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**INTRODUCTION**

Q: **Please state your full name and job title.**

A: Gary A. Norris, P.E., P.T.O.E. I am a Project Manager/Senior Traffic Engineer at DN Traffic Consultants, Preston, Washington.

Q: **Please describe your background and qualifications.**

A: As described more fully in my prefiled testimony dated December 30, 2014, I have more than 40 years experience in traffic engineering and transportation planning both as a consulting engineer and a traffic engineer and planner for local governments.

Q: **BNSF has filed petitions with the Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission seeking to close two at-grade railway crossings, located at Barnhart Road and North Stevens Road on the Yakama Indian Reservation near Toppenish, Washington. Are you familiar with each of those crossings?**

A: Yes. I am familiar with each of the crossings, and have personally inspected both.

Q: **Have you reviewed the pre-filed testimony submitted by Yakima County and the Yakama Nation in opposition to BNSFs petitions to close the Barnhart Road and North Stevens Road crossings?**

A: Yes, I have reviewed each set of prefiled testimony.

Q: **In Kent McHenry’s prefiled testimony, at paragraph 2, he states that:**

**[n]o quantifiable safety benefit will result from the closing of these crossings?Is that consistent with your opinion or do you take exception to his statement?**

A: I believe that Mr. McHenry’s statement is incorrect and unsupported with regard to both the North Stevens Road crossing and the Barnhart Road crossing.

Q: **Can you explain the reasons why you take exception to Mr. McHenry’s statement?**

A: It is an undisputed fact that railway crossings controlled with active warning devices, for example, those controlled by lights and/or gates, have statically significant fewer crashes than crossings with passive warning devices, such as crossbucks and stop signs. This fact is supported by recent national studies regarding crash experience at railway crossings controlled by active and passive devices. In 2011, the United States Department of Transportation, Federal Railroad Administration, published a report stating the risk of a crash between trains and motor vehicles, at passive crossings, was almost ***10 times greater*** than at crossings controlled by active control devices. The reason for this is fairly obvious: people are much less likely to try to drive across tracks in front of the train, either accidently or intentionally, if they have to run a red light and evade lowered gates. Under passive control, the driver must determine if it is safe to cross whereas under active control, the driver is informed through gates and flashers that it is not safe to cross. The North Stevens Road railway crossing is controlled with passive devices. Both of the adjacent crossings, which would be logical alternatives to the North Stevens Road crossing, if it were closed, are controlled with active control devices. Accordingly, all of the traffic previously crossing at the passive North Stevens Road railway crossing will be rerouted to crossings which have been statistically proven to have significantly fewer train/motor vehicle crashes than the North Stevens Road railway crossing. The Barnhart Road railway crossing is also controlled with passive control devices.. One of the adjacent crossings, available to motorists if Barnhart Road is closed, is an active crossing, the other is controlled with passive devices. So, with closure of the Barnhart Road railway crossing, a substantial portion of those previously using Barnhart Road will be diverted to an active crossing. Based on recent counts, the current daily volumes crossing Barnhart Road and North Stevens Road are 130 and 120 vehicles, respectively. If these volumes are diverted to the four adjacent crossings, the resultant impact on overall potential for increased crashe, at the four adjacent crossings, is negligible using the TM method for measuring risk obtained from the 2011 FRA Report. In fact, the existence of additional volume, with the closing of the railway crossing at the adjacent railway crossings would not be verifiable within the statistical reliability of existing traffic volume measuring equipment. Mr. McHenry is concerned about the geometrics and other potential physical limitations at the adjacent alternative crossings using active control. In fact, the physical limitations of the railway crossing is mitigated with the existence of active control. What is important to note is that data shows that the risk of collisions at passive crossings, those that are proposed to be closed, is still ten times higher based on actual national data than the risk at crossings with passive control. The statistical verified national data is much more reliable than local anecdotal comments.

Q: **The exhibit in front of you is a copy of a December, 2011 report entitled Data Analysis of Grade Crossing Incidents (GN-11). Is this the Federal Railroad Administration study to which you were referring?**

A: It is.

Q: **Elsewhere in his prefiled testimony, Mr. McHenry argues that any safety benefit to closing the North Stevens Road and Barnhart Road Crossings, is offset by the risk of additional traffic, and in particular farm traffic, traveling on State Route 22 and South Track Road. Do you agree his statement?**

A: I do not. I have seen no data supporting any statistically significant increase in traffic on those roads as a result of either closure. As set forth in my earlier prefiled testimony, State Route 22 already experiences significant traffic volumes, which includes a substantial volume of existing farm traffic. The fact that SR 22 is currently regularly used by farming equipment is verified in the photos presented by the Respondent. That factor is significant and needs to be included in the overall evaluation. The same is true for South Track Road. Given the negligible number of vehicles currently using either the North Stevens Road or Barnhart Road crossings, the amount of additional traffic diverted onto either State Route 22 or South Track Road due to closing those crossings would be undetectable. Compared to the substantial amount of existing traffic, including farm vehicle traffic, already on those roads, the additional travel on those roads would have virtually no impact. It is the equivalent of adding a drop of water to a five gallon bucket.

Q: **John Hood, another Yakima County employee, argues in his prefiled testimony that although urban crossings present a danger, rural farm crossings such as Barnhart Road and North Stevens are not and have not been a danger. Is he missing something?**

A: He is. Mr. Hood's testimony focuses on the difference between urban and rural crossings which isn't relevant to this petition. We can all agree that urban crossings are likely to have a higher crash rate, as documented in the 2011 FRA report, because of increased vehicular and train traffic. This petition however, focuses on the comparison between adjacent rural crossings. Mr. Hood is discounting the significantly adverse impact and safety concerns related to passive railway crossings as compared to railway crossings with active control. The crossings at North Stevens Road and Barnhart Road are both railway crossings under passive control. He does this without articulating any substantive basis or supporting documentation. The data referenced in the 2011 FRA Report is based on a decade of national data. As set forth in my prior testimony, using the well-established Department of Transportation Accident Prediction Model, it can be assumed that if not closed, there is likely to be a train/vehicle crash once every 10 years at the Barnhart Road crossing and once every 20 years at the North Stevens Road railway crossing. The risk of crashes at passive crossings is compounded during harvesting season when there is generally an increase in farm traffic crossing the railway, pressure to produce during a short time window and long working hours for seaonal labor. Under passive control, the operator of the farm equipment is required to make a decision on whether there is sufficient time to cross the railway prior to the arrival of an oncoming train. Furthermore, as depicted in the photographs, the farm equipment is large, slow moving, and relatively noisy. All of these factors adversely impact the operators decision making process when determining when to cross the railway under passive control. Under active control, that decision is made for the operator. As we are all aware, the impact of train/vehicle crashes is catastrophic, generally resulting in fatalities. The Burlington Northern Santa Fe Railroad has recognized the danger of at-grade crossings in general, and has established an aggressive program entitled Grade Crossing Consolidation Program. This program focuses on closing the most dangerous at-grade crossings first, those that have passive control.

Q. **In his prefiled testimony, Al Pinkham references certain Yakama Nation funeral processions, expressing that the shortest route between the [Satus] Longhouse and the cemetery includes crossing the Barnhart Road railroad crossing, and that closing this railroad crossing would increase the distances for Tribal members traveling between the Satus Longhouse and the nearby cemetery. Do you know how many additional miles participants would have to travel from the Satus Longhouse to the cemetery if they took the Indian Church Road crossing instead of the Barnhart Road crossing.**

A: According to Exhibit 4 in Mr. Pinkham’s prefiled testimony, it is an additional three-tenths of a mile, or 1,584 feet, for a procession to use the Indian Church Road crossing.

Q. **Are there any additional safety benefits to using the Indian Church Road crossing instead of the Barnhart Road crossing for such funeral processions.**

A. There are two obvious safety benefits of using Indian Church Road for a funeral procession. First, the procession would be using a railway crossing with active control devices, rather than passive control, when crossing at Indian Church Road. As discussed above, there is no dispute a crossing with active control has a statistically significant lower rate for train/vehicle crashes and therefore is considered inherently safer than a crossing with passive control. In this circumstance, the use of an active crossing is particularly important because vehicles are likely to follow the vehicle in front without observing the potential for on coming trains when crossing the railway. With active control, crossings are controlled by gates which constrain undesired crossings. Second, using the Indian Church Road crossing will further limit the amount of time a funeral procession would be on SR 22. Although the Nation has not produced any requested information about the nature, frequency, or other details of such processions, the prefiled testimony of the Nation’s witnesses have stated clearly that because traffic during such ceremonies is slow, it is considered safer to stay off the public highway during these times. In other words, because the Nation’s witnesses have indicated a preference to keep slow moving funeral processions off SR 22. Diverting the procession from Barnhart Road to the Indian Church Road crossing accomplishes that goal, and also utilizes the safer option of an active crossing.
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