

WASHINGTON UTILITIES AND TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION

City of Pasco)	DOCKET NO. TR-
_____)	
Petitioner,)	PETITION TO CONSTRUCT A
)	HIGHWAY-RAIL GRADE
)	CROSSING
vs.)	
BNSF Railroad)	
_____)	
Respondent)	
)	
.....)	
_____)	

STATE OF WASH
 UTIL. AND TRANSP.
 COMMISSION

2012 SEP 10 AM 8:22

RECEIVED
 RECORDS MANAGEMENT

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

Section 1 – Petitioner’s Information

City of Pasco	_____
Petitioner	_____
525 N. 3 rd Ave	_____
Street Address	_____
Pasco, WA 99301	_____
City, State and Zip Code	_____
Mailing Address, if different than the street address	
Ahmad Qayoumi	_____
Contact Person Name	_____
509-543-5738	_____
Contact Phone Number and E-mail Address	_____
	qayoumia@pasco-wa.gov

Section 2 – Respondent’s Information

BNSF Railway Company

Respondent

2454 Occidental Ave S. - Suite 2D

Street Address

Seattle, WA 98134-1439

City, State and Zip Code

Mailing Address, if different than the street address

Richard W Wagner – Manager Public Projects

Contact Person Name

206-625-6152 - Richard.Wagner@BNSF.com

Contact Phone Number and E-mail Address

Section 3 – Proposed Crossing Location

1. Existing highway/roadway Road 40 E

2. Existing railroad BNSF

3. Location of proposed crossing:

Located in the SE1/4 of the NW 1/4 of Sec. 34 , Twp. 9N , Range 30E W.M.

4. GPS location, if known Latitude: 46°13'09"N Longitude: 119°02'41"W

5. Railroad mile post (nearest tenth) ≈ 1.62 on proposed spur track

6. City: Pasco

County: Franklin

Section 4 – Proposed Crossing Information

1. Railroad company BNSF

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 1

5. Average daily train traffic, freight 2
Authorized freight train speed 10 Operated freight train speed 10

6. Average daily train traffic, passenger 0
Authorized passenger train speed NA Operated passenger train speed NA

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

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

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

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

Approximate date of removal _____

Section 6 – Current Highway Traffic Information

1. Name of roadway/highway Rd 40 E

2. Roadway classification Urban Unclassified

3. Road authority City of Pasco

4. Average annual daily traffic (AADT) 1557

5. Number of lanes 2

6. Roadway speed 40

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

8. If so, trucks are what percent of total daily traffic? 62

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

10. If so, how many school buses travel over the crossing each day? 26

11. Describe any changes to the information in 1 through 7, above, expected within ten years:

Roadway may be widened to 4 lanes.

Section 7 – Alternatives to the Proposal

1. Does a safer location for a crossing exist within a reasonable distance of the proposed location?

Yes ____ No X

2. If a safer location exists, explain why the crossing should not be located at 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.

5. Is it feasible to construct an over-crossing or under-crossing at the proposed location as an alternative to an at-grade crossing?

Yes ____ No X

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

Not economically feasible to construct grade crossing for the proposed low rail traffic
volume and low track speed. It will greatly impact the access to the properties to the west and east
of Road 40 East.

7. Does the railway line, at any point in the vicinity of the proposed 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

8. If such a location exists, state:

- ◆ The distance and direction from the proposed crossing.
- ◆ The approximate cost of construction.
- ◆ Any reasons that exist to prevent locating the crossing at this site.

9. Is there an existing public or private crossing in the vicinity of the proposed crossing?

Yes No

10. If a crossing exists, state:

- ◆ The distance and direction from the proposed crossing.
- ◆ Whether it is feasible to divert traffic from the proposed to the existing crossing.

Section 8 – Sight Distance

1. Complete the following table, describing the sight distance for motorists when approaching the tracks from either direction.

a. Approaching the crossing from North , the current approach provides an unobstructed view as follows: (North, South, East, West)

Direction of sight (left or right)	Number of feet from proposed crossing	Provides an unobstructed view for how many feet
Right	300	750
Right	200	750
Right	100	1000 minimum
Right	50	1000 minimum
Right	25	1000 minimum
Left	300	1000 minimum
Left	200	1000 minimum
Left	100	1000 minimum
Left	50	1000 minimum
Left	25	1000 minimum

b. Approaching the crossing from South , the current approach provides an unobstructed view as follows: (Opposite direction-North, South, East, West)

Direction of sight (left or right)	Number of feet from proposed crossing	Provides an unobstructed view for how many feet
Right	300	1000 minimum
Right	200	1000 minimum
Right	100	1000 minimum
Right	50	1000 minimum
Right	25	1000 minimum
Left	300	900
Left	200	1000 minimum
Left	100	1000 minimum
Left	50	1000 minimum
Left	25	1000 minimum

2. Will the new crossing provide a level approach measuring 25 feet from the center of the railway on both approaches to the crossing?

Yes No

3. If not, state in feet the length of level grade from the center of the railway on both approaches to the crossing. 5 feet, both sides of railroad crossing.

4. Will the new crossing provide an approach grade of not more than five percent prior to the level grade?

Yes No

5. If not, state the percentage of grade prior to the level grade and explain why the grade exceeds five percent.

Section 9 – Illustration of Proposed Crossing Configuration

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

- ◆ The vicinity of the proposed crossing.
- ◆ 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 the 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 proposed crossing, including a cost estimate for each.

As part of the project, the City proposes to furnish and install crossbucks. Also

proposed are a concrete crossing surface, pavement markings, and advanced

warning signs as shown on the illustration. All elements will be installed per

current MUTCD and railroad standards. Estimated cost to the project for work

directly related to the crossing is \$46,500.

2. Provide an estimate for maintaining the signals for 12 months. NA

3. Is the petitioner prepared to pay to the respondent railroad company its share of installing the warning devices as provided by law?
Yes NA No

Section 11 – Additional Information

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

The City wants to be competitive when there are industrial development prospects. The City regularly submits proposals to potential interested developers that will create jobs and additional tax base for the City. One of the key factors for site selection for potential users is rail access to their site. They would like a site that has existing rail access or a site which can have rail access implemented within 6 months or less.

Section 12 – Waiver of Hearing by Respondent

Waiver of Hearing

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

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

Dated at _____, Washington, on the _____ day of _____, 20 ____.




BNSF Railway Company
Printed name of Respondent

Signature of Respondent's Representative


Title

Phone number and e-mail address


Mailing address



CITY OF PASCO HERITAGE INDUSTRIAL CENTER ROAD 40 EAST GRADE CROSSING BURLINGTON, NORTHERN AND SANTA FE RAILWAY NORTHWEST DINKER SUBDIVISION MAP 11.87		DES: RAH DATE: 08/17/19 REVISIONS:	DRW: RAH AUTH:	CHK. P.W. LINE SEC: 0450	PLAN NO: SHEET: 1 OF 3



NOTE:
RIGHT OF WAY INFORMATION WAS
OBTAINED FROM FRANKLIN COUNTY
ON-LINE ASSESSOR'S DATA.




PROFILE KEY
 --- EXISTING GRADE LINE
 --- LEFT (EAST) PAVEMENT EDGE
 --- RIGHT (WEST) PAVEMENT EDGE

PROPOSED TRACK PROFILE
 CI/CL INTERSECTION
 ELEV.=411.46
 SCALE: 1" = 5' (VERT.)



DES.	RAH	DATE: 08/17/12	REVISED:
CHK: PJW	RAH	AUTH:	
LINE SEC:	0450		

CITY OF PASCO
 HERITAGE INDUSTRIAL CENTER
 ROAD 40 EAST GRADE CROSSING
 BURLINGTON, NORTHERN AND SANTA FE RAILWAY
 NORTHWEST DIVISION, BURBANK SUBDIVISION
 M.P. 0.87
 PLAN NO:
 SHEET 2 OF 3







DES:	RAH	CHK: PAW
DATE:	08/17/12	LINE SEG.: 0450
REVISIONS:		
DRN:	RAH	
AUTH:		

CITY OF PASCO
 HERITAGE INDUSTRIAL CENTER
 ROAD 40 EAST GRADE CROSSING
 BURLINGTON NORTHERN AND SANTA FE RAILWAY
 NORTHWEST DIVISION, BURBANK SUBDIVISION
 W.P. 2.57

PLANS NO:
 SHEET: 3 OF 3