BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF OHIO

In the Matter of the Petition :
 of CSX Transportation, Inc. :
 to Close to Vehicular Traffic :

the Bloomingrove/New

Winchester Road Grade : Case No. 14-0379-RR-UNC Crossing (DOT No. 262042J), :

Crossing (DOT No. 262042J),
Located in Washington
Township, Morrow County,
Ohio.

- - -

PROCEEDINGS

Before Bryce A. McKenney, Attorney Examiner, at the Public Utilities Commission of Ohio, 180 East Broad Street, Room 11-C, Columbus, Ohio, called at 10:00 a.m. on Tuesday, March 3, 2015.

- - -

ARMSTRONG & OKEY, INC.

222 East Town Street, Second Floor
Columbus, Ohio 43215-4620
(614) 224-9481 - (800) 223-9481
Fax - (614) 224-5724

_ _ _

```
2
 1
      APPEARANCES:
 2
                Dickie, McCamey & Chilcote, P.C.
                By R. Leland Evans, Esq.
                and Eric Thompson, Esq.
 3
                2109 Stella Court
 4
                Columbus, Ohio 43215
 5
                     On behalf of CSX Transportation, Inc.
 6
                Morrow County Prosecutor
                By Charles S. Howland, Esq.
 7
                60 East High Street
                Mt. Gilead, Ohio 43338
 8
                     On behalf of Morrow County, Ohio.
 9
10
           Also Present:
11
                Doug Weisenauer, Crawford County
                  Commissioner;
                Rusty Orben, CSX Transportation, Inc.
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
```

				3
1	INDEX			
2 3 4	WITNESSES: Amanda Decesare		PAGE	
5	Direct Examination by Mr. Evans Cross-Examination by Mr. Howland Redirect Examination by Mr. Evans		24 62 69	
7				
8	CSX EXHIBITS	ID'D	REC'D	
	1 - Deposition of Patrick Duffner	8	10	
9	2 - Deposition of Jeffrey Sparks	8	10	
	3 - Deposition of Steven Brenneman	8	10	
11	4 - Deposition of Dean Van Horn	8	10	
12	5 - Deposition of Scott Kent	9	10	
13	6 - Deposition of Chief Brian Satterfield	9	10	
14	7 - Deposition of Chief Phillip Jackson	9	10	
15	8 - Deposition of Rick Fox	9	10	
16	9 - Deposition of Steven Smith	9	10	
1718	10- Letter to Robert Kidd	10	61	
19	11- Letter to Robert Kidd	10	61	
20	12- Aerial Map	27	61	
21	13- Photograph	29	61	
22	14- Photograph	31	61	
23	15- Photograph	31	61	
23	16- Diagnostic Review Team Survey	34	61	
25	17- 4-20-12 Letter to Mr. Bush from Mr. Dietrich with Attachments	42	61	

Armstrong & Okey, Inc., Columbus, Ohio (614) 224-9481

				4
1		INDEX (Continued)		7
2				
3	CSX	EXHIBITS	ID'D	REC'D
4	18-	10-25-13 Letter to Mr. Whiston from Mr. Dietrich	42	61
5 6	19-	12-24-13 Letter to Mr. Whiston from Mr. Evans	42	61
7	20-	Map of Morrow County	45	61
8	21-	Map of Crawford County	45	61
9	22-	Petition for Closure	50	61
10				
11				
12				
13				
14				
15				
16				
17				
18				
19				
20				
21				
22				
23				
24				
25				

Tuesday Morning Session,

March 3, 2015.

EXAMINER McKENNEY: Let's go on the record.

2.0

2.1

Good morning. The Public Utilities

Commission of Ohio calls for hearing at this time and place Case No. 14-379-RR-UNC, being In the Matter of the Petition of CSX Transportation, Inc. to Close to Vehicular Traffic the Bloomingrove/Winchester

Road Grade Crossing (Department of Transportation

No. 262042J), Located in Washington Township, Morrow County, Ohio.

My name is Bryce McKenney, I'm the
Attorney-Examiner assigned by the Commission to hear
this case. Also with me this morning is Megan
Addison, she's a law clerk with the Commission's
Legal Department.

At this time I'd like to take the appearances of the parties. On behalf of the Company.

MR. EVANS: Thank you, Your Honor. Lee Evans, here on behalf of CSX Transportation, along with Eric Thompson from my office, and with us on behalf of the Company today are Amanda Decesare and

6 Rusty Orben, both with CSX. 1 2 EXAMINER McKENNEY: Thank you. Yes, 3 sir. 4 MR. HOWLAND: Charles Howland, Morrow 5 County Prosecuting Attorney, on behalf of Morrow County, Ohio. 6 7 EXAMINER McKENNEY: Thank you, 8 Mr. Howland. 9 Before we proceed any further, are there 10 any motions to address? Mr. Howland, if you have a motion, this would be the time to make it. 11 12 MR. HOWLAND: Well, we would like to ask 13 for a motion to intervene so we can be heard in this 14 matter today. 15 EXAMINER McKENNEY: Thank you, 16 Mr. Howland. 17 Any objection to that? 18 MR. EVANS: There is no objection, Your 19 Honor. 2.0 EXAMINER McKENNEY: Motion to intervene 2.1 will be granted. 22 Pursuant to the entry I issued previously in this case, we had discussed -- in 23 24 discussions at the prehearing conference, we

discussed admitting deposition testimony in place of

having these people come in as long as the railroad certifies that there's no objection to the admission of those.

2.0

2.1

Would you like to mark those depositions at this time?

MR. EVANS: Your Honor, there has been no opposition. We've filed with the Public Utilities Commission the transcripts themselves, along with the correspondence confirming the agreement with respect to the admission of those exhibits, and — or depositions. It would be our understanding that they are, based upon that agreement and Your Honor's previous ruling, to be considered as if the witnesses were here to testify today.

I don't know that we have them separately marked as exhibits today because they're on file, but we can certainly get a copy marked if that's the way you would like us to proceed.

EXAMINER McKENNEY: Okay. I have a list of the witnesses that you have filed. I just want to make sure we go ahead and make sure we don't miss any of them.

MR. EVANS: Sure.

 $\hbox{ EXAMINER McKENNEY: So I'm going to go} \\ \hbox{ahead and read through that list. I will mark them }$

```
8
      as I notify. Please let me know if I miss any of
 1
 2
     them.
 3
                   The first one will be Patrick Duffner;
 4
      is that correct?
 5
                   MR. EVANS: That's correct.
                   EXAMINER McKENNEY: That would be CSX
 6
 7
     Exhibit 1.
 8
                   (EXHIBIT MARKED FOR IDENTIFICATION.)
 9
                   EXAMINER McKENNEY: Next I have Jeffrey
10
      Sparks; is that correct?
                   MR. EVANS: That's correct.
11
12
                   EXAMINER McKENNEY: That will be CSX
13
     Exhibit 2.
14
                   (EXHIBIT MARKED FOR IDENTIFICATION.)
15
                   EXAMINER McKENNEY: Next I have Steven
16
      Brenneman.
17
                   MR. EVANS: That's correct.
18
                   EXAMINER McKENNEY: CSX Exhibit 3.
19
                   (EXHIBIT MARKED FOR IDENTIFICATION.)
2.0
                   EXAMINER McKENNEY: Dean Van Horn.
2.1
                   MR. EVANS: Correct.
22
                   EXAMINER McKENNEY: CSX Exhibit 4.
23
                   (EXHIBIT MARKED FOR IDENTIFICATION.)
24
                   EXAMINER McKENNEY: Scott Kent.
25
                   MR. EVANS: That's correct.
```

```
EXAMINER McKENNEY: CSX Exhibit 5.
 1
 2
                   (EXHIBIT MARKED FOR IDENTIFICATION.)
 3
                   EXAMINER McKENNEY: Chief Brian
 4
      Satterfield.
                   MR. EVANS: That's correct.
 5
 6
                   EXAMINER McKENNEY: CSX Exhibit 6.
 7
                   (EXHIBIT MARKED FOR IDENTIFICATION.)
 8
                   EXAMINER McKENNEY: Chief Phillip
 9
      Jackson.
10
                   MR. EVANS: That's correct.
11
                   EXAMINER McKENNEY: CSX Exhibit 7.
12
                   (EXHIBIT MARKED FOR IDENTIFICATION.)
13
                   EXAMINER McKENNEY: Rick Fox.
14
                   MR. EVANS: That's correct.
15
                   EXAMINER McKENNEY: CSX Exhibit 8.
16
                   (EXHIBIT MARKED FOR IDENTIFICATION.)
17
                   EXAMINER McKENNEY: Next is Steven
18
      Smith; is that correct?
19
                   MR. EVANS: That's correct.
2.0
                   EXAMINER McKENNEY: CSX Exhibit 9.
2.1
                   (EXHIBIT MARKED FOR IDENTIFICATION.)
22
                   EXAMINER McKENNEY: That's all the
23
      subpoenas that I see listed in the docket. Is there
24
      anyone else that you have?
                   MR. EVANS: No, Your Honor. That's a
25
```

```
complete list of both the subpoenas, as well as the
 1
 2
      depositions that have been filed of record with the
 3
      PUCO.
 4
                   EXAMINER McKENNEY: Okay. Mr. Howland,
 5
      is there any objection to the admission of these
      exhibits?
 6
 7
                   MR. HOWLAND: No objection, Your Honor.
 8
                   EXAMINER McKENNEY:
                                       Thank you. They
      will each be so admitted into the record in this
 9
10
     proceeding.
                   I also see that there are two letters
11
12
      indicating that there would be no objection from
13
     Mr. Kidd on behalf of Crawford County Assistant
      Prosecutor. I'd like to have those marked as CSX
14
      Exhibit 10, CSX Exhibit 11.
15
16
                   (EXHIBIT MARKED FOR IDENTIFICATION.)
17
                   EXAMINER McKENNEY: Objection to the
18
      admission of those, Mr. Howland?
19
                   MR. HOWLAND: No, Your Honor.
2.0
                   EXAMINER McKENNEY: They will also be
2.1
      admitted.
22
                   Mr. Evans, is there anything further
      from the railroad?
23
24
                   MR. EVANS: Yes, Your Honor. Depending
25
      on the Hearing Examiner's wishes here, my thought was
```

to provide brief, in essence, opening comments regarding kind of the order of proof today, as well as what we believe the evidence will show in a brief fashion, and call our one witness — live witness today, Ms. Decesare.

2.0

2.1

EXAMINER McKENNEY: Thank you. It's uncommon to have an opening statement, we usually just take the witness, but if you would like to make a brief statement I'd be happy to hear it.

MR. EVANS: Okay. Thank you, Your Honor.

Briefly, first we appreciate the understanding and agreement of the Hearing Examiner and the Counties with respect to the submission of the deposition testimony. We deposed, as you noted, I think nine individuals, all properly noticed and sworn under oath, and we — particularly given the weather as it turns out today, but we simply didn't see a need to inconvenience those people here again to come down for this live testimony. So we appreciate that.

We believe that that testimony is intended to address the issues that we heard and listened carefully to when we attended the two public hearings that Your Honor scheduled and conducted in

Morrow and Crawford County last summer.

2.0

2.1

My intent this morning is basically to discuss the upshot of that testimony and how it fits into the issue at hand under the Ohio Revised Code, which it relates to there not being a demonstrable need for this crossing. If I may just approach the maps for a moment.

EXAMINER McKENNEY: Sure.

MR. EVANS: We've marked as exhibits, and we're going to have to renumber them, which we will do as we get into them, but we marked as exhibits a map of Morrow County as well as a map of Crawford County. These were used during some of the depositions that were taken.

Just to orient ourselves here, if I don't kick it over, the tracks in question are up at this far northwest corner of Morrow County. And I apologize if the prosecutor -- can you see this okay?

MR. HOWLAND: Yes.

MR. EVANS: And you know where it is actually.

MR. HOWLAND: Yes. I'm familiar with the location, yes.

MR. EVANS: So the tracks that we're talking about angle across the northwest corner here,

and essentially form this little triangle along with the -- bordered between the Crawford County and Morrow -- or, Marion County to the west.

2.0

2.1

We -- based upon what we heard at the public hearing, and based upon the factors listed in the Ohio Revised Code section, the depositions were designed to primarily get at, address the question of kind of that Factor No. 8 having to do with impact, if any, upon emergency medical services, fire, police, school, sort of the community in the vicinity of a crossing as a whole, I guess you could say the catchall Category 9 as well. And the rest of the items, which we will go through this morning's testimony under the statute, the first seven factors, I believe we provided the evidence as exhibits to our petition, but Ms. Decesare will testify this morning with respect to those as well.

In a nutshell, addressing these issues, we believe that the evidence will show both today and upon review of the transcripts that in terms of EMS and fire, as the Hearing Examiner knows, this crossing is County Line Road, and so the north side would be Crawford County, south side, Morrow County. So just as you had two public hearings, it was necessary for us to talk to representatives from kind

of both counties, and we did so.

2.0

2.1

The upshot of that is that on the Crawford County side, the EMS response and fire response comes from the Galion Fire Department. And they already, to get out to the western portions on the Crawford County side, would head west out of Galion on one of several roads and cut down to that area to get to this area to the west on Taylor Road, which runs — it's more visible on the Crawford County map, but it runs north and south and comes down into this triangular area that we're talking about, intersects with County Line Road. So that's the — that is the route per their testimony that they would already take.

There is one residence, as you know,
Mr. Fox's residence is just compassed north of the
crossing; so it's Crawford County side. It would be
a Crawford County response typically if they had a
fire or EMS issue.

And the record reflects that they have actually had one or two issues over a number of years, 10 or 15 years, to that residence. They have gone on those instances down to County Line Road on 309 and 61, and then west and across this crossing. But the -- the evidence will show through the

testimony of Chief Jackson that he is perfectly comfortable with the route -- taking the route to Mr. Fox's residence that would be similar to the rest of the residences out there, which would involve going west and then down Taylor Road, and back in slightly on County Road -- County Line Road to Mr. Fox's residence. He acknowledges that the -- any slight addition in length is kind of offset by the fact that there's no grade crossings in that route; so there's no potential for being stopped by either a moving or a stopped train, either at the crossing in question or they would have had to have crossed a crossing at 309 and 61. So -- and that's his testimony both in relation to fire and EMS response from the Crawford County side.

2.0

2.1

On the Morrow County side, the evidence is, through EMS Chief Sparks and through the Iberia Volunteer Fire Department and Assistant Chief Smith, that their response to this northwest corner, that little triangle area within Morrow County up to the south side of County Line Road would be typically from Iberia where the volunteer fire department houses its trucks and they share a bay or rent a bay, whatever their arrangement is, but out of that same building is where the Morrow County EMS would respond

to this area. There are various stations throughout the county where Morrow County EMS has locations. The closest one to this area is in Iberia. So they're starting in the same location.

2.0

2.1

The evidence will show, we believe, that EMS testimony from Chief Sparks was clear that he would travel up 30 to 31 to 32, which 32 has various names, it's called Keifer Road in Morrow County, it's got the County Road designation, 32, and if you take the same road on up into Morrow County it's called Iberia Road, but they're all one in the same. So his testimony, we believe, shows that EMS-wise that is how they would respond.

Assistant Fire Chief Smith said that that is also a route that they would use in good weather, or certainly could use in good weather. His only concern was, as you'll see in his testimony, was on a particularly snowy day he has some concern about the extent to which the county roads are plowed as compared to a state route.

His testimony in that regard, however, and there's a letter which is in the Public Utility Commission docket that was submitted as part of his testimony, he looked at three different routes. On a snowy day, he said they sometimes will take 309 from

Iberia over to 361 and 309 and go on up and go east on County Line Road, which would involve this crossing. They have done that before on bad weather days.

2.0

2.1

But his testimony is that there are -there is another route that is essentially the same
distance, I think it's three-tenths of a mile longer.
His time, as reflected in his testimony and in his
letter that he submitted to the PUCO, is that the
time involved, approximately eight minutes to get
there, is the same whether he would go the route I
just described or go west to State Route 100, which
is slightly into Marion County and go on up to County
Line Road and come in that way.

So we believe that the testimony regarding fire, EMS response, be it from Crawford County or Morrow County, is such that there are other equally as good, if not in some instances better because of the fact that there's no blocked crossings or potentially blocked crossings, that there are alternative routes that are just as good for EMS and fire.

Quickly shifting to police, sheriff's department, that type of response. I think it's clear, as we understand from talking to both county

sheriffs, that on any given day at any given time they typically have several deputy sheriffs out in cruisers cruising their county. Although they roughly divide them up into sort of territories that they are nominally assigned to, the testimony is that because of events and responding to things, that at any given moment they could be at any point really within their jurisdiction.

2.0

2.1

So it becomes -- there's not a defined route that they would be taking if there was some need to get to this corner or in the vicinity of this corner if it's on the Crawford County side. But what is clear from their testimony, and what we believe the evidence would show, is that they -- there is always a route available, I mean, and they -- they can always get to point -- from Point A to Point B.

And they acknowledge that there is some certainty, if this crossing were to be closed pursuant to the PUCO's decision, they would know that this is a closed crossing and they would plan their route accordingly. They would not have to have that potential situation of trying to use this route, getting there, finding there to be either a moving train or a temporarily stationary train.

Regarding the farming in the area, there

was some testimony regarding that at the Public

Utilities Commission, so we deposed -- public

hearing. So we deposed Mr. Fox about that, because

in addition to being a resident very close to the

crossing, he also farms a considerable number of

acres on his property and is familiar with the

farming operations in the area.

2.0

2.1

We believe the evidence shows, based upon his testimony, that first of all in terms of his operation, if folks come in as they do to pick up crop, which we understand to be primarily hay, that they come in usually in large pickup trucks and — and trailers, and they actually pull in his driveway. This is an aerial photograph of the crossing, and this being Mr. Fox's driveway that leads back to his residence. They pull back into there, are able to turn around, get loaded up and pull back out.

He's also aware that there are larger farming operations west of him out County Line Road west of Taylor Road. And his testimony is that he knows that those farming operations have semis come in currently to pick up those crops, and that the typical — you know, weather permitting, the typical procedure for that involves taking the semi actually out onto the field, getting loaded up such that

they're able to turn around and come out head first and head whichever direction. Our point, I guess, being that those trucks are already operating under existing conditions in and about the roads that are out in this northwest corner of the county.

2.0

2.1

Mr. -- we -- otherwise, the evidence will show that Mr. Fox, you know, his primary concern was emergency and fire response. His testimony, you will find, we believe the evidence is, that he is -- if the chief -- Chief Jackson from Galion Fire and EMS is satisfied with his ability to respond, then he would be satisfied with the ability to respond.

He pointed out that there may be actually some advantages to him to closure in terms of fewer -- and the train horns would not be as close to his residence, it would be more private back there. And he has found that there is some debris that -- with cars -- that he testified was primarily from cars passing through that people would use this currently sometimes as a dump, and he believes that that may decrease if the traffic through that area is decreased as a result of closure. So he sees it somewhat, I suppose, as a mixed bag. We believe that's the -- the evidence from Mr. Fox, but the evidence is clear that he is the only nearby property

owner in the vicinity of the crossing.

2.0

2.1

I think I have touched on the main -oh, school transportation. We talked to the
transportation directors of both the schools -school districts; Northmor Schools on the northern
part of Morrow County and the Crawford City Schools
on the Crawford side.

The evidence, we believe, will show that the Crawford side -- well, first of all, neither district as of the time of the depositions was using the crossing for a school bus use, normal routes.

The Crawford County bus transportation director testified that -- I mean, there's some history there that precedes him, but it appeared to him that they actually have consciously, based upon looking at how the routes run, consciously routed around this crossing.

The transportation director from

Northmor did not say that that was a specific

strategy to route around it. He did, however,

testify, having been a bus driver himself -- and I

think this is of some note in terms of the

crossing -- that in order for a school bus to square

up at this crossing, no matter whether you're going

from east to west on County Line Road or west to

east, it's necessary to square up, that you have to essentially go left of center in a school bus in order to be able to get to the point where you have enough room to see. So that's part of, we believe, his testimony, and it exemplifies part of the kind of underlying safety issues related to this particular crossing.

2.0

2.1

The only other point I would make, Your Honor, because there was a little bit of testimony about this, and as Your Honor knows, I think, located on the northwest side of the crossing there is a small substation, I guess is the term I would use, related to the underground pipelines that run in that area.

The evidence shows, first of all, that that's been there — according to Mr. Fox who's lived where he lives for 20-some years, this has been there for somewhere around 10 or 12 years. There's never been an incident of any kind related to that. He's never been told that there is more likelihood of an incident there than there would be perhaps anywhere along the pipeline.

The same is true with respect to the county fire and EMS personnel that were deposed, that they're not aware of any -- they've never been

advised of any particular concerns in that regard, or been provided any specific additional training or things they need to be aware of with respect to that particular location. Of course, if something happened and they needed to get there, the response route to that location, I've already addressed in terms of it would be similar to getting to Mr. Fox's residence, whether it be Crawford County responding or Morrow County responding up into this area and coming across to the location where the substation is located.

2.0

2.1

So we believe that those are -- the evidence will show those things, either in the form of testimony from Ms. Decesare today or in the testimony from the deponents admitted pursuant to deposition, which we understand will be given the same weight and credence as if they came in here today based upon the agreement.

So with that, I would close, and unless you have any questions or anything further you want to do, we would call our first witness.

EXAMINER McKENNEY: You may call your first witness.

MR. EVANS: Call Amanda Decesare.

EXAMINER McKENNEY: Before you sit, I'm

```
24
      going to have you stand and raise your right hand.
 1
 2
                   (Witness placed under oath.)
 3
                   EXAMINER McKENNEY: Thank you. Be
      seated.
 4
 5
                   I will have you state your name for the
 6
      record.
 7
                   THE WITNESS: Amanda Decesare. Do you
 8
      have the spelling of that? D-e-c-e-s-a-r-e.
 9
                   MR. EVANS: Your Honor, do you mind if I
      do this from a seated position?
10
                   EXAMINER McKENNEY: No, absolutely not.
11
12
                   MR. EVANS: It will help me to be able
13
     to read my notes here.
14
15
                          AMANDA DECESARE,
16
      being by me first duly sworn, as hereinafter
17
      certified, deposes and says as follows:
18
                         DIRECT EXAMINATION
      BY MR. EVANS:
19
2.0
              Q. You've already indicated your name,
2.1
     Ms. Decesare. Would you state your residence
22
      address?
23
                   8952 Crimson Oak Drive, Florence,
24
      Kentucky 41042.
25
              Q. And by whom are you employed?
```

- A. CSX Transportation.
- Q. And what is your business address there?
- A. 500 Meijer, M-e-i-j-e-r, Drive,
- 4 Suite 305, Florence, Kentucky 41042.

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

22

- Q. Can you just tell us briefly about your educational background?
 - A. I have a Bachelor's in Construction

 Management and an Associate's in Civil Engineering

 Technology from Michigan Tech University.
- Q. Thank you. And you've indicated you're employed by CSX. What is your job title at this time?
 - A. Project Manager-Public Projects.
- Q. And approximately how long have you been in that position?
- A. About three years.
- Q. And in a nutshell, what are your job duties associated with that?
- A. Coordination of construction projects
 that are mostly sponsored by state and local agencies
 that affect the railroad.
 - Q. Okay. And in that capacity, do you have a particular territory for which you're responsible?
- A. I cover five states; Michigan, Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, and Kentucky.

- Q. And you mentioned Ohio. Does -- your territory within Ohio, I assume, does include the grade crossing located on County Line Road which is on the county line dividing Crawford County and Morrow County?
 - A. Correct.
- Q. And have you been to this particular crossing as part of your professional duties?
 - A. Yes.
- Q. How many tracks comprise that particular crossing?
- A. Two.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

17

18

- Q. Have you driven across this crossing from both directions in a motor vehicle while you were there?
- 16 A. Yes.
 - Q. Ms. Decesare, what county is the crossing itself located in, as you understand it?
- 19 A. Morrow County.
- Q. And do you have an understanding as to whether the properties on either side of County Line Road are either in Crawford County or Morrow County?
- 23 A. Yes.
 - Q. What's your understanding?
- 25 A. North of the road is Crawford County,

```
and south is Morrow County.
```

- Q. Okay. I'm going to show you a few photographs just for the record. I need to renumber things just a little bit as we go. I believe the last -- Your Honor's last exhibit was 11.
- 6 EXAMINER McKENNEY: That's correct.
- 7 BY MR. EVANS:

2

3

4

- Q. So I'm going to label one of these asCSXT Exhibit 12.
- Just for the record, Amanda, are you able to -- Counsel, this is that same aerial view.
- MR. HOWLAND: Oh, that's fine,
- 13 Mr. Evans. No objection.
- MR. EVANS: All right.
- EXAMINER McKENNEY: Mr. Evans, I'm going to mark it as Exhibit 12. Do you have an 8-by-12
- copy of that if we need to introduce these into the
- 18 record?
- 19 (EXHIBIT MARKED FOR IDENTIFICATION.)
- 20 MR. EVANS: We do. Do we have it with
- 21 us?
- 22 EXAMINER McKENNEY: We don't need it
- 23 now.
- MR. EVANS: We do. Everything here we
- 25 have in -- we have these in their original size. We

- 1 don't have an 8-by-12 as to the maps.
- 2 EXAMINER McKENNEY: That's okay. Okay.
- 3 BY MR. EVANS:

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

- Q. In any event, showing you the aerial photograph that we've marked as Exhibit 12 for identification, are you able to tell us what that is?
 - A. That is the crossing in question.
- Q. All right. In that crossing photograph, we can see the two tracks that are located there.
 - A. Uh-huh.
- Q. You have to probably say yes or no.
- 12 A. Yes.
- Q. And is it your -- do you have an understanding as to where Mr. Fox's residence is located?
- A. Yeah. That gray driveway on the north of the track.
 - Q. Leads to his residence?
- 19 A. Yes.
- Q. Okay. And this little square here, do you have an understanding as to what that is?
- 22 A. That is the Columbia Gas substation.
- 23 Q. Okay.
- MR. EVANS: With the Hearing Examiner's permission, I would just briefly mark three

```
additional photographs, I suppose it would be 13, 14,
 1
 2
      15.
 3
                   EXAMINER McKENNEY: Correct, they'll be
 4
      so marked.
 5
                   (EXHIBITS MARKED FOR IDENTIFICATION.)
      BY MR. EVANS:
 6
 7
             Q. To show you these briefly, can you see
 8
     those there?
 9
             A. Uh-huh.
10
              Q. Let's start -- just take them
      sequentially. Exhibit 13, can you tell us what that
11
12
      is?
13
              Α.
                   That is the road going on the north side
     of the tracks towards the -- I'm sorry, on the south
14
      side of the tracks towards the east.
15
16
                  Okay. And there is in this photograph
     to the extent the photographs --
17
18
                   MR. HOWLAND: Excuse me a minute,
19
     Mr. Evans. Your Honor, is it okay if I stand here?
20
      I can't see the pictures from where I'm sitting.
2.1
                   EXAMINER McKENNEY: Absolutely.
22
                   MR. EVANS: My apologizes.
                   MR. HOWLAND: Sorry to interrupt your
23
24
     presentation.
25
                   EXAMINER McKENNEY: That's quite all
```

1 right.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

2.1

22

23

24

25

2 BY MR. EVANS:

- Q. So you said that this is on the south side of the tracks?
 - A. South side of the tracks.
 - Q. Looking in the easterly direction?
 - A. Correct.
- Q. And to the extent it is visible in the photographs, is there a difference in grade or height as we look at the land that exists between the road and where the tracks are located?
- A. Yes. The road is higher, and there is also a mound between the road and the track.
 - Q. Okay. And you said you've driven this area previously, correct?
 - A. Yes.
- Q. As you're coming from east to west, so towards us in the picture heading towards the crossing, as you recall, from a typical vehicle are you able to see the tracks or see something coming along the tracks as you approach this crossing from that direction?
 - A. Not until you start to make that turn to get -- so you can see past the mound.
 - Q. Okay. And then just for the record,

- 1 I've marked as Exhibit 14 another photograph. Can
 2 you see that?
- MR. HOWLAND: I'm good, Mr. Evans.
- 4 BY MR. EVANS:

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

2.1

22

23

- Q. Are you able to identify kind of what direction we're looking here in this picture?
 - A. That would also be the south side of the track. That would be going towards the west, yeah.
 - Q. Okay. And there's an arrow here. Is that -- is this the bend that leads right up to where the tracks are located?
 - A. Yes.
 - Q. As we look at this picture, you described the raised land or mound as you're approaching from east to west. Would it be essentially to your right from the location where this picture was taken?
- A. Yes, in the bottom right corner of that picture.
- Q. And finally, just we marked Exhibit 15, and are you able to indicate what direction we're looking here?
- A. That is the north side of the tracks looking towards the east.
- Q. Okay. And there -- we can see the two

tracks -- sets of tracks in this particular picture;
is that correct?

A. Yes.

2.0

2.1

- Q. And do you know -- and we'll get to this again a little bit later if you don't -- but as part of the diagnostic survey, if not otherwise, was the distance between those tracks measured?
 - A. Yes. It was around 52 feet.
- Q. Okay. And just from your experience dealing with grade crossings in your job with CSX, is that a wider gap than you sometimes or maybe even often see at a grade crossing?
 - A. Yes, wider.
- Q. And do -- as you understand it, these two tracks, how would you describe them, are they through tracks? Are they both through tracks? How are they used?
- A. They're both through tracks for mixed freight.
- Q. Among your job duties, Ms. Decesare, do you -- generally or are you often at least involved in attending diagnostic surveys at Ohio grade crossings?
- A. Yes.
- Q. And just for the record, what is a

diagnostic survey?

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

- A. It is a meeting at a grade crossing to determine if there should be any improvements, if the crossing should be closed or if it should remain the same and is attended by the road authority, the PUCO, the ORDC, and CSX.
- Q. And to your knowledge, was a diagnostic survey done in connection with this particular crossing on County Line Road?
 - A. Yes.
- Q. And did you personally attend that particular diagnostic survey?
- A. I did not. It was attended by my predecessor, Karen Murphy, who has since retired.

MR. EVANS: Your Honor, I'd like to show
the witness what I think we are up to, Exhibit 16,
which would be the diagnostic review for this
particular crossing.

EXAMINER McKENNEY: It will be so marked.

21 (EXHIBIT MARKED FOR IDENTIFICATION.)

EXAMINER McKENNEY: You can approach.

MR. EVANS: Would Your Honor like a

24 copy?

22

25 EXAMINER McKENNEY: Please, if you have

1 one. Thank you.

BY MR. EVANS:

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

2.1

22

23

- Q. Ms. Decesare, I've handed you what has been marked as CSXT Exhibit 16 for identification. I think you indicated that you had reviewed a diagnostic survey or diagnostic review team survey in connection with this crossing; is that correct?
 - A. Yes.
- Q. And is this the survey that you reviewed in connection with this crossing?
 - A. Yes.
- Q. And is there a -- a date indicated with respect to the survey?
 - A. November 8th, 2011 -- 2011.
- Q. And just to ask you a few questions about the survey itself. There is a listing of names under the -- on the first page of Exhibit 16, it says under On-Site Review Team. From your experience in attending these over time, would that typically be a listing of the individuals that attended the survey?
 - A. Yes.
- Q. Does the team survey have a section where they describe the existing traffic control devices at the -- at this crossing?
- 25 A. Yes.

- Q. And -- and at the time of this survey, this crossing involved what traffic control devices?
- A. Crossbucks, signs, and number of track signs, and the CSX inventory sign that goes on the -- says what the DOT number is on the post.
- Q. Okay. Does the -- does the form also include information regarding hazard data as of the time the form was prepared?
- A. Yeah. As of the time of the diagnostic, the hazard ranking of the crossing was 454 in the state of Ohio out of all the public -- or all the public crossings in Ohio.
 - Q. Okay.

2.0

2.1

- A. But that is currently updated to be 110th out of 5,800 crossings.
- Q. So your understanding -- just to make sure the record is clear, you understand that in the state of Ohio there are approximately 5,800 public grade crossings?
 - A. Yes.
- Q. And is it correct that you recently checked with the State to determine where this crossing is currently ranked; is that correct?
 - A. Yes. I got that from ORDC last week.
 - Q. And your understanding is it's currently

110?

1

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

19

2.0

2.1

22

23

24

25

2 A. Yes.

Q. And this form that we're talking about, the survey form, also includes information regarding -- category is entitled Railroad Data?

A. Yes.

- Q. And among other things, that lists the number of trains that would go through this area?
 - A. Yes.
- Q. And as of the time of the survey, do you know how many trains were indicated to go through here?
 - A. It was 20 then.
- Q. And has there been any change based upon your having looked into that since that time as of today?
- A. For the month of February, the average was 26.6 trains per day.
 - Q. Okay. There's also on this form a section that provides information regarding roadway data; is that correct?
 - A. Yes.
 - Q. And it will obviously speak for itself, but there is an indication under Roadway Data as to vehicle speed at this location; is that right?

A. Yes.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

2.1

22

23

24

- Q. And what is the indicated vehicle speed?
- A. Fifty-five miles an hour, and there is a note about 15-mile-an-hour temporary condition.
- Q. Okay. And jumping back to the railroad data for a moment, at the time of the survey, is there an indication as to what the track speed is at this location?
 - A. Sixty miles an hour.
- Q. And from your experience with the railroad, do you understand that that would be a maximum speed for trains coming through here?
 - A. Correct.
- Q. And would that speed vary and potentially be slightly less than that depending upon the nature of the cargo that was being hauled?
- A. Yeah. The typical train speed would be between 55 and 60 miles an hour.
- Q. There is an area on the third page of Exhibit 16 that talks about Type of Development, and there is a box checked. Can you tell us what that box says?
 - A. "Open Space."
- Q. And would that be consistent with your understanding in having been to this crossing that it

would be considered more of a rural crossing with farmland surrounding it?

A. Yes.

2.0

2.1

- Q. To your knowledge, aside from the substation that I referenced in my earlier -- related to gas line referenced in my earlier remarks, are there any commercial enterprises located adjacent to near this particular crossing?
- A. Commercial, no. The -- there are residences and the Fox farm.
- Q. Right. And then we won't get into this, but does -- does the form then contain some measurements and drawings that you understand that would be used if steps were going to be taken to install flashers and gates?
 - A. Yes.
- Q. And this document is signed off on by a number of people; is that correct?
 - A. Yes, one representative from each party.
- Q. And -- and you touched on this when you described what a diagnostic survey is, but is there a place on this form to indicate whether there was consideration or discussion that this crossing is a candidate -- as to whether this crossing is a candidate for closure?

- A. Yes. On Page 3 the question is asked,
 "Is it the consensus of the Diagnostic Review Team
 that this is a potential closure project," and the
 box is checked "Yes."
- Q. And under that it says, "Explain reasons." And what does it say?
 - A. "2 residents."
- Q. On the next page, Page 4 of Exhibit 16, is there also a category that says, "Crossing Consolidation or Closure"?
- 11 A. Yes.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

- 12 Q. What does it say under that?
- 13 A. That it was discussed.
- Q. Ms. Decesare, did you attend the two
 public hearings conducted in this matter last summer?
- 16 A. Yes.
- Q. And one of those was in Morrow County
 and one in Crawford County, correct?
 - A. Correct.
- Q. Do you recall that there was some
 testimony given at these public hearings concerning a
 problem involving blocked crossings in this area, and
 in particular a blocked crossing at this particular
 crossing?
- 25 A. Yes.

Q. To the best of your knowledge on behalf of CSX, did anything related to any issue with blocked crossings or the issuance of an occasional citation to CSX as a result of -- or by local law enforcement as a result of a crossing being blocked for longer than the statutory period, did any of that have anything to do, as you understand it, with this crossing being evaluated at the diagnostic survey or being considered for closure?

2.0

2.1

- A. No. It had nothing to do with the consideration for closure, and I believe that the issue with the blocked crossings was not there at the time of the diagnostic.
- Q. And since that timing -- since you've been involved with this -- this issue, attended these hearings and received correspondence related to potential closure, are you aware of any -- any involvement concerning the blocked crossing issue as it relates to the potential closure for this crossing?
- A. No. I don't believe there's any relationship between the blocked crossing issue and the closure issue.
- Q. And there was some comment at public hearing as to some thought that the railroad wanted

to use the extra -- the second track here as a siding in some fashion if the crossing was closed. Does the railroad have any intention of using that -- either track as a siding or to create some type of extra siding or track at this location?

- A. Not that I'm aware of.
- Q. Ms. Decesare, after the diagnostic survey was done, and without getting into any specific details here today, but do you know if there was a combined effort involving CSX and the Ohio Rail Development Commission to essentially offer incentives to the County to close the crossing?
 - A. Yes, there was.
- Q. Have you, as part of your file related to this matter, seen and reviewed various letters sent to the County related to this general issue?
 - A. Yes.

2.0

2.1

- Q. And is it your understanding as we sit here today that to this point the County has not been interested in any of those discussions, and the crossing currently remains open?
 - A. Correct.
- Q. And that was the status at the time the Petition for Closure was filed?
- A. Correct.

MR. EVANS: Just for the record, I would 1 2 like to -- so I think we're up to 17, 18 and 19 I 3 have. With the Hearing Examiner's permission, I'd 4 like to mark as exhibits -- get it right here -- 17, 5 18 and 19, three letters sent at various times to 6 Morrow County regarding closure -- potential closure. 7 EXAMINER McKENNEY: It will be so 8 marked. 9 (EXHIBITS MARKED FOR IDENTIFICATION.) BY MR. EVANS: 10 So just for the record, Ms. Decesare, I 11 12 put in front of you three letters identified for 13 identification as exhibit -- CSX Exhibits 17, 18 and 14 19. Are these the letters that you have seen over time related to discussions with Morrow County 15 16 regarding closure of the crossing? 17 Α. Yes. 18 And just for the record, the April 20th, 19 2012 letter, which is Exhibit 17, am I correct that 2.0 you're copied on that letter? 2.1 Α. Yes. 22 And the other two letters, Exhibits 18 Ο. 23 and 19, it doesn't appear you're copied on those, but

is someone from CSX, specifically Rusty Orben, copied

24

25

on those two letters?

- A. Yeah. Rusty and Chuck Gullackson, who was my boss's boss at the time, both copied.
- Q. Okay. And just for the record, to identify them, Exhibit 17 is a letter dated April 20, 2012, to Mr. Randy Bush at Morrow County, County Engineer, and it's from the Ohio Rail Development Commission?
 - A. Correct.

2.0

2.1

- Q. And Exhibit 18 is an October 25, 2013, letter to Mr. Whiston, the chairman of the Morrow County Commissioners, from the Ohio Rail Development Commission, correct?
 - A. Correct.
- Q. And finally the Exhibit 19 is a letter dated December 24, 2013, again, to Mr. Whiston from me actually as counsel for CSX, correct?
 - A. Correct.
- Q. Okay. Do you have an understanding on behalf of CSX as to whether the -- this crossing would likely be placed in line for the installation of flashers and gates if this crossing is not ultimately closed pursuant to this procedure?
 - A. Yes, it would be.
- Q. And just for the record, is it your understanding that this -- that the installation of

flashers and gates would involve CSX funds, state and/or federal funds, or some combination of those?

A. State and/or federal.

2.0

2.1

- Q. Would there be some potentially CSX money involved?
- A. If it was a PUCO-hosted project then we would have a contribution, but I believe this would be an ORDC-hosted project because of the previous lead on the project.
- Q. Irrespective, Ms. Decesare, of the breakdown on the payment of these costs associated with flashers and gates, based upon your experience in public projects such as this, can you provide us with a typical or average cost range associated with the installation of flashers and gates?
 - A. \$200- to \$300,000.
 - Q. And it varies depending upon?
 - A. The local track.
- Q. I do want to ask you a few questions just to assist the -- in making sure the record is clear as far as the location of some of the primary landmarks in this area that are the subject of deposition testimony that's been submitted, as well as perhaps a little of your testimony in a few moments.

- A. Okay.
- Q. We have, as you know, two county maps; one for Morrow County, one for Crawford County. Have you had a chance prior to right now to take a look at those?
- A. Yes.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

14

19

2.0

2.1

22

25

MR. EVANS: And just for the record, Exhibits 20 and 21 -- and if it's all right with the Hearing Examiner, I would mark the one that's on the easel here, which is the Morrow County map, as CSXT Exhibit 20.

12 EXAMINER McKENNEY: It will be marked
13 CSX Exhibit 20.

(EXHIBIT MARKED FOR IDENTIFICATION.)

MR. EVANS: For the record, we'll mark
the Crawford County map as Exhibit 21.

17 EXAMINER McKENNEY: It will be so

18 marked.

(EXHIBIT MARKED FOR IDENTIFICATION.)

MR. EVANS: Thank you. Is it all right if the witness just steps down so she can make some markings on the map?

EXAMINER McKENNEY: You may.

24 BY MR. EVANS:

Q. Ms. Decesare, I've got both maps on the

easel there. And so as we go through these, depending on what landmark we're looking to kind of circle and highlight, it's going to be necessary I think for you to switch a little bit between maps.

A. That's fine.

2.0

2.1

- Q. But if you could indicate just for the record on -- based upon your knowledge and experience of being up in this area, where the State Route 309 or 61 grade crossing is located that would be just a little bit west or northwest of this crossing. You can do that on either map.
- A. I've just got to get my bearings here. State Route 309 is here, but it would cross the tracks up here (indicating).
- Q. My eyes aren't good enough to make sure. Okay. Yeah.
 - A. And it's also shown here (indicating).
- Q. All right. So on both county maps, you have -- am I correct you've circled that particular crossing?
 - A. Yes.
- Q. And are you able to point out where County Line Road is located on both maps? Perhaps there's a label there that you can circle where it says County Line Road or County Road 8.

- A. This is the road here --
- Q. Okay.

2.0

2.1

- A. -- and that's the crossing (indicating).

 And it would also leave right here the crossing, the circle.
- Q. Okay. And using the Morrow County map that I described earlier, sort of a triangular area created by the borders of the county and the tracks, would you be able to just kind of highlight that corner area with the marker?

(Witness complies with request.)

- Q. Thank you. There's also a crossing that's referenced in our petition as being an alternate crossing called Biddle Road, which would only be I think visible on the Crawford County map. Can you highlight that with perhaps circling it if it's labeled already?
 - A. Yes.

(Witness complies with request.)

- A. Right here.
- Q. And there's also a road that's part of our petition as an alternate crossing called Keifer Road that I referenced earlier as also County Road 32, or in the other county Iberia Road. Can you locate that?

(Witness complies with request.)

- Q. So on the Morrow County map, just for the record, you've circled where Keifer Road is?
 - A. Yes.

1

2

3

4

5

7

8

9

10

- Q. Did you circle the crossing or the road?
- 6 A. I circled the road.
 - Q. And Keifer Road crosses this particular crossing, correct, or this particular set of tracks?
 - A. Yes.
 - Q. And what direction would that be from,
- 12 A. Southwest.
- Q. And we talked briefly about Biddle Road.

 Where would that be in relation to the crossing that

 is being considered for closure?
- A. That would be northwest -- or, northeast.
- Q. And in connection with the testimony by
 deposition of Morrow County EMS and fire personnel,
 there's reference to County Roads 30, 31 and 32. Are
 you able to find those on the -- in the vicinity
 of --
- 23 A. Yes.
- Q. -- Iberia, and going north and label those to show that -- their general location?

- A. 30, 31 and 32 (indicating).
- Q. So looking at that, based upon -- if I ask you to assume or understand that the -- both the EMS and fire personnel who would begin their run in Iberia have testified that they would take 30 to 31 to 32 potentially to get to this area, I am correct that they would be taking 30 north out of Iberia; is that correct?
 - A. Yes.
 - Q. And then there's -- there would be a left turn on 31 to go west for a short distance.
 - A. Right.
- Q. And then it would be a right turning to north onto --
- 15 A. 32.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

19

2.0

2.1

22

23

- Q. -- 32, which is also Keifer Road, correct?
- 18 A. Correct.
 - Q. All right. Now, there is in some of the testimony that's been provided a reference to Taylor Road that comes down and intersects with County Line Road kind of west of the crossing. Can you find that on the Crawford County map?
 - A. Yes, I circled it.
- Q. And you circled that.

Finally, can you, I guess, put an "X" at the basic location where Mr. Fox's residence would be found? I guess you know he's in Crawford County; so wherever you can put an "X" there.

- A. It would be about right there (indicating).
- Q. Okay. Just for the record, did you put an "X"?
 - A. I put an "X" and wrote "Fox" next to it on the Morrow County map.
- Q. Great. Okay. Thank you. I just wanted to make sure that those particular geographic locations were highlighted.
- Have you reviewed the Petition for Closure that CSX filed in this matter?
- 16 A. Yes.

1

2

3

4

5

6

9

- 17 Q. This is our last exhibit of the day.
- 18 I'm going to mark it -- where are we at?
- MR. THOMPSON: 22.
- MR. EVANS: With the Hearing Examiner's
- 21 permission, CSX Exhibit 22 would be the Petition for 22 Closure.
- 23 EXAMINER McKENNEY: So marked.
- 24 (EXHIBIT MARKED FOR IDENTIFICATION.)
- 25 EXAMINER McKENNEY: I have a copy of

1 that.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

2 MR. EVANS: You do, okay.

THE WITNESS: Thank you.

BY MR. EVANS:

- Q. Ms. Decesare, I've placed in front of you what we've marked as exhibit -- CSX Exhibit 22 for identification. Do you recognize that?
 - A. Yes.
 - Q. And just for the record, what is it?
 - A. The Petition for Closure that was filed.
- Q. And to the best of your knowledge, is the factual information contained in that petition regarding the County Line Road crossing and surrounding crossings true and correct to the best of your knowledge?
 - A. Yes.
 - Q. As of the time of the petition?
 - A. At the time of petition, yes.
- Q. And just to be clear, you've indicated previously that the train count at this area would be different now than it was at the time of the petition?
- A. Yes. It would be increased to 26.6 trains per day.
- Q. Okay. And then -- and feel free,

Ms. Decesare, to as necessary consult the petition if you need to. But directing your attention generally to the factors pertinent to closure of a rural crossing such as this under Revised Code 4907.474 and 475, are you familiar with the daily vehicular traffic count for the County Line Road crossing?

- A. Yes, 121 to 184 vehicles per day.
- Q. And as reflected in the petition, in a nutshell, how was that information obtained? Where was it obtained?
- A. From the PUCO's database, which contains information about road crossings, and I think there was also --
 - Q. Also the US DOT --
- 15 A. Yeah.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

18

19

2.0

2.1

- 16 O. -- database as well?
- 17 A. Yes.
 - Q. And similarly, what is the daily train count? We've basically discussed this, but currently the daily train count you said is between 26 and 27, correct?
 - A. Correct.
- Q. At the time of the petition, it was something less than that?
- 25 A. It was 20 at the time of the petition.

Q. Okay. And I want to talk to you a little bit about daily vehicular and train counts at alternate crossings. But before we discuss that, I guess we should establish what alternate crossings have been identified in the petition.

First thing is the statute itself talks in terms of the number of not so much alternate crossings, but crossings within one linear mile.

With that in mind, which crossings would be -- that are identified in the petition would be considered within one linear mile?

- A. The Biddle Road crossing.
- Q. And approximately how far is that from the county road -- County Line Road crossing?
 - A. A half mile.

2.0

2.1

- Q. And is that -- is that, if you know, measured along the track essentially? I mean, is that how that would be determined?
 - A. As far as I know.
- Q. Okay. So what other alternate crossings have been identified in the petition, and how far are they from the County Line Road crossing?
- A. The Keifer Road crossing is 1.2 miles southwest of the crossing in question here, and the Route 61 railroad crossing is about 1.15 miles

northeast.

2.0

2.1

- Q. And the Route 61, that's -- at that location, that's one in the same as 309, correct?
 - A. Correct.
- Q. And these are the same tracks at these alternate crossings you've identified, Keifer Road to the southwest, Biddle Road to the northeast, and State Route 309/61 a little bit further to the northeast, those would be the same tracks as are at the crossing in question, correct?
 - A. Correct.
- Q. So the train counts that you've talked about both before and what it is now would -- you would expect to be the same; is that correct?
 - A. Correct.
- Q. Again, looking at these alternate crossings, Keifer, Biddle, County Road 309, and -- or 61, can you tell us, please, what the daily vehicular traffic count at these alternate crossings is?
- A. Keifer Road is between 116 and 131 vehicles per day; Biddle Road is 274 vehicles per day; and the Route 61 is between 6,623 and 6,700 vehicles per day.
- Q. And is that data, Ms. Decesare, as you understand it, from the same sources, specifically

the PUCO database and the US Department of Transportation database?

A. Yes.

2.0

2.1

- Q. Now, having been to this area and observed all of these -- well, am I correct that you have seen all of these crossings we just referenced?
 - A. Yes.
- Q. Do you have any sense as to how the -those 120 to 185 vehicles that are indicated to use
 the County Line Road crossing would be redistributed
 over the other crossings if County Line Road would be
 closed?
- A. I would guess they would distribute fairly evenly, but it's impossible to know based on where the people are going and coming from.
- Q. Okay. How would you describe the nature of the roadway at County Line Road where it intersects this crossing?
 - A. At County Line Road?
 - Q. Yes.
- A. It is parallel to the tracks for the most part, and then makes a jog at the tracks to be able to cross at pretty much a perpendicular crossing, and then makes a jog back to continue to be parallel.

- Q. And it's a two-lane road at that location?
 - A. Yes.
 - Q. One -- one lane in each direction?
- A. Correct.

2.0

2.1

- Q. Would you describe it as a relatively narrow two-lane road?
 - A. Yes.
 - Q. And how would you describe the sight view at this crossing, the County Line Road crossing, based upon what you've observed?
 - A. I would say it's inadequate until you make the jog to get across the tracks, at which point you are on top of the tracks.
 - Q. And you've described -- I think going from east to west, you've described in your earlier testimony the mound of -- that is between the road and the tracks, and that the tracks are coming essentially parallel to the road you're on; is that correct?
 - A. Correct.
 - Q. And just so the record's clear, coming from the other direction, you know, there's no mound on that side, but is it a similar situation where the tracks are kind of coming in over the driver's

shoulder?

2.0

2.1

- A. Correct.
- Q. And I guess to complete the discussion regarding the County Line Road, it currently is protected by flashers -- I'm sorry, currently is protected by crossbar, correct?
 - A. Correct.
- Q. Similar questions with respect to the alternate crossings: What is the nature of the roadway at those three crossings?
- A. The Keifer Road is a wide-open crossing, better sight distance than at County Line Road, and it is a two-lane railroad, and there's one track at Keifer Road, and it crosses the road at a 90 degree angle.
- Q. Okay. So at Keifer, the double set of tracks has ended by the time you get to Keifer Road and it's a single track there; is that correct?
 - A. Correct.
- Q. Similar question then with respect to Biddle and State Route 309, or 61. Can you describe the nature of those roadways?
- A. Yeah. Biddle Road is also a wide-open crossing with good sight distance on all directions, and it is also a two-lane railroad. Two tracks do

cross Biddle Road. The angle is near 90 degrees, and it has flashing lights and gates, and I did not say that Keifer Road has crossbars.

- Q. Okay. How about State Route 309.
- A. Yeah. State Route 309, or 61, is also an open -- wide-open crossing with good sight distance in all directions, and it's a two-lane state highway, and there are two tracks at the crossing. The angle is between 30 and 59 degrees of the intersection, and it has flashing lights and gates.
- Q. Thank you. You indicated that you attended the public hearings last summer in both Morrow and Crawford County. Have you on behalf of CSX also reviewed and to the point of having an understanding as to what the deposition testimony has been by various individuals since that time in depositions that were scheduled and taken on behalf of CSX?
 - A. Yes.

2.0

2.1

Q. And based upon that, do you -- what is your understanding -- I'm not asking you to quote testimony, but based upon your review, what is your understanding as to the impact of closure of this crossing based upon -- related to school bus usage at this particular crossing?

1 MR. HOWLAND: Objection. It's calling 2 for hearsay response. The affidavits -- the 3 depositions speak for themselves. 4 EXAMINER McKENNEY: Mr. Evans. 5 MR. EVANS: Well, Your Honor, I'm not --I'm asking for this witness's understanding of the 6 7 impact at this point on school transportation. 8 I'm going to ask her -- my intent would be to ask her 9 a similar question with respect to fire and EMS. 10 I don't think she's providing hearsay testimony. She's just providing her understanding on 11 12 behalf of CSX and, therefore, CSX's understanding as 13 to the impact of this closure and why we continue to 14 feel it's appropriate for closure, not only based upon the public hearing testimony we heard, but the 15 16 subsequent testimony. 17 MR. HOWLAND: May I respond? 18 EXAMINER McKENNEY: You may. 19 MR. HOWLAND: Your Honor, what he's 2.0 asking for is, "Have you read the depositions?" 2.1 "Yes." 22 "And based upon those depositions, what 23 do you think about these issues of school 24 transportation and emergency response?" 25 That's clearly calling for hearsay

response. She's basing her response on what she read in those depositions. We ask that it not be allowed and we move along.

EXAMINER McKENNEY: I agree. The objection's sustained. Let's move along.

MR. EVANS: All right. Well, the testimony will -- from those witnesses will speak for itself.

9 BY MR. EVANS:

2.0

2.1

- Q. Ms. Decesare, you're familiar with the fact that there is a substation -- a gas pipeline substation located in the vicinity of this crossing, correct?
 - A. Correct.
- Q. To your knowledge, has the owner of that particular substation or the associated pipeline ever advised CSX that there is any particular hazard or increased hazard associated with that particular substation or the pipeline in general?
- A. No. We have no instructions or trying to do anything different at that substation than anywhere else on the railroad.

MR. EVANS: With the understanding that the deposition transcripts previously referenced and marked as exhibits are being admitted and will be

given consideration in lieu of live testimony, I think that's all the questions I have for the witness other than -- and I would simply move, if necessary, that any of the exhibits that have been identified here today be admitted.

6 EXAMINER McKENNEY: Thank you,

7 Mr. Evans.

2.0

2.1

I'll rule on the admission after cross-examination. I would rule on admission now.

Do you have any objection to the admission of these exhibits?

MR. HOWLAND: I have no objection to the admission.

EXAMINER McKENNEY: Exhibits will be so admitted. I'm going to go through them just to make sure I've appropriately marked them.

Aerial photo as Exhibit 12 will be so admitted. Two photos of the crossing are Exhibits 13 and 14. I don't believe I saw the photo that was marked as Exhibit 15. Exhibit 16 is the diagnostic review, that will be admitted. Exhibits 17, 18 and 19 are three letters that were filed, those will be admitted. Exhibit 20, map of Morrow County will be admitted. Exhibit 21, map of Crawford County will be admitted. Exhibit 22 is the Petition for Closure.

```
62
1
     Does that sound correct?
 2
                   MR. EVANS: I believe that's correct,
 3
     yes.
 4
                   EXAMINER McKENNEY: It will be so
 5
     admitted.
 6
                   MR. EVANS: Thank you.
 7
                   EXAMINER McKENNEY: Thank you,
8
     Mr. Evans.
9
                   Mr. Howland, are you prepared for
10
     cross-examination?
                   MR. HOWLAND: I promise, Your Honor,
11
12
     I'll be very, very brief.
13
                   EXAMINER McKENNEY: Well, you may take
14
     the time that you need.
15
                   MR. HOWLAND: Thank you.
16
17
                         CROSS-EXAMINATION
18
     BY MR. HOWLAND:
19
                  Ma'am, when you were going through your
2.0
     initial credentials, you're an engineer; is that
2.1
     correct?
22
                   No. I do not -- I'm not a licensed
23
     engineer. I went to school for Construction
24
     Management and an Associate in Applied Science in
25
     Civil Engineering Technology.
```

- Q. Well, you're far more of an engineer than I'll ever be, but close, in the range there.
- Now, I think you and I can agree that closing this crossing is a real priority for CSX, isn't it?
- A. It's a priority in terms of the safety of the crossing, yes.
 - Q. In terms of the safety of the crossing --
 - A. Yes.

2

3

4

5

8

9

10

11

15

16

17

18

24

- Q. -- is that correct?
- Okay. Now, on the issue of the safety
 of the crossing, do you know how many fatal accidents
 have been at this crossing?
 - A. I don't believe there's been any.
 - Q. Okay. Do you know how long the crossing's been there?
 - A. I do not know.
- Q. Okay. We've got a crossing just south
 of Cardington, a grade crossing. Every 10 or 15
 years somebody gets killed down there, and I've
 noticed that's not a priority for anybody to shut
 that down.
 - A. That would have to be discussed with the ORDC and PUCO who schedule these diagnostic meetings.

- Q. I understand that. But I don't see CSX went to close that crossing. Speaking of which, other than this crossing and the ones that are in the neighborhood, have you looked at any other crossings that CSX has? I mean, we've got dozens of them there, you know, in rural Morrow County, Ohio.
- A. I've been to many crossings. I don't know how many I've been to in Morrow County.
- Q. Okay. All right. Now, also we've been offered money, which is nice. Let's see, how much money have we been offered; \$5,000 for CSX funds to be used by the Township and the City, another \$15,000, \$7,500 from CSX, and \$7,500 from ORDC. We haven't been offered any money for any other of the rural crossings in Morrow County.
- A. Have you had diagnostics that have been closed?
- Q. No, we haven't, not that I know of anyway.
 - A. Me, neither.
- Q. Now, earlier on you were asked about the criteria in 4907.474 of the Ohio Revised Code and 4907.475. You're familiar with that criteria?
 - A. Yes.

2.0

2.1

Q. Okay. And parking a train through the

- crossing is not listed as part of that criteria, is it?
- A. I don't think it's relevant. No, it's not listed.
 - O. That's not what I asked.
- A. It's not listed as part of the criteria, correct.
 - Q. Thank you, not listed, good.

All right. In fact, we both know that if you park a train in a crossing it's illegal, right? You can't leave it there for more than a certain amount of time. Do you know how much time it is?

- A. I don't know the time.
- Q. Okay. But we can agree that it's illegal to do that, isn't that right?
- 17 A. After a certain amount of time, yes.
- Q. Okay. All right. Do you understand that there is a park adjacent to this?
 - A. The reservoir?
- 21 O. Yeah.

5

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

2.0

- 22 A. Yes.
- Q. Okay. You understand that's used by the kids for cross country and all sorts of sporting events and that kind of thing throughout the year,

and that crossing is used as an exit. You're familiar with that, aren't you?

2.0

2.1

- A. I'm familiar with the location, but my understanding is that the Morrow -- or the County Road 8 crossing we're talking about is not used for that access for emergency purposes anyway.
- Q. Okay. Do you know what controls the trains as far as making the decision to stop?
- A. Our Operating Department based on many factors which vary day by day, which could be related to weather, other traffic scenarios, things that happen miles away. It changes every day.
- Q. Are you familiar with the fact that between February of 2014 and June of 2014, that there were over 10 citations for trains parked at this location?

MR. EVANS: Objection, assumes --

EXAMINER McKENNEY: Grounds.

MR. EVANS: It assumes facts -- there's no evidence to that.

MR. HOWLAND: Your Honor, this is cross-examination, you should give it some latitude. And it is the facts, they are facts that are in evidence. This was put into evidence at one of the hearings last summer.

EXAMINER McKENNEY: Mr. Evans.

MR. EVANS: Well, as of -- until this morning, the County had not even registered their appearance to take part in this hearing. They've provided no evidence as part of this hearing related to the crossings being blocked and citations being issued, nor have they established that this witness has any knowledge in that area or that it's in any way relevant to the issue of closure. In fact, the testimony has been it's not. But for all those reasons, I object to this line of questioning.

EXAMINER McKENNEY: I'm going to overrule the objection, allow her to respond to whether she's aware of the citations.

Mr. Howland, can you repeat your question?

17 BY MR. HOWLAND:

2.0

2.1

- Q. Are you aware that between February of 2014 and June of 2014, Crawford County Sheriff's Department cited CSX 10 times for parking trains at that crossing?
- A. I'm aware of it because I attended the hearings last summer.
 - Q. Thank you.
 - A. But it was not -- not the case in

November 2011 when this diagnostic occurred, which the County, the railroad and the State were present at and discussed closure at that time.

- Q. I understand what you're saying, that it wasn't part of it, but that has been an ongoing problem. In fact, it goes on back, at least the records do, to 2001.
- A. I'm not aware of that, but I am aware of the 2014 ones you referenced.
- Q. But you and I can both agree that parking a train at that crossing is not part of the criteria for closing the crossing, right?
 - A. Correct.

2.0

2.1

- Q. You and I can both agree that if that closing gets -- if that crossing gets closed, there will be no more citations, right?
 - A. That would make sense.

MR. HOWLAND: Okay. I have no further questions. Your Honor, I'd ask you to forgive my ignorance of these proceedings, I'm just a humble County prosecutor. This is my first time in front of this Board. I thought that these exhibits were admitted last summer. Have they not been for this hearing?

EXAMINER McKENNEY: Which exhibits, the

1 depositions? 2 MR. HOWLAND: The depositions, and also 3 the report from Sheriff Kent concerning the crossing 4 closings, is that not in front of you? 5 EXAMINER McKENNEY: They are not. They've not been marked and admitted; however, 6 they're in the record in this case pursuant to the --7 8 consistent with the public hearing testimony is also considered. 9 10 MR. HOWLAND: So that will be something you will be able to consider in deciding the matter? 11 12 EXAMINER McKENNEY: Yes. If it's in the 13 docket and it's been submitted in the docket, we would mark it and admit it so we can test its 14 15 reliability; however, it is in the docket so it can 16 be seen. 17 MR. HOWLAND: Thank you, Your Honor. 18 Then I have no further questions. 19 EXAMINER McKENNEY: Okay, Mr. Howland. 2.0 Redirect from the railroad? 2.1 MR. EVANS: Very briefly. 22 23 REDIRECT EXAMINATION 24 BY MR. EVANS:

Q. Just to reiterate, Ms. Decesare, first

of all, in terms of citations, I think it's clear from your testimony you don't have anything to do with whether there's a citation and how that is handled on a local basis, if and when that would happen?

A. Correct.

2.0

2.1

- Q. Is it accurate to state then that as you testified earlier, I believe, that to your knowledge the question of what citations have been issued and when have, from your standpoint, no bearing on the process to attempt to close this crossing, including the filing of the Petition for Closure?
 - A. Correct.
- Q. And since you were asked about the cross country event out there, I think it's fair that you would be on behalf of the railroad to indicate the railroad's understanding as to the impact, if any, of that cross country event and how in terms of how they handle emergency response to that and traffic control based upon your understanding of the testimony?
- A. Yes. It is my understanding that the -- is it okay if I point here?
- 24 EXAMINER McKENNEY: You may.
- THE WITNESS: The Galion City EMS

response comes out of Galion, and they actually come down 309 here, and continue down 309, and access the reservoir through some network of dirt roads that are in the park itself.

BY MR. EVANS:

2.0

2.1

- Q. Okay. Is there access both from the north of the reservoir off of County Line Road east of the crossing, as well as from State Route 309?
- A. I believe so, but my memory's a little fuzzy on that.
- Q. Okay. And when there is a large event like the cross country meet there, do you have an understanding as to whether the police and EMS typically maintain a presence there throughout the event?
- A. If it was a scheduled athletic event, they said that they would have somebody there already from emergency response.
- Q. And is there any concern -- what is your understanding as to how they handle traffic with as many people -- spectators, et cetera, that are coming to watch that event, do you have an understanding as to how they handle that traffic?
- A. They make the dirt roads that are in the park one-way roads to exit how they feel would be the

most appropriate way to exit that day.

Q. And is it your understanding that generally that involves entrance from the County Line Road entrance and exit to the east onto State Route 309?

A. Yes.

7 MR. EVANS: That's all the questions I 8 have.

EXAMINER McKENNEY: Thank you.

Mr. Howland, do you have anything for

11 recross?

MR. HOWLAND: No, Your Honor. Thank

13 you.

1

2

3

4

5

6

9

10

17

18

19

2.0

2.1

EXAMINER McKENNEY: Thank you. Thank

you, I have no questions. You can step down.

16 Mr. Evans.

MR. EVANS: Your Honor, we have no additional live witnesses. With this testimony, along in conjunction with the previously admitted deposition testimony, we would rest in terms of our case with respect to the closure of the crossing.

22 EXAMINER McKENNEY: Thank you,

23 Mr. Evans.

Mr. Howland, did you have anything for us this morning?

MR. HOWLAND: I have no witnesses, Your We'd ask that you'd consider all of the exhibits, including the ones that were admitted last Thank you. summer.

EXAMINER McKENNEY: Thank you,

Mr. Howland.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

2.1

22

23

24

25

I have nothing further. Do we have anything else for the good of the order?

MR. EVANS: The only thing I would ask, Your Honor, is we did file, we hope and believe pursuant to the applicable rules, a request to submit a post-hearing brief in lieu of any kind of summation today certainly, and if -- just wanted to clarify as to whether that's acceptable to you, and timing, I guess, if you have any thoughts on that.

EXAMINER McKENNEY: Yes. T do have a proposed briefing schedule. I'm looking at having briefs filed April 3rd, which is Friday, that is 30 days from today, and then reply briefs on April 17th, that is also a Friday, and is 14 days after that. Would that be amenable to everyone?

MR. EVANS: That's fine. So am I correct in understanding that both sides, or anybody who wants to file a brief, could do so initially, and then the other side would have the opportunity to

CERTIFICATE

I do hereby certify that the foregoing is a true and correct transcript of the proceedings taken by me in this matter on Tuesday, March 3, 2015, and carefully compared with my original stenographic notes.

Carolyn D. Ross,
Registered Professional
Reporter and Notary
Public in and for the
State of Ohio.

My commission expires April 3, 2019.

14 (CDR-77907)

2.4

Armstrong & Okey, Inc., Columbus, Ohio (614) 224-9481

This foregoing document was electronically filed with the Public Utilities

Commission of Ohio Docketing Information System on

3/11/2015 2:59:34 PM

in

Case No(s). 14-0379-RR-UNC

Summary: Transcript in the matter of CSX Transportation, Inc. hearing held on 03/03/15 electronically filed by Mr. Ken Spencer on behalf of Armstrong & Okey, Inc. and Anderson, Rosemary Foster Mrs.