

Decision No. 66963

ORIGINAL

BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

Investigation into the safety, maintenance, operation, use and protection of the following crossings at grade with the lines of SOUTHERN PACIFIC COMPANY in the County of San Joaquin, California: Crossing No. B-99.5, Austin Road, and Crossing No. B-102.0, Jack Tone Road.

Case No. 7790
(Filed November 26, 1963)

Harold S. Lentz for Southern Pacific Company
and Robley F. George, Assistant County
Counsel for County of San Joaquin, respondents.
Timothy E. Treacy for the Commission staff.

O P I N I O N

Public hearing was held before Examiner Power at Stockton on January 22, 1964 and the matter was submitted.

Austin Road and Jack Tone Road are north-south public roads of respondent county. They both cross the main line of respondent railroad between Manteca and Ripon. The bearing of the railroad's San Joaquin Valley route main line is generally north-westerly and southeasterly. U. S. Highway No. 99 adjoins the railroad on its northeasterly side. This highway has grade separated interchanges at both Austin Road and Jack Tone Road. Another problem at Austin Road is that a passing track associated with the railroad's centralized traffic control system begins just northwest (railroad west) of this crossing.

Because of the proximity of the Highway No. 99 interchanges to these two crossings, a hazardous situation is created in that certain motorists descend on the crossings from the overpasses. The staff witness accordingly recommended that two Standard

No. 8 Flashing Light Signals be installed at each crossing. Both respondents agreed to this. The question of apportionment of maintenance was deferred by agreement of the parties and an examiner's ruling. This leaves only the issue as to division of the cost of installation.

San Joaquin County made vehicular traffic counts at these two crossings in February, 1962. They showed 450 vehicles per day at Austin and 370 per day at Jack Tone. These counts were at a season when rural traffic was low. In February 1963 train movements at these crossings averaged 21 freight and 2 passenger trains per day. In August of that same year the count was 29 freight and 2 passenger.

The respondent railroad's signal witness estimated the cost to be \$9,560 at Austin Road and \$7,000 in the case of Jack Tone Road. The difference is occasioned by the proximity of the CTC passing track to Austin. To allow for trains stopped on that track more complicated circuits are necessary.

The Commission finds that:

1. The public health, safety and welfare require that the crossings of Austin Road and Jack Tone Road with Southern Pacific Company's San Joaquin Valley main line tracks between Manteca and Ripon be protected by Standard No. 8 Flashing Light Signals.

2. It is fair and reasonable to allocate the cost of installing said signals fifty percent to Southern Pacific Company and fifty percent to the County of San Joaquin.

The Commission concludes that the protection of the crossings referred to in the findings should be increased as provided by the following order.

O R D E R

IT IS ORDERED that:

1. The crossings of Nos. B-99.5, Austin Road, and B-102.0, Jack Tone Road with the main line tracks of Southern Pacific Company between Manteca and Ripon shall be protected by automatic flashing light signals, Standard No. 8 of General Order No. 75-B to be installed by respondent, the Southern Pacific Company.

2. The cost of installing signals as required by paragraph 1 of this order shall be apportioned one half to Southern Pacific Company and one half to the County of San Joaquin.

3. Construction of signals as required by paragraph 1 of this order shall be completed within one hundred eighty days after the effective date of this order.

The effective date of this order shall be twenty days after the date hereof.

Dated at San Francisco, California, this 17th day of MARCH, 1964.

William L. Bennett
President
Everett C. McKeage
George E. Grover
Friedrich B. Holshoff

Commissioners

Commissioner Everett C. McKeage, being necessarily absent, did not participate in the disposition of this proceeding.