

BEFORE THE RAILROAD COMMISSION OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

ORIGINAL

In the matter of the application of Pacific Electric Railway Company for an order granting permission to increase rates for the transportation of passengers between points on the Pacific Electric Railway in the State of California.

Application No. 3791

In the matter of the application of Pacific Electric Railway Company for an order granting permission to increase rates for the transportation of passengers using local service between points on the Pacific Electric Railway Company in the City of Los Angeles, California.

Application No. 4403

In the matter of the application of Pacific Electric Railway Company for an order granting permission to increase rates for the transportation of passengers between points on the Pacific Electric Railway Company in the following cities, communities and territories in the Counties of Los Angeles, Orange, Riverside and San Bernardino, California to wit: Claremont, Colton, Glendale, Huntington Beach, Long Beach, Newport Beach, Pasadena, Pomona, Redlands, Redondo Beach, Riverside, San Bernardino San Gabriel, San Pedro-Wilmington, Santa Ana, Santa Monica, Sawtelle-Soldiers Home, South Pasadena, Upland, Van Nuys, Venice, Santa Monica-Ocean Park-Venice-Playa del Rey, Lankershim, San Fernando, Sherman, Culver City, Hermosa Beach, Manhattan Beach, El Segundo, Gardena, Torrance, Compton, Watts, Seal Beach, Fullerton, Whittier, Brea, El Monte, San Dimas, Covina, La Verne, Ontario, Rialto, Arcadia, Monrovia, Glendora, Sierra Madre, San Marino, Alhambra, and Burbank.

Application No. 4407

In the matter of the application of Pacific Electric Railway Company for an order granting permission to increase rates for the transportation of petroleum and petroleum products, carloads, classified fifth class in current Western Classification, as contained in Pacific Electric Railway Company's local, joint and proportional freight tariff C.R.C. No. 235, applying between points on lines of Pacific Electric Railway Company in California to the basis of four and one-half cents per hundred pounds higher than rates in effect on May 25, 1918, but not to exceed fifth class rates as increased effective June 25, 1918.

Application No. 4733.

In the matter of the application of Pacific Electric Railway Company, a corporation, for an order granting permission to increase rates and to establish just and reasonable rates for the transportation of persons and property between points in the State of California.

Application No. 5806

In the matter of the Commission's investigation into the electric street railway service of the Pacific Electric Railway Company and Los Angeles Railway Corporation in the Hollywood District of the City of Los Angeles.

Case No. 1602.

The Chamber of Commerce
of San Pedro,
Complainant,

vs.

Pacific Electric Railway,
Company,
Defendant.

Case No. 1607.

Frank Kerr and R.C. Gortner, for Pacific Electric Railway Company.

Jess E. Stephens, W.P. Mealey, Milton Bryan, E.Z. Osborne, Jr., and F.A. Lerents, for the City of Los Angeles.

J.H. Howard, for City of Pasadena.

William Hazlett and E.V. Orbison, City Manager, for
 City of South Pasadena.
 Arthur A. Weber, for City of Santa Monica.
 Arthur A. Weber and Charles W. Lyon, for Santa Monica Bay
 Realty Board, Venice Chamber of Commerce, Santa Monica-
 Ocean Park Chamber of Commerce, Santa Monica City Club,
 West Los Angeles Improvement Association and Venice
 Merchants Association.
 R.C. Gould and Grant M. Lorraine, City Manager, for City
 of Alhambra.
 Thomas B. Reed, for City of Covina.
 Frederick Baker, for City of Azusa.
 E.B. Lynch, Bert B. Woodard and Wm. E. Reere, City Manager,
 for City of Glendale.
 Clyde Woodworth, for City of El Segundo, City of Inglewood
 and City of Beverly Hills.
 Geo. L. Hoochenpyl and Bruce Mason and P.E. Howes, City
 Manager, for City of Long Beach.
 Geo. E. Scott, for City of Santa Ana.
 Charles W. Lyon, for City of Venice.
 E.O. Winburn, for the City of Watts.
 William Guthrie, for City of San Bernardino.
 Walter F. Dunn, for City of El Monte and City of Arcadia.
 Miguel Estuñillo, for City of Riverside.
 John P. Dunn and A. Black, for City of Monrovia.
 Frank L. Perry, for Cities of Manhattan Beach, Hermosa
 Beach and Redondo Beach.
 Thomas A. Berkebile, for City of Monterey Park.
 C.L. Welch, for Hollywood, and Santa Monica Boulevard
 Improvement Association.
 Earl Crandall and G.E. Delevan, Jr., for City of Manhattan.
 George R. Wickham, for City of Hermosa Beach.
 W.E. Guerin, for City of Pomona.
 P.A. Stanton and J.P. Frangue, for City of Seal Beach.
 E.P. Gregson, for Associated Jobbers of Los Angeles.
 J.S. Horn, for Los Angeles Central Labor Council.
 W.H. Engle, for Northwest Welfare Association.
 Harold James and F.A. Cattorn for Northeast Los Angeles
 Improvement Association.
 Shannon Crandall, for Los Angeles Chamber of Commerce and
 Torrance Chamber of Commerce.
 Perry G. Briney for Mewelllyn Iron Works and the Union Tool
 Company of Torrance.
 W.H. Ingle, for people of Edendale.
 Henry E. Carter, for Wilmington Chamber of Commerce.
 Rollin L. McKitt, for Eagle Rock Chamber of Commerce.
 I.G. Lewis and Milton Bryan, for Chamber of Commerce of
 San Pedro.
 W.E. Mellinger, for Chamber of Commerce of Hermosa Beach.
 Harlan C. Palmer and E.M. Tilden, for Hollywood Board
 of Trade.
 Robert Young, for Hollywood Chamber of Commerce.
 Howard P. Shepherd and C.L. Welch, for Santa Monica
 Boulevard Improvement Association.
 O.G. Ball and A.L. Colby, for Dayton Improvement Association.
 M.L. Garrigue, for certain citizens of Central-South
 Hollywood.
 Seward Cole and Edwin O. Palmer, for Santa Monica and Vine
 Boulevard Business Men's Club.

R.J. Harwood, for Hollywood Vermont Association.
 Anthony Pratt, for Municipal League.
 E.C. Moore, for Vermont Avenue and Griffith Park Improvement
 Association.
 W.H. Cline and Van M. Griffith, for Los Angeles Park
 Commission.
 W.E. Sibertson, for West Hollywood Association.
 A.A. Pratt, for himself as patron of Pacific Electric and
 driver of automobile.
 H.W. Kidd and F.D. Howell, for Motor Transit Company.
 Rollin L. McNitt, for Pasadena-Pomona Stage Line, Pasadena-
 Ocean Park Stage Line, Mt. Wilson Stage Line, Arrowhead
 Springs Company.
 S.W. Thompson, for United Stages, Inc.
 F. Landior, for Auto Bus Operators in San Pedro.
 A.W. Burt, for Protestants, residents of San Antonio Heights.
 C.F. Sawyer, for himself as a resident of Hollywood.
 A.F. Hall, of Long Beach, in propria persona.
 G.O. Clark, for West Ivanhoe Improvement Association.
 E.L. Duffy, for Maywood Commercial Improvement Association.
 C.D. Swanner, for Seal Beach.
 E.L. Brady and Walter L. McIntyre, for Rose Hill Improve-
 ment Association.
 Mrs. Emma C. Newton, for residents of Avila.
 E.V. Shephard, for Highland Park Chamber of Commerce.
 H.E. Wilson and Phil B. Hart, for Florence Improvement
 Association.
 George E. King, for Chamber of Commerce of Glendale; also
 James W. Rhodes, Secretary.
 J.P. Transue, for Seal Beach Chamber of Commerce.
 William Hazlett also representing citizens of Richardson
 and Atwater Station on the Glendale line; also Dickinson
 and Gillespie, property owners, Richardson Station.
 W.P. Wolff, for residents of Hauser Station.
 John E. Carson, for Chamber of Commerce of Glendora.
 H.D. Anderson, for Watts Chamber of Commerce.
 J.M. Page, Secretary, Chamber of Commerce, Pomona.
 Frank Walton, for Springdale, Willowbrook and Compton.
 John T. Ackley, for Monterey Park Chamber of Commerce.
 W.T. Sterling, for High School Teachers' Association.
 Walter Gould Lincoln, for Baldwin Park Chamber of Commerce.
 Mr. Poor, for Clean Government League.
 Benjamin W. Shipman, for Wilmar Chamber of Commerce.

COMMISSION EN BANC:

FIRST SUPPLEMENTAL OPINION AND ORDER.

The Commission, in its Decision No. 9928, dated December 24, 1921, granted the Pacific Electric Railway Company increases in passenger fares. Among the changes authorized was the discontinuance of the 60-ride individual commutation ticket limited to 40 days from date of sale. In lieu of these 40-day tickets the applicant was authorized to establish individual commutation tickets good for two trips daily, one in each direction, during the calendar month, and rates per mile depending upon distances.

Supplemental hearings on the applications were held at Los Angeles commencing January 24, 1922, at which time additional testimony was received. This testimony indicated that the commuters were not being satisfactorily served by the single monthly commutation ticket. This testimony indicated that the majority of the commuters on this railroad desired other forms of commutation tickets, either substituting the ticket provided for in the Commission's order or supplementing it.

During the hearings held prior to the Commission's Decision No. 9,928, the testimony of witnesses, and the arguments of the city attorneys, clearly indicated that if a raise in the commutation charge was necessary the commuter would prefer calendar-month tickets with no increases in the mileage basis rather than 40-day commutation tickets at increased rates. It was estimated that the calendar-month ticket established January 1, 1922, would in effect procure practically the same sum of money as would be secured under the 40-day, 60-ride ticket at an increase of 20 per cent. The testimony of witnesses in the

instant proceeding was mainly to the effect that the experiences during the month of January indicated that there was a considerable number of commuters whose needs would be better served by an undated 60-ride, 40-day limit ticket. The city attorneys, in their argument, coincided in this view, stating that this type of ticket would, in their opinion, be preferred by a large number of people, even at an increased rate per mile.

The testimony also showed that the largest number of commuters travel daily except Sunday, and that a ticket at a somewhat lower rate per month than the present calendar-month ticket, allowing one round trip for each week-day during the month, would better meet their requirements.

We are of the opinion that the lowest possible rate of transportation should be provided for the regular every-day commuter, and the next lowest for the regular six-day rider.

After giving all of the testimony and the arguments and exhibits full consideration, we reach the conclusion that the original order should be supplemented in the following manner:

1. The present calendar-month dated tickets based on one round trip daily for each day in the month should be continued in effect at the present rates.
2. Individual dated monthly commutation tickets good for one round trip daily except Sunday shall be established at rates ten per cent less than the rates now in effect for the full calendar month ticket.
3. Undated 60-ride, 40-day individual commutation tickets shall be established at the mileage rates hereinafter indicated in the order.

The latter ticket will re-establish a form of transportation in effect prior to January 1, 1922, at rates approximately 20 per cent higher than those obtaining under the old schedule. By reason of the adoption of a non-discriminatory

mileage basis it is impossible to accomplish an exact 20 per cent increase over the old rates for this form of ticket, but the rates will be as near such amount as the maintenance of the mileage schedule will permit. It may also be noted that this form of ticket will show an increase on the mileage basis of approximately 15 per cent over the present calendar-month ticket. The 60-ride ticket shall be on sale at any time, good for 40 days from date of sale, and any number of rides may be used on any one day by the purchaser, the only restriction being that the ticket shall be used by the original purchaser within the 40-day period. It is believed that this 60-ride, 40-day ticket will provide for the transportation needs of persons who have occasion to ride only five days per week, and for that reason no additional five-day commutation ticket has been established.

The three forms of commutation tickets set forth in the order will take care of the needs of all commuters and be fair and equitable. All of the newly-established rates are based on the mileage scales set forth in the order. In the opinion of the Commission, these commutation rates should take effect on February 1, 1922, and the Pacific Electric is hereby authorized to use the present form of commutation tickets, appropriately marked or stamped to indicate that the books will be good as provided in the order during the month of February or until new forms of tickets and new tariffs are distributed to the agents of the Company. The Pacific Electric is further authorized to issue such emergency supplements to its tariffs as may be necessary.

FIRST SUPPLEMENTAL ORDER.

Supplemental public hearings having been held in the above-numbered proceedings, and basing the order on the preceding opinion, the Commission hereby modifies its order as set forth in Decision No. 9,928, dated December 24, 1921, in the following particulars:

THE PACIFIC ELECTRIC RAILWAY COMPANY IS HEREBY AUTHORIZED to publish individual calendar-month commutation tickets good for one round trip daily, except Sunday, at rates 10% less than the full calendar-month rates.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED THAT the Pacific Electric Railway Company be authorized to publish 60-ride, individual commutation tickets, good for transportation when presented by original purchaser and within 40 days from date of sale, on the following mileage basis:

From 1 to 10 miles - - - - -	1.38¢	per mile
From 11 to 15 miles - - - - -	1.242	" "
From 16 to 20 miles - - - - -	1.104	" "
Over 20 miles - - - - -	1.035	" "

All fares shall be constructed on actual mileage, except in communities where it is necessary to zone certain terminal points.

In computing and applying all increased fares authorized herein, fractions of a half cent or over will be increased to the next whole cent; fractions are to be disregarded when less than one-half cent.

In all other respects the original order remains in full force and effect.

The Commission reserves the right to make such further orders in this proceeding relating to service and rates as may appear just and reasonable.

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 Los Angeles, California, this 28th day of January, 1922.

H. K. Rosendick
.....
H. D. Loveland
.....
J. W. Martin
.....
Chas. H. Brown
.....
W. J. Almeda
.....

Commissioners.