FBN/11

Decision No. 87495 June 21, 1977

BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

In the Matter of the Application) of PAUL SIMON, doing business as) SIMON TRUCKING, for authority) to deviate from certain minimum) rates pursuant to Section 3666 of) the California Public Utilities) Code for transportation performed) for POTTERS INDUSTRIES INC.)

+

Application No. 56921 (Filed December 3, 1976) (Amended February 18, 1977)

ORIGINAL

OPINION AND ORDER

By this application, as amended, Paul Simon, doing business as Simon Trucking, requests authority to deviate from the provisions of Minimum Rate Tariff 2 in connection with the transportation of glass highway marking strip spheres for Potters Industries Inc. from Anaheim to all points in California.

The application, as amended, is based on special circumstances and conditions detailed therein.

The application and amendment were listed on the Commission's Daily Calendar of December 9, 1976, and February 23 and 24, 1977, respectively. California Trucking Association (CTA) opposed the ex parte consideration, as proposed, stating:

> "... Application does not contain sufficient information to enable the Commission to determine whether the proposed ratings are related to the costs of performing the service at issue. Purchased transportation accounts for over 30 percent of carrier's operating expense for the first half of 1976; however, no supporting costs have been furnished. Also, Applicant's costs have not been included as a part of the Application ...

"... Costs indicated are lump sum with no indication as to their source or accuracy. Vehicle fixed expenses appear to be understated with a total cost of only \$10,675 for both tractor and trailer, and including tire costs..."

-1-

A. 56921 - jl

Applicant indicates in its amended application that it does not intend to engage subhaulers in connection with the transportation involved herein.

Milton W. Flack, attorney for applicant, replied to CTA's protest stating:

"I am advised by the applicant that the vehicle fixed expenses are not understated and that they reflect equipment utilized in this operation which is old and therefore representative of their value.

"⁵³" It should be noted that no protests to this application have been filed by other carriers, that no diversion of traffic is involved, the shipper is the sole California manufacture (sic) of this product and the nature of these shipments will result in savings to the carrier. The applicant has satisfied all of the Commission requirements with respect to cost and revenue data. Further delay in a decision on this application is not justified and is not in the best interests of the carrier or the shipper."

Revenue and expense data submitted in the application and amendment thereto are sufficient to determine that the transportation involved may reasonably be expected to be profitable under the proposed rates.

In the circumstances, the Commission finds that applicant's proposal is reasonable. A public hearing is not necessary. The Commission concludes that the application should be granted as set forth in the ensuing order and the effective date of this order should be the date hereof because there is an immediate need for this rate relief.

IT IS ORDERED that:

1. Paul Simon is authorized to perform the transportation shown in Appendix A attached hereto and by this reference made a part hereof at not less than the rates set forth therein.

-2-

1

A. 56921 - jl

0

2. The authority granted herein shall expire one year after the effective date of this order unless sooner cancelled, modified or extended by further order of the Commission.

The effective date of this order is the date hereof. Dated at <u>San Francisco</u>, California, this <u>2/2</u> day of <u>IUNE</u>, 1977.

President William

Commissioners

Commissioner Robert Batinovich. being necessarily absent. did not participate in the disposition of this proceeding.

T-99,473

A. 56921

APPENDIX A

Paul Simon is authorized to transport spheres, highway marking strip, glass (as described in Item 177260 of National Motor Freight Classification NMF 100-D) for Potters Industries Inc. from Anaheim to all points in California at rates which are subject to the following ratings and conditions:

<u>Class Ratings</u>	Minimum Weights
50.1	Any Quantity
35	30,000 Pounds
35.1	36,000 Pounds
35.2	42,000 Pounds
35-3	45,000 Pounds

Conditions:

i.

- 1. Shipments shall be power loaded by shipper and power unloaded by the consignee without assistance of, or expense to, the carrier.
- 2. Applicant has indicated that subhaulers will not be engaged nor have any costs of subhaulers been submitted. Therefore, if subhaulers are employed, they shall be paid no less than the rates authorized herein without any deduction for use of applicant's trailing equipment.
- 3. In all other respects, the rates and rules in Minimum Rate Tariff 2 shall apply.

(END OF APPENDIX A)

Appendix B lists, in alphabetical order, the projects nominated for the 1977-78 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 for 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 Conditions 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:

- 1. 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 $\frac{V \times T}{C \times 2L}$ 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.

-13-

The Commission found in Decision No. 85991 that the staff should consider the proposals relating to the use of "State of Readiness" as criteria and present its findings to the Commission prior to the commencement of proceedings to determine the 1977-78 Grade Separation Priority List. Prior to the present proceedings, the Commission's Legal Division prepared a memorandum expressing the opinion that "State of Readiness" cannot be considered as a factor, and this position was subsequently adopted by Commission resolution; therefore, no consideration will be given to "State of Readiness" in these proceedings.

The Commission further found in Decision No. 85991 that when it was established that an agency would not be able to meet the requirements of the California Highway Commission for the filing of an application for an allocation of funds by the February 14 deadline, such project would be included on the list with an asterisk by its priority number. In addition thereto, the Commission found that the Highway Commission should consider the admissions made during the course of hearing that the projects will not be able to meet all of the requirements for an allocation by the February 14th date as waivers and should consider for allocation purposes projects lower on the list that are ready to proceed. The same procedure, with the same recommendations to the Highway Commission, will be followed this year and each year hereafter. Our current recommendations do, of course, reflect the present April 1 administrative deadline. (21 Cal. Adm. Code 1552.)

During the course of hearing, a number of motions were made. For the most part, they were directed towards proposed crossings. In Decision No. 83066 dated June 21, 1974 in Case No. 9603 the Commission recognized that in many instances an at-grade crossing could never be constructed at or near the site of the proposed separation, and, therefore, the projects could not

-14-

•

properly be considered as proposed at-grade crossings nominated for separation. As a result, the Commission found that in future years the Type B projects (proposed crossings nominated for separation) should be subtyped as follows: (1) A grade crossing is practical and feasible, and (2) a grade crossing is not practical nor feasible.

In Decision No. 85991 several projects were omitted from the list where the nominating witness specifically testified that construction of a proposed crossing at grade was not practical nor feasible. The same procedure will again be followed, but, in addition, we will consider the factual situation of certain projects, notwithstanding supporting testimony that construction of at-grade proposed crossings would be practical and feasible. In particular, this would relate to the Saticoy Street project of the city of Los Angeles and the Highway 111 project in Indio, which was nominated by Caltrans. The Truxtun Avenue project of Bakersfield would also have been questionable, but the city by lated-filed Exhibit 22 revised its nomination by proposing an at-grade crossing approximately 900 feet to the west of the railroad's yard at a point crossing a single track where construction would be practical and feasible.

Both the Saticoy Street and State Highway 111 separations would cross railroad yards. The locations of the separations and the respective locations of the proposed at-grade crossings would be the same in each instance. No alternate proposed at-grade crossings were considered.

-15-

The proposed site of the Saticoy Street grade separation would cross 13 tracks consisting of 1 main-line track, 1 passing track, and 11 siding or spur tracks. According to the testimony of the nominating witness, the tracks generate 2 passenger movements per day. The 116 total moves result in 182 minutes delay each day, exclusive of the time that the trains are left standing. In the photographs attached to the nomination there are 5 tracks blocked by standing trains. Many trains are of a length sufficient to block the entire track. The city witness was of the opinion that the railroad could alter its operations, although no specific recommendations were made.

The proposed site of the State Highway 111 grade separation crosses over 11 tracks consisting of 2 main-line tracks, 6 passing tracks, and 3 siding or spur tracks. The 11 tracks generate only 38 train movements, but result in 340 total minutes of delay. The pictures attached to the nomination show 2 tracks blocked by standing trains.

Based upon the record established in this proceeding, it does not appear likely that an agency would seriously pursue an application for authority to construct at-grade crossings at these locations. It is our opinion, therefore, that at-grade crossings at these particular sites would be neither practical nor feasible.

In its opening brief, Caltrans argued that the nomination by the city of Fremont regarding the Durham Road/Grimmer Boulevard separations is not a single project because the proposed crossing at Furham Road has no relation to the crossings of Prune Avenue and Warm Springs Boulevard, which would be closed if the separation is constructed. In its closing brief Caltrans indicated that this matter may have been resolved in last year's proceedings by Decision No. 85991. The nomination was accepted by the Commission last year as a single project and will be so considered for this year's list.

-16-

1.5- -

Caltrans and the staff take issue with the revised nomination by the city of Newark. As initally submitted, the city of Newark nominated three separate projects, namely:

- (1) The proposed elimination of the Elm Street, Locust Street, and Spruce Street grade crossings.
- (2) The proposed Newark Boulevard Grade Separation.
- (3) The proposed Cedar Boulevard Underpass.

During the hearing, the city of Newark revised its first two projects by consolidating them into a single project. No showing was made that the projects are not severable nor that any cost savings would result by consolidation. The only apparent reason for the consolidation is to achieve a higher position on the list. Because there has been no relation established between the proposed Newark Boulevard Grade Separations and the proposed elimination of the Elm Street, Locust Street, and Spruce Street grade crossings, they will be considered as separate projects.

SP moved to strike the "A" Street project nominated by the city of Hayward on the ground that the city failed to include all costs in its estimate of the separation project. The city of Hayward has indicated that the Santa Clara Street realignment on the western terminus of the project will be included in a widening project which will be financed with federal funds. Although the realignment is a necessary part of the separation, it is also a necessary part of a separate project to improve the intersection at Hathaway Avenue. The realignment project will be completed long before the grade separation project goes to construction. On the eastern terminus the city has scaled down the separation project to only that necessary to conform to the existing "A" Street alignment.

According to the Order Instituting Investigation establishing Case No. 10214, failure to appear before the Commission to substantiate a project constitutes grounds for exclusion from the 1977-78 Priority List. The city of Seaside nominated the relocation of Contra Costa/Olympia, but failed to appear before the Commission at their assigned time.

-17-

Subsequent to submission, Caltrans informed the Commission that the following projects have received funds from the 1976-77 priority list: (1) State Route 17 (Richmond), (2) Tlgh-Sta Fe (Santa Fe Springs), (3) Miner Avenue (Stockton), (4) Quick Road (Imperial County), (5) Bear Valley (San Bernardino County), (6) Huntoon (Oroville), (7) Florence-SFS (Los Angeles County), and (8) Waterfront Road (Contra Costa County). In addition, the city of Livermore secured federal funds for East First Street Project and began construction prior to May 2, 1977. Findings

1. The Commission adopts the criteria set forth in Appendices B, C, and D attached hereto for use in establishing the 1977-78 priority list.

2. "State of Readiness" will not be considered as a factor. Those projects that will not be able to meet all of the requirements for an allocation of funds by April 1, 1978 will be included on the list with an asterisk by their priority number in Appendix E, the admissions made during the course of hearing that the projects will not be able to meet all of the requirements for an allocation of funds by April 1, 1978 should be considered as waivers, and the California Highway Commission should consider for allocation purposes projects lower on the list that are ready to proceed.

3. Where the supporting testimony of the nominating witness clearly establishes that construction of a proposed crossing is not practical and feasible, the project should be excluded from the list. The record so indicates in the case of the following projects: 190th Torrance (county of Los Angeles), Madera Road (city of Simi Valley), Lincoln Avenue (city of Corona), and South Street (city of San Luis Obispo).

-18-

4. Based upon the evidence introduced in this proceeding, construction of proposed grade crossings at the proposed separation sites in the case of the Saticoy Street project nominated by the city of Los Angeles and the State Highway 111 project in the city of Indio nominated by Caltrans would not be practical and feasible and said projects will be excluded from the list.

5. Because the city of Newark failed to establish any relation between its proposed Newark Boulevard grade separation and the proposed elimination of the Elm Street, Locust Street, and Spruce Street grade crossings, they will be considered as separate projects.

6. The city of Hayward has presented a reasonable estimate of the cost of its "A" Street project.

7. The city of Seaside did not appear in support of its Contra Costa/Olympia crossing relocation project. The project will, therefore, be excluded from the list.

8. The criteria or rules of the Commission established for usein determining the 1977-78 priority list are subject to modification, and the Commission invites the participation of interested parties to offer their recommendations.

9. The list set out in Appendix E will be established as the 1977-78 Grade Separation Priority List established in accordance with Section 2452 of the Streets and Highways Code.

10. With regard to projects having the same priority index number, consideration shall 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 shall be given to the lowest cost project in order that the maximum number of projects may be accomplished with the available funds.

As the statute requires our order by July 1, the effective date of the order will be the date of signing.

-19-

$O \underline{R} \underline{D} \underline{E} \underline{R}$

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 1977-78 list, in order of priority, of projects which the Commission determines to be most urgently in need of separation or alteration.

2. The Executive Director shall furnish a full, true, and correct copy of this opinion and order to the Transportation Division.

The effective date of this order is the date hereof. Dated at <u>San Francisco</u>, California, this <u>JUNE</u>, 1977.

sident

Commissioners.

Commissioner Robert Batimovich, being necessarily absent, did not participate in the disposition of this proceeding. C.10214 bw/ddb

APPENDIX A

LIST OF APPEARANCES

Interested Parties: <u>Ralph E. Kirkup</u> and <u>George J. Bagdon</u>, for City of Burlingame; <u>George E. Cook</u>, for City of San Carlos; <u>Mark L. Kermit</u>, for Contra Costa County; <u>Robert G. Bezzant</u>, for City of San Mateo; Joseph L. Shilts, for City of Fairfield; Ron Peterson, for Fresno County; Carl Arness, for City of Redding; Ralph Van Heerden and Ronald W. Miller, for City of Stockton; Alfred A. Smith, for City of Dunsmuir; Allen E. Sprague, Attorney at Law, and Thomas M. Blalock, for City of Fremont; Arnold Joens, for City of Salinas; DeLeuw, Cather & Co., by <u>Robert M. Barton</u>, for City of Livermore; <u>Richard W.</u> Turnlund, for City of Newark; James Lundgren, for City of Hayward; <u>Allen H. Kelm</u>, for Los Angeles County Road Department; Hayward; Allen H. Kelm, for Los Angeles County Road Department; Juan Mijiares, for City of Barstow; William D. Gardner, Attorney at Law, for City of Riverside; Charles Wagner, for City of Bakersfield; Ted W. Shettler, for City of San Gabriel; G. Brent Muchow, for City of Irvine; Gary Taylor, for City of Oceanside; Edward R. James, for City of Ontario; Eldon K. Lee, for City of Indio; Willdan Associates, by Gary P. Dysart and Frederick A. Roos, for City of Norwalk; William L. Zaun, for County of Orange; Paul E. Landell, Jr., for City of San Luis Obispo; Daniel B. Pavao, for County of Imperial; Jon D. Edson, for City of Corona; Michael Anthony Caccese, for Santa Barbara County Department of Transportation; John C. Miller, for Western Pacific Railroad: O. J. Solander, Attorney at Law, Western Pacific Railroad; O. J. Solander, Attorney at Law, and Don R. Higgins, for California Department of Transportation; Harold S. Lentz, Attorney at Law, for Southern Pacific Transportation Company and affiliated companies; James G. Galanis, Jr., for San Bernardino County; Leslie E. Corkill, for Department of Public Utilities & Transportation, City of Los Angeles; Burt Pines, City Attorney, by Leonard L. Snaider, Deputy City Attorney, and <u>Pat Davenport</u>, for City of Los Angeles; <u>Gene Rodini</u>, for City of Richmond; <u>Harold Kroegar</u>, for City of Croville; <u>Allan J. Savitz</u>, for City of Chico; <u>Harold W.</u> <u>McDonald</u>, for Butte County; <u>David Tuomey</u>, for City of San <u>Diego; Eugene Bourdonnis</u>, for City of Torrance; <u>Paul Singer</u>, for City of Angheim; William A. Johnson, for City for City of Anaheim; William A. Johnson, for City of Simi Valley; and <u>Clen Danielson</u>, for City of Santa Fe Springs.

Commission Staff: Robert W. Stich.

APPENDIX B Page 1 of 5

Alphabetical List of Projects by Nominating Agency													
Agency	Crossing <u>Name</u>	RR	BR	Mile Post	<u>Suf</u>	Prop	Type Proj	Veh Volume	Train <u>Volum</u> e	Project <u>Cost</u>	<u>V x T</u> C x 24		
Anaheim	Lincoln Ave	1	BK	508.5			1	23900	20	4100000	5		
Anaheim	Lincoln Ave	2		167.7			1	17800	24	2900000	6		
Anaheim	Katella Ave	1	BK	512.4			1	29600	44	3180000	17		
Bakersfield	Truxtun Ave	2		889.25		¥	2A	6700	86	1000000	24		
Barstow	First St	2		746.5	A		4	9925	70	3628000	8		
Burlingame	Broadway	01	E	15.2			1	26300	66	4457000	16		
Butte County	Baggett-Mrys	4		202.7			3	1532	136	400000	22		
Caltrans	49-Placer Co	1	AI	126.3	В		4	19900	16	1395000	10		
Caltrans	237-Snta Clra	1	L	39.8			1	32000	16	4680000	5		
Caltrans	So 47th St	1	A	13.1			1	12000	52	6400000	4		
Caltrans	41-Fresno	1	B	205.9			1	13000	32	6213000	4 3		
Caltrans	84-Yolo Co	1	A	87.5	8	¥	2A	10000	52	1779000	12		
Caltrans	111-Indo	1	B	611,45	A	¥	2B	8100	38	2552000	5		
Caltrans	180-Fresno	2		997.8			1	20000	30	4779000	5		
Caltrans	70-Marysville	1	C	141.7	B		4	12700	50	5302000	-		
Caltrans	79-Beaumont	1	B	562,4	1		1	7100	20 41	1745000	5		
Caltrans	237-Mt View	1	E	37.1	A		4	23500	41 54	2480000	7		
Caltrans	138-Sn Brndo	2		60.9			1	3800	38	2389000 2389000	21 3		

ł



.

APPENDIX B Page 2 of 5

Alphabetical List of Projects by Nominating Agency

Agency	Crossing Name	RR	BR	Mile Post	<u>Suf</u>	Prop	Type Proj	Veh <u>Volume</u>	Train <u>Volume</u>	Project <u>Cost</u>	$\frac{V \times T}{C \times 24}$
Caltrans	112-Sn Leando	1	L	14.9			1	19900	105	5186000	17
Chico	Dayton Rd	1	C	183.8			3	1080	24	450000	2
Contra Costa County	Somersville	1	B	52.10			1	10642	23	1732000	6
Corona	Lincoln Ave	2	В	25.2		×	28	10000	30	2673000	5
Dunsmuir	Scherrer-Btfy	1	C	321.7			1	1527	40	754000	3
Fairfield	Hain-Rio Vata	1	A	49.0			1	15920	44	4250000	7
Fremont	Durham-Grimer	1	DA	34+7			1	17102	45	4690000	7
Fresno County	Chestnut Ave	1	B	210.3			1	6090	26	3247000	2
Hayward	A St	l	D	20.0			1	28200	45	6246000	8
Hayward	A St	4		20.2			1	21400	18	5006000	3
Indio	Monroe St	1	B	609.7			1	12232	49	4645000	5
Irvine	Irvine Lwr	2		180,5			1	34123	16	11963000	2
Los Angeles County	190th-Torrnce	2	H	19,1	В	¥	2B	20603	14	3019000	4
Los Angeles County	Rt 105 R1c	1	BBL	491.91			3	133101	4	27500000	1
Los Angeles County	Hollywood Way	1	В	469.4			1	26446	14	5716000	3
Los Angeles County	Greenwood-Mtb	2		149.5			1	12218	46	3385000	2



APPENDIX B Page 3 of 5

Alphabetical List of Projects by Nominating Agency

Agency	Croseing Name	RR	BR	Mile Post	<u>Suf</u>	Prop	Type <u>Proj</u>	Veh <u>Volume</u>	Train <u>Volume</u>	Project Cost	<u>V x T</u> C x 24
Los Angeles County	Grand-Industy	1	В	508.5		¥	2A	9000	39	3484000	4
Los Angeles County	Flornce-Hunpk	1	80	488.3			1	26669	14	4653000	3
Los Angeles County	Flornce-SFSpr	2		154.87		¥	2A	20000	44	24,89000	15
Los Angeles County	Eastern-Comm	2		147.3			l	15544	44	1747000	16
Los Angeles County	Alondra-La Mr	2		159.6			1	15121	65	6250000	7
Los Angeles	Saticoy St	l	Е	455.6		¥	28	23000	116	4499000	25
Los Angeles	Winnetka Ave	1	Е	447.8		¥	2A	17000	14	3506000	3
Newark	Newark Consld	1	DAB	36.7			3	0	35	180000	0
Newark	Newark Blvd	1	DAB	38.1		*	2A	9500	19	1250000	6
Newark	Cedar Blvd	1	L	30.0			1	4300	24	800000	5
Norwalk	Imperial Hwy	1	BK	498.0			1	38126	8	2465000	5
Oceanside	H111 St	2	E	0.3			1	23400	2	3300000	í
Oceanside	Wisconsin Lwr	2		226.8			1	9614	30	3245000	4
Oceanside	Downtown Lwr	2		226,1			1	11840	53	4785000	5
Oceanside	Cassidy St	2		228,0			1	5228	16	3010000	í
Oceanside	Oceanside Lwr	2		225.9			1	24251	38	7810000	- 5
Ontario	Euclid Ave	1	В	520.1			1	21554	48	6085000	7

C-10214 dd5

APPE	ND)	IX E	}
Page	4	of	5

Alphabetical List of Projects by Nominating Agency													
Agency	Crossing Name	RR	BR	Hile <u>Fost</u>	<u>Suf</u>	Prop	Type <u>Proj</u>	Veh Volume	Train <u>Yolume</u>	Project Cost	<u>V. x T</u> C x 24		
Ontario	Grove Ave	3		39.0			l	13520	14	303100 0	3		
Orange County	Crown Valley	2		193.1	A		4	19300	20	58000 ()	28		
Redding	South St	1	C	258.0			1	8850	31	5111000	2		
Richmond	23rd St	1	A	14.5			1	17500	34	620500¢	4		
Riverside	Van Buren Bd	2	B	16.4			1	21500	31	2262000	12		
Riverside	Arlington Ave	2	В	12.4			1	23290	31	3750000	8		
Salinas	Market-Front	1	E	118.45			1	29407	60	6250000	12		
Santa Barbara County	Hollister Ave	1	E	365.7	B		4	15075	17	1800000	6		
Santa Fe Springs	Carmenita Rd	2		157.3			1	16252	44	3193000	9		
San Bernardino County	Cherry Ave	2		91.7			1	7520	62	1900000	10		
San Bernardino County	Barton Rd	1	BJ	541.1	A		4	4600	2	1200000	0		
San Carlos	Holly St	1	Б	23.2			1	19500	62	5805000	9		
San Carlos	Brittan Ave	1	Е	23.8			l	13350	62	4885000	7		
San Diego	Imperial Ave	36	D	3.1	B		4	9600	2	926000	1		
San Diego	Harbor Dr	2		268.9	A		4	12200	36	2494000	7		
San Diego	Smythe Ave	36		13.8			1	3100	2	1800000	0		
San Gabriel	San Gabriel	1	8	490.2			1	64950	42	12563000	9		

C-10214

APPE	D)	IX E	3
Page	5	0ſ	5

Alphabetical List of Projects by Nominating Agency													
<u>Agency</u> San Luis Obispo San Luis Obispo San Mateo Seaside Simi Valley Torrance	Crossing <u>Name</u> South St Orcutt Rd Laurie Meadow Cnta Csta-Oly Madera Rd	<u>RR</u> 1 1 1 1	BR E E E E E E E E	Mile Post 252.5 253.3 21.1 123.35 432.0	<u>Suf</u>	Prop * *	Nomina Type Proj 2B 1 2A 3 2B	Veh <u>Volume</u> 6000 7400 5000 0	Train Volume 13 13 64 6	Project Cost 3410000 2140000 4300000 795000	$\frac{V \times T}{C \times 2}$ 1 2 3 0		
Torrance Torrance	Torrance Rlc Del Amo Blvd Crenshaw Blvd	1 2 2	BBG . H H	500.73 19.5 20.9		*	26 3 2A 1	17997 53600 20000 42800	20 4 36 35	1962000 810000 2830000 1525000	8 11 11 41		

а 2 C-10214 ddb

.

APPENDIX C Page 1 of 5

Special Conditions Pactors for Grade Crossings	
iominated for Separations or Elimination	

Agency	Crossing <u>Name</u>	RR	BR	Mile <u>Post</u>	<u>Suf</u>	Prop	Veh Spd Limit <u>Gl</u>	Train Speed <u>G2</u>	Xing Geom <u>03</u>	Veh Delay <u>G4</u>	Alt Rte <u>G5</u>	Acc Hist <u>U6</u>	Irr <u>07</u>	Total <u>SCF</u>
Anaheim	Lincoln Ave	1	BK	508.5			1	0	3	2	0	1	7	14
Ansheim	Lincoln Ave	2		167.7			0	5	2	2	0	2	6	17
Anaheim	Katella Ave	1	ВK	512.4			1	0	2	10	5	~ 0	8	26
Bakersfield	Truxtun Ave	2		889.25		¥	5	3	0	10	4	õ	6	28
Burlingame	Broadway	01	Е	15.2			0	5	2	6	4	õ	10	27.
Butte County	Baggett-Mrys	4		202.7			0	2	4	10	5	ì	7	29 29
Caltrans	237-Snta Clra	1	L	39.8			5	4	2	1	4	2	9	27 ·
Caltrans	So 47th St	1	A	13.1			0	3	2	5	4	~ 10	10	21 · 34
Caltrans	41-Fresno	1	В	205.9			0	4	3	2	0	3	8	24 20
Caltrans	84-Yolo Co	1	A	87.5	В	¥	3	1	0	5	3	0	3	15
Caltrans	111-Indo	1	В	611.45	A	¥	4	1	0	10	2	õ	6	23
Caltrans	180-Fresno	2		997.8			0 0	0	2	4	ĩ	8	8	23
Caltrans	79-Beaumont	1	В	562.4			1	3	2	5	1	2	8	22
Caltrans	138-Sn Brndo	2		60.9			5	í	~ 4	5	5	8	6	22 34
Caltrans	112–Sn Leando	1	L	14.9			ì	0	2	10	3	7		
Chico	Dayton Rd	1	C	183.8			1	1	4	4) 0	0	11 6	34 16

C-10214 ddb

APPENDIX C Page 2 of 5

Special Conditions Factors for Grade Crossings Nominated for Separation or Elimination

Agency	Crossing Name	RR	BR	Mile Post	Suf	Prop	Veh Spd Limit <u>Gl</u>	Train Speed <u>G2</u>	Xing Geom <u>G3</u>	Veh Delay <u>G4</u>	Alt Rte <u>G5</u>	Acc Hist <u>G6</u>	Irr <u>G7</u>	* Total <u>SCF</u>
Contra Costa County	Somersville	1	B	52.10			5	2	2	0	3	3	6	21
Corona	Lincoln Ave	2	B	25.2		¥	2	1	0	0	2	0	3	8
Dunsmuir	Scherrer-Rtfy	1	C	321.7			0	0	5	10	5	1	12	33
Fairfield	Main-Rio Vsta	1	A	49.0			0	5	4	9	3	4	11	36.
Fremont	Durham-Grimer	1	DA	34•7			3	2	4	6	5	6	12	38
Fresno County	Chestnut Ave	1	В	210.3			2	5	3	4	1	2	8	25
Hayward	A St	1	D	20.0			0	1	3	2	3	10	11	30
Hayward	A St	4		20.2			0	4	5	0	1	2	8	20
Indio	Monroe St	1	В	609.7			1	1	3	4	5	2	9	25
Irvine	Irvine Lwr	2		108.5			5	5	3	1	2	3	10	29
Los Angeles County	190th-Tormce	2	Н	19.1	В	¥	1	1	0	1	0	0	5	8
Los Angeles County	Rt 105 R1c	1	BBL	491.91			1	0	2	0	0	17	8	28
Los Angeles County	Hollywood Way	1	В	469.4			3	3	3	0	3	3	9	24
Los Angeles County	Greenwood-Mtb	2		149.5			1	4	3	3	3	3	8	25
Los Angeles County	Grand-Industy	1	В	508.5		¥	3	4	0	4	5	0	4	20
Los Angeles County	Flornce-Hunpk	1	BG	488.3			1	0	3	1	2	4	6	17

C-10214 dab *

APPENDIX C Page 3 of 5

.

Special Conditions Factors for Grade Crossings Nominated for Separation or Elimination														400	
Agency	Crossing <u>Name</u>	RR	BR	Mile <u>Post</u>	<u>Suf</u>	Prop	Veh Spd Limit <u>Gl</u>	Train Speed 	Xing Geom <u>G3</u>	Veh Delay <u>G4</u>	Alt Rte <u>G5</u>	Acc Hist <u>G6</u>	Irr <u>G7</u>	Total <u>SCF</u>	
Los Angeles County	Eastern-Comm	2		147.3			1	4	2	3	3	2	7	22	
Los Angeles County	Alondra-La Mr	2		159.6			4	5	3	6	5	1	9	33	
Los Angeles	Saticoy St	1	B	455.6		¥	2	4	0	9	2	0	5	22	
Los Angeles	Winnetka Ave	1	Е	447.8		¥	1	4	0	1	2	0	6	14 .	
Newark	Newark Consld	1	DAB	36.7			0	2	3	4	0	1	4	14	
Newark	Newark Blvd	1	DAB	38.1		¥	1	1	0	3	1	0	7	13	
Newark	Cedar Blvd	1	L	30.0			1	1	2	3	2	0	2	16	
Norwalk	Imperial Hwy	1	BK	498.0			2	1	3	2	2	2	8	20	
Oceanside	Hill St	2	E	0.3			1	0	3	0	1	2	3	10	
Oceanside	Wisconsin Lwr	2		226.8			0)	4	2	2	5	6	20	
Oceanside	Downtown Lwr	2		226.1			0	1	3	6	2	7	7	26	
Oceanside	Cassidy St	2		228.0			0	4	2	1	3	0	4	14	
Oceanside	Oceanside Lwr	2		225.9			0	1	4	4	2	12	9	32	
Ontario	Euclid Ave	1	B	520.1			1	4	2	6	1	3	11	28	
Ontario	Grove Ave	3		39.0			5	4	3	1	2	Ó	5	20	
Redding	South St	1	C	258.0			0	2	3	3	2	3	7	20	

C-10214

.

APPE	ND)	IX (3
Page	4	of	5

Special Conditions Factors for Grade Crossings Nominated for Separation Elimination

Agency	Crossing liane	RR	BR	Mile Post	<u>Suf</u>	Prop	Veh Spd Limit <u>Cl</u>	Train Speed <u>G2</u>	Xing Geom <u>G3</u>	Veh Delay <u>G4</u>	Alt Rte <u>G5</u>	Acc Hist <u>C6</u>	Irr <u>67</u>	Total SCF
Richmond	23rd St	1	A	14.5			0	3	4	3	1	6	8	25
Riverside	Van Buren Bd	2	B	16.4			2	3	5	2	1	4	9	26
Riverside	Arlington Ave	2	В	12.4			1	2	5	3	1	5	9	26
Salinas	Narket-Front	1	E	118,45			0	0	3	1	1	18	13	36
Santa Fe Springs	Carmenita Rd	2		157.3			3	4	3	3	3	9	6	31
San Bernardino County	Cherry Ave	2		91.7			4	5	2	6	5	6	6	34
San Carlos	Holly St	1	E	23.2			0	4	2	4	4	6	10	30
San Carlos	Brittan Ave	1	E	23.8			1	4	2	3	3	1	8	22
San Diego	Smythe Ave	36		13.8			0	1	4	0	1	0	4	10
San Gabriel	San Gabriel	1	B	490.2			0	1	4	5	2	š	12	29
San Luis Obispo	South St	1	Е	252.5		¥	0	0	0	2	3	ó	5	~/ 10
San Luis Obispo	Orcutt Rd	1	E	253.3			1	1	4	2	5	õ	7	20
San Mateo	Laurie Meadow	ı	Е	21.1		¥	1	5	0	3	3	0	4	16
Seaside	Cnta Csta-Oly	1	EE	123.35			0	0	° 3	0	2	õ	4	8
Simi Valley	Madera Rd	1	E	432.0		¥	5	š	0	10	5		-	
Torrance	Torrance Rlc	1	BBG	500.73			2	0	3	2	3	0 3	4 6	27 19

C-10214 ddb

APPEI	YD)	IX (;
Page	5	of	5

C-10214 dab

.

.

P

		Special Conditions Paci- Nominated for Separat	tors for Grade tion or Elimin	Crossi ation	ngs					
io.	Crossing	Mile	Veh Spd Limit			Veh Dol en	Alt	Acc	_	

<u>Agency</u> Torrance	Crossing <u>Name</u>	RR	BR	Mile Post	<u>Suf</u>	Prop	Veh Spd Limit <u>01</u>		Xing Geom <u>03</u>	Delay		Acc Hist <u>G6</u>	Irr <u>07</u>	Total SCF
	Del Amo Blvd	2	н	19.5		¥	3	0	0	2	2	~	-	
Torrance	Crenshaw Blyd	2	н	20.9			2		v	ſ	~	U	5	17
		~		~~+7			3	0	3	2	5	4	8	25

.

APPENDIX D

,

٠

~...

Special Conditions Factors for Separations Nominated for Alteration or Reconstruction

Agency	. Crossing <u>Name</u>	RR	BR	Mile <u>Post</u>	<u>Suf</u>	Prop	Width Clear <u>Sl</u>	Height Clear <u>S2</u>	Speed Reduc S3	Load Limit <u>S4</u>	Acc Struc S5	Irr <u>36</u>	Total SCF
Barstow	First St	2		746.5	A		6	0	2	5	10		
Caltrans	49-Placer Co	1	AI	126.3	В		0					6	29
Caltrans	70-Marysville	1	C	141.7	-			0	0	0	0	5	5
Caltrans	-			_	B		4	4 .	5	0	2	8	23
	237-Mt View).	8	37-1	Å		0	0	0	0	3	5	8
Imperial County	Quick Rd	1	B	728.3	B		6	10	5	0	10	9	
Orange County	Crown Valley	2		193.1	A		0	0	5	ŏ	8	8	40
Santa Barbara County	Hollister Ave	1	E	365.7	B		0	0	•	-			21
San Bernardino County	Barton Rd	1	BJ	541.1					2	0	10	8	20
San Diego					A		6	0	0	0	0	4	10
U	Imperial Ave	36	D	3.1	В		10	4	0	0	2	9	25
,San Diego	Harbor Dr	2		268.9	A		6	0	0	0	1	10	~) 17

C-10214 dab

APPENDIX E Page 1 of 6

Projects Nominated by Priority Index Number

Agency	Crossing <u>Name</u>	<u>RR</u>	BR	Mile <u>Post</u>	<u>Suf</u>	Prop	$\frac{V \times T}{C \times 24}$	<u>SCF</u>	Priority Index <u>Number</u>	Priority <u>Number</u>
Torrance	Creushaw Blvd	2	н	20.9			41	25	66	1
Bakersfield	Truxtun Ave	2		889.25		¥	24	28	52	2
Butte County	Baggett-Mrys	4		202.7			22	29	51	2
Caltrans	112-Sn Leando	1	L	14.9			17	34	51	4
Orange County	Crown Valley	2		193,1	A		28	21	49	5
Salinas	Market-Front	1	E	118,45			12	36	48	6
Fremont	Durham-Grimer	1	DA	34.7			7	38	45	о 7
San Bernardino County	Cherry Ave	2		91.7			10	34	44	8
Anaheim	Katella Ave	1	BK	512.4			17	26	43	9
Fairfield	Main-Rio Vsta	1	A	49.0			7	36	43	10
Burlingame	Broadway	1	E	15.2			16	27	43	11

- .

•

2

C-10214 ddb *

V

APPENDIX E Page 2 of 6

Projects Nominated by Priority Index Number

Agency	Crossing <u>Name</u>	RR	Mile <u>BR</u> Post	$\frac{V \times T}{Suf Prop} \xrightarrow{C \times 24}$	<u>SCF</u>	Priority Index Number	Priority <u>Number</u>
Santa Pe Springs	Carmenita Rd	2	157.3	9	31	40	12
Los Angeles County	Alondra-La Mr	2	159.6	7	33	40	13
San Carlos	Holly St	1	B 23.2	9	30	39	14
Los Angeles County	Eastern-Comm	2	147.3	16	22	38	15
Riverside	Van Buren Bd	2	B : 16.4	12	26	38	16*
Hayward	A St	1	D 20.0	8	30	38	17
Caltrans	So 47th St	1	A 13.1	4	34	38	18
San Gabriel	San Gabriel	1	B 490.2	9	29	38	19
Caltrans	138-Sn Brndo	2	60.9	3	34	37	20
Oceanside	Oceanside Lwr	2	225.9	5	32	37	21

* Project will not be able to proceed during fiscal 1977-78.

APPENDIX B Page 3 of 6 Projects Nominated by Priority Index Number

Agency	Crossing Nane	RR	BR	Mile Post	<u>Suf</u> Pro	<u>V x T</u> <u>P</u> C x 24	<u>SCF</u>	Priority Index <u>Number</u>	Priority <u>Mumber</u>
Barstow	First St	2		746.5	A	8	29	37	22
Dunsmuir	Scherrer-Btfy	1	C	321.7		3	33	36	23*
Ontario	Euclid 'Ave	1	B	520.1		7	28	35	24
Riverside	Arlington Ave	2	B	12.4		8	26	34	25*
Los Angeles County	Greenwood-Mtb	2		149.5		7	25	32	26
Caltrans	237-Snta Clra	1	L	39.8		5	27	32	27
Oceanside	Downtown Lwr	2		226.1		5	26	31	28
Irvine	Irvine Lwr	2		180.5		2	29	31	29
Torrance	Torrance Ric	1	BBC	500.73		11	19	30	30
Indio	Monroe St	1	В	609.7		5	25	30	31 *
Caltrans	79-Beaumont	1	В	562.4		7	22	2)	32

* Project will not be able to proceed during fiscal 1977-78.

APPENDIX E Page 4 of 6

Projects Nominated by Priority Index Mumber

Agency	Crossing <u>Name</u>	RR	BR	Mile <u>Post</u>	<u>Suf</u>	Prop	$\frac{V \times T}{C \times 2l_{4}}$	<u>SCF</u>	Priority Index <u>Number</u>	Priority <u>Number</u>
San Carlos	Brittan Ave	1	E	23.8			7	22	29	33 # #
Richmond	23rd St	1	A	14.5			4	25	29	34 * *
Los Angeles County	Rt 105 R1c	1	BBL	491.91			1	28	29	24 35**
Celtrans	237-Mt View	1	B	37.1	A		21	8	29	36
Caltrans	180-Fresno	2		997.8			5	23	28	37
Caltrans	70-Marysville	1	C	141.7	B		5	23	28	38
Torrance	Del Amo Blvd	2	н	19.5		¥	11	17	28	39
Contra Costa County	Somersville	1	В	52.10			6	21	~~ 27	40
Fresno County	Chestnut Ave	1	В	210.3			2	25	27	41
Los Angeles County	Hollywood Way	1	в	469.4			3	24	27	42
Caltrans	84-Yolo Co	1	A	87.5	B	¥	12	15	~1 27	42 43
San Diego	Imperial Ave	36	D	3.1	B		1	25	~ . 26	42 44

** Project will not be able to proceed during fiscal 1977-78.

APPENDIX E Page 5 of 6

Projects Nominated by Priority Index Number

Agency	Cros sing <u>Name</u>	RR	BR	Mile Post	<u>Suf</u> Prop	$\frac{V \times T}{C \times 24}$	SCF	Priority Index Number	Priority Number
Santa Barbara County	Hollister Ave	1	E	365.7	В	6	20	26	45**
Norwalk	Imperial Hwy	1	BK	498.0		5	20	25	46
Oceanside	Wiscons: in Lwr	2		226.8		I _	20	24	47
San Diego	Harbor Dr	2		268.9	A	7	17	24	48
Los Angeles County	Grand-Industy	1	В	508.5	*	4	20	24	49
Anaheim	Lincoln Ave	2		167.7		6	17	23	50
Ontario	Grove Ave	3		39.0		3	20	23	51
Hayward	A St	4		20.2		3	20	23	52
Caltrans	41-fresmo	1	В	205.9		3	20	23	53
San Luis Obispo	Orcuit Rd	1	E	253.3		2	20	22	54
Redding	South St	1	C	258.0		2	20	22	55
Newark	Cedar Blivd	1	L	30.0		5	16	21	56
Los Angeles County	Flornce—Hunpk	1	BG	488.3		3	17	20	57

** Project will not be able to proceed during fiscal 1977-78.

C-10214 ddb

APPENDIX E Page 6 of 6

Projects Nominated by Priority Index Number

Agency	Crossing <u>Name</u>	<u>RR</u>	BR	Mile <u>Post</u>	<u>Suf</u>	Prop	<u>V x T</u> C x 24	<u>SCF</u>	Priority Index <u>Number</u>	Priority <u>Number</u>
Anaheim	Lincoln Ave	1	BK	508.5			5	14	19	58
Newark	Newark Blvd	1	DAB	38.1		¥	6	13	19	59
San Mateo	Laurie Meadow	1	E	21.1		×	3	16	19	60
Chico	Dayton Rd	1	C	183.8			2	16	18	61
Los Angeles	Winnetka Ave	1	Е	447.8		¥	3	14	17	62
Oceanside	Cassidy St	2		228.0			1	14	15	63
Caltrans	49-Placer Co	1	AI	126.3	B		10	5	15	64
Newark	Newark Consld	1	DAB	36.7			0	14	14	65
Oceanside	Hill St	2	E	0.3			1	10	n	66
San Diego	Smythe Ave	36		13.8			0	10	10	67**
San Bernardino County	Barton Rd	1	BJ	541.1	A		0	10	10	68**

** Project will not be able to proceed during fiscal 1977-78.

à