

Decision No. 66484**ORIGINAL**

BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

Investigation for the purpose of)
 establishing a list for the year 1964)
 of railroad grade crossings of city)
 streets or county roads most urgently)
 in need of separation, or existing)
 separations in need of alteration or)
 reconstruction as contemplated by)
 Section 189 of the Streets and)
 Highways Code.)

Case No. 7683

John MacDonald Smith and James J. Trabuco, for Southern Pacific Company, Pacific Electric Railway, Northwestern Pacific Railroad Company, Petaluma & Santa Rosa Railroad, Visalia Electric Railway, Holton Inter-Urban Railroad Company, and San Diego & Arizona Eastern; Wilbur L. Seabridge, for The Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe Railway Company; William B. Burge and Charles W. Sullivan, for City of Los Angeles; Warren P. Marsden and George D. Moc, for Department of Public Works, State of California; Ed Wallach, Jr., for City of Montebello; R. G. Spencer, for City of Pasadena; John T. Comer, for Union Pacific Railroad Company; Graham K. Mitchell, for Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers; Ronald L. Schneider, for County of Los Angeles; Robert L. White, for City of Burbank; William V. Ellis, for California Legislative Board - BLF&E; Bailey F. Kerr, for La Puente-Industry Chamber of Commerce; William H. Longmire, for City of San Carlos; Daniel J. Higgins, for County of Placer; Richard E. Pratt, for City of Mountain View; Theodore J. George, for County of Yuba; Harold Berliner, for County of Nevada; Thomas G. Dunne, for City of Salinas; A. P. Hamann, for City of San Jose; Marvin C. Haun, for County of Santa Clara; Donald L. Pollard, for City of Fresno; and James B. Turner, for City of Albany, interested parties.

Robert Gibson Johnson and William E. Johnston, for Anvil Building Material Company, Merritt Lumber Company, Northridge Lumber Company, Terry Lumber Company, and Ulmer's Pepper Tree Restaurant; Paul McCann, for Valley-Wide Better Government Committee; Townson T. MacLaren, for Northridge Chamber of Commerce, protestants to the Reseda Crossing.

Robert C. Marks, for the Commission staff.

O P I N I O N

By its order dated August 22, 1963, the Commission instituted an investigation for the purpose of establishing and

furnishing to the Department of Public Works an annual priority list of grade crossings requiring separation and of existing separations requiring alteration or reconstruction.

Public hearings were held before Examiner Daly in Los Angeles and San Francisco and the matter was submitted on October 30, 1963.

In conformity with Sections 189-191 of the Streets and Highways Code, which provide that the annual budget of the Department of Public Works shall include the sum of \$5,000,000 for allocation to grade separations or alterations made to existing grade separations, it is the function of the Public Utilities Commission to furnish a priority list to the Department of Public Works. Upon receipt of the list the Department of Public Works and the California Highway Commission allocate the money.

Copies of the order instituting this investigation were served upon each city, county, and city and county in which there is a railroad grade crossing or separation; each railroad corporation; the Department of Public Works; the California Highway Commission; the Greater Bakersfield Separation of Grade District; the League of California Cities; the County Supervisors Association; and other persons who might have an interest in the proceeding.

In response to the Order Instituting Investigation various public bodies desiring to nominate crossings or separations for inclusion on the 1964 priority list filed with the Commission the following information:

For Crossings at Grade Proposed for Elimination

1. Identification of crossing, including name of street or road, name of railroad and crossing number.
2. Twenty-four hour vehicular traffic volume count, by either 60- or 30-minute periods.

3. Number of train movements for one typical day segregated by type, i.e., passenger, through freight, or switching.

4. Type of separation proposed (overpass or underpass).

5. Preliminary cost estimate of project.

6. Statement as to the amount of money available for construction of the project.

7. Statement as to the need for the proposed improvement.

For Grade Separations Proposed for Alteration

1. Identification of crossing, including name of street or road, name of railroad and crossing number.

2. Twenty-four hour vehicular traffic volume count, by either 60- or 30-minute periods.

3. Description of existing separation structure, with principal dimensions.

4. Type of alteration proposed.

5. Preliminary cost estimate of project.

6. Statement as to the amount of money available for construction of the project.

7. Statement as to the need for the proposed improvement.

The nominations and requested information filed with the Commission were studied by the staff in relation to certain tangible and intangible factors. The results of the study were introduced in evidence in the form of Exhibit 1. The exhibit compared crossings and assigned priorities on the basis of the factors considered. The tangible factors were traffic, cost, accident, delay and state of readiness. The intangible factors were potential traffic, position and relation to city street pattern, relationship to railroad operations, available alternate routes and accident potential. Consideration was also given to the possible elimination of existing grade crossings, located at or within a reasonable distance from the point of crossing of the grade separation as required by Section 1202.5(a) of the Public Utilities Code.

The staff also included crossings not otherwise nominated which it felt were in need of separation. Those not sponsored by the public bodies concerned will not be included in the list because it is the opinion of the Commission that unless the public agency involved urges the particular nomination there is little likelihood that the project could be financed and construction commenced within the priority year.

During the course of hearing those nominating crossings introduced evidence in support of their nominations. To a great extent the showings constituted a brief summarization of the information and data previously filed with the Commission and reflected by the staff in Exhibit 1.

Emphasis was placed upon the time within which financing of a nomination could be accomplished and construction commenced. The Commission, in establishing a list, is required by law to take into consideration the possibility of financing and construction. As a result many crossings nominated and sponsored by a public body will not be placed upon the list or will be placed low upon the list where the record indicates that construction will not commence within the year 1964.

Protests were made to the nomination of Reseda Boulevard in the City of Los Angeles. With the exception of the Northridge Chamber of Commerce and the Valley-Wide Better Government Committee, the protests concern the interests of individuals whose property would be affected by the construction of a separation. The protests are not germane to this proceeding. In the event a crossing should place high on the priority list, construction cannot commence until a formal application is filed with the Commission and it is determined that public safety requires the separation. At such time protests may be entered and evidence in support thereof will be considered by the Commission. The City of Los Angeles presently has on file with the

Commission Application No. 45808, which requests authority to construct a separation at Reseda Boulevard. It is suggested that the protestants herein make their appearance and showing in said proceeding.

The Commission, after considering all of the nominations, establishes the following priority list for 1964:

PRIORITY LIST OF GRADE SEPARATION PROJECTS OR ALTERATIONS
FOR THE YEAR 1964
PURSUANT TO SECTION 189 OF THE STREETS AND HIGHWAYS CODE

<u>Priority No.</u>	<u>Crossing No.(s)</u>	<u>Street</u>	<u>Agency</u>	<u>RR</u>
1*	(A-222.63-B A-222.66-B)	Floriston Rd.	Nevada County	SP
2	A-10.67	Buchanan St.	Albany	SP
3	E-118.9	Alisal St.	Salinas	SP
4	E-51.7	Hillsdale Ave.	San Jose	SP
5	L-43.3	Kifer Rd.	Santa Clara County	SP
6*	6RA-11.73-A	Western Ave.	Los Angeles County	PE
7*	E-47.1-B	Park Ave.	San Jose	SP
8	2-131.1	Walnut St.	Pasadena	AT&SF
9	2-114.5	Downey Rd.	Los Angeles County	AT&SF
10	L-51.8	Sunnyoaks Ave.	Santa Clara County	SP
11*	6T-55.07-B	Rancho Ave.	San Bernardino	PE
12	E-449.8	Reseda Blvd.- Parthenia St.	Los Angeles	SP
13	(D-12.2 4-12.2)	77th Ave.	Oakland	WP&SP
14	B-502.4	Anaheim-Puente Rd.	Los Angeles County	SP
15	2-149.5	Greenwood Ave.	Montebello	AT&SF
16	C-258.0	South St.	Redding	SP
17	3-19.9	Anaheim-Puente Rd.	Los Angeles County	UP
18*	B-205.4-B	Fresno St.	Fresno	SP
19	(C-139.3 C-139.0)	N. Beale Rd. Hammonton Rd.	Yuba County	SP
20	2-887.6	"F" St.	Gr. Bakersfield Sep. of Grade District	AT&SF
21	E-36.8	Whisman Rd.	Mt. View & Santa Clara County	SP
22	C-113.2	Pleasant Grove Rd.	Placer County	SP
23	A-15.6	Kearny St.	Richmond	SP
24	E-23.2	Holly St.	San Carlos	SP
25	A-14.5	23rd St.	Richmond	SP
26	E-22.0	Ralston Ave.	Belmont	SP
27	A-13.8	Cutting Blvd.	Richmond	SP
28*	2-252.9-A	Miramar Rd.	San Diego	AT&SF
29	E-460.8	Hollywood Way	Burbank	SP
30	D-5.9	Adeline St.	Oakland	SP
31	B-312.3	Union Ave.	Gr. Bakersfield Sep. of Grade District	SP
32	A-99.9	Walerga Rd.	Sacramento County	SP
33	4-9.7	Fruitvale Ave.	Oakland	WP
34	2-249.1	Edelweiss St.	San Diego	AT&SF

*Alteration projects for existing separation structures

O R D E R

IT IS ORDERED that the Secretary shall furnish a full, true and correct copy of this decision and order to the State Department of Public Works.

The effective date of this order shall be the date hereof.

Dated at San Francisco, California, this 17th day of DECEMBER, 1963.

William L. Donald
President

John E. Smith

Wesley W. Long

George L. Trover

Fredrick B. Hallock
Commissioners