

BEFORE THE RAILROAD COMMISSION
OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA.

---c0o---

In the Matter of the Application of)
SAN DIEGO ELECTRIC RAILWAY COMPANY)
and POINT LOMA RAILROAD COMPANY for) Application No. 910.
an order authorizing a reduction in)
service.)

Read G. Dilworth for applicants.
John Niven and W. R. Cushman for protestants.

TEELER, Commissioner.

O P I N I O N .

On July 10, 1913, this Commission made its order in Case No. 402, directing the petitioners in this proceeding to establish a twenty minute service on their lines of street railway between the business center of San Diego as one terminus and Point Loma and Ocean Beach as the other terminus. The Commission's order was founded in part on the admission of the general manager of these petitioners that such service would probably be necessary and in part on a count of passengers carried, which count was introduced at the hearing and clearly showed the necessity for the order as made.

The increased travel which occurred just prior to the Commission's said order of July 10, 1913, was due in large measure to the construction and operation of an amusement park at Ocean Beach known as Wonderland Park. It appears that this park closed its doors in November, 1913, and that it has not been re-opened, though its manager testified that he expected to re-open within a few months.

Petitioners now ask that the order heretofore issued in Case No. 402 be rescinded and that they be permitted to establish such service, whether 20 minute or 40 minute or otherwise as they may deem necessary. In support of their petition, they filed

at the hearing counts of the travel on each car between the termini affected during the months of October, November and December, 1913, January, 1914, and the first four days in February, 1914, which counts show a very considerable falling off in travel from that which was shown to the Commission in July, 1913.

The request that petitioners be authorized to do as they please with reference to the service complained of can not be granted. On the other hand, this Commission can not stand watch over such situations, day by day, unless the number of its employes be increased far above the present number. At the hearing the Commission drew attention to the fact that the solution of such problems must be found somewhere between these two extremes and that if the Commission should in this case prescribe such minimum requirements of service as are clearly required by the evidence, the matter of putting on additional service when the traffic again increases must be left in the first instance to the carriers. In this case I believe that if the Commission establishes such minimum 40 minute service as the evidence clearly justifies, the matter of increasing 40 minute service to 20 minute service during other portions of the day, as the necessity therefor arises, may be left to the carriers' own sense of duty to the public. As it becomes necessary, from time to time, to increase the period of 20 minute service, the carriers will be expected to put on such additional service without further order from this Commission.

The two witnesses called by protestants at the hearing admitted frankly that it would not be fair to compel the petitioners herein to give the people of Point Loma and Ocean Beach a better and more expensive service than the travel reasonably justifies. The expense of such excess service, in that event, would have to be borne either by the carriers or by their patrons on other portions of their systems - neither of which alternative would be just or reasonable.

With a view to determining the portions of the day in which a 20 minute service should be retained as a minimum requirement for the petitioners, the counts presented by petitioners have been

carefully analyzed. They show that on certain trips early in the morning no passengers have been carried. On a large number of trips, less than ten passengers were carried. This condition is particularly prevalent after 7 o'clock in the evening. On other trips, even during the first four days of February, passengers have been carried in excess of the seating capacity of a car, which is about 56 passengers.

In determining during what hours a 20 minute service must be retained, a difference must be made between Sundays and the week days. A careful analysis of the actual travel shows that week-day travel moving outbound from San Diego requires a 20 minute service from 6:40 A.M. to 8 A.M. and again from 4 P.M. to about 6:20 P.M. Inbound week-day travel requires a 20 minute service, under existing conditions, from 7 A.M. to 8:20 A.M. and from 3:20 P.M. to 5:20 P.M. I find that, taking the outbound and inbound week-day travel together, the petitioners should be directed to operate their cars on a 20 minute schedule up to 8 A.M. and again from 4 P.M. to 7 P.M. and that during the remaining portion of the day they may operate on a 40 minute schedule until increasing traffic shall necessitate shorter schedules.

With reference to Sunday traffic, 20 minute service is not now necessary during the early morning hours. Outbound travel requires a 20 minute service from 8:40 A.M. to 4 P.M. and inbound business from about 3 P.M. to possibly 7:20 P.M. Petitioners should accordingly retain 20 minute service on Sundays from 8:40 A.M. to 7:20 P.M., but may resume 40 minute service during the remaining portions of the day until increasing traffic requires a restoration of 20 minute service.

It must be clearly understood that in authorizing the carriers to resume in part their former 40 minute service, the Commission particularly draws the attention of the carriers to the necessity of having sufficient equipment during all portions of the day, both during 40 minute and 20 minute service.

Proper study should continue to be given to the movement of the traffic so that the necessity of putting on additional service may be provided against in advance, in so far as possible.

I trust that the disposition herein made of this troublesome matter may work out satisfactorily to all concerned. The Commission will not itself make a time table for the carriers, but will direct them, within a designated time, to prepare and submit for the Commission's approval a time table based as nearly as possible on the views hereinbefore expressed.

I submit herewith the following form of order:

O R D E R.

The petitioners in the above entitled proceeding having filed their petition for a vacation of the order made by this Commission in Case No. 402, Niven vs. San Diego Electric Railway Company, et al, on July 10, 1913, and a public hearing having been held on said application,

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that said application be and the same is hereby denied, but that petitioners may, within twenty (20) days from the date of service of this order, prepare and present to this Commission for its approval, a revised time table providing as nearly as possible for a 20 minute service during the hours referred to in the opinion which precedes this order and providing, until increasing traffic requires a more frequent service, for a resumption of 40 minute service during the remaining portions of the day. The Commission will thereupon pass upon said revised time table.

The foregoing opinion and order are hereby approved
and ordered filed as the opinion and order of the Railroad Com-
mission of the State of California.

Dated at San Francisco, California, this 17th day of
February, 1914.

H. S. Loveland

Marshall

Edwin O. Edgerton

Commissioners.