BEFORE THE WASHINGTON UTILITIES AND TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION

No. TR-030783

PETITION

City of Snoqualmie Petitioner

Road Name **River Street**

vs.

W.U.T.C. Crossing No. **29A 33.00**

Northwest Railway Museum Respondent

D.O.T. Crossing No. **092 026E**

Application is hereby made to the Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission for an order (check one or more of the following)

directing the _____ of a grade crossing;
(construction-reconstruction-relocation)

directing installation of automatic grade crossing signal or other warning device (other than crossbucks) at a new crossing;

directing **installation** of warning devices at an existing crossings;
(replacement-change-upgrade)

allocating funds from the "grade crossing protective fund" for _____ _____of active warning devices; (installation and/or maintenance)

authorizing the construction of the project, funding to be pursuant to the Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act (ISTEA) in cooperation with the Washington State Department of Transportation Local Programs Division;

at the railroad grade crossing identified above and described in this petition. This application seeks the relief specified above by (check one of the following)

hearing and order Ξ order without hearing

[X] Yes [ ] No Has application for funding, pursuant to Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act been made to the Local Programs Division for this project?

[ ] Yes [X] No If the answer is yes to the question above, has the funding requested under the Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act been denied?

I certify under penalty of perjury that the information provided in and with this petition is true and correct.

K Holmes for **City of Snoqualmie**
Petitioner

Kirk Holmes Public Works Director
Print Name Title

PO Box 987 8020 RR Ave SE
Street Address

Snoqualmie, WA 98065
City-State-Zip Code

INTERROGATORIES

Use additional paper as needed

[1]

State name of highway and railway at crossing intersection:

Existing or proposed highway **River Street** mile post _____

Existing or proposed railway **Snoqualmie Valley Railroad** mile post **33.00**

Located in **NE** 1/4 of the **NE** 1/4 of Sec. **31** Twp. **24N** Range **8E** W.M.

WUTC crossing number **29A 33.00** DOT crossing number **092 026E**

Street **River** City **Snoqualmie** County **King**
(if applicable) (if applicable)

[2]

Character of crossing (indicate with X or numbers where applicable):

(a) Common Carrier Ξ Logging or Industrial

(b) Main Line Ξ Branch Line Siding or Spur

(c) Total number of tracks at crossing **One**
(Note: A track separated 100 feet or more from another track constitutes a separate crossing.)

(d) Operating maximum train speed: Legal maximum train speed:

Passenger **15** MPH Passenger **20** MPH
Freight **NA** MPH Freight **NA** MPH

(e) Actual or estimated train traffic in 24 hours:

Passenger Trains **12** Freight Trains **NA**
(Note: Round trip counted as two trains. Include switch movements.)

[3]

Character of Roadway:

(a) State Highway - Classification _____

(b) County Highway - Classification _____

(c) City Street - Classification **Local Collector**

(d) Number of traffic lanes existing in each direction: **One in each direction**
Number of additional traffic lanes proposed: **One, northbound only**

(e) Posted vehicle speed limit: Automobiles 25 MPH Trucks **25** MPH

(f) Estimated vehicle traffic in 24 hours: Current total **1993**, including **99** trucks and **6** school bus trips. Projected traffic in **8** years: total **2193**, including **105** trucks and **6** school bus trips.

[4]

(a) If temporary, state for what purpose crossing is to be used and for how long. **NA**

(b) If temporary grade crossing, will you remove the crossing at completion of the activity requiring the temporary crossing? **NA**

[5]

(a) State whether or not a safer location for a grade crossing exists within a reasonable distance in either direction from the proposed point of crossing, and if so, what reason, if any, why this safer location should not be adopted, even though in doing so, it may be necessary to relocate a portion of the highway or railway. **There is no safer location within a reasonable distance. Crossing signals will improve safety of existing location.**

(b) Are there any hillsides, earth, or other embankments, buildings, trees, orchards, side tracks (on which cars might be spotted), loading platforms, etc., in the vicinity not feasible to move, which may obstruct the view and which can be avoided by relocating the proposed crossing. Would it be practical to do so? Please describe. **It is not practicable to move the crossing to another location. There has been a crossing at this location for nearly 100 years. There is a spur track immediately to the west of the crossing. The signal improvement project is intended in part to mitigate the restricted sight distances caused by buildings and spur tracks in the general vicinity.**

[6]

(a) Is it feasible to construct and use an over or under crossing at the intersection of said railway and highway? If not, state why. **No. Close proximity (50 feet) to a state highway (SR 202) and buildings and laneways in the general vicinity make an over/under crossing impractical.**

(b) Does the railway line at any point in the vicinity of the proposed crossing pass over a fill or trestle or through a cut where it is feasible to construct an under or over crossing, even though it may be necessary to relocate a portion of the highway to reach that point? **No**

(c) If a suitable place for an under - or over - crossing exists in the vicinity of the proposed crossing, state the distance and direction from the proposed crossing; the approximate cost of construction; and what, if any, reason exists why it should not be constructed. **There is no suitable location**.

[7]

(a) State approximate distance to nearest public or private crossing in each direction of railroad involved herein. **Approximately 600 feet in either direction**

(b) If there is an existing crossing in near vicinity, or if more than one crossing is proposed, is it feasible to divert highways served and to be served by existing and proposed crossings, thus eliminating the need for more than once crossing?

No

(c) If so, state approximate cost of highway relocation to effect such changes.

(d) Will the proposed crossing eliminate the need for one or more existing crossings in the vicinity? If so, state direction and approximate distance to the crossing or crossings. **No**

(e) If this crossing is authorized, do you propose to close any existing crossing or crossings? **No**

[8]

State the lengths of views which are now available along the line of railway to travelers on the highway when approaching the crossing from either side of the railway and when at points on the highway as follows:

Approaching crossing from..**South**.(direction) an unobstructed view to

right when on highway 300 feet from crossing of **0** feet
right when on highway 200 feet from crossing of **0** feet
right when on highway 100 feet from crossing of **25** feet
right when on highway 50 feet from crossing of **25** feet
right when on highway 25 feet from crossing of **200** feet
left when on highway 300 feet from crossing of **0** feet
left when on highway 200 feet from crossing of **0** feet
left when on highway 100 feet from crossing of **25** feet
left when on highway 50 feet from crossing of **200** feet
left when on highway 25 feet from crossing of **300** feet

Approaching crossing from...**North**.. (opposite direction) an obstructed view to

right when on highway 300 feet from crossing of **0** feet
right when on highway 200 feet from crossing of **0** feet
right when on highway 100 feet from crossing of **0** feet
right when on highway 50 feet from crossing of **25** feet
right when on highway 25 feet from crossing of **50** feet
left when on highway 300 feet from crossing of **0** feet
left when on highway 200 feet from crossing of **0** feet
left when on highway 100 feet from crossing of **25** feet
left when on highway 50 feet from crossing of **50** feet
left when on highway 25 feet from crossing of **75** feet

[9]

Attach one or more prints showing a vicinity map and a layout of railway and highway, as well as profiles of each, also showing percent of grade, 500 feet of highway and railway when approaching crossing from all four directions. On the prints, spot and identify obstructions of view located in all four quadrants. Provide a traffic control layout showing the location of the existing and proposed signing of the intersection.

[10]

(a) Is it feasible to provide a 25 foot level grade crossing on both sides from center line of railway at point of crossing? **Yes**

(b) If not, state in feet the length of level grade it is feasible to obtain.

(c) Is it feasible to obtain an approach grade, prior to the level grade of five percent or less? If not, state why, and state the percent approach grade possible. **Yes**

[11]

Do you know of any reason not appearing in any of the answers to these interrogatories why the proposed crossing should not be made at grade or at the point proposed by you? If so, please state same fully.

No

Interrogatories 12 and 13 are to be completed only if this petition involves installation, replacement or changing of automatic grade signal or other warning device, other than sawbucks.

---

[12]

(a) State in detail, the number and type of automatic signals or other warning devices (other than sawbucks) proposed to be installed. (This portion should be filled in only after conference between the railroad and the petitioning local governmental agency.) **This is a three-lane crossing: two outer lanes and a center left turn lane. Signal lights will consist of double-sided shoulder-mount lights for each of the outer traffic lanes and a set of double-sided lights mounted above the turn lane on a cantilever structure. Gates will consist of aluminum/fiberglass arms that will block at least 90% of the traveled lanes. Train detection will consist of a solid-state predictor circuit (Harmon HXP or equivalent) and compatible solid-state crossing controls. Crossing will have an event recorder.**

(b) State an estimate of the cost for installing the signals or other devices proposed, as obtained from the respondent railroad company. . . $ **150,000.**

(c) State a cost estimate for maintaining the signals or devices for 12 months, as obtained from the respondent railroad company . . . $ **4,000.**

(d) If this is an existing crossing, what will the proposed warning devices replace in the way of existing devices? **Two cross bucks**

(e) As the petitioner, are you prepared to pay or will you promise to pay to the respondent railroad company, your share of the cost of installing the warning devices proposed as provided by law?

Ξ Yes* No *NOT TO EXCEED $171,500.00 jpw

[13]

Furnish a brief statement of why the public safety requires the installation of the automatic signals or the devices as proposed.

River Street is a two-lane residential collector in an expanding city. This

crossing already suffers from restricted site distances caused by an adjacent state highway and area structures. These crossing conditions already warrant installation of active crossing protection. However the city's desire to install a left turn lane through the crossing will potentially eliminate all the turn lane's sight distances. A three lane crossing requires active crossing protection to assure safety of auto and train traffic.

RESPONDENT'S WAIVER OF HEARING

Docket No. _____

Petition of **City of Snoqualmie**

for **River Street Crossing Signals**

I have investigated the conditions existing at and in the vicinity of the proposed crossing changes. As a result, [check one or more of the following, as appropriate:]

[ ] I am satisfied that conditions are as represented in the petition and the interrogatories and that the petition should be granted.

[x] The cost of installation (estimated at **$ 150,000**)

[x] subject to approval and apportionment pursuant to the Intermodal Surface Transportation Act by the Washington State Department of Transportation Local Programs Division.

[ ] as apportioned between the parties.

[ ] to be paid by petitioner.

Other conditions to waiver of hearing:

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

The undersigned hereby waives hearing and further notice. The Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission may enter a final order without further notice of hearing.

Date at SNOQUALMIE, Washington, on this 16th day of MAY, 20 03.

Respondent NORTHWEST RAILWAY MUSEUM

by _____

Print Name RICHARD R ANDERSON

Title EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

NE 1/4, SEC. 31, T. 24N., R. 8E., W.M.

CONTROL BUNGALOW

423.3

422.3 — BOTTOM

100 YR FLOOD

420.76 — TRACK

420.0 — GROUND

6'

(A)

STA. 18+77.50
BEGIN PLANING

30'

(13) (4) (14) (4)

(20) (B)

2'

BT

℄

W

SR 202
25° 58'16" E

STA 49+50
PAVING LIMITS
BEGIN PLANING

(21) 2-3"

(20) (4)

STA 20+00
PAVING LIMITS
END PLANING

SD

20'

(2) (3) 21'

18+00

RIVER STREET
N 64° 07'19" E

19+00

20+00

(5) (7)

(1)

10" DI

10" AC

15'

(12)

(3)

(4)

(20) 3' (D) (C) 2-3" (21) (20)

CB TYPE 1
STA. 17+75 (19' RT.)
GE 419.21
IE 416.21

STA. 18+69.5
END SIDEWALK
CURB AND GUTTER
MATCH RAILROAD
CROSSING GRADE
(LT & RT)

(18)

202-LINE

51+00

(20) (21) 3-3"

RIVER STREET
SR 202 STA.

STA 50+50
PAVING LIMITS
END PLANING

(A) CONTROL BUNGALOW

(B) EAST GATE

(C) CANTILEVER

(D) WEST GATE

RIVER ST.
SIGNAL LAYOUT

USW
1-10-03