

STATE OF WASHINGTON

UTILITIES AND TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION

1300 S. Evergreen Park Dr. S.W., P.O. Box 47250 ● Olympia, Washington 98504-7250 (360) 664-1160 ● TTY (360) 586-8203

Nov. 21, 2017

Stephen Semenick, Public Projects Manager BNSF Railway Company 2454 Occidental Ave. S., Suite 1A Seattle, WA 98134

Sent via email and First Class Mail

RE: TR-171142 – Petition on Behalf of WSDOT to Modify Active Warning Devices at SR-223 in Toppenish – Response due Dec. 11, 2017

Dear Mr. Semenick:

On Nov. 20, 2017, the Washington State Department of Transportation (WSDOT) filed a petition with the Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission (commission), seeking approval to modify active warning devices at the State Route 223 (SR-223) crossing, identified as USDOT 104520Y, in Toppenish. The commission assigned docket number TR-171142 to this petition.

Please review the enclosed petition and respond within 20 days of the date of this letter (Dec. 11, 2017). Your response options include:

• **Support the petition** – Complete the Respondent's Waiver of Hearing form, which serves as your consent to the commission to issue an order without further notice or hearing.

OR

• **Do not support the petition** – Reply with your position and include whether you feel a hearing is necessary to resolve the issues or suggest other courses of action, such as further discussion prior to go to hearing.

Stephen Semenick Nov. 21, 2017 Page 2

If you do not respond by Dec. 11, 2017, commission staff will ask that the matter be set for hearing. If you have any questions, please contact Betty Young, Transportation Planning Specialist, at 360-664-1202 or byoung@utc.wa.gov.

Sincerely,

Kathy Hunter

Assistant Director, Transportation Safety

Enclosure

cc: Connie Raezer, WSDOT (without enclosure)



WASHINGTON UTILITIES AND TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION

Washington State Dept. of Transportation	DOCKET NO. TR- 171142 PETITION TO MODIFY HIGHWAY-
Petitioner,) RAIL GRADE CROSSING ACTIVE) WARNING DEVICES
vs. BNSF Railway Company	
Respondent) USDOT #104520Y

The Petitioner asks the Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission to approve modification of highway-rail grade crossing warning signals.

Section 1 – Petitioner's Information

R. Weenster School and	
Washington State Department of Transportation	× <u>8</u>
Petitioner	
Change	Samuel mar verberies adamental at a
Signature	
310 Maple Park Avenue SE, Suite 2B	
Street Address	
	a - Al Marciniko Mari 756 reti na belara 🗈 a
Olympia, WA 98504	
City, State and Zip Code	in in the first of a weath and some son in the
PO Box 47329 Olympia, WA 98504-7329	<u>. r do alloui Spatroui Propolitica de la compositore della compositore della compositore della compositore della compositore de la compositore della com</u>
Mailing Address, if different than the street address	
1878 (\$770 tage)	car) i
Connie Raezer	
Contact Person Name	
360-705-7459 raezerc@wsdot.wa.gov	
Contact Phone Number and E-mail Address	

Section 2 - Respondent's Information

BNSF Railway Company
Respondent
2454 Occidental Avenue South, Suite 2D
Street Address
Seattle, WA 98134
City, State and Zip Code
Mailing Address, if different than the street address
Stephen Semenick
Contact Person Name
206.625.6152 stephen.semenick@BNSF.com Contact Phone Number and E-mail Address
Section 3 – Crossing Location
1. Existing highway/roadway State Route 223
2. Existing railroad BNSF
3. USDOT Crossing No. 104520Y
4. Located in the NW 1/4 of the SE 1/4 of Sec. 30, Twp. 10N Range 21E W.M.
5. GPS location, if known 46.32782 -120.23553
6. Railroad mile post (nearest tenth) 66.10
7. City Toppenish CountyYakima

Section 4 – Current Highway Traffic Information

1. Name of highway State Route 223
2. Road authority Washington State Department of Transportation
3. Average annual daily traffic (AADT) 2015 MP 0.00 4,900 and MP 2.27 6,700
4. Number of lanes One 12' lane and one 12' pullout and no shoulders at the track. 12' pullout turns into a 10'shoulder away from the crossing.
5. Roadway speed 55 mph
6. Is the crossing part of an established truck route? Yes X No ———
7. If so, trucks are what percent of total daily traffic?10
8. Is the crossing part of an established school bus route? Yes X No
9. If so, how many school buses travel over the crossing each day? 20
10. Describe any changes to the information in 1 through 7, above, expected within ten years: No known changes anticipated to the highway
Section 5 – Current Crossing Information
1. Railroad company BNSF Railway Company
2. Type of railroad at crossing ⊠ Common Carrier □ Logging □ Industrial
☐ Passenger ☐ Excursion
3. Type of tracks at crossing
4. Number of tracks at crossing One
5. Average daily train traffic, freight 8 trains per day
Authorized freight train speed Operated freight train speed 49
6. Average daily train traffic, passengerN/A
Authorized passenger train speed Operated passenger train speed

- 7. Describe any changes to the information in 1 through 4, above, expected within ten years: No changes expected.
- 8. What is the available sight distance from the stop bar (or 25 feet from the tracks if no stop bar) on both approaches to the crossing? <u>Unobstructed</u>
- 9. If the sight distance is less than 400 feet, describe the structures, roadway or track curvature, visual obstacles or other characteristics that limit sight distance.

Section 5 - Current Warning Devices

1. Provide a complete description of the warning devices currently located at the crossing, including signs, gates, lights, train detection circuitry and any other warning devices.

Crossing currently includes Gates, Overhead Flashing Signals, Shoulder Mounted Flashing Signals, Crossbucks, Stop Bars, and W10-01 Advanced Warning Sign with Payement Markings

Section 6 – Description of Proposed Changes

1. Describe in detail the proposed changes to the crossing. Include the funding source for the proposed installation, if applicable.

RR work: Install new four-quadrant gate system with upgraded LED signals and upgrade circuitry to constant warning.

WSDOT work: Install active advance warning system with intertie to RR system and install guard rail (standard plan) if not included in BNSF work.

Improvements to be funded under Federal Section 130 Program.

Section 7 – Illustration of Proposed Warning Devices

Attach a detailed diagram, drawing, map or other illustration showing the proposed warning devices. See attached Diagnostic Team Worksheet

Section 8 - Waiver of Hearing by Respondent

Waiver of Hearing	
The undersigned represents the crossing warning signals at the	ne Respondent in the petition to modify a highway-rail grade ne following crossing.
USDOT Crossing No. 10452	0Y
as described by the Petitioner	ditions at the crossing. We are satisfied the conditions are the same in this docket. We agree the warning signals should be installed the commission without a hearing.
Dated at	, Washington, on the day of November, 2017.
	Stephen Semenick Printed name of Respondent
•	
	Signature of Respondent's Representative
	Manager Public Projects Title
	206.625.6152 stephen.semenick@BNSF.com Phone number and e-mail address
	2454 Occidental Avenue South, Suite 2D, Seattle, WA 98134 Mailing address

• •

WSDOT RAILROAD GRADE CROSSING DIAGNOSTIC TEAM REVIEW WORKSHEET*

Reviewers: WSDOT (Ahmer Nizam, Connie Raezer, Chuck Wickham SCR: Todd Daley Jeff Davis, Bob Hooker); FHWA (Don Peterson); UTC (Paul Curl, Betty Young); BNSF (Rick Wagner)
Date: September 13, 2016
Location: SR <u>223</u> Mile Post 0.51 WSDOT Region - <u>SCR</u>
Railroad: BNSF Railway USDOT No.: 104520Y
Highway Data
No. of lanes in each direction: One 12' lane and one 12' pullout and no shoulders at the track. 12' pullout turns into a 10'shoulder away from the crossing.
Are sidewalks or bike paths present? Yes \square No X
ADT 2015 at MP 0.00 (begin) 4,900 at MP 2.27 6,700 Roadway speed limit: 55mph posted
School bus route? <u>Yes</u> Truck route? <u>Yes</u> Hazmat transporters? <u>Yes</u>
Crossing angle: Approximately 125 degrees
Approach curvature: SR 223 has an 1100' radius curve 30' west of the crossing. Crossing is in a tangent section.
Approach grades: 0% entering / 0% exiting • Evidence of scrape marks at the crossing from low vehicle clearance? Yes \square No X
Comments on highway data: <u>Includes stop refuge in both directions. The intersection of South Track Road and SR 223 is about 150 feet west of the crossing. The intersection is not signalized.</u>
Railway Data
No. of Tracks: one set Trains per Day: 8
Train Speed Limit: 49 Approach curvature: <u>Tangent section.</u>
Passenger Trains? Yes □ ⊠ No Unknown □
Comments on railway data Mainline

^{*} This report of survey is undertaken in order to comply with 23 United States Code Section 130. The use of this data is governed by 23 United States Code Section 409 and shall not be subject to discovery or admitted into evidence in a federal or state court proceeding or considered for other purposes in any action for damages arising from any occurrence at a location mentioned or addressed in such reports, surveys, schedules, lists, or data.

Warning Device	s (check all that apply	y)		
X Gates X Crossbuck	X Overhead flashing ligs □ # Tracks sign	72/202	unted flashing lights	
	ning signs and pavements ${f X}$	nt markings (including st	op line) properly placed and in	n good condition?
	the W10-1 sign and rauired by the standard p		d condition but not placed in c	conjunction with
Note the presence	of other warning or re	egulatory signs associated	with the crossing. For exam	ple:
□ Stop or Yield□ Low Clearance	•	□ Do Not Stop on Track		·
	mber posted? Yes X notification phone num	2.222	No 🗆	ř.
	e □Asphalt □Timb ssing surface <u>Good</u>		□ Other	_
Sight Distance			4	
Approach Sight Distance from the Unobstructed		rth –bound highway appro	each where the crossing become	mes clearly visible:
Distance from the Unobstructed afte		posing highway approach	where the crossing becomes	clearly visible:
Clearing Sight Di If the crossing has 1350-1 (Case 1)?		earing sight distance meet	the guidance criteria in Desig	gn Manual Figure
Sight Triangle If the crossing is 1 2)? N/A	passive, does the sign t	riangle meet the guidance	e criteria in Design Manual Fi	gure 1350-1 (Case
Is the crossing illu	uminated? Yes			* * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * *
Other Roadways			y "	
		he vicinity of the crossing ft turn movements at S. T	that may cause traffic to que rack Rd	ue back over the

If yes:

• What is the available storage space? Approximately 175 feet

Are traffic signals located within 200 feet of the crossing or otherwise contributing to vehicle queues approaching the tracks? Yes \square No X
If "yes", is Railroad Preemption provided? Yes □ No □
Comments/Observations
Accident Data
No. vehicle-train collisions in the last 5 years
Fatal <u>1</u>
Injury <u>1</u>
Property Damage <u>1-2015</u>
No. non-train-related vehicle collisions at crossing in the last 5 years
Fatal <u>0</u>
Injury <u>0</u>
Property Damage _0_
No. pedestrian-related incidents in the last 5 years
Fatal <u>0</u>
Injury <u>0</u>
Information on reported near misses between vehicles and trains at the crossing
According to UTC staff, BNSF train crews have communicated instances of near misses mainly involving trucks
Other Notes There were 2 accidents in 2005:
9-13-05: 2 fatalities From UTC website: • 9/13/2005 <u>GRANGER</u> - 67 year-old male driver and 57 year-old female passenger struck by BNSF freight train at the SR 223 crossing near Granger. Incident occurred on the BNSF Railway Northwest Division (Yakima Valley Subdivision) at milepost 66.12. Driver drove around lowere gates and through flashing lights.
9-23-05: 1 injury - FRA report states that "driver drove around or thru lowered gates."
Accident in 2015: 10-5-15: One property damage accident involving a pick up that circumvented gates

Crossing Diagram





Recommendations/Action Items

RR work: Install new four quadrant gate system with upgraded LED signals and upgrade circuitry to constant warning

WSDOT work: Install active advance warning system with intertie to RR system and install guard rail (standard plan) if not included in BNSF work

Estimated Cost: _total estimate as of 9/13/2016 is 1 million

A site visit was conducted on October 27^{th} to review the proposed four quadrant gate system. Summary notes attached.

Concurrence:

FHWA:	11/02/16 via email	
UTC:	10/31/16 via email	
BNSF:	10/28/16 via email	

Section 130 Diagnostic Evaluation Meeting Summary SR 223, USDOT 104520Y

Team Participants:

WSDOT: Ahmer Nizam, Jamil Anabtawi, Todd Daley

UTC: Betty Young, Paul Curl

BNSF: Rick Wagner, Rick Van Wey

On October 27, 2016, a Section 130 Diagnostic Evaluation Team was convened to discuss a final recommendation for improvements at the SR 223 railroad grade crossing near Granger, Washington within the limits of the Yakama Nation Reservation.

Following the determination that funds were not available to grade separate the crossing, WSDOT submitted to the Team a report from a value engineering study that recommended improving warning devices in lieu of grade separation, and thus necessitated the reconvening of the Section 130 Diagnostic Team.

The Team met on site and discussed various alternatives including four quadrant gates, active advance warning, median separators, lowering the speed limit, and adding rumble strips.

Based on 1) the nature of accident history and near miss reports; 2) the operating characteristics of the roadway; and 3) the limited ability for enforcement oversight by the Washington State Patrol within the Yakama Nation Reservation, the Team, with FHWA's concurrence, will issue a final recommendation to:

- Install four quadrant gates;
- Upgrade existing signals with LED heads;
- Install an active advance warning system; and
- Upgrade circuitry to constant warning.

WSDOT will update the Diagnostic Team Review Worksheet following concurrence of this summary from the participants.

***** MAINTAIN PROPRIETARY CONFIDENTIALITY *****

BNSF RAILWAY COMPANY FHPM ESTIMATE FOR WA DOT

LOCATION TOPPENISH DETAILS OF ESTIMATE PLAN ITEM: 000289335 VERSION: 4

PURPOSE, JUSTIFICATION AND DESCRIPTION

 $SR-223-TOPPENISH, WA; REPLACE\ CONSTANT\ WARNING/FLASHERS/GATES/CANT;\ NORTHWEST\ DIV;\ YAKIMA\ SUBDIV;\ LS\ 48;\ MP\ 66.12;\ DOT\#\ 104520Y;\ SEQ\#\ 67214.$

MONTHLY POWER UTILITY COST CENTER: 61504.

THE MATERIAL LIST BELOW REFLECTS TYPICAL REPRESENTATIVE PACKAGES USED FOR ESTIMATING PURPOSES ONLY.

THIS ESTIMATE IS GOOD FOR 180 DAYS. THEREAFTER THE ESTIMATE IS SUBJECT TO CHANGE IN COST FOR LABOR, MATERIAL, AND OVERHEAD.

CONTRACTS HAVE BEEN ESTABLISHED FOR PORTIONS OF SIGNAL WORK ON THE BNSF RAILROAD.

THE STATE OF WASHINGTON IS FUNDING 100% OF THIS PROJECT.

MAINTAIN PROPRIETARY CONFIDENTIALITY.

PRIMARY FUNDING SOURCE IS FHWA

** BUY AMERICA(N) APPLIES **

DESCRIPTION	QUANTITY U/M	COST	TOTAL \$

LABOR			

ELECTRICAL LABOR F/SIGNAL EQUIPMENT	54.0 MH	1,669	
SIGNAL FIELD - REPLACE	832.0 MH	25,651	
SIGNAL SHOP LABOR - CAP	1.2 MH	41	
PAYROLL ASSOCIATED COSTS		16,002	
DA OVERHEADS		25,551	
EQUIPMENT EXPENSES		5,331	
INSURANCE EXPENSES		4,592	
TOTAL LABOR COST		78,837	78,837
*******			*
MATERIAL ********			
ARRESTOR, MDSA-2 XS	1.0 EA N	766	
BATTERY, 46 VGL-350	1.0 LS N	14,398	
BELLS	4.0 EA N	784	
BUNGALOW 8X8 W/ AC	1.0 LS N	10,038	
BUNGALOW MATERIAL	1.0 LS N	7,476	
CABLE, 2C/6 TW	500.0 FT N	640	
CABLE, 3C/2	250.0 FT N	1,473	
CABLE, 5C/10	70.0 FT N	139	
CABLE, 5C/6	1000.0 FT N	4,350	
CABLE, 7C/14	1000.0 FT N	1,830	
CANTILEVER (NO QUOTE)	2.0 EA N	34,808	
CHARGERS, 12/80 (20/40/60)	2.0 EA N	2,170	
CONSTANT WARNING, XP4, 1TK	1.0 EA N	17,805	
ELECTRICAL MATERIAL	1.0 EA N	1,500	
ELGX EGMS	1.0 EA N	18,000	
EVENT RECORDER	1.0 EA N	3,560	
FIELD MATERIAL	1.0 LS N	7,372	
FILL DIRT	20.0 CY N	500	
FOUNDATION, CANT	2.0 EA N	8,124	
FOUNDATION, CONCRETE	4.0 EA N	1,200	
GATE KEEPER	4.0 EA N	7,452	*
GATE MECHANISM, S-60	4.0 EA N	24,064	24
GUARD RAIL, DUAL	2.0 EA N	2,508	
HAWK 48 DIM	1.0 EA N	1,425	
LED LIGHT	24.0 EA N	4,824	
LIGHT OUT DETECTOR	2.0 EA N	2,008	

PD LOOP	1.0 LS N	42,000	
RELAY	10.0 EA N	7,500	
RELAY, EOR	1.0 EA N	750	
RELAY, ER	1.0 EA N	750	
RELAY, ISLAND	2.0 EA N	1,500	
SHUNT, NBS	2.0 EA N	2,238 -	
SURFACE ROCK	30.0 CY N	1,500	
U-1400	4.0 EA N	10,000	
USE TAX		23,180	
OFFLINE TRANSPORTATION		3,075	
TOTAL MATERIAL COST		271,707	271,707

OTHER			

AC POWER SERVICE	1.0 EA N	5,000	
BUNGALOW, WIRE AND TEST	1.0 LS N	5,643	
CONTRACT ENGINEERING	1.0 LS N	12,000	
CONTRACT SIGNS/CONES/FLAGGING	1.0 LS N	10,000	
DIRECTIONAL BORING	150.0 FT N	7,500	
TOTAL OTHER ITEMS COST		40,143	40,143
PROJECT SUBTOTAL			390,687
CONTINGENCIES			37,960
BILL PREPARATION FEE			4,287
GROSS PROJECT COST			432,934
LESS COST PAID BY BNSF			0
TOTAL BILLABLE COST			432,934