

Decision No. 32739

ORIGINAL

BEFORE THE RAILROAD COMMISSION OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

In the Matter of Application of INTERURBAN)
ELECTRIC RAILWAY COMPANY for approval of) Application No. 23167
revised operating schedules.)

In the Matter of the Application of KEY)
SYSTEM for approval of revised operating) Application No. 23168
schedules.)

E. J. FOULDS, for Applicant Interurban Electric Railway
Company.

DONAHUE, RICHARDS & HAMLIN, by FRANK S. RICHARDS, for
Applicant Key System

CHESTER C. FISK, Acting City Manager, and FRED HUTCHINSON,
City Attorney, by JOHN D. PHILLIPS, Assistant
City Attorney, for the City of Berkeley.

F. B. FERNHOFF, City Attorney, and WALTER W. COOPER, for the
City of Oakland.

O. C. YENNE, Mayor, and JOSEPH J. YOUNG, City Attorney,
for the City of Albany.

CHARLES W. SCHWANENBERG, City Manager, and H. ALBERT GEORGE,
City Attorney, for City of Alameda.

HARRY SEE and G. F. IRVINE, for Brotherhood of Railroad
Trainmen and Brotherhood of Locomotive
Firemen and Enginemen, in Application
No. 23167.

KEYES AND ERSKINE and W. P. MURPEY and FRANK DUKKEE, by HERBERT
W. ERSKINE and LESLIE E. ROOS, for California
Toll Bridge Authority.

WALTER LUEHN, for the Oakland Real Estate Board.

G. N. RICHARDSON, City Attorney, for City of Piedmont.

FRANCIS C. STARR, for East Bay Service and Improvement Clubs.

GEORGE J. LACOSTE, City Attorney, for Town of Emeryville.

JOHN J. O'TOOLE, City Attorney, and DION R. HOLM, by N. RANDALL
ELLIS, for the City and County of San Francisco.

CHARLES W. BROCK, for Thousand Oaks Improvement Association.

C. C. BOYNTON, in propria persona.

DEVLEN and WAKEFIELD, COMMISSIONERS:

O P I N I O N

In Application No. 23167 the Interurban Electric Railway

Company asks permission to revise its passenger train schedules between San Francisco and the East Bay cities via the San Francisco-Oakland Bay Bridge; and in Application No. 23168 the Key System requests similar authority.

Public hearings were held in these matters on December 13th and 20th, 1939, at which time the matters were consolidated for hearing and determination.

The two carriers involved herein furnish interurban electric passenger train service between San Francisco and the various communities in Alameda County on the east side of the San Francisco Bay. Each operates independently of the other, although both operate through the same terminal in San Francisco and occupy jointly the Bridge Railway between San Francisco and connections with their various interurban systems in the East Bay.

Interurban Electric Railway Company operates all of its lines, except those to and from Alameda, on a headway of 20 minutes during the daytime on each week day, and on a 40-minute headway during the night, Sundays and Holidays. The service on the two lines of this company to Alameda are on a daytime headway of 40 minutes, except during peak hours, when the headway is approximately 20 minutes. During nights, Sundays and Holidays these lines operate on an hourly headway.

All the lines of the Key System are on a 20-minute headway during the daytime and a 40-minute headway at nights, Sundays and Holidays.

It is the proposal of both these companies to lengthen the headways on all the lines in the daytime to 30 minutes and 45 minutes, and at nights, Sundays and Holidays to 45 minutes. One exception is that Key System proposes one-hour headways at nights, Sundays and Holidays on its Sacramento Street line. The headways on the lines to Alameda, however, are proposed to be changed from 40 minutes to 60 minutes in the daytime, and from 60 minutes to 75 minutes at night.

The following is a tabulation showing the lines and proposed headways:

Line	Daytime Headways		Nights, Sundays & Holiday Headways	
	Present	Proposed	Present	Proposed
	(Minutes)		(Minutes)	
<u>INTERURBAN ELECTRIC RAILWAY CO.</u>				
Shattuck Avenue	20	30	40	45
Ninth Street	20	45	40	45
7th Street, Oakland	20	30	40	45 & 60
Lincoln Avenue, Alameda	40	60	60	75 Approx.
Encinal Avenue, Alameda	40	60	60	75
<u>KEY SYSTEM</u>				
12th Street	20	30	40	45
22nd Street	20	30	40	45
Piedmont	20	45	40	45
Claremont	20	45	40	45
Alcatraz Avenue	20	30	40	45
Sacramento Street	20	45	40	60

These changes, however, do not decrease the service during the hours of peak travel⁽¹⁾ westbound in the morning and eastbound in the evening. The same or more frequent schedules will be provided during these peak hour movements.

Witnesses for both applicants presented testimony to show that travel during the daytime and night off-peak hours did not justify the continued operation of trains on 20 and 40-minute headways, respectively, and that sufficient service would be provided to take care of their patrons by the schedules proposed.

Both carriers showed that under their present operations their combined losses amount to over \$1,000,000 per year, and through these reduced schedules a saving of about \$350,000 per year could be effected. It is their contention that this reduction in the losses by curtailed service will not seriously impair the convenience and necessity of their patrons.

The various communities of the East Bay showed that the present schedules had been in effect for many years and they believed

M. Westbound from about 7:30 to 9:00. In P.M. Eastbound about 4:30 to 6:00.

CORRECTION

CORRECTION

THIS DOCUMENT
HAS BEEN REPHOTOGRAPHED
TO ASSURE LEGIBILITY

The following is a tabulation showing the lines and proposed headways:

L i n e	Daytime		Nights, Sundays & Holiday Headways	
	Present	Proposed	Present	Proposed
	(Minutes)		(Minutes)	
<u>INTERURBAN ELECTRIC RAILWAY CO.</u>				
Shattuck Avenue	20	30	40	45
Ninth Street	20	45	40	45
7th Street, Oakland	20	30	40	45 & 60
Lincoln Avenue, Alameda	40	60	60	75 Approx.
Encinal Avenue, Alameda	40	60	60	75
<u>KEY SYSTEM</u>				
12th Street	20	30	40	45
22nd Street	20	30	40	45
Piedmont	20	45	40	45
Claremont	20	45	40	45
Alcatraz Avenue	20	30	40	45
Sacramento Street	20	45	40	60

These changes, however, do not decrease the service during the hours of peak travel⁽¹⁾ westbound in the morning and eastbound in the evening. The same or more frequent schedules will be provided during these peak hour movements.

Witnesses for both applicants presented testimony to show that travel during the daytime and night off-peak hours did not justify the continued operation of trains on 20 and 40-minute headways, respectively, and that sufficient service would be provided to take care of their patrons by the schedules proposed.

Both carriers showed that under their present operations their combined losses amount to over \$1,000,000 per year, and through these reduced schedules a saving of about \$350,000 per year could be effected. It is their contention that this reduction in the losses by curtailed service will not seriously impair the convenience and necessity of their patrons.

The various communities of the East Bay showed that the present schedules had been in effect for many years and they be!

(1) In A.M. Westbound from about 7:30 to 9:00. In P.M. Eastbound from about 4:30 to 6:00.

CORRECTION

CORRECTION

THIS DOCUMENT
HAS BEEN REPHOTOGRAPHED
TO ASSURE LEGIBILITY

The following is a tabulation showing the lines and proposed headways:

L i n e	Daytime		Nights, Sundays & Holidays	
	Present	Proposed	Present	Proposed
	(Minutes)		(Minutes)	
<u>INTERURBAN ELECTRIC RAILWAY CO.</u>				
Shattuck Avenue	20	30	40	45
Ninth Street	20	45	40	45
7th Street, Oakland	20	30	40	45 & 60
Lincoln Avenue, Alameda	40	60	60	75 Approx.
Encinal Avenue, Alameda	40	60	60	75
<u>KEY SYSTEM</u>				
12th Street	20	30	40	45
22nd Street	20	30	40	45
Piedmont	20	45	40	45
Claremont	20	45	40	45
Alcatraz Avenue	20	30	40	45
Sacramento Street	20	45	40	60

These changes, however, do not decrease the service during the hours of peak travel⁽¹⁾ westbound in the morning and eastbound in the evening. The same or more frequent schedules will be provided during these peak hour movements.

Witnesses for both applicants presented testimony to show that travel during the daytime and night off-peak hours did not justify the continued operation of trains on 20 and 40-minute headways, respectively, and that sufficient service would be provided to take care of their patrons by the schedules proposed.

Both carriers showed that under their present operations their combined losses amount to over \$1,000,000 per year, and through these reduced schedules a saving of about \$350,000 per year could be effected. It is their contention that this reduction in the losses by curtailed service will not seriously impair the convenience and necessity of their patrons.

The various communities of the East Bay showed that the present schedules had been in effect for many years and they believed

(1) In A.M. Westbound from about 7:30 to 9:00. In P.M. Eastbound from about 4:30 to 6:00.

that any reduction of the schedules would have a detrimental effect upon these cities and tend to reduce property values. It was urged that the Commission should make a comprehensive survey of transportation needs of the East Bay area before any changes in schedules should be authorized.

It is quite clear from the record that the amount of use made of these services, particularly during the daytime off-peak period, does not in any way justify the existing frequency, and it further appears that the losses incurred by these carriers should be minimized.

The headways proposed vary with different lines, as shown in the table above. A headway of thirty minutes is proposed for the heavier lines and forty-five minutes for the lighter lines. Unquestionably the 45-minute headway on the lighter lines will provide sufficient service to care for the traffic, but on the other hand travel undoubtedly will decrease to some extent due to the lengthened headway. It is therefore believed that a reduction in income will result.

Certain schedules on the Alameda lines of Interurban Electric Railway Company appear to need slight modification to meet the needs of the patrons. The carrier is agreeable to make these changes.

After a review of the entire record in this proceeding it is concluded that applicants should be allowed to modify their time schedules substantially as prayed for in order to minimize their losses and still provide sufficient transportation to meet public convenience and necessity.

Any changes made in the schedules at this time will be of a temporary nature only, as the Commission has ordered a complete investigation of the operations and service of these two carriers. It is to be understood, however, that if traffic demands require additional service prior to the completion of the survey, the Commission will require these changes to be made immediately.

The following form of order is recommended.

O R D E R

Public hearings having been held and the matters having been duly submitted,

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that

I. Interurban Electric Railway Company is hereby authorized to place in effect, on not less than ten (10) days' notice to the Commission and the public, a revised time schedule of its electric passenger trains operating between San Francisco and the East Bay cities in Alameda County substantially in accordance with the time schedule attached to and made a part of Application No. 23167.

II. Key System is hereby authorized to place in effect, on not less than ten (10) days' notice to the Commission and the public, a revised time schedule of its electric passenger trains between San Francisco and the East Bay cities of Alameda County, substantially in accordance with the time schedules attached to and made a part of Application No. 23168.

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.

The effective date of this Order shall be twenty (20) days from the date hereof.

Dated at San Francisco, California, February 6, 1940.

Ray S. Ciley
Francis R. Swept

Justice J. Cremer
Commissioners