## ORIGINAL

Decision No. 45082

BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

In the Matter of the Application of ) FOSTER TRANSPORTATION, INCORPORATED, ) Application No. 31784 for permission to reroute a portion ) of the MISSION MOTOR COACH ROUTE. )

Samuel Greenberg, attorney for applicant. City of San Gabriel, by <u>Carl E. Gruendler</u>, Chief Administrative Officer; San Gabriel Chamber of Commerce, by <u>Lorne B. Pratt</u>, <u>George W. Woerner</u>, protestants.

## <u>O P I N I O N</u>

Applicant requests authority to reroute a portion of its Mission Motor Coach Route within the City of San Gabriel.

A public hearing was held in San Gabriel on November 6, 1950, evidence was presented, and the matter was submitted for decision. Prior to the hearing, notice thereof was posted in applicant's affected buses.

By Decision No. 39420, dated and effective September 17, 1946, applicant was given authority to operate a passenger bus service over and along the following route, the initial route of the Mission Motor Coach line:

> Beginning at the intersection of Chapel Avenue and Main Street, Alhambra, thence along Main Street, Hidalgo Avenue, Mission Road, Santa Anita Street, Mission Drive, Angelino Avenue, San Cabriel Boulevard, to Garvey Avenue.

No figures were presented at the hearing showing the number of passengers carried over the described line except for the

FJ

-1-

months of July, 1948, to March 1, 1949<sup>(1)</sup>. During this period the maximum number of passengers carried during any one month was 45,098 during the month of December, 1948, and the minimum was 37,728 during the month of February, 1949. The exhibit does not purport to show the number of passengers who used the portion of the Mission line along Mission Drive and Angelino Avenue.

By Decision No. 42522, dated February 15, 1949, and effective March 7, 1949, applicant secured authority to reroute the Mission Motor Coach line as follows:

> From Garfield Avenue in Alhambra, along Main Street, Hidalgo Avenue, Mission Road, Santa Anita Street, Las Tunas Drive, and San Gabriel Boulevard to Garvey Avenue.

This latter decision recites that the applicant's purpose in securing authority for the rerouting was "to afford direct connections for those using its Mission Route with Pacific Electric Lines to Los Angeles, Temple City, and Arcadia." The decision stated that it was further alleged in the application that the modification of route "will also furnish bus service to the business district of San Gabriel" and that "there is a large public demand for this change in route." The decision also recites that "Applicant alleges that the proposed change of route, involving discontinuance of service along Mission Drive between Santa Anita Street and Angelono Avenue, and along Angelono Avenue between Mission Drive and San Gabriel Boulevard, will not greatly inconvenience those persons now using the service for the reason that the present Del Mar Route of applicant and the proposed Mission Route extension will provide adequate service within a maximum of three blocks' walking distance."

(1) See Exhibit "B" attached to application herein.

From the evidence presented at the hearing on the application herein, it appears that all of the factors which the Commission took into consideration in arriving at Decision No. 42522, supra, are still in existence. The Pacific Electric Railway Company still operates along Las Tunas Drive, the present route of a portion of the Mission line, the Las Tunas Drive portion of the Mission Route is through San Gabriel's business district, and the City of San Gabriel and the morchants along Las Tunas Drive desire that the presently existing service of applicant be continued. It further appears that the Del Mar Route of applicant is providing the same service it provided at the time Decision No. 42522 became effective and that it is no farther from Santa Anita Street and Angelino Avenue to the Del Mar line than it was when that decision became effective. It is still not over a three-block walk to adequate bus service for persons residing on Angelino Avenue or Mission Drive.

Of interest is the fact that there were no persons interested enough in securing passenger bus service along Angelino Avenue instead of, as at present, along Las Tunas Drive, to appear at the hearing and express their views on this matter.

Applicant attempted to show that since the present Mission Motor Coach Line was authorized by Decision No. 42522, dated February 15, 1949, there has been a loss in passengers<sup>(2)</sup>. The evidence shows that, in March and April, 1949, after Decision No. 42522 became effective, there was an increase in the number of passengers hauled over the line, and that thereafter, to and including July, 1950, there has been a gradual decrease in the number of passengers

(2) See Exhibit "B", supra

-3-

carried over the Mission Route. The same general trend is reflected in the number of passengers transported over the Del Mar line during the same period<sup>(3)</sup>, and, hence, simply reflects a general falling off in applicant's business.

Applicant also introduced evidence purporting to show that applicant's over-all cost of operation is 30 cents per mile and that applicant grosses 12 cents per mile over the portion of the line sought to be discontinued, a loss to applicant of 18 cents per mile. Applicant's witness testified that, in his opinion, if applicant were permitted to operate over Mission Drive and Angelino Avenue in lieu of Las Tunas Drive, the whole Mission Route would gross 25 cents per mile whereas the line, as presently operated, grosses 19 cents per mile. There is nothing in the record to support the claim that operation on Angelino Avenue will increase applicant's gross revenue on the Mission Route other than the statement of the witness. On the contrary, the evidence shows that, in March and April, 1949, after the present routing, as authorized by Decision No. 42522, supra, became effective, more passengers were transported over the line than were carried in January and February, 1949, via Angelino Avenue.

Although applicant has shown a loss per mile over a portion of its Mission line, it has failed to show that there would be any different result by virtue of operations over Mission Drive and Angelino Avenue. In addition, there is evidence to show a need for service along Las Tunas Drive, and there is no ovidence

-4-

(3) See Exhibit "B", supra

of any need along Mission Drive and Angelino Avenue which is not met by prosent services of applicant. For the foregoing reasons, the Commission is of the opinion and finds that the application to reroute applicant's Mission Route by discontinuing service on San Gabriel Boulevard, Las Tunas Drive, and Santa Anita Street, between the intersection of San Gabriel Boulevard and Angelino Avenue, and the intersection of Santa Anita Street and Mission Drive, and to inaugurate a service, in lieu of said existing service, along Mission Drive and Angelino Avenue, between the intersection of San Gabriel Boulevard and Angelino Avenue and the intersection of santa Anita Street and Mission Drive, is not in the public interest and will be denied.

## O R D E R

Application as above entitled having been filed, a public hearing having been held, the Commission being fully advised in the premises, and the matter being under submission,

IT IS ORDERED that the application of Foster Transportation, Incorporated, for authority to reroute its Mission Route, as described in the order of Decision No. 42522, dated February 15, 1949, be, and the same hereby is, denied.

-5-

The effective date of this order shall be twenty (20)

days	: a:	ftor	the	date	hercof				+1
		ہے	lated	l at 🕽	Jantra	ncisco.	California,	this	5 m
day	oſ		) <u>e</u>	lon	her	, 1950.			

-6-

noking J. Gaeun 0. Ø. e 07 SIONERS