

BEFORE THE WASHINGTON UTILITIES AND TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION

No. TR-081864

PETITION

Petitioner

Road Name North Edison Street

vs.

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

Respondent

D.O.T. Crossing No. 104-568B

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

- directing the widening of an existing 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;

2008 OCT -9 AM 9:37
RECEIVED

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?
Yes No

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

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

City of Kennewick
Petitioner
Stephen R. Plummer Project Engineer
Print Name Title
210 W. 6th Avenue
Street Address
Kennewick, WA 99336
City-State-Zip Code

INTERROGATORIES

Use additional paper as needed

[1]

State name of highway and railway at crossing intersection:

Existing or proposed highway North Edison Street mile post N/A

Existing or proposed railway BNSF Yakima Valley Sub. mile post 6.6

Located in NE 1/4 of the SW 1/4 of Sec. 33 Twp 9N Range 29E W.M.

WUTC crossing number _____ DOT crossing number 104-568B

Street North Edison Street City Kennewick County Benton
(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 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 N/A MPH Passenger N/A MPH
Freight 45 MPH Freight 45 MPH
- (e) Actual or estimated train traffic in 24 hours:
Passenger Trains 0 Freight Trains 4-10
(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 North Edison Street is a primary arterial.
- (d) Number of traffic lanes existing in each direction: 2
Number of additional traffic lanes proposed: 0
- (e) Posted vehicle speed limit: Automobiles 35 MPH Trucks 35 MPH
- (f) Estimated vehicle traffic in 24 hours: Current total 15,134 including 36 trucks and 25 school bus trips. Projected traffic in 20 years: total 27,300 including 65 trucks and 25 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 safer location exists for this 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.

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.

The project is for the widening of an existing crossing. Left turn lanes will be constructed for the intersections to the north and south of the existing crossing. A median will be constructed on either side of the crossing to prevent left turning vehicles from fouling the tracks. No additional traffic lanes are proposed over the 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. **Please see 6 (a) and (b) above.**

[7]

- (a) State approximate distance to nearest public or private crossing in each direction of railroad involved herein. **The Fruitland Street at-grade crossing is approximately 3.0 miles to the east; the Kellogg Street at-grade crossing is approximately 0.5 miles to the west. Please note, there are two grade separated crossings to the east – Volland Street/Canal Drive at 0.5 miles east and US 395 at 2.25 miles east.**

- (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. The project will increase capacity on Edison Street by facilitating left turning vehicles to the north and south of the existing crossing; no additional travel lanes are proposed.**
- (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. The project proposes to modify an existing crossing.**
- (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 **northbound** (direction) an unobstructed view to

right when on highway 300 feet from crossing of **310** feet
 right when on highway 200 feet from crossing of **400** feet
 right when on highway 100 feet from crossing of **920** feet
 right when on highway 50 feet from crossing of **1000+** feet
 right when on highway 25 feet from crossing of **1000+** 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

Approaching crossing from **southbound** (opposite direction) an obstructed view to
 right when on highway 300 feet from crossing of **1000+** feet (may change with development)

right when on highway 200 feet from crossing of **1000+** feet (may change with development)
 right when on highway 100 feet from crossing of **1000+** feet
 right when on highway 50 feet from crossing of **1000+** feet
 right when on highway 25 feet from crossing of **1000+** feet
 left when on highway 300 feet from crossing of **380** 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

[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.
Attached.

[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. See attached drawing S6.**
- (b) If not, state in feet the length of level grade it is feasible to obtain. **N/A.**
- (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. See attached drawing S6.**

[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.) **Constant warning, cantilevers and flasher with gates.**
- (b) State an estimate of the cost for installing the signals or other devices proposed, as obtained from the respondent railroad company. . . **\$TBD (attached).**
- (c) State a cost estimate for maintaining the signals or devices for 12 months, as obtained from the respondent railroad company . . . **Included with 12(a)**
- (d) If this is an existing crossing, what will the proposed warning devices replace in the way of existing devices? **The existing cantilevers and flashers will be supplemented with new cantilevers and flashers installed within the median.**
- (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

[13]

Provide any additional information supporting the proposal (i.e. what public benefits would be derived from its implementation?) **The project will enhance traffic flow and increase the level of safety at the crossing.**

RESPONDENT'S WAIVER OF HEARING

Docket No. _____

Petition of City of Kennewick

To modify an existing crossing of BNSF Yakima Valley main line

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 \$TBD)

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:

Waiver is without prejudice and water may be re-opened
if final agreements between City of Kennewick and BNSF
are not reached.

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 Seattle, Washington, on this 8th day
of October, 20 08.

Respondent BNSF Railway Company

by 

Print Name John Li

Title Manager, Public Projects