



Brad Feilberg, P.E.  
 Engineer Director  
 806 W Main Street  
 Monroe WA 98272  
 360-863-4540 phone  
 360-794-4007 fax  
 bfeilberg@ci.monroe.wa.us

January 13, 2004

Washington Utilities & Transportation Commission  
 Chandler Plaza  
 1300 S. Evergreen Park Drive SW  
 Olympia, WA 98504

Re: Kelsey Street Crossing No. 084565X  
 Lewis Street Crossing No. 084564R  
 Main Street Crossing No. 084560N

RECEIVED  
 RECORDS MANAGEMENT  
 04 JAN 15 AM 8:29  
 STATE OF WASH.  
 UTIL. AND TRANSP.  
 COMMISSION

Ladies and Gentlemen:

Enclosed please find the original and one copy of the Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission petition for Kelsey Street STPX-0790(004), Lewis Street STPX-0203(008) and Main Street STPX-D312(004). Each location represents a railroad crossing improvements for the City of Monroe and has been fully executed.

If you have any questions, please contact Jammi Guion, Construction Documents Coordinator at 360-863-4514.

Sincerely,

*Brad Feilberg*  
 Brad Feilberg, P.E.  
 Engineering Director

Encl.

BEFORE THE WASHINGTON UTILITIES AND TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION

The Burlington Northern and Santa Fe Railway Company
Petitioner,
Vs
Monroe, Washington
Respondent

Docket No. \_\_

PETITION

Road Name Main Street

WUTC Crossing No. 084560N

DOT Crossing No. 2A1768.50

RECEIVED RECORDS MANAGEMENT 04 JAN 15 AM 8:29 STATE OF WASH. UTIL. AND TRANSP. COMMISSION

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;
[ ] directing installation of automatic grade crossing signal or other warning device (other than crossbucks) at a new crossing.
[X] directing upgrade of warning devices at an existing crossing;
[ ] allocating funds from the "grade crossing protective fund" for ... of active warning devices;
[X] 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
[X] order without hearing

[X] [ ] Has application for funding, pursuant to Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act YES NO been made to the Local Programs Division for this project.

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

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

Handwritten signature of John M. Cowles

John M. Cowles, Manager Public Projects
Print Name Title

2454 Occidental Avenue South, Ste. 1-A
Street Address

Seattle, WA 98134
City - State - Zip Code

**INTERROGATORIES**  
Use additional paper as needed

[ 1 ]

**State name of highway and railway at crossing intersection:**

Existing or proposed highway Main Street HWY mile post N/A  
Existing or proposed railway The Burlington Northern and Santa Fe Railway Co. RR mile post 1768.57  
Located in the SW1/4 of the NW1/4 of Sec. 6 Twp. 27N Range 7E W.M.  
WUTC crossing number 2A1768.50 DOT crossing number 084560N  
Street Main City Monroe County Snohomish

[ 2 ]

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

- (a) Common Carrier () Logging or Industrial ()  
(b) Main Line (2) Branch Line () Siding or Spur (1)  
(c) Total number of tracks at crossing 3  
(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 45 MPH Passenger 45 MPH  
Freight 45 MPH Freight 45 MPH  
(e) Actual or estimated train traffic in 24 hours:  
Passenger Trains 2 Freight Trains 25  
(Note: Round trip counted as two trains. Include switch movements).

[ 3 ]

**Character of Roadway:**

- (a) State Highway-Classification Minor Arterial  
(b) County Highway-Classification N/A  
(c) City Street-Classification Minor Arterial  
(d) Number of traffic lanes existing in each direction: 4 Number of additional traffic lanes proposed:  
(e) Posted vehicle speed limit: Automobile 25 MPH Trucks \_\_\_\_\_ MPH  
(f) Estimated vehicle traffic in 24 hours: Current total 8,800 including 257 trucks and 25 school bus trips.  
Projected traffic in \_\_\_\_\_ years: total \_\_\_\_\_ including \_\_\_\_\_ trucks and \_\_\_\_\_ school bus trips.

[ 4 ]

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

N/A

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

N/A

[ 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.

No

- (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.

No

[ 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. It is not economically feasible, and traffic volumes do not warrant a grade separation.

- (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 overpass, 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 from the proposed crossing; the approximate cost of construction; and what, if any, reason exists why it should not be constructed.

No

[ 7 ]

- (a) State approximate distance to nearest public or private crossing in each direction of railroad involved herein.  
 0.4 mi West to Lewis Street / SR-203 (public; DOT 084564R)  
 1.18mi East to private crossing (DOT 084559U)
- (b) If there is an existing crossing near the 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 one crossing?  
 No.
- (c) If so, state approximate cost of highway relocation to effect such changes.  
 N/A
- (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 \_\_\_\_\_ (direction) an unobstructed view to the**

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

**Approaching crossing from \_\_\_\_\_ (opposite direction) an unobstructed view to**

right when on highway 300 feet from crossing of	_____	feet
right when on highway 200 feet from crossing of	_____	feet
right when on highway 100 feet from crossing of	_____	feet
right when on highway 50 feet from crossing of	_____	feet
right when on highway 25 feet from crossing of	_____	feet
left when on highway 300 feet from crossing of	_____	feet
left when on highway 200 feet from crossing of	_____	feet
left when on highway 100 feet from crossing of	_____	feet
left when on highway 50 feet from crossing of	_____	feet
left when on highway 25 feet from crossing of	_____	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 intersections.

See exhibit "C" attached

[ 10 ]

- (a) Is it feasible to provide a 25 foot level grade crossing on both sides from centerline of railway at point of crossing?  
N/A (no physical changes to existing crossing)
- (b) If not, state in feet the length of level grade it is feasible to obtain.  
N/A (no physical changes to existing crossing)
- (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.  
N/A (no physical changes to existing crossing)

[ 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 crossing signal or other warning device, other than crossbucks.**

---

[ 12 ]

- (a) State in detail, the number and type of automatic signals or other warning devices (other than crossbucks) proposed to be installed. (This portion should be filled in only after conference between the railroad and the petitioning local government agency.)  
Upgrade circuitry and install new signal bungalow. No physical changes to the existing warning devices are proposed.
- (b) State an estimate of the cost for installing the signals or other devices proposed, as obtained from the respondent railroad company ..... \$ 216,242.00
- (c) State a cost estimate for maintaining the signals or devices for 12 months, as obtained from the respondent railroad company ..... \$ \_\_\_\_\_
- (d) If this is an existing crossing, what will the proposed warning devices replace in the way of existing devices.  
Replaces existing obsolete circuitry.
- (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?  
 Yes     No    (N/A) Railroad is Petitioner

[ 13 ]

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

**Upgrade of warning device circuitry will help to ensure system reliability for the safety of the motoring public.**

**RESPONDENT'S WAIVER OF HEARING**

Docket No. \_\_\_\_\_

Petition of Main Street

For Railroad Crossing Improvement

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.
- The cost of installation (estimated at \$ 216,242.00) is acceptable.
- 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:

As per the agreement between the parties, hereto  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

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

Dated at 330, Washington, on this 13<sup>th</sup> day of Jan., 2004.

Respondent City of Monroe

By Donnetta Walser

Print Name: Donnetta Walser

Title: Mayor