

PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION

515 L STREET, SUITE 1119
SACRAMENTO, CA 95814



January 25, 2008

Re: I.07-07-006 Grade Separation Priority List for fiscal years 2008-2009 under Section 2450 et seq. of the California Streets and Highways Code

To: All Nominating Applicants and Other Interested Parties

Pursuant to Administrative Law Judge (ALJ) Victor D. Ryerson's procedural Ruling issued December 10, 2007, enclosed is the Public Utilities Commission (Commission) Rail Crossings Engineering Section's Staff Exhibit entitled "GRADE SEPARATION PRIORITY LIST FOR FISCAL YEARS 2008-2009". The priority list is based on the nomination submittal made for each project and analysis of the data through the evaluation formulas approved in the proceeding.

The ALJ's ruling set January 25, 2008 as the due date for the Commission's Staff Exhibit. The Ruling also ordered parties to file comments on the Staff Exhibit by February 8, 2008.

If you have any questions or comments regarding the Staff Exhibit, please contact Commission staff, Rosa Muñoz at (213) 576-7078, e-mail: rxm@cpuc.ca.gov.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in blue ink that reads "Daren Gilbert".

Daren Gilbert, Supervisor
Rail Crossings Engineering Section
Consumer Protection & Safety Division

Enclosure

C: ALJ Victor D. Ryerson
Steve Cates, Caltrans



**Consumer Protection and Safety Division
Rail Transit and Crossings Branch**

**STAFF EXHIBIT - GRADE SEPARATION PRIORITY LIST
FOR FISCAL YEAR 2008-2009**

As Required By Section 2452 of the California Streets and Highways Code

L07-07-006
(July 12, 2007)

Rosa Muñoz, PE
Utilities Engineer
Rail Crossings Engineering Section

January 25, 2008

TABLE OF CONTENTS

SUMMARY	3
PROCEDURAL HISTORY & SCHEDULE.....	3
DISCUSSION	4
NOTES REGARDING NOMINATION EVALUATIONS.....	6
NOTES REGARDING SPECIFIC NOMINATIONS.....	7
RECOMMENDATION	10
APPENDIX A – Proposed Priority List for Fiscal Years 2008-2009 by Rank	

SUMMARY

This report submits the Grade Separation Priority List for fiscal years 2008-2009 for highway-rail crossing construction projects that qualify for state Section 190 funding. The Section 190 Grade Separation Program is executed under Streets and Highways (S&H) Code Sections 190-192 and 2450-2461. The priority list is issued in compliance with Commission Order Instituting Investigation (OII) proceeding (I.07-07-006), dated July 12, 2007, and the presiding Administrative Law Judge's (ALJ) procedural Ruling, issued December 10, 2007. The ALJ's ruling set January 25, 2008 as the due date for the Public Utilities Commission's (Commission) Rail Crossings Engineering Section Staff Exhibit. The Ruling also ordered parties to file comments on the Staff Exhibit by February 8, 2008. The OII established the criteria for funding of grade separation projects in accordance with Section 2452 of the S&H Code.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY AND SCHEDULE

On July 12, 2007, the Commission issued I.07-07-006 for the purpose of establishing and furnishing to the California Transportation Commission (CTC) and Department of Transportation (Caltrans) a priority list of highway-rail grade separation projects eligible for state Section 190 funding. S&H Code Section 2452 requires the Commission to establish the priority list for projects and furnish it to the CTC by July 1st of each year for use in the fiscal year beginning on that date. I.07-07-006 established the process for interested parties to submit proposed projects to be included in a new priority list for fiscal years 2008-2009 and 2009-2010 and to submit to the Commission their nominations for grade separation projects by Friday, October 19, 2007.

Staff received a total of 120 timely filed nominations for projects to be included in the current priority list.

The ALJ Ruling issued on December 10, 2007, established the schedule for the proceeding through the issuance of an interim decision for fiscal year 2008-2009. In the Ruling, the Commission set January 25, 2008 as the due date for the Staff Exhibit, including the proposed priority list to be sent to the parties on the service list. The Ruling also ordered parties to file and serve comments on the Staff Exhibit by February 8, 2008. As prescribed in the ALJ Ruling, the final date for revision of Staff Exhibit and the date for mailing the evidentiary hearing schedule to nominating applicants is February 22, 2008.

Evidentiary hearings will be held as follows:

March 3 – 4, 2008 10:00 a.m.	Commission Courtroom State Office Building 505 Van Ness Avenue San Francisco, CA 94102
March 5 – 7, 2008 10:00 a.m.	Junipero Serra State Office Building 320 West 4th Street, Suite 500 Los Angeles, CA 90013

The OII requires nominating parties' representatives to appear personally at the hearings to update, clarify, or explain each nomination, as necessary. After the hearings, staff may revise the tables to incorporate any changes to nominations approved by the assigned ALJ. All matters pertaining to the interim decision are to be submitted on or before, April 15, 2008.

DISCUSSION

Staff evaluated each of the 120 project nominations by analyzing data submitted, comparing information to Commission records, and researching accident history. Certain parties submitted supplemental information at the request of staff, or on their own.

Of the 120 project nominations, staff determined 119 projects qualified. Two project nominations involving adjacent crossings were consolidated together into one multiple crossing project. This project consolidation includes the City of Santa Fe Springs nominations for Los Nietos Road and for Norwalk Boulevard. As indicated in both nominating applications, the consolidation checkbox was marked. Therefore, Santa Fe Springs could have combined the information into one application, but instead submitted two applications. Staff combined the data contained in the two applications and informed the City. Staff then calculated the priority ranking for each of the remaining 119 projects based on the formulas in I.07-07-006, Appendix 2.

Staff analyzed projects involving closure and/or separation of multiple crossings in the same manner as single crossing project. Staff determined the point allocation for multiple crossing projects by adding vehicle counts, number of accidents, and crossing geometric points for each of the crossings. For the special condition factors of passenger buses, school buses, hazardous trucks and blocking delay, staff considered those not on the same roadway as separate and added those points.

Section 2452(g) requires the Commission to determine the maximum project allocation. The total funding for such allocations for a single project shall not exceed \$5 million without specific legislative authorization, except that the amount for a single project may be increased to either (1) an amount which includes the federal construction cost index increase each year since 1976, or (2) an amount which does not exceed one-third of the total funds appropriated.

Staff calculated the cost ceiling up to which the allocation of funds could be increased based on the federal construction cost index. Staff used the “Price Trends for Federal Aid Highway Construction¹” as the federal construction cost index for this purpose. For 2007, the first quarter composite index was 205.352. The 1976 composite average index was 56.9. Based on these numbers, the allocation can be increased to \$18 million ($[205.352/56.9] * \5 million), if this allocation does not exceed one third of funds available. Since 1974, the fund has remained at \$15 million. Funding for an individual project is limited to one-third of the total funds appropriated for grade separation projects for a given year which is \$5 million. Therefore, the controlling limit is based on available funds. For the purpose of this OII, the maximum allocation for a single project is \$5 million per fiscal year, notwithstanding Section 2454(g)(1) of S&H Code, which authorizes the CTC to allocate up to \$15 million to a single project if that project is the highest ranking project on the priority list established by the Commission.

¹ U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics, Consumer Price Index.
<ftp://ftp.bls.gov/pub/special.requests/cpi/cpiiai.txt>

Additional funds may be available as a result of the passage of Proposition 1B², which includes \$150 million for improving highway-rail crossings and constructing grade separations. The basis for allocation and state requirements for both funding sources (\$15 million allocated under S&H Code Section 190, and the \$150M Proposition 1B funds allocated to the Highway-Railroad Crossing Safety Account (HRSCA)) are contained in S&H Code Sections 2450-2461. The HRSCA allocation guidelines are scheduled for adoption February 14, 2008 by the CTC. More information can be found at the CTC website:
<http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/transprog/ibond.htm>.

NOTES REGARDING NOMINATION EVALUATIONS

Crossing Geometric Factor: The crossing geometric factor for each crossing was awarded 0 - 17 points based on the relative severity of physical conditions including sight distances, crossing angles, surface profiles, traffic, and roadway characteristics.

Blocking Delay, Passenger Buses, School Buses, and Haz-mat Trucks Factor: Based on the current pool of applicant nominations, staff assigned the values for the Blocking Delay

² Relevant Proposition 1B language:

(j) (1) Two hundred fifty million dollars (\$250,000,000) shall be deposited in the Highway-Railroad Crossing Safety Account, which is hereby created in the fund. Funds in the account shall be available, upon appropriation by the Legislature, to the Department of Transportation for the completion of high-priority grade separation and railroad crossing safety improvements. Funds in the account shall be made available for allocation pursuant to the process established in Chapter 10 (commencing with Section 2450) of Division 3 of the Streets and Highways Code, except that a dollar for dollar match of nonstate funds shall be provided for each project, and the limitation on maximum project cost in subdivision (g) of Section 2454 of the Streets and Highways Code shall not be applicable to projects funded with these funds.

(2) Notwithstanding the funding allocation process described in paragraph (1), in consultation with the department and the Public Utilities Commission, the California Transportation Commission shall allocate one hundred million dollars (\$100,000,000) of the funds in the account to high-priority railroad crossing improvements, including grade separation projects, that are not part of the process established in Chapter 10 (commencing with Section 2450) of Division 3 of the Streets and Highways Code. The allocation of funds under this paragraph shall be made in consultation and coordination with the High-Speed Rail Authority created pursuant to Division 19.5 (commencing with Section 185000) of the Public Utilities Code.

(BD) factor within a range of 1 to 5. The BD factor accounts for the total daily time a crossing is blocked by trains. A similar process is used to determine variables included in Other Factors (OF) such as average daily traffic counts (ADT) for school buses (SB), passenger buses (PB), and trucks carrying hazardous-material (HT). The BD, PB, SB, HT factors are as follows:

BD (total min/day)	BD < 1	1=<BD< 50	50<=BD<100	100<=BD<155	155<=BD<200	BD>=200
points	0	1	2	3	4	5

SB (ADT)	SB < 1	1=< SB < 20	20<= SB<50	50 <= SB<90	90 <= SB
points	0	0.5	1	2	3

PB (ADT)	PB < 1	1=< PB <=50	50< PB <=88	88< PB < 120	120 <=PB
points	0	0.5	1	2	3

HT (ADT)	HT < 1	1<= HT < 54	54 <=HT <=210	210 < HT<=410	410<HT
points	0	0.5	1	2	3

Accident History: In evaluating the project nominations, Staff reviewed accident history for the ten-year period of October 21, 1997 thru October 21, 2007. The accident history only included vehicle and pedestrian versus train incidents, excluding suicides. Accident history does not include other incidents at or near the crossing, such as vehicle versus vehicle or vehicle versus fixed object incidents.

NOTES REGARDING SPECIFIC NOMINATIONS

City of Bakersfield: Baker-Truxtun-Beale nomination was corrected after receiving an e-mail dated November 20, 2007 from Mr. Ron Ruettgers, consultant to the City, indicating the train count of 287 [(not 406) = 41*7 total crossings]. Staff notified consultant that train count should only be 41 for this multiple crossing project nomination. Consultant accepted value of T=41. Other corrections include: El Toro Viejo, agency was changed to City of Bakersfield from Kern County Roads Department; and Mohawk Street community impact statement correction in language and the vehicle count should have additional 94 trucks per day. Staff accepted the revised data.

City of Colton: Staff contacted the City concerning missing information regarding cost share, train count, and blocking delay for the Valley Boulevard nomination. The City submitted requested information and staff accepted and incorporated additional information.

City of Corona: Auto Center Drive nomination, PUC ID of B-27.50-C, was incorrectly identified in the application. Staff field verified the crossing and noted it should be crossing 2B-27.17. The City's Railroad Street nomination, incorrectly identified as PUC ID of B-25.59-C, was also corrected to 2B-25.61, based on staff field verification.

City of Los Angeles: Staff notified the City that the Riverside Drive nomination qualified for up to \$5 million. The City agreed to the correction of C=\$5M. Also, accident history for the nomination was not provided and therefore AH=0.

City of San Bruno: The San Bruno (PUC ID 105E-11.00) nomination listed an accident of 5/29/05 with one fatality for San Bruno Avenue. The provided Caltrain information attached to the application listed the accident at milepost 10.3 which is not at the crossing. Additionally, FRA and CPUC data were checked and the incident was not attributed to the crossing. Staff notified the City and excluded the incident.

City of Santa Clarita: Staff contacted the City regarding the proposed Magic Mountain Parkway crossing nomination, consisting of four crossings (three to be eliminated and one proposed new replacement) with zero values in a number of requested items: photos of approaches, elevated surface profile in the crossing geometrics, blocking delay, and vehicle counts. City submitted requested items: blocking delay=27 minutes for each crossing, Magic Mountain Parkway ADT= 50,000 projected for 2030, photos of crossing approaches, and the crossing individual elevated surface values. Staff notified the City that future year projected traffic counts were inappropriately used in the nomination and ADT must be based on projected current traffic counts for proposed crossings. Staff estimated the ADT=39,277 for 2008 by using a growth factor of 2% per year, which was removed from the future projected counts. City was informed of the modified figure and concurred in its calculation.

City of Santa Fe Springs: Staff notified the City that their nominations of Norwalk Boulevard/Los Nietos Road (which were combined into a single nomination), Rosecrans Avenue/Marquardt Avenue, and Valley View Avenue were missing their Part H attachments: location map, photos of crossing approaches and community impact statement. Applicant submitted requested information and staff incorporated the information into the nominations.

City of Stockton: Staff contacted the City requesting the Morada Lane and Sperry Road proposed crossing nomination mileposts. The City provided Morada Lane milepost of 99.70, therefore staff substituted the PUC ID of 004-99.70 for the nomination. Staff also incorporated the City's additional PUC ID information for the Sperry Road nomination for three crossings:

- 001D-86.3, UPRR Paralleling El Dorado Street
- 4-89.67, UPRR Paralleling McKinley Street
- 75-2.44, UPRR (former Tidewater Southern Railway)

City of Vista: In its nominations, the City included values of zero for the vehicle and blocking delay for the proposed crossing Olive Avenue/Orange Street nomination. Therefore, staff used the V and BD from the last proceeding. The City agreed with the following changes of V= 42,845 and BD=3. For the Vista Village Drive/Main Street nomination, staff requested the missing cost share information, which the City also submitted. Staff incorporated the value of C=\$20 million.

County of Kern: By e-mail dated November 20, 2007 from Mr. Ron Ruetters, consultant to the County, indicated the following revised counts: for the 7th Standard project nomination SB=14, PB=36 & HT=113; Olive Drive (B-308.9) train count = 44; Rosedale Highway train count = 12.

Imperial County Public Works Department: On January 9, 2007, staff contacted the County concerning their requested cost share, which they listed as the total project cost. For this project, under the current guidelines, the maximum allocation from the Section 190 Program is currently 1/3 of the total funds, or \$5M, unless the County requests multi year funding, which can increase the total allocation to \$20M. The county was contacted and requested the nomination be modified to request the \$20M. Additionally, the blocking delay had a value of zero, which the County indicates it will provide at a later date. Until that information is provided, staff set BD=0.

Los Angeles County Department of Public Works: The Fairway Drive nomination indicated a total truck count of 618 rather than only hazmat trucks (HT) as specified in the nomination forms. Because the trucks reported are included in "Autos", this value was adjusted to HT=0. Additionally, the ADT count was incomplete for the Sierra Highway/Barrel Springs Road nomination. The ADT provided in the nomination forms did not include the count for Barrel Springs Road. Staff used the last proceeding ADT=500 for Barrel Springs and added it to

the figure for Sierra Highway, which was listed as 8,007. Therefore the total ADT for the project nomination is 8,507. The City was notified and accepted these changes.

San Bernardino County: County was notified that its nomination blocking delay was not what was requested in the OII instructions. County provided corrected blocking delay for the following nominations, which were accepted by staff: Palm Avenue: 404 min, Glen Helen Parkway: 404 min., Vista Road: 464 min. and Lenwood Road: 584 min.

RECOMMENDATION

Staff has completed its evaluation and has ranked nominated projects in order of highest priority to the lowest priority using the formulas accepted for use in the OII. The resulting prioritized ranking is as shown in Appendix A. It contains the proposed list of eligible projects nominated for inclusion on the 2008-2009 Grade Separation Priority List by their priority index and rank. This appendix also includes project information such as vehicle and train volumes, project cost, special condition factors or separation factors, and the resulting priority index calculated from the appropriate formula.

APPENDIX A – Proposed Priority List for Fiscal Years 2008-2009 By Rank (Page 1 of 9)

Rank	Agency	Crossing Location	PUC ID	DOT ID	Railroad	VEH	TRN	LTRN	Cost Share	AH/WC	BD/HC	VS/SR	RS/AS	CG/POF	PT/AP	OF/DE	SCF/SF	Priority Index
1	City of Santa Fe Springs	Rosecrans Ave/Marquardt Ave	2-157.8	027656A	BNSF	30506	133	0	5000	20	5	3	4	10.8	10	11.0	43.8	17084.5
2	SANDAG (San Diego)	Taylor Street	2-264.20	026852D	MTS (SDNR)	22010	51	148	5000	32	5	1	3	11.4	7	11	38.4	9596.9
3	City of Santa Fe Springs	Valley View Avenue	2-158.4	027657G	BNSF	44121	133	0	5000	7	3	3	4	11.4	10	12.0	43.4	9432.3
4	County of Riverside	Magnolia Avenue (B-20.30&B-35)	B-20.30 & B-20.35	026517B & 026518H	BNSF	18233	76	0	5000	19	3	3	3	10.8	5	12.5	37.3	5580.1
5	City of Santa Fe Springs	Norwalk Blvd/Los Nietos Rd	BBJ-497.28 & 2-153.1	027649P & 027650J	BNSF	34177	133	0	10000	9	6	5	8	25.8	20	12.5	77.3	4622.8
6	City of Fullerton	State College Boulevard (2B-44.04)	2B-44.04	026579Y	BNSF	31146	103	0	5000	5	5	2	4	14	7	11.5	43.5	3893.1
7	City of Corona	McKinley Street	2B-25.20	026519P	BNSF	20210	76	0	5000	10	3	2	3	11.4	5	11.5	35.9	3415.0
8	City of San Bruno	San Bruno Ave. San Mateo Ave. & Angus Ave	105E-11.0 105E-11.1 105E-11.4	754869P 754870J 754871R	PCJPB	25365	98	0	10000	12	6	0	12	31.2	30	11.0	90.2	3321.7
9	City of Riverside	Third Street	2B-9.5 & 001BJ-545.8	026480N & 747081T	BNSF/U PRR	28476	102	0	5000	3	5	0	3	18.3	3	9.5	38.8	2362.5
10	Los Angeles County DPW	Nogales Street	3-22.4	811479J	UPRR	43678	65	0	5000	3	2	2	5	10.3	5	13.0	37.3	2308.6
11	City of Montclair	Monte Vista Avenue	B-517.4 & 3-35.0	746936L & 810896P	UPRR	13562	119	0	5000	6	4	2	6	21.0	5	11.0	49.0	2308.4
12	Orange County Transportation Authority (Fullerton)	Raymond Avenue	2B-45.00	026581A	BNSF	18800	66	0	5000	8	4	2	3	8	4	12.5	33.5	2266.9
13	City of Ontario	Miliken Avenue (B-525.4)	B-525.4	746964P	UPRR	31949	50	0	5000	6	3	3	4	6.0	1	10.0	27.0	2263.4
14	City of Riverside	Buchanan Street	002B-20.10	026516U	BNSF	8927	98	0	5000	9	3	2	4	6.5	5	8	28.5	1778.2
15	Orange County Transportation	Placentia Avenue	2B-43.60	026578S	BNSF	17314	66	0	5000	6	4	2	3	9.4	4	11.5	33.9	1633.7

APPENDIX A – Proposed Priority List for Fiscal Years 2008-2009 By Rank (Page 2 of 9)

Rank	Agency	Crossing Location	PUC ID	DOT ID	Railroad	VEH	TRN	LTRN	Cost Share	AH/WC	BD/HC	VS/SR	RS/AS	CG/POF	PT/AP	OF/DE	SCF/SF	Priority Index
	Authority (Placentia)																	
16	SANDAG (San Diego)	Sorrento Valley Boulevard	106-249.10	026838H	MTS (SDNR)	31350	51	0	5000	4	3	3	3	9.7		9	34	1632.9
17	Los Angeles County DPW	Fullerton Road	3-21.4	810880T	UPRR	24618	65	0	5000	4	2	1	5	10.3	5	7	30.32	1630.5
18	Orange County Transportation Authority (Placentia)	Lakeview Avenue	2B-39.90	026567E	BNSF	19581	76	0	5000	4	4	2	3	8.32	5	11	33.32	1521.5
19	City of Riverside	Madison Street	2B-13.70	026501E	BNSF	14674	98	0	5000	4	5	1	4	8.3	5	9.5	32.8	1470.8
20	Los Angeles County DPW	Fairway Drive	3-23.4	810883N	UPRR	35135	65	0	5000	2	2	2	5	9.5	5	13.0	36.5	1406.7
21	Kern County	7th Standard Road	B-305.9	756949P	UPRR	22000	34	0	5000	8	2	5	4	7.7		10.0	28.7	1375.1
22	Greater Bakersfield Separation of Grade District	Morning Drive (SR 184)	B-317.50	757413M	UPRR	14600	46	0	5000	8	2	3	5	11.7		10.5	32.2	1241.1
23	City of Ontario	Millikin Avenue (3-43.4)	3-43.40	810913D	UPRR	16960	69	0	5000	4	3	4	5	10.8	5	9.5	37.34	1207.6
24	Orange County Transportation Authority (Anaheim)	Orangethorpe Avenue	2B-41.80	026572B	BNSF	16602	66	0	5000	4	4	3	3	5.72	4	13	32.72	1128.5
25	County of Riverside	Jurupa Avenue	3-48.20 & 3-48.30-C	810979D & 810980X	UPRR	11905	36	0	5000	11	0	1	5	16.5		13	41	1069.6
26	County of Riverside	Clay Street	3-50.90	906015V	UPRR	17892	34	0	5000	7	2	2	5	9.5		9.5	32.5	1005.8
27	City of South San Francisco	South Linden Avenue Scott Street	105E-10.2 105E-10.6	754866U 754867B	PCJPB	11630	98	0	5000	3	4	0	8	22.0	20	9.0	63.0	974.8
28	San Joaquin County	West Lane	D-92.8	752897L	UPRR	25502	37	0	5000	4	2	1	2	5.2	2	11.0	23.2	966.8
29	City of Riverside	Tyler Street	2B-17.4	026512S	BNSF	15528	98	0	5000	2	3	1	4	9.5	5	9.5	32.0	945.0

APPENDIX A – Proposed Priority List for Fiscal Years 2008-2009 By Rank (Page 3 of 9)

Rank	Agency	Crossing Location	PUC ID	DOT ID	Railroad	VEH	TRN	LTRN	Cost Share	AH/WC	BD/HC	VS/SR	RS/AS	CG/POF	PT/AP	OF/DE	SCF/SF	Priority Index
30	City of Irvine	Sand Canyon Ave	101OR-182.9	026765A	SCRRA	23515	64	0	5000	2	2	4	7	9.0	8	10.0	40.0	943.0
31	Kern County	Olive Drive	B-308.9	756945M	UPRR	19500	44	0	5000	4	3	3	4	8.8		12.5	31.3	889.3
32	Los Angeles County DPW	Turnbull Canyon Road	3-17.2	810867E	UPRR	14924	65	0	5000	3	2	1	5	10.6	5	7.0	30.6	806.6
33	Orange County Transportation Authority (Placentia)	Tutstin/Rose	2B-41.50	026571U	BNSF	27164	66	0	5000	1	3	3	3	7.08	4	12	32.08	749.2
34	Los Angeles County DPW	El Segundo Blvd.	BBH-492.6 & 84L-10.4	747868R & 747868R	UPRR/L ACMTA	16875	4	246	5000	6	5	1	2	12.0	10	13.0	43.0	718.6
35	City of Ontario	Archibald Avenue	3-41.20	810911P	UPRR	9435	69	0	5000	4	3	2	5	10.2	5	10.5	35.7	686.7
36	City of Riverside	Columbia Avenue	2B-7.90	026475S	BNSF	16335	100	0	5000	1	5	3	4	8.4	3	9.0	32.4	685.8
37	City of Riverside	Iowa Avenue	2B-7.3	026472W	BNSF	16185	100	0	5000	1	5	4	4	10.2	3	8.0	34.2	681.6
38	Port of Los Angeles	Fries Avenue	BG-503.5 & BG-503.45	747735Y & 747734S	PHL	12088	64	0	5000	3	5	1	0	18.9		8.5	33.4	652.3
39	Alameda Corridor-East Construction Authority	Mission Drive	B-490.30	746880U	UPRR	10958	31	0	5000	7	2	0	5	7.2	1	11.5	26.7	570.2
40	County of Riverside	Bellegrave Avenue & Rutile Street	3-47.10 & 3-47.30	810977P & 810978W	UPRR	15569	71	71	20000	7	6	6	6	19.6	8	11	56.6	543.0
41	City of San Bernardino	Hunts Lane	B-541.0	747168J	UPRR	12447	50	0	5000	3	5	1	3	9.0	1	11.0	30.0	527.9
42	City of San Mateo	Poplar Avenue* Santa Inez Avenue* Monte Diablo Avenue* Tilton Avenue*	105E-17.2B 105E-17.3B 105E-17.4B 105E-17.5B	754896L 754897T 754898A 754899G	PCJPB	18209	98	0	5000	6	38	2	3.2	30.0	29	32.0	146.2	503.1
43	City of Riverside	Jane Street	2B-12.70	026498Y	BNSF	4591	98	0	960	0	4	1	4	8.2	5	7.5	29.7	498.4
44	Orange County	Jefferson Street	002-41.00	026570M	BNSF	6541	66	0	5000	4	3	4	3	7.4	4	9.5	30.5	462.2

APPENDIX A – Proposed Priority List for Fiscal Years 2008-2009 By Rank (Page 4 of 9)

Rank	Agency	Crossing Location	PUC ID	DOT ID	Railroad	VEH	TRN	LTRN	Cost Share	AH/WC	BD/HC	VS/SR	RS/AS	CG/POF	PT/AP	OF/DE	SCF/SF	Priority Index
	Transportation Authority (Placentia)																	
45	City of Santa Clarita	Magic Mountain Parkway, 13th, Drayton Street & Sanitation District Private	101VY-32.50, 101VY-30.39, 101VY-32.36 & 101VY-32.78	Proposed, 746016J, 746014V & 746013N	SCRRA	51337	29	0	20000	4	4	3	16	22	20	12	77	449.2
46	City of Riverside	Pierce Avenue	2B-19.60	026515M	BNSF	10434	98	0	5000	1	3	2	4	7.48	5	9.5	30.98	440.0
47	City of Palmdale	Rancho Vista Blvd.	001 B-412.20 & 101 VY-69.93	750643P	UPRR/S CRRA	33992	33	0	22314	6	1	4	5	7.2	4	13.5	34.7	386.6
48	Orange County Transportation Authority (Anaheim)	Kraemer Boulevard	2B-42.50	026574P	BNSF	25387	66	0	5000	0	4	2	3	10.3	4	14	37.28	372.4
49	City of Anaheim	State College Blvd.(101OR-170.30)	101OR-170.30	026652U	SCRRA	26072	49	0	20000	4	2	2	6	12.6	7	10.5	40.1	359.5
50	City of Corona	Auto Center Drive	2B-27.17	026531W	BNSF	10765	76	0	5000	1	4	1	3	10.8	5	7	30.8	358.1
51	San Bernardino County	Glen Helen Pkwy	BB-480.1 & 2-71.0	747017U & 026103A	UPRR & BNSF	5600	96	0	5000	2	5	5	2	11.7	1	9.5	34.2	356.8
52	SANDAG (Chula Vista)	E Street	036-7.10	662161X	MTS	32458	4	204	5000	1	5	0	3	10	10	9.5	37.5	354.3
53	City Banning	Sunset Avenue	B-566.20	760690A	UPRR	3200	85	0	5000	5	4	1	3	6.36	1	12	27.36	353.8
54	Orange County Transportation Authority (Anaheim)	Kellogg Drive	2B-39.20	026566X	BNSF	7811	66	0	5000	2	4	2	3	13	4	9.5	35.5	344.8
55	City of Riverside	Magnolia Avenue (3-55.2)	3-55.2	811011C	UPRR	25290	59	0	5000	0	3	1	4	9.1	4	12.5	33.6	332.0
56	City of Fresno	Shaw Avenue	001B-198.50	757316D	UPRR	48417	20	0	20000	5	2	2	5	11.9	0	12.5	33.42	323.9
57	City of	Riverside Avenue	3-55.6	811012J	UPRR	11735	59	0	5000	1	3	0	4	11.1	4	9.0	31.1	308.0

APPENDIX A – Proposed Priority List for Fiscal Years 2008-2009 By Rank (Page 5 of 9)

Rank	Agency	Crossing Location	PUC ID	DOT ID	Railroad	VEH	TRN	LTRN	Cost Share	AH/WC	BD/HC	VS/SR	RS/AS	CG/POF	PT/AP	OF/DE	SCF/SF	Priority Index
	Riverside																	
58	City of Riverside	Mary Street	2B-13.0	026499F	BNSF	13676	98	0	5000	0	4	2	4	9.3	5	9.5	33.8	301.8
59	City of Corona	Smith Street	2B-25.84	026530P	BNSF	16014	76	0	5000	0	4	2	3	10.2	5	9	33.2	276.6
60	San Bernardino County	Lenwood Road	002-5.70	026062X	BNSF & UPRR	4192	96	0	5000	2	5	5	2	7.2	1	9	29.2	270.7
61	City of Stockton	Lower Sacramento Road (4-100.40)	0004-100.40	834002T	UPRR	17008	23	0	5000	2	1	5	4	10	3	12.5	35.5	270.2
62	City of Ontario	Grove Avenue*	B-521.40B	746956X	UPRR	25111	50	0	5000	6	0	0	5.8	3.0	2	2.0	18.8	269.9
63	Los Angeles County DPW	Avenue S	101VY-66.92	750601D	SCRRA	26032	23	0	5000	1	1	5	5	8.0	4	11.0	30.0	269.5
64	Orange County Transportation Authority (Placentia)	Richfield Road	2B-40.40	026568L	BNSF	7819	76	0	5000	1	4	3	3	7.32	5	8.5	30.82	268.5
65	City of Bakersfield	Baker-Truxtun-Beale	Consolidation 2-885.6 2-885.75 2-885.77 2-885.95 2-886.2 2-886.4	028281T 028283G 028284N 028285V 028288R 028289X	BNSF	19380	41	0	20000	3	33	1	0	59.6	0	14.5	108.1	267.0
66	Alameda Corridor-East Construction Authority	Ramona Street	B-490.20	746879A	UPRR	12246	31	0	5000	2	2	0	5	9	1	13	30	257.8
67	Alameda Corridor-East Construction Authority	San Gabriel Blvd.	B-491.20	746883P	UPRR	35831	31	0	5000	0	2	1	5	9.96	1	14.5	33.46	255.6
68	City of Los Angeles	Riverside Drive*	101RI-2.11-A	746822Y	SCRRA	15700	72	0	5000	0	0	2	0	4	4	4	14	240.1
69	San Bernardino County	Palm Avenue	2-74.00	026105N	BNSF	5300	96	0	5000	1	5	5	2	7	1	8.5	28.5	232.0

APPENDIX A – Proposed Priority List for Fiscal Years 2008-2009 By Rank (Page 6 of 9)

Rank	Agency	Crossing Location	PUC ID	DOT ID	Railroad	VEH	TRN	LTRN	Cost Share	AH/WC	BD/HC	VS/SR	RS/AS	CG/POF	PT/AP	OF/DE	SCF/SF	Priority Index
70	Kern County	Hageman Road (2-895.2)	2-895.2	028376B	BNSF	13000	65	0	5000	0	4	3	6	8.7	4	11.0	36.7	205.7
71	City of Corona	Railroad Street	2B-25.61	026529V	BNSF	10453	76	0	5000	0	3	2	3	13	5	8.5	34.5	193.4
72	San Bernardino County	National Trails Hwy @Oro Grande*	2-30.6B	reconstruction	BNSF	7860	96	0	5000	6	8	2	0.4	7	10	8	41.4	192.3
73	City of Merced	G Street	002-1055.7	028669E	BNSF	27854	55	0	10000	0	3	1	6	9.0	4	16.0	39.0	192.2
74	SANDAG (Chula Vista)	H Street	036-7.90	662163L	MTS	30798	4	204	5000	0	4	1	3	11	10	9.5	38.5	188.8
75	City of Riverside	Brockton Avenue	3-55.0	811010V	UPRR	13257	59	0	5000	0	3	2	4	9.0	4	9.5	31.5	187.9
76	City of Riverside	Streeter Avenue	3-53.8	811008U	UPRR	12790	59	0	5000	0	3	1	4	12.0	4	11.5	35.5	186.4
77	Kern County	Hageman Road (2Q-111.6)	2Q-111.6	Proposed	BNSF	20000	40	0	5000	0	3	5	0	5.2	4	7.0	24.2	184.2
78	City of Stockton	Eighth Street (4-85.70)	4-85.70	Proposed	UPRR	18060	43	0	5000	0	3	1	3	7	3	11	28	183.3
79	City of Camarillo	Adolfo Road	E-417.9	753765E	UPRR	18046	41	0	5000	0	1	3	4	8.0	4	10.5	30.5	178.5
80	City of Camarillo	Las Posas-Upland Road	E-415.52 (419.0)	912013V	UPRR	18046	41	0	5000	0	1	3	4	8.0	4	8.5	28.5	176.5
81	Caltrain-Peninsula Corridor Joint Powers Board	Jerrold Avenue\Quint Street*	105E-2.8B & 105E-3.0B	754761F & 754762M	PCJPB	5000	98	0	5000	10	12	2	0.1	16.0	12	16.0	70.1	168.1
82	City of Torrance	Plaza Del Amo & Washington Ave.	Proposed & 2H-22.1	028101T	BNSF	32863	20	0	5000	0	2	2	0	12.6	0	10.5	27.06	158.5
83	City of Tulare	Bradsley Avenue	001B-250.70	756982P	UPRR	10899	20	0	5000	2	1	2	5	7.4	0	12	27.4	158.2
84	City of Bakersfield	El Toro Viejo Road	2-892.0	Proposed	BNSF	10000	65	0	5000	0	4	3	6	3	4	6.5	26.5	156.5
85	Alameda Corridor-East Construction Authority	Del Mar Avenue	B-490.70	746882H	UPRR	20703	31	0	5000	0	2	0	5	9	1	10.5	27.5	155.9
86	Kern County	Rosedale Highway (SR 58)	2Q-113.2	029473N	SJVR	56000	12	0	5000	0	1	3	0	3.0	0	13.0	20.0	154.4

APPENDIX A – Proposed Priority List for Fiscal Years 2008-2009 By Rank (Page 7 of 9)

Rank	Agency	Crossing Location	PUC ID	DOT ID	Railroad	VEH	TRN	LTRN	Cost Share	AH/WC	BD/HC	VS/SR	RS/AS	CG/POF	PT/AP	OF/DE	SCF/SF	Priority Index
87	City of Fresno	Herndon Avenue	001B-195.80	757312B	UPRR	21244	19	0	20000	5	1	3	5	10.3	0	14	33.28	154.4
88	City of Ontario	Vineyard Avenue	B-522.40	746960M	UPRR	12629	50	0	5000	0	3	1	4	6	1	13	28	154.3
89	San Bernardino County	Vista Road	2-22.0	026068N	BNSF & UPRR	6207	96	0	5000	0	5	5	2	8	1	10	31	150.2
90	Kern County	7th Standard Road	2-899.5	028381X	BNSF	7300	75	0	5000	0	4	3	6	10.8	4	9	36.8	146.3
91	Orange County Transportation Authority (Placentia)	Van Buren Street	2B-40.70	026569T	BNSF	7288	76	0	5000	0	4	2	3	9.36	5	9.5	32.86	143.6
92	City of Stockton	Alpine Avenue (4-95.7)	004-95.70	833939V	UPRR	21532	23	0	5000	0	2	1	3	10.1	3	12.5	31.62	130.7
93	Kern County	Snow Road	B-307.4	756948H	UPRR	16000	30	0	5000	0	2	5	4	6.0		10.5	27.5	123.5
94	City of Riverside	Palm Avenue	3-54.8	811009B	UPRR	7851	59	0	5000	0	2	1	4	9.0	4	9.0	29.0	121.6
95	City of Newark	Central Avenue	001L-31.10	749943G	UPRR	9920	45	0	5000	0	3	2	4	9.1	4	9.0	31.1	120.4
96	Los Angeles County DPW	Sierra Hwy/Barrel Springs Rd	101VY-65.58 & 101VY-65.77	750600W & 750644W	SCRRA	8507	23	0	5000	1	2	2	10	10.4	8	7.5	39.9	118.1
97	Kern County	Kratzmeyer Road	2-897.33	028380R	BNSF	860	65	0	5000	6.2	4	5	6	7.8	4	9.0	35.8	116.3
98	City of Rocklin	Midas Avenue	001AI-110.9 & 001A-110.9	750568F & 750569M	UPRR	10026	36	0	4500	0	4	0	0	12.8	4	11.5	32.3	112.5
99	City of Colton	Valley Boulevard	002B-3.10	026456M	BNSF	4889	79	0	5000	0	4	1	1	6	3	10	25	102.2
100	City of Stockton	Eight Street (004-101.30)	004-101.30	834003A	UPRR	14332	23	0	5000	0	1	5	4	7.96	3	11.5	32.46	98.4
101	City of Stockton	Alpine Avenue (1D-93.0)	001D-93.0	752898T	UPRR	15866	20	0	5000	0	5	2	0	12	0	14.5	33.46	96.9
102	City of Stockton	Morada Lane	004-99.70	Proposed	UPRR	13644	23	0	5000	0	1	5	4	3	3	12.5	28.5	91.3
103	Kern County	Reina Road Renfro Road Jenkins Road	2-896.6	028379W	BNSF	910	65	0	5000	4	3	5	6	3.8	4	8.5	30.3	89.5
104	City of Stockton	Sperry Road	001D-86.3 4-89.67 & 75-2.44	Proposed	UPRR	7440	28	0	5000	0	6	6	12	11	0	5	40	81.7

APPENDIX A – Proposed Priority List for Fiscal Years 2008-2009 By Rank (Page 8 of 9)

Rank	Agency	Crossing Location	PUC ID	DOT ID	Railroad	VEH	TRN	LTRN	Cost Share	AH/WC	BD/HC	VS/SR	RS/AS	CG/POF	PT/AP	OF/DE	SCF/SF	Priority Index
105	City of Stockton	Eight Mile Road (1D-98.1)	001D-98.1	752904U	UPRR	11980	20	0	5000	0	2	3	3	11.2	0	11.0	30.2	78.1
106	City of Tulare	Cartmill Avenue	001B-247.90	756975E	UPRR	3529	20	0	5000	2	1	5	5	7.4	0	11.5	29.9	72.2
107	San Joaquin County	Lower Sacramento Road*	001D-109.0B	752925M	UPRR	5505	17	0	5000	10	4	5	3.2	6	5	6	39.2	57.9
108	City of Fremont	Warren Avenue	DA-36.2 & 4G-6.7	750073E & 833885S	UPRR/VTA	6837	21	0	5000	0	3	1	0	13.0		10.5	27.5	56.2
109	City of Tulare	Paige Avenue	001B-251.70	766021K	UPRR	5796	20	0	5000	0	1	5	5	8.6	0	11.5	31.1	54.3
110	City of Milpitas	Dixon Landing Road	DA-38.4 & 4G-8.9	833890N	UPRR	23748	7	0	5000	0	1	2	0	8	0	9.5	20.5	53.7
111	City of Bakersfield	Mohawk	2-890.1	028367C	BNSF	934	75	0	5000	0	5	5	4	5	4	8	31	45.0
112	City of Vista	Escondido Avenue	106E-10.1	027569W	SDNR & NCTD	36400	3	0	5000	0	1	1	0	10.6	1	10.0	22.6	44.4
113	City of Vista	Vista Village Drive, Main Street	106E-9.15 & 106E-9.2	917847T & 027566B	SDNR & NCTD	42300	3	0	20000	0	2	4	0	14.3	2	11.0	33.3	39.7
114	City of Vista	Olive Avenue/Orange Street	106E-8.90	Proposed	SDNR & NCTD	42845	3	0	7500	0	1	1	0	12.5	1	7.0	21.5	38.7
115	Port of Stockton	Daggett Road (Port of Stockton Expressway)	002-1125.2	029637C	BNSF	1161	23	0	5000	0	2	1	6	8	3	12.5	32.5	37.8
116	City of Vista	N. Melrose Drive	106E-7.5	026993M	SDNR & NCTD	27400	1	0	5000	0	1	3	0	9.0		10.0	23.0	28.4
117	City of Vista	Mar Vista Drive	106E-11.2	027570R	SDNR & NCTD	11500	3	0	5000	0	1	1	0	9.9	1	9.5	21.4	28.3
118	Imperial County Public Works Department	Dogwood Road	BN-687.50	760838E	UPRR	12360	6	0	20000	0	0	5	2	9.68	0	7	23.68	27.4
119	City of Fremont	Kato Road	001DA-38.0 & 4G-8.5	834497W & 750226F	UPRR	12900	3	0	5000	0	1	2	0	8	0	8.5	19.5	27.2

APPENDIX A – Proposed Priority List for Fiscal Years 2008-2009 By Rank (Page 9 of 9)

Note: VEH- Vehicle, TRN – Train, LTRN – Light Rail Trains, COST Share – Project Cost Share (a cost of more than \$5 million is permitted for qualified projects per S&H Code Section 2454 (h) for multi-year funding)

Formula For Crossing Nominated For Separation Or Elimination:

AH – Accident History **BD** – Crossing Blocking Delay
VS – Vehicular Speed Limit **RS** – Rail Speed Limit
CG – Crossing Geometrics **PT** – Passenger trains
SCF - Special Conditions Factor **OF**-Other Factors (Passenger Buses, School Buses, Hazmat Trains/Trucks, Community Impact)

**Formula For Existing Separations Nominated For Alteration or Reconstruction:*

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

Railroad Abbreviations:

BNSF: The Burlington Northern Santa Fe Railroad Company
LACMTA: Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority
MTS: Metropolitan Transit System
NCTD: North County Transit District (San Diego)
PCJPB: Peninsula Corridor Joint Powers Board (Caltrain)
PHL: Pacific Harbor Line
SCRRA: Southern California Regional Rail Authority (Metrolink)
SDNR: San Diego Northern Railway (Coaster)
SJVR: San Joaquin Valley Railroad
UPRR: Union Pacific Railroad Company
VTA: Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority