

**ORIGINAL**

Decision No. 75114

BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

Investigation for the purpose of )  
 establishing a list for the year )  
 1969 of railroad grade crossings )  
 of city streets or county roads )  
 most urgently in need of separa- )  
 tion, or existing separations in )  
 need of alteration or reconstruc- )  
 tion as contemplated by Section )  
 189 of the Streets and Highways )  
 Code. )

Case No. 8830

(Appearances are listed in Appendix A)

O P I N I O N

On August 6, 1968, the Commission issued an order insti-  
 tuting an investigation to establish the 1969 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 separa-  
 tions. 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 15, 1968.

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 1969 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.

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 delays. 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, Bird 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 1969 and whether or not an application had

been filed with the Public Utilities Commission. The 15 crossings which could be constructed in 1969 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 five separations to be altered or widened, the factors considered were the constriction to traffic flow and the cost of each project. This list was then modified according to the 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 so that a crossing elimination project was followed by an alteration or widening project in the order of priority of each of the two lists; the theory behind this method of combining the two different types of projects being that the costs of the latter are normally relatively minor and do not materially decrease the number of grade crossings that can be reached, thus increasing the overall number of projects that can probably obtain allocations from the Highway Commission in 1969.

The relative position of the 30 remaining nominations which, it was felt, would not be ready for construction in 1969 were similarly determined, with the exception that this included only

three separations to be altered or widened and, consequently, one of the latter was included in each group of nine crossings to be eliminated.

Concerning the City of Los Angeles' Mission and Griffin Roads project, the record indicates that the city will not be able to start construction until some time in 1970 although funds could be made available by the City in 1969. The Mission and Griffin Roads project has, therefore, been included on the priority list after other projects having funds available which can be ready to proceed to construction. The Commission considers construction of a grade separation at Mission and Griffin Roads, and closure of eight grade crossings in the vicinity, by the City of Los Angeles to be an extremely important project, and for this reason the Mission Road crossing has been nominated for separation in past years by the Commission staff as a crossing most urgently in need of separation. Although this project is not given higher priority in the 1969 list, the City of Los Angeles is urged to diligently pursue completion of all requirements including necessary financing in order to place high on the 1970 Grade Separation Priority List, and thereby prevent further delay of the planned construction of this important project.

The Murietta Boulevard project in Livermore was not included in the list since the grade crossing has not as yet been constructed. The Commission cannot include Murietta Boulevard on a list of crossings "most urgently in need of separation" since the Murietta Boulevard crossing does not exist at the present time.

PRIORITY LIST OF GRADE SEPARATION PROJECTS OR ALTERATIONS  
YEAR 1969  
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*	E-47.7-B	Bird Avenue	San Jose	SP
2	2-188.2	El Toro Road	Orange County	AT&SF
3*	EC-116.2-B	Wharf Road	Capitola	SP
4	B-519.0 & 3-36.6	Mountain Avenue	Ontario	SP, UP
5*	EC-116.1-B	Capitola Avenue	Capitola	SP
6	4-27.9	Niles Boulevard	Fremont	WP
7*	5-236.3-B	Dyerville Loop Road	Humboldt County	NWP
8	4-12.0 & 4-12.2	73rd & 77th Avos.	Oakland	WP
9*	6T-54.17-A	Meridian Avenue	San Bernardino	SP
10	E-39.7	Wolfe Road	Sunnyvale	SP
11*	2-975.8-B	Latonia Avenue	Fresno Co.	AT&SF
12	3-9.8	Lexington Avenue	Los Angeles Co.	UP
13	2-131.1	Walnut Street	Pasadena	AT&SF
14	B-483.7 & B-483.5	Mission & Griffin Rds.	Los Angeles	SP
15	A-14.5 & 2K-1.8-B	23rd Street	Richmond	SP, AT&SF
16*	2-252.9-A	Miramar Road	San Diego	AT&SF
17	E-0.13	Fourth Street	San Francisco	SP
18	E-13.7	Millbrae Avenue	Millbrae	SP
19	E-9.3	Grand Avenue	South S.F.	SP
20	E-11.0	San Bruno Avenue	San Bruno	SP
21	B-48.9 & 2-1155.7	Railroad Avenue	Pittsburg	SP, AT&SF
22	A-13.8	Cutting Boulevard	Richmond	AT&SF
23	B-495.3	Peck Road	El Monte	SP
24	2-156.1	Imperial Highway	Santa Fe Springs & Norwalk	AT&SF
25	2-887.6	"F" Street	G.B.S of G.D.	AT&SF
26*	E-46.6-B	Julian Street	San Jose	SP
27	4-9.7	Fruitvale Avenue	Oakland	WP
28	D-47.0 & 4-47.6 D-46.6 & 4-47.2	Livermore Ave. & "P" St.	Livermore	SP, WP
29	B-609.7	Monroe Street	Indio	SP
30	E-15.2	Broadway	Burlingame	SP
31	BG-498.8 & 6M-15.98	223rd Street	Los Angeles	SP
32	B-487.4	Fremont Avenue	Alhambra	SP
33	B-463.4	Van Nuys Boulevard	Los Angeles	SP
34	E-22.0	Ralston Avenue	Belmont	SP
35	E-29.0	Ravenswood Avenue	Menlo Park	SP
36*	D-5.9-A	Adeline Street	Oakland	SP
37	E-23.2	Holly Street	San Carlos	SP
38	E-8.4	Oyster Point Boulevard	South S.F.	SP
39	E-452.3	Roscoe Boulevard	Los Angeles	SP
40	B-202.8	West Avenue	Fresno	SP
41	2H-14.1	El Segundo Boulevard	El Segundo	AT&SF
42	E-58.6	Cottle Road	San Jose	SP
43	B-568.8	Hargrave Street	Banning	SP
44	A-107.2	Berry Street	Roseville	SP
45	2-249.1	Edelweiss Street	San Diego	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 17<sup>th</sup> day of DECEMBER, 1968.

William J. Jensen  
President

August  
Fred P. Monsey  
Commissioners

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



APPENDIX A

LIST OF APPEARANCES

FOR RESPONDENTS:

G. Brent Muchow, for Orange County; William H. Parness, Roger Silva, Burton A. Lewis and Dan Lee, for the City of Livermore; Arthur A. Kreiger, for the City of Pasadena; Lynn W. Kloepper, for the City of Ontario; E. P. Benedict, for Los Angeles County; Roland S. Woodruff, for the Greater Bakersfield Separation of Grade District; Harold S. Lentz, for Southern Pacific Company; C. L. Holman, for The Atchison, Topeka and Santa Fe Railway Company; Charles E. Mattson and Leslie E. Corkill, for the City of Los Angeles; Paul D. Foxworthy, for the City of Azusa; W. Ryder Ray, for the City of Capitola; Richard C. Waker, for the City of Union City; Charles H. Gorham, for the City of Fresno; Lawrence W. Milnes, for the City of Fremont; Harold F. Durham, for Fresno County; Samuel V. McGrath and Ralph E. Mologen, for the City of Richmond; Gerard S. Vergeer, for the City of San Bruno; Herman H. Beneke, for the City and County of San Francisco; Josephine G. Waveh, for the City of Millbrae; A. R. Turturici and James Boring, for the City of San Jose; William C. Sharp, James D. Coolidge and Weston E. Follett, for the City of Oakland.

FOR INTERESTED PARTIES:

Warren P. Marsden, for San Francisco Bay Area Rapid Transit; William E. Sherwood and Joseph C. Easley, for Department of Public Works, Division of Highways; G. R. Mitchell, for Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers.

FOR THE COMMISSION STAFF:

R. O. Collins, William L. Oliver and M. E. Gatchel.