

Decision No. 81753

**ORIGINAL**

BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

Application of the City of Placerville, )  
California, requesting an order )  
authorizing the reconstruction of the )  
existing grade separation at Schnell )  
School Road and the Camino, Placerville, )  
and Lake Tahoe Railroad within the City )  
of Placerville, PUC Crossing No. 18-7.4B)

Application No. 54232  
(Filed August 8, 1973)

O P I N I O N

The City of Placerville requests authority to reconstruct a crossing at separated grades of Schnell School Road under the tracks of the Camino, Placerville and Lake Tahoe Railroad Company. Notice of the application was published in the Commission's Daily Calendar on August 10, 1973. No protests have been received. A public hearing is not necessary.

FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS

The request is in the public interest and should be granted. The City of Placerville should be authorized to reconstruct Schnell School Road at separated grades under Camino, Placerville and Lake Tahoe Railroad Company tracks in Placerville, El Dorado County, at the location described in the application to be identified as Crossing No. 18-7.4B.

The priority list of grade separation projects for the year 1973 as set forth in Decision 80874 shows the project as Priority Number 29.

Construction and maintenance expense should be borne in accordance with an agreement to be entered into between the parties relative thereto, and a copy of said agreement together with plans of said crossing approved by Camino, Placerville and Lake Tahoe Railroad Company should be filed with the Commission prior to commencing construction. Should the parties fail to agree, the Commission will

apportion the cost of construction and maintenance by further order.

Clearances should be in accordance with General Order No. 26-D. Walkway areas adjacent to the railroad tracks should be maintained free of obstructions and should promptly be restored to their original condition in the event of damage during construction.

Applicant is the lead agency for this project pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act of 1970, as amended. A negative declaration of environmental impact for this project was prepared in accordance with an ordinance adopted by the City Council following guidelines established by the Resources Agency of the State of California. It was considered by the City Council in public meeting after notice was duly given in the Mountain Democrat, a newspaper of general circulation in El Dorado County. No one present at the meeting objected, and the City Council approved the negative declaration, after which it was filed with the Clerk of El Dorado County. The Commission has considered the declaration in rendering its decision on this project.

The Commission adopts the applicant's Negative Declaration and finds that:

- (a) The environmental impact of this proposed action is insignificant.
- (b) The planned construction is the most feasible and economical that will avoid any environmental impact.
- (c) There are no known irreversible environmental changes involved in this project.

O R D E R

IT IS ORDERED that:

1. The application is granted conditioned on the findings and conclusions set forth above.

2. Within thirty days after completion, pursuant to this order, applicant shall so advise the Commission in writing. This authorization shall expire if the project is not completed within three years or if the above conditions are not complied with. The

time may be extended, or the authorization may be revoked or modified, if public convenience, necessity or safety so require.

3. The Secretary of the Commission shall file a Notice of Determination with the Secretary for Resources and with the planning agencies of any city and county which will be affected by the project.

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

Dated at San Francisco, California, this 14<sup>th</sup>  
day of AUGUST, 1973.

Thomas L. Stinger  
President  
William S. Jr.  
[Signature]  
Commissioners

Commissioner D. W. Holmes, being necessarily absent, did not participate in the disposition of this proceeding.

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