File Number: G.11-09-006

PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION

180 Promenade Circle, Suite 115 SACRAMENTO, CA 95834-2939



November 15, 2011

Benjamin Scharf Senior Assistant Council Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority 3331 North First Street San Jose, CA 95134-1927

Re: General Order 88-B Request for Authority to Alter the Fruitdale Avenue At-Grade Highway-Rail Crossing, CPUC Crossing No. 82D-4.71, DOT No. 750161P and the Fruitdale Station At-Grade Pedestrian Crossing, CPUC Crossing No. 82D-4.77-D, DOT No. 925807R in the City of San Jose

Dear Mr. Scharf:

This refers to your letter dated September 28, 2011 and received by us on September 30, 2011 requesting authorization to modify one at-grade highway-rail crossing and one at-grade pedestrian crossing of the Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority (VTA) light rail track in the City of San Jose (City). The crossings are identified as the Fruitdale Avenue Highway-Rail Crossing, CPUC Crossing No. 82D-4.71, DOT No. 750161P, and the Fruitdale Station at-grade pedestrian crossing, CPUC Crossing No. 82D-4.77-D, DOT No. 925807R.

The VTA alignment is on a shared corridor with Union Pacific Railroad (UPRR) traveling southwest from Diridon station. The alignment consists of three tracks at this location which travel parallel to Southwest Expressway. VTA owns the alignment and operates on the center and western track while UPRR operates on the eastern track.

Fruitdale Avenue is a six lane roadway with one left turn lane, two through lanes, and one right turn lane traveling through the crossing on the west approach. The east approach consists of two through lanes. The Fruitdale Station pedestrian crossing travels over the center and western tracks.

Fruitdale Avenue has one Commission Standard 9 (flashing light signal assembly with automatic gate) warning device and one median mounted Commission Standard 9 warning device on the east approach. The crossing has one Commission Standard 9-A (Commission Standard 9 with additional flashing light signals over the roadway on a cantilevered arm) warning device and one median mounted Commission Standard 9 warning device on the west approach and one Commission Standard 8 (flashing light signal assembly) warning device in the southeast quadrant.

The Fruitdale Station pedestrian crossing has two Commission Standard 8 warning devices; one each on the east and west approaches.

G.11-09-006 Benjamin Scharf November 15, 2011 Page 2 of 3

VTA states in the GO 88-B request that the project will "enhance pedestrian safety at this crossing by improving channelization through fencing and better placement of tactile strips."

The proposed amendments as indicated in the request letter and/or shown on the plans shall consist of:

Fruitdale Station Pedestrian Crossing Modifications

- Relocation of the ADA compliant detectable warning tactile strips outside of the manual swing gates.
- Relocation of the existing chain link fence in the northeast and southwest quadrants to improve pedestrian channelization to the crossing. The relocated fencing will be tied into the swing gates.

Fruitdale Avenue Crossing Modifications

• Relocation of the ADA compliant detectable warning tactile strips in the southeast quadrant to 7 feet from the nearest rail.

Staff has investigated the request by VTA, and finds it adequately addresses compliance and safety. As VTA, UPRR, and the City are in agreement as to the design and apportionments of the cost under the provisions of GO 88-B, you may proceed with the improvements as described in your request letter and attachments, and summarized above.

Temporary traffic controls shall be provided in compliance with Section 10A.05, Temporary Traffic Control Zones, of the California Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices (CA MUTCD), published by the California Department of Transportation.

All parties shall comply with all applicable rules, including Commission General Orders and CA MUTCD.

This project is categorically exempt from the requirements of the California Environment Quality Act of 1970, as amended [California Pubic Resources Code 21084].

This authorization shall expire if the above conditions are not complied with or if the work is not completed within three years of the date of this letter. Upon written request to this office, the time to complete the project may be extended. Any written request for a time extension must include concurrence letters by involved parties in support of the time extension. If an extension is requested, the Commission's Rail Crossings Engineering Section (RCES) may reevaluate the crossing prior to granting an extension.

Within 30 days after completion of this project, VTA shall notify RCES that the authorized work is completed, by submitting a completed Commission Standard Form G titled *Report of Changes at Highway Grade Crossings and Separations*. Form G requirements and forms can be obtained at the

G.11-09-006 Benjamin Scharf November 15, 2011 Page 3 of 3

CPUC web site Form G page at http://www.cpuc.ca.gov/formg. This report may be submitted electronically to rees@cpuc.ca.gov as outlined on the web page.

If you have any questions, please contact Felix Ko at (415) 703-3722 or fko@cpuc.ca.gov.

Sincerely,

Daren Gilbert, Manager

Rail Transit and Crossings Branch

Consumer Protection and Safety Division

C: John Raaymakers, PE
Associate Engineer
City of San Jose
Department of Transportation
200 East Santa Clara Street
San Jose, CA 95113-1905

Mark S. Robinson Chief Engineering & Construction Officer Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority 3331 North First Street San Jose, CA 95134-1927

James H. Smith Mgr Industry and Public Projects Union Pacific Railroad 9451 Atkinson Street Roseville, CA 95747