
BEFORE THE PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

**IN THE MATTER OF LOGAN CITY'S
PETITION REQUESTING
INVESTIGATION INTO UNION PACIFIC
RAILROAD COMPANY'S
ADMINISTRATION OF AGREEMENTS
AND MAINTENANCE PROVISIONS**

Docket No. 21-888-01

REBUTTAL TESTIMONY AND EXHIBITS

OF TRAVIS BAILEY

ON BEHALF OF UNION PACIFIC RAILROAD COMPANY

1 **Q. Please state your name and business address.**

2 A. Travis Bailey. My business address is 360 S. Fort Ln, Suite 3A, Layton, UT.

3 **Q. Please state your occupation and employment information.**

4 A. I am employed by RailPros and have been for 2 years. For those 2 years, I have held the
5 position of Traffic Engineer/Public Projects Manager.

6 **Q. On whose behalf are you testifying?**

7 A. I'm testifying on behalf of Union Pacific Railroad ("UP").

8 **Q. Have you previously filed testimony in this proceeding?**

9 A. Yes, I filed direct testimony on March 1, 2022.

10 **Q. What is the purpose of your rebuttal testimony?**

11 A. The purpose of my rebuttal testimony is to rebut the concerns raised by Thomas Dickinson
12 about safety at the 1400 North at-grade crossing and James Golden's implication that the
13 Master Agreement has any relevance to this proceeding.

14 **Q. James Golden has testified that the Master Agreement addresses the responsibility
15 for maintaining warning devices at grade crossings. Is this correct?**

16 A. Yes.

17 **Q. Does the Master Agreement apply to the 1400 North at-grade crossing?**

18 A. No. As I stated in my direct testimony, my understanding is that the Master Agreement
19 applies specifically to projects under the FHWA Section 130 program defined under 23
20 USC § 130. The 1400 North at-grade crossing is not a Section 130 crossing safety project.

21 **Q. Thomas Dickinson has testified that UP gave final approval of the design to AECOM.
22 Is this correct?**

23 A. I do not recall what I stated in my correspondence to Logan City while at AECOM, but the
24 Finalized Interconnected Crossing Report states “Over the past months, UPRR, City of
25 Logan and RailPros have worked together to resolve the issues of concern for the proposed
26 1400 North Grade Crossing. We recommend that the project moves forward to the railroad
27 signal design phase.” This report was issued by RailPros on January 24, 2019, and allows
28 the project to move forward to the signal design phase within UP’s process. A copy of this
29 report is attached as Exhibit UP__(TB-1R). However, this report does not constitute
30 approval of the project.

31 **Q. In his testimony, Thomas Dickinson cites several safety concerns at the 1400 North**
32 **at-grade crossing. In your opinion, what created these safety concerns?**

33 A. The safety concerns were created by Logan City when it allowed roadway widening and
34 traffic signal work to proceed without a signed Construction and Maintenance agreement
35 with UP.

36 **Q. Could these concerns have been mitigated without the railroad improvements?**

37 A. Yes. In my opinion, the City could have temporarily stopped widening the roadway when
38 it realized there was an issue with the Construction and Maintenance agreement language.
39 The traffic signal should not have been turned on without interconnection to the railroad’s
40 warning system. Rather, the intersection could have continued to operate as a four-way
41 stop or the stop signs could have been removed from 1400 North to prioritize east-west
42 movement.

43 **Q. Does this conclude your rebuttal testimony?**

44 A. Yes.