## Decision No. 67813

BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF THE STAT

In the Matter of the Application of CITY OF UNION CITY to construct two public roads across Southern Pacific Company drill track at Union City.

Application No. 46766

## <u>ORDER</u>

The City of Union City is hereby authorized to construct two public roads at grade across tracks of Southern Pacific Company in Union City, Alameda County, at the locations described in the application to be identified as Crossings No. L-25.63-C and L-25.55-C. Applicant shall bear entire construction expense, also maintenance cost of the crossing outside of lines two feet outside of rails. Southern Pacific Company shall bear maintenance cost of the crossing between such lines. Width of crossings shall be not less than 32 feet at each location, and grades of approach shall be not greater than five percent. Construction shall be equal or superior to Standard No. 2 of General Order No. 72. Protection at each crossing shall be by two Standard No. 1 crossing signs (General Order No.75-B) reflectorized with reflex-reflective sheet material.

Upon completion of the above crossings, the private crossing located about 50 feet north of Crossing No. L-25.63-C shall be abandoned and closed. Within thirty days after completion pursuant to this order, applicant shall so advise the Commission in writing. This authorization shall expire if not exercised within one year unless time be extended or if above conditions are not complied with. Authorization may be revoked or modified if public convenience, necessity, or safety so require.

- 1 -

lm



A. 46766

Applicant desires to begin construction as soon as possible and has requested immediate authorization. The effective date of this order shall be the date hereof.

Dated at <u>Sen Francisco</u>, California this <u>4</u><sup>TL</sup> day of <u>SEPTEMBER</u>, 1964.

Much B

Commissioners

Commissioner Peter E. Mitchell, being necessarily absent. did not participate in the disposition of this proceeding.

Commissioner William M. Bennett, being necessarily absent, did not participate in the disposition of this proceeding.