

ORIGINALDecision No. 70134

BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

Investigation for the purpose of establishing a list for the year 1966 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. 8244

(Appearances are Listed in Appendix A)

O P I N I O N

On August 10, 1965, the Commission issued an order instituting an investigation to establish the 1966 annual priority list of railroad grade crossings of city streets or county roads most urgently in need of separation and of existing grade separations in need of alteration or reconstruction. Thereafter, such list is to be furnished to the Department of Public Works. Such a list is in conformity with Sections 189-191 of the Streets and Highways Code, which provides that the annual budget of the Department of Public Works shall include the sum of \$5,000,000 for allocations to grade separations or alterations made to existing grade separations. The actual allocation of money from State Highway Division funds is made by the Department of Public Works and the California Highway Commission.

Public hearings were held in Los Angeles and San Francisco before Examiner Daly and the matter was submitted on October 27, 1965.

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 1966 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 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.

During the course of hearing, Exhibit 1 was introduced by the Commission staff. Said exhibit considered the nominations and pertinent data filed pursuant to the Order Instituting Investigation in relation to certain tangible and intangible factors. These factors were used for the purpose of comparing the relative importance of one crossing with another in order to assign priorities. Considered among the tangible factors were traffic, cost, accident and state of readiness. The intangible factors considered were potential traffic, position and relation to city street pattern, relationship to railroad operations, available alternate routes, accident potential and vehicular delay. Also considered was 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.

In addition to the nominations filed, the staff also nominated various crossings which it felt were in need of separation. Many so nominated were not sponsored by the public body affected thereby. Staff recommendations which were not

sponsored by the public bodies involved will not be included in the list; unless the public body concerned urges a particular nomination there is no reasonable probability that the project could be financed during the year in which the priority list is in effect.

Representatives of various cities and counties introduced evidence in support of their nominations.

Many of the crossings nominated either will not be placed on the list or will be placed low on the list where the record indicates that construction would not commence within the year 1966, or where the record indicates there would be no possibility of financing said construction within the provisions of the Streets and Highways Code during said year. The law provides that the Commission include in its list only the crossings or separations which, in its judgment, are most urgently in need of separation or alteration, taking into consideration the possibility of construction and financing. Certain crossings will be either eliminated or placed low on the list because the record indicates that such separation would not result in the elimination of an existing grade crossing, located at or within a reasonable distance from the point of the grade separation.

The Bay Area Rapid Transit District appeared in support of certain crossings placed in nomination by the Cities of Hayward and Richmond. These proposed separations will have to be extended to include the facilities of the District, which will, in part, parallel those of the railroads. The record indicates that in most cases the District will contribute the additional cost required to extend the separation as well as the full shares of the Cities.

The Commission, after considering all of the nominations, establishes the following priority list for 1966:

PRIORITY LIST OF GRADE SEPARATION PROJECTS OR ALTERATIONS
YEAR 1966
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-15.6	Kearny St.	Richmond	SP
2	A-7.2	Powell St.	Emeryville	SP
3*	6RA-11.73-A	Western Ave.	Los Angeles Co.	SP
4	E-39.3	Fair Oaks Ave.	Sunnyvale	SP
5	A-15.1	Barrett Ave.	Richmond	SP
6*	B-466.9-B	Tuxford St.	Los Angeles	SP
7*	C-262.0-A	Oasis Rd.	Shasta Co.	SP
8*	C-260.8-A	Lake Blvd.	Shasta Co.	SP
9	2B-3.5	"N" St.	Colton	AT&SF
10	2-131.1	Walnut St.	Pasadena	AT&SF
11	2-235.5	Andrews St.	San Diego Co.	AT&SF
12*	E-48.4-B	Willow St.	San Jose	SP
13*	E-120.2-A	Sanborn Rd.	Salinas	SP
14	E-460.8	Hollywood Way	Burbank	SP
15	2-170.5	Katella Ave.	Anaheim	AT&SF
16	4-23.2	Tennyson Rd.	Hayward	WP
17*	E-47.1-B	Park Ave.	San Jose	SP
18*	E-398.4-B	Sanjon Rd.	San Buenaventura	SP
19	4-12.0	73rd Ave.	Oakland	WP
20	4-21.9	Harder Rd.	Hayward	WP
21	2K-2.5	37th St.	Richmond	AT&SF
22	4-21.3	Orchard Ave.	Hayward	WP
23*	3-55.9-A	Olivewood Ave.	Riverside	UP
24*	3Y-0.9-B	Norwalk Blvd.	Whittier	UP
25	4-20.4	"C" St.	Hayward	WP
26*	4-23.9-B	Industrial Pkwy.	Hayward	WP
27*	6T-38.15-B	Carnelian St.	San Bernardino Co.	SP
28	2-887.6	"F" St.	G.B.S.G.D.	AT&SF
29	E-29.0	Ravenswood Ave.	Menlo Park	SP
30	DA-40.3 & 4G-10.8	Calaveras Rd.	Milpitas	WP & SP
31	A-14.5	23rd St.	Richmond	SP
32	3-19.9	Anaheim-Puente Rd.	Los Angeles Co.	UP
33	2-239.3	Montgomery St.	San Diego Co.	AT&SF
34*	2H-24.4-A	Vermont Ave.	Los Angeles Co.	AT&SF
35	E-0.13	4th St.	San Francisco	SP
36	D-9.5 & 4-9.4	29th Ave.	Oakland	WP & SP
37	B-48.9 & 2-1155.7	Railroad Ave.	Pittsburg	AT&SF & SP
38	E-9.3	Grand Ave.	So. San Francisco	SP
39	E-15.2	Broadway	Burlingame	SP
40	E-13.7	Millbrae Ave.	Millbrae	SP
41	A-13.8	Cutting Blvd.	Richmond	SP
42	4-9.7	Fruitvale Ave.	Oakland	WP
43	2-249.1	Edelweiss St.	San Diego	AT&SF
44*	D-5.9-A	Adeline St.	Oakland	SP
45*	2-252.9-A	Miramar Rd.	San Diego	AT&SF

*Alteration projects for existing separation structures.

ORDER

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 21st day of DECEMBER, 1965.

Fredrick B. Holcomb
President

John S. [unclear]

George L. Grover

Augustus

William L. [unclear]
Commissioners

APPENDIX A

LIST OF APPEARANCES

FOR RESPONDENTS

Rudolph J. Massman, for San Diego County; R. G. Spencer, for the City of Pasadena; Charles W. Sullivan, for the City of Los Angeles; Valentine F. Padovan, for the City of San Buenaventura; Donald O. Robbins, for the City of San Diego; Robert L. White, for the City of Burbank; Harold W. Kennedy, for the County of Los Angeles; Edward H. Robinson, Jr., for the County of San Bernardino; Lawrence H. Hutton, for the City of Colton; Herman H. Beneke, for the City of San Francisco; Edwin N. Ness, for the City of Emeryville; Louis H. Larson and George S. Nolte, for the Cities of Menlo Park and Emeryville; Weston E. Follett, for the City of Oakland; Louis H. Goss, for the City of South San Francisco; Richard B. DeLong, for the City of Milpitas; Douglas S. Cruickshank, for the City of Hayward; George Marr, for the City of Burlingame; Howard A. York & Edmund T. Dady, for the City of Burlingame; James P. O'Drain, for the City of Richmond; Homer C. Chandler, for the City of Millbrae; T. G. Dunne, for the City of Salinas; Donald M. Somers, for the City of Sunnyvale; Donald D. Chamberlin, for the County of Shasta; Albert C. White, for the City of Richmond; George D. Moe, Melvin R. Dykman and Joseph C. Easley, for the State of California, Department of Public Works, Division of Highways; Byron J. Lawler, for the Union Pacific Railroad Company; Harold S. Lentz, for the Southern Pacific Company; Neal W. McCrory, for The Atchison, Topeka and Santa Fe Railway Company.

FOR INTERESTED PARTIES

Warren P. Marsden and R. J. Rankin, for San Francisco Bay Area Rapid Transit District; George W. Ballard, for the Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, AFL-CIO; G. R. Mitchell, for the Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers.

FOR THE COMMISSION STAFF

Vincent V. MacKenzie and William L. Oliver.