WASHINGTON UTILITIES AND TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION

Inland Northwest Rail Museum Petitioner, vs. Lincoln County Respondent	DOCKET NO. TR- PETITION TO CONSTRUCT A HIGHWAY-RAIL GRADE CROSSING USDOT CROSSING NO.: TBD[1]

By filing this petition with the Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission (UTC), the Petitioner alleges that public safety requires the construction of a highway-rail grade crossing under RCW 81.53.060.

RCW 81.53.020 requires that new highway-rail grade crossings be constructed either over or under grade, when practicable (see Section 7 below). Prior to submitting this petition to the UTC, the Petitioner must complete a feasibility analysis to determine whether a grade-separated crossing is practicable and attach a copy of the analysis with the petition.

In addition, prior to submitting this petition to the UTC, State Environmental Protection Act (SEPA) requirements must be met. While the Commission's actions are generally categorically exempt under SEPA, that categorical exemption does not apply to "authorization of the openings or closing or any highway/rail grade crossing." Washington Administrative Code (WAC) 197-11-865(2). The Petitioner therefore must attach sufficient documentation to demonstrate SEPA compliance. For additional information on SEPA requirements contact the Department of Ecology.

[1] If the petition to construct the crossing is approved, the railroad will assign a USDOT number. If the railroad is unable to assign a USDOT number, the parties can ask the UTC to assign one.

Section 1 – Petitioner's Information

Inland Northwest Rail Museum

Petitioner

Signature

27300 Sprinkle Rd N

Street Address

Reardan, WA 99029

City, State and Zip Code

PO Box 471

Mailing Address, if different than the street address

Dale Swant

Contact Person Name

509-796-3377

Contact Phone Number and Email

Section 2 – Respondent's Information

Lincoln County

Respondent

27234 SR 25 N

Street Address

Davenport, WA 99122

City, State and Zip Code

Mailing Address, if different than the street address

James Wege

Contact Person Name

509-725-7041

Contact Phone Number and Email

Section 3 – Proposed Crossing Location

1. Existing highway/roadway: Old Sunset Hwy
2. Existing railroad: Washington Eastern RR
3. GPS location: 47°39'53.3"N 117°56'09.5"W
4. Railroad mile post (nearest tenth): 29.6
5. City: Reardan County: Lincoln

Section 4 – Current Highway Traffic Information

1. Name of roadway/highway: Old Sunset Highway
2. Roadway classification: Secondary
3. Road authority: Lincoln County
4. Average annual daily traffic (AADT): 3
5. Number of lanes: 2
6. Roadway speed: 40
7. Is the road part of an established truck route? Yes ☐ No ☑
8. If so, trucks are what percent of total daily traffic?
9. Is the road part of an established school bus route? Yes ☐ No ☑
10. If so, how many school buses travel over the crossing each day?
11. Describe any changes to the information in 1 through 9, above, expected within ten years:

None

Section 5 – Railroad Information

1. Railroad company: Washington Eastern RR

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: 1

Authorized freight train speed: 10 Operated freight train speed: 10

6. Average daily train traffic, passenger: 1

Authorized passenger train speed: 10 Operated passenger train speed: 10

7. Will the proposed crossing eliminate the need for one or more existing crossings?

Yes ☐ No ☑

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

9. Does the petitioner propose to close any existing crossings?

Yes ☐ No ☑

Section 6 – Temporary Crossing

1. Is the crossing proposed to be temporary? ☐ Yes ☑ No

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

Approximate date of removal:

Section 7 – Alternatives to the Proposal

1. Is it practicable or feasible to construct an over-crossing or under-crossing at the proposed location as an alternative to an at-grade crossing? (RCW 81.53.020)

☐ Yes ☑ No

2. If constructing an over-crossing or under-crossing is ***not practicable***, explain why and include a copy of the grade crossing feasibility study with petition. (Per RCW 81.53.020 - *In determining whether a separation of grades is practicable, the commission takes into consideration the amount and character of travel on the railroad and on the highway; the grade and alignment of the railroad and the highway; the cost of separating grades; the topography of the country, and all other circumstances and conditions involved*.)

It is not practicable since the traffic volume is so low.

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

☐ Yes ☑ No

4. If a safer location exists, explain why the crossing should not be located at that site:

5. 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

6. 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.

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

☐ Yes ☑ No

8. 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 East , 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	375
Right	200	
Right	100	100
Right	50	
Right	25	
Left	300	100
Left	200	
Left	100	
Left	50	
Left	25	

b. Approaching the crossing from West , 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	320
Right	200	
Right	100	100
Right	50	
Right	25	
Left	300	100
Left	200	
Left	100	
Left	50	
Left	25	

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.

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.

6. 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

7. 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.

Section 9 – Illustration of Proposed Crossing Configuration

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

- ♦ All elements of the proposed crossing (e.g., warning devices, crossing, sidewalks, etc.).
- ♦ 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

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. Include the type of train detection circuitry. (RCW 81.53.261) NOTE: If crossing signals will be interconnected to a highway traffic signal, contact commission staff as additional documentation will be required.

The crossing that is in place has round warning signs in both directions as well crossbucks in both directions.

Section 11 – Additional Information

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

Crossing allows the museum to move rail cars from the Washington Eastern RR mainline onto Inland Northwest Ral Museum property.

Section 12 – Cost Apportionment

If the commission approves the construction of the crossing requested in this petition, it will apportion costs in accordance with the applicable statutes. (RCW 81.53.130 and 81.53.271).

In the alternative, if the parties to this petition have reached an agreement related to apportionment of costs, please sign here to confirm:

Petitioner Signature: Respondent Signature:

Section 13 – Respondent's Review

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

USDOT Crossing No.: **TBD**

We have investigated the conditions at the proposed crossing site. We are satisfied the conditions are the same as described by the Petitioner. We consent to a decision by the commission based on a review of the documents filed in this docket.

Dated at Davenport , Washington, on the 18 day of March, 2025.

James Wege
Printed name of Respondent

James D. Wege P.E. Digitally signed by James Wege, PE Date: 2025.03.18 11:20:22 -07'00'
Signature of Respondent's Representative

County Engineer
Title

Lincoln County
Name of Company

(509) 725-7041
Phone Number

jwege@co.lincoln.wa.us
Email Address

27234 SR 25 N
Davenport, WA 99122
Mailing address

Checklist prior to submitting petition:

- ✓ Ensure all petition fields are completed.
- ✓ Ensure parties sign Section 12 regarding any Cost Apportionment agreement, if applicable.
- ✓ Obtain signature on Respondent's Review (Section 13). *If respondent fails to sign this section, advise UTC staff upon submission.*
- ✓ Attach copies of:
    - SEPA Determination of Non-Significance.
    - Grade separation feasibility study (described in Section 7).
    - Illustration of crossing (described in Section 9).
    - Any other relevant documents to support the petition, including but not limited to support of public need, project information, etc.

Submitting the petition: To officially file the petition, send the petition form and supporting documents to records@utc.wa.gov.

Questions: For questions, please contact:

Mike Turcott Transportation Planning Specialist mike.turcott@utc.wa.gov (360) 764-0572	**Tyler Whitcomb** Transportation Planning Specialist tyler.whitcomb@utc.wa.gov (564) 669-0943