

DECISION NO. _____

ORIGINAL

Decision No. 2962

BEFORE THE RAILROAD COMMISSION OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA.

ROCKRIDGE IMPROVEMENT ASSOCIATION)

vs.)

CASE NO. 744.

SAN FRANCISCO-OAKLAND TERMINAL)
RAILWAYS.)

Chas. F. Craig for Complainant.

W. E. Smith and W. I. Brobeck
for Defendant.

DEVLIN, Commissioner.

O P I N I O N.

The complainant in this case is an association of property owners whose purpose is the betterment of that certain section of Oakland, County of Alameda, known as Rockridge. The complainant alleges that the property owners in the district known as Rockridge and closely adjacent thereto are greatly in need of proper transportation facilities and that there is great need for the construction of an extension of the present car line of the San Francisco-Oakland Terminal Railways on Broadway in the City of Oakland, from the junction of Broadway and College Avenue northerly on said Broadway to its intersection with Ocean View Drive; that many owners of homes in the district known as Rockridge and the closely adjacent territory have been restricted in the full enjoyment of their property by reason of the lack of transportation facilities; that many owners of lots in the district have been deterred from erecting homes thereon by the absence of car service; that there are two hundred and eighty-four homes in the district with an

estimated population of eleven hundred thirty-six persons who are deprived of proper transportation facilities by the refusal of the defendant to construct the extension line requested.

The defendant filed its answer denying the material allegations of the complainant.

Public hearings were held on March 30 and 31 and on April 12, 1915, and the case was submitted and is now ready for decision.

The district for which the extension of car service is desired is an exceptionally high class of residential property carrying rigid building restrictions in varying amounts depending on the location of the various lots. Such street improvements as have been made are of a high type and the entire district is one that is extremely attractive for the erection of modern residences. There are three principal subdivisions in the district: Rockridge Place, bounded by Broadway, Lawton Avenue, Prospect Avenue and Ocean View Drive; Rockridge Park, bounded by Prospect Avenue, Acacia Avenue and McAdam Street, and Hays Avenue; and Rockridge Terrace, bounded by Hays Avenue, Vernon Avenue and Broadway Terrace. The extension of line sought by the complainant from College Avenue at Broadway Terrace would extend along Broadway in a northwesterly direction to its intersection with Ocean View Drive, a distance of thirty-six hundred feet.

The car service now available to residents of this district is furnished by the College Avenue Line of the defendant and by a shuttle car service on Grand Street from the intersection of Grand Street, Broadway and College Avenue along Grand Street to McAdam Street, known as the Rockridge Line.

A check of the number of houses contained in the district bounded by the east line of College Avenue, the east line of Shafter Avenue, the south line of Ocean View Drive and the west line of Broadway Terrace and McAdam Street, filed by defendant as its Exhibit No. 3, indicates that there were 498 houses occupied, 9 unoccupied and 5 under construction in this district, a total of 512, as of March 29, 1915.

In my opinion a distance of two blocks is not an unreasonable distance for the patrons of a street car line to be required to walk and under such condition the occupants of 454 houses are at present served by the transportation offered by the defendant's College Avenue Line, the district so served being that bounded by the east line of Shafter Avenue, the west line of Broadway and the north line of College Avenue, including also the two blocks bounded by Broadway, Manila and Navy Avenues, and the two blocks bounded by Broadway, Prospect Drive and Thomas Avenue. The service available on the Rockridge Line of the defendant, on the basis of a two block walk being required on the part of patrons of the line would care for 8 additional houses, although it would appear from testimony given in this case that cars were operated on this line at infrequent intervals. Deducting the number of houses that are served by the existing lines of the defendant from the total of 512 as shown to exist in this territory on March 29, 1915, there remain 50 houses where a walk of more than two blocks is required to reach an existing car line of the defendant, and assuming five persons to each household that would require and use the transportation to be furnished by the proposed Broadway Extension there would be 250 persons benefited who now have a walk of more than two blocks to one of the present car lines operated by the defendant.

The defendant, San Francisco-Oakland Terminal Railways, presented an estimate of the cost of construction of the 3600 feet of single track railway from Broadway Terrace to Ocean View Avenue, said estimate including a passing track or turnout some 205 feet in length. This estimate gives a total amount of \$25907.72 as the cost of installation and equipment of the proposed extension ready for service. This estimate has been carefully checked by the Commission's Engineering Department and is found to be reasonable in view of the type of construction proposed.

Witnesses for the defendant presented figures indicating the expense of operating the proposed line and in the following detail:

Car Operation	36 car hours per day @ \$1.10	\$14454.00
Track Maintenance	3600' @ \$849.36 per mile per year	611.28
Line Maintenance	3600' @ \$176.98 " " " "	<u>127.32</u>
Total Operating Expense (not including Superintendence or Overhead Charges.)		\$15192.60
Taxes	State @ 5 1/2%	466.20
Franchise Tax @ 2%		177.60
Interest at 6% on estimated cost of construction or \$25907.72		<u>1554.46</u>
		\$17390.86

As regards the possible earning capacity of the projected line and assuming the number of persons in the district to be served to be 1184 as outlined by Mr. Wells, a witness for the complainant, and multiplying such number by the factor of \$7.50 per capita per annum as commonly accepted by traction experts, the line could reasonably be expected to return a gross revenue of \$8880.00 per annum, and in view of the foregoing statements as to cost of operation would show an annual deficit from operation of \$8510.86.

In view of the foregoing facts I am convinced that the construction of the proposed Broadway Extension would not be justified in that the revenue to be derived from its operation would not equal or approximate the cost of operation to say nothing of maintenance, taxes, or reasonable return on investment. I am of the opinion that the complaint should be dismissed and recommend the following form of order:

O R D E R.

A public hearing having been held in the above entitled proceeding, and the case having been submitted and now ready for decision.

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that the complaint be and the same is hereby dismissed.

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 8th day of
December, 1915.

Max Heelan
W. D. Woodard
W. G. ...
Frank ...

Commissioners.