

BEM

Decision No. 73511

ORIGINAL

BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

Investigation for the purpose of establishing a list for the year 1968 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. 8664

(Appearances are Listed in Appendix A)

O P I N I O N

On August 8, 1967, the Commission issued an order instituting an investigation to establish the 1968 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 20, 1967.

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 1968 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. Statement as to delay at crossing.
5. Type of separation proposed (overpass or underpass).
6. Preliminary cost estimate of project.
7. Statement as to the amount of money available for construction of the project.
8. 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.

C. 8664 bem

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, state of readiness, impaired clearance and demand. 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.

In determining the order of priority for the nominations as covered by Exhibit 1, and the record in the above proceeding, Park Avenue in the City of San Jose was assigned first position, as the record indicates that the city has on file with the Division of Highways an acceptable allocation request. This crossing is considered to meet all the necessary requirements, including the maximum state-of-readiness position.

In determining the position of the remainder of the grade crossings or separations nominated, consideration was given first to the availability of funds for each and consequent ability to commence construction in 1968 and whether or not an application had been filed with the Public Utilities Commission. The 16 crossings which could be constructed in 1968 were immediately grouped in the top half of the priority list.

In order to determine the relative position of the grade crossings to be separated, each was ranked according to the factors enumerated in Exhibit 1; viz., traffic factor, cost factor and accident factor. They were then varied in position according to any special conditions such as the intangible factors heretofore referred to. In the case of the 6 separations to be altered or widened, the factors determined by dividing the daily traffic per existing lane in each separation (constriction to traffic flow) by the cost of the project were listed in descending order, the larger factor being first. This list was then modified according to the

C. 8664 bem

impaired clearances existing at each separation, preference being given to the ones with the more serious impairments.

These two separate lists, in the order of priority, covering the crossings to be eliminated or to be altered or widened, respectively, were then combined.

The relative position of the 30 remaining nominations which, it was felt, would not be ready for construction in 1968 were similarly determined.

Although funds are available, according to the record, for the City of Pasadena's Walnut Street project, the record also indicates that the city will not be able to go to construction until some time in 1969, since construction plans will not be completed until after the end of 1968. The Walnut Street project has, therefore, been included in the latter portion of the list according to the factors.

The City of San Dimas' nomination for San Dimas Avenue was placed last on the list since the city did not include all the necessary information required to determine a relative position for this crossing on the priority list.

The Commission, after considering all of the nominations, establishes the following priority list for 1968:

PRIORITY LIST OF GRADE SEPARATION PROJECTS OR ALTERATIONS
 YEAR 1968
 PURSUANT TO SECTION 189 OF THE STREETS AND HIGHWAYS CODE

Priority No.	Crossing No.(s)	Street	Agency	RR
1*	E-47.1-B	Park Avenue	San Jose	SP
2	A-14.5, 2K-1.8-B	23rd Street	Richmond	SP, AT&SF
3*	2E-24.4-A	Vermont Avenue	Los Angeles Co.	AT&SF
4	A-99.9	Walerga Road	Sacramento Co.	SP
5*	EC-116.1-B	Capitola Avenue	Capitola	SP
6	3-19.9	Azusa Avenue	Los Angeles Co.	UP
7*	E-102.0-A	Elkhorn Road	Monterey Co.	SP
8	3X-17.3, 2-164.9	Harbor Blvd.	Fullerton	UP, AT&SF
9*	E-107.9-A	Dolan Road	Monterey Co.	SP
10	E-35.7	Bailey Avenue	Santa Clara Co.	SP
11*	EC-116.2-B	Wharf Road	Capitola	SP
12	2-239.8	Chesterfield Dr.	San Diego Co.	AT&SF
13*	E-56.12-A	Capitol Expwy.	Santa Clara Co.	SP
14	4-12.0	73rd Avenue	Oakland	WP
15*	E-47.7-B	Bird Avenue	San Jose	SP
16	2-188.2	El Toro Road	Orange Co.	AT&SF
17	E-0.13	4th Street	San Francisco	SP
18	A-13.8	Cutting Blvd.	Richmond	SP
19*	2-252.9-A	Miramar Road	San Diego	AT&SF
20	E-13.7	Millbrae Avenue	Millbrae	SP
21	E-15.2	Broadway	Burlingame	SP
22*	E-17.2-B	Poplar Avenue	San Mateo	SP
23	B-48.9, 2-1155.7	Railroad Avenue	Pittsburg	SP, AT&SF
24	E-23.2	Holly Street	San Carlos	SP
25*	2-975.8-B	Latonia Avenue	Fresno Co.	AT&SF
26	2-887.6	"F" Street	Greater Bakersfield Separation of Grade District	AT&SF
27	B-487.4	Fremont Street	Alhambra	SP
28*	6T-54.17-A	Meridian Avenue	San Bernardino	SP
29	E-22.0	Ralston Avenue	Belmont	SP
30	E-29.0	Ravenswood Ave.	Menlo Park	SP
31*	5-236.3-B	Dyerville Loop Rd.	Humboldt Co.	NWP
32	B-483.7	Mission Road	Los Angeles	SP
33	B-609.7	Monroe Street	Indio	SP
34*	D-5.9-A	Adeline Street	Oakland	SP
35	B-202.8	West Avenue	Fresno	SP
36	E-452.3	Roscoe Blvd.	Los Angeles	SP
37*	E-17.4-B	Mount Diablo Ave.	San Mateo	SP
38	B-463.4	Van Nuys Blvd.	Los Angeles	SP
39	BC-500.0	Sepulveda Blvd.	Los Angeles	SP
40*	E-17.3-B	East Santa Inez Ave.	San Mateo	SP
41	4-9.7	Fruitvale Avenue	Oakland	WP
42	2-131.1	Walnut Street	Pasadena	AT&SF
43*	E-17.5-B	Tilton Avenue	San Mateo	SP
44	A-107.2	Berry Street	Roseville	SP
45	2-249.1	Edelweiss Street	San Diego	AT&SF
46	2-110.1	San Dimas Avenue	San Dimas	AT&SF

*Alteration projects for existing separation structures.

O R D E R

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 19th day of DECEMBER, 1967.

[Signature]
President

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]
Commissioners

APPENDIX A

LIST OF APPEARANCES

FOR RESPONDENTS

Lynn Stewart, for the City of Alhambra; Hugh L. Berry, for the City of Fullerton; Arthur R. McDaniel, for the City of Indio; George Weir Bullock, for the City of Burbank; C. L. Holman and Robert B. Curtiss, for The Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe Railway Company; Harold S. Lentz, for Southern Pacific Company; Leslie E. Corkill, for the City of Los Angeles; Jerald E. Wheat, for Los Angeles County; Wendell L. Hartman, for the County of Orange; James R. Callens, for the City of Pasadena; William Schempers, Jr., for the City of San Diego; Rudolf J. Massman, for the County of San Diego; Donald M. Winton, for the City of Fresno; Ben B. White, for the City of Capitola; Willis E. Haines, for the County of Monterey; William C. Sharp, for the City of Oakland; Valentine F. Padovan, for the City of Millbrae; W. John Atteberry, for the City of Roseville; E. C. Marriner, for the City of Pittsburg; James W. Boring, for the City of San Jose; Edward C. Steffani, for the County of Santa Clara; James E. Ray, for the County of Sacramento; George E. Cork, for the City of San Carlos; Robert G. Pezzant, for the City of San Mateo; William James Scruggs, for the City and County of San Francisco; James P. O'Drain, for the City of Richmond.

FOR INTERESTED PARTIES

Joseph C. Easley and Melvin R. Dykman, for State Department of Public Works; G. R. Mitchell, for Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers; G. W. Ballard, by James E. Howe, for Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, California Legislative Board, AFL-CIO; J. L. Evans, by James E. Howe, for Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen, AFL-CIO.

FOR THE COMMISSION STAFF

William L. Oliver and M. E. Getchel.