PORT OF PASCO
Economic Development and Transportation

904 E. Ainsworth
P.O. Box 769
Pasco, WA 99301
Phone 509.547.3378
Fax 509.547.2547
portofpasco@portofpasco.org

June 25, 2009

Ms. Kathy Hunter
Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission
PO Box 47250
Olympia, WA 98504

Subject: Crossing Petition

Dear Kathy:

Please find attached one original and one copy of the Port of Pasco Petition to install a signalized at-grade railroad crossing in Pasco, Washington.

We have been working closely with the BNSF Railway Company and the City of Pasco, both of whom have signed Waivers of Hearing for the project.

Please let me know if you need anything else and thank you for your assistance.

Respectfully,

PORT OF PASCO

Randy Hayden, P.E.
Director of Planning & Engineering

c: Todd Kuhn, BNSF
Bob Alberts, City of Pasco
Paul Weber, HDR
file

UTC
ILITIES AND TRANSPORTATION
COMMISSION

WASHINGTON UTILITIES AND TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION

Port of Pasco Petitioner,	)	DOCKET NO. TR-091064 PETITION TO RECONSTRUCT A HIGHWAY-RAIL GRADE CROSSING
vs. BNSF Railway Co. and City of Pasco Respondents	)	USDOT NO.: 097206U UTC NO.: 3A232.9 LOCATION: Pasco, WA
. . . . .	)	

The Petitioner asks the Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission to approve reconstruction of a highway-rail grade crossing.

Section 1 – Petitioner's Information

Port of Pasco
Petitioner

904 East Ainsworth
Street Address

Pasco, WA 99301
City, State and Zip Code

PO Box 769, Pasco, WA 99301
Mailing Address, if different than the street address

Randy Hayden
Contact Person Name

509-547-3378, rhayden@portofpasco.org
Contact Phone Number and E-mail Address

Section 2 – Respondent's Information

BNSF Railway Co.
Respondent

2454 Occidental Ave S, Suite 1-A
Street Address

Seattle, WA 98134
City, State and Zip Code

Mailing Address, if different than the street address

Todd Kuhn
Contact Person Name

206-625-6146, todd.kuhn@bnsf.com
Contact Phone Number and E-mail Address

City of Pasco
Respondent

525 N 3rd
Street Address

Pasco, WA 99301
City, State and Zip Code

Mailing Address, if different than the street address

Bob Alberts
Contact Person Name

509-545-3446, albertsb@pasco-wa.gov
Contact Phone Number and E-mail Address

Section 3 – Crossing Location

1. Existing highway/roadway Sacajawea Park Road

2. Existing railroad BNSF Railway Co.

3. Location of the crossing planned for reconstruction:
   Located in the NW 1/4 of the NE 1/4 of Sec. 2, Twp. 8N, Range 30E W.M.

4. GPS location, if known 46-deg 12' 41" North, 119-deg 02' 41" West

5. Railroad mile post (nearest tenth) Burbank SUB 232/09

6. City Pasco County Franklin

Section 4 – Crossing Information

1. Railroad company BNSF Railway Co.

2. Type of railroad at crossing ☒ Common Carrier ☐ Logging ☒ Industrial

   ☐ Passenger ☐ Excursion

3. Type of tracks at crossing ☒ Main Line ☒ Siding or Spur

4. Number of tracks at crossing 2 Exist, 1 New

5. Average daily train traffic, freight 6

   Authorized freight train speed 20 mph Operated freight train speed 20 mph

6. Average daily train traffic, passenger 0

   Authorized passenger train speed 20 Operated passenger train speed N/A

7. Will the reconstructed crossing eliminate the need for one or more existing crossings?
   Yes ____ No X

8. If so, state the distance and direction from the reconstructed crossing.

   N/A

9. Does the petitioner propose to close any existing crossings?
   Yes ____ No X

Section 5 – Temporary Crossing

1. Is the crossing proposed to be temporary? Yes ____ No __X__

2. If so, describe the purpose of the crossing and the estimated time it will be needed
N/A

3. Will the petitioner remove the crossing at completion of the activity requiring the temporary crossing? Yes ____ No ____

Approximate date of removal _____

Section 6 – Current Highway Traffic Information

1. Name of roadway/highway Sacajawea Park Road

2. Roadway classification Collector

3. Road authority City of Pasco

4. Average annual daily traffic (AADT) 800

5. Number of lanes 2

6. Roadway speed 35

7. Is the crossing part of an established truck route? Yes X No _____

8. If so, trucks are what percent of total daily traffic? 12.5%

9. Is the crossing part of an established school bus route? Yes _____ No X

10. If so, how many school buses travel over the crossing each day? _____

11. Describe any changes to the information in 1 through 7, above, expected within ten years:
AADT 900, Truck % same

Section 7 – Alternatives to the Proposal

1. Does a safer location for a crossing exist within a reasonable distance of the crossing planned for reconstruction? Yes ____ No X

2. If a safer location exists, explain why the crossing should not be relocated to that site.

3. Are there any hillsides, embankments, buildings, trees, railroad loading platforms or other barriers in the vicinity which may obstruct a motorist's view of the crossing?
Yes ____ No X

4. If a barrier exists, describe:
- ♦ Whether petitioner can relocate the crossing to avoid the obstruction and if not, why not.
- ♦ How the barrier can be removed.
- ♦ How the petitioner or another party can mitigate the hazard caused by the barrier.

N/A

5. Is it feasible to construct an over-crossing or under-crossing as an alternative to an at-grade crossing?
Yes ____ No X

6. If an over-crossing or under-crossing is not feasible, explain why.

The crossing is needed to connect an industry spur track to an existing BNSF track at grade. A separated grade crossing would put the industry spur track to high or low to make the connection to the BNSF track.

7. Does the railway line, at any point in the vicinity of the crossing, pass over a fill area or trestle or through a cut where it is feasible to construct an over-crossing or an under-crossing, even though it may be necessary to relocate a portion of the roadway to reach that point?

Yes ____ No X

8. If such a location exists, state:

- ♦ The distance and direction from the crossing planned for reconstruction.
- ♦ The approximate cost of construction.
- ♦ Any reasons that exist to prevent locating the crossing at this site.

N/A

9. Is there an existing public or private crossing in the vicinity of the crossing planned for reconstruction?

Yes ____ No X

10. If a crossing exists, state:

- ♦ The distance and direction from the crossing planned for reconstruction.
- ♦ Whether it is feasible to divert traffic from the crossing planned for reconstruction to the crossing located in the vicinity.

N/A

Section 8 – Sight Distance

1. What is the sight distance in each quadrant at the crossing planned for reconstruction?
   NW quadrant: 500' Min
   NE quadrant: 500' Min
   SW quadrant: 500' Min
   SE quadrant: 500' Min

2. Will the reconstructed crossing provide a level approach measuring 25 feet from the center of the railway on both approaches to the crossing?
   Yes ____ No X

3. If not, state in feet the length of level grade from the center of the railway on both approaches to the crossing. 0'

4. Will the new crossing provide an approach grade of not more than five percent prior to the level grade?
   Yes ____ No X

5. If not, state the percentage of grade prior to the level grade and explain why the grade exceeds five percent.
   The existing roadway descends away from the existing crossing in excess of a 9% grade.

   Proposed roadway profile will improve the existing roadway profile (from 9% to 7%).

Section 9 – Illustration of Proposed Crossing Configuration

Attach a detailed diagram, drawing, map or other illustration showing the following:

- ♦ The vicinity of the crossing planned for reconstruction.
- ♦ Layout of the railway and highway 500 feet adjacent to the crossing in all directions.
- ♦ Percent of grade.
- ♦ Obstructions of view as described in Section 7 or identified in Section 8.
- ♦ Traffic control layout showing the location of existing and proposed signage.

Section 10 – Proposed Warning Signals or Devices

1. Explain in detail the number and type of automatic signals or other warning devices planned at the reconstructed crossing, including a cost estimate for each.

The existing crossing signals and gate on the south crossing approach will be relocated south of the new track crossing. The cost of the signal modifications as estimated by BNSF is $45,074.

2. Is the petitioner prepared to pay to the respondent railroad company its share of installing the warning devices as provided by law?

Yes X No ____

Section 11 – Additional Information

Provide any additional information supporting the proposal, including information such as the public benefits that would be derived from reconstructing the crossing as proposed.

The new crossing will be 30.8 feet centerline to centerline from the existing crossing. Use of median barriers on both approaches to the crossing was considered to reduce possibility of driving around downed gates, but was deemed unnecessary by Port, BNSF, and City based on low traffic/train volumes and past experience at the crossing. Adding median barriers to the narrow 20-ft wide road was also deemed a potential safety hazard for the large trucks using the road. Widening the roadway for the trucks would be very difficult as the roadway is built on top of a river levee. The crossing will be monitored and if weaving patterns emerge the median barriers/road widening measures will be reconsidered.

Public Benefits: The crossing is part of an overall plan to increase industrial and rail activity At the Port of Pasco's Big Pasco Industrial Center. The plan is consistent with City of Pasco Zoning and comprehensive planning to attract more industrial businesses to the the area. The Plan is also supported by BNSF as a strategic economic development property easily served By their Pasco switchyard. Specific public benefits include: 1) Secure Class 1 rail access for Regionally produced agricultural exports; 2) Promote creation of new family wage jobs by Making rail served industrial property available for new business; and 3) Increase safety by Removing freight trucks from local roads and highways and shifting to rail cars.

Section 12 – Waiver of Hearing by Respondent

Waiver of Hearing

The undersigned represents the Respondent in the petition to reconstruct a highway-railroad grade crossing.

We have investigated the conditions at the crossing site. We are satisfied the conditions are the same as described by the Petitioner in this docket. We agree that the crossing be reconstructed and consent to a decision by the commission without a hearing.

Dated at Seattle, Washington, on the 22nd day of June, 2009.

Todd Kuhn, BNSF Railway Company
Printed name of Respondent

Signature of Respondent's Representative

Manager, Public Projects
Title

206-625-6146, todd.kuhn@bnsf.com
Phone number and e-mail address

2454 Occidental Ave S, Suite 1-A

Seattle, WA 98134
Mailing address

Section 12 – Waiver of Hearing by Respondent

Waiver of Hearing

The undersigned represents the Respondent in the petition to reconstruct a highway-railroad grade crossing.

We have investigated the conditions at the crossing site. We are satisfied the conditions are the same as described by the Petitioner in this docket. We agree that the crossing be reconstructed and consent to a decision by the commission without a hearing.

Dated at Pasco, Washington, on the 24th day of June, 2009.

Bob Alberts, City of Pasco
Printed name of Respondent

Bob Alberts
Signature of Respondent's Representative

Public Works Director
Title

509-545-3446, albertsb@pasco-wa.gov
Phone number and e-mail address

525 N Third Ave

Pasco, WA 99301
Mailing address