

DECISION NO.       

ORIGINAL

Decision No. 2975

BEFORE THE RAILROAD COMMISSION OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA.

ALAMEDA IMPROVEMENT CLUB )

vs.

CASE NO. 844.

SAN FRANCISCO-OAKLAND TERMINAL )  
RAILWAYS. )

Ray W. Ryder for Complainant.

W. H. Smith for Defendant.

GORDON, Commissioner.

O P I N I O N.

The complainant in this action is an association for the promotion of such public improvements as are calculated to materially benefit the City of Alameda. The complaint alleges that there is a district in the City of Alameda, bounded on the east by Webster Street, on the south and west by San Francisco Bay and on the north by the Oakland Estuary which is entirely without street car service and that approximately 2500 people are inconvenienced by reason of the lack of such transportation. The complainant prays for an order of this Commission which will compel the San Francisco-Oakland Terminal Railways to construct a single track line of railway from the intersection of Webster Street and Santa Clara Avenue in the City of Alameda, westerly along said Santa Clara Avenue to its intersection with Third Street, a distance of 3300 feet, thereby affording connection with the existing street car lines of the defendant. The defendant filed its answer denying the material allegations of the complainant.

A public hearing was held on November 10, 1915, and the

matter was submitted and is now ready for decision.

The entire district comprising that portion of the City of Alameda as specified in the complaint contains 534 houses of which number 16 were vacant on September 28, 1915, the date that the survey of the district was made. There is also a factory employing approximately 50 men located within the district. The area contained in the westerly portion of the district named in the complaint is as yet not subdivided and the streets are not opened, the land being used for agricultural purposes/ <sup>such</sup> as the growing of vegetables. There are 38 blocks in this portion of the district which are not yet improved and are principally devoted to the raising of vegetables and garden truck.

In my opinion a walk of two blocks is not an unreasonable distance for the patrons of a street car line and under such condition the persons residing in the portion of the district bounded by Buena Vista Avenue, Webster Street, Fifth Street and Taylor Avenue and also in the block bounded by Central Avenue, Sixth Street, Taylor Avenue and Webster Street are served by the defendant's street car line on Webster Street, a total of 256 houses. Deducting this number of houses from the total of 534 houses which were found to be located in this district there would be 278 houses outside the reasonable walking distance of two blocks. Assuming five residents to each household who would desire and use street car transportation and adding the 50 employees of the factory located within the district, there would be a total of 1440 persons in the district who are located more than two blocks from existing car service.

The defendant presented an estimate of the cost of constructing the line on Santa Clara Avenue from the intersection with its present car line on Webster Street, westerly along Santa Clara Avenue to the intersection of Third Street showing the cost of construction to be \$22388.05. This estimate has been checked by the Commission's representatives and is found to be reasonable for the type of construction proposed.

The expense of operating this line after construction on the basis of an 18 hour day and covering wages of platform men, cost of power, car inspection and repairs, lubrication, etc., would amount to \$7222.40 per annum. The cost of track and overhead maintenance, proportion of supervisory expense, state taxes at 5 $\frac{1}{4}$  per cent. of gross revenue, franchise tax of 2 per cent. of gross revenue, and a reasonable interest return on the investment would practically double the cost estimated for actual car operation, making a total annual expense of approximately \$14450.00. On the basis of the line serving 1440 persons who are now located at a greater distance than two blocks from an existing car line and who would use the transportation furnished by the proposed extension, and multiplying such number by the factor of \$7.50 per capita per annum, which is commonly used by traction experts, the extension of line could reasonably be expected to earn a gross revenue of \$10800.00 per annum which amount would not equal the cost of maintenance and operation and a reasonable interest return on the investment by \$3650.00. I am of the opinion that the usual factor of \$7.50 per capita per annum would not apply to this territory and that the actual loss would, therefore, approximate a considerably larger amount.

I am convinced that the construction of the extension requested is not justified by the foregoing facts and accordingly recommend that the complaint be dismissed.

I hereby submit the following form of order:

O R D E R

The case of Alameda Improvement Club vs. San Francisco Oakland Terminal Railways for an extension of car line in the westerly

portion of the City of Alameda having been duly heard and the Commission being fully advised in the premises,

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 15<sup>th</sup> day of December, 1915.

Max Theiler  
H. J. Donaldson  
W. G. ...  
Frank ...

Commissioners.