

DECISIONS OF

The Public Service Commission

OF THE

COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA

September 10, 1929 to May 11, 1931

VOLUME 10



HARRISBURG, PENNSYLVANIA

1931

shipped, packed or protected against chipping or breaking. The common brick can be readily identified at the shipping point.

With respect to the regulation that the random loading of common brick be a pre-requisite to the application of Group 2 or common brick rates, we held in *Hummelstown Brownstone Co. v. Reading Company*, supra, and again in *Glen Gery Shale Brick Company v. Reading Company*, supra, that random loading of brick is an economic waste to both the trade and the carriers and should be abandoned.

Upon the facts of record, we are convinced and determine that the rates on common brick, made from low grade surface clay, shale and sand and lime, in carloads, from the plants of the complainants as charged by the respondents, are unjust and unreasonable to the extent that they exceed Group 2 common brick rates.

These complaints are sustained. An order will issue directing the respondents, to the extent that they perform or participate in the transportation, to file, post and publish and maintain in effect, rates on common brick made from low grade surface clay or shale, and sand and lime, in carloads, from Perkiomen Junction, Reading, Shoemakersville, Royalton, and Penbrook (Lansdale) on the Reading Company, from Harrisburg, Royalton, Watsonstown, Mountville Lancaster and Altoona on The Pennsylvania Railroad, from New Oxford (Berlin Junction) on the Western Maryland Railroad and from the plant of the Nazareth Brick Company near Nazareth, on the Lehigh and New England Railroad and Delaware, Lackawanna and Western Railroad, and from Bloomsburg on the Delaware, Lackawanna and Western Railroad, which shall not exceed 80 per cent of the contemporaneous standard or Group 1 brick rates and shall cease and desist from the practice of requiring random loading of common brick, and make the necessary tariff changes to discontinue this regulation.

APPLICATION OF DELAWARE, LACKAWANNA AND WESTERN RAILROAD COMPANY

APPLICATION DOCKET No. 20,358

Service—Employes—Railroad—Withdrawal of station-agent—Public convenience.

Where the only difference in the service resulting from the withdrawal of a station agent would be that tickets would have to be purchased and baggage checked on the train, the latter being handled by the train crew or station caretaker, and where the passenger service consisted of four trains daily and the average outbound passengers was eight or nine per day at the two stations of the borough, application for the change of the one to a non-agency station was approved.

Daniel R. Reese and G. W. Morgan for The Delaware, Lackawanna and Western Railroad Company.

O. C. Foster and B. W. Davis for Borough of West Pittston.

REPORT BY THE COMMISSION, *October 7, 1929:*

By this proceeding, the applicant railroad company seeks approval by the Commission of the withdrawal of the agent from its Susquehanna Avenue station in the Borough of West Pittston, Luzerne County. This station is located on the applicant's Bloomsburg Branch, extending from Scranton, Lackawanna County, to Northumberland, Northumberland County. Passenger service over the branch consists of four trains daily, each way.

There are two stations in West Pittston,—one known as Susquehanna Avenue station being located in the eastern part of the borough, and the other, known as West Pittston station, being about three-fourths of a mile westward. At Susquehanna Avenue the only business done is the sale of tickets and the checking of baggage, while at the other station, there are facilities for the handling of freight, express and milk traffic in addition to the sale of tickets to passengers. It also appears that the West Pittston station serves patrons of the railroad from the Borough of Exeter. The record shows that the sale of tickets to out-bound passengers average from eight to nine per day at each station. Both stations have long been maintained.

Protest is made by the Borough of West Pittston to the withdrawal of the agent at the Susquehanna Avenue station and there is some evidence of record as to which agency should be retained and the proper location of the station in the borough. The only question now before the Commission is whether the withdrawal of the agent at Susquehanna Avenue would cause an undue inconvenience to the public.

The applicant proposes, following the withdrawal of the agent of the Susquehanna Avenue station, to have the station heated, cleaned and lighted by a caretaker, who will have it opened and heated for a reasonable length of time before the arrival of each train and will assist in the placing of baggage on the car. Baggage will be checked by the train crew and tickets issued by the conductor on the train. From the record it appears that the only difference in the service given to the public resulting from this change will be that tickets will be purchased and baggage checked on the train, baggage being handled by the train crew or caretaker instead of the station agent. Commutation tickets to Scranton may be purchased at the latter point. As far as the convenience of having the station opened is concerned, there

will be a slight advantage to the public since the station will be opened to meet all trains, whereas under the present arrangement one train arrives in the evening after the station is closed for the day. Under these circumstances the Commission does not feel that the public convenience requires the continuance of an agent at this station.

Upon a consideration of all the facts and circumstances involved, the Commission finds and determines that the change of the station of The Delaware, Lackawanna and Western Railroad Company at Susquehanna Avenue in the Borough of West Pittston from an agency to a non-Agency station is proper for the safety, accommodation and convenience of the public.

An order will issue accordingly.

READING AUTOMOBILE CLUB

v.

READING COMPANY and CITY OF READING

COMPLAINT DOCKET No. 8003

Crossings—Bridge—Reconstruction—Plan—Apportionment of cost.

An overgrade bridge was ordered reconstructed by widening the roadway thereon and the placing of sidewalks, thus conforming to the highway. The cost of the improvement was apportioned.

Edgar S. Richardson for Reading Automobile Club.

Wm. I. Woodcock, Jr., for Reading Company.

John G. Rothermel for City of Reading.

J. L. Shelley, Jr., for Department of Highways.

REPORT BY THE COMMISSION, *October 7, 1929:*

Schuylkill Avenue is carried over the grade of the two tracks of the Reading Belt Line of the Reading Company, by means of a concrete and steel bridge, at a point in the 15th Ward of the City of Reading, just south of the intersection of Columbia Street with Schuylkill Avenue. In the above entitled proceeding it is alleged that the alteration and reconstruction of this bridge is necessary for the safety, accommodation and convenience of the public. The bridge, which was