

DECISIONS OF

The Public Service Commission

OF THE

COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA

July 7, 1924, to June 1, 1926

VOLUME VII



HARRISBURG, PA.

1926

The Commission is of the opinion, however, that in the determination of this matter it cannot give consideration to this contention of the county, and that the award must be made upon the basis that the guard rail of the viaduct cannot be removed or any entrance afforded from these premises to the viaduct; therefore, there are no means of ingress or egress to the remainder of the property, approximately 4,300 square feet lying to the rear of the viaduct. Nevertheless, this has not been rendered entirely valueless.

From a consideration of all the evidence the Commission finds and determines that applicant has suffered damage for property taken for the construction of the viaduct and bridge in the sum of \$21,000. An order will issue awarding said sum to Robert Letham, and directing its payment by the County of Allegheny in accordance with the order of the Commission of June 17, 1924.

JOHN R. WILSON

vs.

MOSCOW ELECTRIC COMPANY

COMPLAINT DOCKET No. 6351

Electric companies—Service—Private lines—Repairs—Meters.

An electric company was ordered to furnish service to the owner of a private electric line upon the condition that the owner would make certain changes and repairs to place the line in a reasonably safe condition for the reception of this service.

A service meter was ordered installed at a point where the private line joined with the lines of the company and not at the house of the owner.

Walter L. Hill for Complainant.

M. J. Martin for Respondent.

REPORT BY THE COMMISSION, *June 16, 1925:*

In this proceeding an order is sought to compel the respondent company to connect its electric power circuit to a line built by the complainant and to furnish said complainant with service at his house which is located about 1.3 miles from the distribution circuits of respondent company.

The petition of the complainant, John R. Wilson, sets forth that he had applied to the Moscow Electric Company for service and had been informed that because his house was at such a distance from Electric Company's lines they could not serve him unless he, at his own expense, would build a line from his dwelling house to the state highway upon which the respondent's service lines are situated; that he had constructed such a line and that upon application to the respondent, he had been refused service on the grounds his line had not been properly and safely constructed.

The respondent's answer admits refusal of service, but alleges that the line constructed by complainant is so defective that it would be unsafe to connect it with the respondent's circuits.

At hearing upon the complaint a stipulation was agreed to upon the record to the effect that the Commission's findings should be based upon an inspection and report by its Bureau of Engineering. The inspection and report were made but due to the frozen condition of the ground at the time it was impossible to determine whether the poles were securely set or not. In the meantime parties living beyond the line in question interposed objections, thereby introducing other considerations than the purely engineering phases relating to the safety of construction. These two conditions gave rise to further inspection and reports by the Bureau of Engineering followed by a second hearing in the case.

The inspection developed the fact that out of a total of 59 poles, more than half of them could be easily swayed back and forth. This in many cases is due to the fact that the earth was not placed around the poles but loose rocks were thrown into the holes. This could be remedied in many cases by removing the rock and properly backfilling with both earth and rock around the poles. In some cases the poles are so insecurely set that they should be reset at a greater depth. One or two places were found where the trimming of trees was not adequately done and guying is required at several points. It is therefore necessary to make the following changes or repairs to the line in question before it can be considered reasonably safe for use for the transmission of electric energy:

1. That the Moscow Electric Company replace the first pole on complainant's line and own and maintain this pole; string and maintain the wires of the crossing span in accordance with the requirements of the Commission's General Order No. 13, because it crosses not only the highway but lines of the Bell Telephone Company. The cost of replacing said poles to be borne by complainant; the cost of the crossing span to be borne by respondent.

2. That complainant should have the following work done in a manner conformable with proper electrical line construction:

- (a) Go over entire line renewing and replacing material around the poles, properly tamping same. During the process of this

work an attempt should be made to bring the poles into better alignment.

(b) Trim trees between the sixth and seventh poles counting from the main highway. Also between the thirteenth and fourteenth poles around the seventeenth pole and between the twentieth and twenty-first poles and around the twenty-third pole.

(c) Guy the following poles: No. 31, No. 40, No. 48, No. 51 and No. 53. No. 51 is the corner pole, being the last pole on the highway where the line turns to cross the private right-of-way. This pole should be guyed in two directions.

(d) Reset the following poles: No. 31, No. 35, No. 38, No. 39, No. 52.

(e) Go over the line and change the manner in which the conductors are attached to the insulators so that the pull of the wires will be toward the pin rather than away from it.

When the changes above named have been made, this line may be considered reasonably safe for the use to which it is to be put. It will not however be a high grade of construction but rather a type which will have relatively high maintenance charges. As the complainant's requirements for the use of electricity will not produce a revenue sufficient to warrant the company maintaining this line in the future, it will devolve upon complainant to properly maintain the same.

The question has also been raised as to the point at which service should be metered if and when such service is actually established; complainant contending the metering should be done at his house 1.3 miles from the main highway; the company taking the position that current should be measured at the point where complainant's line comes out to the state highway. In view of the fact that complainant has built to the company's line to obtain service and that to meter that service at the point selected by the company would put complainant in a position comparable with other patrons of the company living along the state highway, it would seem reasonable to install, at its own expense, the metering equipment on the first pole of the line. In this position it would be readily accessible to the meter reader in his regular trips along the state highway.

In accordance with the foregoing findings and determinations, an order will issue requiring respondent company to establish service to complainant in the manner herein set forth.