

Decision No. 24652.

BEFORE THE RAILROAD COMMISSION OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

CITY OF ALAMEDA, a  
Municipal Corporation,  
  
Complainant,  
  
vs.  
  
SOUTHERN PACIFIC COMPANY,  
a corporation,  
  
Defendant.

**ORIGINAL**

Case No. 3210.

Mr. Edward J. Silver and Mr. Harry A. Encell,  
for the City of Alameda, Complainant.

Mr. C. W. Durbrow and Mr. Wm. Meinhold, for  
Southern Pacific Company, Defendant.

SEAVEY, COMMISSIONER:

O P I N I O N

Pursuant to the procedure prescribed in the Commission's General Order No. 27-A, Southern Pacific Company, on February 6th, 1932, advised, in writing, that it planned to reduce electric train and ferry service between Alameda and San Francisco on Sundays and holidays and during the evening hours on week days. This reduced service was to have become effective on February 28th, 1932. Notice to the public of this curtailment was posted in all cars and boats operated in this service on February 18th. On February 27th the City of Alameda filed the above numbered case, protesting the proposed reduction in service.

Upon the filing of this complaint, Southern Pacific Company suspended the placing into effect of the proposed reduced service.

Public hearings were held in Alameda on March 17th, 22nd and 25th, 1932.

Southern Pacific Company's proposed plan provides for a sixty-minute headway, to replace the present thirty-minute service, on Sundays and the following holidays - New Year's Day, Washington's Birthday, Decoration Day, Fourth of July, Labor Day, Thanksgiving and Christmas, the first boat to leave San Francisco at 6:45 A.M. and thence hourly to 12:45 A.M.; in the opposite direction the first boat to leave Alameda Pier at 6:15 A.M., the next at 7:06 A.M. and thence hourly until 1:06 A.M.

Daily, except Sundays and holidays, the service is to remain as at present until after the evening commute period, thence hourly from San Francisco from 6:45 P.M. to 12:45 A.M., and from Alameda Pier at 6:19 P.M., then 7:06 P.M. and hourly thereafter until 1:06 A.M.

The company contends that the amount of traffic during the periods of proposed curtailed service does not justify the present frequency of service. In support of this contention, various exhibits were introduced to show the volume and distribution of traffic. Furthermore, this reduction will effect a saving in the cost of operation of approximately \$43,000. in boat operation and \$16,000. in electric train operation, or a total of approximately \$59,000., as shown in Exhibit No. 7.

The proposed curtailment in service was protested by the City of Alameda, particularly the reduction on Sundays and holidays, on the ground that the present schedules are necessary to sustain property investments and that Sunday service is vital to business activities in Alameda. Although no serious protest was made against the curtailment of evening service, it was suggested that the break from half-hourly to hourly service be extended from 6:45 P.M. to 7:15 P.M. The record shows that to extend the half-

hourly service as suggested it would be necessary to employ two eight-hour crews instead of one twelve-hour crew, thus materially affecting operating expenses. Exhibits Nos. 3 and 3A show that after 5:45 P.M. there is a material reduction in the traffic flow. Although it would be of some public convenience to extend the half-hourly service to about 7:00 P.M., it appears that the benefits which would accrue would not justify the additional expense.

From an analysis of the traffic flow during the hours of proposed service curtailment, it appears that more service is now given than the amount of traffic justifies. It therefore is recommended that this complaint be dismissed without prejudice and that the defendant be allowed to carry out its plan of curtailment of service, pursuant to the provisions of General Order No.27-A, until such time as changed conditions may warrant changes in the schedules.

O R D E R

A public hearing having been held on this proceeding, the matter having been submitted and being now ready for decision,

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that Case No. 3210 is hereby dismissed without prejudice.

The foregoing Opinion and Order are hereby approved and ordered filed as the Opinion and Order of the Railroad Commission of the State of California.

Dated at San Francisco, California, this 4<sup>th</sup> day of April, 1932.

C. C. [Signature]  
Leon [Signature]  
W. A. [Signature]  
W. B. [Signature]  
Frank G. [Signature]  
Commissioners.