

Decision No. 24114 .

BEFORE THE RAILROAD COMMISSION OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

---oOo---

In the Matter of the Application of )  
PACIFIC ELECTRIC RAILWAY COMPANY for )  
authority to reduce service on the ) Application No. 17657.  
LOS ANGELES-SAN BERNARDINO Line. )

Frank Karr and R. E. Wedekind for Applicant.

Jess M. Roberts for Group of Commuters,  
Protestants.

F. F. Ball, Board of Public Utilities &  
Transportation, City of Los Angeles,  
Interested Party.

R. D. Wickham, City Attorney, City of Alhambra,  
Interested Party.

BY THE COMMISSION:

O P I N I O N

The Pacific Electric Railway Company filed the above  
entitled application requesting permission to reduce service and  
revise the schedule on its Los Angeles-San Bernardino Line.

A public hearing on this application was conducted before  
Examiner Kennedy at Los Angeles, on September 24, 1931, at which  
time the matter was duly submitted.

In this proceeding, the applicant proposes to ~~rearrange~~ <sup>rearrange</sup> the  
schedule on its Los Angeles-San Bernardino Line which permits of  
a saving of about seven hundred car miles per day out of the  
present operation of some 4200 car miles. The proposed change  
will result in some improvement during morning and evening time  
of peak travel, and a reduction during the remainder of the day.  
The proposed changes will result in a saving of approximately  
\$3,000 per month.

ORIGINAL

O. A. Smith, passenger traffic manager for applicant, testified that the reduction in service and the revision of schedule, as proposed, was necessitated by the large amount of layover and dead head operation occasioned by the present schedule; that travel on this line has been diminishing at a rapid pace; that the earnings of the company during the present period of depression are such as to require the effecting of every reasonable economy, and that present travel on said line does not warrant the existing service.

The following tabulation shows the fare passengers and passenger revenue during the first eight months' period of 1929 to 1931, inclusive, on applicant's Los Angeles-San Bernardino Line:

<u>Fare Passengers</u>			<u>Passenger Revenue</u>		
<u>Jan. to August (Inclusive)</u>			<u>Jan. to August (Inclusive)</u>		
<u>1929</u>	<u>1930</u>	<u>1931</u>	<u>1929</u>	<u>1930</u>	<u>1931</u>
1,406,455	1,198,583	1,041,176	\$484,674.	\$451,406.	\$382,591.

During the hearing, applicant amended the proposed schedule attached to the application, to provide for an additional trip during the evening peak hours, together with certain other changes.

Mr. Jess M. Roberts, appearing in behalf of a number of commuters, testified that these riders objected principally to the method the company employed in presenting their plan of the proposed change rather than their objection to the revision in schedule. (1)

(1) EXAMINER KENNEDY: Q. I just have this thought, Mr. Roberts, in connection with many statements you have outlined here: This exhibit of course, was drawn in advance of this public hearing, and therefore was written at a time when you were not in possession of the knowledge that you have now\*\*\*?

MR. ROBERTS: A. Yes.

EXAMINER KENNEDY: Q. And if you had knowledge which you have now, derived from this public hearing, the exhibit presented here would be somewhat different, would it not?

A. Yes, it would. I want to back up my statement that the average commuter is fair. We want facts, however, and we want facts which are not selected for the P. E.'s purposes. \*\*\* Now in view of this reduction in traffic, I believe that the commuters are ready to receive a reduced service. As objecting to the facts, we are dissatisfied with the way the thing has been handled. We do think that

Mr. Jess M. Roberts was the only party appearing to protest the granting of the application; however, the record shows that numerous cities, Chambers of Commerce and individuals were notified of this proceeding, but did not make an appearance at the hearing.

After carefully considering all of the evidence in this proceeding, we are of the opinion that the revision and reduction in schedules, as proposed in the application, is reasonable and should be granted.

#### O R D E R

A public hearing having been held upon the above-entitled proceeding, the Commission being duly apprised of the facts,

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that Pacific Electric Railway Company be, and it is hereby authorized to reduce and revise its schedule on its Los Angeles-San Bernardino Line, substantially in accordance with the schedule attached to the application as amended, subject to the following conditions:

1. Applicant shall afford the public at least ten (10) days' notice of such reduction and revision in service, by posting notices of reduction and revision in service in all cars operating on said line, and at all stations affected, and in newspapers of general circulation in the territory affected.

---

(Foot Note (1) Continued)

the thing could be studied along the lines I have suggested, and that is my answer to Mr. Smith's request for concrete suggestions.

EXAMINER KENNEDY: Q. In other words, Mr. Roberts, I understand that your position,--or I would gather from your position as stated and testified to this morning--is that you are rather dissatisfied with the general picture as to the relationship existing between the Pacific Electric and the Commuters?

A. Yes, sir.

EXAMINER KENNEDY: Q. And use this particular instance of what, in your mind, you feel is not fair? \* \* \* I do draw from your testimony \* \* \* that you admit there is some merit in the application of the Pacific Electric, and that you would not expect the matter to be denied arbitrarily just by reason of the facts that you have submitted?

A. No. In view of these figures which have been stated, we do not arbitrarily deny the justification for this reduction of service.

2. Applicant shall, within thirty (30) days thereafter, notify this Commission in writing, of the reduction and revision of service herein authorized and of its compliance with the conditions hereof.
3. The authorization herein granted shall lapse and become void, if not exercised within one (1) year from the date hereof, unless further time is granted by subsequent order.

The effective date of this order shall be twenty (20) days from the date hereof.

Dated at San Francisco, California, this 13<sup>th</sup> day of October, 1931.

C. J. Seavey  
Leon Whalley  
M. J. ...  
M. B. Harris  
Fred G. Stewart  
Commissioners.