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1 P R O C E E D I N G S

2 <<<<<< >>>>>>

3

4 JUDGE CHARTOFF: We are on the record. Good

5 morning. Today is Tuesday, March 5th, 2019, and the time is

6 approximately 9:33. We are here today for an evidentiary

7 hearing in Docket TR-180466 related to a petition filed by

8 Whatcom County to approve the installation of median

9 barriers at a highway rail grade crossing at Cliffside Drive

10 in Whatcom County as part of a quiet zone improvement.

11 My name is Laura Chartoff. To my left is Rayne

12 Pearson. We are administrative law judges with the

13 Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission. We are

14 co-presiding on this matter so I'm going to start speaking

15 but either of us will jump in at any point.

16 Okay. So we took care of several housekeeping

17 matters off the record this morning and the parties have

18 stipulated to the admission of all the pre-filed testimony

19 and exhibits so I will give a copy of the exhibit list to

20 the court reporter instead of reading it into the record.

21 We will address the cross exhibits at the time that they are

22 offered.

23 So as far as the order of the proceeding, we're

24 going to start with Whatcom County's witness, followed by

25 UTC staff's witness and then BNSF's witnesses.
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1 Just for the record, we are in the Whatcom County

2 courthouse and we will also be here this evening for the

3 public comment hearing that's scheduled to begin at

4 6:00 p.m.

5 So let's start by taking short appearances.

6 Please state your name and who you represent for the record.

7 MR. QUINN: Christopher Quinn with Whatcom

8 County Prosecutor's Office representing Whatcom County in

9 this matter in support of its petition.

10 JUDGE CHARTOFF: Thank you.

11 MR. ROBERSON: Jeff Roberson, AAG, appearing

12 for Commission staff.

13 MS. ENDRES: Good morning. Kelsey Endres for

14 BNSF Railway Company. With me this morning is Jennifer

15 Willingham and also Stephen Semenick.

16 JUDGE CHARTOFF: If there's nothing else

17 we'll get started by calling witnesses, so Whatcom County,

18 if you would please call your first witness.

19 MR. QUINN: That would be Mr. Cody Swan.

20 CODY SWAN, having been first duly sworn,

21 testified as follows:

22

23 JUDGE CHARTOFF: Thank you. Please be

24 seated. Please state your name, spelling your last name for

25 the record.
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1 THE WITNESS: Cody Swan, S-W-A-N.

2 JUDGE CHARTOFF: Thank you.

3 MR. QUINN: Your Honor, I have no direct

4 questions of Mr. Swan at this time.

5 JUDGE CHARTOFF: Okay. Thank you. So cross?

6 MS. ENDRES: Do Your Honors have a preference

7 whether we cross from the podium or stay at our seats?

8 JUDGE CHARTOFF: You can stay in your seat.

9

10 CROSS-EXAMINATION

11 BY MS. ENDRES:

12 Q. Good morning, Mr. Swan. My name is Kelsey Endres.

13 Again, I represent BNSF Railway Company. I'm going to be

14 asking you some questions today as we have a group

15 discussion about the warning devices or supplemental safety

16 devices that should be installed at Cliffside Drive when

17 it's converted to a quiet zone.

18 As an initial matter if I ask you a question that

19 you don't understand, and I'm sure it will happen, please

20 let me know and I'll rephrase it. Otherwise I'm going to

21 assume we're on the same page; is that fair?

22 A. Sounds good.

23 Q. We do have -- I can't see up there if we have a

24 binder of exhibits for you, but if there is anything --

25 A. I don't have a binder.
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1 Q. -- that has been submitted on your behalf either in

2 your pre-file or your rebuttal testimony that you think

3 would be helpful to explain your answer, please let me know

4 and collectively we've got it here somewhere and we can

5 provide that to you.

6 JUDGE PEARSON: So I think we accidentally

7 stole his exhibits so we'll pass them back down. Or maybe

8 not. I don't think actually we have -- there were some

9 copies sitting up on the bench, but I don't think it was --

10 JUDGE CHARTOFF: It was these.

11 JUDGE PEARSON: Oh, yeah, you're right.

12 MS. WILLINGHAM: Your Honor, may I approach

13 with the binder?

14 JUDGE CHARTOFF: Yes.

15 MS. ENDRES: Hopefully we have everything in

16 there.

17 MR. QUINN: Looks like you do.

18 MS. ENDRES: If not, we'll figure it out. I

19 will tell you there are some exhibits that have been

20 numbered twice, either they were submitted once in someone's

21 pre-file testimony and then later as a cross-examination

22 exhibit so I'll try to be really clear in using both

23 numbers. I'll also tell you because that's our attempt to

24 save trees. There are some places where you'll see a page

25 that says go to this other location, so we'll walk through
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1 that together but just as a heads-up.

2 BY MS. ENDRES:

3 Q. As an initial matter I'd like to do a little bit of

4 housekeeping so that we all have our terminology down.

5 We've been using a lot of acronyms in the pre-file testimony

6 and just so we have a clear record to make sure that we're

7 all on the same page in the terminology that we're using.

8 The first is QZRI, we've seen that a lot in the pre-file

9 testimony which is the Quiet Zone Risk Index if I'm correct;

10 is that right?

11 A. Yep.

12 Q. And that as I saw in your testimony and elsewhere

13 is the measure of the risk to the motoring public in the

14 absence of the regular sounding of the train horn; is that

15 right?

16 A. I believe so, yes.

17 Q. And that must be below the National -- Nationwide

18 Significant Risk Threshold or the NSRT, in order to convert

19 the quiet zone, the crossing to a quiet zone; is that right?

20 A. That's right.

21 Q. And in this particular case your testimony is that

22 the Nationwide Significant Risk Threshold, that maximum

23 number, for the Cliffside Drive crossing is 14,723; is that

24 right?

25 A. If that is what is in my quiet zone calculator
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1 calculations then that's what I believe to be correct.

2 Q. Feel free --

3 A. Which one was that?

4 Q. The first set should be all of yours, so your

5 pre-file direct testimony is CS1T, should be that first tab

6 I think, and then the exhibits that you submitted are tabbed

7 behind it.

8 A. Yeah, 14,723.

9 Q. And I think that the quiet zone calculator exhibit,

10 if I'm right, is CS-9?

11 A. It's not 9. Oh, this is Exhibit --

12 Q. Do you have a tab that says CS-9?

13 A. I do but I don't see the quiet zone calculator in

14 there.

15 MS. ENDRES: May I approach, Your Honor?

16 JUDGE PEARSON: Yes.

17 THE WITNESS: For some reason it's not -- oh,

18 it's on the text. I was looking behind -- sorry.

19 BY MS. ENDRES:

20 Q. So okay, so we're going to be hearing the term

21 "QZRI" and term "NSRT," although perhaps for clarity we can

22 try to say their full names. The next one is -- that I saw

23 is "SSM" or supplemental safety measure, just for

24 terminology?

25 A. Yes.
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1 Q. Okay.

2 A. Yep.

3 Q. And in this particular case, the County is

4 proposing the installation of the supplemental safety

5 measure of a traversable median with channelization paddles

6 or devices; is that right?

7 A. That's right.

8 Q. I'm going to talk a little bit more about the QZRI

9 calculations and the SSM that the County has proposed but

10 before I do I want to see if there are some things that we

11 can all agree on just to set our framework as we're moving

12 forward this morning.

13 Is it your understanding from the materials you

14 reviewed that the County, the UTC and the BNSF materials all

15 agree that it's a better idea to install some kind of

16 supplemental safety measure at this crossing once it's

17 converted to a quiet zone as compared to just leaving it how

18 it is?

19 A. Well, yeah. The code says that the risk index,

20 being the Quiet Zone Risk Index, being below the Nationwide

21 Significant Risk Threshold, this qualifies as being a quiet

22 zone as it sits right now. However, we feel that an

23 additional supplemental safety measure to increase that risk

24 to the motoring public that uses quiet zone is a good idea.

25 Q. And the safety of the motoring public is this
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1 priority here as we look at what type of devices or

2 additional supplemental safety measure should be installed?

3 A. It is, amongst other considerations.

4 Q. Do you agree that all railroad crossings are

5 inherently dangerous to some degree?

6 A. Yes, they all carry a risk index of some sort, yes.

7 Q. And obviously it's everyone's goal to prevent an

8 accident with a train at this crossing once it's converted

9 to a quiet zone?

10 A. That's correct.

11 JUDGE PEARSON: Ms. Endres, I just want to

12 clarify one thing. When I'm looking at Exhibit CS-9, I

13 think what I'm seeing, correct me if I'm wrong, is that the

14 Nationwide Significant Risk Threshold is the 14,723 number

15 that you referenced and for this crossing in particular

16 Mr. Swan calculated it 14,562.45.

17 MS. ENDRES: That's the Quiet Zone Risk Index

18 if that's my understanding.

19 JUDGE PEARSON: For this particular crossing?

20 MS. ENDRES: Correct. Maybe Mr. Swan can

21 clarify what the calculation is on Exhibit CS --

22 THE WITNESS: I can clarify. So there's a

23 couple pieces of information here. So up you'll see

24 traffic. Traffic is ADT traffic count. That kind of is a

25 consideration in determining the Quiet Zone Risk Index of
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1 that crossing. As that changed, the Quiet Zone Risk Index

2 changes and the risk index performance changes. This is

3 what we believe to be the existing risk index at the

4 crossing as is with no improvements, so...

5 JUDGE PEARSON: Thank you for that

6 clarification. Go ahead.

7 BY MS. ENDRES:

8 Q. And for just clarity of the record, let's see here.

9 CS-9 is also CS-16X. Now, another thing to see if we can

10 all agree on is that every railroad crossing is unique which

11 is one of the reasons that a diagnostic team is gathered to

12 explore potential changes on the conversion to a quiet zone;

13 is that fair to say?

14 A. I missed the first part of that. Will you repeat

15 the question?

16 Q. Sure. One of the reasons that a diagnostic team is

17 gathered to address potential modifications to a crossing

18 upon conversion to a quiet zone is that every crossing is

19 unique, there's no, not necessarily one size fits all any

20 time a crossing is converted to a quiet zone; is that fair

21 to say?

22 A. I would say that's a fair assumption in most cases.

23 Q. And as I said, I'm going to ask you some questions

24 about the SSM that the County has proposed, but just

25 generally do you agree that nonmountable medians lower the
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1 risk of an accident at this crossing more than

2 channelization -- traversable channelization?

3 A. I would say -- could you please repeat the question

4 one more time?

5 Q. Sure. Do you agree that nonmountable medians lower

6 the risk of an accident at this crossing more than

7 traversable channelization?

8 A. I would say they do 5 percent less.

9 Q. Is it fair to say that to some degree a

10 nonmountable median makes the crossing safer than

11 traversable channelization?

12 A. In this situation I think there's several

13 considerations of what would be the safest option and

14 there's plenty of other options that are safer. We weren't

15 trying to choose the safest option because safest option

16 would be us requesting BNSF to put in four quadrant gates

17 and we'll install the median on our road and that would be

18 the safest aside from closing the road or doing a grade

19 separation. So we were doing something that was economical,

20 safe and provided a greatly reduced Quiet Zone Risk Index.

21 Q. And nobody's debating that it reduces the Quiet

22 Zone Risk Index. My question, though, is that one of those

23 safer options to some degree is a nonmountable median; do

24 you agree?

25 A. Yeah, they both significantly reduce the Quiet Zone
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1 Risk Index.

2 Q. Just --

3 A. Yes, 5 percent.

4 Q. -- comparing a reversible median and a nonmountable

5 median, to some degree the nonmountable median makes the

6 crossing a little bit safer?

7 A. 5 percent safer.

8 Q. And this particular location is no outlet road,

9 there's no other access to the neighborhood?

10 A. That's correct.

11 MS. ENDRES: We had premarked as

12 cross-examination exhibits CS-22X and CS-23X as two aerial

13 views of the area in the crossing configuration. I would

14 like to ask you about those but given our initial

15 housekeeping matter, those are exhibits that BNSF would

16 offer into evidence.

17 JUDGE PEARSON: Are there any objections to

18 those two exhibits, Mr. Quinn?

19 MR. QUINN: No, Your Honor.

20 JUDGE PEARSON: We will admit those into the

21 record then and mark them accordingly.

22 (Exhibit Nos. CS-22X and CS-23X admitted.)

23 BY MS. ENDRES:

24 Q. Do you have those there, Mr. Swan?

25 A. Yep.
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1 Q. And you may recognize these as exhibits that were

2 used in your deposition testimony. You can see that CS-22X

3 was Exhibit 4 and CS-23X was Exhibit 9.

4 Do you see where those stickers are?

5 A. Uh-huh, yes.

6 Q. So you've seen these before?

7 A. Yes.

8 Q. And we can see from Exhibit CS-22X the entire

9 footprint of the residential area served by the Cliffside

10 Drive railroad crossing?

11 A. Actually I was looking at the wrong one, but...

12 sorry. I have also seen these ones too. Yes.

13 Q. And then Exhibit CS-23X we had used in your

14 deposition as a not-to-scale estimate of the approximate

15 footprint of the traversable channelization that the County

16 has proposed that you had marked in Sharpie on that exhibit;

17 is that correct?

18 A. That's right.

19 Q. One of the topics that I want to ask you about that

20 you have described as one of the bases for the proposed

21 safety measure that the County has suggested has to do with

22 the installation and repair issues presented by mountable

23 channelization devices as compared to a nonmountable median;

24 is that right?

25 A. Yes.
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1 Q. Okay. And am I using the terminology you're

2 comfortable with when I say "traversable channelization" as

3 being the option the County's proposed and a "nonmountable

4 median" as being the option that BNSF prefers?

5 A. I understand what you're talking about, yes.

6 Q. What terminology would you use?

7 A. That's -- that's fine. Just the use of the term

8 "median" is kind of defined differently within the final

9 code, but -- or the final rule, but I understand what you're

10 speaking of when you're talking about that.

11 JUDGE PEARSON: Can I interject here? I

12 think that for brevity sake we could just say "mountable"

13 and "nonmountable."

14 MS. ENDRES: Okay. We can do that.

15 BY MS. ENDRES:

16 Q. When we discussed this during your deposition, if I

17 have this down right, you said the installation costs are

18 relatively the same to install the nonmountable system

19 versus the mountable system?

20 A. Yeah, and after I reconsidered that, I mean, I

21 didn't do a direct analysis of what the costs are to install

22 either one of them really, but I would say they are similar

23 based on some assumptions on how frequently we paint road

24 center lines and how often we may paint the curb and then

25 how often we may replace channelization devices on the
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1 mountable medians.

2 And I've talked to other agencies and how they have

3 performed for them, and mainly Kent, and they said they

4 haven't had to replace much of the curb in the past 15 years

5 so I think the maintenance cost on that is relatively low.

6 Q. And when you say curb you mean the nonmountable

7 system?

8 A. No, the -- I'm sorry. The mountable plastic

9 composite curb is what I'm talking about.

10 Q. Okay.

11 A. So there hasn't been a direct analysis of gathering

12 information about maintenance costs for both curbs, but we

13 anticipate that we could be more proactive in our approach

14 to maintaining the mountable medians.

15 Q. But at the time I took your deposition your

16 testimony was that you expect the initial installation cost

17 to be about the same?

18 A. Oh, yeah, yeah. I thought you said maintenance

19 costs.

20 Q. I apologize if I misspoke or wasn't clear.

21 And like you just said, one of the things you like

22 about the mountable system is you can install that with

23 County forces where if you install the nonmountable system

24 you have to get a contractor to come out and do that

25 concrete work initially?
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1 A. That's right.

2 Q. And you estimated that process might take about a

3 month?

4 A. Yeah, perhaps. Maybe longer.

5 Q. And so I'm clear, the County's petition reflects

6 that it intends to install a curb off the fog line to

7 protect the warning devices at the crossing. Is that a

8 different type of installation process or do you also have

9 to have a contractor come do that curb work?

10 A. It depends on what we actually use in that

11 situation, what BNSF -- this was a request by BNSF. I guess

12 it's some type of policy that they need to protect those

13 warning devices that aren't a certain distance from the fog

14 line. So provided they approve something that's precast,

15 no, we wouldn't have to do extra concrete work, we'd install

16 something that's precast and that would be what we would

17 propose. So no.

18 Q. But if BNSF standard is to have something other

19 than precast, if concrete had to be installed for that part

20 of the project, then it would have to be a contractor to

21 come do it?

22 A. Uh-huh.

23 Q. "Yes"?

24 A. Yes.

25 Q. I only say that so we have a clear transcript.
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1 A. Yes.

2 JUDGE PEARSON: I have a quick question. Can

3 we get a definition for "fog line"?

4 THE WITNESS: It would be the edge striping

5 of the road, the white line.

6 JUDGE PEARSON: On the outside edges of the

7 road?

8 THE WITNESS: Yeah.

9 BY MS. ENDRES:

10 Q. And if that were the case that a contractor would

11 have to pour the concrete curb off the fog line to protect

12 the warning lights, could presumably that company also

13 present a bid to install a nonmountable median?

14 A. Sure.

15 Q. And is it the case that anywhere concrete curbs or

16 medians exist in the County system, you have to have a

17 contractor come out and do that work?

18 A. Yeah, we don't do any concrete work ourselves.

19 Q. But the County does paint so if there was an issue

20 with painting of a nonmountable system, that's something the

21 County could do itself?

22 A. Yes.

23 Q. And when I took your deposition, if I have this

24 right, you said at that time you had not analyzed the

25 frequency of repair between nonmountable and mountable
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1 systems; is that right?

2 A. That's right.

3 Q. I'm going to talk a bit about the Yacht Club Road

4 in more detail in a minute but that is a system that has a

5 nonmountable protection; is that right?

6 A. That's right.

7 Q. And since that's been installed, the County has not

8 had to have a contractor come repair the concrete work; is

9 that right?

10 A. No, it's been installed for about a year but the

11 channelization devices have suffered some impacts and one of

12 them is lost at the westerly end and we've sent in a federal

13 application to shorten that.

14 Q. And I apologize if my question was unclear. For

15 this particular question I'm just asking about the curb, the

16 concrete part itself.

17 A. The concrete? No, we have not.

18 Q. And the County doesn't have any other crossings

19 with a mountable median or mountable system; is that right?

20 A. As far as I know we only have the Yacht Club Road.

21 Q. But Yacht Club Road has a nonmountable system; is

22 that right?

23 A. With any median, yes, mountable or otherwise.

24 Q. You provided, with the initial petition to close

25 the crossing, a photo from a crossing in Vancouver. Do you
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1 recall that photo I'm talking about?

2 A. I do.

3 Q. And the petition for the installation I believe is

4 CS-3. Am I correct that the photo was submitted with the

5 petition or --

6 A. I think it was the notice of the quiet zone.

7 Q. Was the quiet zone. So the notice of the quiet

8 zone was CS-2. And those were the two color photographs

9 that accompanied that petition; is that right?

10 A. Yes.

11 Q. Or excuse me. The notice. And when I took your

12 deposition, you stated that you had not had a conversation

13 with the Vancouver engineer about their repair or

14 maintenance costs at that crossing; is that right still?

15 A. That's correct.

16 Q. We've submitted some photographs of this crossing

17 that we found from Google Earth as CS-12X, 13X, let's see,

18 14X and 15X. Do you have those there with you?

19 A. Yes.

20 MS. ENDRES: And we would also offer those

21 exhibits into evidence, Your Honor.

22 JUDGE PEARSON: Mr. Quinn?

23 MR. QUINN: I'm going to object at this time.

24 No. 1, I don't think there's proper foundation, and No. 2,

25 I'm not sure what the relevance is. Maybe that could be
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1 addressed.

2 JUDGE PEARSON: Go ahead, Ms. Endres, if you

3 want to explain the purpose for that --

4 MS. ENDRES: I can ask a foundational

5 question. The relevance would be to show the damage that

6 has occurred to the crossing that the County submitted as an

7 example of the type of devices that it proposes to install

8 as well as the configuration that we'll be exploring in

9 later questioning as a potential in this case.

10 JUDGE PEARSON: And how about the foundation?

11 MS. ENDRES: The foundation.

12 BY MS. ENDRES:

13 Q. Mr. Swan, do you recognize these photos as showing

14 the same crossing that you had submitted as an example in

15 the notice --

16 A. Yeah, I believe this is Evergreen Highway which I

17 don't believe would be apples to apples. It's a highway.

18 We're talking about a residential no outlet crossing.

19 Q. Do you recognize this as the same crossing --

20 A. Yes.

21 Q. -- as the photos that were submitted with the

22 notice of intent to establish a quiet zone?

23 A. Yes.

24 MR. QUINN: May I question in aid of the

25 objection?
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1 JUDGE PEARSON: Sure.

2

3 REDIRECT EXAMINATION

4 BY MR. QUINN:

5 Q. Mr. Swan, do you know how old that SSM is?

6 A. I have no idea.

7 Q. Okay. And what's the setting in which it's

8 portrayed? Is it a railroad crossing?

9 A. It's -- yes, it's a close proximity railroad

10 crossing to an intersection on a highway.

11 Q. Okay. And do we know what the ADTs at that

12 crossing are?

13 A. I have no idea.

14 Q. Do we know if trucks or buses use that crossing on

15 a regular basis?

16 A. I have no idea.

17 Q. You've previously said that you can't say it's an

18 apple-to-apples comparison. Do you want to expand on that

19 for purposes of -- counsel wants to suggest that this is a

20 demonstration of how these wear over time, how they degrade

21 over time.

22 Would that help the fact finder determine that that

23 would be the case for the Cliffside Drive crossing?

24 A. No, because I don't know what the ADT is, and like

25 you said, we don't know what type of vehicles use this road.
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1 We don't know how old they are. We obviously probably would

2 differ a little bit in our maintenance plan than Vancouver,

3 so I would say it's not a fair comparison.

4 MR. QUINN: All right. No further questions,

5 Your Honor. I stand by the objection.

6 JUDGE PEARSON: Okay. So I think that these

7 exhibits, I'm going to allow them. I think they have

8 limited probative value. So with that caveat, I'll admit

9 them into the record and we will afford them weight

10 accordingly.

11 (Exhibit Nos. CS-12X-15X admitted.)

12 MS. ENDRES: So Your Honor, just for clarity,

13 is this 12 through 15?

14 JUDGE PEARSON: Correct. You can continue

15 with your questions with the understanding that Mr. Swan

16 probably isn't going to have a lot of information.

17 MS. ENDRES: Understood.

18

19 RECROSS-EXAMINATION

20 BY MS. ENDRES:

21 Q. Well, let me just ask you this basically, Mr. Swan.

22 Does the depiction of the condition of the devices in that

23 crossing, which is the crossing that the County submitted in

24 its notice of intent to submit a quiet zone, does that

25 change your assessment at all relating to whether
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1 traversable devices are appropriate here?

2 A. No.

3 Q. Or mountable devices?

4 A. Are appropriate -- when you say "here" you mean at

5 Cliffside?

6 Q. Yes, thank you.

7 A. Yes.

8 Q. These photographs show that on one side of the

9 crossing there's a mountable system. We can see that

10 there's at least one paddle missing on that side but it

11 looks like on the far side that they installed a

12 nonmountable system or a concrete curve.

13 Do you see that?

14 A. I do.

15 Q. And my question to you is whether that's also a

16 configuration that the County would think appropriate at the

17 Cliffside Drive crossing, to have a nonmountable system on

18 the east side of the tracks even if there's a mountable

19 system order installed on the west side?

20 A. No, because what we're proposing is an SSM that

21 satisfies the requirements of the final rule so I think that

22 there's no reason to mix and match. Picking one would be

23 easier maintenance effort, not picking both.

24 Q. So is it the County's position that regardless of

25 whether an alternative configuration could make the crossing
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1 safer for a similar cost because the FRA calculation allows

2 for the installation of a mountable system, that's simply

3 what the County -- the County's position is appropriate?

4 A. Could you please repeat that?

5 Q. Sure. If I understood your answer just now, you

6 said the FRA regulations and calculation allows for the

7 installation of a mountable system as an appropriate

8 supplemental safety device.

9 Do I have that accurately?

10 A. Uh-huh.

11 Q. "Yes"?

12 A. Yes.

13 Q. And is it the County's position that regardless of

14 if another system could be installed for the same cost and

15 make this crossing safer, the County still believes that

16 having a mountable system on both sides of the crossing is

17 the right approach in this case?

18 A. The -- yes.

19 Q. Now, the mountable system has these channelization

20 devices or paddles. Can those be twisted off or does there

21 have to be a pretty significant impact to actually shear one

22 off of the base?

23 A. They're pretty durable. I believe there would have

24 to be a significant and repetitive abuse of the paddle

25 before it became sheared off at the rubber. At Yacht Club
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1 Road, the repetitive driving over of the last reflector to

2 the west on that crossing broke at the base which was

3 connected to the concrete which don't apply in this

4 situation because that base is not required to install them

5 on the quick curb. So I didn't see them shear off there

6 after repetitive abuse.

7 Q. We're going -- we've talked already a bit and the

8 materials reflect discussion about what was done at Yacht

9 Club Road. So we all understand the configuration of that

10 crossing, it's also a crossing that generally runs

11 east/west. In that particular case it's from the Chumstick

12 Highway across -- you're correcting me, it's not a highway?

13 A. Chuckanut.

14 Q. Chuckanut, thank you. Chuckanut Highway across

15 BNSF's tracks to another residential road on the west side

16 of BNSF's tracks; is that right?

17 A. That's right.

18 Q. And that particular case, once you cross the tracks

19 and you get to the end of the nonmountable median that was

20 installed, it comes to a T right at the end of that; is that

21 right?

22 A. That's right.

23 Q. Whereas in this particular case with Cliffside, we

24 don't have that T configuration right at the end of the

25 nonmountable system, the road continues heading -- it curves
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1 more towards the westerly direction and parallels the water;

2 is that right?

3 A. That's right.

4 Q. Now, when I took your deposition, you said you were

5 not able to quantify how often concrete would need to be

6 repaired as compared to repainted; is that right?

7 A. That's right.

8 Q. Or how often it may need to be repainted?

9 A. No. This is kind of a test scenario.

10 Q. And you characterized the Cliffside Drive as a

11 very, very low traffic road compared to other locations in

12 the county; is that right?

13 A. That's right.

14 Q. And that you would then expect the frequency of

15 needing to repaint or repair a damaged concrete median to be

16 correspondingly much lower than if it were on a road with

17 much higher traffic use; is that right still?

18 A. I would say yes to that as well as the other

19 median, the mountable median to be installed.

20 Q. My question was specific to the non-traversable

21 system or the concrete.

22 A. Yes.

23 Q. And you had stated that you would be -- the County

24 would be able to replace a deficiency quicker with a

25 mountable system than if it had to contract work out with a
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1 nonmountable system; is that right?

2 A. I would say yes.

3 Q. But that assumes that a deficiency is encountered;

4 is that still the case?

5 A. Yes.

6 Q. And concrete is less likely to be damaged to the

7 point of repair than a channelization marker that's been

8 driven over; is that fair to say?

9 A. Yeah. Yes.

10 Q. And the County, I apologize if I asked you this

11 already, but the County has not had to repair the median

12 system at Yacht Club Road to this point other than you

13 mentioned there were a couple of the paddles that have been

14 removed?

15 A. Yes.

16 Q. At the Cliffside Drive it services, I think I saw

17 40 or 44 residential homes; is that right?

18 A. That's correct. Low 40s, yes.

19 Q. But the petition reflects or states there are no

20 school buses?

21 A. Yes.

22 Q. Where is the school bus stop service for those

23 residences?

24 A. I'm not sure.

25 Q. But it's a solely residential neighborhood, there
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1 aren't commercial businesses?

2 A. That's correct.

3 Q. And the County plans to inspect the crossing

4 monthly?

5 A. That is the plan.

6 Q. And is that the same plan whether a traversable

7 system median is installed or a non-traversable median is

8 installed?

9 A. Yeah, that's the plan initially. That could change

10 as we see how they're performing. I mean, our sign crew

11 does a monthly sign inventory so that would just be

12 incorporated into that.

13 Q. So is there a scenario where the County would

14 inspect the crossing system more frequently than once a

15 month?

16 A. More frequently? If it proves to be something that

17 we have to do after inspecting it monthly and it warrants us

18 inspecting it more often or potentially changing it, I would

19 say yes.

20 Q. The FRA regulations don't require the reflective

21 panels to be installed if a nonmountable system is selected;

22 is that true?

23 A. Yes.

24 Q. I want to ask you a bit about the QZRI or the Quiet

25 Zone Risk Index calculations that you did. Your pre-file
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1 testimony reflects that the, at least when you submitted it,

2 the existing QZRI at Cliffside Drive is 13,837 and 78?

3 A. Can I reference a --

4 Q. Yes, please.

5 A. Which?

6 Q. Pre-file testimony at Page 4, your pre-file

7 testimony is CS-1T. It should be the first thing in there.

8 A. What page are we looking at?

9 Q. Page 4.

10 A. (Witness reviews document.) Yeah.

11 Q. And so that assumes that a horn is not blown; is

12 that right?

13 A. That assumes -- the Quiet Zone Risk Index assumes

14 that there's no horn or -- that existing one assumes there's

15 no horn or supplemental safety measure.

16 Q. Okay. And then with the proposed SSM of a

17 mountable system, the risk index was reduced by 75 percent

18 to 3,459.45; is that right?

19 A. That's right.

20 Q. And that 75 percent figure, that comes from the FRA

21 regulation?

22 A. It does.

23 Q. Did you calculate what the QZRI would be with

24 BNSF's proposed supplemental safety measure?

25 A. I did. It would be 5 percent more than that. I
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1 don't know if I -- if it's included in this document, but,

2 yeah.

3 Q. So to do that calculation we would take the

4 existing QZRI, same existing QZRI of 13,837.78 and then

5 using the FRA percentage we would reduce that by 80 percent?

6 A. That's right.

7 Q. Okay. And by my calculation then that comes up

8 with a QZRI of 2,767.56. Do you have any reason to disagree

9 with that?

10 A. If that's 5 percent less or 80 percent from that,

11 then yes, that's correct.

12 Q. And you're welcome to do -- I don't know if you

13 have a calculator --

14 A. I don't.

15 Q. -- on your phone or you want to do that yourself

16 and not take my word for it you're welcome to.

17 A. I take your word for it.

18 Q. So then when I compare the QZRI of the County's

19 proposed supplemental safety measure of 3,459.45 and I

20 compare that with the QZRI of BNSF's proposed supplemental

21 safety measure QZRI of 2,767.56 and I compare those two,

22 that's a 20 percent difference between those two, not 5

23 percent?

24 A. I don't -- then the math is wrong I would say.

25 Q. My math is wrong?
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1 A. I would say the reduction from the Quiet Zone Risk

2 Index of 75 percent to 3,459 is 75 percent.

3 Q. Right.

4 A. The reduction, your method is 80 percent. That

5 delta is 5 percent.

6 Q. I understand the delta between the 75 and 80 is

7 5 percent.

8 A. You're saying you reduce our Quiet Zone Risk Index

9 20 percent. I mean that's a different way of looking at it

10 I would say.

11 Q. Let me ask it this way: Assume that's correct.

12 Assume that we're comparing the difference between the Quiet

13 Zone Risk Index of the County's proposed supplemental safety

14 measure and BNSF's proposed supplemental safety measure. If

15 BNSF's proposed measure reduces the QZRI of the County's

16 proposed measure by 20 percent, does that change your

17 opinion?

18 A. I don't believe that's how we would assess these

19 percentages. I would say they both have significant risk

20 reduction. I mean I don't necessarily think that it does

21 reduce it 20 more percent. I think it reduces it another

22 5 percent from 75 to 80 percent.

23 Q. Does that make a difference to you whether it

24 reduces the County --

25 A. That 5 percent safety?
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1 Q. Let me make sure I get my question out clearly just

2 for our record and to make sure I'm doing this right in my

3 head.

4 The difference between the QZRIs calculated using

5 the County's proposed supplemental safety measure and

6 BNSF's, if BNSF's reduces the County's QZRI by an additional

7 20 percent, does that make a difference to you?

8 A. If it was an additional 25 -- or 20 percent and it

9 was reduced to 95 percent below the QZRI, then that would be

10 a different consideration, but I don't believe the

11 20 percent mathematics that's involved in this is the

12 20 percent reduction in the QZRI.

13 Q. Is there any percent -- say there was another

14 alternative that cost the same that cut the County's

15 proposed QZRI, the new one of 3,459, cut that by half, is

16 there --

17 A. I don't know that one. I don't know what that

18 would be. I don't think that was a consideration in the

19 code or the final rule that came to that conclusion. These

20 are kind of comparable solutions. We chose one that for

21 other reasons we thought was a better fit at this location.

22 So the 5 percent for us is pretty insignificant when there's

23 other safety factors that come into play with this crossing

24 that probably mitigate that 5 percent difference, so -- such

25 as emergency access and things like that.
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1 Q. If the FRA regulation had that as more than a

2 5 percent difference, would that make a difference to you?

3 A. I don't know. I would have to be presented with

4 that. I have no idea.

5 Q. Your rebuttal testimony that you submitted --

6 MS. ENDRES: Has the rebuttal testimony been

7 pre-admitted?

8 JUDGE PEARSON: Yes.

9 BY MS. ENDRES:

10 Q. Okay. You calculated a different QZRI using an

11 updated traffic count that the County ran after your

12 deposition?

13 A. Sure.

14 Q. And in that particular case, you increased the

15 average daily traffic count to 324 vehicles instead of 300

16 that you initially used; is that right?

17 A. That's right.

18 Q. And that was based on the fact that when we took a

19 closer look at the traffic count materials that the County

20 had relied on, we realized they had only looked at two

21 weekdays and so you had a new traffic count run using -- and

22 that case if I remember right, nine days, and the County

23 used seven of those meaning that two were outliers; is that

24 right?

25 A. Actually three were outliers. That 324 number
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1 includes one of the outliers so it is a skewed high ADT,

2 so --

3 Q. And this --

4 A. -- yes.

5 Q. Sorry. I didn't mean to interrupt you. This is

6 the only time the County's actually measured seven days or

7 more at this crossing to your knowledge?

8 A. Since my time here, yes, since 2013, but it's very

9 common for places like Cliffside that have not seen any

10 development in decades to not change much. So snapshots in

11 the middle of the week represent a good indication of what

12 the average daily traffic is on a weekly basis. Sometimes

13 they might need it for a project or might need a quick

14 little snapshot and that's probably what that was. And it's

15 upheld by the one we just did a couple months ago, I mean,

16 it supports it.

17 Q. So initially the FRA calculator had 450 set there

18 as a preset or whatever their most recent information was

19 until the parties here started modifying the numbers to make

20 different calculations; is that right?

21 A. Yes.

22 Q. And you said there was an estate sale that weekend?

23 A. Yes.

24 Q. Which explained the outlying information on the

25 Saturday and Sunday?
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1 A. Friday, Saturday and Sunday, yes.

2 Q. And did you do any determination of other events or

3 sales that that area has had throughout the last year, say?

4 A. No.

5 Q. So when you ran the new QZRI, the new risk index,

6 the number you came up with was 14,562.45? And this is, if

7 you want to look at I think CS-9?

8 A. Okay. That's the existing one.

9 Q. That's where traffic counts as 324?

10 A. Yeah, but that's not the calculated one. There's

11 been no -- that's the -- yeah, with no supplemental safety

12 measures that's the number.

13 Q. And that was using the newer traffic information?

14 A. Yeah, that's 324.

15 Q. I meant to ask you this before just generally about

16 running this QZRI calculator. This is a website that you

17 can log into that the FRA provides to be able to input

18 different pieces of information to see how that changes the

19 QZRI; is that right?

20 A. Yes.

21 Q. So things that you can modify like you did here are

22 the average daily traffic count, right?

23 A. That's right.

24 Q. What other things can you modify?

25 A. You can modify train speeds, train counts. There's
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1 a couple other things. The main thing that I would modify

2 in that case or the things that I definitively know are

3 different than what they prompt you to, that's the ADT and I

4 got train counts from Stephen, so...

5 Q. What train counts did you use?

6 A. 19.

7 Q. And how many trains per day?

8 A. That would be 19 trains per day.

9 Q. So correct me if I'm wrong, my understanding is

10 that there are two pieces of information that you input

11 about train counts: One is total trains per day and of that

12 you say how many are in the daytime; is that your

13 understanding?

14 A. Oh, no, it just gives you train -- average daily

15 train count.

16 Q. Okay. So your calculations do include 19 trains

17 per day?

18 A. Yes.

19 Q. And then if there was another space to input the

20 number of those that are in the daytime, I take it you

21 didn't change that?

22 A. I didn't, but I did -- one thing I did do is I

23 manipulated that data wildly in varying directions and it

24 didn't get up until about -- any realistic train count or

25 traffic count input in there with the installation of our
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1 supplemental safety measure put us well below the Quiet Zone

2 Risk Index. I mean up until you get to about 250,000 ADT,

3 then it starts to get funny, but I mean whatever you put

4 into that calculator as the ADT, with the installation of

5 the supplemental safety measure brings us below our

6 threshold.

7 Q. The new number that you calculated using 324

8 vehicles, that's right at the threshold, right?

9 A. With no -- yeah, that's right, so...

10 Q. Your -- 14,562.45 was your calculation and the

11 threshold is 14,723, that's 98 or 99 percent there; is that

12 right?

13 A. Oh, yeah, it's real close. That's why we're

14 installing supplemental safety measures.

15 Q. Right. So there's not much wiggle room there with

16 the traffic count in terms of just that initial QZRI without

17 the additional modifications?

18 A. Yeah, there's not a lot of wiggle room to be

19 eligible to do something that we can by the code which is

20 install -- or establish this as a quiet zone as is with no

21 supplemental safety measures. There's not a lot of wiggle

22 room there, no.

23 Q. And if you used all of the traffic counts that you

24 measured that would put it over the national -- Nationwide

25 Significant Risk Threshold without making modifications?
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1 A. Yeah.

2 Q. The traffic counts that the County got were

3 submitted to your rebuttal pre-file testimony and those

4 were -- those have been marked as CS-8 and CS-17X.

5 MS. ENDRES: BNSF would move to admit.

6 JUDGE PEARSON: Can you tell us again which

7 exhibits those are?

8 MS. ENDRES: CS- -- well, we would move to

9 admit the new quiet zone calculation that he ran and the new

10 traffic count so those are -- the quiet zone calculation is

11 CS-9 and it's also CS-16.

12 JUDGE PEARSON: So those are already in the

13 record, those are pre-filed.

14 MS. ENDRES: Oh, you're right, 8 and 9.

15 BY MS. ENDRES:

16 Q. I just have two more topics to cover with you,

17 Mr. Swan, and I'll try to move it along here.

18 I want to talk about the consideration of the

19 motorist safety at the crossing. We can agree that a

20 nonmountable system is also an FRA approved supplemental

21 safety measure at this crossing once it's converted to a

22 quiet zone?

23 A. Could you restate that question?

24 Q. Can we agree that the nonmountable system is also

25 an FRA approved safety measure to convert the crossing to a
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1 quiet zone?

2 A. Yes.

3 Q. And the purpose of the Supplemental Safety Measures

4 that the County's proposed, or any I suppose Supplemental

5 Safety Measures, is to deter bad driver behavior at railroad

6 crossings; is that fair to say?

7 A. Yes.

8 Q. Because unfortunately drivers don't always make

9 smart or logical or lawful decisions at railroad crossings,

10 right?

11 A. That's correct.

12 Q. And can we agree that most people probably don't

13 like waiting for trains to clear the railroad crossing?

14 A. I'd say that's very subjective. I mean maybe.

15 Q. And this location, as you noted, is a no outlet

16 road?

17 A. That's right.

18 Q. And so if a car or vehicle is stuck waiting for a

19 train either to get into the neighborhood or to get out,

20 there's not an alternative way to go, there's no overpass or

21 underpass, they just have to wait?

22 A. That's right.

23 Q. And the petition reflects that there are 17 freight

24 trains a day on average going about 45 or timetable speed

25 limits 45 miles an hour?
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1 A. I believe so.

2 Q. And if you want to look at your petition that's

3 CS-3, if you feel like you want to refresh your memory.

4 A. I think I just looked at it as well.

5 Q. If you need to.

6 A. (Witness reviewing document.)

7 Q. Right?

8 A. Yep.

9 Q. That is the number plus two passenger trains a day,

10 that's the number you used for the train count for your QZRI

11 calculations?

12 A. That's right.

13 Q. And so 17 or 19 times a day, those are all

14 potential times that the residents are going to be stuck

15 waiting for a train at that crossing?

16 A. A portion of those, whatever is during the day when

17 you have those traffic volumes.

18 Q. But the traffic count that the County did, weren't

19 there also some amount of vehicular traffic at all hours of

20 the day and night?

21 A. Perhaps, yeah.

22 Q. Do you have that there?

23 A. What was it again?

24 Q. That is --

25 A. 9? 8.
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1 Q. 8.

2 A. (Witness reviewing document.)

3 The timing would have to be impeccable between the

4 hours of like 10:00 to say 7:00 in the morning to encounter

5 a train, but yeah, there's traffic at night.

6 Q. I mean just taking that very first day, for

7 example, January 5th, there were six vehicles between

8 12:00 a.m. and 4:00 a.m.?

9 A. Yeah.

10 Q. Between westbound and eastbound traffic? Yeah?

11 A. Yeah.

12 Q. And the mountable devices or the channelization

13 devices, those are designed so that if someone is determined

14 and drives over them, they will in theory pop back up

15 without being broken off; is that right?

16 A. Yes.

17 Q. They can drive over that nonmountable system if

18 they choose to?

19 A. Yes.

20 MS. ENDRES: I think I can wrap up before

21 taking a break, if that works?

22 JUDGE PEARSON: If it works for you.

23 BY MS. ENDRES:

24 Q. The east side of the crossing, in your discussions

25 with emergency response, did they raise any concerns
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1 specific to a nonmountable system east of the crossing?

2 A. No.

3 Q. And it's on the west side of the crossing that has

4 that home with its driveway that comes --

5 A. It's not even that. It's the geometry of the road

6 that doesn't allow them to -- their trailing rail to track

7 completely on the road without going over the center line.

8 Q. And the County intends to widen the shoulder part

9 of the road on the west side of the crossing regardless of

10 which supplemental safety is installed; that was your

11 deposition testimony?

12 A. Widening -- widening the gravel portion of the

13 shoulder to provide support for the vehicles, the larger

14 vehicles.

15 Q. And that's regardless of which supplemental safety

16 measure is installed?

17 A. Regardless.

18 Q. And your testimony was that you believe emergency

19 vehicles do have sufficient space to traverse the road even

20 if a nonmountable system is installed; is that correct?

21 A. I believe they will get to where they're going

22 regardless of what supplemental safety measure is installed.

23 Q. And the aerial photo that you had there that we

24 looked at showed -- during your deposition, you identified

25 at least three places that emergency responders could turn
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1 around west of the tracks if they needed to; is that right?

2 A. I would -- which document are you looking at here?

3 Q. We're looking at the photo that showed the aerial

4 view of the neighborhood.

5 JUDGE PEARSON: Can you identify these by

6 exhibit number?

7 MS. ENDRES: I'm flipping through it.

8 BY MS. ENDRES:

9 Q. I believe this was CS-22X. It was the one that was

10 Exhibit 4 to your deposition. Yes.

11 A. Okay. Yeah, there appears to be about three,

12 perhaps more but at least three.

13 Q. And do you agree that for emergency response

14 traversing a crossing that Yacht Club Road is actually a

15 tighter configuration than would exist at Cliffside?

16 A. I'm not sure. I don't know the exact width of the

17 road but I would say there's definitely geometry issues with

18 Yacht Club Road, that's why we proposed mountable medians

19 there.

20 Q. When a vehicle is approaching the Yacht Club

21 crossing in a westbound direction, before they get to the

22 tracks on the right side there's like a rock face there,

23 there's literally no space next to the road; is that right?

24 A. There's a little bit, but yeah, there is a big

25 slope right there, yeah.
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1 Q. And whereas with Cliffside when you're approaching

2 heading towards the track in the westbound direction on the

3 east side, there is some shoulder width there that's grassy

4 and has at least more space to the right compared to Yacht

5 Club Road?

6 A. Yeah. Yes.

7 Q. And you said earlier obviously we don't have that T

8 configuration at Cliffside?

9 A. That's right.

10 Q. And the crossing has a phone number to call the

11 railroad if something happens near the crossing itself; is

12 that right?

13 A. I believe so.

14 Q. And the homeowner near the crossing has its own

15 turnaround driveway if someone needed to pull in there and

16 turn around?

17 A. No, it's locked up. Are you talking at the T?

18 Q. I'm sorry. I apologize. At Cliffside Drive

19 there's a home just west of the railroad crossing and that

20 home has its own turnaround, correct?

21 A. Yes.

22 Q. And you said that that homeowner has advised the

23 County they don't mind driving down the way to turn around

24 if it means they get a quiet zone?

25 A. That's what our special programs manager informed
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1 me of, yes.

2 Q. If a nonmountable median was installed, your

3 deposition testimony was that that footprint would be within

4 the currently painted stripe?

5 A. If a non -- yes.

6 Q. And widening the shoulder width using gravel is

7 meant to allow all emergency vehicles to traverse the

8 roadway without having to encroach on the median?

9 A. Yes.

10 Q. So under normal circumstances, even if the UTC

11 orders that a nonmountable system be installed, you expect

12 emergency responders will be able to travel up and down the

13 road freely?

14 A. I would say the incumbrance of a nonmountable

15 versus a mountable may impact the response time to those

16 emergencies but they will get to where they need to go, yes.

17 Q. What's the basis --

18 A. Could potentially impact those response times.

19 Q. Do you have any data that supports that?

20 A. No, but I've talked to drivers that at Yacht Club

21 Road specifically are very cognizant of the fact that

22 there's something there and very -- watching for it at all

23 costs and driving very slowly down that access to get to the

24 bottom of Yacht Club Road.

25 Q. Okay. But here for Cliffside you expect emergency
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1 responders will be able to navigate the road even with a

2 nonmountable system installed?

3 A. Yes.

4 Q. And if there's an emergency, whether a mountable

5 system is installed or a nonmountable system is installed,

6 you would expect the responders to flag traffic like they

7 would anywhere else if they needed to?

8 A. I would expect that of them, yeah.

9 Q. And you weren't provided with any data about the

10 actual response frequency to that neighborhood on the west

11 side of the tracks?

12 A. I mean, no, I wasn't provided any direct data

13 besides some kind of vague -- the fire marshal's office gave

14 me some kind of things they respond to during the summer

15 months which are brush fires down there and he says they do

16 it frequently.

17 Q. But they didn't tell you how often?

18 A. The frequency, no.

19 Q. And the County didn't submit any testimony on

20 behalf of the fire department itself, did it?

21 A. No.

22 MS. ENDRES: I think I'm just about finished.

23 If I can just take about 30 seconds and flip back through my

24 notes and make sure I don't have any other questions, I'd

25 appreciate that.
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1 BY MS. ENDRES:

2 Q. My last question for you, Mr. Swan, is: Can we

3 agree that one train accident at this crossing would be too

4 many?

5 A. That's right.

6 MS. ENDRES: That's all I have. I appreciate

7 your time.

8 MR. QUINN: May we break now? I'll have a

9 few questions for Mr. Swan when we get back.

10 JUDGE PEARSON: That sounds good. So let's

11 go ahead and be in recess for 30 minutes and come back.

12 MR. QUINN: Whatever works for counsel.

13 JUDGE PEARSON: Does that work?

14 We'll come back then at approximately 11:10.

15 (Recess 10:38-11:10.)

16 JUDGE CHARTOFF: We are back on the record.

17 Mr. Swan, you're still under oath. Mr. Quinn, you may

18 proceed with your redirect.

19 MR. QUINN: I'm not sure whether actually UTC

20 intended to cross before with that procedurally.

21 MR. ROBERSON: It seemed like time for cross.

22 So staff has no questions.

23 MR. QUINN: No questions? Thanks.

24 ////

25 ////
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1 REDIRECT EXAMINATION

2 BY MR. QUINN:

3 Q. Mr. Swan, if we could I'd like to talk a little bit

4 more about the community that's being served at the

5 crossing. We touched on it in your cross-examination but

6 can you please describe for the Court the community that's

7 being served and the area that's going to be included in the

8 quiet zone?

9 A. Yes. It's a no outlet road servicing approximately

10 44 residents, all of which are very familiar with the

11 existing crossing, use it about 160 times a day based on

12 traffic counts and are very aware of the proposed

13 improvement that's under discussion today.

14 Q. And why do you say that the residents of this

15 community are very familiar with the proposed improvements?

16 A. So this was initiated by that small proactive

17 community addressing our council and requesting assistance

18 on creating a quiet zone at that crossing. They were

19 actually willing to pay for those costs or a portion of

20 those costs and by them bringing this to counsel we have

21 moved to the stage of the process.

22 Q. And fair to say -- strike that.

23 And this is the only crossing in the proposed quiet

24 zone; is that correct?

25 A. That's correct.
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1 Q. Is this the only means for accessing that

2 neighborhood which houses the 40 some odd residences?

3 A. That's correct.

4 Q. If you can describe for the Court, what's the

5 socioeconomic, as far as you know, makeup of this community?

6 A. I would say they're upper middle class, some

7 affluent people down there, yeah.

8 Q. Some nicer homes?

9 A. Yeah.

10 Q. And to date have there been any issues at this

11 crossing with motorists trying to run gates without SSMs?

12 A. Not to my knowledge. There has been no evidence

13 that I've found through looking at traffic data and anything

14 like that of any citations for that.

15 Q. And in the County's interaction with its

16 constituents with its residents on this issue, have they

17 expressed concerns about road motorists or aggressive

18 motorists trying to run the gates in this location?

19 A. They have not.

20 Q. Okay. Now, currently there are no -- I'm going to

21 refer to them as "mountable curbs" versus "nonmountable

22 curbs"; is that fair?

23 A. Perfect.

24 Q. And maybe if we could describe for the Court, so

25 what is the physical makeup, just of the curb now, that's
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1 mountable? Give me the dimensions if you could.

2 A. It's approximately I think a little shy of

3 12 inches wide domed and about three and a half inches tall,

4 made out of a composite, a durable composite rubber with --

5 that are painted yellow and right in those curves is a

6 groove to attach the channelization devices.

7 Q. When we talk about channelization devices, we're

8 talking about those reflective panels that you discussed --

9 A. That's correct.

10 Q. -- not only in your pre-file testimony but during

11 cross-examination?

12 A. That's correct.

13 Q. So this is an added feature on top of the curb --

14 A. That's correct.

15 Q. -- that's mounted to the ground. And then how

16 many -- how many intervals or at what intervals are these

17 panels posted on top of them?

18 A. I want to say 44 inches, I believe it's 44 inches.

19 Q. And how tall are these panels?

20 A. I can tell you exactly how they are. They're 34

21 plus 5 -- they're 41 inches tall.

22 Q. Okay. So it's the 41 inches plus the three inches

23 give or take maybe a couple inches because --

24 A. (Witness nods head up and down.)

25 Q. And what's -- what's the general purpose of this
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1 assessment? What's it serve to do?

2 A. Physical determent for circumventing the gates and

3 provide safer crossing based on some risk index numbers.

4 Q. And that's recognized by the federal rule, I'll

5 refer to the FRA's final rule and I should have said that,

6 the final rule that's 22 -- excuse me -- 49 CFR 222, what's

7 been previously been admitted into evidence. That's

8 considered an approved channelization device for purposes of

9 applying for quiet zone and reducing QZRs, correct?

10 A. It's approved supplemental safety measure based on

11 the final code.

12 Q. Right. Now, let's talk about what the railroad

13 BNSF would like you to install. Now, that's a nonmountable

14 curb, correct?

15 A. Yeah, theoretically, yes.

16 Q. Theoretically a nonmountable curb. Describe that

17 physically, if you would?

18 A. It's approximately 12 inches wide with near

19 vertical faces six inches tall.

20 Q. Okay. And then what goes on -- does any

21 channelization devices, any reflective panels go on top of

22 that?

23 A. BNSF is requiring no reflective channelization

24 devices.

25 Q. They're not requiring them?
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1 A. They're not requiring that.

2 Q. Okay. So what's the purpose -- and I believe --

3 correct me if I'm wrong, I believe that's referred to, this

4 type of nonmountable curb is referred to in the rule, final

5 rule as a "non-traversable curb"; is that your

6 understanding?

7 A. Yes, I believe so.

8 Q. Okay. And what's the purpose of a non-traversable

9 curb?

10 A. To deter motorists from circumventing the gate.

11 Q. It's actually not to prevent them from crossing

12 lanes, is it?

13 A. It's to deter them.

14 Q. So it serves the same purpose as the mountable curb

15 that the County's proposing; is that correct?

16 A. Yes.

17 Q. And so I'm clear, the County is going to be

18 incurring the cost for the installation of these SSMs,

19 correct?

20 A. That's correct.

21 Q. And so I'm clear, the final rule, the FRA's final

22 rule does not require the County to utilize a specific SSM,

23 only that it use an approved SSM; is that correct?

24 A. Yes, you have the option between several SSMs to

25 implement, as BNSF's counsel described, very specific
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1 crossings with very specific needs and you can choose from

2 several.

3 Q. And I know you discussed this on cross and we

4 focused on the curbs as SSMs. They have to be coupled of

5 course with gates at the crossing, correct?

6 A. That's correct.

7 Q. And those gates already exist, that's not an issue?

8 A. That's correct.

9 Q. Okay. What's another SSM that the FRA approves for

10 purposes of establishing a quiet zone?

11 A. Four quadrant gates, four quadrant gates with

12 medians closing the road.

13 Q. Okay.

14 A. Making it a private crossing when they have other

15 rules they follow, yeah.

16 Q. Let's talk about the four quadrant gates. So right

17 now there's just one gate on either side and I assume the

18 four quadrant gates mean two gates on each side so that cars

19 are deterred from crossing because there's two barriers?

20 A. That's correct.

21 Q. The whole crossing is blocked off; is that correct?

22 A. Essentially, yes.

23 Q. Who -- and where are those gates located if

24 installed?

25 A. Opposite the existing gates.
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1 Q. Okay. Who is responsible for those installations?

2 A. Within BNSF's right of way then BNSF would be

3 responsible for installation.

4 Q. So County is responsible for the approach to road

5 leading to the tracks and then the railroad is responsible

6 basically for the tracks and probably a parallel area on

7 either side? I'm not sure how far it extends, but...

8 A. Yes, that's correct.

9 Q. Now, those four quadrant gates, does that have --

10 does that reduce the risk index?

11 A. It does, yes.

12 Q. Do you know off the top of your head how

13 significant --

14 A. I think it's 77 percent but I'm not sure. There's

15 other factors that come into play with continued -- some

16 type of system that's a type of technology that's built into

17 the railroad system that affects that effectiveness rating,

18 and coupled with channelization devices or curb medians of

19 either type it goes up to 92 percent.

20 Q. Sure. So there's -- so we can actually make this

21 crossing even safer if we want to, right? We could put in

22 quadrant gates; is that right?

23 A. Yes.

24 Q. Now, the railroad, since they're responsible for

25 those gates, could put those gates in, couldn't they?
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1 A. Yes.

2 MS. ENDRES: I'm going to object to the term

3 "responsible" to the extent we're getting into legal

4 opinions about cost sharing regulations and FRA preemption

5 issues and I think we're going afield of what's been

6 submitted in the pre-filed testimony or raised in the

7 cross-exam.

8 JUDGE PEARSON: Do you want to rephrase your

9 question?

10 MR. QUINN: Sure, sure.

11 BY MR. QUINN:

12 Q. Could the railroad install quadrant gates at this

13 crossing?

14 A. Yes, they can.

15 MS. ENDRES: And Your Honor, I apologize but

16 same objection about UTC regulation and laws. I'm not sure

17 that Mr. Swan has the appropriate foundation to be

18 testifying about cost allocation, installation and that

19 process with the UTC for the four quadrant gates.

20 JUDGE PEARSON: Okay. I understand your

21 objection. I'm going to allow it insofar as I think

22 Mr. Quinn is trying to establish that there are other SSMs

23 available at the crossing and I'll ignore anything that has

24 to do with cost allocation.

25 BY MR. QUINN:
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1 Q. And has BNSF asked that the County install quadrant

2 gates --

3 A. No.

4 Q. -- at Cliffside?

5 A. No.

6 Q. Has the -- has BNSF asked that you install medians

7 to the approaches for Cliffside Drive? Medians, not curbs

8 as we've discussed --

9 A. Okay.

10 Q. -- but medians as described in the rule?

11 A. No.

12 Q. Okay. Has BNSF suggested using wayside horns as an

13 additional protection in this quiet zone?

14 A. No.

15 Q. Are wayside horns something that could make the

16 crossing safer also?

17 A. I'm not usually familiar on the effectiveness

18 rating and how that reduces risk, but -- so I don't know.

19 Q. Okay. I'd like -- there was a lot of discussion

20 about the calculations. What I'd like you to do -- let's

21 just take this from the beginning.

22 For the County to establish a quiet zone, the QZRI,

23 right?

24 A. Sure.

25 Q. Has to be below the Nationwide Significant Risk
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1 Threshold?

2 A. That's right.

3 Q. And the Nationwide Significant Risk Threshold at

4 this crossing that you've discussed is 14,723, that was your

5 testimony, your pre-file testimony and also your response on

6 cross; is that correct?

7 A. That's correct.

8 Q. Okay. What is the current QZRI; in other words,

9 what is the current risk index without horns, right, because

10 that's what the QZRI is the risk index without horns, at

11 Cliffside Drive?

12 A. That is 14,562.45.

13 Q. So that is currently -- and that's with an ADT of

14 how many?

15 A. 324.

16 Q. And that was based on a traffic study; is that

17 correct?

18 A. Yes.

19 Q. That was conducted when?

20 A. When was that conducted? Starting the week of

21 January 5th.

22 Q. Okay. And did you comply with the requirements of

23 a proper traffic study?

24 A. We did a seven-day traffic study. I think these

25 are used for different things, yes.
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1 Q. Are you confident that the ADT you utilized is an

2 accurate depiction of the trips for that community?

3 A. Through this week, yes, I would say -- based on

4 interpreting this data I would say it's less than that

5 actually because there's some skewed amounts in there.

6 Q. "Skewed amounts," in other words, there was some

7 additional trips because there were -- there was an estate

8 sale in the community on one of the days that you took data?

9 A. Yes, that's correct.

10 Q. And so if the current QZRI is below the Nationwide

11 Significant Risk Threshold, and let me clarify, under the

12 rule you don't have to install any SSMs; is that correct?

13 A. That's correct.

14 Q. Which means you wouldn't have to petition the UTC

15 for the installation of these mountable curbs; is that

16 correct?

17 A. That's correct.

18 Q. So why are we doing this?

19 A. To reduce the risk index below the Risk Index With

20 Horns as it currently exists and make the crossing

21 ultimately safer than it stands now with the horns sounding.

22 Q. Okay. In your department, the Department of Public

23 Works for Whatcom County, who are your clients? Who are you

24 primarily concerned with?

25 A. The Whatcom County citizens.
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1 Q. These residents in particular as it applies to your

2 application?

3 A. That's right.

4 Q. And do you think that this decision to get well

5 below not just the QZRI but the current Risk Index With

6 Horns is in your community's best interest?

7 A. I do, and I believe the community feels that way

8 because they're -- they've been with us the whole process

9 and they're astutely aware of the improvements that are

10 proposed there and how the crossing will change.

11 Q. So the current QZRI, which is below the Nationwide

12 Significant Risk Threshold, is 13,837. What is the risk

13 index currently with horns?

14 A. 8,730.

15 Q. I'm sorry. Can you say that one more time, 8 --

16 A. 8,730.49.

17 Q. So that is with horns and no additional SSMs?

18 A. That's correct.

19 Q. And how long have we been operating under that --

20 under that rule? Because there's a trade horn rule in

21 place, right, I think it was --

22 A. Yeah, I'm not entirely sure off the top of my head.

23 Q. All right. Not a problem. So implementing a

24 mountable curb with channelization devices reduces that QZR

25 by 75 percent; is that correct?
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1 A. Yes.

2 Q. Okay. So that gets us to 3,459. Is that well

3 below the current risk index at that crossing?

4 A. It's below both the Risk Index With Horns and the

5 Nationwide Significant Risk Threshold, yes.

6 Q. Would you agree with me that it's significantly

7 below the current risk index for Cliffside Drive?

8 A. I would agree that it's significantly below, yes.

9 Q. And in fact if we look at the Nationwide

10 Significant Risk Threshold of 14,723, what percentage

11 reduction do we have if the QZRI is knocked down to 3,459?

12 A. I'm not sure off the top of my head. I don't have

13 calculations but it would be over 75 percent.

14 Q. Okay. And if we utilize the nonmountable curb,

15 again, assuming that the 80 percent reduction is

16 appropriate, what's the difference between -- what's the

17 difference or what's the percentage reduction?

18 A. Between the nonmountable and the Nationwide

19 Significant, well, it would be probably right around 80 or a

20 little bit more.

21 Q. Okay. So we're talking about a 3 or 4 percent

22 reduction?

23 A. No more than 5.

24 Q. But we agree that both of those numbers are

25 significantly below the current risk index for Cliffside
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1 Drive?

2 A. Both of them significantly reduce the risk based on

3 these numbers, yes.

4 Q. So regardless of what the Commission decides, this

5 is going to be a significantly safer crossing than it was or

6 than it currently is --

7 A. Yes.

8 Q. -- going forward; is that fair to say?

9 A. Yes.

10 MR. QUINN: I have no further questions.

11 Thank you.

12 JUDGE PEARSON: Thank you. I have a couple

13 of questions for you, Mr. Swan, and let me know if they

14 would more appropriately be addressed to either one of

15 BNSF's witnesses or Ms. Young. This is just for our

16 informational purposes.

17 Judge Chartoff and I did visit the crossing

18 yesterday, drove across it, drove through the neighborhood,

19 and we were curious whether trains travel in both directions

20 on that track or only one direction, and if so, which

21 direction do they travel?

22 THE WITNESS: I would assume they travel both

23 directions but BNSF would be better suited to answer that

24 question.

25 JUDGE PEARSON: Okay. I'll ask them. And
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1 then this also might not be a question you can answer.

2 Do you know how much time elapses between the time

3 the flashing lights come on and the gates go down and when

4 the train actually passes the crossing?

5 THE WITNESS: I don't off the top of my head.

6 JUDGE PEARSON: Okay. And so with respect to

7 the Yacht Club Road crossing that has come up a couple of

8 times, I'm interested in hearing both your answer to this

9 and also Ms. Young's as to why did the parties decide that

10 concrete medians were more appropriate at that crossing and

11 what's the difference between that crossing and the crossing

12 at issue here?

13 THE WITNESS: So originally the same thing

14 was proposed at Yacht Club Road as it was at Cliffside. At

15 the 11th hour kind of prehearing conference I believe it was

16 called, we decided to concede to BNSF and install what they

17 had -- what they requested. We did that as a matter of not

18 going this far along in litigation and just thinking that

19 that might be maybe an isolated quiet zone. We had a lot of

20 familiarity with any quiet zones. I think there's a handful

21 in the state and none in Whatcom County -- well, one in

22 Whatcom County now, but -- so it was just getting to know

23 that process and I guess we installed what BNSF required at

24 the time.

25 In looking back on that, I wish we probably would
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1 have went through that process then to get the mountable

2 medians because we've -- we've had firsthand concerns by

3 larger vehicles that use that -- use that road about

4 continuous wear and tear on trash vehicles.

5 The fire marshal drove that as a training

6 exercise. I don't know why they chose that road but they

7 chose that road and it was difficult for them to move in and

8 out of that -- the T intersection to make the corner, and at

9 that point in time we changed to the nonmountable and kept

10 the lengths the same. Since then we've submitted a federal

11 application to shorten that, the length of that to make that

12 turning movement easier for all big trucks that use that

13 based on the feedback from the community.

14 JUDGE PEARSON: Okay. Thank you. I think

15 that's it. I'll ask those questions to the other witnesses

16 when they're up here.

17 THE WITNESS: Okay.

18 JUDGE PEARSON: So you are excused. Thank

19 you.

20 JUDGE CHARTOFF: Ms. Young, can you please

21 come up?

22

23 BETTY YOUNG, having been first duly sworn,

24 testified as follows:

25 ////
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1 JUDGE CHARTOFF: And please state your name

2 and spell your last name for the record.

3 THE WITNESS: Sure. It's Betty, last name is

4 Young, Y-O-U-N-G.

5 JUDGE CHARTOFF: Thank you.

6 JUDGE PEARSON: Mr. Roberson, is she

7 available for cross?

8 MR. ROBERSON: I don't need to introduce her

9 if you don't need that done.

10 JUDGE PEARSON: Okay, thanks. Ms. Endres can

11 go ahead.

12

13 CROSS-EXAMINATION

14 BY MS. ENDRES:

15 Q. Good morning, Ms. Young. We haven't met. My name

16 is Kelsey. I'm going to be asking you some questions this

17 morning about this proceeding. Thank you for being here

18 today.

19 Is this the first quiet zone "discussion" for lack

20 of a better word that you've been involved with on the UTC's

21 staff's behalf or were you also involved in the Yacht Club

22 Road or others?

23 A. This is the first petition I've been involved with

24 before the Commission specifically.

25 Q. Is it the UTC's -- now, I'm not trying to put words
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1 in your mouth so you can rephrase this after my question but

2 just so I understand clearly UTC's staff's position, is it

3 staff's position that whatever supplemental safety measures

4 the County proposes are fine so long as the QZRI is below

5 that national threshold when the crossing is converted to a

6 quiet zone?

7 A. Yes.

8 Q. Does staff agree that to some degree a nonmountable

9 median presents a safer alternative supplemental safety

10 measure at this crossing?

11 A. Yes, according to the FRA. In the federal rule

12 there's a 5 percent difference in the effectiveness rating.

13 Q. If the County had proposed installing a

14 non-traversable system, non-traversable median, concrete

15 median, is that something the staff would have supported in

16 this case?

17 A. Yes.

18 Q. And if the judge orders, based on all the evidence

19 presented here, that a nonmountable system is appropriate

20 either on one side or both sides of the crossing, is that a

21 decision that staff would support?

22 A. Yes.

23 Q. Was it your predecessor -- well, strike that.

24 Who on behalf of UTC staff was involved in the

25 discourse about the yacht club supplemental safety measures?

0079

1 A. A staff person named Bob Boston.

2 Q. And in that case -- and I think this is BY-5 and

3 it's an exhibit that was submitted to your testimony.

4 Mr. Boston on staff's behalf wrote a letter in that case

5 saying that staff's opinion, and take a moment and flip to

6 it.

7 Do you have that there?

8 A. I do.

9 Q. In the yacht club proceeding it was the staff's

10 opinion, and I'm reading on Page 2, that first paragraph,

11 "It is Commission staff's opinion that non-traversable

12 medians provide a much higher disincentive for motorists to

13 drive over them because of the potential damage to

14 vehicles."

15 Did I read that correctly?

16 A. Yes.

17 Q. And understanding that your statement that so long

18 as the risk index is low enough the staff supports the

19 proposed modifications of the County, does the staff still

20 believe that non-traversable medians in general provide a

21 much higher disincentive for motorists to drive over them

22 because of the potential damage to vehicles?

23 A. I can't speak to Mr. Boston's opinion, but in my

24 personal opinion, there's a 5 percent difference in the

25 effectiveness rating according to the federal code so
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1 there's a bigger disincentive because of potential damage to

2 a vehicle.

3 Q. As compared to a traversable system?

4 A. Correct.

5 Q. Now, at particular crossings, and I'll just ask

6 this question: The tracks at this location trains travel in

7 both directions; is that your understanding?

8 A. That's my understanding, yes.

9 Q. And they can travel through that crossing any time

10 of day. Other than Amtrak trains, freight trains don't run

11 on schedules necessarily; is that your understanding?

12 A. That's my understanding, yes.

13 Q. And so can vehicle and train traffic patterns vary

14 over time?

15 A. Yes.

16 Q. So when we look at or when you're participating in

17 a diagnostic team evaluation at a particular crossing, are

18 you trying to select a system that to some degree can handle

19 some traffic fluctuations in vehicle traffic or train

20 traffic?

21 A. So I want to clarify some things about diagnostic

22 team meetings. They are not required in the federal quiet

23 zone process. It's just suggested. When UTC staff

24 participates as a member of a diagnostic team, we're not

25 traffic engineers. We're not railroad engineers. So we do
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1 not make any sort of comments about design. Certainly the

2 County as the expert on its roads and its traffic management

3 techniques, they would be the ones to have the say what the

4 best traffic management device would be.

5 So my role when I participate as part of a

6 diagnostic team is really just to give administrative

7 guidance about what the regulations are and what the process

8 is before the Comission.

9 Q. In past diagnostic meetings that you've attended

10 have there been discussions about how to select a system

11 that can handle any fluctuations in rail or vehicular

12 traffic?

13 A. I imagine there would have been. I don't recall

14 that specifically at this particular meeting.

15 Q. Okay. And you stated that traffic -- or excuse

16 me -- diagnostic team meetings are not required but they're

17 recommended.

18 Are you referring to the FRA's guide to the quiet

19 zone establishment process?

20 A. Not specifically. It's my understanding that is

21 part of the quiet zone evaluation process. Again, this is a

22 federal process so I am not the expert on it. It's my

23 understanding that the diagnostic meeting is not a

24 requirement.

25 Q. Okay. Do you have BY-4 there in front of you?
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1 This was submitted to your pretrial testimony. It's also

2 BY-11X for the record.

3 A. I do, yes.

4 Q. And what was the purpose of submitting this as an

5 exhibit to your testimony? How did this impact the staff's

6 opinion?

7 A. Well, my purpose for including it is this is really

8 the first time that in my experience that the quiet zone

9 conversation is coming before the Commission and it was

10 really my effort at educating the Commission more about the

11 process. Again, this is a guide. This is not the code.

12 This is not the federal rule. So it's just a guidance

13 document that the FRA produces for local jurisdictions that

14 want to create a quiet zone. So it was informational.

15 Q. Okay. And I understand if a diagnostic team

16 meeting isn't required but there is some involvement or at

17 least communication with the railroads that is required

18 before a crossing zone is created; is that right?

19 A. I believe that's true. Again, it's a federal

20 process.

21 Q. Okay. I'm looking, just for example, on Page 8 of

22 this exhibit where it's got a headline called Role of

23 Railroads. Do you see that there?

24 A. Yes.

25 Q. Okay. And so at least this document that was
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1 attached as an exhibit to your testimony in this section

2 states that they're "required to send a notice of intent and

3 a notice of quiet zone establishment to railroads operating

4 over the public highway rail grade crossings within the

5 proposed quiet zone. Railroad officials can provide

6 valuable input during the quiet zone establishment process

7 and should be included on all diagnostic teams."

8 Did I read that correctly?

9 A. Yes.

10 Q. So that's something that BNSF in this case has

11 participated in the diagnostic discussion that was commenced

12 in this particular instance?

13 A. Is that a question for me?

14 Q. Well, I suppose. BNSF was at the diagnostic

15 meeting you attended?

16 A. Yes.

17 Q. Okay. Did you have a chance or opportunity or

18 reason to read through Cody Swan's deposition? It was

19 submitted as a cross-examination exhibit in this case.

20 A. Cross-examination exhibit for me?

21 Q. No, it wasn't for you. I just was wondering, in

22 the materials you reviewed was that something that you

23 looked at?

24 A. I would have looked through everyone's testimony

25 that was filed, yes.
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1 Q. So his deposition testimony was something that we

2 took with a court reporter. It was a different format than

3 what was submitted.

4 A. I apologize. No, I have not seen that.

5 Q. You've heard today some discussion about the ease

6 of maintenance for the County. The County has said if

7 there's repair needed to these reflectorized paddles, that's

8 something they could do themselves. If there's repair

9 needed to a concrete curb they have to have a contractor

10 come in and do that.

11 Do you remember hearing that this morning?

12 A. Yes.

13 Q. Okay. Does the ease of installation or repair for

14 the County factor into the staff's opinion as to what

15 supplemental safety measures are appropriate?

16 MR. ROBERSON: Objection. This is beyond the

17 scope of her direct testimony.

18 JUDGE PEARSON: Okay. Do you want to either

19 rephrase that or move on?

20 MS. ENDRES: Well, I think it's certainly

21 fair to inquire as to the bases for the staff's opinion that

22 they've made in this case and understand. I think that is

23 the topic of her pre-file testimony.

24 JUDGE PEARSON: Okay.

25 MR. ROBERSON: She doesn't testify about
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1 maintenance or anything. Her testimony is totally dedicated

2 to application of the federal code, the effectiveness

3 ratings of the supplementary safety measures. That's what

4 she said she formed her opinion based on. This is beyond

5 the scope of that.

6 JUDGE PEARSON: So I'll sustain the objection

7 and I'll rephrase the question for you. You can ask her

8 what she considered in making her recommendation.

9 BY MS. ENDRES:

10 Q. In making sure we understand what you did consider,

11 am I correct in understanding that the repair or maintenance

12 issues by the County was not something that you considered?

13 A. That's correct.

14 Q. Would Commission staff support the installation of

15 a nonmountable median on the east side of the tracks and the

16 installation of a mountable system on the west side of the

17 tracks?

18 MR. QUINN: For clarification purposes, Your

19 Honor, I heard the term "median." Are we referring to the

20 curb or median as defined under the federal rule?

21 MS. ENDRES: Well, the system that bisects

22 the roadway. The system between the two lanes of travel.

23 JUDGE PEARSON: Can you repeat that question

24 so I can understand exactly what you're talking about?

25 MS. ENDRES: Sure.
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1 BY MS. ENDRES:

2 Q. In the -- we had a discussion with Mr. Swan about

3 whether the County would support installing a

4 non-traversable system on the east side of the tracks and a

5 traversable system on the west side of the tracks.

6 Do you recall hearing that this morning?

7 A. Yes.

8 Q. Is that something that UTC staff would feel

9 appropriate to this crossing?

10 A. You know, the burden of proof when a petition is

11 filed before the Commission is on the petitioner, and if

12 this was the approach that the County deemed was best for

13 its traffic control, then assuming I had attended a

14 diagnostic meeting where that specifically was discussed and

15 the reasons why, I could see that I would support that.

16 JUDGE PEARSON: Can I just clarify? You're

17 talking about a concrete median going into the neighborhood

18 or coming out of the neighborhood?

19 MS. ENDRES: So the neighborhood is on the

20 west side of the tracks so having a mountable system on the

21 west side of the tracks on the homeowner side.

22 JUDGE PEARSON: Right. And having concrete

23 on the other side?

24 MS. ENDRES: On the east side having

25 concrete, similar to that Vancouver crossing has two
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1 different setups.

2 JUDGE PEARSON: Got it.

3 BY MS. ENDRES:

4 Q. Was the traffic count provided by the County

5 something that impacted staff's opinion?

6 A. Opinion related to what?

7 Q. What system would be appropriate?

8 A. In a roundabout way. I mean really all of this

9 goes into what goes into that calculator, the federal quiet

10 zone calculator, which is a planning tool that the FRA

11 provides for and anyone that's trying to plan a quiet zone

12 and it's just one of the variables. So it was one of the

13 elements on the petition. Yes, it was part of the

14 consideration.

15 Q. And on that topic I saw in your rebuttal testimony

16 that you attempted to replicate the calculation in that

17 planning tool that Mr. Semenick's testimony provided using

18 that 450 traffic count number that was preloaded in there.

19 Do you remember that?

20 A. Yes.

21 Q. And were you ever able to replicate his figure?

22 A. I tried it multiple different ways. I think the

23 key for me here, and it was something I would like to

24 clarify, is that the initial calculation that you get when

25 you use the FRA quiet zone calculator is the information
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1 that exists in the FRA's federal crossing inventory. So

2 that information is updated by the UTC for the state which

3 means that the local road authorities like Whatcom County

4 can contact us if traffic counts have changed and we can

5 make those changes at the UTC.

6 The railroad is responsible for updating its train

7 counts and all of its train information, I believe the

8 requirement is every three years. So if you don't

9 manipulate anything, any of the numbers when you first go

10 into the quiet zone calculator, you strictly are getting the

11 information that comes from the federal crossing inventory.

12 I touched none of that. I ran the calculation with

13 exactly what exists in the inventory today. So it's my

14 understanding now that Mr. Swan and Mr. Semenick both

15 manipulated the numbers so I think there's reason why we all

16 came out with different numbers.

17 Q. So you didn't change the train count numbers, you

18 left whatever the numbers were that were automatically

19 preloaded based on the crossing inventory data that existed

20 at that time?

21 A. That's correct.

22 Q. Did you have an opportunity to review

23 Mr. Arrington's rebuttal pre-file testimony?

24 A. Yes.

25 Q. And he submitted some information relating to how

0089

1 the FRA appears to have generated those risk reduction

2 percentages. Did you read that section?

3 MR. ROBERSON: Okay. This is Mr. Arrington's

4 testimony. It's not Ms. Young's testimony. This is beyond

5 the scope.

6 JUDGE PEARSON: So can you -- I wasn't

7 listening to exactly what you were referring to because I

8 was looking at the exhibit list.

9 Can you repeat the question?

10 MS. ENDRES: Sure. I just asked if she had

11 reviewed the portion of his testimony where he describes how

12 the FRA apparently generated the risk reduction percentages.

13 I'm just asking at this point if she read that as part of

14 what she reviewed.

15 JUDGE PEARSON: I'll allow it.

16 THE WITNESS: Yes.

17 BY MS. ENDRES:

18 Q. And did Mr. Arrington's pre-file testimony on that

19 topic change staff's position relating to the proposed

20 safety measures that the County has suggested?

21 A. No. The effectiveness ratings are set out in the

22 CFR so that is the governing rule here. That's the law,

23 so...

24 Q. In Mr. Swan's redirect, he was asked about several

25 other alternative supplemental safety measures and whether
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1 the railroad has asked to install those or not.

2 Do you recall hearing that this morning?

3 A. Yes.

4 Q. And in your experience have you been involved in

5 diagnostic team meetings where four quadrant gates were

6 discussed?

7 A. Yes.

8 Q. And is that something that is -- I'm saying

9 "governed by," that's not the right word, but subject to the

10 standards of the MUTCD for where four quadrants gates are

11 appropriate?

12 A. So just for the Commission's information, the MUTCD

13 is the Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices. The

14 Commission adopts that and 480-62-999 is the national

15 standard. So Part 8 deals with railroad devices, traffic

16 devices related to railroad crossings and the guidance about

17 anything related to quiet zones, it's just that they have to

18 comply with the MUTCD. There's nothing specifically that

19 talks about four quadrant gates to my knowledge related to

20 SSMs.

21 Q. The MUTCD's discussion of four quadrants gates, are

22 those only recommended when daily traffic rises to a certain

23 level?

24 A. Well, the MUTCD's guidance is that there is no one

25 standard treatment that works at every single crossing
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1 because of all the variables, train speeds, traffic, et

2 cetera, et cetera. So it's really up to the diagnostic

3 team, or an engineering study in this case, that's the

4 expertise of the railroad and the expertise of the road

5 authority to decide which treatment is the most appropriate.

6 When you're talking about quiet zones, it's one of

7 those options that the FRA provides that the local agency

8 can pursue whichever one is selected. Generally unless it's

9 a first class city, the entity has to come in here and

10 petition the Commission to make that change at the railroad

11 crossing.

12 Q. Are you aware of any quiet zone crossings with

13 similar ADT counts, here the most recent figure is 324,

14 where four quadrants gates were installed as an SSM?

15 A. Not that I'm aware of.

16 Q. And another alternative that Mr. Swan was asked

17 about by the County was whether the railroad requested for a

18 median as described in the rule.

19 Do you remember hearing that?

20 A. Yes.

21 Q. Is there, to your knowledge, space in the current

22 roadway for a median to be installed as distinguished from

23 the non-traversable concrete curb?

24 A. I guess I don't understand the distinction. I

25 don't --
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1 Q. Fair enough. And then he was also asked about

2 wayside horns. Are there quiet zones that you're aware of

3 with similar configurations to this location where wayside

4 horns were installed as a supplemental safety measure?

5 A. Wayside horns are not a supplemental -- approved

6 supplemental safety measure. They are a one-for-one

7 tradeoff for the train horn so the train does not sound its

8 horn if a wayside horn is installed. So to answer your

9 question, not that I'm aware of.

10 Q. And wayside horns then sort of defeat the purpose

11 of the quiet zone, do they not?

12 A. That's my understanding.

13 Q. That's about all I have but just so I clearly

14 understand: The UTC supports the County's petition as is

15 but if the decision was made to install a non-traversable

16 system, the UTC staff would also support that decision?

17 A. Yeah. I just want to make sure that we're clear

18 that I'm considered UTC staff. I am not speaking for the

19 Commission. I am a party to the case just like the other

20 parties are. So UTC staff would support either treatment at

21 the crossings. They're both approved SSMs.

22 MS. ENDRES: That's all I have. I appreciate

23 your time.

24 JUDGE PEARSON: Mr. Roberson, do you have any

25 redirect?
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1 MR. ROBERSON: Can I try the redirect without

2 the microphone? I'm having trouble getting the volume. Can

3 you hear me?

4 JUDGE PEARSON: I can.

5 MR. ROBERSON: Thank you.

6

7 REDIRECT EXAMINATION

8 BY MR. ROBERSON:

9 Q. So does the FRA require any particular SSM to

10 convert a crossing into a quiet zone?

11 A. Do they require one? No.

12 Q. Any particular? Do they select the appropriate SSM

13 for any given crossing?

14 A. No.

15 Q. So who has the discretion to determine the

16 appropriate SSM?

17 A. The party that's applying for the quiet zone.

18 Q. In this case that would be Whatcom County, correct?

19 A. Correct.

20 Q. And so Whatcom County has determined that the

21 appropriate SSM is the mountable medians with channelization

22 devices, correct?

23 A. Correct.

24 Q. And staff supports that because it represents a

25 significant reduction in risk to the traveling public,
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1 correct?

2 A. Correct.

3 Q. Staff does not select the SSM, correct?

4 A. That is correct.

5 Q. So when Ms. Endres asked you about selecting the

6 appropriate SSM, that's the road authority, that's not

7 staff, correct?

8 A. Correct.

9 Q. Okay. In terms of the Quiet Zone Risk Index

10 calculator, so you just ran the numbers straight with the

11 FRA defaults?

12 A. Yes.

13 Q. And those FRA defaults are set by the railroad for

14 railroad purposes, correct?

15 A. The information that's entered into the federal

16 inventory by the railroad, yes.

17 Q. So train counts came from BNSF?

18 A. Yes.

19 Q. Train speeds came from BNSF?

20 A. Yes.

21 Q. Any other information dealing with trains came from

22 BNSF?

23 A. Yes.

24 Q. So when you ran BNSF's information you got a QZRI

25 that was less than the NSRT?
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1 A. Yes.

2 MR. ROBERSON: That's all I have.

3 JUDGE PEARSON: Okay. Thank you. So

4 Ms. Young, I had a question for you, I think you've kind of

5 addressed it but I just want to clarify. It sounds like

6 staff's position in these proceedings, including Yacht Club

7 Road so I won't necessarily ask you the same question that I

8 asked Mr. Swan, is to defer to the County in what their

9 request is in their petition; is that accurate?

10 THE WITNESS: That's correct.

11 JUDGE PEARSON: Okay. And then in your

12 testimony in your -- I believe it was in your direct

13 testimony, you testified that in the last 10 years there

14 haven't been any accidents at the Cliffside Drive crossing.

15 Do you know if there have ever been any accidents

16 at that crossing?

17 THE WITNESS: I believe there have been but I

18 don't have the dates in front of me. It was prior to that

19 10-year period. We have them in our crossing inventory

20 information at the office. I just don't have that with me.

21 JUDGE PEARSON: Okay. So if -- can you get

22 that to me, and we'll just mark it as a bench exhibit, just

23 by the end of the week?

24 THE WITNESS: Sure.

25 JUDGE PEARSON: If you can just file it, that
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1 would be useful, thank you.

2 THE WITNESS: Uh-huh.

3 JUDGE PEARSON: Okay. You are excused.

4 Thank you very much.

5 MR. ROBERSON: So just for my purposes, Bench

6 Request No. 1 is the accident data at that crossing --

7 JUDGE PEARSON: For all time.

8 MR. ROBERSON: March 8th?

9 JUDGE PEARSON: Sure. If you need longer,

10 just let me know.

11 Okay. So we have two witnesses left for

12 cross-examination. Mr. Quinn, this kind of falls on me

13 about how long you think it will take and whether you think

14 we should break for lunch and come back.

15 MR. QUINN: I tell you, I don't think I'm

16 going to request cross-examination of -- well, I'm just

17 going to cross Mr. Semenick. Then I'll be done. So I don't

18 anticipate a need to get the other witness on the phone.

19 JUDGE PEARSON: And do you think that your

20 original time estimate is still accurate?

21 MR. QUINN: Yeah, probably less than that,

22 quite frankly.

23 JUDGE PEARSON: I'm sorry, Mr. Roberson. You

24 actually estimated cross for Mr. Semenick as well and do you

25 have questions for Mr. Arrington?
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1 MR. ROBERSON: I do, but it's no longer than

2 five or ten minutes.

3 JUDGE PEARSON: For each witness? Okay, so

4 it's noon. If everyone is okay I think we should just press

5 on --

6 MS. ENDRES: Can we take a five-minute break

7 so I can touch with Mr. Arrington?

8 JUDGE PEARSON: Absolutely. So we can take a

9 five-minute break. We'll be in recess until 12:05.

10 (Recess 11:59-12:05.)

11 JUDGE CHARTOFF: We're back on the record.

12 The next witness is Mr. Semenick.

13

14 STEPHEN SEMENICK, having been first duly sworn,

15 testified as follows:

16 JUDGE CHARTOFF: Please state your name,

17 spelling your last name for the record.

18 THE WITNESS: Stephen Semenick,

19 S-E-M-E-N-I-C-K.

20 JUDGE CHARTOFF: Thank you.

21 JUDGE PEARSON: Ms. Endres, do you have any

22 preliminaries or is he available for cross?

23 MS. ENDRES: He's available.

24 JUDGE PEARSON: Mr. Quinn?

25 ////
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1 CROSS-EXAMINATION

2 BY MR. QUINN:

3 Q. Good afternoon, Mr. Semenick. Thank you for being

4 here.

5 Mr. Semenick, when did you graduate from college?

6 A. May of 2013.

7 Q. How long have you been with BNSF?

8 A. About five and one-quarter years.

9 Q. And how long have you been in your current position

10 with BNSF?

11 A. Since June of 2017 I've been the manager of public

12 projects covering British Columbia and Washington.

13 Q. Less than two years in that position?

14 A. That is correct.

15 Q. How many quiet zone establishments in Washington

16 have you been involved with, sir?

17 A. I have to think for a minute.

18 Q. Okay.

19 A. I'd say about half a dozen.

20 Q. Okay. Do you recall which jurisdictions -- and

21 strike that.

22 In your current position as project manager how

23 many?

24 A. At the tail end of the Yacht Club Road, several

25 NOIs with the city of Kent, so I guess a smaller number
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1 since you said the establishment.

2 Q. So is that two?

3 A. Two that I'm aware of.

4 Q. Okay. Is it fair to say that you're familiar with

5 the process that a municipality goes through to establish a

6 quiet zone?

7 A. Yes.

8 Q. Are you very familiar?

9 A. Fairly familiar. It depends how you would define

10 "very."

11 Q. Well, how familiar do you have to be in your role,

12 in your position with BNSF?

13 A. I would say I am very familiar then since I have to

14 work with them quite closely throughout the process.

15 Q. And what is the -- what is the federal rule that

16 governs the establishment of quiet zones, sir?

17 A. The road authority, in this case Whatcom County,

18 would need to submit a petition, the NOI, or rather the NOI

19 to --

20 Q. And I'm sorry. What is the federal rule? Can you

21 refer us to the federal rule that governs the establishment

22 of quiet zones?

23 A. The CFR part 222.

24 Q. And you have that up there. It's marked as CS-7.

25 We'll be referring to that so I'll just direct your
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1 attention to it so you get situated.

2 This is the rule that you're familiar with

3 regarding the establishment of quiet zones; is that correct?

4 A. Once I get there I'll --

5 Q. Okay. Take your time.

6 A. Yes, that is correct. This is what I'm familiar

7 with.

8 Q. Okay. And why is it important that you be familiar

9 with this rule as the representative for BNSF?

10 A. As the representative for BNSF I'm responsible on

11 the railroad's behalf to ensure that the road authority that

12 follows this process does so in the correct manner.

13 Q. You're aware Whatcom County is currently seeking to

14 establish a quiet zone at Cliffside Drive; is that correct?

15 A. That is correct.

16 Q. And you're familiar with the Cliffside Drive

17 crossing; is that correct?

18 A. That is also correct.

19 Q. How many times have you been to the crossing, sir?

20 A. Five or six times.

21 Q. Will you please describe for the Court, describe

22 the proposed quiet zone area and the surrounding

23 environments?

24 A. The proposed quiet zone area consists of the

25 Cliffside Drive railroad crossing which leads into the
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1 residential area with approximately 44 residents. The

2 crossing is currently equipped with crossing gates, flashing

3 lights, bells. Would you like me to go into further detail

4 or is that --

5 Q. What's the current QZ -- excuse me -- what's the

6 current risk index there with the horns being sounded, the

7 horns sounding?

8 A. I would have to reference the --

9 Q. If that would help refresh your recollection, by

10 all means.

11 A. Is there a specific exhibit where it's located?

12 Q. Oh, so you're not familiar with the current risk

13 index of the Cliffside Drive crossing?

14 MS. ENDRES: Your Honor, he's simply asking

15 to be directed to an exhibit to refresh his memory.

16 MR. QUINN: I'm just asking if he knows.

17 MS. ENDRES: That's argumentative. It's not

18 necessary.

19 JUDGE PEARSON: Okay. Just please do direct

20 him to the exhibit. I think everyone in this room knows

21 what that number is.

22 BY MR. QUINN:

23 Q. Let me just ask you outright: Do you know what the

24 current risk index is for the Cliffside Drive crossing?

25 A. Not off the top of my head.
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1 Q. Okay. We'll come back to that.

2 Now, you're familiar with how a public authority

3 can establish a quiet zone in its own jurisdiction, correct?

4 A. Yes.

5 Q. What section of the rule outlines those procedures?

6 And actually I'll direct you. It is at Section 22.39. It

7 would be on Page -- upper left-hand corner, Page, I believe

8 it's 21894, if that's going to help, Section 22.39.

9 A. Yes, that is correct.

10 Q. Okay. And you agree with me that a public

11 authority can designate a quiet zone pursuant to this rule,

12 correct?

13 A. Correct.

14 Q. Okay. And what does that mean that a public

15 authority, or in this case the County, can simply designate

16 a quiet zone? What does that mean?

17 A. That means that the County follows the required

18 processes to establish a quiet zone that they made use of.

19 Q. Without having to apply with the FRA; is that

20 correct?

21 A. That is not correct.

22 Q. Okay. Could you review the rule and tell me where

23 it requires that the public authority actually apply for a

24 designation quiet zone?

25 A. The first sentence of 222.39.
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1 Q. Can you read that, please?

2 A. It describes, "A quiet zone may be designated by a

3 public authority without the need for formal application to

4 get an approval by the FRA."

5 Q. Thank you. And under what circumstances can the

6 County do that without even applying to the FRA formally?

7 Because I think it's going to be the next three paragraphs.

8 Feel free to -- under what circumstances can the County

9 designate a quiet zone without formal application?

10 A. (Witness reviewing document.)

11 Q. I'll direct you to Paragraph No. 1. What's the

12 first way they can do that?

13 MS. ENDRES: Your Honor, I'm just going to

14 object and say this rule obviously speaks for itself. If

15 we're just going to walk through Mr. Semenick reading what's

16 here and already been submitted as an exhibit for the Court

17 to look at it, then I think argumentative, the fact we're

18 going to sit through and read what it says.

19 JUDGE PEARSON: Do you want to respond to

20 that, Mr. Quinn?

21 MR. QUINN: I can move things along a little

22 bit quickly, but I think I'm allowed to inquire as to the

23 basis for the County's application and what constitutes

24 proper grounds for establishing a quiet zone to specifically

25 include what the County's petitioning the UTC to do here. I
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1 think it's completely material. This is the rule that we

2 have to scrutinize and the Commission has to consider.

3 JUDGE PEARSON: Can you ask your questions a

4 bit more generally then?

5 MR. QUINN: Sure, I will. Thank you.

6 BY MR. QUINN:

7 Q. Mr. Semenick, isn't it true that a quiet zone can

8 be established by simply implementing that every public

9 highway, railway crossing within the quiet zone either one

10 or more of the SSMs identified in the rule?

11 A. That is correct.

12 Q. Okay. And that's what the County's proposing to do

13 here; isn't that correct?

14 A. That is correct.

15 Q. Okay. So in fact, we're in compliance with that

16 first requirement of the final rule which allows the County

17 to establish a quiet zone with no formal application to the

18 FRA, correct?

19 A. That is correct.

20 Q. And the final rule actually deems the use of an SSM

21 such as the one the County's proposing as basically per se

22 sufficient to establish a quiet zone.

23 Do you agree with me?

24 A. Can you repeat the question?

25 Q. Okay. Under that provision, the FRA is saying
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1 that, hey, if you have an SSM in the quiet zone, at every

2 crossing in the quiet zone you're per se, you can per se

3 establish that quiet zone, it's per se safe enough to

4 establish a quiet zone; isn't that correct?

5 A. That is correct.

6 Q. Okay. And that would be the status in the current

7 case here in Whatcom County at Cliffside Drive, right?

8 A. Correct.

9 Q. Okay. Paragraph 2 talks about a second way the

10 County can establish a quiet zone without formal application

11 to the -- and approval by the FRA. It says, "A quiet zone

12 may be established if the Nationwide Significant Risk

13 Threshold," right, "is at or below the Nationwide

14 Significant Risk Threshold."

15 Do you agree with me that currently Cliffside Drive

16 is below that Nationwide Significant Risk Threshold?

17 A. Depending on how you inputted what parameters you

18 utilize in the quiet zone calculator.

19 Q. Fair enough. The two calculations that were

20 performed by Mr. Swan, do you agree with me that in those

21 cases it came in under the Nationwide Significant Risk

22 Threshold?

23 A. Yes, I agree.

24 Q. Okay. And assuming that that's the case, would

25 Whatcom County qualify for establishing a quiet zone without
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1 formally applying to the Federal Railroad Administration?

2 A. They would.

3 Q. Now, let's assume we -- strike that.

4 Let's move on a little bit from there.

5 So assuming that, again, using Mr. Swan's numbers

6 and there's a QZRI below the national risk, Nationwide --

7 excuse me -- Nationwide Significant Risk Threshold, there is

8 no requirement that the County install SSMs; do you agree

9 with me on that?

10 A. Based off of Mr. Swan's calculations I agree.

11 Q. But under this scenario, even though the County

12 doesn't have to do that, they are seeking to install such;

13 isn't that correct?

14 A. That is correct.

15 Q. Okay. And you're aware that the UTC supports

16 Whatcom County's petition to install these SSMs?

17 A. I am aware, that's correct.

18 Q. Okay. And do you have a compelling reason or does

19 BNSF have a compelling reason for requiring or for

20 requesting -- for requesting that the County utilize an SSM

21 other than the one they propose?

22 A. That request is based off of the -- primarily the

23 FRA's risk reduction calculation which shows nonmountable

24 medians are 5 percent, have a 5 percent greater reduction

25 than the nonmountables. Additionally, BNSF believed that

0107

1 the maintenance required for the channelization devices

2 along a mountable median could present problems as -- once

3 the quiet zone is established.

4 Q. So just so I understand, it's twofold, No. 1, you

5 think the 5 percent increase in safety requires the County

6 to install a nonmountable curb versus a mountable curb,

7 No. 1, correct?

8 MS. ENDRES: Your Honor, that's misconstruing

9 his question. The question was whether there's a compelling

10 reason, not whether the County is required. He's

11 misconstruing the witness's testimony.

12 JUDGE PEARSON: Mr. Quinn, do you want to

13 respond?

14 MR. QUINN: I'll rephrase.

15 JUDGE PEARSON: Thank you.

16 BY MR. QUINN:

17 Q. Mr. Semenick, you gave a twofold response to the

18 compelling reason why the railroad is objecting to Whatcom

19 County's proposed use of a nonmountable curb; is that

20 correct?

21 A. That's correct.

22 Q. One was the 5 percent difference in safety in risk

23 reduction; is that correct?

24 A. Yes, the ability to greater reduce the risk.

25 Q. And you agree with me that it's 5 percent?
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1 A. Per what the FRA publishes, yes, it's 5 percent.

2 Q. And the second part of your -- the compelling

3 reason was concerns over maintenance of a mountable system

4 and channelization devices?

5 A. Primarily the channelization devices as they may

6 present maintenance and safety issues for drivers if a piece

7 of a delineator or channelization device rather were to

8 fracture off if it was impacted.

9 Q. Have you discussed these concerns with Whatcom

10 County Public Works?

11 A. Yes.

12 Q. Have they allayed any of those concerns during your

13 discussions about that?

14 A. Can you rephrase?

15 Q. Have they allayed, have they -- did they share your

16 concerns about maintenance and upkeep and possible risk to

17 drivers in this community related to a mountable system?

18 A. To an extent, and they additionally discussed their

19 proposed maintenance and inspection to mitigate those risks.

20 Q. So they -- in other words, they addressed your

21 concern? They represented, Hey, we're going to keep up on

22 this and we're going to maintain them?

23 A. They provided a response. I wouldn't say

24 necessarily it addressed my overall concerns.

25 Q. Okay. But you also heard the testimony of Mr. Swan
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1 today as far as the County's intentions to maintain their

2 roads and maintain their SSMs such as the one that will be

3 out at Cliffside Drive?

4 A. And that included a month -- initially a monthly

5 inspection and increasing frequency based on performance?

6 Q. Yes.

7 A. I understand that was their plan.

8 Q. And do you have any reason to doubt that they'll

9 address their -- address their roads and address their SSMs

10 they represent?

11 A. I do based on performance of channelization devices

12 on mountable medians and other jurisdictions throughout

13 Washington where I've frequently seen a number of missing

14 "paddles" as I'll call them.

15 Q. Sure. And these are at crossings, railroad

16 crossings?

17 A. Yes.

18 Q. And where are the ADTs at those locations then?

19 A. I'm not aware of what the ADTs are.

20 Q. Can you describe the neighborhoods that these

21 crossings service? Are they through traffic, if you

22 describe them more in detail?

23 A. It's through traffic in a city's downtown area.

24 Q. Downtown areas. Buses go through there, trucks?

25 A. I can't confirm but I believe so.
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1 Q. Okay. So really not similar to what we're dealing

2 with here; is that fair to say?

3 A. To an extent, yes.

4 Q. You heard Mr. Swan testify that the current risk

5 index with train horns at Cliffside Drive is 8296. Any

6 reason to doubt that representation, doubt that testimony?

7 A. No.

8 Q. And let me ask you this: Has BNSF invested in any

9 additional safety measures to reduce this number, that

10 current number?

11 A. So may I respond to the previous question?

12 Mr. Swan's QZRI for --

13 Q. I didn't ask about the QZRI. I asked about the --

14 sorry.

15 MS. ENDRES: I apologize.

16 BY MR. QUINN:

17 Q. No, I'm asking about the current Risk Index With

18 Horns at Cliffside Drive.

19 A. Okay.

20 Q. Not the QZRI. QZRI --

21 A. No concern then.

22 Q. Okay. So has BNSF invested in any additional

23 safety measures to reduce the current risk index at that

24 crossing to date?

25 A. So you're asking if BNSF, since the diagnostic
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1 meeting, has invested in the crossing infrastructure

2 maintenance.

3 Q. No, at any time even before that. What investments

4 has BNSF made to reduce the current risk at that crossing?

5 A. At some point in time I would believe that we

6 installed the active signals, the flashing lights, gates,

7 the advanced warning system.

8 Q. Anything after that?

9 A. We perform periodic maintenance and inspections and

10 we will update equipment based on industry standards and

11 internal BNSF standards.

12 Q. Okay. So let's talk a little bit about the risk

13 index calculator. You indicate that you ran numbers for

14 Cliffside Drive; is that correct?

15 A. That is correct.

16 Q. You used a different number of average daily trips,

17 ADT number when you ran your calculations; is that correct?

18 A. That is correct.

19 Q. What number did you use?

20 A. For the ADT I used the prepopulated value of 450.

21 Q. And you said it's a prepopulated value. Did you

22 have any personal knowledge of the number of ADTs?

23 A. I did not.

24 Q. Did BNSF conduct any independent traffic studies on

25 its own?
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1 A. BNSF did not and does not.

2 Q. So why did you use 450 as opposed to the 324 that

3 Mr. Swan used based on a week-long traffic study?

4 A. The value of 450 was the current value. I was not

5 aware of the 324. I completed the study back in -- before

6 that information was available.

7 Q. You mean you conducted your calculation before?

8 A. Yes.

9 Q. So there's really no basis for using the 450 ADT

10 other than that was a prepopulated figure in the calculator?

11 A. That is correct.

12 Q. Okay. But let's utilize your number, though.

13 Using your 450 ADT, what is the QZRI for Cliffside Drive?

14 A. Using the 450 ADT I came up with a value of

15 15,707.4 I believe.

16 Q. And that's clearly above the Nationwide Significant

17 Risk Threshold; isn't that correct?

18 A. That is correct.

19 Q. Okay. And by that number, what does that number

20 represent? Does that represent the risk index without

21 horns?

22 A. Yes.

23 Q. Okay. Does it consider any SSMs at that point?

24 A. It does not.

25 Q. Okay. So what I'd like to do is ask you: Well,
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1 can you reduce that QZRI that you used by 75 percent for me?

2 A. You can.

3 Q. No.

4 A. Can I?

5 Q. Can you?

6 A. Not without a calculator.

7 Q. Did you calculate it?

8 A. Did I?

9 Q. Yeah.

10 A. I have.

11 Q. You have. So you know what the resulting QZRI is

12 if you reduce -- excuse me. You'd know what the resulting

13 QZRI would be if you reduce that 15,707 number by

14 75 percent, you just don't have it in front of you?

15 A. If I had a calculator I could.

16 Q. How about this: Why don't we just split it in

17 half. Let's reduce it by 50 percent. What's half of

18 15,000?

19 A. About 7,500.

20 Q. Is that less than the current risk -- the current

21 risk index at the crossing with horns?

22 A. Yes.

23 Q. Okay. And that's just --

24 A. The risk index being approximately 8,300.

25 Q. Yeah, approximately 8,300. And that's just a
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1 50 percent reduction, correct?

2 A. That is correct.

3 Q. And it's well below, that 50 percent reduction is

4 well below the Nation- -- excuse me -- the Nationwide

5 Significant Risk Threshold, isn't it, the 14,723?

6 A. That is correct.

7 Q. Okay. And in fact that 50 percent reduction based

8 on your numbers, right, well qualifies Cliffside Drive for

9 quiet zone consideration, right?

10 A. It would qualify Cliffside Drive for a quiet zone.

11 Q. And in fact, so much so that the County wouldn't

12 even have to formally apply to the FRA for its

13 establishment; isn't that correct?

14 A. That is correct.

15 Q. Do you agree that the County's best situated to

16 deal with its county roadways, its road projects, its

17 responsibilities, if you will, to its motoring public? Do

18 you agree with me on that?

19 A. Can you rephrase to make sure I understand that the

20 County would be the best --

21 Q. Best situated, in the best position to address its

22 road needs.

23 A. As compared to?

24 Q. Well, for example, let's say a railroad.

25 A. They would be as compared to BNSF.
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1 Q. Okay. Is BNSF involved in county road projects as

2 far as you know up here in Whatcom County?

3 A. To an extent. If it involves a UTC petition

4 adjacent to a railroad crossing we would be, otherwise we

5 would not be.

6 Q. Fair enough. What about regular maintenance,

7 regular inspections, regular -- again of the roadways, the

8 approaches in particular? Are they involved in that aspect?

9 A. Of routine maintenance and inspection, we are not.

10 Q. Does Whatcom County get to tell the railroad how to

11 maintain its tracks in its area that it's legally

12 responsible for at crossings?

13 A. Whatcom County does not. They can but they do not

14 have any authority to dictate how BNSF maintain or inspects

15 our right-of-way. That lies within the FRA.

16 Q. Sure. Fair enough. I mean they could be heard and

17 I'm sure --

18 A. Yes.

19 Q. Because it is a partnership of course, right?

20 A. It is.

21 MR. QUINN: Sir, I don't think I have any

22 more questions. Thank you very much. I appreciate it.

23 MR. ROBERSON: I have a very limited number

24 of questions.

25 ////
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1 CROSS-EXAMINATION

2 BY MR. ROBERSON:

3 Q. I guess first of all, the SSM proposed by the

4 County is approved by the FRA, correct?

5 A. That is correct.

6 Q. And you mentioned that it has an effectiveness

7 rating of 75 percent?

8 A. That is correct.

9 Q. So that's something that a road authority could

10 choose to install at a crossing if it wanted to install or

11 to create a quiet zone, correct?

12 A. Correct.

13 Q. One of your big concerns is maintenance. BNSF

14 wouldn't be responsible for any of the maintenance of the

15 SSM, correct?

16 A. That is correct.

17 Q. So the party that's responsible for maintaining the

18 SSM is the County and they want this particular SSM; is that

19 correct?

20 A. That is correct.

21 Q. Okay. In your testimony you express concern that a

22 driver who damages a channelization device wouldn't report

23 it; is that right?

24 A. That is correct.

25 Q. Is that the basis of your concern about
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1 maintenance, just that these things are going to get damaged

2 and no one is going to hear about it?

3 A. Yes.

4 Q. Okay. So could someone else report a broken

5 channelization device if they saw it?

6 A. Somebody else could.

7 Q. And you've heard today that the residents in the

8 other side of Cliffside Drive are very much in favor of this

9 quiet zone, correct?

10 A. That's what they stated.

11 Q. They drove the creation of it. So they would have

12 an incentive to make sure that the SSM is appropriately

13 functioning because otherwise it's no longer a quiet zone,

14 correct?

15 A. That's correct, they would have incentive.

16 Q. So these involved citizens would have a strong

17 device to report a broken channelization device, correct?

18 A. Correct.

19 MR. ROBERSON: That's actually all I have.

20 JUDGE PEARSON: Ms. Endres, do you have any

21 redirect?

22 MS. ENDRES: I do, Your Honor.

23 ////

24 ////

25 ////
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1 REDIRECT EXAMINATION

2 BY MS. ENDRES:

3 Q. You were just asked some questions about BNSF not

4 being responsible for maintenance and the County being

5 responsible for maintenance. If there is a maintenance

6 problem, say the County sets a schedule to inspect this

7 crossing every 30 days and they inspect the crossing and the

8 next day someone drives over this and breaks a

9 channelization device and the County doesn't -- it's not

10 reported, the County doesn't find it until its next monthly

11 inspection.

12 What is BNSF's concern about safety at that

13 crossing for its train crews and the motoring public?

14 A. BNSF's concern is that with the reduced number of

15 the channelization devices residents traversing the crossing

16 would have more of an opportunity to mount the curb and

17 drive around as opposed to a fully equipped channelization,

18 channelized median.

19 Q. And in that scenario there's no train horn to warn

20 the public?

21 A. There would not be.

22 Q. You were asked about why you ran a quiet zone risk

23 calculation using 450 cars when the County had submitted

24 updated traffic patterns reflecting an average daily traffic

25 count of 324.
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1 Did you ever replicate or calculate a Quiet Zone

2 Risk Index using that 324 count?

3 A. I did.

4 Q. And what value did you get?

5 A. I would have to reference my notes. I don't have

6 it in front of me.

7 Q. Is that something here you do have to refresh your

8 memory --

9 A. Yes.

10 Q. -- that I could bring you?

11 A. Yes.

12 Q. Where?

13 A. It would be on my -- in my notes, my binder.

14 MS. ENDRES: May I approach, Your Honor?

15 JUDGE PEARSON: Sure.

16 MS. ENDRES: Is it this (indicating)?

17 THE WITNESS: Yes.

18 BY MS. ENDRES:

19 Q. If you want to just take that page of notes I'll

20 take the rest back.

21 A. (Witness reviewing document.)

22 Q. In looking at that, does that refresh your

23 recollection?

24 A. It does.

25 Q. And what value did you calculate using that updated
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1 figure?

2 A. With 324 ADT the QZRI that I was able to calculate

3 was 15,387.35.

4 Q. And how does that compare to the risk threshold?

5 A. That is greater than it.

6 Q. And what inputs did you modify, if anything, other

7 than the ADT figure?

8 A. In addition to the ADT figure being modified, I

9 increased the train count to 19 from the 14 which is

10 prepopulated, and increased the day through trains from 7 to

11 10, trying to stick with the 50 percent split between day

12 through and night through.

13 Q. And did you attempt to do that to accurately

14 reflect the actual train traffic through this crossing?

15 A. Yes.

16 Q. The maintenance concern that you described based on

17 your experience at other crossings having mountable

18 channelization systems, do you have personal knowledge of

19 what type of vehicle caused particular damage that you

20 observed?

21 A. I didn't observe any of the vehicles striking --

22 striking the channelization devices.

23 Q. And can you give us a sense in your experience at

24 those other crossings where you observed damage, the range

25 of how long that action in real life got taken to fix?
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1 A. It still has not been fixed. It's been quite some

2 time. Site visits were completed on those locations in late

3 2017 and to date I haven't seen any repairs.

4 MR. QUINN: Your Honor, I'm going to move --

5 I'm going to object to the question and move to strike. I'm

6 not sure how that's relevant to Cliffside Drive, quite

7 frankly, what the status is of another location. I'm not

8 sure how that bears upon the decision you have to make.

9 MS. ENDRES: Your Honor, I'm just exploring

10 the basis for his concern and certainly he was asked in

11 cross examination about the difference in traffic and what

12 types of vehicles might have caused that damage, also in the

13 context of the County's plan to be inspecting these

14 crossings. I think that's fair to see and explore in his

15 experience the basis for his testimony as to why in real

16 life they're inspection and maintenance problems and that's

17 the basis for his testimony.

18 JUDGE PEARSON: I'll allow it. Go ahead.

19 BY MS. ENDRES:

20 Q. Mr. Semenick, you're not disputing the fact that

21 the County has a right to establish a quiet zone assuming

22 the calculations, the risk index calculations are correct,

23 are you?

24 A. I am not.

25 Q. And you're not disputing that a supplemental safety
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1 measure is a good idea at this crossing, are you?

2 A. I am not.

3 Q. Have you heard anything today that changes your

4 opinion that these municipalities can do a safer alternative

5 for these 44 residents for the same cost?

6 A. Could you rephrase? As I understand you're asking

7 is there anything that's changed my opinion on if they

8 should install mountable versus nonmountable?

9 Q. Yes.

10 A. I have not.

11 Q. And this crossing doesn't only serve 44 residences

12 but it serves to some degree train crews that are traveling

13 across the tracks. How many train crew members ride a

14 train?

15 A. There are two members to each crew.

16 Q. And what about passenger trains?

17 A. Passenger trains, I'd have to refer to Amtrak but

18 I'm guessing hundreds per train.

19 MS. ENDRES: Those are the only questions I

20 have.

21 MR. QUINN: Your Honor, I know that normally

22 the parties are limited to one round. Unfortunately I think

23 Mr. Semenick introduced some testimony that's not included

24 in his pre-file regarding other calculations using other

25 numbers so I'm going to ask if you find good cause to allow
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1 just a very brief recross on that specific issue?

2 JUDGE PEARSON: Can you be more specific?

3 MR. QUINN: Of course. The question was

4 posed whether or not Mr. Semenick used the risk calculator

5 for utilizing the ADT of 324. In his testimony he didn't

6 talk about running those numbers. He -- obviously he

7 testified that that increased other numbers to get to the

8 QZRI that he testified to. I would just like to be able to

9 follow up on that to clarify, because again, that was not

10 provided in his direct testimony. He only ran it with an

11 ADT of 450.

12 JUDGE PEARSON: So I wouldn't have a problem

13 with that except that, just to be perfectly transparent,

14 we're deciding between two different medians here so the

15 number without the medians is of no consequence to our

16 decision.

17 MR. QUINN: I understand. I'll withdraw the

18 request. Thank you.

19 JUDGE PEARSON: So I have a couple of

20 questions for you, Mr. Semenick. You heard a couple of them

21 earlier today.

22 Which directions do the trains travel on that

23 track at Cliffside Drive, do you know?

24 THE WITNESS: It would be both northbound and

25 southbound.
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1 JUDGE PEARSON: Okay, so they go both

2 directions, okay.

3 THE WITNESS: Yeah.

4 JUDGE PEARSON: And then my other question

5 was: How much time elapses between when the safety device

6 is activated so the gates go down and the lights start

7 flashing and when the train actually passes the crossing?

8 THE WITNESS: So each crossing will have

9 different parameters that lead to the ultimate advanced

10 warning time. The FRA minimum is 20 seconds, the gate's

11 activating prior to the train occupying the crossing. I do

12 not have the exact number for Cliffside Drive.

13 JUDGE PEARSON: I just needed a ballpark.

14 THE WITNESS: I believe it's somewhere in the

15 neighborhood of 30 seconds. I can provide a more definitive

16 calculation.

17 JUDGE PEARSON: That's okay. It's the same

18 amount of time basically as the horns go off?

19 THE WITNESS: Approximately.

20 JUDGE PEARSON: Do the horns typically go off

21 simultaneous with the gates coming down or do the gates come

22 down first and then the horns?

23 THE WITNESS: I think there's a timing

24 requirement for when the horns must sound. It's either 25

25 or 15 seconds as noted by the FRA.
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1 JUDGE PEARSON: Okay. I was just curious.

2 And then -- so this is just kind of a general

3 question about BNSF's opinions about quiet zones generally.

4 If BNSF could have its way, would there not be quiet zones?

5 THE WITNESS: BNSF, we don't like quiet

6 zones. I believe the train horn, if there does have to be a

7 crossing that the train horn should sound at each crossing.

8 JUDGE PEARSON: Okay. For safety reasons?

9 THE WITNESS: Correct.

10 JUDGE PEARSON: Okay. And then at this

11 Cliffside Drive crossing, do you know when those active

12 safety devices were installed, the gates and the lights?

13 THE WITNESS: I do not have a date for that.

14 JUDGE PEARSON: So I want to get that

15 information and it will be Bench Request No. 2. I would

16 actually like a full history of all the improvements that

17 have been made at the Cliffside Drive crossing.

18 Do you know about how long it would take to get

19 that information?

20 THE WITNESS: I -- off the top of my head I

21 do not.

22 JUDGE PEARSON: Do you think you could get it

23 by the end of the week or do you need longer?

24 THE WITNESS: I could probably have it by the

25 end of the week.
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1 JUDGE PEARSON: So why don't we set that as

2 the due date. If you need more time just let me know.

3 THE WITNESS: Okay.

4 JUDGE PEARSON: Okay. And I think that was

5 it. So you can be excused at this point. You're excused.

6 Thank you. I think we're ready to call Mr. Arrington on the

7 phone. We can be in recess until we get him on the line.

8 (Discussion off the record.)

9 JUDGE CHARTOFF: We're back on record.

10 Mr. Arrington, I am Judge Chartoff and beside me is Judge

11 Pearson. We're co-presiding in this matter. Can you please

12 stand and raise your right hand so I can swear you in.

13

14 DUSTY ARRINGTON, having been first duly sworn,

15 testified as follows via

16 speakerphone:

17

18 JUDGE CHARTOFF: Thank you. Please be

19 seated. Can you please state your name, spelling your last

20 name for the record.

21 THE WITNESS: Sorry. You were cutting out a

22 little bit. My name is Dusty Arrington, D-U-S-T-Y,

23 A-R-R-I-N-G-T-O-N.

24 JUDGE CHARTOFF: Thank you. Is the witness

25 available for cross?

0127

1 MS. ENDRES: Yes.

2 JUDGE CHARTOFF: Please proceed.

3

4 CROSS-EXAMINATION

5 BY MR. ROBERSON:

6 Q. Good afternoon, Mr. Arrington. How are you doing?

7 A. Doing well. How about yourself?

8 Q. I'm doing all right. So --

9 JUDGE PEARSON: Mr. Roberson, you might want

10 to identify yourself.

11 MR. ROBERSON: Good point.

12 BY MR. ROBERSON:

13 Q. My name is Jeff Roberson. I'm an assistant

14 attorney general representing the Commission staff in this

15 matter. I just have a couple of questions for you. Okay.

16 Are you familiar with 49 CFR Part 222, the code

17 provisions dealing with quiet zones?

18 A. Yes.

19 Q. And you're aware that the FRI has approved certain

20 SSMs for use in establishing quiet zones?

21 A. Yes.

22 Q. And you're aware that the FRA has set the

23 effectiveness ratings of those SSMs by rule?

24 A. Yes.

25 Q. And are you aware of -- well, strike that.
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1 You have concerns with those effectiveness ratings.

2 Did you ever present those concerns to the FRA?

3 A. I have not.

4 Q. Did BNSF ever comment in the rule to express

5 concern about those effectiveness ratings?

6 A. I don't have information to validate that so I

7 don't know.

8 Q. Okay. And a road authority that wanted to

9 establish a quiet zone would, per the rule, have to use the

10 effectiveness rating established by the FRA, correct?

11 A. They would have to follow the ruling, yes.

12 Q. Okay. You talk a little bit about maintenance, the

13 maintenance necessary to keep up channelization devices in

14 your testimony. I just have a couple questions on that.

15 Did you review the County's maintenance plan

16 when you -- before you testified?

17 A. I did not.

18 Q. Did you talk to any County employees about the

19 plans for maintenance for the channelization devices?

20 A. I did not. I did not. All my information on the

21 maintenance is based off of personal experience and the

22 projects that I was involved with with TTI.

23 Q. Have you ever had any personal experience in

24 Whatcom County?

25 A. No.
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1 MR. ROBERSON: That's all actually all the

2 questions I have.

3 JUDGE PEARSON: Any redirect, Ms. Endres?

4 MS. ENDRES: No.

5 JUDGE PEARSON: Mr. Arrington, can you hear

6 me? This is Judge Pearson.

7 THE WITNESS: Yes.

8 JUDGE PEARSON: Okay. Thank you. So my

9 first question is: Did you personally visit the crossing at

10 Cliffside Drive?

11 THE WITNESS: I have not. I reviewed the

12 location using publicly available tools such as Google

13 Street View and Google Earth.

14 JUDGE PEARSON: Okay. And in your rebuttal

15 testimony on Page 3, Lines 15 through 16, you speak

16 generally about research standards and you said that site

17 specific conditions affect human behavior.

18 Do you recall that testimony?

19 THE WITNESS: Yes.

20 JUDGE PEARSON: Okay. So as that relates to

21 railroad crossings, would you agree that site specific

22 conditions such as the surrounding area, what type of

23 neighborhood it is, would affect human behavior at that

24 crossing?

25 THE WITNESS: Yes.
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1 JUDGE PEARSON: And would you agree that

2 visibility at the crossing would affect people's behavior?

3 THE WITNESS: I would agree that pretty much

4 everything to do with a site specific condition would affect

5 human behavior.

6 JUDGE PEARSON: So you said you haven't been

7 to the crossing and the aerial view of the crossing, just to

8 let you know, is much different from when you're actually

9 physically at the crossing looking to get across the

10 crossing.

11 And so would it affect your opinion at all if you

12 knew that the visibility at the crossing is -- it's fairly

13 "treacherous," I guess is the word that I would use?

14 THE WITNESS: Well, I guess my question is:

15 How would you define the human perception of it? Because in

16 some ways it may make it more likely and in some ways it may

17 make it less likely that a person may try and violate the

18 conditions.

19 JUDGE PEARSON: Okay. So if visibility was

20 low, if there was a corner right there and you can only see

21 a very little ways, do you think that would affect someone's

22 decision to try and circumvent the gates?

23 THE WITNESS: Yes. I think it could have

24 affected it both positively and negatively. There could be

25 a chance that because a person cannot see a potential train
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1 coming, depending on that particular person, some people may

2 find that to embolden them to try and cross because they

3 don't see a train coming, but others it may restrict them

4 from doing it because they may not feel comfortable trying

5 to cross without being able to see a long distance down the

6 track.

7 JUDGE PEARSON: Okay. That's helpful. Thank

8 you.

9 Those are the only questions that I have. Do you

10 have anything for him?

11 JUDGE CHARTOFF: No.

12 JUDGE PEARSON: Okay, then we'll excuse you.

13 We'll go ahead and hang up. Thank you for being available

14 today.

15 THE WITNESS: All right. Thank you.

16 JUDGE CHARTOFF: So that concludes the

17 evidentiary portion of the hearing.

18 Anything else before we go off the record?

19 MR. QUINN: Not from the County, Your Honor.

20 MR. ROBERSON: Not from staff.

21 MS. ENDRES: No, Your Honor.

22 JUDGE CHARTOFF: Okay. We will be in recess

23 until the public comment hearing later in evening. We are

24 off the record.

25 (Hearing adjourned at 12:52 p.m.)
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