

RECEIVED-DOCKETING DIV

2013 JUL 24 AM 10:37

**Public Utilities
Commission of Ohio**

PUCO

Memo

To: Docketing Division
From: George Martin, Grade Crossing Planner, Rail Division
Re: In the matter of the authorization of CSX Transportation to install an active grade crossing warning device in Hardin County
Date: July 24, 2013

The Ohio Rail Development Commission (ORDC) has authorized funding for CSX Transportation (CSX) to install **mast-mounted flashing lights and roadway gate** in Hardin County, Hale Township, TR 179, DOT# 518371V. The crossing was surveyed on November 9, 2011, and was discussed as potential candidate for closure. On January 9, 2013 it was determined that the appropriate treatment for the crossing was the installation of the active warning devices.

The project will be paid for with federal funds, and is actual cost. As the plan and estimate for the project has been submitted and approved, staff requests an Entry with completion due in nine months. Construction may commence at once. Staff requests that the following language be incorporated in the Entry:

It is expected that all work necessary for FHWA acceptance of the warning devices will be completed by the in-service due date and that the railroad will be responsible for this work. This work includes, but is not limited to:

**Any ancillary work to make the warning devices function as designed and visible to the roadway user, and
MUTCD compliance, including minor roadway work if necessary.**

A suggested case coding and heading would be:

PUCO Case No. 13- **1675** -RR-FED In the matter of the authorization of CSX Transportation to install an active grade crossing warning device in Hardin County

C: Legal Department

Please serve the following parties of record.

Ms Cathy Stout

Ohio Rail Development Commission

1980 W Broad St, Mailstop # 3140

Columbus, Oh 43223

Ms Amanda CeCesare

CSX Transportation

1717 Dixie Hwy, Ste 400

Ft Wright, Ky 41011

Hale Township Trustees

310 W Mansfield Rd

Mt Victory, Oh 43340

Ohio Power Company (AEP)

**OHIO RAIL DEVELOPMENT COMMISSION
INTER-OFFICE COMMUNICATION**

TO: Randall Schumacher, Supervisor, Rail Division, PUCO
FROM: Cathy Stout, Manager, Safety Section, ORDC
BY: Don Damron, Project Manager, ORDC
SUBJECT: Hardin County, TR 179
DOT# 518 371 V
PID# 95300
DATE: July 19, 2013

The Public Utilities Commission of Ohio (PUCO) established a diagnostic survey at the subject location on 11-09-2011. The Ohio Rail Development Commission (ORDC) attended the review. The Diagnostic Team recommended the improvement of warning devices to flashing lights and roadway gates. Copies of the diagnostic review form and the plan and estimate are attached.

PE has already been provided by the railroad. ORDC approves the site plans and estimates as provided. Please issue a construction-only order for the project outlined above. This authorization is made with the stipulation and understanding that an approved estimate may contain entries for items or activities that may be cited and found to be ineligible for federal participation during the project audit.

It is expected that all work necessary for FHWA acceptance of the warning devices will be completed by the in-service due date and that the railroad will be responsible for this work. This work includes, but is not limited to:

- any ancillary work to make warning devices function as designed and visible to the roadway user, and
- MUTCD compliance – including minor roadway work if necessary.

Thank you for your assistance with these matters.

Attachments:

Diagnostic Review
Plan & Estimate

c: George Martin, PUCO
ORDC Project Manager (file)



OHIO RAIL DEVELOPMENT COMMISSION

Mail Stop #3140, 1980 West Broad Street, Columbus OH 43223

John R. Kasich, Governor • James G. Bradley, Chairman

July 18, 2013

Amanda DeCesare
Project Manager – Public Projects
CSX Transportation
1717 Dixie Highway, Suite 400
Ft. Wright, KY 41011

RE: Hardin County, TR 179
AAR# 518371V
PID# 95300
CSX OP: OH0931

Dear Ms. DeCesare:

The plan and estimate dated 06/12/2013, for the referenced project has been reviewed and is acceptable. CSX Transportation may proceed with the construction of the proposed grade crossing warning system in accordance with the abbreviated plan. This authorization is made with the stipulation and understanding that the approved estimate may contain entries for items or activities that may be cited and found to be ineligible for federal participation during the project audit. Reimbursement of eligible actual cost is limited to \$390,968.00. Additional costs must be approved in writing by the Ohio Rail Development Commission (ORDC) prior to being incurred. Emergency verbal authorizations by ORDC may be permitted and will be confirmed by ORDC in writing within ten (10) business days of the verbal approval.

This authorization is contingent upon CSX Transportation accepting the following instructions:

1. CSX's project foreman will furnish written notification five (5) working days prior to the date work will start at the project site to Don Damron, ORDC, Mail Stop #3140, 1980 West Broad Street, 2nd Floor, Columbus Ohio 43223, or email don.damron@dot.state.oh.us, or Fax 614-728-4520, (phone: 614-466-2509; cell phone: 614-917-8466), and to the Public Utilities Commission of Ohio at George.martin@puc.state.oh.us (phone 614-752-9107). The CSX project foreman will also notify the same of any stops and re-starts of the work activity and of the date work was completed for the project.
2. CSX will arrange for utilities to be located at the project site by the Ohio Utilities Protection Service (OUPS) prior to any construction activities at the site. Utilities that are not participating members of the service must be contacted directly by CSX.
3. CSX's project foremen will notify Don Damron at 614-917-8466 (cell) or don.damron@dot.state.oh.us (email) of any changes in the scope of work, cost overruns,



www.rail.ohio.gov

phone: 614.644.0306

IMPROVING RAIL TODAY FOR TOMORROW'S ECONOMY

material changes, etc. which are not included in the approved plan and estimate and secure approval of same before the work is performed.

4. CSX will furnish two (2) copies of each partial bill to ORDC. Please find the enclosed ODOT Purchase Order to reference when billing.
5. CSX will furnish two (2) copies of the final all-inclusive bill to ORDC stating the exact dates of starting and completing work, the initial and final dates of construction and location where the accounts may be audited.

Thank you for your assistance with these matters.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read "Donald J. Damron".

Donald J. Damron
Project Manager

C: Randall Schumacher, Supervisor, Rail Division, PUCO
George Martin, Grade Crossing Planner, PUCO
ORDC (file)



Diagnostic Review Team Survey

Date: 11-9-11

Location Data

Street or Road Name:

Route/Road Number
(i.e. Twp., Co., SR or US) TR 179

AAR-DOT No.: 518371V

County: HAR

Township: Hale Township

City:
(In or Near)

Ridgeway

Railroad
Name: CSX

Railroad
Division: Great Lakes

Branch/Line
Name:

Nearest RR
Timetable Station: Ridgeway

RR Milepost:
DI 124.02

On-Site Review Team

(Include: Name - Organization - Phone Number - Email)

1. Pam Arnold - Hale Township - 937.354.3415 (3171)

2. Ron Cronley - 937.354.3994

3. Ken McCullough - 937.354.5212

Ken McCullough

4. Karen Murphy CSXT 904-359-1650

5. Todd Darius ORDC 614-374-9298

6. George Martin PUCO 614-752-9107

7. E. Dea Elliott (937) 645-0631

8.

9.

Existing Traffic Control Devices

Type of Warning Devices	Installed?		Quantity/Comments
Advance Warning Signs (condition?)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No	2 good
'Stop' Signs	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	
'Stop Ahead' Signs	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	
Pavement Markings (condition?)	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	
Crossbucks	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No	2
Number of Tracks Signs	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No	2
Inventory Tags	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No	2
Interconnected Highway Traffic Signal	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	
Mast-Mounted Flashing Lights	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	
Cantilever Flashing Lights	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	Number: Length:
Side Lights	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	
Automatic Gates	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	Number: Length:
Bells	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	Number:
Sidewalk Gate Arms	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	
'No Turn' Signs	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	
Illumination	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	
Is crossing flagged by train crew?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	
Other	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	

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

	Initial Information (from database)	Revised
Number & dates of crashes in previous 5 years	0	0
Hazard Ranking	609	Date Run: 10/27/11

Railroad Data

Railroad Characteristics	Initial Information (from database)	Revised
Total trains per day	29	29
< 1 per day		
Day thru trains	12	12
Night thru trains	15	15
Daytime switching movements	2	2
Nighttime switching movements	0	
Total number of tracks	2	2
Number of main tracks	2	2
Number of other tracks	1	1
Maximum train speed	60	60
Typical train speed		55 to 60
Amtrak		

If non-gated crossing, is clearing sight distance adequate in all quadrants? (See Table 1) ☐ Yes ☒ No

If multiple tracks, can two trains occupy crossing at the same time? ☒ Yes ☐ No

Can one train block the motorists' view of another train at crossing? ☒ Yes (Explain below) ☐ No

Can one or more tracks be eliminated through the crossing? ☐ Yes ☒ No

Are there other track(s) crossing this same roadway within 100 ft of this crossing? ☐ Yes ☒ No

If yes, Crossing DOT #(if different) _____

If yes, distance _____ (take measurement between track centerlines at closest point along roadway)

Roadway Data

Local Highway Authority:	Hale Township	
Roadway Characteristics	Initial Information (from database)	Revised
Average daily traffic	68 (2007)	68
Highway paved	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
Roadway Surface:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Blacktop <input type="checkbox"/> Gravel <input type="checkbox"/> Concrete <input type="checkbox"/> Other _____	
Roadway width:	18.0 ft.	
Number of highway lanes		2
Urban or Rural	Rural Local	Rural
Vehicle Speed:	55 MPH	
School Bus Operation:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Amount	
Hazardous Materials Trucks:	<input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Amount	
Shoulders:	<input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	
Is the shoulder surfaced?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Yes	
Is there existing guardrail along roadway in crossing vicinity?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Yes	
Is stopping site distance adequate? (See Table 2)	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No If no, deficient approach(es) _____	

Quadrant _____ Curb and Gutter: <input type="checkbox"/> Functional (Curb height = 4" or more) <input type="checkbox"/> Non-functional (Curb height = Less than 4") <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> None	Quadrant _____ Curb and Gutter: <input type="checkbox"/> Functional (Curb height = 4" or more) <input type="checkbox"/> Non-functional (Curb height = Less than 4") <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> None
Pedestrians: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Yes	
Is sidewalk present? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Yes	
Is there a nearby intersection that could cause queuing over the crossing? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Yes If yes, Distance _____	
Is this intersection signalized? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Yes	
Are the signals currently interconnected with the existing crossing warning devices? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Yes	
Is there a 'Do not Stop on Track' sign? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Yes	
Is a roadway improvement project (e.g. widening, turn lanes, nearby new or upgraded traffic signal, sidewalk) planned at or near this location in the foreseeable future? <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Yes If yes, Improvement type <u>NO</u> Lead Agency _____ Timeline/completion _____	
Is it the consensus of the Diagnostic Review Team that this is a potential closure project? <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes Explain reasons: _____	
Type of Development	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Open Space <input type="checkbox"/> Industrial <input type="checkbox"/> Residential	<input type="checkbox"/> Institutional <input type="checkbox"/> Commercial Location of nearby schools: <u>1 1/2 each way see comment</u>
Utility Information	
Is commercial power available? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Yes	
Utility Provider (Company Name) _____ Phone Number _____	
Nearest Available Power Source <u>300' From Crossing</u>	
What other utilities are present? <u>Sprint</u> (add locations to sketch)	
Is(are) there potential utility conflict(s) <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Unknown	
Comments: _____	

Potential Red Flags / Project Challenges

Traffic Signal Preemption (include traffic signal intersection name and LHA with jurisdiction over traffic signal, if known):

NA

Crossing Consolidation or Closure:

Poss see comments

Real Estate or ROW:

CSX 115 Twp 30'

Culverts / Drainage / Ballast Conditions:

Roadway and/or Sidewalks:

NA

Circuitry (e.g. reaches out to other crossings, specific needs, etc.):






Overlapping Circuits

Environmental:

NA

Other:

Diagnostic Team Recommendations

	Quadrants Needed
<input type="checkbox"/> Install/upgrade active devices	
<input type="checkbox"/> Automatic Flashing Lights (AFLS)	
<input type="checkbox"/> AFLS / Cants	
<input type="checkbox"/> AFLS / Gates	
<input type="checkbox"/> AFLS / Gates / Cants	
<input type="checkbox"/> Bells / number	
<input type="checkbox"/> Upgrade circuitry / type	
<input type="checkbox"/> Sidelights	
<input type="checkbox"/> Guardrail Needed	
<input type="checkbox"/> Install/Replace curb	
<input type="checkbox"/> Bungalow placement & offset from rail & highway	
<input type="checkbox"/> Other (define)	
Comments:	
Hold til further conversation tarp	
<input type="checkbox"/> Install/upgrade traffic signal preemption	
<input type="checkbox"/> No improvements needed	
<input type="checkbox"/> Other (define)	
Acknowledgement of Recommendations (each entity represented at the diagnostic must have at least one signature acknowledgement):	
 	
 	
	

1st Monday @ 7:00

grain bins on 31 Mt Victory

10/29/2012: CSX and PUCO agree to L&G installation.

1/9/2013: Township (R. Conley) agrees to L&G install.

1/9/2013: ORDC concurs that L&G install is the appropriate treatment. C. Stout 1/9/13.

Field Dimensions

Sidewalk

Parkway

Roadway

Roadway

Parkway

Sidewalk

Show North
Direction

Crossing Angle ☐ 0-29° ☐ 30-59° ☐ 60-90° Measured in 1st Quadrant?

Measurements by: [Signature]

Field Sketch

Include utilities as marked by OUPS and LHA; include ROW boundaries as indicated by railroad and LHA.

See attached Earth photo

Crossing Angle ☐ 0-29° ☐ 30-59° ☐ 60-90° Measured in _____ Quadrant?

Sketch by: _____

TABLE 1

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)
0	n/a
5	50
10	70
15	105
20	135
25	180
30	225
35	280
40	340
45	410
50	490
55	570
60	660
65	760
70	865

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

Notes:

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

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

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



HAR TR 179 518371V



40.5228872N,83.5530004W

© 2011 Google

Imagery State of Ohio / OSIP

Google earth

Google earth

feet
meters

