

ORIGINAL

Decision No. 46054

BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

In the Matter of the application of)
 LOS ANGELES TRANSIT LINES for)
 authority to reroute and extend)
 its Vernon Avenue Motor Coach Line) Application No. 32471
 No. 27, to consolidate the same)
 with a portion of the former West)
 Washington-West Jefferson Boulevard)
 Motor Coach Line No. 62, and to)
 make related changes in service.)

Max Eddy Utt for applicant. Arthur S. Katz and
Elsie Martin, protestants. George Phillips, Ruth Shea, Bernice
Pentecost, Milton Gordon, Mrs. Kelley Morin, interested parties.

O P I N I O N

Applicant seeks authority to extend its Vernon Avenue Motor Coach Line No. 27, which now operates along Vernon and Santa Barbara Avenues between Hoover Street and Hillcrest Drive, westerly to the intersection of Fairfax Avenue and Jefferson Boulevard, at which point it will be consolidated with that portion of its present West Washington-West Jefferson Motor Coach Line No. 62, which is operated along Jefferson Boulevard. It is also proposed to discontinue service along that portion of Line No. 62 which is operated along Washington Boulevard westerly from Vineyard Avenue to the intersection of Fairfax Avenue and Jefferson Boulevard.

A public hearing was held on July 11, 1951, at Los Angeles.

Several witnesses, apartment project managers, and representatives of large retail concerns situated at the Crenshaw-Santa Barbara Business Center, testified in favor of the proposed extension. The evidence shows that this Baldwin Hills area is a rapidly developing business and residential community. Several large apartment projects have been completed recently, and are now occupied. Some 6,000 persons live in the vicinity of the proposed extension. There is substantial evidence that it would be in the public interest to authorize the proposed extension. If this route is authorized, applicant will discontinue a turnaround loop along Hillcrest Avenue, Santa Tomas Drive and Muirfield Road. This loop is not part of the present-described route, but has been used for operational convenience. The elimination of this optional terminal loop will enable applicant to operate an improved schedule for a greater number of patrons. Persons now boarding or alighting along the present loop will not be required to walk more than an additional quarter of a mile to Santa Rosalia Drive. Mr. Katz opposed the elimination of this loop on the grounds that it would inconvenience some patrons.

We find that public convenience and necessity require the proposed extension of Line No. 27.

Applicant bases its request for authority to abandon its present service along the West Washington portion of Line No. 62 on a decline in patronage and because, it contends, revenues do not meet out-of-pocket costs. A company representative testified that the Culver City Municipal Bus Lines now operate along said portion of Washington Boulevard at more

frequent intervals than does applicant. The latter company has recently received authority from the City of Los Angeles to operate locally along Washington Boulevard. Another reason given in support of the abandonment is that patrons could walk to Venice Boulevard and use the Pacific Electric Railway Company service, or to West Adams Boulevard where applicant operates its No. 11 bus line.

We are not convinced that it would be in the public interest to permit applicant to abandon its service along West Washington Boulevard upon the evidence presented in this proceeding. As no material evidence was offered by Miss Elsie Martin, the only person protesting this portion of the application, we have reached our conclusion upon the evidence offered by applicant, and the consideration of other matters of which this Commission can properly take notice, such as applicant's fares, fare zones, line operations and interchange points.

Line No. 62 is a bus line routed as follows (Decision No. 39512):

"Commencing at the off-street terminal on Jefferson Boulevard near Tenth Avenue; thence via West Jefferson Boulevard and Fairfax Avenue in the City of Los Angeles, and via Fairfax Avenue, Adams Boulevard, Hines Avenue and West Washington Boulevard in the City of Culver City; thence via West Washington Boulevard and Vineyard Avenue in the City of Los Angeles; return via reverse of above route."

At one terminus it meets rail line "J" at Tenth Avenue and Jefferson Boulevard, and at the other terminus it meets rail line "W" at Vineyard Avenue and Washington Boulevard. Line No. 62 crosses applicant's bus line No. 85 at Jefferson

Boulevard and La Brea Avenue, and again at Washington Boulevard and La Brea Avenue. It is entirely within applicant's Zone 2, and therefore a ride between any two points along the route requires a fare of ten cents. Applicant's line No. 85, between Wilshire Boulevard and Coliseum Street, is also within the same Zone 2. Transfers from one line to another within the same zone do not require an additional fare. Applicant's basic fare for the first zone is ten cents, with an additional fare of five cents for each additional zone traversed.

Applicant did not present data to substantiate its claims that out-of-pocket costs are not met by the revenues derived from the operation of its Line No. 62. Applicant's Exhibit No. 2 is a summary check of passengers boarding and alighting the West Washington-West Jefferson Line No. 62 the entire service day, November 15, 1950. This exhibit shows that, along that portion of this line proposed to be abandoned, applicant transported, northbound toward the city of Los Angeles, 780 passengers⁽¹⁾, 323 having boarded the bus, and 457 having alighted from the bus. In the opposite direction, 878 passengers were carried along Washington Boulevard between Pickford Street and a point 800 feet south of Adams Boulevard, 503 having boarded and 375 alighted.⁽²⁾ On July 12, 1951, Supplemental Exhibit No. 2 shows applicant transported 492 northbound and 672 southbound passengers along the Washington Boulevard segment.

-
- (1) The number of passengers which both boarded and alighted along the West Washington Boulevard segment was not established, but it is believed to be small as Line No. 62 is primarily a feeder operation.
- (2) The figures for July 12, 1951, do not include any school children that may ride this line between the junction of Jefferson Boulevard and Fairfax Avenue and applicant's terminus at Vineyard Avenue and Washington Boulevard.

The total number of passengers transported on the entire line on each of said days was 3,347 and 2,401 respectively.

If the service is discontinued, the West Washington Boulevard patrons would have to ride either the Culver City Municipal Bus Lines, walk northerly to Venice Boulevard for the Pacific Electric Railway service, or walk southerly to Adams Boulevard for applicant's No. 11 line.

As the entire West Washington Boulevard segment of Line No. 62 is within applicant's Zone 2, the fare is ten cents. An additional five cents is charged for a ride to the downtown portion of Los Angeles by transferring to applicant's "W" rail line at Rimpau Boulevard. Those passengers desiring to transfer to applicant's Line No. 85, which operates along La Brea Avenue, can now transfer at Washington Boulevard and La Brea Avenue and ride northerly to Wilshire Boulevard, or southerly to Coliseum Street, without paying any additional fare, as that portion of Line No. 85 is also within Fare Zone 2. If these passengers were required to ride the Culver City Municipal Bus Lines along Washington Boulevard, their fares would be increased five cents for a ride into the city, and vice versa, and increased ten cents for an interline ride within Zone 2 on Line No. 85. That is, the fares would be the combination of the Culver City Municipal Bus Lines' fare and applicant's fare. The only way this increase in fare could be avoided would be by walking to other lines, either that of applicant or Pacific Electric Railway Company. Depending upon the point of origin or destination of the passenger, a walk of as much as 2,400 feet

would be necessary to board, or after alighting from, one or the other of the suggested lines operating along Venice Boulevard⁽³⁾ or Adams Boulevard.

The record does not show applicant's cost of operating Line No. 62, but whether or not revenues on this line, or a portion thereof, meet the expenses of operation is not the only matter that must be considered by this Commission when an abandonment of service is proposed. It could hardly be possible that a transportation system as extensive as applicant's would be operated profitably over all portions of all lines. The record is clear that several hundred persons (at least 532 by the July 12, 1951, figures⁽⁴⁾) will be either inconvenienced by being required to walk various distances to other lines, or will have to pay considerably higher fares.

Having considered the facts as above set forth, we are of the opinion and find that the proposed abandonment is not in the public interest. Furthermore, we are not satisfied that applicant has fully explored all practicable operations resulting from a consolidation of its Lines Nos. 27 and 62 as hereinafter authorized.

The application will be partially granted and partially denied.

-
- (3) Curson Place or Clyde Avenue between Washington Boulevard and Venice Boulevard; Hauser Boulevard or Ridgely Drive between Washington Boulevard and Adams Boulevard.
- (4) One-half of the 1,064 passengers, the total number of persons boarding and alighting from the Washington segment in both directions (Supplemental Exhibit No. 2).

O R D E R

A public hearing having been held in the above-entitled proceeding, the Commission being fully advised in the premises and having found the facts to be as hereinabove set forth,

IT IS ORDERED:

(1) That Los Angeles Transit Lines, a corporation, be, and it hereby is, granted a certificate of public convenience and necessity authorizing it to establish and operate a service as "a passenger stage corporation", as that term is defined in Section 2 $\frac{1}{4}$ of the Public Utilities Act, for the transportation of passengers between the intersection of Santa Rosalia Drive and Hillcrest Avenue and the intersection of Jefferson Boulevard and Fairfax Avenue, and intermediate points, as an extension and enlargement of, and to be consolidated with, applicant's present operative rights.

(2) That, in providing service pursuant to the certificate herein granted, there shall be compliance with the following service regulations:

- (a) Within thirty (30) days after the effective date hereof, applicant shall file a written acceptance of the certificate herein granted.
- (b) Within sixty (60) days after the effective date hereof, and upon not less than five (5) days' notice to the Commission and the public, applicant shall establish the service herein authorized and comply with the provisions of General Order No. 79 and Part 19 of General Order No. 98 by filing in triplicate, and concurrently making effective, tariffs and time schedules satisfactory to the Commission.
- (c) Subject to the authority of this Commission to change or modify such at any time, Los Angeles Transit Lines shall conduct said passenger stage operation over and along the following-described route:

Beginning at the intersection of Santa Rosalia Drive and Hillcrest Avenue, thence along Hillcrest Drive, Santa Barbara Avenue, Rodeo Road, Jefferson Boulevard, to its junction with Fairfax Avenue.

Applicant is authorized to turn its motor vehicles at termini and intermediate points, in either direction, at intersections of streets or by operating around a block contiguous to such intersections, or in accordance with local traffic rules.

(3) That, in all other respects, Application No. 32471 be, and it hereby is, denied.

The effective date of this order shall be twenty (20) days after the date hereof.

Dated at San Francisco, California, this 7th day of August, 1951.

Justin F. Cresser
Harold D. Hill
Lawrence H. Patten
John E. Mitchell

COMMISSIONERS