

ORIGINAL

Decision No. 52914

BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

Application of METROPOLITAN COACH LINES,)
 a corporation, for authority to reroute)
 Line 75 - Glendale-Burbank-Los Angeles-)
 Beverly Hills-Venice-Santa Monica, and)
 Line 93 - Los Angeles-North Hollywood-)
 Van Nuys via Hollywood, in the downtown)
 business district of Los Angeles.)

Application No. 37503

Waldo K. Greiner and James H. Lyons, by James H. Lyons,
 for applicant.
 Gibson, Dunn and Crutcher, by Max Eddy Utt; Francis J.
 Donnelly, for Transportation Union, Division No.
 1277; and James A. Evans, for California Institute
 of Social Welfare; protestants.
 Roger Arnebergh, City Attorney, Alan G. Campbell,
 Assistant City Attorney, Ralph J. Eubank, Deputy
 City Attorney, T. M. Chubb, Chief Engineer and
 General Manager, and Thomas V. Tarbert, Assistant
 Chief Engineer, of the Department of Public
 Utilities and Transportation of the City of Los
 Angeles; Carl F. Fennema, for the Downtown
 Business Men's Association; Henry McClernan, City
 Attorney, and John H. Lauten, Assistant City
 Attorney, for the City of Glendale; interested
 parties.
A. F. Ager for the Commission staff.

O P I N I O N

Applicant herein operates its Line 75 into the center of
 Los Angeles over three principal routes, designated as 75-B, 75-S,
 and 75-V. The 75-B line operates inbound from the Burbank and
 Glendale areas into Los Angeles via various routes to the Hollywood
 Freeway, thence via the Hollywood Freeway, Hope Street, Temple
 Street, Grand Avenue, Third Street, and Olive Street to Fifth Street.
 The outbound route is operated from the intersection of Fifth and
 Olive Streets via Fifth Street and the Harbor and Hollywood Freeways.
 The 75-S line operates both inbound and outbound between the Santa
 Monica area and the center of Los Angeles via various routes to

Olympic Boulevard, thence via Olympic Boulevard and Olive Street to Fifth Street. The 75-V line operates in both directions between Venice and the center of Los Angeles via Venice Boulevard and Olive Street to Fifth Street.

It is proposed in the instant application to change the downtown routing of these lines so as to operate the 75-B line in both directions along Glendale Boulevard, Temple Street, and Spring Street; the 75-S line in both directions along Olympic Boulevard, Main Street between Olympic Boulevard and Ninth Street, and Spring Street; and the 75-V line in both directions along Venice Boulevard, Main Street between Venice Boulevard and Ninth Street, and Spring Street.

This applicant also operates its Line 93, which is known as its Los Angeles-North Hollywood-Van Nuys via Hollywood Line, between Van Nuys, North Hollywood, and Hollywood and downtown Los Angeles, inbound via various routes to the Hollywood Freeway, thence via the Hollywood Freeway, Hope Street, Temple Street, Grand Avenue, Third Street, and Olive Street, to a turnaround at 17th Street. Outbound, Line 93 is operated via Olive Street, Fifth Street, and the Harbor and Hollywood Freeways.

It is proposed herein to abandon the present downtown routing and to substitute for these routes an operation in both directions along Temple Street and Hill Street between Grand Avenue and Venice Boulevard.

Public hearings were held in this matter before Examiner Grant E. Syphers in Los Angeles on December 16, 1955, January 25 and 26 and February 9 and 10, 1956. On these dates evidence was adduced and on the last named date the matter was submitted.

The evidence in these proceedings may be divided into four principal categories: (1) the presentation of the applicant,

setting forth its reasons for desiring the requested changes, (2) the presentation of Los Angeles Transit Lines in opposition thereto, (3) the public witness testimony, and (4) the position of the Board of Public Utilities and Transportation of the City of Los Angeles.

The Presentation of the Applicant

The superintendent of traffic of Metropolitan Coach Lines testified as to the details of the proposal and introduced various maps and charts to show the present routings and the proposed reroutings. This witness contended that the reroutings will provide a better location of passenger routes and stops and relieve the passengers from a great deal of walking and the necessity of making transfers. Relative to the proposed rerouting of Line 75 he pointed out that at the present time applicant has no operations on Spring Street which, in his opinion, is capable of accommodating additional motor coaches. Exhibit 3 is a study showing a comparison of the number of motor coach trips operated on Spring Street between Eighth Street and Temple Street during the peak periods at the present time and the number that would be operated by the rerouting of the three segments of Line 75. This exhibit may be summarized as follows:

| | <u>Present Northbound</u> | <u>Proposed Northbound</u> | <u>Additional Bus Trips</u> |
|-----------|-------------------------------|--------------------------------|---------------------------------|
| A.M. Peak | 49 | 99 | 50 |
| P.M. Peak | 57 | 102 | 45 |
| | <u>Present Southbound</u> | <u>Proposed Southbound</u> | <u>Additional Bus Trips</u> |
| A.M. Peak | 47 | 84 | 37 |
| P.M. Peak | 46 | 97 | 51 |

A particular reason for the rerouting arises from a change in a bus stop on Fifth Street. Formerly the bus could stop at Fifth and Olive Streets, but this stop has now been removed to Fifth Street and Grand Avenue, which causes an uphill walk of one

and one-half blocks for passengers using those facilities. As a result of this change, which was ordered by the Department of Public Utilities and Transportation of the City of Los Angeles because of crowded conditions at the former stop, many protests have been received. Applicant believes the proposed reroutings to Hill Street and Spring Street will remedy this situation.

A second witness for applicant presented testimony as to the results of a poll which the company took regarding the results of the proposed changes. As to Line 75, this poll indicated that of a total of 7,664 people who answered questionnaires, 42 per cent preferred the changes and 43 per cent opposed them, while 15 per cent indicated no preference. On Line 93, of 2,205 people who answered questionnaires, 58 per cent preferred the change, 31 per cent opposed it, and 11 per cent indicated no preference. Concerning the fact that the poll of Line 75 indicated a greater number of people opposing than favoring the changes, the applicant's witnesses testified that in their opinion the 15 per cent who indicated no preference were riders who would favor the change.

Evidence was also presented relative to running times of the present and proposed routes and studies as to destination checks for passengers using the three branches of Line 75. One of the principal reasons for rerouting Line 75 was stated to be that an operation along Spring Street would serve the rapidly growing Civic Center. It was conceded that this operation would be competitive with Los Angeles Transit Lines on Spring Street in that it might compete for the short-haul passengers using public transportation in that area. In this connection, applicant is willing to accept a restriction against transporting local passengers on Spring Street between Temple Street and Olympic Boulevard. However, in the opinion of company witnesses such a restriction would be practically

unenforceable. The applicant's witnesses conceded that the proposed reroutings, particularly the changes to Spring Street, would result in some loss in revenue to Los Angeles Transit Lines, and in this connection presented Exhibit 11 which estimated this diversion would amount to \$33,607 annually.

Presentation of Los Angeles Transit Lines

In opposition to this proposal the Los Angeles Transit Lines presented testimony to the effect that the present motor coach operations of Metropolitan Coach Lines are not as inconvenient as the rail operations which they replaced. Previously the rail passengers all were deposited at the subway terminal at Fifth and Olive Streets. Under the present arrangements there are several stops in the downtown area. It was further testified that the reroutings would inconvenience passengers whose destinations were in any area west of Hill Street, and that under present arrangements passengers can reach the Civic Center by transferring to the lines of Los Angeles Transit Lines. A map of the transfer points was introduced in evidence, as well as a study of travel times in connection with these routes.

The principal contention of Los Angeles Transit Lines was that the proposed reroutings would result in loss of revenue to that company. This loss in revenue, in the opinion of witnesses for this company, would result primarily from the operations along Spring Street and would amount to approximately \$163,498 annually.

Public Witness Testimony

In support of the application various witnesses who work in the Civic Center area testified. These witnesses were almost unanimous in pointing out the difficulties they encounter under the present routings. Once they disembark from one of the present stops of Metropolitan Coach Lines it is necessary for them to either walk several blocks to reach the Civic Center or to transfer to other

lines. Transfer arrangements are not satisfactory since they entail waits and the use of crowded vehicles. Likewise it was testified that some of the present stops of Metropolitan Coach Lines are on hills and it is very difficult for some of the passengers to walk up the hills to these stops.

The public relations director of the Disabled American Veterans testified that many members of that organization must come into the various veteran centers in Los Angeles for medical treatment. He stated that the proposed routings would better serve these passengers.

A deputy chief of police of the City of Los Angeles favored the proposed reroutings in order to avoid certain crowded traffic conditions on the present routes. A representative of the Department of Traffic of the City of Los Angeles also favored these proposed reroutings and was of the opinion that certain streets now being used by applicant, particularly Fifth Street, were too crowded. It was suggested that the proposed routings along Spring and Hill Streets would divert the bus traffic to less crowded streets. A director of planning of the City of Burbank submitted a resolution by the City Council of that city supporting the proposed reroutings so as to better serve the people who use these facilities from the Burbank area.

In opposition to the proposal, representatives of three large downtown churches presented testimony to the effect that the present routings better serve their membership. Likewise, the president of a chain of cafeterias in the downtown area testified that the present routings are better for the majority of people in Los Angeles. This testimony was supported by a representative of a large movie theater, and a representative of a large office building. Additional testimony in opposition to these reroutings was along the

lines that the reroutings would cause congestion. A representative of the Grand Central Public Market stated that the rerouting would increase traffic on Hill Street, from which street the market receives its deliveries. The director of public relations of the California Institute of Social Welfare opposed the reroutings on the grounds that most of the members of this institute are people who must use public transportation and their destinations are more convenient to the present routing. A representative of the transportation union which represents all of the bus drivers, maintenance people and certain other employees of Los Angeles Transit Lines, likewise testified in opposition to the proposal.

The Position of the Board of Public Utilities and Transportation of the City of Los Angeles

A representative of the Board of Public Utilities and Transportation of the City of Los Angeles presented a resolution from the city Board of Public Utilities and Transportation favoring the proposed rerouting. This resolution was reached after public hearings held by this Board, and sets out that the reroutings will materially improve traffic conditions and will benefit more transit riders than does the present service. The witness for this department also presented a study relative to the problem, which study points out the importance of transportation to the Civic Center. It contains destination checks of transit riders and a comparison of bus speeds on the present and proposed routes. It also indicates that the rerouting will improve the existing crowded traffic conditions.

Conclusions and Findings

A consideration of all of the evidence in this matter leads us to conclude, and we now find, that the proposed rerouting of Line 93 is in the public interest and accordingly will be granted.

The principal contest is related to the proposed rerouting of Line 75. We are aware of the position of Los Angeles Transit Lines that a rerouting of this line will result in some diversion of traffic. However, we do not believe this diversion will be as great as estimated by that company but will be more in line with the estimate of applicant. In addition, we cannot agree with the contention of Los Angeles Transit Lines that these reroutings will result in a conflict between the two carriers as to service rendered or area served.

The evidence in this case clearly shows that the purpose of the proposed reroutings is to provide a better service to applicant's patrons who enter and leave the business center of Los Angeles rather than an attempt to increase the local transportation business of the applicant in the downtown area. Such a change is desirable and in the public interest. We are impressed with the position of the City of Los Angeles to the effect that these proposed reroutings will not result in any loss to public transit as such. There may be a diversion from one carrier to another, but this should not be the controlling factor. Rather, the problem should be considered in the light of the public interest.

In considering the public witness testimony, we are mindful of the fact that those who supported the proposed rerouting were in the main people who work in the Los Angeles area and, accordingly, are required to ride public transportation during the peak periods. The witnesses who appeared in opposition to the proposal contained in their numbers a good many people who travel to Los Angeles to attend church, to shop, or for purposes other than employment. Many of these people can use public transportation during off-peak periods and, accordingly, should not face the same difficulties as to transfers that are occasioned during the peak hours.

Therefore, in the light of this record, we further find that the proposed rerouting of Line 75 is in the public interest and accordingly will be granted.

O R D E R

A public hearing having been held, the Commission being fully advised in the premises and having found that public convenience and necessity so require,

IT IS ORDERED:

(1) That Metropolitan Coach Lines be, and it hereby is, authorized to reroute its existing Line 75 and Line 93 between the points and over the routes more particularly set forth in Appendix A attached hereto and made a part hereof.

(2) That in providing service pursuant to the authority 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. By accepting the certificate of public convenience and necessity herein granted, applicant is placed upon notice that it will be required, among other things, to file annual reports of its operations and to comply with and observe the safety rules and other regulations of the Commission's General Order No. 98. Failure to file such reports, in such form and at such time as the Commission may direct, or to comply with and observe the provisions of General Order No. 98, may result in a cancellation of the operating authority granted by this decision.

(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.

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

Dated at San Francisco, California, this 17th day of April, 1956.

John E. Mitchell
President
Justin F. Calmes
Ray L. Linterman
Walter H. Hooley
B. H. Hardy
Commissioners

SECTION 1 (continued)

LINE 75 - GLENDALE-BURBANK-LOS ANGELES-BEVERLY HILLS-VENICE-
SANTA MONICA

- * (a) From Orange Grove Avenue and Glenoaks Boulevard (Burbank), thence along Glenoaks Boulevard (Burbank), Glenoaks Boulevard, Brand Boulevard (Glendale), Glendale Boulevard (Los Angeles), Riverside Drive, Allesandro Street, Glendale Boulevard, Temple Street, Spring Street, Main Street, Olympic Boulevard, San Vicente Boulevard, Burton Way (Los Angeles), Burton Way (Beverly Hills), Rexford Drive, Santa Monica Boulevard, (Beverly Hills), Santa Monica Boulevard (Los Angeles), Santa Monica Boulevard (Santa Monica), Ocean Avenue, Pico Boulevard, Main Street (Santa Monica), Main Street (Venice), Windward Avenue, Pacific Avenue, Venice Boulevard (Los Angeles) (through Culver City), Main Street, Spring Street, Temple Street, Glendale Boulevard, and return to Burbank via reverse of above route.
- * (b) Also, reverse of above route from Main Street and Venice Boulevard to Venice Boulevard and Mildred Avenue (Venice), thence via Mildred Avenue, Pacific Avenue, and continue reverse of above route.

ALTERNATE ROUTES

- * 1. Over the regular route from Orange Grove Avenue (Burbank), to Santa Monica Boulevard and Federal Avenue (Los Angeles), thence along Federal Avenue, San Vicente Boulevard, San Vicente Boulevard (Santa Monica), and Ocean Avenue to Broadway (Santa Monica).

Issued by California Public Utilities Commission

* Changed by Decision No. 52914, Application No. 37503
 Correction No. 1.

EI *

APPENDIX A METROPOLITAN COACH LINES

First Revised Page 34
Cancels
Original Page 34

SECTION 1 (continued)

2. Regular route inbound to San Vicente Boulevard and Carillo Drive (Los Angeles), thence south on Carillo Drive, thence via Stearns Drive and Olympic Boulevard to San Vicente Boulevard and continue on regular route on Olympic Boulevard.
3. Also, from Brand Boulevard and Glenoaks Boulevard (Glendale), thence along Brand Boulevard to Mountain Street (Glendale).
4. Also, from Glendale Boulevard and Riverside Drive (Los Angeles), thence along Glendale Boulevard to Allesandro Street (Los Angeles).

RESTRICTIONS

1. No passengers shall be picked up on eastbound trips or discharged on westbound trips between the intersection of Olympic Boulevard and Grand Avenue and the intersection of Olympic Boulevard and Fairfax Avenue, both points inclusive.
- * 2. No passengers will be handled locally, or passenger stops made, on Temple Street between Grand Avenue and Glendale Boulevard, both points excluded.

Issued by California Public Utilities Commission

* Changed by Decision No. 52914, Application No. 37503
Correction No. 2.

SECTION 1 (continued)

LINE 93 - LOS ANGELES-NORTH HOLLYWOOD-VAN NUYS-VIA HOLLYWOOD

- * (a) From Venice Boulevard and Hill Streets, thence along Hill Street, Temple Street, Grand Avenue, 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 Hope Street exit ramp, thence along Temple Street and Hill Street to Venice Boulevard.
- (b) Also, along Hollywood Freeway between Santa Monica Boulevard and Highland Avenue.
- (c) Also, along frontage roads of Hollywood Freeway between Highland Avenue and Barham Boulevard.
- (d) Also, from the intersection of Barham Boulevard and Cahuenga Boulevard via Cahuenga Boulevard, Ventura Boulevard, and Vineland Avenue to Hollywood Freeway.
- (e) Also, along Lankershim Boulevard between Magnolia Boulevard and Vineland Avenue.
- (f) 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.
- (g) Also, turnaround for short line service by operating in either direction around any two blocks contiguous to the intersection of 15th and Hill Streets.

Issued by California Public Utilities Commission

* Changed by Decision No. 52914, Application No. 37503
Correction No. 3.