

ORIGINAL

Decision No. 31894.

BEFORE THE RAILROAD COMMISSION OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

In the Matter of the Application of)
the LOS ANGELES RAILWAY CORPORATION) 23rd Supplemental
for an in lieu certificate for its) Application No. 19179.
motor coach lines.)

S. M. Haskins, General Counsel, by Woodward
M. Taylor, General Attorney, for applicant.

C. L. McGaughey, Acting City Attorney, for the
City of Maywood, protesting portions of the
application.

Eugene L. Graves, for the Cudahy Chamber of
Commerce, protestant.

Carlton H. Casjens, City Attorney, for the
City of Bell, proponent.

BY THE COMMISSION:

SUPPLEMENTAL OPINION AND ORDER

In this 23rd Supplemental Application of Los Angeles
Railway Corporation, authority is sought to make certain changes
in the routings of its Maywood-Bell motor coach line and its
East Florence motor coach line, so as to better serve the com-
munities of Maywood and Bell and also the county territory, com-
monly known as Cudahy, south of the city limits of the City of
Bell.

A public hearing in this matter was held before Examiner
Ager at Los Angeles on January 17th, 1939, at which time it was
taken under submission, and it is now ready for decision.

The Maywood-Bell motor coach line was established pur-
suant to the authority granted by this Commission in its Decision
No. 28916, dated June 22nd, 1936, on the 10th Supplemental Appli-
cation in this proceeding, and the route subsequently was amended

by Decision No. 29843, dated June 7th, 1937, and by Decision No. 31127, dated July 25th, 1938, on 16th and 22nd Supplemental Applications, respectively, in this proceeding. Service on the East Florence Avenue motor coach line was established pursuant to the authority granted by the Commission's Decision No. 19903, dated June 20th, 1928, on Application No. 14649, and the route subsequently was amended by Decision No. 27205, dated July 10th, 1934, on the 3rd Supplemental Application in this proceeding.

As a result of numerous requests and complaints filed with the company, study and analysis of the area involved have been made and the instant application proposes the following changes, in an effort to satisfy these complaints:

- (1) Abandon that portion of the Maywood-Bell coach line south of Randolph Street in the City of Bell and terminate that end of the line at the intersection of Randolph Street and Heliotrope Avenue in the City of Maywood, turning the coaches at this point via Randolph Street, Palm Avenue and Sixty-first Street, or the reverse.
- (2) Abandon that portion of the Maywood-Bell coach line south of Gage Avenue in the City of Bell.
- (3) Extend the Maywood-Bell coach line along Gage Avenue in the City of Bell to the intersection of Gage and Pala Avenues, turning the coaches at this point via Pala Avenue, Filmore Street and Alamo Avenue, or the reverse.
- (4) Extend the East Florence Avenue coach line from its present terminus at Florence and Otis Avenues (eliminating the present turn-around via Otis Avenue, Weik Avenue and Corona Street) easterly along Florence Avenue to Wilcox Avenue, in the City of Bell, thence in unincorporated county territory, south on Wilcox Avenue to Clara Street, west on Clara Street to Atlantic Avenue and north on Atlantic Avenue to Florence Avenue.

(1)

The record shows that the City of Maywood objects to the proposal that coaches on the Maywood-Bell line be turned in

(1) Exhibit No. 2 is a copy of Resolution No. 473, passed by the Maywood City Council on January 10th, 1939, opposing the method of turning the coaches as proposed in the application and suggesting an alternate method.

the block bounded by Randolph Street, Palm Avenue and 61st Street or vice versa, for the reason that Palm Avenue and 61st Street are narrow (thirty feet between curbs), and the pavement on the two streets is not of sufficient thickness to carry the heavy coaches which would be required to operate over them. The city further alleges that operation over these residential streets would be extremely hazardous to children playing in the streets, that it would create unnecessary disturbance to the residents living on these two streets and that it would be difficult to conduct the operation by reason of the extreme narrowness of the streets involved. This latter objection would be particularly true on occasions when cars were parked opposite each other, thereby leaving insufficient room for the passage of a motor coach between them.

As a counter proposal, the city offered the suggestion that the coaches turn around by crossing Pacific Electric Railway Company's Whittier line at Heliotrope Avenue, then east on South Randolph Street to Alamo Avenue, thence north on Alamo Avenue across the Pacific Electric tracks to North Randolph Street, thence over North Randolph Street to Heliotrope Avenue or via the reverse of this loop. Witnesses for applicant objected to this alternate proposal, basing their objections upon the hazard which would be created by the necessity of twice crossing these tracks of Pacific Electric Railway and also upon the contention that this turn-around would necessitate placing an extra coach in the service to fill the schedules. By the provisions of the Commission's Decision No. 30650, dated February 21st, 1938, on Application No. 21467, authority was granted to Pacific Electric Railway Company to discontinue all passenger rail service over the line involved so that rail movements have now been reduced to one round trip freight, plus four round trip box motors per day. Both crossings, over which the alternate turn-around would be made, are protected by automatic

signals and only one track of the double-track line is used.

Section 576 of the Vehicle Code of the State of California requires that all passenger vehicles shall stop prior to crossing such a track and it therefore appears that, in so far as the hazard is concerned, no real objection could be offered.

Exhibit No. 8 shows that approximately 0.35 route miles would be added to the length of the line if the proposal of the City of Maywood were complied with. Testimony of witnesses for the applicant was to the effect that this additional mileage would necessitate placing an extra coach in the service to fill the schedules. We are of the opinion, however, that the scheduled speeds on the line can be increased sufficiently to eliminate the necessity for placing this extra coach in the service and it appears that if, by changing the routing of the turn-around as proposed by the City of Maywood, the objections of that city can be removed and the operation conducted safely and at no material additional cost to the operator, the substitute or alternate turn-around should be used.

On the south end of the Maywood-Bell coachline, applicant proposes to eliminate that portion of the line on Atlantic Avenue, between Gage Avenue and Florence Avenue, and to extend the service over Gage Avenue to a turn-around at Alamo Avenue, Filmore Street and Pala Avenue. This proposal was highly satisfactory to the citizens of Bell but met with vigorous opposition from the community of Cudahy in county territory south of Atlantic Avenue and west of Wilcox Avenue. These latter people contend that the elimination of service on Atlantic Avenue between Florence and Gage Avenues prohibits them from reaching the business section of Bell where they normally do their shopping and have their banking connections. In place of the extension over Gage Avenue, as proposed, it is their suggestion that the existing service be extended south on Wilcox Avenue to Cecelia Street, thence over

Cecelia Street to Atlantic and over Atlantic via the present route.

Exhibit No. 10, filed by the Cudahy Chamber of Commerce, consists of 476 petitions allegedly representing 1707 adults and 455 children, asking that the extension to Cecelia Street be made and that the present routing over Atlantic Avenue between Florence Avenue and Gage Avenue be retained. In addition to the contentions that their banking and other business interests are in the City of Bell along Gage Avenue, these persons allege that the service on Atlantic Avenue is required for school children attending the public high school in Bell in the area north of Florence Avenue and bounded by Pine Avenue, Bell Avenue and Flora Street. The record shows, however, that in so far as the school is concerned, no necessity exists for the bus service, for the reason that a check was made and reveals that only one student used the facilities.

A house count, made in the area bounded by Florence Avenue, Wilcox Avenue, Cecelia Street and Atlantic Avenue, shows that there are approximately 300 houses in the area and this count further shows that 233 of these houses are within a quarter of a mile of the loop now operated. The application proposes that this identical loop shall remain but that it shall be served from the East Florence line, which will be extended from its present terminus at Florence Avenue and Otis Street, along Florence to Wilcox, thence over the loop now served by the Maywood-Bell line.

The proposed extension of the East Florence coach line would provide the Cudahy residents with a more direct connection to the "J" line of Los Angeles Railway Corporation which, in turn, traverses the business section of Huntington Park and operates into and through the downtown section of the City of Los Angeles. This, we believe, is a more important connection than the one

through the business section of the City of Bell. The record shows (Exhibit No. 6), that the East Florence motor coach line operated at a loss of in excess of \$5,500 for the eleven months January to November, 1938. Exhibit No. 8 shows that to increase the size of the loop, as proposed by the Cudahy Chamber of Commerce, would add .88 route miles to the present route at an annual cost in excess of \$5,800. It would be inconsistent on the part of this Commission to require an operator to make a substantial extension of a route, the operation of which is already being conducted at a serious loss, when there seems to be no possibility of the proposed extension doing anything except to increase the amount of this loss. Exhibit No. 7 shows that the bulk of the people in this area are now within walking distance of the service and we are forced to the conclusion that it is more important that the residents of the City of Bell be provided with transportation within their own city than that the extension, as sought by the community of Cudahy, be granted.

Thorough consideration of the entire record in this proceeding convinces us that the proposals made by the applicant will best serve the needs of the communities involved (with the one exception of the proposed loop for turning the Maywood-Bell coaches in the City of Maywood). With these facts in mind and for the reasons fully discussed above, the following Order appears just and equitable to all concerned.

O R D E R

Public hearing having been held and the Commission having been fully advised;

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that:

I. Applicant is hereby authorized to reroute its Maywood-Bell motor coach line over the following route:

Commencing at the intersection of Heliotrope Avenue and Randolph Street, thence via Heliotrope Avenue, Helio-

trope Circle, Slauson Avenue, Rugby Avenue, Belgrave Avenue, Pacific Boulevard, Gage Avenue to Pala Avenue; returning via Gage Avenue, Pacific Boulevard, Slauson Avenue, Heliotrope Circle, thence Heliotrope Avenue to Randolph Street;

instead of over the route described in paragraph I of the 23rd Supplemental Application in this proceeding.

II. Applicant is hereby authorized to reroute its East Florence motor coach line over the following route:

From the intersection of Long Beach Boulevard and Florence Avenue, thence via Florence Avenue, State Street, Hope Street, California Avenue, Florence Avenue, Wilcox Avenue, Clara Street, Atlantic Boulevard, Florence Avenue, California Avenue, Hope Street, State Street, and Florence Avenue to the point of commencement;

instead of over the route described in paragraph II of the 23rd Supplemental Application in this proceeding.

Both of the above new routes are to be considered as part of the in lieu certificate granted by this Commission's Decision No.27052, dated May 14th, 1934, on Application No.19179.

This entire Order is subject to the following condition:

Applicant shall afford the public at least five (5) days' notice of the changes authorized herein, by posting notices in all coaches operating on the line involved and at the terminals of each of the lines.

Within thirty (30) days after such rerouting, pursuant to this Order, applicant shall so advise the Commission in writing.

For all other purposes, the effective date of this Order shall be twenty (20) days from the date hereof.

Dated at San Francisco, April 4, 1939.

Robert W. [Signature]
Robert W. [Signature]
[Signature]
Justus J. [Signature]
Commissioners.