

BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF THE STATE OF COLORADO

PROCEEDING NO. 19A-0391R

IN THE MATTER OF THE APPLICATION OF COLORADO PACIFIC RAILROAD FOR
AUTHORITY TO CHANGE A GRADE CROSSING FROM ACTIVE WITH FLASHERS TO
PASSIVE WARNING SIGNS ONLY AT COLORADO BLVD. AND COLORADO PACIFIC
RAILROAD IN ORDWAY, CROWLEY COUNTY, STATE OF COLORADO.

**COMMISSION DECISION DENYING
APPLICATION WITHOUT PREJUDICE**

Mailed Date: November 5, 2019
Adopted Date: September 25, 2019

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	BY THE COMMISSION	1
A.	Statement	1
B.	Background.....	2
C.	Application	3
D.	Findings and Conclusions.....	5
II.	ORDER.....	7
A.	The Commission Orders That:	7
B.	ADOPTED IN COMMISSIONERS' WEEKLY MEETING September 25, 2019.	8

I. BY THE COMMISSION

A. Statement

1. By this Decision, the Commission denies, without prejudice, the application filed on July 12, 2019, by Colorado Pacific Railroad (CPR) for authorization to change the active crossing protection from flashers to passive warning only at the crossing at Colorado Boulevard

and Colorado Pacific Railroad in Ordway, Crowley County, Colorado (Application). As part of this Decision, the Commission provides instruction to CPR on additional information that CPR should include in any new application for authorization to change the protections at this crossing.

B. Background

2. On July 12, 2019, CPR filed the Application with the Commission. The Application requests an order authorizing changing the active crossing protection from flashers to passive warning only, with the addition of new retroreflective R15-1 crossbuck signs, new R1-2 YIELD signs, new I-13 ENS signs, new W10-1 advance warning signs on the north and south approaches, and two new W10-2 advance warning signs on the east and west approaches to Colorado Boulevard, north of the CPR.

3. On July 16, 2019, the Commission issued notice of the Application and set an intervention period of 30 days from the date of the notice.

4. On August 8, 2019, the Mayor of Town of Ordway (Town) filed an objection to the Application on behalf of the Town. The Mayor explains that, based on safety concerns stressed by constituents, the Town adopted the objection at its July 22, 2019 Town of Ordway Board of Trustee's meeting. The Mayor explains that because Colorado Avenue serves as the main entry into the Town, the Town believes it is necessary to equip the crossing with flashers. The Mayor explains the Town believes this will ensure safe crossing in a high traffic area where residents have become accustomed to crossing void a locomotive or other such machinery. The Mayor states it is the Town's desire that CPR willfully comply with this request, thus ensuring safety for all residents residing in, or visiting, the Town, and, in doing so, ensuring a cooperative and sustainable working relationship with the Town and its elected officials.

5. On August 28, 2019, the Commission deliberated on the Application at its Commissioners' Weekly Meeting. By minute entry, the Commission deemed the Application complete for purposes of § 40-6-109.5, C.R.S., which establishes timelines for a Commission decision on applications. *See also* the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure, Rule 4 *Code of Colorado Regulations* 723-1-1303(c) (setting forth the process by which the Commission determines completeness of an application). However, after discussion, the Commission tabled any further decisions on the Application in order to consult with legal counsel.

6. On September 18, 2019, the Commission deliberated again on the Application at its Commissioners' Weekly Meeting. After discussion among the two Commissioners present, the Commission tabled the matter to its next Commissioners' Weekly Meeting, when all three Commissioners would be present to vote.

7. On September 25, 2019, the Commission deliberated on the Application at its Commissioners' Weekly Meeting. The Commission determined that it would deny the Application without prejudice and provide instruction on additional information that CPR should include in any new application.

C. Application

8. The Application indicates one train per day is anticipated at this crossing, with no projection for additional trains within the next five years. The Application indicates the maximum speed of trains using the crossing is ten miles per hour (MPH).¹ The Application indicates the speed limit for vehicles traveling through the crossing is 25 MPH. The Application

¹ The Application at p. 6, ¶ 6 states the maximum speed of trains using the crossing is ten MPH. This appears to conflict with the statement in the Application at p. 6, ¶ 7, that the timetable speed will be 25 mph.

reports the most recent average daily traffic study at the crossing, performed in 1985, accounted for 200 vehicles, 0 percent trucks, and 0 school buses. The Application includes an Accident Report from a December 11, 1995, accident at the crossing, when it was used by Union Pacific Railroad Company. The report indicates a driver did not stop at the crossing and was struck by a train. The driver was injured. The report is included as Attachment E to the Application.

9. The Application describes the following proposed changes: The existing crossing flashers and masts are to be removed. Two R15-1 retroreflective crossbuck signs will be installed, along with two R1-2 YIELD signs and two I-13 ENS signs, one on each approach. Two W10-1 advance warning signs will be installed, one on the north approach and one on the south approach. W10-2 advance warning signs will be installed on the east and west approaches to Colorado Boulevard, north of the main line. The Application states private funding by the railroad owner will cover the cost to remove the signals and install the proposed signs, estimated at \$5,000.

10. The Application describes the nature and need for these changes as follows:²

Missouri Pacific stopped running trains in 1999. They ran 10 trains per day, with some of the trains operating at night, at Timetable speed of 55 mph. The CPR will have one train per day, with timetable speed at this location of 25 mph. Revised traffic counts have been incorporated in the diagnostic review, and it has been determined that the crossing may be changed from Flashers to passive warning signs only, with no reduction in terms of the safety risk. At this remote location, and because there will not be a full time signal maintainer on the line, in the event of a power failure or signal malfunction, the flashers and bell could be activated and run in the on setting. It is most desirable to change to passive warning only. The local road is posted at 25 mph, and the crossing location has very good sight distance. Also, the train speed is very low.

11. The Application indicates the Diagnostic Team Review was performed on May 31, 2019 and included Dr. Pam Fischhaber of the Public Utilities Commission, Roy Elliott

² *Id.* at p. 6, ¶ 7.

(Crowley County Commissioner), and attendees from Crouch Engineering for CPR. The Grade Crossing Diagnostic Notes are included as Attachment D to the Application.

D. Findings and Conclusions

12. Section 40-4-106, C.R.S., gives the Commission jurisdiction over the crossings between railroad tracks and public highways. In enacting that statute, the General Assembly charged the Commission with, *inter alia*, promoting and safeguarding health and safety of the public and preventing accidents. *See* §§ 40-4-106(1) and (2)(a), C.R.S. Pursuant to this statute, the Commission has the power to determine the just and reasonable manner, including the particular point of crossing; prescribe the terms and conditions of installation and operation, maintenance, and warning at such crossings; and to allocate the costs of safety signals or devices, among other things. The Commission reviews the crossing safety issues in this Proceeding pursuant to this express statutory authority.

13. Mindful of our statutory charge to promote and safeguard the health and safety of the public and prevent accidents, we do not take lightly a request to remove existing active crossing protections at a crossing and replace them with passive warning protections. We are particularly concerned when cost savings appear to be the driving force for removing the existing active crossing protections. After reviewing the Application and its attachments, we have significant concerns with the lack of supporting evidence. Although we deemed the Application complete for purposes of § 40-6-109.5, C.R.S., that was a determination that the Application meets the basic requirements in our rules and not a determination that we found the Application would support granting the requested relief.

14. After further review of the Application, we find the Application and its attachments fall short of the information and supporting documentation that we would need to

authorize removal of the existing active protections at this crossing. In the Application, CPR concludes it is “most desirable” to change from active flashers to passive warning signs only.³ CPR contends that, because the crossing is in a “remote location” and there will not be a full time signal maintainer on the line, in the event of a power failure or signal malfunction, the flashers and bell could become activated and run continuously in the on setting.⁴ For further support, CPR states the local road is posted at 25 MPH, the crossing has “very good” sight distance, and train speed is “very low.”⁵ In a proceeding of this type concerning public safety at a crossing, we will not rely on mere conclusory statements that it is “most desirable” to change to passive warning at this “remote” crossing because the flashers and bell could become stuck in the on setting. Nor are we persuaded by the claims and existing support in the Application that the vehicle speed limit of 25 MPH, the “very good” sight distance, and “very low” train speed mitigate safety concerns of removing the existing active crossing protections.

15. Because of the lack of support in the Application, we find it appropriate at this time to deny the Application, without prejudice, and provide instruction on additional information to be included in any new application. In these circumstances, we conclude that denial without prejudice, and the opportunity for CPR to file a new application, provides the most straightforward and efficient avenue of relief for CPR.

16. In preparing any new application for authorization to change the active crossing protections at this crossing, we identify for CPR the following areas where we believe additional information is appropriate and would help our decision-making:

- a) The costs and benefits of maintaining the existing crossing protections at this crossing, including hiring sufficient staff to address signal maintenance,

³ *Id.*

⁴ *Id.*

⁵ *Id.*

compared to removing the existing crossing protections and replacing them with the protections proposed in the Application.

- b) The potential for CPR's business operations to change such that the train or speed increases in the short- or long-term, and the impact such changes would have on the hazard index.
- c) The operational expertise of CPR in managing this type of operation including its previous experience and levels of insurance.
- d) How CPR described its proposed business and operational expertise in its filings to the Federal Railroad Authority seeking authority to operate this business in Colorado.
- e) Potential changes in the risk of civil liability for CPR resulting from modifying the crossing protections as proposed in the Application.

17. Finally, we direct that in the event CPR files a new application, Dr. Pamela Fischhaber should participate as Commission Trial Staff, rather than as Commission Advisory Staff. We ask that Dr. Fischhaber intervene in the application proceeding as a party and provide testimony in the record to assist in our decision-making.

II. ORDER

A. The Commission Orders That:

1. The application filed on July 12, 2019, by Colorado Pacific Railroad for authorization to change the active crossing protection from flashers to passive warning only at the crossing at Colorado Boulevard and Colorado Pacific Railroad in Ordway, Crowley County, Colorado, is dismissed, without prejudice, consistent with the discussion above.

2. The 20-day period provided by § 40-6-114, C.R.S., to file applications for rehearing, reargument, or reconsideration begins on the first day after the effective date of this Decision.

3. This Decision is effective on its Mailed Date.

**B. ADOPTED IN COMMISSIONERS' WEEKLY MEETING
September 25, 2019.**

(S E A L)



ATTEST: A TRUE COPY

Doug Dean,
Director

THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION
OF THE STATE OF COLORADO

JEFFREY P. ACKERMANN

FRANCES A. KONCILJA

JOHN GAVAN

Commissioners