#### BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF OHIO

In the Matter of the Joint Petition of Norfolk Southern Railway Company and CSX Transportation Inc., to Close the Franklin Street Crossings (DOT Nos. 481482D &518257V) in Orange Township, **Delaware County.** 

Case No. 19-180-RR-UNC

# PRE-FILED TESTIMONY OF AMANDA DeCESARE OF CSX TRANSPORTATION, INC.

Petitioners Norfolk Southern Railway Company and CSX Transportation, Inc., intend to

offer th	ne sworn testimony of Amanda DeCesare as follows:
1.	Please state your name.

By whom are you employed? 2.

Amanda DeCesare

CSX Transportation, Inc.

3. What is your job title there?

Project Manager—Public Projects

4. How long have you held that position?

9 years

Where is your office located? 5.

Taylor Mill, Kentucky

6. In your position, are you responsible for making recommendations regarding possible crossing closures and/or crossings that may require flashers and gates?

Yes.

7. Are you involved with implementation of crossing closures?

Yes.

8. Are you responsible for the CSXT territory that includes the Franklin Street grade crossing, located in Lewis Center, Ohio, that being DOT crossing nos. 481482D (Norfolk Southern Railway Company) and 518257V (CSX Transportation, Inc.)?

Yes.

9. How many tracks comprise that crossing?

Three; two owned and operated by Norfolk Southern Railway Company, and one owned and operated by CSX Transportation, Inc.

10. As established by the two crossing numbers referenced above, are there technically two crossings at this location?

Yes.

11. As a practical matter, can you close one without the other?

No. For all intents and purposes it is one crossing.

12. At this crossing, using the directions on the compass, which track belongs to CSX Transportation, Inc.?

CSXT owns and operates the track located furthest to the East at the crossing. The other two tracks at that location are owned and operated by Norfolk Southern.

13. What is the vehicular traffic count at this crossing based on the most current, available information?

The most current vehicular traffic count at this crossing based on data maintained by the Federal Railroad Administration (FRA) and the PUCO is 64 vehicles per day.

14. What is the train traffic count at this crossing based on the most recent, available FRA/PUCO information?

For CSX Transportation, Inc., the train traffic at this crossing is typically four trains per day. I also understand that Norfolk Southern Railway Company has many (38) trains per day that pass through their crossing at Franklin Street.

15. Are there alternate crossings in the vicinity of this crossing? If so, which crossings?

Yes.
Lewis Center Road crossing to the North
Shanahan Road crossing to the North
Orange Road crossing to the South

16. Would the daily train traffic at these crossings be the same as previously indicated for the Franklin Street crossing?

Yes.

17. What is the most current daily vehicular traffic count at these three alternative crossings based on the FRA/PUCO data?

Lewis Center Road crossing – 10,295 vehicles Shanahan Road crossing – 1,034 vehicles Orange Road crossing – 13,711 vehicles

18. If the Franklin Street crossing is closed, what would be the approximate daily increase in vehicular traffic at the three alternate crossings be?

It is estimated that these vehicles, as stated above approximately 64 per day, will be distributed between the Lewis Center, Shanahan and Orange Road crossings, with more vehicles likely utilizing the Lewis Center Road crossing because it is in such close proximity to Franklin Street. It is anticipated that the majority of the vehicles that would have otherwise used the Franklin Street crossing would likely be starting or ending their trip in Lewis Center, Ohio, as few drivers not intending to begin or end their trip in Lewis Center, Ohio would intentionally drive to this area and cross at the Franklin Street crossing.

19. What is the nature of the roadway at the three alternative crossings?

Lewis Center Road, Shanahan Road and Orange Road are all two lane roads, one lane in each direction, running generally east and west, surrounded by residential and/or light commercial properties. All three roads cross the tracks at between a 60 and 90 degree angle.

20. Are the three alternative crossings already protected by flashers and gates?

Yes, all three alternative crossings already have flashers and gates.

21. Which alternative crossings are within one linear mile of the Franklin Street crossing?

There are two crossings within one linear mile; Lewis Center Road crossing (less than .1 mile north) and the Shanahan Road crossing (one mile north). The Orange Road crossing is located 1.65 linear miles to the south.

22. Are there any sight distance obstructions at the three alternative crossings?

No. There do not appear to be any permanent sight obstructions at any of the three alternative crossings and, as previously indicated, all three crossings are already protected by flashers and gates.

23. Do you have an opinion regarding the impact of closure of the Franklin Street crossing on vehicular traffic, emergency vehicles, and/or commercial enterprises?

Yes.

## 24. What is your opinion?

It is my opinion that closure of the Franklin Street crossing would have minimal, if any, impact on vehicular traffic generally, on emergency vehicles, and/or on commercial enterprises. There are no commercial enterprises (excluding a Delaware County EMS station) in the vicinity of this crossing. Furthermore, based on my understanding of sworn testimony provided by Orange Township and Delaware County personnel, the impact of closure of the Franklin Street crossing on the operation of the Delaware County EMS station, located in the Northeast quadrant of the crossing, would be negligible.

## 25. What is the basis of your opinion?

I am familiar with this area and I have driven the various roads in the area, including the narrow roads (sometimes less than two full lanes) located in Lewis Center, Ohio, specifically including Franklin Street. I have also read or otherwise been advised of the sworn testimony of the various Delaware County or Orange Township officials who have been deposed in this matter.

Based on this information, it is my opinion that the relatively few motor vehicle operators who might use this crossing each day will not be significantly impacted by the closure of this redundant grade crossing, located less than .1 mile south of the Lewis Center crossing. It is also my opinion that closure of this crossing will not significantly affect emergency vehicle traffic or resulting response times anywhere in Delaware County, including Orange Township generally and the area compass west of the tracks, despite the current location of a Delaware County EMS station (Medic No. 3) in the Northeast quadrant of the crossing. Closure of the Franklin Street crossing will have little or no impact on Medic No. 3's ability to respond to calls east of the crossing, which geographically comprises most of Medic No. 3's territory, because they do not need to cross the tracks to get to those areas. Regarding Medic No. 3's response to the west of the crossing, I am aware that Delaware County and Orange Township emergency vehicles successfully responded to all areas of the community, with no documented impact on response times, despite prior contemporaneous closures of the Lewis Center and Franklin Street crossings for maintenance, and despite a lengthy closure of Lewis Center Road in both directions in 2019 for construction of a roundabout located west of the railroad tracks.

Additionally, there are no nearby commercial enterprises located in the proximity of the Franklin Street crossing that would be impacted by closure of that crossing.

26. Do you have an opinion as to whether the Franklin Street crossing meets the statutory requirements for closure under Ohio law?

Yes.

27. What is your opinion?

The Franklin Street crossing meets all of the criteria for closure set forth in R.C. 4907.474 and R.C. 4907.475, and should be closed to the motoring public because there is no demonstrable need for the Franklin Street crossing.

28. What is the basis of that opinion?

As discussed in my testimony above, all of the statutory criteria for closure are met. Moreover, this crossing is very hazardous because of its layout, including the large separation between the Norfolk Southern and the CSXT tracks, and the site view considerations. The crossing has been evaluated by the State of Ohio and currently ranks as the 39<sup>th</sup> most hazardous crossing in Ohio based on that analysis. A Diagnostic Review Team met at this crossing in 2012 and agreed to recommend that the Franklin Street crossing should be closed. Furthermore, if the Franklin Street crossing is not closed, the PUCO will likely order the installation of flashers and gates. That installation project would be very expensive because of the need to tie in the electrical wiring for this crossing with the existing electric wiring for the Lewis Center Road crossing, and because two different railroads are involved at both crossings. The cost of this project to install flashers and gates would not be at all commensurate with the vehicle usage (approximately 64 vehicles per day) at this crossing, and the federal and/or state funds that would be used to install flashers and gates here, if required, could be far better used at other, busier crossings.

29. Did you attend the diagnostic survey at this crossing?

Yes.

30. Attached hereto is Exhibit A to your testimony. Are you able to authenticate that Exhibit as a true and accurate copy of the Diagnostic Review Team Survey for this crossing?

Yes.

31. Did you sign this survey form?

Yes.

32. Did representatives of Orange Township also attend the Diagnostic Team survey and sign the Diagnostic Survey form?

Yes.

33. What were the findings of the Diagnostic Review Team that led to the recommendation that the crossing should be closed?

In addition to consideration of the crossing data referenced above concerning motor vehicle and train usage, the Diagnostic Review Team considered the roadway characteristics of Franklin Street, the lack of existing crossing protection, the width of the overall crossing, including the Norfolk Southern tracks and the CSXT track, the fact that there are three schools in the area and that it has been observed that high school students use this crossing to get around school buses backed up on Lewis Center Road, among other factors. All of these factors caused the Diagnostic Review team to conclude that the Franklin Street crossing is unsafe for the motoring public and meets the criteria for closure under the Ohio Revised Code.

34. Does this complete your pre-filed testimony?

Yes. I reserve the right to file rebuttal testimony as warranted based upon further developments in this case.

Respectfully submitted,

#### /s/R. Leland Evans\_

R. Leland Evans (0006833)

(Trial Attorney)

Richard J. Silk, Jr. (0074111)

DICKIE, McCAMEY & CHILCOTE, P.C.

250 Civic Center Dr., Suite 280

Columbus, Ohio 43215

Telephone: (614) 258-6000 Facsimile: (614) 258-6006

revans@dmclaw.com

rsilk@dmclaw.com

Attorneys for Co-Petitioner CSX Transportation, Inc.

/s/ D. Casey Talbott (via e-mail approval)\_

D. Casey Talbott (0046767)

(Trial Attorney)

Mark W. Sandretto (0079536)

EASTMAN & SMITH LTD.

One SeaGate, 24th Floor

P. O. Box 10032

Toledo, Ohio 43699-0032

Telephone: (419) 241-6000

Fax: (419) 247-1777

dctalbott@eastmansmith.com

mwsandretto@eastmansmith.com

Attorneys for Co-Petitioner Norfolk Southern Railway Company

#### **CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

A copy of the foregoing *Pre-Filed Testimony of Amanda DeCesare of CSX Transportation*, *Inc.* was filed electronically with the PUCO this 5<sup>th</sup> day of October, 2021. Notice of this filing has been sent via electronic mail to the following:

D. Casey Talbott

DCTalbott@eastmansmith.com

Counsel for Co-Petitioner Norfolk Southern Railway Company

Aric Hochstettler

AHochstettler@co.delaware.oh.us

Julie Donnan jdonnan@BJGlaw.net

Jennifer L. Huber jhuber@BJGlaw.net

/s/ R. Leland Evans

R. Leland Evans Attorney for Co-Petitioner CSX Transportation, Inc.



Diagnostic Review Team Survey

			Date: Follow up 10/19/2012
Location Data			TO SERVICE SER
. Prankin Sc		·	
Route/Road Number (I.e. Twp., Co., SR or US) TR 1041			US DOT No.: 481482D
County: Delaware Townst	<sup>hlp:</sup> Orange	City: (In or Near)	Lewis Center (Advacent 25x 51825
Railroad Name: Norfolk Southern Corp	Rallroad Lake		Branch/Line Sandusky
Nearest RR Timetable Station: Lewis Center	**************************************	**************************************	RR Milepost: 16.43
On-Site Review Team			
Include: Name-Organization-Phone Nu	•		4
. Cathy Stout, ORDC, Catherine.st	tout@dot.state.oh.us, 614-6	44-0313	
. George Martin, PUCO, George n	nartin@puc.state.oh.us, 614	l-203-4714 (c), 6	14-762-9107 (0)
Scott OVECTURE			1-204-1428
. 1 1			
. Betrittyly - ovange To		7	740-657-2630
. TARUS SHOUL - EMH	ut terfonto	emblicon	6/4-775-40FFY6/6
Casey FOURTH detel	billion chame and b.	/ S MIR.L	Minterior of
	4004	1	*
	unes@oran	ungo e	
. KAND FATTERSON	PUCS RAIL PIS	siall.	614466-115
Amanda Delesano	» CSX 85	9-42-42	1-424
*			M. C.
Existing Traffic Control Dev	ices		
Type of Warning Devices	Instal	led?	Quantity/Comments
dvance Warning Signs' (condition?)		□No	
itop' Signs	☐ Yes	[] No	
Stop Ahead' Signs	Yes		
avement Markings (condition?)		<u> No</u>	
irossbucks		□ No	
lumber of Tracks Signs		No	
ventory Tags		<u> </u>	
terconnected Highway Traffic Signal	☐ Yes	No	
	Shirt		
	<u> </u>	☐ No	
antilever Flashing Lights			Number: Length:
antilever Flashing Lights de Lights	Yes Yes	□No □No	
antilever Flashing Lights de Lights utomatic Gates	Yes Yes	□ No □ No □ No	Number: Longth:
antilever Flashing Lights ide Lights utomatic Gates alls	Tyes Tyes Tyes Tyes	No No No	
eantilever Flashing Lights de Lights automatic Gates ells dewalk Gate Arms	Yes   Yes	No No No No No	Number: Longth:
Cantilever Flashing Lights ide Lights automatic Gates ells idewalk Gate Arms No Turn' Signs	Yes   Yes	No No No No No No No No	Number: Longth:
Cantilever Flashing Lights ide Lights automatic Gates ells idewalk Gate Arms No Turn' Signs lumination	Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes	No   No   No   No   No   No   No   No	Number: Longth:
Nast-Mounted Plashing Lights Cantilever Flashing Lights Ide Lights Automatic Gates Gells Idewalk Gate Arms No Turn' Signs Jumination Scrossing flagged by train crew?	Yes   Yes	No No No No No No No No	Number: Longth:

404 582-5295 William, BARRIAGNENSCORR COM 614-771-2183 Michael. Brahler@ NSCorp. Com M. L. Barmier NS M. C. Brohver NS



Diagnostic Review Team Survey

		Date: 9/21/2012
Location Data		<b>《沙丘以红"的《</b> 《古典史】
Street or Road Name: Franklin St		**
Route/Road Number TR 1041 (i.e. Twp., Co., SR or US)		US DOT No.: 481482D
County: Delaware Township:	Orange (In or Near)	Lewis Center
Railroad Norfolk Southern Corp	Railroad Lake	Branch/Une Sandusky Name:
Nearest RR Timetable Station: Lewis Center		RR Milepost: 16.43
On-Site Review Team		的
(Include: Name - Organization - Phone Number -	- Email)	
1. MIKE FORTE	ORDC	614.644.0283
2. George Martin, PUCO, George martin	1@puc.state.oh.us, 614-203-4714 (c). 6	514-752-9107 (b) Gm
	ANGE TWP govern	er Corangetup, org
4 SPIT OVERTURE	" EPOTOR	FE HOL. Com
5. Kon Doyler	" Louisla	Corase tel. ors
6. Debbie Tarento	11 Diava	to p ovange tup ove
7. Betn thish	y bhushe	corange two ors
8. TANIS Eifent	EINHAT to feat	eachtion 219-775-4615
2. Amanda J Oclesoc	CX 959-	426-6724
Existing Traffic Control Devices		
Type of Warning Devices		Quantity/Comments
Advance Warning Signs (condition?)	Yes □No	
'Stop' Signs	☐ Yes ☑ No	
'Stop Ahead' Signs	☐ Yes ☐ No	ONE MISSING STOP BO
Pavement Markings (condition?)		4 Z W/ YIELD
Crossbucks	✓ Yes □ No	The Winds Control of the Control of
Number of Tracks Signs	Yes No	
Inventory Tags	Yes No	
Interconnected Highway Traffic Signal	A Secretary of the second seco	
Mast-Mounted Flashing Lights		Number; Length:
Cantilever Flashing Lights		Hanbar. Falkar.
Side Lights	☐ Yes ☑ No	Number: Length:
Automatic Gates	☐ Yes Ø No	
Bells	☐ Yes ☑ No	Number:
Sidewalk Gate Arms	Yes VNo	
'No Turn' Signs	Yes Myo	
Illumination	☐ Yes ☑ No	
is crossing flagged by train crew?	Yes WNo	
Other		I I AV-#

Safety Data (Obtain cu	e khi ezana	rts, if possible, prior to review) 🦿	
	un de la company	ial Information (from database)	Revised
Number & dates of crashes	0		
in previous 5 years			
Hazard Ranking	1003	Date Run: 8/24/12	
Railroad Data			Company of the Compan
Railroad Characteris	stics	Initial Information (from database)	Revised
Total trains per day		28 🗸	
<pre>&lt;   per day</pre>	<u> </u>		
Day thru trains Night thru trains	······································	<u>  14</u>   14	
Daytime switching moveme	ante		
Nighttime switching movem		O	
Total number of tracks	**************************************	2 4	
Number of main tracks	······································	2	
Number of other tracks		0	
Maximum train speed		60 🗸	
Typical train speed	<del></del>		
Amtrak	,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,		
If non-gated crossing, is clearing	ıg sight distan	ce adequate in all quadrants? (See Table I)	☐ Yes ☐ No
If multiple tracks, can two train Can one train block the motor		ossing at the same time? Yes No another train at crossing? Yes (Explain be	alow) 🔲 No
Can one or more tracks be ell			•
If yes, Crossing DOT #(if d	minaced thro ing this same	ugh the crossing? Tes Mo roadway within 100 ft of this crossing? M 78257V CSX	Yes [] No
Are there other track(s) cross If yes, Crossing DOT #(if d If yes, distance	minaced thro ing this same	ugh the crossing? Yes No	Yes [] No
Are there other track(s) cross If yes, Crossing DOT #(if d If yes, distance Roadway Data	minaced thro ing this same	ugh the crossing? Yes Mo roadway within 100 ft of this crossing?  78257V CSX asurement between track centerlines at close	Yes [] No
Are there other track(s) cross If yes, Crossing DOT #(if d If yes, distance Roadway Data Local Highway Authority:	minated thro ing this same lifferent)(take me	ugh the crossing? Yes No roadway within 100 ft of this crossing? Y 78257V C5X asurement between track centerlines at close Orange Township	Yes No
Are there other track(s) cross If yes, Crossing DOT #(if d If yes, distance Roadway Data Local Highway Authority: Roadway Characteri	minated thro ing this same lifferent)(take me	ugh the crossing? Yes Mo roadway within 100 ft of this crossing?  78257V CSX asurement between track centerlines at close	Yes [] No
Are there other track(s) cross If yes, Crossing DOT #(if d If yes, distance Roadway Data Local Highway Authority:	minated thro ing this same lifferent)(take me	ugh the crossing? Yes No roadway within 100 ft of this crossing? Y 78257V C5X asurement between track centerlines at close Orange Township	Yes No st point along roadway) Revised
Are there other track(s) cross If yes, Crossing DOT #(if d If yes, distance Roadway Data Local Highway Authority: Roadway Characteri	minated thro ing this same lifferent)(take me	ugh the crossing? Yes No roadway within 100 ft of this crossing? Y 78257V C5X asurement between track centerlines at close Orange Township Initial Information (from database)	Yes No
Are there other track(s) cross If yes, Crossing DOT #(if d If yes, distance Roadway Data Local Highway Authority: Roadway Characteri Average daily traffic Highway paved	minated thro ing this same lifferent) (take mea	ugh the crossing? Yes No roadway within 100 ft of this crossing? Yes 78257V CSX asurement between track centerlines at close Orange Township Initial Information (from database) 64 (2012) Yes No	Yes No st point along roadway) Revised
Are there other track(s) cross If yes, Crossing DOT #(if d If yes, distance Road(way Data) Local Highway Authority: Roadway Characteri Average dally traffic Highway paved Roadway Surface: Blacktop	minated thro ing this same lifferent) (take med stics	ugh the crossing? Yes No roadway within 100 ft of this crossing?  78257V C5X asurement between track centerlines at close Orange Township Initial Information (from database)  64 (2012) Yes No Concrete Other	Yes No st point along roadway) Revised
Are there other track(s) cross If yes, Crossing DOT #(if d If yes, distance Roadway Data Local Highway Authority: Roadway Characteri Average daily traffic Highway paved Roadway Surface: X Blacktop Roadway width: 75 ft.	minated thro ing this same lifferent) (take med stics	ugh the crossing? Yes No roadway within 100 ft of this crossing? 78257V C5X asurement between track centerlines at close Orange Township Initial Information (from database) 64 (2012) Yes No Concrete Other	Yes No st point along roadway) Revised
Are there other track(s) cross If yes, Crossing DOT #(if d If yes, distance Roadway Data Local Highway Authority: Roadway Characteri Average dally traffic Highway paved Roadway Surface: Blacktop Roadway width: 5 ft. Number of highway lanes	minated thro ing this same lifferent) (take med stics	ugh the crossing? Yes No roadway within 100 ft of this crossing? Yes 78257V CSX asurement between track centerlines at close Orange Township Initial Information (from database) 64 (2012) Yes No Concrete Other Sowo ApproacH) 2	Yes No  Revised  Yes No
Are there other track(s) cross If yes, Crossing DOT #(if d If yes, distance    Rond(way Pries)   Local Highway Authority:   Roadway Characterical   Average daily traffic   Highway paved   Roadway Surface:   Blacktor   Roadway width:   Gr.   Number of highway lanes   Urban or Rural	minated thro ing this same lifferent) (take med stics	ugh the crossing? Yes No roadway within 100 ft of this crossing? Yes asurement between track centerlines at close Orange Township Initial Information (from database) 64 (2012) Yes No Concrete Other BOWD APPROACH)	Yes No st point along roadway) Revised
Are there other track(s) cross If yes, Crossing DOT #(if d If yes, distance    Roadway Data    Local Highway Authority:   Roadway Characteri   Average daily traffic   Highway paved   Roadway Surface:   Blacktop   Roadway width:   G.ft.   Number of highway lanes   Urban or Rural   Vehicle Speed:   MPH	minated thro ing this same lifferent) (take med stics  Gravel (17' &	ugh the crossing? Yes No roadway within 100 ft of this crossing? Yes 78257V CSX asurement between track centerlines at close Orange Township Initial Information (from database) 64 (2012) Yes No Concrete Other Bown Approach 2 Rurel	Yes No  Revised  Yes No
Are there other track(s) cross If yes, Crossing DOT #(if d If yes, distance Roadway Database Local Highway Authority: Roadway Characteri Average daily traffic Highway paved Roadway Surface: Blacktop Roadway width: Brt. Number of highway lanes Urban or Rural Vehicle Speed: MPH School Bus Operation: Roadway	minated thro ing this same lifferent) (take met stics  Gravel (17) 6	ugh the crossing? Yes No roadway within 100 ft of this crossing?  78257V CSX asurement between track centerlines at close Orange Township Initial Information (from database) 64 (2012) Yes No Concrete Other Rowo Approach 2 Rivet	Yes No  Revised  Yes No
Are there other track(s) cross If yes, Crossing DOT #(if d If yes, distance    Roadway Parent   Local Highway Authority:   Roadway Characterical   Average daily traffical   Highway paved   Roadway Surface:   Blacktore     Roadway Surface:   Blacktore     Roadway width:   G. ft.     Number of highway lanes     Urban or Rural   Vehicle Speed:   MPH     School Bus Operation:   No     Hazardous Materials Trucks:	minated thro ing this same lifferent) (take met stics  Gravel (17) 6	ugh the crossing? Yes No roadway within 100 ft of this crossing?  78257V CSX asurement between track centerlines at close Orange Township Initial Information (from database) 64 (2012) Yes No Concrete Other Rowo Approach  2 Rivet	Yes No  Revised  Yes No
Are there other track(s) cross If yes, Crossing DOT #(if d If yes, distance  Roadway Data  Local Highway Authority:  Roadway Characteri  Average dally traffic  Highway paved  Roadway Surface: Blacktor  Roadway width: Gt.  Number of highway lanes  Urban or Rural  Vehicle Speed: MPH  School Bus Operation: No  Hazardous Materials Trucks: Shoulders: No	minated thro ing this same lifferent) (take met stics  Gravel (177' 6  No es	ugh the crossing? Yes No roadway within 100 ft of this crossing? Yes 78257V CSX asurement between track centerlines at close Orange Township Initial Information (from database) 64 (2012) Yes No Concrete Other Sound Approach Ruset  Ses Aamount Yes Amount	Yes No  Revised  Yes No
Are there other track(s) cross If yes, Crossing DOT #(if d If yes, distance    Roadway Parent   Local Highway Authority:   Roadway Characterical   Average daily traffical   Highway paved   Roadway Surface:   Blacktore     Roadway Surface:   Blacktore     Roadway width:   G. ft.     Number of highway lanes     Urban or Rural   Vehicle Speed:   MPH     School Bus Operation:   No     Hazardous Materials Trucks:	minated thro ing this same lifferent) (take met stics  Gravel (17' 6 No es	ugh the crossing? Yes No roadway within 100 ft of this crossing?  78257V CSX asurement between track centerlines at close Orange Township Initial Information (from database) 64 (2012) Yes No Concrete Other Round Approach 2 Rivel S Amount Yes Amount	Yes No  Revised  Yes No

Quadrant Curb and Gutter:	Quadrant Curb and Gutter:		
Functional (Curb height = 4" or more)	[ Functional (Curb height = 4" or more)		
The state of the s	Non-functional (Curb height = Less than 4")		
Non-functional (Curb height = Less than 4")	\/ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \		
[] None	☑ None		
Pedestrians: No Yes			
is sidewalk present? No Yes	rossing? 127 No Yes		
is there a nearby intersection that could cause queuing over the could cause queuing over the could be a second over the could be	rossingr 10 1 tes		
If yes, Distance			
Is this intersection signalized? No Yes			
Are the signals currently interconnected with the existing crossi	ng warning devices?  No Yes		
Is there a 'Do not Stop on Track' sign? No Yes			
Is a roadway improvement project (e.g. widening, turn lanes, nearl location in the foreseeable future? \( \bigve{V} \) No \( \bigve{V} \) Yes	by new or upgraded traffic signal, sidewalk) planned at or near this		
If yes, Improvement typeLead Agency	Timeline/completion		
	,		
Is it the consensus of the Diagnostic Review Team that this is a po Explain reasons: HIGH SCHOOL KIPS RUW ON LEWIS CENT	stential closure project: No Yes		
Explain reasons: HIGH SCHOOL KIDS KUN	MING ALOUND 1909569 STOTPING		
ON LEWIS CENT			
Type of Development  Open Space Institutional Location of nearby	y schools:		
Industrial Commercial	3 SCHOOLS ON LEWIS CENTER		
☐ Industrial ☐ Commercial ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐	y Schools on all the		
Utility Information			
is commercial power available? No 🔯 Yes			
Utility Provider (Company Name)	Phone Number		
1 (464) 696 Literal at 144 at	of track		
What other utilities are present? F, V, C (add locations to sketch)			
Is(are) there potential utility conflict(s) Yes No [ Comments:	Unknown		
The second of th			

Potential Red Flags / Project Challenges
Traffic Signal Preemption (include traffic signal intersection name and LHA with jurisdiction over traffic signal, if known):
Crossing Consolidation or Closure:
Real Estate or ROW:
Culverts / Drainage / Ballast Conditions:
Roadway and/or Sidewalks:
Circultry (e.g. reaches out to other crossings, specific needs, etc.):
Environmental:
Other:
Others.

Diagnostic Team Recommendations	
Dishiparic Leath Mecontinendarions	Quadrants Needed
Install/upgrade active devices	
Automatic Flashing Lights (AFLS)  AFLS/Cants	
	A STATE OF THE PROPERTY OF THE
AFLS / Gates  AFLS / Gates / Cants	
Bells / number	
Upgrade droultry / type	
Sidelights  Guardrall Needed	
Install/Replace curb	
Bungalow placement & offset from rail & highway	
T Other (defeat)	
Comments: Agree to some closure	If walle to close
comments rigide to person closer	i till - 10 - Cdo-
will improve (Lag) it co	ossing shill qualities after
data is rerun.	if unable to close ossing still qualifies after
☐ Install/upgrade traffic signal preemption	
No Improvements needed	
Cther (define)	
Acknowledgement of Recommendations (each entity represente	d at the diagnostic must have at least one signature
acknowledgement):	······································
All Dan West	Cathy Stout.
AUS Man We Barre	
	<i>Q</i>

- Rerun data revised ADT, possibly link CSX & NS crossics.
- EMS Station
- Home Road realisment in the fibre
- No would like to see closure, would offer inentives (+ csx)
- Divides Lewis Earther in half.
- Orange Township bile path will work with Twp on closing
- -If close agreement to close should occur within 6 mth of leter from orde with combined NS, CSX, ORDE offer.

Sidewalk Parkway Roadway			Show North Direction
Andrews Andrew		Roadway	
		Parkway	
		Sidewalk	
Crossing Angle □ 0-29* □ 30-59* ▼ 60-9	O' Measure	ed in <u>NE</u> Quadrant?	
Measurements by: MDF			

Field Skotch Include utilities as marked by OUPS and LHA; Include ROW bour	ndaries as indicated by railr	oad and LHA.
literate printing as maked by sold and mark indicate not a now	Harder some and District condition and Control	And the same that the same the
	<b>4</b>	]
	D Fo.C.	
	ρ	
l cp		ca
	no company to the com	The subsection of the subsecti
		4 ' 1
	4	
		A STATE OF THE PARTY OF THE PAR
	The state of the s	
(		ی ر
	Fac. MARKIR	7.0
	3 8	
	χ.	CAS
<b>5</b> # #	CS.	
	•	
	in <u>NE</u> Quadranti	
Sketch by: MDF		

TABLE I

## Clearing Sight Distances

Maximum Authorized Train Speed	Distance (dT) Along 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. 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 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

Highway Vehicle Speed	Distance (dH) Along Roadway from Crossing (ft)
Ø	n/a
\$	50
10	70
15	105
20	
(25	180 >
4	
35	280
40	340
45	410
50	490
<u> </u>	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.

This foregoing document was electronically filed with the Public Utilities

**Commission of Ohio Docketing Information System on** 

10/5/2021 3:01:46 PM

in

Case No(s). 19-0180-RR-UNC

Summary: Testimony Pre-filed Testimony of Amanda DeCesare of CSX Transportation, Inc. electronically filed by Mr. R. Leland Evans on behalf of CSX Transportation, Inc.