

Decision No. 51638**ORIGINAL**

BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

In the Matter of the Application of)
LONG BEACH MOTOR BUS COMPANY request-)
ing authority to reroute and/or extend)
portions of its Routes Nos. 1, 4 and) Application No. 36738
11 and to adjust the frequency of)
service on certain lines.)

John Munholland and George H. Hook, for applicant.
Walfrid Jacobson, City Attorney, by Leslie E. Still,
Deputy City Attorney, for the City of Long Beach;
Henry E. Jordan, for the Bureau of Franchises and
Public Utilities of the City of Long Beach;
Frederick W. Hickman, for the City of Seal Beach,
protestants.

Henry L. Goerlick, for the City of Lakewood; Dale
Isenberg, for the Lakewood Chamber of Commerce;
Carlisle M. Terry, for Los Altos Association;
Harry B. Frishman, for Board of Education of
Long Beach Unified School District; Mrs. Ruth M.
Bach, Councilwoman, 5th District, and member of
the Bureau of Franchises of the City of Long
Beach, interested parties.

James K. Gibson and Arthur F. Ager, for the
Commission's staff.

O P I N I O N

Applicant is a passenger stage corporation rendering services as such pursuant to authority from this Commission in and around the City of Long Beach, California. By the application herein, filed on February 14, 1955, it seeks authority (1) to reroute and extend certain of its lines, and (2) to reduce the frequency of service on the majority of its lines.¹

Public hearings were held in Long Beach on April 20, 21, and 29, 1955, before Examiner Kent C. Rogers. At the conclusion

1

By Decision No. 49835 in Application No. 34812, dated March 23, 1954, this applicant was instructed not to institute any reductions in its service without prior express authorization from the Commission.

of the hearing on April 29, 1955, the matter was submitted subject to the filing of concurrent briefs by the applicant and the City of Long Beach on or before May 6, 1955. These briefs have been filed and the matter is ready for decision. Prior to the first hearing the applicant posted and published notice thereof as required by this Commission.

Proposed Reroutings and Extensions

Applicant proposes to make changes in three of its existing lines as hereinafter stated. There were no protests to these proposals, but some riders appeared and requested routings differing from those asked for by the applicant. They were advised that such requests are beyond the scope of this application, and that their requests should be presented to the applicant in the first instance. Several bus riders appeared in support of the proposed modifications in the existing routings.

(a) Pacific Coast Highway Route No. 1

2

The presently authorized route is as follows:

Beginning at the intersection of Pacific Avenue and First Street in the City of Long Beach, around a terminal loop along First Street, Pine Avenue, Ocean Boulevard, Pacific Avenue to its intersection with First Street, thence along Pacific Avenue, Pacific Coast Highway, Los Alamitos Traffic Circle, Los Coyotes Diagonal, Stearns Street, Palo Verde Avenue, Willow Street, Nipomo Avenue, Barrios Street, Lodoga Avenue, Spring Street, Nipomo Avenue to its intersection with Barrios Street.

Also, beginning at the intersection of Gladys Avenue and Pacific Coast Highway in the City of Long Beach, around a terminal loop, thence along Gladys Avenue, Seventeenth Street, Temple Avenue to its intersection with Pacific Coast Highway.

Also, beginning at the intersection of Los Coyotes Diagonal and Ximeno Avenue in the City of Long Beach, along Ximeno Avenue, Atherton Street to its intersection with Palo Verde Avenue.

2

Decision No. 49482, dated December 21, 1953, in Application No. 34923.

The applicant proposes to discontinue service via the portion of the terminal loop on Gladys Avenue, Seventeenth Street and Temple Avenue. All portions of the loop sought to be abandoned are a short block from the remaining portions of the line.

As appears from the route description above, the line branches at the intersection of Los Coyotes Diagonal and Ximeno Avenue. At this point one branch proceeds via Los Coyotes Diagonal, Stearns Street, Palo Verde Avenue, Willow Street, Nipomo Avenue, Barrios Street, Ladoga Avenue, Spring Street and Nipomo Avenue to Barrios Street. The other branch proceeds from the intersection of Los Coyotes Diagonal and Ximeno Avenue via Ximeno Avenue and Atherton Street to Palo Verde Avenue.

The applicant proposes to abandon service between the intersection of Willow Street and Palo Verde Avenue and the intersection of Barrios Street and Nipomo Avenue; to extend service from the intersection of Willow Street and Palo Verde Avenue via Palo Verde Avenue, Los Coyotes Diagonal, Studebaker Road and Walkerton Street to Los Coyotes Diagonal; and to extend service from the intersection of Atherton Street and Palo Verde Avenue, via Palo Verde Avenue, Stearns Street and Studebaker Road to Walkerton Street.

The evidence shows that the proposed abandonments and extensions will enable applicant to provide service to large numbers of persons in areas not now served by public transportation (see Exhibit No. 22), and will require no person to walk over one-fourth of a mile in addition to the distance he now travels to reach public transportation.

(b) Fourth-Anaheim, Route No. 4

The presently authorized route is as follows:³

³ See Decision No. 49482, referred to in footnote (1).

Beginning at the intersection of Fourth Street and Roycroft Avenue in the City of Long Beach; thence along Fourth Street, Pacific Avenue, Anaheim Street, Los Altos Plaza, Anaheim Road, Bellflower Boulevard, Anaheim Road to State College parking lot.

Also, beginning at the intersection of Anaheim Street and Clark Avenue in the City of Long Beach; thence along Clark Avenue, Pacific Coast Highway to its intersection with Anaheim Street:

Applicant proposes to abandon service east from the intersection of Bellflower Boulevard and Anaheim Road, and in lieu thereof to serve from that intersection east via Bellflower Boulevard, Seventh Street, Campus Road (west); Anaheim Road and Studebaker Road to Stearns Street.

Applicant proposes to operate a shuttle service on this line between the intersection of Stearns Street and Studebaker Road, on the one hand, and the intersection of Anaheim Street and Pacific Coast Highway, on the other hand, which will connect with every third schedule on the main line inbound and outbound. Applicant states that the service has been scheduled to conform to the class periods of the Long Beach State College (located north of Anaheim Road and east of Bellflower Boulevard). This college, applicant alleges, has moved the major portion of its 4,200 students and 275 faculty members from temporary quarters to permanent buildings, and the proposed route would better serve the students and faculty members. In addition, the evidence shows that the proposed extension will enable applicant to serve a highly developed residential area now without public transportation within a reasonable walking distance.

A representative of the college stated that the faculty favors the proposed route but objects to the proposed fare-break point at the intersection of Anaheim Road and Palo Verde Avenue, as students coming from the area north and east of that intersection

would be required to pay a second-zone fare for service to the college. He suggested an overlapping fare-break point. The parties stated that they would attempt to reach an agreement on this matter. It appears that subsequent to the hearing an agreement was reached, and applicant has amended its proposals so that, inbound, the first fare zone will end at a point about half way between Anaheim Road and Seventh Street on Campus Road (west); and, outbound, the first fare zone will terminate at a point on Anaheim Road between Campus Road (west) and Palo Verde Avenue (see map attached to letter from John Munholland to Examiner Rogers, dated May 1, 1955).

The Commission's staff recommended that, instead of operating a shuttle, through service should be provided by operating every third or fourth schedule from the intersection of Studebaker Road and Stearns Street to downtown Long Beach. It was the staff's opinion that such service could be provided without additional equipment.

(c) Bellflower-Lakewood Route No. 11

This service is presently authorized to operate as follows:

Beginning at the intersection of American Avenue and Ocean Boulevard in the City of Long Beach, around a terminal loop along Ocean Boulevard, Locust Avenue, Broadway, American Avenue to its intersection with Ocean Boulevard, thence along Ocean Boulevard, Livingston Drive, Ximeno Avenue, Pacific Coast Highway, Los Alamitos Traffic Circle, Lakewood Boulevard, Flower Avenue, Bellflower Boulevard, Center Street, Orchard Avenue, Harvard Avenue to its intersection with Bellflower Boulevard.

Also, beginning at the intersection of Redondo Avenue and Ocean Boulevard in the City of Long Beach, thence along Redondo Avenue, Second Street, Redondo Avenue, Pacific Coast Highway, to its intersection with Los Alamitos Traffic Circle.

Also, beginning at the intersection of Spring Street and Lakewood Boulevard in the City of Long Beach, thence along Spring Street, Clark Avenue, to its intersection with Flower Avenue.

⁴ Decision No. 49482, referred to above.

Also, beginning at the intersection of South Street and Lakewood Boulevard, around a terminal loop, thence along South Street, Oliva Avenue, Ashworth Street to its intersection with Lakewood Boulevard.

Also, beginning at the intersection of Del Amo Boulevard and Clark Avenue, thence along the Del Amo Boulevard, Graywood Avenue, Candlewood Street to its intersection with Clark Avenue.

Also, beginning at the intersection of Graywood Avenue and B Street, thence along B Street, Hazelbrook Avenue, C Street, to its intersection with Graywood Avenue.

Applicant proposes to discontinue service on Spring Street between Lakewood Boulevard and Clark Avenue, and in lieu thereof to operate a service from the intersection of Lakewood Boulevard and Willow Street via Willow Street and Clark Avenue to Spring Street.

In support of this proposal, applicant alleges that there is and will be no development along Spring Street, as the area on each side of Spring Street is reserved for the Long Beach Municipal Airport. The proposed rerouting will, it is alleged, provide service to many residents west of Clark Street and south of Willow Street not now served by public transportation.

A branch of this line is authorized from the intersection of Ocean Boulevard and Redondo Avenue via Redondo Avenue, Second Street and Redondo Avenue to Pacific Coast Highway. Applicant alleges that the City of Long Beach has realigned Redondo Avenue so that it goes directly through from Ocean Boulevard to Pacific Coast Highway and has eliminated the use of Second Street. Applicant states that it has in consequence been required to discontinue the use of Second Street and asks that it be authorized to serve via Redondo Avenue at all points between Ocean Boulevard and Pacific Coast Highway.

On the evidence herein and the pleadings on file, we find that the proposed abandonments of service are not adverse to the public interest and that public convenience and necessity require that applicant be given authority to extend its services as requested in the application and as set forth in the order herein. In the absence of any showing that the shuttle service proposed by applicant will be inadequate, we shall not require it to provide in lieu thereof the through service recommended by the staff.

Proposed Service Reductions

In addition to requesting authority to make the changes in routing referred to above, Long Beach Motor Bus Company requested authority to reduce the frequency of service on ten of its fifteen lines.⁵ The present and proposed frequencies are shown on pages 14 through 19 of Exhibit No. 17. The routes are visually depicted on Exhibit No. 3. It should be noted that several of the routes branch one or more times so that the intervals between service on the branches are multiples of the intervals between service on the downtown Long Beach portion of the line involved. While some of the headways during the base and peak periods would be increased by only two or three minutes, others would be increased ten or more minutes. On weekdays and Saturdays night service is to be reduced from an hourly maximum to as much as eighty to ninety minutes in some instances, and on Sundays night service is to be reduced from an hourly maximum to periods ranging from eighty to one hundred minutes, in some instances.

5

For descriptions of all routes as authorized at the time of the hearings herein, see Exhibit No. 1 on Application No. 34923, confirmed in Decision No. 49482, referred to above.

In an attempt to show that its service exceeds the demand, applicant presented a group of ninety charts (Exhibit No. 5). Each of these charts shows (a) the number of passengers past a given peak point on a given line on a given day, (b) whether the count on the chart was of inbound or outbound traffic, (c) the number of seats available on the particular line at the given peak point in the given direction on the given day, and (d) the number of seats which would be available under the proposal on the particular line, in the given direction, on a named day, i.e., Saturday, Sunday, or Monday. With few exceptions, the charts appear to show that the supply of seats exceeds the number of passengers. Applicant's witness stated that the charts demonstrate that a reduction in service is warranted. It should be noted that applicant has buses which vary in capacity from thirty-six to forty-five passengers, and that the individual charts reflect the number of seats available in relation to the size of the buses used on a particular line. No count was made of passengers who rode the buses but did not pass the line check points referred to above.

A transportation engineer of the Commission's staff was of the opinion, based on traffic counts, that the proposed service would be adequate in all cases to handle the present volume of traffic. He stated, however, that odd-minute headways, e.g., those of 13, 35, or 55 minutes, should be avoided and service rendered on a 10-, 12-, 15- or 30-minute basis so that buses would pass a given point at a given time each hour. It was also the opinion of the engineer that headways of over one hour result in eventual abandonment of the service, and that if any service is justified it should be on at least 60-minute headways. He estimated that the proposed service reductions would result in an annual decrease of 362,941 miles, and the extensions referred to above would result

in an increase of 85,372 miles annually, leaving a net annual saving of 277,569 miles. The engineer stated that if no schedules on any bus on any day of the week were at greater intervals than one hour, the net saving would be 181,750 miles.

The Commission's engineer testified further that the City of Long Beach has indicated to the Commission and the applicant that it feels the service reductions as proposed are too drastic, and if placed in effect would result in a further loss of passengers and affect property and business values in certain areas, as well as the social welfare of the city. The engineer proposed an alternate plan which, he stated, should be considered even though a separate application would be required. It was his suggestion that applicant request authority (1) to discontinue service on the Third Street branch of Line No. 3 east of Third Street and American Avenue; (2) to discontinue service on the Tenth Street branch of Line No. 8 north and east of Third Street and American Avenue; (3) to extend Line No. 4 from Fourth Street and Roycroft Avenue, along Fourth Street and Park Avenue to Third Street, from which point it would continue east and south to Second and Bayshore Avenue over that portion of the present Line No. 3 route; (4) to discontinue all Sunday services on Lines Nos. 2, 11 and 13.

The witness stated that at present there are seven east and west routes between Anaheim Street and Ocean Boulevard, spaced one-fourth mile or less apart. The Commission's staff is of the opinion, he said, that the spacing is too close and that the Third and Fourth Street branches of Lines Nos. 3 and 6 could be discontinued without seriously inconveniencing persons in the area, as the maximum walking distance to reach one of the remain-

ing lines would be not to exceed one-fourth of a mile. If these changes were made, the remaining lines could, he said, with few exceptions adequately handle the combined total of passengers. (See pages 23 to 34, inclusive, of Exhibit No. 17).

Discontinuance of Sunday service on Lines Nos. 2, 11 and 13 was suggested by the witness as they appear, he said, to be the poorest lines on the system from the standpoint of passengers carried and revenue per mile. (See pages 35 to 37, inclusive, of Exhibit No. 17).

The witness stated that if all these service reductions were placed in effect, the following annual mileage savings would result:

Line No. 3	- Daily, Saturdays and Sundays	- 108,164	miles
Line No. 8	- " " " "	141,125	"
Line No. 2	- Sundays	12,562	"
Line No. 11	- " "	51,979	"
Line No. 13	- " "	<u>36,983</u>	"
	<u>Total</u>	350,813	"

This is approximately the reduction in mileage the applicant claims would be effected if this application were granted.

The traffic engineer of the City of Long Beach testified that the city has planned by the end of 1955 to make the streets between First Street on the south, and Seventh Street on the north, into alternate one-way streets between the Los Angeles River on the west and Alamitos Avenue on the east (see Exhibit No. 3). None of the witnesses knew what effect this plan, if placed in effect, would have on applicant's services.

The Chief Engineer and Secretary of the Bureau of Franchises and Public Utilities of the City of Long Beach stated that the bureau's position is that the service offered by the applicant is at a level which is not attractive to, nor conducive to, use thereof by the riding public and should not be adjusted

downward by arbitrarily applying a formula to establish a ratio between the passengers obtained from a load check and the number of seats in the buses which the company has on hand and proposes to assign to the services involved. The witness introduced in evidence Exhibit No. 21, which shows that the population of the Cities of Long Beach, Lakewood and Signal Hill have increased from a total of 286,505 in April 1950 to 369,089 in January 1955. The City of Long Beach, he said, is the fifth largest city in California and the fortieth largest city in the United States.

The engineer stated that the present service frequency is unsatisfactory in many areas of the city. He had, he said, come to the well-considered conclusion that it is both inadvisable and inappropriate to make a further reduction of the service level rendered by this applicant.

A councilwoman for the Lakewood-Signal Hill area (of the City of Long Beach) stated that her constituents complained about the defectiveness of the existing service. These persons, she said, desire a more frequent service and better cross-town transportation.

In addition to attempting to show that the present level of service is too high, applicant presented evidence intended to show that its services will be rendered at a loss in the future if it is not permitted to reduce the frequency thereof.

Applicant's records reflect that during the calendar year 1954, it made a claimed net profit, after income taxes, of \$41,980, including a credit of \$7,722.80 for prior years' tax

adjustments.⁶ The treasurer of the Long Beach Motor Bus Company testified that that net profit was after applicant had lost \$65,935 during the first three months of 1954.

Applicant's forecasts of operations under present and proposed service levels for the period May 1, 1955, to April 30, 1956, are set forth in Exhibit No. 10 and are summarized as follows:

	<u>Present Service</u>	<u>Proposed Service</u>
Estimated Miles	4,556,340	4,280,626
Revenue, Including Charter and Advertising	\$1,915,310	\$1,940,335
Operating Expenses and Taxes	1,931,577	1,850,833
Net Operating Revenue	(16,267)	89,502
Other Income	750	750
Net Profit before Income Taxes	(15,517)	90,252
Income Taxes	- - -	42,657
Net Profit	(15,517)	47,595
Operating Ratio	116.03%	95.55%

(Red Figure)

Applicant's calculated rate base for the same period was \$623,991.60 (Exhibit No. 15). The results given above include, in each instance, the sum of \$142,300 for public liability and property damage insurance and \$67,000 for management, supervision and accounting.

In preparing these forecasts, applicant's witness assumed that during the stated period applicant would carry an average of 1,100,000 adult fare-paying passengers per year (Exhibit No. 13).

6

Exhibit 8.

Actual passenger counts per month from January 1, 1952, to April 1, 1955, are shown in Exhibit No. 12. The witness stated that the 1,100,000 passengers represents a downward trend of 7.98% less passengers than were carried for the 12-months' period ending March 31, 1955.

The witness said that the cost of public liability and property damage insurance would increase from \$117,853.64 in 1954 (Exhibit 8) to an estimated \$142,300 per year (Exhibit 10), a sum equal to 7½% of applicant's gross revenue. Applicant must, however, pay the insurer the total amount of all claims paid. He said that \$36,077 of this future cost will be used to reimburse the insurance carrier (an affiliated company) for losses dating back to 1950. The witness stated that in 1953 applicant's insurance carrier paid losses amounting to \$77,492 and set up reserves of \$18,115 for unsettled claims. For the first 11 months of 1954 the insurance carrier paid out \$45,046 on claims against the applicant.

Included in applicant's expenses for the year 1954, is the sum of \$81,922 for management, supervision and accounting (Exhibit 8). In the forecast (Exhibit 10) applicant has included the sum of \$67,000 for these services. The witness stated that this item was based on 3½% of the applicant's gross revenue. In both instances the witness was to furnish the basis for these charges, but they have not been furnished to the Commission.

The Commission's staff made a study which shows the following:⁷

	Estimate for rate year ending April 30, 1956 at the present level of service.	Estimate for rate year ending April 30, 1956 at the proposed level of service.
Coach Miles	4,585,466	4,293,250
<u>Operating Revenue</u>		
Passengers	\$1,888,270	\$1,888,270
Special Bus	8,760	8,760
Advertising	<u>18,000</u>	<u>18,000</u>
Total	1,915,030	1,915,030
Operating Expenses	1,559,700	1,483,990
Depreciation	95,408	95,408
Operating Taxes	<u>188,961</u>	<u>181,793</u>
Total	\$1,841,099	\$1,761,191
Operating Income	73,931	153,839
Income Taxes	<u>34,363</u>	<u>77,451</u>
Net Income	\$ 39,568	\$ 76,388
Rate Base	636,532	636,532
Rate of Return	6.22%	12%
Operating Ratio after Income Taxes	97.93%	96.01%

These figures assume the same number of passengers as applicant did in its forecast.

The witness for the staff listed instances in which the staff's estimates differed from those of the applicant.

Applicant's witness estimated its cost of insurance at \$142,300. The staff's witness allowed the sum of \$122,210 for

this item. He said that he took the cost per claim from the insurer's records and the average number of claims. He found the average cost per claim was \$131.00 and there were about 900 claims per year for a total cost of \$117,900 to which he added approximately \$4,400 for reinsurance for a total of \$122,260. He said that while the applicant is currently paying its insurer 7½% of its gross revenue, this figure is subject to revision and is not a constant factor.

Another material difference between the applicant's forecast and the staff witness's forecast is the allowance for management, supervision and accounting. Applicant's witness allowed \$67,000 for this item. The staff's witness allowed \$51,470 therefor. This figure, the witness said, was based on the staff's estimate of a fair and equitable amount to manage this property after making an analysis of the records of the management company. ✓

Although it appears that the applicant's equipment is not operated with the best possible load factors, it also appears that this result is contributed to by the failure of applicant to shift its buses in conformance with the available traffic.

If we accepted the applicant's forecast of its results of operations, it would be entitled to reduce its services as proposed. We are convinced, however, that applicant's records do not reflect the true picture of the results of future operations. Among other things, we are of the opinion that the staff's allowances for management, supervision and accounting, and for the cost of public liability and property damage insurance are more reasonable than those sought by applicant.

Upon the evidence of record herein, we are of the opinion and find that applicant's rate of return in the future under the present level of services will not be so low as to require the relief sought herein and the authority to reduce the frequency of services will be denied. It is also our opinion that operating economies can be effected which will better applicant's financial position without materially impairing its services. We believe that the applicant should seriously consider the recommendations of the Commission's staff (Exhibit No. 17) and, if it feels so inclined, file an application for authority to make changes in service including any or all of the changes therein recommended.

O R D E R

An application having been filed, public hearings having been held thereon, evidence having been presented and the Commission having made the findings set forth above and based upon said findings,

IT IS ORDERED:

(1) That Long Beach Motor Bus Company be, and it hereby is, authorized to abandon portions of routes authorized to be served by Decision No. 49482, dated December 21, 1953, in Application No. 34923 as follows:

- (a) That portion of Pacific Coast Highway Route No. 1 from the intersection of Willow Street and Palo Verde Avenue via Willow Street, Nipomo Avenue, Barrios Street, Lodoga Avenue, Spring Street and Nipomo Avenue to Barrios Street.
- (b) That portion of Pacific Coast Highway Route No. 1 from the intersection of Gladys Avenue and Pacific Coast Highway via Gladys Avenue, Seventeenth Street and Temple Avenue to Pacific Coast Highway.
- (c) That portion of Fourth-Anaheim, Route No. 4 from the intersection of Anaheim Road and Bellflower Boulevard via Bellflower Boulevard and Anaheim Road to State College Parking Lot:

- (d) That portion of Bellflower-Lakewood Route No. 11 on Spring Street between its intersections with Lakewood Boulevard and Clark Avenue.
- (e) That portion of Bellflower-Lakewood Route No. 11 on Second Street.

(2) That a certificate of public convenience and necessity be, and it hereby is granted to Long Beach Motor Bus Company authorizing the establishment and operation of service as a passenger stage corporation, as defined in Section 226 of the Public Utilities Code, for the transportation of passengers over the routes and between the points set out below, as extensions of and to be consolidated with its existing rights:

- (a) As an extension of Pacific Coast Highway Route No. 1, from the intersection of Willow Street and Palo Verde Avenue, via Palo Verde Avenue, Los Coyotes Diagonal, Studebaker Road and Walkerton Street to Los Coyotes Diagonal.
- (b) As an extension of Pacific Coast Highway Route No. 1, from the intersection of Atherton Street and Palo Verde Avenue via Palo Verde Avenue, Stearns Street, and Studebaker Road to Walkerton Street.
- (c) As an extension of Fourth-Anaheim Route No. 4 from the intersection of Bellflower Boulevard and Anaheim Road via Bellflower Boulevard, Seventh Street, Campus Road (west), Anaheim Road and Studebaker Road to Stearns Street.
- (d) As an extension of Bellflower-Lakewood Route No. 11 from the intersection of Lakewood Boulevard and Willow Street via Willow Street and Clark Avenue to Spring Street.
- (e) As an extension of Bellflower-Lakewood Route No. 11 along Redondo Avenue between its intersections with First Street and Second Street.

(3) That in providing service pursuant to the authority granted by paragraph (2) of this order, Long Beach Motor Bus Company shall comply with and observe 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 sixty days after the effective date hereof, and upon not 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.

(4) That applicant may consolidate those portions of Routes 1, 4 and 11 as described in Decision No: 49482, dated December 21, 1953, in Application No. 34923, which remain after the abandonment of those portions thereof described in paragraph (1) of the order herein, respectively with the extensions authorized by paragraph (2) of the order herein into lines to be known and described as follows:

Route No. 1 - Pacific Coast Highway Line

Beginning at the intersection of Pacific Avenue and First Street in the City of Long Beach, around a terminal loop along First Street, Pine Avenue, Ocean Boulevard, Pacific Avenue to its intersection with First Street, thence along Pacific Avenue, Pacific Coast Highway, Los Alamitos Traffic Circle, Los Coyotes Diagonal, Stearns Street, Palo Verde Avenue, Los Coyotes Diagonal, Studebaker Road, Walkerton Street to its intersection with Los Coyotes Diagonal.

Also, beginning at the intersection of Los Coyotes Diagonal and Ximeno Avenue in the City of Long Beach, along Ximeno Avenue, Atherton Street, Palo Verde Avenue, Stearns Street, Studebaker Road to its intersection with Walkerton Street.

Route No. 4 - Fourth-Anaheim Line

Beginning at the intersection of Fourth Street and Roycroft Avenue in the City of Long Beach, thence along Fourth Street, Pacific Avenue, Anaheim Street, Los Altos Plaza, Anaheim Road, Bellflower Boulevard, Seventh Street, Campus Road (west), Anaheim Road and Studebaker Road to its intersection with Stearns Street.

Also, beginning at the intersection of Anaheim Street and Clark Avenue in the City of Long Beach, thence along Clark Avenue, Pacific Coast Highway to its intersection with Anaheim Street.

Route No. 11 - Bellflower-Lakewood Line

Beginning at the intersection of American Avenue and Ocean Boulevard in the City of Long Beach, around a terminal loop along Ocean Boulevard, Locust Avenue, Broadway, American Avenue to its intersection with Ocean Boulevard, thence along Ocean Boulevard, Livingston Drive, Ximeno Avenue, Pacific Coast Highway, Los Alamitos Traffic Circle, Lakewood Boulevard, Flower Avenue, Bellflower Boulevard, Center Street, Orchard Avenue, Harvard Avenue to its intersection with Bellflower Boulevard.

Also, beginning at the intersection of Redondo Avenue and Ocean Boulevard in the City of Long Beach, thence along Redondo Avenue, Pacific Coast Highway, to its intersection with Los Alamitos Traffic Circle.

Also, beginning at the intersection of Willow Street and Lakewood Boulevard in the City of Long Beach, thence along Willow Street, Clark Avenue, to its intersection with Flower Avenue.

Also, beginning at the intersection of South Street and Lakewood Boulevard, around a terminal loop, thence along South Street, Oliva Avenue, Ashworth Street to its intersection with Lakewood Boulevard.

Also, beginning at the intersection of Del Amo Boulevard and Clark Avenue, thence along Del Amo Boulevard, Graywood Avenue, Candlewood Street to its intersection with Clark Avenue.

Also, beginning at the intersection of Graywood Avenue and B Street, thence along B Street, Hazelbrook Avenue, C Street, to its intersection with Graywood Avenue.

(5) That prior to the discontinuance of service pursuant to subparagraphs (a), (c) and (d) of paragraph (1) of the order herein Long Beach Motor Bus Company shall post plainly visible notices in all of its buses and terminals and in its Line 1, Line 4 and Line 11 services stating the changes to be made in its routings and services. Such notices shall remain posted for at

least five days prior to the placing in effect of the changes authorized by paragraphs (1) and (4) of the order herein.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that 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.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that except as specifically granted herein, the application is denied.

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

Dated at San Francisco, California, this 5th day of July, 1955.

Justus F. Casner
 President

Ralph L. ...

...

...

Commissioners

Commissioner Peter E. Mitchell, being necessarily absent, did not participate in the disposition of this proceeding.