

Unknown

From: David E. Peterson <DEPETERS@up.com>
Sent: Thursday, April 21, 2011 11:47 AM
To: Burgess, Dwight
Cc: Kelly A. Abaray; Jack F. Mullen
Subject: UPRR Comments on proposed grade separation at SH 92, MP 67.66, North Fork Sub, SH 92, Hotchkiss, CO, DOT 254041G.

Proposed Grade Separation
CO: Hotchkiss
SH 92
MP TBD: North Fork Sub
DOT # TBD

Crossing: Public, At-grade
CO: Hotchkiss
SH 92
MP 67.66: North Fork Sub
DOT # 254041G

Dwight,

I received feedback from Jack Mullen concerning the two concepts for SH 92. The overpass option is our preference. If CDOT elected to pursue the underpass option, we would require a permanent easement or fee title to the underlying property. We are not agreeable paying any party a recurring fee for our property rights nor would we allow for a termination clause. Based on what you told us during the field review this by itself might eliminate any further consideration of the track realignment / underpass option. Once this project get further underway, please forward plans to either myself or Kelly Abaray. Kelly, will be back working 3 day a week beginning May 4th.

David Peterson
Sr. Mgr. Ind. & Public Projects
Union Pacific Railroad Company
1400 Douglas St., MS 0910
Omaha, NE 68179
phone: (402) 544-5891
email: depeters@up.com

----- Forwarded by David E. Peterson/UPC on 04/21/2011 11:52 AM -----

Public Project Review Document :

Category:Overhead Structure

Description:concept - overpass and underpass altenatives

City: Hotchkiss	MP: 67.66 &	AWO#
State: CO	Subdivision: NORTH FORK SUB	Contract Audit #
Roadway/Other: SH 92	Lat/Long: /	Service Order#

DOT: 254041G &	Folder #:	
Date Received: 02/24/2011	Received From: dave peterson	Status: Approved- with Exceptions
Date Assigned: 02/24/2011	Assigned To: Jack F. Mullen/UPC	
Date Released: 04/13/2011	Released To: David E. Peterson	
Send To:	David E. Peterson/UPC, Kelly A. Abaray/UPC	
Copy To:		
Subject:	Underpass Structure, concept - permanent realignment, MP 67.66, North Fork Sub, SH 92, Hotchkiss, CO, DOT 254041G	

1. The overpass is the preferred alternative from UPRR's perspective.
2. The underpass alternative does not appear viable, since the terms for railroad relocation onto BLM lands would be unacceptable.
3. UPRR will waive its requirement for a clear span over the right-of-way, considering site constraints, and operating and capacity requirements for this rail line.
4. The proposed location of bridge piers within UPRR ROW is acceptable. All piers on railroad ROW shall be of heavy construction or incorporate crash wall protection to a minimum height of 12 feet above top of rail. Maintain 25' minimum clearance from track centerline on outside of curve.
5. We discussed use of MSE retaining walls. MSE walls are not acceptable on railroad right-of-way according to UPRR policy, and we recommend that CDOT consider alternatives as design progresses. If alternatives are unfeasible, we will approve a variance provided that the walls are a minimum of 25 feet from track centerline. and may require installation of inside guardrail at project expense to mitigate risk of derailment damage.

----- Forwarded by David E. Peterson/UPC on 03/08/2011 05:48 PM -----

"Burgess, Dwight"
 <Dwight.Burgess@DOT.STATE.CO.US>

02/24/2011 04:26 PM

To"Kelly A. Abaray"
 <KAABARAY@UP.COM>

cc"David E. Peterson" <DEPETERS@up.com>,
 "Jack F. Mullen" <JFMULLEN@up.com>,
 "Alexander, Ronald B"
 <Ronald.B.Alexander@DOT.STATE.CO.US>,
 "Mertes, Pete"
 <Pete.Mertes@DOT.STATE.CO.US>,
 "paul_wells@urscorp.com"
 <paul_wells@urscorp.com>,
 "John_R_O'Connor@URSCorp.com"
 <John_R_O'Connor@URSCorp.com>,
 "ted_rutledge@urscorp.com"
 <ted_rutledge@urscorp.com>, "Snowden,
 William" <William.Snowden@dot.state.co.us>

SubjectRE: SH 92 Proposed Grade Separation, Public
 Closure & Private Closure

Kelly,

Thank for your comments on our conceptual submittal. We will address your comments on all future documents and plan submittals. However, I did provide some additional information below in red under each of your comments.

We had a great meeting with Dave Peterson and Jack Mullen on February 15th and appreciated their willingness to meet us on site. They indicated we could expect a letter from the UPRR on our conceptual submittal within a couple weeks.

If there is any further information that you need for your review please don't hesitate to contact me. Thank you.

Dwight Burgess

CDOT - Region 3 Utility Engineer

222 South 6th Street, Rm. 317

Grand Junction, CO 81501

PH: 970-683-6209

Cell: 970-216-5748

Fax: 970-683-6205

From: Kelly A. Abaray [<mailto:KAABARAY@UP.COM>]

Sent: Friday, February 04, 2011 6:24 AM

To: Burgess, Dwight; Snowden, William

Cc: David E. Peterson; Jack F. Mullen

Subject: Fw: SH 92 Proposed Grade Separation, Public Closure & Private Closure

Proposed Grade Separation

CO: Hotchkiss

SH 92

MP TBD: North Fork Sub

DOT # TBD

Crossing: Public, At-grade

CO: Hotchkiss

SH 92

MP 67.66: North Fork Sub

DOT # 254-041G

Crossing: Private, At-grade

CO: Hotchkiss

Ranch Homes Access

MP 68.06: North Fork Sub

DOT # 254-042N

Great write-up but if I had to make improvements here is what I would do:

1. In letter, under discussion of future track, last bullet point state a highway grade separated structure sized for two tracks would add significant costs. How much cost? You are able to provide an estimate for the two options how come an estimate for the increased structure cannot be supplied?

Our design consultants, URS Corp provided the cost information you requested.

	Original Cost +	Additional Cost (Double Tack)	= Total
Rail Over SH 92	\$11,058,000 +	\$3,583,234	= \$14,641,234
SH 92 Over Rail (3 Span)	\$8,979,000 +	\$607,200	= \$9,586,200

2. All documents, List DOT numbers for the crossing that are going to be closed and show them on the drawings.

All future documents and/or drawings will list DOT numbers. After our meeting last week with Dave and Jack, our Resident Engineer Ron Alexander met with BLM and it sounds like they are now agreeable to allowing us to relocate the private access road that ties into SH 92 southwest of the current crossing and run it along the south side of SH 92 and tie it into the Pleasure Park access road on the west end of the project.

3. All documents, Provide UPRR MP for proposed structures.

All future documents and/or drawings will show the UPRR Mile Post.

4. Address vertical clearance variance in the letter. The UPRR vertical clearance is 23'4", not 23.28 which is a little under 23'4".

A variance for clearance should not be necessary. The 23.28' shown on Exhibit D, Sheet 5 is the vertical clearance at the pier and is 18 feet away from the centerline of the track. The minimum vertical clearance over the track is 25.5' as shown on Exhibit D, Sheet 2. I apologize that we did not make that more clear.

5. Show MOW road on plans.

The service road will be depicted on future drawings.

6. Call out UPRR ROW on plans and width of ROW.

As you are aware there is still some uncertainty on all the ROW lines. Our ROW sections is currently researching titles and easements and the ROW lines and ownerships will be shown on future plans.

As mentioned above, the information supplied was a great start to help UPRR determine how to respond to CDOT. I really appreciate the time put into the submittal. Dave Peterson and Jack Preston will be conducting a site visit with CDOT on Feb. 2011 and then UPRR will have comments back to CDOT.

Sincerely,

Kelly Abaray

**

This email and any attachments may contain information that is confidential and/or privileged for the sole use of the intended recipient. Any use, review, disclosure, copying, distribution or reliance by others, and any forwarding of this email or its contents, without the express permission of the sender is strictly prohibited by law. If you are not the intended recipient, please contact the sender immediately, delete the e-mail and destroy all copies.

**