To: Docketing Division
From: George Martin, Grade Crossing Planner, Rail Division fu
Re: In the matter of the authorization of CSX Transportation, Indiana \& Ohio Railway, and Norfolk Southern Railway to install active grade crossing warning devices in five counties

Date: November 6, 2007
The Ohio Rail Development Commission (ORDC) has authorized the funding for CSX Transportation (CSX), Indiana \& Ohio Railway (IORY), and Norfolk Southern Railway (NS) to install active grade crossing waming devices at the following locations:

CSX
Auglaize County, Pusheta Township, Owl Creek Rd/TR 126, DOT\# 155-270D
Miami County, City of Troy, Union St, DOT\# 155-181L
Logan County, Near De Graff, CR 11, DOT\# 538-716T
IORY
Clinton County, Village of Sabina, Hulse St, DOT\# 151-936P
NS
Montgomery County, City of Miamisburg, Kercher St, DOT\# 524-650E
These crossings were surveyed by staff from the railroads, the Commission, ORDC, and local authorities and were found to warrant upgrades. Due to the complexity of the CSX project in Miami County it is anticipated that extensions will be requested.

These projects are actual cost and will be federally funded. Staff requests an Entry with plans and estimates to be submitted within 90 days and completion within one year. Upon approval of the plans and estimates by ORDC construction may commence. A suggested case coding and heading would be:

PUCO Case No. 07- $1 / 69$
-RR-FED In the malter of the authorization of CSX Transportation, Indiana \& Ohio Railway, and Norfolk Southern Railway to install active grade crossing warning devices in five counties

C: Legal Department

Please serve the following parties of record:

Ms Susan Kirkland
Ohio Rail Development Commission
50 W Broad St, $15^{\text {th }}$ Floor
Columbus, Oh 43215

## Mr Rick Ray

Norfolk Southern Railway
1200 Peachtree St NE, Box 123
Atlanta, Ga 30309

Mr Mel McNichols
CSX Transportation
500 Water St J-301
Jacksonville, F| 32202

Mr Biff Conrad

Indiana \& Ohio Railway
497 Circle Freeway Dr, Ste 230
Cincinnati, Oh 45246

Pusheta Township Trustees
14002 Pusheta Rd
Wapakoneta, Oh 45895

Steve Leffel
City of Troy
100 S Market St
PO Box 3003
Troy, Oh 45373

Logan County Engineer
1991 CR 13
PO Box 427
Bellefontaine, On 43311-0427

Mayor Dean Carnahan
99 N Howard St
Sabina, Oh 45169

Robert Stanley, City Engineer
10 N First St
Miamisburg, Oh 45342

# OHIO RAIL DEVELORMENT COMMISSION INTER-OFFICE COMMUNICATION 

TO: George Martin, Planner, Railroad Division, PUCO
FROM: Susan Kirkland, Supervisor, Rail-Highway Safety Section BY: Tim Perkins, Grade Crossing Specialist inn 40, SUBJECT: Grade Crossing Warning Projects DATE: October 24, 2007

You may authorize the railroads to proceed with the non-field work for these projects. This construction authorization is made with the stipulation and understanding that any field work needs prior approval before work begins. This authorization is made with the stipulation and understanding that an approved estimate may contain entries for items or activities that may be cited and found to be ineligible for federal participation during the project audit. The construction portion and preliminary engineering will be financed with federal Eunds.

Please initiate a one (1) year order with the plan and estimate due in ninety (90) days for the following. PUSAKTA TWP
AUG - T.R. 126, Owi Creek - CSX AAR No. 155270 D (Actual cost)
MIA - Union Street - CSX AAR No. 155181 L (Actual cost) CiTY of TRoY
LOG - C.R. 11 - CSX AAR NO. 538716 T (Actual cost) LOGAN COUNTY (NEAR DE GRAR)
CLI - Hulse street - I\&O AAR No. 151936 P (Actual cost)VhaAGE of SABLJA
MOT - Kercher Street - NS AAR No. 524650 E (75\% ORDC / 25\% NS)
Thank you for your assistance with this matter.
TP:tp
c: S. Kirkland - File

The Public Utilities Commission of Ohio

Rail Division
180 East Broad Street
Columbus, OH 43215

Diagnostic Review Team Survey
Date: $9 / 61071030 \mathrm{Am}$
Location Data


In. 114.87
On-Site Review Team

8. $\qquad$
9. $\qquad$
10. $\qquad$
Existing Traffic Control Devices


|  | Initial Information (from database) | Revised |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Number \& dates of crashes in previous 5 years | 1317107 |  |
| Hazard Ranking 121 | Date Run: $7 \times 3107$ | 112 |
| Railroad Data |  |  |
| Railroad Characteristics | Initial Information (from database) | Revised |
| Total trains per day | 22 |  |
| $<1$ per day |  |  |
| Day thru trains | 8 |  |
| Night thru trains | 13 |  |
| Daytime switching movements | 1 |  |
| Nighttime switching movements | $\infty$ |  |
| Total number of tracks | 1 |  |
| Number of main tracks | 1 |  |
| Number of other tracks | 0 |  |
| Maximum train speed | 58 |  |
| Typical train speed | 45 |  |
| Amtrak | NO |  |
| If non-gated crossing, is ciearing sight distance adequate in all quadrants? (See Table I) Xes $\square$ No |  |  |
| If multiple tracks, can two trains occupy crossing at the same time? $\square$ Yes XNo Can one train block the motorists' view of another train at crossing? $\square$ Yes (Explain below) |  |  |
| Are there other track(s) crossing this same roadway within 100 ft of this crossing? Yes $\square$ No If yes, Crossing DOT \#(ff different) $\qquad$ If yes, distance $\qquad$ (take measurement between track centerlines at closest point along roadway) |  |  |

## Roadway Data



8


Field Dimensions


Field Sketch


TABLE I
Clearing Sight Distances

| Maximum Authorized Train <br> Speed | Distance (dT) Along <br> Railroad from Crossing (ft) |
| :---: | :---: |
| $\mathrm{I}-10$ | 240 |
| 15 | 360 |
| 20 | 480 |
| 25 | 600 |
| 30 | 720 |
| 35 | 840 |
| 40 | 960 |
| 45 | 1080 |
| 50 | 1200 |
| 55 | 1320 |
| 60 | 1440 |
| 65 | 1560 |
| 70 | 1680 |
| 75 | 1800 |
| 80 | 1920 |
| 85 | 2040 |
| 90 | 2160 |

Source: R-H Grade Crossing Handbook Table 36 (pp. 132-133)
Notes:
All calculated distances are rounded up to the next higher 5foot incremene.

Distances indicated are for 65 -ft double bottom semi-tractor trailers and level single track 90 degree crossings; and may need to be adjusted for multiple tracks, skewed crossings or approaches on grades.

Clearing Sight Distance is to be measured in each vehicle travel direction at non-gated crossings as viewed from a point 25 feet from centerline of nearest track in the center of whichever travel lane is nearest the direction along track beling measured.

Table 2

## Stopping Sight Distances

| Highway Vehicle Speed | Distance (dH) Along Roadway <br> from Crossing (ft) |
| :---: | :---: |
| 0 | n/a |
| 5 | 50 |
| 10 | 70 |
| 15 | 105 |
| 20 | 135 |
| 25 | 180 |
| 30 | 225 |
| 35 | 280 |
| 40 | 340 |
| 45 | 410 |
| 50 | 490 |
| 55 | 660 |
| 65 | 760 |
| 70 | 865 |

Source: R-H Grade Crossing Handbook Table 36 (pp. 132-133)
Notes:
All calculated distances are rounded up to the next higher 5foot increment.

Distances indicated are for 65 -ft double bottom semi-tractor trailers on dry level pavements.
Stopping Sight Distance is to be measured on each roadway approach to crossing from stop bar.

The Public Utilities Commission of Ohio

Rail Division
180 East Broad Street
Columbus, OH 43215
Diagnostic Review Team Survey $\frac{\text { DEBBIE SWAN } 937,335}{\text { S }}$
Date: $9 / 6 / 07 \quad 1725$
Location Data


OnSite Review Team
(Include; Name - Organization - Phone Number)

4. BOp ROScMATN CSKT 944-359-1/C6
5. NEM E. TEATORD CITY of TROY 937-339-2641
6. STEVE LEFFE U " " " " "
7. $\qquad$
8. $\qquad$
9. $\qquad$
10. $\qquad$
Existing Traffic Control Devices




Is it the consensus of the Diagnostic Review Team that this is a potential closure project: No $\square$ Yes
Explain reasons:

Type of Development


Utility Information


Field Dimensions



TABLE I
Clearing Sight Distances

| Maximum Auchorized Train <br> Speed | Distance (JT) Along <br> Railroad from Crossing ( f ) |
| :---: | :---: |
| $1-10$ | 240 |
| 15 | 360 |
| 20 | 480 |
| 25 | 600 |
| 30 | 720 |
| 35 | 840 |
| 40 | 960 |
| 45 | 1080 |
| 50 | 1200 |
| 55 | 1320 |
| 60 | 1440 |
| 65 | 1560 |
| 70 | 1680 |
| 75 | 1800 |
| 80 | 1920 |
| 85 | 2040 |
| 90 | 2160 |

Source: R-H Grade Crossing Handbook Table 36 (pp. 132-133)
Notes:
All calculated distances are rounded up to the next higher 5foot increment.

Distances indicated are for 65 -ft double bottom semi-cractor trailers and level single track 90 degree crossings; and may need to be adjusted for multiple tracks, skewed crossings or approaches on grades.

Clearing Sight Distance is to be measured in each vehicle travel direction at non-gated crossinga as viewed from a point 25 feet from centerline of nearest track in the center of whichever travel lane is nearest the direction along track being measured.

Table 2
Stopping Sight Dlstances

| Highway Vehicle Speed | Distance (dH) Along Raadway <br> from Crossing (ft) |
| :---: | :---: |
| 0 | n/a |
| 5 | 50 |
| 10 | 70 |
| 15 | 105 |
| 20 | 135 |
| 25 | 180 |
| 30 | 225 |
| 35 | 280 |
| 40 | 340 |
| 45 | 410 |
| 50 | 490 |
| 55 | 570 |
| 60 | 660 |
| 65 | 76 |
| 70 |  |

Source: R-H Grade Crossing Handbook Table 36 (pp. 132-133)

## Notes:

All calculated distances are rounded up to the next higher 5foot increment.

Distances indicated are for 65 -ft double bottom semi-tractor trailers on dry level pavements.
Stopping Sight Distance is to be measured on each roadway approach to crossing from stop bar.

The Public Utilities Commission of Ohio

Rail Division
180 East Broad Street
Columbines, OH 43215
Sean coleman 937-592-

Diagnostic Review Team Survey $\quad 1$

Location Data


Existing Traffic Control Devices

Safety Data（Obtain crash reports，if possible，prior to review）

|  | Initial Information（from database） | Revised |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Number \＆dates of crashes in prevous 5 years | 18106 |  |
| Hazard Ranking 37 | Date Run： $7 / 36107$ |  |

Railroad Data

| Railroad Characteristics | Initial Information（from database） | Revised |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Total trains per day | 39 |  |
| ＜I per day |  |  |
| Day thru trains | 16 |  |
| Night thru trains | 19 |  |
| Daytime switching movements | 2 |  |
| Nighttime switching movements | 2 |  |
| Tocal number of tracks | 2 |  |
| Number of main tracks | 2 |  |
| Number of other tracks | 0 |  |
| Maximum tralin speed | 60 |  |
| Typlcal train speed | 50 |  |
| Amtrak |  |  |
| If non－gated crossing，is clearing sight distance adequate in all quadrants？（See Table 1）区 Yes：$\square$ No |  |  |
| If multiple tracks，can two trains occupy crossing at the same time？区Yes$\square$ No |  | PAS |
| Are there other track（s）crossing this If yes，Crossing DOT \＃（fif differen If yes，distance $\qquad$ （tal | dway within 100 ft of this crossing？ <br> ement between track centerlines at close | \|way) |

## Roadway Data



1


## Utility Information



## Diagnostic Team Recommendations

| Install/upgrade active devices |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| $\square$ Automatic Flashing Lights (AFLS) |  |
| $\square$ AFLS /Cants |  |
| $\square$ AFLS / Gates |  |
| $\square$ ARLS / Gates / Cants |  |
| $\square$ Upgrade circuitry |  |
| $\square$ Sidelights |  |
| $\square$ Guardrail Needed |  |
| $\square$ Install/Replace curb |  |
| $\square$ Other (define) |  |
| Comments: |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
| $\square$ Install/upgrade traffic signal preemption |  |
| $\square$ No improvements needed |  |
| $\square$ Other (define) |  |




Crossing Angle $\square$
$\square$
Sketch by: $1 / \mathrm{M}$

TABLEI
Clearing Sight Distances

| Maximum Authorized Train <br> Speed | Distance (dT) Along <br> Railroad from Crossing (f) |
| :---: | :---: |
| $1-10$ | 240 |
| 15 | 360 |
| 20 | 480 |
| 25 | 600 |
| 30 | 720 |
| 35 | 840 |
| 40 | 960 |
| 45 | 1080 |
| 50 | 1200 |
| 55 | 1320 |
| 60 | 1440 |
| 65 | 1560 |
| 70 | 1680 |
| 75 | 1800 |
| 80 | 1920 |
| 85 | 2040 |
| 90 | 2160 |

Source: R-H Grade Crossing Handbook Table 36 (pp. 132-133)
Notes:
All calculated distances are rounded up to the next higher 5foot increment.

Distances indicated are for 65 -ft double bottom semi-tractior trallers and level single track 90 degree crossings; and may need to be adjusted for multiple tracks, skewed crossings or approaches on grades.
Clearing Sight Distance is to be measured in each vehicle travel direction at non-eated crossinge as viewed from a point 25 feet from centerline of nearest track in the center of whichever travel lane is nearest the direction along track being measured.

Table 2
Stopping Sight Distances

| Highway Vehicie Speed | Distance (dH) Along Roadway <br> from Crossing ( ft ) |
| :---: | :---: |
| 0 | $\mathrm{n} / \mathrm{a}$ |
| 5 | 50 |
| 10 | 70 |
| 15 | 105 |
| 20 | 135 |
| 25 | 180 |
| 30 | 225 |
| 35 | 280 |
| 40 | 340 |
| 45 | 410 |
| 50 | 490 |
| 55 | 570 |
| 60 | 660 |
| 65 | 760 |
| 70 | 865 |

Source: R-H Grade Crossing Handbook Table 36 (pp. 132-133)
Notes:
All calculated distances are rounded up to the next higher 5 foot increment.

Distances indicated are for 65 -ft double bottom semi-tractor trailers on dry level pavements.
Stopping Sight Distance is to be measured on each roadway approach to crossing from stop bar.

The Public Utilities Commission of Ohio

Rail Division
180 East Broad Street
Columbus, OH 43215

Diagnostic Review Team Survey $97-302-0840$
Bob $D$ 私
Date:
Location Data


OnSite Review Team

6. $\qquad$
7. $\qquad$
8. $\qquad$
9. $\qquad$
10. $\qquad$
Existing Traffic Control Devices


Safety Data (Obtain crash reports, if possible, prior to review)


## Railroad Data



## Roadway Data

Local Highway Authority: (Who maintains this roadway?)
VILLAGE OF SABINA


| Quadrant $\qquad$ <br> Curb and Gutter: $\square$ Functional (Curb height $=\mathbf{4}^{\prime \prime}$ or more) Non-functional (Curb height $=$ Less than $4^{\prime \prime}$ ) <br> None | Quadrant $\qquad$ <br> Curb and Gutter: $\square$ Functional (Curb height $=4^{\prime \prime}$ or more) Non-functional (Curb height $=$ Less than $4^{\prime \prime}$ ) None |
| :---: | :---: |
| Pedestrians: $\square$ No $\square$ Yes |  |
| Is sidewalk present? $\square$ No $\square$ Yes |  |
| Is there a nearby intersection that could cause queuing over the If yes, <br> Distance $\qquad$ <br> Is this incersection signalized? $\square$ No <br> Are the signals currently interconnected with the existing cros | $\square$ No $\square$ Yes <br> $g$ warning devices? $\square$ INo Yes |
| Is it the consensus of the Diagnostic Review Team that this is a p Explain reasons: | 开tial closure project $\square$ Yos |
| Type of Development |  |
| $\square$ Open Space $\square$ Institurional Location of nearty <br> $\square]$ Industrial $\square$ Commercial  <br> $\varnothing$ Residential   | schools: $1 / 4 \text { MLL }$ |
| Utility Information |  |
| Is commercial power avallable? <br> Utlity Provider (Company Name) <br> Nearest Available Power Source $\qquad$ <br> What other utilities are present? $\qquad$ 06 <br> CAB Is there potential utility conflict(s) <br> Yes $\square$ No <br> Dou | Phone Number $\qquad$ |
| Diagnostic Team Recommendations |  |
| 7 | Quadrants Needed |
| D Inscall/upgrade active devices |  |
| $7 \square$ Automatic Flashing Lights (AFLS) |  |
| $\square$ AFLS/Cants |  |
| \#/ AFLS/Gates |  |
| 17 AFLS/Gates / Cants |  |
| [] Upgrade circuitry |  |
| $\square$ Sidelights |  |
| $\square$ Guardrail Needed |  |
| $\square$ Install/Replace curb |  |
| $\square$ Other (define) |  |
| Comments: |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
| $\square$ Install/upgrade traffic signal preemption |  |
| $\square$ No Improvements needed |  |
| $\square$ Other (define) |  |



Field Sketch


Crossing Angle $\square$ 42 Quadrant?
Sketch by $A M M$

TABLEI
Clearing Sight Distances

| Maximum Authorized Train <br> Speed | Distance (d) Along <br> Railroad from Crossing (f) |
| :---: | :---: |
| $1-10$ | 240 |
| 15 | 360 |
| 20 | 480 |
| 25 | 600 |
| 30 | 720 |
| 35 | 840 |
| 40 | 960 |
| 45 | 1080 |
| 50 | 1200 |
| 55 | 1320 |
| 60 | 1440 |
| 65 | 1560 |
| 70 | 1680 |
| 75 | 1800 |
| 80 | 1920 |
| 85 | 2040 |
| 90 | 2160 |

Source: R-H Grade Crossing Handbook Table 36 (pp. 132-133)

## Notes:

All calculated distances are rounded up to the next higher 5foot increment.

Distances indicated are for 65-ft double bottom semi-tractor trailers and level single track 90 degree crossings; and may need to be adjusted for multiple tracks, skewed crossings or approaches on grades.

Clearing Sight Distance is to be measured in each vehicle travel direction at non-gated crossings as viewed from a point 25 feet from centerline of nearest track in the center of whichever cravel lane is nearest the direction along crack being measured.

Table 2
Stopping Sight Distances

| Highway Vehicle Speed | Distance (dH) Along Roadway <br> from Crossing (ft) |
| :---: | :---: |
| 0 | n/a |
| 5 | 50 |
| 10 | 70 |
| 15 | 105 |
| 20 | 135 |
| 25 | 180 |
| 30 | 225 |
| 35 | 280 |
| 40 | 340 |
| 45 | 410 |
| 50 | 490 |
| 55 | 570 |
| 60 | 660 |
| 65 | 760 |
| 70 | 865 |

Source: R-H Grade Crossing Handtook Table 36 (pp. |32-133)

## Notes:

All calculated distances are rounded up to the next higher 5foot increment.

Distances indicated are for 65-ft double bottom semi-tractor trailers on dry level pavements.

Stopping Sight Distance is to be measured on each roadway approach to crossing from stop bar.

Public Utilities Commission of Ohio

The Public Utilities Commission of Ohio

Safety Data (Obtain crash reports, if possible, prior to review)

|  | Initial Information (from database) | Revised |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Number \& dates of crashes in previous 5 years | 16181041 |  |
| Hazard Ranking 90 | Date Run: $7 / 3107$ | 86 |
| Railroad Data |  |  |
| Railroad Characteristics | Initial Information (from database) | Revised |
| Total trains per day | 18. |  |
| < I per day |  |  |
| Day thru trains | 6 |  |
| Night thru trains | 10 |  |
| Daytime switching movements | 2 |  |
| Nighttime switching movements | 0 |  |
| Total number of tracks | 2 |  |
| Number of main tracks | 2 |  |
| Number of other tracks | 0 |  |
| Maximum train speed | 45 |  |
| Typical train speed | 45 |  |
| Amtrak |  |  |
| If non-gated crossing, is clearing sight distance adequate in all quadrants? (See Table I) |  | No (NE |


|  |
| :---: |
|  |  |

Are there other track(s) crossing this same roadway within 100 ft of this crossing? $\square$ Yes No
If yes, Crossing DOT \#(if different)
If yes, distance ____ (take measurement between track centerlines at closest point along roadway)

## Roadway Data



| $\qquad$ N $\square$ Functional（Curb height $=4$＂or more） Non－functional（Curb height $=$ Less than $4^{1 "}$ ） None | Quadrant $\qquad$ <br> Curb and Gutter：$\chi^{\prime}$ Functional（Curb height $=4^{\prime \prime}$ or more） Non－functional（Curb height $=$ Less than $4^{\prime \prime}$ ） None |
| :---: | :---: |
| Pedestrians：$\square$ No ${ }^{\text {N }}$ Yes |  |
| Is sidewalk present？$\square^{\text {No }}$ N $\nabla^{\text {a }}$ Yes |  |
| Is there a nearby intersection that could cause queuing over the crossing？No $\square$ Yes If yes， <br> Distance $\qquad$ <br> Is this intersection signalized？ $\square$ No <br> Are the signals currently interconnected with the existing crossing warning devices？No Yes |  |
| Is it the consensus of the Diagnostic Review Team that this is a p Explain reasons： | tential closure project：$X N_{0} \quad \square$ Yes |
| Type of Development |  |
| $\square$ Open Space $\square$ institutional Location of nearby <br> Q Induscrial $\square$ Commercial  <br> $母$ Residential   | schools： |
| Utility Information |  |
| Is commercial power available？ $\square$ № $x^{\text {Yes }}$ <br> Utility Provider（Company Name） $\qquad$ DP $\Delta P \& L$ <br> Nearest Available Power Source $\qquad$ <br>  <br> What other utilities are present？ $\square$ IT CROSSing NEW GISct <br> Is there potential utility conflict（s） $\qquad$ $\square$ No DUnknown |  |
| Diagnostic Team Recommendations |  |
| 7 | Quadrants Needed |
| D Install／upgrade active devicos |  |
| $\square$ Automatc Flashing Lights（AFLS） |  |
|  |  |
| －${ }^{\text {a }}$ AFLS／Gates |  |
| $\square$ AFLS／Gates／Cants |  |
| $\square$ Upgrade circulitry |  |
| $\square$ Sidelights |  |
| $\square$ Guardrail Needed |  |
| $\square$ Insall／Replace curb |  |
| $\square$ Other（define） |  |
| Comments： |  |
|  |  |
| $\square$ Installupgrade trafic signal preemption |  |
| $\square$ No improvements needed |  |
| Other（define） |  |
| WARNING SUUN TATAT WAS MISSWOB |  |




TABLE I
Clearing Sight Distances

| Maximum Authorized Train <br> Speed | Distance (dT) Along <br> Railroad from Crossing (ft) |
| :---: | :---: |
| $1-10$ | 240 |
| 15 | 360 |
| 20 | 480 |
| 25 | 600 |
| 30 | 720 |
| 35 | 840 |
| 40 | 960 |
| 45 | 1080 |
| 50 | 1200 |
| 55 | 1320 |
| 60 | 1440 |
| 65 | 1560 |
| 70 | 1680 |
| 75 | 1800 |
| 80 | 1920 |
| 85 | 2040 |
| 90 | 2160 |

Source: R-H Grade Crossing Handbook Table 36 (pp. I 32-133)

## Notes:

All calculated distances are rounded up to the next higher 5foot increment.

Distances indicated are for 65 -ft double bottom semi-tractor trailers and level single track 90 degree crossings; and may need to be adjusted for multiple tracks, skewed crossings or approaches on grades.
Clearing Sight Distance is to be measured in each vehicle travel direction at non-gated crossings as viewed from a point 25 feet from centerline of nearest track in the center of whichever travel lane is nearest the direction along track being measured.

Table 2
Stopping Sight Distances

| Higtway Vehicle Speed | Distance (dH) Along Roadway <br> from Crossing (f) |
| :---: | :---: |
| 0 | n/a |
| 5 | 50 |
| 10 | 70 |
| 15 | 105 |
| 20 | 135 |
| 25 | 180 |
| 30 | 225 |
| 35 | 280 |
| 40 | 340 |
| 45 | 410 |
| 50 | 490 |
| 55 | 570 |
| 60 | 660 |
| 65 | 760 |
| 70 | 865 |

Source: R-H Grade Crossing Handbook Table 36 (pp. 132-133)
Notes:
All calculated distances are rounded up to the next higher 5foot increment.

Distances indicated are for 65-ft double bottom semi-tractor trailers on dry level pavements.
Stopping Sight Distance is to be measured on each roadway approach to crossing from stop bar.

