Decision _____

BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

Application of the Bay Area Toll Authority (BATA) for authority to construct a proposed West Oakland Link project (proposed CPUC Crossing No. 016-2.52-ACD) (proposed DOT No. 857922A) over the existing railroads within the County of Alameda, California.	Application 26-03-006

DECISION AUTHORIZING THE BAY AREA TOLL AUTHORITY TO CONSTRUCT AN OVERHEAD GRADE-SEPARATED BICYCLE AND PEDESTRIAN CROSSING AS PART OF THE WEST OAKLAND LINK PROJECT

Summary

This decision authorizes the Bay Area Toll Authority to construct an overhead grade-separated bicycle and pedestrian crossing, part of the West Oakland Link Project, at milepost 2.52, extending over Oakland Global Rail Enterprise Tracks in the City of Oakland, County of Alameda.

This proceeding is closed.

1. Background

1.1. Procedural and Factual Background

On March 10, 2026, the Bay Area Toll Authority (BATA or Applicant) filed an expedited application for authority to construct a proposed overhead grade-

separated bicycle and pedestrian crossing (proposed CPUC Crossing No. 016-2.52-ACD) (proposed DOT No. XXX) over Oakland Global Rail Enterprise railroad tracks in the City of Oakland, County of Alameda, State of California (Application).[1] The proposed crossing (Crossing) is part of Phase 1 of the West Oakland Link project. The Crossing will connect to the Bay Bridge Trail at one end and West Grand Avenue at the other. The overhead structure will include fencing where it crosses over a road or railroad and a metal guardrail barrier over other areas.

In its Application, BATA requested an expedited schedule to complete this proceeding by November 30, 2026, which will allow BATA to meet funding deadlines set by the California Transportation Commission.

On April 13, 2026, the Commission's Rail Safety Division (RSD) filed a response to the Application. RSD found no safety issues and further concluded that the Crossing complies with applicable regulatory requirements and the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure (Rules). There were no protests to the Application.

On June 3, 2026, Applicant, its consultants, a representative from the City of Oakland, a representative from the Oakland Bulk and Oversized Terminal,[2] representatives from RSD, the assigned Administrative Law Judge (ALJ), and the assigned Assistant Chief Administrative Law Judge (ACALJ) conducted a site

[1] Rail Safety Division Response, Attachment A at A-1.

[2] The Oakland Bulk and Oversized Terminal will be rehabilitating the railroad tracks under the proposed new grade-separated crossing with the intention of providing railroad access to the bulk and oversize terminal being constructed at the Port of Oakland.

visit to the area where the proposed Crossing will be constructed. The purpose of the site visit was to give the assigned ALJ and the assigned ACALJ the opportunity to see where the proposed Crossing will be constructed and to understand any constraints or considerations in constructing the Crossing. During the site visit, the ACALJ and the ALJ observed the proposed connection of the Crossing to the Bay Bridge bike path, and the location of the proposed park that is intended to intersect with the Bay Trail that will connect the West Oakland neighborhoods to both Treasure Island (with potential access to San Francisco via water ferry) and northern East Bay cities such as Emeryville, Berkeley and Albany.

On June 8, 2026, the assigned ALJ held a prehearing conference.

On July 16, 2026, Commissioner Harada issued a Scoping Memo and Ruling (Scoping Memo) that set forth the issue to be addressed in this proceeding and established a schedule for the proceeding. The Scoping Memo also included a request for additional information, namely a request for an accurate Department of Transportation (DOT) number for the proposed crossing and a copy of, or link to,the original California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) documentation.

BATA responded to the request for additional information on August 6, 2026. BATA provided links to the original Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration (IS/MND), and the appendences and addendum thereto. BATA also provided a declaration of Nafis Majd confirming that the DOT number provided in the Application is correct; however, upon review the DOT number provided remains invalid. While the CPUC crossing number is sufficient to adequately

identify the crossing for our purposes, for safety reasons, it would behoove the Applicant to obtain a valid DOT identification number as well.

2. Receiving Application and Exhibits into the Evidentiary Record, Taking Judicial Notice of Mitigated Negative Declaration, and Closing the Proceeding Record

2.1. Receiving and Admitting Evidence into the Evidentiary Record

On March 10, 2026, BATA filed its Application. Along with the Application, BATA provided several exhibits. On August 6, 2026, BATA provided supplemental information. All exhibits are marked as follows and admitted into the evidentiary record:

Exhibit Number	Party or Witness	Exhibit Name and Description
BATA-01	Bay Area Toll Authority	Application of the Bay Area Toll Authority for authority to construct a proposed West Oakland Link project over the existing railroads within the County of Alameda, California.
BATA-02	Bay Area Toll Authority	Appraisal map and legal description, dated October 6, 2025, Exhibit A to the Application
BATA-03	Bay Area Toll Authority	Project drawings, Exhibit B to the Application
BATA-04	Bay Area Toll Authority	City of Oakland letter of concurrence, dated March 3, 2026, Exhibit C to the Application
BATA-05	Bay Area Toll Authority	Scoping Memo form, Exhibit D to the Application
BATA-06	Bay Area Toll Authority	IS/MND Addendum, Exhibit E to the Application, dated November 2024
BATA-07	Bay Area Toll Authority	Funding Documentation, Exhibit H to the Application

BATA-08	Bay Area Toll Authority	Lighting plans, Exhibit I to the Application.
BATA-09	Nafis Majd	Declaration regarding DOT number, Attachment 2 to BATA Response filed on 8/6/26
BATA-10	Bay Area Toll Authority	IS/MND dated December 2022

2.2. Judicial Notice of Mitigated Negative Declaration

Rule 13.10 allows the Commission to take official notice "of such matters as may be judicially noticed by the courts . . . pursuant to Evidence Code section 450 et seq." The Evidence Code permits taking judicial notice of regulations and legislative enactments issued by or under the authority of any public entity.[3] We take judicial notice of the IS/MND[4] dated June 2022 and the IS/MND Addendum[5] dated November 2024.

We find that taking judicial notice of the IS/MND and the IS/MND Addendum is appropriate because the documents are relevant to this proceeding, and they are within the scope of the documents that the Commission may take official notice of under the Rules and the Evidence Code.

3. Submission Date

This matter was submitted on August 6, 2026, upon BATA's filing a response to the addition information requested in the Scoping Memo.

[3] Evidence Code section 452.

[4] *See* BATA-10.

[5] *See* BATA-06.

4. Jurisdiction

The Commission has jurisdiction over railroad crossings under Public Utilities (Pub. Util.) Code sections 1201 and 1202. The applicable safety and regulatory requirements are found in Pub. Util. Code sections 1201-1205. Rules 3.7-3.11 also govern applications to construct crossings involving railroads and public roads.

5. Issues Before the Commission

The issues to be determined or otherwise considered are:

1. Should the Commission approve the Application for construction of a grade-separated pedestrian and bicycle crossing under Pub. Util. Code section 1201-1205 and Rule 3.7?
2. Has the Applicant complied with CEQA?
3. Should the Commission grant the Applicant a period of 60 months, or five years, from the date the Application is approved to complete the proposed project?
4. Does the Application align with or impact the achievement of any of the nine goals of the Commission's Environmental and Social Justice (ESJ) Action Plan?

6. Public Utilities Code Sections 1202–1205 and Rule 3.7

6.1. Public Utilities Code Sections 1201–1205

Under Pub. Util. Code section 1201, Applicant must obtain the Commission's permission before it can construct a public road, highway, or street across an at-grade railroad track. BATA complied with Pub. Util. Code section 1201 by submitting Application 26-03-006 to the Commission to construct an overhead grade-separated bicycle and pedestrian crossing. BATA also

complied with the railroad crossing application requirements detailed in Pub. Util. Code section 1201.2 as follows:

Section 1201.2(a): The Application included a legal description of the location of the proposed Crossing in Exhibit A.[6]

The Application included a plan compliant with section 1201.2(a) in Exhibit B2-1.[7]

Section 1201.2(b): The Application included a map compliant with section 1201.2(b) in Exhibit B1.[8]

Section 1201.2(c): The Application included a profile compliant with section 1201.2(c) in Exhibit B2-1.[9]

Section 1201.2(d) is not applicable, as Applicant is not constructing a railroad.

Section 1201.2(e): Applicant states the Crossing will include fencing and barriers pursuant to all relevant, Caltrans, railroad, building and safety codes. The fencing will also meet the safety requirements of the Highway Design Manual and Guidelines for Railroad Grade Separation Projects from UPRR-BNSF.

6.2. Rule 3.7

Rule 3.7 details the necessary components of an application to construct a public road, highway, or street across a railroad. Rule 3.7 is satisfied as follows:

---

[6] Exhibit BATA-02.

[7] Exhibit BATA-03.

[8] *Ibid.*

[9] *Ibid.*

BATA served its application on the City of Oakland, the affected railroad corporation.

Rule 3.7(a): The proposed Crossing will be at milepost 2.52 with coordinates: Latitude 37.823994, Longitude -122.304383.[10] The Application contains a legal description of the location of the proposed Crossing in Exhibit A.[11]

Rule 3.7(b): The crossing identification numbers of the nearest existing public crossings are:

- To the east, I-880/Grand Avenue (CPUC Crossing No. 016-2.50-AC, US DOT # XXX).
- To the west, Burma Road (CPUC Crossing No. 016-0.75, US DOT # 967680V).[12]

Rule 3.7(c) is not applicable, as the proposed project is grade-separated.

Rule 3.7(d): The Application included a map compliant with Rule 3.7(d) in Exhibit B2-1.[13]

Rule 3.7(e): The Application included a map compliant with Rule 3.7(d) in Exhibit B1.[14]

[10] Milepost was supplied by RSD's response. The Application was incomplete.

[11] Exhibit BATA-02.

[12] Crossing identification numbers were supplied by RSD's response. Applicant did not identify the public crossing to the west of the proposed crossing.

[13] Exhibit BATA-03.

[14] *Ibid.*

Rule 3.7(f): The Application included a profile compliant with Rule 3.7(f) in Exhibit B2-1.[15]

Applicant has provided sufficient evidence to satisfy Rule 3.7.

6.3. The Commission's General Order 26-D

General Order (GO) 26-D sections 2.1 and 3.2 prescribe minimum vertical and horizontal clearances for railroads with overhead structures. BATA's design exceeds these minimum clearances. The minimum vertical clearance permitted by GO 26-D section 2.1 is 22 feet six inches. The Crossing's minimum vertical clearance is 23 feet 10 inches. The minimum horizontal clearance permitted by GO 26-D section 3.2 is eight feet six inches. The Crossing's minimum horizontal clearance is 15 feet one inch.

7. California Environmental Quality Act Compliance

CEQA requires governmental agencies to evaluate environmental impacts from proposed projects, and to mitigate any identified environmental impacts to the extent possible.[16] The proposed West Oakland Link Project is considered a "project" under CEQA. As such, CEQA requires analysis and possible exemption or mitigation of adverse or significant environmental impacts.

The CEQA "lead agency" is the public agency with the principal responsibility for approving or carrying out the project. The lead agency maintains the responsibility for deciding whether an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) or a negative declaration will be required and has the obligation to

[15] *Ibid.*

[16] Public Resources Code sections 21000 *et seq.*

prepare the appropriate document,[17] or to determine whether the project is statutorily or categorically exempt from CEQA. A CEQA "responsible agency" is a public agency that will make a discretionary decision about the project for which a lead agency is preparing or has prepared an EIR or negative declaration.[18]

Here, BATA is the lead agency, and the Commission is a responsible agency under CEQA. As a responsible agency, the Commission must consider the lead agency's environmental document and findings before acting on or approving the project.[19]

The Commission is responsible for mitigating or avoiding only the direct or indirect environmental effects of those parts of the project that it decides to carry out, finance, or approve.[20] In this case, the Commission only needs to consider the direct or indirect environmental effects of the proposed Crossing.

7.1. Environmental Review

BATA adopted the IS/MND in January 2023.[21] The IS/MND described the proposed project, identified potential environmental impacts, and identified mitigation measures. BATA ultimately determined that the project's environmental impacts will be less than significant with mitigation. After the

[17] 14 California Code of Regulations (CCR) section 15367.

[18] 14 CCR section 15381. For the purposes of CEQA, the term "responsible agency" includes all public agencies other than the lead agency that have discretionary approval power over the project.

[19] 14 CCR, sections 15050(b) and 15096.

[20] 14 CCR section 15096 (g)(1).

[21] *See* Exhibit BATA-10.

adoption of the IS/MND, BATA revised the project, and several design elements were changed or taken out. Accordingly, BATA attached an IS/MND Addendum (Addendum) to its application, dated November 2024.[22] The Addendum described the differences between the environmental impacts described in the IS/MND and the predicted environmental impacts of the revised project.

The Addendum identifies several potentially significant environmental impacts of the revised project that can be mitigated down to a less-than-significant level.

There is an earthen drainage ditch with dense cattail vegetation on the project site. The ditch is a riparian habitat and a potential wetland. To mitigate potential impacts, Applicant will install environmentally sensitive area fencing, avoid placing stormwater treatment facilities in the area, avoid the introduction and spread of invasive plants, and develop and implement worker awareness training.[23]

The project is located in a "very high" liquefaction susceptibility zone. It is unknown whether expansive soils underly the project area. To mitigate these risks, Applicant will perform a site-specific geotechnical investigation.[24] During this investigation, a geologist will test subsurface conditions. If dangerous conditions are found, the geologist will make project recommendations.

The project will introduce four potentially hazardous intersections.

---

[22] Exhibit BATA-06.

[23] Exhibit BATA-10, Mitigation Measures BIO-1; BIO-2; BIO-3; and BIO-4 at 2-42.

[24] Exhibit BATA-06, Mitigation Measure GEO-1 at 2-26.

First, the project will add pedestrian and bicycle traffic to the West Grand Avenue/Frontage Road/I-80 Ramps intersection, where the current pedestrian crosswalk and signals will be insufficient to accommodate increased demand. This could create a hazard for bicyclists and pedestrians. To improve safety, Applicant plans to implement signal upgrades and crosswalk improvements to accommodate increased pedestrian and bicycle traffic.[25]

Second, the project will add pedestrian and bicycle traffic to the West Grand Avenue/Mandela Parkway Northbound intersection. Pedestrians and bicyclists will be exposed to vehicles at the intersection, which could be potentially hazardous. To mitigate this impact, Applicant will implement signal upgrades and optimization at the intersection.[26]

Third, there might be conflicts between bicyclists and pedestrians at the connection to the Bay Bridge Trail. To mitigate potential hazards, Applicant will implement path and signage improvements at the Bay Bridge Trail intersection.[27]

Fourth, the project involves a 180-degree curve to transition from the elevated structure to grade level, which could result in unsafe conditions for bicyclists and pedestrians. Applicant will improve safety at the switchback by installing warning signs and maintaining clear lines of sight.[28]

[25] Exhibit BATA-06, Mitigation Measure TR-1 at 2-51.

[26] Exhibit BATA-06, Mitigation Measure TR-2 at 2-51.

[27] Exhibit BATA-06, Mitigation Measure TR-3 at 2-51.

[28] Exhibit BATA-06, Mitigation Measure TR-5 at 2-52.

7.2. Determination

After reviewing the IS/MND and the IS/MND Addendum, we find that the project to construct a bicycle and pedestrian crossing has been sufficiently reviewed under CEQA and that the CEQA documents contain sufficient and appropriate mitigation to less than significant levels of the environmental impacts associated with the rail Crossing discussed in this decision. Following issuance of this decision and in compliance with CCR, Title 14, section 15096(h) through (i), the Commission's Energy Division shall file a Notice of Determination with the CEQA Clearinghouse certifying that the Commission considered the environmental documents related to the proposed Crossing prior to issuing this decision.

8. Timing for the Construction of the Bicycle and Pedestrian Crossing

The Application did not specify a construction period. RSD, however, recommended an authorization period of 60 months.[29] We find RSD's recommendation to be reasonable. Accordingly, the authorization in this decision is granted for a period of 60 months during which time BATA must complete construction of the grade-separated Crossing at milepost 2.52.

9. Compliance with the Commission's Environmental and Social Justice Action Plan

The Commission promulgated its ESJ Action Plan 2.0 (Action Plan) to provide an operating framework for incorporating ESJ considerations into all Commission proceedings. The Action Plan requires the Commission to consider equity, diversity, inclusion, access, and burdens on low-income populations,

[29] Rail Safety Division Response, filed April 13, 2026, at 2.

populations of color, and Native American Tribes. The Action Plan contains nine goals, and the operational framework established four steps in achieving those goals, namely 1) determine if the proceeding has an ESJ impact; 2) establish an outreach plan for potentially impacted communities; 3) determine the specific ESJ impact in the proceeding; and 4) incorporate ESJ impacts into the proceeding and record.[30]

The first step is determining whether the proposed rail crossing has a social and environmental impact. According to the most recent United States Census information, Oakland's population is roughly 30% White, 29% Latino, 20% Black, 17% Asian and Pacific Islander, and 2% Native American.[31] Oakland's median household income in 2024 was $101,600.[32] The West Oakland Link Project will be located within Census Tract 6001401700, with a CalEnviroScreen score of 80. The ESJ Plan defines Disadvantaged Communities as those scoring in the top 25% of CalEnviroScreen 4.0. Accordingly, the Crossing will be constructed in a disadvantaged community.

In rail crossing cases, ESJ considerations include whether the project will create physical, racial, or economic boundaries and whether the new rail crossings provide easy and safe access to community amenities for all residents. The West Oakland Link project will not divide the community, as the Crossing will be grade-separated and thus will not interrupt the at-grade flow of traffic. Additionally, the Crossing is in an industrial area a distance from residential

[30] CPUC Environmental and Social Justice Action Plan 2.0 at 15.

[31] https://www.census.gov/quickfacts/fact/table/oaklandcitycalifornia/PST045224

[32] *Ibid.*

neighborhoods. The project will improve safe access to non-motorized transportation corridors for the West Oakland community and the Bay Bridge for all residents. The project will also improve access to San Francisco, although community members will have to bike to Treasure Island, then take a ferry to San Francisco.[33] The bicycle ride back to the Bay Bridge bike path is steep, but bicyclists will have an alternate route that is less steep.[34]

The project aligns with the Commission's ESJ goals. The Crossing will provide West Oakland, a disadvantaged community, with improved access to non-motorized transportation corridors. The West Oakland community will also have greater access to San Francisco. Further, the project is likely to result in a mode shift, which will decrease air pollution and greenhouse gas emissions in the community.

The project has involved and will continue to involve outreach efforts to vulnerable communities, including the West Oakland Environmental Indicators Project, a local community-based environmental justice organization. Through these outreach efforts, Applicant has incorporated and will continue to solicit community input into project design.

10. Summary of Public Comment

Rule 1.18 allows any member of the public to submit written comment in any Commission proceeding using the "Public Comment" tab of the online Docket Card for that proceeding on the Commission's website. Rule 1.18(a) requires that all written public comments submitted prior to the submission of

[33] Reporter's Transcript (RT) page 13: 10–13.

[34] RT 13:20–14:11.

the proceeding are part of the administrative record of the proceeding. Rule 1.18(b) requires that relevant written comments submitted in a proceeding be summarized in the final decision issued in that proceeding.

There are no comments on the Docket Card for this proceeding.

11. Conclusion

As discussed in the preceding sections, the proposed overhead grade-separated bicycle and pedestrian Crossing, as described in the Application, complies with the requirements set forth in Pub. Util. Code section 1201, Rule 3.7 as well as the relevant sections of GO 26-D. The proposed rail Crossing has been sufficiently reviewed under CEQA and does not raise any ESJ issues adverse to the Commission's Action Plan.

We therefore conclude that the Application should be granted. BATA should be granted a period of 60 months from the date of this decision within which to complete construction of the proposed Crossing.

Finally, we also find it reasonable to adopt RSD's recommended language, in part, for the Ordering Paragraphs in this decision.

12. Procedural Matters

This decision affirms all rulings made by the assigned ALJ and assigned Commissioner in this proceeding. All motions not ruled on are deemed denied, except Applicant's request for an expedited schedule, which the Commission has approved.

13. Waiver of Comment Period

This is an uncontested matter in which the decision grants the relief requested. Accordingly, as provided in Rule 14.6(c)(2), the otherwise applicable 30-day public review and comment period for this decision is waived.

14. Assignment of Proceeding

Christine Harada is the assigned Commissioner and Leah Goldberg is the assigned Administrative Law Judge in this proceeding.

Findings of Fact

1. BATA submitted A.26-03-006 to construct an overhead grade-separated bicycle and pedestrian Crossing over Oakland Global Rail Enterprise railroad tracks.

2. The Crossing will connect to the Bay Bridge Trail at one end and West Grand Avenue at the other.

3. The Crossing will connect West Oakland to Treasure Island, where pedestrians and bicyclists can take a ferry to San Francisco.

4. The overhead structure will include fencing where it crosses over a road or railroad and a metal guardrail barrier over other areas.

5. In its Application, BATA formally requested an expedited process to meet its funding deadline.

6. RSD found no safety issues and concluded that the Application complies with the applicable Rules and safety requirements.

7. RSD has no objections to the Application.

8. The proposed Crossing is located at MP 2.52 and geographic coordinates Latitude 37.823994, Longitude -122.304383.

9. The crossing identification numbers of the nearest existing public crossings to the proposed Crossing are as follows: to the east, I-880/Grand Avenue overhead bridge rail crossing, CPUC Crossing No. 016-2.50-AC and US Dot #

XXX; and to the west, Burma Road at-grade crossing, CPUC Crossing No. 016-0.75 and US Dot # 967680V.

10. A map in compliance with Rule 3.7(d) is included as Exhibit B2-1.

11. A map in compliance with Rule 3.7(e) is included as Exhibit B1.

12. A profile in compliance with Rule 3.7(f) is included in Exhibit B2-1.

13. The minimum vertical clearance between the tracks and the Crossing will be minimum 23 feet 10 inches.

14. The minimum horizontal side clearance between tracks and structures will be minimum 15 feet one inch.

15. RSD recommends an authorization time period of 60 months from the date of the Commission Order within which to complete construction of the Crossing.

16. In 2023, BATA adopted the IS/MND for the project. The IS/MND found environmental impacts will be less than significant with mitigation.

17. In 2025, BATA adopted an Addendum to the IS/MND. The Addendum found that no new or substantially more severe impacts will result from the revised project.

18. The West Oakland neighborhood is classified as a disadvantaged community due to its CalEnviroScreen score of 80.

19. The project will provide a disadvantaged community access to non-motorized transportation corridors.

20. The project is predicted to cause a mode shift, decreasing vehicle emissions in a disadvantaged community.

Conclusions of Law

1. Taking judicial notice of the IS/MND and the IS/MND Addendum is appropriate because the document is relevant to this proceeding and within the scope of the documents that the Commission may take official notice of under the Rules and the Evidence Code.

2. Applicant provided sufficient evidence to satisfy Pub. Util. Code section 1201.2.

3. Applicant provided sufficient evidence to satisfy Rule 3.7.

4. Applicant provided sufficient evidence to satisfy GO 26-D.

5. The project to construct a grade-separated overhead bicycle and pedestrian Crossing has been sufficiently reviewed under CEQA, and any adverse environmental impacts will be appropriately mitigated to less than significant levels.

6. The proposed Crossing is consistent with the Commission's ESJ goals.

7. The authorization to construct should be granted for a period of 60 months to complete the grade-separated overhead bicycle and pedestrian Crossing.

8. Any motions not ruled on should be deemed denied, except Applicant's request for an expedited schedule, which the Commission has approved.

9. The Application should be approved.

O R D E R

IT IS ORDERED that:

1. The following exhibits are received into the evidentiary record: BATA-01, BATA-02, BATA-03, BATA-04, BATA-05, BATA-06, BATA-07, BATA-08 BATA-09 and BATA-10.

2. The Bay Area Toll Authority is authorized to construct one grade separated overhead bicycle and pedestrian crossing over the Oakland Global Rail Enterprise tracks in the City of Oakland, County of Alameda.

3. The grade-separated overhead bicycle and pedestrian crossing shall be identified as California Public Utilities Commission Crossing Number CPUC No. 016-2.52-ACD and DOT # XXX.

4. The grade-separated overhead bicycle and pedestrian crossing shall have the configuration specified in Application 26-03-006 and its attachments.

5. The Bay Area Toll Authority shall comply with all applicable Commission rules, including California Public Utilities Commission General Orders and the California Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices.

6. The Bay Area Toll Authority shall notify the California Public Utilities Commission's Rail Crossings and Engineering Branch of the Rail Safety Division at least five business days prior to the opening of the grade-separated overhead bicycle and pedestrian crossing. Notification should be made by e-mail to rceb@cpuc.ca.gov.

7. Within 30 days after completion of the work authorized by this decision, the Bay Area Toll Authority shall notify the California Public Utilities Commission's Rail Crossings and Engineering Branch of the Rail Safety Division that the authorized work is complete by submitting a completed California Public Utilities Commission Standard Form G, Report of Changes at Highway Grade Crossing and Separations. Form G requirements and forms can be obtained at the California Public Utilities Commission website at

https://www.cpuc.ca.gov/crossings. The Form G report must be submitted via email to rceb@cpuc.ca.gov.

8. Upon issuance of this decision and in compliance with California Code of Regulations, Title 14, sections 15096(h) and (i), the Commission's Energy Division shall file a Notice of Determination with the California Environmental Quality Act clearinghouse certifying that the Commission considered the environmental documents related to the proposed grade-separated overhead bicycle and pedestrian crossing.

9. This authorization shall expire if not exercised within 60 months of the issuance of this decision unless time is extended or if the above conditions are not satisfied. The authorization may be revoked or modified if public convenience, necessity, or safety so require.

10. A request for extension of the 60-month authorization time period must be submitted to the California Public Utilities Commission's Rail Crossings and Engineering Branch of the Rail Safety Division at least 30 days before the expiration of that period. A copy of the extension request shall be sent to all interested parties.

11. Any motions not previously ruled on are denied, except Applicant's request for an expedited schedule, which the Commission has approved.

12. Application 26-03-006 is closed.

This order is effective today.

Dated _____, at Sacramento, California