

# Memorandum

**To:** CHAIR AND COMMISSIONERS

**Date:** July 15, 2010

**From:** BIMLA G. RHINEHART  
Executive Director

**File No:** Reference 4.5  
INFORMATION

**Ref: Hearing - Proposition 1B Highway-Railroad Crossing Safety Account Program**

## **ISSUE**

The Highway-Railroad Crossing Safety Account (HRCSA) Program Guidelines stipulate that at least one public hearing will be held before the Commission adopts its 2010 HRCSA program of projects.

The hearing provides an opportunity for the HRCSA applicants to familiarize the Commission with the project nominations received by the July 1, 2010 deadline. The schedule also calls for the issuance of staff recommendations by August 26, 2010, with adoption of the 2010 HRCSA program of projects at the Commission's September 22, 2010 meeting.

## **BACKGROUND**

On November 7, 2006, the voters approved Proposition 1B. Proposition 1B provides \$250 million to fund the HRCSA for two sub-programs – \$150 million for highway-railroad grade separations derived from the California Public Utilities Commission's Section 190 grade separation priority list and \$100 million for non-Section 190 high-priority grade crossing improvements.

Specifically, Proposition 1B authorized the \$250 million for the HRCSA in two parts:

- (1) Part 1. Proposition 1B provided that \$150 million from the HRCSA shall be made available for allocation to projects on the priority list established by the Public Utilities Commission (PUC) pursuant to the process established in Chapter 10 (commencing with Section 2450) of Division 3 of the Streets and Highways Code, with two exceptions:
  - (1) a dollar for dollar match of non-state funds shall be provided for each project, and
  - (2) the \$5 million maximum in Section 2454 shall not apply to HRCSA funds.

- (2) Part 2. Proposition 1B provided that the other \$100 million from the HRCSA shall be made available 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. These may include projects at any of the following:
- (a) Crossings where freight and passenger rail share the affected rail line.
  - (b) Crossings with a high incidence of motor vehicle-rail or pedestrian-rail collisions.
  - (c) Crossings with a high potential for savings in rail and roadway traffic delay.
  - (d) Crossings where an improvement will result in quantifiable emission benefits.
  - (e) Crossings where the flow of rail freight to or from a port facility will be improved.

All funds programmed in the initial HRCSA program that were not allocated by the Commission by June 30, 2010, as required under the HRCSA Guidelines, will be reprogrammed into the 2010 HRCSA program. The Commission will adopt a 2010 HRCSA program of projects for the funds available under each part from projects nominated by Caltrans, regional agencies or recipient local agencies. A single nomination will be considered for funding from either part of the program, as appropriate. The principal differences between the two parts of the HRCSA program are:

- PUC priority list. Projects to be funded from Part 1 must be on the priority list established by the PUC pursuant to Section 2452 of the Streets and Highways Code. Projects to be funded under Part 2 may be, but need not be, on the PUC priority list.
- Match. Projects to be funded from Part 1 require at least a one-to-one match of local, federal or private funds. In accordance with subdivision (d) of Section 2454 of the Streets and Highways Code, no allocation shall be made unless the railroad agrees to contribute 10 percent of the cost of the project. Projects to be funded from Part 2 do not require any specific match or railroad contribution. However, the Commission will give higher priority for funding from Part 2 to projects with a non-state match.
- Program Year. Because the PUC priority list to be adopted by July 1, 2010, will be valid only for the 2010-11 and 2011-12 fiscal years, the Commission will initially program Part 1 funding only for projects that are expected to be ready for a project construction allocation by June 2012. The Commission anticipates that it will allocate all of the remaining funds for Part 1 by June 2012. If it has not allocated all available Part 1 funding by that time, the Commission will update the HRCSA program of projects to reflect the PUC priority list to be adopted by July 1, 2012.

For Part 2, the 2010 program of projects may include projects scheduled for construction at any time through June 2012. However, the Commission will give higher priority for funding for Part 2 to projects with earlier delivery.

Highway-Railroad Crossing Safety Account Nominations  
2010 Program  
(Dollars in Thousands)

ID	County	Nominated By	Project Title	Part 1	Part 2	Both	TCIF	Enviro. Clearance	Const. Start	Total Project Cost	HRCSA Request
1	ALA	City of Fremont	Warren Avenue Grade Separation	X	X	X		Jul-02	Nov-11	57,168	9,600
2	ALA	City of Fremont	Kato Road Grade Separation	X	X	X		Apr-09	May-11	52,265	10,000
3	LA	City of Los Angeles	North Spring Street Grade Separation Reconstruction	X	X	X		Jun-11	Jun-12	48,766	5,001
4	LA	SCRRA	Broadway-Brazil Street Grade Crossing Improvements		X			May-06	Jul-11	8,900	4,005
5	LA	ACE	Nogales Street Grade Separation	X	X	X		Sep-09	Oct-11	89,049	25,600
6	SAC	City of Sacramento	6th Street Overcrossing		X			Dec-07	Apr-11	16,102	8,051
7	TUL	City of Tulare	Bardsley Avenue Grade Separation	X	X	X		Dec-08	Dec-10	16,935	7,156
8	ORA	OCTA	Kraemer Blvd & Placentia Avenue Track Improvements	X	X	X	X	Jan-10	Feb-11	78,229	6,875
9	ORA	OCTA	Raymond Avenue & State College Blvd Track Improvements	X	X	X	X	Nov-09	Sep-12	76,768	6,875
10	ORA	OCTA	Dana Point & San Clemente Crossings Safety Enhancements		X			Mar-11	Nov-11	4,200	2,100
11	ORA	OCTA	San Clemente Beach Trail Crossings Safety Enhancements		X			Jun-11	Nov-11	4,500	2,250
12	ORA	OCTA	North Beach Crossing Safety Enhancements		X			Jun-11	Jun-12	1,200	600
<b>Total Nominations</b>										<b>454,082</b>	<b>88,113</b>

Note: The above project costs and requests are based on a preliminary review of the nominations and are subject to revision.