

hjh

ORIGINAL

Decision No. 76497

BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

Investigation for the purpose of
 establishing a list for the year
 1970 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. 8950

(Appearances are listed in Appendix A)

O P I N I O N

On August 12, 1969, the Commission issued an order instituting an investigation to establish the 1970 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 21, 1969.

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 1970 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 2 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 several crossings which it felt were in need of separation. These nominations are included in the list.

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

In determining the position of the grade crossings or separations nominated, consideration was given to the availability of funds for each and consequent ability to commence construction in 1970 and whether or not an application had been filed with the Public Utilities Commission.

In order to determine the relative position of the grade crossings to be separated, each was ranked according to the factors enumerated in Exhibit 2; 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 separations to be altered or widened, the factors considered were the constriction to traffic flow, the cost of each project and impaired clearances which may exist.

Because of a recent amendment, money that is unallocated during a calendar year no longer reverts to the Highway Fund, but is added to the money provided for in the succeeding year. This permits a wider scope of consideration for complying nominations. As a result less emphasis will be placed upon the ability of a public agency to finance and complete the project and more emphasis will be placed upon the need for the project.

The Hawthorne Boulevard crossing in Torrance is located on a State Highway and therefore cannot be included on the priority list, which relates only to grade crossings of city streets or county roads.

The Commission, after considering all the nominations, establishes the following priority list for 1970:

PRIORITY LIST OF GRADE SEPARATION PROJECTS OR ALTERATIONS
YEAR 1970
PURSUANT TO SECTION 189 OF THE STREETS AND HIGHWAYS CODE

<u>Priority No.</u>	<u>Crossings Nos.</u>	<u>Street</u>	<u>Agency</u>	<u>RR</u>
1	E-58.6	Cottle Road	San Jose	SP
2	E-13.7	Millbrae Avenue	Millbrae	SP
3*	4-55.9-B	Dyer Road	Alameda County	WP
4	3-9.8	Lexington Avenue	Los Angeles County	UP
5	2-744.4	Riverside Drive	Barstow	AT&SF
6*	EC-116.2-B	Wharf Road	Capitola	SP
7	2-131.1	Walnut Street	Pasadena	AT&SF
8	A-91.0	28th Street	Sacramento	SP
9*	2-975.8-B	Latonía Avenue	Fresno County	AT&SF
S 10	B-483.7 B-483.5	Mission Road and Griffin Avenue	Los Angeles	SP
11	A-14.5 & 2K-1.8-B	23rd Street	Richmond	SP-AT&SF
12*	5-14.7-B	Sir Francis Drake Blvd.	Larkspur	NWP
13	D-46.0 & 4-46.7 D-46.6 & 4-47.2 D-47.0 & 4-47.7	Murrieta Boulevard N. "P" Street N. Livermore Avenue	Livermore	SP-WP
14	6T-13.31 6T-12.77	Valley Boulevard Santa Anita Avenue	El Monte	SP
15*	E-17.2-B	Poplar Avenue	San Mateo	SP
16	E-0.13	4th Street	San Francisco	SP
17	A-13.8	Cutting Boulevard	Richmond	SP
18	EG-498.8 & 6M-15.98	223rd Street	Los Angeles County	SP
19	D-20.0	"A" Street	Hayward	SP
S 20	2-156.1	Imperial Highway	Santa Fe Springs & Norwalk	AT&SF
S 21	E-500.5	Hacienda Boulevard	Industry	SP
22	E-23.2	Holly Street	San Carlos	SP
23	D-20.6	Winton Avenue	Hayward	SP
24	E-15.2	Broadway	Burlingame	SP
S 25	B-488.5	Atlantic Boulevard	Alhambra	SP
26	2B-0.7	Rialto Avenue	San Bernardino	AT&SF
27	2B-10.3 & 3-57.0	14th Street	Riverside	AT&SF-UP
28	B-202.8	West Avenue	Fresno	SP
29	E-47.45	Auzerais Street	San Jose	SP
S 30	B-463.4	Van Nuys Boulevard	Los Angeles	SP
S 31	E-452.3	Roscoe Boulevard	Los Angeles	SP
32	4-9.7	Fruitvale Avenue	Oakland	WP
33	2H-14.1	El Segundo Boulevard	El Segundo	AT&SF
34	B-469.4	Hollywood Way	Burbank	SP
35	B-110.9	Blue Gum Avenue	Stanislaus County	SP
36	B-609.7	Monroe Street	Indio	SP
37	2-249.1	Edelweiss Street	San Diego	AT&SF
38*	D-5.9-A	Adeline Street	Oakland	SP
39*	E-46.6-B	Julian Street	San Jose	SP
40*	2-252.9-A	Miramar Road	San Diego	AT&SF

* Alteration projects for existing separation structures.

S Staff Nomination

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 2nd day of DECEMBER, 1969.

William J. ...
President
Augustus ...
J. M. ...
T. ...
Norman L. ...
Commissioners

APPENDIX A

LIST OF APPEARANCES

FOR RESPONDENTS:

John F. Varozza, for the City of Sacramento; James W. Boring, for the City of San Jose; Ralph Molagen, for the City of Richmond; Luchan G. Baker, for the County of Alameda; Harold F. Durham, for the County of Fresno; Herman H. Beneke, for the City & County of San Francisco; Kent B. Bathurst, for the City of Larkspur; W. Ryder Ray, for the City of Capitola; Val Padovan, for the City of Millbrae; John A. Lewis, for the City of Livermore; Douglas S. Cruickshank, for the City of Hayward; M. Glenn Weaver, for the City of Torrance; Robert F. Beach, for the City of Barstow; Glenn F. Welch, for the City of El Monte; James F. Martinek, for the City of Riverside; Edwin C. Benedict, for the County of Los Angeles; Arthur A. Krieger, for the City of Pasadena; Leslie E. Corkill, for the City of Los Angeles; W. W. Toliver, for The Atchison, Topeka, and Santa Fe Railway Company; Harold S. Lentz, for Southern Pacific Company.

FOR INTERESTED PARTIES:

G. R. Mitchell, for Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers; William E. Sherwood, David H. Frederickson and Larry Thelen for the California Department of Public Works; Scott L. Harrington, for IBM International Business Machine Corporation.

FOR THE COMMISSION STAFF:

William L. Oliver and M. E. Getchel.