24 East Tioga Street Tunkhannock, PA 18657 phone: (570) 836-7625 fax: (570) 836-7620 e-mail: plitwin@epix.net

Friday, June 15, 2018

Rosemary Chiavetta, Secretary Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission PO Box 3265 Harrisburg, PA 17105-3265

RE: M-2013-2364201 & I-2015-2472242

Dear Secretary Chiavetta:

Enclosed for filing please find the Joint Brief of Wyoming County and Nicholson Borough in the above captioned matter. This filing does not contain facts that are not current in the record. Therefore, a verification is not required.

I hereby certify that a copy has been sent to all parties of record as indicated by the Certificate of Service.

Very truly yours,

Anthony P. Litwin

Solicitor for Wyoming County

and Nicholson Borough

Enclosure

cc: Parties of Record

2018 JUN 19 PM 3: 32

BEFORE THE PENNSYLVANIA PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION

Bridge Structure where State Route 1025 crosses over a single track of Delaware and Hudson Railway Company, Inc. (264 293 K) in Nicholson Borough, Wyoming County	:	M-2013-2364201	SECRET!	2018 JUN	
Investigation upon the Commission's own motion to determine the condition and disposition of six (6) existing structures carrying various highways above the grade of the tracks of the Canadian Pacific Railroad in Great Bend Township, New Milford Township, Brooklyn Township, Hop Bottom Borough Lathrop Township, Susquehanna County and Benton Township, Lackawanna County	:	1-2015-2472242	A PUC \RY'S BUREAU	19 PH 3: 32	

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that a true and correct copy of the County of Wyoming and Borough of Nicholson's Joint Brief was served upon the parties listed below, in accordance with the requirements of § 1.54 (relating to service by party), on this 15th day of June 2018:

Via Email and First Class Mail

JENNIFER BROWN-SWEENEY, ESQ GINA M. D'ALFONSO, ESQUIRE PENNDOT OFFICE OF CHIEF COUNSEL PO BOX 8212 HARRISBURG PA 17105-8212 jbrownswee@pa.gov

BENJAMIN C. DUNLAP, JR, ESQUIRE NAUMAN SMITH 200 NORTH THIRD STREET 18TH FL PO BOX 840 HARRISBURG PA 17108-0840 (For Norfolk Southern Railway Co) bdunlap@nssh.com DONALD J. FREDERICKSON, JR, ESQ LACKAWANNA COUNTY COMMISIONERS 200 ADAMS AVENUE 6th FLOOR SCRANTON PA 18503 Donald Frederickson@yahoo.com

CHARLES E. THOMAS, III, ESQ. 212 LOCUST STREET, SUITE 302 HARRISBURG PA 17101 (For Great Bend Township) cet3@tntlawfirm.com

TORI L. GIESLER, ESQUIRE
FIRST ENERGY SERVICE COMPANY
2800 POTTSVILLE PIKE
PO BOX 16001
READING PA 19612-6001
(For PENELEC)
tgiesler@firstenergycorp.com
tharrold@firstenergycorp.com

MICHAEL J. GIANGRIECO, ESQ SUSQUEHANNA COUNTY 60 PUBLIC SQUARE PO BOX 126 MONTROSE PA 18801 (For Susquehanna County) judy@giangriecolaw.com

BRADLEY R. GORTER, ESQ PA PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION AND ENFORCEMENT PO BOX 3265 HARRISBURG PA 17120 bgorter@pa.gov

Via Fist Class Mail

LARRY SEAMOUR CHAIRMAN BENTON TOWNSHIP PO BOX 29 FLEETVILLE PA 18420

DON SHIBLEY 19730 STATE ROUTE 11 NEW MILFORD PA 18834

COLONEL TYREE C BLOCKER
ACTING COMMISSIONER
PA STATE POLICE
3rd FLOOR DEPT HEADQUARTERS
1800 ELMERTON AVENUE
HARRISBURG PA 17110

GRAHAM A. ANTHONY SUPERVISOR TOWNSHIP OF BROOKLYN PO BOX 24 BROOKLYN PA 18813 ELMER DAY 1 COMCAST WAY DURYEA PA 18642-1114

PAUL J. HIMKA SUPERVISOR LATHROP TOWNSHIP 2479 STATE ROUTE 2096 HOP BOTTOM PA 18824

JOHN KOSHINSKI BOROUGH OF HOP BOTTOM 350 GREENWOOD STREET PO BOX 175 HOP BOTTOM PA 18824

SPRINT COMMUNICATIONS COMPANY LP WESLEY CARPENTER 484 WILLIAMSPORT PIKE BOX 113 MARTINSBURG WV 25404

JOE STEC 100 CTE DRIVE **DALLAS PA 18612** (For Frontier Communications Solutions)

Anthony P. Litwin, Esq.
Solicitor for Nicholson Borough and Wyoming

County

BEFORE THE PENNSYLVANIA PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION

Administrative Law Judge David A. Salapa

Bridge Structure where State Route 1025 crosses over a single track of Delaware and Hudson Railway Company, Inc. (264 293 K) in Nicholson Borough. **Wyoming County**

Investigation upon the Commission's own motion to determine the condition and disposition of six (6) existing structures carrying various highways. above the grade of the tracks of the Canadian Pacific Railroad in Great Bend Township, New Milford Township, Brooklyn Township, Hop Bottom Borough, Lathrop Township, Susquehanna County and Benton Township, Lackawanna County: M-2013-2364201

1-2015-2472242

Electronically Filed

JOINT MAIN BRIEF OF THE BOROUGH OF NICHOLSON AND THE COUNTY OF WYOMING

Anthony P. Litwin Attorney ID # 76218 Solicitor, Nicholson Borough and Wyoming County 24 East Tioga St. Tunkhannock, PA 18657 Telephone: 570-836-7625 Fax: 570-836-7620 e-mail: plitwin@epix.net

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1.	TABLE OF CITATIONS	2
2.	STATEMENT OF THE CASE	3
3.	SUMMARY OF ARGUMENT	4
4.	ARGUMENT	5
5.	CONCLUSION	8

TABLE OF CITATIONS

		t of Transportation v. Pennsylvania Public Utility n. 469 A.2d 1149 (Pa.Cmwlth 1983)				
	Green Twp. Bd. Of Supervi Pa. Cmwlth 1995)		<u>.C.</u> , 668 A.2d 6	•.	*******	6
Statutes	:			•		
6	66 Pa.C.S. § 2704(a)	**************		***************************************	*********	6

STATEMENT OF THE CASE

This case concerns the responsibility of the Borough of Nicholson ("Borough") and the County of Wyoming ("County") (collectively "Municipalities") towards maintenance and repair (or replacement) of a bridge believed to have been constructed by the Delaware, Lackawanna and Western Railroad Company located in Nicholson Borough, Wyoming County. The interests of the County and the Borough are limited to: Bridge Structure where State Route 1025 crosses over a single track of Delaware and Hudson Railway Company, Inc. (264 293 K) in Nicholson Borough, Wyoming County, M-2013-2364201 and not the other (proposed) consolidated matters filed to 1-2015-2472242.

On May 23, 2013, the Pennsylvania Utility Commission ("PUC") entered an Order, inter alia, directing the Pennsylvania Department of Transportation ("PennDOT") to close the Bridge where State Route 1025 crosses over a single track of Delaware and Hudson Railway Company, Inc. in Nicholson Borough, Wyoming County and to perform inspections and analysis necessary to determine the condition of, and reopen the bridge at its initial cost.

On November 8, 2013, in response to Joint Petition filed by PennDOT and Delaware and Hudson Railway Company ("D&H"), the then owner of the rail line, the PUC issued a Secretarial Letter, *inter alia*, directing PennDOT at its initial expense to perform work to open the bridge to a single lane of traffic.

On October 30, 2014, PennDOT filed a "Petition of the Department of Transportation Requesting a Hearing for the Purpose of Allocating Costs Associated with the Secretarial Letter Dated November 8, 2013."

Ownership of the rail line and associated facilities was transferred from D&H to Norfolk Southern Railway Company ("NS") during the pendency of this matter.

An Evidentiary Hearing was held of the Petition on April 24, 2018, before the Honorable Administrative Law Judge David A. Salapa.

SUMMARY OF ARGUMENT

A Commission order presently exists for the subject bridge entered June 11, 1951, at Docket A-76276. The said Order recites at page 2 that the bridge is owned and maintained by the Railroad. Paragraph Number 13 of the said Order requires the Railroad, "at its sole cost and expense, furnish all materials and do all work necessary to maintain the substructure and superstructure of the bridge exclusive of the roadway paving." Paragraph 14 of the said Order requires PennDOT, "at its sole cost and expense, furnish all material and do all work necessary to maintain the remainder of the improvement, including any drainage facilities installed in accordance with this order and including the roadway paving located on the bridge at the crossing above grade, herein ordered altered. No evidence was introduced justifying why the 1951 Order should be modified in a manner giving the Municipalities responsibilities for the maintenance, repair or replacement of the bridge or the state highway that crosses it.

The Municipalities did not construct the bridge or highway. They have never maintained the bridge. The bridge serves a regional purpose beyond the Borough and County boundaries. The railroad has no stops, depots, passenger or transfer facilities or any other facilities in Nicholson Borough, Wyoming County that provide a benefit different than provided to the general population of Pennsylvania. There is no current or planned pedestrian facilities on the bridge. The Municipalities do not have the resources, financially or otherwise, to assist in the maintenance, repair or replacement of the bridge.

As such Nicholson Borough and Wyoming County should not be allocated any responsibility for maintenance, repair, replacement, or other costs associated with the bridge, now or in the future.

ARGUMENT

JUNE 11, 1951, ORDER

In or about 1951, PennDOT filed an application with the PUC to reconstruct and relocate a portion of the SR 1025, then known as SR 65015. PennDOT's proposed work included modifying the alignment and grade of the highway approaches to the crossing. In response following an evidentiary proceeding, the PUC Commissioners entered an Order on June 11, 1951, at Docket A-76276, inter alia, approving the proposed work with modifications ("1951 Order").

On page 2 of the 1951 Order, as the PUC Commissioners recite the facts of the case, they explicitly find that the "Bridge is owned and maintained by the Delaware, Lackawanna and Western Railroad Company." Delaware, Lackawanna and Western Railroad Company participated in the proceeding before the PUC and nothing in the record indicates that this fact was in dispute.

Paragraph 13 of the 1951 Order provides:

That, upon completion of the improvement herein ordered and its opening to the public use, the Delaware, Lackawanna and Western Railroad Company, at its sole cost and expense, furnish all material and do all work necessary to maintain the substructure and superstructure of the bridge, exclusive of the roadway paving thereon at the crossing above grade, herein ordered altered.

Paragraph 14 of the 1951 Order provides:

That, upon completion of the improvement herein ordered and its opening to the public use, Department of Highways, at its sole cost and expense, furnish all material and do all work necessary to maintain the remainder of the improvement, including any drainage facilities installed in accordance with this order and

including the roadway paving located on the bridge at the crossing above grade, herein ordered altered.

Nothing in the record justifies a deviation from the existing responsibilities established in the 1951 Order. It is both just and reasonable for allocation of responsibilities to continue unaltered.

JUST AND REASONABLE ANALYSIS

The PUC has the authority to determine the allocation of costs for the repair or replacement of any rail crossing in its discretion pursuant to Section 2704(a) of the Public Utility Code, 66 Pa.C.S. § 2704(a). In determining the allocation of costs the PUC should take all relevant factors into consideration. Department of Transportation v. Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission, 79 Pa.Cmwlth. 266, 469 A.2d 1149 (1983).

In Green Twp. Bd. Of Supervisors v. Pa. P.U.C., 668 A.2d 615 (Pa. Cmwlth 1995), the Commonwealth Court stated:

The Commission's discretion in allocating costs is not, however, unfettered. The Commission's decision must be just and reasonable. Moreover, the decision must be based upon some sound legal or factual basis and not just the Commission's policy. The Commission is required to make specific findings of fact concerning the factors it considered in rendering its decision. If the adjudication of the Commission is insufficiently detailed to permit this Court to assess the evidence and to evaluate the Commission's resolution of the contested issues, then a remand is appropriate. Moreover, if this Court determines that the Commission's findings of fact are insufficient, i.e., more specific findings would be more helpful in conducting a meaningful appellate review, or that the Commission's decision does not address all of the relevant factors in allocating costs, then it may remand the matter to the Commission to make such findings of fact and to address such factors. Id. at 618.

The Court in <u>Green Twp</u>. went on to examine some of the factors previously relied on by the PUC in exercising its discretion. They include: The party that originally built the crossing; The party that owned and maintained the crossing; The relative benefit initially conferred on each party with the construction of the crossing; Whether either party is responsible for the

deterioration of the crossing that has led to the need for its repair, replacement or removal; The relative benefit that each party will receive from the repair, replacement or removal of the crossing. <u>Id</u>.at 619.

Here, no evidence was submitted indicating that the Municipalities built, owned or maintained the crossing. To the contrary, there was specific evidence that Nicholson Borough does not own or maintain this or any other bridge carrying vehicular traffic. Station Hill Bridge is not a County owned bridge. The Municipalities cannot use liquid fuel funds to maintain. repair or replace a bridge that does not carry a municipal road or that they do not own.³ The Municipalities do not have any available funds to budget towards the maintenance, repair or replacement of the Bridge.⁴ The Municipalities do not have employees trained or experienced with bridge repair and maintenance. There are no pedestrian facilities on the bridge. There are no businesses located in Wyoming County (including Nicholson Borough) that are accessed by the bridge. There are businesses such as stone quarries, gas wells and an antique business located in Susquehanna County that use the bridge for access.8 Additionally, there is no evidence that there are any stops, depots (passenger or freight), or transfer facilities in Nicholson Borough, Wyoming County, or relatively close thereto that provide an economic benefit to the Municipalities or their residents that is different to the benefit the rail line provides to the citizens of the Commonwealth, nor was any evidence submitted that the crossing carries any municipally owned utilities or other improvements.

¹ Nicholson Borough Statement 1, Page 4, Line 6.

² Wyoming County Statement 2, Page 2, Line 21.

³ Wyoming County Statement 2, Page 2, Line 22. Nicholson Borough Statement 1, Page 4, Line 20.

Wyoming County Statement 2, Page 3, Line 10. Nicholson Borough Statement 1, Page 5, Line 15.

⁵ Wyoming County Statement 2, Page 2, Line 12. Nicholson Borough Statement 1, Page 4, Line 9.

⁶ Nicholson Borough Statement 1, Page 2, Line 17.

⁷ Wyoming County Statement 1, Page 4, Line 3.

⁸ Wyoming County Statement 1, Page 4, Line 8.

RECEIPED

Clearly, as evidenced by the 1951 Order the Municipalities have not been responsible for maintenance or repair of the bridge and therefore have done nothing that has contributed to its current state of disrepair.

CONCLUSION

Upon consideration of existing PUC Orders, the relevant factors in this matter, and the evidence presented, allocating any costs of maintenance, repair, or replacement of Station Hill Bridge to the Borough of Nicholson or to the County of Wyoming would be unjust, unreasonable and unsupported by evidence.

Respectfully submitted,

/WIV. Z

Anthony P. Litwin, Esq. (PA ID 76218) 24 East Tioga St.

Dated: April 28, 2018

Tunkhannock, PA 18657 Telephone: 570-836-7625 Facsimile: 570-836-7620

E-mail: plitwin@epix.net

24 E. Tioga Street Tunkhannock, PA 18657





Rosemary Chiavetta, Secretary

Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission PO Box 3265 Harrisburg, PA 17105-3265