

Decision No. 74941

ORIGINAL

BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

In the Matter of the Application of the CITY OF LOS ANGELES, a municipal corporation, to widen and improve the Hazeltine Avenue grade crossing of Southern Pacific Company's Burbank Branch Line south of Bessemer Street (Crossing No. BY-458.9).)))))))))))	Application No. 49913
---	---	-----------------------

SUPPLEMENTAL ORDER

Decision No. 74243 dated June 11, 1968, authorized the City of Los Angeles to widen and improve the Hazeltine Avenue grade crossing of Southern Pacific Company's Burbank Branch Line (Crossing No. BY-458.9). Two Standard No. 8 flashing light signals (General Order No. 75-B), supplemented with automatic gates, were ordered installed at the crossing.

After further study and by agreement between the parties involved, Southern Pacific Company has requested an amendment of said decision to include the addition of flashing light signals mounted on cantilever arms to provide better protection for the proposed multilane roadway.

IT IS ORDERED that Ordering Paragraph 2 of Decision No. 74243 is hereby amended to read as follows:

"The widened crossing at Hazeltine Avenue (Crossing No. BY-458.9) shall be protected by two Standard No. 8 flashing light signals (General Order No. 75-B) supplemented with additional flashing light signals mounted

on cantilever arms and with automatic gate arms. Such protection shall be placed in service before the alteration work is completed and the crossing is fully opened to vehicular traffic."

In all other respects, Decision No. 74243 shall remain in full force and effect.

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

Dated at San Francisco, California, this 13th day of NOVEMBER, 1968.

William M. Bennett President

A. W. Gato

F. P. Morrissey Commissioners

WILLIAM M. BENNETT
A. W. GATOV
FRED P. MORRISSEY
Commissioners

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

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