

ORIGINALDecision No. 48417

BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

In the Matter of the Application of)
 PASADENA CITY LINES, INC. requesting)
 authority to reroute and extend a) Application No. 33723
 portion of its Colorado Street)
 Route No. 1.)

Dunlap, Holmes, Ross & Woodson by John W. Holmes,
 for applicant. Robert E. Michalski, attorney, and
Clarence A. Winder, for City of Pasadena, J. Robert
Meserve, for Hastings Ranch Company, and Warren Dorn,
 interested parties; Zilpha Riley, John C. Yates, Mildred
Phillips, F. A. Rohrig, Christy Vorm, Louise R. Hooker,
 and May Captain, protestants.

OPINION AND ORDER ON REHEARING

By Decision No. 47942, dated November 18, 1952, on Application No. 33723, this Commission authorized applicant (1) to extend its Daisy Avenue branch of the Colorado Street Route No. 1 from the intersection of Daisy Avenue and Foothill Boulevard along Foothill Boulevard and Hastings Ranch Road to the Alegria Street terminus, an additional distance of approximately 2-1/2 miles, and (2) denied authority to abandon service between the intersection of Daisy Avenue and Foothill Boulevard and its present terminus on Villa Street, a distance of approximately 1/3 of a mile.

On December 6, 1952, applicant filed a petition for reconsideration of that portion of the order in Decision No. 47942 which denied authority to abandon passenger service north of Foothill Boulevard.

On January 13, 1953, the Commission ordered the matter reopened for further hearing for the purpose of determining whether ordering paragraph No. (3) of Decision No. 47942, denying authority to abandon service between the intersection of Daisy Avenue and

Foothill Boulevard, via Daisy Avenue, Villa Street, Mercedes Street and Daisy Avenue to its intersection with Foothill Boulevard, should be altered or amended.

A public rehearing was held in Pasadena, California, on March 6, 1953, before Examiner Chiesa. Evidence, oral and documentary, having been adduced, the matter was again submitted for decision.

At the rehearing applicant called three public witnesses, residents of the Hastings Ranch area. Two of the witnesses stated that continued operation of the Daisy Avenue loop (a distance of .7 miles) would be an inconvenience to them and might adversely affect patronage along the proposed extension along Foothill Boulevard and Hastings Ranch Road. The other witness, president of the Hastings Ranch Property Owners' Association, testified that the property owners he represented wanted the service with or without the Daisy loop operation, although elimination of the loop seemed desirable.

Applicant's superintendent of transportation again took the stand to testify in support of applicant's position that discontinuance of the Daisy Avenue loop service is justified upon the grounds of (1) lack of patronage, (2) cost of operation, and (3) public inconvenience to patrons expected to be served along the proposed extension.

There is no substantial evidence to support applicant's position. The entire loop proposed to be abandoned is only .7 miles in length, the farthest point being approximately .3 miles north of Foothill Boulevard along which the new service would operate. Under ordinary operating conditions the running time for the loop operation is between four and five minutes. Most of the patrons on the Daisy loop board and alight at the terminal stop.

on Villa Street (Exhibit No. 28), indicating that they reside beyond the farthest point served. The latest passenger checks (Exhibits Nos. 24, 25, 26 and 27) show that for the twenty days shown (including three Saturdays and three Sundays), 801 passengers alighted and 908 passengers boarded applicant's buses along that portion of the loop north of Foothill Boulevard. This is an average of 40 passengers per day outbound and 45 passengers per day inbound. During said twenty days applicant operated 16 round trips daily except on Sundays, when 9 round trips were operated, or a total of 299 round trips.

Assuming that all of the 1,709 passengers were riding for a minimum token fare of 7-1/2 cents (the fare is 10 cents cash, two tokens for 15 cents), the revenue attributable to the loop passengers is \$128.17 for said period. Considering an alleged operating cost of 42 cents per bus mile, and .7 miles per round trip, the 299 round trips would show an operating cost of \$87.90⁽¹⁾. No evidence was presented which shows that the company is operating at a loss nor that the entire Daisy Avenue line of its Colorado Street Route No. 1 is not profitable.

However, the evidence does show that the greatest number of inbound passengers board applicant's bus on three of the early-morning schedules, and that most outbound passengers use the service in the late afternoon. If the Hastings Ranch service is established, and the Daisy Avenue loop retained, a revised schedule for the latter area seems justified. The evidence also indicates

(1) It is to be noted that in arriving at these income and expense figures a per mile cost of 42 cents and a minimum fare of 7-1/2 cents for all passengers is used. The cost per bus mile of operation seems high for this line and was not supported by operating data. Also, it is not unreasonable to assume that some passengers pay the straight 10-cent cash fare which would show the loop operation to be even more profitable.

that a rerouting along Villa Street and Eaton Road would be desirable not only for the Daisy Avenue patrons but for the company as well. Such rerouting, however, cannot be authorized in this proceeding.

We are not impressed, upon the evidence in this record, with the position taken by both the company and some of its prospective patrons that the continued service to Villa Street would materially inconvenience the passengers nor adversely affect applicant's revenues. That a matter of four to five minutes additional riding time, for persons who do not now have any service, would be a serious deterrent is doubtful. We are not unmindful that bus lines should be operated in such manner as to furnish the best service to the greatest number of people, and that a direct service is usually preferable. However, under the circumstances presented in this proceeding, we are unable to say that the prospective passengers would be inconvenienced, by the short deviation, to such an extent as to justify a withdrawal of service from other patrons.

Applicant also contends that the proposed service with retention of the Daisy Avenue loop would require one additional bus. The evidence clearly shows that one additional bus will be required with or without said loop operation, as the additional distance to be traveled is in excess of two miles. (Exhibit No. 29). We are not satisfied upon the showing made in this record that service along the Daisy Avenue loop would require two additional buses.

The protestants and others testified that abandonment of the Daisy Avenue loop would cause great inconvenience to them and many others who now use said line, that most of the passengers boarding and alighting at the Villa Street terminal live northerly

and easterly of said terminus and that there is no other convenient public transportation available to and from the Pasadena business area.

We have carefully reviewed the evidence presented at the original hearing together with the evidence submitted at the rehearing and we are unable to find that the proposed abandonment of the Daisy Avenue loop would be in the general public interest, nor that its retention would adversely affect applicant's income or schedules. Our previous order will be affirmed.

O R D E R

A rehearing having been held in the above-entitled proceeding, the Commission being fully advised in the premises, and good cause appearing,

IT IS ORDERED that the Order in Decision No. 47942, dated November 18, 1952, on Application No. 33723, be, and the same hereby is, affirmed.

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

Dated at San Francisco, California, this 20th day of March, 1953.

[Signature]
President
Justin J. Casper
Harold H. Kuls
[Signature]

Commissioners

Commissioner KENNETH POTTER, being necessarily absent, did not participate in the disposition of this proceeding.