



**Washington State  
Department of Transportation**  
**Douglas B. MacDonald**  
Secretary of Transportation

**Transportation Building**  
310 Maple Park Avenue S.E.  
P.O. Box 47300  
Olympia, WA 98504-7300  
  
360-705-7000  
TTY: 1-800-833-6388  
[www.wsdot.wa.gov](http://www.wsdot.wa.gov)

February 26, 2007

Kathy Hunter  
Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission  
PO Box 47250  
Olympia, WA 98504

Subject: **TR-070025**

Dear Ms. Hunter:

Enclosed herewith is the Washington State Department of Transportation's waiver of hearing in TR-070025 regarding the City of Spokane's petition to establish a new highway-rail grade crossing at SR-902. Please note that the only condition of waiver is for the grade crossing surface to be constructed with concrete crossing materials. You may contact me at (360) 705-7271 with any questions.

Sincerely,

Ahmer Nizam  
WSDOT – Railroad Liaison

RECEIVED  
RECORDS MANAGEMENT  
07 FEB 27 PM 3:58  
STATE OF WASH.  
UTIL. AND TRANSP.  
COMMISSION

BEFORE THE WASHINGTON UTILITIES AND TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION

No. TR-070025

PETITION

Petitioner

Road Name SR 902

vs.

W.U.T.C. Crossing No. New Crossing

Respondent

D.O.T. Crossing No. \_\_\_\_\_

Application is hereby made to the Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission for an order (check one or more of the following)

- directing the construction of a grade crossing;  
(construction-reconstruction-relocation)
- directing installation of automatic grade crossing signal or other warning device (other than crossbucks) at a new crossing;
- directing \_\_\_\_\_ of warning devices at an existing crossings;  
(replacement-change-upgrade)
- allocating funds from the "grade crossing protective fund" for \_\_\_\_\_ of active warning devices;  
\_\_\_\_\_ (installation and/or maintenance)
- authorizing the construction of the project, funding to be pursuant to the Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act (ISTEA) in cooperation with the Washington State Department of Transportation Local Programs Division;

RECEIVED  
RECORDS MANAGEMENT  
07 FEB 27 PM 3:58  
STATE OF WASH  
UTILITIES AND TRANSP  
COMMISSION

at the railroad grade crossing identified above and described in this petition. This application seeks the relief specified above by (check one of the following)

- hearing and order
- order without hearing

[ ] Yes  No Has application for funding, pursuant to Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act been made to the Local Programs Division for this project?

[ ] Yes [ ] No If the answer is yes to the question above, has the funding requested under the Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act been denied?

I certify under penalty of perjury that the information provided in and with this petition is true and correct.

Spokane County  
 Petitioner  
Robert Bruggeman Acting County Engineer  
 Print Name Title  
1026 W. Broadway  
 Street Address  
Spokane WA 99260-0170  
 City-State-Zip Code

# INTERROGATORIES

Use additional paper as needed

[ 1 ]

State name of highway and railway at crossing intersection:

Existing or proposed highway SR. 902 mile post 9.48

Existing or proposed railway Geizer Spur mile post 0.73

Located in NW 1/4 of the NW 1/4 of Sec. 10 Twp. 24 Range 41 W.M.

WUTC crossing number \_\_\_\_\_ DOT crossing number \_\_\_\_\_

Street \_\_\_\_\_ City \_\_\_\_\_ County Spokane  
(if applicable) (if applicable)

[ 2 ]

Character of crossing (indicate with X or numbers where applicable):

(a) Common Carrier  Logging or Industrial

(b) Main Line  Branch Line  Siding or Spur

(c) Total number of tracks at crossing one  
(Note: A track separated 100 feet or more from another track constitutes a separate crossing.)

(d) Operating maximum train speed: Legal maximum train speed:

Passenger \_\_\_\_\_ MPH Passenger \_\_\_\_\_ MPH  
Freight 20 MPH Freight 25 MPH

(e) Actual or estimated train traffic in 24 hours:

Passenger Trains \_\_\_\_\_ Freight Trains one  
(Note: Round trip counted as two trains. Include switch movements.)

[ 3 ]

Character of Roadway:

(a) State Highway - Classification Minor Arterial

(b) County Highway - Classification \_\_\_\_\_

(c) City Street - Classification \_\_\_\_\_

(d) Number of traffic lanes existing in each direction: one  
Number of additional traffic lanes proposed: one pull-out lane

(e) Posted vehicle speed limit: Automobiles 55 MPH Trucks 55 MPH

(f) Estimated vehicle traffic in 24 hours: Current total 5200, including 300 trucks and 4 school bus trips. Projected traffic in 20 years: total 10000, including 500 trucks and 6 school bus trips.

[ 4 ]

- (a) If temporary, state for what purpose crossing is to be used and for how long.

*N/A*

- (b) If temporary grade crossing, will you remove the crossing at completion of the activity requiring the temporary crossing?

*N/A*

[ 5 ]

- (a) State whether or not a safer location for a grade crossing exists within a reasonable distance in either direction from the proposed point of crossing, and if so, what reason, if any, why this safer location should not be adopted, even though in doing so, it may be necessary to relocate a portion of the highway or railway.

*The terrain is flat and open, no safer location was identified*

- (b) Are there any hillsides, earth, or other embankments, buildings, trees, orchards, side tracks (on which cars might be spotted), loading platforms, etc., in the vicinity not feasible to move, which may obstruct the view and which can be avoided by relocating the proposed crossing. Would it be practical to do so? Please describe.

*No*

[ 6 ]

- (a) Is it feasible to construct and use an over or under crossing at the intersection of said railway and highway? If not, state why.

*Construction cost would be prohibitive to provide grade separation for this low train volume crossing*

- (b) Does the railway line at any point in the vicinity of the proposed crossing pass over a fill or trestle or through a cut where it is feasible to construct an under or over crossing, even though it may be necessary to relocate a portion of the highway to reach that point?

*No*

- (c) If a suitable place for an under - or over - crossing exists in the vicinity of the proposed crossing, state the distance and direction from the proposed crossing; the approximate cost of construction; and what, if any, reason exists why it should not be constructed.

*N/A*

- (a) State approximate distance to nearest public or private crossing in each direction of railroad involved herein. *Nearest public right of way is located 1/4 mile north of this crossing but is not constructed or maintained for vehicular travel.*
- (b) If there is an existing crossing in near vicinity, or if more than one crossing is proposed, is it feasible to divert highways served and to be served by existing and proposed crossings, thus eliminating the need for more than once crossing?  
*Not feasible to divert this highway*
- (c) If so, state approximate cost of highway relocation to effect such changes.  
*N/A*
- (d) Will the proposed crossing eliminate the need for one or more existing crossings in the vicinity? If so, state direction and approximate distance to the crossing or crossings. *Yes, crossing at main entrance to Fairchild Air Force Base (FAFB) located six miles north west will be eliminated with the realignment of the Geizer Spur.*
- (e) If this crossing is authorized, do you propose to close any existing crossing or crossings?  
*Remove crossing at FAFB entrance*

State the lengths of views which are now available along the line of railway to travelers on the highway when approaching the crossing from either side of the railway and when at points on the highway as follows:

Approaching crossing from <i>west</i> (direction) an unobstructed view to		
right when on highway 300 feet from crossing of	<u>1500</u>	feet
right when on highway 200 feet from crossing of	<u>1500</u>	feet
right when on highway 100 feet from crossing of	<u>1000</u>	feet
right when on highway 50 feet from crossing of	<u>900</u>	feet
right when on highway 25 feet from crossing of	<u>900</u>	feet
left when on highway 300 feet from crossing of	<u>5000</u>	feet
left when on highway 200 feet from crossing of	<u>5000</u>	feet
left when on highway 100 feet from crossing of	<u>5000</u>	feet
left when on highway 50 feet from crossing of	<u>5000</u>	feet
left when on highway 25 feet from crossing of	<u>5000</u>	feet
Approaching crossing from <i>east</i> (opposite direction) an obstructed view to		
right when on highway 300 feet from crossing of	<u>5000</u>	feet
right when on highway 200 feet from crossing of	<u>5000</u>	feet
right when on highway 100 feet from crossing of	<u>5000</u>	feet
right when on highway 50 feet from crossing of	<u>5000</u>	feet
right when on highway 25 feet from crossing of	<u>5000</u>	feet
left when on highway 300 feet from crossing of	<u>900</u>	feet
left when on highway 200 feet from crossing of	<u>900</u>	feet
left when on highway 100 feet from crossing of	<u>900</u>	feet
left when on highway 50 feet from crossing of	<u>900</u>	feet
left when on highway 25 feet from crossing of	<u>900</u>	feet

[ 9 ]

Attach one or more prints showing a vicinity map and a layout of railway and highway, as well as profiles of each, also showing percent of grade, 500 feet of highway and railway when approaching crossing from all four directions. On the prints, spot and identify obstructions of view located in all four quadrants. Provide a traffic control layout showing the location of the existing and proposed signing of the intersection.

[ 10 ]

(a) Is it feasible to provide a 25 foot level grade crossing on both sides from center line of railway at point of crossing?

*Yes*

(b) If not, state in feet the length of level grade it is feasible to obtain.

(c) Is it feasible to obtain an approach grade, prior to the level grade of five percent or less? If not, state why, and state the percent approach grade possible.

*Yes*

[ 11 ]

Do you know of any reason not appearing in any of the answers to these interrogatories why the proposed crossing should not be made at grade or at the point proposed by you? If so, please state same fully.

*No*

---

Interrogatories 12 and 13 are to be completed only if this petition involves installation, replacement or changing of automatic grade signal or other warning device, other than sawbucks.

---

[ 12 ]

(a) State in detail, the number and type of automatic signals or other warning devices (other than sawbucks) proposed to be installed. (This portion should be filled in only after conference between the railroad and the petitioning local governmental agency.) *Cantilever signals and automatic gates*

(b) State an estimate of the cost for installing the signals or other devices proposed, as obtained from the respondent railroad company. . . \$ 483,500

(c) State a cost estimate for maintaining the signals or devices for 12 months, as obtained from the respondent railroad company . . . \$ 3,000

(d) If this is an existing crossing, what will the proposed warning devices replace in the way of existing devices? *N/A*

(e) As the petitioner, are you prepared to pay or will you promise to pay to the respondent railroad company, your share of the cost of installing the warning devices proposed as provided by law?

Yes       No

Provide any additional information supporting the proposal (i.e. what public benefits would be derived from its implementation?)

The construction of the realignment of the Geiger Spur railline is necessary to continue service to the existing manufacturers and industries located on the line while accommodating the U.S. Dept. of Defense mandate to remove the railroad from FAFB for homeland security.

**RESPONDENT'S WAIVER OF HEARING**

Docket No. TR-070025

Petition of Spokane County

for Construction of a new grade Crossing

I have investigated the conditions existing at and in the vicinity of the proposed crossing changes. As a result, [check one or more of the following, as appropriate:]

I am satisfied that conditions are as represented in the petition and the interrogatories and that the petition should be granted.

The cost of installation (estimated at \$ \_\_\_\_\_)

subject to approval and apportionment pursuant to the Intermodal Surface Transportation Act by the Washington State Department of Transportation Local Programs Division.

as apportioned between the parties.

to be paid by petitioner.

Other conditions to waiver of hearing:

Grade Crossing Surface must be constructed with  
Concrete Surface materials.

The undersigned hereby waives hearing and further notice. The Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission may enter a final order without further notice of hearing.

Date at Olympia, Washington, on this 26<sup>th</sup> day  
of February, 20 07.

Respondent Washington State Dept. of Transp.

by Thomas G. Swafford

Print Name Thomas G. Swafford

Title Utilities, Railroad, and Agreements Manager