WASHINGTON UTILITIES AND TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION

*****REVISED PETITION *****

Puget Sound and Pacific Railroad	)	DOCKET NO. TR-**111261**
Petitioner,	)	PETITION TO RECONSTRUCT A HIGHWAY-RAIL GRADE CROSSING
vs. **Grays Harbor County**	)	**Elma-Gate Road**
Respondent	)	USDOT CROSSING NO.: **092595K**
. . . . .	)	

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

Section 1 – Petitioner's Information

Puget Sound and Pacific Railroad

Petitioner

Signature

501 North 2nd Street

Street Address

Elma, WA 98541

City, State and Zip Code

P.O. Box L-2, Elma, WA 98541

Mailing Address, if different than the street address

Steve Hefley

Contact Person Name

360-482-4994, Steve.Hefley@RailAmerica.com

Contact Phone Number and E-mail Address

Section 2 – Respondent's Information

Grays Harbor County

Respondent

100 West Broadway, Suite 31

Street Address

Motesano, WA 98563

City, State and Zip Code

Mailing Address, if different than the street address

Mr. Russell Esses, P.E., County Engineer

Contact Person Name

360-429-4222

Contact Phone Number and E-mail Address

Section 3 – Crossing Location

1. Existing highway/roadway **Elma-Gate Road**

2. Existing railroad **Puget Sound and Pacific Railroad**

3. Location of the crossing planned for reconstruction:
   Located in the____ 1/4 of the ____1/4 of Sec. ____ , Twp.____, Range _____W.M.

4. GPS location, if known **46° 53' 56" , -123° 17' 20"**

5. Railroad mile post (nearest tenth) **MP 38.5**

6. City **Porter** County **Grays Harbor County**

Section 4 – Crossing Information

1. Railroad company **Puget Sound and Pacific Railroad**

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

☐ Passenger ☐ Excursion

3. Type of tracks at crossing ☒ Main Line **(Existing)** ☒ Siding or Spur (**Proposed)**

4. Number of tracks at crossing **1 (Existing); the proposed modification of the crossing will add a second track at the existing crossing.**

5. Average daily train traffic, freight **2-4 trains per day (existing); 4-6 t.p.d. (proposed)**

Authorized freight train speed **25 mph** Operated freight train speed **25 mph**

6. Average daily train traffic, passenger **0**

Authorized passenger train speed **25 mph** Operated passenger train speed **0**

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.

_____

_____

_____

9. Does the petitioner propose to close any existing crossings?
Yes ____ No **X** **(Not as part of this project)**

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 ____

Approximate date of removal _____

Section 6 – Current Highway Traffic Information

1. Name of roadway/highway **Elma-Gate Road**

2. Roadway classification **Local Street**

3. Road authority **Grays Harbor County**

4. Average annual daily traffic (AADT) **60-80 vehicles/day**
PM Peak hour was 1450 hrs to 1550 hrs; 6 vehicles during that time. Counted on 6/28/2011.

5. Number of lanes **2**

6. Roadway speed **30 mph (County requirement for roads in rolling terrain with <400ADT)**

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

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

9. Is the crossing part of an established school bus route? Yes _____ No **X**
School buses approach the crossing from the north, but do not cross. Instead they head back to Highway 12.
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:
The proposed reconstruction includes:
1) Rebuilding the existing track through the crossing and installing concrete crossing panels.
2) Adding a track 15' east of the existing track. The new track would have concrete panels.

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 **X (trees)** No____

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.

Trees could be trimmed. Trees are on County or WSDOT property.

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 proximity of Highway 12 to the crossing (both longitudinally and laterally) does not allow adequate room for approach grades or embankments.

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.

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.

Section 8 – Sight Distance

1. What is the sight distance in each quadrant at the crossing planned for reconstruction?

Note, the following distances are defined with respect to railroad directions at the *proposed* crossing. That is, "railroad west", as indicated below, would actually be "compass north" in the field. Also note that the roadway essentially parallels the railroad on either side of the crossing itself, meaning site distances are quite long, if motorists look "to the side" or "over their shoulder" as they approach the crossing.

NW quadrant: **300**
NE quadrant: **500**
SW quadrant: **300**
SE quadrant: **500**

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. **Approach grades expected to be less than 3% (design not yet complete)**

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.

_____

_____

_____

_____

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.

Puget Sound and Pacific proposes to employ passive warning devices at the reconstructed crossing.

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 ____

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.

By allowing for trains to meet each other, public benefits will accrue to the customers of the Puget Sound and Pacific Railroad within Grays Harbor County, including the Port of Grays Harbor.

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.: **092595K**

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 _____ , Washington, on the _____ day of

_____ , 20____ .

_____
Printed name of Respondent

_____
Signature of Respondent's Representative

_____
Title

_____
Phone number and e-mail address

_____

_____
Mailing address