

Decision 00-06-078 June 22, 2000

BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

Investigation for the purpose of establishing a list for the fiscal years 2000-2001 and 2001-2002 of existing and proposed crossings at grade of city streets, county roads, or state highways 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 alterations or reconstruction in accordance with Section 2452 of the Streets and Highways Code.

Investigation 99-07-001
(Filed July 8, 1999)

(See Appendix A for Appearances.)

Table of Contents

| Title | Page |
|--|------|
| OPINION ESTABLISHING PRIORITY LIST..... | 2 |
| FOR YEARS 2000-2001 AND 2001-2002..... | 2 |
| Summary..... | 2 |
| Procedural Matters..... | 2 |
| Background..... | 3 |
| Total Funds Available..... | 4 |
| Maximum Allocation Per Project..... | 5 |
| Formulas To Evaluate Projects..... | 6 |
| Multiple Crossing Project Evaluation..... | 6 |
| Disqualification, Exclusion, and Withdrawal of Projects..... | 6 |
| Disputed Scoring Of Projects..... | 7 |
| City of Redding..... | 7 |
| Kern County Standard Road Project..... | 8 |
| City of Torrance..... | 8 |
| 1. Blocking Delay..... | 8 |
| 2. Cost of Project..... | 9 |
| Priority List Adopted..... | 10 |
| New Procedure To Establish Priority List..... | 10 |
| Formula Revision..... | 11 |
| Comments on Proposed Decision..... | 12 |
| Findings of Fact..... | 13 |
| Conclusions of Law..... | 14 |
| ORDER..... | 15 |

APPENDIX A
APPENDIX B
APPENDIX C

**OPINION ESTABLISHING PRIORITY LIST
FOR YEARS 2000-2001 AND 2001-2002**

Summary

In this proceeding, we resolve three major issues:

1. We establish the Priority List for the grant of state funds to construct, reconstruct or remove grade separations in Year 2000-2001 in accordance with the current formula.
2. We establish a process by which the Priority List is amended for the Year 2001-2002 in accordance with the current formula.
3. Finally, we also establish a procedure to afford parties an opportunity to raise issues regarding the revisions of the formula by which the Priority List is established. Namely, we order that the Commission Rail Safety and Carriers Division (Staff) shall conduct workshops in an attempt to achieve a consensus on proposed revisions to the formula by which we rank projects. Staff shall report on the status of workshops in the proceeding to establish the Priority List for Year 2002-2003.

Procedural Matters

The order instituting investigation (OII) in this proceeding instructed applicants to submit nominations for the Priority List on or before October 15, 1999. In response, the Commission received 68 nominations.

Prehearing conferences (PHCs) were held in Los Angeles and San Francisco on September 20 and 21, 1999, respectively.

On October 20, 1999, the assigned Commissioner issued a Scoping Memo and Ruling affirming the preliminary "quasi-legislative" category of this proceeding, naming the assigned Administrative Law Judge (ALJ) as the presiding officer in any evidentiary hearing on adjudicative facts, outlining two issues and setting the schedule. The two issues designated for resolution were:

- (1) Whether the formulas used to establish the Priority List should be revised;

and (2) In what order should the nominated projects be ranked on the Priority List.

On January 3, 2000, the assigned Commissioner amended the Scoping Memo to delay resolution of the first issue—formula revision-- until the Grade Separation Program proceeding in 2001-2002. We affirm the assigned Commissioner's determination.

Evidentiary hearings on adjudicative facts were held in Los Angeles and San Francisco on February 22-23 and 28-29, 2000, respectively, where Staff, interested parties, and nominees appeared.

Background

Section 2450 *et seq.* of the California Streets and Highways (S&H) Code establishes the Grade Separation Program to fund projects throughout the state that will eliminate hazardous grade crossings. Each year, the California Transportation Commission (CTC) distributes a total of \$15 million to eligible projects (S&H Code § 190) in the priority established by this Commission. Therefore, prior to July 1, the Commission establishes a Priority List of eligible separation projects throughout the state most urgently in need of construction pursuant to S&H Code § 2452.

In Decision (D.) 98-06-074 (I.97-07-014), the Commission indicated that the total fund of \$15 million was woefully inadequate to fund projects totaling \$600 million that were direly needed to protect the public. As of the date of this decision this fund has not been increased. However, Assembly Bill 357, a Commission-sponsored bill, is currently pending before the California Senate. This bill proposes to increase funding for grade separation projects from \$15 million to \$60 million per year.

The Commission Priority List may contain projects for the construction of new grade crossings, alteration of existing separations, or projects that eliminate crossings by removing or relocating streets or railroad tracks. For a project that eliminates an existing crossing or alters or reconstructs an existing grade separation, an allocation of 80% of the estimated cost of the project is made, with the local agency and railroad each contributing 10%. For a project that plans a grade separation of a proposed new crossing (where currently there is no existing crossing), an allocation of 50% of the estimated project costs is made, with the remaining 50% contributed by the local agency.

Total Funds Available

The California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) annually receives \$15 million for allocation to projects on the Priority List. However, funds allocated by Caltrans may be held in abeyance for years due to delayed projects, causing other eligible projects to remain without adequate funding. All projects on the Priority List are categorized as being urgently in need of construction. Many of them are ready to commence construction as soon as Caltrans makes an allocation. Since funds for grade separation projects are scarce, this year Caltrans has established a new policy regarding project delays. Caltrans is reviewing uncompleted projects allocated funds in the prior years to ascertain whether they are ready to commence construction. Allocations to projects in a prior year that are delayed indefinitely will revert to the fund to be distributed to other eligible, timely projects.

Caltrans has identified two delayed projects in the City of Fresno where approximately \$9.5 million will revert to the fund and be reallocated. This amount, added to the annual \$15 million grant, totals approximately \$24.5 million to be allocated in fiscal year 1999-2000. At the hearing, Caltrans

estimated that four new projects will be funded in fiscal year 1999-2000. On June 7, 2000, Caltrans notified the Commission that the following four projects, with their current ranking on the Priority List in this proceeding, had been funded from 1999 funds: City of Monclair, Ramona Avenue (#11); Kern County, Seventh Standard Road (#14); City of San Buenaventura, Auto Center Drive/Johnson Drive (#44); and Fresno County, Chestnut Avenue (#46). Accordingly, staff removed these projects from the Priority List in this proceeding. Caltrans anticipates a total of \$15 million in state funding will be allocated in this proceeding (July 1, 2000-June 30, 2001).

Maximum Allocation Per Project

In compliance with S&H Code § 2454(g), the total allocation for a single project shall not exceed \$5 million without specific legislative authorization, except that the amount for a single project allocation may be increased to either: the amount that includes the federal construction cost index increase since 1976; or, an amount that does not exceed one-third of the total funds appropriated for grade separation projects. The Commission Staff uses the Price Trends for Federal-Aid Highway Construction as the federal construction cost index. For 1999, the second quarter composite index is 143.4. The 1976 composite index is 56.3. Based on these numbers, the allocation can be increased to \$12.7 million $([143.4/56.3] * \$5 \text{ million})$, if this allocation does not exceed one-third of the funds available. Since 1974, the fund has remained at \$15 million. One-third of this fund is \$5 million. Therefore, the controlling limit is based on available funds. For the purpose of this investigation, the maximum allocation for a single project is \$5 million.

Formulas To Evaluate Projects

In 1990, the Commission established the two formulas by which it will evaluate and rank projects for the Priority List. (D.90-06-058). Appendix B contains the formulas which are used to evaluate projects in this proceeding.

Multiple Crossing Project Evaluation

Staff evaluates projects involving the closure and/or separation of multiple crossings in the same manner as single crossing projects. However, Staff reviews the commonalties among the crossings and proximity to each other. Any portion of a multiple project that is clearly separable is treated as a separate nomination. Point allocation for multiple crossing projects are determined by adding the vehicle or train volumes, the crossing geometrics, accident history, and/or blocking delays of each crossing.

Disqualification, Exclusion, and Withdrawal of Projects

In its Staff report and during the hearing, Staff requested that the following projects be excluded because they are entirely light rail: the three projects of the County of Santa Clara, and the Bradshaw Road project of the Sacramento Regional Transit District. Staff requested to exclude the following nominations because the nominees failed to appear at the hearing, a requirement of this proceeding pursuant to the OII: California City, Sonoma, Rancho Cucumonga and two projects of San Bernardino County. In addition, Staff requested to exclude the Anaheim Street project of the Port of Long Beach, which was already under construction (S&H Code § 2460.7). In a ruling on March 22, 2000, the presiding officer granted Staff's requests to exclude these projects from the Priority List.

Disputed Scoring Of Projects

During the hearing, several nominees disputed Staff's assignment of points for various categories in scoring the projects. Staff assigned points to projects for the categories and criteria, which are input into one of two formulas above in order to derive a total score for the project. The presiding officer preliminarily resolved the adjudicative facts as described below. We affirm the presiding officer's rulings.

City of Redding

At the hearing in San Francisco, the City of Redding challenged Staff's rating for the hazard factor of its South Street project. Vehicles approaching this crossing are forced to wait on the railroad tracks in order to make a left turn because the traffic in this location backs up to the corner. Therefore, Robert M. Barton, witness for the City of Redding, believes a greater rating should be given due to this extreme hazard. Staff did not allocate any points in the "Other Factor (OF)" category for this hazard.

The presiding officer ruled that this condition of traffic back-up which leaves cars waiting or stranded on railroad tracks creates the likelihood of a serious and unavoidable accident in the event of a train passing through these crossings. At the hearing, several witnesses testified about this same traffic back-up problem that currently exists at other proposed project sites. Therefore, the presiding officer ordered revisions to the City of Redding and other similar projects commensurate with the hazard this back-up condition creates. Staff revised its evaluation of this and similar projects by adding one point to the OF. (Appendix C, Attachment 1, pp. 1-3.)

Kern County Standard Road Project

At the hearing in San Francisco, Barton challenged Staff's rating of the crossing geometrics of Kern County's Standard Road project. Barton believes the 135% angle turn which causes trucks to hit the railroad crossing arm 2-3 times a week when making the turn warrants a greater rating. Staff rated this factor as 8.72 based upon the description of the project.

Based upon comparable ratings in other projects with hazardous conditions, the presiding officer concurred with Staff's rating.

City of Torrance

At the hearing in Los Angeles, Staff opposed the blocking delay (BD) and cost estimate factors in the proposed Del Amo Boulevard project submitted by the City of Torrance (the City). The presiding officer's ruling is discussed below.

1. Blocking Delay

BD is the average wait and traffic delay created by a train passing through a railroad crossing. D.90-06-058 mandates that BD be measured at a crossing based upon reliable data supplied for similar grade crossings in close proximity to the one proposed. The City contends there is no comparable crossing near the proposed site and the proposed site has no existing crossing, therefore, it used the traffic delays at the proposed site of the train traffic in an adjacent switching yard. However, Staff points out that these trains in the switching yard create delays that exceed 10 minutes, a violation of G.O. 135, which will not be allowed at the regulated crossing once it is completed. At the hearing, Staff recommended that we exclude delays over 10 minutes used to compute the average delay. Alternatively, Staff recommended that the City perform a traffic delay study at a comparable site or that five minutes be used instead of the original nine-minute average blocking delay submitted in the

nomination. The City contends there is no comparable site and will not agree to perform a study.

The presiding officer concluded that a five-minute average BD was appropriate.

2. Cost of Project

Staff contends that the qualifications for an eligible project contained in S&H Code § 2450(b) require that the project cost must include all approaches, ramps, connections, drainage and other construction required to make the grade separation operable and to effect the separation of grades.¹ The City contends the cost to acquire the right-of-way and construct a new roadway are not a necessary part of this proposed grade separation project. However, Staff points out that these costs were included in applications for funding in two prior years. Moreover, Staff contends that this proposed grade separation will not be operable without the additional road construction.

¹ § 2450(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 nonmotorized traffic from the vehicular roadway and the railroad tracks. If a separation of nonmotorized traffic is not to be included in a project, there shall be an affirmative finding that the separation of nonmotorized 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:

- (1) The alteration or reconstruction of existing grade separations.
- (2) The construction of new grade separations to eliminate existing or proposed grade crossings.
- (3) The removal or relocation of highways or railroad tracks to eliminate existing grade crossings.

The map of this project indicates that this grade separation will be built on currently vacant land between the ends of two city streets. In order to enter and exit the grade separation, the road must be extended to meet both ends of the grade separation. Therefore, the presiding officer concluded that the project is not operable without this additional road construction and this cost must be included in the total project cost.

Priority List Adopted

No party disputed the Priority List revised in accordance with the presiding officer's ruling. After receipt of Caltrans notification that four additional projects on this list were funded from existing funds, the list was revised to delete these projects. Therefore, we adopt Staff's revised Priority List, Exhibit 73, attached as Appendix C.

New Procedure To Establish Priority List

Unlike past years, this proceeding has been changed from a two-year to a one-year process due to statutory time limitations that were enacted in Senate Bill (SB) 960, effective January 1, 1998. Under SB 960, quasi-legislative proceedings, such as this, must be completed in 18 months. However, this statutory time period does not allow adequate time in the second year to issue a second formal Commission decision. Therefore, we notified all known interested parties in the OII in this proceeding of the need for a new one year procedure to establish a Priority List.² Prior to this proceeding, in D.99-06-035, we outlined several procedural options: to open a new docket to establish the Priority List for

² Including all cities, counties, railroads, the League of California Cities, the County Board of Supervisors Association, CTC, California Department of Transportation, Light Rail Transit Agencies and known interested parties.

each year of the two-year period, or to certify the Priority List for both years in one decision the first year. After two years experience in operating under SB 960, we deem the latter option as the less burdensome for parties and the Commission. We will adopt a Priority List for a two year period and authorize Staff to revise the Priority list after the first year based upon input from Caltrans.

Formula Revision

At the PHC, Robert M. Barton of DeLeuw, Cather and Company representing the City of Bakersfield and Kern County, proposed revisions to the existing formula by which projects are prioritized. As requested, he submitted in writing his proposed revisions to the formulas. Five parties, including the Commission Rail Safety & Carriers Division (Staff), filed timely comments.

Barton recommends that accident history and blocking delay be added as part of the "Special Conditions Factor" instead of a multiplier in the current formulas and that a "Readiness Factor" be added. Four parties³ agree that the existing formulas need revision, yet each party offers a variance of Barton's proposal. All four parties request that a workshop be held to discuss the appropriate formula revisions. Edward Ohannesian, Senior Engineer for the Fresno County Public Works Department, offers to host the workshop.

A fifth party, John Clifton, while testifying during the hearing regarding the Wine Train Project, recommended that projects be ranked on the Priority List by need, safety, and hazard and that the Commission become more involved in the communities of proposed projects.

³ H. Richard Neill of Moffatt & Nichol Engineers, Edward Ohannesian representing Fresno County Public Works Department, O. Gary Plunkett, P.E., Director of Tehama County Public Works and Rick Raives, P.E., City Engineer for the City of San Buenaventura.

Staff, on the other hand, believes Barton's proposal was considered at length in Investigation 89-09-021 when the Commission adopted the present priority formulas in D.90-06-058. Staff recommends that the Commission review these proposals after July 1, 2000 given the short time framework to complete the priority list.

Barton's proposal and the parties' comments on his proposal require review and analysis of the historical basis of the existing priority formulas as well as evaluation of the effectiveness of the existing formulas since they were established in 1990. The schedule outlined in the scoping memo would not accommodate the time Staff obviously needs to assess the existing formulas, research Barton's proposal, hold workshops, and take any other necessary steps to attempt to reach a resolution on any revisions.

In addition, a wider group of potential parties interested in this proceeding had no notice of the proposed new formulas and existing parties had no notice prior to submitting nominations for the two-year list process to be established in this proceeding. It would be unfair to establish a Priority List for two years, as we had planned, and change the formulas for the established list in the second year. Therefore, this issue was removed from this to the next such proceeding. We herein instruct Staff to provide notice to all cities, counties and interested parties and conduct a workshop on the proposed revisions to the priority formulas, submit a workshop report and make its recommendations to the Commission prior to the OII in the next Grade Separation Program proceeding.

Comments on Proposed Decision

The proposed decision of Commissioner Wood and ALJ Bennett in this matter was mailed to the parties in accordance with Section 311(d) of the Public Utilities Code and Rule 77.1 of the Rules of Practice and Procedure. No

comments were filed. However, the proposed decision was revised to include updated funding information from Caltrans. Accordingly, Appendix C, the Revised Priority List, was corrected to exclude the four funded projects.

Findings of Fact

1. Each year the Commission is required pursuant to S&H Code § 2452 to establish a Priority List for the Grade Separation Program to fund projects throughout the state that will eliminate hazardous grade crossings.

2. On July 8, 1999, in its order instituting the investigation in this proceeding, the Commission provided written notice to all cities, counties, railroads, the League of California Cities, the County Board of Supervisors Association, CTC, Caltrans, Light Rail Transit Agencies and known interested parties that the procedure of issuing a Commission decision each year for two years would change due to newly effective time limits in SB 960. No party commented on this revision.

3. Notice of this proceeding was also published in the Commission's Daily Calendar on July 9, 1999.

4. PHCs were held in Los Angeles and San Francisco on September 20 and 21, 1999, respectively.

5. The procedure of certifying in one decision a Priority List for the first fiscal year of the two-year period, and authorizing Staff to revise the list for the second year of this period is the most efficient and less burdensome procedure under SB 960 for this two-year Priority List process.

6. EHs on adjudicative facts were held in Los Angeles and San Francisco on February 22-23 and February 28-29, 2000, respectively, where the Commission Rail Safety and Carriers Division Staff, interested parties, and nominees appeared.

7. At the evidentiary hearing, the presiding officer preliminarily resolved all adjudicative facts disputed by the parties. The preliminary resolution of those facts is reasonable.

8. During the fiscal year 2000-2001, Caltrans will notify Staff of projects to be deleted from the Priority List for Year 1 herein established. After these projects are removed, the remaining projects in the same priority form the Priority List for Year 2.

9. No party opposed establishing the Priority List attached as Appendix C, which is revised pursuant to the presiding officer's ruling on disputed adjudicative facts.

10. Parties commenting on Robert M. Barton's proposed formula revisions were unable to agree that revisions were necessary or what these revisions should be.

11. The commenting parties requested that a workshop be held to discuss the proposed revisions to the formulas and attempt to either agree or narrow the disputed issues.

12. Due to time constraints in this proceeding and Staff's request that studies on the impact of the existing formulas be conducted, the assigned Commissioner deferred resolution of the proposed formula revisions until after a workshop is held.

Conclusions of Law

1. The assigned Commissioner's determination to defer resolution of revisions to the formulas used to prioritize projects in this proceeding should be affirmed.

2. The presiding officer's resolution of disputed adjudicative facts should be affirmed.

3. The revised Priority List, attached as Appendix C, should be established as the list of projects most urgently needed to receive Grade Separation Program funds for the fiscal year July 1, 2000 to June 30, 2001 (Year 1).

4. The Staff should be ordered to revise the Priority List for Year 1 established in this proceeding based upon revisions submitted by Caltrans during the fiscal year July 1, 2001 to June 30, 2002 to establish the Priority List for Year 2.

5. The ranking criteria established in past Grade Separation Program proceedings for consideration of projects with the same priority index number, and projects of otherwise equal priority where the city or county contributes 50% of the cost should be applied to the Priority List for Year 2.

6. The Staff should be ordered to convene a workshop after 60 days notice to all cities, counties, and known interested parties to discuss the proposals presented in this proceeding to revise the formulas by which the Commission ranks projects for the Priority List in proceedings such as this. Staff should be ordered to provide a written report on the outcome of the workshop in time to include this report in the order instituting the next Grade Separation Program proceeding for 2002-2003.

7. The order in this proceeding should be effective on the date signed so that our statutory deadline of issuing an order by July 1, 2000 may be met.

8. This proceeding should be closed.

O R D E R

IT IS ORDERED that:

1. The assigned Commissioner's determinations and the presiding officer's rulings during this proceeding are affirmed.

2. The Priority List, attached as Appendix C, is established as the list of projects most urgently in need of construction for the fiscal year July 1, 2000 to June 30, 2001 (Year 1).

3. Prior to July 1, 2001, the Rail Safety and Carriers Division (Staff) will revise the Priority List established in this proceeding as directed by the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) to establish the Priority List for the fiscal year July 1, 2001 to June 30, 2002 (Year 2).

4. For projects on the Priority List for Year 2, with regard to any projects having the same priority index number, Staff will first consider projects which separate or eliminate existing grade crossings, then projects which alter or reconstruct existing grade separations, and finally projects to construct new grade separations. Within each of these categories, Staff will first consider the lowest cost project so that the maximum number of projects may be accomplished with available funds.

5. For projects on the Priority List for Year 2, Staff will give greater priority to grade separation projects of otherwise equal priority for which the amount contributed by a city or county is equal to or greater than 50% of the cost of the project.

6. Prior to the institution of the next Grade Separation Program proceeding for the Year 2002-2003, the Staff will convene a workshop after a minimum of 60 days notice to discuss the proposals presented in this proceeding to revise the formulas by which the Commission ranks projects for the Priority List. Staff will serve notice of this workshop on all parties in this proceeding, all cities, counties, and railroads, the League of California Cities, the County Board of Supervisors Association, the California Transportation Commission, the California Department of Transportation, all Light Rail Transit Agencies and all known interested parties. Staff will provide a written report on the outcome of the

workshop in time to include this report in the order instituting the Grade Separation Program proceeding for Year 2002-2003.

7. The Executive Director shall furnish a certified copy of this decision to Caltrans and the California Transportation Commission prior to July 1, 2000.

8. This proceeding is closed.

This order is effective today.

Dated June 22, 2000, at San Francisco, California.

HENRY M. DUQUE
JOSIAH L. NEEPER
RICHARD A. BILAS
CARL W. WOOD
Commissioners

President Loretta M. Lynch, being necessarily absent, did not participate.

**APPENDIX A
(APPEARANCES)**

*

***** SERVICE LIST *****

Last Update on 28-MAR-2000 by: LIL
I9907001 LIST

Page 1

***** APPEARANCES *****

Roy V. Ketring, Iii
Assistant Director - Public Projects
BNSF
740 EAST CARNEGIE DRIVE
SAN BERNARDINO CA 92408-3571
(909) 386-4470
roy.ketring@bnsf.com
For: MARIPOSA ROAD-BURLINGTON NORTHERN &
SANTA FE RAILWAY COMPANY

O.J. Solander
Attorney At Law
CALTRANS
PO BOX 942874-MS-57
1120 N STREET
SACRAMENTO CA 95821-1438
(916) 654-2630
o.j.solander@dot.ca.gov
For: STATE OF CALIFORNIA, DEPARTMENT OF
TRANSPORTATION (CALTRANS)

Stephen R. Cameron
Attorney At Law
CALTRANS
PO BOX 1438 MS 57
SACRAMENTO CA 95812-1438
(916) 654-2630
stephen.r.cameron@dot.ca.gov
For: CALTRANS

Jacques La Rochelle
Engineering Services Manager
CITY OF BAKERSFIELD
1501 TRUXTUN AVE
BAKERSFIELD CA 93301
(661) 326-3574

Paul Toor
City Engineer
CITY OF BANNING
99 EAST RAMSEY
PO BOX 998
BANNING CA 92220-0998
(909) 937-0200

Daniel J.V. Greeley
Director Of Engineering Services
CITY OF CAMARILLO
601 CARMEN DR
CAMARILLO CA 93011
(805) 388-5340

Roc Pulido
Assistant Traffic Engineer
CITY OF CAMARILLO
601 CARMEN DRIVE
CAMARILLO CA 93010
(805) 388-5340

John P. Lippitt
Director Of Public Works
CITY OF CHULA VISTA
276 FOURTH AVENUE
CHULA VISTA CA 91910
(619) 691-5294

Samir M. Nuhaily
CITY OF CHULA VISTA
276 FOURTH AVENUE
CHULA VISTA CA 91710
(619) 691-5259
snuhaily@ci.chula-vista.ca.us
For: City of Chula Vista

Byron Woosley
City Manager
CITY OF COACHELLA
1515 SIXTH STREET
COACHELLA CA 92236
(760) 398-4202

Anne Palatino
Transportation Planner
CITY OF CORONA
815 W. SIXTH STREET
CORONA CA 92882-3238
(909) 736-2235
For: CITY OF CORONA/MCKINLEY GRADE SEPARATION

Gerald F. Helt
City Engineer
CITY OF DELANO
PO BOX 939
DELANO CA 93216
(661) 323-6045
Helt@lightspeed.net

Anthony M. La
City Traffic Engineer
CITY OF DOWNEY
11111 BROOKSHIRE AVENUE
DOWNEY CA 90241-7016
(562) 904-7108
ala@downey.ca.org

*

APPENDIX A

Page 2

Martin Boyle
Transportation Engineer
CITY OF FREMONT
39550 LIBERTY STREET
FREMONT CA 94538
(510) 494-4684
mboyle@ci.fremont.ca.us

Rob Wilson
City Engineer
CITY OF FREMONT
39550 LIBERTY STREET
FREMONT CA 94538
(510) 494-4723

Brent Salmi
City Engineer
CITY OF HERCULES
111 CIVIC DRIVE
HERCULES CA 94547
(510) 799-8247

Erwin R. Blancaflor
CITY OF HERCULES
111 CIVIC DRIVE
HERCULES CA 94547
(510) 799-8242
eblancaflor@msn.com
For: LOCAL AGENCY REPRESENTATIVE (CITY OF
HERCULES)

Amir Modarressi
City Engineer
CITY OF INDIO- DEPT OF PUBLIC WORKS
PO DRAWER 1788
INDIO CA 92202
(760) 342-6530

Farideh E. Lyons
Senior Transportation Analyst
CITY OF IRVINE
ONE CIVIC CENTER PLAZA
IRVINE CA 92623-9575
(949) 724-6237

Violet Jakab
City Engineer
CITY OF LATHROP
16775 HOWLAND ROAD
LATHROP CA 95330
(209) 858-2860

Mashi Hashemi
CITY OF LOS ANGELES
650 S. SPRING ST STE 1200
LOS ANGELES CA 90014
(213) 847-5033
mhashemi@eng.ci.la.ca.us
For: VALLEY BLVD. GRADE SEPARATION

Arsen Mangasarian
Supervising Transportation Planner
CITY OF LOS ANGELES DEPT. OF TRANSPORTA
221 NORTH FIGUEROA ST., NO. 600
LOS ANGELES CA 90012
(213) 580-5427

Marilyn Stats
Director Of Redevelopment/Public Works
CITY OF MONTCLAIR
PO BOX 2308
MONTCLAIR CA 91763
(909) 626-8571

Micharl C. Hudson
CITY OF MONTCLAIR
5111 BENITO STREET
MONTCLAIR CA 91763
(909) 625-9441
mhudson@ci.montclair.ca.us

Steve Williams
CITY OF PALMDALE
708 E. PALMDALE BLVD.
PALMDALE CA 93551
(661) 267-5300
swilliams@cityofpalmdale.org
For: City of Palmdale

Tom Horne
CITY OF PALMDALE
708 E. PALMDALE BLVD.
PALMDALE CA 93551
(661) 267-5300
thorne@cityofpalmdale.org

Mike Olivier
Senior Civil Engineer
CITY OF RANCHO CUCAMONGA
PO BOX 807
10500 CIVIC CENTER DRIVE
RANCHO CUCAMONGA CA 91729
(909) 477-2740

*

APPENDIX A

Page 3

Ray Duryee
Transportation Coordinator
CITY OF REDDING
PO BOX 496071
760 PARKVIEW AVE
REDDING CA 96001
(530) 224-6114

Tom Boyd
Engineering Manager
CITY OF RIVERSIDE
3900 MAIN STREET
RIVERSIDE CA 92522
(909) 826-5575
btom@riverside.ca.us

Rick Raives
City Engineer
CITY OF SAN BUENAVENTURA
PO BOX 99
501 POLI STREET
VENTURA CA 93002
(805) 654-7870
rraives@ci.ventura.ca.us

Rajeev Batra
Deputy Director Of Public Works
CITY OF SAN JOSE
801 N FIRST STREET
SAN JOSE CA 95110
(408) 277-3236

Brett Dawson
City Engineer
CITY OF SHAFTER
336 PACIFIC AVENUE
SHAFTER CA 93263
(661) 746-6361

Richard Perkins
Senior Division Engineer
CITY OF TORRANCE
3031 TORRANCE BLVD, 2ND FLOOR
TORRANCE CA 90503
(310) 618-2823

Caroline Quinn
CITY OF WEST SACRAMENTO
1951 SOUTH RIVER ROAD
WEST SACRAMENTO CA 95691
(916) 373-5854
caroline.quinn@ci.west-sacramento.ca.us
For: CITY OF WEST SACRAMENTO

Toby Wong
Associate Civil Engineer
CITY OF WEST SACRAMENTO
1951 SOUTH RIVER ROAD
WEST SACRAMENTO CA 95691
(916) 373-5854

John R. Clifton
21 LEMON CT.
NAPA CA 94558
(707) 252-7069
clif@napanet.net
For: PRIVATE CITIZEN

Craig M. Pope
Director, Road Department
COUNTY OF KERN
2700 M STREET SUITE 400
BAKERSFIELD CA 93301
(661) 862-8850

Ken Giovanetti
Senior Civil Engineer
COUNTY OF SONOMA
575 ADMINISTRATION DRIVE RM 117-A
SANTA CLARA CA 95403
(707) 565-2231

Robert M. Barton
DELEUW, CATHER & CO.
120 MARKET STREET, SUITE 850
SAN FRANCISCO CA 94530
(415) 495-6066
For: BAKERSFIELD, KERN COUNTY, REDDING

Mario Montes
Project Manager
FLUOR DANIEL INFRASTRUCTURE
ONE FLOUR DANIEL DRIVE
ALISO VIEJO CA 92698
(949) 349-7201 X2206
Mario.Montes@flour.com

Sam Erwin Ohannesian
FRESNO COUNTY
2220 TULARE ST. 6TH FLOOR
FRESNO CA 93721
(559) 262-4093
For: FRESNO COUNTY

*

APPENDIX A

Page 4

Gerald F. Helt
City Engineer
HELT ENGINEERING, INC./CITY OF DELANO
2930 UNION AVE.
BAKERSFIELD CA 93305
(661) 323-6045
helt@lightspeed.net
For: CITY OF DELANO

Curtis Ballantyne
Attorney At Law
HILL, FARRER & BURRILL
ONE CALIFORNIA PLAZA
300 S. GRANT AVE., 37TH FLOOR
LOS ANGELES CA 90071-3147
(213) 621-0814

William J. Wagner
President
HMH, INCORPORATED
PO BOX 611510
SAN JOSE CA 95161-1510
(408) 487-2200
bwagner@hmh-engineers.com
For: CITY OF SAN JOSE

Douglas H. Mays
L.D. KING, INC.
SUITE 100
2151 CONVENTION CENTER WAY
ONTARIO CA 91764
(909) 937-0200
ldking@primenet.com
For: CITIES OF MONTCLAIR, COACHELLA & BANING

William Winter
Civil Engineer
LA COUNTY DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS
900 SOUTH FREMONT AVENUE
ALHAMBRA CA 91803
(626) 458-3943
wwinter@dpw.co.la.ca.us
For: Los Angeles County

Greg Jaquez
Supervising Civil Engineering Assistant
LOS ANGELES COUNTY DEPT. OF PUBLIC WORKS
900 S. FREMONT AVENUE
PO BOX 1460
ALHAMBRA CA 91802-1460
(626) 458-3935
gjaquez@dpw.co.la.ca.us
For: LOS ANGELES COUNTY DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS

Keith Halvorson
Director Of Engineering
MC GILL MARTIN SELF, INC.
1500 NEWELL AVENUE SUITE 700
WALNUT CREEK CA 94596
(925) 988-9188
For: SAN JOAQUIN COUNTY

Joe Baughman
MK CENTENNIAL
5000 HOPYARD ROAD
PLEASANTON CA 94550
(925) 460-5050
joe_baughman@mk100.com
For: SAN JOAQUIN COUNTY PUBLIC WORKS

H. Richard Neill
MOFFATT & NICHOL ENGINEERS
250 W. WARDLOW ROAD
LONG BEACH CA 92704
(562) 426-9551
dneill@moffattnichol.com
For: CITY OF IRVINE

Gary L. Rouse
President, C.O.O.
NAPA VALLEY RAILROAD COMPANY
800 EIGHTH STREET
NAPA CA 94559
(707) 258-0504
railroad@winetrain.com
For: NAPA VALLEY RAILROAD/NAPA VALLEY WINE TRAINS

Vincent Dedomenico
Chairman
NAPA VALLEY WINE TRAIN, INC.
1275 MCKINSTRY STREET
NAPA CA 94559
(707) 253-2160

Robert M. Barton
PARSONS TRANSPORTATION GROUP
120 HOWARD STREET
SAN FRANCISCO CA 94105
(415) 495-6060
For: BAKERSFIELD SEPR. OF GRADE DIST.; CITY OF REDDING

Ronald F. Ruettgers
Consultant Engineer
RUETTGER & SCHULER CE
1801 21ST STREET, SUITE 4
BAKERSFIELD CA 93301
(661) 327-1969
For: COUNTY OF KERN, CITY OF SHAFTER, CITY OF BAKERSFIELD

*

APPENDIX A

Page 5

Michael Wiley
SACRAMENTO REGIONAL TRANSIT DISTRICT
PO BOX 2110
SACRAMENTO CA 95812-2110
(916) 321-2811
mwiley@sacrt.com
For: PUC GRADE SEPARATION PRIORITY

Teri Sheets
Senior Grants Analyst
SACRAMENTO REGIONAL TRANSIT DISTRICT
PO BOX 2110
SACRAMENTO CA 95812-2110
(916) 321-2868

Kathleen Robles
SAN BERNARDINO CO. DEPT. TRANSPORTATION
825 E. 3RD STREET
SAN BERNARDINO CA 92415
(661) 387-2724
For: SAN BERNARDINO COUNTY DEPARTMENT OF
TRANSPORTATION

Patrick J. Mead
Assistant Director
SAN BERNARDINO COUNTY-TFCD
825 E 3RD STREET
SAN BERNARDINO CA 92415-0835
(909) 387-2799

Manuel Solorio
Civil Senior Engineer
SAN JOAQUIN COUNTY
1810 EAST HAZELTON AVE
STOCKTON CA 95205
(209) 468-3038

Sukh S. Chahal
Senior Civil Engineer
SAN JOAQUIN COUNTY
1810 EAST HAZELTON AVENUE
STOCKTON CA 95205
(209) 468-3035

Nan A. Vaughan
SANTA CLARA COUNTY ROADS & AIRPORTS
101 SKYPORT DRIVE
SAN JOSE CA 95127
(408) 573-2408
nan729@aol.com
For: SANTA CLARA COUNTY ROADS & AIRPORTS

Rollo Parsons
Manager, Design And Construction
SANTA CLARA COUNTY-ROADS AND AIRPORTS
101 SKYPORT
SAN JOSE CA 95110
(408) 573-2482

Lou Cluster
Public Projects Engineer
SCRRA METROLINK
700 SOUTH FLOWER ST. 26TH FLR.
LOS ANGELES CA 90017-4101
(213) 452-0217
clusterl@scrra.net

Emily Landin-Lowe
STATE OF CALIF. DEPT OF TRANSPORTATION
PO BOX 23660
OAKLAND CA 94623-0660
(510) 286-5124
emily_landin-low@dot.ca.gov
For: CITY OF FREMONT

O.J. Solander
Attorney At Law
STATE OF CALIF. DEPT OF TRANSPORTATION
1120 N STREET
SACRAMENTO CA 95812-1438
(916) 654-2630
For: CALTRANS

Gary Plunkett
TEHAMA COUNTY
9380 SAN BENITO AVENUE
GERBER CA 96035
(530) 385-1462
plunkett@tco.net
For: TEHAMA COUNTY

Jerry Brownfield
Deputy Director Of Public Works
TEHAMA COUNTY PUBLIC WORKS
9380 SAN BENITO AVENUE
GERBER CA 96035
(530) 385-1462

E D Allen
Chief Harbor Engineer
THE PORT OF LONG BEACH
PO BOX 570
LONG BEACH CA 90801-0570
(562) 590-4139

*

APPENDIX A

Page 6

***** STATE EMPLOYEE *****

Patricia A. Bennett
Administrative Law Judge Division
RM. 5016
505 VAN NESS AVE
San Francisco CA 94102
(415) 703-2271
pab@cpuc.ca.gov

Robert Futrell
Rail Safety and Carriers Division
AREA LOSA
320 WEST 4TH STREET SUITE 500
Los Angeles CA 90013
(213) 576-7088
ref@cpuc.ca.gov

Robert Futrell
Rail Safety and Carriers Division
RM. 2-B
505 VAN NESS AVE
San Francisco CA 94102
(415) 703-2665
ref@cpuc.ca.gov

Marc E. Gottlieb
Rail Safety and Carriers Division
AREA 2-B
505 VAN NESS AVE
San Francisco CA 94102
(415) 703-2230
mar@cpuc.ca.gov

Thomas P. Hunt
Rail Safety and Carriers Division
320 WEST 4TH STREET SUITE 500
Los Angeles CA 90013
(213) 576-7089
tph@cpuc.ca.gov

Tack S. Joe
Rail Safety and Carriers Division
AREA 2-B
505 VAN NESS AVE
San Francisco CA 94102
(415) 703-2280
tsj@cpuc.ca.gov

Kenneth L. Koss
Rail Safety and Carriers Division
RM. 2102
505 VAN NESS AVE
San Francisco CA 94102
(415) 703-1090
klk@cpuc.ca.gov

Alex Lutkus
Rail Safety and Carriers Division
RM. 2101
505 VAN NESS AVE
San Francisco CA 94102
(415) 703-2069
alx@cpuc.ca.gov

Rosa Munoz
Rail Safety and Carriers Division
AREA LOSA
320 WEST 4TH STREET SUITE 500
Los Angeles CA 90013
(213) 576-7078
rxm@cpuc.ca.gov

Barbara Ortega
Executive Division
RM. 500
320 WEST 4TH STREET SUITE 500
Los Angeles CA 90013
(213) 576-7070
bho@cpuc.ca.gov

Vahak Petrossian
Rail Safety and Carriers Division
RM. 5109
320 WEST 4TH STREET SUITE 500
Los Angeles CA 90013
(213) 576-7077
vap@cpuc.ca.gov

3
RAIL SAFETY
2ND FLOOR
CPUC

Tom Glover
STATE OF CALIF., DEPT. OF TRANSPORTATION
1801 - 30TH STREET
SACRAMENTO CA 95816
(916) 227-5203
tom_glover@dot.ca.gov
For: STATE OF CALIFORNIA, DEPARTMENT OF
TRANSPORTATION (CALTRANS)

Robert G. Webb
Rail Safety and Carriers Division
770 L STREET, SUITE 1050
Sacramento CA 95814
(916) 327-3131
clo@cpuc.ca.gov

*

APPENDIX A

Page 7

***** INFORMATION ONLY *****

Gregg Bragg
CALIFORNIA HIGHWAY PATROL
PO BOX 942898
SACRAMENTO CA 94289-0001

Jim M. Schroeter
City Engineer
CITY OF CALIFORNIA CITY
21000 HACIENDA BLVD.
CALIFORNIA CITY CA 93505
(760) 373-8661
For: CITY OF CALIFORNIA CITY

William Pagett
Assistant City Engineer
CITY OF PARAMOUNT
16400 COLORADO AVENUE
PARAMOUNT CA 90723-5012
(562) 220-2020

Timm Borden
CITY OF SAN JOSE
801 N. FIRST STREET, ROOM 308
SAN JOSE CA 95110
(408) 277-8626
timm.borden@ci.sj.ca.us
For: CITY OF SAN JOSE

Juan Pantoja
Engineer
HELT ENGINEERING
2930 UNION AVENUE
BAKERSFIELD CA 93305
(805) 323-6045

Renee Berlin
Director-Arterials/Signals & Goods Mngt.
METROPOLITAN TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY
ONE GATEWAY PLAZA MS-99-22-3
LOS ANGELES CA 90012-2952
(213) 922-3035

Lou Cluster
Public Projects Engineer
SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA REGIONAL RAIL AUTH
700 SOUTH FLOWER STREET, 26TH FLOOR
LOS ANGELES CA 90017-4101
(213) 452-0217
clusterl@scrra.net
For: SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA REGIONAL RAIL
AUTHORITY

Richard Gonzales
Senior Public Projects Engineer
UNION PACIFIC RAILROAD COMPANY
19100 SLOVER AVENUE
BLOOMINGTON CA 92316
(909) 879-6264

Rudy San Miguel
Manager Of Public Projects
WILSON & COMPANY
1335 E. COOLEY DRIVE, SUITE B
COLTON CA 92324
(909) 423-0980

(END OF APPENDIX A)

APPENDIX B

(Page 1)

**FORMULA FOR CROSSING NOMINATED FOR
SEPARATION OR ELIMINATION**

$$P = \frac{V(T + 0.1 \times LRT)(AH + BD)}{C \times F} + SCF$$

Where:

- P** - Priority Index Number
- V** - Average 24-Hour Vehicular Volume (1 point per vehicle)
- C** - Total Separation Project Costs (1 point per thousand dollars)
- T** - Average 24-Hour Train Volume (1 point per train)
- LRT** - Average 24-Hour Light Rail Train Volume (1 point per train)
- F** - Cost Inflation Factor based on the Current Construction Cost Index (8.32)
- AH** - Accident History (up to 3 points per accident)
- BD** - Crossing Blocking Delay (up to 10 points)
- SCF** - Special Conditions Factor = VS+RS+CG+PT+OF
- VS** - Vehicular Speed Limit (up to 5 points)
- RS** - Railroad Prevailing Maximum Speed (up to 7 points)
- CG** - Crossing Geometrics (up to 17 points)
- AR** - Alternate Route Availability (up to 5 points)
- PT** - Passenger Trains (up to 10 points)
- OF** - Other Factors: secondary accidents, emergency vehicle usage, passenger buses, school buses, trains carrying hazardous materials trains and trucks, and community impact (up to 18 points)

**APPENDIX B
(Page 2)**

F = Cost Inflation Factor - the inflation factor "F" is determined by comparing the 1976 inflation factor with the changes in the construction cost index (CCI) from 1976 to the current investigation year (1999) found in the ENR (Engineering News Record) journal. The calculation is as follows:

$$F = \frac{CCI ('75-'76) \times '75-'76 "f"}{CCI (Current Year)}$$

Where, the CCI for 1975-76 is 2100,
 "f" - cost inflation factor for 1975-76 is 24, and
 the average CCI for 1999 is 6060,*
 therefore; the new F for this OII is $(2100 \times 24) / 6060 = 8.32$

*The average CCI for 1999 is the sum from January to December (72714) / 12 = 6060 per the following ENR data:

| Month | Jan | Feb | Mar | Apr | May | Jun | Jul | Aug | Sep | Oct | Nov | Dec |
|-------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|
| CCI | 6000 | 5992 | 5986 | 6008 | 6006 | 6039 | 6076 | 6091 | 6128 | 6134 | 6127 | 6127 |

AH = Accident History (last 10 years from application filing due date)

The Commission's FORM A is the record for reportable accidents for each crossing under jurisdiction. The AH points will be based on accidents that involve trains at the crossing. For each accident Staff assigns points based on the following:

Points = $(1 + 2 \times \text{No. Killed} + \text{No. Injured}) \times \text{CPF}$

CPF = The Crossing Protection Factor is based on warning devices at crossing.

| | | | | |
|----------|-----|-----|-----|-----|
| STANDARD | 9 | 8 | 3 | 1 |
| CPF | 1.0 | 0.4 | 0.2 | 0.1 |

Note 1: No more than three points shall be allowed for each accident prior to modification by the protection factor.

Note 2: Each accident is rated separately and modified by a factor based on the warning devices in existence at time of the accident.

APPENDIX B**(Page 3)**

BD = Blocking Delay Per Train (The time in which vehicular traffic is delayed to allow a train to pass at a crossing.) The blocking delay, for a typical day, is the elapse time in minutes when trains pass the crossing. The delay is measured from the point that the warning devices are activated at the crossing and the time after the train has cleared the crossing and the warning devices are reset. The average BD points are the total delay time divided by the total number of trains observed (10 points max).

VS = Vehicular Speed Limit - Posted Speed Limit

| | | | | | | |
|-------------|------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-----|
| SPEED (mph) | 0-30 | 31-35 | 36-40 | 41-45 | 46-50 | 51+ |
| POINTS | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

RS = Railroad Maximum Speed

| | | | | | | | | |
|-----------|------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-----|
| SPEED-MPH | 0-25 | 26-35 | 36-45 | 46-55 | 56-65 | 66-75 | 76-85 | 86+ |
| POINTS | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |

CG = Crossing Geometrics - 0 - 17 points are assigned to each crossing based on the relative severity of physical conditions, i.e. grade, alignment, site distance, track skew angle, traffic signals, entrances and exits, etc.

AR = Alternate Route Availability - The AR is the nearest crossing available that vehicles may cross if the highway-rail grade crossing is blocked by train(s). The alternate route distance is the roadway distance between the blocked crossing and the available crossing measured in feet. The AR points are determined by dividing the distance (in feet) by 1000. A maximum of 5 points is assigned to AR distances greater than 5000 ft.

PT = Passenger Trains - Additional points are given to projects that have passenger trains travelling through the crossing based on the following:

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|---------------|-----|-----|------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-----|
| NO. OF TRAINS | 1-2 | 3-5 | 6-10 | 11-20 | 21-30 | 31-40 | 41-50 | 51-60 | 61-70 | 70+ |
| POINTS | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 |

APPENDIX B

(Page 4)

OF = Other Factors- Other Factors are valued in a range from 0 to 18 points based on:

| CATEGORY | POINTS |
|--------------------------------|---------------|
| SECONDARY ACCIDENTS | 0-3 |
| EMERGENCY/ OTHER VEHICLE USAGE | 0-3 |
| PASSENGER BUSES | 0-3 |
| HAZ-MAT TRAINS & TRUCKS* | 0-3 |
| COMMUNITY IMPACT | 0-3 |
| SCHOOL BUSES | 0-3 |

* Hazardous Material Trains & Trucks must display the placard with a clearly visible diamond-shaped sign to be counted for this category.

FORMULA FOR EXISTING SEPARATIONS NOMINATED FOR ALTERATION OR RECONSTRUCTION

$$P = \frac{V (T + 0.1 \times LRT)}{C \times F} + SF$$

Where:

- P** - Priority Index Number
- V** - Average 24-Hour Vehicular Volume (1 point per vehicle)
- T** - Average 24-Hour Train Volume (1 point per train)
- LRT** - Average 24-Hour Light Rail Train Volume (1 point per train)
- C** - Total Separation Project Costs (1 point per thousand dollars)
- F** - Cost Inflation Factor (8.32)
- SF** - Separation Factor = WC + HC + SR + AS + POF + AP + DE
- WC** - Width Clearance (up to 10 points)
- HC** - Height Clearance (up to 10 points)
- SR** - Speed Reduction (up to 5 points)
- AS** - Accidents at or near structure (0.1 pt per accident)
- POF** - Probability of Failure (up to 10 points)
- AP** - Accident Potential (up to 10 points)
- DE** - Delay Effects (up to 10 points)

APPENDIX B

(Page 5)

F = Cost Inflation Factor - the inflation factor "F" is determined by comparing the 1976 inflation factor with the changes in the construction cost index (CCI) from 1976 to the current investigation year (1999) found in the ENR (Engineering News Record) journal. The calculation is as follows:

$$F = \frac{CCI ('75-'76) \times '75-'76 'f'}{CCI (Current Year)}$$

Where, the CCI for 1975-76 is 2100,
 "f" - cost inflation factor for 1975-76 is 24 and
 the average CCI for 1999 is 6060,

therefore; **the new F for this OII is $(2100 \times 24) / 6060 = 8.32$**

The average CCI for 1999 is the sum from January to December (72714) / 12 = 6060, per the following ENR Data:

| Month | Jan | Feb | Mar | Apr | May | Jun | Jul | Aug | Sep | Oct | Nov | Dec |
|-------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|
| CCI | 6000 | 5992 | 5986 | 6008 | 6006 | 6039 | 6076 | 6091 | 6128 | 6134 | 6127 | 6127 |

SF = Separation Factor = WC+HC+SR+AS+PF+AP+ DE

WC = Width Clearance is determined by bridge width (in feet) and the number of traffic lanes in existence (N):

| If the Width is: | POINTS |
|-------------------------------|--------|
| 16'+12(N) | 0 |
| 12' but less than 16' + 12(N) | 2 |
| 8' but less than 12' + 12(N) | 4 |
| Less than 8'+12(N) | 6 |
| 11(N) | 8 |
| Less than 11(N) | 10 |

APPENDIX B

(Page 6)

HC = Separation Height Clearance is determined by the height clearance from center of traffic lane and bridge (Underpass) or from top of rail and bridge (Overpass).

Underpass

| Height (feet) | Points |
|-----------------------|--------|
| 15' and above | 0 |
| 14' but less than 15' | 4 |
| 13' but less than 14' | 8 |
| Less than 13' | 10 |

Overpass

| Height (feet) | Points |
|-------------------------|--------|
| 22.5' and above | 0 |
| 20' but less than 22.5' | 4 |
| 18' but less than 20' | 8 |
| Less than 18' | 10 |

SR = Speed Reduction or Slow Order

| | Points |
|----------|--------|
| None | 0 |
| Moderate | 2 |
| Severe | 5 |

AS = Accidents at or Near Structure during the last 10 years from the application due date (October 1, 1989 to October 1, 1999). The AS points are determined by dividing the total number of occurrences by 10 and rounded off to the nearest tenth of a point (86 occurrences = $86/10 = 8.6$ points).

PF = Probability of Failure has a 10 point maximum taking structure age into account.

| | Points |
|--------------|--------|
| Minimal/None | 0 |
| Slight | 2-3 |
| Moderate | 4-6 |
| Extreme | 7-10 |

APPENDIX B

(Page 7)

AP = Accident Potential – A maximum of 10 points is given for the geometrics at the separation like: road curvature, signage, and illumination.

| | Points |
|----------|--------|
| None | 0 |
| Slight | 2-3 |
| Moderate | 4-6 |
| Extreme | 7-10 |

DE = Delay Effects – A maximum of 10 points is given to conditions that cause traffic delays at the separation like road bottlenecks, slow vehicle usage (trucks, agriculture equipment, lack of left or right turn lanes or other traffic congestion.

| | Points |
|----------|--------|
| None | 0 |
| Slight | 2-3 |
| Moderate | 4-6 |
| Extreme | 7-10 |

(END OF APPENDIX B)

I.99-07-001 CXW/PAB/eap

APPENDIX C – EXHIBIT 73

*

PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION

320 WEST 4TH STREET, SUITE 500
LOS ANGELES, CA 90013



June 7, 2000

Re: I.99-07-001 - Grade Separation Priority List for FY 2000-01 and FY 2001-02
Late-filed Exhibit 73

To: All Parties of Record

The Department of Transportation (Caltrans) notified the Commission staff that the following four projects are receiving allocated funds this fiscal year 1999-2000:

| PUC ID | Agency | Crossing Location |
|---------------|-------------------|--------------------------------|
| B-516.9 | City of Montclair | Ramona Avenue |
| E-404.24B | City of Ventura | Auto Center Drive (Johnson Dr) |
| B-210.3 | Fresno County | Chestnut Avenue |
| B-305.9 | Kern County | 7 th Standard Road |

Subsequently, the four projects are to be removed from the proposed Separation of Highway-Rail Grade Crossing Priority List for Fiscal Years 2000-2001 and 2001-2002.

Enclosed is the Revised Exhibit 73, incorporating these changes. ATTACHMENT 1, REVISED APPENDIX A, REVISED APPENDIX B, and REVISED APPENDIX C of Revised Exhibit 73 supercede those in Late Filed Exhibit 73.

If you have any questions, you may contact me at (213) 576-7078 or e-mail rxm@cpuc.ca.gov.

Sincerely,

Rosa Muñoz
Transportation Engineer

Enclosure

C: Administrative Law Judge Patricia A. Bennett

ATTACHMENT 1 - Changes To Application Data for Fiscal Years 2000-2001 & 2001-2002

(Page 1 of 3)

| Exhibit | PUC ID | Agency | Crossing Location | Exhibit 1 Priority Index | Changes | Revised Priority Index |
|---------|---------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------------------|--------------------------|--|------------------------|
| 2 | 101VY-1.17 | LOS ANGELES | NORTH MAIN ST | 55.62 | Change T to 117 Change PT to 72 for 10 pts | 56.09 |
| 3 | 101EB-484A 101VY-1.36A | LOS ANGELES (2 Xings) | North Spring St & North Spring St | 49.42 | Change T to 117 | 53.47 |
| 4 | B-485.8 | LOS ANGELES | VALLEY BLVD | 123.38 | Change project to Underpass | 123.38 |
| 5 | 1BK-495.4 | DOWNEY | BROOKSHIRE AVE | 49.84 | BD verified, no change O to 303 for 2 pts | 51.84 |
| 7 | PROPOSE D | TORRANCE | DEL AMO BLVD | 116.68 | Change C to 18,722 Change BD to 5 | 42.60 |
| 8 | 2B-21.20 | CORONA | MCKINLEY ST | 37.99 | Change V to 33,720 Change C to 17,250 Change BD to 1.6 Change PB to 23 for 1 pt Change SB to 20 for 1 pt Change H to 770 for 3 pts Change O to 3 for 1 pt Change SA to 53 for 3 pts Change CI to 3 | 53.61 |
| 11 | OR-182.9 | IRVINE | SAND CANYON AVE | 93.71 | Change SA to 9 for 1 pt No change for Priority Index | 93.71 |
| 12 | 3-53.1 | RIVERSIDE | JURUPA AVE | 75.64 | Change V to 16,190 Change C to 13,300 Change VS to 43.6 for 3 pts Change RS to 62.18 for 4 pts Change CG to 21.92 Change SA to 8 for 1 pt Change SB to 25 for 2 pts | 100.85 |
| 14 | B-281.2 | DELANO | GARCES HWY | 40.06 | Change C to 7,095 Change BD to 3.43 Change CI to 3 | 33.34 |
| 15 | B-280.2 | DELANO | CECIL AVE | 80.17 | Change C to 7,848 Change BD to 3.43 Change CI to 3 | 61.93 |
| 21 | B-517.4 | MONTCLAIR | MONTE VISTA AVE | 128.18 | Change V to 12,514 Change BD to 3.52 | 133.46 |
| 24 | B-613.0 | COACHELLA | DILLON RD | 60.35 | Change V to 14,269 | 68.08 |
| 27 | B-413.7 | PALMDALE | PALMDALE BLVD (SR138) | 49.24 | Change T to 60 Change PT to 15 for 4 pts Evaluate as single year nomination | 71.94 |
| 31 | 36-7.4 | CHULA VISTA | E ST | 32.74 | Change V to 28,643 Change O to 90 for 1 pt Change PB to 0 for 0 pts Change SB to 2 for 1 pt Change H to 1 for 1 pt | 40.62 |
| 41 | VY-69.33 | LOS ANGELES CO | SIERRA HWY | 64.84 | Change T to 60 Change VS to 55 for 5 pts Change RS to 65 for 4 pts Change PT to 15 for 4 pts Change AH to 11 | 153.23 |

*

ATTACHMENT 1 - Changes To Application Data for Fiscal Years 2000-2001 & 2001-2002
(Page 2 of 3)

| Exhibit | PUC ID | Agency | Crossing Location | Exhibit 1 Priority Index | Changes | Revised Priority Index |
|---------|--|--|--|--------------------------|---|------------------------|
| 44 | VY-66.92 | LOS ANGELES CO | AVENUE S | 29.52 | Change T to 22 Change PT to 15 for 4 pts | 31.29 |
| 46 | 2-1114.7 2-1113.5 | BNSF/ Alternate for San Joaquin Consolidation | CONSOLIDATION (2 Xings) Mariposa Rd & Kaiser Rd | 67.12 | Change V to 6,777 Change C to 6,439 | 72.48 |
| 47 | 2-1112.2 2-1113.5 2-1114.7 2-1108.3 | SAN JOAQUIN CO | CONSOLIDATION (4 Xings) Jack Tone Rd Kaiser Rd Mariposa Rd Wagner Rd | 270.79 | Change V to 10,511 Change C to 10,444 Change AH to 7.5 | 86.91 |
| 48 | D-92.8 | SAN JOAQUIN CO | WEST LANE | 56.73 | Change CI to 3 | 58.73 |
| 50 | 2-885.6 2-885.6 2-885.75 2-885.77 2-885.95 2-886.2 2-886.4 | BAKERSFIELD | BEALE-TRUXTON-BAKER (7 Xings) 21 st St Gage St Beale Ave Truxtun Ave Baker St Tulare St Sonora St | 151.85 | Change AR to 3.73 | 152.95 |
| 52 | B-308.9 | KERN COUNTY | OLIVE DR | 54.23 | Change AR to 4.9 | 55.13 |
| 55 | 2-889.5 | SHAFTER | 7TH STANDARD | 46.17 | Change O to 24 for 1 pt | 47.17 |
| 56 | C-258.0 | REDDING | SOUTH ST | 43.11 | Change AR to 3 Change CI to 3 | 47.36 |
| 59 | E-64.0 E-64.7 E-65.2 | SAN JOSE | CONSOLIDATION (3 Xings) Bailey Ave Laguna Ave Richmond Ave | 64.10 | Change V to 6,298 | 63.02 |
| 63 | 4-84.8 | LATHROP | LATHROP RD | 91.59 | Change T to 26 Change BD to 3.06 Change PT to 6 for 3 pts | 64.34 |
| 64 | D-82.1 | LATHROP | LATHROP RD | 92.93 | Change T to 20 Change BD to 3.87 Change PT to 0 for 0 pts | 54.29 |
| 66 | BB-0.4B | WEST SACRAMENTO | WEST CAPITAL AVE/Permanent | 37.26 | Change POF to 9 correction | 39.26 |
| 67 | BB-0.4B | WEST SACRAMENTO | WEST CAPITAL AVE Emergency Repair | 51.31 | Change DE to 6 correction | 54.37 |
| 69 | 4-132.9 | SRTD (1) | FLORIN RD | 72.54 | Change LT to 0 | 50.98 |
| 70 | 2-1180.41-B | HERCULES | SYCAMORE AVE | 32.46 | Change T to 35 | 27.43 |

ATTACHMENT 1 – Changes To Application Data for Fiscal Years 2000-2001 & 2001-2002

(Page 3 of 3)

| PUC ID | Agency | Crossing Location | Exhibit 1 Priority Index | Recommended to Dismiss |
|--------------------|-------------------|---|--------------------------|---|
| BAM-386.9 | CALIFORNIA CITY | CALIFORNIA CITY BLVD | 21.98 | Dismiss non-appearance |
| SG-41.10 | RANCHO CUCAMONGA | HAVEN AVE | 34.59 | Dismiss non-appearance |
| 2-71.0 BB-480.1 | SAN BERNARDINO CO | (2 Xings) Glen Helen Parkway Glen Helen Parkway | 35.80 | Dismiss non-appearance |
| 2-30.6B | SAN BERNARDINO CO | NATIONAL TRAILS HWY | 39.55 | Dismiss non-appearance |
| NWP498-6555 | SONOMA CO | OLD REDWOOD HWY | 34.78 | Dismiss non-appearance |
| 83E-10.03 | SRTD (1) | BRADSHAW RD | 63.67 | Dismiss – exclusive light-rail train operations |

(1) SRTD – Sacramento Regional Transit District

*

REVISED APPENDIX A – Priority List by Ranking for Fiscal Years 2000-2001 & 2001-2002

(Page 1 of 2)

| Rank | PUC ID | AGENCY | CROSSING LOCATION | Priority Index |
|------|--|-----------------------------------|--|----------------|
| 1 | 3-22.4 | LOS ANGELES CO | NOGALES ST | 157.47 |
| 2 | VY-69.33 | LOS ANGELES CO | SIERRA HWY | 153.23 |
| 3 | 2-885.6 2-885.6 2-885.75 2-885.77 2-885.95 2-886.2 2-886.4 | BAKERSFIELD | BEALE-TRUXTON-BAKER (7 Xings) 21 st St Gage St Beale Ave Truxtun Ave Baker St Tulare St Sonora St | 152.95 |
| 4 | B-517.4 | MONTCLAIR | MONTE VISTA AVE | 133.46 |
| 5 | DA-30.5 DA-30.9 DA-32.1 4G-2.6 SA-32.65 DA-32.7 DA-32.8 4G-3.2 DAB-42.4B DA-29.9B | FREMONT | CONSOLIDATION (10 Xings) Walnut Ave Stevenson Blvd Paseo Padre Pkwy Paseo Padre Pkwy High St Main St Washington Blvd Washington Blvd Mowry Ave Mowry Ave | 126.49 |
| 6 | B-485.8 | LOS ANGELES | VALLEY BLVD | 123.38 |
| 7 | 3-23.4 | LOS ANGELES CO | FAIRWAY DR | 107.43 |
| 8 | 3-53.1 | RIVERSIDE | JURUPA AVE | 100.85 |
| 9 | OR-182.9 | IRVINE | SAND CANYON AVE | 93.71 |
| 10 | 2-1112.2 2-1113.5 2-1114.7 2-1108.3 | SAN JOAQUIN CO | CONSOLIDATION (4 Xings) Jack Tone Rd Kaiser Rd Mariposa Rd Wagner Rd | 86.91 |
| 11 | 2-1114.7 2-1113.5 | BNSF Alternate for San Joaquin | CONSOLIDATION (2 Xings) Mariposa Rd Kaiser Rd | 72.48 |
| 12 | B-413.7 | PALMDALE | PALMDALE BLVD (SR138) | 71.94 |
| 13 | BBJ-497.28 2-153.1 | LOS ANGELES CO | (2 Xings) Norwalk Blvd Norwalk Blvd | 69.54 |
| 14 | B-311.8 | BAKERSFIELD | Q ST | 68.29 |
| 15 | B-613.0 | COACHELLA | DILLON RD | 68.08 |
| 16 | 4-84.8 | LATHROP | LATHROP RD | 64.34 |
| 17 | 3-17.2 | LOS ANGELES CO | TURNBULL CANYON RD | 63.45 |
| 18 | E-64.0 E-65.2 E-64.7 | SAN JOSE | CONSOLIDATION (3 Xings) Bailey Ave Richmond Ave Laguna Ave | 63.02 |
| 19 | B-280.2 | DELANO | CECIL AVE | 61.93 |
| 20 | D-92.8 | SAN JOAQUIN CO | WEST LANE | 58.73 |



REVISED APPENDIX A – Priority List by Ranking for Fiscal Years 2000-2001 & 2001-2002
(Page 2 of 2)

| Rank | PUC ID | AGENCY | CROSSING LOCATION | Priority Index |
|------|---|------------------------|---|----------------|
| 21 | DA-32.1 4G-2.6 SA-32.65 DA-32.7 DA-32.8 4G-3.2 | FREMONT Alternate | CONSOLIDATION (6 Xings) Paseo Padre Pkwy Paseo Padre Pkwy High St Main St Washington Blvd Washington Blvd | 57.59 |
| 22 | 3A-3.4 2-147.1C | LOS ANGELES CO | (2 Xings) Bandini Blvd Bandini Blvd | 56.18 |
| 23 | 101VY-1.17 | LOS ANGELES | NORTH MAIN ST | 56.09 |
| 24 | E-417.93 | CAMARILLO | ADOLFO RD | 55.49 |
| 25 | B-308.9 | KERN COUNTY | OLIVE DR | 55.13 |
| 26 | BB-0.4B | WEST SACRAMENTO | WEST CAPITAL AVE Emergency Repair | 54.37 |
| 27 | D-82.1 | LATHROP | LATHROP RD | 54.29 |
| 28 | 2B-21.20 | CORONA | MCKINLEY ST | 53.61 |
| 29 | 101EB-484A 101VY-1.36A | LOS ANGELES | (2 Xings) North Spring St North Spring St | 53.47 |
| 30 | E-419.92 | CAMARILLO | LAS POSAS/UPLAND | 52.16 |
| 31 | BK-495.4 | DOWNEY | BROOKSHIRE AVE | 51.84 |
| 32 | 4-132.9 | SRTD | FLORIN RD | 50.98 |
| 33 | DA-36.2 4G-6.7 | FREMONT | (2 Xings) WARREN AVE | 49.85 |
| 34 | B-393.9 | KERN COUNTY | ROSAMOND BLVD | 49.40 |
| 35 | C-258.0 | REDDING | SOUTH ST | 47.36 |
| 36 | 2-889.5 | SHAFTER | 7TH STANDARD | 47.17 |
| 37 | PROPOSED | TORRANCE | DEL AMO BLVD | 42.60 |
| 38 | BBH-487.42 | LOS ANGELES CO | SLAUSON AVE | 42.43 |
| 39 | 108AE-177.0 | TEHAMA COUNTY | SOUTH AVE | 40.97 |
| 40 | 36-7.4 | CHULA VISTA | E ST | 40.62 |
| 41 | BB-0.4-B | WEST SACRAMENTO | WEST CAPITAL AVE Permanent | 39.26 |
| 42 | 1C-238.3 | TEHAMA COUNTY | BOWMAN RD | 36.99 |
| 43 | B-281.2 | DELANO | GARCES HWY | 33.34 |
| 44 | VY-66.92 | LOS ANGELES CO | AVENUE S | 31.29 |
| 45 | B-568.8 | BANNING | HARGRAVE ST | 30.62 |
| 46 | 2-1180.41-B | HERCULES | SYCAMORE AVE | 27.43 |
| 47 | 3A-7.8 | LOS ANGELES CO | FIRESTONE BLVD | 27.32 |
| 48 | BBH-492.6 | LOS ANGELES CO | EL SEGUNDO | 26.64 |
| 49 | 2-1180.40B | HERCULES | PALM AVE | 24.12 |
| 50 | PROPOSED | BAKERSFIELD | HAGEMAN RD | 21.78 |
| 51 | 36-9.7 | CHULA VISTA | PALOMAR ST | 21.41 |
| 52 | 36-7.9 | CHULA VISTA | H ST | 20.40 |
| 53 | PROPOSED | LOS ANGELES CO | FLORES ST | 13.87 |
| 54 | 087-68-3 | NAPA VALLEY WINE TRAIN | IMOLA AVE SR 121 | 13.23 |

I.99-07-001

REVISED APPENDIX B - Nominations in Alphabetical Order with Priority Index and Rank

(Page 1 of 2)

| AGENCY | CROSSING LOCATION | Vehicle Volume | Train | Light Rail | Blkng Delay | Accd Hist | Cost (000) | SCF /SF | Priority Index | Rank |
|-----------------|----------------------------------|----------------|-------|------------|-------------|-----------|------------|---------|----------------|------|
| | | V | T | LT | BD | AH | C | | | |
| BAKERSFIELD | BEALE-TRUXTON-BAKER (7 Xings) | 19870 | 39 | 0.0 | 5.24 | 12 | 17680 | 62.13 | 152.95 | 3 |
| BAKERSFIELD | HAGEMAN RD | 15126 | 6 | 0.0 | 1.50 | 0 | 2820 | 15.98 | 21.78 | 50 |
| BAKERSFIELD | Q ST | 9252 | 36 | 0.0 | 4.87 | 3 | 7145 | 24.20 | 68.29 | 14 |
| BANNING | HARGRAVE ST | 2710 | 36 | 0.0 | 6.90 | 0 | 6960 | 19.00 | 30.62 | 45 |
| BNSF | Mariposa /Kaiser ALT (2 Xings) | 6777 | 38 | 0.0 | 1.44 | 6 | 6439 | 36.72 | 72.48 | 11 |
| CAMARILLO | ADOLFO RD | 18019 | 34 | 0.0 | 1.96 | 1 | 7390 | 26.00 | 55.49 | 24 |
| CAMARILLO | LAS POSAS/UPLAND | 18046 | 34 | 0.0 | 1.96 | 0 | 6522 | 30.00 | 52.16 | 30 |
| CHULA VISTA | E ST | 28643 | 2 | 20.6 | 0.53 | 4 | 15381 | 17.70 | 40.62 | 40 |
| CHULA VISTA | H ST | 23546 | 2 | 20.6 | 0.53 | 0 | 17381 | 18.45 | 20.40 | 52 |
| CHULA VISTA | PALOMAR ST | 41480 | 3 | 20.6 | 0.55 | 0 | 17381 | 17.69 | 21.41 | 51 |
| COACHELLA | DILLON RD | 14269 | 36 | 0.0 | 2.30 | 2 | 6375 | 26.44 | 68.08 | 15 |
| CORONA | MCKINLEY ST | 33720 | 51 | 0.0 | 1.60 | 0 | 17250 | 34.44 | 53.61 | 28 |
| DELANO | CECIL AVE | 18000 | 18 | 0.0 | 3.43 | 4 | 7848 | 25.06 | 61.93 | 19 |
| DELANO | GARCES HWY | 9957 | 18 | 0.0 | 3.43 | 1 | 7095 | 19.89 | 33.34 | 43 |
| DOWNEY | BROOKSHIRE AVE | 18766 | 11 | 0.0 | 10.00 | 0 | 8315 | 22.00 | 51.84 | 31 |
| FREMONT | Walnut Ave & Others (10 Xings) | 84598 | 11 | 0.0 | 8.82 | 0 | 28230 | 90.30 | 126.49 | 5 |
| FREMONT | Paseo Padre Pkwy + ALT (6 Xings) | 49976 | 11 | 0.0 | 8.82 | 0 | 39935 | 43.00 | 57.59 | 21 |
| FREMONT | WARREN AVE (2 Xings) | 11725 | 49 | 0.0 | 2.31 | 2 | 10688 | 22.00 | 49.85 | 33 |
| HERCULES | PALM AVE | 5000 | 35 | 0.0 | 0.00 | 0 | 6740 | 21.00 | 24.12 | 49 |
| HERCULES | SYCAMORE AVE | 8218 | 35 | | | 0 | 7800 | 23.00 | 27.43 | 46 |
| IRVINE | SAN CANYON AVE | 22000 | 62 | 0.0 | 0.89 | 4 | 15810 | 43.00 | 93.71 | 9 |
| KERN CO. | OLIVE DR | 17200 | 44 | 0.0 | 2.07 | 0 | 7070 | 28.50 | 55.13 | 25 |
| KERN CO. | ROSAMOND BLVD | 13400 | 18 | 0.0 | 2.90 | 2 | 6720 | 28.26 | 49.40 | 34 |
| LATHROP | LATHROP RD | 10497 | 20 | 0.0 | 3.87 | 4 | 6150 | 22.00 | 54.29 | 27 |
| LATHROP | LATHROP RD | 10497 | 26 | 0.0 | 3.06 | 5 | 6720 | 25.00 | 64.34 | 16 |
| LOS ANGELES | NORTH MAIN ST | 14188 | 117 | 0.0 | 2.76 | 1 | 55040 | 42.46 | 56.09 | 23 |
| LOS ANGELES | NORTH SPRING ST (2 Xings) | 19676 | 117 | 0.0 | 0.00 | 0 | 10146 | 26.20 | 53.47 | 29 |
| LOS ANGELES | VALLEY BLVD | 29203 | 68 | 0.0 | 3.09 | 9 | 30700 | 29.39 | 123.38 | 6 |
| LOS ANGELES CO. | AVENUE S | 21032 | 22 | 0.0 | 1.31 | 3 | 28243 | 22.80 | 31.29 | 44 |
| LOS ANGELES CO. | BANDINI BLVD (2 Xings) | 28453 | 39 | 0.0 | 1.91 | 2 | 29338 | 38.40 | 56.18 | 22 |
| LOS ANGELES CO. | EL SEGUNDO | 15332 | 2 | 23.6 | 0.84 | 0 | 24185 | 25.00 | 26.64 | 48 |
| LOS ANGELES CO. | FAIRWAY DR | 33205 | 51 | 0.0 | 2.00 | 3 | 13056 | 29.48 | 107.43 | 7 |
| LOS ANGELES CO. | FIRESTONE BLVD | 66310 | 14 | 0.0 | 1.60 | 0 | 25074 | 20.20 | 27.32 | 47 |
| LOS ANGELES CO. | FLORES ST | 10850 | 13 | 0.0 | 1.56 | 0 | 9630 | 11.12 | 13.87 | 53 |
| LOS ANGELES CO. | NOGALES ST | 43290 | 51 | 0.0 | 1.90 | 5 | 14514 | 31.32 | 157.47 | 1 |
| LOS ANGELES CO. | NORWALK BLVD (2 Xings) | 23247 | 110 | 0.0 | 2.35 | 0 | 23495 | 38.80 | 69.54 | 13 |
| LOS ANGELES CO. | SIERRA HWY | 12867 | 60 | 0.0 | 1.37 | 11 | 9216 | 28.68 | 153.23 | 2 |
| LOS ANGELES CO. | SLAUSON AVE | 35021 | 20 | 0.0 | 2.70 | 0 | 17992 | 29.80 | 42.43 | 38 |

REVISED APPENDIX B – Nominations in Alphabetical Order with Priority Index and Rank
(Page 2 of 2)

| AGENCY | CROSSING LOCATION | Vehicle Volume | Train | Light Rail | Blkng Delay | Accd Hist | Cost (000) | SCF /SF | Priority Index | Rank |
|------------------------|-----------------------------------|----------------|-------|------------|-------------|-----------|------------|---------|----------------|------|
| | | V | T | LT | BD | AH | C | | | |
| LOS ANGELES CO. | TURNBULL CANYON RD | 22136 | 51 | 0.0 | 2.14 | 2 | 16974 | 30.36 | 63.45 | 17 |
| MONTCLAIR | MONTE VISTA AVE | 12514 | 77 | 0.0 | 3.52 | 4 | 8500 | 31.00 | 133.46 | 4 |
| NAPA VALLEY WINE TRAIN | IMOLA AVE SR 121 | 28200 | 1 | 0.0 | 1.67 | 0 | 2000 | 10.40 | 13.23 | 54 |
| PALMDALE | PALMDALE AVE | 33260 | 60 | 0.0 | 1.45 | 1 | 15030 | 32.84 | 71.94 | 12 |
| REDDING | SOUTH ST | 12405 | 39 | 0.0 | 3.13 | 0 | 7010 | 21.40 | 47.36 | 35 |
| RIVERSIDE | JURUPA AVE | 16190 | 55 | 0.0 | 1.95 | 5 | 13300 | 44.92 | 100.85 | 8 |
| SAN JOAQUIN CO. | WEST LANE | 22873 | 13 | 0.0 | 3.13 | 5 | 9100 | 26.80 | 58.73 | 20 |
| SAN JOAQUIN CO. | Mariposa & Others (4 Xings) | 10511 | 38 | 0.0 | 1.33 | 7.5 | 10444 | 46.32 | 86.91 | 10 |
| SAN JOSE | Bailey Ave & Others (3 Xings) | 6298 | 20 | 0.0 | 1.00 | 9 | 6950 | 41.24 | 63.02 | 18 |
| SHAFTER | 7 TH STANDARD RD | 5300 | 62 | 0.0 | 2.09 | 1 | 7454 | 30.80 | 47.17 | 36 |
| SRTD (1) | FLORIN RD | 37022 | 16 | 0.0 | 0.93 | 3 | 10000 | 23.00 | 50.98 | 32 |
| TEHAMA COUNTY | BOWMAN RD | 5116 | 27 | 0.0 | 1.30 | 0 | 2484 | 28.30 | 36.99 | 42 |
| TEHAMA COUNTY | SOUTH AVE | 4970 | 23 | 0.0 | 2.60 | 0 | 2558 | 27.00 | 40.97 | 39 |
| TORRANCE | DEL AMO BLVD | 29000 | 29 | 0.0 | 5.00 | 0 | 18722 | 15.60 | 42.60 | 37 |
| WEST SACRAMENTO | WEST CAPITAL AVE Permanent | 7848 | 6 | 0.0 | 0.00 | 0 | 5320 | 38.20 | 39.26 | 41 |
| WEST SACRAMENTO | WEST CAPITAL AVE Emergency Repair | 7848 | 6 | 0.0 | 0.00 | 0 | 350 | 38.20 | 54.37 | 26 |

(1) SRTD – Sacramento Regional Transit District

*

REVISED APPENDIX C – Nominations in Alphabetical Order with SCF/SF
(Page 1 of 3)

| Agency | Crossing Location | CG | SB | PB | H | O | PT | AR | VS | RS | SA | CI | TOTAL SCF |
|--------------------------------|--|-------|----|----|---|----|----|------|-----|-----|------|----|-----------|
| BAKERSFIELD | BEALE-TRUXTON-BAKER (7 Xings) | 46.40 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 3.73 | 3 | 0 | 1.00 | 3 | 62.13 |
| BAKERSFIELD | HAGEMAN RD | 2.48 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 3.50 | 5 | 0 | 0.00 | 1 | 15.98 |
| BAKERSFIELD | Q ST | 12.60 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1.60 | 1 | 3 | 0.00 | 3 | 24.20 |
| BANNING | HARGRAVE ST | 6.00 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | 1 | 3 | 1.00 | 1 | 19.00 |
| BNSF | Mariposa Rd & Kaiser (2 Xings) | 10.72 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 3 | 5.00 | 5 | 5 | 1.00 | 2 | 36.72 |
| CAMARILLO | ADOLFO RD | 5.00 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 5.00 | 2 | 4 | 3.00 | 2 | 26.00 |
| CAMARILLO | LAS POSAS/UPLAND RD | 7.00 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 5.00 | 3 | 4 | 3.00 | 2 | 30.00 |
| CHULA VISTA | E ST | 7.00 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0.70 | 1 | 3 | 1.00 | 2 | 17.70 |
| CHULA VISTA | H ST | 9.00 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0.45 | 1 | 1 | 1.00 | 2 | 18.45 |
| CHULA VISTA | PALOMAR ST | 6.60 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0.09 | 1 | 1 | 1.00 | 2 | 17.69 |
| COACHELLA | DILLON RD | 9.44 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | 2 | 5 | 2.00 | 1 | 26.44 |
| CORONA | MCKINLEY ST | 8.44 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 4 | 5.00 | 1 | 4 | 3.00 | 3 | 34.44 |
| DELANO | CECIL AVE | 5.44 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 0 | 2.62 | 1 | 4 | 2.00 | 3 | 25.06 |
| DELANO | GARCES HWY | 4.43 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 2.47 | 0 | 4 | 0.00 | 3 | 19.89 |
| DOWNEY | BROOKSHIRE AVE | 7.00 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 5.00 | 1 | 0 | 1.00 | 3 | 22.00 |
| FREMONT | Walnut Ave & Others (10 Xings) + Mowry | 48.00 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 3.20 | 1 | 1 | 3.00 | 3 | 90.30 |
| FREMONT | Paseo Padre Pkwy + ALT (4 Xings) | 32.80 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3.20 | 1 | 1 | 2.00 | 3 | 43.00 |
| FREMONT | WARREN AVE (2 Xings) | 9.00 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 5.00 | 1 | 1 | 1.00 | 2 | 22.00 |
| * HERCULES | PALM AVE | | | | | 6 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 4 | 6 | 2 | 21.00 |
| * HERCULES | SYCAMORE AVE | | | | | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 4 | 5 | 23.00 |
| IRVINE | SAN CANYON AVE | 8.00 | 3 | 2 | 0 | 3 | 8 | 5.00 | 4 | 7 | 1.00 | 2 | 43.00 |
| KERN CO | OLIVE DR | 8.60 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 4.90 | 3 | 4 | 2.00 | 1 | 28.50 |
| KERN CO | ROSAMOND BLVD | 8.26 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 5.00 | 3 | 4 | 1.00 | 2 | 28.26 |
| LATHROP | LATHROP RD | 6.00 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5.00 | 1 | 4 | 0.00 | 2 | 22.00 |
| LATHROP | LATHROP RD | 6.00 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 5.00 | 1 | 4 | 0.00 | 2 | 25.00 |
| LOS ANGELES | NORTH MAIN ST | 22.16 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 10 | 1.30 | 1 | 0 | 1.00 | 2 | 42.46 |
| * LOS ANGELES | NORTH SPRING ST (2 Xings) | | | | | 10 | 0 | 5 | 0.2 | 4 | 4 | 3 | 26.20 |
| LOS ANGELES | VALLEY BLVD | 11.16 | 3 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 4.23 | 2 | 1 | 1.00 | 2 | 29.39 |
| LOS ANGELES CO | AVENUE S | 2.80 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 4 | 5.00 | 5 | 3 | 0.00 | 1 | 22.80 |
| LOS ANGELES CO | BANDINI BLVD (2 Xings) | 17.00 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 4.40 | 2 | 5 | 0.00 | 1 | 38.40 |
| LOS ANGELES CO | EL SEGUNDO | 12.60 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1.40 | 1 | 2 | 0.00 | 1 | 25.00 |
| LOS ANGELES CO | FAIRWAY DR | 8.48 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 5.00 | 2 | 5 | 0.00 | 1 | 29.48 |
| LOS ANGELES CO | FIRESTONE BLVD | 9.00 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 2.20 | 1 | 0 | 0.00 | 1 | 20.20 |
| LOS ANGELES CO | FLORES ST | 3.12 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5.00 | 1 | 0 | 0.00 | 2 | 11.12 |
| LOS ANGELES CO | NOGALES ST | 8.32 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 4 | 5.00 | 1 | 5 | 0.00 | 1 | 31.32 |
| LOS ANGELES CO | NORWALK BLVD (2 Xings) | 15.40 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 7 | 3.40 | 3 | 3 | 0.00 | 2 | 38.80 |
| LOS ANGELES CO | SIERRA HWY | 6.68 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 4 | 5.00 | 5 | 4 | 0.00 | 2 | 28.68 |
| * KEY FOR EXISTING SEPARATIONS | | | | | | WC | HC | SR | AS | POF | AP | DE | SF |

*

REVISED APPENDIX C – Nominations in Alphabetical Order with SCF/SF
(Page 2 of 3)

| Agency | Crossing Location | CG | SB | PB | H | O | PT | AR | VS | RS | SA | CI | TOTAL SCF |
|--------------------------------|--------------------------------------|-------|----|----|---|----|----|------|-----|-----|------|-----|-----------|
| LOS ANGELES CO | SLAUSON AVE | 15.80 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 5.00 | 1 | 0 | 0.00 | 1 | 29.80 |
| LOS ANGELES CO | TURNBULL CANYON | 9.56 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 4.80 | 1 | 5 | 1.00 | 1 | 30.36 |
| MONTCLAIR | MONTE VISTA AVE | 9.00 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 5.00 | 2 | 4 | 2.00 | 3 | 31.00 |
| NAPA VALLEY WINE TRAIN | IMOLA AVE SR 121 | 2.40 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5.00 | 2 | 0 | 0.00 | 1 | 10.40 |
| PALMDALE | PALMDALE AVE | 6.24 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 4 | 2.60 | 2 | 6 | 3.00 | 2 | 32.84 |
| REDDING | SOUTH ST | 10.40 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3.00 | 0 | 2 | 0.00 | 3 | 21.40 |
| RIVERSIDE | JURUPA AVE | 21.92 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 5.00 | 3 | 4 | 1.00 | 2 | 44.92 |
| SAN JOAQUIN CO | WEST LANE | 6.80 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 5.00 | 1 | 2 | 3.00 | 3 | 26.80 |
| SAN JOAQUIN CO | Mariposa Rd & Others (4 Xings) | 20.32 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 3 | 5.00 | 5 | 3 | 2.00 | 3 | 46.32 |
| SAN JOSE | Bailey Ave & Others (3 Xings) | 21.24 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 5.00 | 2 | 6 | 1.00 | 2 | 41.24 |
| SHAFTER | 7TH STANDARD RD | 6.80 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 5.00 | 5 | 5 | 1.00 | 1 | 30.80 |
| SRTD (1) | FLORIN RD | 8.00 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5.00 | 2 | 2 | 0.00 | 2 | 23.00 |
| TEHAMA COUNTY | BOWMAN RD | 9.80 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | 5 | 5 | 1.00 | 0.5 | 28.30 |
| TEHAMA COUNTY | SOUTH AVE | 6.00 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | 5 | 5 | 1.00 | 2 | 27.00 |
| TORRANCE | DEL AMO BLVD | 4.60 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 4.00 | 1 | 0 | 0.00 | 1 | 15.60 |
| * W. Sacramento | WEST CAPITAL AVE Permanent | | | | | 6 | 8 | 3 | 0.2 | 9 | 6 | 6 | 38.20 |
| * W. Sacramento | WEST CAPITAL AVE Emergency Repair | | | | | 6 | 8 | 3 | 0.2 | 9 | 6 | 6 | 38.20 |
| * KEY FOR EXISTING SEPARATIONS | | | | | | WC | HC | SR | AS | POF | AP | DE | SF |

(1) SRTD – Sacramento Regional Transit District

*

REVISED APPENDIX C – *Nominations in Alphabetical Order with SCF/SF*
(Page 3 of 3)

For Special Conditions Factor - SCF

| | | |
|--------------------------|-------------------------|---------------------------|
| CG – Crossing Geometrics | H- Hazmat Trains/Trucks | AR-Alternate Route |
| SB – School Buses | O-Other Vehicles | VS –Vehicular Speed Limit |
| PB- Passenger Buses | PT – Passenger trains | RS – Rail Speed Limit |
| SA – Secondary Accidents | CI –Community Impact | |

For Separation Factor – SF

| | | |
|-------------------------------|---------------------|------------------------------|
| WC – Width Clearance | HC-Height Clearance | SR – Speed Reduction |
| AS – Accidents Near Structure | | POF – Probability of Failure |
| AP – Accident Potential | DE – Delay Effects | |

(END OF APPENDIX C)