



not reached an agreement as to the type of protection to be installed at the crossing. The witnesses for the County testified that the old crossing is abrupt, narrow and unimproved and is protected by one crossbuck. The old road serves only a few homes or small farms; carries traffic of approximately 70 cars per day and has a record of no accidents. The new road is to be straightened, improved and widened to 40 feet. A County witness testified that an asbestos-cement pipe plant has been built a short distance from the railroad and will use the new crossing; when the plant is put in operation it will increase the traffic to approximately 400 cars per day; and the heaviest traffic will be in the morning and evening at the change of shift. The witnesses also testified that this is the only industrial plant in the area which will use the crossing and whether any others are planned at this time is not known.

A traffic engineer of the Riverside County Road Department testified that he keeps safety records of all railroad crossings in Riverside County; he has made a priority list of the approximately 140 crossings in Riverside County; the old crossing at Wilson Street is number 109 on the list; and that the improved crossing will be numbered 78 on a revised list with 50 crossings having higher use, priority and lower safety factors and which do not have any automatic protection.

The witnesses for the applicant testified that the County of Riverside is limited as to the amount of tax funds available for the installation of automatic crossing protection; consideration should be given to the other crossings which have higher priority and greater need for protection; and that automatic lights are not needed at this crossing at this time or in the immediate future.

An inspector of public projects for the railroad testified that he is familiar with the Union Pacific Railroad Company's crossings as part of his duties; he made a study of this new crossing; the road work has been completed at the crossing; and that it is presently open as a private crossing to the pipe plant. He introduced into evidence his report, Exhibit 4, parts of which are as follows:

Traffic, 24-hour volumes

Vehicles .....	360
Trains .....	2
Maximum vehicular speed, estimated	20 to 30 m.p.h.
Maximum train speed .....	15 m.p.h.

Proposed Grade Crossing Data

Number of tracks .....	1
Number of moving vehicular lanes	2
Angle of crossing .....	90°
Track alignment .....	Tangent
Street alignment	11° 30' Curve

Visibility

Northeast quadrant .....	Good
Southeast quadrant .....	Good
Northwest quadrant .....	Fair
Southwest quadrant .....	Fair

Recommendation

Maximum vehicular traffic over proposed crossing will occur in the morning hours, between 7 a.m. and 9 a.m. The Crestmore Branch local arrives at the proposed crossing between 2 p.m. and 4 p.m. In view of relatively light vehicular and train movements over the proposed crossing, recommend the installation of two reflectorized Standard No. 1 crossbucks.

An associate transportation engineer of the Commission staff testified and submitted his report, Exhibit 6, in evidence. Exhibit 6 outlines the need for protection and makes recommendations as follows:

Need for Automatic Protection

Based on the projected use of the proposed crossing by vehicular traffic and motorists' restricted visibility of approaching

trains in the southwest quadrant, it is concluded that adequate protection would not be provided by Standard No. 1 signs and that automatic protection should be installed.

Recommendation

It is recommended that two Standard No. 8 flashing light signals be installed as the minimum protection with the installation cost to be apportioned 50/50 between Union Pacific Railroad Company and Riverside County.

The Commission finds that:

1. The applicant and the Union Pacific Railroad Company are in agreement as to the need for the proposed crossing changes and improvements and that counsel have stated that the work has been completed, the crossing placed in operation for the asphalt plant as a private crossing, and remaining issues are the type of crossing protection and apportionment of cost.

2. The recommendation of the engineers for the County of Riverside and the Union Pacific Railroad Company should be adopted for the improved and widened crossing at 20th Street and the division of the cost of road work but due to the expected increased vehicular traffic and train movements over the proposed crossing, resulting from the full usage of the new pipe plant, it should be protected by installation of two Standard No. 8 flashing light signals and the cost of installation should be borne equally by the County of Riverside and the Union Pacific Railroad Company.

O R D E R

IT IS ORDERED that:

1. The County of Riverside is authorized to open a public grade crossing at 20th Street and the Union Pacific Railroad tracks

substantially in the manner and in accordance with the plans filed in this proceeding, subject to the conditions herein set forth.

2. The work required to be performed shall be done and the cost thereof shall be divided between the County of Riverside and the Union Pacific Railroad Company in accordance with the agreement between the parties.

3. Crossing protection at said crossing shall be by two Standard No. 8 flashing light signals. The cost of protection and installation shall be apportioned 50 percent to the County of Riverside and 50 percent to the Union Pacific Railroad Company.

4. On or before thirty days after the effective date of this order the grade crossing, formerly known as Wilson Street, No. 3-54.4-C, with the Union Pacific Railroad Company track in Riverside County shall be closed and the roadway barricaded.

5. The Union Pacific Railroad Company shall perform the work of closing said Wilson Street crossing and bear the entire cost of same.

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

Dated at San Francisco, California, this 3rd day of AUGUST, 1965.

[Signature] President  
[Signature]  
[Signature]

Commissioner George G. Grover, being necessarily absent, did not participate in the disposition of this proceeding.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Commissioners

*I would not require the installation of Standard No. 8 flashing light signals. In my judgment, vehicular and train movements do not justify the expenditure of the required funds. Other locations are worthier of such protection.*

*Frederick B. Holhoff<sup>57</sup>*