BEFORE THE WASHINGTON UTILITIES AND TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION

No. _____

PETITION

Petitioner City of Walla Walla

Road Name West Chestnut Street

vs.

W.U.T.C. Crossing No. _____

Respondent

D.O.T. Crossing No. _____

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

X directing the reconstruction 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 _____ 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 ✷ order without hearing

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

[ ] Yes [ ] 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.

_____
Petitioner

Neal Chavre, PE Principal Engineer
Print Name Title

P.O. Box 478
Street Address

Walla Walla, WA 99362
City-State-Zip Code

INTERROGATORIES

Use additional paper as needed

[1]

State name of highway and railway at crossing intersection:

Existing or proposed highway _____ mile post _____

Existing or proposed railway _____ mile post _____

Located in SW 1/4 of the NE 1/4 of Sec. 30 Twp. 7N. Range 36E. W.M.

WUTC crossing number _____ DOT crossing number _____

Street W. Chestnut _____ City Walla Walla _____ County Walla Walla _____
(if applicable) (if applicable)

[2]

Character 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 1
(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 NA MPH Passenger _____ MPH
Freight <<20 MPH Freight _____ MPH

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

Passenger Trains N/A Freight Trains <1
(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 Collector

(d) Number of traffic lanes existing in each direction: 1
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 total 2500 (est.) incl. <10% trucks and 20 (est.) school bus trips. Projected traffic in 10 years: total >2500 including _____ trucks and 20 (est.) school bus trips.

[4]

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

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

[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.

This project is simply the addition of 2 ADA- accessible pedestrian crossings at an EXISTING railroad crossing. There is sidewalk on both sides of the rail, with gaps at the railroad. No safer locations exist for this crossing. The area is completely developed, and the most logical location to crss pedestrians is at the road crossing.

(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.

The crossing is already controlled by automatic gates and lights. Visual obstructions would only present a problem for vehicle speeds IF the warning system failed to operate. This is not applicable to pedestrians.

[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. These solutions would be cost-prohibitive, especially for the volume of pedestrian traffic expected vs. the very light volume of trains using these tracks.

(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.

N/A

[7]

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

Approximately 1 city block in either direction. These crossings are not signal-controlled in any way.

(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 new crossings are being constructed. This project will improve pedestrian safety at an EXISTING RR crossing.

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

No, however, creation of a safer, more convenient pedestrian crossing facility may divert pedestrian traffic from surrounding areas that are not as safe.

[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:

This is a pedestrian facility for an existing crossing. This information is not relevant.

Approaching crossing from.....(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

Approaching crossing from ..... (opposite direction) an obstructed 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 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 change will be made to the road profile. Sidewalk approaches are essentially level.

(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.

[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.

There is no reason to deny this crossing. It will improve safety at an existing crossing. It has been discussed and approved by the local RR personnel.

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.) No change proposed

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

(c) State a cost estimate for maintaining the signals or devices for 12 months, as obtained from the respondent railroad company . . . N/A

(d) If this is an existing crossing, what will the proposed warning devices replace in the way of existing devices? No changes proposed

(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 (see reasons above)

[13]

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

W. Chestnut Street is the primary route to Blue Ridge Elementary School. The existing RR crossing is safe for vehicles, as there are already standard gates and signals. Gaps in the sidewalk across the RR r/w create an unsafe situation for walkers. The proposed solution is to install custom concrete panels across the racks to match the sidewalk. Signs and RR signals will function adequately to protect pedestrians.