REYNOLDS: Yes, Your Honor, thank you. BY MS. REYNOLDS: Q. Sir, I will ask again. Does the Barker Road crossing involve installation of a new grade crossing protective device? A. Yes, yes, there will be crossing arms installed there with this with this project. That is within the scope of the project, yes. Q. What type of highway funds are being [Zoom interference] installing the grade crossing protective device? THE COURT REPORTER: Ms. Reynolds, I'm sorry, this is the court reporter. Can you please repeat that? It kind of cut out. MS. REYNOLDS: Yes, my apologies. BY MS. REYNOLDS: Q. What type of highway funds are being used to pay
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	JUDGE HOWARD: Let me let's swear in the witness before we I imagine you're about to tender him for cross, but (Brett Johnson sworn.) JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Thank you. You may proceed. MS. FOSTER: Thank you, Judge Howard. BY MS. FOSTER: Q. Mr. Johnson, I would ask that you either pull up or have your prefiled testimony in front of you. This has been designated as BJ-1T. A. Yes, it's in front of me. Q. Thank you. Can you just please quickly review that? A. Okay. Q. Thank you. Is that your testimony in this matter? A. Yes, it is. Q. Okay. Thank you. MS. FOSTER: That is all I have. I believe	 And the answer is, Yes, with explanation. JUDGE HOWARD: I will deny the objection. I'll allow the question. You may need to repeat the question for him. MS. REYNOLDS: Yes, Your Honor, thank you. BY MS. REYNOLDS: Q. Sir, I will ask again. Does the Barker Road crossing involve installation of a new grade crossing protective device? A. Yes, yes, there will be crossing arms installed there with this with this project. That is within the scope of the project, yes. Q. What type of highway funds are being [Zoom interference] installing the grade crossing protective device? THE COURT REPORTER: Ms. Reynolds, I'm sorry, this is the court reporter. Can you please repeat that? It kind of cut out. MS. REYNOLDS: Yes, my apologies. BY MS. REYNOLDS: Q. What type of highway funds are being used to pay
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	JUDGE HOWARD: Let me let's swear in the witness before we I imagine you're about to tender him for cross, but (Brett Johnson sworn.) JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Thank you. You may proceed. MS. FOSTER: Thank you, Judge Howard. BY MS. FOSTER: Q. Mr. Johnson, I would ask that you either pull up or have your prefiled testimony in front of you. This has been designated as BJ-1T. A. Yes, it's in front of me. Q. Thank you. Can you just please quickly review that? A. Okay. Q. Thank you. Is that your testimony in this matter? A. Yes, it is. Q. Okay. Thank you. MS. FOSTER: That is all I have. I believe I will now be turning it over to Ms. Reynolds for cross. JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Union Pacific may	 And the answer is, Yes, with explanation. JUDGE HOWARD: I will deny the objection. I'll allow the question. You may need to repeat the question for him. MS. REYNOLDS: Yes, Your Honor, thank you. BY MS. REYNOLDS: Q. Sir, I will ask again. Does the Barker Road crossing involve installation of a new grade crossing protective device? A. Yes, yes, there will be crossing arms installed there with this with this project. That is within the scope of the project, yes. Q. What type of highway funds are being [Zoom interference] installing the grade crossing protective device? THE COURT REPORTER: Ms. Reynolds, I'm sorry, this is the court reporter. Can you please repeat that? It kind of cut out. MS. REYNOLDS: Yes, my apologies. BY MS. REYNOLDS: Q. What type of highway funds are being used to pay the cost of installing the grade crossing protective
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	JUDGE HOWARD: Let me let's swear in the witness before we I imagine you're about to tender him for cross, but (Brett Johnson sworn.) JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Thank you. You may proceed. MS. FOSTER: Thank you, Judge Howard. BY MS. FOSTER: Q. Mr. Johnson, I would ask that you either pull up or have your prefiled testimony in front of you. This has been designated as BJ-1T. A. Yes, it's in front of me. Q. Thank you. Can you just please quickly review that? A. Okay. Q. Thank you. Is that your testimony in this matter? A. Yes, it is. Q. Okay. Thank you. MS. FOSTER: That is all I have. I believe I will now be turning it over to Ms. Reynolds for cross. JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Union Pacific may proceed with its cross.	 And the answer is, Yes, with explanation. JUDGE HOWARD: I will deny the objection. I'll allow the question. You may need to repeat the question for him. MS. REYNOLDS: Yes, Your Honor, thank you. BY MS. REYNOLDS: Q. Sir, I will ask again. Does the Barker Road crossing involve installation of a new grade crossing protective device? A. Yes, yes, there will be crossing arms installed there with this with this project. That is within the scope of the project, yes. Q. What type of highway funds are being [Zoom interference] installing the grade crossing protective device? THE COURT REPORTER: Ms. Reynolds, I'm sorry, this is the court reporter. Can you please repeat that? It kind of cut out. MS. REYNOLDS: Yes, my apologies. BY MS. REYNOLDS: Q. What type of highway funds are being used to pay the cost of installing the grade crossing protective device?

8 (Pages 41 to 44)

	Page 45	Page 47
1	Q. And what type of federal funds are on this	1 Q. And the Phase 2 of the project entails more than
2	project?	2 just the Union Pacific Railroad Barker Road crossing,
3	A. These these funds come from SRTC, they're STP	3 does it not?
4	funds. So they're the SRTC awarded them to the	4 A. Yes, it does.
5	Spokane Valley for this project.	5 Q. What else does this Phase 2 entail?
6	Q. And when you say "SRTC," are you referring to	6 A. Well, there's roadway work up to up to each
7	the Spokane Regional Transportation Corridor or	7 end of the crossing, so there was a Phase 1 project.
8	A. Council.	8 There's actually been several phases of this project
9	Q. Council.	9 broken into phases due to the delay caused by, you know
10	A. Spokane Regional Transportation Council.	10 this this crossing issue. So there's roadway work
11	Q. All right. The federal funds that are being	and then there's also a path path work to the north
12	used for this project are not part of the	12 of this project.
13	railway-highway crossing program managed by the State of	13 Q. And when you say there's path work to the north
14	Washington to provide funding for safety improvements to	14 of this project, that includes a multiuse path, correct?
15	reduce the number of fatalities, injuries, and crashes	15 A. That is correct.
16	at public grade crossing known as Section 130, correct?	16 Q. And that's a multiuse path that was requested by
17	A. These are not 130 funds.	17 the City of Spokane Valley?
18	Q. And are you able to tell us today what funds are	18 A. Yes, that's where that request came from.
19	specifically being used relative to the grade crossing	19 Q. And so is it accurate, as we sit here today, you
20	as opposed to the project as a whole?	20 cannot tell the Commission what specific federal funds
21	A. Well, the the cost of these the crossing	21 would be used specifically for the installation of the
22	arms and and signals exceed the state funds that are	22 new grade crossing protective device?
23	available, so there will be federal and state funds used	A. Yes, it will be STP funds from that was
24	for this crossing.	awarded to the project from SRTC. So, you know, it
25	Q. And my question is somewhat more specific in	depends on how either way, when they submit the fund
	Page 46	Page 48
1	terms of, is there a way for you to identify which	1 obligations for this project, there will be federal
2	federal funds and which federal funding source is being	2 funds for this crossing work that the Railroad will give
3	applied specifically to the Barker Road crossing?	3 their estimate for.
4	A. Well, I'm just saying there's there's both	4 MS. REYNOLDS: Okay. I think those are all
5	state and federal funds applied to this project, and	5 the questions I have for you. I thank you for your
6	when the when the Valley submits their funding	6 time, sir.
7	obligation for construction, that's when that will be	7 JUDGE HOWARD: Is there is there any
8	totally clear on how they submit that.	8 redirect by the City?
9	But there will be required to have fed funds on	9 MS. FOSTER: Yes, thank you, Judge Howard.
10	this project because the the cost of these	10
11	improvements exceed the state funds available on this	11 REDIRECTEXAMINATION
12	project.	12 BY MS. FOSTER:
13	Q. When you say "this project," are you referring	13Q. Mr. Johnson, will the City know the specific
14	to the piece of the project that goes from Euclid to the	14 funds that will be used for this project until they
15	Spokane River on Barker Road?	15 receive project approval?
16	A. No, I'm I'm referring to just the this	16 A. They know which funds are available right now.
17	last Phase 2, which we're currently that the Valley	17 They have their the federal funds from SRTC and
18	is working on to complete this this project.	18 the I believe their state funds.
19	Q. And Phase 2 includes what?	Q. Did the City receive more than one federal grant
20	A. Well, this project includes the crossing that	20 for this project?
21	you reference. The work by the Union Pacific	A. Well, this specific project, I do not believe
22	Construction had a current estimate for that work of	22 so. I mean, I
23	\$613,758. That is the current estimate that I received.	23 Q. Okay.
24	And the total construction of the project is 1.4	24 MS. FOSTER: Thank you. That is all the
25	million.	25 City has.

9 (Pages 45 to 48)

	Page 49	Page 51
1	JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Thank you,	1 involves traffic devices, so it relates to the signing
2	Mr. Johnson, for your testimony today.	2 and pavement markings that are part of this project.
3	THE WITNESS: You're welcome.	3 Q. And, sir, it may be helpful for our court
4	JUDGE HOWARD: You may turn off your camera,	4 reporter if you can put your camera so that we can see
5	and we will turn to the next witness for the City.	5 your mouth.
6	Robert Lochmiller, if you would turn on your	6 A. Oh, sorry.
7	camera and I will swear you in.	7 Q. Thank you. That's helpful.
8	(Robert Lochmiller sworn.)	8 Are you aware that Washington State adopted
9	JUDGE HOWARD: You may introduce the	9 the 2009 version of the MUTCD?
10	witness.	10 A. Yeah, I believe that's the current version.
11	MS. FOSTER: Thank you, Judge Howard.	Q. And the adoption of the MUTCD includes Section
12		12 1A.07; do you agree with that?
13	EXAMINATION	13 A. I'm not familiar with that. I don't know every
14	BY MS. FOSTER:	14 page of the MUTCD.
15	Q. Mr. Lochmiller, can you please just state your	15 MS. REYNOLDS: Okay. With Your Honor's
16	name and occupation for the record?	16 permission, I would like to share my screen to display
17	A. Yeah, my name's Rob Lochmiller. I'm a senior	17 what has been marked as RL-5X.
18	engineer project manager with the City of Spokane	18 MS. FOSTER: Aziza Foster for the City.
19	Valley.	19 Judge Howard, the City is going to object to the
20	Q. And how long have you been in that role?	20 introduction of this cross-examination exhibit. As
21	A. Six and a half years.	21 Ms. Reynold's just stated herself, the 2009 version of
22	Q. Okay. And then do you have your prefiled	the MUTCD is the most current version. What UP has
23	testimony in front of you?	23 entered into the record is the 2003 version, and
24	A. I do.	therefore, it is no longer relevant to this case.
25	Q. And is that your testimony in this matter?	JUDGE HOWARD: What does the what is the
	Page 50	Page 52
1	Page 50 A. Yes, it is.	Page 52 1 Railroad's response to that?
1 2		
	A. Yes, it is.	1 Railroad's response to that?
2	A. Yes, it is. Q. Thank you.	 Railroad's response to that? MS. REYNOLDS: The version that is
2 3 4 5	 A. Yes, it is. Q. Thank you. MS. FOSTER: That is all the City has at this point. JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Union Pacific may 	 Railroad's response to that? MS. REYNOLDS: The version that is submitted, the section that is at issue, has not changed from 2003 to 2009. It's the same language, verbiage, et cetera.
2 3 4	 A. Yes, it is. Q. Thank you. MS. FOSTER: That is all the City has at this point. 	 Railroad's response to that? MS. REYNOLDS: The version that is submitted, the section that is at issue, has not changed from 2003 to 2009. It's the same language, verbiage, et cetera. JUDGE HOWARD: If it I am concerned if
2 3 4 5	 A. Yes, it is. Q. Thank you. MS. FOSTER: That is all the City has at this point. JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Union Pacific may cross the witness. 	 Railroad's response to that? MS. REYNOLDS: The version that is submitted, the section that is at issue, has not changed from 2003 to 2009. It's the same language, verbiage, et cetera. JUDGE HOWARD: If it I am concerned if it even if it didn't change, we're looking at
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	A. Yes, it is. Q. Thank you. MS. FOSTER: That is all the City has at this point. JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Union Pacific may cross the witness. CROSS-EXAMINATION	 Railroad's response to that? MS. REYNOLDS: The version that is submitted, the section that is at issue, has not changed from 2003 to 2009. It's the same language, verbiage, et cetera. JUDGE HOWARD: If it I am concerned if it even if it didn't change, we're looking at something that changed, and that was a manual that was
2 3 5 6 7 8 9	A. Yes, it is. Q. Thank you. MS. FOSTER: That is all the City has at this point. JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Union Pacific may cross the witness. CROSS-EXAMINATION BY MS. REYNOLDS:	 Railroad's response to that? MS. REYNOLDS: The version that is submitted, the section that is at issue, has not changed from 2003 to 2009. It's the same language, verbiage, et cetera. JUDGE HOWARD: If it I am concerned if it even if it didn't change, we're looking at something that changed, and that was a manual that was updated in 2009 before any of these circumstances,
2 3 6 7 8 9	A. Yes, it is. Q. Thank you. MS. FOSTER: That is all the City has at this point. JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Union Pacific may cross the witness. CROSS-EXAMINATION BY MS. REYNOLDS: Q. Good morning, Mr. Lochmiller.	 Railroad's response to that? MS. REYNOLDS: The version that is submitted, the section that is at issue, has not changed from 2003 to 2009. It's the same language, verbiage, et cetera. JUDGE HOWARD: If it I am concerned if it even if it didn't change, we're looking at something that changed, and that was a manual that was updated in 2009 before any of these circumstances, and and we're instead relying on the older exhibit,
2 3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11	 A. Yes, it is. Q. Thank you. MS. FOSTER: That is all the City has at this point. JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Union Pacific may cross the witness. C R O S S - E X A M I N A T I O N BY MS. REYNOLDS: Q. Good morning, Mr. Lochmiller. A. Morning. 	 Railroad's response to that? MS. REYNOLDS: The version that is submitted, the section that is at issue, has not changed from 2003 to 2009. It's the same language, verbiage, et cetera. JUDGE HOWARD: If it I am concerned if it even if it didn't change, we're looking at something that changed, and that was a manual that was updated in 2009 before any of these circumstances, and and we're instead relying on the older exhibit, the older version of this manual.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	 A. Yes, it is. Q. Thank you. MS. FOSTER: That is all the City has at this point. JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Union Pacific may cross the witness. C R O S S - E X A M I N A T I O N BY MS. REYNOLDS: Q. Good morning, Mr. Lochmiller. A. Morning. Q. Do you have the cross-examination exhibits that 	 Railroad's response to that? MS. REYNOLDS: The version that is submitted, the section that is at issue, has not changed from 2003 to 2009. It's the same language, verbiage, et cetera. JUDGE HOWARD: If it I am concerned if it even if it didn't change, we're looking at something that changed, and that was a manual that was updated in 2009 before any of these circumstances, and and we're instead relying on the older exhibit, the older version of this manual. I'm I'm going to grant the objection.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	 A. Yes, it is. Q. Thank you. MS. FOSTER: That is all the City has at this point. JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Union Pacific may cross the witness. C R O S S - E X A M I N A T I O N BY MS. REYNOLDS: Q. Good morning, Mr. Lochmiller. A. Morning. Q. Do you have the cross-examination exhibits that were filed and served by Union Pacific available to you? 	 Railroad's response to that? MS. REYNOLDS: The version that is submitted, the section that is at issue, has not changed from 2003 to 2009. It's the same language, verbiage, et cetera. JUDGE HOWARD: If it I am concerned if it even if it didn't change, we're looking at something that changed, and that was a manual that was updated in 2009 before any of these circumstances, and and we're instead relying on the older exhibit, the older version of this manual. I'm I'm going to grant the objection. BY MS. REYNOLDS:
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	 A. Yes, it is. Q. Thank you. MS. FOSTER: That is all the City has at this point. JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Union Pacific may cross the witness. C R O S S - E X A M I N A T I O N BY MS. REYNOLDS: Q. Good morning, Mr. Lochmiller. A. Morning. Q. Do you have the cross-examination exhibits that were filed and served by Union Pacific available to you? A. Yes. 	 Railroad's response to that? MS. REYNOLDS: The version that is submitted, the section that is at issue, has not changed from 2003 to 2009. It's the same language, verbiage, et cetera. JUDGE HOWARD: If it I am concerned if it even if it didn't change, we're looking at something that changed, and that was a manual that was updated in 2009 before any of these circumstances, and and we're instead relying on the older exhibit, the older version of this manual. I'm I'm going to grant the objection. BY MS. REYNOLDS: Q. Without referencing the or you've agreed with
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	 A. Yes, it is. Q. Thank you. MS. FOSTER: That is all the City has at this point. JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Union Pacific may cross the witness. C R O S S - E X A M I N A T I O N BY MS. REYNOLDS: Q. Good morning, Mr. Lochmiller. A. Morning. Q. Do you have the cross-examination exhibits that were filed and served by Union Pacific available to you? A. Yes. Q. All right. I'd like to direct your attention to 	 Railroad's response to that? MS. REYNOLDS: The version that is submitted, the section that is at issue, has not changed from 2003 to 2009. It's the same language, verbiage, et cetera. JUDGE HOWARD: If it I am concerned if it even if it didn't change, we're looking at something that changed, and that was a manual that was updated in 2009 before any of these circumstances, and and we're instead relying on the older exhibit, the older version of this manual. I'm I'm going to grant the objection. BY MS. REYNOLDS: Q. Without referencing the or you've agreed with me that Washington has adopted the 2009 version of the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	 A. Yes, it is. Q. Thank you. MS. FOSTER: That is all the City has at this point. JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Union Pacific may cross the witness. C R O S S - E X A M I N A T I O N BY MS. REYNOLDS: Q. Good morning, Mr. Lochmiller. A. Morning. Q. Do you have the cross-examination exhibits that were filed and served by Union Pacific available to you? A. Yes. Q. All right. I'd like to direct your attention to your prefiled testimony, specifically where you 	 Railroad's response to that? MS. REYNOLDS: The version that is submitted, the section that is at issue, has not changed from 2003 to 2009. It's the same language, verbiage, et cetera. JUDGE HOWARD: If it I am concerned if it even if it didn't change, we're looking at something that changed, and that was a manual that was updated in 2009 before any of these circumstances, and and we're instead relying on the older exhibit, the older version of this manual. I'm I'm going to grant the objection. BY MS. REYNOLDS: Q. Without referencing the or you've agreed with me that Washington has adopted the 2009 version of the MUTCD, correct?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	 A. Yes, it is. Q. Thank you. MS. FOSTER: That is all the City has at this point. JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Union Pacific may cross the witness. C R O S S - E X A M I N A T I O N BY MS. REYNOLDS: Q. Good morning, Mr. Lochmiller. A. Morning. Q. Do you have the cross-examination exhibits that were filed and served by Union Pacific available to you? A. Yes. Q. All right. I'd like to direct your attention to your prefiled testimony, specifically where you reference the Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices 	 Railroad's response to that? MS. REYNOLDS: The version that is submitted, the section that is at issue, has not changed from 2003 to 2009. It's the same language, verbiage, et cetera. JUDGE HOWARD: If it I am concerned if it even if it didn't change, we're looking at something that changed, and that was a manual that was updated in 2009 before any of these circumstances, and and we're instead relying on the older exhibit, the older version of this manual. I'm I'm going to grant the objection. BY MS. REYNOLDS: Q. Without referencing the or you've agreed with me that Washington has adopted the 2009 version of the MUTCD, correct? A. I believe so.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	 A. Yes, it is. Q. Thank you. MS. FOSTER: That is all the City has at this point. JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Union Pacific may cross the witness. C R O S S - E X A M I N A T I O N BY MS. REYNOLDS: Q. Good morning, Mr. Lochmiller. A. Morning. Q. Do you have the cross-examination exhibits that were filed and served by Union Pacific available to you? A. Yes. Q. All right. I'd like to direct your attention to your prefiled testimony, specifically where you reference the Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices at page 2, lines 16 and 17. 	 Railroad's response to that? MS. REYNOLDS: The version that is submitted, the section that is at issue, has not changed from 2003 to 2009. It's the same language, verbiage, et cetera. JUDGE HOWARD: If it I am concerned if it even if it didn't change, we're looking at something that changed, and that was a manual that was updated in 2009 before any of these circumstances, and and we're instead relying on the older exhibit, the older version of this manual. I'm I'm going to grant the objection. BY MS. REYNOLDS: Q. Without referencing the or you've agreed with me that Washington has adopted the 2009 version of the MUTCD, correct? A. I believe so. Q. And while you've stated that you don't recall or
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	 A. Yes, it is. Q. Thank you. MS. FOSTER: That is all the City has at this point. JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Union Pacific may cross the witness. CROSS-EXAMINATION BY MS. REYNOLDS: Q. Good morning, Mr. Lochmiller. A. Morning. Q. Do you have the cross-examination exhibits that were filed and served by Union Pacific available to you? A. Yes. Q. All right. I'd like to direct your attention to your prefiled testimony, specifically where you reference the Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices at page 2, lines 16 and 17. A. Okay. 	 Railroad's response to that? MS. REYNOLDS: The version that is submitted, the section that is at issue, has not changed from 2003 to 2009. It's the same language, verbiage, et cetera. JUDGE HOWARD: If it I am concerned if it even if it didn't change, we're looking at something that changed, and that was a manual that was updated in 2009 before any of these circumstances, and and we're instead relying on the older exhibit, the older version of this manual. I'm I'm going to grant the objection. BY MS. REYNOLDS: Q. Without referencing the or you've agreed with me that Washington has adopted the 2009 version of the MUTCD, correct? A. I believe so. Q. And while you've stated that you don't recall or haven't memorized the 2009 version of the MUTCD, you
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	 A. Yes, it is. Q. Thank you. MS. FOSTER: That is all the City has at this point. JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Union Pacific may cross the witness. CROSS-EXAMINATION BY MS. REYNOLDS: Q. Good morning, Mr. Lochmiller. A. Morning. Q. Do you have the cross-examination exhibits that were filed and served by Union Pacific available to you? A. Yes. Q. All right. I'd like to direct your attention to your prefiled testimony, specifically where you reference the Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices at page 2, lines 16 and 17. A. Okay. Q. Do you recall offering prefiled testimony about 	 Railroad's response to that? MS. REYNOLDS: The version that is submitted, the section that is at issue, has not changed from 2003 to 2009. It's the same language, verbiage, et cetera. JUDGE HOWARD: If it I am concerned if it even if it didn't change, we're looking at something that changed, and that was a manual that was updated in 2009 before any of these circumstances, and and we're instead relying on the older exhibit, the older version of this manual. I'm I'm going to grant the objection. BY MS. REYNOLDS: Q. Without referencing the or you've agreed with me that Washington has adopted the 2009 version of the MUTCD, correct? A. I believe so. Q. And while you've stated that you don't recall or haven't memorized the 2009 version of the MUTCD, you would have no reason to disagree with me that Section
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	 A. Yes, it is. Q. Thank you. MS. FOSTER: That is all the City has at this point. JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Union Pacific may cross the witness. CROSS-EXAMINATION BY MS. REYNOLDS: Q. Good morning, Mr. Lochmiller. A. Morning. Q. Do you have the cross-examination exhibits that were filed and served by Union Pacific available to you? A. Yes. Q. All right. I'd like to direct your attention to your prefiled testimony, specifically where you reference the Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices at page 2, lines 16 and 17. A. Okay. Q. Do you recall offering prefiled testimony about the MUTCD? 	 Railroad's response to that? MS. REYNOLDS: The version that is submitted, the section that is at issue, has not changed from 2003 to 2009. It's the same language, verbiage, et cetera. JUDGE HOWARD: If it I am concerned if it even if it didn't change, we're looking at something that changed, and that was a manual that was updated in 2009 before any of these circumstances, and and we're instead relying on the older exhibit, the older version of this manual. I'm I'm going to grant the objection. BY MS. REYNOLDS: Q. Without referencing the or you've agreed with me that Washington has adopted the 2009 version of the MUTCD, correct? A. I believe so. Q. And while you've stated that you don't recall or haven't memorized the 2009 version of the MUTCD, you would have no reason to disagree with me that Section 1A.07 of the MUTCD would apply?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	 A. Yes, it is. Q. Thank you. MS. FOSTER: That is all the City has at this point. JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Union Pacific may cross the witness. CROSS-EXAMINATION BY MS. REYNOLDS: Q. Good morning, Mr. Lochmiller. A. Morning. Q. Do you have the cross-examination exhibits that were filed and served by Union Pacific available to you? A. Yes. Q. All right. I'd like to direct your attention to your prefiled testimony, specifically where you reference the Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices at page 2, lines 16 and 17. A. Okay. Q. Do you recall offering prefiled testimony about the MUTCD? A. Right. 	 Railroad's response to that? MS. REYNOLDS: The version that is submitted, the section that is at issue, has not changed from 2003 to 2009. It's the same language, verbiage, et cetera. JUDGE HOWARD: If it I am concerned if it even if it didn't change, we're looking at something that changed, and that was a manual that was updated in 2009 before any of these circumstances, and and we're instead relying on the older exhibit, the older version of this manual. I'm I'm going to grant the objection. BY MS. REYNOLDS: Q. Without referencing the or you've agreed with me that Washington has adopted the 2009 version of the MUTCD, correct? A. I believe so. Q. And while you've stated that you don't recall or haven't memorized the 2009 version of the MUTCD, you would have no reason to disagree with me that Section 1A.07 of the MUTCD would apply? A. I have no idea.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	 A. Yes, it is. Q. Thank you. MS. FOSTER: That is all the City has at this point. JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Union Pacific may cross the witness. CROSS-EXAMINATION BY MS. REYNOLDS: Q. Good morning, Mr. Lochmiller. A. Morning. Q. Do you have the cross-examination exhibits that were filed and served by Union Pacific available to you? A. Yes. Q. All right. I'd like to direct your attention to your prefiled testimony, specifically where you reference the Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices at page 2, lines 16 and 17. A. Okay. Q. Do you recall offering prefiled testimony about the MUTCD? A. Right. Q. And so you agree that the MUTCD is applicable in 	 Railroad's response to that? MS. REYNOLDS: The version that is submitted, the section that is at issue, has not changed from 2003 to 2009. It's the same language, verbiage, et cetera. JUDGE HOWARD: If it I am concerned if it even if it didn't change, we're looking at something that changed, and that was a manual that was updated in 2009 before any of these circumstances, and and we're instead relying on the older exhibit, the older version of this manual. I'm I'm going to grant the objection. BY MS. REYNOLDS: Q. Without referencing the or you've agreed with me that Washington has adopted the 2009 version of the MUTCD, correct? A. I believe so. Q. And while you've stated that you don't recall or haven't memorized the 2009 version of the MUTCD, you would have no reason to disagree with me that Section 1A.07 of the MUTCD would apply? A. I have no idea. Q. And you would have no reason to disagree with me
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	 A. Yes, it is. Q. Thank you. MS. FOSTER: That is all the City has at this point. JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Union Pacific may cross the witness. CROSS-EXAMINATION BY MS. REYNOLDS: Q. Good morning, Mr. Lochmiller. A. Morning. Q. Do you have the cross-examination exhibits that were filed and served by Union Pacific available to you? A. Yes. Q. All right. I'd like to direct your attention to your prefiled testimony, specifically where you reference the Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices at page 2, lines 16 and 17. A. Okay. Q. Do you recall offering prefiled testimony about the MUTCD? A. Right. 	 Railroad's response to that? MS. REYNOLDS: The version that is submitted, the section that is at issue, has not changed from 2003 to 2009. It's the same language, verbiage, et cetera. JUDGE HOWARD: If it I am concerned if it even if it didn't change, we're looking at something that changed, and that was a manual that was updated in 2009 before any of these circumstances, and and we're instead relying on the older exhibit, the older version of this manual. I'm I'm going to grant the objection. BY MS. REYNOLDS: Q. Without referencing the or you've agreed with me that Washington has adopted the 2009 version of the MUTCD, correct? A. I believe so. Q. And while you've stated that you don't recall or haven't memorized the 2009 version of the MUTCD, you would have no reason to disagree with me that Section 1A.07 of the MUTCD would apply? A. I have no idea.

10 (Pages 49 to 52)

	Page 53		Page 55
1	the public agency or official having jurisdiction; is	1	belabor this. I can move on if Your Honor would prefer
2	that correct?	2	us to and I can address this a different way.
3	MS. FOSTER: Aziza Foster for the City. We	3	JUDGE HOWARD: I am yes, I am going to
4	will object. That statement is not in the record.	4	after after hearing the City's position and
5	Counsel is testifying.	5	reconsidering this, I do think it would be inadvisable
6	JUDGE HOWARD: I am going to I am going	6	to take administrative notice of the entire currently
7	to grant the objection. We if we're if we're	7	published manual. If if the Railroad could move on
8	going to be crossing the witness on the contents of this	8	from this point, that would be helpful.
9	manual, it would need to be in evidence.	9	MS. REYNOLDS: Thank you, Your Honor.
10	I am going to ask the Union Pacific to	10	BY MS. REYNOLDS:
11	just to clarify. Is this who is the publisher of	11	Q. Mr. Lochmiller, are you familiar with the
12	this manual? Is this the Department of Transportation?	12	February 17th, 2017 Construction and Maintenance
13	MS. REYNOLDS: It's the Department of	13	Agreement for the public highway at-grade crossing for
14	Transportation Federal Highway Administration. And	14	Barker Road?
15	it I I will submit to Your Honor that it gets	15	A. 2017, no, I'm not.
16	quite confusing because there are WACs and RCWs, and	16	Q. All right.
17	it's a piecemeal adoption from the Washington State	17	MS. FOSTER: Objection, Your Honor. This
18	Legislature. So there's not a particularly simple way	18	isn't one of the cross-examination exhibits that was
19	of producing essentially, the State of Washington has	19	entered into for Mr. Lochmiller. It's outside of the
20	adopted the 2009 version, and then there are specific	20	scope of his testimony.
21	kind of excerpts where they have excerpted out	21	JUDGE HOWARD: Would the Railroad like to
22	modifications from the state in a very long series of	22	respond?
23	administrative code provisions.	23	MS. REYNOLDS: I haven't sought to move
24 25	JUDGE HOWARD: All right. So I don't want	24 25	anything into evidence, Your Honor. I asked him if he
20	to put form before substance here. This is something	25	was familiar and he said no.
	Page 54		Page 56
1	that is publicly available. It is something that and	1	MS. FOSTER: It's still outside the scope of
2	it's a government document that's published and freely	2	his testimony, Your Honor.
3	available. I believe the Commission can take		
5		3	JUDGE HOWARD: I'm going to deny the
4	administrative notice of it, but the problem is at this	3	JUDGE HOWARD: I'm going to deny the objection on insofar as it's specifically focused on
	administrative notice of it, but the problem is at this point that we don't have we don't have this document		
4	point that we don't have we don't have this document before us.	4	objection on insofar as it's specifically focused on
4 5	point that we don't have we don't have this document before us. MS. FOSTER: Judge Howard, if I may. I	4 5	objection on insofar as it's specifically focused on whether it's outside the scope of his testimony. I think she's free to cross on whether he's familiar with this agreement.
4 5 6	point that we don't have we don't have this document before us. MS. FOSTER: Judge Howard, if I may. I would actually object to the Commission taking judicial	4 5 6 7 8	objection on insofar as it's specifically focused on whether it's outside the scope of his testimony. I think she's free to cross on whether he's familiar with this agreement. MS. FOSTER: Thank you, Your Honor.
4 5 7 8 9	point that we don't have we don't have this document before us. MS. FOSTER: Judge Howard, if I may. I would actually object to the Commission taking judicial notice anyways. As Ms. Reynolds herself stated, it is a	4 5 6 7 8 9	objection on insofar as it's specifically focused on whether it's outside the scope of his testimony. I think she's free to cross on whether he's familiar with this agreement. MS. FOSTER: Thank you, Your Honor. BY MS. REYNOLDS:
4 5 7 8 9 10	point that we don't have we don't have this document before us. MS. FOSTER: Judge Howard, if I may. I would actually object to the Commission taking judicial notice anyways. As Ms. Reynolds herself stated, it is a very complicated matter determining what portions of the	4 5 6 7 8 9 10	objection on insofar as it's specifically focused on whether it's outside the scope of his testimony. I think she's free to cross on whether he's familiar with this agreement. MS. FOSTER: Thank you, Your Honor. BY MS. REYNOLDS: Q. Sir, can you please pull up in front of you
4 5 7 8 9 10 11	point that we don't have we don't have this document before us. MS. FOSTER: Judge Howard, if I may. I would actually object to the Commission taking judicial notice anyways. As Ms. Reynolds herself stated, it is a very complicated matter determining what portions of the MUTCD that the State of Washington has adopted versus	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	objection on insofar as it's specifically focused on whether it's outside the scope of his testimony. I think she's free to cross on whether he's familiar with this agreement. MS. FOSTER: Thank you, Your Honor. BY MS. REYNOLDS: Q. Sir, can you please pull up in front of you RL-8X?
4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12	point that we don't have we don't have this document before us. MS. FOSTER: Judge Howard, if I may. I would actually object to the Commission taking judicial notice anyways. As Ms. Reynolds herself stated, it is a very complicated matter determining what portions of the MUTCD that the State of Washington has adopted versus what portions they have modified. And without UP laying	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	 objection on insofar as it's specifically focused on whether it's outside the scope of his testimony. I think she's free to cross on whether he's familiar with this agreement. MS. FOSTER: Thank you, Your Honor. BY MS. REYNOLDS: Q. Sir, can you please pull up in front of you RL-8X? A. Okay.
4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	point that we don't have we don't have this document before us. MS. FOSTER: Judge Howard, if I may. I would actually object to the Commission taking judicial notice anyways. As Ms. Reynolds herself stated, it is a very complicated matter determining what portions of the MUTCD that the State of Washington has adopted versus what portions they have modified. And without UP laying a foundation, we have no knowledge of what sections	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	 objection on insofar as it's specifically focused on whether it's outside the scope of his testimony. I think she's free to cross on whether he's familiar with this agreement. MS. FOSTER: Thank you, Your Honor. BY MS. REYNOLDS: Q. Sir, can you please pull up in front of you RL-8X? A. Okay. Q. Do you have that in front of you now, sir?
4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	point that we don't have we don't have this document before us. MS. FOSTER: Judge Howard, if I may. I would actually object to the Commission taking judicial notice anyways. As Ms. Reynolds herself stated, it is a very complicated matter determining what portions of the MUTCD that the State of Washington has adopted versus what portions they have modified. And without UP laying a foundation, we have no knowledge of what sections if the section that Ms. Reynolds is citing is even a	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	 objection on insofar as it's specifically focused on whether it's outside the scope of his testimony. I think she's free to cross on whether he's familiar with this agreement. MS. FOSTER: Thank you, Your Honor. BY MS. REYNOLDS: Q. Sir, can you please pull up in front of you RL-8X? A. Okay. Q. Do you have that in front of you now, sir? A. Yes, I do.
4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	point that we don't have we don't have this document before us. MS. FOSTER: Judge Howard, if I may. I would actually object to the Commission taking judicial notice anyways. As Ms. Reynolds herself stated, it is a very complicated matter determining what portions of the MUTCD that the State of Washington has adopted versus what portions they have modified. And without UP laying a foundation, we have no knowledge of what sections if the section that Ms. Reynolds is citing is even a section that the State of Washington has adopted, and UP	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	 objection on insofar as it's specifically focused on whether it's outside the scope of his testimony. I think she's free to cross on whether he's familiar with this agreement. MS. FOSTER: Thank you, Your Honor. BY MS. REYNOLDS: Q. Sir, can you please pull up in front of you RL-8X? A. Okay. Q. Do you have that in front of you now, sir? A. Yes, I do. Q. And are you familiar with what is included in
4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	point that we don't have we don't have this document before us. MS. FOSTER: Judge Howard, if I may. I would actually object to the Commission taking judicial notice anyways. As Ms. Reynolds herself stated, it is a very complicated matter determining what portions of the MUTCD that the State of Washington has adopted versus what portions they have modified. And without UP laying a foundation, we have no knowledge of what sections if the section that Ms. Reynolds is citing is even a section that the State of Washington has adopted, and UP has not entered that into the record.	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	 objection on insofar as it's specifically focused on whether it's outside the scope of his testimony. I think she's free to cross on whether he's familiar with this agreement. MS. FOSTER: Thank you, Your Honor. BY MS. REYNOLDS: Q. Sir, can you please pull up in front of you RL-8X? A. Okay. Q. Do you have that in front of you now, sir? A. Yes, I do. Q. And are you familiar with what is included in RL-8X?
4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	point that we don't have we don't have this document before us. MS. FOSTER: Judge Howard, if I may. I would actually object to the Commission taking judicial notice anyways. As Ms. Reynolds herself stated, it is a very complicated matter determining what portions of the MUTCD that the State of Washington has adopted versus what portions they have modified. And without UP laying a foundation, we have no knowledge of what sections if the section that Ms. Reynolds is citing is even a section that the State of Washington has adopted, and UP has not entered that into the record. JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Would the	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	 objection on insofar as it's specifically focused on whether it's outside the scope of his testimony. I think she's free to cross on whether he's familiar with this agreement. MS. FOSTER: Thank you, Your Honor. BY MS. REYNOLDS: Q. Sir, can you please pull up in front of you RL-8X? A. Okay. Q. Do you have that in front of you now, sir? A. Yes, I do. Q. And are you familiar with what is included in RL-8X? A. It was an email from Mr. Mays to myself.
4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	point that we don't have we don't have this document before us. MS. FOSTER: Judge Howard, if I may. I would actually object to the Commission taking judicial notice anyways. As Ms. Reynolds herself stated, it is a very complicated matter determining what portions of the MUTCD that the State of Washington has adopted versus what portions they have modified. And without UP laying a foundation, we have no knowledge of what sections if the section that Ms. Reynolds is citing is even a section that the State of Washington has adopted, and UP has not entered that into the record. JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Would the would the Railroad like to respond to that?	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	 objection on insofar as it's specifically focused on whether it's outside the scope of his testimony. I think she's free to cross on whether he's familiar with this agreement. MS. FOSTER: Thank you, Your Honor. BY MS. REYNOLDS: Q. Sir, can you please pull up in front of you RL-8X? A. Okay. Q. Do you have that in front of you now, sir? A. Yes, I do. Q. And are you familiar with what is included in RL-8X? A. It was an email from Mr. Mays to myself. Q. And to be clear, it I'm sorry, sir. I cut
4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	point that we don't have we don't have this document before us. MS. FOSTER: Judge Howard, if I may. I would actually object to the Commission taking judicial notice anyways. As Ms. Reynolds herself stated, it is a very complicated matter determining what portions of the MUTCD that the State of Washington has adopted versus what portions they have modified. And without UP laying a foundation, we have no knowledge of what sections if the section that Ms. Reynolds is citing is even a section that the State of Washington has adopted, and UP has not entered that into the record. JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Would the would the Railroad like to respond to that? MS. REYNOLDS: The response would be that	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	 objection on insofar as it's specifically focused on whether it's outside the scope of his testimony. I think she's free to cross on whether he's familiar with this agreement. MS. FOSTER: Thank you, Your Honor. BY MS. REYNOLDS: Q. Sir, can you please pull up in front of you RL-8X? A. Okay. Q. Do you have that in front of you now, sir? A. Yes, I do. Q. And are you familiar with what is included in RL-8X? A. It was an email from Mr. Mays to myself. Q. And to be clear, it I'm sorry, sir. I cut you off. Can you finish your answer?
4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	point that we don't have we don't have this document before us. MS. FOSTER: Judge Howard, if I may. I would actually object to the Commission taking judicial notice anyways. As Ms. Reynolds herself stated, it is a very complicated matter determining what portions of the MUTCD that the State of Washington has adopted versus what portions they have modified. And without UP laying a foundation, we have no knowledge of what sections if the section that Ms. Reynolds is citing is even a section that the State of Washington has adopted, and UP has not entered that into the record. JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Would the would the Railroad like to respond to that? MS. REYNOLDS: The response would be that the MUTCD was injected into this case by the prefiled	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	 objection on insofar as it's specifically focused on whether it's outside the scope of his testimony. I think she's free to cross on whether he's familiar with this agreement. MS. FOSTER: Thank you, Your Honor. BY MS. REYNOLDS: Q. Sir, can you please pull up in front of you RL-8X? A. Okay. Q. Do you have that in front of you now, sir? A. Yes, I do. Q. And are you familiar with what is included in RL-8X? A. It was an email from Mr. Mays to myself. Q. And to be clear, it I'm sorry, sir. I cut you off. Can you finish your answer? A. It was an email from Ellis Mays to myself, I
4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	point that we don't have we don't have this document before us. MS. FOSTER: Judge Howard, if I may. I would actually object to the Commission taking judicial notice anyways. As Ms. Reynolds herself stated, it is a very complicated matter determining what portions of the MUTCD that the State of Washington has adopted versus what portions they have modified. And without UP laying a foundation, we have no knowledge of what sections if the section that Ms. Reynolds is citing is even a section that the State of Washington has adopted, and UP has not entered that into the record. JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Would the would the Railroad like to respond to that? MS. REYNOLDS: The response would be that the MUTCD was injected into this case by the prefiled testimony of Mr. Lochmiller who states that the signage	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	 objection on insofar as it's specifically focused on whether it's outside the scope of his testimony. I think she's free to cross on whether he's familiar with this agreement. MS. FOSTER: Thank you, Your Honor. BY MS. REYNOLDS: Q. Sir, can you please pull up in front of you RL-8X? A. Okay. Q. And are you familiar with what is included in RL-8X? A. It was an email from Mr. Mays to myself. Q. And to be clear, it I'm sorry, sir. I cut you off. Can you finish your answer? A. It was an email from Ellis Mays to myself, I believe, in December of 2020 regarding costs associated
4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	point that we don't have we don't have this document before us. MS. FOSTER: Judge Howard, if I may. I would actually object to the Commission taking judicial notice anyways. As Ms. Reynolds herself stated, it is a very complicated matter determining what portions of the MUTCD that the State of Washington has adopted versus what portions they have modified. And without UP laying a foundation, we have no knowledge of what sections if the section that Ms. Reynolds is citing is even a section that the State of Washington has adopted, and UP has not entered that into the record. JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Would the would the Railroad like to respond to that? MS. REYNOLDS: The response would be that the MUTCD was injected into this case by the prefiled	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	 objection on insofar as it's specifically focused on whether it's outside the scope of his testimony. I think she's free to cross on whether he's familiar with this agreement. MS. FOSTER: Thank you, Your Honor. BY MS. REYNOLDS: Q. Sir, can you please pull up in front of you RL-8X? A. Okay. Q. Do you have that in front of you now, sir? A. Yes, I do. Q. And are you familiar with what is included in RL-8X? A. It was an email from Mr. Mays to myself. Q. And to be clear, it I'm sorry, sir. I cut you off. Can you finish your answer? A. It was an email from Ellis Mays to myself, I
4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	point that we don't have we don't have this document before us. MS. FOSTER: Judge Howard, if I may. I would actually object to the Commission taking judicial notice anyways. As Ms. Reynolds herself stated, it is a very complicated matter determining what portions of the MUTCD that the State of Washington has adopted versus what portions they have modified. And without UP laying a foundation, we have no knowledge of what sections if the section that Ms. Reynolds is citing is even a section that the State of Washington has adopted, and UP has not entered that into the record. JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Would the would the Railroad like to respond to that? MS. REYNOLDS: The response would be that the MUTCD was injected into this case by the prefiled testimony of Mr. Lochmiller who states that the signage is being installed in accordance with the MUTCD. And so	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	 objection on insofar as it's specifically focused on whether it's outside the scope of his testimony. I think she's free to cross on whether he's familiar with this agreement. MS. FOSTER: Thank you, Your Honor. BY MS. REYNOLDS: Q. Sir, can you please pull up in front of you RL-8X? A. Okay. Q. Do you have that in front of you now, sir? A. Yes, I do. Q. And are you familiar with what is included in RL-8X? A. It was an email from Mr. Mays to myself. Q. And to be clear, it I'm sorry, sir. I cut you off. Can you finish your answer? A. It was an email from Ellis Mays to myself, I believe, in December of 2020 regarding costs associated with the revising that crossing signal.
4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	point that we don't have we don't have this document before us. MS. FOSTER: Judge Howard, if I may. I would actually object to the Commission taking judicial notice anyways. As Ms. Reynolds herself stated, it is a very complicated matter determining what portions of the MUTCD that the State of Washington has adopted versus what portions they have modified. And without UP laying a foundation, we have no knowledge of what sections if the section that Ms. Reynolds is citing is even a section that the State of Washington has adopted, and UP has not entered that into the record. JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Would the would the Railroad like to respond to that? MS. REYNOLDS: The response would be that the MUTCD was injected into this case by the prefiled testimony of Mr. Lochmiller who states that the signage is being installed in accordance with the MUTCD. And so the import of it was created by Mr. Lochmiller's	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	 objection on insofar as it's specifically focused on whether it's outside the scope of his testimony. I think she's free to cross on whether he's familiar with this agreement. MS. FOSTER: Thank you, Your Honor. BY MS. REYNOLDS: Q. Sir, can you please pull up in front of you RL-8X? A. Okay. Q. Do you have that in front of you now, sir? A. Yes, I do. Q. And are you familiar with what is included in RL-8X? A. It was an email from Mr. Mays to myself. Q. And to be clear, it I'm sorry, sir. I cut you off. Can you finish your answer? A. It was an email from Ellis Mays to myself, I believe, in December of 2020 regarding costs associated with the revising that crossing signal. Q. And please take your time before answering this

11 (Pages 53 to 56)

	Page 57	Page 59
1	A. Yes, it is.	1 A. He provided that information, but that was the
2	MS. REYNOLDS: All right. At this time,	2 first he's ever acknowledged that the City would be
3	Your Honor, I would move to admit RL-8X into evidence.	³ responsible for those costs. So that was the only
4	JUDGE HOWARD: It is admitted admitted.	4 description we ever got, and really wasn't determined
5	Thank you.	5 the implications until we received the draft
6	(Exhibit RL-8X admitted.)	6 Construction and Maintenance Agreement seven months
7	MS. REYNOLDS: Thank you. And at this time,	7 later.
8	Your Honor, may I at least attempt to share my screen?	8 MS. REYNOLDS: And I would respectively move
9	I think it may be helpful to get through quickly.	⁹ to strike the nonresponsive portion.
10	JUDGE HOWARD: Certainly.	10 JUDGE HOWARD: It's granted.
11	BY MS. REYNOLDS:	11 Mr. Lochmiller, please focus on just just
12	Q. Mr. Lochmiller, can you see on your screen an	12 answering the question posed to you, and then Ms. Foster
13	email from you dated Tuesday, December 8th, 2020?	13 can will have a chance to ask you questions after
14	A. Yes.	14 this.
15	Q. All right. Do you agree that this email states	15 THE WITNESS: Sure.
16	that or this email was directed to Ellis Mays, Jeff	16 A. Can you repeat the question?
17	Morse, and then there are cc's?	17 BY MS. REYNOLDS:
18	A. Correct.	18 Q. Certainly.
19	Q. And can you read to me the first paragraph of	19 So your response to Mr. Ellis Mays sending you
20	this email?	20 AREMA annual maintenance cost that the City will be
21	A. Okay. (As read) The City's okay with this and	billed for was, City is okay with this and would like to
22 23	would like to proceed with the agreement. The City will	22 proceed with the agreement, correct?
24	likely need some railroad flagging for the City's contractor to complete the road improvements within the	 A. That was my response to that email, yes. Q. Okay. I'm going to stop sharing.
25	UPRR right away to so if the contract so if the	24Q. Okay. I'm going to stop sharing.25In your prefiled testimony, you detail the
25	of first light away to so it the contract so it the	25 in your premed testimony, you detail the
	Page 58	Page 60
1	City's contractor isn't able to work within the UPRR	1 proposed modifications to this subject crossing,
2	railroad at the same time the UPRR construction, then we	2 correct?
3	probably need to add another five days to the flagging.	3 A. Yes.
4	Q. All right. And I'm scrolling down to the bottom	4 Q. Now, the proposed excuse me. The proposed
5	of page 3 of Exhibit RL-8X. And do do you see that	5 modifications will not eliminate queueing at the
6	there is an email dated Monday, December 7, 2020, from	6 railroad crossings, will they?
7		
	Ellis Mays?	7 A. Queueing?
8	A. Yes.	7 A. Queueing?8 Q. Or lining up?
8 9	A. Yes.Q. And was your December 8th email in response to	 7 A. Queueing? 8 Q. Or lining up? 9 A. Queueing from the trains?
8 9 10	 A. Yes. Q. And was your December 8th email in response to that December 7th email? 	 7 A. Queueing? 8 Q. Or lining up? 9 A. Queueing from the trains? 10 Q. Correct.
8 9 10 11	 A. Yes. Q. And was your December 8th email in response to that December 7th email? A. Yes. 	 7 A. Queueing? 8 Q. Or lining up? 9 A. Queueing from the trains? 10 Q. Correct. 11 A. It would not eliminate queuing from the trains.
8 9 10 11 12	 A. Yes. Q. And was your December 8th email in response to that December 7th email? A. Yes. Q. Okay. And the again, scrolling down to the 	 7 A. Queueing? 8 Q. Or lining up? 9 A. Queueing from the trains? 10 Q. Correct. 11 A. It would not eliminate queuing from the trains. 12 It's an at-grade crossing.
8 9 10 11 12 13	 A. Yes. Q. And was your December 8th email in response to that December 7th email? A. Yes. Q. Okay. And the again, scrolling down to the Monday, December 7th email from Ellis Mays, do you agree 	 7 A. Queueing? 8 Q. Or lining up? 9 A. Queueing from the trains? 10 Q. Correct. 11 A. It would not eliminate queuing from the trains. 12 It's an at-grade crossing. 13 Q. The multiuse path will separate bicycles and
8 9 10 11 12 13 14	 A. Yes. Q. And was your December 8th email in response to that December 7th email? A. Yes. Q. Okay. And the again, scrolling down to the Monday, December 7th email from Ellis Mays, do you agree that Mr. Mays was providing to you certain terms to be 	 7 A. Queueing? 8 Q. Or lining up? 9 A. Queueing from the trains? 10 Q. Correct. 11 A. It would not eliminate queuing from the trains. 12 It's an at-grade crossing. 13 Q. The multiuse path will separate bicycles and 14 pedestrians from the roadway, correct?
8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	 A. Yes. Q. And was your December 8th email in response to that December 7th email? A. Yes. Q. Okay. And the again, scrolling down to the Monday, December 7th email from Ellis Mays, do you agree that Mr. Mays was providing to you certain terms to be considered for the Barker Road project? 	 7 A. Queueing? 8 Q. Or lining up? 9 A. Queueing from the trains? 10 Q. Correct. 11 A. It would not eliminate queuing from the trains. 12 It's an at-grade crossing. 13 Q. The multiuse path will separate bicycles and 14 pedestrians from the roadway, correct? 15 A. Correct.
8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	 A. Yes. Q. And was your December 8th email in response to that December 7th email? A. Yes. Q. Okay. And the again, scrolling down to the Monday, December 7th email from Ellis Mays, do you agree that Mr. Mays was providing to you certain terms to be considered for the Barker Road project? A. My understanding of that email was he's 	 7 A. Queueing? 8 Q. Or lining up? 9 A. Queueing from the trains? 10 Q. Correct. 11 A. It would not eliminate queuing from the trains. 12 It's an at-grade crossing. 13 Q. The multiuse path will separate bicycles and 14 pedestrians from the roadway, correct? 15 A. Correct. 16 Q. But the multiuse path will not separate
8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	 A. Yes. Q. And was your December 8th email in response to that December 7th email? A. Yes. Q. Okay. And the again, scrolling down to the Monday, December 7th email from Ellis Mays, do you agree that Mr. Mays was providing to you certain terms to be considered for the Barker Road project? A. My understanding of that email was he's providing construction costs for the project. I do note 	 7 A. Queueing? 8 Q. Or lining up? 9 A. Queueing from the trains? 10 Q. Correct. 11 A. It would not eliminate queuing from the trains. 12 It's an at-grade crossing. 13 Q. The multiuse path will separate bicycles and 14 pedestrians from the roadway, correct? 15 A. Correct. 16 Q. But the multiuse path will not separate 17 pedestrians and bicyclists from the actual tracks or
8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	 A. Yes. Q. And was your December 8th email in response to that December 7th email? A. Yes. Q. Okay. And the again, scrolling down to the Monday, December 7th email from Ellis Mays, do you agree that Mr. Mays was providing to you certain terms to be considered for the Barker Road project? A. My understanding of that email was he's providing construction costs for the project. I do note that he provided number five, and really I did not 	 7 A. Queueing? 8 Q. Or lining up? 9 A. Queueing from the trains? 10 Q. Correct. 11 A. It would not eliminate queuing from the trains. 12 It's an at-grade crossing. 13 Q. The multiuse path will separate bicycles and 14 pedestrians from the roadway, correct? 15 A. Correct. 16 Q. But the multiuse path will not separate 17 pedestrians and bicyclists from the actual tracks or 18 crossing; is that right?
8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	 A. Yes. Q. And was your December 8th email in response to that December 7th email? A. Yes. Q. Okay. And the again, scrolling down to the Monday, December 7th email from Ellis Mays, do you agree that Mr. Mays was providing to you certain terms to be considered for the Barker Road project? A. My understanding of that email was he's providing construction costs for the project. I do note 	 7 A. Queueing? 8 Q. Or lining up? 9 A. Queueing from the trains? 10 Q. Correct. 11 A. It would not eliminate queuing from the trains. 12 It's an at-grade crossing. 13 Q. The multiuse path will separate bicycles and 14 pedestrians from the roadway, correct? 15 A. Correct. 16 Q. But the multiuse path will not separate 17 pedestrians and bicyclists from the actual tracks or 18 crossing; is that right? 19 A. Correct. The path will cross the tracks as
8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	 A. Yes. Q. And was your December 8th email in response to that December 7th email? A. Yes. Q. Okay. And the again, scrolling down to the Monday, December 7th email from Ellis Mays, do you agree that Mr. Mays was providing to you certain terms to be considered for the Barker Road project? A. My understanding of that email was he's providing construction costs for the project. I do note that he provided number five, and really I did not review that nor anticipate the consequences of that 	 7 A. Queueing? 8 Q. Or lining up? 9 A. Queueing from the trains? 10 Q. Correct. 11 A. It would not eliminate queuing from the trains. 12 It's an at-grade crossing. 13 Q. The multiuse path will separate bicycles and 14 pedestrians from the roadway, correct? 15 A. Correct. 16 Q. But the multiuse path will not separate 17 pedestrians and bicyclists from the actual tracks or 18 crossing; is that right? 19 A. Correct. The path will cross the tracks as 20 well.
8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	 A. Yes. Q. And was your December 8th email in response to that December 7th email? A. Yes. Q. Okay. And the again, scrolling down to the Monday, December 7th email from Ellis Mays, do you agree that Mr. Mays was providing to you certain terms to be considered for the Barker Road project? A. My understanding of that email was he's providing construction costs for the project. I do note that he provided number five, and really I did not review that nor anticipate the consequences of that statement and how it would relate to future maintenance 	 7 A. Queueing? 8 Q. Or lining up? 9 A. Queueing from the trains? 10 Q. Correct. 11 A. It would not eliminate queuing from the trains. 12 It's an at-grade crossing. 13 Q. The multiuse path will separate bicycles and 14 pedestrians from the roadway, correct? 15 A. Correct. 16 Q. But the multiuse path will not separate 17 pedestrians and bicyclists from the actual tracks or 18 crossing; is that right? 19 A. Correct. The path will cross the tracks as 20 well. 21 Q. It, in fact, creates an at-grade crossing for
8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	 A. Yes. Q. And was your December 8th email in response to that December 7th email? A. Yes. Q. Okay. And the again, scrolling down to the Monday, December 7th email from Ellis Mays, do you agree that Mr. Mays was providing to you certain terms to be considered for the Barker Road project? A. My understanding of that email was he's providing construction costs for the project. I do note that he provided number five, and really I did not review that nor anticipate the consequences of that statement and how it would relate to future maintenance funds for the remaining of the life of that signal work. 	 7 A. Queueing? 8 Q. Or lining up? 9 A. Queueing from the trains? 10 Q. Correct. 11 A. It would not eliminate queuing from the trains. 12 It's an at-grade crossing. 13 Q. The multiuse path will separate bicycles and 14 pedestrians from the roadway, correct? 15 A. Correct. 16 Q. But the multiuse path will not separate 17 pedestrians and bicyclists from the actual tracks or 18 crossing; is that right? 19 A. Correct. The path will cross the tracks as 20 well. 21 Q. It, in fact, creates an at-grade crossing for
8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	 A. Yes. Q. And was your December 8th email in response to that December 7th email? A. Yes. Q. Okay. And the again, scrolling down to the Monday, December 7th email from Ellis Mays, do you agree that Mr. Mays was providing to you certain terms to be considered for the Barker Road project? A. My understanding of that email was he's providing construction costs for the project. I do note that he provided number five, and really I did not review that nor anticipate the consequences of that statement and how it would relate to future maintenance funds for the remaining of the life of that signal work. Q. But you agree that on December 7th, 2020, Ellis 	 7 A. Queueing? 8 Q. Or lining up? 9 A. Queueing from the trains? 10 Q. Correct. 11 A. It would not eliminate queuing from the trains. 12 It's an at-grade crossing. 13 Q. The multiuse path will separate bicycles and 14 pedestrians from the roadway, correct? 15 A. Correct. 16 Q. But the multiuse path will not separate 17 pedestrians and bicyclists from the actual tracks or 18 crossing; is that right? 19 A. Correct. The path will cross the tracks as 20 well. 21 Q. It, in fact, creates an at-grade crossing for 22 pedestrians and bicyclists, correct?
8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	 A. Yes. Q. And was your December 8th email in response to that December 7th email? A. Yes. Q. Okay. And the again, scrolling down to the Monday, December 7th email from Ellis Mays, do you agree that Mr. Mays was providing to you certain terms to be considered for the Barker Road project? A. My understanding of that email was he's providing construction costs for the project. I do note that he provided number five, and really I did not review that nor anticipate the consequences of that statement and how it would relate to future maintenance funds for the remaining of the life of that signal work. Q. But you agree that on December 7th, 2020, Ellis Mays sent you AREMA annual maintenance cost that the 	 A. Queueing? Q. Or lining up? A. Queueing from the trains? Q. Correct. A. It would not eliminate queuing from the trains. It's an at-grade crossing. Q. The multiuse path will separate bicycles and pedestrians from the roadway, correct? A. Correct. Q. But the multiuse path will not separate pedestrians and bicyclists from the actual tracks or crossing; is that right? A. Correct. The path will cross the tracks as well. Q. It, in fact, creates an at-grade crossing for pedestrians and bicyclists, correct? A. Correct.

12 (Pages 57 to 60)

	Page 61	Page 63
1	grade crossing at issue in this case, correct?	1 A. Correct.
2	A. Yes, I did.	2 Q. But the system itself isn't changing
3	Q. And the petition does not reference public	3 fundamentally, correct?
4	safety, does it?	4 A. Correct. I mean, there's a couple additional
5	A. I'm not sure. I can't recall.	5 things, I believe, that changed. But for the majority,
6	Q. Would you like me to if I could direct if	6 it's the standard signal crossing, at-grade crossing.
7	I could direct your attention, sir, to RL-4X.	7 Q. The traffic control devices themselves aren't
8	A. Okay.	8 changing in any way except to cover the additional
9	Q. Do you have that in front of you, sir?	9 length to account for the roadway configuration changes,
10	A. Yes, I do.	10 correct?
11	Q. And do you recognize this document?	11 A. I think it was modified for the additional width
12	A. Yes.	12 of the roadway, and I believe there's additional warning
13	Q. What do you recognize it to be?	13 flashing signs that were also added for a couple
14	A. It's the UTC petition I put together and	14 different directions and were not previous on the
15	submitted.	15 existing system.
16	Q. And on this first page of the petition under	16 Q. And were those additional warning devices
17	Petitioner's Information, there are two blue signatures.	17 included because the road is wider now or will be wider?
18	Are those your signatures, sir?	18 A. No, those flashes were added for additional
19	A. Yes.	19 public access on that side street.
20	Q. Is this a true and accurate copy of the petition	20 Q. Where is that detailed in your petition, sir,
21	that you completed and filed with the Utilities and	21 the additional warning systems?
22	Transportation Commission?	A. I think it's based on the additional the
23	A. It looks like it, yes.	23 flashings, the flashers that was in my testimony, the
24	MS. REYNOLDS: At this time, Your Honor, I	24 number of them.
25	would move to admit RL-4X.	25 Q. Okay. There's new equipment that's being
	Page 62	Page 64
1		
1	JUDGE HOWARD: It is admitted. Thank you.	1 installed because when you move the roadway, you have to
2	JUDGE HOWARD: It is admitted. Thank you. (Exhibit RL-4X admitted.)	installed because when you move the roadway, you have tomove the equipment, right?
2 3	JUDGE HOWARD: It is admitted. Thank you. (Exhibit RL-4X admitted.) MS. REYNOLDS: Thank you.	 installed because when you move the roadway, you have to move the equipment, right? A. Yeah.
2 3 4	JUDGE HOWARD: It is admitted. Thank you. (Exhibit RL-4X admitted.) MS. REYNOLDS: Thank you. BY MS. REYNOLDS:	 installed because when you move the roadway, you have to move the equipment, right? A. Yeah. Q. There's no but the new equipment is going to
2 3 4 5	JUDGE HOWARD: It is admitted. Thank you. (Exhibit RL-4X admitted.) MS. REYNOLDS: Thank you. BY MS. REYNOLDS: Q. Sir, can you take a look at RL-4X, your petition	 installed because when you move the roadway, you have to move the equipment, right? A. Yeah. Q. There's no but the new equipment is going to be the same design and function as the currently
2 3 4	JUDGE HOWARD: It is admitted. Thank you. (Exhibit RL-4X admitted.) MS. REYNOLDS: Thank you. BY MS. REYNOLDS: Q. Sir, can you take a look at RL-4X, your petition in this case, and tell me whether the petition	 installed because when you move the roadway, you have to move the equipment, right? A. Yeah. Q. There's no but the new equipment is going to be the same design and function as the currently
2 3 4 5 6	JUDGE HOWARD: It is admitted. Thank you. (Exhibit RL-4X admitted.) MS. REYNOLDS: Thank you. BY MS. REYNOLDS: Q. Sir, can you take a look at RL-4X, your petition in this case, and tell me whether the petition references public safety.	 installed because when you move the roadway, you have to move the equipment, right? A. Yeah. Q. There's no but the new equipment is going to be the same design and function as the currently existing equipment, correct? A. Okay.
2 3 4 5 6 7	JUDGE HOWARD: It is admitted. Thank you. (Exhibit RL-4X admitted.) MS. REYNOLDS: Thank you. BY MS. REYNOLDS: Q. Sir, can you take a look at RL-4X, your petition in this case, and tell me whether the petition references public safety. A. It does not state that.	 installed because when you move the roadway, you have to move the equipment, right? A. Yeah. Q. There's no but the new equipment is going to be the same design and function as the currently existing equipment, correct? A. Okay. Q. Do you agree with that?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	JUDGE HOWARD: It is admitted. Thank you. (Exhibit RL-4X admitted.) MS. REYNOLDS: Thank you. BY MS. REYNOLDS: Q. Sir, can you take a look at RL-4X, your petition in this case, and tell me whether the petition references public safety. A. It does not state that. Q. In fact, the petition doesn't include the word	 installed because when you move the roadway, you have to move the equipment, right? A. Yeah. Q. There's no but the new equipment is going to be the same design and function as the currently existing equipment, correct? A. Okay. Q. Do you agree with that?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	JUDGE HOWARD: It is admitted. Thank you. (Exhibit RL-4X admitted.) MS. REYNOLDS: Thank you. BY MS. REYNOLDS: Q. Sir, can you take a look at RL-4X, your petition in this case, and tell me whether the petition references public safety. A. It does not state that.	 installed because when you move the roadway, you have to move the equipment, right? A. Yeah. Q. There's no but the new equipment is going to be the same design and function as the currently existing equipment, correct? A. Okay. Q. Do you agree with that? A. I'm not sure I understand the question.
2 3 5 6 7 8 9 10	JUDGE HOWARD: It is admitted. Thank you. (Exhibit RL-4X admitted.) MS. REYNOLDS: Thank you. BY MS. REYNOLDS: Q. Sir, can you take a look at RL-4X, your petition in this case, and tell me whether the petition references public safety. A. It does not state that. Q. In fact, the petition doesn't include the word "safety," does it?	 installed because when you move the roadway, you have to move the equipment, right? A. Yeah. Q. There's no but the new equipment is going to be the same design and function as the currently existing equipment, correct? A. Okay. Q. Do you agree with that? A. I'm not sure I understand the question. Q. The new equipment that will be installed under
2 3 6 7 8 9 10 11	JUDGE HOWARD: It is admitted. Thank you. (Exhibit RL-4X admitted.) MS. REYNOLDS: Thank you. BY MS. REYNOLDS: Q. Sir, can you take a look at RL-4X, your petition in this case, and tell me whether the petition references public safety. A. It does not state that. Q. In fact, the petition doesn't include the word "safety," does it? A. I don't think so. Q. And the petition does not allege that the public	 installed because when you move the roadway, you have to move the equipment, right? A. Yeah. Q. There's no but the new equipment is going to be the same design and function as the currently existing equipment, correct? A. Okay. Q. Do you agree with that? A. I'm not sure I understand the question. Q. The new equipment that will be installed under your proposed modification, it's the same design as the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	JUDGE HOWARD: It is admitted. Thank you. (Exhibit RL-4X admitted.) MS. REYNOLDS: Thank you. BY MS. REYNOLDS: Q. Sir, can you take a look at RL-4X, your petition in this case, and tell me whether the petition references public safety. A. It does not state that. Q. In fact, the petition doesn't include the word "safety," does it? A. I don't think so.	 installed because when you move the roadway, you have to move the equipment, right? A. Yeah. Q. There's no but the new equipment is going to be the same design and function as the currently existing equipment, correct? A. Okay. Q. Do you agree with that? A. I'm not sure I understand the question. Q. The new equipment that will be installed under your proposed modification, it's the same design as the currently existing system?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	JUDGE HOWARD: It is admitted. Thank you. (Exhibit RL-4X admitted.) MS. REYNOLDS: Thank you. BY MS. REYNOLDS: Q. Sir, can you take a look at RL-4X, your petition in this case, and tell me whether the petition references public safety. A. It does not state that. Q. In fact, the petition doesn't include the word "safety," does it? A. I don't think so. Q. And the petition does not allege that the public safety requires the installation of the proposed	 installed because when you move the roadway, you have to move the equipment, right? A. Yeah. Q. There's no but the new equipment is going to be the same design and function as the currently existing equipment, correct? A. Okay. Q. Do you agree with that? A. I'm not sure I understand the question. Q. The new equipment that will be installed under your proposed modification, it's the same design as the currently existing system? A. I'm not responsible for the original design, so
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	JUDGE HOWARD: It is admitted. Thank you. (Exhibit RL-4X admitted.) MS. REYNOLDS: Thank you. BY MS. REYNOLDS: Q. Sir, can you take a look at RL-4X, your petition in this case, and tell me whether the petition references public safety. A. It does not state that. Q. In fact, the petition doesn't include the word "safety," does it? A. I don't think so. Q. And the petition does not allege that the public safety requires the installation of the proposed modification, correct?	 installed because when you move the roadway, you have to move the equipment, right? A. Yeah. Q. There's no but the new equipment is going to be the same design and function as the currently existing equipment, correct? A. Okay. Q. Do you agree with that? A. I'm not sure I understand the question. Q. The new equipment that will be installed under your proposed modification, it's the same design as the currently existing system? A. I'm not responsible for the original design, so I and UPR's designing the system, so I don't know the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	JUDGE HOWARD: It is admitted. Thank you. (Exhibit RL-4X admitted.) MS. REYNOLDS: Thank you. BY MS. REYNOLDS: Q. Sir, can you take a look at RL-4X, your petition in this case, and tell me whether the petition references public safety. A. It does not state that. Q. In fact, the petition doesn't include the word "safety," does it? A. I don't think so. Q. And the petition does not allege that the public safety requires the installation of the proposed modification, correct? A. Correct.	 installed because when you move the roadway, you have to move the equipment, right? A. Yeah. Q. There's no but the new equipment is going to be the same design and function as the currently existing equipment, correct? A. Okay. Q. Do you agree with that? A. I'm not sure I understand the question. Q. The new equipment that will be installed under your proposed modification, it's the same design as the currently existing system? A. I'm not responsible for the original design, so I and UPR's designing the system, so I don't know the fine details of that.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	JUDGE HOWARD: It is admitted. Thank you. (Exhibit RL-4X admitted.) MS. REYNOLDS: Thank you. BY MS. REYNOLDS: Q. Sir, can you take a look at RL-4X, your petition in this case, and tell me whether the petition references public safety. A. It does not state that. Q. In fact, the petition doesn't include the word "safety," does it? A. I don't think so. Q. And the petition does not allege that the public safety requires the installation of the proposed modification, correct? A. Correct. Q. And you can put that aside, sir.	 installed because when you move the roadway, you have to move the equipment, right? A. Yeah. Q. There's no but the new equipment is going to be the same design and function as the currently existing equipment, correct? A. Okay. Q. Do you agree with that? A. I'm not sure I understand the question. Q. The new equipment that will be installed under your proposed modification, it's the same design as the currently existing system? A. I'm not responsible for the original design, so I and UPR's designing the system, so I don't know the fine details of that. Q. Okay. Are you aware well, let me ask it this
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	JUDGE HOWARD: It is admitted. Thank you. (Exhibit RL-4X admitted.) MS. REYNOLDS: Thank you. BY MS. REYNOLDS: Q. Sir, can you take a look at RL-4X, your petition in this case, and tell me whether the petition references public safety. A. It does not state that. Q. In fact, the petition doesn't include the word "safety," does it? A. I don't think so. Q. And the petition does not allege that the public safety requires the installation of the proposed modification, correct? A. Correct. Q. And you can put that aside, sir. Do you agree that there are no fundamental	 installed because when you move the roadway, you have to move the equipment, right? A. Yeah. Q. There's no but the new equipment is going to be the same design and function as the currently existing equipment, correct? A. Okay. Q. Do you agree with that? A. I'm not sure I understand the question. Q. The new equipment that will be installed under your proposed modification, it's the same design as the currently existing system? A. I'm not responsible for the original design, so I and UPR's designing the system, so I don't know the fine details of that. Q. Okay. Are you aware well, let me ask it this way.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	JUDGE HOWARD: It is admitted. Thank you. (Exhibit RL-4X admitted.) MS. REYNOLDS: Thank you. BY MS. REYNOLDS: Q. Sir, can you take a look at RL-4X, your petition in this case, and tell me whether the petition references public safety. A. It does not state that. Q. In fact, the petition doesn't include the word "safety," does it? A. I don't think so. Q. And the petition does not allege that the public safety requires the installation of the proposed modification, correct? A. Correct. Q. And you can put that aside, sir. Do you agree that there are no fundamental changes between the current warning devices and the	 installed because when you move the roadway, you have to move the equipment, right? A. Yeah. Q. There's no but the new equipment is going to be the same design and function as the currently existing equipment, correct? A. Okay. Q. Do you agree with that? A. I'm not sure I understand the question. Q. The new equipment that will be installed under your proposed modification, it's the same design as the currently existing system? A. I'm not responsible for the original design, so I and UPR's designing the system, so I don't know the fine details of that. Q. Okay. Are you aware well, let me ask it this way. There isn't an improvement in the design of the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	JUDGE HOWARD: It is admitted. Thank you. (Exhibit RL-4X admitted.) MS. REYNOLDS: Thank you. BY MS. REYNOLDS: Q. Sir, can you take a look at RL-4X, your petition in this case, and tell me whether the petition references public safety. A. It does not state that. Q. In fact, the petition doesn't include the word "safety," does it? A. I don't think so. Q. And the petition does not allege that the public safety requires the installation of the proposed modification, correct? A. Correct. Q. And you can put that aside, sir. Do you agree that there are no fundamental changes between the current warning devices and the proposed modifications?	 installed because when you move the roadway, you have to move the equipment, right? A. Yeah. Q. There's no but the new equipment is going to be the same design and function as the currently existing equipment, correct? A. Okay. Q. Do you agree with that? A. I'm not sure I understand the question. Q. The new equipment that will be installed under your proposed modification, it's the same design as the currently existing system? A. I'm not responsible for the original design, so I and UPR's designing the system, so I don't know the fine details of that. Q. Okay. Are you aware well, let me ask it this way. There isn't an improvement in the design of the device in your proposed modification, is there? A. There's an improvement in my design?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	JUDGE HOWARD: It is admitted. Thank you. (Exhibit RL-4X admitted.) MS. REYNOLDS: Thank you. BY MS. REYNOLDS: Q. Sir, can you take a look at RL-4X, your petition in this case, and tell me whether the petition references public safety. A. It does not state that. Q. In fact, the petition doesn't include the word "safety," does it? A. I don't think so. Q. And the petition does not allege that the public safety requires the installation of the proposed modification, correct? A. Correct. Q. And you can put that aside, sir. Do you agree that there are no fundamental changes between the current warning devices and the proposed modifications? A. In regards to the actual signal crossing?	 installed because when you move the roadway, you have to move the equipment, right? A. Yeah. Q. There's no but the new equipment is going to be the same design and function as the currently existing equipment, correct? A. Okay. Q. Do you agree with that? A. I'm not sure I understand the question. Q. The new equipment that will be installed under your proposed modification, it's the same design as the currently existing system? A. I'm not responsible for the original design, so I and UPR's designing the system, so I don't know the fine details of that. Q. Okay. Are you aware well, let me ask it this way. There isn't an improvement in the design of the device in your proposed modification, is there? A. There's an improvement in my design? A. In the City's design of the roadway?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	JUDGE HOWARD: It is admitted. Thank you. (Exhibit RL-4X admitted.) MS. REYNOLDS: Thank you. BY MS. REYNOLDS: Q. Sir, can you take a look at RL-4X, your petition in this case, and tell me whether the petition references public safety. A. It does not state that. Q. In fact, the petition doesn't include the word "safety," does it? A. I don't think so. Q. And the petition does not allege that the public safety requires the installation of the proposed modification, correct? A. Correct. Q. And you can put that aside, sir. Do you agree that there are no fundamental changes between the current warning devices and the proposed modifications? A. In regards to the actual signal crossing? Q. That's correct, sir. A. Well, all of it's being replaced with a new system so that's	 installed because when you move the roadway, you have to move the equipment, right? A. Yeah. Q. There's no but the new equipment is going to be the same design and function as the currently existing equipment, correct? A. Okay. Q. Do you agree with that? A. I'm not sure I understand the question. Q. The new equipment that will be installed under your proposed modification, it's the same design as the currently existing system? A. I'm not responsible for the original design, so I and UPR's designing the system, so I don't know the fine details of that. Q. Okay. Are you aware well, let me ask it this way. There isn't an improvement in the design of the device in your proposed modification, is there? A. There's an improvement in my design? A. In the City's design of the roadway? Q. Of the device?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	JUDGE HOWARD: It is admitted. Thank you. (Exhibit RL-4X admitted.) MS. REYNOLDS: Thank you. BY MS. REYNOLDS: Q. Sir, can you take a look at RL-4X, your petition in this case, and tell me whether the petition references public safety. A. It does not state that. Q. In fact, the petition doesn't include the word "safety," does it? A. I don't think so. Q. And the petition does not allege that the public safety requires the installation of the proposed modification, correct? A. Correct. Q. And you can put that aside, sir. Do you agree that there are no fundamental changes between the current warning devices and the proposed modifications? A. In regards to the actual signal crossing? Q. That's correct, sir. A. Well, all of it's being replaced with a new system so that's Q. It's all being replaced with a new system	 installed because when you move the roadway, you have to move the equipment, right? A. Yeah. Q. There's no but the new equipment is going to be the same design and function as the currently existing equipment, correct? A. Okay. Q. Do you agree with that? A. I'm not sure I understand the question. Q. The new equipment that will be installed under your proposed modification, it's the same design as the currently existing system? A. I'm not responsible for the original design, so I and UPR's designing the system, so I don't know the fine details of that. Q. Okay. Are you aware well, let me ask it this way. There isn't an improvement in the design of the device in your proposed modification, is there? A. There's an improvement in my design? A. In the City's design of the roadway? Q. Of the device? A. City hasn't designed the device.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	JUDGE HOWARD: It is admitted. Thank you. (Exhibit RL-4X admitted.) MS. REYNOLDS: Thank you. BY MS. REYNOLDS: Q. Sir, can you take a look at RL-4X, your petition in this case, and tell me whether the petition references public safety. A. It does not state that. Q. In fact, the petition doesn't include the word "safety," does it? A. I don't think so. Q. And the petition does not allege that the public safety requires the installation of the proposed modification, correct? A. Correct. Q. And you can put that aside, sir. Do you agree that there are no fundamental changes between the current warning devices and the proposed modifications? A. In regards to the actual signal crossing? Q. That's correct, sir. A. Well, all of it's being replaced with a new system so that's	 installed because when you move the roadway, you have to move the equipment, right? A. Yeah. Q. There's no but the new equipment is going to be the same design and function as the currently existing equipment, correct? A. Okay. Q. Do you agree with that? A. I'm not sure I understand the question. Q. The new equipment that will be installed under your proposed modification, it's the same design as the currently existing system? A. I'm not responsible for the original design, so I and UPR's designing the system, so I don't know the fine details of that. Q. Okay. Are you aware well, let me ask it this way. There isn't an improvement in the design of the device in your proposed modification, is there? A. There's an improvement in my design? A. In the City's design of the roadway? Q. Of the device?

13 (Pages 61 to 64)

	Page 65	Page	67
	Ū.		07
1	your petition, is there an improvement in the design of	1 A. Yes.	
2	the device?	2 Q. Where did you get that information?	-1.
3	A. I guess I'm confused what you're trying to ask.	A. That came from our diagnostics team meeting ba	СК
4	Q. Let me ask you differently.	4 in, I believe, June of 2020. And that information was	
5	Is the proposed modification that is the subject	5 provided by Mr. Mays for [inaudible], consultant	
6	of your petition marked as RL-4X, is there an	6 representing UPRR.	
7	improvement in the functionality of that proposed device?	7 Q. And did Mr. Mays tell you where he got that	
8		8 data?	
9	A. Like I said, I believe there's some improvements	9 A. I assume it's his from his collection of	
10	on direction of flashers for certain traffic movements,	10 maintenance records.	
11	yes. But for the majority, it's basically the same, I	11 Q. But you don't know that?	
12	think.	12 A. I do not.	
13	Q. Great.	13 Q. And you don't have any personal knowledge of	any
14	Do you agree that currently there are two gate	14 of the safety data statistics regarding the UPRR	
15	mechanisms at the Barker Road UP crossing?	15 crossing, correct?	
16	A. Yes, one on each side.	16 A. I do not.	
17	Q. And at the conclusion of this project, there	17 Q. Okay.	
18	will be two gate mechanisms?	18 MS. REYNOLDS: Those are all the questions I	
19	A. Correct.	19 have for you at this time. Thank you very much.	
20	Q. And there are currently two cantilevers at the	20 JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Is there any	
21	Barker Road crossing?	21 redirect from the City?	
22	A. Correct.	22 MS. FOSTER: Yes, Judge Howard. Just a few	
23	Q. And at the end of this project, there will be	23 questions.	
24	two cantilevers?	24 /////	
25	A. Yes.	25 /////	
	Page 66	Page	68
1 2 3	Q. And at the end of or as currently exist at Barker Road, there are nine flashers at the crossing,	1 REDIRECTEXAMINATION 2 BY MS. FOSTER:	68
2 3	Q. And at the end of or as currently exist at Barker Road, there are nine flashers at the crossing, correct?	 REDIRECTEXAMINATION BY MS. FOSTER: Q. Mr. Lochmiller, do you have the authority to 	68
2 3 4	 Q. And at the end of or as currently exist at Barker Road, there are nine flashers at the crossing, correct? A. I believe so. 	 REDIRECTEXAMINATION BY MS. FOSTER: Q. Mr. Lochmiller, do you have the authority to enter into agreements on behalf of the City? 	68
2 3 4 5	 Q. And at the end of or as currently exist at Barker Road, there are nine flashers at the crossing, correct? A. I believe so. Q. And at the end of this project, there will be 	 REDIRECTEXAMINATION BY MS. FOSTER: Q. Mr. Lochmiller, do you have the authority to enter into agreements on behalf of the City? A. I do not. 	68
2 3 4 5 6	 Q. And at the end of or as currently exist at Barker Road, there are nine flashers at the crossing, correct? A. I believe so. Q. And at the end of this project, there will be ten flashers? 	 REDIRECTEXAMINATION BY MS. FOSTER: Q. Mr. Lochmiller, do you have the authority to enter into agreements on behalf of the City? A. I do not. Q. Okay. And then can I please direct you to the 	68
2 3 4 5 6 7	 Q. And at the end of or as currently exist at Barker Road, there are nine flashers at the crossing, correct? A. I believe so. Q. And at the end of this project, there will be ten flashers? A. Okay. 	 REDIRECTEXAMINATION BY MS. FOSTER: Q. Mr. Lochmiller, do you have the authority to enter into agreements on behalf of the City? A. I do not. Q. Okay. And then can I please direct you to the Exhibit RL-X4, the petition? 	68
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	 Q. And at the end of or as currently exist at Barker Road, there are nine flashers at the crossing, correct? A. I believe so. Q. And at the end of this project, there will be ten flashers? A. Okay. Q. Do you agree with that? 	 REDIRECTEXAMINATION BY MS. FOSTER: Q. Mr. Lochmiller, do you have the authority to enter into agreements on behalf of the City? A. I do not. Q. Okay. And then can I please direct you to the Exhibit RL-X4, the petition? A. Okay. 	68
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	 Q. And at the end of or as currently exist at Barker Road, there are nine flashers at the crossing, correct? A. I believe so. Q. And at the end of this project, there will be ten flashers? A. Okay. Q. Do you agree with that? A. I believe that's the case, yeah. 	 REDIRECTEXAMINATION BY MS. FOSTER: Q. Mr. Lochmiller, do you have the authority to enter into agreements on behalf of the City? A. I do not. Q. Okay. And then can I please direct you to the Exhibit RL-X4, the petition? A. Okay. Q. Specifically, can you look at page 3 of the 	
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	 Q. And at the end of or as currently exist at Barker Road, there are nine flashers at the crossing, correct? A. I believe so. Q. And at the end of this project, there will be ten flashers? A. Okay. Q. Do you agree with that? A. I believe that's the case, yeah. Q. All right. So there's no differences in the 	 REDIRECT EXAMINATION BY MS. FOSTER: Q. Mr. Lochmiller, do you have the authority to enter into agreements on behalf of the City? A. I do not. Q. Okay. And then can I please direct you to the Exhibit RL-X4, the petition? A. Okay. Q. Specifically, can you look at page 3 of the petition, section 4 entitled Vehicle Traffic. And then 	
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	 Q. And at the end of or as currently exist at Barker Road, there are nine flashers at the crossing, correct? A. I believe so. Q. And at the end of this project, there will be ten flashers? A. Okay. Q. Do you agree with that? A. I believe that's the case, yeah. Q. All right. So there's no differences in the type of traffic control devices that are being 	 REDIRECTEXAMINATION BY MS. FOSTER: Q. Mr. Lochmiller, do you have the authority to enter into agreements on behalf of the City? A. I do not. Q. Okay. And then can I please direct you to the Exhibit RL-X4, the petition? A. Okay. Q. Specifically, can you look at page 3 of the petition, section 4 entitled Vehicle Traffic. And then I would like to direct you to question ten or stateme 	
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	 Q. And at the end of or as currently exist at Barker Road, there are nine flashers at the crossing, correct? A. I believe so. Q. And at the end of this project, there will be ten flashers? A. Okay. Q. Do you agree with that? A. I believe that's the case, yeah. Q. All right. So there's no differences in the type of traffic control devices that are being installed? 	 REDIRECTEXAMINATION BY MS. FOSTER: Q. Mr. Lochmiller, do you have the authority to enter into agreements on behalf of the City? A. I do not. Q. Okay. And then can I please direct you to the Exhibit RL-X4, the petition? A. Okay. Q. Specifically, can you look at page 3 of the petition, section 4 entitled Vehicle Traffic. And then I would like to direct you to question ten or stateme ten, which states, Describe any changes to the 	nt
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	 Q. And at the end of or as currently exist at Barker Road, there are nine flashers at the crossing, correct? A. I believe so. Q. And at the end of this project, there will be ten flashers? A. Okay. Q. Do you agree with that? A. I believe that's the case, yeah. Q. All right. So there's no differences in the type of traffic control devices that are being installed? A. Other than the additional flasher, yeah. 	 REDIRECTEXAMINATION BY MS. FOSTER: Q. Mr. Lochmiller, do you have the authority to enter into agreements on behalf of the City? A. I do not. Q. Okay. And then can I please direct you to the Exhibit RL-X4, the petition? A. Okay. Q. Specifically, can you look at page 3 of the petition, section 4 entitled Vehicle Traffic. And then I would like to direct you to question ten or stateme ten, which states, Describe any changes to the information in 1 through 7 above expected within terms 	nt
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	 Q. And at the end of or as currently exist at Barker Road, there are nine flashers at the crossing, correct? A. I believe so. Q. And at the end of this project, there will be ten flashers? A. Okay. Q. Do you agree with that? A. I believe that's the case, yeah. Q. All right. So there's no differences in the type of traffic control devices that are being installed? A. Other than the additional flasher, yeah. Q. There's no upgrades in the device technology 	 REDIRECTEXAMINATION BY MS. FOSTER: Q. Mr. Lochmiller, do you have the authority to enter into agreements on behalf of the City? A. I do not. Q. Okay. And then can I please direct you to the Exhibit RL-X4, the petition? A. Okay. Q. Specifically, can you look at page 3 of the petition, section 4 entitled Vehicle Traffic. And then I would like to direct you to question ten or stateme ten, which states, Describe any changes to the information in 1 through 7 above expected within ter 	nt
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	 Q. And at the end of or as currently exist at Barker Road, there are nine flashers at the crossing, correct? A. I believe so. Q. And at the end of this project, there will be ten flashers? A. Okay. Q. Do you agree with that? A. I believe that's the case, yeah. Q. All right. So there's no differences in the type of traffic control devices that are being installed? A. Other than the additional flasher, yeah. Q. There's no upgrades in the device technology that is being proposed? 	1 REDIRECT EXAMINATION 2 BY MS. FOSTER: 3 Q. Mr. Lochmiller, do you have the authority to 4 enter into agreements on behalf of the City? 5 A. I do not. 6 Q. Okay. And then can I please direct you to the 7 Exhibit RL-X4, the petition? 8 A. Okay. 9 Q. Specifically, can you look at page 3 of the 10 petition, section 4 entitled Vehicle Traffic. And then 11 I would like to direct you to question ten or stateme 12 ten, which states, Describe any changes to the 13 information in 1 through 7 above expected within te 14 years. 15 Can you please read for me the response that y	nt
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	 Q. And at the end of or as currently exist at Barker Road, there are nine flashers at the crossing, correct? A. I believe so. Q. And at the end of this project, there will be ten flashers? A. Okay. Q. Do you agree with that? A. I believe that's the case, yeah. Q. All right. So there's no differences in the type of traffic control devices that are being installed? A. Other than the additional flasher, yeah. Q. There's no upgrades in the device technology that is being proposed? A. I have no idea on the technology of the UPR's 	1 REDIRECT EXAMINATION 2 BY MS. FOSTER: 3 Q. Mr. Lochmiller, do you have the authority to 4 enter into agreements on behalf of the City? 5 A. I do not. 6 Q. Okay. And then can I please direct you to the 7 Exhibit RL-X4, the petition? 8 A. Okay. 9 Q. Specifically, can you look at page 3 of the 10 petition, section 4 entitled Vehicle Traffic. And then 11 I would like to direct you to question ten or stateme 12 ten, which states, Describe any changes to the 13 information in 1 through 7 above expected within te 14 years. 15 Can you please read for me the response that you to 16 wrote?	nt
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	 Q. And at the end of or as currently exist at Barker Road, there are nine flashers at the crossing, correct? A. I believe so. Q. And at the end of this project, there will be ten flashers? A. Okay. Q. Do you agree with that? A. I believe that's the case, yeah. Q. All right. So there's no differences in the type of traffic control devices that are being installed? A. Other than the additional flasher, yeah. Q. There's no upgrades in the device technology that is being proposed? A. I have no idea on the technology of the UPR's signal crossing. 	1REDIRECT EXAMINATION2BY MS. FOSTER:3Q. Mr. Lochmiller, do you have the authority to4enter into agreements on behalf of the City?5A. I do not.6Q. Okay. And then can I please direct you to the7Exhibit RL-X4, the petition?8A. Okay.9Q. Specifically, can you look at page 3 of the10petition, section 4 entitled Vehicle Traffic. And then11I would like to direct you to question ten or stateme12ten, which states, Describe any changes to the13information in 1 through 7 above expected within te14years.15Can you please read for me the response that y16wrote?17A. Traffic volumes will increase as the vacant land	nt
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	 Q. And at the end of or as currently exist at Barker Road, there are nine flashers at the crossing, correct? A. I believe so. Q. And at the end of this project, there will be ten flashers? A. Okay. Q. Do you agree with that? A. I believe that's the case, yeah. Q. All right. So there's no differences in the type of traffic control devices that are being installed? A. Other than the additional flasher, yeah. Q. There's no upgrades in the device technology that is being proposed? A. I have no idea on the technology of the UPR's signal crossing. Q. And the currently existing system has operated 	1 REDIRECT EXAMINATION 2 BY MS. FOSTER: 3 Q. Mr. Lochmiller, do you have the authority to 4 enter into agreements on behalf of the City? 5 A. I do not. 6 Q. Okay. And then can I please direct you to the 7 Exhibit RL-X4, the petition? 8 A. Okay. 9 Q. Specifically, can you look at page 3 of the 10 petition, section 4 entitled Vehicle Traffic. And then 11 I would like to direct you to question ten or stateme 12 ten, which states, Describe any changes to the 13 information in 1 through 7 above expected within te 14 years. 15 Can you please read for me the response that y 16 wrote? 17 A. Traffic volumes will increase as the vacant land 18 to the north is developed.	nt
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	 Q. And at the end of or as currently exist at Barker Road, there are nine flashers at the crossing, correct? A. I believe so. Q. And at the end of this project, there will be ten flashers? A. Okay. Q. Do you agree with that? A. I believe that's the case, yeah. Q. All right. So there's no differences in the type of traffic control devices that are being installed? A. Other than the additional flasher, yeah. Q. There's no upgrades in the device technology that is being proposed? A. I have no idea on the technology of the UPR's signal crossing. Q. And the currently existing system has operated safely for many years; do you agree with that? 	1 REDIRECT EXAMINATION 2 BY MS. FOSTER: 3 Q. Mr. Lochmiller, do you have the authority to 4 enter into agreements on behalf of the City? 5 A. I do not. 6 Q. Okay. And then can I please direct you to the 7 Exhibit RL-X4, the petition? 8 A. Okay. 9 Q. Specifically, can you look at page 3 of the 10 petition, section 4 entitled Vehicle Traffic. And then 11 I would like to direct you to question ten or stateme 12 ten, which states, Describe any changes to the 13 information in 1 through 7 above expected within te 14 years. 15 Can you please read for me the response that y 16 wrote? 17 A. Traffic volumes will increase as the vacant land 18 to the north is developed. 19 Q. And will increased traffic volumes impact the	nt
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	 Q. And at the end of or as currently exist at Barker Road, there are nine flashers at the crossing, correct? A. I believe so. Q. And at the end of this project, there will be ten flashers? A. Okay. Q. Do you agree with that? A. I believe that's the case, yeah. Q. All right. So there's no differences in the type of traffic control devices that are being installed? A. Other than the additional flasher, yeah. Q. There's no upgrades in the device technology that is being proposed? A. I have no idea on the technology of the UPR's signal crossing. Q. And the currently existing system has operated safely for many years; do you agree with that? A. I have no idea. I do not know the stats of 	1 REDIRECT EXAMINATION 2 BY MS. FOSTER: 3 Q. Mr. Lochmiller, do you have the authority to 4 enter into agreements on behalf of the City? 5 A. I do not. 6 Q. Okay. And then can I please direct you to the 7 Exhibit RL-X4, the petition? 8 A. Okay. 9 Q. Specifically, can you look at page 3 of the 10 petition, section 4 entitled Vehicle Traffic. And then 11 I would like to direct you to question ten or stateme 12 ten, which states, Describe any changes to the 13 information in 1 through 7 above expected within te 14 years. 15 Can you please read for me the response that y 16 wrote? 17 A. Traffic volumes will increase as the vacant land 18 to the north is developed. 19 Q. And will increased traffic volumes impact the 20 public safety?	nt
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	 Q. And at the end of or as currently exist at Barker Road, there are nine flashers at the crossing, correct? A. I believe so. Q. And at the end of this project, there will be ten flashers? A. Okay. Q. Do you agree with that? A. I believe that's the case, yeah. Q. All right. So there's no differences in the type of traffic control devices that are being installed? A. Other than the additional flasher, yeah. Q. There's no upgrades in the device technology that is being proposed? A. I have no idea on the technology of the UPR's signal crossing. Q. And the currently existing system has operated safely for many years; do you agree with that? A. I have no idea. I do not know the stats of the stats of how well it functions. 	1 REDIRECT EXAMINATION 2 BY MS. FOSTER: 3 Q. Mr. Lochmiller, do you have the authority to 4 enter into agreements on behalf of the City? 5 A. I do not. 6 Q. Okay. And then can I please direct you to the 7 Exhibit RL-X4, the petition? 8 A. Okay. 9 Q. Specifically, can you look at page 3 of the 10 petition, section 4 entitled Vehicle Traffic. And then 11 I would like to direct you to question ten or stateme 12 ten, which states, Describe any changes to the 13 information in 1 through 7 above expected within te 14 years. 15 Can you please read for me the response that y 16 wrote? 17 A. Traffic volumes will increase as the vacant land 18 to the north is developed. 19 Q. And will increased traffic volumes impact the 20 MS. REYNOLDS: Objection. Speculation.	nt
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	 Q. And at the end of or as currently exist at Barker Road, there are nine flashers at the crossing, correct? A. I believe so. Q. And at the end of this project, there will be ten flashers? A. Okay. Q. Do you agree with that? A. I believe that's the case, yeah. Q. All right. So there's no differences in the type of traffic control devices that are being installed? A. Other than the additional flasher, yeah. Q. There's no upgrades in the device technology that is being proposed? A. I have no idea on the technology of the UPR's signal crossing. Q. And the currently existing system has operated safely for many years; do you agree with that? A. I have no idea. I do not know the stats of the stats of how well it functions. Q. Right. 	1 REDIRECT EXAMINATION 2 BY MS. FOSTER: 3 Q. Mr. Lochmiller, do you have the authority to 4 enter into agreements on behalf of the City? 5 A. I do not. 6 Q. Okay. And then can I please direct you to the 7 Exhibit RL-X4, the petition? 8 A. Okay. 9 Q. Specifically, can you look at page 3 of the 10 petition, section 4 entitled Vehicle Traffic. And then 11 I would like to direct you to question ten or stateme 12 ten, which states, Describe any changes to the 13 information in 1 through 7 above expected within te 14 years. 15 Can you please read for me the response that y 16 wrote? 17 A. Traffic volumes will increase as the vacant land 18 to the north is developed. 19 Q. And will increased traffic volumes impact the 20 mS. REYNOLDS: Objection. Speculation. 21 MS. REYNOLDS: Objection. Speculation.	nt n rou
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	 Q. And at the end of or as currently exist at Barker Road, there are nine flashers at the crossing, correct? A. I believe so. Q. And at the end of this project, there will be ten flashers? A. Okay. Q. Do you agree with that? A. I believe that's the case, yeah. Q. All right. So there's no differences in the type of traffic control devices that are being installed? A. Other than the additional flasher, yeah. Q. There's no upgrades in the device technology that is being proposed? A. I have no idea on the technology of the UPR's signal crossing. Q. And the currently existing system has operated safely for many years; do you agree with that? A. I have no idea. I do not know the stats of the stats of how well it functions. Q. Right. Your prefiled testimony included a reference to 	1 REDIRECT EXAMINATION 2 BY MS. FOSTER: 3 Q. Mr. Lochmiller, do you have the authority to 4 enter into agreements on behalf of the City? 5 A. I do not. 6 Q. Okay. And then can I please direct you to the 7 Exhibit RL-X4, the petition? 8 A. Okay. 9 Q. Specifically, can you look at page 3 of the 10 petition, section 4 entitled Vehicle Traffic. And then 11 I would like to direct you to question ten or stateme 12 ten, which states, Describe any changes to the 13 information in 1 through 7 above expected within te 14 years. 15 Can you please read for me the response that y 16 wrote? 17 A. Traffic volumes will increase as the vacant land 18 to the north is developed. 19 Q. And will increased traffic volumes impact the 21 MS. REYNOLDS: Objection. Speculation. 22 MS. FOSTER: Your Honor, Ms. Reynolds was	nt n rou
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	 Q. And at the end of or as currently exist at Barker Road, there are nine flashers at the crossing, correct? A. I believe so. Q. And at the end of this project, there will be ten flashers? A. Okay. Q. Do you agree with that? A. I believe that's the case, yeah. Q. All right. So there's no differences in the type of traffic control devices that are being installed? A. Other than the additional flasher, yeah. Q. There's no upgrades in the device technology that is being proposed? A. I have no idea on the technology of the UPR's signal crossing. Q. And the currently existing system has operated safely for many years; do you agree with that? A. I have no idea. I do not know the stats of the stats of how well it functions. Q. Right. Your prefiled testimony included a reference to blocked crossings, unsafe motorists, and one vehicle on 	1 REDIRECT EXAMINATION 2 BY MS. FOSTER: 3 Q. Mr. Lochmiller, do you have the authority to 4 enter into agreements on behalf of the City? 5 A. I do not. 6 Q. Okay. And then can I please direct you to the 7 Exhibit RL-X4, the petition? 8 A. Okay. 9 Q. Specifically, can you look at page 3 of the 10 petition, section 4 entitled Vehicle Traffic. And then 11 I would like to direct you to question ten or stateme 12 ten, which states, Describe any changes to the 13 information in 1 through 7 above expected within te 14 years. 15 Can you please read for me the response that y 16 wrote? 17 A. Traffic volumes will increase as the vacant land 18 to the north is developed. 19 Q. And will increased traffic volumes impact the 20 MS. REYNOLDS: Objection. Speculation. 21 MS. FOSTER: Your Honor, Ms. Reynolds was 23 asking about whether or not the public safety was	nt n rou
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	 Q. And at the end of or as currently exist at Barker Road, there are nine flashers at the crossing, correct? A. I believe so. Q. And at the end of this project, there will be ten flashers? A. Okay. Q. Do you agree with that? A. I believe that's the case, yeah. Q. All right. So there's no differences in the type of traffic control devices that are being installed? A. Other than the additional flasher, yeah. Q. There's no upgrades in the device technology that is being proposed? A. I have no idea on the technology of the UPR's signal crossing. Q. And the currently existing system has operated safely for many years; do you agree with that? A. I have no idea. I do not know the stats of the stats of how well it functions. Q. Right. Your prefiled testimony included a reference to 	1 REDIRECT EXAMINATION 2 BY MS. FOSTER: 3 Q. Mr. Lochmiller, do you have the authority to 4 enter into agreements on behalf of the City? 5 A. I do not. 6 Q. Okay. And then can I please direct you to the 7 Exhibit RL-X4, the petition? 8 A. Okay. 9 Q. Specifically, can you look at page 3 of the 10 petition, section 4 entitled Vehicle Traffic. And then 11 I would like to direct you to question ten or stateme 12 ten, which states, Describe any changes to the 13 information in 1 through 7 above expected within te 14 years. 15 Can you please read for me the response that y 16 wrote? 17 A. Traffic volumes will increase as the vacant land 18 to the north is developed. 19 Q. And will increased traffic volumes impact the 21 MS. REYNOLDS: Objection. Speculation. 22 MS. FOSTER: Your Honor, Ms. Reynolds was	nt n rou

14 (Pages 65 to 68)

	Page 69		Page 71
1	directly to her questions.	1	JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Thank you.
2	JUDGE HOWARD: I am going to deny the	2	I will deem RL-2 and RL-3 admitted.
3	objection and allow the question.	3	(Exhibits RL-2 and RL-3 admitted.)
4	BY MS. FOSTER:	4	JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Mr. Lochmiller,
5	Q. I will reask it just so you have it, Rob.	5	thank you for your testimony. You may turn off your
6	Will increased traffic volumes impact the public	6	camera.
7	safety?	7	THE WITNESS: Thank you.
8	A. Yes.	8	JUDGE HOWARD: The City may will call the
9	Q. Okay. Then last question.	9	next witness from the City, Gloria Mantz.
10	Specifically, as we relate to what the City is	10	Would you please turn on your camera and I
11	going to be doing at the crossing, are the warning	11	will swear you in.
12	devices the only improvements that the City is going to	12	(Gloria Mantz sworn.)
13	be putting at this crossing?	13	JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. You may introduce
14	A. No.	14	the witness.
15	Q. What else will the City be doing at this	15	MS. FOSTER: Thank you, Judge Howard.
16	crossing?	16	
17	A. As far as roadway improvements, so there's	17	EXAMINATION
18	actually we're going to install new median curb	18	BY MS. FOSTER:
19	between northbound and southbound directions that will	19	Q. Ms. Mantz, can you please state your name and
20	help eliminate people going through the tracks when the	20	occupation for the record?
21	gate arms are down. That curb's also been extended	21	A. Yes. My name is Gloria Mantz, and I'm the City
22	further south to eliminate a left turn movement of a	22	engineer for the City of Spokane Valley.
23	private road just south of the tracks. That was a	23	Q. And how long have you been in this position?
24	concern.	24	A. About three months.
25	We're also widening on the north side of the	25	Q. And what was your position before being City
	Page 70		Page 72
1	tracks on Euclid for larger truck turning movements to	1	engineer?
2	make them be able to stay on the roadway and not jump	2	A. I was the capital improvement programs
3	the curb and accidentally hit any of the signal	3	engineering manager, and I oversaw the capital programs
4	equipment.	4	for the City including this project.
5	Q. One final question.	5	Q. And how long were you in that position?
6	You noted that there was a concern of cars	6	A. About five years.
7	jumping the curb and trying to get around the track.	7	Q. And do you have your prefiled testimony in front
8	Whose concern was that?	8	of you?
9	A. I recall it was the Union Pacific representative	9	A. I do.
10	at our diagnostic meeting, and I believe that was Ellis	10	Q. Okay. And is that your testimony in this
11	Mays.	11	matter?
12	MS. FOSTER: Thank you, Mr. Lochmiller.	12	A. It is.
13	That's all I have, Judge Howard.	13	MS. FOSTER: That's all the City has at this
14 15	JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Before we conclude with this witness, I just wanted to make sure	14 15	point, Your Honor.
16	we had a clear record regarding the supporting exhibits	16	JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Union Pacific may proceed with its cross.
17	for his prefiled testimony. And this is probably down	17	MS. REYNOLDS: Thank you, Your Honor.
18	to my I didn't clearly address this earlier.	18	WO. NETWOEDO. THANK YOU, TOUTHONOI.
19	So for Exhibit RL-2 and RL-3, are there any	19	C R O S S - E X A M I N A T I O N
20	objections to the admissibility of those exhibits?	20	BY MS. REYNOLDS:
20	MS. REYNOLDS: There are none from the	21	Q. Good morning.
22	Railroad, Your Honor.	22	A. Good morning.
23	JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Staff, do you	23	Q. Ms. Mantz, have you had an opportunity to review
24	object to either of these exhibits?	24	the petition to modify warning devises at a
25	MR. ROBERSON: No.	25	highway-railroad grade crossing that was filed by the

15 (Pages 69 to 72)

	Page 73	Page 75
1	City of Spokane valley in this case?	1 Q. Can you read those words into the record,
2	A. I can pull it up. I haven't seen it for a	2 please?
3	while.	3 A. Petition to modify warning devices at
4	Q. If you could if I could direct you to, ma'am,	4 highway-railroad grade crossing.
5	what has been premarked as GM-9X.	5 Q. It is not a petition to install a new device, is
6	MS. REYNOLDS: And, Your Honor, this is the	6 it?
7	same as RL-4X, and I'm not sure if Your Honor would	7 A. It does not say "new."
8	prefer me to refer to the already admitted exhibit or	8 Q. Okay. And you can put that aside. Thank you
9	lay foundation with this witness.	9 very much.
10	A. I have it in front of me.	10 Do you agree that the Barker Road project is
11	JUDGE HOWARD: Since it's marked separately,	11 driven by anticipated future growth and economic
12	let's let's just proceed on on the formal side	12 development in Spokane Valley?
13	here and if you would lay foundation.	13 A. No, it actually, no. It's actually to help
14	MS. REYNOLDS: Thank you, Your Honor.	14 with current traffic and also anticipated growth. So
15	BY MS. REYNOLDS:	15 it's not just for future growth.
16	Q. Ms. Mantz, you indicated you have 9 what's	16 Q. It's both current and future?
17	been marked as GM-9X in front of you; is that correct?	17 A. Oh, yeah.
18	A. I do.	18Q. All right. And the Barker Road project would
19	Q. And do you recognize this document?	19 widen the roadway, correct?
20	A. Yeah.	20 A. Yes.
21	Q. Do you believe it's a true and correct copy of	Q. In addition to widening the roadway, the project
22	the petition that was filed in this case?	22 also has components for installation or modification of
23	A. I do.	23 the sewage system in the city?
24 25	MS. REYNOLDS: Your Honor, we would move to admit what has been marked as GM-9X.	 A. Yes, in Spokane County. Q. And the project also includes the creation of a
25	admit what has been marked as GM-9A.	25 Q. And the project also includes the creation of a
	Page 74	Page 76
1	JUDGE HOWARD: It is admitted. Thank you.	1 multiuse path for bicycles and pedestrians, correct?
2	(Exhibit GM-9X admitted.)	2 A. Yes, whenever we improve the road, we're
3	BY MS. REYNOLDS:	3 required to provide an extra facility for bikers and
4	Q. Ms. Mantz, do you know whether the petition	4 pedestrians.
5	references public safety?	5 Q. Is that a City requirement?
6	A. I do not know.	6 A. No, Washington requires us to do that.
7	Q. All right. Do you see a request in the petition	7 Q. All right. Do you agree that there are no
8	of an installation of a new grade crossing protective	8 fundamental changes between the currently existing
9	device?	 9 crossing traffic control devices and the proposed 10 modifications?
10 11	A. What section are you looking at?Q. Throughout the entire petition.	
12	A. Can you repeat the question, please?	11 A. I'm not familiar with how the devices operate, 12 but
13	Q. Can you well, the petition does not request	13 Q. I will move on, then.
14	installation of a new grade crossing protective device,	14Let me just ask you this: Did you have any part
15	does it?	15 in designing the proposed modifications that are
16	A. Well, Section 7 talk about the gates, the new	16 detailed in the petition that we just talked about?
17	gates and the cantilevers.	17 A. I did not.
18	Q. Can I direct you to the top of page 1 where	18 Q. Okay. Your prefiled testimony states that the
19	there is a caption. Are you there?	19 City first documented concerns along the Barker corridor
20	A. Just above Section 1, is that what you're	20 in its SEPA analysis for the 2016 Comprehensive Plan
21	referring to?	21 Update, correct?
22	Q. There's language in all caps that starts with	A. Yes, there's concerns about the corridor and the
23	the word "Petition" on the right-hand side; do you see	23 growth that was in there.
24	that?	Q. And as part of that analysis, the City undertook
25	A. Yes.	25 something called the Northeast Industrial Area Planned

16 (Pages 73 to 76)

	Page 77	Page	79
			, ,
1	Action Ordinance, correct?	1 both Barker Road and Flora Road.	
2	A. Yes.	2 Q. And then can you read what I have now marked	in
3	Q. And that resulted in a document that has been	3 blue into the record, please?	
4	marked in your prefiled testimony as GM-7; is that	4 A. (As read) Historic crash data indicates that the	
5	correct?	5 grade crossings on Barker Road and Flora Road for bot	h
6	A. I do not have GM-7. I have GM-9 through 20, but	6 rail lines have operated safely over the last 25 years.	
7	I don't have 7 in front of me. It was not provided to	7 Q. And do you agree that the next sentence reads,	
8		8 Figure 12 shows that despite high train volumes, it ha	
9	Q. All right. I can share my	9 been over 25 years since a crash occurred at any of t	ne
10	MS. REYNOLDS: Your Honor, I would the	10 four at-grade rail crossings in the study area?	
11	Railroad does not have any objection to the	11 A. That's what it says.	
12 13	admissibility. In fact, we stipulated to the admissibility of GM-7 as part of our prehearing	12 Q. So the City deemed the UP Barker Road crossin	ig
13 14	discussions. And with that, we would ask to move this	13 to be safe, correct?	
15	document into evidence, and I would request permission	 A. That's what that statement says. Q. Okay. If we go on to my apologies if this is 	
16	to publish.		
17	JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you.		
18	Does Staff any objections with this exhibit?	17If we go to page 65 of 138 in GM-7, there is a18section that is titled "Traffic Impacts of At-Grade Rail	
19	MR. ROBERSON: Staff will stipulate to the	19 Crossings," do you see that?	
20	admission of all the City's exhibits as well as the	20 A. I do.	
21	Railroad's exhibits.	21 Q. And this references Figure 13, which is Vehicle	
22	JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. It is admitted.	22 Queue Lengths at Barker Road At-Grade Rail Crossin	as
23	(Exhibit GM-7 admitted.)	23 When Gates are Down During the Peak Hour. And the	-
24	MS. REYNOLDS: Thank you and I will attempt	24 some data in Figure 13; do you see that?	
25	to share my screen.	25 A. Yes, I see the queueing lengths for the UP and	
	·		
	Page 78	Page	80
1	BY MS. REYNOLDS:	1 the BNSF crossing.	
2			
2	Q. Ms. Mantz, do you see on your screen something	2 Q. All right. And there was an estimate that was	
3	Q. Ms. Mantz, do you see on your screen something that states "Northeast Industrial Area Planned Action	-	
		-	
3	that states "Northeast Industrial Area Planned Action	3 done by the City to estimate both the average queue	
3 4	that states "Northeast Industrial Area Planned Action Ordinance SEPA Analysis"?	 done by the City to estimate both the average queue lengths and then the worst case scenario queue length 	
3 4 5	that states "Northeast Industrial Area Planned Action Ordinance SEPA Analysis"? A. I do.	 done by the City to estimate both the average queue lengths and then the worst case scenario queue leng do you agree with that? 	
3 4 5 6	 that states "Northeast Industrial Area Planned Action Ordinance SEPA Analysis"? A. I do. Q. And it's very lengthy, and I'm just scrolling so 	 done by the City to estimate both the average queue lengths and then the worst case scenario queue lengthered do you agree with that? A. Yes. 	
3 4 5 6 7	 that states "Northeast Industrial Area Planned Action Ordinance SEPA Analysis"? A. I do. Q. And it's very lengthy, and I'm just scrolling so that you can familiarize yourself and acquaint yourself 	 done by the City to estimate both the average queue lengths and then the worst case scenario queue length do you agree with that? A. Yes. Q. And can you read what is highlighted in blue 	
3 4 5 6 7 8	 that states "Northeast Industrial Area Planned Action Ordinance SEPA Analysis"? A. I do. Q. And it's very lengthy, and I'm just scrolling so that you can familiarize yourself and acquaint yourself with this document. But do you generally recognize this 	 done by the City to estimate both the average queue lengths and then the worst case scenario queue length do you agree with that? A. Yes. Q. And can you read what is highlighted in blue into the record? 	gths;
3 4 5 6 7 8 9	 that states "Northeast Industrial Area Planned Action Ordinance SEPA Analysis"? A. I do. Q. And it's very lengthy, and I'm just scrolling so that you can familiarize yourself and acquaint yourself with this document. But do you generally recognize this document? A. Generally I do. Q. All right. Appendix A of this document 	 done by the City to estimate both the average queue lengths and then the worst case scenario queue length do you agree with that? A. Yes. Q. And can you read what is highlighted in blue into the record? A. (As read) The estimate includes both the average, which is the 50th percentile queue length due to an average gate down time in the worst case, which 	gths;
3 4 5 7 8 9 10	 that states "Northeast Industrial Area Planned Action Ordinance SEPA Analysis"? A. I do. Q. And it's very lengthy, and I'm just scrolling so that you can familiarize yourself and acquaint yourself with this document. But do you generally recognize this document? A. Generally I do. Q. All right. Appendix A of this document Appendix A of this document is titled "Existing 	 done by the City to estimate both the average queue lengths and then the worst case scenario queue length do you agree with that? A. Yes. Q. And can you read what is highlighted in blue into the record? A. (As read) The estimate includes both the average, which is the 50th percentile queue length due to an average gate down time in the worst case, which a 95th percentile queue length during the peak hours, 	gths;
3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	 that states "Northeast Industrial Area Planned Action Ordinance SEPA Analysis"? A. I do. Q. And it's very lengthy, and I'm just scrolling so that you can familiarize yourself and acquaint yourself with this document. But do you generally recognize this document? A. Generally I do. Q. All right. Appendix A of this document Appendix A of this document is titled "Existing Transportation Conditions Report for Spokane Valley 	 done by the City to estimate both the average queue lengths and then the worst case scenario queue length do you agree with that? A. Yes. Q. And can you read what is highlighted in blue into the record? A. (As read) The estimate includes both the average, which is the 50th percentile queue length due to an average gate down time in the worst case, which a 95th percentile queue length during the peak hours, still the longest gate down time observed. The latter 	gths;
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	 that states "Northeast Industrial Area Planned Action Ordinance SEPA Analysis"? A. I do. Q. And it's very lengthy, and I'm just scrolling so that you can familiarize yourself and acquaint yourself with this document. But do you generally recognize this document? A. Generally I do. Q. All right. Appendix A of this document Appendix A of this document is titled "Existing Transportation Conditions Report for Spokane Valley Northeast Industrial Area PAO," do you see that, ma'am? 	 done by the City to estimate both the average queue lengths and then the worst case scenario queue lengths do you agree with that? A. Yes. Q. And can you read what is highlighted in blue into the record? A. (As read) The estimate includes both the average, which is the 50th percentile queue length due to an average gate down time in the worst case, which a 95th percentile queue length during the peak hours, still the longest gate down time observed. The latter likely occurs a handful of times per year, although it's 	gths;
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	 that states "Northeast Industrial Area Planned Action Ordinance SEPA Analysis"? A. I do. Q. And it's very lengthy, and I'm just scrolling so that you can familiarize yourself and acquaint yourself with this document. But do you generally recognize this document? A. Generally I do. Q. All right. Appendix A of this document Appendix A of this document is titled "Existing Transportation Conditions Report for Spokane Valley Northeast Industrial Area PAO," do you see that, ma'am? A. I do. 	 done by the City to estimate both the average queue lengths and then the worst case scenario queue length do you agree with that? A. Yes. Q. And can you read what is highlighted in blue into the record? A. (As read) The estimate includes both the average, which is the 50th percentile queue length due to an average gate down time in the worst case, which a 95th percentile queue length during the peak hours, still the longest gate down time observed. The latter likely occurs a handful of times per year, although it's about five times more likely to occur on a BNSF line 	gths;
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	 that states "Northeast Industrial Area Planned Action Ordinance SEPA Analysis"? A. 1 do. Q. And it's very lengthy, and I'm just scrolling so that you can familiarize yourself and acquaint yourself with this document. But do you generally recognize this document? A. Generally I do. Q. All right. Appendix A of this document Appendix A of this document is titled "Existing Transportation Conditions Report for Spokane Valley Northeast Industrial Area PAO," do you see that, ma'am? A. I do. Q. And if we go down to page 64 of what's been 	 done by the City to estimate both the average queue lengths and then the worst case scenario queue length do you agree with that? A. Yes. Q. And can you read what is highlighted in blue into the record? A. (As read) The estimate includes both the average, which is the 50th percentile queue length due to an average gate down time in the worst case, which a 95th percentile queue length during the peak hours, still the longest gate down time observed. The latter likely occurs a handful of times per year, although it's about five times more likely to occur on a BNSF line than a UP line because trains are five times more 	gths;
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	 that states "Northeast Industrial Area Planned Action Ordinance SEPA Analysis"? A. 1 do. Q. And it's very lengthy, and I'm just scrolling so that you can familiarize yourself and acquaint yourself with this document. But do you generally recognize this document? A. Generally I do. Q. All right. Appendix A of this document Appendix A of this document is titled "Existing Transportation Conditions Report for Spokane Valley Northeast Industrial Area PAO," do you see that, ma'am? A. I do. Q. And if we go down to page 64 of what's been marked GM-7, do you see an area of Appendix A titled 	 done by the City to estimate both the average queue lengths and then the worst case scenario queue length do you agree with that? A. Yes. Q. And can you read what is highlighted in blue into the record? A. (As read) The estimate includes both the average, which is the 50th percentile queue length due to an average gate down time in the worst case, which a 95th percentile queue length during the peak hours, still the longest gate down time observed. The latter likely occurs a handful of times per year, although it's about five times more likely to occur on a BNSF line than a UP line because trains are five times more frequent on the BNSF line. 	gths;
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	 that states "Northeast Industrial Area Planned Action Ordinance SEPA Analysis"? A. 1 do. Q. And it's very lengthy, and I'm just scrolling so that you can familiarize yourself and acquaint yourself with this document. But do you generally recognize this document? A. Generally I do. Q. All right. Appendix A of this document Appendix A of this document is titled "Existing Transportation Conditions Report for Spokane Valley Northeast Industrial Area PAO," do you see that, ma'am? A. I do. Q. And if we go down to page 64 of what's been marked GM-7, do you see an area of Appendix A titled "Rail Operations"? 	 done by the City to estimate both the average queue lengths and then the worst case scenario queue length do you agree with that? A. Yes. Q. And can you read what is highlighted in blue into the record? A. (As read) The estimate includes both the average, which is the 50th percentile queue length due to an average gate down time in the worst case, which a 95th percentile queue length during the peak hours, still the longest gate down time observed. The latter likely occurs a handful of times per year, although it's about five times more likely to occur on a BNSF line than a UP line because trains are five times more frequent on the BNSF line. Q. So, Ms. Mantz, do you agree with me that the 	gths;
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	 that states "Northeast Industrial Area Planned Action Ordinance SEPA Analysis"? A. I do. Q. And it's very lengthy, and I'm just scrolling so that you can familiarize yourself and acquaint yourself with this document. But do you generally recognize this document? A. Generally I do. Q. All right. Appendix A of this document Appendix A of this document is titled "Existing Transportation Conditions Report for Spokane Valley Northeast Industrial Area PAO," do you see that, ma'am? A. I do. Q. And if we go down to page 64 of what's been marked GM-7, do you see an area of Appendix A titled "Rail Operations"? A. I do. 	 done by the City to estimate both the average queue lengths and then the worst case scenario queue lengths do you agree with that? A. Yes. Q. And can you read what is highlighted in blue into the record? A. (As read) The estimate includes both the average, which is the 50th percentile queue length due to an average gate down time in the worst case, which a 95th percentile queue length during the peak hours, still the longest gate down time observed. The latter likely occurs a handful of times per year, although it's about five times more likely to occur on a BNSF line than a UP line because trains are five times more frequent on the BNSF line. Q. So, Ms. Mantz, do you agree with me that the worst case scenario of queueing at the Barker Road 	gths; e is
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	 that states "Northeast Industrial Area Planned Action Ordinance SEPA Analysis"? A. I do. Q. And it's very lengthy, and I'm just scrolling so that you can familiarize yourself and acquaint yourself with this document. But do you generally recognize this document? A. Generally I do. Q. All right. Appendix A of this document Appendix A of this document is titled "Existing Transportation Conditions Report for Spokane Valley Northeast Industrial Area PAO," do you see that, ma'am? A. I do. Q. And if we go down to page 64 of what's been marked GM-7, do you see an area of Appendix A titled "Rail Operations"? A. I do. Q. And can you read into the record the portion of 	 done by the City to estimate both the average queue lengths and then the worst case scenario queue lengths do you agree with that? A. Yes. Q. And can you read what is highlighted in blue into the record? A. (As read) The estimate includes both the average, which is the 50th percentile queue length due to an average gate down time in the worst case, which a 95th percentile queue length during the peak hours, still the longest gate down time observed. The latter likely occurs a handful of times per year, although it's about five times more likely to occur on a BNSF line than a UP line because trains are five times more frequent on the BNSF line. Q. So, Ms. Mantz, do you agree with me that the worst case scenario of queueing at the Barker Road crossing only occurs a handful of times per year and 	gths; e is
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	 that states "Northeast Industrial Area Planned Action Ordinance SEPA Analysis"? A. 1 do. Q. And it's very lengthy, and I'm just scrolling so that you can familiarize yourself and acquaint yourself with this document. But do you generally recognize this document? A. Generally I do. Q. All right. Appendix A of this document Appendix A of this document is titled "Existing Transportation Conditions Report for Spokane Valley Northeast Industrial Area PAO," do you see that, ma'am? A. 1 do. Q. And if we go down to page 64 of what's been marked GM-7, do you see an area of Appendix A titled "Rail Operations"? A. 1 do. Q. And can you read into the record the portion of the Rail Operations section that I have highlighted in 	 done by the City to estimate both the average queue lengths and then the worst case scenario queue length do you agree with that? A. Yes. Q. And can you read what is highlighted in blue into the record? A. (As read) The estimate includes both the average, which is the 50th percentile queue length due to an average gate down time in the worst case, which a 95th percentile queue length during the peak hours, still the longest gate down time observed. The latter likely occurs a handful of times per year, although it's about five times more likely to occur on a BNSF line than a UP line because trains are five times more frequent on the BNSF line. Q. So, Ms. Mantz, do you agree with me that the worst case scenario of queueing at the Barker Road crossing only occurs a handful of times per year and 	gths; e is
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	 that states "Northeast Industrial Area Planned Action Ordinance SEPA Analysis"? A. 1 do. Q. And it's very lengthy, and I'm just scrolling so that you can familiarize yourself and acquaint yourself with this document. But do you generally recognize this document? A. Generally I do. Q. All right. Appendix A of this document Appendix A of this document is titled "Existing Transportation Conditions Report for Spokane Valley Northeast Industrial Area PAO," do you see that, ma'am? A. 1 do. Q. And if we go down to page 64 of what's been marked GM-7, do you see an area of Appendix A titled "Rail Operations"? A. 1 do. Q. And can you read into the record the portion of the Rail Operations section that I have highlighted in blue? 	 done by the City to estimate both the average queue lengths and then the worst case scenario queue length do you agree with that? A. Yes. Q. And can you read what is highlighted in blue into the record? A. (As read) The estimate includes both the average, which is the 50th percentile queue length due to an average gate down time in the worst case, which a 95th percentile queue length during the peak hours, still the longest gate down time observed. The latter likely occurs a handful of times per year, although it's about five times more likely to occur on a BNSF line than a UP line because trains are five times more frequent on the BNSF line. Q. So, Ms. Mantz, do you agree with me that the worst case scenario of queueing at the Barker Road crossing only occurs a handful of times per year and more likely to occur at the BNSF crossing? A. Yeah, however, the table does say that on 	gths; e is
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	 that states "Northeast Industrial Area Planned Action Ordinance SEPA Analysis"? A. 1 do. Q. And it's very lengthy, and I'm just scrolling so that you can familiarize yourself and acquaint yourself with this document. But do you generally recognize this document? A. Generally I do. Q. All right. Appendix A of this document Appendix A of this document is titled "Existing Transportation Conditions Report for Spokane Valley Northeast Industrial Area PAO," do you see that, ma'am? A. 1 do. Q. And if we go down to page 64 of what's been marked GM-7, do you see an area of Appendix A titled "Rail Operations"? A. 1 do. Q. And can you read into the record the portion of the Rail Operations section that I have highlighted in blue? A. Sure. (As read) There are four at-grade 	 done by the City to estimate both the average queue lengths and then the worst case scenario queue length do you agree with that? A. Yes. Q. And can you read what is highlighted in blue into the record? A. (As read) The estimate includes both the average, which is the 50th percentile queue length due to an average gate down time in the worst case, which a 95th percentile queue length during the peak hours, still the longest gate down time observed. The latter likely occurs a handful of times per year, although it's about five times more likely to occur on a BNSF line than a UP line because trains are five times more frequent on the BNSF line. Q. So, Ms. Mantz, do you agree with me that the worst case scenario of queueing at the Barker Road crossing only occurs a handful of times per year and more likely to occur at the BNSF crossing? A. Yeah, however, the table does say that on average, you still see 225 feet of queueing in the 	gths; e is
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	 that states "Northeast Industrial Area Planned Action Ordinance SEPA Analysis"? A. 1 do. Q. And it's very lengthy, and I'm just scrolling so that you can familiarize yourself and acquaint yourself with this document. But do you generally recognize this document? A. Generally I do. Q. All right. Appendix A of this document Appendix A of this document is titled "Existing Transportation Conditions Report for Spokane Valley Northeast Industrial Area PAO," do you see that, ma'am? A. 1 do. Q. And if we go down to page 64 of what's been marked GM-7, do you see an area of Appendix A titled "Rail Operations"? A. 1 do. Q. And can you read into the record the portion of the Rail Operations section that I have highlighted in blue? A. Sure. (As read) There are four at-grade crossings of the main line railroads within the study 	 done by the City to estimate both the average queue lengths and then the worst case scenario queue length do you agree with that? A. Yes. Q. And can you read what is highlighted in blue into the record? A. (As read) The estimate includes both the average, which is the 50th percentile queue length due to an average gate down time in the worst case, which a 95th percentile queue length during the peak hours, still the longest gate down time observed. The latter likely occurs a handful of times per year, although it's about five times more likely to occur on a BNSF line than a UP line because trains are five times more frequent on the BNSF line. Q. So, Ms. Mantz, do you agree with me that the worst case scenario of queueing at the Barker Road crossing only occurs a handful of times per year and more likely to occur at the BNSF crossing? A. Yeah, however, the table does say that on average, you still see 225 feet of queueing in the northbound lane and 500 feet in the southbound lane. 	gths; e is
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	 that states "Northeast Industrial Area Planned Action Ordinance SEPA Analysis"? A. 1 do. Q. And it's very lengthy, and I'm just scrolling so that you can familiarize yourself and acquaint yourself with this document. But do you generally recognize this document? A. Generally I do. Q. All right. Appendix A of this document Appendix A of this document is titled "Existing Transportation Conditions Report for Spokane Valley Northeast Industrial Area PAO," do you see that, ma'am? A. 1 do. Q. And if we go down to page 64 of what's been marked GM-7, do you see an area of Appendix A titled "Rail Operations"? A. 1 do. Q. And can you read into the record the portion of the Rail Operations section that I have highlighted in blue? A. Sure. (As read) There are four at-grade 	 done by the City to estimate both the average queue lengths and then the worst case scenario queue length do you agree with that? A. Yes. Q. And can you read what is highlighted in blue into the record? A. (As read) The estimate includes both the average, which is the 50th percentile queue length due to an average gate down time in the worst case, which a 95th percentile queue length during the peak hours, still the longest gate down time observed. The latter likely occurs a handful of times per year, although it's about five times more likely to occur on a BNSF line than a UP line because trains are five times more frequent on the BNSF line. Q. So, Ms. Mantz, do you agree with me that the worst case scenario of queueing at the Barker Road crossing only occurs a handful of times per year and more likely to occur at the BNSF crossing? A. Yeah, however, the table does say that on average, you still see 225 feet of queueing in the 	gths; e is

17 (Pages 77 to 80)

	Page 81		Page 83
-			-
1 2	part of the Barker Road project eliminate queueing at	 states, it takes it out of context and it's not the available evidence. 	best
2 3	the Barker Road crossing? A. So the queueing happens because of the railroads	3 JUDGE HOWARD: I will allow the qu	octions
4	when the gates are down. So the project not eliminate	4 about 19X as it's sorry, GM-19X, but I will a	
4 5	the queueing, but it will reduce it.	5 City to introduce the complete version of this	
5	Q. It will reduce it for traffic that's going	 Do you require extra time to to submit this? 	report.
7	northbound and intending to turn left, correct?	7 MS. FOSTER: Yes, Your Honor.	
8	A. And also southbound, we are going to have a left	3 JUDGE HOWARD: All right. How ab	out o wook
9	turn lane on Euclid Avenue that's going to for	 9 from today, let's see, May 17th, and the City of 	
10	eastbound traffic.	introduce the complete version of this report?	
11	Q. Are you familiar with a City of Spokane Valley	11 MS. FOSTER: That's perfect, Your H	
12	Risk-Based Safety Assessment for the analysis of fatal	12 Thank you.	onor.
13	and serious crashes?	13 JUDGE HOWARD: All right. You ma	vnroceed
14	A. Yes.	14 with your questioning.	y proceed
15	Q. And do you agree that as part of that risk	15 MS. REYNOLDS: Thank you, Your H	onor
16	assessment, the City analyzed the top ten intersections	16 BY MS. REYNOLDS:	01101.
17	with high priority crashes?	17Q. Do you agree that the Executive Summer	narv first
18	A. Can you please pull that exhibit that you're	18 page of 19X, identifies roadways with high	
19	referring to because I think it's been taken out of	19 crashes?	shoring
20	context.	A. Yes, but if I can direct you to the very fir	st
21	Q. I guess my question was before I refer to an	21 paragraph, that it says, This analysis follows f	
22	exhibit is, are you familiar that the City analyzed the	steps yielding the following results for each st	
23	top ten intersections with high priority crashes?	23 you're only showing three steps out of the five	•
24	A. So like I said, you're taking that out of	24 Q. And I would like to ask you about the	
25	context. The exhibit that you're referring to is not	25 the five steps, ma'am.	
	, ₅	• *	
	Page 82		Page 84
1		1 A. Sure.	Page 84
1 2	complete, and that was only one of the elements that we	1 A. Sure.	
		 A. Sure. Q. Do you agree with me that the third ste 	p is to
2	complete, and that was only one of the elements that we looked when we evaluated the areas where we're going to	 A. Sure. Q. Do you agree with me that the third stee 	p is to
2 3	complete, and that was only one of the elements that we looked when we evaluated the areas where we're going to be applying for a grant.	 A. Sure. Q. Do you agree with me that the third ste identify locations in the City transportation methods. 	p is to etwork
2 3 4	complete, and that was only one of the elements that we looked when we evaluated the areas where we're going to be applying for a grant. Q. So you are familiar with the Risk-Based Safety	 A. Sure. Q. Do you agree with me that the third ste identify locations in the City transportation n that are associated with priority crashes? 	p is to etwork
2 3 4 5	complete, and that was only one of the elements that we looked when we evaluated the areas where we're going to be applying for a grant. Q. So you are familiar with the Risk-Based Safety Assessment?	 A. Sure. Do you agree with me that the third stee identify locations in the City transportation in that are associated with priority crashes? A. What third step says that top ten location 	p is to etwork s are
2 3 4 5 6	 complete, and that was only one of the elements that we looked when we evaluated the areas where we're going to be applying for a grant. Q. So you are familiar with the Risk-Based Safety Assessment? A. Yes, 2018 one, yes. 	 A. Sure. Q. Do you agree with me that the third stee identify locations in the City transportation in that are associated with priority crashes? A. What third step says that top ten location those. It doesn't say that those are all of the 	p is to etwork s are
2 3 4 5 6 7	 complete, and that was only one of the elements that we looked when we evaluated the areas where we're going to be applying for a grant. Q. So you are familiar with the Risk-Based Safety Assessment? A. Yes, 2018 one, yes. Q. Okay. I can go ahead and pull that up. 	 A. Sure. Q. Do you agree with me that the third stee identify locations in the City transportation in that are associated with priority crashes? A. What third step says that top ten location those. It doesn't say that those are all of the locations. We have a really big City, so there's 	p is to etwork s are lots
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	 complete, and that was only one of the elements that we looked when we evaluated the areas where we're going to be applying for a grant. Q. So you are familiar with the Risk-Based Safety Assessment? A. Yes, 2018 one, yes. Q. Okay. I can go ahead and pull that up. So, ma'am, can I direct your attention to 	 A. Sure. Q. Do you agree with me that the third step identify locations in the City transportation methat are associated with priority crashes? A. What third step says that top ten location those. It doesn't say that those are all of the locations. We have a really big City, so there's of locations we have issues. 	p is to etwork s are lots or
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	 complete, and that was only one of the elements that we looked when we evaluated the areas where we're going to be applying for a grant. Q. So you are familiar with the Risk-Based Safety Assessment? A. Yes, 2018 one, yes. Q. Okay. I can go ahead and pull that up. So, ma'am, can I direct your attention to GM-19X? 	 A. Sure. Q. Do you agree with me that the third step identify locations in the City transportation me that are associated with priority crashes? A. What third step says that top ten location those. It doesn't say that those are all of the locations. We have a really big City, so there's of locations we have issues. Q. Sure. But among the top ten locations 	p is to etwork s are lots or
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	 complete, and that was only one of the elements that we looked when we evaluated the areas where we're going to be applying for a grant. Q. So you are familiar with the Risk-Based Safety Assessment? A. Yes, 2018 one, yes. Q. Okay. I can go ahead and pull that up. So, ma'am, can I direct your attention to GM-19X? A. Yes. Q. And is are you familiar with this document? A. I am familiar with the document, and like I 	 A. Sure. Q. Do you agree with me that the third step identify locations in the City transportation in that are associated with priority crashes? A. What third step says that top ten location those. It doesn't say that those are all of the locations. We have a really big City, so there's of locations we have issues. Q. Sure. But among the top ten locations intersections, Barker and Euclid are not lister 	p is to etwork s are lots or d,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	 complete, and that was only one of the elements that we looked when we evaluated the areas where we're going to be applying for a grant. Q. So you are familiar with the Risk-Based Safety Assessment? A. Yes, 2018 one, yes. Q. Okay. I can go ahead and pull that up. So, ma'am, can I direct your attention to GM-19X? A. Yes. Q. And is are you familiar with this document? A. I am familiar with the document, and like I said, this is an incomplete executive summary. 	 A. Sure. Q. Do you agree with me that the third step identify locations in the City transportation me that are associated with priority crashes? A. What third step says that top ten location those. It doesn't say that those are all of the locations. We have a really big City, so there's of locations we have issues. Q. Sure. But among the top ten locations intersections, Barker and Euclid are not listed correct? 	p is to etwork s are lots or d,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	 complete, and that was only one of the elements that we looked when we evaluated the areas where we're going to be applying for a grant. Q. So you are familiar with the Risk-Based Safety Assessment? A. Yes, 2018 one, yes. Q. Okay. I can go ahead and pull that up. So, ma'am, can I direct your attention to GM-19X? A. Yes. Q. And is are you familiar with this document? A. I am familiar with the document, and like I 	 A. Sure. Q. Do you agree with me that the third step identify locations in the City transportation me that are associated with priority crashes? A. What third step says that top ten location those. It doesn't say that those are all of the locations. We have a really big City, so there's of locations we have issues. Q. Sure. But among the top ten locations intersections, Barker and Euclid are not listed correct? A. Exactly. It doesn't make it any less imponentiation 	p is to etwork s are lots or d, rtant,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	 complete, and that was only one of the elements that we looked when we evaluated the areas where we're going to be applying for a grant. Q. So you are familiar with the Risk-Based Safety Assessment? A. Yes, 2018 one, yes. Q. Okay. I can go ahead and pull that up. So, ma'am, can I direct your attention to GM-19X? A. Yes. Q. And is are you familiar with this document? A. I am familiar with the document, and like I said, this is an incomplete executive summary. Q. All right. The is the document Executive 	 A. Sure. Q. Do you agree with me that the third step identify locations in the City transportation me that are associated with priority crashes? A. What third step says that top ten location those. It doesn't say that those are all of the locations. We have a really big City, so there's of locations we have issues. Q. Sure. But among the top ten locations intersections, Barker and Euclid are not listed correct? A. Exactly. It doesn't make it any less impo though. MS. REYNOLDS: Okay. I'll move to st the nonresponsive portion. 	p is to etwork s are lots or d, rtant, rike
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	 complete, and that was only one of the elements that we looked when we evaluated the areas where we're going to be applying for a grant. Q. So you are familiar with the Risk-Based Safety Assessment? A. Yes, 2018 one, yes. Q. Okay. I can go ahead and pull that up. So, ma'am, can I direct your attention to GM-19X? A. Yes. Q. And is are you familiar with this document? A. I am familiar with the document, and like I said, this is an incomplete executive summary. Q. All right. The is the document Executive 	 A. Sure. Q. Do you agree with me that the third step identify locations in the City transportation in that are associated with priority crashes? A. What third step says that top ten location those. It doesn't say that those are all of the locations. We have a really big City, so there's of locations we have issues. Q. Sure. But among the top ten locations intersections, Barker and Euclid are not lister correct? A. Exactly. It doesn't make it any less impo though. MS. REYNOLDS: Okay. I'll move to st 	p is to etwork s are lots or d, rtant, rike
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	 complete, and that was only one of the elements that we looked when we evaluated the areas where we're going to be applying for a grant. Q. So you are familiar with the Risk-Based Safety Assessment? A. Yes, 2018 one, yes. Q. Okay. I can go ahead and pull that up. So, ma'am, can I direct your attention to GM-19X? A. Yes. Q. And is are you familiar with this document? A. I am familiar with the document, and like I said, this is an incomplete executive summary. Q. All right. The is the document Executive Summary complete? A. No, there's two pages to that. That's what I'm saying, this is incomplete. 	 A. Sure. Q. Do you agree with me that the third step identify locations in the City transportation methat are associated with priority crashes? A. What third step says that top ten location those. It doesn't say that those are all of the locations. We have a really big City, so there's of locations we have issues. Q. Sure. But among the top ten locations intersections, Barker and Euclid are not listed correct? A. Exactly. It doesn't make it any less important though. MS. REYNOLDS: Okay. I'll move to state the nonresponsive portion. JUDGE HOWARD: I will grant I will grant 	p is to etwork s are lots or d, rtant, rike
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	 complete, and that was only one of the elements that we looked when we evaluated the areas where we're going to be applying for a grant. Q. So you are familiar with the Risk-Based Safety Assessment? A. Yes, 2018 one, yes. Q. Okay. I can go ahead and pull that up. So, ma'am, can I direct your attention to GM-19X? A. Yes. Q. And is are you familiar with this document? A. I am familiar with the document, and like I said, this is an incomplete executive summary. Q. All right. The is the document Executive Summary complete? A. No, there's two pages to that. That's what I'm saying, this is incomplete. Q. Okay. What's missing from this? 	 A. Sure. Q. Do you agree with me that the third step identify locations in the City transportation methat are associated with priority crashes? A. What third step says that top ten location those. It doesn't say that those are all of the locations. We have a really big City, so there's of locations we have issues. Q. Sure. But among the top ten locations intersections, Barker and Euclid are not listed correct? A. Exactly. It doesn't make it any less important though. MS. REYNOLDS: Okay. I'll move to statistic the nonresponsive portion. JUDGE HOWARD: I will grant I will grant that motion to strike for everything in the answer following the word "Exactly." 	p is to etwork s are lots or d, rtant, rike grant er
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	 complete, and that was only one of the elements that we looked when we evaluated the areas where we're going to be applying for a grant. Q. So you are familiar with the Risk-Based Safety Assessment? A. Yes, 2018 one, yes. Q. Okay. I can go ahead and pull that up. So, ma'am, can I direct your attention to GM-19X? A. Yes. Q. And is are you familiar with this document? A. I am familiar with the document, and like I said, this is an incomplete executive summary. Q. All right. The is the document Executive Summary complete? A. No, there's two pages to that. That's what I'm saying, this is incomplete. Q. Okay. What's missing from this? MS. FOSTER: Aziza Foster for the City. The 	1 A. Sure. 2 Q. Do you agree with me that the third step 3 identify locations in the City transportation me 4 that are associated with priority crashes? 5 A. What third step says that top ten location 6 those. It doesn't say that those are all of the 7 locations. We have a really big City, so there's 8 of locations we have issues. 9 Q. Sure. But among the top ten locations 10 intersections, Barker and Euclid are not lister 11 correct? 12 A. Exactly. It doesn't make it any less importance 13 though. 14 MS. REYNOLDS: Okay. I'll move to state 15 the nonresponsive portion. 16 JUDGE HOWARD: I will grant I will grant 17 that motion to strike for everything in the answer 18 following the word "Exactly." 19 MS. REYNOLDS: Thank you, Your Ho	p is to etwork s are lots or d, rtant, rike grant er
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	 complete, and that was only one of the elements that we looked when we evaluated the areas where we're going to be applying for a grant. Q. So you are familiar with the Risk-Based Safety Assessment? A. Yes, 2018 one, yes. Q. Okay. I can go ahead and pull that up. So, ma'am, can I direct your attention to GM-19X? A. Yes. Q. And is are you familiar with this document? A. I am familiar with the document, and like I said, this is an incomplete executive summary. Q. All right. The is the document Executive Summary complete? A. No, there's two pages to that. That's what I'm saying, this is incomplete. Q. Okay. What's missing from this? MS. FOSTER: Aziza Foster for the City. The City will then object to the introduction of this 	1 A. Sure. 2 Q. Do you agree with me that the third step 3 identify locations in the City transportation me 4 that are associated with priority crashes? 5 A. What third step says that top ten location 6 those. It doesn't say that those are all of the 7 locations. We have a really big City, so there's 8 of locations we have issues. 9 Q. Sure. But among the top ten locations 10 intersections, Barker and Euclid are not lister 11 correct? 12 A. Exactly. It doesn't make it any less impo 13 though. 14 MS. REYNOLDS: Okay. I'll move to st 15 the nonresponsive portion. 16 JUDGE HOWARD: I will grant I will grant 17 that motion to strike for everything in the answer 18 following the word "Exactly." 19 MS. REYNOLDS: Thank you, Your Ho 20 JUDGE HOWARD: And I would Ms.	p is to etwork s are lots or d, rtant, rike grant er nor. Mantz, I
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	 complete, and that was only one of the elements that we looked when we evaluated the areas where we're going to be applying for a grant. Q. So you are familiar with the Risk-Based Safety Assessment? A. Yes, 2018 one, yes. Q. Okay. I can go ahead and pull that up. So, ma'am, can I direct your attention to GM-19X? A. Yes. Q. And is are you familiar with this document? A. I am familiar with the document, and like I said, this is an incomplete executive summary. Q. All right. The is the document Executive Summary complete? A. No, there's two pages to that. That's what I'm saying, this is incomplete. Q. Okay. What's missing from this? MS. FOSTER: Aziza Foster for the City. The City will then object to the introduction of this exhibit as it is not complete. 	1 A. Sure. 2 Q. Do you agree with me that the third step 3 identify locations in the City transportation me 4 that are associated with priority crashes? 5 A. What third step says that top ten location 6 those. It doesn't say that those are all of the 7 locations. We have a really big City, so there's 8 of locations we have issues. 9 Q. Sure. But among the top ten locations 10 intersections, Barker and Euclid are not lister 11 correct? 12 A. Exactly. It doesn't make it any less impo 13 though. 14 MS. REYNOLDS: Okay. I'll move to st 15 the nonresponsive portion. 16 JUDGE HOWARD: I will grant I will ge 17 that motion to strike for everything in the answer 18 following the word "Exactly." 19 MS. REYNOLDS: Thank you, Your Ho 20 JUDGE HOWARD: And I would Ms. 21 would just I would suggest that you just focus	p is to etwork s are lots or d, rtant, rike grant er nor. Mantz, I s on
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	 complete, and that was only one of the elements that we looked when we evaluated the areas where we're going to be applying for a grant. Q. So you are familiar with the Risk-Based Safety Assessment? A. Yes, 2018 one, yes. Q. Okay. I can go ahead and pull that up. So, ma'am, can I direct your attention to GM-19X? A. Yes. Q. And is are you familiar with this document? A. I am familiar with the document, and like I said, this is an incomplete executive summary. Q. All right. The is the document Executive Summary complete? A. No, there's two pages to that. That's what I'm saying, this is incomplete. Q. Okay. What's missing from this? MS. FOSTER: Aziza Foster for the City. The City will then object to the introduction of this exhibit as it is not complete. JUDGE HOWARD: Ms. Foster, could you 	1 A. Sure. 2 Q. Do you agree with me that the third step 3 identify locations in the City transportation me 4 that are associated with priority crashes? 5 A. What third step says that top ten location 6 those. It doesn't say that those are all of the 7 locations. We have a really big City, so there's 8 of locations we have issues. 9 Q. Sure. But among the top ten locations 10 intersections, Barker and Euclid are not lister 11 correct? 12 A. Exactly. It doesn't make it any less importance 13 though. 14 MS. REYNOLDS: Okay. I'll move to straight the nonresponsive portion. 15 the nonresponsive portion. 16 JUDGE HOWARD: I will grant I would suggest that you just focus 10 JUDGE HOWARD: And I would Ms. 21 would just I would suggest that you just focus 22 answering the question posed to you and then	p is to etwork s are lots or d, rtant, rike grant er nor. Mantz, I s on Ms. Foster
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	 complete, and that was only one of the elements that we looked when we evaluated the areas where we're going to be applying for a grant. Q. So you are familiar with the Risk-Based Safety Assessment? A. Yes, 2018 one, yes. Q. Okay. I can go ahead and pull that up. So, ma'am, can I direct your attention to GM-19X? A. Yes. Q. And is are you familiar with this document? A. I am familiar with the document, and like I said, this is an incomplete executive summary. Q. All right. The is the document Executive Summary complete? A. No, there's two pages to that. That's what I'm saying, this is incomplete. Q. Okay. What's missing from this? MS. FOSTER: Aziza Foster for the City. The City will then object to the introduction of this exhibit as it is not complete. JUDGE HOWARD: Ms. Foster, could you could you repeat the last part of your objection? 	 A. Sure. Q. Do you agree with me that the third step identify locations in the City transportation me that are associated with priority crashes? A. What third step says that top ten location those. It doesn't say that those are all of the locations. We have a really big City, so there's of locations we have issues. Q. Sure. But among the top ten locations intersections, Barker and Euclid are not listed correct? A. Exactly. It doesn't make it any less import though. MS. REYNOLDS: Okay. I'll move to stat the nonresponsive portion. JUDGE HOWARD: I will grant I will get that motion to strike for everything in the answer following the word "Exactly." MS. REYNOLDS: Thank you, Your Ho JUDGE HOWARD: And I would Ms. would just I would suggest that you just focus answering the question posed to you and then will have a chance to ask you follow-up question 	p is to etwork s are lots or d, rtant, rike grant er nor. Mantz, I s on Ms. Foster
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	 complete, and that was only one of the elements that we looked when we evaluated the areas where we're going to be applying for a grant. Q. So you are familiar with the Risk-Based Safety Assessment? A. Yes, 2018 one, yes. Q. Okay. I can go ahead and pull that up. So, ma'am, can I direct your attention to GM-19X? A. Yes. Q. And is are you familiar with this document? A. I am familiar with the document, and like I said, this is an incomplete executive summary. Q. All right. The is the document Executive Summary complete? A. No, there's two pages to that. That's what I'm saying, this is incomplete. Q. Okay. What's missing from this? MS. FOSTER: Aziza Foster for the City. The City will then object to the introduction of this exhibit as it is not complete. JUDGE HOWARD: Ms. Foster, could you could you repeat the last part of your objection? MS. FOSTER: Yes. We're objecting because 	 A. Sure. Q. Do you agree with me that the third step identify locations in the City transportation me that are associated with priority crashes? A. What third step says that top ten location those. It doesn't say that those are all of the locations. We have a really big City, so there's of locations we have issues. Q. Sure. But among the top ten locations intersections, Barker and Euclid are not listed correct? A. Exactly. It doesn't make it any less import though. MS. REYNOLDS: Okay. I'll move to state the nonresponsive portion. JUDGE HOWARD: I will grant I will get following the word "Exactly." MS. REYNOLDS: Thank you, Your Ho JUDGE HOWARD: And I would Ms. would just I would suggest that you just focus answering the question posed to you and then will have a chance to ask you follow-up question 24 this. 	p is to etwork s are lots or d, rtant, rike grant er nor. Mantz, I s on Ms. Foster
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	 complete, and that was only one of the elements that we looked when we evaluated the areas where we're going to be applying for a grant. Q. So you are familiar with the Risk-Based Safety Assessment? A. Yes, 2018 one, yes. Q. Okay. I can go ahead and pull that up. So, ma'am, can I direct your attention to GM-19X? A. Yes. Q. And is are you familiar with this document? A. I am familiar with the document, and like I said, this is an incomplete executive summary. Q. All right. The is the document Executive Summary complete? A. No, there's two pages to that. That's what I'm saying, this is incomplete. Q. Okay. What's missing from this? MS. FOSTER: Aziza Foster for the City. The City will then object to the introduction of this exhibit as it is not complete. JUDGE HOWARD: Ms. Foster, could you could you repeat the last part of your objection? 	 A. Sure. Q. Do you agree with me that the third step identify locations in the City transportation me that are associated with priority crashes? A. What third step says that top ten location those. It doesn't say that those are all of the locations. We have a really big City, so there's of locations we have issues. Q. Sure. But among the top ten locations intersections, Barker and Euclid are not listed correct? A. Exactly. It doesn't make it any less import though. MS. REYNOLDS: Okay. I'll move to stat the nonresponsive portion. JUDGE HOWARD: I will grant I will get that motion to strike for everything in the answer following the word "Exactly." MS. REYNOLDS: Thank you, Your Ho JUDGE HOWARD: And I would Ms. would just I would suggest that you just focus answering the question posed to you and then will have a chance to ask you follow-up question 	p is to etwork s are lots or d, rtant, rike grant er nor. Mantz, I s on Ms. Foster

18 (Pages 81 to 84)

	Page 85	Page 87
1	BY MS. REYNOLDS:	1 Q. The proposed modifications will not eliminate
2	Q. Ms. Mantz, I'd like to direct your attention	2 queueing at the railroad crossing, correct?
3	back to your prefiled testimony. You testified that the	3 A. It will not.
4	third lane that will be installed as part of the project	4 Q. It will not create additional room for queueing
5	will reduce rear-end	5 traffic except for the motorists making left turns?
6	MR. ROBERSON: Your Honor, if I may, I think	6 A. It will provide storage for the northbound
7	Ms. Reynolds' email is up on the screen. I don't know	7 traffic and for eastbound traffic on Euclid.
8	if that's a problem.	8 Q. Northbound traffic turning left and eastbound
9	MS. REYNOLDS: Oh, yeah, it is.	9 traffic turning left as well, correct?
10	JUDGE HOWARD: Oh, yeah, we might want to	10 A. Yes.
11	stop sharing. And, you know, since we're already	11 Q. Are you familiar with Washington State
12	pausing for a moment anyways and we were discussing	12 Department of Transportation's five-year crash data for
13	GM-19X, I don't believe that was moved into evidence	13 the Barker Road corridor project from 2012 to 2016?
14	formally or I might not have given a clear ruling on	14 A. I don't know that I can say that I'm familiar
15	that. Were there any objections to the admission of	15 with it, no.
16	that beyond what the City has already articulated?	16 Q. Okay. I'd like to switch topics and ask you
17	MS. FOSTER: Not in addition to what the	about the timing of this project, okay?
18	City has already articulated, no.	18 A. Sure.
19	JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Thank you.	19 Q. All right. How was the project, the Barker Road
20	GM-19X is admitted.	20 project, originally phased?
21	(Exhibit GM-19X admitted.)	A. So after we secured the grants for the project,
22	JUDGE HOWARD: Sorry, Ms. Reynolds, you may	22 this project was very successful, we decided to phase
23	proceed.	the project into two phases. So the first one was north
24	MS. REYNOLDS: Thank you very much.	24 of Euclid, two, south of Trent Avenue, and the next
25	BY MS. REYNOLDS:	25 phase would have gone from Euclid down to the river.
	Page 86	Page 88
1	Q. Ms. Mantz, I would like to point you back to	1 Q. And isn't it true that projects like this or
2	your prefiled testimony, specifically at page 2 where	2 projects of this magnitude have variability in terms of
3	you state that the third lane that will be installed as	3 timelines?
4	part of the Barker Road corridor project will reduce	4 A. Can you repeat that question, please?
5	rear-end and turning-related crashes. Do you recall	5 Q. Isn't it true that projects of this magnitude
6	stating that in your prefiled statement?	6 have variability in terms of timeline?
7	A. Yes.	7 A. Sure.
8	Q. Or your prefiled testimony.	8 Q. And projects like this will have changes
9	Do you agree the third lane will not eliminate	9 throughout their life span; do you agree?
10	rear-end accidents?	10 A. That's true for anything, I guess.
11	A. It will not, but it will reduce them, yes.	11 Q. What was your expectation or understanding for
12	Q. Do you agree the third lane will not eliminate	12 how long it would take to negotiate the Construction and
13	turning-related crashes?	13 Maintenance Agreement for the Barker Road crossing with
14	A. It will not eliminate them a hundred percent,	14 Union Pacific?
15	no.	15 A. Well, we started in coordination with the UP in
16	Q. Can you tell the Commission how many rear-end	16 2019. We were hoping that we would have a crossing
17	collisions were associated with the Barker Road crossing	17 agreement by 2020. That's the project that we have
18	in the ten years before beginning this project?	18 left is claimed to have advertised a year and a half
19	A. I do not have that information. Is that in my	19 ago if we would have had that agreement in place.
20	testimony?	20 Q. And when did the diagnostic take place for this
21	Q. Can you tell the Commission how many	21 project?
22	turning-related crashes were associated with the Barker	A. I do not recall the date.
23	Road crossing in the ten years before the beginning of this project?	 Q. Were you present at the diagnostic? A. I was not.
24	this project?	24 A. I was not.
25	A. I don't have that information handy, no.	25 Q. Have you seen the notes associated with the

19 (Pages 85 to 88)

	Page 89	Page 91
1	diagnostic?	1 Do you see a PowerPoint on your screen?
2	A. At one point. I I do not remember the date.	2 A. Yes.
3	Q. You wouldn't have any reason to disagree with	3 Q. Okay. And do you recognize that this is a
4	representation that the diagnostic occurred at the end	4 PowerPoint that was titled "PowerPoint of Project
5	of June 2020, would you?	5 Phasing" attached to your prefiled testimony?
6	A. I don't know what you mean by the	6 A. Yes.
7	"representation."	7 Q. Great.
8	MS. FOSTER: Aziza Foster for the City. The	8 I wanted to take you to page 4 of 6. And you
9	City is going to object to this line of questioning.	 say, Project 2 was split into two additional phases; do
10	This is starting to get outside of the scope of Mrs.	10 you see that?
11	Mantz' testimony. She testified to the project as a	11 A. Yes.
12	whole, not the specific improvements to the crossing.	12 Q. And then underneath that, it says, Project 2A,
13	JUDGE HOWARD: I'm going to deny the	13 Spokane River to Euclid East. WSDOT did not approve
14	objection and allow the questioning insofar as it's	14 inclusion of multiuse path.
15	we're addressing what her knowledge is.	15 A. That's correct.
16	BY MS. REYNOLDS:	16 Q. And what do you mean by "WSDOT did not approve
17	Q. Did you ask Union Pacific how long it could take	17 inclusion of multiuse path"?
18	to negotiate and to have a finalized or executed	18 A. So when we phase a project, because we did not
19	construction and maintenance agreement?	19 have the agreement with the UP, we decided to advertise
20	A. I did not specifically ask that question.	20 the project from the river to Euclid South. We intended
21	Q. As part of your project timeline, what	to include the multiuse path with that segment of the
22	contingencies did you plan for in negotiating the	 project, but at that time, WSDOT indicated that the
23	necessary various agreements with Union Pacific?	 multiuse path had not independent utility because it had
24	A. I don't know what you mean by that.	no connection to the north. So they only allow us to
25	Q. Did you plan in any sort of delays or timing to	 include the road portion of the work from the river to
	Page 90	Page 92
1		
1	allow for negotiations with the Railroad for the	1 Euclid at that time.
2	allow for negotiations with the Railroad for the Construction and Maintenance Agreement for this	 Euclid at that time. Q. And so that was a delay, at least in part,
	-	
2	Construction and Maintenance Agreement for this	2 Q. And so that was a delay, at least in part,
2 3	Construction and Maintenance Agreement for this crossing? A. You always plan for delays when you're dealing with the Railroad.	 Q. And so that was a delay, at least in part, caused by the State Department of Transportation?
2 3 4	Construction and Maintenance Agreement for this crossing? A. You always plan for delays when you're dealing	 Q. And so that was a delay, at least in part, caused by the State Department of Transportation? A. It is, but at this point, everything else has
2 3 4 5	Construction and Maintenance Agreement for this crossing? A. You always plan for delays when you're dealing with the Railroad.	 Q. And so that was a delay, at least in part, caused by the State Department of Transportation? A. It is, but at this point, everything else has been constructed. We're just waiting for the UP to give
2 3 4 5 6	 Construction and Maintenance Agreement for this crossing? A. You always plan for delays when you're dealing with the Railroad. Q. Do you also plan for delays when you're dealing 	 Q. And so that was a delay, at least in part, caused by the State Department of Transportation? A. It is, but at this point, everything else has been constructed. We're just waiting for the UP to give us approval so we can finish the last segment of the
2 3 4 5 6 7	 Construction and Maintenance Agreement for this crossing? A. You always plan for delays when you're dealing with the Railroad. Q. Do you also plan for delays when you're dealing with the State Department of Transportation? A. Not as extensive as with the Railroad. Q. Okay. I would like to direct your attention to 	 Q. And so that was a delay, at least in part, caused by the State Department of Transportation? A. It is, but at this point, everything else has been constructed. We're just waiting for the UP to give us approval so we can finish the last segment of the project.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	 Construction and Maintenance Agreement for this crossing? A. You always plan for delays when you're dealing with the Railroad. Q. Do you also plan for delays when you're dealing with the State Department of Transportation? A. Not as extensive as with the Railroad. Q. Okay. I would like to direct your attention to your prefiled testimony, which has been stipulated as 	 Q. And so that was a delay, at least in part, caused by the State Department of Transportation? A. It is, but at this point, everything else has been constructed. We're just waiting for the UP to give us approval so we can finish the last segment of the project. MS. REYNOLDS: I'll move to strike the
2 3 6 7 8 9 10 11	 Construction and Maintenance Agreement for this crossing? A. You always plan for delays when you're dealing with the Railroad. Q. Do you also plan for delays when you're dealing with the State Department of Transportation? A. Not as extensive as with the Railroad. Q. Okay. I would like to direct your attention to your prefiled testimony, which has been stipulated as admissible by the Railroad and I believe by Staff. 	 Q. And so that was a delay, at least in part, caused by the State Department of Transportation? A. It is, but at this point, everything else has been constructed. We're just waiting for the UP to give us approval so we can finish the last segment of the project. MS. REYNOLDS: I'll move to strike the nonresponsive portions. JUDGE HOWARD: Granted for everything following, "It is."
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	 Construction and Maintenance Agreement for this crossing? A. You always plan for delays when you're dealing with the Railroad. Q. Do you also plan for delays when you're dealing with the State Department of Transportation? A. Not as extensive as with the Railroad. Q. Okay. I would like to direct your attention to your prefiled testimony, which has been stipulated as 	 Q. And so that was a delay, at least in part, caused by the State Department of Transportation? A. It is, but at this point, everything else has been constructed. We're just waiting for the UP to give us approval so we can finish the last segment of the project. MS. REYNOLDS: I'll move to strike the nonresponsive portions. JUDGE HOWARD: Granted for everything
2 3 6 7 8 9 10 11	 Construction and Maintenance Agreement for this crossing? A. You always plan for delays when you're dealing with the Railroad. Q. Do you also plan for delays when you're dealing with the State Department of Transportation? A. Not as extensive as with the Railroad. Q. Okay. I would like to direct your attention to your prefiled testimony, which has been stipulated as admissible by the Railroad and I believe by Staff. MS. REYNOLDS: And at this point, we would ask Your Honor if we could move into evidence GM-2. 	 Q. And so that was a delay, at least in part, caused by the State Department of Transportation? A. It is, but at this point, everything else has been constructed. We're just waiting for the UP to give us approval so we can finish the last segment of the project. MS. REYNOLDS: I'll move to strike the nonresponsive portions. JUDGE HOWARD: Granted for everything following, "It is."
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	 Construction and Maintenance Agreement for this crossing? A. You always plan for delays when you're dealing with the Railroad. Q. Do you also plan for delays when you're dealing with the State Department of Transportation? A. Not as extensive as with the Railroad. Q. Okay. I would like to direct your attention to your prefiled testimony, which has been stipulated as admissible by the Railroad and I believe by Staff. MS. REYNOLDS: And at this point, we would ask Your Honor if we could move into evidence GM-2. JUDGE HOWARD: Yes, it is admitted. And 	 Q. And so that was a delay, at least in part, caused by the State Department of Transportation? A. It is, but at this point, everything else has been constructed. We're just waiting for the UP to give us approval so we can finish the last segment of the project. MS. REYNOLDS: I'll move to strike the nonresponsive portions. JUDGE HOWARD: Granted for everything following, "It is." MS. REYNOLDS: Thank you, Your Honor. BY MS. REYNOLDS: Q. Are you aware, Ms. Mantz, if there are any
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	 Construction and Maintenance Agreement for this crossing? A. You always plan for delays when you're dealing with the Railroad. Q. Do you also plan for delays when you're dealing with the State Department of Transportation? A. Not as extensive as with the Railroad. Q. Okay. I would like to direct your attention to your prefiled testimony, which has been stipulated as admissible by the Railroad and I believe by Staff. MS. REYNOLDS: And at this point, we would ask Your Honor if we could move into evidence GM-2. 	 Q. And so that was a delay, at least in part, caused by the State Department of Transportation? A. It is, but at this point, everything else has been constructed. We're just waiting for the UP to give us approval so we can finish the last segment of the project. MS. REYNOLDS: I'll move to strike the nonresponsive portions. JUDGE HOWARD: Granted for everything following, "It is." MS. REYNOLDS: Thank you, Your Honor. BY MS. REYNOLDS:
2 3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	 Construction and Maintenance Agreement for this crossing? A. You always plan for delays when you're dealing with the Railroad. Q. Do you also plan for delays when you're dealing with the State Department of Transportation? A. Not as extensive as with the Railroad. Q. Okay. I would like to direct your attention to your prefiled testimony, which has been stipulated as admissible by the Railroad and I believe by Staff. MS. REYNOLDS: And at this point, we would ask Your Honor if we could move into evidence GM-2. JUDGE HOWARD: Yes, it is admitted. And 	 Q. And so that was a delay, at least in part, caused by the State Department of Transportation? A. It is, but at this point, everything else has been constructed. We're just waiting for the UP to give us approval so we can finish the last segment of the project. MS. REYNOLDS: I'll move to strike the nonresponsive portions. JUDGE HOWARD: Granted for everything following, "It is." MS. REYNOLDS: Thank you, Your Honor. BY MS. REYNOLDS: Q. Are you aware, Ms. Mantz, if there are any
2 3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	 Construction and Maintenance Agreement for this crossing? A. You always plan for delays when you're dealing with the Railroad. Q. Do you also plan for delays when you're dealing with the State Department of Transportation? A. Not as extensive as with the Railroad. Q. Okay. I would like to direct your attention to your prefiled testimony, which has been stipulated as admissible by the Railroad and I believe by Staff. MS. REYNOLDS: And at this point, we would ask Your Honor if we could move into evidence GM-2. JUDGE HOWARD: Yes, it is admitted. And just to be clear, since it appears that the parties are 	 Q. And so that was a delay, at least in part, caused by the State Department of Transportation? A. It is, but at this point, everything else has been constructed. We're just waiting for the UP to give us approval so we can finish the last segment of the project. MS. REYNOLDS: I'll move to strike the nonresponsive portions. JUDGE HOWARD: Granted for everything following, "It is." MS. REYNOLDS: Thank you, Your Honor. BY MS. REYNOLDS: Q. Are you aware, Ms. Mantz, if there are any federal aid highway funds being used to install a new
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	 Construction and Maintenance Agreement for this crossing? A. You always plan for delays when you're dealing with the Railroad. Q. Do you also plan for delays when you're dealing with the State Department of Transportation? A. Not as extensive as with the Railroad. Q. Okay. I would like to direct your attention to your prefiled testimony, which has been stipulated as admissible by the Railroad and I believe by Staff. MS. REYNOLDS: And at this point, we would ask Your Honor if we could move into evidence GM-2. JUDGE HOWARD: Yes, it is admitted. And just to be clear, since it appears that the parties are agreeing to the admissibility of the supporting 	 Q. And so that was a delay, at least in part, caused by the State Department of Transportation? A. It is, but at this point, everything else has been constructed. We're just waiting for the UP to give us approval so we can finish the last segment of the project. MS. REYNOLDS: I'll move to strike the nonresponsive portions. JUDGE HOWARD: Granted for everything following, "It is." MS. REYNOLDS: Thank you, Your Honor. BY MS. REYNOLDS: Q. Are you aware, Ms. Mantz, if there are any federal aid highway funds being used to install a new grade protective device?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	 Construction and Maintenance Agreement for this crossing? A. You always plan for delays when you're dealing with the Railroad. Q. Do you also plan for delays when you're dealing with the State Department of Transportation? A. Not as extensive as with the Railroad. Q. Okay. I would like to direct your attention to your prefiled testimony, which has been stipulated as admissible by the Railroad and I believe by Staff. MS. REYNOLDS: And at this point, we would ask Your Honor if we could move into evidence GM-2. JUDGE HOWARD: Yes, it is admitted. And just to be clear, since it appears that the parties are agreeing to the admissibility of the supporting exhibits, GM-2 through GM-7 are all admitted. I've already spoken to GM-7, so GM-2 through 6 are all admitted. 	 Q. And so that was a delay, at least in part, caused by the State Department of Transportation? A. It is, but at this point, everything else has been constructed. We're just waiting for the UP to give us approval so we can finish the last segment of the project. MS. REYNOLDS: I'll move to strike the nonresponsive portions. JUDGE HOWARD: Granted for everything following, "It is." MS. REYNOLDS: Thank you, Your Honor. BY MS. REYNOLDS: Q. Are you aware, Ms. Mantz, if there are any federal aid highway funds being used to install a new grade protective device? A. Yes, we have a federal grant that will
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	 Construction and Maintenance Agreement for this crossing? A. You always plan for delays when you're dealing with the Railroad. Q. Do you also plan for delays when you're dealing with the State Department of Transportation? A. Not as extensive as with the Railroad. Q. Okay. I would like to direct your attention to your prefiled testimony, which has been stipulated as admissible by the Railroad and I believe by Staff. MS. REYNOLDS: And at this point, we would ask Your Honor if we could move into evidence GM-2. JUDGE HOWARD: Yes, it is admitted. And just to be clear, since it appears that the parties are agreeing to the admissibility of the supporting exhibits, GM-2 through GM-7 are all admitted. I've already spoken to GM-7, so GM-2 through 6 are all 	 Q. And so that was a delay, at least in part, caused by the State Department of Transportation? A. It is, but at this point, everything else has been constructed. We're just waiting for the UP to give us approval so we can finish the last segment of the project. MS. REYNOLDS: I'll move to strike the nonresponsive portions. JUDGE HOWARD: Granted for everything following, "It is." MS. REYNOLDS: Thank you, Your Honor. BY MS. REYNOLDS: Q. Are you aware, Ms. Mantz, if there are any federal aid highway funds being used to install a new grade protective device? A. Yes, we have a federal grant that will participate in the costs of those improvements.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	Construction and Maintenance Agreement for this crossing? A. You always plan for delays when you're dealing with the Railroad. Q. Do you also plan for delays when you're dealing with the State Department of Transportation? A. Not as extensive as with the Railroad. Q. Okay. I would like to direct your attention to your prefiled testimony, which has been stipulated as admissible by the Railroad and I believe by Staff. MS. REYNOLDS: And at this point, we would ask Your Honor if we could move into evidence GM-2. JUDGE HOWARD: Yes, it is admitted. And just to be clear, since it appears that the parties are agreeing to the admissibility of the supporting exhibits, GM-2 through GM-7 are all admitted. I've already spoken to GM-7, so GM-2 through 6 are all admitted. (Exhibits GM-2 through GM-6 admitted.) MS. REYNOLDS: Thank you, Your Honor.	 Q. And so that was a delay, at least in part, caused by the State Department of Transportation? A. It is, but at this point, everything else has been constructed. We're just waiting for the UP to give us approval so we can finish the last segment of the project. MS. REYNOLDS: I'll move to strike the nonresponsive portions. JUDGE HOWARD: Granted for everything following, "It is." MS. REYNOLDS: Thank you, Your Honor. BY MS. REYNOLDS: Q. Are you aware, Ms. Mantz, if there are any federal aid highway funds being used to install a new grade protective device? A. Yes, we have a federal grant that will participate in the costs of those improvements. Q. And an installation of what specifically?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	 Construction and Maintenance Agreement for this crossing? A. You always plan for delays when you're dealing with the Railroad. Q. Do you also plan for delays when you're dealing with the State Department of Transportation? A. Not as extensive as with the Railroad. Q. Okay. I would like to direct your attention to your prefiled testimony, which has been stipulated as admissible by the Railroad and I believe by Staff. MS. REYNOLDS: And at this point, we would ask Your Honor if we could move into evidence GM-2. JUDGE HOWARD: Yes, it is admitted. And just to be clear, since it appears that the parties are agreeing to the admissibility of the supporting exhibits, GM-2 through GM-7 are all admitted. I've already spoken to GM-7, so GM-2 through 6 are all admitted. (Exhibits GM-2 through GM-6 admitted.) 	 Q. And so that was a delay, at least in part, caused by the State Department of Transportation? A. It is, but at this point, everything else has been constructed. We're just waiting for the UP to give us approval so we can finish the last segment of the project. MS. REYNOLDS: I'll move to strike the nonresponsive portions. JUDGE HOWARD: Granted for everything following, "It is." MS. REYNOLDS: Thank you, Your Honor. BY MS. REYNOLDS: Q. Are you aware, Ms. Mantz, if there are any federal aid highway funds being used to install a new grade protective device? A. Yes, we have a federal grant that will participate in the costs of those improvements. Q. And an installation of what specifically? A. The signal improvements of the UP that are
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	Construction and Maintenance Agreement for this crossing? A. You always plan for delays when you're dealing with the Railroad. Q. Do you also plan for delays when you're dealing with the State Department of Transportation? A. Not as extensive as with the Railroad. Q. Okay. I would like to direct your attention to your prefiled testimony, which has been stipulated as admissible by the Railroad and I believe by Staff. MS. REYNOLDS: And at this point, we would ask Your Honor if we could move into evidence GM-2. JUDGE HOWARD: Yes, it is admitted. And just to be clear, since it appears that the parties are agreeing to the admissibility of the supporting exhibits, GM-2 through GM-7 are all admitted. I've already spoken to GM-7, so GM-2 through 6 are all admitted. (Exhibits GM-2 through GM-6 admitted.) MS. REYNOLDS: Thank you, Your Honor.	 Q. And so that was a delay, at least in part, caused by the State Department of Transportation? A. It is, but at this point, everything else has been constructed. We're just waiting for the UP to give us approval so we can finish the last segment of the project. MS. REYNOLDS: I'll move to strike the nonresponsive portions. JUDGE HOWARD: Granted for everything following, "It is." MS. REYNOLDS: Thank you, Your Honor. BY MS. REYNOLDS: Q. Are you aware, Ms. Mantz, if there are any federal aid highway funds being used to install a new grade protective device? A. Yes, we have a federal grant that will participate in the costs of those improvements. Q. And an installation of what specifically? A. The signal improvements of the UP that are required by the UPRR.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	Construction and Maintenance Agreement for this crossing? A. You always plan for delays when you're dealing with the Railroad. Q. Do you also plan for delays when you're dealing with the State Department of Transportation? A. Not as extensive as with the Railroad. Q. Okay. I would like to direct your attention to your prefiled testimony, which has been stipulated as admissible by the Railroad and I believe by Staff. MS. REYNOLDS: And at this point, we would ask Your Honor if we could move into evidence GM-2. JUDGE HOWARD: Yes, it is admitted. And just to be clear, since it appears that the parties are agreeing to the admissibility of the supporting exhibits, GM-2 through GM-7 are all admitted. I've already spoken to GM-7, so GM-2 through 6 are all admitted. (Exhibits GM-2 through GM-6 admitted.) MS. REYNOLDS: Thank you, Your Honor. A. Will you be able to pull that up on the screen	 Q. And so that was a delay, at least in part, caused by the State Department of Transportation? A. It is, but at this point, everything else has been constructed. We're just waiting for the UP to give us approval so we can finish the last segment of the project. MS. REYNOLDS: I'll move to strike the nonresponsive portions. JUDGE HOWARD: Granted for everything following, "It is." MS. REYNOLDS: Thank you, Your Honor. BY MS. REYNOLDS: Q. Are you aware, Ms. Mantz, if there are any federal aid highway funds being used to install a new grade protective device? A. Yes, we have a federal grant that will participate in the costs of those improvements. Q. And an installation of what specifically? A. The signal improvements of the UP that are required by the UPRR. Q. When you say "required by the UPRR," what do you
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	Construction and Maintenance Agreement for this crossing? A. You always plan for delays when you're dealing with the Railroad. Q. Do you also plan for delays when you're dealing with the State Department of Transportation? A. Not as extensive as with the Railroad. Q. Okay. I would like to direct your attention to your prefiled testimony, which has been stipulated as admissible by the Railroad and I believe by Staff. MS. REYNOLDS: And at this point, we would ask Your Honor if we could move into evidence GM-2. JUDGE HOWARD: Yes, it is admitted. And just to be clear, since it appears that the parties are agreeing to the admissibility of the supporting exhibits, GM-2 through GM-7 are all admitted. I've already spoken to GM-7, so GM-2 through 6 are all admitted. (Exhibits GM-2 through GM-6 admitted.) MS. REYNOLDS: Thank you, Your Honor. A. Will you be able to pull that up on the screen because I don't have that in front of me? Thank you.	 Q. And so that was a delay, at least in part, caused by the State Department of Transportation? A. It is, but at this point, everything else has been constructed. We're just waiting for the UP to give us approval so we can finish the last segment of the project. MS. REYNOLDS: I'll move to strike the nonresponsive portions. JUDGE HOWARD: Granted for everything following, "It is." MS. REYNOLDS: Thank you, Your Honor. BY MS. REYNOLDS: Q. Are you aware, Ms. Mantz, if there are any federal aid highway funds being used to install a new grade protective device? A. Yes, we have a federal grant that will participate in the costs of those improvements. Q. And an installation of what specifically? A. The signal improvements of the UP that are required by the UPRR. Q. When you say "required by the UPRR," what do you mean?

20 (Pages 89 to 92)

	Page 93	Page 95
1	Q. The City of Spokane Valley reached out to UPRR	1 Program, which they're being used right now to pay for
2	as part of the Barker Road project, correct?	2 the multiuse path that is being constructed right now
3	A. We have to.	3 from the river to south of the railroad tracks.
4	Q. The Railroad didn't come to the City of Spokane	4 And then we have the grant, the FSWA grant,
5	Valley and propose the modifications that we're here	5 the STBG grant that will be used for the last segment
6	discussing today, did they?	6 that we have in part for the crossing devices at the UP
7	A. No.	7 railroad. Did that answer your question?
8	MS. REYNOLDS: Ma'am, thank you very much	8 JUDGE HOWARD: Yes, yes, and that was my
9	for your time. Those are all the questions I have.	9 only question. So thank you for your testimony today.
10	JUDGE HOWARD: Do we have any redirect from	10 You may turn off your camera.
11	the City?	11 THE WITNESS: Thank you.
12	MS. FOSTER: Yes, Judge. We do have a few	12 JUDGE HOWARD: And that was the last City
13	redirect questions.	13 witness. And we've been going since 9:30. I think we
14		14 should take a brief recess. Let's say return at 11:30,
15	REDIRECTEXAMINATION	15 and we will try to proceed. It looks like we have
16	BY MS. FOSTER:	16 between roughly an hour of the hearing left based on our
17	Q. Ms. Mantz, are crashes the only safety concerns	17 estimate and it could be less. What do to parties
18	at an at-grade crossing?	18 think? Well, let's be off the record now.
19	A. No, they're not. I mean, the safety of	19 (Recess from 11:17 a.m. to 11:31 a.m.)
20	pedestrians and vehicles and bikers as well too.	20 JUDGE HOWARD: Let's be back on the record.
21	Q. Okay. Can crashes ever be completely eliminated	21 We're returning after our recess and we're turning to
22	by traffic safety improvement projects?	22 Union Pacific's witnesses.
23	A. I don't believe so.	23 Let's have witness Ellis Mays turn on his
24	Q. Okay. Will the improvements to this crossing,	24 camera. All right.
25	will it at least reduce queueing at the crossing	25 (Ellis Mays sworn.)
	Page 94	Page 96
		Fage 90
1	location?	1 JUDGE HOWARD: Ms. Reynolds, you may
1 2		
	location?	1 JUDGE HOWARD: Ms. Reynolds, you may
2	location? A. It would reduce queueing, yes.	1 JUDGE HOWARD: Ms. Reynolds, you may 2 introduce your witness.
2 3	 Iocation? A. It would reduce queueing, yes. Q. And then last question. Has the multiuse path already been constructed? A. So we right now, we are constructing the 	 JUDGE HOWARD: Ms. Reynolds, you may introduce your witness. MS. REYNOLDS: Thank you, Your Honor.
2 3 4	 location? A. It would reduce queueing, yes. Q. And then last question. Has the multiuse path already been constructed? 	1 JUDGE HOWARD: Ms. Reynolds, you may 2 introduce your witness. 3 MS. REYNOLDS: Thank you, Your Honor. 4 5 5 E X A M I N A T I O N 6 BY MS. REYNOLDS:
2 3 4 5	 Iocation? A. It would reduce queueing, yes. Q. And then last question. Has the multiuse path already been constructed? A. So we right now, we are constructing the multiuse path from the river to just south of the UPRR railroad right-of-way. 	 JUDGE HOWARD: Ms. Reynolds, you may introduce your witness. MS. REYNOLDS: Thank you, Your Honor. E X A M I N A T I O N BY MS. REYNOLDS: Q. Good morning. Can you please state and spell
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	 Iocation? A. It would reduce queueing, yes. Q. And then last question. Has the multiuse path already been constructed? A. So we right now, we are constructing the multiuse path from the river to just south of the UPRR railroad right-of-way. MS. FOSTER: Okay. And those are the only 	1 JUDGE HOWARD: Ms. Reynolds, you may 2 introduce your witness. 3 MS. REYNOLDS: Thank you, Your Honor. 4
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	 Iocation? A. It would reduce queueing, yes. Q. And then last question. Has the multiuse path already been constructed? A. So we right now, we are constructing the multiuse path from the river to just south of the UPRR railroad right-of-way. MS. FOSTER: Okay. And those are the only questions that the City has. 	1 JUDGE HOWARD: Ms. Reynolds, you may 2 introduce your witness. 3 MS. REYNOLDS: Thank you, Your Honor. 4
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	 Iocation? A. It would reduce queueing, yes. Q. And then last question. Has the multiuse path already been constructed? A. So we right now, we are constructing the multiuse path from the river to just south of the UPRR railroad right-of-way. MS. FOSTER: Okay. And those are the only questions that the City has. JUDGE HOWARD: All right. I have just one 	1 JUDGE HOWARD: Ms. Reynolds, you may 2 introduce your witness. 3 MS. REYNOLDS: Thank you, Your Honor. 4 5 5 E X A M I N A T I O N 6 BY MS. REYNOLDS: 7 Q. Good morning. Can you please state and spell 8 your name for the record? 9 A. Yes. My name is Ellis, E-I-I-i-s, Mays, 10 M-a-y-s.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	 Iocation? A. It would reduce queueing, yes. Q. And then last question. Has the multiuse path already been constructed? A. So we right now, we are constructing the multiuse path from the river to just south of the UPRR railroad right-of-way. MS. FOSTER: Okay. And those are the only questions that the City has. JUDGE HOWARD: All right. I have just one clarifying question for Ms. Mantz. 	1 JUDGE HOWARD: Ms. Reynolds, you may 2 introduce your witness. 3 MS. REYNOLDS: Thank you, Your Honor. 4 5 5 E X A M I N A T I O N 6 BY MS. REYNOLDS: 7 Q. Good morning. Can you please state and spell 8 your name for the record? 9 A. Yes. My name is Ellis, E-I-I-i-s, Mays, 10 M-a-y-s. 11 Q. What is your current occupation, Mr. Mays?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	 Iocation? A. It would reduce queueing, yes. Q. And then last question. Has the multiuse path already been constructed? A. So we right now, we are constructing the multiuse path from the river to just south of the UPRR railroad right-of-way. MS. FOSTER: Okay. And those are the only questions that the City has. JUDGE HOWARD: All right. I have just one clarifying question for Ms. Mantz. THE WITNESS: Okay. 	 JUDGE HOWARD: Ms. Reynolds, you may introduce your witness. MS. REYNOLDS: Thank you, Your Honor. E X A M I N A T I O N BY MS. REYNOLDS: Q. Good morning. Can you please state and spell your name for the record? A. Yes. My name is Ellis, E-I-I-i-s, Mays, M-a-y-s. Q. What is your current occupation, Mr. Mays? A. I'm the public project manager for UP.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	 Iocation? A. It would reduce queueing, yes. Q. And then last question. Has the multiuse path already been constructed? A. So we right now, we are constructing the multiuse path from the river to just south of the UPRR railroad right-of-way. MS. FOSTER: Okay. And those are the only questions that the City has. JUDGE HOWARD: All right. I have just one clarifying question for Ms. Mantz. THE WITNESS: Okay. JUDGE HOWARD: On and this may be my own 	1 JUDGE HOWARD: Ms. Reynolds, you may 2 introduce your witness. 3 MS. REYNOLDS: Thank you, Your Honor. 4
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	 Iocation? A. It would reduce queueing, yes. Q. And then last question. Has the multiuse path already been constructed? A. So we right now, we are constructing the multiuse path from the river to just south of the UPRR railroad right-of-way. MS. FOSTER: Okay. And those are the only questions that the City has. JUDGE HOWARD: All right. I have just one clarifying question for Ms. Mantz. THE WITNESS: Okay. JUDGE HOWARD: On and this may be my own lack of understanding of of of the technicalities 	 JUDGE HOWARD: Ms. Reynolds, you may introduce your witness. MS. REYNOLDS: Thank you, Your Honor. E X A M I N A T I O N BY MS. REYNOLDS: Q. Good morning. Can you please state and spell your name for the record? A. Yes. My name is Ellis, E-I-I-i-s, Mays, M-a-y-s. Q. What is your current occupation, Mr. Mays? A. I'm the public project manager for UP. Q. And I'm having a bit of difficulty hearing you. So can you make sure that you speak a little slowly so
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	 Iocation? A. It would reduce queueing, yes. Q. And then last question. Has the multiuse path already been constructed? A. So we right now, we are constructing the multiuse path from the river to just south of the UPRR railroad right-of-way. MS. FOSTER: Okay. And those are the only questions that the City has. JUDGE HOWARD: All right. I have just one clarifying question for Ms. Mantz. THE WITNESS: Okay. JUDGE HOWARD: On and this may be my own lack of understanding of of of the technicalities here, but on page 4 of your testimony, you refer to the 	 JUDGE HOWARD: Ms. Reynolds, you may introduce your witness. MS. REYNOLDS: Thank you, Your Honor. E X A M I N A T I O N BY MS. REYNOLDS: Q. Good morning. Can you please state and spell your name for the record? A. Yes. My name is Ellis, E-I-I-i-s, Mays, M-a-y-s. Q. What is your current occupation, Mr. Mays? A. I'm the public project manager for UP. Q. And I'm having a bit of difficulty hearing you. So can you make sure that you speak a little slowly so everyone on the hearing, and most importantly, our court
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	 Iocation? A. It would reduce queueing, yes. Q. And then last question. Has the multiuse path already been constructed? A. So we right now, we are constructing the multiuse path from the river to just south of the UPRR railroad right-of-way. MS. FOSTER: Okay. And those are the only questions that the City has. JUDGE HOWARD: All right. I have just one clarifying question for Ms. Mantz. THE WITNESS: Okay. JUDGE HOWARD: On and this may be my own lack of understanding of of of the technicalities here, but on page 4 of your testimony, you refer to the Highway Safety Improvement Program grant of \$267,000. 	1 JUDGE HOWARD: Ms. Reynolds, you may 2 introduce your witness. 3 MS. REYNOLDS: Thank you, Your Honor. 4
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	 Iocation? A. It would reduce queueing, yes. Q. And then last question. Has the multiuse path already been constructed? A. So we right now, we are constructing the multiuse path from the river to just south of the UPRR railroad right-of-way. MS. FOSTER: Okay. And those are the only questions that the City has. JUDGE HOWARD: All right. I have just one clarifying question for Ms. Mantz. THE WITNESS: Okay. JUDGE HOWARD: On and this may be my own lack of understanding of of of the technicalities here, but on page 4 of your testimony, you refer to the Highway Safety Improvement Program grant of \$267,000. THE WITNESS: Yes. 	1 JUDGE HOWARD: Ms. Reynolds, you may 2 introduce your witness. 3 MS. REYNOLDS: Thank you, Your Honor. 4
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	 Iocation? A. It would reduce queueing, yes. Q. And then last question. Has the multiuse path already been constructed? A. So we right now, we are constructing the multiuse path from the river to just south of the UPRR railroad right-of-way. MS. FOSTER: Okay. And those are the only questions that the City has. JUDGE HOWARD: All right. I have just one clarifying question for Ms. Mantz. THE WITNESS: Okay. JUDGE HOWARD: On and this may be my own lack of understanding of of the technicalities here, but on page 4 of your testimony, you refer to the Highway Safety Improvement Program grant of \$267,000. THE WITNESS: Yes. JUDGE HOWARD: And then on the next page of 	1 JUDGE HOWARD: Ms. Reynolds, you may 2 introduce your witness. 3 MS. REYNOLDS: Thank you, Your Honor. 4 5 5 E X A M I N A T I O N 6 BY MS. REYNOLDS: 7 Q. Good morning. Can you please state and spell 9 your name for the record? 9 A. Yes. My name is Ellis, E-I-I-i-s, Mays, 10 M-a-y-s. 11 Q. What is your current occupation, Mr. Mays? 12 A. I'm the public project manager for UP. 13 Q. And I'm having a bit of difficulty hearing you. 14 So can you make sure that you speak a little slowly so 15 everyone on the hearing, and most importantly, our court 16 reporter, can get everything you're saying? 17 A. Sure. 18 Q. All right. Have you are you familiar with
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	 Iocation? A. It would reduce queueing, yes. Q. And then last question. Has the multiuse path already been constructed? A. So we right now, we are constructing the multiuse path from the river to just south of the UPRR railroad right-of-way. MS. FOSTER: Okay. And those are the only questions that the City has. JUDGE HOWARD: All right. I have just one clarifying question for Ms. Mantz. THE WITNESS: Okay. JUDGE HOWARD: On and this may be my own lack of understanding of of of the technicalities here, but on page 4 of your testimony, you refer to the Highway Safety Improvement Program grant of \$267,000. THE WITNESS: Yes. JUDGE HOWARD: And then on the next page of your testimony, you refer to there's more than 800,000 	1 JUDGE HOWARD: Ms. Reynolds, you may 2 introduce your witness. 3 MS. REYNOLDS: Thank you, Your Honor. 4 5 5 E X A M I N A T I O N 6 BY MS. REYNOLDS: 7 Q. Good morning. Can you please state and spell 9 your name for the record? 9 A. Yes. My name is Ellis, E-I-I-i-s, Mays, 10 M-a-y-s. 11 Q. What is your current occupation, Mr. Mays? 12 A. I'm the public project manager for UP. 13 Q. And I'm having a bit of difficulty hearing you. 14 So can you make sure that you speak a little slowly so 15 everyone on the hearing, and most importantly, our court 16 reporter, can get everything you're saying? 17 A. Sure. 18 Q. All right. Have you are you familiar with 19 your prefiled testimony that was filed in this case?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	 Iocation? A. It would reduce queueing, yes. Q. And then last question. Has the multiuse path already been constructed? A. So we right now, we are constructing the multiuse path from the river to just south of the UPRR railroad right-of-way. MS. FOSTER: Okay. And those are the only questions that the City has. JUDGE HOWARD: All right. I have just one clarifying question for Ms. Mantz. THE WITNESS: Okay. JUDGE HOWARD: On and this may be my own lack of understanding of of of the technicalities here, but on page 4 of your testimony, you refer to the Highway Safety Improvement Program grant of \$267,000. THE WITNESS: Yes. JUDGE HOWARD: And then on the next page of your testimony, you refer to there's more than 800,000 in federal funding. 	1 JUDGE HOWARD: Ms. Reynolds, you may 2 introduce your witness. 3 MS. REYNOLDS: Thank you, Your Honor. 4 5 5 E X A M I N A T I O N 6 BY MS. REYNOLDS: 7 Q. Good morning. Can you please state and spell 9 your name for the record? 9 A. Yes. My name is Ellis, E-I-I-i-s, Mays, 10 M-a-y-s. 11 Q. What is your current occupation, Mr. Mays? 12 A. I'm the public project manager for UP. 13 Q. And I'm having a bit of difficulty hearing you. 14 So can you make sure that you speak a little slowly so 15 everyone on the hearing, and most importantly, our court 16 reporter, can get everything you're saying? 17 A. Sure. 18 Q. All right. Have you are you familiar with 19 your prefiled testimony that was filed in this case? 20 A. Yes.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	 Iocation? A. It would reduce queueing, yes. Q. And then last question. Has the multiuse path already been constructed? A. So we right now, we are constructing the multiuse path from the river to just south of the UPRR railroad right-of-way. MS. FOSTER: Okay. And those are the only questions that the City has. JUDGE HOWARD: All right. I have just one clarifying question for Ms. Mantz. THE WITNESS: Okay. JUDGE HOWARD: On and this may be my own lack of understanding of of of the technicalities here, but on page 4 of your testimony, you refer to the Highway Safety Improvement Program grant of \$267,000. THE WITNESS: Yes. JUDGE HOWARD: And then on the next page of your testimony, you refer to there's more than 800,000 in federal funding. I was just curious, what was the source of 	1 JUDGE HOWARD: Ms. Reynolds, you may 2 introduce your witness. 3 MS. REYNOLDS: Thank you, Your Honor. 4 5 5 E X A M I N A T I O N 6 BY MS. REYNOLDS: 7 Q. Good morning. Can you please state and spell 9 your name for the record? 9 A. Yes. My name is Ellis, E-I-I-i-s, Mays, 10 M-a-y-s. 11 Q. What is your current occupation, Mr. Mays? 12 A. I'm the public project manager for UP. 13 Q. And I'm having a bit of difficulty hearing you. 14 So can you make sure that you speak a little slowly so 15 everyone on the hearing, and most importantly, our court 16 reporter, can get everything you're saying? 17 A. Sure. 18 Q. All right. Have you are you familiar with 19 your prefiled testimony that was filed in this case? 20 A. Yes. 21 Q. Do you have that with you?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	 Iocation? A. It would reduce queueing, yes. Q. And then last question. Has the multiuse path already been constructed? A. So we right now, we are constructing the multiuse path from the river to just south of the UPRR railroad right-of-way. MS. FOSTER: Okay. And those are the only questions that the City has. JUDGE HOWARD: All right. I have just one clarifying question for Ms. Mantz. THE WITNESS: Okay. JUDGE HOWARD: On and this may be my own lack of understanding of of of the technicalities here, but on page 4 of your testimony, you refer to the Highway Safety Improvement Program grant of \$267,000. THE WITNESS: Yes. JUDGE HOWARD: And then on the next page of your testimony, you refer to there's more than 800,000 in federal funding. I was just curious, what was the source of that larger amount of federal funding if you recall? 	1 JUDGE HOWARD: Ms. Reynolds, you may 2 introduce your witness. 3 MS. REYNOLDS: Thank you, Your Honor. 4
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	 Iocation? A. It would reduce queueing, yes. Q. And then last question. Has the multiuse path already been constructed? A. So we right now, we are constructing the multiuse path from the river to just south of the UPRR railroad right-of-way. MS. FOSTER: Okay. And those are the only questions that the City has. JUDGE HOWARD: All right. I have just one clarifying question for Ms. Mantz. THE WITNESS: Okay. JUDGE HOWARD: On and this may be my own lack of understanding of of of the technicalities here, but on page 4 of your testimony, you refer to the Highway Safety Improvement Program grant of \$267,000. THE WITNESS: Yes. JUDGE HOWARD: And then on the next page of your testimony, you refer to there's more than 800,000 in federal funding. I was just curious, what was the source of that larger amount of federal funding if you recall? THE WITNESS: Yeah, I do recall. So yes, so 	1 JUDGE HOWARD: Ms. Reynolds, you may 2 introduce your witness. 3 MS. REYNOLDS: Thank you, Your Honor. 4 5 5 E X A M I N A T I O N 6 BY MS. REYNOLDS: 7 Q. Good morning. Can you please state and spell 9 your name for the record? 9 A. Yes. My name is Ellis, E-I-I-i-s, Mays, 10 M-a-y-s. 11 Q. What is your current occupation, Mr. Mays? 12 A. I'm the public project manager for UP. 13 Q. And I'm having a bit of difficulty hearing you. 14 So can you make sure that you speak a little slowly so 15 everyone on the hearing, and most importantly, our court 16 reporter, can get everything you're saying? 17 A. Sure. 18 Q. All right. Have you are you familiar with 19 your prefiled testimony that was filed in this case? 17 A. Yes. 18 Q. Do you have that with you? 19 Xes. 20 A. Yes. 21 Q. And is the prefiled testimony that was submitted
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	 Iocation? A. It would reduce queueing, yes. Q. And then last question. Has the multiuse path already been constructed? A. So we right now, we are constructing the multiuse path from the river to just south of the UPRR railroad right-of-way. MS. FOSTER: Okay. And those are the only questions that the City has. JUDGE HOWARD: All right. I have just one clarifying question for Ms. Mantz. THE WITNESS: Okay. JUDGE HOWARD: On and this may be my own lack of understanding of of of the technicalities here, but on page 4 of your testimony, you refer to the Highway Safety Improvement Program grant of \$267,000. THE WITNESS: Yes. JUDGE HOWARD: And then on the next page of your testimony, you refer to there's more than 800,000 in federal funding. I was just curious, what was the source of that larger amount of federal funding if you recall? 	1 JUDGE HOWARD: Ms. Reynolds, you may 2 introduce your witness. 3 MS. REYNOLDS: Thank you, Your Honor. 4

21 (Pages 93 to 96)

	Page 97	Page 99
1	MS. REYNOLDS: All right. With that, Union	1 A. I do have them. I can pull them up.
2	Pacific would tender Mr. Mays for cross-examination.	2 Q. Okay. Can you please pull up the exhibit marked
3	JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. And to be clear,	3 EM-X9?
4	so we have is Ellis Mays direct testimony EM-1T. Is	4 A. EM-X sorry.
5	there any objection to the supporting exhibits filed on	5 Q. 9.
6	April 13th and revised on May 5th that we have not	6 A. Got it.
7	already addressed today and those exhibits are EM-2	7 Q. And do you recognize
8	through EM-6?	8 A. Okay.
9	MS. FOSTER: Not from the City, Judge	9 Q. Do you recognize this document?
10	Howard.	10 A. Yes.
11	MR. ROBERSON: Nor from Staff.	11 Q. And can you just state what it is, please?
12	JUDGE HOWARD: All right. So those Exhibits	12 A. What I'm looking at now is a document, it looks
13	EM-2 through EM-6 are also admitted.	13 like a recital of the State statute.
14	(Exhibits EM-2 through EM-6 admitted.)	14 Q. Specifically, would you agree that it's RCW
15	JUDGE HOWARD: All right. And the City	15 81.58.285 ?
16	indicated cross for this witness, so you may proceed.	16 A. Yes.
17	MS. FOSTER: Thank you, Judge Howard.	17 MS. REYNOLDS: Just to correct the record
18		18 5-3, not 5-8.
19	C R O S S - E X A M I N A T I O N	19 MS. FOSTER: 5-3, yes. Thank you,
20	BY MS. FOSTER:	20 Ms. Reynolds.
21	Q. And good morning, Mr. Mays.	21 JUDGE HOWARD: And and is it section 295?
22	A. How are you?	22 MS. FOSTER: 295, correct.
23	Q. Good.	23 JUDGE HOWARD: All right.
24	What is your knowledge of municipal	24 BY MS. FOSTER:
25	infrastructure improvement projects?	25 Q. And do you believe this to be a correct copy of
		, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,
	Page 98	
	Page 98	Page 100
1	A. My knowledge would be limited to the impacts of	Page 100
1 2	_	
	A. My knowledge would be limited to the impacts of	1 the RCW?
2	A. My knowledge would be limited to the impacts of the Railroad, which typically would be	 the RCW? A. To the scope that I would use it, yes.
2 3	A. My knowledge would be limited to the impacts of the Railroad, which typically would be THE COURT REPORTER: Mr. Mays, this is the	 the RCW? A. To the scope that I would use it, yes. MS. FOSTER: The City would move to admit
2 3 4	A. My knowledge would be limited to the impacts of the Railroad, which typically would be THE COURT REPORTER: Mr. Mays, this is the court reporter. I'm having a little trouble hearing	 the RCW? A. To the scope that I would use it, yes. MS. FOSTER: The City would move to admit Exhibit EM-X9.
2 3 4 5	A. My knowledge would be limited to the impacts of the Railroad, which typically would be THE COURT REPORTER: Mr. Mays, this is the court reporter. I'm having a little trouble hearing you.	 the RCW? A. To the scope that I would use it, yes. MS. FOSTER: The City would move to admit Exhibit EM-X9. JUDGE HOWARD: It is admitted.
2 3 4 5 6	A. My knowledge would be limited to the impacts of the Railroad, which typically would be THE COURT REPORTER: Mr. Mays, this is the court reporter. I'm having a little trouble hearing you. JUDGE HOWARD: I am also I think it might be your connection to the Internet. And I'm not an IT person, but it does seem to be the case. Do you have	 the RCW? A. To the scope that I would use it, yes. MS. FOSTER: The City would move to admit Exhibit EM-X9. JUDGE HOWARD: It is admitted. (Exhibits EM-X9 admitted.) BY MS. FOSTER: Q. Mr. Mays, can you take a second for me and just
2 3 4 5 6 7	A. My knowledge would be limited to the impacts of the Railroad, which typically would be THE COURT REPORTER: Mr. Mays, this is the court reporter. I'm having a little trouble hearing you. JUDGE HOWARD: I am also I think it might be your connection to the Internet. And I'm not an IT	 the RCW? A. To the scope that I would use it, yes. MS. FOSTER: The City would move to admit Exhibit EM-X9. JUDGE HOWARD: It is admitted. (Exhibits EM-X9 admitted.) BY MS. FOSTER:
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	A. My knowledge would be limited to the impacts of the Railroad, which typically would be THE COURT REPORTER: Mr. Mays, this is the court reporter. I'm having a little trouble hearing you. JUDGE HOWARD: I am also I think it might be your connection to the Internet. And I'm not an IT person, but it does seem to be the case. Do you have	 the RCW? A. To the scope that I would use it, yes. MS. FOSTER: The City would move to admit Exhibit EM-X9. JUDGE HOWARD: It is admitted. (Exhibits EM-X9 admitted.) BY MS. FOSTER: Q. Mr. Mays, can you take a second for me and just
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	A. My knowledge would be limited to the impacts of the Railroad, which typically would be THE COURT REPORTER: Mr. Mays, this is the court reporter. I'm having a little trouble hearing you. JUDGE HOWARD: I am also I think it might be your connection to the Internet. And I'm not an IT person, but it does seem to be the case. Do you have any perhaps you could call in?	 the RCW? A. To the scope that I would use it, yes. MS. FOSTER: The City would move to admit Exhibit EM-X9. JUDGE HOWARD: It is admitted. (Exhibits EM-X9 admitted.) BY MS. FOSTER: Q. Mr. Mays, can you take a second for me and just read the RCW? Actually, can I have you read that into
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	A. My knowledge would be limited to the impacts of the Railroad, which typically would be THE COURT REPORTER: Mr. Mays, this is the court reporter. I'm having a little trouble hearing you. JUDGE HOWARD: I am also I think it might be your connection to the Internet. And I'm not an IT person, but it does seem to be the case. Do you have any perhaps you could call in? THE WITNESS: Let me try that.	 the RCW? A. To the scope that I would use it, yes. MS. FOSTER: The City would move to admit Exhibit EM-X9. JUDGE HOWARD: It is admitted. (Exhibits EM-X9 admitted.) BY MS. FOSTER: Q. Mr. Mays, can you take a second for me and just read the RCW? Actually, can I have you read that into the record, please?
2 3 6 7 8 9 10 11	A. My knowledge would be limited to the impacts of the Railroad, which typically would be THE COURT REPORTER: Mr. Mays, this is the court reporter. I'm having a little trouble hearing you. JUDGE HOWARD: I am also I think it might be your connection to the Internet. And I'm not an IT person, but it does seem to be the case. Do you have any perhaps you could call in? THE WITNESS: Let me try that. JUDGE HOWARD: Okay. Let's go off the	 the RCW? A. To the scope that I would use it, yes. MS. FOSTER: The City would move to admit Exhibit EM-X9. JUDGE HOWARD: It is admitted. (Exhibits EM-X9 admitted.) BY MS. FOSTER: Q. Mr. Mays, can you take a second for me and just read the RCW? Actually, can I have you read that into the record, please? JUDGE HOWARD: Just to be clear, sorry sorry to interrupt your questioning there. But it generally isn't necessary for the witnesses to read the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	A. My knowledge would be limited to the impacts of the Railroad, which typically would be THE COURT REPORTER: Mr. Mays, this is the court reporter. I'm having a little trouble hearing you. JUDGE HOWARD: I am also I think it might be your connection to the Internet. And I'm not an IT person, but it does seem to be the case. Do you have any perhaps you could call in? THE WITNESS: Let me try that. JUDGE HOWARD: Okay. Let's go off the record for a moment.	 the RCW? A. To the scope that I would use it, yes. MS. FOSTER: The City would move to admit Exhibit EM-X9. JUDGE HOWARD: It is admitted. (Exhibits EM-X9 admitted.) BY MS. FOSTER: Q. Mr. Mays, can you take a second for me and just read the RCW? Actually, can I have you read that into the record, please? JUDGE HOWARD: Just to be clear, sorry sorry to interrupt your questioning there. But it
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	A. My knowledge would be limited to the impacts of the Railroad, which typically would be THE COURT REPORTER: Mr. Mays, this is the court reporter. I'm having a little trouble hearing you. JUDGE HOWARD: I am also I think it might be your connection to the Internet. And I'm not an IT person, but it does seem to be the case. Do you have any perhaps you could call in? THE WITNESS: Let me try that. JUDGE HOWARD: Okay. Let's go off the record for a moment. (Recess from 11:35 a.m. to 11:37 a.m.)	 the RCW? A. To the scope that I would use it, yes. MS. FOSTER: The City would move to admit Exhibit EM-X9. JUDGE HOWARD: It is admitted. (Exhibits EM-X9 admitted.) BY MS. FOSTER: Q. Mr. Mays, can you take a second for me and just read the RCW? Actually, can I have you read that into the record, please? JUDGE HOWARD: Just to be clear, sorry sorry to interrupt your questioning there. But it generally isn't necessary for the witnesses to read the
2 3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	A. My knowledge would be limited to the impacts of the Railroad, which typically would be THE COURT REPORTER: Mr. Mays, this is the court reporter. I'm having a little trouble hearing you. JUDGE HOWARD: I am also I think it might be your connection to the Internet. And I'm not an IT person, but it does seem to be the case. Do you have any perhaps you could call in? THE WITNESS: Let me try that. JUDGE HOWARD: Okay. Let's go off the record for a moment. (Recess from 11:35 a.m. to 11:37 a.m.) JUDGE HOWARD: Let's be back on the record.	 the RCW? A. To the scope that I would use it, yes. MS. FOSTER: The City would move to admit Exhibit EM-X9. JUDGE HOWARD: It is admitted. (Exhibits EM-X9 admitted.) BY MS. FOSTER: Q. Mr. Mays, can you take a second for me and just read the RCW? Actually, can I have you read that into the record, please? JUDGE HOWARD: Just to be clear, sorry sorry to interrupt your questioning there. But it generally isn't necessary for the witnesses to read the longer amounts of material into the record because it is in the record at this point. But feel free to ask your questions.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	A. My knowledge would be limited to the impacts of the Railroad, which typically would be THE COURT REPORTER: Mr. Mays, this is the court reporter. I'm having a little trouble hearing you. JUDGE HOWARD: I am also I think it might be your connection to the Internet. And I'm not an IT person, but it does seem to be the case. Do you have any perhaps you could call in? THE WITNESS: Let me try that. JUDGE HOWARD: Okay. Let's go off the record for a moment. (Recess from 11:35 a.m. to 11:37 a.m.) JUDGE HOWARD: Let's be back on the record. And, Ms. Foster, you may proceed with your cross.	 the RCW? A. To the scope that I would use it, yes. MS. FOSTER: The City would move to admit Exhibit EM-X9. JUDGE HOWARD: It is admitted. (Exhibits EM-X9 admitted.) BY MS. FOSTER: Q. Mr. Mays, can you take a second for me and just read the RCW? Actually, can I have you read that into the record, please? JUDGE HOWARD: Just to be clear, sorry sorry to interrupt your questioning there. But it generally isn't necessary for the witnesses to read the longer amounts of material into the record because it is in the record at this point. But feel free to ask your
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	 A. My knowledge would be limited to the impacts of the Railroad, which typically would be THE COURT REPORTER: Mr. Mays, this is the court reporter. I'm having a little trouble hearing you. JUDGE HOWARD: I am also I think it might be your connection to the Internet. And I'm not an IT person, but it does seem to be the case. Do you have any perhaps you could call in? THE WITNESS: Let me try that. JUDGE HOWARD: Okay. Let's go off the record for a moment. (Recess from 11:35 a.m. to 11:37 a.m.) JUDGE HOWARD: Let's be back on the record. And, Ms. Foster, you may proceed with your cross. MS. FOSTER: Thank you, Judge Howard. BY MS. FOSTER: Q. And just Mr. Mays, I'm going to reask that 	 the RCW? A. To the scope that I would use it, yes. MS. FOSTER: The City would move to admit Exhibit EM-X9. JUDGE HOWARD: It is admitted. (Exhibits EM-X9 admitted.) BY MS. FOSTER: Q. Mr. Mays, can you take a second for me and just read the RCW? Actually, can I have you read that into the record, please? JUDGE HOWARD: Just to be clear, sorry sorry to interrupt your questioning there. But it generally isn't necessary for the witnesses to read the longer amounts of material into the record because it is in the record at this point. But feel free to ask your questions. BY MS. FOSTER: Q. Well, Mr. Mays, I would just like you to read
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	 A. My knowledge would be limited to the impacts of the Railroad, which typically would be THE COURT REPORTER: Mr. Mays, this is the court reporter. I'm having a little trouble hearing you. JUDGE HOWARD: I am also I think it might be your connection to the Internet. And I'm not an IT person, but it does seem to be the case. Do you have any perhaps you could call in? THE WITNESS: Let me try that. JUDGE HOWARD: Okay. Let's go off the record for a moment. (Recess from 11:35 a.m. to 11:37 a.m.) JUDGE HOWARD: Let's be back on the record. And, Ms. Foster, you may proceed with your cross. MS. FOSTER: Thank you, Judge Howard. BY MS. FOSTER: Q. And just Mr. Mays, I'm going to reask that first question just so that we have it on the record. 	 the RCW? A. To the scope that I would use it, yes. MS. FOSTER: The City would move to admit Exhibit EM-X9. JUDGE HOWARD: It is admitted. (Exhibits EM-X9 admitted.) BY MS. FOSTER: Q. Mr. Mays, can you take a second for me and just read the RCW? Actually, can I have you read that into the record, please? JUDGE HOWARD: Just to be clear, sorry sorry to interrupt your questioning there. But it generally isn't necessary for the witnesses to read the longer amounts of material into the record because it is in the record at this point. But feel free to ask your questions. BY MS. FOSTER: Q. Well, Mr. Mays, I would just like you to read the statute. You can read it to yourself and just let
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	 A. My knowledge would be limited to the impacts of the Railroad, which typically would be THE COURT REPORTER: Mr. Mays, this is the court reporter. I'm having a little trouble hearing you. JUDGE HOWARD: I am also I think it might be your connection to the Internet. And I'm not an IT person, but it does seem to be the case. Do you have any perhaps you could call in? THE WITNESS: Let me try that. JUDGE HOWARD: Okay. Let's go off the record for a moment. (Recess from 11:35 a.m. to 11:37 a.m.) JUDGE HOWARD: Let's be back on the record. And, Ms. Foster, you may proceed with your cross. MS. FOSTER: Thank you, Judge Howard. BY MS. FOSTER: Q. And just Mr. Mays, I'm going to reask that first question just so that we have it on the record. 	 the RCW? A. To the scope that I would use it, yes. MS. FOSTER: The City would move to admit Exhibit EM-X9. JUDGE HOWARD: It is admitted. (Exhibits EM-X9 admitted.) BY MS. FOSTER: Q. Mr. Mays, can you take a second for me and just read the RCW? Actually, can I have you read that into the record, please? JUDGE HOWARD: Just to be clear, sorry sorry to interrupt your questioning there. But it generally isn't necessary for the witnesses to read the longer amounts of material into the record because it is in the record at this point. But feel free to ask your questions. BY MS. FOSTER: Q. Well, Mr. Mays, I would just like you to read
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	 A. My knowledge would be limited to the impacts of the Railroad, which typically would be THE COURT REPORTER: Mr. Mays, this is the court reporter. I'm having a little trouble hearing you. JUDGE HOWARD: I am also I think it might be your connection to the Internet. And I'm not an IT person, but it does seem to be the case. Do you have any perhaps you could call in? THE WITNESS: Let me try that. JUDGE HOWARD: Okay. Let's go off the record for a moment. (Recess from 11:35 a.m. to 11:37 a.m.) JUDGE HOWARD: Let's be back on the record. And, Ms. Foster, you may proceed with your cross. MS. FOSTER: Thank you, Judge Howard. BY MS. FOSTER: Q. And just Mr. Mays, I'm going to reask that first question just so that we have it on the record. What is your knowledge of municipal infrastructure improvement projects? 	 the RCW? A. To the scope that I would use it, yes. MS. FOSTER: The City would move to admit Exhibit EM-X9. JUDGE HOWARD: It is admitted. (Exhibits EM-X9 admitted.) BY MS. FOSTER: Q. Mr. Mays, can you take a second for me and just read the RCW? Actually, can I have you read that into the record, please? JUDGE HOWARD: Just to be clear, sorry sorry to interrupt your questioning there. But it generally isn't necessary for the witnesses to read the longer amounts of material into the record because it is in the record at this point. But feel free to ask your questions. BY MS. FOSTER: Q. Well, Mr. Mays, I would just like you to read the statute. You can read it to yourself and just let me know when you've read it, and that's perfectly fine. A. Okay.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	 A. My knowledge would be limited to the impacts of the Railroad, which typically would be THE COURT REPORTER: Mr. Mays, this is the court reporter. I'm having a little trouble hearing you. JUDGE HOWARD: I am also I think it might be your connection to the Internet. And I'm not an IT person, but it does seem to be the case. Do you have any perhaps you could call in? THE WITNESS: Let me try that. JUDGE HOWARD: Okay. Let's go off the record for a moment. (Recess from 11:35 a.m. to 11:37 a.m.) JUDGE HOWARD: Let's be back on the record. And, Ms. Foster, you may proceed with your cross. MS. FOSTER: Thank you, Judge Howard. BY MS. FOSTER: Q. And just Mr. Mays, I'm going to reask that first question just so that we have it on the record. What is your knowledge of municipal infrastructure improvement projects? A. I do not have knowledge of those projects 	 the RCW? A. To the scope that I would use it, yes. MS. FOSTER: The City would move to admit Exhibit EM-X9. JUDGE HOWARD: It is admitted. (Exhibits EM-X9 admitted.) BY MS. FOSTER: Q. Mr. Mays, can you take a second for me and just read the RCW? Actually, can I have you read that into the record, please? JUDGE HOWARD: Just to be clear, sorry sorry to interrupt your questioning there. But it generally isn't necessary for the witnesses to read the longer amounts of material into the record because it is in the record at this point. But feel free to ask your questions. BY MS. FOSTER: Q. Well, Mr. Mays, I would just like you to read the statute. You can read it to yourself and just let me know when you've read it, and that's perfectly fine. A. Okay. Q. Okay. Is there any requirement in RCW 81.53.295
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	 A. My knowledge would be limited to the impacts of the Railroad, which typically would be THE COURT REPORTER: Mr. Mays, this is the court reporter. I'm having a little trouble hearing you. JUDGE HOWARD: I am also I think it might be your connection to the Internet. And I'm not an IT person, but it does seem to be the case. Do you have any perhaps you could call in? THE WITNESS: Let me try that. JUDGE HOWARD: Okay. Let's go off the record for a moment. (Recess from 11:35 a.m. to 11:37 a.m.) JUDGE HOWARD: Let's be back on the record. And, Ms. Foster, you may proceed with your cross. MS. FOSTER: Thank you, Judge Howard. BY MS. FOSTER: Q. And just Mr. Mays, I'm going to reask that first question just so that we have it on the record. What is your knowledge of municipal infrastructure improvement projects? A. I do not have knowledge of those projects outside of the impacts to the Railroad's property. 	 the RCW? A. To the scope that I would use it, yes. MS. FOSTER: The City would move to admit Exhibit EM-X9. JUDGE HOWARD: It is admitted. (Exhibits EM-X9 admitted.) BY MS. FOSTER: Q. Mr. Mays, can you take a second for me and just read the RCW? Actually, can I have you read that into the record, please? JUDGE HOWARD: Just to be clear, sorry sorry to interrupt your questioning there. But it generally isn't necessary for the witnesses to read the longer amounts of material into the record because it is in the record at this point. But feel free to ask your questions. BY MS. FOSTER: Q. Well, Mr. Mays, I would just like you to read the statute. You can read it to yourself and just let me know when you've read it, and that's perfectly fine. A. Okay. Q. Okay. Is there any requirement in RCW 81.53.295 for the expenditure of Section 130 funds?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	 A. My knowledge would be limited to the impacts of the Railroad, which typically would be THE COURT REPORTER: Mr. Mays, this is the court reporter. I'm having a little trouble hearing you. JUDGE HOWARD: I am also I think it might be your connection to the Internet. And I'm not an IT person, but it does seem to be the case. Do you have any perhaps you could call in? THE WITNESS: Let me try that. JUDGE HOWARD: Okay. Let's go off the record for a moment. (Recess from 11:35 a.m. to 11:37 a.m.) JUDGE HOWARD: Let's be back on the record. And, Ms. Foster, you may proceed with your cross. MS. FOSTER: Thank you, Judge Howard. BY MS. FOSTER: Q. And just Mr. Mays, I'm going to reask that first question just so that we have it on the record. What is your knowledge of municipal infrastructure improvement projects? A. I do not have knowledge of those projects outside of the impacts to the Railroad's property. Q. And do you have the cross-examination exhibits 	 the RCW? A. To the scope that I would use it, yes. MS. FOSTER: The City would move to admit Exhibit EM-X9. JUDGE HOWARD: It is admitted. (Exhibits EM-X9 admitted.) BY MS. FOSTER: Q. Mr. Mays, can you take a second for me and just read the RCW? Actually, can I have you read that into the record, please? JUDGE HOWARD: Just to be clear, sorry sorry to interrupt your questioning there. But it generally isn't necessary for the witnesses to read the longer amounts of material into the record because it is in the record at this point. But feel free to ask your questions. BY MS. FOSTER: Q. Well, Mr. Mays, I would just like you to read the statute. You can read it to yourself and just let me know when you've read it, and that's perfectly fine. A. Okay. Q. Okay. Is there any requirement in RCW 81.53.295
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	 A. My knowledge would be limited to the impacts of the Railroad, which typically would be THE COURT REPORTER: Mr. Mays, this is the court reporter. I'm having a little trouble hearing you. JUDGE HOWARD: I am also I think it might be your connection to the Internet. And I'm not an IT person, but it does seem to be the case. Do you have any perhaps you could call in? THE WITNESS: Let me try that. JUDGE HOWARD: Okay. Let's go off the record for a moment. (Recess from 11:35 a.m. to 11:37 a.m.) JUDGE HOWARD: Let's be back on the record. And, Ms. Foster, you may proceed with your cross. MS. FOSTER: Thank you, Judge Howard. BY MS. FOSTER: Q. And just Mr. Mays, I'm going to reask that first question just so that we have it on the record. What is your knowledge of municipal infrastructure improvement projects? A. I do not have knowledge of those projects outside of the impacts to the Railroad's property. 	 the RCW? A. To the scope that I would use it, yes. MS. FOSTER: The City would move to admit Exhibit EM-X9. JUDGE HOWARD: It is admitted. (Exhibits EM-X9 admitted.) BY MS. FOSTER: Q. Mr. Mays, can you take a second for me and just read the RCW? Actually, can I have you read that into the record, please? JUDGE HOWARD: Just to be clear, sorry sorry to interrupt your questioning there. But it generally isn't necessary for the witnesses to read the longer amounts of material into the record because it is in the record at this point. But feel free to ask your questions. BY MS. FOSTER: Q. Well, Mr. Mays, I would just like you to read the statute. You can read it to yourself and just let me know when you've read it, and that's perfectly fine. A. Okay. Q. Okay. Is there any requirement in RCW 81.53.295 for the expenditure of Section 130 funds?

22 (Pages 97 to 100)

	Page 101		Page 103
1	MS. FOSTER: It doesn't. I'm asking what	1 objection.	5
2	the statute states, and specifically Mr. Mays testified	2 A. No, this project does not el	liminata bazarda at
3	that this is not a Section 130 project. So it's very	3 the at-grade crossing.	in the trazarus at
4	relevant that I get what he believes the RCW to state on	4 BY MS. FOSTER:	
5	the record.	5 Q. Even with the inclusion o	f the eight-inch-high
6	JUDGE HOWARD: At the Commission, we will	6 concrete median?	
7	frequently allow testimony as a matter of practice that	7 A. With the inclusion of the ei	aht-inch-hiah
8	is in sort of a gray area between regulatory opinions	8 median, this project does not elir	c
9	and legal opinions. So I will allow the allow the	9 at-grade crossing.	
10	question.	Q. Will it help reduce hazard	s?
11	BY MS. FOSTER:	A. I could not say that it would	d reduce with the
12	Q. And I will repeat the question for you,	information that I have.	
13	Mr. Mays.	Q. Okay. So do you agree th	
14	Is there any requirement in RCW 81.53.295 for	adding an additional lane to Ba	
15	the expenditure of Section 130 funds?	A. I would add I would agre	
16	A. No, I do not see any indication of Section 130	does add a turn lane to this road	, which is an
17	in that section.	additional lane, correct.	
18	Q. Okay. Thank you.	Q. Okay. And won't the add	
19	I would now like to direct you to your prefiled	19 lane, won't that help alleviate re	ear-end incidents and
20 21	testimony, specifically page 2, and the question at lines 12 and 13. So you'll note can you I'm	20 accidents? 21 MS. REYNOLDS: Object	tion Choquiation
21	sorry. Let me back up.	MS. REYNOLDS: Objec MS. FOSTER: He testifie	-
23	Can you please read lines 14 through 16 for me?	this project won't reduce or allevi	
24	A. Sure. (As read) No, this project is not a	24 accidents.	
25	Section 130 crossing safety project. Excluding the	JUDGE HOWARD: I'm g	joing to allow the
	Page 102		Page 104
1	installation of the median, this project does not	1 question.	
2	eliminate vehicular hazards at the rail-highway	2 BY MS. FOSTER:	
3	crossing. Furthermore, this project promotes increased	3 Q. Would you like me to repea	- () () () () () () () () () (
4	pedestrian use at this crossing.	4 A. Sure.	at, Mr. Mays?
			-
5	Q. Thank you.	5 Q. So with the inclusion of th	is additional lane,
6	Q. Thank you. So your testimony talks about the exclusion of	6 won't that additional lane help to	is additional lane,
6 7	Q. Thank you. So your testimony talks about the exclusion of the median; however, with the inclusion of the	6 won't that additional lane help to7 incidents and accidents?	is additional lane, o alleviate rear-end
6 7 8	Q. Thank you. So your testimony talks about the exclusion of the median; however, with the inclusion of the installation of the	 won't that additional lane help to incidents and accidents? A. I don't have sufficient inform 	is additional lane, alleviate rear-end
6 7 8 9	Q. Thank you. So your testimony talks about the exclusion of the median; however, with the inclusion of the installation of the THE COURT REPORTER: Ms. Foster, you cut out	 won't that additional lane help to incidents and accidents? A. I don't have sufficient inform the number of rear-end accidents 	is additional lane, b alleviate rear-end nation to deduce that are present.
6 7 8 9 10	Q. Thank you. So your testimony talks about the exclusion of the median; however, with the inclusion of the installation of the THE COURT REPORTER: Ms. Foster, you cut out for me	 won't that additional lane help to incidents and accidents? A. I don't have sufficient inform the number of rear-end accidents Q. Generally, then, in general 	is additional lane, o alleviate rear-end nation to deduce that are present. , will the addition
6 7 8 9	 Q. Thank you. So your testimony talks about the exclusion of the median; however, with the inclusion of the installation of the THE COURT REPORTER: Ms. Foster, you cut out for me A. Can you repeat the question? 	 won't that additional lane help to incidents and accidents? A. I don't have sufficient inform the number of rear-end accidents Q. Generally, then, in general of an additional lane help to aller 	is additional lane, o alleviate rear-end nation to deduce that are present. , will the addition
6 7 8 9 10 11	 Q. Thank you. So your testimony talks about the exclusion of the median; however, with the inclusion of the installation of the THE COURT REPORTER: Ms. Foster, you cut out for me A. Can you repeat the question? BY MS. FOSTER: 	 won't that additional lane help to incidents and accidents? A. I don't have sufficient inform the number of rear-end accidents Q. Generally, then, in general of an additional lane help to aller incidents and accidents? 	is additional lane, o alleviate rear-end nation to deduce that are present. , will the addition viate rear-end
6 7 8 9 10 11 12	 Q. Thank you. So your testimony talks about the exclusion of the median; however, with the inclusion of the installation of the THE COURT REPORTER: Ms. Foster, you cut out for me A. Can you repeat the question? 	 won't that additional lane help to incidents and accidents? A. I don't have sufficient inform the number of rear-end accidents Q. Generally, then, in general of an additional lane help to aller incidents and accidents? 	is additional lane, o alleviate rear-end nation to deduce that are present. , will the addition viate rear-end ould say that's too
6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	 Q. Thank you. So your testimony talks about the exclusion of the median; however, with the inclusion of the installation of the THE COURT REPORTER: Ms. Foster, you cut out for me A. Can you repeat the question? BY MS. FOSTER: Q. Yes, certainly. Apologies. 	 won't that additional lane help to incidents and accidents? A. I don't have sufficient inform the number of rear-end accidents Q. Generally, then, in general of an additional lane help to aller incidents and accidents? A. As a general statement, I we 	is additional lane, o alleviate rear-end nation to deduce that are present. , will the addition viate rear-end ould say that's too e it would not. So as a
6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	 Q. Thank you. So your testimony talks about the exclusion of the median; however, with the inclusion of the installation of the THE COURT REPORTER: Ms. Foster, you cut out for me A. Can you repeat the question? BY MS. FOSTER: Q. Yes, certainly. Apologies. So your testimony talks about the exclusion of 	 won't that additional lane help to incidents and accidents? A. I don't have sufficient inform the number of rear-end accidents Q. Generally, then, in general of an additional lane help to aller incidents and accidents? A. As a general statement, I we broad. There are instances where 	is additional lane, o alleviate rear-end nation to deduce that are present. , will the addition viate rear-end ould say that's too e it would not. So as a ver that yes.
6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	 Q. Thank you. So your testimony talks about the exclusion of the median; however, with the inclusion of the installation of the THE COURT REPORTER: Ms. Foster, you cut out for me A. Can you repeat the question? BY MS. FOSTER: Q. Yes, certainly. Apologies. So your testimony talks about the exclusion of the eight-inch high concrete median; however, with the 	 won't that additional lane help to incidents and accidents? A. I don't have sufficient inform the number of rear-end accidents Q. Generally, then, in general of an additional lane help to aller incidents and accidents? A. As a general statement, I we broad. There are instances where general statement, I couldn't answ 	is additional lane, o alleviate rear-end nation to deduce that are present. , will the addition viate rear-end ould say that's too e it would not. So as a ver that yes. point you back to
6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	 Q. Thank you. So your testimony talks about the exclusion of the median; however, with the inclusion of the installation of the THE COURT REPORTER: Ms. Foster, you cut out for me A. Can you repeat the question? BY MS. FOSTER: Q. Yes, certainly. Apologies. So your testimony talks about the exclusion of the eight-inch high concrete median; however, with the inclusion of the eight-inch-high concrete median, does 	 won't that additional lane help to incidents and accidents? A. I don't have sufficient inform the number of rear-end accidents Q. Generally, then, in general of an additional lane help to aller incidents and accidents? A. As a general statement, I we broad. There are instances where general statement, I couldn't answ Q. Okay. I would now like to 	is additional lane, o alleviate rear-end nation to deduce that are present. , will the addition viate rear-end ould say that's too e it would not. So as a ver that yes. point you back to ally at lines 24 and 25.
6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	 Q. Thank you. So your testimony talks about the exclusion of the median; however, with the inclusion of the installation of the THE COURT REPORTER: Ms. Foster, you cut out for me A. Can you repeat the question? BY MS. FOSTER: Q. Yes, certainly. Apologies. So your testimony talks about the exclusion of the eight-inch high concrete median; however, with the inclusion of the eight-inch-high concrete median, does this project eliminate vehicular hazards at the rail 	 won't that additional lane help to incidents and accidents? A. I don't have sufficient inform the number of rear-end accidents Q. Generally, then, in general of an additional lane help to aller incidents and accidents? A. As a general statement, I we broad. There are instances where general statement, I couldn't answ Q. Okay. I would now like to your testimony, page 2, specification 	is additional lane, o alleviate rear-end nation to deduce that are present. , will the addition viate rear-end ould say that's too e it would not. So as a ver that yes. point you back to ally at lines 24 and 25. to me?
6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	 Q. Thank you. So your testimony talks about the exclusion of the median; however, with the inclusion of the installation of the THE COURT REPORTER: Ms. Foster, you cut out for me A. Can you repeat the question? BY MS. FOSTER: Q. Yes, certainly. Apologies. So your testimony talks about the exclusion of the eight-inch high concrete median; however, with the inclusion of the eight-inch-high concrete median, does this project eliminate vehicular hazards at the rail highway crossing? 	 won't that additional lane help to incidents and accidents? A. I don't have sufficient inform the number of rear-end accidents Q. Generally, then, in general of an additional lane help to aller incidents and accidents? A. As a general statement, I will broad. There are instances where general statement, I couldn't answ Q. Okay. I would now like to your testimony, page 2, specification 	is additional lane, o alleviate rear-end nation to deduce that are present. , will the addition viate rear-end ould say that's too e it would not. So as a ver that yes. point you back to ally at lines 24 and 25. to me? ncludes signal
6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	 Q. Thank you. So your testimony talks about the exclusion of the median; however, with the inclusion of the installation of the THE COURT REPORTER: Ms. Foster, you cut out for me A. Can you repeat the question? BY MS. FOSTER: Q. Yes, certainly. Apologies. So your testimony talks about the exclusion of the eight-inch high concrete median; however, with the inclusion of the eight-inch-high concrete median, does this project eliminate vehicular hazards at the rail highway crossing? MS. REYNOLDS: Objection. Foundation. Speculation. MS. FOSTER: His testimony talks about the 	 won't that additional lane help to incidents and accidents? A. I don't have sufficient inform the number of rear-end accidents Q. Generally, then, in general of an additional lane help to aller incidents and accidents? A. As a general statement, I will broad. There are instances where general statement, I couldn't answ Q. Okay. I would now like to your testimony, page 2, specificat Can you please read those lines A. Sure. Yes. (As read) UP in maintenance fees and all construct agreements wherein the project ty 	is additional lane, o alleviate rear-end nation to deduce that are present. , will the addition viate rear-end ould say that's too e it would not. So as a ver that yes. point you back to ally at lines 24 and 25. to me? includes signal ction and maintenance
6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	 Q. Thank you. So your testimony talks about the exclusion of the median; however, with the inclusion of the installation of the THE COURT REPORTER: Ms. Foster, you cut out for me A. Can you repeat the question? BY MS. FOSTER: Q. Yes, certainly. Apologies. So your testimony talks about the exclusion of the eight-inch high concrete median; however, with the inclusion of the eight-inch-high concrete median, does this project eliminate vehicular hazards at the rail highway crossing? MS. REYNOLDS: Objection. Foundation. Speculation. MS. FOSTER: His testimony talks about the exclusion is not going to eliminate vehicular hazards, 	 won't that additional lane help to incidents and accidents? A. I don't have sufficient inform the number of rear-end accidents Q. Generally, then, in general of an additional lane help to aller incidents and accidents? A. As a general statement, I we broad. There are instances where general statement, I couldn't answ Q. Okay. I would now like to your testimony, page 2, specification A. Sure. Yes. (As read) UP in maintenance fees and all construct agreements wherein the project ty prohibit their inclusion. 	is additional lane, o alleviate rear-end nation to deduce that are present. , will the addition viate rear-end ould say that's too e it would not. So as a ver that yes. point you back to ally at lines 24 and 25. to me? includes signal ction and maintenance ype or funding do not
6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	 Q. Thank you. So your testimony talks about the exclusion of the median; however, with the inclusion of the installation of the THE COURT REPORTER: Ms. Foster, you cut out for me A. Can you repeat the question? BY MS. FOSTER: Q. Yes, certainly. Apologies. So your testimony talks about the exclusion of the eight-inch high concrete median; however, with the inclusion of the eight-inch-high concrete median, does this project eliminate vehicular hazards at the rail highway crossing? MS. REYNOLDS: Objection. Foundation. Speculation. MS. FOSTER: His testimony talks about the exclusion is not going to eliminate vehicular hazards, and I want to know why he excluded that from his 	 won't that additional lane help to incidents and accidents? A. I don't have sufficient inform the number of rear-end accidents Q. Generally, then, in general of an additional lane help to aller incidents and accidents? A. As a general statement, I we broad. There are instances where general statement, I couldn't answ Q. Okay. I would now like to your testimony, page 2, specification Can you please read those lines A. Sure. Yes. (As read) UP in maintenance fees and all construct agreements wherein the project ty prohibit their inclusion. Q. So based upon that testime 	is additional lane, o alleviate rear-end nation to deduce that are present. , will the addition viate rear-end ould say that's too e it would not. So as a ver that yes. point you back to ally at lines 24 and 25. to me? icludes signal ction and maintenance ype or funding do not
6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	 Q. Thank you. So your testimony talks about the exclusion of the median; however, with the inclusion of the installation of the THE COURT REPORTER: Ms. Foster, you cut out for me A. Can you repeat the question? BY MS. FOSTER: Q. Yes, certainly. Apologies. So your testimony talks about the exclusion of the eight-inch high concrete median; however, with the inclusion of the eight-inch-high concrete median, does this project eliminate vehicular hazards at the rail highway crossing? MS. REYNOLDS: Objection. Foundation. Speculation. MS. FOSTER: His testimony talks about the exclusion is not going to eliminate vehicular hazards, and I want to know why he excluded that from his calculation. 	 won't that additional lane help to incidents and accidents? A. I don't have sufficient inform the number of rear-end accidents Q. Generally, then, in general of an additional lane help to aller incidents and accidents? A. As a general statement, I we broad. There are instances where general statement, I couldn't answ Q. Okay. I would now like to your testimony, page 2, specifications A. Sure. Yes. (As read) UP in maintenance fees and all construct agreements wherein the project ty prohibit their inclusion. Q. So based upon that testime 	is additional lane, o alleviate rear-end nation to deduce that are present. , will the addition viate rear-end ould say that's too e it would not. So as a ver that yes. point you back to ally at lines 24 and 25. to me? acludes signal ction and maintenance ype or funding do not ony, can there be does prohibit the
6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	 Q. Thank you. So your testimony talks about the exclusion of the median; however, with the inclusion of the installation of the THE COURT REPORTER: Ms. Foster, you cut out for me A. Can you repeat the question? BY MS. FOSTER: Q. Yes, certainly. Apologies. So your testimony talks about the exclusion of the eight-inch high concrete median; however, with the inclusion of the eight-inch-high concrete median, does this project eliminate vehicular hazards at the rail highway crossing? MS. REYNOLDS: Objection. Foundation. Speculation. MS. FOSTER: His testimony talks about the exclusion is not going to eliminate vehicular hazards, and I want to know why he excluded that from his 	 won't that additional lane help to incidents and accidents? A. I don't have sufficient inform the number of rear-end accidents Q. Generally, then, in general of an additional lane help to aller incidents and accidents? A. As a general statement, I we broad. There are instances where general statement, I couldn't answ Q. Okay. I would now like to your testimony, page 2, specification Can you please read those lines A. Sure. Yes. (As read) UP in maintenance fees and all construct agreements wherein the project ty prohibit their inclusion. Q. So based upon that testime 	is additional lane, o alleviate rear-end nation to deduce that are present. , will the addition viate rear-end ould say that's too e it would not. So as a ver that yes. point you back to ally at lines 24 and 25. to me? acludes signal ction and maintenance ype or funding do not ony, can there be does prohibit the

23 (Pages 101 to 104)

	Page 105		Page 107
1	A. I understand that that could be the case, yes.	1	review this email chain and just let me know when you've
2	Q. Okay. And that is also the case in which the	2	finished reviewing it?
3	project type could prohibit the inclusion of maintenance	3	A. I reviewed it.
4	fees?	4	Q. Okay. Thank you.
5	A. Can you specify "project type"?	5	So based upon this email chain, did the City not
6	Q. We could talk about a road widening project	6	respond to and incorporate your various signal design
7	simply just adding a curb and gutter, actually replacing	7	requests into this crossing layout?
8	the track ties, just depending upon the construction	8	A. Can you specify my request?
9	project.	9	Q. Well, I have various emails here such as on page
10	A. Can you repeat the question with that	10	4 of 9, the very first email in which you state, Jeff,
11	understanding? Sorry.	11	please see attached diagram per our call if you have the
12	Q. Sure.	12	actual dimensions.
13	Is based upon your testimony, are there	13	Did they not when you requested and made
14	project types that would preclude the inclusion of	14	comments, did they not then incorporate those comments?
15	signal maintenance fees in the Construction and	15	A. It does appear that they haven't accommodated
16	Maintenance Agreement?	16	any recommendations, correct.
	-	1	-
17	A. There are no project types based on your	17 18	Q. Okay. And then does UP have to approve the
18	definition of "types" that would exclude signal	1	crossing layout when there are modifications to an
19	maintenance fees, assuming there are signals, traffic	19	at-grade crossing?
20	control devices being installed.	20	A. For what purpose do you say "have"? I guess I'm
21	Q. Okay. Thank you.	21	a little confused by the question.
22	Can I now have you pull up Exhibit EM-X8,	22	Q. I mean, would the City be allowed to proceed
23	please?	23	with the project if they had not gotten your approval on
24	A. Okay.	24	their crossing layout?
25	Q. And can you please do you recognize this	25	MS. REYNOLDS: Objection. Vague. Calls for
	Page 106		Page 108
1	document, these documents?	1	a legal conclusion.
2	A. Yes.	2	MS. FOSTER: It's not vague, Your Honor.
3	Q. And can you just explain to me what these are,	3	They testified to the fact that UP didn't request
4	please?	4	anything. That the City was the one who created these
5	A. This this is an email chain between myself	5	designs. I'm getting to the fact that UP was the one
6	and Jeff as far as the first email. I'm not sure the	6	who requested these designs and the City cannot go forth
7	trailing emails are looks to be dating back to some	7	without UP approval.
8	plan review comment type.	8	JUDGE HOWARD: I will allow the question.
9	Q. Okay. Would you agree if I told you that these	9	A. The City can, from my understanding, proceed
10	are emails regarding signal design and comments relating	10	through a petition process without UP's approval.
11	to signal design?	11	BY MS. FOSTER:
12	A. I would agree that these are regarding signal	12	Q. That's not the question I appreciate the
13	placement.	13	answer.
14	Q. And then do you believe this to be a true and	14	Isn't it true that in order for the City to
15	correct copy of these emails?	15	actually physically do the work, the City needs a
16	A. From what I can see, this appears to be true.	16	Construction and Maintenance Agreement from UP?
17	Q. Okay. Thank you.	17	A. That's correct.
18	MS. FOSTER: The City would move to admit	18	Q. Would UP have started drafting and/or would they
19	Exhibit EM-X8 into the record.	19	enter into a Construction and Maintenance Agreement if
20	MS. REYNOLDS: No objection from the	20	the City does not have an approved crossing layout?
21	Railroad.	21	A. Typically, no.
22	JUDGE HOWARD: Admitted.	22	Q. Okay. Thank you.
23	(Exhibit EM-X8 admitted.)	23	Then just a few few more questions, Mr. Mays.
24	BY MS. FOSTER:	24	Can fees and project costs change from the
· · ·			
25	Q. So, Mr. Mays, can I please just have you quickly	25	initial estimate that you send to a municipality to the

24 (Pages 105 to 108)

	Page 109		Page 111
1	actual Construction and Maintenance Agreement?	1	Mr. Lochmiller constituted the City's approval of the
2	A. The fees and the estimate are what is reflected	2	cost and fees for this project, why then did UP require
3	as exhibit to the CM agreement.	3	a Construction and Maintenance Agreement?
4	Q. Understood.	4	A. The Construction and Maintenance Agreement has
5	But you mentioned how you sent these estimates	5	other documents, has other paragraphs, and other
6	in a December 8th email to Mr. Lochmiller. Are you	6	information that would be shared as part of that
7	saying that those fees will never change from when UP	7	agreement. This email would not include those terms for
8	then sends a Construction and Maintenance Agreement?	8	those other items.
9	A. No, because those estimates expire.	9	Q. So then this email doesn't constitute approval
10	Q. So the fees and costs can change?	10	of the project?
11	A. The fees provided in the estimates and the costs	11	MS. REYNOLDS: Objection. Calls for a legal
12	therein can expire.	12	conclusion.
13	Q. But I'm asking if they can change, meaning, will	13	MS. FOSTER: It doesn't. Once again, they
14	the numbers in the Construction and Maintenance	14	keep they've testified to the fact that this email
15	Agreement ever be different from the estimate that you	15	somehow constituted City approval to maintenance fees.
16	provided by the email?	16	JUDGE HOWARD: I will allow the question.
17	A. That could be the case wherein the agreement is	17	And and but the Railroad may feel free to redirect
18	not signed before the estimates expire.	18	on this point.
19	Q. Okay. Thank you.	19	BY MS. FOSTER:
20	Just one last question. This goes back to that	20	Q. So once again, Mr. Mays, this email did not
21	December 8th email.	21	constitute approval of the project; is that correct?
22	So if that email constituted City approval of	22	MS. REYNOLDS: Objection. Asked and
23	the cost and fees, then why did UP require a	23	answered.
24	Construction and Maintenance Agreement?	24	MS. FOSTER: He didn't answer my question.
25	A. One second. Let me pull up that email.	25	You objected and I'm reasking it.
	Page 110		Page 112
1	JUDGE HOWARD: Are we able to give an	1	JUDGE HOWARD: Yeah, I am agreeing with the
2	exhibit for this email?	2	City on that one.
3	THE WITNESS: Yeah, I'm not seeing	3	BY MS. FOSTER:
4	MS. FOSTER: It is Exhibit EM-5.	4	Q. Would you like me to ask again, Mr. Mays?
5	A. Okay. Can you repeat the question? I'm sorry.	5	A. Yes, please.
6	BY MS. FOSTER:	6	Q. Does the email from Mr. Lochmiller or I'm
7	Q. Sure.	7	sorry. Why is that email from Mr. Lochmiller
8	If the email, which UP has stated constitutes		approval of the project? Did that email constitute
9 10	approval of all the cost and fees regarding this crossing, if that email constituted approval from the	9 10	approval of the project? A. The email was never intended to approve the
11	City, then why did UP then require a Construction and	11	project. This email is an approval of the estimates and
12	Maintenance Agreement?	12	AREMA costs and the other items that are listed out.
13	Maintenance Agreement? MS. REYNOLDS: Objection. Calls for a legal	13	MS. FOSTER: Okay. That is all the City
14	conclusion.	14	has, Judge Howard.
15	MS. FOSTER: It doesn't, Your Honor. His	15	JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Do we have any
16	testimony has been that Mr. Lochmiller accepted these	16	redirect from Union Pacific?
17	costs and fees. This goes directly to the fact that	17	MR. ROBERSON: If I may, Your Honor, I have
18	that email did not constitute acceptance.	18	a small number of questions that probably would be
19	JUDGE HOWARD: I will allow the question.	19	better asked before redirect, if possible.
20	As I indicated, at the Commission, we will frequently	20	JUDGE HOWARD: Does Union Pacific mind if
21	allow testimony about regulatory practice and opinions	21	Staff asks his questions now or should we take them
22	that that are in the gray area.	22	next?
23	MS. FOSTER: Thank you.	23	MS. REYNOLDS: I agree with Staff, that it
24	BY MS. FOSTER:	24	may make sense to do them now.
25	Q. So once again, Mr. Mays, if that email from	25	JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Mr. Roberson, you

25 (Pages 109 to 112)

	Page 113	Page 115
1	may proceed.	1 crossing, the traffic control system would be modified
2	CROSS-EXAMINATION	2 in some way.
3	BY MR. ROBERSON:	3 Q. Okay. Do you often deal with the funding
4	Q. Good morning, Mr. Mays. You were just talking	4 sources?
5	about your testimony, page 2, line 14, which is your	5 A. I do not directly deal with the funding sources.
б	discussion of whether or not this is a Section 130	6 Q. Okay. But you are aware that state law doesn't
7	program.	7 require the expenditure of Section 130 funds for it to
8	To your knowledge, are there other federal aid	8 be considered a federal aid program, correct?
9	programs that fund grade crossing improvements?	9 MS. REYNOLDS: Objection. Calls for a legal
10	A. Yes, I am aware there would be other federal	10 conclusion.
11	funds available for other types of projects, yes.	11 JUDGE HOWARD: I am going to deny the
12	Q. And could you tell us what those programs would	12 objection and we've already I've already denied a
13	be?	13 similar objection.
14	A. I I couldn't recite exactly, but I'm	14 A. Can you repeat the question? Sorry.
15	certainly familiar that familiar enough to know that	15 BY MR. ROBERSON:
16	there are other federal sources of funds	16 Q. Yeah.
17	Q. Are	17 Are you aware that state law doesn't require the
18	A outside of Section 130.	18 expenditure of Section 130 funds for a program to be
19	Q. Sorry.	19 considered funded by a federal aid program?
20	Are service transportation block grants under 23	20 A. Yes, I would imagine that to be true.
21	USC Section 133 one of those types of programs?	21 Q. Okay. Ms. Foster was just asking you about kind
22	A. I'm not familiar.	22 of reductions in traffic accidents, and you said you
23	Q. Are highway safety improvement program grants	23 couldn't say if this project would reduce the number of
24	under 23 USC Section 148 another example?	24 accidents because I think you said you didn't have
25	A. I'm not familiar.	25 sufficient info. I'm just curious, what kind of info
1	Page 114 Q. Okay. So do you do a lot of grade crossings,	Page 116 1 would you need?
2	projects at grade crossings?	2 A. I believe the claim was regarding rear-end
3	A. I do grade crossing projects, yes.	3 accidents, and the information would be typically
4	Q. And so personally, so you work for Benesch;	4 incident data.
5	is that correct?	5 Q. So I guess I don't understand how the baseline
6	A. Correct.	6 would affect whether or not the project would reduce the
7	Q. So is that a contractor for Union Pacific?	7 number of collisions. Right? Because this is this
8	A. We have a contract with UP, a consultant on	 8 question is relative to the baseline, right? 9 A Can you reword that a different way Louess?
9	behalf of UP, correct.	
10	Q. So you run UP's public construction projects; is	10 Q. Well, I guess you're saying you couldn't answer 11 her guestion because you didn't know how frequent
11	that is that a proper understanding of your job?	
12 13	A. In the state of Washington, I manage the	
14	projects, even outside of construction, to include the preliminary side as well.	 baseline is, doesn't this project reduce the number of accidents from that baseline?
15	Q. Okay. So, I guess, do you have much experience	15 A. Well, that cannot be the case. There could be
16	with grade crossing improvement programs?	16 motorist confusion at some cases when you have
17	A. The programs as in the funding?	17 additional lanes that aren't needed.
18	Q. Well, no, just grade crossing improvements.	18 Q. Okay. Do you have any reason to believe that
18 19	We'll talk about the funding in a second.	19 this extra lane isn't needed?
20	A. I have I do have experience working grade	20 A. I don't have enough information to say one way
20 21	crossing projects, yes.	21 or another.
22	Q. So does that include like signals,	22 Q. And the information you would need would be the
23	reconstruction, signals maintenance, installing new	23 frequency of accidents?
20	reserved detern, orginale manifemation, installing new	
24	grade crossing, protective warning devices?	
24 25	grade crossing, protective warning devices? A. Generally it would include projects where grade	 A. That would be a very big piece of it. Q. Okay.

26 (Pages 113 to 116)

	Page 117		Page 119
1	MR. ROBERSON: Okay. I think that's all the	1	Q. In other words, the City of Spokane Valley
	estions I have, Judge Howard. Thank you.	2	developed a project and went to the Railroad, not the
3	JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you.	3	other way around; is that right?
4	Union Pacific may redirect the witness.	4	A. Correct.
5	MS. REYNOLDS: Thank you, Your Honor.	5	Q. I'd like to ask you about the construction and
6	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,	6	maintenance process.
7	REDIRECTEXAMINATION	7	Is it common for parties to agree to terms in
8 BY	MS. REYNOLDS:	8	less formal ways before memorializing the terms in a
	. Mr. Mays, can you please pull up the statute. I	9	Construction and Maintenance Agreement?
	ieve it was marked EM-8X. I'm sorry, EM-9X. Do you	10	A. Yes.
	ve that in front of you, sir?	11	Q. And did you interpret the December 8th email
	. I do.	12	from Robert Lochmiller saying the City is okay with this
13 Q	. Okay. Does this project involve the	13	and like to move forward as an indication that you
14 ins	tallation of a grade crossing protective device?	14	should include City responsibility for maintenance in
15 A	. This project includes includes it includes	15	the draft CMA?
16 a re	einstallation. I mean, in layman's terms a	16	A. Yes.
	pocation potentially.	17	Q. Was elimination of rear-end accidents the
18 Q	. And have you seen any evidence or data that	18	impetus for the proposed grade change modifications at
19 the	re's an installation of a new grade crossing	19	Barker Road?
20 pro	tective device that's associated with the UP Barker	20	A. Not that I'm aware.
21 Ro a	ad crossing?	21	MS. REYNOLDS: Okay. Mr. Mays, those are
22 A	. Can you clarify "new"?	22	all the questions I have for you at this time. Thank
23 Q	. Yes. Is there anything other than relocating	23	you.
24 dev	vices, is there is this a new system that's being	24	JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Mr. Mays, thank
25 ins	talled or an existing system?	25	you for your testimony today. You may feel free to turn
	Page 118		Page 120
	. No, there are no additional devices being	1	off your camera.
	alled at this location.	2	And could we have Peggy Ygbuhay turn on her
	. And do you know what federal aid highway funds	3	camera. Please raise your right hand and I will swear
	at issue for the project modifications to the	4	you in.
	ssing specifically as opposed to the project at	5	Oh, and, Mr. Mays, would you mind muting
6 larg	•	6	your phone that you're calling in. I'm going to mute
	. No, I don't have I don't have that level of	7	this from here just so we're not getting that feedback.
-	rmation.	8	(Peggy Ygbuhay sworn.)
	. Now, you were asked a series of questions about	9	JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you.
	City incorporating Union Pacific's requested changes the design of the proposed crossing modifications.	10 11	Ms. Reynolds, you may introduce the witness.
	you remember those questions?	12	
	. Yes.	13	E X A M I N A T I O N BY MS. REYNOLDS:
	Did Union Pacific approach the City of Spokane	14	Q. Good morning. Could you please state your name
	ley and say, We would like to make grade crossing	15	for the record?
	difications at Barker Road because of concerns about	16	A. Yes. Good afternoon. Peggy Ygbuhay,
	blic safety?	17	Y-g-b-u-h-a-y.
	. No.	18	Q. And what do you do for a living?
	What was the impetus for the discussions between	19	A. I work for Union Pacific Railroad in our
	City of Spokane Valley and you and your colleagues	20	engineering department for industry and public projects.
	Inion Pacific about the Barker Road project?	21	Q. How long have you been employed in that
	. My understanding of the project was it was	22	capacity?
	dominantly a pedestrian activity at the time and	23	A. This is my 28th year.
	entially just some amount of future development. You	24	Q. And do you have in front of you your prefiled
	w, it's pretty typical.	25	testimony in this case that is marked as Exhibit PY-1T?
	·····		

27 (Pages 117 to 120)

	Page 121	Page 123
1	A. I do.	1 line 25?
2	Q. And is that your testimony?	2 MS. FOSTER: You're correct. My apologies,
3	A. Yes.	³ Judge Howard. I'll clarify a little bit.
4	MS. REYNOLDS: All right. With that, Union	4 BY MS. FOSTER:
5	Pacific would tender Ms. Ygbuhay for cross-examination.	5 Q. Do you have a cost sharing agreement in
6	JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. And just so we're	6 Washington?
7	making a clear record here, we've already admitted PY-1T	7 A. I do not.
8	with the exception of page 7, line 9 to page 8, line 25.	8 Q. Okay. So do you have a cost sharing agreement
9	Were there any objections to the supporting Exhibits	9 with the City of Spokane Valley?
10	PY-2 through PY-7?	10 A. We have various agreements with various
11	MS. FOSTER: Not from the City.	agencies, and I have not analyzed each agreement. So
12	MR. ROBERSON: Nor from Staff.	12 each agreement has different articles and sections
13	JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Thank you. PY-2	13 relative to maintenance costs. So I believe there was
14	through PY-7 are admitted.	14 one agreement. I don't I don't recall this time if
15	(Exhibits PY-2 through PY-7 admitted.)	15 it was actually with the City of Spokane Valley or a
16	JUDGE HOWARD: And, Ms. Foster, you may	16 different City in the state of Washington.
17	proceed with your cross.	17 Q. Okay. So to the best of your knowledge, is
18	MS. FOSTER: Thank you, Judge Howard.	18 there a cost sharing agreement between UP and the City
19		19 of Spokane Valley?
20	C R O S S - E X A M I N A T I O N	A. Not that I'm aware as I sit here today.
21	BY MS. FOSTER:	21 Q. Do you currently charge the City of Spokane
22	Q. Good afternoon now, Ms. Ygbuhay. What is your	22 Valley for signal maintenance at this crossing location?
23	knowledge of municipal infrastructure improvement	23 A. No.
24	projects?	24 Q. Okay. I would, in fact, like to pull up now I
25	A. I have very little knowledge of municipal	25 believe it's our cross-examination Exhibit P Y-8X, but
	Page 122	Page 124
1		
1	improvement projects.	 it's also the exhibit to your testimony, PY-5, which is the 2017 Construction and Maintenance Agreement. Can
2 3	Q. Has preliminary engineering been completed for this project?	3 you pull that out?
4		4 A. Yeah.
4 5	 A. It's still in a preliminary engineering phase until we enter into a Construction and Maintenance 	5 MS. FOSTER: And, Judge Howard, I think this
6	Agreement.	6 may be a question Ms. Reynolds had when she was
7	Q. But has UP been reimbursed for the preliminary	 ring be a question wish regional may when she was cross-examining, but would you like us to lay foundation
8	engineering costs that it has already expended?	8 for the cross-examination exhibit even though it's the
9	A. Union Pacific accepted an agreement from the	 9 same as her testimony?
10	City for reimbursement of the preliminary design phase	10 JUDGE HOWARD: Do the other parties have any
11	and engineering phase.	11 concerns or objections to this?
12	Q. Right. But my question was whether or not Union	12 MR. ROBERSON: None from Staff.
13	Pacific had actually been reimbursed, meaning, has the	13 MS. REYNOLDS: None from Union Pacific, Your
14	City executed their portion of the contract and paid UP	14 Honor.
15	for the preliminary engineering costs?	15 JUDGE HOWARD: All right. I don't believe
16	A. That is my understanding, that they are paying	that there is a need to to lay the foundation. I'm
17	for these costs to reimbursing UP.	17 going to change my thinking on that slightly. We can
18	Q. Okay. Now I would like to go to your testimony,	18 admit PY-8X into evidence.
19	if we may.	19 (Exhibit PY-8X admitted.)
20	You mention that you have local agreements in 21	20 MS. FOSTER: Thank you, Judge Howard.
21	of the 23 states in which you operate. What are those	21 BY MS. FOSTER:
22	21 states that you have a cost sharing agreement in?	22 Q. Would you agree that this 2017 agreement was
23	JUDGE HOWARD: Ms. Foster, I may stop you	23 entered into between UP and Spokane Valley regarding
24	there. Are we within the portions of the testimony that	24 surface construction work?
25	we did not admit? Is it page 7, line 9 through page 8	A. Yeah, surface maintenance work, that's correct.

28 (Pages 121 to 124)

	Page 125	Page 127
1	Q. Okay. And there was a statement by your counsel	1 which states the opposite, correct? Which states that
2	which stated that pursuant to this agreement, all	2 if there's a federal aid project, the Railroad is to
3	maintenance costs were to be borne by Spokane Valley.	3 bear the cost of maintenance; is that also correct?
4	Do you agree with that statement?	4 MS. REYNOLDS: Objection. Misstates
5	A. Maintenance costs relative to the road	5 A. That is correct.
6	approaches	6 MS. REYNOLDS: the statute.
7	Q. In the	7 MS. FOSTER: I'm I could cite the
8	A outside of the	8 statute exactly for what it states. I'm just trying to
9	(Simultaneous talking.)	9 point out that there's a conflict between the Public
10	A. Yeah.	10 Projects Manual and the statute to help illuminate my
11	Q. Yes, you would. Okay.	11 question.
12	So I would like to point to you, if you could	12 JUDGE HOWARD: I will allow the question.
13	please go with me to page 13 on your Exhibit PY-8X.	13 BY MS. FOSTER:
14	A. Yes, I'm here.	14 Q. So you would agree with me, then, that there's a
15	Q. Okay. Specifically, Section 5, Subsection A,	15 conflict between the statute and there's a conflict
16	can you please read that for me?	16 between the Public Project Manual?
17	A. (As read) The political body shall at its own	17 A. Yeah. The Public Project Manual provides the
18	sole expense maintain, repair, and renew our costs to be	18 Union Pacific guidelines for public projects.
19	maintained, repaired, and renewed the entire crossing	19 Q. Right. But there's a conflict with state law,
20	area and roadway except the portions between the track	20 correct?
21	tie-ends, which shall be maintained by and at the	A. Which is why we're here today, yes.
22	expense of the Railroad.	22 Q. Well, have you ever had that in other
23	Q. So Spokane Valley doesn't pay all maintenance	23 jurisdictions?
24	costs at this location?	A. There has been not me personally, but my
25	A. No, not outside of the track tie-ends, that's	25 my company has, yes.
	- 100	
	Page 126	Page 128
1		
1 2	correct.	1 Q. Certainly.
		1Q. Certainly.2So when you're doing a project and there is a
2	correct. Q. Okay. So UP does pay maintenance costs for its facilities?	1Q. Certainly.2So when you're doing a project and there is a3conflict between the manual and we'll say state and/or
2 3	correct. Q. Okay. So UP does pay maintenance costs for its facilities? A. Yes, Union Pacific is bearing the maintenance	1Q. Certainly.2So when you're doing a project and there is a3conflict between the manual and we'll say state and/or4federal law, what controls?
2 3 4	correct. Q. Okay. So UP does pay maintenance costs for its facilities? A. Yes, Union Pacific is bearing the maintenance burden here, yes.	1Q. Certainly.2So when you're doing a project and there is a3conflict between the manual and we'll say state and/or4federal law, what controls?
2 3 4 5	 correct. Q. Okay. So UP does pay maintenance costs for its facilities? A. Yes, Union Pacific is bearing the maintenance burden here, yes. Q. Okay. And then lastly, I just want to reference 	1Q. Certainly.2So when you're doing a project and there is a3conflict between the manual and we'll say state and/or4federal law, what controls?5MS. REYNOLDS: Objection. Calls for a legal6conclusion.
2 3 4 5 6	 correct. Q. Okay. So UP does pay maintenance costs for its facilities? A. Yes, Union Pacific is bearing the maintenance burden here, yes. Q. Okay. And then lastly, I just want to reference and go to your Exhibit PY-6, which is the Union Pacific 	1Q. Certainly.2So when you're doing a project and there is a3conflict between the manual and we'll say state and/or4federal law, what controls?5MS. REYNOLDS: Objection. Calls for a legal6conclusion.7MS. FOSTER: She just stated that there have
2 3 4 5 6 7	 correct. Q. Okay. So UP does pay maintenance costs for its facilities? A. Yes, Union Pacific is bearing the maintenance burden here, yes. Q. Okay. And then lastly, I just want to reference and go to your Exhibit PY-6, which is the Union Pacific Public Policy Manual. 	1Q. Certainly.2So when you're doing a project and there is a3conflict between the manual and we'll say state and/or4federal law, what controls?5MS. REYNOLDS: Objection. Calls for a legal6conclusion.7MS. FOSTER: She just stated that there have8been instances. That's important to this. You
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	 correct. Q. Okay. So UP does pay maintenance costs for its facilities? A. Yes, Union Pacific is bearing the maintenance burden here, yes. Q. Okay. And then lastly, I just want to reference and go to your Exhibit PY-6, which is the Union Pacific Public Policy Manual. A. Okay. 	1Q. Certainly.2So when you're doing a project and there is a3conflict between the manual and we'll say state and/or4federal law, what controls?5MS. REYNOLDS: Objection. Calls for a legal6conclusion.7MS. FOSTER: She just stated that there have8been instances. That's important to this. You9introduced the Public Project Manual into the record as
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	 correct. Q. Okay. So UP does pay maintenance costs for its facilities? A. Yes, Union Pacific is bearing the maintenance burden here, yes. Q. Okay. And then lastly, I just want to reference and go to your Exhibit PY-6, which is the Union Pacific Public Policy Manual. 	1Q. Certainly.2So when you're doing a project and there is a3conflict between the manual and we'll say state and/or4federal law, what controls?5MS. REYNOLDS: Objection. Calls for a legal6conclusion.7MS. FOSTER: She just stated that there have8been instances. That's important to this. You9introduced the Public Project Manual into the record as
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	 correct. Q. Okay. So UP does pay maintenance costs for its facilities? A. Yes, Union Pacific is bearing the maintenance burden here, yes. Q. Okay. And then lastly, I just want to reference and go to your Exhibit PY-6, which is the Union Pacific Public Policy Manual. A. Okay. Q. So are there ever times in which, you know, 	1Q. Certainly.2So when you're doing a project and there is a3conflict between the manual and we'll say state and/or4federal law, what controls?5MS. REYNOLDS: Objection. Calls for a legal6conclusion.7MS. FOSTER: She just stated that there have8been instances. That's important to this. You9introduced the Public Project Manual into the record as10though that's the law in this case.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	 correct. Q. Okay. So UP does pay maintenance costs for its facilities? A. Yes, Union Pacific is bearing the maintenance burden here, yes. Q. Okay. And then lastly, I just want to reference and go to your Exhibit PY-6, which is the Union Pacific Public Policy Manual. A. Okay. Q. So are there ever times in which, you know, you're doing a project and there are certain things in 	1Q. Certainly.2So when you're doing a project and there is a3conflict between the manual and we'll say state and/or4federal law, what controls?5MS. REYNOLDS: Objection. Calls for a legal6conclusion.7MS. FOSTER: She just stated that there have8been instances. That's important to this. You9introduced the Public Project Manual into the record as10though that's the law in this case.11JUDGE HOWARD: I will allow the question
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	 correct. Q. Okay. So UP does pay maintenance costs for its facilities? A. Yes, Union Pacific is bearing the maintenance burden here, yes. Q. Okay. And then lastly, I just want to reference and go to your Exhibit PY-6, which is the Union Pacific Public Policy Manual. A. Okay. Q. So are there ever times in which, you know, you're doing a project and there are certain things in the public projects manual, but there's a conflict between state and federal law? 	1Q. Certainly.2So when you're doing a project and there is a3conflict between the manual and we'll say state and/or4federal law, what controls?5MS. REYNOLDS: Objection. Calls for a legal6conclusion.7MS. FOSTER: She just stated that there have8been instances. That's important to this. You9introduced the Public Project Manual into the record as10though that's the law in this case.11JUDGE HOWARD: I will allow the question12because it it could be understood as going to what
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	 correct. Q. Okay. So UP does pay maintenance costs for its facilities? A. Yes, Union Pacific is bearing the maintenance burden here, yes. Q. Okay. And then lastly, I just want to reference and go to your Exhibit PY-6, which is the Union Pacific Public Policy Manual. A. Okay. Q. So are there ever times in which, you know, you're doing a project and there are certain things in the public projects manual, but there's a conflict 	1Q. Certainly.2So when you're doing a project and there is a3conflict between the manual and we'll say state and/or4federal law, what controls?5MS. REYNOLDS: Objection. Calls for a legal6conclusion.7MS. FOSTER: She just stated that there have8been instances. That's important to this. You9introduced the Public Project Manual into the record as10though that's the law in this case.11JUDGE HOWARD: I will allow the question12because it it could be understood as going to what13their practice is.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	 correct. Q. Okay. So UP does pay maintenance costs for its facilities? A. Yes, Union Pacific is bearing the maintenance burden here, yes. Q. Okay. And then lastly, I just want to reference and go to your Exhibit PY-6, which is the Union Pacific Public Policy Manual. A. Okay. Q. So are there ever times in which, you know, you're doing a project and there are certain things in the public projects manual, but there's a conflict between state and federal law? A. I mean, I guess I would have to know what 	1 Q. Certainly. 2 So when you're doing a project and there is a 3 conflict between the manual and we'll say state and/or 4 federal law, what controls? 5 MS. REYNOLDS: Objection. Calls for a legal 6 conclusion. 7 MS. FOSTER: She just stated that there have 8 been instances. That's important to this. You 9 introduced the Public Project Manual into the record as 10 though that's the law in this case. 11 JUDGE HOWARD: I will allow the question 12 because it it could be understood as going to what 13 their practice is. 14 BY MS. FOSTER:
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	 correct. Q. Okay. So UP does pay maintenance costs for its facilities? A. Yes, Union Pacific is bearing the maintenance burden here, yes. Q. Okay. And then lastly, I just want to reference and go to your Exhibit PY-6, which is the Union Pacific Public Policy Manual. A. Okay. Q. So are there ever times in which, you know, you're doing a project and there are certain things in the public projects manual, but there's a conflict between state and federal law? A. I mean, I guess I would have to know what specifically you're referring to. Q. Well, sure. I'm just thinking about in this 	1Q. Certainly.2So when you're doing a project and there is a3conflict between the manual and we'll say state and/or4federal law, what controls?5MS. REYNOLDS: Objection. Calls for a legal6conclusion.7MS. FOSTER: She just stated that there have8been instances. That's important to this. You9introduced the Public Project Manual into the record as10though that's the law in this case.11JUDGE HOWARD: I will allow the question12because it it could be understood as going to what13their practice is.14BY MS. FOSTER:15Q. And once again
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	 correct. Q. Okay. So UP does pay maintenance costs for its facilities? A. Yes, Union Pacific is bearing the maintenance burden here, yes. Q. Okay. And then lastly, I just want to reference and go to your Exhibit PY-6, which is the Union Pacific Public Policy Manual. A. Okay. Q. So are there ever times in which, you know, you're doing a project and there are certain things in the public projects manual, but there's a conflict between state and federal law? A. I mean, I guess I would have to know what specifically you're referring to. 	1Q. Certainly.2So when you're doing a project and there is a3conflict between the manual and we'll say state and/or4federal law, what controls?5MS. REYNOLDS: Objection. Calls for a legal6conclusion.7MS. FOSTER: She just stated that there have8been instances. That's important to this. You9introduced the Public Project Manual into the record as10though that's the law in this case.11JUDGE HOWARD: I will allow the question12because it it could be understood as going to what13their practice is.14BY MS. FOSTER:15Q. And once again16A. Federal law.17Q. Federal law
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	 correct. Q. Okay. So UP does pay maintenance costs for its facilities? A. Yes, Union Pacific is bearing the maintenance burden here, yes. Q. Okay. And then lastly, I just want to reference and go to your Exhibit PY-6, which is the Union Pacific Public Policy Manual. A. Okay. Q. So are there ever times in which, you know, you're doing a project and there are certain things in the public projects manual, but there's a conflict between state and federal law? A. I mean, I guess I would have to know what specifically you're referring to. Q. Well, sure. I'm just thinking about in this case, I'm assuming that I don't want to get into my 	1 Q. Certainly. 2 So when you're doing a project and there is a 3 conflict between the manual and we'll say state and/or 4 federal law, what controls? 5 MS. REYNOLDS: Objection. Calls for a legal 6 conclusion. 7 MS. FOSTER: She just stated that there have 8 been instances. That's important to this. You 9 introduced the Public Project Manual into the record as 10 though that's the law in this case. 11 JUDGE HOWARD: I will allow the question 12 because it it could be understood as going to what 13 their practice is. 14 BY MS. FOSTER: 15 Q. And once again 16 A. Federal law. 17 Q. Federal law.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	 correct. Q. Okay. So UP does pay maintenance costs for its facilities? A. Yes, Union Pacific is bearing the maintenance burden here, yes. Q. Okay. And then lastly, I just want to reference and go to your Exhibit PY-6, which is the Union Pacific Public Policy Manual. A. Okay. Q. So are there ever times in which, you know, you're doing a project and there are certain things in the public projects manual, but there's a conflict between state and federal law? A. I mean, I guess I would have to know what specifically you're referring to. Q. Well, sure. I'm just thinking about in this case, I'm assuming that I don't want to get into my own testimony or my own thoughts, but I'm assuming the Public Project Manual was introduced into evidence 	1Q. Certainly.2So when you're doing a project and there is a3conflict between the manual and we'll say state and/or4federal law, what controls?5MS. REYNOLDS: Objection. Calls for a legal6conclusion.7MS. FOSTER: She just stated that there have8been instances. That's important to this. You9introduced the Public Project Manual into the record as10though that's the law in this case.11JUDGE HOWARD: I will allow the question12because it it could be understood as going to what13their practice is.14BY MS. FOSTER:15Q. And once again16A. Federal law.17Q. Federal law18(Simultaneous talking.)
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	 correct. Q. Okay. So UP does pay maintenance costs for its facilities? A. Yes, Union Pacific is bearing the maintenance burden here, yes. Q. Okay. And then lastly, I just want to reference and go to your Exhibit PY-6, which is the Union Pacific Public Policy Manual. A. Okay. Q. So are there ever times in which, you know, you're doing a project and there are certain things in the public projects manual, but there's a conflict between state and federal law? A. I mean, I guess I would have to know what specifically you're referring to. Q. Well, sure. I'm just thinking about in this case, I'm assuming that I don't want to get into my own testimony or my own thoughts, but I'm assuming the Public Project Manual was introduced into evidence because there's a section in there on UP charging 	1 Q. Certainly. 2 So when you're doing a project and there is a 3 conflict between the manual and we'll say state and/or 4 federal law, what controls? 5 MS. REYNOLDS: Objection. Calls for a legal 6 conclusion. 7 MS. FOSTER: She just stated that there have 8 been instances. That's important to this. You 9 introduced the Public Project Manual into the record as 10 though that's the law in this case. 11 JUDGE HOWARD: I will allow the question 12 because it it could be understood as going to what 13 their practice is. 14 BY MS. FOSTER: 15 Q. And once again 16 A. Federal law. 17 Q. Federal law 18 (Simultaneous talking.) 19 Q. I'm sorry.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	 correct. Q. Okay. So UP does pay maintenance costs for its facilities? A. Yes, Union Pacific is bearing the maintenance burden here, yes. Q. Okay. And then lastly, I just want to reference and go to your Exhibit PY-6, which is the Union Pacific Public Policy Manual. A. Okay. Q. So are there ever times in which, you know, you're doing a project and there are certain things in the public projects manual, but there's a conflict between state and federal law? A. I mean, I guess I would have to know what specifically you're referring to. Q. Well, sure. I'm just thinking about in this case, I'm assuming that I don't want to get into my own testimony or my own thoughts, but I'm assuming the Public Project Manual was introduced into evidence because there's a section in there on UP charging maintenance costs to municipalities. Is that an 	1Q. Certainly.2So when you're doing a project and there is a3conflict between the manual and we'll say state and/or4federal law, what controls?5MS. REYNOLDS: Objection. Calls for a legal6conclusion.7MS. FOSTER: She just stated that there have8been instances. That's important to this. You9introduced the Public Project Manual into the record as10though that's the law in this case.11JUDGE HOWARD: I will allow the question12because it it could be understood as going to what13their practice is.14BY MS. FOSTER:15Q. And once again16A. Federal law.17Q. Federal law.19Q. I'm sorry.20A. Federal law.21Q. Okay. Well, what about when there's a conflict
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	 correct. Q. Okay. So UP does pay maintenance costs for its facilities? A. Yes, Union Pacific is bearing the maintenance burden here, yes. Q. Okay. And then lastly, I just want to reference and go to your Exhibit PY-6, which is the Union Pacific Public Policy Manual. A. Okay. Q. So are there ever times in which, you know, you're doing a project and there are certain things in the public projects manual, but there's a conflict between state and federal law? A. I mean, I guess I would have to know what specifically you're referring to. Q. Well, sure. I'm just thinking about in this case, I'm assuming that I don't want to get into my own testimony or my own thoughts, but I'm assuming the Public Project Manual was introduced into evidence because there's a section in there on UP charging 	1Q. Certainly.2So when you're doing a project and there is a3conflict between the manual and we'll say state and/or4federal law, what controls?5MS. REYNOLDS: Objection. Calls for a legal6conclusion.7MS. FOSTER: She just stated that there have8been instances. That's important to this. You9introduced the Public Project Manual into the record as10though that's the law in this case.11JUDGE HOWARD: I will allow the question12because it it could be understood as going to what13their practice is.14BY MS. FOSTER:15Q. And once again16A. Federal law.17Q. Federal law18(Simultaneous talking.)19Q. I'm sorry.20A. Federal law.21Q. Okay. Well, what about when there's a conflict
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	 correct. Q. Okay. So UP does pay maintenance costs for its facilities? A. Yes, Union Pacific is bearing the maintenance burden here, yes. Q. Okay. And then lastly, I just want to reference and go to your Exhibit PY-6, which is the Union Pacific Public Policy Manual. A. Okay. Q. So are there ever times in which, you know, you're doing a project and there are certain things in the public projects manual, but there's a conflict between state and federal law? A. I mean, I guess I would have to know what specifically you're referring to. Q. Well, sure. I'm just thinking about in this case, I'm assuming that I don't want to get into my own testimony or my own thoughts, but I'm assuming the Public Project Manual was introduced into evidence because there's a section in there on UP charging maintenance costs to municipalities. Is that an accurate statement of what's in the Public Project 	1 Q. Certainly. 2 So when you're doing a project and there is a 3 conflict between the manual and we'll say state and/or 4 federal law, what controls? 5 MS. REYNOLDS: Objection. Calls for a legal 6 conclusion. 7 MS. FOSTER: She just stated that there have 8 been instances. That's important to this. You 9 introduced the Public Project Manual into the record as 10 though that's the law in this case. 11 JUDGE HOWARD: I will allow the question 12 because it it could be understood as going to what 13 their practice is. 14 BY MS. FOSTER: 15 Q. And once again 16 A. Federal law. 17 Q. Federal law. 17 Q. Federal law. 19 Q. I'm sorry. 20 A. Federal law. 21 Q. Okay. Well, what about when there's a conflict 22 between state law and your projects manual? You may
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	 correct. Q. Okay. So UP does pay maintenance costs for its facilities? A. Yes, Union Pacific is bearing the maintenance burden here, yes. Q. Okay. And then lastly, I just want to reference and go to your Exhibit PY-6, which is the Union Pacific Public Policy Manual. A. Okay. Q. So are there ever times in which, you know, you're doing a project and there are certain things in the public projects manual, but there's a conflict between state and federal law? A. I mean, I guess I would have to know what specifically you're referring to. Q. Well, sure. I'm just thinking about in this case, I'm assuming that I don't want to get into my own testimony or my own thoughts, but I'm assuming the Public Project Manual was introduced into evidence because there's a section in there on UP charging maintenance costs to municipalities. Is that an accurate statement of what's in the Public Project Manual? 	1 Q. Certainly. 2 So when you're doing a project and there is a 3 conflict between the manual and we'll say state and/or 4 federal law, what controls? 5 MS. REYNOLDS: Objection. Calls for a legal 6 conclusion. 7 MS. FOSTER: She just stated that there have 8 been instances. That's important to this. You 9 introduced the Public Project Manual into the record as 10 though that's the law in this case. 11 JUDGE HOWARD: I will allow the question 12 because it it could be understood as going to what 13 their practice is. 14 BY MS. FOSTER: 15 Q. And once again 16 A. Federal law. 17 Q. Federal law. 17 Q. Federal law. 19 Q. I'm sorry. 20 A. Federal law. 21 Q. Okay. Well, what about when there's a conflict 22 between state law and your projects manual? You may 23 have not encountered that situation, and that's fine.

29 (Pages 125 to 128)

	Page 129		Page 131
-			
1	either negotiated with the parties of interest and/or we	1 2	CROSS-EXAMINATION
2	go to litigation.	3	BY MR. ROBERSON:
3	Q. Okay. But I just want to go back, because I	4	Q. So good afternoon, Ms. Ygbuhay. On page 6 of
4 5	think we may have talked over each other.	4 5	your testimony, you testified that UP derives no
5	Federal law controls over the Public Project	6	benefits from the proposed project; is that correct?
7	Manual is what you said?	7	 A. That's correct. Q. Does UP benefit from a safer crossing?
8	MS. REYNOLDS: Objection. Misstates A. Federal	8	
9	MS. FOSTER: I'm asking her to clarify her	9	 A. Union Pacific doesn't have any ascertainable benefit to crossing improvement projects.
10	statement.	10	Q. Do you know why crossings have warning devices?
11	A. Yeah, again, federal federal law provides	11	
12	information and and laws relative to the maintenance	12	A. It's been part of the federal rules and safety since the introduction of vehicles that they started
13	practices. And this is actually not in conflict with	13	putting active traffic control devices at railroad
14	our Public Project Manual.	14	crossings for the motorists
15	BY MS. FOSTER:	15	Q. Can you sorry, go ahead.
16	Q. Right. But I'm not asking specifically about	16	A. For the motorists' information in accordance
17	maintenance. I'm talking about the Public Project	17	with the Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices.
18	Manual as a whole, that when you have instances in which	18	Q. Why do motorists need information that there's a
19	there is conflict between the project manual and there	19	grade crossing?
20	is conflict between the state or federal law, which one	20	A. Because the it's just another intersection
21	controls for UP?	21	so
22	A. The Public Project Manual is in compliance with	22	Q. A motorist could cross in front of a train,
23	federal law.	23	right? And hit the train?
24	Q. That's not the question I'm asking. I'm asking	24	A. A motorist could cross in front of a train, yes.
25	if there's a conflict, which controls?	25	Q. Can a car crash derail a train?
	Dago 120		- 100
	Page 130		Page 132
1	MS. REYNOLDS: Objection. Incomplete	1	Page 132 A. A car crash? You know, I'm I'm not a I
1 2		1 2	
	MS. REYNOLDS: Objection. Incomplete		A. A car crash? You know, I'm I'm not a I
2	MS. REYNOLDS: Objection. Incomplete hypothetical.	2	A. A car crash? You know, I'm I'm not a I don't think that's I think that's outside of my area
2 3	MS. REYNOLDS: Objection. Incomplete hypothetical. MS. FOSTER: I've asked this question.	2 3	A. A car crash? You know, I'm I'm not a I don't think that's I think that's outside of my area of expertise. I'm more public projects, sorry.
2 3 4	MS. REYNOLDS: Objection. Incomplete hypothetical. MS. FOSTER: I've asked this question. She's not answering my question.	2 3 4	 A. A car crash? You know, I'm I'm not a I don't think that's I think that's outside of my area of expertise. I'm more public projects, sorry. Q. Okay. So but there's the possibility without
2 3 4 5	MS. REYNOLDS: Objection. Incomplete hypothetical. MS. FOSTER: I've asked this question. She's not answering my question. JUDGE HOWARD: I'm going to allow the question. BY MS. FOSTER:	2 3 4 5	 A. A car crash? You know, I'm I'm not a I don't think that's I think that's outside of my area of expertise. I'm more public projects, sorry. Q. Okay. So but there's the possibility without warning devices that you would have crashes, right?
2 3 4 5 6	MS. REYNOLDS: Objection. Incomplete hypothetical. MS. FOSTER: I've asked this question. She's not answering my question. JUDGE HOWARD: I'm going to allow the question.	2 3 4 5 6	 A. A car crash? You know, I'm I'm not a I don't think that's I think that's outside of my area of expertise. I'm more public projects, sorry. Q. Okay. So but there's the possibility without warning devices that you would have crashes, right? A. There's a there's a possibility to have
2 3 4 5 6 7	MS. REYNOLDS: Objection. Incomplete hypothetical. MS. FOSTER: I've asked this question. She's not answering my question. JUDGE HOWARD: I'm going to allow the question. BY MS. FOSTER:	2 3 4 5 6 7	 A. A car crash? You know, I'm I'm not a I don't think that's I think that's outside of my area of expertise. I'm more public projects, sorry. Q. Okay. So but there's the possibility without warning devices that you would have crashes, right? A. There's a there's a possibility to have crashes with or without, that's correct.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	MS. REYNOLDS: Objection. Incomplete hypothetical. MS. FOSTER: I've asked this question. She's not answering my question. JUDGE HOWARD: I'm going to allow the question. BY MS. FOSTER: Q. I'm going to ask, if there's a conflict between either the Public Project Manual and state or federal law, which one controls?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	 A. A car crash? You know, I'm I'm not a I don't think that's I think that's outside of my area of expertise. I'm more public projects, sorry. Q. Okay. So but there's the possibility without warning devices that you would have crashes, right? A. There's a there's a possibility to have crashes with or without, that's correct. Q. Do you think that motorists are more likely to stop and not be hit by a train if there's a flashing bar telling them not to enter the crossing?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	MS. REYNOLDS: Objection. Incomplete hypothetical. MS. FOSTER: I've asked this question. She's not answering my question. JUDGE HOWARD: I'm going to allow the question. BY MS. FOSTER: Q. I'm going to ask, if there's a conflict between either the Public Project Manual and state or federal law, which one controls? A. Federal law.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	 A. A car crash? You know, I'm I'm not a I don't think that's I think that's outside of my area of expertise. I'm more public projects, sorry. Q. Okay. So but there's the possibility without warning devices that you would have crashes, right? A. There's a there's a possibility to have crashes with or without, that's correct. Q. Do you think that motorists are more likely to stop and not be hit by a train if there's a flashing bar telling them not to enter the crossing? MS. REYNOLDS: Objection. Incomplete
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	MS. REYNOLDS: Objection. Incomplete hypothetical. MS. FOSTER: I've asked this question. She's not answering my question. JUDGE HOWARD: I'm going to allow the question. BY MS. FOSTER: Q. I'm going to ask, if there's a conflict between either the Public Project Manual and state or federal law, which one controls? A. Federal law. MS. FOSTER: Okay. Those are the only	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	 A. A car crash? You know, I'm I'm not a I don't think that's I think that's outside of my area of expertise. I'm more public projects, sorry. Q. Okay. So but there's the possibility without warning devices that you would have crashes, right? A. There's a there's a possibility to have crashes with or without, that's correct. Q. Do you think that motorists are more likely to stop and not be hit by a train if there's a flashing bar telling them not to enter the crossing? MS. REYNOLDS: Objection. Incomplete hypothetical. Argumentative.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	MS. REYNOLDS: Objection. Incomplete hypothetical. MS. FOSTER: I've asked this question. She's not answering my question. JUDGE HOWARD: I'm going to allow the question. BY MS. FOSTER: Q. I'm going to ask, if there's a conflict between either the Public Project Manual and state or federal law, which one controls? A. Federal law. MS. FOSTER: Okay. Those are the only questions I have, Judge Howard.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	 A. A car crash? You know, I'm I'm not a I don't think that's I think that's outside of my area of expertise. I'm more public projects, sorry. Q. Okay. So but there's the possibility without warning devices that you would have crashes, right? A. There's a there's a possibility to have crashes with or without, that's correct. Q. Do you think that motorists are more likely to stop and not be hit by a train if there's a flashing bar telling them not to enter the crossing? MS. REYNOLDS: Objection. Incomplete hypothetical. Argumentative. JUDGE HOWARD: I'm going to allow the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	MS. REYNOLDS: Objection. Incomplete hypothetical. MS. FOSTER: I've asked this question. She's not answering my question. JUDGE HOWARD: I'm going to allow the question. BY MS. FOSTER: Q. I'm going to ask, if there's a conflict between either the Public Project Manual and state or federal law, which one controls? A. Federal law. MS. FOSTER: Okay. Those are the only questions I have, Judge Howard. JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Does Staff have	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	 A. A car crash? You know, I'm I'm not a I don't think that's I think that's outside of my area of expertise. I'm more public projects, sorry. Q. Okay. So but there's the possibility without warning devices that you would have crashes, right? A. There's a there's a possibility to have crashes with or without, that's correct. Q. Do you think that motorists are more likely to stop and not be hit by a train if there's a flashing bar telling them not to enter the crossing? MS. REYNOLDS: Objection. Incomplete hypothetical. Argumentative. JUDGE HOWARD: I'm going to allow the question.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	MS. REYNOLDS: Objection. Incomplete hypothetical. MS. FOSTER: I've asked this question. She's not answering my question. JUDGE HOWARD: I'm going to allow the question. BY MS. FOSTER: Q. I'm going to ask, if there's a conflict between either the Public Project Manual and state or federal law, which one controls? A. Federal law. MS. FOSTER: Okay. Those are the only questions I have, Judge Howard. JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Does Staff have any cross that it would like to	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	 A. A car crash? You know, I'm I'm not a I don't think that's I think that's outside of my area of expertise. I'm more public projects, sorry. Q. Okay. So but there's the possibility without warning devices that you would have crashes, right? A. There's a there's a possibility to have crashes with or without, that's correct. Q. Do you think that motorists are more likely to stop and not be hit by a train if there's a flashing bar telling them not to enter the crossing? MS. REYNOLDS: Objection. Incomplete hypothetical. Argumentative. JUDGE HOWARD: I'm going to allow the question.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	MS. REYNOLDS: Objection. Incomplete hypothetical. MS. FOSTER: I've asked this question. She's not answering my question. JUDGE HOWARD: I'm going to allow the question. BY MS. FOSTER: Q. I'm going to ask, if there's a conflict between either the Public Project Manual and state or federal law, which one controls? A. Federal law. MS. FOSTER: Okay. Those are the only questions I have, Judge Howard. JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Does Staff have any cross that it would like to MR. ROBERSON: Just a few questions, Judge	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	 A. A car crash? You know, I'm I'm not a I don't think that's I think that's outside of my area of expertise. I'm more public projects, sorry. Q. Okay. So but there's the possibility without warning devices that you would have crashes, right? A. There's a there's a possibility to have crashes with or without, that's correct. Q. Do you think that motorists are more likely to stop and not be hit by a train if there's a flashing bar telling them not to enter the crossing? MS. REYNOLDS: Objection. Incomplete hypothetical. Argumentative. JUDGE HOWARD: I'm going to allow the question. A. So I'll answer it this way, Jeff, and then maybe you can ask an additional question. But the Manual of
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	MS. REYNOLDS: Objection. Incomplete hypothetical. MS. FOSTER: I've asked this question. She's not answering my question. JUDGE HOWARD: I'm going to allow the question. BY MS. FOSTER: Q. I'm going to ask, if there's a conflict between either the Public Project Manual and state or federal law, which one controls? A. Federal law. MS. FOSTER: Okay. Those are the only questions I have, Judge Howard. JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Does Staff have any cross that it would like to MR. ROBERSON: Just a few questions, Judge Howard.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	 A. A car crash? You know, I'm I'm not a I don't think that's I think that's outside of my area of expertise. I'm more public projects, sorry. Q. Okay. So but there's the possibility without warning devices that you would have crashes, right? A. There's a there's a possibility to have crashes with or without, that's correct. Q. Do you think that motorists are more likely to stop and not be hit by a train if there's a flashing bar telling them not to enter the crossing? MS. REYNOLDS: Objection. Incomplete hypothetical. Argumentative. JUDGE HOWARD: I'm going to allow the question. A. So I'll answer it this way, Jeff, and then maybe you can ask an additional question. But the Manual of Uniform Traffic Control Devices is basically created for
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	MS. REYNOLDS: Objection. Incomplete hypothetical. MS. FOSTER: I've asked this question. She's not answering my question. JUDGE HOWARD: I'm going to allow the question. BY MS. FOSTER: Q. I'm going to ask, if there's a conflict between either the Public Project Manual and state or federal law, which one controls? A. Federal law. MS. FOSTER: Okay. Those are the only questions I have, Judge Howard. JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Does Staff have any cross that it would like to MR. ROBERSON: Just a few questions, Judge Howard. JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Ms. Reynolds, are	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	 A. A car crash? You know, I'm I'm not a I don't think that's I think that's outside of my area of expertise. I'm more public projects, sorry. Q. Okay. So but there's the possibility without warning devices that you would have crashes, right? A. There's a there's a possibility to have crashes with or without, that's correct. Q. Do you think that motorists are more likely to stop and not be hit by a train if there's a flashing bar telling them not to enter the crossing? MS. REYNOLDS: Objection. Incomplete hypothetical. Argumentative. JUDGE HOWARD: I'm going to allow the question. A. So I'll answer it this way, Jeff, and then maybe you can ask an additional question. But the Manual of Uniform Traffic Control Devices is basically created for the safe traversal of motor vehicles over all types of
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	MS. REYNOLDS: Objection. Incomplete hypothetical. MS. FOSTER: I've asked this question. She's not answering my question. JUDGE HOWARD: I'm going to allow the question. BY MS. FOSTER: Q. I'm going to ask, if there's a conflict between either the Public Project Manual and state or federal law, which one controls? A. Federal law. MS. FOSTER: Okay. Those are the only questions I have, Judge Howard. JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Does Staff have any cross that it would like to MR. ROBERSON: Just a few questions, Judge Howard. JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Ms. Reynolds, are you fine with Staff proceeding with its cross now or	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	 A. A car crash? You know, I'm I'm not a I don't think that's I think that's outside of my area of expertise. I'm more public projects, sorry. Q. Okay. So but there's the possibility without warning devices that you would have crashes, right? A. There's a there's a possibility to have crashes with or without, that's correct. Q. Do you think that motorists are more likely to stop and not be hit by a train if there's a flashing bar telling them not to enter the crossing? MS. REYNOLDS: Objection. Incomplete hypothetical. Argumentative. JUDGE HOWARD: I'm going to allow the question. A. So I'll answer it this way, Jeff, and then maybe you can ask an additional question. But the Manual of Uniform Traffic Control Devices is basically created for the safe traversal of motor vehicles over all types of roadways. So it is there specifically for the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	MS. REYNOLDS: Objection. Incomplete hypothetical. MS. FOSTER: I've asked this question. She's not answering my question. JUDGE HOWARD: I'm going to allow the question. BY MS. FOSTER: Q. I'm going to ask, if there's a conflict between either the Public Project Manual and state or federal law, which one controls? A. Federal law. MS. FOSTER: Okay. Those are the only questions I have, Judge Howard. JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Does Staff have any cross that it would like to MR. ROBERSON: Just a few questions, Judge Howard. JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Ms. Reynolds, are you fine with Staff proceeding with its cross now or would you like to do redirect now?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	 A. A car crash? You know, I'm I'm not a I don't think that's I think that's outside of my area of expertise. I'm more public projects, sorry. Q. Okay. So but there's the possibility without warning devices that you would have crashes, right? A. There's a there's a possibility to have crashes with or without, that's correct. Q. Do you think that motorists are more likely to stop and not be hit by a train if there's a flashing bar telling them not to enter the crossing? MS. REYNOLDS: Objection. Incomplete hypothetical. Argumentative. JUDGE HOWARD: I'm going to allow the question. A. So I'll answer it this way, Jeff, and then maybe you can ask an additional question. But the Manual of Uniform Traffic Control Devices is basically created for the safe traversal of motor vehicles over all types of roadways. So it is there specifically for the enhancement of motor vehicle use at at crossings and
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	MS. REYNOLDS: Objection. Incomplete hypothetical. MS. FOSTER: I've asked this question. She's not answering my question. JUDGE HOWARD: I'm going to allow the question. BY MS. FOSTER: Q. I'm going to ask, if there's a conflict between either the Public Project Manual and state or federal law, which one controls? A. Federal law. MS. FOSTER: Okay. Those are the only questions I have, Judge Howard. JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Does Staff have any cross that it would like to MR. ROBERSON: Just a few questions, Judge Howard. JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Ms. Reynolds, are you fine with Staff proceeding with its cross now or would you like to do redirect now? MR. ROBERSON: Either way. It's Your	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	 A. A car crash? You know, I'm I'm not a I don't think that's I think that's outside of my area of expertise. I'm more public projects, sorry. Q. Okay. So but there's the possibility without warning devices that you would have crashes, right? A. There's a there's a possibility to have crashes with or without, that's correct. Q. Do you think that motorists are more likely to stop and not be hit by a train if there's a flashing bar telling them not to enter the crossing? MS. REYNOLDS: Objection. Incomplete hypothetical. Argumentative. JUDGE HOWARD: I'm going to allow the question. A. So I'll answer it this way, Jeff, and then maybe you can ask an additional question. But the Manual of Uniform Traffic Control Devices is basically created for the safe traversal of motor vehicles over all types of roadways. So it is there specifically for the enhancement of motor vehicle use at at crossings and elsewhere.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	MS. REYNOLDS: Objection. Incomplete hypothetical. MS. FOSTER: I've asked this question. She's not answering my question. JUDGE HOWARD: I'm going to allow the question. BY MS. FOSTER: Q. I'm going to ask, if there's a conflict between either the Public Project Manual and state or federal law, which one controls? A. Federal law. MS. FOSTER: Okay. Those are the only questions I have, Judge Howard. JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Does Staff have any cross that it would like to MR. ROBERSON: Just a few questions, Judge Howard. JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Ms. Reynolds, are you fine with Staff proceeding with its cross now or would you like to do redirect now? MR. ROBERSON: Either way. It's Your Honor's discretion.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	 A. A car crash? You know, I'm I'm not a I don't think that's I think that's outside of my area of expertise. I'm more public projects, sorry. Q. Okay. So but there's the possibility without warning devices that you would have crashes, right? A. There's a there's a possibility to have crashes with or without, that's correct. Q. Do you think that motorists are more likely to stop and not be hit by a train if there's a flashing bar telling them not to enter the crossing? MS. REYNOLDS: Objection. Incomplete hypothetical. Argumentative. JUDGE HOWARD: I'm going to allow the question. A. So I'll answer it this way, Jeff, and then maybe you can ask an additional question. But the Manual of Uniform Traffic Control Devices is basically created for the safe traversal of motor vehicles over all types of roadways. So it is there specifically for the enhancement of motor vehicle use at at crossings and elsewhere. BY MR. ROBERSON:
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	MS. REYNOLDS: Objection. Incomplete hypothetical. MS. FOSTER: I've asked this question. She's not answering my question. JUDGE HOWARD: I'm going to allow the question. BY MS. FOSTER: Q. I'm going to ask, if there's a conflict between either the Public Project Manual and state or federal law, which one controls? A. Federal law. MS. FOSTER: Okay. Those are the only questions I have, Judge Howard. JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Does Staff have any cross that it would like to MR. ROBERSON: Just a few questions, Judge Howard. JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Ms. Reynolds, are you fine with Staff proceeding with its cross now or would you like to do redirect now? MR. ROBERSON: Either way. It's Your Honor's discretion. JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Mr. Roberson, you	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	 A. A car crash? You know, I'm I'm not a I don't think that's I think that's outside of my area of expertise. I'm more public projects, sorry. Q. Okay. So but there's the possibility without warning devices that you would have crashes, right? A. There's a there's a possibility to have crashes with or without, that's correct. Q. Do you think that motorists are more likely to stop and not be hit by a train if there's a flashing bar telling them not to enter the crossing? MS. REYNOLDS: Objection. Incomplete hypothetical. Argumentative. JUDGE HOWARD: I'm going to allow the question. A. So I'll answer it this way, Jeff, and then maybe you can ask an additional question. But the Manual of Uniform Traffic Control Devices is basically created for the safe traversal of motor vehicle use at at crossings and elsewhere. BY MR. ROBERSON:
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	MS. REYNOLDS: Objection. Incomplete hypothetical. MS. FOSTER: I've asked this question. She's not answering my question. JUDGE HOWARD: I'm going to allow the question. BY MS. FOSTER: Q. I'm going to ask, if there's a conflict between either the Public Project Manual and state or federal law, which one controls? A. Federal law. MS. FOSTER: Okay. Those are the only questions I have, Judge Howard. JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Does Staff have any cross that it would like to MR. ROBERSON: Just a few questions, Judge Howard. JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Ms. Reynolds, are you fine with Staff proceeding with its cross now or would you like to do redirect now? MR. ROBERSON: Either way. It's Your Honor's discretion. JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Mr. Roberson, you may proceed.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	 A. A car crash? You know, I'm I'm not a I don't think that's I think that's outside of my area of expertise. I'm more public projects, sorry. Q. Okay. So but there's the possibility without warning devices that you would have crashes, right? A. There's a there's a possibility to have crashes with or without, that's correct. Q. Do you think that motorists are more likely to stop and not be hit by a train if there's a flashing bar telling them not to enter the crossing? MS. REYNOLDS: Objection. Incomplete hypothetical. Argumentative. JUDGE HOWARD: I'm going to allow the question. A. So I'll answer it this way, Jeff, and then maybe you can ask an additional question. But the Manual of Uniform Traffic Control Devices is basically created for the safe traversal of motor vehicle use at at crossings and elsewhere. BY MR. ROBERSON: A. So piggybacking on that, the MUTCD does have a chapter on rail warning devices, right? Chapter 8?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	MS. REYNOLDS: Objection. Incomplete hypothetical. MS. FOSTER: I've asked this question. She's not answering my question. JUDGE HOWARD: I'm going to allow the question. BY MS. FOSTER: Q. I'm going to ask, if there's a conflict between either the Public Project Manual and state or federal law, which one controls? A. Federal law. MS. FOSTER: Okay. Those are the only questions I have, Judge Howard. JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Does Staff have any cross that it would like to MR. ROBERSON: Just a few questions, Judge Howard. JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Ms. Reynolds, are you fine with Staff proceeding with its cross now or would you like to do redirect now? MR. ROBERSON: Either way. It's Your Honor's discretion. JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Mr. Roberson, you	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	 A. A car crash? You know, I'm I'm not a I don't think that's I think that's outside of my area of expertise. I'm more public projects, sorry. Q. Okay. So but there's the possibility without warning devices that you would have crashes, right? A. There's a there's a possibility to have crashes with or without, that's correct. Q. Do you think that motorists are more likely to stop and not be hit by a train if there's a flashing bar telling them not to enter the crossing? MS. REYNOLDS: Objection. Incomplete hypothetical. Argumentative. JUDGE HOWARD: I'm going to allow the question. A. So I'll answer it this way, Jeff, and then maybe you can ask an additional question. But the Manual of Uniform Traffic Control Devices is basically created for the safe traversal of motor vehicle use at at crossings and elsewhere. BY MR. ROBERSON:

30 (Pages 129 to 132)

	Page 133	Page 135
1	Q. So that's to create safe car-rail interactions,	1 REDIRECT EXAMINATION
2	right?	2 BY MS. REYNOLDS:
3	A. Yes.	3 Q. To be clear, are there any traffic control
4	Q. Okay. So without the warning device, it's	4 devices at the Barker Road crossing today?
5	possible that a car could enter the crossing and hit a	5 A. There are.
6	train, right?	6 Q. There's not just an unfettered access for cars
7	A. Yeah.	7 to go onto the tracks at this current moment, correct?
8	Q. Okay. Would UP benefit from not having cars hit	8 A. There aren't, that's correct.
9	its train or trains?	9 Q. Are you aware of prior accidents at the Barker
10	A. Will UP benefit from cars not hitting us?	10 Road crossing on UP's tracks?
11	Q. At Barker Road, I guess, specifically?	11 A. I'm not.
12	A. At Barker Road? I don't know that it's	12 Q. Are you aware of any derailments at the Barker
13	necessarily a benefit or it's, in fact, a detriment that	13 Road crossing?
14	vehicles would crash into our railroad operations.	14 A. I'm not.
15	Q. Okay. So just so I'm clear, UP is indifferent	15 Q. I'd like to direct your attention back to the
16	as to whether or not cars hit its trains?	16 construction and maintenance agreement from 2017, which
17	MS. REYNOLDS: Objection. Argumentative.	17 has been admitted as Exhibit PY-5. Do you have that in
18	JUDGE HOWARD: I'm going to allow the	18 front of you?
19	question.	19 A. Ido.
20	A. Union Pacific endorses the road authorities and	20 Q. And can I direct your attention to Section 6.
21	the jurisdictions to provide as safe a crossing as	21 What is Section 6 titled?
22	possible so that the motor vehicles do not interact with	A. No Project Expenses to be Borne by Railroad.
23	train operations.	23 Q. And what does Section 6 say?
24	BY MR. ROBERSON:	A. (As read) The political body agrees that no
25	Q. That's not my question. My question is, is	25 project costs and expenses are to be borne by the
	$D_{2} \sim 124$	
	Page 134	Page 136
1	Union Pacific indifferent to its cars or its trains	Page 136 1 Railroad. In addition, the Railroad is not required to
1 2	2	
	Union Pacific indifferent to its cars or its trains	1 Railroad. In addition, the Railroad is not required to
2	Union Pacific indifferent to its cars or its trains being hit by cars at grade crossings?	 Railroad. In addition, the Railroad is not required to contribute any funding for the project.
2 3	Union Pacific indifferent to its cars or its trains being hit by cars at grade crossings? A. Union Pacific wants to see zero collisions at	 Railroad. In addition, the Railroad is not required to contribute any funding for the project. Q. And then can I direct your attention to Section
2 3 4	Union Pacific indifferent to its cars or its trains being hit by cars at grade crossings? A. Union Pacific wants to see zero collisions at our crossings. It is	 Railroad. In addition, the Railroad is not required to contribute any funding for the project. Q. And then can I direct your attention to Section 12?
2 3 4 5	Union Pacific indifferent to its cars or its trains being hit by cars at grade crossings? A. Union Pacific wants to see zero collisions at our crossings. It is Q. And why is that	 Railroad. In addition, the Railroad is not required to contribute any funding for the project. Q. And then can I direct your attention to Section 12? A. Yes.
2 3 4 5 6	 Union Pacific indifferent to its cars or its trains being hit by cars at grade crossings? A. Union Pacific wants to see zero collisions at our crossings. It is Q. And why is that A not indifferent. 	 Railroad. In addition, the Railroad is not required to contribute any funding for the project. Q. And then can I direct your attention to Section 12? A. Yes. Q. And Section 12 involves future projects?
2 3 4 5 6 7	 Union Pacific indifferent to its cars or its trains being hit by cars at grade crossings? A. Union Pacific wants to see zero collisions at our crossings. It is Q. And why is that A not indifferent. Q. Okay. So why does UP want to see zero 	 Railroad. In addition, the Railroad is not required to contribute any funding for the project. Q. And then can I direct your attention to Section 12? A. Yes. Q. And Section 12 involves future projects? A. That's correct.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	 Union Pacific indifferent to its cars or its trains being hit by cars at grade crossings? A. Union Pacific wants to see zero collisions at our crossings. It is Q. And why is that A not indifferent. Q. Okay. So why does UP want to see zero collisions? 	 Railroad. In addition, the Railroad is not required to contribute any funding for the project. Q. And then can I direct your attention to Section 12? A. Yes. Q. And Section 12 involves future projects? A. That's correct. Q. Future projects are to be funded by whom
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	 Union Pacific indifferent to its cars or its trains being hit by cars at grade crossings? A. Union Pacific wants to see zero collisions at our crossings. It is Q. And why is that A not indifferent. Q. Okay. So why does UP want to see zero collisions? A. Because we collisions are catastrophic 	 Railroad. In addition, the Railroad is not required to contribute any funding for the project. Q. And then can I direct your attention to Section 12? A. Yes. Q. And Section 12 involves future projects? A. That's correct. Q. Future projects are to be funded by whom according to the 2017 CMA?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	 Union Pacific indifferent to its cars or its trains being hit by cars at grade crossings? A. Union Pacific wants to see zero collisions at our crossings. It is Q. And why is that A not indifferent. Q. Okay. So why does UP want to see zero collisions? A. Because we collisions are catastrophic typically with with railroad and vehicles and and 	 Railroad. In addition, the Railroad is not required to contribute any funding for the project. Q. And then can I direct your attention to Section 12? A. Yes. Q. And Section 12 involves future projects? A. That's correct. Q. Future projects are to be funded by whom according to the 2017 CMA? A. It it says that it future projects will
2 3 6 7 8 9 10 11	 Union Pacific indifferent to its cars or its trains being hit by cars at grade crossings? A. Union Pacific wants to see zero collisions at our crossings. It is Q. And why is that A not indifferent. Q. Okay. So why does UP want to see zero collisions? A. Because we collisions are catastrophic typically with with railroad and vehicles and and pedestrians and the like. So we we endorse the 	 Railroad. In addition, the Railroad is not required to contribute any funding for the project. Q. And then can I direct your attention to Section 12? A. Yes. Q. And Section 12 involves future projects? A. That's correct. Q. Future projects are to be funded by whom according to the 2017 CMA? A. It it says that it future projects will not be allowed until there is an agreement between the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	 Union Pacific indifferent to its cars or its trains being hit by cars at grade crossings? A. Union Pacific wants to see zero collisions at our crossings. It is Q. And why is that A not indifferent. Q. Okay. So why does UP want to see zero collisions? A. Because we collisions are catastrophic typically with with railroad and vehicles and and pedestrians and the like. So we we endorse the federal law for contributions for grade separations and 	 Railroad. In addition, the Railroad is not required to contribute any funding for the project. Q. And then can I direct your attention to Section 12? A. Yes. Q. And Section 12 involves future projects? A. That's correct. Q. Future projects are to be funded by whom according to the 2017 CMA? A. It it says that it future projects will not be allowed until there is an agreement between the Railroad and political body.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	 Union Pacific indifferent to its cars or its trains being hit by cars at grade crossings? A. Union Pacific wants to see zero collisions at our crossings. It is Q. And why is that A not indifferent. Q. Okay. So why does UP want to see zero collisions? A. Because we collisions are catastrophic typically with with railroad and vehicles and and pedestrians and the like. So we we endorse the federal law for contributions for grade separations and the elimination of at-grade crossings altogether. 	 Railroad. In addition, the Railroad is not required to contribute any funding for the project. Q. And then can I direct your attention to Section 12? A. Yes. Q. And Section 12 involves future projects? A. That's correct. Q. Future projects are to be funded by whom according to the 2017 CMA? A. It it says that it future projects will not be allowed until there is an agreement between the Railroad and political body. Q. And was there an agreement reached in this case?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	 Union Pacific indifferent to its cars or its trains being hit by cars at grade crossings? A. Union Pacific wants to see zero collisions at our crossings. It is Q. And why is that A not indifferent. Q. Okay. So why does UP want to see zero collisions? A. Because we collisions are catastrophic typically with with railroad and vehicles and and pedestrians and the like. So we we endorse the federal law for contributions for grade separations and the elimination of at-grade crossings altogether. Q. Okay. So is it fair, then, to say that UP 	 Railroad. In addition, the Railroad is not required to contribute any funding for the project. Q. And then can I direct your attention to Section 12? A. Yes. Q. And Section 12 involves future projects? A. That's correct. Q. Future projects are to be funded by whom according to the 2017 CMA? A. It it says that it future projects will not be allowed until there is an agreement between the Railroad and political body. Q. And was there an agreement reached in this case? A. No.
2 3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	 Union Pacific indifferent to its cars or its trains being hit by cars at grade crossings? A. Union Pacific wants to see zero collisions at our crossings. It is Q. And why is that A not indifferent. Q. Okay. So why does UP want to see zero collisions? A. Because we collisions are catastrophic typically with with railroad and vehicles and and pedestrians and the like. So we we endorse the federal law for contributions for grade separations and the elimination of at-grade crossings altogether. Q. Okay. So is it fair, then, to say that UP derives a benefit if you avoid these kinds of 	 Railroad. In addition, the Railroad is not required to contribute any funding for the project. Q. And then can I direct your attention to Section 12? A. Yes. Q. And Section 12 involves future projects? A. That's correct. Q. Future projects are to be funded by whom according to the 2017 CMA? A. It it says that it future projects will not be allowed until there is an agreement between the Railroad and political body. Q. And was there an agreement reached in this case? A. No. Q. Now, I'd like to go back to the statute, Section
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	 Union Pacific indifferent to its cars or its trains being hit by cars at grade crossings? A. Union Pacific wants to see zero collisions at our crossings. It is Q. And why is that A not indifferent. Q. Okay. So why does UP want to see zero collisions? A. Because we collisions are catastrophic typically with with railroad and vehicles and and pedestrians and the like. So we we endorse the federal law for contributions for grade separations and the elimination of at-grade crossings altogether. Q. Okay. So is it fair, then, to say that UP derives a benefit if you avoid these kinds of catastrophic collisions? 	 Railroad. In addition, the Railroad is not required to contribute any funding for the project. Q. And then can I direct your attention to Section 12? A. Yes. Q. And Section 12 involves future projects? A. That's correct. Q. Future projects are to be funded by whom according to the 2017 CMA? A. It it says that it future projects will not be allowed until there is an agreement between the Railroad and political body. Q. And was there an agreement reached in this case? A. No. Q. Now, I'd like to go back to the statute, Section 295, that you were asked about.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	 Union Pacific indifferent to its cars or its trains being hit by cars at grade crossings? A. Union Pacific wants to see zero collisions at our crossings. It is Q. And why is that A not indifferent. Q. Okay. So why does UP want to see zero collisions? A. Because we collisions are catastrophic typically with with railroad and vehicles and and pedestrians and the like. So we we endorse the federal law for contributions for grade separations and the elimination of at-grade crossings altogether. Q. Okay. So is it fair, then, to say that UP derives a benefit if you avoid these kinds of catastrophic collisions? A. I don't know that we derive a benefit, but we 	 Railroad. In addition, the Railroad is not required to contribute any funding for the project. Q. And then can I direct your attention to Section 12? A. Yes. Q. And Section 12 involves future projects? A. That's correct. Q. Future projects are to be funded by whom according to the 2017 CMA? A. It it says that it future projects will not be allowed until there is an agreement between the Railroad and political body. Q. And was there an agreement reached in this case? A. No. Q. Now, I'd like to go back to the statute, Section 295, that you were asked about. A. Okay.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	 Union Pacific indifferent to its cars or its trains being hit by cars at grade crossings? A. Union Pacific wants to see zero collisions at our crossings. It is Q. And why is that A not indifferent. Q. Okay. So why does UP want to see zero collisions? A. Because we collisions are catastrophic typically with with railroad and vehicles and and pedestrians and the like. So we we endorse the federal law for contributions for grade separations and the elimination of at-grade crossings altogether. Q. Okay. So is it fair, then, to say that UP derives a benefit if you avoid these kinds of catastrophic collisions? A. I don't know that we derive a benefit, but we want to work with the communities to get to a zero 	 Railroad. In addition, the Railroad is not required to contribute any funding for the project. Q. And then can I direct your attention to Section 12? A. Yes. Q. And Section 12 involves future projects? A. That's correct. Q. Future projects are to be funded by whom according to the 2017 CMA? A. It it says that it future projects will not be allowed until there is an agreement between the Railroad and political body. Q. And was there an agreement reached in this case? A. No. Q. Now, I'd like to go back to the statute, Section 295, that you were asked about. A. Okay. Q. Do you have that in front of you?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	 Union Pacific indifferent to its cars or its trains being hit by cars at grade crossings? A. Union Pacific wants to see zero collisions at our crossings. It is Q. And why is that A not indifferent. Q. Okay. So why does UP want to see zero collisions? A. Because we collisions are catastrophic typically with with railroad and vehicles and and pedestrians and the like. So we we endorse the federal law for contributions for grade separations and the elimination of at-grade crossings altogether. Q. Okay. So is it fair, then, to say that UP derives a benefit if you avoid these kinds of catastrophic collisions? A. I don't know that we derive a benefit, but we want to work with the communities to get to a zero incident, yes. 	 Railroad. In addition, the Railroad is not required to contribute any funding for the project. Q. And then can I direct your attention to Section 12? A. Yes. Q. And Section 12 involves future projects? A. That's correct. Q. Future projects are to be funded by whom according to the 2017 CMA? A. It it says that it future projects will not be allowed until there is an agreement between the Railroad and political body. Q. And was there an agreement reached in this case? A. No. Q. Now, I'd like to go back to the statute, Section 295, that you were asked about. A. Okay. Q. Do you have that in front of you? A. Yes.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	 Union Pacific indifferent to its cars or its trains being hit by cars at grade crossings? A. Union Pacific wants to see zero collisions at our crossings. It is Q. And why is that A not indifferent. Q. Okay. So why does UP want to see zero collisions? A. Because we collisions are catastrophic typically with with railroad and vehicles and and pedestrians and the like. So we we endorse the federal law for contributions for grade separations and the elimination of at-grade crossings altogether. Q. Okay. So is it fair, then, to say that UP derives a benefit if you avoid these kinds of catastrophic collisions? A. I don't know that we derive a benefit, but we want to work with the communities to get to a zero incident, yes. MR. ROBERSON: I think I'm done, Judge 	 Railroad. In addition, the Railroad is not required to contribute any funding for the project. Q. And then can I direct your attention to Section 12? A. Yes. Q. And Section 12 involves future projects? A. That's correct. Q. Future projects are to be funded by whom according to the 2017 CMA? A. It it says that it future projects will not be allowed until there is an agreement between the Railroad and political body. Q. And was there an agreement reached in this case? A. No. Q. Now, I'd like to go back to the statute, Section 295, that you were asked about. A. Okay. Q. Do you have that in front of you? A. Yes. Q. You were asked about whether this state law
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	 Union Pacific indifferent to its cars or its trains being hit by cars at grade crossings? A. Union Pacific wants to see zero collisions at our crossings. It is Q. And why is that A not indifferent. Q. Okay. So why does UP want to see zero collisions? A. Because we collisions are catastrophic typically with with railroad and vehicles and and pedestrians and the like. So we we endorse the federal law for contributions for grade separations and the elimination of at-grade crossings altogether. Q. Okay. So is it fair, then, to say that UP derives a benefit if you avoid these kinds of catastrophic collisions? A. I don't know that we derive a benefit, but we want to work with the communities to get to a zero incident, yes. MR. ROBERSON: I think I'm done, Judge Howard. Thank you. 	 Railroad. In addition, the Railroad is not required to contribute any funding for the project. Q. And then can I direct your attention to Section 12? A. Yes. Q. And Section 12 involves future projects? A. That's correct. Q. Future projects are to be funded by whom according to the 2017 CMA? A. It it says that it future projects will not be allowed until there is an agreement between the Railroad and political body. Q. And was there an agreement reached in this case? A. No. Q. Now, I'd like to go back to the statute, Section 295, that you were asked about. A. Okay. Q. Do you have that in front of you? A. Yes. Q. You were asked about whether this state law conflicts with UP's Public Project Manual. Do you have
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	 Union Pacific indifferent to its cars or its trains being hit by cars at grade crossings? A. Union Pacific wants to see zero collisions at our crossings. It is Q. And why is that A not indifferent. Q. Okay. So why does UP want to see zero collisions? A. Because we collisions are catastrophic typically with with railroad and vehicles and and pedestrians and the like. So we we endorse the federal law for contributions for grade separations and the elimination of at-grade crossings altogether. Q. Okay. So is it fair, then, to say that UP derives a benefit if you avoid these kinds of catastrophic collisions? A. I don't know that we derive a benefit, but we want to work with the communities to get to a zero incident, yes. MR. ROBERSON: I think I'm done, Judge Howard. Thank you. JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Do we have any 	 Railroad. In addition, the Railroad is not required to contribute any funding for the project. Q. And then can I direct your attention to Section 12? A. Yes. Q. And Section 12 involves future projects? A. That's correct. Q. Future projects are to be funded by whom according to the 2017 CMA? A. It it says that it future projects will not be allowed until there is an agreement between the Railroad and political body. Q. And was there an agreement reached in this case? A. No. Q. Now, I'd like to go back to the statute, Section 295, that you were asked about. A. Okay. Q. Do you have that in front of you? A. Yes. Q. You were asked about whether this state law conflicts with UP's Public Project Manual. Do you have an opinion about the conflict of this particular statute
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	 Union Pacific indifferent to its cars or its trains being hit by cars at grade crossings? A. Union Pacific wants to see zero collisions at our crossings. It is A. And why is that A not indifferent. A. Okay. So why does UP want to see zero collisions? A. Because we collisions are catastrophic typically with with railroad and vehicles and and pedestrians and the like. So we we endorse the federal law for contributions for grade separations and the elimination of at-grade crossings altogether. A. Okay. So is it fair, then, to say that UP derives a benefit if you avoid these kinds of catastrophic collisions? A. I don't know that we derive a benefit, but we want to work with the communities to get to a zero incident, yes. MR. ROBERSON: I think I'm done, Judge Howard. Thank you. JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Do we have any redirect? 	 Railroad. In addition, the Railroad is not required to contribute any funding for the project. Q. And then can I direct your attention to Section 12? A. Yes. Q. And Section 12 involves future projects? A. That's correct. Q. Future projects are to be funded by whom according to the 2017 CMA? A. It it says that it future projects will not be allowed until there is an agreement between the Railroad and political body. Q. And was there an agreement reached in this case? A. No. Q. Now, I'd like to go back to the statute, Section 295, that you were asked about. A. Okay. Q. Do you have that in front of you? A. Yes. Q. You were asked about whether this state law conflicts with UP's Public Project Manual. Do you have an opinion about the conflict of this particular statute in UP's Project Manual?

31 (Pages 133 to 136)

	Page 137		Page 139
1	Q. Yes. Do you believe that they're in conflict?	1	And so in order for the Commission to grant
2	A. I mean, one one's our policy manual and one	2	this petition, it's actually kind of simple. It just
3	is the state's law.	3	has to determine whether or not the public safety is
4	Q. Do you see that RCW 81.53.295 discusses the	4	being helped or being improved by by the improvements
5	installation of a grade crossing protective device?	5	to this crossing.
6	A. Yes.	6	Contrary to what it seems like Union Pacific
7	Q. Does the Barker Road project, as it relates to	7	may be suggesting, which is that the Railroad has to be
8	the crossing at UP's lines, involve the installation of	8	the one that comes up with the improvements to the
9	a grade crossing protective device?	9	crossing, that it can never be a City or a municipal
10	A. It involves the installation of the traffic	10	initiated project. And that's simply not in the statute
11	control devices I believe that are contemplated here.	11	and taking their position to the end. Well, cities
12	Q. Is it installing any new devices? Does the	12	could essentially never improve grade crossings because
13	Barker Road project involve the installation of any new	13	cities can't do anything unless the Railroad comes up
14	devices?	14	with it on their own.
15	A. The Barker Road project, as proposed by the	15	But in this case, there is absolutely a
16	City, is to widen the crossing and basically install the	16	public safety aspect to allowing this petition and
17	same devices that exist today; two cantilevers, two	17	allowing the widening of Barker Road.
18	flashings sorry. Ten flashing light pairs and two	18	First, we are adding signals specifically to
19	gate arms. The there is an additional flashing light	19	Hadmer [phonetic] Lane and some of the side roads. If
20	pair that is being contemplated or proposed by the City	20	you look at Euclid, Euclid is not a continuous street.
21	as a result of the diagnostic meeting held in, I	21	There's a lot of offsets. I'm from that area. It's a
22	believe, 2020.	22	real interesting area. It's not the safest area as it
23	MS. REYNOLDS: Thank you very much for your	23	is.
24	time. Those are all my questions.	24	Second, the City is adding another lane,
25	JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Ms. Ygbuhay,	25	which will help with queueing, which will also help
	Dogo 120		Doco 140
	Page 138		Page 140
1	thank you for your testimony today. You may turn off	1	reduce certain queuing and turning-related crashes.
2	your camera.	2	They're also expanding the turn radius, which will help
3	And I believe that was our last witness for	3	cars and trucks from jumping the curb on Euclid.
4	today. We can turn to brief closing statements and, of	4	Lastly, they are adding a concrete median at the request of UP, which will stop cars from jumping the
5	course, we already have the the deadline for post-hearing briefs. So I imagine these closing	5	the request of UP which will stop cars from lumping the
6		6	tracks that get annoyed at having to wait so long
7	statements today would be relatively brief, but I would	7	tracks that get annoyed at having to wait so long because there's such a long queue and such a long
7 8	statements today would be relatively brief, but I would appreciate counsels' arguments and thoughts.	7 8	tracks that get annoyed at having to wait so long because there's such a long queue and such a long backup. And that will also help public safety by
7 8 9	statements today would be relatively brief, but I would appreciate counsels' arguments and thoughts. So let's turn to the City first.	7 8 9	tracks that get annoyed at having to wait so long because there's such a long queue and such a long backup. And that will also help public safety by preventing certain amounts of crashes in other instances
7 8 9 10	statements today would be relatively brief, but I would appreciate counsels' arguments and thoughts. So let's turn to the City first. MS. FOSTER: Thank you, Judge Howard.	7 8 9 10	tracks that get annoyed at having to wait so long because there's such a long queue and such a long backup. And that will also help public safety by preventing certain amounts of crashes in other instances at the grade crossing.
7 8 9 10 11	statements today would be relatively brief, but I would appreciate counsels' arguments and thoughts. So let's turn to the City first. MS. FOSTER: Thank you, Judge Howard. There has been a lot of discussion today,	7 8 9 10 11	tracks that get annoyed at having to wait so long because there's such a long queue and such a long backup. And that will also help public safety by preventing certain amounts of crashes in other instances at the grade crossing. And that's all the City has for their
7 8 9 10 11 12	statements today would be relatively brief, but I would appreciate counsels' arguments and thoughts. So let's turn to the City first. MS. FOSTER: Thank you, Judge Howard. There has been a lot of discussion today, both from the City and UP, regarding RCW 81.53.295 and	7 8 9 10 11 12	tracks that get annoyed at having to wait so long because there's such a long queue and such a long backup. And that will also help public safety by preventing certain amounts of crashes in other instances at the grade crossing. And that's all the City has for their closing, Judge Howard.
7 8 9 10 11 12 13	statements today would be relatively brief, but I would appreciate counsels' arguments and thoughts. So let's turn to the City first. MS. FOSTER: Thank you, Judge Howard. There has been a lot of discussion today, both from the City and UP, regarding RCW 81.53.295 and the apportionment of maintenance costs. But really,	7 8 9 10 11 12 13	tracks that get annoyed at having to wait so long because there's such a long queue and such a long backup. And that will also help public safety by preventing certain amounts of crashes in other instances at the grade crossing. And that's all the City has for their closing, Judge Howard. JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you.
7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	statements today would be relatively brief, but I would appreciate counsels' arguments and thoughts. So let's turn to the City first. MS. FOSTER: Thank you, Judge Howard. There has been a lot of discussion today, both from the City and UP, regarding RCW 81.53.295 and the apportionment of maintenance costs. But really, that statute is somewhat irrelevant. It's	7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	tracks that get annoyed at having to wait so long because there's such a long queue and such a long backup. And that will also help public safety by preventing certain amounts of crashes in other instances at the grade crossing. And that's all the City has for their closing, Judge Howard. JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. Would the Railroad like to give a closing?
7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	statements today would be relatively brief, but I would appreciate counsels' arguments and thoughts. So let's turn to the City first. MS. FOSTER: Thank you, Judge Howard. There has been a lot of discussion today, both from the City and UP, regarding RCW 81.53.295 and the apportionment of maintenance costs. But really, that statute is somewhat irrelevant. It's essentially, it's a mandatory statute. It's a shell.	7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	tracks that get annoyed at having to wait so long because there's such a long queue and such a long backup. And that will also help public safety by preventing certain amounts of crashes in other instances at the grade crossing. And that's all the City has for their closing, Judge Howard. JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. Would the Railroad like to give a closing? MS. REYNOLDS: Yes, Your Honor, and I would
7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	statements today would be relatively brief, but I would appreciate counsels' arguments and thoughts. So let's turn to the City first. MS. FOSTER: Thank you, Judge Howard. There has been a lot of discussion today, both from the City and UP, regarding RCW 81.53.295 and the apportionment of maintenance costs. But really, that statute is somewhat irrelevant. It's essentially, it's a mandatory statute. It's a shell. If federal highway funds, state highway funds are being	7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	tracks that get annoyed at having to wait so long because there's such a long queue and such a long backup. And that will also help public safety by preventing certain amounts of crashes in other instances at the grade crossing. And that's all the City has for their closing, Judge Howard. JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. Would the Railroad like to give a closing? MS. REYNOLDS: Yes, Your Honor, and I would like to share my screen if I can.
7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	statements today would be relatively brief, but I would appreciate counsels' arguments and thoughts. So let's turn to the City first. MS. FOSTER: Thank you, Judge Howard. There has been a lot of discussion today, both from the City and UP, regarding RCW 81.53.295 and the apportionment of maintenance costs. But really, that statute is somewhat irrelevant. It's essentially, it's a mandatory statute. It's a shell. If federal highway funds, state highway funds are being used for a grade crossing project, then the maintenance	7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	tracks that get annoyed at having to wait so long because there's such a long queue and such a long backup. And that will also help public safety by preventing certain amounts of crashes in other instances at the grade crossing. And that's all the City has for their closing, Judge Howard. JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. Would the Railroad like to give a closing? MS. REYNOLDS: Yes, Your Honor, and I would like to share my screen if I can. JUDGE HOWARD: Certainly. I assume we're
7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	statements today would be relatively brief, but I would appreciate counsels' arguments and thoughts. So let's turn to the City first. MS. FOSTER: Thank you, Judge Howard. There has been a lot of discussion today, both from the City and UP, regarding RCW 81.53.295 and the apportionment of maintenance costs. But really, that statute is somewhat irrelevant. It's essentially, it's a mandatory statute. It's a shell. If federal highway funds, state highway funds are being used for a grade crossing project, then the maintenance costs shall be borne by the Railroad. So really the	7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	tracks that get annoyed at having to wait so long because there's such a long queue and such a long backup. And that will also help public safety by preventing certain amounts of crashes in other instances at the grade crossing. And that's all the City has for their closing, Judge Howard. JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. Would the Railroad like to give a closing? MS. REYNOLDS: Yes, Your Honor, and I would like to share my screen if I can. JUDGE HOWARD: Certainly. I assume we're looking at an exhibit that's been admitted?
7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	statements today would be relatively brief, but I would appreciate counsels' arguments and thoughts. So let's turn to the City first. MS. FOSTER: Thank you, Judge Howard. There has been a lot of discussion today, both from the City and UP, regarding RCW 81.53.295 and the apportionment of maintenance costs. But really, that statute is somewhat irrelevant. It's essentially, it's a mandatory statute. It's a shell. If federal highway funds, state highway funds are being used for a grade crossing project, then the maintenance costs shall be borne by the Railroad. So really the issue here is whether or not that statute applies.	7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	tracks that get annoyed at having to wait so long because there's such a long queue and such a long backup. And that will also help public safety by preventing certain amounts of crashes in other instances at the grade crossing. And that's all the City has for their closing, Judge Howard. JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. Would the Railroad like to give a closing? MS. REYNOLDS: Yes, Your Honor, and I would like to share my screen if I can. JUDGE HOWARD: Certainly. I assume we're looking at an exhibit that's been admitted? MS. REYNOLDS: It is a demonstrative
7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	statements today would be relatively brief, but I would appreciate counsels' arguments and thoughts. So let's turn to the City first. MS. FOSTER: Thank you, Judge Howard. There has been a lot of discussion today, both from the City and UP, regarding RCW 81.53.295 and the apportionment of maintenance costs. But really, that statute is somewhat irrelevant. It's essentially, it's a mandatory statute. It's a shell. If federal highway funds, state highway funds are being used for a grade crossing project, then the maintenance costs shall be borne by the Railroad. So really the issue here is whether or not that statute applies. So the real issue is RCW 81.53.261 or	7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	tracks that get annoyed at having to wait so long because there's such a long queue and such a long backup. And that will also help public safety by preventing certain amounts of crashes in other instances at the grade crossing. And that's all the City has for their closing, Judge Howard. JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. Would the Railroad like to give a closing? MS. REYNOLDS: Yes, Your Honor, and I would like to share my screen if I can. JUDGE HOWARD: Certainly. I assume we're looking at an exhibit that's been admitted? MS. REYNOLDS: It is a demonstrative PowerPoint, Your Honor.
7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	statements today would be relatively brief, but I would appreciate counsels' arguments and thoughts. So let's turn to the City first. MS. FOSTER: Thank you, Judge Howard. There has been a lot of discussion today, both from the City and UP, regarding RCW 81.53.295 and the apportionment of maintenance costs. But really, that statute is somewhat irrelevant. It's essentially, it's a mandatory statute. It's a shell. If federal highway funds, state highway funds are being used for a grade crossing project, then the maintenance costs shall be borne by the Railroad. So really the issue here is whether or not that statute applies. So the real issue is RCW 81.53.261 or whether or not this Commission will grant the City's	7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	tracks that get annoyed at having to wait so long because there's such a long queue and such a long backup. And that will also help public safety by preventing certain amounts of crashes in other instances at the grade crossing. And that's all the City has for their closing, Judge Howard. JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. Would the Railroad like to give a closing? MS. REYNOLDS: Yes, Your Honor, and I would like to share my screen if I can. JUDGE HOWARD: Certainly. I assume we're looking at an exhibit that's been admitted? MS. REYNOLDS: It is a demonstrative PowerPoint, Your Honor. JUDGE HOWARD: All right.
7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	statements today would be relatively brief, but I would appreciate counsels' arguments and thoughts. So let's turn to the City first. MS. FOSTER: Thank you, Judge Howard. There has been a lot of discussion today, both from the City and UP, regarding RCW 81.53.295 and the apportionment of maintenance costs. But really, that statute is somewhat irrelevant. It's essentially, it's a mandatory statute. It's a shell. If federal highway funds, state highway funds are being used for a grade crossing project, then the maintenance costs shall be borne by the Railroad. So really the issue here is whether or not that statute applies. So the real issue is RCW 81.53.261 or whether or not this Commission will grant the City's petition and allow them to modify the grade crossing at	7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	tracks that get annoyed at having to wait so long because there's such a long queue and such a long backup. And that will also help public safety by preventing certain amounts of crashes in other instances at the grade crossing. And that's all the City has for their closing, Judge Howard. JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. Would the Railroad like to give a closing? MS. REYNOLDS: Yes, Your Honor, and I would like to share my screen if I can. JUDGE HOWARD: Certainly. I assume we're looking at an exhibit that's been admitted? MS. REYNOLDS: It is a demonstrative PowerPoint, Your Honor. JUDGE HOWARD: All right. MS. REYNOLDS: Are you able to see the
7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	statements today would be relatively brief, but I would appreciate counsels' arguments and thoughts. So let's turn to the City first. MS. FOSTER: Thank you, Judge Howard. There has been a lot of discussion today, both from the City and UP, regarding RCW 81.53.295 and the apportionment of maintenance costs. But really, that statute is somewhat irrelevant. It's essentially, it's a mandatory statute. It's a shell. If federal highway funds, state highway funds are being used for a grade crossing project, then the maintenance costs shall be borne by the Railroad. So really the issue here is whether or not that statute applies. So the real issue is RCW 81.53.261 or whether or not this Commission will grant the City's petition and allow them to modify the grade crossing at Barker Road. If the Commission does so, then then	7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	tracks that get annoyed at having to wait so long because there's such a long queue and such a long backup. And that will also help public safety by preventing certain amounts of crashes in other instances at the grade crossing. And that's all the City has for their closing, Judge Howard. JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. Would the Railroad like to give a closing? MS. REYNOLDS: Yes, Your Honor, and I would like to share my screen if I can. JUDGE HOWARD: Certainly. I assume we're looking at an exhibit that's been admitted? MS. REYNOLDS: It is a demonstrative PowerPoint, Your Honor. JUDGE HOWARD: All right. MS. REYNOLDS: Are you able to see the PowerPoint?
7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	statements today would be relatively brief, but I would appreciate counsels' arguments and thoughts. So let's turn to the City first. MS. FOSTER: Thank you, Judge Howard. There has been a lot of discussion today, both from the City and UP, regarding RCW 81.53.295 and the apportionment of maintenance costs. But really, that statute is somewhat irrelevant. It's essentially, it's a mandatory statute. It's a shell. If federal highway funds, state highway funds are being used for a grade crossing project, then the maintenance costs shall be borne by the Railroad. So really the issue here is whether or not that statute applies. So the real issue is RCW 81.53.261 or whether or not this Commission will grant the City's petition and allow them to modify the grade crossing at Barker Road. If the Commission does so, then then the 295 applies. If it doesn't if they don't, it	7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	tracks that get annoyed at having to wait so long because there's such a long queue and such a long backup. And that will also help public safety by preventing certain amounts of crashes in other instances at the grade crossing. And that's all the City has for their closing, Judge Howard. JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. Would the Railroad like to give a closing? MS. REYNOLDS: Yes, Your Honor, and I would like to share my screen if I can. JUDGE HOWARD: Certainly. I assume we're looking at an exhibit that's been admitted? MS. REYNOLDS: It is a demonstrative PowerPoint, Your Honor. JUDGE HOWARD: All right. MS. REYNOLDS: Are you able to see the PowerPoint? JUDGE HOWARD: Yes, thank you.
7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	statements today would be relatively brief, but I would appreciate counsels' arguments and thoughts. So let's turn to the City first. MS. FOSTER: Thank you, Judge Howard. There has been a lot of discussion today, both from the City and UP, regarding RCW 81.53.295 and the apportionment of maintenance costs. But really, that statute is somewhat irrelevant. It's essentially, it's a mandatory statute. It's a shell. If federal highway funds, state highway funds are being used for a grade crossing project, then the maintenance costs shall be borne by the Railroad. So really the issue here is whether or not that statute applies. So the real issue is RCW 81.53.261 or whether or not this Commission will grant the City's petition and allow them to modify the grade crossing at Barker Road. If the Commission does so, then then	7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	tracks that get annoyed at having to wait so long because there's such a long queue and such a long backup. And that will also help public safety by preventing certain amounts of crashes in other instances at the grade crossing. And that's all the City has for their closing, Judge Howard. JUDGE HOWARD: Thank you. Would the Railroad like to give a closing? MS. REYNOLDS: Yes, Your Honor, and I would like to share my screen if I can. JUDGE HOWARD: Certainly. I assume we're looking at an exhibit that's been admitted? MS. REYNOLDS: It is a demonstrative PowerPoint, Your Honor. JUDGE HOWARD: All right. MS. REYNOLDS: Are you able to see the PowerPoint?

32 (Pages 137 to 140)

	Dogo 141	Dage 14
	Page 141	Page 143
1	believes the dismissal of both the petition and the	1 of flashers.
2	complaint is warranted for three separate reasons.	2 There is going to be one cantilever and one
3	Number one, the petition is facially	³ flood gate flasher for each direction of travel, both
4	deficient. It fails to allege the public safety need,	4 now and then, or in the future. There will be nine
5	and therefore, does not meet the plain language of	5 flasher sets, two stop bars, two W10-1 approach signs,
6	section 261.	6 two railroad crossing pavement markings, and two W10-4
7	Second, the petition fails to state the	7 approach signs.
8	necessity from the standpoint of public safety for the	8 There's a difference between the number of
9	installation of the proposed modifications and does not	9 bells that's listed in the proposed description, which
10	indicate the cost or the installation or maintenance	10 would make sense because they're adding an additional
11	also required by section .271.	11 lane.
12	Finally, as to the complaint, the complaint	12 There's nothing in this petition that says
13	relies upon section 295, which contemplates installation	13 we've had some close calls, we've had cars jumping the
14	of new grade crossing protective devices, not redoing	14 tracks, we've had accidents or we've had derailments
15 16	what is already there as is the case in this case. So this is a case of cause and effect.	15 that is causing the City of Spokane Valley to file this
17	just heard the City's counsel state that public safety	16 petition.
18	could be, quote, helped or improved. I heard the	17 Now, we know the best evidence that there
19	statement, quote, public safety aspect.	 18 are no safety concerns is there is no changes 19 fundamentally to the system.
20	Staff asked questions of the Railroad	19fundamentally to the system.20So let's look at the petition quickly. The
21	witnesses that said things like, Does this impact the	21 City's prefiled testimony and the statements here today,
22	public safety? Or, Is there a reduction in accidents?	 21 City's premed testimony and the statements here today, 22 including most recently in the argument, talks about
23	All of those safety considerations may be	23 impacts to public safety, but that is not the standard.
24	affected, but they weren't concerns about this	24 The burden of proof is on the City as the petitioner
25	particular grade crossing, were not the impetus for this	 and the complainant. And this statute, upon which they
-	······································	
	Page 142	Page 14
	rage 142	
1		
1 2	project.	1 rely, states the City shall deem that the public safety
		 rely, states the City shall deem that the public safety requires the proposed modifications. And then their
2	project. This is not a public safety project. The	 rely, states the City shall deem that the public safety requires the proposed modifications. And then their
2 3	project. This is not a public safety project. The Barker Road UPRR crossing according to the City's own	 rely, states the City shall deem that the public safety requires the proposed modifications. And then their petition specifically must allege in writing that the
2 3 4	project. This is not a public safety project. The Barker Road UPRR crossing according to the City's own data has been safe for 25 years. There have been no	 rely, states the City shall deem that the public safety requires the proposed modifications. And then their petition specifically must allege in writing that the public safety requires the installation of specified
2 3 4 5	project. This is not a public safety project. The Barker Road UPRR crossing according to the City's own data has been safe for 25 years. There have been no accidents in the past 25 years. The Barker Road project	 rely, states the City shall deem that the public safety requires the proposed modifications. And then their petition specifically must allege in writing that the public safety requires the installation of specified signals or other warning devices at such crossing or the
2 3 4 5 6	project. This is not a public safety project. The Barker Road UPRR crossing according to the City's own data has been safe for 25 years. There have been no accidents in the past 25 years. The Barker Road project is developed or it was really motivated by future	 rely, states the City shall deem that the public safety requires the proposed modifications. And then their petition specifically must allege in writing that the public safety requires the installation of specified signals or other warning devices at such crossing or the specified changes in the method and manner of existin
2 3 4 5 6 7	project. This is not a public safety project. The Barker Road UPRR crossing according to the City's own data has been safe for 25 years. There have been no accidents in the past 25 years. The Barker Road project is developed or it was really motivated by future growth and development, and according to Ms. Mantz, some	 rely, states the City shall deem that the public safety requires the proposed modifications. And then their petition specifically must allege in writing that the public safety requires the installation of specified signals or other warning devices at such crossing or the specified changes in the method and manner of existin crossing warning devices.
2 3 4 5 6 7	project. This is not a public safety project. The Barker Road UPRR crossing according to the City's own data has been safe for 25 years. There have been no accidents in the past 25 years. The Barker Road project is developed or it was really motivated by future growth and development, and according to Ms. Mantz, some concerns about current traffic patterns.	 rely, states the City shall deem that the public safety requires the proposed modifications. And then their petition specifically must allege in writing that the public safety requires the installation of specified signals or other warning devices at such crossing or the specified changes in the method and manner of existin crossing warning devices. And it's important to be precise in the language with this because railroads are not obligated to fund every public project that happens to cross their
2 3 6 7 8 9 10 11	project. This is not a public safety project. The Barker Road UPRR crossing according to the City's own data has been safe for 25 years. There have been no accidents in the past 25 years. The Barker Road project is developed or it was really motivated by future growth and development, and according to Ms. Mantz, some concerns about current traffic patterns. The City has proposed this project for the City's benefit. The City's installing and modernizing sewage lines. The City is constructing a multiuse path.	 rely, states the City shall deem that the public safety requires the proposed modifications. And then their petition specifically must allege in writing that the public safety requires the installation of specified signals or other warning devices at such crossing or the specified changes in the method and manner of existin crossing warning devices. And it's important to be precise in the language with this because railroads are not obligated to fund every public project that happens to cross their lines. The funding is triggered when there is a public
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	project. This is not a public safety project. The Barker Road UPRR crossing according to the City's own data has been safe for 25 years. There have been no accidents in the past 25 years. The Barker Road project is developed or it was really motivated by future growth and development, and according to Ms. Mantz, some concerns about current traffic patterns. The City has proposed this project for the City's benefit. The City's installing and modernizing sewage lines. The City is constructing a multiuse path. The this is a 1.3-mile-long corridor, and it happens	 rely, states the City shall deem that the public safety requires the proposed modifications. And then their petition specifically must allege in writing that the public safety requires the installation of specified signals or other warning devices at such crossing or the specified changes in the method and manner of existin crossing warning devices. And it's important to be precise in the language with this because railroads are not obligated to fund every public project that happens to cross their lines. The funding is triggered when there is a public safety need that's associated with the railroad. And
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	project. This is not a public safety project. The Barker Road UPRR crossing according to the City's own data has been safe for 25 years. There have been no accidents in the past 25 years. The Barker Road project is developed or it was really motivated by future growth and development, and according to Ms. Mantz, some concerns about current traffic patterns. The City has proposed this project for the City's benefit. The City's installing and modernizing sewage lines. The City is constructing a multiuse path. The this is a 1.3-mile-long corridor, and it happens to cross over Union Pacific Railroad's crossing. Union	 rely, states the City shall deem that the public safety requires the proposed modifications. And then their petition specifically must allege in writing that the public safety requires the installation of specified signals or other warning devices at such crossing or the specified changes in the method and manner of existin crossing warning devices. And it's important to be precise in the language with this because railroads are not obligated to fund every public project that happens to cross their lines. The funding is triggered when there is a public safety need that's associated with the railroad. And the not only does the evidence not support that
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	project. This is not a public safety project. The Barker Road UPRR crossing according to the City's own data has been safe for 25 years. There have been no accidents in the past 25 years. The Barker Road project is developed or it was really motivated by future growth and development, and according to Ms. Mantz, some concerns about current traffic patterns. The City has proposed this project for the City's benefit. The City's installing and modernizing sewage lines. The City is constructing a multiuse path. The this is a 1.3-mile-long corridor, and it happens to cross over Union Pacific Railroad's crossing. Union Pacific Railroad was not the impetus of this project,	 rely, states the City shall deem that the public safety requires the proposed modifications. And then their petition specifically must allege in writing that the public safety requires the installation of specified signals or other warning devices at such crossing or the specified changes in the method and manner of existin crossing warning devices. And it's important to be precise in the language with this because railroads are not obligated to fund every public project that happens to cross their lines. The funding is triggered when there is a public safety need that's associated with the railroad. And the not only does the evidence not support that public safety required these changes to an already safe
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	project. This is not a public safety project. The Barker Road UPRR crossing according to the City's own data has been safe for 25 years. There have been no accidents in the past 25 years. The Barker Road project is developed or it was really motivated by future growth and development, and according to Ms. Mantz, some concerns about current traffic patterns. The City has proposed this project for the City's benefit. The City's installing and modernizing sewage lines. The City is constructing a multiuse path. The this is a 1.3-mile-long corridor, and it happens to cross over Union Pacific Railroad's crossing. Union Pacific Railroad was not the impetus of this project, and I think that's the crux of the argument.	 rely, states the City shall deem that the public safety requires the proposed modifications. And then their petition specifically must allege in writing that the public safety requires the installation of specified signals or other warning devices at such crossing or the specified changes in the method and manner of existin crossing warning devices. And it's important to be precise in the language with this because railroads are not obligated to fund every public project that happens to cross their lines. The funding is triggered when there is a public safety need that's associated with the railroad. And the not only does the evidence not support that public safety required these changes to an already safe crossing, but the petition didn't meet the statute, and
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	project. This is not a public safety project. The Barker Road UPRR crossing according to the City's own data has been safe for 25 years. There have been no accidents in the past 25 years. The Barker Road project is developed or it was really motivated by future growth and development, and according to Ms. Mantz, some concerns about current traffic patterns. The City has proposed this project for the City's benefit. The City's installing and modernizing sewage lines. The City is constructing a multiuse path. The this is a 1.3-mile-long corridor, and it happens to cross over Union Pacific Railroad's crossing. Union Pacific Railroad was not the impetus of this project, and I think that's the crux of the argument. The effect of the City's decision is to	 rely, states the City shall deem that the public safety requires the proposed modifications. And then their petition specifically must allege in writing that the public safety requires the installation of specified signals or other warning devices at such crossing or the specified changes in the method and manner of existin crossing warning devices. And it's important to be precise in the language with this because railroads are not obligated to fund every public project that happens to cross their lines. The funding is triggered when there is a public safety need that's associated with the railroad. And the not only does the evidence not support that public safety required these changes to an already safe crossing, but the petition didn't meet the statute, and therefore, dismissal is warranted.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	project. This is not a public safety project. The Barker Road UPRR crossing according to the City's own data has been safe for 25 years. There have been no accidents in the past 25 years. The Barker Road project is developed or it was really motivated by future growth and development, and according to Ms. Mantz, some concerns about current traffic patterns. The City has proposed this project for the City's benefit. The City's installing and modernizing sewage lines. The City is constructing a multiuse path. The this is a 1.3-mile-long corridor, and it happens to cross over Union Pacific Railroad's crossing. Union Pacific Railroad was not the impetus of this project, and I think that's the crux of the argument. The effect of the City's decision is to reinstall basically the same traffic warning devices and	 rely, states the City shall deem that the public safety requires the proposed modifications. And then their petition specifically must allege in writing that the public safety requires the installation of specified signals or other warning devices at such crossing or the specified changes in the method and manner of existin crossing warning devices. And it's important to be precise in the language with this because railroads are not obligated to fund every public project that happens to cross their lines. The funding is triggered when there is a public safety need that's associated with the railroad. And the not only does the evidence not support that public safety required these changes to an already safe crossing, but the petition didn't meet the statute, and therefore, dismissal is warranted. If you go to 271, the next section, it also
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	project. This is not a public safety project. The Barker Road UPRR crossing according to the City's own data has been safe for 25 years. There have been no accidents in the past 25 years. The Barker Road project is developed or it was really motivated by future growth and development, and according to Ms. Mantz, some concerns about current traffic patterns. The City has proposed this project for the City's benefit. The City's installing and modernizing sewage lines. The City is constructing a multiuse path. The this is a 1.3-mile-long corridor, and it happens to cross over Union Pacific Railroad's crossing. Union Pacific Railroad was not the impetus of this project, and I think that's the crux of the argument. The effect of the City's decision is to reinstall basically the same traffic warning devices and system as currently exists.	1rely, states the City shall deem that the public safety2requires the proposed modifications. And then their3petition specifically must allege in writing that the4public safety requires the installation of specified5signals or other warning devices at such crossing or the6specified changes in the method and manner of existin7crossing warning devices.8And it's important to be precise in the9language with this because railroads are not obligated10to fund every public project that happens to cross their11lines. The funding is triggered when there is a public12safety need that's associated with the railroad. And13the not only does the evidence not support that14public safety required these changes to an already safe15crossing, but the petition didn't meet the statute, and16therefore, dismissal is warranted.17If you go to 271, the next section, it also18further describes what the petition must include, also
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	project. This is not a public safety project. The Barker Road UPRR crossing according to the City's own data has been safe for 25 years. There have been no accidents in the past 25 years. The Barker Road project is developed or it was really motivated by future growth and development, and according to Ms. Mantz, some concerns about current traffic patterns. The City has proposed this project for the City's benefit. The City's installing and modernizing sewage lines. The City is constructing a multiuse path. The this is a 1.3-mile-long corridor, and it happens to cross over Union Pacific Railroad's crossing. Union Pacific Railroad was not the impetus of this project, and I think that's the crux of the argument. The effect of the City's decision is to reinstall basically the same traffic warning devices and system as currently exists. How do we know they're basically the same?	 rely, states the City shall deem that the public safety requires the proposed modifications. And then their petition specifically must allege in writing that the public safety requires the installation of specified signals or other warning devices at such crossing or the specified changes in the method and manner of existin crossing warning devices. And it's important to be precise in the language with this because railroads are not obligated to fund every public project that happens to cross their lines. The funding is triggered when there is a public safety need that's associated with the railroad. And the not only does the evidence not support that public safety required these changes to an already safe crossing, but the petition didn't meet the statute, and therefore, dismissal is warranted. If you go to 271, the next section, it also further describes what the petition must include, also not included in the City's petition. The petition must
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	project. This is not a public safety project. The Barker Road UPRR crossing according to the City's own data has been safe for 25 years. There have been no accidents in the past 25 years. The Barker Road project is developed or it was really motivated by future growth and development, and according to Ms. Mantz, some concerns about current traffic patterns. The City has proposed this project for the City's benefit. The City's installing and modernizing sewage lines. The City is constructing a multiuse path. The this is a 1.3-mile-long corridor, and it happens to cross over Union Pacific Railroad's crossing. Union Pacific Railroad was not the impetus of this project, and I think that's the crux of the argument. The effect of the City's decision is to reinstall basically the same traffic warning devices and system as currently exists. How do we know they're basically the same? If we compare the sections from the petition, and	1rely, states the City shall deem that the public safety2requires the proposed modifications. And then their3petition specifically must allege in writing that the4public safety requires the installation of specified5signals or other warning devices at such crossing or the6specified changes in the method and manner of existin7crossing warning devices.8And it's important to be precise in the9language with this because railroads are not obligated10to fund every public project that happens to cross their11lines. The funding is triggered when there is a public12safety need that's associated with the railroad. And13the not only does the evidence not support that14public safety required these changes to an already safe15crossing, but the petition didn't meet the statute, and16therefore, dismissal is warranted.17If you go to 271, the next section, it also18further describes what the petition must include, also19not included in the City's petition. The petition must20describe the proposed modification, including the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	project. This is not a public safety project. The Barker Road UPRR crossing according to the City's own data has been safe for 25 years. There have been no accidents in the past 25 years. The Barker Road project is developed or it was really motivated by future growth and development, and according to Ms. Mantz, some concerns about current traffic patterns. The City has proposed this project for the City's benefit. The City's installing and modernizing sewage lines. The City is constructing a multiuse path. The this is a 1.3-mile-long corridor, and it happens to cross over Union Pacific Railroad's crossing. Union Pacific Railroad was not the impetus of this project, and I think that's the crux of the argument. The effect of the City's decision is to reinstall basically the same traffic warning devices and system as currently exists. How do we know they're basically the same? If we compare the sections from the petition, and although they're worded slightly differently, I think	1rely, states the City shall deem that the public safety2requires the proposed modifications. And then their3petition specifically must allege in writing that the4public safety requires the installation of specified5signals or other warning devices at such crossing or the6specified changes in the method and manner of existin7crossing warning devices.8And it's important to be precise in the9language with this because railroads are not obligated10to fund every public project that happens to cross their11lines. The funding is triggered when there is a public12safety need that's associated with the railroad. And13the not only does the evidence not support that14public safety required these changes to an already safe15crossing, but the petition didn't meet the statute, and16therefore, dismissal is warranted.17If you go to 271, the next section, it also18further describes what the petition must include, also19not included in the City's petition. The petition must20describe the proposed modification, including the21necessity from the standpoint of public safety for such
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	project. This is not a public safety project. The Barker Road UPRR crossing according to the City's own data has been safe for 25 years. There have been no accidents in the past 25 years. The Barker Road project is developed or it was really motivated by future growth and development, and according to Ms. Mantz, some concerns about current traffic patterns. The City has proposed this project for the City's benefit. The City's installing and modernizing sewage lines. The City is constructing a multiuse path. The this is a 1.3-mile-long corridor, and it happens to cross over Union Pacific Railroad's crossing. Union Pacific Railroad was not the impetus of this project, and I think that's the crux of the argument. The effect of the City's decision is to reinstall basically the same traffic warning devices and system as currently exists. How do we know they're basically the same? If we compare the sections from the petition, and although they're worded slightly differently, I think the witnesses all acknowledged today that it's	1rely, states the City shall deem that the public safety2requires the proposed modifications. And then their3petition specifically must allege in writing that the4public safety requires the installation of specified5signals or other warning devices at such crossing or the6specified changes in the method and manner of existin7crossing warning devices.8And it's important to be precise in the9language with this because railroads are not obligated10to fund every public project that happens to cross their11lines. The funding is triggered when there is a public12safety need that's associated with the railroad. And13the not only does the evidence not support that14public safety required these changes to an already safe15crossing, but the petition didn't meet the statute, and16therefore, dismissal is warranted.17If you go to 271, the next section, it also18further describes what the petition must include, also19not included in the City's petition. The petition must20describe the proposed modification, including the21necessity from the standpoint of public safety for such22installation and include the approximate cost of
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	project. This is not a public safety project. The Barker Road UPRR crossing according to the City's own data has been safe for 25 years. There have been no accidents in the past 25 years. The Barker Road project is developed or it was really motivated by future growth and development, and according to Ms. Mantz, some concerns about current traffic patterns. The City has proposed this project for the City's benefit. The City's installing and modernizing sewage lines. The City is constructing a multiuse path. The this is a 1.3-mile-long corridor, and it happens to cross over Union Pacific Railroad's crossing. Union Pacific Railroad was not the impetus of this project, and I think that's the crux of the argument. The effect of the City's decision is to reinstall basically the same traffic warning devices and system as currently exists. How do we know they're basically the same? If we compare the sections from the petition, and although they're worded slightly differently, I think the witnesses all acknowledged today that it's essentially the same system. It's not new technology.	1 rely, states the City shall deem that the public safety 2 requires the proposed modifications. And then their 3 petition specifically must allege in writing that the 4 public safety requires the installation of specified 5 signals or other warning devices at such crossing or the 6 specified changes in the method and manner of existin 7 crossing warning devices. 8 And it's important to be precise in the 9 language with this because railroads are not obligated 10 to fund every public project that happens to cross their 11 lines. The funding is triggered when there is a public 12 safety need that's associated with the railroad. And 13 the not only does the evidence not support that 14 public safety required these changes to an already safe 15 crossing, but the petition didn't meet the statute, and 16 therefore, dismissal is warranted. 17 If you go to 271, the next section, it also 18 further describes what the petition must include, also 19 not included in the City's petition. The petition must 20 describe the proposed modification, including the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	project. This is not a public safety project. The Barker Road UPRR crossing according to the City's own data has been safe for 25 years. There have been no accidents in the past 25 years. The Barker Road project is developed or it was really motivated by future growth and development, and according to Ms. Mantz, some concerns about current traffic patterns. The City has proposed this project for the City's benefit. The City's installing and modernizing sewage lines. The City is constructing a multiuse path. The this is a 1.3-mile-long corridor, and it happens to cross over Union Pacific Railroad's crossing. Union Pacific Railroad was not the impetus of this project, and I think that's the crux of the argument. The effect of the City's decision is to reinstall basically the same traffic warning devices and system as currently exists. How do we know they're basically the same? If we compare the sections from the petition, and although they're worded slightly differently, I think the witnesses all acknowledged today that it's essentially the same system. It's not new technology. It's not updated in accordance with concerns about the	1rely, states the City shall deem that the public safety2requires the proposed modifications. And then their3petition specifically must allege in writing that the4public safety requires the installation of specified5signals or other warning devices at such crossing or the6specified changes in the method and manner of existin7crossing warning devices.8And it's important to be precise in the9language with this because railroads are not obligated10to fund every public project that happens to cross their11lines. The funding is triggered when there is a public12safety need that's associated with the railroad. And13the not only does the evidence not support that14public safety required these changes to an already safe15crossing, but the petition didn't meet the statute, and16therefore, dismissal is warranted.17If you go to 271, the next section, it also18further describes what the petition must include, also19not included in the City's petition. The petition must20describe the proposed modification, including the21necessity from the standpoint of public safety for such22installation and include the approximate cost of23installation and related work and the appropriate annual24cost of maintenance. The petition again is deficient
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	project. This is not a public safety project. The Barker Road UPRR crossing according to the City's own data has been safe for 25 years. There have been no accidents in the past 25 years. The Barker Road project is developed or it was really motivated by future growth and development, and according to Ms. Mantz, some concerns about current traffic patterns. The City has proposed this project for the City's benefit. The City's installing and modernizing sewage lines. The City is constructing a multiuse path. The this is a 1.3-mile-long corridor, and it happens to cross over Union Pacific Railroad's crossing. Union Pacific Railroad was not the impetus of this project, and I think that's the crux of the argument. The effect of the City's decision is to reinstall basically the same traffic warning devices and system as currently exists. How do we know they're basically the same? If we compare the sections from the petition, and although they're worded slightly differently, I think the witnesses all acknowledged today that it's essentially the same system. It's not new technology.	1 rely, states the City shall deem that the public safety 2 requires the proposed modifications. And then their 3 petition specifically must allege in writing that the 4 public safety requires the installation of specified 5 signals or other warning devices at such crossing or the 6 specified changes in the method and manner of existin 7 crossing warning devices. 8 And it's important to be precise in the 9 language with this because railroads are not obligated 10 to fund every public project that happens to cross their 11 lines. The funding is triggered when there is a public 12 safety need that's associated with the railroad. And 13 the not only does the evidence not support that 14 public safety required these changes to an already safe 15 crossing, but the petition didn't meet the statute, and 16 therefore, dismissal is warranted. 17 If you go to 271, the next section, it also 18 further describes what the petition must include, also 19 not included in the City's petition. The petition must 20 describe the proposed modification, including the

33 (Pages 141 to 144)

		1	
	Page 145		Page 147
1	And then finally, 295, we have talked about	1	relevant inquiry is whether Union Pacific acted in
2	this previously. Union Pacific doesn't characterize	2	accordance with what it understood the course and
3	their reinstallation of the same basic traffic control	3	conduct of this negotiation were.
4	system as a new installation that a railroad must fund	4	So the burden is on the City, and the City
5	under 295. This is a reinstallation of an already	5	has failed to produce pleadings that satisfy the
6	existing system.	6	statute. They haven't proven the public safety
7	And I'm it's conspicuous for its absence	7	necessity, only impacts on public safety. There's no
8	of specific evidence of what specific federal aid	8	evidence that 295 applies because they're not installing
9	highway funds are coming to use for the construction and	9	new protective devices, they're just the same thing
10	installation of the modification. There's there are	10	moved to accommodate an additional lane, and common
11	a lot of prefiled statements and testimony that was	11	sense.
12	given today that there's federal funding for the	12	If we were to take the City's argument to
13	project. The project is a 1.3-mile-long corridor that	13	its logical conclusion, I mean, roadways, railroads,
14	happens to cross this Union Pacific Railroad, but no one	14	bicycle lanes, all of that type of stuff impacts the
15	has offered specific evidence about the federal funds,	15	public safety. And the goal of municipalities, the goal
16	the federal aid highway funds, that are being used for	16	of transportation companies, and the goal of
17	these particular devices. And so for two reasons,	17	Commissions, like the UTC, is to provide for public
18	Section 295 does not apply.	18	safety, and public safety is always a consideration.
19	And the evidence that we have in the record	19	But only in particular instances is there a
20	is that there are federal funds overall for this lengthy	20	public safety requirement or necessity. And what we did
21	project, but there is a deficiency in the evidence and	21	not hear from the City is a necessity from a public
22	in the record about those federal funds as they relate	22	safety concern about this particular crossing, which
23	specifically to this modification.	23	warrants imposition of maintenance costs onto the
24	Finally, 261 allows parties to enter into	24	Railroad.
25	contract and negotiate costs, and that's exactly what	25	And for those reasons, the Railroad requests
	5 146		- 140
	Page 146		Page 148
1	they had done in the previous CMA that was dated 2017.	1	that the Commission dismiss the complaint and the
2	And I think that I I will correct myself here, City	2	petition. Thank you.
3	paid maintenance costs. The Railroad was paying certain	3	JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Thank you.
4	maintenance costs. But the important thing is that the	4	
		1	Would Staff like to give a brief closing
5	parties were required to negotiate about future	5	statement?
6	projects, which is exactly what happened here.	5 6	statement? MR. ROBERSON: Very briefly. There we go
6 7	projects, which is exactly what happened here. And despite the sense of urgency that is	5 6 7	statement? MR. ROBERSON: Very briefly. There we go with the video. Staff will largely defer its arguments
6 7 8	projects, which is exactly what happened here. And despite the sense of urgency that is listed in the complaint that says it's harmful to the	5 6 7 8	statement? MR. ROBERSON: Very briefly. There we go with the video. Staff will largely defer its arguments to its brief. I note a couple of points.
6 7 8 9	projects, which is exactly what happened here. And despite the sense of urgency that is listed in the complaint that says it's harmful to the public, the parties previously agreed that they were	5 6 7 8 9	statement? MR. ROBERSON: Very briefly. There we go with the video. Staff will largely defer its arguments to its brief. I note a couple of points. One, the Railroad moved initially to dismiss
6 7 8 9 10	projects, which is exactly what happened here. And despite the sense of urgency that is listed in the complaint that says it's harmful to the public, the parties previously agreed that they were going to enter into this negotiation period. And	5 6 7 8 9 10	statement? MR. ROBERSON: Very briefly. There we go with the video. Staff will largely defer its arguments to its brief. I note a couple of points. One, the Railroad moved initially to dismiss the complaint for deficient pleadings. Judge Pearson
6 7 8 9 10 11	projects, which is exactly what happened here. And despite the sense of urgency that is listed in the complaint that says it's harmful to the public, the parties previously agreed that they were going to enter into this negotiation period. And urgency does not justify disregard of the statutory	5 6 7 8 9 10 11	statement? MR. ROBERSON: Very briefly. There we go with the video. Staff will largely defer its arguments to its brief. I note a couple of points. One, the Railroad moved initially to dismiss the complaint for deficient pleadings. Judge Pearson denied that. That was I think in the prehearing
6 7 8 9 10 11 12	projects, which is exactly what happened here. And despite the sense of urgency that is listed in the complaint that says it's harmful to the public, the parties previously agreed that they were going to enter into this negotiation period. And urgency does not justify disregard of the statutory requirement that the public safety required these	5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	statement? MR. ROBERSON: Very briefly. There we go with the video. Staff will largely defer its arguments to its brief. I note a couple of points. One, the Railroad moved initially to dismiss the complaint for deficient pleadings. Judge Pearson denied that. That was I think in the prehearing conference order. That was not appealed. So basically
6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	projects, which is exactly what happened here. And despite the sense of urgency that is listed in the complaint that says it's harmful to the public, the parties previously agreed that they were going to enter into this negotiation period. And urgency does not justify disregard of the statutory requirement that the public safety required these modifications to be made.	5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	statement? MR. ROBERSON: Very briefly. There we go with the video. Staff will largely defer its arguments to its brief. I note a couple of points. One, the Railroad moved initially to dismiss the complaint for deficient pleadings. Judge Pearson denied that. That was I think in the prehearing conference order. That was not appealed. So basically that closing argument constituted a collateral attack on
6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	projects, which is exactly what happened here. And despite the sense of urgency that is listed in the complaint that says it's harmful to the public, the parties previously agreed that they were going to enter into this negotiation period. And urgency does not justify disregard of the statutory requirement that the public safety required these modifications to be made. Finally, in December 2020, whether	5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	statement? MR. ROBERSON: Very briefly. There we go with the video. Staff will largely defer its arguments to its brief. I note a couple of points. One, the Railroad moved initially to dismiss the complaint for deficient pleadings. Judge Pearson denied that. That was I think in the prehearing conference order. That was not appealed. So basically that closing argument constituted a collateral attack on Commission order. It's improper. You should disregard
6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	projects, which is exactly what happened here. And despite the sense of urgency that is listed in the complaint that says it's harmful to the public, the parties previously agreed that they were going to enter into this negotiation period. And urgency does not justify disregard of the statutory requirement that the public safety required these modifications to be made. Finally, in December 2020, whether Mr. Lochmiller or Mrs. Mantz were authorized to accept	5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	statement? MR. ROBERSON: Very briefly. There we go with the video. Staff will largely defer its arguments to its brief. I note a couple of points. One, the Railroad moved initially to dismiss the complaint for deficient pleadings. Judge Pearson denied that. That was I think in the prehearing conference order. That was not appealed. So basically that closing argument constituted a collateral attack on Commission order. It's improper. You should disregard the argument.
6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	projects, which is exactly what happened here. And despite the sense of urgency that is listed in the complaint that says it's harmful to the public, the parties previously agreed that they were going to enter into this negotiation period. And urgency does not justify disregard of the statutory requirement that the public safety required these modifications to be made. Finally, in December 2020, whether Mr. Lochmiller or Mrs. Mantz were authorized to accept terms on behalf of the City or not, Union Pacific was	5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	statement? MR. ROBERSON: Very briefly. There we go with the video. Staff will largely defer its arguments to its brief. I note a couple of points. One, the Railroad moved initially to dismiss the complaint for deficient pleadings. Judge Pearson denied that. That was I think in the prehearing conference order. That was not appealed. So basically that closing argument constituted a collateral attack on Commission order. It's improper. You should disregard the argument. To the extent, I think the parties agree on
6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	projects, which is exactly what happened here. And despite the sense of urgency that is listed in the complaint that says it's harmful to the public, the parties previously agreed that they were going to enter into this negotiation period. And urgency does not justify disregard of the statutory requirement that the public safety required these modifications to be made. Finally, in December 2020, whether Mr. Lochmiller or Mrs. Mantz were authorized to accept terms on behalf of the City or not, Union Pacific was told that the City accepted these terms. And the Union	5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	statement? MR. ROBERSON: Very briefly. There we go with the video. Staff will largely defer its arguments to its brief. I note a couple of points. One, the Railroad moved initially to dismiss the complaint for deficient pleadings. Judge Pearson denied that. That was I think in the prehearing conference order. That was not appealed. So basically that closing argument constituted a collateral attack on Commission order. It's improper. You should disregard the argument. To the extent, I think the parties agree on what the relevant facts are. It's whether or not public
6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	projects, which is exactly what happened here. And despite the sense of urgency that is listed in the complaint that says it's harmful to the public, the parties previously agreed that they were going to enter into this negotiation period. And urgency does not justify disregard of the statutory requirement that the public safety required these modifications to be made. Finally, in December 2020, whether Mr. Lochmiller or Mrs. Mantz were authorized to accept terms on behalf of the City or not, Union Pacific was told that the City accepted these terms. And the Union Pacific Railroad acted in accordance with what they were	5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	statement? MR. ROBERSON: Very briefly. There we go with the video. Staff will largely defer its arguments to its brief. I note a couple of points. One, the Railroad moved initially to dismiss the complaint for deficient pleadings. Judge Pearson denied that. That was I think in the prehearing conference order. That was not appealed. So basically that closing argument constituted a collateral attack on Commission order. It's improper. You should disregard the argument. To the extent, I think the parties agree on what the relevant facts are. It's whether or not public safety requires the installation of these warning
6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	projects, which is exactly what happened here. And despite the sense of urgency that is listed in the complaint that says it's harmful to the public, the parties previously agreed that they were going to enter into this negotiation period. And urgency does not justify disregard of the statutory requirement that the public safety required these modifications to be made. Finally, in December 2020, whether Mr. Lochmiller or Mrs. Mantz were authorized to accept terms on behalf of the City or not, Union Pacific was told that the City accepted these terms. And the Union Pacific Railroad acted in accordance with what they were told in the plain language of the December 8th email.	5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	statement? MR. ROBERSON: Very briefly. There we go with the video. Staff will largely defer its arguments to its brief. I note a couple of points. One, the Railroad moved initially to dismiss the complaint for deficient pleadings. Judge Pearson denied that. That was I think in the prehearing conference order. That was not appealed. So basically that closing argument constituted a collateral attack on Commission order. It's improper. You should disregard the argument. To the extent, I think the parties agree on what the relevant facts are. It's whether or not public safety requires the installation of these warning devices or the modification, whether there's a
6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	projects, which is exactly what happened here. And despite the sense of urgency that is listed in the complaint that says it's harmful to the public, the parties previously agreed that they were going to enter into this negotiation period. And urgency does not justify disregard of the statutory requirement that the public safety required these modifications to be made. Finally, in December 2020, whether Mr. Lochmiller or Mrs. Mantz were authorized to accept terms on behalf of the City or not, Union Pacific was told that the City accepted these terms. And the Union Pacific Railroad acted in accordance with what they were told in the plain language of the December 8th email. December 7th, Union Pacific says, Here's the estimated	5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	statement? MR. ROBERSON: Very briefly. There we go with the video. Staff will largely defer its arguments to its brief. I note a couple of points. One, the Railroad moved initially to dismiss the complaint for deficient pleadings. Judge Pearson denied that. That was I think in the prehearing conference order. That was not appealed. So basically that closing argument constituted a collateral attack on Commission order. It's improper. You should disregard the argument. To the extent, I think the parties agree on what the relevant facts are. It's whether or not public safety requires the installation of these warning devices or the modification, whether there's a statutorily allocated apportionment of maintenance, and
6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	projects, which is exactly what happened here. And despite the sense of urgency that is listed in the complaint that says it's harmful to the public, the parties previously agreed that they were going to enter into this negotiation period. And urgency does not justify disregard of the statutory requirement that the public safety required these modifications to be made. Finally, in December 2020, whether Mr. Lochmiller or Mrs. Mantz were authorized to accept terms on behalf of the City or not, Union Pacific was told that the City accepted these terms. And the Union Pacific Railroad acted in accordance with what they were told in the plain language of the December 8th email. December 7th, Union Pacific says, Here's the estimated costs that we're going to bill you, City of Spokane	5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	statement? MR. ROBERSON: Very briefly. There we go with the video. Staff will largely defer its arguments to its brief. I note a couple of points. One, the Railroad moved initially to dismiss the complaint for deficient pleadings. Judge Pearson denied that. That was I think in the prehearing conference order. That was not appealed. So basically that closing argument constituted a collateral attack on Commission order. It's improper. You should disregard the argument. To the extent, I think the parties agree on what the relevant facts are. It's whether or not public safety requires the installation of these warning devices or the modification, whether there's a statutorily allocated apportionment of maintenance, and whether or not the parties agreed.
6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	projects, which is exactly what happened here. And despite the sense of urgency that is listed in the complaint that says it's harmful to the public, the parties previously agreed that they were going to enter into this negotiation period. And urgency does not justify disregard of the statutory requirement that the public safety required these modifications to be made. Finally, in December 2020, whether Mr. Lochmiller or Mrs. Mantz were authorized to accept terms on behalf of the City or not, Union Pacific was told that the City accepted these terms. And the Union Pacific Railroad acted in accordance with what they were told in the plain language of the December 8th email. December 7th, Union Pacific says, Here's the estimated costs that we're going to bill you, City of Spokane Valley, and the representative for the City of Spokane	5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	statement? MR. ROBERSON: Very briefly. There we go with the video. Staff will largely defer its arguments to its brief. I note a couple of points. One, the Railroad moved initially to dismiss the complaint for deficient pleadings. Judge Pearson denied that. That was I think in the prehearing conference order. That was not appealed. So basically that closing argument constituted a collateral attack on Commission order. It's improper. You should disregard the argument. To the extent, I think the parties agree on what the relevant facts are. It's whether or not public safety requires the installation of these warning devices or the modification, whether there's a statutorily allocated apportionment of maintenance, and whether or not the parties agreed. I think the latter two are fairly technical
6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	projects, which is exactly what happened here. And despite the sense of urgency that is listed in the complaint that says it's harmful to the public, the parties previously agreed that they were going to enter into this negotiation period. And urgency does not justify disregard of the statutory requirement that the public safety required these modifications to be made. Finally, in December 2020, whether Mr. Lochmiller or Mrs. Mantz were authorized to accept terms on behalf of the City or not, Union Pacific was told that the City accepted these terms. And the Union Pacific Railroad acted in accordance with what they were told in the plain language of the December 8th email. December 7th, Union Pacific says, Here's the estimated costs that we're going to bill you, City of Spokane Valley, and the representative for the City of Spokane Valley said, Okay. We agree with that.	5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	statement? MR. ROBERSON: Very briefly. There we go with the video. Staff will largely defer its arguments to its brief. I note a couple of points. One, the Railroad moved initially to dismiss the complaint for deficient pleadings. Judge Pearson denied that. That was I think in the prehearing conference order. That was not appealed. So basically that closing argument constituted a collateral attack on Commission order. It's improper. You should disregard the argument. To the extent, I think the parties agree on what the relevant facts are. It's whether or not public safety requires the installation of these warning devices or the modification, whether there's a statutorily allocated apportionment of maintenance, and whether or not the parties agreed. I think the latter two are fairly technical and I'm just going to talk about those on brief, but I
6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	projects, which is exactly what happened here. And despite the sense of urgency that is listed in the complaint that says it's harmful to the public, the parties previously agreed that they were going to enter into this negotiation period. And urgency does not justify disregard of the statutory requirement that the public safety required these modifications to be made. Finally, in December 2020, whether Mr. Lochmiller or Mrs. Mantz were authorized to accept terms on behalf of the City or not, Union Pacific was told that the City accepted these terms. And the Union Pacific Railroad acted in accordance with what they were told in the plain language of the December 8th email. December 7th, Union Pacific says, Here's the estimated costs that we're going to bill you, City of Spokane Valley, and the representative for the City of Spokane	5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	statement? MR. ROBERSON: Very briefly. There we go with the video. Staff will largely defer its arguments to its brief. I note a couple of points. One, the Railroad moved initially to dismiss the complaint for deficient pleadings. Judge Pearson denied that. That was I think in the prehearing conference order. That was not appealed. So basically that closing argument constituted a collateral attack on Commission order. It's improper. You should disregard the argument. To the extent, I think the parties agree on what the relevant facts are. It's whether or not public safety requires the installation of these warning devices or the modification, whether there's a statutorily allocated apportionment of maintenance, and whether or not the parties agreed. I think the latter two are fairly technical

34 (Pages 145 to 148)

	Page 149		Page 151
1	The statute I believe says the Commission	1	CERTIFICATE
2	needs to determine whether or not public safety requires	2	
3	the modifications, the installation, whatever, of the	3	STATE OF WASHINGTON
4	warning devices.	4	COUNTY OF THURSTON
5	The City presented evidence that the	5	
б	population is growing, traffic is increasing, they're	6	I, Tayler Garlinghouse, a Certified Shorthand
7	concerned about traffic, accidents, those kinds of	7	Reporter in and for the State of Washington, do hereby
8	things. These modifications were intended to address	8	certify that the foregoing transcript is true and
9	that. Call it an impact on public safety, call it	9	accurate to the best of my knowledge, skill and ability.
10	whatever you want. That's how you measure public	10	
11	safety. Will this make the road safer?	11	
12	Staff submits that the City has carried its	12	00763
13	burden on that by showing that by installing the extra	13 14	
14	lane, by installing the, you know, extra flashers to	15	
15	make sure that all the lanes are aware that they need to		Tayler Garlinghouse, CCR 3358
16	stop when the cantilever arm goes down or what have you,	16	
17	that those reduce the frequency of accidents and improve	17	
18	the safety of the crossing.	18	
19	So the Commission should find accordingly	19	
20	and enter an order to that effect. And like I said, I'm	20	
21	going to defer the rest of my argument to the brief.	21	
22	JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Thank you. I	22	
23	would like to thank everyone for participating in this	23	
24	proceeding today and the witnesses for their testimony.	24	
25	I will take all of this under advisement and issue an	25	
	Page 150		
1	order in the near future. As we noted already, we have		
2	the post-hearing briefs due May 31st with a 30-page		
3	limit.		
4	I would frequently for initial orders at		
5	the Commission, we have a ten-day deadline following the		
6	hearing. But here the parties have asked for the		
7	post-hearing briefs. I would therefore try to get my		
8	order finished my goal now is probably June 14th, about		
9	two weeks after those post-hearing briefs. And I will		
10	send the updated exhibit list to the court reporter		
11	after our hearing today showing what has been admitted.		
12	Is there anything else that we should		
13	address before we adjourn today?		
14	MR. ROBERSON: Not from Staff.		
15	MS. FOSTER: There's nothing from the City,		
16 17	Judge Howard.		
17 18	MS. REYNOLDS: Nothing from Union Pacific.		
18 19	Thank you, Your Honor. JUDGE HOWARD: All right. Thank you all.		
20	We are adjourned.		
20 21	(Adjourned at 12:48 p.m.)		
22	(Aujoumed at 12.40 p.m.)		
23			
24			
25			

35 (Pages 149 to 151)

A	109:1 146:25	106:18 122:25	59:6,22 88:13,17	allows 33:22
$\frac{\mathbf{A}}{\mathbf{A} \cdot \mathbf{z} \cdot \mathbf{i} \cdot \mathbf{z} \cdot \mathbf{a} \ 21:1}$	ad 23:6	124:18	88:19 89:19 90:2	145:24
	add 58:3 103:15,16	admitted 40:19,20	91:19 105:16	altogether 134:13
a.m 13:18 20:2,8	added 63:13,18	40:25 57:4,4,6	108:16,19 109:1,3	amount 94:22
95:19,19 98:13,13	adding 103:14	62:1,2 71:2,3 73:8	109:8,15,17,24	118:24
AAG 21:11	105:7 139:18,24	74:1,2 77:22,23	110:12 111:3,4,7	amounts 100:14
ability 41:11 151:9	140:4 143:10	85:20,21 90:14,17	119:9 122:6,9,22	140:9
able 23:5 45:18	addition 37:9,12	90:19,20 97:13,14	123:5,8,11,12,14	analysis 16:19
58:1 70:2 90:22	75:21 85:17	100:5,6 106:22,23		76:20,24 78:4
110:1 140:22		· · · ·	123:18 124:2,22	81:12 83:21
absence 145:7	103:18 104:10	121:7,14,15	125:2 135:16	
absent 35:1,2	136:1	124:19 135:17	136:11,13	analyzed 81:16,22
absolutely 139:15	additional 33:8	140:18 150:11	agreements 29:21	123:11
accept 32:14	35:5 63:4,8,11,12	adopted 51:8 52:15	31:4 32:18 33:3	and/or 108:18
146:15	63:16,18,21,22	53:20 54:11,15	33:18,20 68:4	128:3 129:1
acceptance 35:3	66:13 87:4 91:9	adoption 51:11	89:23 104:21	annoyed 140:6
110:18	103:14,17,18	53:17	122:20 123:10	annual 58:23 59:20
accepted 110:16	104:5,6,11 116:17	advertise 91:19	agrees 36:25 37:5,5	144:23
122:9 146:17	118:1 132:16	advertised 88:18	135:24	answer 44:1 56:19
access 63:19 135:6	137:19 142:25	advisement 149:25	ahead 82:7 131:15	84:17 95:7 104:15
accidentally 70:3	143:10 147:10	affect 116:6	aid 17:20 92:15	108:13 111:24
accidents 86:10	address 36:8 40:21	afternoon 120:16	113:8 115:8,19	116:10 132:15
103:20,24 104:7,9	55:2 70:18 149:8	121:22 131:3	118:3 127:2 145:8	answered 111:23
104:12 115:22,24	150:13	agencies 123:11	145:16	answering 56:23
116:3,12,14,23	addressed 68:25	agency 17:20 53:1	allege 62:12 141:4	59:12 84:22 130:4
119:17 135:9	97:7	ago 88:19	144:3	anticipate 38:16
141:22 142:5	addresses 33:6	agree 50:23 51:12	alleged 34:7	58:19
143:14 149:7,17	34:17	57:15 58:13,22	alleviate 103:19,23	anticipated 75:11
accommodate	addressing 89:15	62:17 64:8 65:14	104:6,11	75:14
147:10	adjourn 150:13	66:8,19 75:10	allocated 29:2	anyways 54:9
accommodated	adjourned 150:20	76:7 79:7 80:5,18	30:25,25 32:20	85:12
107:15	150:21	81:15 83:17 84:2	34:22 148:20	apologies 44:19
account 63:9	Administration	86:9,12 88:9	allocation 29:3,6	79:15 102:13
accurate 47:19	53:14	99:14 103:13,15	32:5	123:2
61:20 126:22	administrative	106:9,12 112:23	allow 22:1 30:14	appealed 148:12
151:9	13:15 14:2 20:19	119:7 124:22	44:3 69:3 83:3,4	appear 35:25 40:11
acknowledged 59:2	53:23 54:4 55:6	125:4 127:14	89:14 90:1 91:24	56:24 107:15
142:22	admissibility 28:16	146:23 148:16	101:7,9,9 103:25	appearance 21:4,9
acquaint 78:7	70:20 77:12,13	agreed 29:6 52:14	108:8 110:19,21	appearances 20:21
acted 146:18 147:1	90:16	146:9 148:21	111:16 127:12	appears 28:5 36:2
Action 16:20 77:1	admissible 90:11	agreeing 90:16	128:11 130:5	39:17 90:15
	admission 16:2	112:1	132:13 133:18	106:16
78:3	17:2 18:2 19:2	agreement 16:13	138:22	Appendix 78:11,12
active 131:13	22:11,13 26:6	18:14,18,19,22	allowed 107:22	78:17
activities 33:4	27:21 77:20 85:15	19:3 31:6 33:17	136:11	applicable 50:23
activity 118:23	admit 57:3 61:25	34:9,16,20 35:2	allowing 22:3	applied 46:3,5
actual 43:17 60:17	73:25 100:3	55:13 56:7 57:22	27:22 139:16,17	applies 34:18
62:20 107:12	15.25 100.5	55.15 50.1 51.44	21.22 137.10,17	uppnes 57.10
	1	1	1	1

				Fage 155
138:19,24 147:8	articulated 85:16	Attorney 14:17	79:1,5,12,22	beneficial 37:2
apply 40:10 52:21	85:18	August 16:24 18:20	80:19 81:1,2	benefit 31:22 131:7
138:25 145:18	ascertain 26:16,18	authenticity 27:14	84:10 86:4,17,22	131:9 133:8,10,13
applying 82:3	ascertainable	authorities 133:20	87:13,19 88:13	134:15,17 142:10
apportionment	131:8	authority 68:3	93:2 103:14	benefits 131:5
138:13 148:20	aside 38:20 40:17	146:25	117:20 118:16,21	Benesch 114:4
		authorized 146:15	· · · · ·	best 26:21 83:1
appreciate 108:12	62:16 75:8		119:19 133:11,12	
138:8	asked 55:24 111:22	available 45:23	135:4,9,12 137:7	123:17 143:17
approach 36:23	112:19 118:9	46:11 48:16 50:13	137:13,15 138:23	151:9 h - + + + + + + + + + + + + + + + + + +
118:14 143:5,7	130:3 136:16,20	54:1,3 83:2	139:17 142:3,5	better 112:19
approaches 125:6	141:20 150:6	113:11	bars 143:5	Beyer 14:7 21:1
appropriate 144:23	asking 26:23 68:24	Avenue 13:22 14:7	based 38:25 63:22	beyond 85:16
approval 48:15	101:1 109:13	14:12 81:9 87:24	95:16 104:23	bicycle 147:14
92:6 107:23 108:7	115:21 129:9,16	average 31:16,17	105:13,17 107:5	bicycles 60:13 76:1
108:10 109:22	129:24,24	80:3,10,11,23	baseline 116:5,8,13	bicyclists 60:17,22
110:9,10 111:1,9	asks 112:21	avoid 134:15	116:14	big 84:7 116:24
111:15,21 112:8,9	aspect 34:13	Award 16:16,17	basic 145:3	bikers 76:3 93:20
112:11	139:16 141:19	awarded 45:4	basically 65:11	bill 146:21
approve 91:13,16	assessment 18:3	47:24	132:17 137:16	billed 58:24 59:21
107:17 112:10	81:12,16 82:5	aware 21:14 51:8	142:17,19 148:12	Bisgaard 14:12
approved 108:20	assign 20:16	64:16 92:14	basis 39:13 58:24	bit 96:13 123:3
approximate	assistant 26:8	113:10 115:6,17	bear 33:4 127:3	BJ-1T 16:3 40:18
144:22	41:21	119:20 123:20	bearing 126:4	40:24 42:11
April 23:25 97:6	associated 56:21	135:9,12 149:15	bears 31:11,14	block 113:20
area 16:20 76:25	84:4 86:17,22	Aziza 14:6 20:25	32:23 33:16	blocked 39:11 40:5
78:3,14,17,25	88:25 117:20	22:20 35:10 43:13	began 21:22	66:24
79:10 101:8	144:12	51:18 53:3 82:19	beginning 22:18,21	blue 61:17 78:22
110:22 125:20	Associates 17:6,12	89:8	39:7 86:18,23	79:3 80:7
132:2 139:21,22	assume 67:9		behalf 21:1,7 32:13	BNSF 80:1,15,17
139:22	140:17	B	68:4 114:9 146:16	80:21
areas 82:2	assuming 105:19	back 67:3 85:3 86:1	belabor 55:1	body 125:17
AREMA 58:23	126:17,18	95:20 98:14	believe 32:10 42:20	135:24 136:12
59:20 112:12	at-grade 55:13	101:22 104:16	43:12 48:18,21	borne 125:3 135:22
argument 31:7,14	60:12,21 63:6	106:7 109:20	51:10 52:17 54:3	135:25 138:18
31:21 142:15	78:23 79:10,18,22	129:3 135:15	56:21 63:5,12	bottom 58:4
143:22 147:12	93:18 103:3,9	136:15	65:9 66:4,9 67:4	Box 14:18
148:13,15 149:21	107:19 134:13	background 21:15	70:10 73:21 85:13	Breakdown 16:18
Argumentative	attached 23:21	36:3	90:11 93:23 99:25	Brett 14:23 15:2
132:12 133:17	26:7 91:5 107:11	backup 140:8	106:14 116:2,18	41:8,21 42:4
arguments 138:8	attack 148:13	bar 132:9	117:10 123:13,25	brief 37:7,12,15
148:7	attempt 57:8 77:24	Barker 16:9 18:7	124:15 137:1,11	95:14 138:4,7
arm 149:16	attention 24:1	20:15 31:18 43:6	137:22 138:3	148:4,8,23 149:21
arms 44:10 45:22	26:14,15,20 50:15	43:9 44:8 46:3,15	149:1	briefing 36:12,16
69:21 137:19	61:7 82:8 85:2	47:2 55:14 58:15	believes 101:4	36:19,21,22 37:1
Article 16:9 18:7	90:9 135:15,20	65:15,21 66:2	141:1	37:5,18
articles 123:12	136:3	75:10,18 76:19	bells 143:9	briefly 148:6
	150.5		UCHO 173.7	511011y 170.0
	I	1	1	1

ſ				1 aye 134
briefs 38:10 138:6	133:5	changed 52:3,8	81:16,22 82:19,20	133:15 135:3
150:2,7,9	car-rail 133:1	63:5	83:5,9 84:3,7	clearer 23:14
bring 26:15 28:9	carried 149:12	changes 62:18 63:9	85:16,18 89:8,9	clearly 28:6 70:18
Brisbois 14:12	cars 70:6 133:8,10	68:12 76:8 88:8	93:1,4,11 94:9	close 143:13
broad 104:14	133:16 134:1,2	118:10 143:18	95:12 97:9,15	closing 22:4 36:16
broken 47:9	135:6 140:3,5	144:6,14	98:25 100:3	37:8,12,15 138:4
brought 26:10,13	143:13	changing 63:2,8	106:18 107:5,22	138:6 140:12,14
26:20	case 21:22 24:3	chapter 132:24,24	108:4,6,9,14,15	148:4,13
Buell 13:22	25:7 30:23 32:13	characterize 145:2	108:20 109:22	CM 109:3
burden 126:5	33:16 36:21 51:24	charge 123:21	110:11 111:15	CMA 119:15 136:9
143:24 147:4	54:20 61:1 62:6	charged 34:25	112:2,13 118:10	146:1
149:13	66:9 73:1,22 80:4	charging 126:20	118:14,20 119:1	Co.'s 17:5,7,10,13
147.15	80:11,19 96:19	Checklist 17:18	119:12,14 121:11	17:16,18,21 18:4
С	98:8 105:1,2	circumstances	122:10,14 123:9	code 53:23
C 14:1 16:24 20:4	109:17 116:15	50:24 52:9	122:10,14 125.9	collateral 148:13
43:1 48:11 50:8	120:25 126:17	cite 30:9 127:7	137:16,20 138:9	colleagues 118:20
68:1 72:19 93:15	128:10 136:13	cities 31:8 139:11	138:12 139:9,24	collection 67:9
97:19 113:2 117:7	139:15 141:15,15	139:13	140:11 142:9,11	collects 32:7
121:20 131:1	141:16	citing 54:14	143:15,24 144:1	collisions 86:17
135:1 151:1,1	cases 116:16	city 13:5,8 14:5	146:2,16,17,21,22	116:7 134:3,8,9
calculation 102:24	catastrophic 134:9	16:16 17:4,7,10	147:4,4,21 149:5	134:16
calendar 37:17	134:16	17:13,15,18,21	149:12 150:15	come 32:18 45:3
call 24:1 41:5 71:8	Categorical 17:4	18:3 20:11,12,14	City's 16:9 18:7	93:4
98:9 107:11 149:9	cause 141:16	20:24 21:2,23	21:22 23:4,5 26:8	comes 139:8,13
149:9	caused 47:9 92:3	22:2,9,20,20,22	27:5,8,16,24 30:7	coming 145:9
called 76:25	causing 143:15	24:2,6,14,25	31:22 33:2 34:1	comment 25:4 35:8
calling 120:6	cc's 57:17	25:13,15 26:15	38:14 55:4 57:21	35:13 106:8
calls 100:24 107:25	CCR 13:21 151:15	28:4 29:5,22	57:23 58:1 62:25	comments 16:11
110:13 111:11	certain 58:14 65:10	31:18,22 32:14,21	64:22 77:20 111:1	18:9 27:18 40:3,4
115:9 128:5	126:11 140:1,9	33:19 34:4,6,10	138:21 141:17	106:10 107:14,14
143:13	146:3	34:11,23 35:1,8	142:3,10,10,16	Commission 13:2
camera 41:8,11	certainly 26:4,11	35:11,11 36:24,25	143:21 144:19	13:19 14:15 28:14
49:4,7 51:4 71:6	32:3 57:10 59:18	37:6,13,14,22	147:12	40:10 47:20 54:3
71:10 95:10,24	102:13 113:15	38:4,20,21,25	Civil 27:15	54:8 61:22 86:16
120:1,3 138:2	128:1 140:17	39:19 41:2,5	claim 116:2	86:21 101:6
cantilever 143:2	Certified 151:6	43:13 47:17 48:8	claimed 88:18	110:20 138:21,23
149:16	certify 151:8	48:13,19,25 49:5	clarification 26:1	139:1 148:1,14
cantilevers 65:20	cetera 30:22 52:5	49:18 50:3 51:18	clarify 25:5 53:11	149:1,19 150:5
65:24 74:17	chain 106:5 107:1,5	51:19 53:3 57:22	117:22 123:3	Commissions
137:17	challenges 26:5	58:24 59:2,20,21	129:9	147:17
capacity 120:22	chance 22:4 25:3,3	60:24 64:24 67:21	clarifying 94:11	common 119:7
capital 72:2,3	59:13 84:23	68:4 69:10,12,15	clarity 22:23 23:20	147:10
caps 74:22	change 22:7 52:7	71:8,9,21,22,25	clear 21:19 35:15	communities
caption 74:19	108:24 109:7,10	72:4,13 73:1	36:13 46:8 56:18	134:18
captioned 20:10	109:13 119:18	75:23 76:5,19,24	70:16 85:14 90:15	companies 147:16
car 131:25 132:1	124:17	79:12 80:3 81:11	97:3 100:11 121:7	company 13:7,11
l I			l	I

				0
20:13 127:25	conflict 126:12	88:12 89:19 90:2	73:21 99:25	112:12 122:8,15
compare 142:20	127:9,15,15,19	104:20 105:8,15	106:15	122:17 123:13
complainant 13:9	128:3,21,25	108:16,19 109:1,8	correct 25:9 26:21	125:3,5,18,24
143:25	129:13,19,20,25	109:14,24 110:11	35:17 45:16 47:14	126:2,21 135:25
complaint 16:24	130:8 136:22	111:3,4 114:10,13	47:15 52:16 53:2	138:13,18 145:25
20:16 21:23 27:5	137:1	119:5,9 122:5	56:24 57:18 58:25	146:3,4,21 147:23
30:7 34:8 141:2	conflicts 136:21	124:2,24 135:16	59:22 60:2,10,14	Council 45:8,9,10
141:12,12 146:8	confused 65:3	145:9	60:15,19,22,23	counsel 22:14 53:5
148:1,10	107:21	consultant 67:5	61:1 62:14,15,21	125:1 141:17
complete 46:18	confusing 53:16	92:25 114:8	62:25 63:1,3,4,10	counsels' 138:8
57:24 82:1,15,21	confusion 116:16	Cont 17:1 18:1	64:6 65:19,22	counting 25:11,14
82:25 83:5,10	connection 91:24	19:1	66:3 67:15 73:17	County 75:24
completed 27:5	98:7	contained 27:12	73:21 75:19 76:1	151:4
61:21 122:2	consequence 28:18	contemplated	76:21 77:1,5	couple 25:17 63:4
completely 93:21	28:21 29:1,17,23	137:11,20	79:13 81:7 84:11	63:13 148:8
completeness 27:7	30:2,24 32:25	contemplates 43:21	87:2,9 91:15 93:2	course 40:12 138:5
compliance 129:22	consequences	141:13	99:17,22,25	147:2
complicated 54:10	58:19	contents 53:8	103:17 106:15	court 21:19 44:16
comply 24:18	consider 31:18	context 32:16 33:2	107:16 108:17	44:17 51:3 96:15
components 75:22	consideration	81:20,25 83:1	111:21 114:5,6,9	98:3,4 102:9
Comprehensive	34:14 37:8 147:18	contingencies	115:8 119:4 123:2	150:10
16:19 76:20	considerations	89:22	124:25 126:1	court's 34:13
concern 69:24 70:6	141:23	continuing 39:8	127:1,3,5,20	cover 63:8
70:8 147:22	considered 27:6	continuous 139:20	131:5,6 132:7,25	crash 79:4,9 87:12
concerned 27:24	58:15 115:8,19	contract 114:8	135:7,8 136:7	131:25 132:1
28:20 38:2,4,7	considering 36:22	122:14 145:25	146:2	133:14
52:6 149:7	considers 32:14	contract- 57:25	corridor 31:19	crashes 45:15
concerns 33:7	consistent 33:21	contractor 57:24	45:7 76:19,22	81:13,17,23 83:19
37:11 39:10 76:19	consolidated 13:5	58:1 114:7	86:4 87:13 142:12	84:4 86:5,13,22
76:22 93:17	20:9	contracts 33:23	145:13	93:17,21 132:5,7
118:16 124:11	conspicuous 145:7	Contrary 139:6	corroborating	140:1,9
141:24 142:8,24	constitute 110:18	contribute 136:2	40:11	create 87:4 133:1
143:18	111:9,21 112:8	contributions	cost 31:17 32:19	created 54:23
conclude 70:15	constituted 109:22	134:12	33:13 34:12,17	108:4 132:17
conclusion 65:17	110:10 111:1,15	control 50:17 52:25	35:3 44:22 45:21	creates 60:21
100:25 108:1	148:13	58:25 63:7 66:11	46:10 58:23 59:20	creation 75:25
110:14 111:12	constitutes 110:8	76:9 105:20 115:1	109:23 110:9	cross 22:2 31:24
115:10 128:6	constructed 92:5	131:13,17 132:17	111:2 122:22	42:3,21,23 50:6
147:13	94:4 95:2	135:3 137:11	123:5,8,18 127:3	56:6 60:19 72:16
concrete 102:15,16	constructing 94:5	145:3	141:10 144:22,24	97:16 98:15
103:6 140:4	142:11	controls 128:4	costs 20:16 29:1	121:17 130:15,19
Conditions 78:13	construction 18:14	129:5,21,25	30:24 31:10,16,23	131:22,24 142:13
conduct 34:3 147:3	18:19,21 19:3	130:10	32:5 34:4,22	144:10 145:14
conference 36:11	31:9 32:17 34:9	convinced 28:2	56:21 58:17 59:3	cross-examination
148:12	46:7,22,24 55:12	coordination 88:15	92:18 108:24	24:7 25:23 26:22
configuration 63:9	58:2,17 59:6	copy 56:25 61:20	109:10,11 110:17	27:9 36:9 41:3
	I	I	1	I

50:12 51:20 55:18	149:18	December 16:12	description 59:4	132:5,17,24 135:4
97:2 98:24 121:5	crossings 29:16	18:11 56:21 57:13	143:9	137:11,12,14,17
123:25 124:8	30:22 31:4 32:2	58:6,9,10,13,22	design 18:15 64:5	141:14 142:17
cross-examine	40:5 60:6 66:24	109:6,21 119:11	64:11,13,18,20,21	144:5,7 145:17
21:25 40:13	78:24 79:5,10,19	146:14,19,20	64:22 65:1 106:10	147:9 148:19
cross-examining	79:22 114:1,2	decide 31:8	106:11 107:6	149:4
124:7	131:10,14 132:20	decided 87:22	118:11 122:10	devises 72:24
crossed 30:9	134:2,4,13 139:12	91:19	designated 42:11	diagnosis 40:2
crossing 13:6 20:15	crux 142:15	decision 142:16	designed 64:24	diagnostic 16:10
28:23 29:17 30:4	curb 69:18 70:3,7	deduce 104:8	92:24	18:9 70:10 88:20
30:5 31:6 33:13	105:7 140:3	deem 40:18 71:2	designing 64:14	88:23 89:1,4
33:17,18 34:17,25	curb's 69:21	144:1	76:15	137:21
39:11 43:7,9,10	curious 94:21	deemed 79:12	designs 108:5,6	diagnostics 67:3
43:17,22,25 44:8	115:25	defer 148:7 149:21	despite 79:8 146:7	diagram 107:11
44:9,10,14,22	current 16:5 46:22	deficiency 145:21	detail 59:25	difference 143:8
45:13,16,19,21,24	46:23 51:10,22	deficient 141:4	detailed 63:20	differences 66:10
46:3,20 47:2,7,10	62:18 75:14,16	144:24 148:10	64:25 76:16	different 34:13
47:22 48:2 53:8	96:11 135:7 142:8	definition 105:18	details 64:15	55:2 63:14 109:15
55:13 56:22 60:1	currently 46:17	Definitions 18:13	determination	116:9 123:12,16
60:12,18,21 61:1	55:6 64:5,12	delay 32:12 47:9	32:19	differently 65:4
62:20 63:6,6	65:14,20 66:1,18	92:2	determine 139:3	142:21
65:15,21 66:2,17	76:8 123:21	delays 89:25 90:4,6	149:2	difficulties 24:13
67:15 69:11,13,16	142:18	demonstrative	determined 59:4	difficulty 96:13
72:25 74:8,14	cut 44:18 56:18	140:19	determining 54:10	dimensions 107:12
75:4 76:9 79:12	102:9	denied 27:16 38:14	detriment 133:13	direct 16:3,4,14
80:1,20,21 81:2		115:12 148:11	develop 31:8	18:6,17 30:20
86:17,23 87:2	D	deny 27:23 28:7	developed 68:18	38:18 39:6 40:1
88:13,16 89:12	D 20:4 48:11 68:1	35:20 40:9 44:2	119:2 142:6	50:15 61:6,7 68:6
90:3 93:18,24,25	93:15 117:7 135:1	56:3 69:2 89:13	development 75:12	68:11 73:4 74:18
95:6 101:25 102:3	data 39:23 67:8,14	102:25 115:11	118:24 142:7	82:8 83:20 85:2
102:4,18 103:3,9	79:4,24 87:12	denying 36:1	device 16:6 43:10	90:9 97:4 101:19
107:7,18,19,24	116:4 117:18	department 17:9	44:9,15,23 47:22	135:15,20 136:3
108:20 110:10	142:4	53:12,13 87:12	64:19,23,24 65:2	directed 57:16
113:9 114:3,16,18	date 24:14,16 37:17	90:7 92:3 120:20	65:8 66:14 74:9	direction 65:10
114:21,24 115:1	88:22 89:2	depend 36:18	74:14 75:5 92:16	143:3
117:14,19,21	dated 18:5,10,20	depending 105:8	117:14,20 133:4	directions 63:14
118:5,11,15	57:13 58:6 146:1	depends 47:25	137:5,9	69:19
123:22 125:19	dating 106:7	derail 131:25	devices 13:6 16:5	directly 27:19
131:7,9,19 132:10	day 24:20	derailments 135:12	30:6 34:18 43:23	32:23 69:1 110:17
133:5,21 135:4,10	days 58:3 deadline 25:24	143:14	50:17 51:1 52:25	115:5
135:13 137:5,8,9	138:5 150:5	derive 134:17	60:25 62:18 63:7	disagree 52:20,23
137:16 138:17,22	deadlines 27:25	derives 131:4	63:16 66:11 69:12	89:3
139:5,9 140:10	deal 115:3,5	134:15	75:3 76:9,11 95:6	discretion 23:15
141:14,25 142:3	dealing 29:3 90:4,6	describe 68:12	105:20 114:24	130:22
142:13 143:6	deals 29:15	144:20	117:24 118:1	discuss 27:11
144:5,7,15 147:22	ucais 27.13	describes 144:18	131:10,13,17	148:24
	I	I	I	I

				Faye 157
discussed 30:1 34:5	E 14:1,1 20:4,4	EM-3 18:9 40:2	108:19 122:5	144:13 145:8,15
38:16 128:25	41:14 43:1 48:11	EM-4 18:10	132:10 133:5	144.13 145.8,15
discusses 137:4	48:11,11 49:13	EM-5 18:11 110:4	145:24 146:10	149:5
discussing 36:15	50:8 68:1,1,1	EM-6 18:13 97:8	149:20	EVIDENTIARY
85:12 93:6	71:17 72:19 93:15	97:13,14	entered 33:20	13:13
discussion 34:22	93:15,15 96:5	EM-7X 18:14	51:23 54:16 55:19	exactly 43:12 84:12
113:6 138:11	97:19 113:2 117:7	EM-8X 18:15	124:23	84:18 113:14
discussions 77:14	117:7,7 120:12	117:10	entertain 36:5	127:8 145:25
118:19	121:20 131:1	EM-9X 18:16	entire 55:6 74:11	146:6
dismiss 148:1,9	135:1,1,1 151:1,1	117:10	125:19	examination 15:1,2
dismissal 141:1	E-l-l-i-s 96:9	EM-X 99:4	entirety 40:19	15:6,11,15,21
144:16	earlier 70:18	EM-X8 105:22	entities 29:21	21:24 22:14
display 51:16	easier 22:23	106:19,23	entitled 68:10	examinations 23:6
dispute 27:8	East 91:13	EM-X9 99:3 100:4	Environmental	38:12
disregard 146:11	eastbound 81:10	100:6	17:6,12	example 113:24
148:14	87:7,8	email 16:12,24 18:5	equipment 63:25	exceed 45:22 46:11
Division 14:18	economic 32:3	18:10,11,14,15,20	64:2,4,6,10 70:4	exceedingly 33:2
dockets 13:4 20:9	75:11	24:11,13,15 26:25	ER 26:17 27:6,15	exception 40:20
20:10	economically 31:12	56:17,20,25 57:13	28:17	121:8
document 17:5,8	effect 141:16	57:15,16,20 58:6	essentially 53:19	excerpted 53:21
17:11,14,16,19,22	142:16 149:20	58:9,10,13,16	138:15 139:12	excerpts 53:21
18:4 39:3 54:2,5	effort 21:18	59:23 85:7 106:5	142:23	exchange 18:14,15
61:11 73:19 77:3	eight-inch 102:15	106:6 107:1,5,10	estimate 18:24	56:25
77:15 78:8,9,11	eight-inch-high	109:6,16,21,22,25	46:22,23 48:3	exclude 28:13
78:12 82:11,12,14	102:16 103:5,7	110:2,8,10,18,25	80:2,3,9 95:17	105:18
99:9,12 106:1	either 42:9 47:25	111:7,9,14,20	108:25 109:2,15	excluded 102:23
documentary	70:24 129:1 130:9	112:6,7,8,10,11	estimated 33:13	Excluding 101:25
39:15	130:21	119:11 146:19	34:12 146:20	exclusion 17:4
Documentation	elements 82:1	emailed 24:20	estimates 109:5,9	102:6,14,22
17:4	eliminate 60:5,11	emails 106:7,10,15	109:11,18 112:11	excuse 60:4
documented 76:19	69:20,22 81:1,4	107:9	et 30:22 52:4	executed 89:18
documents 26:24	86:9,12,14 87:1	employed 120:21	Euclid 46:14 70:1	122:14
27:3,6,9 106:1	102:2,17,22 103:2	encountered	81:9 84:10 87:7	executive 82:13,14
111:5	103:8	128:23	87:24,25 91:13,20	83:17
doing 21:13 24:3	eliminated 93:21	endorse 134:11	92:1 139:20,20	exhibit 16:1,24
41:16,17 69:11,15	elimination 119:17	endorses 133:20	140:3	17:1 18:1 19:1
126:11 128:2	134:13	engineer 41:22	evaluated 82:2	22:8 26:9 28:11
DOT 19:3 41:22	Ellis 14:24 15:15	49:18 71:22 72:1	evidence 23:18	29:9,19,19,24
draft 59:5 119:15	56:20 57:16 58:7	engineering 16:13	26:17,18 28:13,15	39:6 40:1,19
drafting 108:18	58:13,22 59:19	18:18 72:3 120:20	28:16,17 31:11	51:20 52:10 57:6
driven 75:11	70:10 95:23,25	122:2,4,8,11,15	38:13 39:14,16	58:5 62:2 68:7
due 23:24 24:9,14	96:9 97:4	enhancement	40:11,22 53:9	70:19 73:8 74:2
24:15,20 38:10	EM-1T 18:6 40:19	132:20	55:24 57:3 77:15	77:18,23 81:18,22
47:9 80:10 150:2	40:25 97:4	entail 47:5	83:2 85:13 90:13	81:25 82:21,25
E	EM-2 18:7 97:7,13	entails 47:1	117:18 124:18	85:21 99:2 100:4
£	97:14	enter 34:8 68:4	126:19 143:17	105:22 106:19,23
	I	l	l	

				1 age 130
109:3 110:2,4	extrapolate 32:1	126:13 127:2	five-year 87:12	93:12,16 94:8
120:25 123:25	eyes 79:16	128:4,16,17,20	flagging 57:23 58:3	97:9,17,20 98:15
120.23 123.23	cycs 79.10	129:5,8,11,11,20	flasher 66:13 143:3	98:16,17 99:19,22
124.1,0,19 125.15	F	129:23 130:9,11	143:5	99:24 100:3,7,17
140:18 150:10	F 151:1	131:11 134:12	flashers 63:23	101:1,11 102:9,12
exhibits 16:2 17:2	facially 141:3	138:16 145:8,12	65:10 66:2,6	101:1,11 102:9,12
18:2 19:2 22:8,10	facilities 126:3	145:15,16,20,22	143:1 149:14	102:21 105:1,22
22:12,13,22 23:4	facility 76:3	feedback 120:7	flashes 63:18	108:2,11 110:4,6
23:13,21,23 24:4	fact 24:13 26:17	feel 40:12 100:15	flashing 63:13	110:15,23,24
24:7,8,10 25:11	28:18 29:16 30:24	111:17 119:25	132:9 137:18,19	111:13,19,24
25:23 26:6,8,13	32:24 37:14 60:21	fees 104:20,25	flashings 63:23	112:3,13 115:21
27:13,14,21 38:20	62:9 77:12 103:22	105:4,15,19	137:18	121:11,16,18,21
40:17,18,22,24	108:3,5 110:17	108:24 109:2,7,10	flood 143:3	122:23 123:2,4
50:12 55:18 70:16	111:14 123:24	109:11,23 110:9	Flora 79:1,5	124:5,20,21 127:7
70:20,24 71:3	133:13	110:17 111:2,15	focus 59:11 84:21	127:13 128:7,14
77:20,21 90:17,20	facts 28:21,25 29:4	feet 80:23,24	focused 35:16 56:4	129:9,15 130:3,7
97:5,7,12,14	29:9,22 30:1,2	Figure 78:25 79:8	follow 28:15	130:12 138:10
98:24 100:6 121:9	32:23 148:17	79:21,24	follow-up 84:23	150:15
121:15	failed 34:2 147:5	file 143:15	following 83:22	foundation 39:1,18
exist 66:1 137:17	failing 34:8	filed 20:15 23:24	84:18 92:11 150:5	40:6 54:13 68:22
existing 63:15 64:6	fails 141:4,7	24:5,7,9,21,23	follows 83:21	73:9,13 102:19
64:12 66:18 76:8	failure 24:18	25:6,17,19,20,21	foregoing 151:8	124:7,16
78:12 117:25	failures 27:25	25:23 26:25 38:25	form 17:4 53:25	four 78:23 79:10
142:25 144:6	fair 134:14	50:13 61:21 72:25	formal 73:12 119:8	Fourth 13:22
145:6	fairly 148:22	73:22 96:19 97:5	formally 85:14	free 40:12 56:6
exists 142:18	familiar 51:13	final 33:11 70:5	forth 39:14 108:6	100:15 111:17
expanding 140:2	55:11,25 56:6,15	finalized 89:18	forward 119:13	119:25
expectation 88:11	76:11 81:11,22	finally 141:12	Foster 14:6 15:3,5	freely 54:2
expected 68:13	82:4,11,12 87:11	145:1,24 146:14	15:7,9,12,14,17	frequency 116:23
expended 122:8	87:14 96:18	find 149:19	15:23 20:25 21:1	149:17
expenditure 100:23	113:15,15,22,25	fine 64:15 100:20	22:19,20 23:17,19	frequent 80:17
101:15 115:7,18	familiarize 78:7	128:23 130:19	25:9,13,22 35:10	116:11
expense 125:18,22	far 28:20 69:17	finish 56:19 92:6	35:11 36:25 37:13	frequently 101:7
expenses 135:22,25	106:6	finished 107:2	37:22 38:4,21	110:20 150:4
experience 114:15	fatal 81:12	150:8	39:21 41:4,10,15	front 42:10,12
114:20	fatalities 45:15	first 21:24 23:21	42:7,8,20 43:13	49:23 56:10,13
expertise 132:3	February 55:12	25:7 28:22 41:2,5	43:13 48:9,12,24	61:9 72:7 73:10
expire 109:9,12,18	fed 46:9	57:19 59:2 61:16	49:11,14 50:3	73:17 77:7 90:23
explain 106:3	federal 17:20 31:2	76:19 83:17,20	51:18,18 53:3,3	98:25 117:11
explanation 44:1	32:4 43:16,21,24	87:23 98:19 106:6	54:7 55:17 56:1,8	120:24 131:22,24
explicitly 32:9 34:7	44:24 45:1,11,23	107:10 138:9	59:12 67:22 68:2	135:18 136:18
extended 69:21	46:2,2,5 47:20	139:18	68:23 69:4 70:12	FSWA 95:4
extensive 90:8	48:1,17,19 53:14	Firstly 26:5,6	71:15,18 72:13	function 64:5
extent 148:16	92:15,17 94:20,22	five 41:25 58:3,18	82:19,19,22,24	functionality 65:7
extra 76:3 83:6	94:24 113:8,10,16	72:6 80:15,16	83:7,11 84:22	functions 66:21
116:19 149:13,14	115:8,19 118:3	83:21,23,25	85:17 89:8,8	fund 47:25 113:9
	l			I

1				1 490 100
144:10 145:4	79:23 81:4	82:7 98:11 108:6	114:24,25 117:14	hazard 103:8
fundamental 62:17	general 14:17	122:18 125:13	117:19 118:15	hazards 102:2,17
76:8	104:10,13,15	126:7 129:2,3	119:18 131:19	102:22 103:2,10
fundamentally	generally 33:6	131:15 135:7	134:2,12 137:5,9	hear 43:3 147:21
63:3 143:19	35:11 40:9 78:8	136:15 144:17	138:17,22 139:12	heard 141:17,18
funded 31:25	78:10 100:13	148:6	140:10 141:14,25	hearing 13:13 20:9
115:19 136:8	104:10 114:25	goal 147:15,15,16	grading 34:21	21:13,20,22 22:3
funding 16:18	getting 108:5 120:7	150:8	Grand 16:17	22:11,18 23:2
31:23 34:10 43:7	give 22:4 25:2	goes 46:14 68:25	grant 16:16 35:20	24:2 26:16 40:23
43:21 45:14 46:2	27:18 30:14 48:2	109:20 110:17	48:19 52:12 53:7	55:4 95:16 96:13
46:6 94:20,22,24	92:5 110:1 140:14	149:16	82:3 84:16,16	96:15 98:4 148:25
104:21,24 114:17	148:4	going 20:22 21:14	92:17 94:16 95:4	150:6,11
114:19 115:3,5	given 36:14 85:14	21:23 24:2 27:23	95:4,5 138:21	hearsay 38:25
136:2 144:11	145:12	28:6 35:19,20	139:1	39:17,22 40:9
145:12	Gloria 14:23 15:11	36:13 40:8 51:19	granted 38:14	held 137:21
funds 43:16,25	32:10 71:9,12,21	52:12 53:6,6,8,10	59:10 92:10	help 69:20 75:13
44:13,21,24,24	GM-10X 16:24	55:3 56:3 59:24	granting 35:21	103:10,19 104:6
45:1,3,4,11,17,18	GM-10X 10:24 GM-11X 17:3	64:4 69:2,11,12	grants 87:21	103.10,17 104.0
45:22,23 46:2,5,9	GM-11X 17:5 GM-12X 17:4	69:18,20 81:6,8,9	113:20,23	139:25,25 140:2,8
46:11 47:20,23	GM-12 X 17:4 GM-13X 17:6	82:2 89:9,13	gray 101:8 110:22	helped 139:4
48:2,14,16,17,18	GM-14X 17:9	95:13 98:18	Great 38:1,9 65:13	141:18
58:21 92:15	GM-15X 17:12	102:22,25 103:25	91:7	helpful 36:18 37:6
100:23 101:15	GM-16X 17:12	115:11 120:6	grounds 29:18	51:3,7 55:8 57:9
113:11,16 115:7	GM-10X 17:15 GM-17X 17:18	124:17 128:12	growing 149:6	hesitant 36:21
115:18 118:3	GM-18X 17:20	130:5,8 132:13	growth 75:11,14,15	high 79:8 81:17,23
138:16,16 145:9	GM-19X 18:3 82:9	133:18 143:2	76:23 142:7	83:18 102:15
145:15,16,20,22	83:4 85:13,20,21	146:10,21 148:23	guess 43:11,11 65:3	highlighted 78:21
further 24:17 32:4	GM-1T 16:14	149:21	81:21 88:10	80:7
38:17,22 40:1	40:18,24	good 20:6 21:6,10	107:20 114:15	highway 44:13,21
69:22 144:18	GM-2 16:15 90:13	23:10 43:3 50:10	116:5,9,10 126:14	53:14 55:13 92:15
furthermore 40:10	90:17,18,20	72:21,22 96:7	133:11	94:16,25 102:18
102:3	GM-20X 18:5	97:21.23 113:4	guidelines 127:18	113:23 118:3
future 34:24 58:20	GM-3 16:16	120:14,16 121:22	gutter 105:7	138:16,16 145:9
75:11,15,16	GM-4 16:17	131:3		145:16
118:24 136:6,8,10	GM-5 16:18	Google 17:3	Н	highway-railroad
142:6 143:4 146:5	GM-6 16:19 90:20	gotten 107:23	Hadmer 139:19	13:6 60:25 72:25
150:1	GM-7 16:20 77:4,6	government 31:2	half 49:21 88:18	75:4
150.1	77:13,23 78:17	54:2	hand 120:3	Historic 79:4
G	79:17 90:17,18	grade 13:6 29:15	handful 80:14,20	hit 70:3 131:23
G 20:4	GM-8T 16:22	30:21 34:25 43:10	handy 86:25	132:9 133:5,8,16
Garlinghouse	40:18,24	43:17,22 44:9,14	happened 146:6	132:9 135:5,6,10
13:21 151:6,15	GM-9 77:6	44:22 45:16,19	happens 31:24 81:3	hitting 133:10
gate 65:14,18 69:21	GM-9X 16:23 73:5	47:22 61:1 72:25	142:12 144:10	hoc 23:6
80:11,13 137:19	73:17,25 74:2	74:8,14 75:4 79:5	145:14	Honor 20:25 21:6
143:3	go 23:6 27:3 29:1,8	92:16 113:9 114:1	harmed 34:8	23:4,7 24:21 25:9
gates 74:16,17	78:16 79:15,17	114:2,3,16,18,20	harmful 146:8	25:13,22 26:4,10
- ·		,0,10,10,20		
	•	•	•	•

26:20 27:11 29:11	83:3,8,13 84:16	impacts 79:18 98:1	include 62:9 91:21	industry 120:20
30:18,20 31:14	84:20 85:10,19,22	98:23 143:23	91:25 111:7	info 115:25,25
32:19 33:7,15	89:13 90:14 92:10	147:7,14	114:13,22,25	information 27:12
35:4 37:4,13 39:5	93:10 94:10,13,18	imperfect 79:16	119:14 144:18,22	36:3 39:15 59:1
42:24 43:20 44:5	95:8,12,20 96:1	imperiect 79:10 impetus 118:19	included 56:15	61:17 67:2,4
53:15 55:1,9,17	97:3,10,12,15,17	119:18 141:25	63:17 66:23	68:13 86:19,25
55:24 56:2,8 57:3	98:6,11,14,16	142:14	144:19	103:12 104:8
57:8 61:24 68:23	99:21,23 100:5,11	implication 33:25	includes 46:19,20	111:6 116:3,20,22
70:22 72:14,17	101:6 102:25	implication 33.25	47:14 51:11 75:25	111:0 110:3,20,22
73:6,7,14,24	101:0 102:25	59:5	80:9 104:19	131:16,18
77:10 83:7,11,15	103.23 100.22	implicitly 32:10	117:15,15,15	infrastructure
84:19 85:6 90:13	111:16 112:1,14	implicitly 32.10 import 54:23	including 33:19	97:25 98:21
90:21 92:12 96:3	111:10 112:1,14	import 34.23 important 32:18	72:4 143:22	121:23
108:2 110:15	112.13,20,23	33:24 34:13,21	144:20	inherent 146:24
112:17 117:5	119:24 120:9	84:12 128:8 144:8	inclusion 91:14,17	initial 24:19 108:25
112.17 117.5		04.12 120.0 144.0 146:4	102:7,16 103:5,7	150:4
	121:6,13,16,18 122:23 123:3			
140:15,20 150:18		importantly 96:15	104:5,22,25 105:3 105:14	initially 148:9
Honor's 37:8 51:15	124:5,10,15,20	impose 31:10		initiated 139:10
130:22	127:12 128:11	imposition 31:23	incomplete 82:13	injected 54:20
hoping 88:16	130:5,13,14,17,18	147:23	82:17 130:1	injuries 45:15
hour 79:23 95:16	130:23 132:13	improper 24:23	132:11	inquiry 146:25
hours 80:12	133:18 134:21,22	148:14	incorporate 107:6	147:1
Howard 13:15 14:3	137:25 138:10	improve 76:2	107:14	insofar 56:4 89:14
20:6,18 21:3,8,10	140:12,13,17,21	139:12 149:17	incorporating	install 69:18 75:5
21:12 22:19,25	140:24 148:3	improved 139:4	118:10	92:15 137:16
23:8,11,16,19,25	149:22 150:16,19	. 141:18	increase 68:17	installation 43:10
25:2,10,18,25	hundred 86:14	improvement	increased 68:19	43:22 44:9 47:21
27:17,23 29:13	hurting 79:16	64:18,20 65:1,7	69:6 102:3	62:13 74:8,14
30:8,13 33:10	hypothetical 130:2	72:2 93:22 94:16	increasing 149:6	75:22 92:19 102:1
34:15 35:6,10,14	132:12	94:25 97:25 98:21	independent 91:23	102:8 117:14,19
35:18,19 36:20		113:23 114:16	INDEX 15:1 16:1	137:5,8,10,13
37:3,10,16 38:1,5		121:23 122:1	17:1 19:1	141:9,10,13 144:4
38:7,9,22 39:2,19	idea 52:22 66:16,20	131:9	indicate 141:10	144:22,23 145:4
39:21 40:8 41:1,4	identifies 83:18	improvements	indicated 73:16	145:10 148:18
42:1,5,7,22 43:18	identify 21:17 46:1	45:14 46:11 57:24	91:22 97:16	149:3
44:2 48:7,9 49:1,4		65:9 69:12,17	110:20	installed 44:10
49:9,11 50:5	II 13:13	89:12 92:18,20	indicates 79:4	54:22 64:1,10
51:19,25 52:6	illuminate 127:10	93:24 113:9	indication 101:16	66:12 80:25 85:4
53:6,24 54:7,17	illustrated 78:25	114:18 139:4,8	119:13	86:3 105:20
55:3,21 56:3 57:4	illustrative 34:20	inadvertently 26:8	indicative 34:20	117:25 118:2
57:10 59:10 62:1	imagine 42:2	inadvisable 55:5	indifferent 133:15	installing 44:14,22
67:20,22 69:2	115:20 138:6	inaudible 67:5	134:1,6	114:23 137:12
70:13,14,23 71:1	impact 31:11 32:3	incident 116:4	individually 27:10	142:10 147:8
71:4,8,13,15	68:19 69:6 141:21	134:19	30:19	149:13,14
72:15 73:11 74:1	149:9	incidents 103:19	Industrial 16:20	instance 25:12,20
77:17,22 82:22	impacted 68:25	104:7,12	76:25 78:3,14	instances 104:14
				1

				i age i ui
104:24 128:8	items 111:8 112:12	96:1 97:3,9,12,15	107:1 113:15	136:20 137:3
129:18 140:9	ICHIS 111.0 112.12	97:17 98:6,11,14	116:11 118:3,25	laws 129:12
147:19	J	98:16 99:21,23	126:10,14 131:10	lay 73:9,13 124:7
intended 91:20	Jackson 14:7 21:1	100:5,11 101:6	132:1 133:12	124:16
112:10 149:8	Jeff 14:16 21:11	102:25 103:25	134:17 142:19	laying 54:12
intending 81:7	23:11 28:10 57:16	102.25 103.25	143:17 149:14	layman's 117:16
intends 22:22	106:6 107:10	110:1,19 111:16	knowledge 43:15	layout 16:6 107:7
interact 133:22	132:15	112:1,14,15,20,25	54:13 67:13 89:15	107:18,24 108:20
interactions 133:1	jeff.roberson@u	115:11 117:2,3	97:24 98:1,20,22	leave 23:14
interest 129:1	14:20	119:24 120:9	113:8 121:23,25	left 36:11 69:22
interested 22:7	job 114:11	121:6,13,16,18	123:17 128:24	81:7,8 87:5,8,9
interesting 139:22	Johnson 14:23 15:2	122:23 123:3	151:9	88:18 95:16
interference 44:14	41:6,7,16,21 42:4	122:23 123:3	known 45:16	legal 26:7 36:14
Interior 17:9	42:9 43:3 48:13	127:12 128:11	KIIOWII 4 5.10	100:24 101:9
internal 29:25	49:2	130:5,13,14,16,18	L	108:1 110:13
Internet 98:7	Johnson's 43:15,24	130:23 132:13	Lacey 13:20 20:1	111:11 115:9
interpret 26:18	join 37:14	133:18 134:20,22	lack 94:14	128:5
119:11	judge 13:15 14:2	137:25 138:10	lacking 39:18	Legislature 53:18
interrelate 26:12	20:6,19 21:3,8,10	140:12,13,17,21	land 68:17	length 63:9 80:10
interrelated 31:1	21:12 22:19,25	140:24 148:3,10	lane 80:24,24,25	80:12
interrupt 100:12	23:8,10,16,19,25	149:22 150:16,19	81:9 85:4 86:3,9	lengths 79:22,25
intersection 131:20	25:2,10,18,25	judicial 54:8	86:12 103:14,16	80:4,4
intersections 81:16	27:17,23 29:13	jump 70:2	103:17,19 104:5,6	lengthy 78:6
81:23 84:10	30:8,13 33:10	jumping 70:7	104:11 116:19	145:20
introduce 41:2	34:15 35:6,10,14	140:3,5 143:13	139:19,24 143:11	let's 20:6,21 21:21
49:9 71:13 83:5	35:17,19 36:13,20	June 67:4 89:5	147:10 149:14	42:1 73:12,12
83:10 96:2 120:10	37:3,10,16 38:1,5	150:8	lanes 116:17	83:9 95:14,18,20
introduced 126:19	38:7,9,22,23 39:2	jurisdiction 53:1	147:14 149:15	95:23 98:11,14
128:9	39:19,21 40:1,8	jurisdictions 35:24	language 52:4	138:9 143:20
introduction 51:20	41:1,4 42:1,5,7,22	127:23 133:21	74:22 141:5 144:9	Letter 17:7,10,13
82:20 131:12	43:18 44:2 48:7,9	justice 17:6,12	146:19	letting 24:12
involve 43:9 44:8	49:1,4,9,11 50:5	26:16	large 36:14 118:6	level 118:7
117:13 137:8,13	51:19,25 52:6	justify 146:11	largely 148:7	Lewis 14:12
involvement 43:6	53:6,24 54:7,17		larger 70:1 94:22	lieu 36:16
involves 31:1 51:1	55:3,21 56:3 57:4	K	largest 148:25	life 58:21 88:9
136:6 137:10	57:10 59:10 62:1	keep 111:14	lastly 126:6 140:4	light 137:18,19
irrelevant 28:14	67:20,22 69:2	kind 44:18 53:21	late 24:10,21 25:7	lightly 28:1
30:6 138:14	70:13,14,23 71:1	115:21,25 139:2	25:17,19,20,20	limit 38:3,11 150:3
issue 21:17 30:23	71:4,8,13,15	kinds 134:15 149:7	27:1	limited 98:1
31:19 35:23 47:10	72:15 73:11 74:1	know 24:12 27:19	law 13:15 14:2	line 29:10,20,20,24
52:3 61:1 118:4	77:17,22 82:22	43:12 47:9,24	20:19 115:6,17	29:25 30:9,11,12
126:25 138:19,20	83:3,8,13 84:16	48:13,16 51:13	126:13 127:19	33:12 35:16,16,22
148:24 149:25	84:20 85:10,19,22	64:14 66:20 67:11	128:4,10,16,17,20	35:22 39:7,8,8
issues 26:12 33:5	89:13 90:14 92:10	74:4,6 85:7,11	128:22 129:5,11	40:20,21 41:8
33:16 36:14 84:8	93:10,12 94:10,13	87:14 89:6,24	129:20,23 130:10	78:24,25 80:15,16
item 33:11 35:15	94:18 95:8,12,20	100:20 102:23	130:11 134:12	80:17 89:9 113:5
L				

· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·				0
121:8,8 122:25	longest 80:13	119:6,9,14 122:5	material 25:7	34:16 109:5
123:1	look 62:5 68:9	123:13,22 124:2	35:23 36:2 100:14	method 144:6
lines 29:12,14,19	139:20 143:20	124:25 125:3,5,23	materials 31:16	Michael 13:15 14:3
30:3,20 36:6	looked 82:2	126:2,4,21 127:3	matter 13:4 20:11	20:18
40:20 50:18 79:6	looking 37:19 52:7	129:12,17 135:16	42:17 49:25 54:10	microphone 21:15
101:21,23 104:17	74:10 99:12	138:13,17 141:10	72:11 101:7	million 46:25
104:18 137:8	140:18	144:24 146:3,4	Mays 14:24 15:15	mind 112:20 120:5
142:11 144:11	looks 61:23 95:15	147:23 148:20	16:12 18:5,10,11	minute 41:12
lining 60:8	99:12 106:7	majority 63:5	18:20 23:22 39:23	minutes 16:10 18:9
list 18:1 26:9	Loop 13:19	65:11	56:17,20,25 57:16	27:1 40:2
150:10	lot 114:1 138:11	making 23:20 87:5	58:7,13,14,23	missing 82:18
listed 26:13 27:8	139:21 145:11	121:7	59:19 67:5,7	mission 27:3
84:10 112:12	lots 84:7	manage 114:12	70:11 95:23,25	Misstates 127:4
143:9 146:8	low 33:2	managed 45:13	96:9,11 97:2,4,21	129:7
lists 22:8		manager 49:18	98:3,18 100:8,18	modernizing
litigation 129:2	M	72:3 96:12	101:2,13 104:3	142:10
little 96:14 98:4	M 41:14 43:1 48:11	mandatory 138:15	106:25 108:23	modification 62:14
107:21 121:25	49:13 50:8 68:1	manner 22:24	110:25 111:20	64:11,19,25 65:5
123:3	71:17 72:19 93:15	144:6	112:4 113:4 117:9	75:22 144:20
living 120:18	96:5 97:19 113:2	Mantz 14:23 15:11	119:21,24 120:5	145:10,23 148:19
LLC 13:22	117:7 120:12	32:10 71:9,12,19	mean 48:22 63:4	modifications
LLP 14:7,12	121:20 131:1	71:21 72:23 73:16	89:6,24 91:16	28:23 53:22 60:1
local 17:20 41:21	135:1	74:4 78:2 80:18	92:23 93:19	60:5 62:19 76:10
122:20	M-a-y-s 96:10	82:25 84:20 85:2	107:22 117:16	76:15 87:1 93:5
location 39:13 94:1	ma'am 73:4 78:14	86:1 92:14 93:17	126:14 137:2	107:18 118:4,11
118:2 123:22	79:16 82:8 83:25	94:11 142:7	147:13	118:16 119:18
125:24	90:25 93:8	146:15	meaning 109:13	141:9 144:2
locations 84:3,5,7,8	magnitude 88:2,5	Mantz' 89:11	122:13	146:13 149:3,8
84:9	main 78:24	manual 18:23	means 39:15	modified 54:12
Lochmiller 14:22	maintain 125:18	50:17 52:8,11	measure 149:10	63:11 115:1
15:6 32:11 38:25	maintained 125:19	53:9,12 55:7	mechanisms 65:15	modify 13:6 20:14
49:6,8,15,17	125:21	126:8,12,19,23	65:18	60:25 72:24 75:3
50:10 54:21 55:11	maintenance 16:12	127:10,16,17	median 69:18	138:22
55:19 57:12 59:11	18:12,14,19,21	128:3,9,22 129:6	102:1,7,15,16	moment 22:5 30:14
68:3 70:12 71:4	19:3 20:16 29:1	129:14,18,19,22	103:6,8 140:4	30:15 85:12 98:12
109:6 110:16	30:4,5,24 31:17	130:9 131:17	meet 27:25 141:5	135:7
111:1 112:6,7	31:17 32:8,18,20	132:16 136:21,23	144:15	Monday 58:6,13
119:12 146:15	33:13 34:9,17	136:25 137:2	meeting 16:10 18:9	moneys 32:7
Lochmiller's 54:23	52:25 55:12 58:20	Map 17:3	40:2 67:3 70:10	months 59:6 71:24
logical 147:13	58:23,25 59:6,20	marked 51:17 65:6	137:21	morning 20:7,23
long 41:24 49:20	67:10 88:13 89:19	73:11,17,25 77:4	memorializing	21:6,10 23:10
53:22 71:23 72:5	90:2 104:20,20,25	78:17 79:2 99:2	119:8	43:3 50:10,11
88:12 89:17	105:3,15,16,19	117:10 120:25	memorized 52:19	72:21,22 96:7
120:21 140:6,7,7	108:16,19 109:1,8 109:14,24 110:12	markings 51:2	Menke 14:7 21:1	97:21 113:4
longer 51:24	109:14,24 110:12 111:3,4,15 114:23	143:6	mention 122:20	120:14
100:14	111.3,4,13 114.23	massive 32:3	mentioned 28:8	Morse 57:17
	l		Ι	

				Faye 103
motion 22:17,21	52:19,21 54:11,20	146:10 147:3	50:8 68:1 71:17	offered 96:24
23:1,5,17 27:16	54:22 132:23	negotiations 90:1	72:19,19 93:15	145:15
27:24 28:7,9 35:9	mute 21:15 120:6	NEPA 17:4	96:5 97:19,19	offering 50:20
35:12,15,20,21	muting 120:5	network 84:3	113:2,2 117:7	Office 14:17
36:1 38:14,14	muting 120.5	never 109:7 112:10	120:12 121:20,20	officer 28:13
40:9 84:17	N	139:9,12	131:1,1 135:1	official 53:1
motions 23:20 36:7	N 14:1,7 20:4 41:14	new 43:10,22 44:9	000 20:3	offsets 139:21
38:13	41:14 43:1,1	47:22 62:22,24	object 21:16 22:14	Oh 51:6 75:17 85:9
motivated 142:6	48:11,11 49:13,13	63:25 64:4,10	22:22 24:3 29:18	85:10 120:5
motor 132:18,20	50:8,8 68:1,1	69:18 74:8,14,16	43:14 51:19 53:4	okay 27:23 38:1,9
133:22	71:17,17 72:19,19	75:5,7 92:15	54:8 70:24 82:20	40:15 42:15,19
motorist 40:5	93:15,15 96:5,5	114:23 117:19,22	89:9	43:8 48:4,23
116:16 131:22,24	97:19,19 113:2,2	117:24 137:12,13	objected 27:4	49:22 50:19 51:15
motorists 39:12	117:7,7 120:12,12	141:14 142:23	33:12 111:25	56:12 57:21,21
66:24 87:5 131:14	121:20,20 131:1,1	145:4 147:9	objecting 24:4	58:12 59:21,24
131:18 132:8	135:1,1	nine 39:11 40:4	82:24	61:8 63:25 64:7
motorists' 131:16	name 20:18 41:19	66:2 143:4	objection 23:21	64:16 66:7 67:17
mouth 51:5	49:16 71:19,21	noise 21:15	27:12,13,21 36:5	68:6,8 69:9 72:10
move 22:12 31:15	96:8,9 120:14	nonresponsive 59:9	38:24 39:4 40:16	75:8 76:18 79:15
40:22 55:1,7,23	name's 49:17	84:15 92:9	44:2 52:12 53:7	82:7,18 84:14
57:3 59:8 61:25	national 13:24	noon 24:9	55:17 56:4 68:21	87:16,17 90:9
64:1,2 73:24	50:25	normally 28:1	69:3 77:11 82:23	91:3 93:21,24
76:13 77:14 84:14	near 150:1	north 47:11,13	89:14 97:5 100:24	94:8,12 98:11
90:13 92:8 100:3	necessarily 133:13	68:18 69:25 87:23	102:19 103:1,21	99:2,8 100:21,22
106:18 119:13	necessary 89:23	91:24	102.19 103.1,21	101:18 103:13,18
moved 25:15 85:13	100:13	northbound 69:19	110:13 111:11,22	101.18 105.13,18
147:10 148:9	necessitated 31:9	80:24 81:7 87:6,8	115:9,12,13 127:4	104.10 105.2,21
movement 69:22	necessity 141:8	Northeast 16:20	128:5 129:7 130:1	107:4,17 108:22
movements 65:10	144:21 147:7,20	76:25 78:3,14	132:11 133:17	109:19 110:5
70:1	147:21	note 23:25 24:10,22	objections 23:11	112:13 114:1,15
Moving 32:6	need 21:16 44:3	26:9 40:4 58:17	24:25 38:17,22	115:3,6,21 116:18
multiuse 47:14,16	53:9 54:25 57:23	101:21 148:8	70:20 77:18 85:15	116:25 117:1,13
60:13,16 76:1	58:3 116:1,22	noted 70:6 150:1	121:9 124:11	119:12,21 122:18
91:14,17,21,23	124:16 131:18	notes 88:25	objects 24:6	123:8,17,24 125:1
94:4,6 95:2	141:4 144:12	notice 17:15 54:4,9	obligated 144:9	125:11,15 126:2,6
142:11	149:15	55:6	obligation 46:7	126:9,25 128:21
municipal 97:24	needed 22:15	number 45:15	obligations 34:2	129:3 130:12
98:20 121:23,25	116:17,19	58:18 63:24 104:9	48:1	132:4 133:4,8,15
139:9	needs 108:15 149:2	112:18 115:23	observed 80:13	134:7,14 136:17
municipalities	nefarious 32:12	116:7,13 141:3	occasions 25:6	146:23
126:21 147:15	negotiate 33:22	143:8	occupation 41:19	older 52:10,11
municipality	88:12 89:18	numbers 109:14	49:16 71:20 96:11	Olympia 13:24
108:25	145:25 146:5		occur 80:15,21	14:19
MUTCD 16:8	negotiated 129:1	0	occurred 79:9 89:4	once 24:8 110:25
50:21,23,25 51:9	negotiating 89:22	O 20:4 41:14 43:1,1	occurs 80:14,20	111:13,20 128:15
51:11,14,22 52:16	negotiation 35:1,2	48:11 49:13 50:8	October 18:5,10	one's 137:2
, ,			- , -	
L				

				1 age 104
open 39:3	25:3 26:3 30:16	PAO 78:14	146:3	91:18 122:4,10,11
opening 22:6	33:20 34:7 37:3,4	paragraph 57:19	peak 79:23 80:12	phased 87:20
operate 76:11	37:14,25 39:10	83:21	Pearson 36:13	phases 47:8,9 87:23
122:21	40:7,12 42:22	paragraphs 111:5	148:10	91:9
operated 66:18	43:18 46:21 47:2	parcel 27:4	pedestrian 102:4	Phasing 16:15 91:5
79:6	50:5,13 53:10	part 27:4 31:7	118:23	phone 120:6
operations 78:18	70:9 72:15 88:14	35:20,21 38:15	pedestrians 60:14	phonetic 139:19
78:21 133:14,23	89:17,23 97:2	45:12 51:2 76:14	60:17,22 76:1,4	Photos 16:5
opinion 136:22,24	112:16,20 114:7	76:24 77:13 81:1	93:20 134:11	physically 108:15
opinion 150.22,24	117:4 118:14,21	81:15 82:23 85:4	Peggy 14:22 15:21	piece 46:14 116:24
110:21	120:19 121:5	86:4 89:21 92:2	120:2,8,16	piecemeal 53:17
opponent 39:24	120:19 121:5	93:2 95:6 111:6	people 69:20	pieces 33:8
opportunity 22:6	126:4,7 127:18	131:11 132:25	percent 86:14	piggybacking
37:7 72:23	131:8 133:20	participate 92:18	percentile 80:10,12	132:23
opposed 45:20	131.8 133.20	participating	perfect 83:11	place 88:19,20
118:5	140:25 142:13,14	149:23	perfectly 100:20	place 88.19,20 placeholder 36:12
opposing 22:14	140.23 142.13,14	particular 31:3,6	period 146:10	placement 106:13
opposite 127:1	146:18,20 147:1	34:25 136:22	permission 51:16	plain 141:5 146:19
oral 37:7	140.18,20 147.1	141:25 145:17	77:15	plan 16:19 22:7
order 108:14 139:1	Pacific's 31:24	147:19,22	person 98:8	23:1 76:20 89:22
148:12,14 149:20	37:11 40:3 95:22	particularly 31:20	personal 67:13	89:25 90:4,6
148.12,14 149.20	118:10	36:5 53:18	128:24	106:8
orders 150:4	page 15:2 17:17	parties 20:21 21:14	personally 114:4	Planned 16:20
Ordinance 16:21	18:4 29:10,10,11	22:10,12,16,17	127:24	76:25 78:3
77:1 78:4	29:11,12,13,14,20	24:11,20 32:7	pertain 27:19	planning 22:5
original 64:13	29:20,24,25 30:3	33:19,22 36:15	35:23	plans 21:21
originally 87:20	30:9,10,11,12,20	37:2,10,18 38:2	petition 13:4 16:7	play 33:5
outside 43:14 55:19	31:15 32:6 33:12	38:16 90:15 95:17	16:23 20:11 21:23	pleadings 147:5
56:1,5 89:10	35:16,16,21,22	119:7 124:10	30:7 60:25 61:3	148:10
98:23 113:18	36:6 38:3 39:7,8	129:1 145:24	61:14,16,20 62:5	please 21:17 23:17
114:13 125:8,25	40:20,21 50:18	146:5,9 148:16,21	62:6,9,12 63:20	39:3 41:7,19
132:2	51:14 58:5 61:16	140.3,9 148.10,21	65:1,6 68:7,10,25	42:14 44:17 49:15
overall 145:20	68:9 74:18 78:16	party 22:4,6 25:4	72:24 73:22 74:4	56:10,23 59:11
overlap 26:12	79:17 83:18 86:2	39:24	74:7,11,13,23	68:6,15 71:10,19
oversaw 72:3	91:8 94:15,18	path 47:11,11,13	74.7,11,13,23	74:12 75:2 79:3
oversights 28:4,5	101:20 104:17	47:14,16 60:13,16	108:10 138:22	81:18 88:4 96:7
010151g1118 20.4,J	107:9 113:5 121:8	60:19 76:1 91:14	139:2,16 141:1,3	99:2,11 100:10
P	107.9 113.3 121.8	91:17,21,23 94:4	141:7 142:20	101:23 104:18
P 14:1,1 20:4	121.8 122.23,23	94:6 95:2 142:11	141.7 142.20	101.23 104.18
123:25	pages 13:14 17:5,8	patterns 142:8	144:3,15,18,19,19	105.25,25 100.4
p.m 150:21	17:11,14,19,22	pausing 85:12	144.3,13,18,19,19	112:5 117:9 120:3
Pacific 13:7,11	38:3 82:16	pavement 51:2	petitioned 20:14	120:14 125:13,16
14:10 17:5,7,10	paid 34:4 122:14	143:6	petitioner 143:24	PO 14:18
17:13,16,18,21	146:3	pay 44:21 95:1	Petitioner's 61:17	point 50:4 54:5
18:3 20:13 21:7	pair 137:20	125:23 126:2	phase 46:17,19	55:8 72:14 86:1
21:25 22:1,9 23:1	pairs 137:18	paying 122:16	47:1,5,7 87:22,25	89:2 90:12 92:4
	Pans 137.10	Paying 122.10	+1.1,3,101.22,23	07.2 70.12 72.4
	1	I	I	1

				1 aye 105
100:15 104:16	23:22,24 26:7	22:23 23:17 39:4	101:24,25 102:1,3	144:20
111:18 125:12	31:15 32:9,11	40:23 42:6,23	101:24,25 102:1,5	Prospectus 17:21
127:9	33:25 38:17,24	57:22 59:22 72:16	102:17 103:2,8,13	protective 43:10,22
points 148:8	40:16 42:10 43:24	73:12 83:13 85:23	105:3,5,6,9,14,17	44:9,14,22 47:22
policy 29:25 126:8	49:22 50:16,20	95:15 97:16 98:15	107:23 108:24	74:8,14 92:16
137:2	54:20 59:25 66:23	107:22 108:9	111:2,10,21 112:8	114:24 117:14,20
political 125:17	70:17 72:7 76:18	113:1 121:17	112:9,11 115:23	137:5,9 141:14
135:24 136:12	77:4 85:3 86:2,6,8	130:24	112:9,11 113:23	147:9
population 149:6	90:10 91:5 96:19	proceeding 20:20	117:15 118:4,5,21	proven 147:6
porting 25:11	96:23 101:19	35:25 36:4 130:19	117:13 118:4,5,21	provide 22:5 36:3
portion 38:15 59:9	120:24 143:21	149:24	122:3 126:11,19	45:14 76:3 87:6
78:20 84:15 91:25	145:11	process 108:10	126:22 127:2,16	133:21 147:17
122:14	prehearing 36:11	119:6	127:17 128:2,9	provided 58:18
portions 23:12 29:8	77:13 148:11	produce 147:5	129:5,14,17,19,22	59:1 67:5 77:7
54:10,12 92:9	prejudice 28:3,4	producing 53:19	129.3,14,17,19,22	109:11,16
122:24 125:20	preliminary 16:13	Production 17:5,8	135:22,25 136:2	provides 28:12,14
posed 59:12 84:22	18:18 114:14	17:11,14,16,19,22	136:21,23,24	127:17 129:11
position 34:15	122:2,4,7,10,15	18:4	137:7,13,15	providing 32:16
41:24 55:4 71:23	premarked 73:5	program 45:13	138:17 139:10	58:14,17
71:25 72:5 139:11	present 88:23	94:16 95:1 113:7	142:1,2,5,9,14	provisions 53:23
possibility 132:4,6	104:9	113:23 115:8,18	144:10 145:13,13	public 18:23 20:14
possible 112:19	presented 36:15	115:19	145:21	28:22 30:21 31:10
133:5,22	149:5	programs 41:21	projects 31:9 34:24	34:8 45:16 53:1
post-hearing 36:12	presiding 20:19	72:2,3 113:9,12	88:1,2,5,8 93:22	55:13 61:3 62:7
36:22 37:1,17	28:13	113:21 114:16,17	97:25 98:21,22	62:12 63:19 68:20
38:10 138:6 150:2	presumption 33:25	prohibit 104:22,24	113:11 114:2,3,10	68:24 69:6 74:5
150:7,9	pretty 118:25	105:3	114:13,21,25	96:12 114:10
potentially 117:17	preventing 140:9	project 16:9,15,18	120:20 121:24	118:17 120:20
118:24	previous 63:14	17:20 18:8,23	120:20 121:21	126:8,12,19,22
PowerPoint 16:15	146:1	31:18,23 44:11,12	127:10,18 128:22	127:9,16,17,18
91:1,4,4 140:20	previously 34:5	44:25 45:2,5,12	131:9 132:3 136:6	128:9 129:5,14,17
140:23	145:2 146:9	45:20 46:5,10,12	136:8,10 146:6	129:22 130:9
practice 35:24	prior 31:5 33:3	46:13,14,18,20,24	promotes 102:3	132:3 136:21,24
101:7 110:21	34:2 135:9	47:1,7,8,12,14,24	proof 143:24	139:3,16 140:8
128:13	priority 81:17,23	48:1,14,15,20,21	proper 114:11	141:4,8,17,19,22
practices 34:3	83:18 84:4	49:18 51:2 58:15	properly 23:24	142:2 143:23
129:13	private 69:23	58:17 65:17,23	property 98:23	144:1,4,10,11,14
precise 144:8	probable 32:25	66:5 72:4 75:10	propose 93:5	144:21 146:9,12
precisely 40:10	probably 23:13	75:18,21,25 81:1	proposed 16:6 60:1	147:6,7,15,17,18
preclude 105:14	30:19 58:3 70:17	81:4 85:4 86:4,18	60:4,4 62:13,19	147:20,21 148:17
predominantly	112:18 150:8	86:24 87:13,17,19	64:11,19,25 65:5	148:24 149:2,9,10
118:23	problem 54:4 85:8	87:20,21,22,23	65:7 66:15 76:9	publicly 54:1
prefer 22:17 36:16	procedural 24:18	88:17,21 89:11,21	76:15 87:1 118:11	publish 77:16
55:1 73:8	26:19 36:11	91:4,9,12,18,20	119:18 131:5	published 54:2
prefers 23:7	Procedures 18:13	91:22 92:7 93:2	137:15,20 141:9	55:7
prefiled 22:12	proceed 20:22	94:24 96:12 101:3	142:9 143:9 144:2	publisher 53:11
	-			-

				ÿ
pull 42:9 56:10	116:8,11,12	79:6,10,18,22	138:12,20	recognize 61:11,13
73:2 81:18 82:7	122:12 124:6	102:17 132:24	RCWs 53:16	73:19 78:8 91:3
90:22 99:1,2	127:11,12 128:11	rail-highway 102:2	reached 93:1	99:7,9 105:25
105:22 109:25	129:24 130:3,4,6	railroad 13:7,11	136:13	recommendations
117:9 123:24	132:14,16 133:19	14:10 17:5,7,10	read 57:19,21	107:16
124:3	133:25,25	17:13,16,18,21	68:15 75:1 78:20	reconsidering 55:5
purpose 107:20	questioning 83:14	18:4 20:13,17	78:23 79:2,4 80:7	reconstruction
purposes 30:6	89:9,14 100:12	21:5,7 23:1,3 24:8	80:9 100:9,9,13	114:23
pursuant 27:6,14	questions 33:8 35:5	24:11,15,18 25:6	100:18,19,20	record 20:6 21:19
125:2	36:8 43:6 48:5	29:6 31:8,12,24	101:23,24 104:18	22:20 36:14 41:20
put 37:16 51:4	59:13 67:18,23	32:13,15,20 33:3	104:19 125:16,17	49:16 51:23 53:4
53:25 61:14 62:16	69:1 83:3 84:23	33:20 34:1 35:2,3	135:24	54:16 70:16 71:20
75:8	93:9,13 94:9	38:6 43:25 47:2	reads 43:24 79:7	75:1 78:20 79:3
putting 69:13	100:16 108:23	48:2 54:18 55:7	real 138:20 139:22	80:8 95:18,20
131:13 142:25	112:18,21 117:2	55:21 57:23 58:2	realized 26:24	96:8 98:12,14,19
PY-1T 18:17 28:12	118:9,12 119:22	60:6 70:22 77:11	really 24:17 58:18	99:17 100:10,14
29:10,19,24 30:3	130:13,16 137:24	87:2 90:1,5,8,11	59:4 84:7 138:13	100:15 101:5
40:19,25 120:25	141:20	93:4 94:7 95:3,7	138:18 142:6	106:19 120:15
121:7	queue 79:22 80:3,4	98:2 106:21	Realtime 13:22	121:7 128:9
PY-2 18:18 121:10	80:10,12 140:7	111:17 119:2	rear-end 85:5 86:5	145:19,22
121:13,15	queueing 60:5,7,9	120:19 125:22	86:10,16 103:19	records 67:10
PY-3 18:19	79:25 80:19,23	127:2 131:13	103:23 104:6,9,11	redirect 48:8 67:21
PY-4 18:20	81:1,3,5 87:2,4	133:14 134:10	116:2 119:17	93:10,13 111:17
PY-5 18:21 124:1	93:25 94:2 139:25	135:22 136:1,1,12	reask 69:5 98:18	112:16,19 117:4
135:17	queuing 60:11	138:18 139:7,13	reasking 111:25	130:20 134:23
PY-6 18:23 126:7	140:1	140:14,25 141:20	reason 23:23 25:15	redoing 141:14
PY-7 18:24 121:10	quickly 42:14 57:9	142:14 143:6	52:20,23 89:3	reduce 45:15 81:5
121:14,15	106:25 143:20	144:12 145:4,14	116:18	81:6 85:5 86:4,11
PY-8X 19:3 124:18	quite 53:16	146:3,18 147:24	reasons 141:2	93:25 94:2 103:10
124:19 125:13	quote 141:18,19	147:25 148:9	145:17 147:25	103:11,23 115:23
PY-9X 19:4	quote/unquote	Railroad's 24:1	reattached 26:8	116:6,13 140:1
Q	24:22 25:14	33:3 34:15 35:24	rebuttal 16:22	149:17
	R	52:1 77:21 98:23	24:22 25:14,19	reduction 141:22
question 43:12,14		142:13	38:19	reductions 115:22
44:3,4 45:25	R 14:1 20:4 43:1	railroads 31:10,20	recall 50:20 52:18	refer 73:8 81:21
56:24 59:12,16	48:11,11 50:8	78:24 81:3 144:9	61:5 70:9 86:5	94:15,19
64:9 68:11 69:3,9 70:5 74:12 81:21	68:1,1 72:19 93:15,15 97:19	147:13	88:22 94:22,23	reference 46:21
84:22 88:4 89:20	113:2 117:7,7	railway-highway	123:14	50:17 61:3 66:23
94:3,11 95:7,9	121:20 131:1	45:13	receive 22:9 48:15	126:6
98:19 101:10,12	135:1,1 151:1	raise 21:16 38:23	48:19	referenced 29:3
101:20 102:11	Rachel 14:11 21:7	120:3	received 22:8 46:23	32:11
101.20 102.11	rachel.reynolds	raised 33:7	59:5	references 62:7
107:21 108:8,12	14:14	RCW 18:16 19:4	recess 95:14,19,21	74:5 79:21
107.21 108.8,12	radius 140:2	28:24 33:21 43:20	98:13	referencing 39:6
111:16,24 115:14	rail 78:18,21,25	99:14 100:1,9,22	recital 99:13	52:14 referred 25:5
111.10,27 113.17	1411 / 0.10,21,23	101:4,14 137:4	recite 113:14	Teleffeu 25:5
	I	I	I	I

				
referring 39:7 45:6	147:1 148:17	34:10,11 47:16	return 95:14	135:2 137:23
46:13,16 74:21	relies 141:13	107:13 108:6	returning 95:21	140:15,19,22,25
81:19,25 126:15	relocating 117:23	118:10	review 42:14 58:19	150:17
reflected 109:2	relocation 117:17	requesting 37:15	72:23 106:8 107:1	Reynolds' 85:7
refusing 32:13	rely 144:1	requests 107:7	reviewed 107:3	right 22:25 23:8,16
regard 28:11 29:17	relying 52:10	147:25	reviewing 107:2	23:16 25:18,25
regarding 16:12	remaining 40:16	require 83:6	revised 97:6	26:2 27:17 30:13
18:11 23:18 31:6	58:21	109:23 110:11	revising 56:22	30:16 35:19 36:7
32:4 33:8 34:24	remember 89:2	111:2 115:7,17	reword 116:9	37:16 39:2,3,3
37:1 38:13 40:13	118:12	required 46:9 76:3	Reynold's 51:21	40:8 41:1 42:5,22
56:21 67:14 70:16	renew 125:18	92:21,22 136:1	Reynolds 14:11	43:5,7 45:11
106:10,12 110:9	renewed 125:19	141:11 144:14	15:4,8,13,16,19	48:16 49:1 50:5
116:2 124:23	repair 125:18	146:5,12	15:22,25 21:6,7	50:15,22 53:24
138:12	repaired 125:19	requirement 26:14	23:3 24:11 26:4	54:17 55:16 57:2
regards 36:6 39:22	repeat 44:3,18	76:5 100:22	30:18 33:15 34:19	57:15,25 58:4
62:20	59:16 74:12 82:23	101:14 146:12	37:4,24 38:6,23	60:18 64:2 66:10
Regional 45:7,10	88:4 101:12	147:20	39:5 42:21,24	66:22 67:20 70:14
regulation 31:20	102:11 104:3	requires 28:23	43:2,20 44:5,6,16	70:23 71:1,4
regulations 31:1	105:10 110:5	62:13 76:6 144:2	44:19,20 48:4	72:15 74:7 75:18
32:4	115:14	144:4 148:18	50:9 51:15 52:2	76:7 77:9 78:11
regulatory 101:8	repeated 27:24,25	149:2	52:13 53:13 54:9	80:2 82:14 83:8
110:21	replaced 62:22,24	respect 35:21 38:15	54:14,19 55:9,10	83:13 84:25 85:19
reimbursed 122:7	replacing 105:7	respectively 20:11	55:23 56:9 57:2,7	87:19 94:5,10
122:13	report 78:13 83:5	59:8	57:11 59:8,17	95:1,2,24 96:18
reimbursement	83:10	respond 25:3 30:17	61:24 62:3,4	97:1,12,15 99:23
122:10	reported 13:21	33:10 39:20 43:19	67:18 68:21,23	112:15,25 116:7,8
reimbursing	39:12 40:6	54:18 55:22 107:6	70:21 72:17,20	119:3,24 120:3
122:17	reporter 21:19	Respondent 13:12	73:6,14,15,24	121:4,13 122:12
reinstall 142:17	44:16,17 51:4	responding 23:5	74:3 77:10,24	124:15 127:19
reinstallation	96:16 98:3,4	response 17:4,7,10	78:1 83:15,16	129:16 130:14,18
117:16 145:3,5	102:9 150:10	17:13,16,18,21	84:14,19 85:1,9	130:23 131:23
relate 58:20 69:10	151:7	18:3 24:19,24	85:22,24,25 89:16	132:5,24 133:2,6
145:22	Reporting 13:22	25:8,16,19 26:2	90:12,21,24 92:8	134:22 137:25
related 144:23	reports 40:4	38:19 52:1 54:19	92:12,13 93:8	140:21 148:3
relates 51:1 137:7	representation	58:9 59:19,23	96:1,3,6 97:1	149:22 150:19
relating 106:10	89:4,7	68:15	99:17,20 100:24	right-hand 74:23
relative 45:19	representative	responses 30:14	102:19 103:21	right-of-way 94:7
116:8 123:13	39:24 70:9 146:22	responsibility	106:20 107:25	risk 81:15
125:5 129:12	representing 67:6	32:14,15 52:24	110:13 111:11,22	Risk-Based 18:3
relatively 138:7	request 17:5,7,11	119:14	112:23 115:9	81:12 82:4
relevance 29:18	17:14,16,19,22	responsible 59:3	117:5,8 119:21	river 46:15 87:25
relevancy 33:1	18:4 31:22 37:11	64:13	120:10,13 121:4	91:13,20,25 94:6
relevant 28:17,24	47:18 74:7,13	rest 52:25 149:21	124:6,13 127:4,6	95:3
29:2 31:13 35:25	77:15 107:8 108:3	result 137:21	128:5 129:7 130:1	RL-1T 16:4 39:6
36:2,4 51:24	140:5	resulted 77:3	130:18 132:11	40:18,24
101:4 146:25	requested 31:22	results 83:22	133:17 134:24	RL-2 16:5 70:19

				T age 100
71:2,3	36:10 37:21 38:8	141:19,22,23	141:6,11,13	setting 38:20 40:16
RL-3 16:6 70:19	70:25 77:19 85:6	142:2 143:18,23	144:17 145:18	40:17
71:2,3	97:11 112:17,25	144:1,4,12,14,21	sections 54:13	seven 59:6
RL-4X 16:7 61:7	113:3 115:15	146:12 147:6,7,15	123:12 142:20	sewage 75:23
61:25 62:2,5 65:6	117:1 121:12	147:18,18,20,22	secured 87:21	142:11
73:7	124:12 130:16,21	148:18,24 149:2,9	see 24:14 51:4	share 51:16 57:8
RL-5X 16:8 51:17	130:23 131:2	149:11,18	57:12 58:5 74:7	77:9,25 140:16
RL-6X 16:9	132:22 133:24	satisfy 147:5	74:23 78:2,14,17	shared 111:6
RL-7X 16:10	134:20 148:6	saying 46:4 82:17	79:19,24,25 80:23	sharing 59:24
RL-8X 16:12 56:11	150:14	96:16 109:7	83:9 91:1,10	85:11 122:22
56:16 57:3,6 58:5	Robert 14:22 15:6	116:10 119:12	101:16 106:16	123:5,8,18
RL-9X 16:13	49:6,8 119:12	says 28:17 79:11,14	107:11 134:3,7	shell 138:15
RL-X4 68:7	role 49:20	83:21 84:5 91:12	137:4 140:22	Shorthand 151:6
road 20:15,15	room 87:4	136:10 143:12	seeing 28:3,4 110:3	showing 83:23
31:18 43:6,9 44:8	roughly 95:16	146:8,20 149:1	seeking 20:16	149:13 150:11
46:3,15 47:2	round 36:19,22	scenario 80:4,19	seen 73:2 88:25	shows 79:8
55:14 57:24 58:15	37:1,5,17 38:10	schedule 24:19	117:18	shy 41:25
63:17 65:15,21	rounds 36:17,21	36:12	segment 91:21 92:6	side 63:19 65:16
66:2 69:23 75:10	rule 27:7,15	science 79:16	95:5	69:25 73:12 74:23
75:18 76:2 79:1,1	rules 26:17,18	scope 43:15 44:12	SEIS 16:21	114:14 139:19
79:5,5,12,22	28:15 40:9 131:11	55:20 56:1,5	send 108:25 150:10	signage 54:21
80:19 81:1,2 86:4	ruling 28:15 85:14	89:10 100:2	sending 59:19	signal 16:12 18:12
86:17,23 87:13,19	run 114:10	screen 51:16 57:8	sends 109:8	18:15 32:7 56:22
88:13 91:25 93:2		57:12 77:25 78:2	senior 49:17	58:21 62:20 63:6
103:14,16 105:6	S	85:7 90:22 91:1	sense 30:19 112:24	66:17 70:3 92:20
117:21 118:16,21	S 14:1 20:4 43:1,1	140:16	143:10 146:7	104:19,25 105:15
119:19 125:5	50:8,8 72:19,19	scrolling 58:4,12	147:11	105:18 106:10,11
133:11,12,20	97:19,19 113:2,2	78:6	sent 24:13,15 26:25	106:12 107:6
135:4,10,13 137:7	121:20,20 131:1,1	Seattle 13:23,23	58:23 109:5	123:22
137:13,15 138:23	safe 79:13 132:18	14:13	sentence 79:7	signals 34:18 45:22
139:17 142:3,5	133:1,21 142:4	second 25:11 28:25	SEPA 16:19 17:18	105:19 114:22,23
149:11	144:14	29:11 35:15 100:8	76:20 78:4	139:18 144:5
roads 139:19	safely 66:19 79:6	109:25 114:19	separate 60:13,16	signatures 61:17
roadway 47:6,10	safer 131:7 149:11	139:24 141:7	141:2	61:18
60:14 62:25 63:9	safest 139:22	second-to-last 30:8	separately 73:11	signed 16:13 18:18
63:12 64:1,22	safety 16:16 18:3	section 16:8 34:24	separations 134:12	60:24 109:18
69:17 70:2 75:19	28:22 31:10 32:5	45:16 51:11 52:3	series 31:1 53:22	significant 28:3
75:21 125:20	34:18 39:10 45:14	52:20,24 54:14,15	118:9	signing 51:1
roadways 83:18	61:4 62:7,10,13	68:10 74:10,16,20	serious 81:13	signs 63:13 143:5,7
132:19 147:13	67:14 68:20,24	78:21 79:18 99:21	served 50:13	similar 115:13
Rob 49:17 69:5	69:7 74:5 81:12	100:23 101:3,15	service 34:17	simple 53:18 139:2
Roberson 14:16	82:4 93:17,19,22	101:16,17,25	113:20	simply 105:7
15:18,24 21:10,11	94:16,25 101:25	113:6,18,21,24	set 28:25 29:4	139:10
23:10,11 27:20	113:23 118:17	115:7,18 125:15	32:23 38:3 39:13	simultaneous 37:18
28:8,10,11 29:14	131:11 139:3,16	126:20 135:20,21	142:25	125:9 128:18
30:11 35:12,14,17	140:8 141:4,8,17	135:23 136:3,6,15	sets 143:5	single 38:10
	I			l

				Faye 109
sir 44:7 48:6 51:3	specific 29:9 33:8	28:10,20 29:18	37:12,15 39:9,11	street 63:19 139:20
56:10,13,18 61:7	35:12 45:25 47:20	30:24 32:23 33:7	39:24 40:14 53:4	stricken 24:22
61:9,18 62:5,16	48:13,21 53:20	33:12 36:10,15,18	58:20 68:11 79:14	strike 25:15 59:9
62:21 63:20	89:12 145:8,8,15	36:25 37:6,21	86:6 104:13,15	84:14,17 92:8
117:11	specifically 33:22	38:8 70:23 77:18	125:1,4 126:22	study 78:24 79:10
sit 47:19 123:20	34:3,23 39:7 40:3	77:19 90:11 97:11	129:10 141:19	stuff 147:14
situation 31:3	43:7,16,21 45:19	112:21,23 121:12	129.10 141.19	subject 60:1 65:5
128:23	46:3 47:21 50:16	124:12 130:14,19	statements 22:6	subject 00.1 05.5 submissions 37:18
situations 32:17	56:4 68:9 69:10	141:20 148:4,7	138:4,7 143:21	submit 27:15 31:13
Six 49:21	86:2 89:20 92:19	149:12 150:14	145:11	33:9 36:19 46:8
skill 151:9	99:14 101:2,20	Staff's 35:8,12,20	states 17:9 52:24	47:25 53:15 83:6
slightly 124:17	104:17 118:5	35:21 36:1 38:14	54:21 57:15 68:12	submits 46:6
142:21	125:15 126:15	staffing 92:24	76:18 78:3 83:1	149:12
slowly 96:14	129:16 132:19	standard 32:22,24	101:2 122:21,22	submitted 24:10
snowly 90.14 small 112:18	129.10 132.19	33:1 50:25 63:6	101.2 122.21,22	52:3 61:15 96:23
Smith 14:12	144:3 145:23	143:23	stating 86:6	98:25
sole 125:18	specified 144:4,6		statistics 67:14	Subsection 125:15
somewhat 45:25	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	standpoint 141:8 144:21	stats 66:20,21	
138:14	specify 105:5 107:8 Speculation 68:21	start 20:24 23:2,14	status 26:23	substance 53:25 substantive 26:5
soon 26:19,24	102:20 103:21	started 88:15	statute 33:21 43:23	27:12
sorry 29:10,12,14	spell 96:7	108:18 131:12	99:13 100:19	successful 87:22
29:20 35:1,4	spend 32:6	starting 89:10	101:2 117:9	sufficient 104:8
44:17 51:6 56:18	split 91:9	starts 74:22	126:25 127:6,8,10	115:25
83:4 85:22 99:4	Spokane 13:5,8	state 31:2,5,19 32:2	127:15 136:15,22	suggest 22:12
100:11,12 101:22	14:5 17:3,4,7,10	33:4 41:19 44:24	136:25 138:14,15	84:21
105:11 110:5	17:13,15,18,21	45:13,22,23 46:5	138:19 139:10	suggesting 139:7
112:7 113:19	18:3 20:12,12	46:11 48:18 49:15	143:25 144:15	suggestion 34:6
115:14 117:10	33:19 34:23 45:5	51:8 53:17,19,22	147:6 149:1	Suite 13:22 14:12
128:19 131:15	45:7,10 46:15	54:11,15 62:8	statutes 27:7 29:2	summary 37:7
132:3 137:18	47:17 49:18 60:24	71:19 86:3 87:11	statutorily 148:20	82:13,15 83:17
sort 32:12 39:17	71:22 73:1 75:12	90:7 92:3 96:7	statutory 146:11	support 144:13
89:25 101:8	75:24 78:13 81:11	99:11,13 101:4	stay 70:2	supporting 38:20
sought 55:23	91:13 93:1,4	107:10 114:12	STBG 16:17 95:5	40:17,22 70:16
source 46:2 94:21	118:14,20 119:1	115:6,17 120:14	step 83:22 84:2,5	90:16 97:5 121:9
sources 94:24	123:9,15,19,21	123:16 126:13	steps 83:22,23,25	supports 35:11
113:16 115:4,5	123.3,13,13,21	127:19 128:3,22	stipulate 22:11	supports 55.11 sure 59:15 61:5
south 69:22,23	143:15 146:21,22	129:20 130:9	23:13 27:20 77:19	64:9 70:15 73:7
87:24 91:20 94:6	Spokane's 31:18	136:20 138:16	stipulated 23:3	78:23 84:1,9
95:3	spoken 90:18	141:7,17 151:3,7	77:12 90:10	87:18 88:7 96:14
southbound 69:19	Square 13:19	state's 137:3	stop 59:24 85:11	96:17 101:24
80:24 81:8	Square 15:17 SRTC 45:3,4,6	stated 30:23 32:9	122:23 132:9	104:4,19 105:12
Southeast 13:19	47:24 48:17	34:3,24 51:21	140:5 143:5	106:6 110:7
span 88:9	Staff 14:15 21:9,11	52:18 54:9 110:8	149:16	126:16 149:15
speak 21:17,18	21:25 22:10 23:9	125:2 128:7	storage 87:6	surface 18:24 30:4
96:14	23:11,12 25:3	statement 22:4	STP 45:3 47:23	33:14,18 34:21
speaking 21:16	27:18,19,20 28:8	26:7 36:17 37:8	straight 43:23	124:24,25
. 0				ŕ

				i aye i ro
swear 42:1 49:7	team 67:3	49:25 50:16,20	124:20 134:21,24	timely 24:4,9 26:25
71:11 120:3	technical 24:12	54:21,24 55:20	137:23 138:1,10	times 80:14,15,16
switch 87:16	148:22	56:2,5 59:25	140:13,24 148:2,3	80:20 126:10
sworn 42:4 49:8	technicalities 26:19	63:23 66:23 70:17	149:22,23 150:18	timing 87:17 89:25
71:12 95:25 120:8	94:14	71:5 72:7,10	150:19	titled 78:12,17
system 62:23,24	technically 23:20	76:18 77:4 85:3	thing 146:4 147:9	79:18 91:4 135:21
63:2,15 64:12,14	24:21 25:14,16	86:2,8,20 89:11	things 63:5 126:11	today 20:7 21:20
66:18 75:23 115:1	technology 66:14	90:10 91:5 94:15	141:21 149:8	22:18 34:22 37:7
117:24,25 142:18	66:16 142:23	94:19 95:9 96:19	think 22:23 23:20	37:12 45:18 47:19
142:23,25 143:19	tell 45:18 47:20	96:23,24 97:4	29:11 30:18 31:14	49:2 83:9 93:6
145:4,6	62:6 67:7 86:16	101:7,20 102:6,14	33:6,11,15 36:20	95:9 97:7 119:25
systems 63:21	86:21 113:12	102:21 104:17,23	36:22,24 48:4	123:20 127:21
·	telling 132:10	105:13 110:16,21	54:25 55:5 56:6	135:4 137:17
T	tells 26:17	113:5 119:25	57:9 62:11 63:11	138:1,4,7,11
T 41:14 43:1 48:11	ten 27:1 66:6 68:11	120:25 121:2	63:22 65:12 81:19	142:22 143:21
48:11 49:13 50:8	68:12,13 81:16,23	122:18,24 124:1,9	85:6 95:13,18	145:12 149:24
68:1,1 71:17	84:5,9 86:18,23	126:18 131:4	98:6 115:24 117:1	150:11,13
72:19 93:15,15	137:18	138:1 143:21	124:5 129:4 132:2	today's 20:19 21:21
96:5 97:19 113:2	ten-day 150:5	145:11 149:24	132:2,8 134:20	37:19
117:7,7 120:12	tendency 28:18	thank 20:25 21:3,8	142:15,21 146:2	told 106:9 146:17
121:20 131:1	tender 21:24 22:1	21:12 22:19 23:8	148:11,16,22	146:19
135:1,1 151:1,1	41:2 42:2 97:2	23:19 25:2,25	thinking 124:17	top 74:18 81:16,23
table 80:22	121:5	27:17 30:13 35:6	126:16	84:5,9
take 20:21 23:5,6	terms 23:4 26:22	35:10,13 38:1,9	third 14:12 24:17	topics 87:16
27:10 28:1 30:19	46:1 58:14 88:2,6	39:5,21 40:7 41:4	25:4,22 29:4	total 46:24
31:2 32:1 54:3	111:7 117:16	41:10,18,23 42:5	80:25 83:24 84:2	totally 46:8
55:6 56:23 62:5	119:7,8 146:16,17	42:7,13,16,19,24	84:5 85:4 86:3,9	TR-210809 13:4
88:12,20 89:17	testified 85:3 89:11	44:5 48:5,9,24	86:12	20:10
91:8 95:14 100:8	101:2 103:22	49:1,11 50:2 51:7	thoughts 126:18	TR-210814 13:4
112:21 147:12	108:3 111:14	55:9 56:8 57:5,7	138:8	20:10
149:25	131:4	62:1,3 67:19	three 25:6 28:21	track 40:6 70:7
taken 81:19	testifying 43:16	70:12 71:1,5,7,13	37:20 71:24 83:23	105:8 125:20,25
takes 83:1	53:5	71:15 72:17 73:14	141:2	tracks 39:12 60:17
talk 20:22 21:21	testimony 16:3,4	74:1 75:8 77:17	THURSTON 151:4	60:19 66:25 69:20
74:16 105:6	16:14,22 18:6,17	77:22,24 83:12,15	tie-ends 125:21,25	69:23 70:1 95:3
114:19 148:23	23:12,22,24 24:19	84:19,25 85:19,24	ties 105:8	135:7,10 140:6
talked 34:21 76:16	24:23,24 25:8,15	90:21,23 92:12	time 20:7 34:10	143:14
129:4 145:1	25:16,17,19,20,21	93:8 95:9,11 96:3	35:7 48:6 56:23	traffic 39:10 50:17
talking 26:11 31:19	26:6 29:8,15,21	97:3,17 98:16	57:2,7 58:2 61:24	51:1 52:25 58:25
113:4 125:9	30:21 31:15 32:9	99:19 101:18	67:19 80:11,13	63:7 65:10 66:11
128:18 129:17	32:11 33:9,11	102:5 105:21	83:6 91:22 92:1	68:10,17,19 69:6
talks 102:6,14,21	34:1 35:15,22	106:17 107:4	93:9 118:23	75:14 76:9 79:18
143:22	38:15,18,18,19,19	108:22 109:19	119:22 123:14	81:6,10 87:5,7,7,8
TALLON 14:11	38:24,24 39:6	110:23 117:2,3,5	137:24	87:9 93:22 105:19
Tayler 13:21 151:6	40:16 42:10,17	119:22,24 120:9	timeline 88:6 89:21	115:1,22 131:13
151:15	43:15,24 49:2,23	121:6,13,18	timelines 88:3	131:17 132:17
	l ·			ļ

				i aye i ri
135:3 137:10	87:8,9 95:21	21:24 22:1,9 23:1	102:4 132:20	volume 13:13
142:8,17 145:3	turning-related	25:3 26:3 30:16	145:9	26:23
149:6,7	86:5,13,22 140:1	31:24 33:19 34:7	UTC 16:7,23 61:14	volumes 68:17,19
trailing 106:7	turns 36:3 87:5	37:3,4,11,14,24	147:17	69:6 79:8
train 79:8 131:22	two 23:20 36:17,21	39:9 40:3,6,12	Utilities 13:2,19	07.077.0
131:23,24,25	61:17 65:14,18,20	42:22 43:18 46:21	14:17 61:21	W
131:23,24,25	65:24 82:16 87:23	47:2 50:5,13	utility 17:15 91:23	W10-1 143:5
trains 60:9,11	87:24 91:9 94:24	53:10 70:9 72:15	utility 17.15 71.25	W10-4 143:6
80:16 133:9,16	137:17,17,18	88:14 89:17,23	V	WA 17:3
134:1	143:5,5,6,6	95:22 97:1 112:16	v 13:10 20:12	WAC 28:12
transcript 151:8	145:17 148:22	112:20 114:7	vacant 68:17	WACs 53:16
transportation	145.17 148.22	117:4 118:10,14	vacuum 31:3	wait 24:2 140:6
13:2,19 14:17	type 31:16 44:13,21	117.4 118.10,14	vague 107:25 108:2	waiting 92:5
45:7,10 53:12,14	45:1 66:11 104:21	121:4 122:9,12	valid 36:23	want 36:13 53:24
61:22 78:13 84:3	105:3,5 106:8	121:4 122:9,12 124:13 126:4,7	valley 13:5,8 14:5	85:10 102:23
90:7 92:3 113:20	105:5,5 106:8	124:13 126:4,7 127:18 131:8	17:3 20:12,12	126:6,17 129:3
90:7 92:5 113:20	types 28:21 32:17	127:18 131:8 133:20 134:1,3	33:19 34:23 45:5	134:7,18 149:10
Transportation's	• 1	133:20 134:1,3	46:6,17 47:17	wanted 28:9 70:15
87:12	105:14,17,18 113:11,21 132:18	139:6 140:25	49:19 71:22 73:1	91:8
travel 143:3	typical 118:25	142.13,13 145.2	75:12 78:13 81:11	wants 134:3
traversal 132:18	typically 30:25,25	146:20 147:1	93:1,5 118:15,20	warning 13:6 16:5
Trent 87:24	98:2 108:21 116:3	140.20 147.1	119:1 123:9,15,19	16:6 60:25 62:18
			123:22 124:23	63:12,16,21 69:11
triggered 144:11	134:10	Union's 37:11	125:3,23 143:15	72:24 75:3 114:24
trouble 98:4	U	United 17:9	146:22,23	131:10 132:5,24
truck 70:1 trucks 140:3	underneath 91:12	unsafe 39:12 40:5 66:24	Valley's 17:4,7,10	131:10 132:3,24
true 56:24 61:20	underscores 39:16	untimely 24:23	17:13,16,18,21	144:5,7 148:18
73:21 88:1,5,10	understand 43:11	UP's 29:21,25	18:3 60:24	149:4
	64:9 105:1 116:5	108:10 114:10	variability 88:2,6	warranted 141:2
106:14,16 108:14	understanding		various 89:23	144:16
115:20 151:8 truth 26:16,19	58:16 88:11 94:14	135:10 136:21,23	107:6,9 123:10,10	warrants 147:23
,	105:11 108:9	137:8	vehicle 39:12 40:5	Washington 13:1
truth-seeking 27:2	114:11 118:22	Update 76:21	66:24 68:10 79:21	13:19,20,23 14:8
truthfully 96:24	122:16	updated 52:9	132:20	14:13,19 20:1
try 95:15 98:10	understood 109:4	142:24 150:10	vehicles 93:20	29:16 31:5 33:4
150:7	128:12 147:2	upgrade 43:25	131:12 132:18	45:14 51:8 52:15
trying 65:3 70:7	undertake 35:3	upgrades 66:14	133:14,22 134:10	53:17,19 54:11,15
127:8 128:24	undertook 76:24	uphold 34:2	vehicular 102:2,17	76:6 87:11 114:12
Tuesday 20:7	undertook 70.24 unfettered 135:6	UPR's 64:14 66:16	102:22	123:6,16 151:3,7
57:13 turn 38:12 41:7,11	Uniform 50:17	UPRR 16:10 18:9	verbiage 52:4	Washington's
· · · · · ·	131:17 132:17	43:25 57:25 58:1	version 51:9,10,21	28:15
49:4,5,6 69:22	unintentional 28:6	58:2 67:6,14	51:22,23 52:2,11	wasn't 36:13 59:4
71:5,10 81:7,9	Union 13:7,11	92:21,22,24 93:1	52:15,19 53:20	way 34:2 46:1
95:10,23 103:16	14:10 17:5,7,10	94:6 142:3	83:5,10	47:25 53:18 55:2
119:25 120:2	17:13,16,18,21	urgency 146:7,11	versus 54:11	63:8 64:17 115:2
138:1,4,9 140:2	18:3 20:12 21:7	USC 113:21,24	video 148:7	116:9,20 119:3
turning 42:21 70:1	10.5 20.12 21.7	use 22:13 100:2	1400 170.7	110.7,20 117.5
	I	I	I	I

130:21 132:15	100:13 141:21	85:10 94:23 110:3	11/15/2019 17:10	50:18 86:2 91:9
ways 119:8	142:22 149:24	112:1 115:16	11:17 95:19	101:20 104:17
we'll 20:22 43:14	Woodland 13:19	124:4,25 125:10	11:30 95:14	113:5
114:19 128:3	word 62:9 74:23	124.4,25 125.10		20 77:6
			11:31 95:19	
we're 20:22 21:13	84:18	129:11 133:7	11:35 98:13	2003 51:23 52:4
23:5,20 24:2,3	worded 142:21	year 80:14,20	11:37 98:13	2009 51:9,21 52:4,9
27:2 46:17 52:7	words 34:6 75:1	88:18 120:23	1111 14:12	52:15,19 53:20
52:10 53:7,7	119:1	yearly 58:24	113 15:18	2012 87:13
69:18,25 76:2	work 46:21,22 47:6	years 41:25 49:21	117 15:19	2016 76:20 87:13
82:2,24 85:11	47:10,11,13 48:2	66:19 68:14 72:6	12 18:4 34:24 79:8	2017 18:21 19:3
89:15 92:5 93:5	58:1,21 91:25	79:6,9 86:18,23	101:21 136:4,6	31:6 33:17 34:16
95:21,21 120:7	108:15 114:4	142:4,5	12/30/2019 17:13	34:20 55:12,15
121:6 127:21	120:19 124:24,25	Ygbuhay 14:22	12:48 150:21	124:2,22 135:16
140:17 146:21	134:18 144:23	15:21 23:22 28:11	120 15:22	136:9 146:1
we've 95:13 115:12	workable 22:16	31:16 120:2,8,16	121 15:23 17:17	2018 82:6
121:7 143:13,13	working 46:18	121:5,22 131:3	12th 23:25	2019 88:16
143:14,14	114:20	137:25	13 79:21,24 101:21	2020 16:12 18:5,10
Website 16:9 18:7	works 37:21,22,24	Ygbuhay's 23:12	125:13	18:11 56:21 57:13
week 83:8	worst 80:4,11,19	29:8	13-151 13:14	58:6,22 67:4
weeks 25:17 37:20	wouldn't 32:4 89:3	yielding 83:22	130 45:16,17	88:17 89:5 137:22
150:9	writing 144:3		100:23 101:3,15	146:14
welcome 49:3	wrong 29:10	Z	101:16,25 113:6	2021 16:24 18:20
went 119:2	wrote 68:16	zero 134:3,7,18	113:18 115:7,18	2022 13:17 20:1,7
weren't 26:13	WSDOT 17:20	zfoster@mbje.com	131 15:24	23:25
141:24	91:13,16,22	14:9	1325 13:22	206 13:23 14:13
widen 75:19 137:16	www.buellrealti	Zoom 21:13 44:13	133 113:21	21 122:20,22
Widener 17:6,12	13:25		135 15:25	225 80:23
widening 62:25		0	138 79:17	23 113:20,24
69:25 75:21 105:6	Χ		13th 97:6	122:21
139:17	X 41:14 43:1 48:11	1	14 101:23 113:5	24 104:17
wider 63:17,17	49:13 50:8 68:1	1 17:5,8,11,14,17	14 101.25 115.5 148 113:24	25 29:12,15,20 30:9
width 63:11	71:17 72:19 93:15	17:19,22 27:15	140 115.24 14th 150:8	35:16,22 40:21
wish 27:18	96:5 97:19 113:2	47:7 68:13 74:18	16 50:18 101:23	79:6,9 104:17
witness 40:13 41:2	117:7 120:12	74:20	161-175 17:19	121:8 123:1 142:4
41:5,9,12 42:2	121:20 131:1	1.3-mile-long	101-175 17:19 17 50:18	121:8 125:1 142:4
	135:1	142:12 145:13	17 50:18 17th 55:12 83:9	26 29:24 30:11
49:3,5,10 50:6		1.4 46:24		
53:8 59:15 70:15	Y	1/27/2021 17:15	18 30:20 39:11 40:5	261 141:6 145:24
71:7,9,14 73:9	Y-8X 123:25	10 13:17 20:1	1840 13:22	267,000 94:16,25
84:25 94:12,17,23	Y-g-b-u-h-a-y	101 18:13	19 18:5,10 29:12,15	27 30:21
95:11,13,23 96:2	120:17	102 26:17 27:15	19X 83:4,18	2700 14:12
97:16 98:10 110:3	Yakima 14:8	102-107 17:11	1A.07 16:8 51:12	271 141:11 144:17
117:4 120:10	yeah 29:14 49:17	104 27:6	52:21	144:25
138:3	50:25 51:10 64:3	108-113 17:14	2	28 39:7
witnesses 14:21	66:9,13 73:20	10th 20:7 37:19		287-9066 13:23
21:24,25 22:2,2	75:17 80:22 85:9	11 78:25	2 29:12,13,14 30:20	28th 120:23
34:1 36:9 95:22	13.11 00.22 03.9		46:17,19 47:1,5	295 99:21,22
1		1	1	

136:16 138:24	36:6 90:18 91:8	9	
141:13 145:1,5,18	131:3 135:20,21	9 29:20,25 30:3,10	
147:8	135:23	30:12 33:12 35:16	
2A 91:12	613,758 46:23	35:22 36:6 40:20	
	621 13:19	73:16 99:5 107:10	
3	64 78:16	121:8 122:25	
3 18:4 39:7 58:5	65 79:17	9:30 13:18 20:2,8	
68:9	66256C 19:3	95:13	
30 38:3	664-1188 14:19	93 15:14	
30-page 38:11	68 15:9	95 15.14 95th 80:12	
150:2	6th 24:9	95 (1) 80.12 96 15:16	
31st 37:20 38:11		90 15:10 97 15:17	
150:2	7	98101 13:23 14:13	
3358 13:21 151:15	7 29:10,19,20 31:15		
360 13:24 14:19	35:16,22 40:20	98503 13:20 98504 14:19	
394-397 17:22	58:6 68:13 74:16	98902 14:8	
39th 14:7	77:7 121:8 122:25	70702 14.0	
	71 15:12		
4	72 15:13		
4 16:24 18:20 39:8	73-80 17:5		
68:10 91:8 94:15	7th 58:10,13,22		
107:10	146:20		
401 28:17			
40128 14:18	8		
41 15:3	8 16:12 18:11 29:20		
43 15:4	29:24 30:3,9,11		
436-2020 14:13	32:6 33:12 35:16		
48 15:5	35:22 36:6 40:21		
480-07-495(1)	121:8 122:25		
28:12	132:24,25		
49 15:7	800 13:24		
5	800,000 94:19		
	807 14:7		
5 29:25 30:12 39:8	81.53.261 28:24		
125:15 5-3 99:18,19	29:3 33:21 138:20		
5-8 99:18	81.53.295 18:16		
50 15:8	19:4 43:21 100:22		
501 3.8 500 80:24	101:14 137:4		
509 14:8	138:12 81 58 385 00:15		
50th 80:10	81.58.285 99:15 846-6989 13:24		
534-9066 13:24	840-0989 13:24 85-89 17:8		
575-0313 14:8	85-89 17:8 8th 57:13 58:9		
5th 97:6	109:6,21 119:11		
	146:19		
6	140.17		
6 29:11 30:3 33:12			
	l		 l