\mathbf{K} DIVISION OF ENGINEERING AND ROADS

A DIVISION OF THE PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT

December 29, 2006

Ms. Kathy Hunter Washington Utility and Transportation Commission PO Box 47250 1300 S. Evergreen Park Dr. SW Olympia, WA 98504-7250

E

Dear Ms. Hunter,

As we discussed in our telephone conversation, I am forwarding to you petitions for four new highway/railroad grade crossings which result from the proposed realignment of the Geiger Spur track south to connect with the PCCR-CW line and abandon the current track crossing Fairchild Air Force Base and connecting to the BNSF. As you will note, three of the four petitions (Hallett Rd, Thorpe Rd, and McFarlane Rd) show Spokane County as both the petitioner and the respondent as owners of both the roadways and the railroad. The fourth petition involving the Geiger Spur is for the SR 902 crossing. I have included an additional copy of the petition for the Commission to serve to WSDOT (respondent) after you have had an opportunity to review it.

During our telephone conversation we also discussed another pending project for Spokane County, Freya Street crossing BNSF Railroad. Although the project does not alter the crossing other than the addition of sidewalks, it does appear that WAC 480-62-150 requires the filing of a petition due to the installation of a highway traffic signal at the adjacent intersection and the subsequent requirement for an intertie with the existing railroad crossing signal. I have enclosed an original and two copies of the petition for this crossing. If you agree that the petition is required, please forward a copy to the respondent railroad company.

Thank you for considering these petitions for new and modified crossings. I or a staff member will be available to assist in your site visit and review of the crossings. Please contact me at 509/477-3600 if you have any questions and to schedule site visits.

Sincerely.

Robert Brueggeman, P.E. **Acting County Engineer**

BEFORE THE WASHINGTON UTILITIES AND TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION No. **PETITION** Petitioner Road Name Freya Street VS. W.U.T.C. Crossing No. _____ Respondent D.O.T. Crossing No. 058803 V 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 П than crossbucks) at a new crossing: directing <u>upgrade</u> of warning devices at an existing crossings; (replacement-change-upgrade) X allocating funds from the "grade crossing protective fund" for П of active warning devices; (installation and/or maintenance) authorizing the construction of the project, funding to be pursuant to the Intermodal П 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 order without hearing Has application for funding, pursuant to Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act been made to the Local Programs Division for this project? 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. Petitioner Robert Brueggeman Acting County Engineer Print Name Title 1026 W. Broadway Spokane WA 99260-0170 City-State-Zip Code UTC RR (3/00)

I:\TRAN\RAILROAD\FORMS\PETITION.DOC

INTERROGATORIESUse additional paper as needed

[1]

State harne of highway and railway at crossing intersection:					
	Existing or proposed highway <u>Freya Street</u> mile post <u>1.69</u>				
Existing or proposed railway <u>BNSF</u> mile post <u>1470</u>					
	Located in <u>NE</u> 1/4 of the <u>Sw</u> 1/4 of Sec. <u>22</u> Twp. <u>26</u> Range <u>43</u> W.I WUTC crossing number DOT crossing number DOT crossing number				
	Street <u>Freya St.</u> City County <u>Spokane</u> (if applicable)				
	[2]				
Cha	racter 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)					
	Passenger MPH Passenger MPH Freight MPH				
(e)					
Passenger Trains Freight Trains // (Note: Round trip counted as two trains. Include switch movements.)					
[3]					
Char	acter of Roadway:				
(a)	State Highway - Classification				
(b)	County Highway - Classification Minor Arterial				
(c)	City Street - Classification				
(d)	Number of traffic lanes existing in each direction: Number of additional traffic lanes proposed:				
(e)	Posted vehicle speed limit: Automobiles35MPH				
(f)	Estimated vehicle traffic in 24 hours: Current total <u>4600</u> , including <u>600</u> trucks				
	and 6 school bus trips. Projected traffic in 20 years: total 5700,				
	including 750 trucks and 8 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?

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.

No safer location for a grade crossing exists

(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.

Proximity of parallel highway causes grade separation 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.

MA

(a)	State approximate distance to nearest public or proof railroad involved herein.	rivate crossing in eac	h direction
	Francis Avenue crosses 1.4 miles	to the could	,
	Parksmith Drive crosses 1.7 miles	to the south	•
/1 \			
(b)	If there is an existing crossing in near vicinity, or if proposed, is it feasible to divert highways served and proposed crossings, thus eliminating the need	more than one cross and to be served by a d for more than once	sing is existing crossing?
	No		
(c)	If so, state approximate cost of highway relocation	to effect such chang	jes.
	N/A		
	' / '		
(d)	Will the proposed crossing eliminate the need for	one or more existing	crossings
	in the vicinity? If so, state direction and approxima crossings.	ate distance to the cr	ossing or
	Clossings.		
	_		
(0)	If this argains is outherized do you may be at all		
(e)	If this crossing is authorized, do you propose to clo	ose any existing cros	sing or
	$\mathcal{N}_{\mathcal{O}}$		
	[8]	•	
State	the lengths of views which are now available along	the line of railway to	travalare
on th	e highway when approaching the crossing from either	er side of the railway	and when
at po	ints on the highway as follows:	•	
Annr	oaching crossing from.eas.t(direction) an unobstr	rioted view to	
Appi	right when on highway 300 feet from crossing of		£ a a 4
	right when on highway 200 feet from crossing of	35 ⁻ 4 0	feet
	right when on highway 100 feet from crossing of		feet
	right when on highway 50 feet from crossing of	36	feet
	right when on highway 25 feet from crossing of	550 1500	feet
	left when on highway 300 feet from crossing of		feet
	left when on highway 200 feet from crossing of	<u>60</u> 70	feet
	left when on highway 100 feet from crossing of	140	feet feet
	left when on highway 50 feet from crossing of	1500	feet
	left when on highway 25 feet from crossing of	16 00	feet
Appro	oaching crossing from west. (opposite direction) and	hstructed view to	1001
	right when on highway 300 feet from crossing of	250	feet
	right when on highway 200 feet from crossing of	10 75	feet
	right when on highway 100 feet from crossing of	1700	feet
	right when on highway 50 feet from crossing of	1860	feet
	right when on highway 25 feet from crossing of	1800	feet
	left when on highway 300 feet from crossing of	3500	feet

3500

3200

3000

2500

feet

feet

feet

feet

left when on highway 200 feet from crossing of

left when on highway 100 feet from crossing of

left when on highway 50 feet from crossing of

left when on highway 25 feet from crossing of

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?
- (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.

/es [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.)

 [Install Signal crossing control]
- (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? Supplement existing signals and gates with interconnect to new highway signal
- (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?

 Provide any additional information supporting the proposal (i.e. what public benefits would be derived from its implementation?)

There will be no changes made to the existing highway/rail crossing or warning devices other than the installation of sidewalks adjacent to the pavement and the interconnect tie to the existing railroad crossing signal and the new highway intersection signal. The public benefit is achieved with the safety improvement at the highway intersection.

RESPONDENT'S WAIVER OF HEARING

Docket No
Petition of
for
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 \$)
 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 learing.
Date at, Washington, on this day f, 20
Respondent
by
Print Name
Title







