1		Exhibit No	(FP-2T)
2			
3			
4	•		
5	;		
6	BEFORE THE WASHING	TON STATE	
7	UTILITIES AND TRANSPORTA	TION COMMISSION	
8			
9			, •
10	Corporation,		
11	Petitioner	DOCKET NO: TR-0'	70696
12	vs.	PREFILED REBUTT	
13	CITY OF MOUNT VERNON	OF FOSTER PETERS	SON
14 15	Respondents.		
16	SKAGIT COUNTY, WSDOT, and WEST		
17	Intervenors.		
18			
19			
20	1. Have you reviewed any of the WUTC's pref	filed testimony in this case	?
21		mas Zeinz, Paul Curl, and	
22			
23			
24	2. Zoo o sogai sy taming the true is too	timony. Did you agree wit	h any of his
25			
26	Toolie to that the agree about the barety issues in	volved where a road crosses	both mainline
27	and siding tracks. We agree that the Hickox crossing w	rill likely be blocked often, p	ossibly for an
- 1	II		

extended period of time. We also agree that keeping the Hickox crossing open would increase the risk of a crossing collision where motorists may ignore crossing warning devices by trying to "beat" an oncoming train or falsely presuming activated signals are for a stopped train a second train is approaching but their view of the second train is blocked by the stopped train.

3. Do you disagree with any of Mr. Zeinz's conclusions?

I disagree with Mr. Zeinz's recommendation to improve both Stackpole and Blackburn crossings if the Hickox Road crossing is closed.

4. Why do you disagree that both Stackpole and Blackburn need to be improved if Hickox is closed?

I believe it is sufficient to close Hickox without upgrading either Stackpole or Blackburn, for the reasons described below. I also believe that it is sufficient to close Hickox and upgrade Stackpole to have active warning protection, without changing the Blackburn crossing. I do note, however, that Mr. Zeinz was not apparently asked to consider the option of closing the Hickox crossing, leaving the Blackburn crossing as-is, and improving the Stackpole crossing to have active warning devices (when asked to compare alternatives on Page 13 of his prefiled testimony).

5. Why do you disagree with Mr. Zeinz's recommendation to improve the Blackburn crossing?

I visited each crossing involved in this matter (Blackburn, Hickox and Stackpole) on November 6, 2007. First and foremost, the Blackburn crossing meets all required safety standards for grade crossings. This was also acknowledged in Mr. Johnston's prefiled testimony.

///

26 ///

27

22

23

24

25

6. Is there another reason you disagree with Mr. Zeinz's recommendation to improve the Blackburn crossing?

Yes. I disagree with Mr. Zeinz's claim that the Blackburn crossing's traffic signal placement and coordination increases the likelihood of motorist confusion. The Blackburn crossing not only has active crossing protection, but has the additional component of normal traffic signals. Although this is generally unusual at grade crossings, it actually makes the crossing safer than a crossing with only flashing lights and gates (notably, Mr. Johnston also testified that on "the positive side, the Blackburn . . . railroad signals are connected with traffic signals").

7. Why do traffic signals make the grade crossing safer?

Driver behavior at crossings equipped with traffic signals is modified because drivers stop at or before the railroad stop line even when a train is not approaching. The consistent stopping location, with or without the presence of a train, means drivers will not become confused about a safe location to stop when a train is approaching the crossing. Lights and gates really become icing on the cake when traffic signals are installed. It is very difficult to imagine a driver claiming "I didn't know what that meant" - because traffic signals are such a basic part of operating a motor vehicle. Drivers are less likely to ignore active crossing protection when they are also facing a red traffic light. Blackburn involves four streets intersecting, and drivers would stop at the same traffic lights even if the tracks did not exist.

Also, I am unaware of any information that the Blackburn crossing has had problems with drivers facing conflicting warning devices - such as facing lowering warning gates but green traffic lights. That would be the only scenario of conflicting warning devices I believe could be considered confusing - but I am not aware of a situation in which that has happened.

8. How are the warning devices linked to traffic signals at Blackburn?

When a train is coming to a crossing at or near a street intersection, such as the Blackburn crossing, the oncoming train trips a sensor that "preempts" the traffic signals. This means that the

1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |

~ -

traffic signals change to clear any traffic that may be on the crossing the train is approaching. At Blackburn, the signals are wired so that the traffic signal lights will turn red before a train nears, preventing motorists from entering the crossing. Preemption means the lights will not be green when the gates lower.

9. Do you believe the north siding switch should be relocated?

No. Blackburn is located at the north end of the siding. Mr. Zeinz did not address the fact or did not have information that the siding track has been designed so a train in the siding will not block Blackburn. There will not be the same visibility or safety concerns that drivers may ignore warning devices when they cannot see an oncoming train. Further, a train pulling into the siding will travel through the Blackburn crossing whether the siding switch is located north or south of the crossing. Trains may not travel faster than 20 m.p.h. when pulling into the Mt. Vernon siding, so the speed of a train will be relatively slow. See Exhibit 1, attached hereto (BNSF Timetable for Bellingham Subdivision) whether it has just pulled into the siding or is about to pull into the siding. In my opinion, the cost of such construction outweighs the benefit, if any.

10. Are there any other factors that explain why you recommend closing Hickox but leaving the Blackburn crossing as-is, even though both would cross siding and mainline tracks?

Yes. Another factor that I have considered is where the speed limit changes near the crossings. The speed limit between mileposts 51.0 and 67.9 (Stackpole, Hickox and Blackburn are located between these mileposts) is 79 m.p.h. for passenger trains and 60 m.p.h. for freight trains. See Exhibit 1. More than two miles north of Hickox and less than one mile north of Blackburn, at MP 67.9, the speed limit is slower: it is 50 m.p.h. for passenger trains and 45 m.p.h. for freight trains. A northbound passenger train must be traveling at or slower than 50 m.p.h. when its lead locomotive reaches MP 67.9, so it is likely that trains will be slowing when they cross Blackburn in anticipation of the reduced speed limit ahead. It follows that since Hickox is more

1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |

9

1011

1213

14 15

16

17

18 19

20

2122

2324

2526

27

than two miles from the speed zone change, northbound trains will likely be traveling across Hickox at a faster speed than at Blackburn - potentially up to 29 m.p.h. faster for passenger trains. Southbound trains cannot speed up until the entire train has passed MP 67.9, so it correspondingly follows that a southbound passenger train could well be traveling at or slightly faster than 50 m.p.h. at Blackburn (depending on its length), but may potentially reach 79 m.p.h. by the time it crosses Hickox. Keeping the Blackburn crossing as-is is less dangerous than keeping the Hickox crossing open, for the reasons described in my earlier answers but also because trains potentially cross Hickox at a greater rate of speed.

11. Do four-quadrant gates solve the safety concerns at Hickox?

Not necessarily. The FRA has recognized that vehicle presence detection systems that keep exit gates up longer may encourage drivers to follow violators through crossings using the oncoming traffic exit gate opening in a steady stream, defeating the intended warning. Further, drivers who know the exit gates will not close when a vehicle is on the crossing may be more likely to try to beat the "entrance" gate, knowing the exit gate will not lower on top of their vehicle. Here, Hickox is unique in that motorists (especially drivers familiar with the crossing) who know the crossing may be blocked might be tempted to go around the gates to avoid having to retrace their route and use an alternative crossing. It is not safe to have an open crossing in the middle of siding track. Neither Blackburn nor Stackpole are in the middle of a siding track.

12. Do you have any exhibits to illustrate the scenario of motorists ignoring or trying to beat gates at a crossing?

It is my understanding that BNSF will provide two or three demonstrative videos showing drivers ignoring warning devices, a scenario I discussed in my earlier testimony. This will illustrate the concern of keeping the Hickox crossing open, creating potential temptation for motorists to try to beat safety gates to cross the tracks.

13. What is your professional conclusion about whether to install four-quadrant gates at Hickox?

Four-quadrant gates do not eliminate the safety hazards posed at the Hickox crossing. It is my opinion that the proper mitigation in this case is to close the Hickox crossing, the only way to eliminate its safety hazards. The other two crossings, Blackburn and Stackpole, have adequate, safer crossing protection. The WUTC admits that Blackburn and Stackpole meet all required safety standards.

14. In your opinion, as between the following alternatives, which would you deem safer:
(a) leaving the Hickox Road crossing open, but with four-quadrant gates, or (b) closing the Hickox Road crossing and diverting the traffic to the Blackburn and Stackpole crossings with no improvement to either of these alternative crossings?

Under the circumstances described, (b) closing the Hickox Road crossing and diverting the traffic to the Blackburn and Stackpole crossings with no improvement to either of these alternative crossings would be safer. Whether or not Hickox has two-quadrant or four-quadrant gates, the crossing is going to be blocked significantly, so it is safer to avoid any potential conflict with motor vehicles. Stackpole has excellent visibility, and Blackburn has adequate safety devices, including normal traffic signals. It is unsafe to create incentives for drivers to "beat" lowering gates (to avoid having to take a detour when a train is parked in the siding) and risk feeling trapped between the gates if the driver does not make it across in time.

15. In your opinion, as between the following alternatives, which would you recommend:
(a) leaving the Hickox Road crossing open, but with four-quadrant gates, (b) closing the Hickox Road crossing and installing active warning devices at Stackpole crossing, or (c) closing the Hickox Road crossing with improvements being made to both Stackpole and Hickox crossings?

Telephone (206) 625-1801 Facsimile (206) 625-1807

	2	
	3	
	4	
	5	
	6	
	7	The second secon
	8	
	9	-
geosinsk	7 8 9 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1	
)	1	
****	2	
1	3	
1	4	-
patroneur	5	
and the same of	6	
Méssobo	7	
-	8	
***************************************	9	
2	0	
2	1	
2	7	
2	3	
2	4	Action in contrast of
2	5	The second secon
2	6	
2	7	

1

I would recommend (b). Closing the Hickox crossing is the best, safest way to mitigate the hazards presented by extending the siding track across the road. I do not believe that Blackburn needs to be upgraded, and I believe Mr. Zeinz's analysis is based on incorrect information (trains parked across Blackburn, confusion because of stop lights, etc.).

16. Did any part of Mr. Zeinz's testimony change your conclusion that the Hickox crossing should be closed?

No. If this stretch of track has three crossings now and goes to two, it will concentrate where vehicles and pedestrians have contact with railroad tracks. Removing one whole crossing from mix means that crossing cannot have any accidents, and drivers will not risk wasting travel time by driving to the crossing, seeing it blocked, retracing their journey, and taking an alternative route. The bottom line is that Hickox will be blocked by trains with regularity. Closing the Hickox crossing is the best solution.

DECLARATION

1, Foster Peterson, declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of Washington that the foregoing PREFILED REBUTTAL TESTIMONY OF FOSTER PETERSON is true and correct to the best of my knowledge and belief.

DATED this $\frac{29^{+16}}{2}$ day of November, 2007.

FOSTER PETERSON

1	DATED this 30th day of November, 2007.
2	Manta annon Carm MacDanaell DLLC
3	Montgomery Scarp MacDougall, PLLC
4	1200a.
5	T. M. A. P. N. 10000
6	Tom Montgomery, WA. Bar No. 19998 Bradley P. Scarp, WA. Bar No. 21453
7	Kelsey Endres, WA. Bar. No. 39409 Of Attorneys for BNSF Railway Company
8	1218 Third Ave., Ste. 2700
	Seattle, WA 08101 Tel. (206) 625-1801
9	Fax (206) 625-1807
10	<u>tom@montgomeryscarp.com</u> <u>brad@montgomeryscarp.com</u>
11	kelsey@montgomeryscarp.com
12	
13	CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE
14	I am over the age of 18; and not a party to this action. I am the assistant to an attorney with Montgomery Scarp
15	MacDougall, PLLC, whose address is 1218 Third Avenue, Suite 2700, Seattle, Washington, 98101.
16	I hereby certify that the original and 12 copies of PREFILED REBUTTAL TESTIMONY OF FOSTER PETERSON
17	has been sent by FedEx to Carole J. Washburn at WUTC and a PDF and word perfect version sent by electronic mail. I also certify that true and complete copies have been sent via electronic mail and U.S. Mail to the following interested parties:
18	
19	Stephen Fallquist L.Scott Lockwood Deputy Prosecuting Attorney Assistant Attorney General
	Skagit County 1400 S. Evergreen Park Dr. S.W. 605 S. 3 rd Street P.O. Box 40128
20	Mount Vernon, WA 98273 Olympia, WA 98504
21	
22	Gary T. Jones Jonathan Thompson Jones & Smith Assistant Attorney General
23	PO Box 1245 Assistant Attorney General Assistant Attorney General 1400 S. Evergreen Park Dr. S.W.
24	Mount Vernon, WA 98273 PO Box 40128
	Olympia, WA 98504
25	Brian K Snure Kevin Rogerson Snure Law Office City Attorney
26	612 South 227 th Street P.O Box 809
2.5	Des Moines, WA 98198 Mount Vernon, WA 98273

27

Adam E. Torem 1300 S. Evergreen Park Dr. SW P.O. Box 47250 Olympia, WA 98504-7250 I declare under penalty under the laws of the State of Washington that the foregoing information is true and correct. DATED this 30 day of November, 2007 at Seattle, Washington. Lisa Miller, Paralegal

1	Exhibit No (FP-3)
2	
3	DOCKET TR-070696 PREFILED REBUTTAL TESTIMONY OF FOSTER PETERSON
4	
5	
6	
7	
8	"EXHIBIT 1"
9	BNSF TIMETABLE FOR BELLINGHAM SUBDIVISION
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	

BNSF Safety Vision

We believe every accident or injury is preventable. Our vision is that BNSF Railway will operate free of accidents and injuries. BNSF Railway will achieve this vision through:

A culture that makes safety our highest priority and provides continuous self-examination as to the effectiveness of our safety process and performance ...

A work environment, including the resources and tools, that is safe and accident-free where all known hazards will be eliminated or safe-guarded ...

Work practices and training for all employees that make safety essential to the tasks we perform ...

An empowered work force, including all employees, that takes responsibility for personal safety, the safety of fellow employees, and the communities in which we serve.



Northwest Division

Timetable No. 3

IN EFFECT AT 0700
Pacific Continental Time
Wednesday April 26, 2006

Division General Manager

Douglas B. Jones Seattle, WA (206) 625-6333

General Director Transportation

R.T. Bartoskewitz Seattle, WA (206) 625-6266

NORTHWEST DIVISION—No. 3—April 26, 2006—Bellingham Subdivision

Length of Siding (Feel)	Station Nos.	Mile Post	Bellingham Subdivision MAIN LINE STATIONS	Rule 4.3	Type of Oper.	Line Segment	Miles to Next Stn.
		119.6	USA CANADA BORDER	Y	ABS		0.3
6,060	15088	119.3	BLAINE	BY	ocs	To the state of th	2.4
8,588		116.4	SWIFT	A 100 A 400 A 400 A 400 A			4.3
	15081	112.1	INTALCO	JΥ	СТС		5.9
8,478	15075	106.3	FERNDALE				9.0
	15067	97.0	BELLINGHAM	BY	ABS		3.2
6,347	15062	92.9	SOUTH BELLINGHAM	Y	003	50	13.4
8,884	15049	79.7	BOW			50	7.4
4,635	15042	71.9	BURLINGTON to Fidalgo 12.4	J			3.9
6,075	15038	66.8	MT. VERNON	В		has seemed	12.4
6,381	15025	55.5	STANWOOD		СТС		9.7
10,680	15016	45.5	ENGLISH				3.6
	15012	42.2	KRUSE JCT. to Arlington 6.9				3.4
2,557	15009	38.8	MARYSVILLE				2.7
		37.0 10.9	DELTA JCT.	ВМТҮ			1.8
	15005	9.1	DELTA	Υ	ABS	408	1.9
	02165	0.0	PA JCT	JY		407	97.4

Radio Channel No. 76 in service.

Bayside Yard at Everett is assigned Channel 14. All Bayside switch jobs and yardmasters will operate on this channel. Yardmaster will monitor Channel 66 and Seattle North Branch Channel 76. Delta Yard will operate on Channel 60.

Radio Call-In			
Everett - 37(X)	Burlington - 38(X)	Bellingham - 39(X)	
Blaine - 41(X)	Seattle North Branch [Disp Stanwood - 65(X)	
	Emergency - Call 91	1	
ispr X=0, Mechar	ical X=2, Field Support >	X=3, Warm Bearing X=5	

Train Dispatcher Telephone Number—8-234-1607

1. Speed Regulations

1(A). Speed-Maximum

	Passenger	Freight
MP 119.6 to MP 37.0	79 MPH	60 MPH.
MP 10.9 to MP 0.0	35 MPH	15 MPH.
Amtrak Talgo Trains	50 MPH.	
MP 8.10 to MP 8.20	35 MPH	25 MPH.
Loaded Coal Trains		40 MPH.
Delta Jct. to Everett Jct. via Bayside	15 MPH	15 MPH.
Lowell to Sea Line Jct.		10 MPH.

1(B). Speed—Permanent Restrictions

Speed—Permanent Restrictions	
MP 119.6 to MP 118.2	50 MPH 30 MPH.
MP 118.2 to MP 108.7	79 MPH 60 MPH.
MP 108.7 to MP 108.3	70 MPH 50 MPH.
MP 108.3 to MP 106.2	79 MPH 60 MPH.
MP 106.2 to MP 105.8	45 MPH 40 MPH.
MP 105.8 to MP 103.4	70 MPH 50 MPH.
MP 103.4 to MP 101.1	55 MPH 50 MPH.
MP 101.1 to MP 100.2	40 MPH 35 MPH.
MP 100.2 to MP 97.1	45 MPH 35 MPH.
MP 97.1 to MP 96.7	20 MPH 20 MPH.
MP 96.7 to MP 93.6	35 MPH 30 MPH.
MP 93.6 to MP 90.45	
MP 90.45 to MP 88.3	45 MPH 35 MPH.
MP 88.3 to MP 87.2	40 MPH 35 MPH.
MP 87.2 to MP 85.1	
MP 85.1 to MP 82.5	40 MPH 35 MPH

	Passenger	Freight
MP 82.5 to MP 76.7	79 MPH	60 MPH.
MP 76.7 to MP 76.5	60 MPH	55 MPH.
MP 76.5 to MP 74.8	79 MPH	55 MPH.
MP 74.8 to MP 74.5	45 MPH	40 MPH.
MP 74.5 to MP 70.4	79 MPH	60 MPH.
MP 70.4 to MP 67.9	50 MPH	45 MPH.
MP 67.9 to MP 51.0	79 MPH	60 MPH.
MP 51.0 to MP 49.5	65 MPH	55 MPH.
MP 49.5 to MP 48.9		
MP 48.9 to MP 47.9	70 MPH	60 MPH.
MP 47.9 to MP 41.0	79 MPH	60 MPH.
MP 41.0 to MP 38.7	50 MPH	50 MPH.
MP 38.7 to MP 37.7	20 MPH	20 MPH.
MP 37.7 to MP 37.2		
MP 37.2 to MP 37.0	10 MPH	10 MPH.
MP 10.9 to MP 10.7		
MP 10.7 to MP 8.2		
MP 8.2 to MP 8.1		
MP 8.1 to MP 7.9		
MP 0.8 to MP 0.0	30 MPH	15 MPH.
Bellingham—over street crossings (HER)		
MP 96.2—Pine Street crossing	20 MPH	20 MPH.
Burlington to Fidalgo		
Kruse Jct. to Arlington		10 MPH.
Delta Roundhouse/Rip Tracks		5 MPH.
Amtrak Talgo Train Maximum Speeds	Passenger	
MP 119.6 to MP 118.2	50 MPH.	

MP 119.6 to MP 118.2	50 MPH.
MP 118.2 to MP 106.2	79 MPH.
MP 106.2 to MP 105.8	45 MPH.
MP 105.8 to MP 103.4	79 MPH.
MP 103.4 to MP 101.1	60 MPH.
MP 101.1 to MP 100.2	45 MPH.
MP 100.2 to MP 97.1	50 MPH.
MP 97.1 to MP 96.7	20 MPH.
MP 96.7 to MP 93.6	40 MPH.
MP 93.6 to MP 90.5	40 MPH.
MP 90.5 to MP 88.3	
MP 88.3 to MP 87.2	
MP 87.2 to MP 85.1	
MP 85.1 to MP 82.5	
MP 82.5 to MP 76.7	
MP 76.7 to MP 76.5	
MP 76.5 to MP 74.8	
MP 74.8 to MP 74.5	
MP 74.5 to MP 70.4	
MP 70.4 to MP 67.9	
MP 67.9 to MP 51.0	
MP 51.0 to MP 49.5	
MP 49.5 to MP 48.9	
MP 48.9 to MP 41.0	
MP 41.0 to MP 38.7	
MP 38.7 to MP 37.7	
MP 37.7 to MP 37.2	
MP 37.2 to MP 37.0	
MP 10.9 to MP 10.7	
MP 10.7 to MP 8.2	
MP 8.2 to MP 8.1	
MP 8.1 to MP 7.9	
MP 0.8 to MP 0.0	. 30 MPH

1(C). Speed-Switches and Turnouts

Through dual control turnouts at the following loc	ations:	
Swift, Ferndale, Bow, and English	30 MPH.	 30 MPH.
Mt. Vernon	20 MPH.	 20 MPH.

Trains over 100 TOB must not exceed 25 MPH through turnouts shown to exceed that speed.

1(D). Speed-Other

Sidings: Swift, Ferndale, Bow, and English	30 MPH.	 30 MPH.
Siding: Mt Vernon	20 MPH.	 20 MPH.
All other sidings	10 MPH.	 10 MPH.
Through turnout on G.P. Pulp Switch Track # 3302	·	 5 MPH.
Bridges 105.8, 99.1, cars heavier		
than 138 tons	25 MPH.	 25 MPH.