

## Hunter, Kathy (UTC)

---

**From:** Dombrow, William (Zach) <William.Dombrow@BNSF.com>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, March 18, 2014 4:28 PM  
**To:** Lee Carter; Hunter, Kathy (UTC)  
**Cc:** Sandy Petersen; Joe Rutan; Reagan, Megan T  
**Subject:** RE: UTC Petition Docket No. TR-140301 for Loomis Trail BNSF Realignment  
**Attachments:** UTC Petition Loomis Trail Construct-Reconstruct a Crossing 11-14-13 Rev 2.pdf

Mr. Carter – please see attached the revised crossing petition correcting Section 8.

Thank you for your attention to this matter and I hope all submittals will hit the target dates.

**Zach Dombrow**  
**901-619-9461**

---

**From:** Lee Carter [mailto:lcarter@co.whatcom.wa.us]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, March 18, 2014 1:13 PM  
**To:** Dombrow, William (Zach); Kathy Hunter (Khunter@utc.wa.gov)  
**Cc:** Sandy Petersen; Joe Rutan  
**Subject:** RE: UTC Petition Docket No. TR-140301 for Loomis Trail BNSF Realignment

It was my intent to have you fill-in/correct the referenced information on the two pages comprising Section 8 and email a revised PDF version so I would be able to include these revised pages in our signed Waiver of Hearing packet that we are ready to send back to the UTC. It is my preference to have you produce the changes rather than us needing to make changes on your behalf and document to the UTC why we made the changes to the packet we received.

Please bear in mind we are attempting to comply with our March 20<sup>th</sup> deadline from the UTC.

---

**From:** Dombrow, William (Zach) [mailto:William.Dombrow@BNSF.com]  
**Sent:** Monday, March 17, 2014 5:07 PM  
**To:** Lee Carter; Kathy Hunter (Khunter@utc.wa.gov)  
**Cc:** Sandy Petersen; Joe Rutan  
**Subject:** RE: UTC Petition Docket No. TR-140301 for Loomis Trail BNSF Realignment

Lee –

Thanks for the call and email today. Below are the responses to your inquiries.

Sec 8 – 1. A) EAST; B) WEST

Sec 8 – 4. 45 feet level grade to the WEST, the grade up to it is 6.46%. It is above 5% due to real estate constraints and a reduction of disturbance outside the crossing area. This project reduces the approach grade by approximately 2.5% from existing conditions.

What revised pages are you requesting?

Regards,

**Zach Dombrow**

901-619-9461

---

**From:** Lee Carter [<mailto:lcarter@co.whatcom.wa.us>]  
**Sent:** Monday, March 17, 2014 12:55 PM  
**To:** Dombrow, William (Zach); Kathy Hunter ([Khunter@utc.wa.gov](mailto:Khunter@utc.wa.gov))  
**Cc:** Sandy Petersen; Joe Rutan  
**Subject:** UTC Petition Docket No. TR-140301 for Loomis Trail BNSF Realignment

Zach,

Along with my voice mail message to you today (3/17/14 @ 12:35PM) for the needed information missing on page 7 under Section 8 - Sight Distance, I also have a question as to part 4 of same section in that the question is as follows:

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

The answer marked with an "X" is that the response is YES, however, the plan set page (dated 12/18/13) attached with the petition packet appears to show the grade prior to the 0.00% level grade crossing portion as +6.46%.

Please let me know your response to these items as we are preparing to send the packet back to the UTC (March 20<sup>th</sup> deadline) and need your revised PDF pages as a replacement with the updated information.

Thank you.

Lee D. Carter II  
Engineering Technician V  
(360)676-6730

**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	n/a
Right	200	n/a
Right	100 (70' to parallel road)	1275'
Right	50	1600'
Right	25	unlimited
Left	300	n/a
Left	200	n/a
Left	100 (70' to parallel road)	320'
Left	50	600'
Left	25	unlimited

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	50'
Right	200	75'
Right	100	100'
Right	50	1320'
Right	25	Unlimited
Left	300	50'
Left	200	50'
Left	100	200'
Left	50	1200'
Left	25	unlimited

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.

EB approach approx. 45'; WB approach approx. 10' (limited due to adjacent intersection with Portal Way) this is the existing alignment; no changes will be made on the East side of the tracks

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.

45 feet level grade to the WEST, the grade up to it is 6.46%. It is above 5% due to real estate constraints and a reduction of disturbance outside the crossing area. This project reduces the approach grade by approximately 2.5% from existing conditions.

### *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 – Sidewalks*

1. Provide the following information:

- a. Provide a description of the type of sidewalks proposed.
- b. Describe who will maintain the sidewalks.
- c. Attach a proposed diagram or design of the crossing including the sidewalks.

No sidewalks are proposed.