

Decision No. 6735

BEFORE THE RAILROAD COMMISSION OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

GEORGE H. KITTAMS,
Complainant,

vs.

LOS ANGELES RAILWAY CORPORATION,
Defendant.

ORIGINAL

Case No. 1316.

C. C. Hartley, for Complainant,
Gibson, Dunn and Crutcher, for Defendant.

BRUNDIGE, Commissioner.

O P I N I O N

The Complainant in this case represents a number of petitioners residing in and adjacent to Euntington Park, Los Angeles County, California, who ask the Commission to make an order requiring the Defendant to extend its street railway system from the present terminus on the Santa Fe Avenue line south to Florence Avenue, a distance of 1.06 miles. The extension asked for is desired because it would accommodate, according to Complainant, a very large number of residents of Euntington Park and adjoining territory. A petition asking that this extension be made and containing about eight hundred names was filed in connection with the complaint.

The Defendant in its answer states that it is financially unable to construct the desired extension and that public convenience and necessity do not require this expenditure. Defendant also states that a double track street railway line is now maintained and operated along Pacific Boulevard in Huntington Park parallel to Santa Fe Avenue at a distance of 1500 feet and that this line furnishes adequate service to the public living in this vicinity. The answer to the complaint also makes the point that the Defendant has no franchise or other rights to construct the extension prayed for and that this Commission is without jurisdiction to order such an extension.

This case was heard in Los Angeles on June 19, 1919. The Commission's Engineering Department had been instructed to make an investigation into the merits of the complaint and the department's report was filed at this hearing.

The investigation shows that there are now about 250 residences and houses in the district immediately tributary to the proposed extension, with a maximum population of approximately 2,000. The majority of the patrons of the line are, however, now served either by the Pacific Boulevard line or by the lines of the Pacific Electric Railway running through Huntington Park.

It appears that a single track extension, making use of old rail and adopting the least expensive construction standards, could not be built for less than \$25,000. Assuming this cost and also a minimum operation, namely 1 one-man shuttle car giving about a fifteen minute service and connecting with every second car on the Santa Fe Avenue line, the operating expenses would amount to \$22.40 per day, to which should be added a minimum allowance for depreciation, taxes and interest of \$9.29 per day. A minimum gross revenue from the extension of \$31.69 would

be necessary, therefore, in order to pay for the bare cost of this service. About 650 cash fares per day would be required to pay the expenses of operating the proposed extension. According to the Engineering Department's estimate, in the neighborhood of 500 cash fares per day could be expected from this district. But since most of these patrons now use the Huntington Park line on Pacific Boulevard, probably not more than twenty per cent of the 500 riders would be additional fares to the Company. A net gain in traffic of 200 additional cash fares each day could be expected, therefore, by reason of this additional service. The gross revenue from these fares would be \$10.00 per day. With gross expenses of \$31.69 per day, this would mean a net loss each day of \$21.69.

The witnesses for the Complainant questioned this earning estimate as too conservative. In view of the fact, however, that an eighteen hour traffic check at Vernon and Santa Fe Avenues was made by the Engineering Department, with the showing that about 1,800 persons on 132 round trips ride in and out of the entire district south of Vernon Avenue now served by the Huntington Park line, the estimate would not seem unsound. From this entire district at this time the Company receives about 3,600 fares per day, with the result that the Huntington Park line is not paying the expenses of operation since its revenue per car mile is only about 17.3 cents. It is evident that its earnings would be further decreased by the construction of the proposed extension.

Although Huntington Park and the adjacent territory is a rapidly growing community, it does not appear from the evidence in the case that conditions in the near future will change to an extent to warrant an order as asked for by the Complainant because of immediate future development. If later such a development

should occur, the matter can again be taken under consideration.

In view of this condition and also having in mind the fact that the territory in question is not without street car service (although the requested extension would undoubtedly add to public convenience), it does not seem reasonable to require the Company to construct this line at this time.

I recommend to the Commission that the complaint be dismissed without prejudice.

O R D E R

Complaint having been made by GEORGE H. KITTIM against LOS ANGELES RAILWAY CORPORATION asking for the extension of Defendant's street railway system as set forth in the foregoing Opinion; an investigation having been made and a hearing having been held; and the Commission finding as a fact that public convenience and necessity do not require the construction of the desired extension and that an unreasonable expense would have to be incurred by Defendant if such an extension were ordered, and that the gross revenue would be insufficient to pay the cost of service:

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED That the complaint be, and the same 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 2 day of ~~Sept~~
October, 1919.

Edwin O. Edgerton
H. D. Lybrand
Frank Weston
H. W. Brundage
Wesley Martin
Commissioners.