

**ORIGINAL**Decision No. 72891

## BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

In the matter of the Application )	
of the CITY OF ANAHEIM to construct )	
a city street across the right of )	Application No. 48743
way of The Atchison, Topeka and )	(Filed August 25, 1966)
Santa Fe Railway Company at Linda )	(Amended July 3, 1967)
Vista Street. )	

ORDER

The City of Anaheim is hereby authorized to construct Linda Vista Street at grade across tracks of The Atchison, Topeka and Santa Fe Railway Company in the City of Anaheim, at the location described in the application, as amended, to be identified as Crossing No. 2N-0.8.

Width of crossing shall be not less than 102 feet and grades of approach not greater than three percent. Construction shall be equal or superior to Standard No. 2 of General Order No. 72. Protection shall be by four Standard No. 8 flashing light signals (General Order No. 75-B) supplemented with automatic crossing gates.

Applicant shall bear entire construction expense, also maintenance cost of the crossing outside of lines two feet outside of rails. The Atchison, Topeka and Santa Fe Railway Company shall bear maintenance cost of the crossing between such lines. The maintenance cost of the automatic protection shall be borne in accordance with the provisions of Section 1202.2 of the Public Utilities Code.

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

Dated at San Francisco, California, this 15<sup>th</sup> day of AUGUST, 1967.

\_\_\_\_\_  
 President  
*William L. Bennett*

\_\_\_\_\_  
*August*

\_\_\_\_\_  
*William L. Bennett, Jr.*

\_\_\_\_\_  
*Chief P. W. ...*  
 Commissioners

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