UTC
TILITIES AND TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION

TR-131721

WASHINGTON UTILITIES AND TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION

BNSF Railway Petitioner,	)	DOCKET NO. TR- PETITION TO RECONSTRUCT A HIGHWAY-RAIL GRADE CROSSING
vs.	)	
City Of Cheney, County Of Spokane, WA Respondent	)	USDOT CROSSING NO.: 089624P

2015 SEP 11 PM 4:17

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

Section 1 – Petitioner's Information

BNSF Railway
Petitioner

_____
Signature

2454 Occidental Ave South, Suite 2D
Street Address

Seattle, WA 98134
City, State and Zip Code

Same as above
Mailing Address, if different than the street address

Mr. Richard Wagner (Manager – Public Projects)
Contact Person Name

(206)-625-6152 Richard.Wagner@BNSF.com
Contact Phone Number and E-mail Address

Section 2 – Respondent's Information

City of Cheney, County of Spokane, Washington
Respondent

112 Anderson Road
Street Address

Cheney, WA 99004
City, State and Zip Code

Same as above
Mailing Address, if different than the street address

Mr. Todd Ableman (Director – Public Works)
Contact Person Name

(509)-498-9293 Tableman@cityofcheney.org
Contact Phone Number and E-mail Address

Section 3 – Crossing Location

1. Existing highway/roadway Mullinix Road

2. Existing railroad BNSF Railway (Lakeside Subdivsion)

3. Location of the crossing planned for reconstruction:
   Located in the NW 1/4 of the SW 1/4 of Sec. 23 , Twp. 23N , Range 41E W.M.

4. GPS location, if known 47.4674344, -117.6076259

5. Railroad mile post (nearest tenth) 18.42

6. City Cheney, WA County Spokane County, WA

Section 4 – Crossing Information

1. Railroad company BNSF Railway

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 One (1)

5. Average daily train traffic, freight 39 Trains/Day

   Authorized freight train speed 60 MPH Operated freight train speed 0 – 60 MPH

6. Average daily train traffic, passenger 2 Trains/Day

   Authorized passenger train speed 79 MPH Operated passenger train speed 0 – 79 MPH

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 X

Approximate date of removal N/A

Section 6 – Current Highway Traffic Information

1. Name of roadway/highway Mullinix Road

2. Roadway classification Rural Major Collector

3. Road authority City of Cheney

4. Average annual daily traffic (AADT) 410

5. Number of lanes 2

6. Roadway speed 25 MPH

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

8. If so, trucks are what percent of total daily traffic? None

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? 3

11. Describe any changes to the information in 1 through 7, above, expected within ten years:
None

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.
N/A

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.

Crossing has relatively low AADT. Constructing a grade separated crossing would not be cost effective. Additionally, the existing geometry of the crossing would require significant re-design in order to provide the necessary approach distance for a grade separated crossing.

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.

No options exist in the vicinity of the existing grade crossing.

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

Yes X No ____

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.

As part of the BNSF Railway project, five public crossings in or near the City of Cheney, WA will be revised / reconstructed. The closest existing public crossing to Mullinix Rd is Lance Hill Rd (DOT # 089625W). It is located approximately 0.86 miles to the west of the existing Mullinix Rd crossing. It is feasible to divert traffic to Lance Hill Rd during the revision/ reconstruction of Mullinix Rd. However, detour length would be long

Section 8 – Sight Distance

1. What is the sight distance in each quadrant at the crossing planned for reconstruction?
   NW quadrant: 1000 + feet
   NE quadrant: 1000 + feet
   SW quadrant: 1000 + feet
   SE quadrant: 1000 + feet

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 X No ____

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

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

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

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.

Crossing currently includes the following items:

Signs - Advanced Warning Signs, Stop Lines, and RR Xing Symbols

Train Activated Devices – Two (2) Gates, Two (2) Mast Mounted Flashing Lights w/ Bells

Track is currently equipped with (Constant Warning) Train Detection Circuitry

Crossing will have the following items at the completion of the project:

Signs - Advanced Warning Signs, Stop Lines and RR Xing Symbols

Train Activated Devices – Two (2) Gates, Two (2) Mast Mounted Flashing Lights w/ Bells

Track will be equipped with (Constant Warning) Train Detection Circuitry

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

Yes ____ No X

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.

Improved approach surfaces and potentially improved signal warning equipment.

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.

USDOT Crossing No.: 089624P

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 Cheney, Washington, on the 5th day of August, 2013.

Tom Trulove
Printed name of Respondent

Signature of Respondent's Representative

Mayor, City of Cheney
Title

(509) 498-9200
Phone number and e-mail address

609 2nd Street, Cheney, WA 99004
Mailing address





GENERAL NOTE:

EXISTING ADVANCE RAILROAD WARNING SIGN & RAILROAD CROSSING SYMBOL ARE NOT SHOWN ON THIS SHEET. THE LOCATIONS ARE APPROXIMATE 700 FEET NORTH AND SOUTH OF RAILROAD CROSSING.

LEGEND:

- NEW PANELS
- EXISTING PANELS
- NEW ASPHALT CONCRETE PAVEMENT
- NEW CEMENT CONCRETE SIDEWALK
- RX-XX MUTCD SIGN DESIGNATION

NO.	○ — NEW CONSTRUCTION ITEM ◇ — REMOVE AND RECONSTRUCT ⬡ — REMOVAL ITEM ○ — EXISTING TO REMAIN ITEM
1	CONCRETE GRADE CROSSING PANELS (BY BNSF)
2	24" THERMOPLASTIC STOP BAR
3	STEEL GUARDRAIL & ANCHOR (WSDOT TYPE 1)
4	4" DOUBLE YELLOW CENTERLINE (EXISTING)
6	ASPHALT PAVEMENT (EXISTING)
10	R15-1 48" x 9" (RAILROAD CROSSING) (BY BNSF)
11	R15-2 9" x9" (NUMBER) - PER PLAN (BNSF)
12	R15-2 27" x 9" (TRACKS) (BY BNSF)
13	AUTOMATIC GATE W/ FLASHERS (BY BNSF)
16	SAWCUT FULL DEPTH
17	HMA CL 1/2 INCH, PG 64-22, MATCH EXISTING DEPTH

NOTES:

1. REPLACE STRIPING/PAVEMENT MARKINGS IN KIND ACROSS NEW PAVEMENT.
2. AUTOMATIC GATE AND RAILROAD WARNING DEVICE ASSEMBLIES WILL BE CONSTRUCTED SO THAT THE CLOSEST POINT OF THE GATE MASTARM IS 15' FROM THE CENTERLINE OF THE NEW TRACK TO BE DONE BY BNSF-NOT PART OF CONTRACT.
3. COORDINATE WITH BNSF RAILROAD BEFORE BEGINNING CONSTRUCTION TO INSTALL NEW CONCRETE CROSSING.
4. GRADE CROSSING SIGNAGE & PAVEMENT MARKING SYMBOL LOCATIONS SHALL MEET MUTCD 2009 TABLE 2C-4. SEE WSDOT STANDARD PLAN M-11.10-01 FOR GRADE CROSSING SYMBOL DETAIL.
5. PANELS WILL BE FURNISHED AND INSTALLED BY BNSF.
6. TRANSITION SIDEWALK AS NECESSARY TO MATCH EXISTING.

HORIZONTAL SCALE IN FEET 0 20 40 60 80
VERTICAL SCALE IN FEET 0 5 10 15 20

ISSUED FOR BID

CONSULTANT	DATE
DESIGNED BY H H PHAN	07-13-12
ENTERED BY H H PHAN	07-13-12
CHECKED BY A M SHIELDS	07-13-12
PROJ. MGR. A R SILVER	07-13-12

ISSUE NO.	DATE	BY	DESCRIPTION

BNSF APPROVALS DEPARTMENT	SIGNATURE	DATE

AECOM
710 - 2nd Avenue, Suite 1000
Seattle, Washington 98104
Phone: (206) 624-9349 Fax: (206) 624-3701
www.aecom.com

BNSF RAILWAY

BNSF RAILWAY COMPANY
LAKESIDE SUBDIVISION
CHENEY TO BABB DOUBLE TRACK
MP 14.90 TO MP 21.49
GRADE CROSSING
MP 18.42 MULLINIX ROAD

BNSF NO. X103
SHEET 38 OF 50 SHEETS

R:\60215279 - BNSF Lakeside Sub North\ACADD\Civil\Sheet\Cheney to Babb\LSH-X103.dgn
brafferton.tbl
BNSF LSH-half.plt
BY: HPHAN
7/25/2012 7:05:39:50 PM

© 2012 Google
Google Earth Pro
feet
meters
700
200