

PENNSYLVANIA PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION
Uniform Cover and Calendar Sheet

| | |
|---|---|
| 1. REPORT DATE: March 8, 2000 | 2. BUREAU AGENDA NO.: MAR-2000-OSA-0092* |
| 3. BUREAU: Office of Special Assistants | 5. PUBLIC MEETING DATE: March 16, 2000 |
| 4. SECTION(S): | |
| 6. APPROVED BY: Director: C. W. Davis, 7-1827 Supervisor: | |
| 7. PERSONS IN CHARGE: R. H. Albert, 7-8108 | |
| 8. DOCKET NO.: C-00992533 | |

DOCKETED
MAR 24 2000

9. (a) **CAPTION** (abbreviate if more than 4 lines)
 (b) **Short summary of history & facts, documents & briefs**
 (c) **Recommendation**

DOCUMENT FOLDER

(a) Borough of Tamaqua v. Reading, Blue Mountain and Northern Railroad

(b) On May 24, 1999, the Borough of Tamaqua (Borough) filed a Formal Complaint against Reading, Blue Mountain and Northern Railroad Co. (Railroad). Answers to the Complaint were filed by the Pennsylvania Department of Transportation (PennDOT), the County of Schuylkill, and the Railroad. After the conduct of a hearing, the Recommended Decision of Administrative Law Judge (ALJ) Herbert Cohen herein was issued on January 26, 2000, in which he recommended, *inter alia*, that the entire cost for the project be placed on the Railroad. The Railroad filed Exceptions to the Recommended Decision on February 9, 2000, as did the Borough on February 10, 2000. PennDOT filed Reply Exceptions on February 18, 2000.

(c) The Office of Special Assistants recommends that the Commission adopt a proposed draft Opinion and Order which: (1) denies the Exceptions of the Railroad; (2) grants, in part, the Exceptions of the Borough, and (3) otherwise adopts the Recommended Decision as the action of the Commission.

| | |
|--|--------------------------------|
| 10. MOTION BY: Commissioner Bloom | Commissioner Wilson - Yes |
| | Commissioner Fitzpatrick - Yes |
| SECONDED: Commissioner Brownell | Commissioner |

CONTENTS OF MOTION: Staff recommendation adopted.

**PENNSYLVANIA
PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION
Harrisburg, PA 17105-3265**

Public Meeting held March 16, 2000

Commissioners Present:

Robert K. Bloom, Vice Chairman
Nora Mead Brownell
Aaron Wilson, Jr.
Terrance J. Fitzpatrick

Borough of Tamaqua

C-00992533

v.

Reading, Blue Mountain and
Northern Railroad Co.

OPINION AND ORDER

BY THE COMMISSION:

Before the Commission for consideration and disposition are the Exceptions¹ filed by Reading, Blue Mountain and Northern Railroad (Railroad) on February 9, 2000, and the Exceptions filed by the Borough of Tamaqua (Borough) on February 10, 2000, to the Recommended Decision of Administrative Law Judge (ALJ) Herbert S. Cohen which was issued on January 26, 2000, in the above-captioned proceeding. The Pennsylvania Department of Transportation (PennDOT) filed Reply

¹ Although styled "Exceptions," the documents filed by both the Railroad and the Borough consisted, in fact, of only one (1) Exception. However, the designation "Exceptions" will be employed in the instant Opinion and Order.

Exceptions on February 18, 2000. On February 23, 2000, the Honorable David G. Argall filed a Letter in support of the Borough's Exceptions.

History of Proceeding

On May 24, 1999, the Borough filed a Formal Complaint at the above-captioned docket against the Railroad. The Borough alleged that the condition of an at-grade railroad crossing situated on West Broad Street (Pennsylvania State Route 209) in the Borough was in such a deteriorated condition that the traffic in the westbound lane swerves either to the left or to the right to avoid significant depressions caused by the deterioration of the rubberized surface of the crossing, thereby endangering the safety of pedestrians using the sidewalks and the motor vehicles traveling in the opposite direction. In its prayer for relief, the Borough requested that the Commission order the Railroad "to fix the railroad crossing on West Broad Street in the Borough of Tamaqua."

Answers to the Complaint were filed by PennDOT, the County of Schuylkill (County), and the Railroad. Thereafter, by written notice dated August 3, 1999, the Parties were advised that an initial hearing on the Complaint was scheduled for September 21, 1999, in Harrisburg.

At the hearing, the Railroad, PennDOT, the Commission's Bureau of Transportation and Safety (BTS), and the County were all represented by counsel. The Parties collectively offered the testimony of five (5) witnesses. The record of the proceeding consists of sixty-seven (67) pages of testimony. The Recommended Decision of ALJ Cohen was issued on January 26, 2000. In his Recommended Decision, the ALJ recommended, *inter alia*, that the entire cost for the reconstruction of the rail-highway

crossing be placed on the Railroad. Exceptions and Reply Exceptions were filed as noted above.

Discussion

In his Recommended Decision, ALJ Cohen made thirty-six (36) Findings of Fact (R. D., pp. 3-7) and drew eight (8) Conclusions of Law (R. D., pp. 16-17). We shall adopt and incorporate herein by reference the ALJ's Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law to the extent that they are not expressly or by necessary implication overruled or modified by this Opinion and Order.

Initially, we are reminded that we are not required to consider expressly or at great length each and every contention raised by a party to our proceedings. *University of Pennsylvania v. Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission*, 86 Pa. 410, 485 A.2d 1217, 1222 (1984). Any Exception or argument which is not specifically addressed herein shall be deemed to have been duly considered and denied without further discussion.

The Railroad filed one (1) Exception to the Recommended Decision. In its Exception, the Railroad objects to Ordering Paragraph No. 3 of the Recommended Decision, wherein, the ALJ recommended as follows:

3. That Reading, Blue Mountain and Northern Railroad Co., at its sole cost and expense, within 6 months of the approval of the detailed construction plans, furnish all material and do all work necessary to reconstruct the West

Broad Street at-grade crossing in accordance with the approved construction plans.

(R.D., p. 18).

The Railroad objects to the foregoing Ordering Paragraph because it places the entire cost of the crossing reconstruction upon the Railroad. The Railroad contends that it is inconceivable that the benefit to a relatively lightly used rail line such as the one here at issue could so outweigh the benefit to the Commonwealth that one hundred percent (100%) of the cost of the project would be assessed to the Railroad:

The Railroad points to the following considerations as mandating that PennDOT be ordered to bear one hundred percent (100%) of the crossing relocation costs: (1) relative benefits accruing to the Railroad versus PennDOT; (2) availability of state/federal funding; (3) responsibility for deferred maintenance at the crossing; (4) the general equities of the situation; and (5) directives of the prior Order herein, issued on May 2, 1980. (Railroad Exc., pp. 1-5).

We note that, in the Opinion of the Commonwealth Court of Pennsylvania in the consolidated proceeding captioned *City of Philadelphia v. Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission* (No. 1999 C.D. 1995, filed May 24, 1996) and *Consolidated Rail Corporation v. Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission* (No. 2100 C.D. 1995, filed May 24, 1996), 676 A.2d 1298, 1301 (Pa. Commonwealth), *alloc. denied* 684 A.2d 558 (1996), *cert. Denied*, 117 S.Ct. 1334 (1997), the standards traditionally applied by the Commission to allocate costs and assign maintenance responsibility in rail/highway crossing matters were reviewed. The Court stated, in pertinent part, as follows:

In exercising this [allocation and assignment] authority, the PUC is not limited to any fixed rate [sic] with respect to the allocation of costs, but instead, may take all relevant factors into consideration. *Department of Transportation v. Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission*, 469 A.2d 1149 (Pa. Cmwlth. 1983). The allocation of costs between the parties is within the discretion of the PUC, but such allocation must be just and reasonable. *Borough of South Greensburg v. Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission*, 544 A.2d 82 (Pa. Cmwlth. 1988). The decision must be based upon some sound legal or factual basis. *Port Authority of Allegheny County v. Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission*, 207 Pa. Superior Ct. 299, 217 A.2d 810 (1966). (Footnote omitted).

In the referenced omitted footnote, the Court (slip. op. at 5-6) noted that it had restated, recently, in *Green Township Board of Supervisors*, 668 A.2d 615, 619 (Pa. Cmwlth. 1995), the factors that have "consistently been viewed as relevant to the Commission's allocation of costs:

1. The party that originally built the crossing.
2. The party that owned and maintained the crossing.
3. The relative benefit initially conferred on each party with the construction of the crossing.
4. Whether either party is responsible for the deterioration of the crossing that has led to the need for its repair, replacement or removal.
5. The relative benefit that each party will receive from the repair, replacement or removal of the crossing.
(Citations omitted).

Specific factors that have been considered by the Commission in determining an appropriate allocation of costs associated with the relocation of facilities of non-carrier utilities in connection with the alteration of rail/highway crossings are as follows:

- (1) the extent of the benefit to the utility and its ratepayers which results from the alteration of the involved facilities;
 - (2) the placing of the involved costs on the party responsible for the alteration;
 - (3) the availability of state and federal funds;
 - (4) the equities of the situation.
- (Footnote omitted.)

Re City of Pittsburgh, 62 Pa. P.U.C. 150, 156 (1986).

However, as we have often had occasion to note, these factors do not present a fixed test, and the Commission is not required to limit itself to any or all factors enumerated. *Bell Atlantic-Pennsylvania v. Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission*, 672 A.2d 352, 354-355 (Pa. Cmwlth 1995). In short, the Commission must take all relevant factors into consideration, and the only fundamental requirement placed on the Commission, as above noted, is that its final Order must be just and reasonable.

The first factor to be considered is the relative benefits accruing to the Railroad and to PennDOT as a result of completion of this project. While we recognize that the reconstructed crossing will provide a benefit to the motoring public, we also recognize that substantial benefits will thereby accrue to the Railroad. We note that the installation of a full depth concrete crossing would provide a longer useful life than a rubber crossing, and would require less maintenance. (R.D., p. 11, citing the testimony of William J. Knerr, a Senior Civil Engineer with the Commission's Bureau of Transportation and Safety). Accordingly, we conclude that the Railroad will benefit from

the reconstructed crossing by experiencing, in the future, fewer service interruptions due to the deteriorated condition of this crossing.

The Railroad asserted that, given its choice, it would have chosen to install a timber and asphalt crossing at the relevant site. (Tr., p. 47). However, we note that the future maintenance of a full depth concrete crossing will not require the replacement of timber and asphalt components. (Tr., p. 56). The Railroad will, as discussed above, thus benefit in the future by incurring fewer maintenance costs due to the installation of the type of crossing herein mandated.

The next factor we consider is the availability of state or federal funding. The Railroad argues that the record supports a finding that state or federal funding is currently available for replacement of the subject crossing. However, our review of the record leads us to a different conclusion. PennDOT's witness, Ken McClain, stated that the subject crossing is not currently programmed under the Federal Rail Safety Program or under any PennDOT state programs. (R.D., p. 12).

Mr. McClain further provided uncontradicted testimony that all current federal and state funding has been programmed and allocated to other crossing projects and that a new four (4)-year program will open starting in the 2001 to 2004 time frame. (Tr., p. 31). Therefore, to take advantage of this program, a plan for replacement of the crossing would have to be submitted, approved and ultimately prioritized within the grade crossing program for the 2001 to 2004 time frame. As will be further discussed below, this time frame is unacceptable due to safety considerations at the crossing. Additionally, we note that we are here discussing only the *potential* for funding of this crossing reconstruction project in the 2001 to 2004 time frame. Even if application were made for

inclusion of this project in the program, there can be no certainty at this point that the subject crossing will actually be chosen for funding under the program.

The next factor to be considered is whether the Railroad deferred maintenance on the subject crossing. The Railroad argues that it did not defer maintenance on the crossing, but our review of the record leads us to a different conclusion. Indeed, the Railroad's own witness indicated that it had never even made a cursory inspection of the crossing and had never inspected the crossing panels, the condition of the sub-base or the condition of the ties. Also, the testimony indicates that the Railroad never replaced any of the rubber panels, even when they began to fail. (Tr., p. 52).

The evidentiary record supports a finding that the deteriorated condition of the crossing stems from the Railroad's failure to conduct any type of investigation or assessment of the problems at the crossing, even though it was aware of trouble with the crossing as far back as 1995. (Tr., p. 54). We note that the Railroad could have pursued replacement of this crossing any time in the last five (5) years. Had the Railroad programmed the crossing for replacement five (5) years ago, there would most likely be a new crossing at this site today.

The next factor to be considered is the general equities present in this proceeding. The Railroad argues that, on the basis of general equities, it should not be required to bear the cost of replacing the subject crossing. Our review of the record, however, leads us to a different conclusion. We note that the Railroad will benefit from a safe, signalized, smooth crossing area that will prevent accidents and also will promote public safety. Additionally, as noted above, it is the Railroad's lack of prior diligence in maintenance of this crossing that has led to its current deteriorated condition.

Installation of a new concrete crossing surface will provide a smooth riding surface for vehicular traffic, allowing unimpeded travel through the crossing area and, as a result, a safer crossing area. We find that a safer crossing area will be a benefit to the Railroad as well as to the motoring public, because the traffic will then be moving through the crossing in the proper signalized area, and erratic car movements will be prevented. (Tr., p. 11). This will help prevent accidents that could potentially involve vehicles, trains, and pedestrians.

The final factor for consideration herein is our prior Order issued relative to this crossing. The Railroad took the position that the instant Opinion and Order should be consistent with our prior Order herein, which was issued on May 2, 1980 (PennDOT Exh. No. 4), which required Consolidated Rail Corporation (Conrail) to construct the current rubber crossing and further required PennDOT to reimburse Conrail for the work. Our review of the evidentiary record herein, however, leads us to conclude that there have been substantial changes in circumstances in the almost twenty (20) years since the issuance of the May 2, 1980 Order such as to mandate a different result herein.

In our 1980 Order, we determined that the subject crossing should be replaced with a high-type crossing surface. In that case, federal and state funding was available for the reconstruction of the crossing. As such, PennDOT volunteered to submit the project for placement on the statewide high-type crossing surface program. (PennDOT Exh. No. 4, p. 3). Also, we note that, in the prior proceeding herein, the subject crossing was not in such dire need of repair as it is at the present time. Thus, the replacement of the crossing under the 1980 Order could be postponed until funding was available and in place. Finally, we note that PennDOT paid for the last total reconstruction of this crossing and has also fulfilled all of its concurrent maintenance

responsibilities at this crossing. These considerations lead to the conclusion that the Railroad should be directed to undertake the financial responsibility of reconstructing this crossing in the present instance.

Based on consideration of the above-recounted factors, we find that the ALJ's recommended allocation of reconstruction costs herein to the Railroad is just and reasonable and in accord with the evidence of record. Accordingly, the Railroad's Exceptions are denied.

The Borough also filed an Exception to the Recommended Decision in which it objects to Ordering Paragraphs Nos. 2 and 3 therein, which are as follows:

2. That Reading, Blue Mountain and Northern Railroad Co., at its sole cost and expense, within three (3) months of the date of issuance of this Opinion and Order, prepare and submit to all Parties of record for review, and to this Commission for review and approval, detailed construction plans for the removal of the failed rubber crossing surface and the reconstruction of the West Broad Street at-grade crossing with a new concrete surface between the tracks and for a distance of two (2) feet outside of the tracks. Said plan to provide for but not be limited to work related to the track, wooden ties, stone ballast and drainage facilities as necessary to accommodate the new concrete surface.

6. That Reading, Blue Mountain and Northern Railroad Co., at its sole cost and expense, within six (6) months of the date of approval of the detailed construction plans, furnish all material and do all work necessary to reconstruct the West Broad Street at-grade

crossing in accordance with the approved construction plans.

The Borough's objection to the foregoing Ordering Paragraphs is that, according to their terms, the Railroad will be given three (3) months from the date of issuance of this Opinion and Order to submit for approval detailed construction plans. After approval of those plans, the Railroad will be given six (6) months to reconstruct the subject crossing.

The Borough objects to this proposed time frame for the completion of the work because it will mean a delay of nine (9) months plus the time necessary for the Commission to review and approve the plans until the crossing is repaired. The Borough points out that all Parties hereto agree that, because of the significant depressions and defects in the rubberized surface of the crossing, there is a danger to the safety of pedestrians using the sidewalks adjacent to the crossing and to motor vehicles traveling over the crossing itself.

The Borough notes that it first complained about the condition of the crossing in April of 1995. (Tr., pp. 20-23). The Borough states that, from April of 1995 until the present, the Railroad has done nothing to alleviate the danger and hazards attendant to the condition of the crossing. Since the date of the hearing on September 21, 1999, the condition of the crossing has deteriorated even further and has become an even greater hazard to the pedestrians and motor vehicles which use this crossing daily. The Borough posits that it is unacceptable to permit the Railroad to defer final construction of the new crossing for a period of nine (9) months after review of the Recommended Decision by the Commission, such that this project will be delayed until the year 2001.

The Borough concludes by requesting that we shorten the time frame for completion of this project such that the Railroad be directed to prepare and submit detailed construction plans within twenty (20) days of the date of issuance of this Opinion and Order. The Borough further requests that the Railroad be directed to complete the necessary work to reconstruct the crossing within sixty (60) days of the date of approval of the plans. (Borough Exc., pp. 1-3).

The Honorable David G. Argall, State Representative of the 124th Legislative District, filed a Letter herein in which he offered his support of the Borough's Exceptions. Representative Argall notes that it is imperative that replacement of this dangerous and heavily traveled railroad grade crossing not be permitted to drag on any longer than is absolutely necessary. Representative Argall further notes that the timeline established by the ALJ in his Recommended Decision would allow this long overdue project to continue well into the year 2001. Representative Argall concludes by requesting that we shorten the ALJ's recommended timeline so as to allow for total replacement of this crossing within the calendar year 2000.²

In considering the Borough's Exceptions, we note that it is our statutory responsibility regarding rail-highway crossing matters, to protect and promote the public safety. There is substantial credible evidence in the record which demonstrates that the instant crossing presents a significant hazard to pedestrian and motor vehicle traffic. With this consideration in mind, we agree with the Borough that the timeframe for the submission of the plans and the completion of the work herein ordered should be

² We note that Representative Argall was not a party or participant in these proceedings. Accordingly, his comments shall be afforded only such treatment as permitted by the Public Utility Code and the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure under these circumstances. (See, 66 Pa. C.S. §335(b) and 52 Pa. Code §5.533).

shortened, in order that all the relevant work be completed within the current calendar year of 2000.

However, we are also mindful of the need to provide the Railroad with a feasible timeframe for the completion of the relevant work. Accordingly, we direct that the Railroad submit detailed construction plans for this project to all Parties and to the Commission within thirty (30) days of the date of issuance of this Opinion and Order. We further direct that the Railroad complete all the necessary work for this project within three (3) months of the Commission's approval of the detailed construction plans. The Borough's Exceptions are, therefore, granted to the extent consistent with this Opinion and Order.

Conclusion

We have carefully reviewed the record as developed in this proceeding, including the ALJ's Recommended Decision and the Exceptions taken thereto. Premised upon our review, we conclude that: (1) the Railroad's Exceptions are not meritorious, and will be denied; (2) the Borough's Exceptions are meritorious, in part, and will be granted to that extent; and (3) the ALJ's Recommended Decision will be adopted as modified by this Opinion and Order; **THEREFORE,**

IT IS ORDERED:

1. That the Exceptions filed by Reading, Blue Mountain and Northern Railroad on February 9, 2000, to the Recommended Decision of Administrative Law Judge Herbert S. Cohen herein are denied.

2. That the Exceptions filed by the Borough of Tamaqua on February 10, 2000, to the Recommended Decision of Administrative Law Judge Herbert S. Cohen herein are granted, in part, consistent with this Opinion and Order.

3. That the Recommended Decision of Administrative Law Judge Herbert S. Cohen issued herein on January 26, 2000, is adopted, as modified, to the extent that it is consistent with this Opinion and Order.

4. That the Complaint at Docket No. C-00992533, *Borough of Tamaqua v. Reading, Blue Mountain and Northern Railroad Co.*, involving West Broad Street (S.R. 209) where it crosses the tracks of Reading, Blue Mountain and Northern Railroad Co. in the Borough of Tamaqua is hereby sustained.

5. That Reading, Blue Mountain and Northern Railroad Co., at its sole cost and expense, within thirty (30) days of the date of issuance of this Opinion and Order, prepare and submit to all Parties of record for review, and to this Commission for review and approval, detailed construction plans for the removal of the failed rubber crossing surface and the reconstruction of the West Broad Street at-grade crossing with a new concrete surface between the tracks and for a distance of two (2) feet outside of the tracks. Said plan is to provide for, but not be limited to, work related to the track, wooden ties, stone ballast and drainage facilities as necessary to accommodate the new concrete surface.

6. That Reading, Blue Mountain and Northern Railroad Co., at its sole cost and expense, within three (3) months of the date of approval of the detailed construction plans, furnish all material and do all work necessary to reconstruct the West Broad Street at-grade crossing in accordance with the approved construction plans.

7. That Reading, Blue Mountain and Northern Railroad Co., at its sole cost and expense, furnish all material and do all work necessary to establish, mark and maintain a suitable detour, if necessary, for vehicular traffic desiring to use the West Broad Street at-grade crossing during the time the crossing surface is being reconstructed. Said detour is to be established in cooperation with Pennsylvania Department of Transportation and the Borough of Tamaqua and is to be established in accordance with the Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices.

8. That Reading, Blue Mountain and Northern Railroad Co., at its sole cost and expense, furnish all material and do all work necessary to alter or relocate any of its other rail facilities to accommodate construction of the project.

9. That the Reading, Blue Mountain and Northern Railroad Co., at its sole cost and expense, furnish and maintain flagmen, watchmen and engineering and construction inspection services, as necessary, while work is being performed along and across its tracks in accordance with this Opinion and Order.

10. That, during the time the improvement is being constructed across and adjacent to its tracks, Reading, Blue Mountain and Northern Railroad Co. shall conduct its operations in the vicinity of the crossing in a safe manner and under control.

11. That any relocation of, changes in, or removal of any existing structures, equipment, or facilities of any public utility other than the Reading, Blue Mountain and Northern Railroad Co. located within the limits of any highway within the limits of this Commission's jurisdiction, which may be required as incidental to the execution of the improvement, be made by the said public utility at its initial cost and

expense and in such a manner as will not interfere with the construction of the improvement.

12. That any relocation of, changes in, or removal of any existing structures, equipment, or facilities of any public utility other than the Reading, Blue Mountain and Northern Railroad Co. located beyond the limits of any highway within the limits of this Commission's jurisdiction, which may be required as incidental to the execution of the improvement, be made by the said public utility in such a manner as will not interfere with the construction of the improvement.

13. That the Pennsylvania Department of Transportation, the Borough of Tamaqua, the Reading, Blue Mountain and Northern Railroad Co., and the involved non-carrier utilities cooperate with each other during the construction of the improvement so that the operations or facilities of any of the Parties will not be endangered or unnecessarily impeded.

14. That Reading, Blue Mountain and Northern Railroad Co., at least ten (10) days prior to the start of work, notify the Pennsylvania Department of Transportation and the Borough of Tamaqua of the actual date the work will be started on the West Broad Street at-grade crossing.

15. That, upon completion of the improvement, Reading, Blue Mountain and Northern Railroad Co., at its sole cost and expense, furnish all material and do all work necessary thereafter to maintain its railroad facilities at the West Broad Street at-grade crossing.


16. That, upon completion of the improvement and its opening to public use, Pennsylvania Department of Transportation, at its sole cost and expense, furnish all material and do all work necessary thereafter to maintain the highway approaches to the West Broad Street at-grade crossing to a point two (2) feet from the outermost rail.

17. That upon completion of the improvement and its opening to public use, Reading, Blue Mountain and Northern Railroad Co., at its sole cost and expense, furnish all material and do all work necessary thereafter to maintain its railroad facilities at the West Broad Street at-grade crossing, including but not limited to the crossing surface between the tracks and to a point two (2) feet beyond the outermost rails.

18. That this Opinion and Order, insofar as it imposes the cost of the improvement on the Reading, Blue Mountain and Northern Railroad Co., is without prejudice to it to recover from others the cost so incurred in accordance with any lawful agreement.

19. That this Opinion and Order is binding upon the Parties hereto and their respective successors and assigns.

BY THE COMMISSION,


James J. McNulty
Secretary

(SEAL)

ORDER ADOPTED: March 16, 2000

ORDER ENTERED: MAR 20 2000