

ORIGINAL

Decision No. 50447

BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

In the Matter of the Application of)
 METROPOLITAN COACH LINES, a corporation,)
 to replace rail service on the Subway-)
 Hollywood Boulevard-Beverly Hills rail)
 line with motor coach service, and to)
 combine and to reroute certain motor)
 coach service in the Hollywood area.)

Application No. 34830

In the Matter of the Application of)
 METROPOLITAN COACH LINES, a corporation,)
 for authority to replace rail service on)
 the Subway-Glendale-Burbank rail line)
 with motor coach service and to combine)
 said motor coach line with existing)
 Line 75, Los Angeles-Santa Monica-)
 Venice.)

Application No. 34990

APPEARANCES

Waldo K. Greiner, for Metropolitan Coach Lines, applicant.
Henry McClernan, City Attorney, by John H. Lauten, Assistant City Attorney, for City of Glendale, protestant.
Cecil G. Zaun, Supervisor of Safety, for Los Angeles City Schools, protestant.
Thomas W. Pepler, for Apartment House Association of Los Angeles County and Gardner Street Property Owners, protestants.
Mrs. Charles E. Millikan and McKay Mitchell, for the Mass Transportation Committee of the City of Glendale, protestants.
Milo Allen Parker, Chairman and Dr. Charles S. Young, for the Glendale Action Committee on Transportation, protestant in 34990 and interested party in 34830.
Dan Banta, for Citizens Group of Atwater, and in propria persona, protestants.
Don Packer, for Glendale Chamber of Commerce, and in propria persona, protestant.
J. Lee Gregg, in propria persona, protestant.
Gibson, Dunn & Crutcher, by Max Eddy Utt, for Los Angeles Transit Lines, interested party.
Roger Arnebergh, City Attorney, Alan Campbell, Assistant City Attorney, and T. M. Chubb, General Manager of the Department of Public Utilities and Transportation, for City of Los Angeles, interested party.
Harry Morrison, General Manager, and Carl F. Fennema, Transportation Director, for Downtown Businessmen's Association, interested party.

Thomas Arnott, for Asbury Rapid Transit Company, interested party.

Henry E. Jordan, Chief Engineer, Bureau of Franchises & Public Utilities, for the City of Long Beach, interested party.

Archie L. Walters, City Attorney, for the City of Burbank, interested party.

James K. Gibson, Otto B. Liersch, William R. Peters, J. G. Hunter, and A. F. Ager, for the staff of the Public Utilities Commission.

INTERIM OPINION

The Metropolitan Coach Lines, a California corporation, and successor in interest to the rail and motor coach passenger operations formerly conducted by the Pacific Electric Railway Company,⁽¹⁾ herein proposes by Application No. 34830, as amended, to discontinue rail passenger service on the Subway-Hollywood Boulevard-Beverly Hills line (No. 32) and to replace it with motor coaches, to remove or otherwise dispose of the track and overhead facilities, to operate a portion of the proposed motor coach line over the Hollywood Freeway, and to replace two existing motor coach lines, Nos. 77 and 78, with two revised motor coach lines to be designated as Nos. 89 and 91. By Application No. 34990, it is proposed to discontinue rail passenger service on the Subway-Glendale-Burbank rail passenger line and replace it with motor coaches, to remove or otherwise dispose of the track and overhead facilities, to connect and combine the proposed Los Angeles-Glendale-Burbank motor coach line with the present Los Angeles-Santa Monica-Venice motor coach line (No. 75), and to operate a portion of the service to and from Glendale and Burbank

(1) Decision No. 48923, dated August 4, 1953, in Applications Nos. 34249 and 34402.

over Glendale Boulevard between Allesandro Street and Riverside Drive.

Public hearings were held before Commissioner Potter and Examiner Syphers at Los Angeles on December 17, 1953, February 17 and 18, March 8, and April 2, 1954. On these dates evidence was adduced and on the last named date the matter was submitted subject to the late filing of Exhibit D-8 by the City of Los Angeles. This exhibit now has been filed and the matter is ready for decision.

The first day of hearing, December 17, 1953, was concerned only with Application No. 34830, the Subway-Hollywood Boulevard-Beverly Hills line. Subsequently, on December 22, 1953, Application No. 34990, relating to the Subway-Glendale-Burbank line, was filed. At the hearing on February 17, 1954 both of these applications were consolidated for hearing and decision.

The president of applicant company testified that Metropolitan Coach Lines presently operates forty-four different routes. Of these, six are rail routes and thirty-eight motor coach routes. Two of these rail routes operate north and west from the Subway Terminal on Hill Street between 4th and 5th Streets, and these are the two lines involved in the instant applications.

Exhibit No. 1⁽³⁾ is a map of the existing rail service

(2) It should be noted that the remaining four routes operate southerly and include the Long Beach, San Pedro, Watts, and Bellflower lines.

(3) Three sets of exhibits were received in this case. Those designated with plain numbers relate to the Subway-Hollywood Boulevard-Beverly Hills line, those designated with the letter "G" relate to the Los Angeles-Glendale-Burbank line, and those designated with the letter "D" relate to the downtown area.

on the Subway-Hollywood Boulevard-Beverly Hills line, and Exhibit No. 2 is a map of the proposed motor coach service. Exhibits Nos. 3, 4, and 5 relate to streetcar and motor coach service on a national basis and tend to show that the number of rail streetcars and the number of passengers carried by them are decreasing. Although in recent years the number of passengers carried by motor coaches is declining, this is less of a decline than that being experienced by rail streetcars.

To relate these exhibits to local conditions the witness testified that there are approximately 2 million automobiles in Los Angeles County and that, coupled with the extensive freeway construction, provides a great field for private passenger transportation. He observed that it was the intention of this company to make use of the freeways for buses.

Exhibit No. 6 sets out the history of the Subway-Hollywood Boulevard-Beverly Hills line. Exhibit No. 7 shows the proposed headways for the contemplated motor coach service on this line, and Exhibit No. 8 shows the time saving to passengers which it is contended will result from this proposal. Exhibit No. 9, which shows the walking time from the street to the rail loading points in the Subway Terminal, was presented to show alleged delays and difficulties passengers encounter in the use of that facility.

A table showing all of the revenue passengers and all transfers for the period October 1950 to September 1953 on the Subway-Hollywood Boulevard-Beverly Hills line was submitted as Exhibit No. 10.

The witness further testified that experience has shown that rail streetcars are involved in more accidents than motor

coaches. Exhibit No. 11 shows the number of accidents in 1952 on the Pacific Electric rail passenger and motor coach operations and also the cost of accident claims paid. The Pacific Electric was the predecessor in interest of applicant, and it was observed that the experience of Pacific Electric was compiled in the area involved and was the best comparison available.

At the present time the applicant has on order one hundred new motor coaches, which, added to the present fleet, will constitute a sufficient number of coaches to effect the requested replacements. Testimony as to the alleged comfort features of these new motor coaches was presented in Exhibit No. 12. In addition it was pointed out that they will be 102 inches wide, but otherwise will conform to the size and weight limitations as set out in the Vehicle Code.

It was also testified that use of motor coaches would tend to eliminate traffic congestion, and in this connection photographs of a street area in San Diego where streetcars have been eliminated, and photographs of Hollywood Boulevard and Ivar Street, a street area concerned in the instant application, were submitted. These photographs were designated Exhibits Nos. 13 to 16 inclusive.

The estimated operating results for motor coach operation on the Subway-Hollywood Boulevard-Beverly Hills line were set out in Exhibit No. 17, as well as the estimated results of operation with present rail and motor coach lines. Pertinent figures from this exhibit follow:

Estimated Operating Results with Proposed Motor Coaches

Total revenue	\$1,475,830
Operating Expenses	<u>1,127,290</u>
Net Income before Income Taxes	\$ 348,540
Operating ratio	76.38%

Estimated Operating Results with Present Rail and Motor
Coach Lines

Total revenue	\$1,474,500
Operating Expenses	<u>1,790,650</u>
Net Loss	\$(<u>316,150</u>)
Operating Ratio	121.44%

(Red Figure)

Exhibit No. 18 is a summary of the estimates of cost for the removal of track, and Exhibit No. 19 is a balance sheet for applicant as of October 31, 1953.

It was contended by applicant's witness that diesel motor coaches were relatively free of any noxious gases and in support of this contention Exhibits Nos. 20 to 23 and 32 to 34 were presented. The substance of this testimony was that the buses would be a very minor factor in creating noxious gases.

Exhibit No. 24 is a copy of a decision of the Interstate Commerce Commission in Finance Docket No. 18125, authorizing applicant herein to abandon the lines herein concerned.

Additional testimony was presented as to the routes, some of which related to various proposed changes thereto. Subsequently, however, applicant filed a third amendment to its application which purportedly covered the route descriptions proposed for the Subway-Hollywood Boulevard-Beverly Hills line. Exhibits Nos. 27, 28, 29, and 30 are maps of the present and proposed

routes, while Exhibit No. 31 is a chart which tends to show annual savings allegedly to result by combining the Wilshire Boulevard and Sunset Boulevard lines, which combination is one of the proposals herein.

Relative to the Subway-Glendale-Burbank line, the testimony presented was similar to that heretofore described in connection with the Subway-Hollywood Boulevard-Beverly Hills line. Exhibit G-1 shows the present motor coach and rail routes, while Exhibits G-8 and G-9 contain a description of the proposed routes. Exhibit G-2 is the same as Exhibit No. 3 previously referred to herein. Exhibits G-3 and G-4 show the revenue passengers and transfers carried between Los Angeles-Glendale-Burbank rail line during the period from January, 1950 to December, 1952. Exhibit G-5 covers the same material as Exhibit No. 9, previously referred to, viz., the walking distances to and from the Subway Terminal loading platforms, but G-5 contains certain corrections to the prior exhibit. Exhibit G-6 is an extension of the accident comparisons between rail and motor coach previously described in Exhibit 11, while Exhibit G-7 is a duplicate of Exhibit No. 12 heretofore mentioned, relating to the features of the new motor coaches. G-10 is a statement showing the present and proposed headways for operations between Los Angeles and Glendale, while G-11 shows similar information for operations between Los Angeles and Burbank. A comparison of the running time of rail and motor coach operations in the areas involved was submitted as Exhibit G-12 and was later corrected by Exhibit G-23.

The estimated operating results for the Subway-Glendale-Burbank line under the proposed operations as compared with the

present rail operations are set out in Exhibit G-13. The present rail figures are for the year ending September 30, 1953, and the proposed motor coach estimates for the year commencing October 1, 1953. The pertinent figures follow:

<u>Present Rail</u>		<u>Proposed Motor Coach</u>
Total Revenue	\$ 803,530	\$ 805,220
Operating Expenses	<u>1,688,060</u>	<u>761,490</u>
Net Income or Loss Before Income Taxes	\$ <u>(884,530)</u>	\$ 43,730
Operating Ratio	210.08%	94.57%
<u>(Red Figure)</u>		

Exhibit G-14 shows the estimated cost of removal of tracks and overhead, and Exhibit G-15 is a photograph purportedly showing the effects in San Diego of the removal of rail passenger lines. A balance sheet as of December 31, 1953 was submitted as Exhibit G-18.

The applicant submitted various resolutions in support of the application, Exhibit No. 25 being a resolution of the West Hollywood Chamber of Commerce, and Exhibit G-16 being a resolution of the Glendale Junior Chamber of Commerce. Extracts of the decision of the Interstate Commerce Commission in Finance Docket No. 18125, referred to hereinabove, were submitted as Exhibit G-17.

There was considerable testimony concerning the proposed routing and the effects thereof in the downtown area of Los Angeles. In this connection the company presented Exhibit D-1, a map of the area showing its proposed routings, and an engineer of the Commission staff presented Exhibit D-2 showing the bus operations on Hill Street. A witness for the Los Angeles Transit Lines testified in this connection, stating that his company had no objections to the amended routings if arrangements were made,

to provide for split stops on Hill Street southbound between 4th and 8th Streets in a manner similar to those used in the splitting of stops northbound on Hill Street at the present time. Exhibit D-3 is a chart of the routes which Los Angeles Transit Lines believes to be proper, and Exhibit D-4 is a statement of restrictions which that company proposes. Exhibit D-5 is a suggested rerouting of the proposed operations in the vicinity of Allesandro Street, while Exhibit D-6 is a general map of the operations of the Los Angeles Transit Lines.

A statement from the Department of Public Works was received as Exhibit D-9, which statement is to the effect that that department has no objections to the proposed motor coach operations using the Hollywood Freeway between Grand Avenue and Hollywood Boulevard, subject to a condition that any stops to pick up or discharge passengers be made only where facilities have been provided for that purpose, and subject to the further condition that applicant obtain a franchise from the City of Los Angeles. It should be noted that a departmental staff report prepared by the chief engineer and general manager of the Board of Public Utilities and Transportation of the City of Los Angeles was received as Exhibit D-7, in connection with an accompanying supplement designated as D-7-A. These exhibits show various estimates of the costs involved in rehabilitating the Subway Terminal and the two rail lines involved. These estimates are summarized below:

Rehabilitation of system for continued streetcar operation	\$3,815,000
Conversion of system from streetcar to motor bus operation	\$1,225,000

Conversion of system from streetcar to trolley bus operation	\$1,823,000
Conversion of system from streetcar to motor bus operation using subway ramp to Hill Street in lieu of terminal	\$1,179,600
Conversion of system from streetcar to motor bus operation with Hill Street ramp and full terminal improvement	\$1,661,900

It should be noted that all of these estimates contemplate the use of the subway facilities which in the instant applications are proposed to be abandoned.

Exhibit D-8 consists of three documents. The first is a tentative resolution of the Board of Public Utilities and Transportation of the City of Los Angeles, dated April 13, 1954, authorizing the Metropolitan Coach Lines to abandon rail passenger service and substitute therefor motor coach service on the Hollywood Boulevard-Beverly Hills rail line, together with certain related authorizations as to routes and types of service subject to specified conditions. The second document is Board Order No. 142 of the Board of Public Utilities and Transportation of the City of Los Angeles, making substantially the same authorizations as are set out in the tentative resolution. The third document is Board Order No. 143 which disapproves the application of Metropolitan Coach Lines for motor coach substitution on the Los Angeles-Glendale-Burbank rail line because that company failed to make an adequate showing regarding "the vital necessity of speeding up the movement of passengers on public vehicles" in its over-all or long-range aspects.⁽⁴⁾

A senior bridge engineer for the Division of Highways requested prompt action be taken relative to the Glendale line since the location of that line will affect the freeway planning in

(4) Subsequently a petition for rehearing, considered by the Board, resulted in an order reaffirming this action.

that area. While neither the exact route of the freeway in the area concerned, nor the nature of the structures has been determined, the witness stated that if the rail tracks were to remain it would be necessary to build a subway under the tracks at a probable cost of \$660,000. The position of the Division of Highways, as expressed in a letter from the State Highway Engineer read into the record by the witness, was that the Division, without taking a position for or against the abandonment of the rail lines, urged an early determination of the matter.

Witnesses in opposition to the proposal presented testimony to the effect that the proposed bus operation will be slower and will not meet the demands of the public. It was also alleged that bus transportation is not healthful in that buses emit fumes and jostle the passengers. A petition containing approximately 862 signatures, protesting the proposed bus substitution so far as the Glendale line is concerned, was received for filing. A second petition containing approximately 209 signatures favored the proposed substitution on the Glendale line, while a third petition opposed the use of buses on Gardner Street between Sunset Boulevard and Santa Monica Boulevard, which is part of the proposed route on the Subway-Hollywood Boulevard-Beverly Hills line. Another witness presented a study of the running time which he had made on the Subway-Glendale-Burbank line during a test run which was made by the company, and testified that the stops on the test run were not long enough to permit operations under normal conditions. A resolution of the Glendale Action Committee on Transportation, received as Exhibit G-20, favored the retention of the present Glendale rail line. Likewise a resolution of the Council of the City of Glendale, Exhibit G-21, requested a continuance of this matter for

ninety days in order to enable the Council to make a survey of the problem. This resolution was presented on March 8. At the hearing on April 2 a representative of the City of Glendale made a statement to the effect that the City Council of that city requests a denial of the application for the Subway-Glendale-Burbank line. In the event the application is not denied, then the City of Glendale requests a continuance for at least six months in order to permit an adequate study to be made of the situation, and in the event this request is not granted the City of Glendale requests that all equipment and rights of way be held intact for a period of at least six months.

After a consideration of all of the evidence herein we hereby find it to be in the public interest to grant Application No. 34830 relating to the Subway-Hollywood Boulevard-Beverly Hills line, subject to the modifications hereinafter noted. As to Application No. 34990, relative to the Subway-Glendale-Burbank line, having in mind the request of the City of Glendale that it be given an opportunity to make a study of this matter, and having in mind the action of the City of Los Angeles in disapproving this application, as set out in Exhibit D-8, we will defer action upon this application.

Also we will authorize herein the replacement of motor coach lines Nos. 77 and 78 with the revised motor coach routes to be designated as Nos. 89 and 91.

The new buses proposed to be used are 102 inches in width and it is noted that Section 694(g) of the Vehicle Code requires the approval of this Commission for the operation of buses of such width. In addition, this section requires the approval of the Department of Public Works for operation of such buses "over state highways outside limits of incorporated cities where

"the one-way route mileage is over 25 miles but does not exceed 50 miles ..." The evidence herein shows that in no case does the one-way route mileage exceed 25 miles. We will approve in this order the operation of these 102-inch buses on the Subway-Hollywood Boulevard-Beverly Hills line.

INTERIM ORDER

Applications as above entitled having been filed, a public hearing having been held therein, the Commission being fully advised in the premises and hereby finding that public convenience and necessity so require,

IT IS ORDERED:

(1) That, subject to the conditions hereinafter provided, the Metropolitan Coach Lines be, and it hereby is, authorized to discontinue passenger service on the Subway-Hollywood Boulevard-Beverly Hills line.

(2) That the Metropolitan Coach Lines be, and it hereby is, authorized to abandon rails over the following described routes:

RAIL ROUTE 2 (Metropolitan Rail Line No. 32)

Portion to be Abandoned

Beginning at a point on the City boundary along the northerly line of Fountain Avenue, 30 feet westerly thereon from the easterly line of Spaulding Avenue; thence northeasterly in an approximately direct line to a point in Vista Street 150 feet southerly of Hawthorne Avenue; thence northeasterly in an approximately direct line to a point in Hawthorne Avenue 200 feet westerly of Fuller Avenue; thence via Hawthorne Avenue, along Marshfield Way, via Hollywood Boulevard and Sunset Boulevard to Route 3 at Park Avenue.

Street Areas to be Abandoned

Across Sunset Boulevard (100 feet) from the point of intersection of the southerly line of Sunset Boulevard and the westerly line of Gardner Street, to a point on the northerly line of Sunset Boulevard, 40 feet easterly thereon from the easterly line of Gardner Street.

Hawthorne Avenue from the southerly prolongation of the center line of Martel Avenue to a line parallel with the 60 feet easterly of the northerly prolongation of the easterly line of Poinsettia Place.

Across La Brea Avenue (40 feet) from a point on the southwesterly line 110 feet southeasterly thereon from the southerly line of Hollywood Boulevard, to a point on the northeasterly line of La Brea Avenue 80 feet southeasterly thereon from the easterly prolongation of the southerly line of Hollywood Boulevard.

Hollywood Boulevard (1 track in northerly half) from a line parallel with and 400 feet westerly of Sycamore Avenue, to a line parallel with and 15 feet easterly of the westerly line of Highland Avenue.

Hollywood Boulevard (1 track in southerly half) across northerly prolongation of Orange Drive (40 feet).

Hollywood Boulevard from a line parallel with and 15 feet easterly of the westerly line of Highland Avenue, to a line parallel with and 200 feet westerly of the westerly line of Vermont Avenue.

Sunset Boulevard across Manzanita Street (60 feet).

Sunset Boulevard (1 track in southwesterly half) from the northwesterly line of Sanborn Avenue to a point 30 feet northwesterly thereof.

Sunset Boulevard across the following streets:

Sanborn Avenue (60 feet)
Hyperion Avenue (60 feet)
Lucille Avenue (60 feet)
Edgecliff Drive (60 feet)

Sunset Boulevard from the northwesterly prolongation of the southwesterly line of Sunset Boulevard lying southeasterly of Maltman Avenue, to a line perpendicular to the center line of Sunset Boulevard at a point 228 feet southeasterly thereof from Micheltorena Street.

Sunset Boulevard across the easterly prolongation of the former Reservoir Street (82.5 feet) vacated by Ordinance No. 48,049.

Sunset Boulevard from a line parallel with and 185 feet westerly of Waterloo Street to Park Avenue.

RAIL ROUTE 3

Portion to be Abandoned

Beginning at a point in Glendale Boulevard on Route 1, northerly thereon 260 feet from the center line of Montrose Street; thence northerly via Park Avenue to a point in Sunset Boulevard on Route 2, westerly thereon 100 feet from the intersection of the northerly prolongation of the center line of Park Avenue with the center line of Sunset Boulevard.

Street Area to be Abandoned

Park Avenue from Glendale Boulevard to Sunset Boulevard.

(3) That the Metropolitan Coach Lines be, and it hereby is, authorized to discontinue service on its existing motor coach routes Nos. 77 and 88.

(4) That a certificate of public convenience and necessity be, and it hereby is, granted to the Metropolitan Coach Lines, authorizing the establishment and operation of a service as a passenger stage corporation, as that term is defined in Section 226 of the Public Utilities Code, for the transportation of persons along the routes and between the points hereinafter specified, and as an extension and enlargement of, and to be consolidated with, applicant's existing rights:

Fairfax Avenue Line No. 89

From Fairfax Avenue and 18th Street, thence along 18th Street, Genesee Avenue, Venice Boulevard, Fairfax Avenue, Sunset Boulevard, La Brea Avenue, Hollywood Boulevard, Gower Street, Franklin Avenue, and Western Avenue to Santa Monica Boulevard. Return via reverse of above route.

Also, from Franklin Avenue and Beachwood Drive, thence along Beachwood Drive to Westshire Drive. Return via reverse of above route.

Hollywood Boulevard Line No. 91

From 11th and Hill Streets, thence along Hill Street, Sunset Boulevard, Hollywood Boulevard, La Brea Avenue, Sunset Boulevard, Fairfax Avenue and Santa Monica Boulevard to Canon Drive (Beverly Hills). Return via reverse of above route.

Also, from Hollywood Boulevard and the Hollywood Freeway, thence along Hollywood Freeway and Temple Street to Hill Street. Return via reverse of above route.

Also, from Hollywood Boulevard and La Brea Avenue, thence along Hollywood Boulevard, Laurel Canyon Boulevard, Sunset Boulevard, Rodeo Drive, Lomitas Avenue, Canon Drive, Dayton Way, Beverly Drive, Pico Boulevard and Beverwil Drive to Beverly Drive. Return via reverse of above route.

Also, from Wilshire Boulevard and Beverly Drive, thence along Wilshire Boulevard, Camden Drive and Brighton Way to Canon Drive.

Also, from Canon Drive and Sunset Boulevard, thence along Sunset Boulevard, Hilgard Avenue, University Drive, Hilgard Avenue, Le Conte Avenue and Westwood Boulevard to Wilshire Boulevard. Return via reverse of above route.

Santa Monica Boulevard-Van Nuys Line No. 93

From 15th and Olive Streets, thence along Olive Street, 5th Street, Harbor Freeway, Hollywood Freeway, Santa Monica Boulevard, Highland Avenue, Hollywood Freeway, Vineland Avenue, Magnolia Boulevard, Lankershim Boulevard, Chandler Boulevard and Van Nuys Boulevard to Sherman Way.

Return via reverse of route to 4th Street exit ramp, thence along 4th Street and Olive Street to 15th Street.

Also, along Hollywood Freeway between Santa Monica Boulevard and Highland Avenue. Return via reverse of going route.

Also, along frontage roads of Hollywood Freeway between Highland Avenue and Barham Boulevard. Return via reverse of going route.

Also, from the intersection of Barham Boulevard and Cahuenga Boulevard via Cahuenga Boulevard, Ventura Boulevard and Vineland Avenue to Hollywood Freeway. Return via reverse of going route.

Also, along Lankershim Boulevard between Magnolia Boulevard and Vineland Avenue. Return via reverse of going route.

Also, turnaround for short line service by operating in either direction around two blocks contiguous to the intersection of Highland Avenue and Santa Monica Boulevard.

Also, turnaround for short line service by operating in either direction around any two blocks contiguous to the intersection of 15th and Hill Streets.

TEMPORARY ROUTE

From Hollywood Freeway and Harbor Freeway, thence along Hollywood Freeway, Grand Avenue, 3rd Street and Olive Street to 4th Street. To be used pending completion of 4th Street connection to Harbor Freeway.

Wilshire-Sunset Line No. 83

From Sunset Boulevard and Crescent Heights Boulevard in the City of Los Angeles, thence along Sunset Boulevard, Vermont Avenue, Oakwood Avenue, Hollywood Freeway, Hope Street exit ramp, Temple Street, Hill Street, 8th Street, Hope Street, Wilshire Boulevard, Ocean Avenue (Santa Monica), Colorado Avenue and Second Street to Wilshire Boulevard.

Return via reverse of route to Ninth Street and Hope Street, thence along Ninth Street, Hill Street, Temple Street, Grand Avenue entrance ramp of Hollywood Freeway, Vermont Avenue and Sunset Boulevard to Crescent Heights Boulevard.

From Hilgard Avenue and Strathmore Drive (West Los Angeles), thence along Hilgard Avenue, Le Conte Avenue and Westwood Boulevard to Wilshire Boulevard.

Return via reverse of route.

Restrictions

(1) No passengers shall be transported locally in the territory between the intersection of Federal Avenue and Wilshire Boulevard, and the intersection of Colorado Avenue and Ocean Avenue.

(2) No passengers shall be picked up on eastbound (inbound to downtown Los Angeles business district) trips or discharged on westbound (outbound from downtown Los Angeles business district) between the intersection of Fairfax Avenue and Wilshire Boulevard and the intersection of Seventh and Hope Streets, both points inclusive.

(3) No passengers shall be picked up on inbound trips to downtown Los Angeles business district or discharged on outbound trips from downtown Los Angeles business district at Alvarado Street on the Hollywood Freeway (Applies to Lines Nos. 83, 91 and 93).

(4) No passengers shall be picked up or discharged on the Hollywood Freeway except at points where proper facilities have been provided for that purpose, and no operations shall be conducted along the Hollywood Freeway unless and until the Metropolitan Coach Lines obtains the necessary franchise for use of the freeway from the City of Los Angeles.

(5) That the Metropolitan Coach Lines, in accordance with the provisions of Section 694(g) of the California Vehicle Code is hereby granted permission in the conduct of the service herein authorized to operate motor coaches having a maximum outside width not exceeding 104 inches.

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

- (a) Within thirty days after the effective date hereof, applicant shall file a written acceptance of the certificate herein granted.
- (b) Within one hundred eighty days after the effective date hereof, and upon not less than the periods otherwise herein prescribed, and in no case less than five days' notice to the Commission and the public, applicant shall establish the service herein authorized and file in triplicate, and concurrently make effective, tariffs and time schedules satisfactory to the Commission.

(7) That the abandonment of rail service hereinabove authorized is subject to the following conditions:

- (a) Changes in service shall be made only after thirty days' notice to the Commission and to the public, and motor coach service shall be inaugurated coincident with the abandonment of rail service.
- (b) Motor coaches to be purchased shall be new, modern equipment, and shall be equal or superior to the equipment described at the hearings in these proceedings in connection with the company's proposals. Particularly, shall such equipment contain forced ventilation and shall be designed in such a manner as to reduce noise, fumes, and odors to a practical

minimum. Before any motor coach equipment is substituted for rail service, the company shall submit detailed specifications to this Commission and secure the Commission's approval.

(8) That failure of applicant to comply with any of the provisions of this order, without prior authorization of this Commission, will render the authority herein granted null and void.

(9) This order is without prejudice to further consideration of Application No. 34990.

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

Dated at San Francisco, California,
this 17th day of August, 1954.

(John E. Miller)
President

Justus Z. Callahan

Francis P. Lott

Gene Higgins

Commissioners