

UNION PACIFIC RAILROAD COMPANY

Terrel A. Anderson
Manager of Industry and Public
Projects
taanders@up.com



9451 Atkinson Street
Roseville, CA. 95747
Fax (402) 233 3066
PH (916) 789-5134

March 16, 2010

David Pratt
Assistant Director, Transportation Safety
Washington Utilities & Transportation Commission
1300 S. Evergreen Park Dr. SW
P.O. Box 47250
Olympia, WA 98504-7250

Re: Supplemental Response to TR-100098 (Petition from the City of Fife to Construct a Pedestrian-Only At-Grade Crossing at 54th Avenue East)

Dear Mr. Pratt:

Union Pacific Railroad Company recommends the following modifications to the City of Fife's proposal as a means of reaching agreement without going to hearing:

1. The city has stated that the at-grade pedestrian crossing is proposed solely as an interim measure, pending construction of a grade-separated crossing that would accommodate both vehicles and pedestrians. To ensure that the at-grade pedestrian crossing is indeed only a temporary solution and that the city moves diligently toward constructing a grade-separated crossing, UP would ask that authority for the at-grade pedestrian crossing carry an expiration date, e.g., five years, at which time the emergency-use-only vehicular crossing and the at-grade pedestrian crossing would need to be removed.

2. It is not clear why the city is proposing to construct a new pedestrian crossing adjacent to the fenced and locked 54th crossing, rather than within the existing footprint. The city said in its application that it needs to preserve the full width of the existing roadway surface for motor vehicles in the event of an emergency, such as occurred in January 2009 when the city evacuated the area south of the tracks during a flood event. Given the placement of barriers and planters in the roadway, however, it does not seem feasible for vehicular traffic to travel over both lanes of the road. (See attached photos.) Union Pacific suggests that the existing crossing be reconfigured and re-constructed as a pedestrian crossing, but be wider than an ordinary pedestrian crossing to accommodate emergency vehicles or a one-lane emergency exit. To limit ordinary use of the crossing to pedestrians only, the city could place bollards across the path, using a type of bollard that is removable in the case of emergency.

3. It is a burden for UP to continue to maintain lights and gates for a crossing that is in reality closed to use by the general public. Union Pacific urges that the 54th crossing be officially recognized as "closed" to vehicular use, except during emergencies, and that UP be allowed to remove the existing gates and lights. Warning devices installed for pedestrian users could serve to warn motor vehicles on the rare occasion when emergency use of the crossing is required.

4. Union Pacific has had problems with children hanging onto and damaging pedestrian gates. In addition, unless the city plans to fence the south side of the tracks and install locked gates across the roadway on the south side, children heading toward the school won't really be "channeled" onto a path where a gate would block them from access onto the right of way. For these reasons, Union Pacific suggests that the parties consider installing flashing lights only.

5. As a condition of agreeing to the conversion of the 54th crossing to a pedestrian-only crossing, with emergency only use by motor vehicles, UP would want to the city to pay for all costs associated with the newly configured crossing, including the cost of installing and maintaining warning devices.

Union Pacific is willing to meet with the city and the WUTC to further discuss these options.

Sincerely,



Terrel A. Anderson
Manager of Industry and Public Projects

cc: Russell Blount, City of Fife