

## PORT OF CENTRALIA

3508 Galvin Road - Centralia, WA 98531-9002 Established 1986

360-736-3527 phone 360-330-5666 fax www.portofcentralia.com Gene Groshong - President Art Lehman - Vice President Don Meek - Secretary Kyle W. Heaton - Executive Dir.

July 26, 2006

Ms. Cathy Hunter WUTC Rail Safety P.O. Box 47250 Olympia, WA 98504-7250

Re: Petition

Dear Ms. Hunter:

Per the instructions of Bob Leslie of Puget Sound and Pacific Railroad we are forwarding the executed copies of the enclosed Petitions. Please let us know if you have questions or need additional information. Thank you for your help.

Sincerely,

PORT OF CENTRALIA

Kim M. Amrine

Administrative Assistant

**Enclosures** 

## BEFORE THE WASHINGTON UTILITIES AND TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION

				No				
Port	of Ce	entralia	Petitioner			PETITIO	V	
1016	OI CE		Feditioner	Road Nam	e Robert	Thompson R	load	
D		VS.		W.U.T.C.	Crossing No.	40F 4.29		
Puget	Railr	oad	<sup>C</sup> Respondent	D.O.T. Cro	ssing No. <u>9</u>	22982W		· · ·
			e to the Wash of the followin		ies and Tran	sportation Co	mmission	for an
X	direct	ing the <u>Co</u> (cons	nstruction truction-recon	struction-re	of a	a grade cross	ing;	
			n of automatic t a new crossi		sing signal oi	· other warnin	g device (	other
	direct	ing (replacem	ent-change-u	of ware ograde)	arning device	es at an existi	ng crossin	ıgs;
		ating funds fro	m the "grade o of active wa			for_ (installation a	ınd/or	<del></del>
	Surfa	ce Transporta	struction of the tion Efficiency of Transportation	Act (ISTE	A) in coopera	tion with the \	e Intermod Nashingto	dal on
at the seeks	railroa the re	d grade cross lief specified a	sing identified a above by (che	above and o	lescribed in t e following)	his petition.	This applic	cation
		□ hearing a	nd order	XI C	rder without	hearing		
[ ] Yes	[ X] No	Has applicat Efficiency Ac	ion for funding at been made t	, pursuant to the Local	o Intermodal Programs D	Surface Trar	nsportation project?	n
[ ] Yes	[ ] No		r is yes to the eermodal Surfa					
			er penalty of pe le and correct.		ne informatio	n provided in	and with t	his
				Petitioner	a mile			
				Kyle Heat Print Name	on, Executi	<u>ve Director</u> Titl <b>e</b>		
				3508 Galv		1 100	(C)	<u></u>
				Street Add				
				Centralia City-State-				<del></del>

UTC RR (3/00) I:\TRAN\RAILROAD\FORMS\PETITION.DOC

## **INTERROGATORIES**

Use additional paper as needed

[1]

State	name of highway and railway at crossing intersection:
	Existing or proposed highway Robert Thompson mile post 0.1
	Existing or proposed railway PSAP Railroad mile post 4.5
	Located in SW 1/4 of the NE 1/4 of Sec 25 Twp.15N Range 3W W.M.
	WUTC crossing number 40F 4.29 DOT crossing number 922982W
	Street Robt. ThompsonRDCity Centralia County Lewis (if applicable)
	[2]
Chara	acter of crossing (indicate with X or numbers where applicable):
(a)	Common Carrier □ Logging or Industrial ☑
(b)	Main Line ☑ Branch Line □ Siding or Spur □
(c)	Total number of tracks at crossing
(d)	Operating maximum train speed: Legal maximum train speed:
	Passenger MPH Passenger MPH Freight MPH
(e)	Actual or estimated train traffic in 24 hours:
	Passenger Trains Freight Trains 8 per day (Note: Round trip counted as two trains. Include switch movements.)
	[3]
Chara	acter of Roadway:
(a)	State Highway - Classification
(b)	County Highway - Classification
(c)	City Street - Classification Industrial Collector
(d)	Number of traffic lanes existing in each direction: 2  Number of additional traffic lanes proposed: 0
(e)	Posted vehicle speed limit: Automobiles 25 MPH Trucks 25 MPH
(f)	Estimated vehicle traffic in 24 hours: Current total0, including _0 trucks
	and school bus trips. Projected traffic in 2008 years: total 490,
	including 101 trucks and 0 school bus trips.

- (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 Road access for A industry.
- (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 needed cost exceeds need.

(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.  $_{\rm N/A}$ 

- (a) State approximate distance to nearest public or private crossing in each direction of railroad involved herein. There is an existing private crossing at the site. Otherwise, 3/10 mile +/- to the North.

  1/2 mile +/- to the South.
- (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? The existing crossing at the site(immediately to the south of the propsed crossing) will be removed otherwise, 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.

The existing private crossing at the site will be, eliminated.

(e) If this crossing is authorized, do you propose to close any existing crossing or crossings? Yes, see above.

[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 fromWes.t(direction) an unobstructed view to		
right when on highway 300 feet from crossing of	200	feet
right when on highway 200 feet from crossing of	200	feet
right when on highway 100 feet from crossing of	200	feet
right when on highway 50 feet from crossing of	200	feet
right when on highway 25 feet from crossing of	200	feet
left when on highway 300 feet from crossing of	75	feet
left when on highway 200 feet from crossing of	75	feet
left when on highway 100 feet from crossing of	75	feet
left when on highway 50 feet from crossing of	75	feet
left when on highway 25 feet from crossing of	75	feet
Approaching crossing from East (opposite direction) an obstructed view to	to	
right when on highway 300 feet from crossing of	300	feet
right when on highway 200 feet from crossing of	300	feet
right when on highway 100 feet from crossing of	500	feet
right when on highway 50 feet from crossing of	700	feet
right when on highway 25 feet from crossing of	700	feet
left when on highway 300 feet from crossing of	1000	feet
left when on highway 200 feet from crossing of	1000	feet
left when on highway 100 feet from crossing of	1000	feet
left when on highway 50 feet from crossing of	1000	feet
left when on highway 25 feet from crossing of	1000	feet

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? NO, due to the site's topography with the rail elevation 5' above the existing ground elevation and 360' to an intersection to the West.
- (b) If not, state in feet the length of level grade it is feasible to obtain. see (a) above.
- (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, a 1.3% grade to the West and a 2.2% grade to the east of the 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.

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.) GCP. Train Detection with shoulder mountgates & lights with Instrument Bungalow.
- (b) State an estimate of the cost for installing the signals or other devices proposed, as obtained from the respondent railroad company. . \$ 168,222.70 Includes cost of concrete crossing.
- (c) State a cost estimate for maintaining the signals or devices for 12 months, as obtained from the respondent railroad company . . . \$ 1800.00
- (d) If this is an existing crossing, what will the proposed warning devices replace in the way of existing devices?
- (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?

χŊ	es :	No

[ 13 ]

Provide any additional information supporting the proposal (i.e. what public benefits

would be derived from its implementation?)

## RESPONDENT'S WAIVER OF HEARING

		Docket No.
Petiti	on of	Port of Centralia
for _	Robert	Thompson Road Crossing
		gated the conditions existing at and in the vicinity of the proposed crossing result, [check one or more of the following, as appropriate:]
		n satisfied that conditions are as represented in the petition and the rrogatories and that the petition should be granted.
	[ ] The	cost of installation (estimated at \$ 168,222.70
	• • •	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 o	conditions to waiver of hearing:
	Fransport ng.	ned hereby waives hearing and further notice. The Washington Utilities tation Commission may enter a final order without further notice of
Date of	at	Respondent Small Sand Flacher  Print Name Thomas R. Foster
		Title INterim Gent Man