Decision No. 84530

CRICINAL

BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

Investigation for the purpose of establishing a list for the fiscal year 1975-76 of existing and proposed crossings at grade of city streets, county roads or state highways most urgently in need of separation, or projects effecting the elimination of grade crossings by removal or relocation of streets or railroad tracks, or existing separations in need of alteration or reconstruction as contemplated by Section 2402 of the Streets and Highways Code.

Case No. 9842 (Filed December 17, 1974)

(Appearances are listed in Appendix A.)

<u>opinion</u>

By its order dated December 17, 1974, the Commission instituted an investigation for the purpose of establishing the 1975-76 railroad-highway grade separation priority list as required by Section 2452 of the Streets and Highways Code, which requires that by July 1 of each year the California Public Utilities Commission shall establish a priority list of those railroad grade separation projects, including the elimination of existing or proposed grade crossings, the elimination of grade crossings by removal or relocation of streets or railroad tracks, and the alteration or reconstruction of existing grade separations most urgently in need of separation or alteration. The list, based on criteria established by the Commission, contains projects on city streets, county roads, and State highways which are not freeways as defined in Section 257

^{1/} Chapter 8 of the Streets and Highways Code was amended and renumbered as Chapter 10, Sections 2450 to 2461, by Statutes 1974, Chapter 545.

of the Streets and Highways Code. The list is furnished to the Department of Public Works and the California Highway Commission and seld agencies, pursuant to the provisions of Sections 190 and 2453 of the Streets and Highways Code, allocate \$15,000,000 annually, plus amounts carried over, to those nominations in accordance with their priority on the list.

Public hearings were held in Los Angeles and San Francisco before Examiner Daly and the matter was submitted on April 17, 1975 upon the receipt of late-filed Exhibit 73 and concurrent opening and closing briefs, the latter having been filed on May 9, 1975. 3/

Copies of the Order Instituting Investigation were served upon each city, county, and city and county in which there is a railroad crossing, each railroad corporation involved, the Department of Transportation (Caltrans), the California Highway Commission, the League of California Cities, the County Supervisors Association, and other persons who might have an interest in the proceeding.

In response to the Order Instituting Investigation, various public bodies desiring to nominate crossings or separations on the 1975-76 priority list filed with the Commission the following information:

- A. For Existing or Proposed Crossings at Grade Nominated for Elimination by Proposed Separation and Grade Crossings Nominated for Elimination by Removal or Relocation of Streets or Railroad Tracks
 - 1. Identification of crossing, including name of street or road, name of railroad, and crossing number.
 - Twenty-four hour vehicular traffic count, or for proposed crossings, estimated ADT for 1976.

If the Alhambra project, which was Priority No. 9 on the 1974-75 list, is not funded, \$3,985,476 will be carried over to the 1975-76 period, and will result in available funds in the amount of \$18,985,476 as of July 1, 1975.

^{3/} The hearings on March 19 and 20, 1975, at Los Angeles, were held before Examiner Main because Examiner Daly was ill. The transcript covering those two days was read by Examiner Daiy.

- 3. Number of train movements for one typical day segregated by type, i.e., passenger, through freight, or switching.
- 4. Vehicular speed limit and the maximum prevailing train speed.
- 5. Quantitative statement as to vehicular delay at crossing, in minutes per day.
- 6. Distance on each side of the crossing to the nearest alternate routes, in feet.
- A statement approximating the amount of school bus and emergency vehicle usage, per day.
- 8. A 10-year accident history of the number of vehicle-object and vehicle-vehicle accidents directly attributable to the presence of the grade crossing.
- 9. Width of the crossing in feet and in number of lanes.
- 10. If automatic gates are not present, a statement detailing why they would not be feasible.
- 11. Approach grade for both directions of approach.
- 12. Type of separation proposed (underpass or overpass).
- 13. Preliminary cost estimate for project with costs separated into right-of-way, engineering, and construction, with a statement as to the certainty and date of the cost estimate.
- 14. Statement as to need for the proposed improvement and agencies' willingness to pursue the project.
- 15. Any proposed crossing nominated for separation should be subtyped either:
 - a. A grade crossing is practical and feasible.
 - b. A grade crossing is not practical and feasible.

- 16. For grade crossing(s) nominated for elimination by removal or relocation of streets or tracks, the estimated cost of eliminating crossing(s) if grade separation facilities on the existing alignment of the street and railroad tracks were constructed.
- B. For Grade Separations
 Proposed for Alteration
 - 1. Identification of crossing, including name of street or road, name of railroad, and crossing number.
 - 2. Twenty-four hour vehicular traffic count.
 - Number of train movements for one typical day segregated by type, i.e., passenger, through freight, or switching.
 - Description of existing and proposed separation structure with principal dimensions.
 - 5. Type of alteration proposed.
 - 6. Preliminary cost estimate of project with costs separated into right-of-way, engineering, and construction, with a statement as to the certainty and date of the cost estimate.
 - 7. A list and relative description of any of the following, if applicable:
 - a. Substandard highway width or height clearances.
 - b. Highway speed reduction due to alignment.
 - c. Railroad slow order due to structure.
 - d. Highway load limit due to structure.
 - 8. A 10-year history of the number of vehicle accidents attributable to the structure.
 - 9. A detailed statement describing acute structural deficiencies, if any, and the probability of structural failure.
 - 10. Statement as to need for the proposed improvement and agencies willingness to pursue the project.

Upon receipt of the requested information the staff applied a formula adopted in determining the 1974-75 Grade Separation Priority List, subject to certain reevaluations of the criteria, and introduced the results thereof in Exhibit 2.

In determining the 1974-75 Grade Separation Priority List, the following formula was adopted:

Where:

P = Priority Index Number

V = Hourly Vehicle Volumes

T - Hourly Train Volumes

C = Total cost of separation project (in thousands of dollars)

SCF = Special Conditions Factor

(Site conditions, type of protection, special routes, unusual community benefits, accident history, project scope, and the public agencies willingness to pursue and fund the project.)

In an effort to standardize the procedure the Commission staff attempted to incorporate suggestions presented by cities, counties, state agencies, and railroads during hearings on Case No. 9663 and from subsequent meetings. The main difference between the 1974-75 criteria and that proposed for 1975-76 is that the "Special Conditions Factor" for 1974-75 was based upon the Commission staff's judgment and not upon specific percentages or point scales.

For the purposes of determining the 1975-76 Grade Separation Priority List, the staff proposes the following modified criteria:

$$P = \frac{\nabla \times T}{C \times 24} + SCF$$

Where:

P = Priority Index Number V = Average 24-Hour Vehicular Volume

T = Average 24-Hour Train Volume SCF = Special Conditions Factor

For Existing or Proposed Crossings Nominated For Separation or Elimination

SCF = G1 + G2 + G3 + G4 + G5 + G6 + G7

Where:	Points Possible
G1 = Vehicular Speed Limit G2 = Railroad Prevailing Maximum Speed G3 = Crossing Geometrics G4 = Crossing Blocking Delay G5 = Alternate Route Availability	0- 5 0- 5 0- 5 0-10 0- 5
G6 = Accident History G7 = Irreducibles	0-20 0-15
Total Possible	0-65

For Separations Nominated for Alteration or Reconstruction

SCF = S1 + S2 + S3 + S4 + S5 + S6

Where:	Points Possible
S1 = Width Clearance S2 = Height Clearance S3 = Speed Reduction or Slow Or S4 = Load Limit S5 = Accidents at or Near Struc S6 = Probability of Failure & Irreducibles	Λ <u>-</u> 5
Total Possible	0-50

Points in each category were assigned according to the following schedule:

Grade Crossings

G1 = Vehicular Speed Limit

MPH	Ţ	oints
0-30		0
31-35		ĭ
36-40		2
41-45		3
46-50		4
51-55		5

G2 = Railroad Maximum Speed

MPH	Points
0-25	0
26-35	1
36-45	2
46-55	<u>-</u> 3
56-65	Ž.
66+	Š

G3 = Crossing Geometrics

0-5 points based on relative severity of physical conditions

G4 - Crossing Blocking Delay, Total Minutes per Day

Minutes	Points
0- 20	0
21- 40 41- 60	1
61- 80	2 3
81-100	4
101-120 121-140	5 6
141-160	ž
161-180 181-200	8
201+	10

G5 = Alternate Route Availability

Distance-feet	Points
0-1,000	0
1,001-2,000	ĭ
2,001-3,000	2
3,001-4,000	3
4,001-5,000	4
5,001+	5

G6 = Accident History (10 yrs.)

Each reportable vehicle-train accident

Points = (1 + 2 x No. killed + No. injured) x PF*

* PF = Protection Factor for:

Std. #9 = 1.0 Std. #8 = 0.4 Std. #3 = 0.2 Std. #1 = 0.1 Note: 1. No more than 3 points shall be allowed for each accident prior to modification by the protection factor.

Note: 2. Each accident shall be rated separately and modified by a factor appropriate to the protection in existence at the time of the accident.

G7 = Irreducibles

(a) Secondary accidents

(b) Emergency vehicle usage

(c) Accident potential

Separations

S1 = Width Clearance*

% of Assumed	$\frac{N-k}{2} = \frac{N-k}{2}$	Points
91-100		0
81-90		2
71-80	·	$\bar{4}$
61-70		6
51-60		8
50	., .	10

S2 = Height Clearance*

% of Assumed		٠.	Points
96-100	*	.:	0
91-95			ž
86-90			Z
81-85			Š
76-80	0		Ř
75			10

* Assumed Clearances

Historyon Tones		pass ances	Underpass Clearances		
Highway Lanes	Height	Width	Height Width		
2	22.5	34	15 42		
4 6	22.5	58	15 66		
•	22.5	82	15 90		

S3 = Speed Reduction or Slow Order

None - 0
Mcderate - 2
Severe - 5

S4 = Load Limit
None 0
Moderate 2
Severe 5

S5 = Accidents at or Near Structure (10 yrs.)

Number	Points
0-10	0
11-20	1
21-30 31-40	2
41-50	3 4
51-60	5
61-70 71-80	6
81-90	8
91-100 101+	9 10
	10

S6 = Irreducibles

Probability of Failures

Appendix B lists in alphabetical order the projects nominated for the 1975-76 priority list. Included in the table, in addition to information identifying each project, are the vehicular and train volumes, project cost, and the $\frac{V \times T}{C \times 24}$ calculation with each named project.

Appendix C is a list of point values awarded in each Special Conditions Factor category to existing or proposed crossings nominated for separation or elimination.

Appendix D is a list of point values awarded in each Special Condition Factor category to existing grade separations nominated for alteration or reconstruction.

The basic procedure employed by the staff for processing and evaluating the nominations was as follows:

- Nominations were received by the Commission and logged in by the Traffic Engineering Section staff.
- 2. The data required to complete the formulae and the information identifying the crossing(s) were entered on a crossing file input form.
- 3. Data entered on the form was transferred to data input cards and entered into the computer.
- 4. The $\frac{V \times T}{C \times 24}$ calculation was performed for each project and SCF points were assigned according to the defined schedules by the computer.
- 5. Totals for each project in the Special Conditions Factor categories were gathered and the Priority Index Number was calculated.
- 6. The projects were ranked according to their descending Priority Index Numbers.

Representatives of nominating agencies appeared in support of their respective projects and in many instances provided information either revising or updating the information originally filed with the nomination. In certain instances, individuals and local officials testified about special conditions that should be considered

in relation to specific nominations. In one instance, an individual property owner protested a nomination claiming there was no urgent need for a separation.

The new criteria proposed by the staffwere well received by all parties. It was generally conceded that the proposed criteria changes are fundamentally sound and that they should be accepted; however, certain exceptions, suggestions, and recommendations were made.

Southern Pacific Transportation Company (SP) and Robert M. Barton, Chief Civil Engineer for De Leuw, Cather & Company, both were of the opinion that dividing the total accident history index by the number of grade crossings in a multiple crossing project will discourage local agencies from closing little used and otherwise unnecessary grade crossings. They argue that this method penalizes the cities unfairly, because the more grade crossings that are closed the lower the priority value. They recommended that the accident history component for each project should be approached by adding the accident history points for each accident at each crossing to be closed. This, they contend, would afford an incentive to cities to close as many crossings as possible.

Caltrans argues that in the case of multiple projects each crossing should be considered on its own merits. It contends that if there are enough individual priorities, the total project can be constructed if there are funds available. If the individual priorities fail to bring a multiple crossing project within reach of available funds, Caltrans suggests that the agency can either make up the balance of the necessary funds or the agency can modify its project and construct those individual separations that are reachable with funds.

The staff, upon further consideration, indicated in latefiled Exhibit 73 that the criteria applied in multiple crossings, wherein one street crosses the tracks of two or more railroads, should be revised so that the points for blocking delay and for accident history are cumulative rather than being averaged. In response thereto, SP argues that whether you eliminate two crossings because you have two railroads and one street, or because you have one railroad and two streets, is a distinction without a difference in the absence of any other special facts. In any event, SP believes that the staff's change of position, in at least one situation, is a recognition on the part of the staff that projects should be afforded special benefits from multiple closures rather than being penalized.

Leslie E. Corkill, Public Utilities Engineer for the Los Angeles Department of Public Utilities and Transportation, recommended that because proposed crossings under the staff's proposal can receive a maximum of only 35 points in the Special Conditions Factors, that such projects be placed in a separate group and afforded the same possible maximum of 65 points in the seven categories of the Special Conditions Factor that are afforded existing crossing projects.

He also recommends that the maximum Special Conditions Factors points for alteration and reconstruction projects should be upgraded to a possible maximum of 65 points rather than the 50 point maximum proposed by the staff. In addition, he suggests that a possible maximum of 20 points should be afforded to projects on the basis of "State of Readiness."

The following procedural recommendations were made by Caltrans:

- 1. All nominations and data contained therein should be submitted under an affidavit of penalty of perjury.
- 2. All nominees for grade separation priority should be required to personally appear by authorized representative, who would be subject to cross-examination.

- 3. The Public Utilities Commission should recommend to the California Highway Commission that all allocations be limited to the estimated cost of the project specified in the nomination for priority consideration. The Department is concerned that many nominees will use a lower estimated cost before the Public Utilities Commission, than is submitted to the Highway Commission, the reason being that in applying the staff's proposal a low cost factor can result in a higher priority index number.
- 4. All information relating to railroad movements at crossings should be obtained by the Commission's staff directly from the railroad or railroads involved to assure the reliability of the information and the source thereof.

During the course of hearing various motions were made relating to certain nominations.

Motions were made by SP to exclude the State Highway 111 project in the city of Indio and the Point Pinole Park project in the city of Richmond from the 1975-76 priority list on the ground that both projects are "proposed separations" and do not represent the elimination of any bona fide proposed grade crossings. The motions were made pursuant to Decision No. 83479 in Case No. 9663 dated September 24, 1974, wherein the Commission specifically held that:

"...the Streets and Highways Code defines projects as including either the alteration or reconstruction of existing grade separations; the construction of new grade separations to eliminate existing or proposed grade crossings; or the removal or relocation of highways or railroad tracks to eliminate grade crossings. Projects do not include proposed separations." (Emphasis added.)

The limited evidence of record indicates that the State Highway 111 project is designed to go over the center of the SP yard in the city of Indio because an at-grade crossing assertedly is not practicable or feasible; that the Point Pinole Park is located west

of the SP track; that the proposed separation is designed to provide access to the park for pedestrians, bicycles, park maintenance vehicles, and occasional bus tours; that private vehicles will not enter the park over the grade separation, but will be parked in a parking lot east of the track; and that because of a steep bank, an at-grade crossing is assertedly not practical or feasible.

If these nominations fall within the classification of "proposed grade separations" they would not be projects within the meaning of Section 2450(b) of the Streets and Highways Code and, therefore, would not be eligible for the priority list.

A motion was made by Caltrans that the Durham Road project in the city of Fremont be classified as a "proposed crossing" rather than the elimination of an existing crossing, because the separation would be located approximately one-half mile from Prune Avenue, which

^{4/ &}quot;2450. For purposes of this chapter:

^{* * *}

[&]quot;(b) 'Project' means the grade separation and all approaches, ramps, connections, drainage, and other construction required to make the grade separation operable and to effect the separation of grades. Such grade separation project may include provision for separation of non-motorized traffic from the vehicular roadway and the railroad tracks. If a separation of non-motorized traffic is not to be included in a project, there shall be an affirmative finding that the separation of non-motorized traffic is not in the public interest. On any project where there is only one railroad track in existence, the project shall be built so as to provide for expansion to two tracks when the Director of Transportation determines that the project is on an existing or potential major railroad passenger corridor. Such project may consist of:

[&]quot;(1) The alteration or reconstructions of existing grade separations.

[&]quot;(2) The construction of new grade separations to eliminate existing or proposed grade crossings.

[&]quot;(3) The removal or relocation of highways or railroad tracks to eliminate existing grade crossings."

presently crosses the SP track at grade. The motion was strongly opposed by the city of Fremont. The major issue on this motion relates to the allocation of funds.

Caltrans also made a motion to exclude the city of Chico's nomination of the Dayton Road project. The city of Chico proposes to close the existing at-grade crossing of Dayton Road. Caltrans is of the opinion' that the relocation of the roadway would not eliminate any vehicle-train conflicts, contending that the vehicular traffic presently crossing the SP tracks at Dayton Road will merely be transferred to the existing crossings at West Eighth and West Ninth Streets.

The city of Stockton again filed a motion in opposition to the nomination by The Western Pacific Railroad Company of the March Lane crossing project. The nomination was excluded from the 1974-75 priority list by Decision No. 83066 dated June 25, 1974 in Case No. 9663. Its exclusion was reaffirmed by Decision No. 83479 dated September 24, 1974 on the ground that strong opposition by the city of Stockton had significant bearing upon the urgency of the need for separation. The city again opposes the March Lane nomination and requests favorable consideration of its own nomination of the Miner Avenue crossing, a project that it is financially able and prepared to support. Findings

- 1. The Commission adopts the staff's formula as set forth on pages 6 through 3 as well as the criteria set forth in Appendix B, C, and D attached hereto and its application for use in establishing the 1975-76 priority list.
- 2. Although the Commission adopts, for the purpose of the 1975-76 priority list, the staff's revision of accumulating points for blocking delay and accident history for multiple crossing projects when one street crosses the tracks of two or more railroads, it believes that this matter should be given further consideration in formulation of the 1976-77 priority list.

- 3. With respect to the suggestion that the special condition factors be reevaluated in the case of proposed crossings and alteration and reconstruction projects, the Commission believes that greater consideration should be given those projects that eliminate at-grade crossings in view of the fact that the major object of the program is the elimination of most hazardous grade crossings.
- 4. The Commission is in agreement with the suggestions that for future lists all nominations and data contained therein should be submitted with an affidavit and under a penalty of perjury, and that all nominations for grade separation priority should be supported by an appearance in person of an authorized representative.
- 5. The Commission does not believe that the staff should be burdened with the responsibility for obtaining information relating to railroad movements directly from the railroads. Aside from the staff time which would be required (there were 109 projects nominated for the 1975-76 priority list), it does not appear that this would improve the accuracy of railroad movement data. This was well demonstrated by the city of San Leandro in its support of the Caltrans State Route 112 project for separation of the crossing of the SP tracks at Milepost 14.7. By observation, the city determined that the number of railroad movements should be increased from the 26 obtained from the railroad to a total of 101.
- 6. The Commission does not believe that it should make any recommendation to the California Highway Commission relating to the allocation of funds or the limitation. It is conceded, however, that in the absence of extenuating circumstances all allocations should be substantially in conformity with the estimated costs of the projects specified in the recommendations for priority consideration.
- 7. The motions to exclude the State Highway 111, Point Pinole Park and Dayton Road projects from the 1975-76 priority list and the motions to change the classification of the Durham Road project will be denied. All of those motions raise questions of fact that can not be fully explored in this proceeding because of the time element, but should be developed at such time as the nominating agencies file with this Commission applications for authority to construct their respective

projects, which authority they must have before they can apply to the Highway Commission for allocation of funds.

- 8. In view of the continued opposition by the city of Stockton, and for the same reason stated in Decision No. 83479, the nomination of the March Lane project will again be excluded from the priority list.
- 9. The criteria or rules of the Commission established for use in determining the 1975-76 priority list are subject to modification, and the Commission invites the participation of interested parties to offer their suggestions and recommendations.
- 10. The list set out in Appendix E should be established as the 1975-76 grade separation priority list established in accordance with Section 2452 of the Streets and Highways Code.
- Il. The Eighth Street reconstruction project in San Luis Obispo County has been elevated, because the urgency and uniqueness of the situation cannot be accurately reflected within the constraints of the criteria as proposed by the staff. The project is exceptional in that the existing structure is so unsafe that failure may occur at any time. School buses are presently driven across the structure empty and the school children are required to walk across. San Luis Obispo County will lose \$337,500 in federal funds if the reconstruction project does not go forward within the next fiscal year.
- 12. The State Route 29 project in Napa County has also been elevated because of unique conditions. The existing crossing, when blocked, results in a serious bottleneck that severely hampers and impairs the efficiency of police, fire, and emergency ambulance services for approximately 6,000 people living within an area immediately south of the crossing. Use of an alternate route requires an additional 15 minutes in driving time.
- 13. The railroad lowering project in Alhambra, which was found by Decision No. 83066 in Case No. 9663 to be urgently in need of separation on the 1974-75 priority list, has been elevated because of the substantial funds expended in the reasonable expectation that the city

would receive an adequate allocation from the 1974-75 Grade Separation Priority List. Since it could not anticipate the extraordinary inflation affecting those projects with higher priorities on the 1974-75 list, the city of Alhambra applied for an allocation of funds from Caltrans, only to be informed that increases in project costs have resulted in reducing the allocation available to the city of Alhambra from the 1974-75 Grade Separation Priority List to approximately one-half of the amount it would otherwise be entitled to. In large projects such as Alhambra's, where the construction period will last over several years, Caltrans should consider only allocating part of the project's allocation initially and the remainder in the following year(s) so that other projects could be financed and not held up by a large allocation that may not be expended for several years.

14. With regard to projects having the same priority intex number, consideration should first be given to projects which separate or eliminate existing grade crossings, then to projects for the alteration or reconstruction of grade separations, and finally to projects for the construction of new grade separations. Within each of these categories, first consideration should be given to the lowest cost project in order that the maximum number of projects may be accomplished within the available funis.

ORDER

IT IS ORDERED that:

- 1. The list of projects appearing in Appendix E is established, as required by Section 2452 of the Streets and Highways Code, as the 1975-76 list, in order of priority, of projects which the Commission determines to be most urgently in need of separation or alteration.
- 2. The Secretary shall furnish a full, true, and correct copy of this decision and order to the Department of Transportation.

- 3. With the exception of the motion made by the city of Stockton, all motions to exclude projects from the 1975-76 priority list are denied. The motion of the city of Stockton to exclude the March Lane project is granted.
- 4. The motion of the Department of Transportation to reclassify the Durham Road project is denied.

	The effective	date of this	order is the date	hereof.
	Dated at	San Francisco	, California,	/ L
day o	e <u>June</u>	, 197		

APPENDIX A Page 1 of 2

LIST OF APPEARANCES

Interested Parties: <u>Harold S. Lentz</u>, Attorney at Law, for Southern Pacific Transportation Co. & subsidiary railroads; <u>Melvin R. Dykman</u>, O. J. Solander, Attorneys at Law, and Gerry O'Shea, for Department of Transportation and California Highway Commission; Ted W. Shettler and Leroy E. Moeller, for City of Alhambra; Daniel B. Pavao, for County of Imperial; Harold R. Callahan, for Santa Barbara County Department of Transportation; Ronald L. Schneider, Attorney at Law, and John J. McBride, for County of Los Angeles; Leslie E. Corkill, for Department of Public Utilities & Transportation, City of Los Angeles; Gary P. Dysart, for City of Norwalk; Ken Miller, Edward J. Ferraro, and Eugene E. Bourbonnais, for City of Torrance; Bellur K. Devaraj, for City of Compton; Arthur E. Goulet, for Cities of Loma Linda and Corona; Mr. Eccles and Bob Warner, for City of Simi Valley; Glen E. Danielsen, for City of Santa Fe Springs; James S. Wiegand, Attorney at Law, for City of San Diego; Edward R. James, for City of Pomona; Gerald R. Winterburn, for City of La Mirada; Hugh L. Berry, for City of Fullerton; Arnold C. Jones, for City of Salinas; Robert Barton, for City of San Barnardino; James E. McCarty, for City of Oakland; Jim Lungren, for City of Hayward; David Pelz, for City of Davis; Chris Fernandez, for City of Santa Clara; Perry H. Taft, Attorney at Law, A. W. Warren, and George S. Nolte, for City of Stockton; at Law, A. W. Warren, and George S. Nolte, for City of Stockton; Selmer K. Satre, for City of Martinez; Ron Peterson, for Fresno County; Tony Lopez, for City of San Mateo; Carl Arness, for City of Redding; Charles E. Moore, for County of San Luis Obispo; Allen E. Sprague, Attorney at Law, and Larry Milnes, for City of Fremont; Ralph E. Mohagen, for City of Richmond; L. J. Reagan, for Contra Costa County, Public Works Department; Paul F. Hughey, for Contra Costa County, Public Works Department; Paul F. Hughey, for Contra Costa County, Public Works Department; Paul F. Hughey, for Contra Costa County, Public Works Department; Paul F. Hughey, for Contra Costa County, Public Works Department; Paul F. Hughey, for Contra Costa County, Public Works Department; Paul F. Hughey, for Contra Costa County, Public Works Department; Paul F. Hughey, for Contra Costa County and Costa County of Montager, Toseph Elliott, for for Contra Costa County and City of Martinez; Joseph Elliott, for City of Mountain View; Stanford E. Davis, for City of Antioch; John Maccoum, for Placer County; Alfred A. Affinito, City Attorney, for City of Pittsburg; William M. Calvert, for City of San Leandro; Earold W. McDonald, for Butte County; John Middlebrook, for Yuba County; Robert B. Kutz, Attorney at Law, for Richard Meline; Allan J. Savitz, Attorney at Law, for City of Chico; Bill Buxton, for Kaiser Steel Corporation; William A. Carlson, for City of Marysville; Gayle L. Collins, for the Napa-Solano Counties Labor Council (AFL-CIO): Donald Frank Evans, for Napa Valley Unified Council (AFL-CIO); Donald Frank Evans, for Napa Valley Unified School District; Jack Frey, for American Canyon Fire District; Captain Ray Gilbert, for California Highway Patrol, Napa County; Ron K. Greenslate, Harry Hamilton, and John Tuteur, for Napa County; Don McConnell, for Basalt Rock Company, Inc; Captain Joseph Page, for Napa County Sheriff's Office; Gary Piner, for Emergency Medical Services, Napa County; C. Xavier Powers and Bob Remboldt, for Employees Mare Island Navy Yard Association; Raymond M. Rinderhagen, for City of Indio; G. Brent Muchow, for City of Irvine;

APPENDIX A Page 2 of 2

Richard W. Bridges, Attorney at Law, for The Western Pacific Rallroad Company; George W. Bullock, for the City of Burbank; Alton Ruden and Gerald Taylor, for City of Oceanside; James R. Johnson, for City of El Monte; Frank F. Forbes and Dwight F. French, for City of San Gabriel; Dennis Sundstrom, for County of Orange; Thomas A. Lance, Attorney at Law, for The Atchison, Topeka and Santa Fe Railway Company; Glenn T. Sparks, for City of Beaumont; L. Dale King, for City of Ontario; William R. Bradley, for City of San Marcos; John Shone, for San Bernardino County; George W. Miley, Attorney at Law, for Department of Transportation; Ronald E. Moran, Logan R. Cotton, Mrs. Angie Papadakis, Neal Howard, and Ayyad R. Chobrial, for themselves.

Commission Staff: Robert W. Stich and Edward C. Cole.

APPENDIX B Page 1 of 6

Agency	Crossing Name	RE	<u>BR</u>	Mile Post	Suf	Prop	Type Proj	Veh Volume	Train Volume	Project Cost	V x T 0 x 24
Alhambra	Alhambra Lwr	1	В	487.3			1	122368	42	15000000	14
Anaheim	State College	2		170.30			1	30600	6	3380000	2
Anaheim	Katella Ave	• 1	BK	512.40			1	26200	44	2650000	18
Anaheim	Lincoln Ave	1	BK	508.50			1	25000	84	4375000	20
Anaheim	Anaheim Lwrng	2		166.2			1	120299	18	15000000	6
Brea	Birch St	1	BBJ	509.31			1	3600	2	1000000	0
Butte County	Baggett-Hrys	4		202.7			1	1300	15	375000	2
Butte County	Midway Co Rd	1	C	179.50			1	2500	22	1155000	2
Chico	Dayton Rd	1	C	183.80		:	3	3400	30	530000	8
Claremont	SPT Relocation	1	BBO	514.71			3	30000	2	147000	17
Coupton	Rosecrans	1	BO	493.3			1	31500	10	4177000	3
Contra Costa County	Waterfront Rd	1	В	36.9	A		4	3000	30	711000	5
Contra Costa County	Someraville	1	В	52.10	•		1	10600	28	1430000	9
Corona	Lincoln Ave	2	В	25.20		*	28	10000	22	1485000	6
Davis	Richards Blvd	ì	A	74.5	В		4	17200	53	182000	209
Dept. of Transp.	State Rt 112	1	L	14.7			Ť	21500	101	5000000	18
Dept. of Transp.	State Rt 111	1	В	611.45		*	2B	2130	- 38	2155000	2
Dept. of Transp.	State Rt 29	1	AA	61.70	- ,		i.	27000	42	4887000	10
Dept. of Transp.	State Rt 70	1	C	141.7'	B		4	13500	50	4630000	6

APPENDIX B Page 2 of 6

Agency	Crossing <u>Kasa</u>	<u>RR</u>	BR	Mile <u>Post</u>	<u>Suf</u>	Prop	Type Proj	Veh Volume	Train Volume	Project Cost	V x T 0 x 24
Dept. of Transp.	State Rt 84	1	A	87.50		*	2A	9600	44	1616000	n.
Dept. of Transp.	State Rt 112	4		14.75			1	22500	10	8900000	1
Dept. of Traisp.	State Rt 83	1	В	520.10			1	19000	பு	6940000	5
Dept. of Transp.	State Rt 17	2	3.5	1190.20			1	28000	61	6900000	10
Dept. of Transp.	State Rt 41	1	В	205.9	en e		1	17500	32	5837000	4
Dept. of Transp.	State Rt 79	1	В	562.40	•	·	1	54,00	42	1196000	8
Dept. of Transp.	State Rt 180	2		997.8	• :		1	23500	30	3905000	8
Dept. of Transp.	State Rt 49	1	AI	126.3	В		4	16500	15	800000	13
Dept. of Traisp.	State Rt 237	1	B	37.1	A		4	23000	54	1730000	30
Dept. of Traisp.	State Rt 17	2	K	1.15	C	*	1	34000	10	5200000	3-
Dept. of Transp.	State Rt 19	1	BBL	497.37			1	25400	15	3000000	5
Dept. of Transp.	State Rt 68	1	R	119.29		-	1.	12500	50	1700000	15.
El Monte	Peck-Ramona	ì	В	495.00			1	40290	53	9000000	10
Fontana	Sierra Ave	2		88.7			1	25205	12	1665000	8
Fremont	Durham Rd	1	DÀ	34.20	` .		1	4000	23	2650000	. 1
Fresno County	Chestnut Ave	1	В	210.30			. 1	7540	26.	2092000	4.
Fullerton	Lemon St	2		165.10			1	16181	50	3751000	9
Hayward	A St	1	D	20.00		,	ì	27224	36	6646000	6
Hayward	Harder Rd	1	D	21.6			Ĵ,	23257	14	1994000	7

Agency	Crossing Name	RR	BR	Mile Post	Suf	Prop	Type Pro.1	Veh Volume	Train Volume	Project Cost	$\frac{V \times T}{0 \times 24}$
Hayward	A St	4		20.20			ì	21344	12	2866000	4
Runtington Beach	Kilis Ave	1	BAA	522.09		*	28	3500	1	460000	0
Imperial County	Quick Rd	1	В	728.3	B		4	200	29	105000	2
Indio	Monroe St	1	В	609.70			1	12232	49	3000000	8
Irvine	Culver Dr	2	• • • • • •	180.50			1	14973	12	4458000	2
Larkspur	Sr Francis Dr	5		14.7	В		4	11000	1	697000	1
La Mirada	Alondra Bd	2		159.60	d .	*	1	14383	72	3726000	12
Livernore	East First St	1	. D	47.2		:	1	15765	17	2285000	5
Loma Linda	Mountain View	1	В	543.40	٠, .		1	4297	65	654000	18
Los Angeles County	Hacienda Bd	1	В	500.5			1	32000	39	4925000	11
Los Angeles County	Florence Ave	1	BG	488.30			1	28000	20	4226000	6
Los Angeles County	Florence Ave	2		154.87		*	2A	20000	60	1670000	30
Los Angeles County	Hollywood Way	1	В	469.4			1	20000	16	4319000	3
Los Angeles County	Century Frwy	ì	BBG	491.19			3	117400	4	7000000	3
Los Angeles County	Grand Ave	1	В	508.50	,	*	2B	9000	49	2972000	6
Los Angeles County	190th St	2	Н	19.1		*	ŻB	23000	10	2101000	5
Los Angeles County	Avenue J	1	В	406.10		-	1	20000	24	5820000	3
Los Angeles	Tampa Ave	1	B	448.8			1	25484	16	3200000	5
Marin County	Ignacio Bd	5 .		24.60		*	2A	8000	4	1300000	ı

APPENDIX B Page 4 of 6

<u>Agency</u>	Crossing Name	RR	BR	Mile <u>Post</u>	Suf	<u>Prop</u>	Type Proj	Veh Volume	Train <u>Volume</u>	Project Cost	V x T 0 x 24
Montebello	Greenwood Ave	2	/ - /	149.50			1	12300	46	2901000	8
Montebello	Montebello Ed	3		8.50			.1	15000	22	3539000	4
Norwalk	Imperial Hwy	i i	BK	498.0			1	27203	6	2328000	3
Oakland	Adeline St	1	D	5.9			1	6500	84	3692000	6
Oceanside	Oceanside Lwr	2		225.9	•		1	30951	28	16772000	2
Ontario	Grove Ave	3 .		39.00	¿ · · -	:	1	9800	20	2600000	3
Orange County	Alioia Pkwy	2		189.3	- A		4	12000	16	270000	30
Orange County	Crown Valley	2		193.1	A		4	12000	16	532000	15
Orange County	Los Alisos	2		190.70		#	2A	6000	16	568000	7
Orange County	Fairmont Blvd	2	В	37.70		*	2A	5000	31	490000	13
Oroville	Huntoon St	4		202.02	В		4	2460	17	360000	5
Oroville	Bridge St	4		205.3	A		4	6921	17	759000	6
Pittsburg	Railroad Ave	1	ġ	48.90	•		1	15529	63	7118000	6
Pittsburg	Pittsburg Rml	8	N	1.85		÷	3	15091	4	600000	4
Pomona	Roselawn Ave	1	В	511.8		*	2A	12000	45.	1519000	15
Pomona	Dudley St	1	В	513.00	•	*	2A	6000	60	6075000	2
Redding	South St	1	0	258.0			1	8000	31	5000000	2
Rialto	Riverside Ave	2		84.80			1	13677	n	1464000	- 4
Richmond	Pt Pinole Pk	1	A	19.30	•	*	ŹВ	850	46	200000	8

APPENDIX B Page 5 of 6

Agency	Crossing Name	<u>rr</u>	<u>BR</u>	Mile <u>Post</u>	<u>Suf</u>	<u>Prop</u>	Type Proj	Veh Volume	Train Volume	Project Cost	V x T C x 24
Riverside	Seventh St	2	B	9.75			1	13000	67	3000000	12
Riverside	Arlington Ave	2	B	12.40			1	19700	39	2000000	16
Sacramento	28th St	1	A	91.0			1	1386	58	495000	7
Salinas	Market-Front	1	B	118.50			1	26766	43	4665000	10
Santa Barbara County	Hollister Ave	1	E	365.7	В		4	15079	14	1675000	5
Santa Clara	Chestnut St	1	L	41.9			3	1605	30	150000	13
Santa Pe Springs	Carmenita	2	. *	157.30			1	16071	62	2507000	17
Santa Fe Springs	Santa Fe Spr	2		154.1			ì	5260	64	2130000	7
Senta Fe Springs	Telegraph Rd	2		154.60			1	25100	64	2050000	33
Santa Fe Springs	Imperial Hwy	2		156.10	* ; :	-	1	32970	62	2513000	34
San Bernardino County	Cherry Ave	2		91.70			1	7600	50	3310000	5
San Bernardino County	Bear Valley	2		41.60	. : *		1	8600	55	1839000	i n
San Bernardino	Mill St	2	В	1.3	. :	*	2A	9600	200	3750000	21
San Bernardino	Rialto Ave	2	В	0.7			1	11517	48	450000	51
San Carlos	Holly St	1	E	23.20			1	19300	64	4500000	11
San Diego	Harbor Dr	2	,	268.9	A		4	14000	48	1498000	19
San Diego	Imperial Ave	36	D	3.1	В		4	9000	2	523000	1
San Diego	Smythe Ave	36		13.8	:		`1	3800	4	1101000	1 .
San Gabriel	San Gabrl Lwr	1	В	490.2	: .	*	1	64072	42	12563000	9

APPENDIX B Page 6 of 6

Agency	Crossing Name	RR	<u>BR</u>	Mile Post	<u>Suf</u>	<u> </u>	Type Proj	Veh Volume	Train Volume	Project Cost	V x T 0 x 24
San José	Bernal Rd	ì	B	61.00			1	5208	22	3540000	1
San Luis Obispo Co.	Eighth St	1	Б	222.01	A		4	646	12	231000	1
San Marcos	Twin Oaks Vly	2	B	16.50			1	15000	10	1828000	3
San Mateo	Laurie Meadow	1	E	21.00		*	2A	5000	59	2500000	5
Simi Valley	Madera Rd	1	B	432.00		# .	2B	22000	20	1050000	17
Stockton	Miner Ave	1	D	90.2	В		4	14628	50	3463000	9
Stockton	March Lane	4		96.9		- #	2A	20000	14	1250000	9
Torrance	Crenshaw Bd	2	Н	20.9		- '	1	48000	16	1320000	24
Torrance	Del Amo Blvd	2 .	H	19.50		*	2A	20000	31	2450000	\mathbf{n}
Torrance	Spt Relocation	1	BBG	500.73			3	115563	3	1420000	10
Yuba County	Pasado Rd	4	-	176.10		************************************	2A	6000	19	1184000	4

Special Conditions Factors for Grade Crossings Nominated for Separation or Klimination

Agency	Crossing Name	<u>rr</u>	<u>BŔ</u>	Mile <u>Post</u>	Suf Prop	Veh Spd Limit 01	Train Speed 02	Xing Géom 03	Veh Delay G4	Alt Rte G5	Aco: Hist <u>C6</u>	Irr <u>07</u>	Total SCF	
Alhambra	Alhambra Lwr	1	В	487.3		\Q	2	4	4	4	4	10	28	. (
Anaheim	State College	2		170.30		2	5	1	1	3	3	3	18	
Anaheim	Katella Ave	1	BK	512.40		1	0	1	8	5	Ó	: 7	22	
Anaheim (Lincoln Ave	1	BK	508.50		0	0	2	10	3	1	. 4	20	
Anaheim	Anaheim Lwring	2	•	166.2	and the same	1	5	2	2	2	1	5	18	
Brea	.Birch St	1	DŖJ	509.31		3	ì	1	-0	2	0	2	9	-
Butte County	Baggett-Mrys	4		202.7		0	2	4	7	2	1	3	19	
Butte County	Midway Co Rd	1	C	179.50	· · · · · ·	0	4	3	3	5	0	Ĺ	19	
Chico	Dayton Rd	1	C	183.80		5	0	2	6	5	0	3	21	
Claremont	Spt Relocation	1	BBO	514.71		0	1	ì	Ó	0	0.	1	3	
Compton	Rosecrans	1	BG	493.3		0	0	2	1	0	2	8	13	
Contra Costa County	Somersville	1	B	52.10		2	4	1	2	2	4	2	17	
Corona	Lincoln Ave	2	В	25.20	*	0	4	0	- 0	2	0	1	7	
Dept. of Transp.	State Rt 112	1	L	14.7		1	0	2	9	4	6	8	30	
Dept. of Transp.	State Rt 111	1	В	611.45	*	4	1	0	4	2	. 0	5	16	
Dept. of Transp.	State Rt 29	1	AA	61.70		.5	0	1	10	Š	4	10	35	
Dept. of Transp.	State Rt 84	1	A	87.50	*	3	1	Ó	4	3	0	2	13	(
Dept. of Transp.	State Rt 112	4		14.75		0	1	2	Ò	· 0	2	5	10	
Dept. of Transp.	State Rt 83	1	B	520.10		1	4	2	4	· 1 .	1	3	16	

APPENDIX 0 Page 2 of 5

Special Conditions Factors for Grade Crossings Nominated for Separation or Elimination

Agency	Crossing Name	<u>rr</u>	<u> BR</u>	Mile Post	Suf Prop	Veh Spd Limit Ol	Train Speed 02	Xing Geom G3	Veh Delay G4	Alt Rte G5	Acc Hist G6	Irr <u>07</u>	Total SCF
Dept. of Transp.	State Rt 17	2		1190.20		1	0	2	6	1	14	6	30
Dept. of Transp.	State Rt 41	1	В	205.9		•	2	3	3	0	Ò	6	14
Dept. of Transp.	State Rt 79	1	В	562.40		1	3	2	4	1	3	8	22
Dept. of Transp.	State Rt 180	2		997.8		0	2	1	2	1	7	7	20
Dept. of Transp.	State Rt 17	2	K	1.15	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	3
Dept. of Transp.	State Rt 19	1	BBL	497.37		1	0	1	1	4	Ó.	1	8
Dept. of Transp.	State Rt 68	1	E	119.29	_	1	0	3	4	1	4	- 6	19
El Monte	Peck-Ramona	1	В	495.00		1	4	3	5	1	11	8	33
Fontana	Sierra Ave	2		88.7		0	3	2	1	1	0	5	12
Fremont	Durham Rd	1	DA	34.20	· .	1	2	4	4	2	2	3	18
Fresno County	Chestnut Ave	: 1	В	210.30		2	4	2	5	1	2	8	24
Fullerton	Lemon St	2		165.10		0	3	3	4	0	2	6	18
Hayward	A St	ì	D	20.00		0	1	3	2	5	12	. 9	32
Hayward	Harder Rd	1	Ð	21.6	*	ì	1	3	1	5	2	3	16
Hayward	A St	4		20.20		0	. 4	4	0	2	2	6	18
Huntington Beach	Ellis Ave	1	BAA	522.09	*	2	1	0	. 0	2	0	2	7
Indio	Monroe St	1	В	609.70		ì,	1	. 3	4	5	2	7.	23
Irvine	Culver Dr	2		180.50		· 5	5	1	1	·- ż	0	5	19
La Mirada	Alondra Bd	2		159.60		2	4	2	10	4	1	9	32

APPENDIX C Page 3 of 5

Special Conditions Pactors for Grade Crossings Nominated for Separation or Elimination

Agency	Grossing Name	<u>rr</u>	<u>BR</u>	Mile Post	Suf Prop	Veh Spd Limit 01	Train Speed 02	Xing Geom	Veh Delay G4	Alt Rte G5	Aco Hist G6	Irr <u>07</u>	Total SCF
Livermore	East First St	1	D	47.2		0	2	2	1	2	2	3	12
Lona Linda	Mountain View	1	В	543.40		2	4	2	9	3	1	5	26
Los Angeles County	Hacienda Bd	1	В	500.5	eria (j. 1915). Notas k	1	3	3	5.	4	4	7	27
Los Angeles County	Florence Ave	ì	BG	488.30		1	1	2	3	2	6		- 20
Los Angeles County	Florence Ave	2	Ja	154.87	- 2=2 (v. 🙀)	1	4.,	0	10	2	Ò	3	20
Los Angeles County	Hollywood Way	1	В	469.4		1	4	3	1	3	4	7	23
Los Angeles County	Century Frwy	1	BBG	491.19		0	0	2	-0	0	2	4	8
Los Angeles County	Grand Ave	1	В	508.50	*. *	3	4	0	7	4	0	2	20
Los Angeles County	190th St	2	H	19.1	*	1	0	0	3	0	0	3	7
Los Angeles County	Avenue J	1	В	406.10		1	5	Ź	3	·3	2	4	20
Los Angeles	Tampa Ave	'n	· B	448.8		2	4	1	2	2	0	2	13
Marin County	Ignacio Bd	5	Ŧ	24.60	*	1	0	0	Ó	0	0	3	4
Kontebello	Greenwood Ave	2	,	149.50		1	. 	2	. 6	N-3	1	Ž	24
Montebello	Montebello Bd	3		8.50	Grovenis St State	1	3	1	3	1	6	6	21
Norwalk	Imperial Hwy	1	BK	498.0		2	. 1	2	1	3	1	5	15
Oakland	Adeline St	1	D	5.9		0	0	3	10	5	9	6	- 33
Oceanside	Oceanside Lwr	2		225.9		Ó	1	2	6	2	2	. L	17
Ontario	Grove Ave	3		39.00		1	2	2	1	2	1	2	11
Orange County	Los Alisos	2		190.70	*	0	5	0	-0	2	0	2	9

APPENDIX 0 Page 4 of 5

Special Conditions Factors for Grade Crossings Nominated for Separation or Elimination

Ageńcy	Crossing Name	<u>rr</u>	BR	Mile Post	<u>Suf Prop</u>	Veh Spd Limit 01	Train Speed 02	Xing Geom	Veh Delay <u>G4</u>	Alt Rte G5	Aco Hist G6	1rr <u>67</u>	Total SCF
Orange County	Fairmont Blvd	2	В	37.70		0	5	0	-0	3	0	3	\overline{n}
Pittsburg	Railroad Ave	1	В	48.90		0	0	4	10	2	6	9	31
Pittsburg	Pittsburg Rml	8	N	1.85		0	Ó	1	0	0	0	3	4
Ponona	Roselawn Ave	1	В	511.8	***	2	4	٥	4	2	0	2	14:
Pomona	Dudley St	1 📆	В	513100	*	2	4	0	5	3	0	1	15
Redding	South St	1	C	258.0		0	1	3	2	2	3	5	16
Rialto	Riverside Ave	2	. •	84.80		1	2	2	0	1	3	4	13
Richmond	Pt Pinole Pk	1	A	19.30	#	0	4	0	-0	2	0	2	8
Riverside	Seventh St	2	В	9.75		0	2	1	10	0	4	3	20
Riverside	Arlington Ave	2	В	12.40		1	4	0	7	2	5	• 0,	19
Sacramento	28th St	1	À	91.0		0	1	2	8	0	0	2	13
Salinas	Market-Front	1	E	118.50		0	0	2	1	1	5	9	. 18
Santa Clara	Chestnut St	1	L	41.9		0	4	3	2	1	1	3	14
Santa Pe Springs	Carmenita	2		157.30		3	4	2	3	· 1 ·	1	4	18
Santa Pe Springs	Santa Fe Spr	2		154.1		2	4	4	3	2	5	5	25
Santa Fe Springs	Telegraph Rd	2		154.60		3	4	2	4	2	6	5	26
Santa Fe Springs	Imperial Hwy	2		156.10		3	4	1	3	5	3	6	25
San Bernardino Co.	Cherry Ave	2		91.70		4	5	2	6	5	1	6	29
San Bernardino Co.	Bear Valley	2		41.60	•	5	3	3	3	5	5	4	28

Special Conditions Factors for Grade Crossings Nominated for Separation or Elimination

Agendy	Crossing Name	<u>RR</u>	<u> BR</u>	Mile Post	Suf	<u>Prop</u>	Veh Spd Limit Ol	Train Speed G2	Xing Géom 03	Veh Delay G4		Aco Hist G6	1rr 07	Total SCF.
San Bernardino	Mill St	2	В	1.3		*	1	2	0	10	3	0	4	20
San Bernardino	Rialto Ave	2	В	0.7			1.	0	1	10	1	3	5	21
San Carlos	Holly St	1	E	23.20			0	5	2	5	4	6	8	30
San Diego	Smythe Ave	36		13.8		1.5	0	1.	4	Ó	1	0	2	8
San Gabriel	San Gabrl Lwr	1	B	490.2	•		Ō	2	4	5	2	2	8	23
San Jose	Bernal Road	1	E	61.00	· · · · ·	: ^	1	4	. 2	3	5	0	3	18
San Marcos	Twin Oaks Vly	2	E	16.50			3	0	. 2	0	1	0	3	9
San Mateo	Laurie Meadow	1	E	21.00		*	, 1 .	5	0	5	3	0	3	17
Simi Valley	Madera Rd	1	E	432.00		# /	5	5	0	3	5	Ó	4	22
Stockton	March Lane	4		96.9		*	3	3	0	1	1	0	4	12
Torrance	Crenshaw Bd	2	н	20.9	-	. ,	3	0	2	3	2	4	5	19
Torrance	Del Amo Blyd	2	Н	19.50		*	2	0	0	7	3	0	2	14
Torrance	Spt Relocation	1	BBO	500.73		s	0	0	1	-0	Ó	1	2	4
Yuba County	Pasado Rd	4		176.10		×	4	4	0	-Ó	5	0	7	20

C. 98/2

ဗိ

APPENDIX D

Special Conditions Pactors for Separations Nominated for Alteration or Reconstruction

<u>Agency</u>	Crossing Name	<u> </u>	<u>BR</u>	Hile Post	Suf	Prop.	Clear	Height Clear S2			Aco Struo S5	Irr S6	
Contra Costa County	Waterfront Rd	1	В	36.9	Ā		6	0	5	5	2	8	26
Davis	Richards Blvd	ì	À	74.5	В		0	0	2	0	3	1	6
Cept. of Transp.	State Rt 70	1	C	141.7	В		6	2	2	0	2	8	20
Dept. of Transp.	State Rt 49	1	AI	126.3	В		2	Ó	0	0	0	4	6
Dept. of Transp.	State Rt 237	1	E	37.1	A		0	0	5	0	1	4	10
Imperial County	Quick Rd	1	В	728.3	В		8	6	5	0	0	8	27
Larkspur	Sr Francis Dr	5		14.7	B		4	2	0	0	10	5	21
Orange County	Alicia Pkwy	2		189.3	× A =		0	. •	0.	0	0	Ź	2
Orange County	Crown Valley	2	•	193.1	À		0	0	0	Ó	0	2	2
Oroville	Huntoon St	4		202.02	В		··· 2	4	2	Ò	0	7	15
Oroville	Bridge St	4		205.3	A.		6	0	2	0	1	5	14
Santa Barbara County	Hollister Ave	1	B	365.7	В		0	0	2	0	7	7	16
San Diego	Harbor Dr	2	• •	268.9	A		Ź	Ò	2	2	2	8	16
San Diego	Imperial Ave	36	D	3.1	В		8	0	0	Ó	. 6	6	20
San Luis Obispo Co.	Eighth St	1	E	222.01	. A		6	0	5	5	1	10	27
Stockton	Hiner Ave	1	D	90.2	В		8	4	2	Ó	10	8	32

APPENDIX B Page 1 of 6

Priority List of Grade Separation Projects or Alterations Fiscal Year 1975-76

Agency	Crossing Name	Mile Post	V x T 0 x 24	<u>scr</u>	Priority Index Number	Priority Number
San Luis Obispo County	Eighth St	E-222.01-A	1	27	28	ì
Dept. of Transp.	State Rt 29	AA-61.70	10	35	45	2
Alhambra	Alhambra Lwr	B-487.3	-14	28	42	3
Davis	Richards Blvd	A-74.5-B	209	6	215	<u>,</u>
San Bernardino	"Rialto Ave	2B-0.7	51	21	72	5
Santa Pe Springs	Tolegraph Rd	2-154.60	33	26	59	6
Santa Fe Springs	Imperial Hwy	2-156.10	34	25	59	7
Los Angeles County	Plorence Ave	2-154.87	30	20	50	. 8
Dept. of Transp.	State Rt 112	L-14.7	18	30	48	9
Loma Linda	Mountain View	B-543.40	18	26	144	10
La Mirada	Alondra Bd	2-159.60	12	32	44	11
Torrance .	Crenshaw Bd	2H-20.9	24	19	43	12
El Monte	Peck-Ranona	B-495.00	10	33	43	13
San Carlos	Holly St	E-23.20	11	30	41	14
Stockton	Miner Ave	D-90.2-B	9	32	41	15
San Bernardino	Mill St	28-1.3	21	20	41	16
Anaheim	Katella Ave	BK-512.40	18	22	40	17
Anaheim	Lincoln Ave	BK-508.50	20	20	40	18
Dept. of Transp.	State Rt 17	2-1190,20	10	30	10	19

APPENDIX B Page 2 of 6

Priority List of Grade Separation Projects or Alterations Fiscal Year 1975-76

<u>Agency</u>	Crossing Name	Mile <u>Post</u>	V x T 0 x 24	<u>scr</u>	Priority Index <u>Number</u>	Priority Number
Dept. of Transp.	State Rt 237	E-37.1-A	30	10	40	20
San Bernardino County	Bear Valley	2-41.60	ń	28	39	21
Oakland	Adeline St	D-5.9	6	33	39	22
Simi Valley	Madera Rd	E-432.00	17	22	39	23
Los Angeles County	Hacienda Bd	B-500.5	n	27	38	24
Hayward	A St	D-20.00	6	32	38	25
Pittsburg	Railroad Ave	B-48.90	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	31	37	26
Riverside	Arlington Ave	2B-12.40	16	19	35	27
Santa Fe Springs	Carmenita	2-157.30	17	18	35	28
San Diego	Harbor Dr	2-268.9-A	19	16	35	29
Dept. of Transp.	State Rt 68	E-119.29	15	19	34	30
San Bernardino County	Cherry Ave	2-91.70	5	29	34	31
Santa Fe Springs	Santa Fe Spr	2-154.1	7	25	32	32
Montebello	Greenwood Ave	2-149.50	8	24	32	33
Riverside	Seventh St	28-9.75	12	20	32	34
San Gabriel	San Gabrl Lwr	B-490.2	9	23	32	35
Orange County	Alioia Pkwy	2-189.3-A	30	2	32	36
Indio	Monroe St	B-609.70	8	23	31	37
Contra Costa County	Waterfront Rd	B-36.9-A	5	26	31	38

Agency	Crossing Name	Mile <u>Post</u>	V x T C x 24	SCF	Priority Index Number	Priority Number
Dept. of Transp.	State Rt 79	B-562,40	8	22	30	39
Chico	Dayton Rd	C-183.80	8	21	29	40
Imperial County	Quick Rd	B-728.3-B	2	27	29	41
Pomona	Roselawn Ave	B-511.8	15	14	29	42
Fresno County	Chestnut Ave	B-210.30	4	24	28	43
Dept. of Transp.	State Rt 180	2-997.8	8	20	28	44
Salinas	Harket-Front	E-118.50	10	18	28	45
Santa Clara	Chestnut St	L-41.9	13	14	27	46
Fullerton	Lemon St	2-165.10	9	18	27	47
Contra Costa County	Somersville	B-52.10	9	17	26	48
Los Angeles County	Plerence Ave	BG-488.30	6	20	26	49
Los Angeles County	Hollywood Way	8-469.4	3	23	26	50
Dept. of Transp.	State Rt 70	C-141.7-B	± 6	20	26	51
Los Angeles County	Grand Ave	B-508.50	6	20	26	52
Montebello	Montebello Bd	3-8,50	4	21	25	53
Torrance	Del Amo Blyd	2H-19.50	11	14	25	54
Anaheim	Anaheim Lwrng	2-166.2	6	18	24	55
Orange County	Fairmont Blvd.	2B-37.70	13	11	24	56
Yuba County	Pasado Rd	4-176.10	4	20	24	57
Dept. of Transp.	State Rt 84	A-87.50	11	13	24	58

C- 98/2

o

APPENDIX B Page 4 of 6

Priority List of Grade Separation Projects or Alterations Fiscal Year 1975-76

Agency	Crossing Name	Mile Post	V x 1 0 x 24	<u>scf</u>	Priority Index Number	Priority Number
Hayward	Harder Rd	D-21.6	7	16	23	59
Los Angeles County	Avenue J	B-406.10	3	20	23	60
Hayward	A St	4-20.20	4	18	22	61
Larkspur	Sr Francis Dr	5-14.7-B	Error St. Young and S	21	22	62
San Mateo	Laurie Meadow	E-21.00	5	17	22	63
Butte County	Baggett-Mrys	4-202.7	2	19	21	64
Butte County	Midway Co Rd	C-179.50	2	19	21	65
Irvine	Culver Dr	2-180.50	2	19	21	··············· 66
Dept. of Transp.	State Rt 83	B-520.10	5	16	21	67
San Diego	Imperial Ave	36D-3.1-B	ı	20	21	68
Santa Barbara County	Hollister Ave	E-365.7-B	5	16	21	69
Claremont	Spt Relocation	BB0-514.71	17	3	20	70
Sacramento	28th St	A-91.0	7	13	20	71
Fontana	Sierra Ave	2-88.7	8	12	20	72
Anaheim	State College	2-170.30	2	18	20	73
Oroville	Huntoon St	4-202.02-B	5	15	20	74
Oroville	Bridge St	4-205.3-A	6	14	20	75
Fremont	Durham Rd	DA-34.20	1	18	19	76
San Jose	Bernal Road	E-61.00	1	18	19	77

APPENDIX E Page 5 of 6

Priority List of Grade Separation Projects or Alterations Fiscal Year 1975-76

Agency	Grossing Name	Mile <u>Post</u>	V x T 0 x 24	SCF	Priority Index Number	Priority Number
Oceanside	Oceanside Lyr	2-225.9	2	17	19	78
Dept. of Transp.	State Rt 49	AI-126.3-B	13	6	19	79
Norwalk	Imperial Hwy	BK-498.0	3	15	18	80
Los Angeles	Tampa Ave	E-448.8	5	13	18	81
Redding	South St	C-258.0	2	16	18	82
Dept. of Transp.	State Rt 41	B-205.9	4	14	18	83
Dept. of Transp.	State Rt 111	B-611.45	2	16=	18	84
Rielto	Riverside Ave	2-84.80	4	13	17	85
Livernore	East First St	D-47.2	5	12	17.	86
Orange County	Crown Valley	2-193.1-A	15	2	17	87
Popona	Dudley St	B-513.00	2	15	17	. 88
Compton	Rosecrans	BG-493.3	3	13	16	89.
Richmond	Pt Pinole Pk	A-19.30	8	8	16	90
Orange County	Los Alisos	2-190.70	7	9	16	91
Torrance	Spt Relocation	880-500.73	10	4	14	92
Ontario	Grove Ave	3-39.00	3	11	14	93
Dept. of Transp.	State Rt 19	BBL-497.37	5	8	13	94
Corona	Lincoln Ave	2B-25.20	6	7	13	95
San Marcos	Twin Oaks Vly	2E-16.50	3	9	12	96
and the second of the second o						

APPENDIX E Page 6 of 6

Priority List of Grado Separation Projects or Alterations Fiscal Year 1975-76

<u>Agénoy</u>	Crossing Name	Mile Post	V x T C x 24	<u>scr</u>	Priority Index Number	Priority Number
Los Angeles County	190th St	2H-19.1-B	5	7	12	97
Los Angeles County	Century Frwy	BB0-491.19	3	8	11	98
Dept. of Transp.	State Rt 112	4-14.75		10	11	99
Brea	Birch St	BBJ-509.31	. 0	9	9	100
San Diego	Smythe Ave	36-13.8	1	8	9	101
Pittsburg	Pittsburg Rml	8N-1.85	4	4	8	102
Huntington Beach	Ellis Ave	BAA-522.09	0	7	7	103
Dept. of Transp.	State Rt 17	2K-1.15-0	3	3	6	104
Marin County	Ignacio Bd	5-24.60	1	4	5	105