

TENTH ANNUAL REPORT

OF THE

Board of Public Utility Commissioners

FOR THE

STATE OF NEW JERSEY

For the Year 1919

N.J. STATE LIBRARY
P.O. BOX 520
TRENTON, NJ 08625-0520

TRENTON, N. J.
PUBLISHED BY THE STATE

1919

MONMOUTH COUNTY LIBRARY
EASTERN BRANCH
ROUTE 35
SREWSBURY, N. J. 07701

350.87
NEW
c.1 (1919)

TRENTON, N. J.
MACCRELLISH & QUIGLEY Co., STATE PRINTERS

1920

E

COMMISSIONERS.

JOHN W. SLOCUM, President,

ALFRED S. MARCH,

GEORGE F. WRIGHT,

ANDREW GAUL, JR.,*

HARRY L. KNIGHT.*

ALFRED N. BARBER, Secretary.

*Appointed February 18th, 1919.

REPORT.

To the Honorable William N. Runyon, Governor of the State of New Jersey:

Sir—The Board of Public Utility Commissioners respectfully submits its report for the year ending December 31st, 1919.

During the year hearings were held in 294 formal proceedings. These related to the rates charged and service afforded by public utilities, approvals of issues of securities, privileges granted to public utilities by municipalities, sales by public utilities of properties owned by them, leases and mergers, both of public utilities and miscellaneous corporations, and the protection of railroad grade crossings. Informal complaints totaling 700 were received. Some of these were of such a nature they could be disposed of satisfactorily by correspondence, but usually they were referred to inspectors to investigate and report with recommendations believed by them to be reasonable. Copies of inspector's reports were sent to the complainants and utilities and in most cases the recommendations were accepted. Where the informal treatment did not result in satisfactory adjustment opportunity was afforded complainants to be heard. Records of formal and informal proceedings are submitted herewith.

The engineering and inspection departments of the Board's administrative force, in addition to affording assistance in determining the facts with respect to formal proceedings and informal complaints, have made regular inspections of the properties and equipment of the utilities subject to the Board's jurisdiction and have reported thereon with such criticisms and recommendations as in their opinion were warranted. Where differences of opinion develop between the inspectors and the utilities as to the necessity or desirability of complying with recommendations, the same are made the subject of hearing and formal ruling by the Board. The inspections are referred to in greater detail in another part of this report.

4 PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSIONERS' REPORT.

RECEIPTS AND OPERATING EXPENSES OF PUBLIC UTILITIES.

The Board requires reports to be made to it annually by public utilities of their finances and operations, supplying to them for this purpose forms so prepared as to give, when filled in, complete information as to finances and operations. These reports must be sworn to as to accuracy by the officials of the company making them, and are examined and criticised by expert accountants employed by the Board. If the details reported appear to be in any respect inconsistent or inaccurate, the matter is taken up with the utility reporting and full explanation required.

Uniform systems of accounting have been prescribed by the Board for street railways, gas, water and electric light and power companies, and these utilities are required to keep their books in accordance with such systems. The Interstate Commerce Commission has prescribed systems of accounting for railroads and telephone companies, and these systems, in accordance with the public utility act, apply to local companies.

As the fiscal year for public utilities is the same as the calendar year the Board does not have, at the time this report is submitted, reports of finances and operations for the year 1919. It is believed that the reports for this year will not show any material change in the general financial condition of the utilities.

Summaries of operating revenues and expenses in 1914, before prices and wages began to be affected by war conditions, and in 1918 compiled from annual reports of important utilities are submitted:

	<i>Operating Revenues</i>		<i>Operating Expenses and Taxes</i>		<i>Per Cent. of Operating Revenues</i>	
	1914	1918	1914	1918	1914	1918
Gas Companies, . . .	\$13,065,924	\$18,487,653	\$7,683,673	\$12,994,815	58.8	70.2
Electric Light and Power Companies,	11,404,044	20,945,861	6,002,555	14,669,891	52.6	70.0
Water Companies, . .	4,844,096	6,242,019	2,364,378	4,105,462	48.8	65.8
Sewer Companies, . .	267,525	306,026	179,515	194,816	67.1	63.7
Street Railways, . . .	19,041,299	23,582,485	12,621,522	17,945,189	66.2	76.1
Telephone Companies,	9,001,801	12,962,364	6,488,021	9,825,021	72.1	75.8
Total,	\$57,624,689	\$82,526,408	\$35,339,664	\$59,735,194	61.3	72.4

PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSIONERS' REPORT.

5

The foregoing shows an increase in operating revenues for 1918 over 1914 of \$24,901,719 or 43.2 per cent. This increase was due to the growth in population, the greater industrial activity of 1918, the general prosperity of the people, causing a more liberal use of utility service, and to increases in rates. If the relation of operating expenses and taxes to operating revenues had been in 1918 the same as in 1914 the utilities' net revenues would have increased \$9,652,696. Instead of this, owing to the greatly increased costs of operation, the increase was but \$506,190. For each dollar, therefore, of additional operating revenue received approximately 98 cents were paid out in operating expenses and taxes.

With the development of growing communities there must be additions to and extensions of the facilities of public utilities. It is not regarded as desirable for rates to be charged which will provide, in addition to a reasonable return on invested capital, large surpluses to be expended in additions to plant.

When additions to plant and extensions of facilities to serve new territory are made upon any considerable scale, it is an approved practice to take care of these by issues of securities.

During the time our country was actively engaged in war, the policy of issuing securities was disapproved by the Federal Government, unless the proceeds from the sales thereof were to be used for purposes which would help to win the war; and the employment of labor to provide extensions, having in view merely the convenience of those to be served, was discouraged by the War Department.

Additions were made to capital in 1918 to provide for extensions to cantonments and industries engaged in war activities, but the additions made in that year to provide for normal development were for the reasons stated much less than otherwise would have been the case. The total par value of issues of new securities from January 1, 1915, to December 31, 1918, to provide for additions to and changes in plant made or to be made to take care of increased business or provide improved facilities was in round figures \$26,450,000. None of these securities was issued except after an investigation at which it was shown that the purpose of the issue was a proper one and

6 PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSIONERS' REPORT.

worthy of the Board's approval. The increased net earnings from 1914 provide approximately two per cent. upon these additional securities.

It is not intended that from the foregoing any deduction should be made as to the reasonableness of rates in particular cases. Inasmuch, however, as it has been charged that increases in rates allowed public utilities are in line with so-called "profit-eering" which has resulted in so much public dissatisfaction, it is deemed advisable to submit the general statement showing the effect upon the public utilities of the high costs of material and high wages of labor resulting from conditions produced by the war.

Railroads, other than street railways, are not included among the utilities for whom the comparative statements are given. The receipts and operating expenses of these companies are not generally segregated to show the part belonging to purely local business. It is a matter of common knowledge that under government operation there have been material increases in passenger and freight rates for all railroad companies, but that notwithstanding this their general financial condition is unfavorable.

STREET RAILWAYS.

Street railways, being the largest employers of labor among public utilities, have been particularly affected by wage increases.

In 1914 the operating expenses and taxes of the street railways were 66.2 per cent. of the operating revenues. In 1918 they were 76.1 per cent. While increased travel and higher fares resulted in 1918 in increased operating revenues to the amount of \$4,541,186 over 1914, the net return was \$782,481 less than in that year when fewer cars were in service and the investment of capital smaller.

The great bulk of the travel upon the street railway systems is intrastate, and the regulation of these utilities, with comparatively few and unimportant exceptions, is not within the province of the Federal Government.

PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSIONERS' REPORT.

7

The condition of the street railways throughout the country has become such, however, that a special commission was appointed by President Wilson to investigate, study and report upon the question of the best means of preventing a menace to the public welfare from the imminent general collapse of the industry. This was done in response to a letter written to the President and signed jointly by the Secretaries of Commerce and Labor, reading as follows:

"The President,

"The White House, Washington, D. C.:

"DEAR MR. PRESIDENT—The Electric Railway problem, to which your attention has been called on several occasions, has recently assumed such serious national proportions as to warrant the prompt attention of the Federal Government. Already fifty or more urban systems, representing a considerable percentage of the total electric railway mileage of the country, are in the hands of receivers. The communities affected are among the most important—New York, Providence, Buffalo, New Orleans, Denver, St. Louis, Birmingham, Montgomery, Pittsburgh, Memphis, Ft. Wayne, Des Moines, St. Paul, Spokane, Chattanooga.

"Other large systems are on the verge of insolvency, for the industry as a whole is virtually bankrupt. The continued shrinkage in the value of hundreds of millions of electric railway securities held by savings banks, national banks, life insurance companies and by the public at large, threatens to embarrass the nation's financial operations. Furthermore, the withdrawal of this industry's buying power, which is said to rank third in magnitude, involves the unsettlement of collateral industries, naturally entailing labor dislocation that will affect hundreds of thousands of employees.

"The return to normal conditions is being hampered and the efforts of the Government to avert strained conditions in finance, labor and commerce are being less fruitful of satisfactory results than should be expected, if some solution of the electric railway problem were in view.

"What the solution is may, we believe, be evolved by a thorough investigation of general franchise and operating conditions in their relation to rates, including service-at-cost plans, State and municipal taxation, local paving requirements, and internal economies that may be effected.

"We, therefore, propose and recommend the appointment by you of a Federal Board or Commission, whose duty it shall be to study and report upon the entire problem, in order that the State and municipal authorities and others concerned may have the benefit of full information and of any conclusions or recommendations that may be formulated. Such a study will, in our opinion, exert a helpful

and constructive force in this critical period of the industry's existence, and will aid in the readjustment. If you would make such an appointment before June 30th your Contingency Fund could be used to defray the expenses, which would be about \$10,000.

"The National Association of State Commissioners has already invited Federal aid in this matter, and the recent conference of Governors and Mayors adopted a resolution recommending Federal consideration of the problem of preventing the financial disaster threatening this industry.

"We propose that such a Commission shall be made up of one representative of each of the following groups:

"Treasury Department or War Finance Corporation.

"Department of Commerce.

"Department of Labor.

"National Association of State Commissioners.

"American Cities' League of Mayors.

"Amalgamated Association of Street Railway Employees.

"American Electric Railway Association.

"Investment Bankers' Association of America.

"We respectfully urge your authorization for such a Commission, to be followed by your formal proclamation upon the selection of personnel.

"Cordially yours,

"(Signed) WILLIAM C. REDFIELD,

"Secretary of Commerce.

"(Signed) W. B. WILSON,

"Secretary of Labor."

The commission appointed in response to this recommendation has the representation suggested, and has held a number of hearings at which the subject has been discussed from many points of view.

The Board of Public Utility Commissioners in response to a request from the Federal Commission submitted a statement of its views upon a cost of service plan. A copy of the Board's communication is submitted in another part of this report. The conclusions of the Federal Commission it is anticipated will be announced at an early date. While their recommendations will not be controlling in the solution of a problem within the exclusive jurisdiction of the State and municipal governments, they should, and undoubtedly will, be given serious attention and consideration.

PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSIONERS' REPORT. 9

THE PUBLIC SERVICE RAILWAY COMPANY.

During the greater part of the year proceedings involving the charges of the Public Service Railway Company have been before the Board.

On March 11th the company submitted, in compliance with the Board's direction, a plan for a zone system of fares. This provided for a division of the lines of the company into zones approximately one mile in length, with a charge of five cents applying to travel in the zone in which the passenger boarded the car, and a charge of one cent for travel in each additional zone or part thereof. A charge of one cent for an initial transfer was also provided for.

The fares proposed were suspended and hearing was held, of which notice was given to each of the municipalities in which the company operates.

Before the proceeding was concluded the War Labor Board made an award still further increasing the wages of the company's platform men, and materially increasing its operating expenses. The company thereupon asked the Board's permission to either increase its existing flat rate; adopt a schedule of fares based upon the zone plan, providing for a charge of five cents for the first two zone miles and two cents for each zone mile thereafter with one cent for a transfer, or a schedule of fares providing for a charge of three cents for the first zone mile and two cents for each zone mile thereafter, with no transfers. The conditions, in the Board's opinion, justified a trial of the latter of the two zone plans.

It was expected that the low initial fare would increase the number of short haul riders and the principle of charging in accordance with the distance travelled had already received the Board's endorsement.

It was not intended that the plan which the Board permitted to go into effect should be regarded as permanent or beyond adjustment with respect to its details, but it was hoped that the experience to be derived from its trial would be of material assistance in fixing a zone system of reasonable charges based upon the fair value of the company's property.

10 PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSIONERS' REPORT.

Unfortunately the plan encountered, particularly upon some parts of the system, much opposition from the public. This was due in part to the increased fares for those whose journeys were more than three miles in length, and in part to details incidental to the method of fare collection. In addition there was encountered the prejudice which always exists to some extent against a departure from a long established practice. Opposition to the plan was endorsed and encouraged by candidates for public office, who gave no consideration to the principle involved, but sought political advantage by denouncing it because of its apparent unpopularity.

After a trial of some weeks it appeared that the receipts were so much less than they were from the fares in effect prior to the adoption of the zone plan as to cause serious concern with respect to the continued solvency of the company. The Board was thereupon requested to abrogate the zone plan and to permit the company to return to a flat fare of seven cents with one cent for a transfer. The Board recommended that instead of doing this the company continue for further trial the zone plan, changing the fare to five cents for the first two zones with one cent for each zone thereafter and one cent for an initial transfer.

The company rejected this recommendation, but upon the Board insisting upon its trial agreed to put it into effect. During the brief period of the trial of the plan as changed, receipts further decreased and application was again made for permission to return to the old flat rate of fare. The Board was not convinced that under more favorable conditions a zone plan similar to that recommended would not be practicable, but in view of the company's financial plight, the dissatisfaction of a considerable part of the riding public, the determined opposition of the platform men to working under the plan, and the apparent impracticability of obtaining under the existing conditions the co-operation essential for success, it was decided to permit the abrogation of the zone plan, and the restoration of the former flat rates of fare.

These fares are now being charged. The Board, during the time the zone plan was in effect and since its abrogation, has continued the proceeding in which there are involved the ques-

tions of the fair value of the company's property and the reasonable return which should be allowed upon the same. The taking of testimony with respect to this is practically complete. This testimony has been given by experts eminent in their professions, called by the company, the associated municipalities and the Board.

A complete inventory and appraisal made for the company under the direction of Mortimer E. Cooley, Dean of the Colleges of Engineering and Architecture of the University of Michigan, and Henry C. Anderson, head of the Mechanical Engineering Department of the University of Michigan, has been offered in evidence. With this were submitted all the field notes and underlying data including the calculation of unit costs applied to the various elements of property. The methods used in building up and applying the unit costs to the various elements of property were checked from the field notes and underlying data used by the compilers of the appraisal by the Board's Engineers and by special experts engaged by it. Experts employed by the municipalities have examined the books of the railway company and its leased and underlying properties, and have testified as to their findings as to moneys invested in the property. An estimate of total value much less than that presented by the company has been submitted by the experts employed by the associated municipalities.

Many hearings have been necessary to afford opportunity for the examination and cross-examination of the witnesses called on behalf of the parties in interest. This necessarily has taken much time, but the proceeding could not have been shortened without the sacrifice of material and relevant testimony. With the conclusion of this proceeding the Board will have before it a record which will show the actual physical properties owned by the company, the estimates from different viewpoints of the value of these properties, and illuminative testimony and argument from experts employed by the company, the public, and this Board, as to proper allowances for intangibles and the methods to be followed in determining the fair value upon the record. It is the intention of the Board to determine and

definitely fix the company's charges upon the basis of a reasonable return on the value of its property as found in this proceeding.

JITNEY COMPETITION.

The return reasonable to allow a public utility upon the fair value of its property must, of course, come from the difference between the utility's receipts and its operating expenses. In this connection attention is directed to the fact that when traffic in large volume is diverted from a street railway to other means of transportation and the revenues of the railway in consequence are materially decreased the rate of fare is necessarily affected.

The street railway tracks in our populous centers are paralleled by the so-called "jitneys," running in the same streets as the street railways and taking many passengers the street railways would otherwise carry. The "jitneys" are relieved of the regulation to which the street railways are subject. Their owners may be companies operating busses seating a number of passengers, or individuals, running for temporary periods, motor cars of a cheap type. These busses and cars are not held to regular schedules, nor are they under any obligation to supply continuous service. They may be operated where their owners desire and withdrawn at any time from any route where operation is unprofitable.

The operation of the street cars must be continued during periods of light as well as heavy travel. Such operation necessarily is confined to fixed routes. The street railway companies must keep strict accounts of revenues and operations, and make regular reports thereof to the State, and a percentage of gross receipts must go to the municipalities in which they operate. Such great disparity between competing transportation agencies does not appear to be reasonable or in the best interest of the public. If the development of the automobile has brought a method of public transportation better than that afforded by the trolley car, the latter must give way, just as the stage coach was supplanted by the steam railway; but the automobile should justify its position as a common carrier upon terms of fair competition.

PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSIONERS' REPORT.

13

If the electric railway is not to be supplanted, but must be depended upon, in the future as in the past, for local transportation, plans should be devised which will admit of reasonable regulation of "jitneys" as well as street railways, and result in the progressive development of both in the directions in which such development fairly and legitimately leads.

In many States motor bus lines and automobiles used for passenger traffic are regarded as public utilities and made subject to the regulations of the Utility Commissions. They are not so regarded in this State and local regulations appear to be far from adequate.

CRITICISMS OF RATE ADVANCES.

It is a matter of regret that advances in charges of public utilities to meet increased operating costs and which, under the circumstances, it would have been unreasonable to deny have been misunderstood by many, and the important principles involved ignored in public discussion conducted in the heat and turmoil of political campaigns.

There are but two methods by which public utility service can be supplied; one, where in the expectation of the protection of the law and the enjoyment of a reasonable profit capital is invested and public utilities are conducted as business concerns, subject to the regulation and restraint which because of their public nature it is reasonable and proper to impose; the other requiring a departure from the principle of the regulated business concern and the substitution of municipal or public ownership.

The policy of the regulated business concern is with respect to our public utilities, except in some instances, chiefly pertaining to water supply, that of the State. Because of this a public utility commission exists and the duty is imposed upon the commission to deal fairly not only with the people and prevent unjust impositions upon them, but also with the business enterprises which supply utility service.

The decisions of such a commission with respect to rates to be charged by the utilities subject to its jurisdiction affect the interests of many thousands of people and millions of dollars

of invested capital and the responsibility resting upon it is very grave. A public utility commission is not a court, but, in formal cases, it must observe a procedure not unlike that of a court. Its decisions must be upon the evidence adduced at hearings and in conformity with the principles of law, as defined by our statutes, and the decisions of the State and Federal Courts.

No matter how much the decisions of the Board may be misrepresented and misunderstood, or to what extent through misrepresentation and misunderstanding prejudice may be created, it cannot, unless it fails in the performance of its duty, permit this to influence its action. What was said by Lincoln in his first inaugural should apply to public utility commissioners as well as judges of courts:

"It is a duty from which they may not shrink to decide cases properly brought before them, and it is no fault of theirs if others seek to turn their decisions to political purposes."

The performance of this duty requires, when conditions justify it, that rates should be reduced to prevent the exaction of more than a reasonable price for the service afforded. The reduction of rates naturally is far more popular than their increase. It, therefore, is much more agreeable to public officials to reduce rates when reasonable to do this.

But increases in rates cannot, in the proper performance of public duty, be denied when they are justly due. Though the allowance of increases may result in misunderstanding and false charges of undue favoritism to corporate enterprises, the public officials upon whom the law imposes the duty of increasing rates when existing rates are insufficient, must perform this duty, disagreeable though it may be. It seems to us that in much of the recent discussion of the public utility question this fact is not appreciated. There are those who urge in effect that the efforts of a public utility commission should be directed, not to dealing fairly with the people and the utilities who serve them, and to seeing that both are protected in their just rights, but to ascertaining what those who claim to speak for the public demand, and allow it without question or consideration of the effect upon the utility.

Such a contention, if it is to shape the public utility policy of the State, can only lead to disaster. Its primary effect would be the widespread ruin of public utility enterprises. After this would come demoralization of service; inability to attract capital to provide for the continued development necessary to meet the requirements of growing communities, and a condition affecting the comfort and well-being of the many thousands of our people to whom, under modern living conditions, the service afforded by public utilities is a necessity of existence.

Rather than adopt any such policy, it would be far better not to continue the present plan of looking to companies in which private capital is invested for any form of public utility service, but provide as speedily as possible for public ownership and operation. The arguments that greater efficiency, more economical operation and a more satisfactory service can be obtained with private ownership, subject to public regulation, have no force if the serious problems it involves are not to be fairly considered and reasonably determined with justice to all, but are to be regarded as something to be juggled with to gain the applause of those who give no heed to their true significance and importance, and fail to appreciate the ultimate effect of ill-considered action.

VALUATION OF PROPERTIES OF PUBLIC UTILITIES.

It has been suggested, and the suggestion appears to have much popular support, that the problem of determining charges to be made by public utilities can only be solved by independent appraisals of their properties and the fixing of rates to afford reasonable returns upon the values of such properties.

It is understood that the word "independent" as used means that the appraisals upon which rates should be based shall not be those made by the public utilities, but by appraisers whose reports as to values would not be colored by the self-interest which would affect and influence the estimates of the utility corporations. The desirability of having such appraisals in rate proceedings cannot be too strongly emphasized.

Unfortunately this has been sometimes so advocated as to create an impression that no such appraisals have been made

heretofore. This is not only unfair to the present Board of Public Utility Commissioners and its predecessors, but if such impression is continued without contradiction it may lead to a duplication of work both costly and unnecessary.

The Board of Public Utility Commissioners has from the time of its creation caused independent appraisals of the properties of public utilities to be made, and has used such appraisals in fixing rates.

The Board maintains an appraisal department, at the head of which is an expert in such work. The head of the department and his assistants have been appointed after thorough examinations conducted by the Civil Service Commission.

In addition to its regular force the Board has employed in important proceedings special experts of the highest standing in their profession to assist it in determining fair property values.

The Board's appraisal department is an important part of its administrative force, not alone in rate proceedings, but because the Board must pass upon proposed issues of securities and this requires consideration of property values.

The funds allotted to the Board have never been sufficient to admit of a force sufficient to appraise the properties of all the public utilities of the State. It seems to us that legislation having in view the completion of this work is most desirable.

We would respectfully suggest that in the enactment of legislation to provide for this, care should be taken to so frame the same that an Appraisal Board, if established, may not be estopped by the language of the act from giving due consideration to inventories and appraisals already made. If a law is so worded as to preclude such consideration, it would lead to an unnecessary and very expensive repetition of work already done.

INVESTIGATION OF PUBLIC UTILITY PROBLEM.

Reference has been made to the apparent existence of a misunderstanding with respect to the nature of the duties and responsibilities of the Public Utility Commission and to the discussion of the Public Utility problem in recent political campaigns. Ordinarily, interjection of the rulings of an administrative board upon matters affecting public utilities into party

PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSIONERS' REPORT. 17

campaigns might be regarded as part of the so-called "political game" and dismissed without serious consideration, upon the assumption that any misunderstanding which might exist would in the course of time be cleared away without any far-reaching evil effect. The social and industrial conditions now prevailing are such that a misunderstanding of this kind permitted to exist and strengthen may result in a serious menace to the public welfare.

We therefore respectfully recommend to the Legislature that it provide for a thorough, intelligent and impartial investigation of the whole problem of public utility regulation, including the manner in which the Board of Public Utility Commissioners has administered its duties, particularly during the period in which rates have been raised to meet increased operating costs.

Such an investigation should be conducted by a commission of citizens of our State who are free from any connection with public utility enterprises; in whose fairness and ability the public would have confidence, and who would be above the suspicion of either avoiding just criticism of the Board or creating prejudice against it for political reasons.

The condition of the public utilities of our State and the problems of public utility regulation are sufficiently serious to justify investigation by such a commission. A thorough, intelligent and impartial investigation of this nature will be welcomed by the Board. We believe it would be to the public advantage and we hope the recommendation that it be conducted will receive favorable consideration by the Legislature.

Dated December 31st, 1919.

Respectfully submitted,

JOHN W. SLOCUM,
President.

ALFRED S. MARCH,
GEORGE F. WRIGHT,
HARRY L. KNIGHT,
A. GAUL, JR.

ALFRED N. BARBER,
Secretary.

You Are Viewing an Archived Report from the New Jersey State Library

Cost of Service Plan.

The following is a copy of a letter written at the Board's direction to Hon. Charles E. Elmquist, President of the National Association of Railway and Utilities Commissioners and Chairman of the Federal Electric Railways Commission in answer to a letter addressed to the Board containing a number of questions referring to proposed adjustment of rates for street railway service in accordance with the cost of service plan.

July 22d, 1919.

PROPOSED RETURN TO AND REGULATION OF ELECTRIC RAILWAYS.

Honorable Charles E. Elmquist, President,
National Association of Railway and Utilities Commissioners,
724 Eighteenth St., N. W., Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR—The Board instructs me to acknowledge receipt of your circular letter referring to the above, and to write you as follows:

It seems to the Board that the theory that fares should be adjusted on a cost of service plan does not differ materially from that of rate-making which is now generally held—that is, that the utility is entitled, after meeting operating expenses, to a reasonable return upon the fair value of its property used and useful in the service of the public.

Your letter states that in the cost of service plan the principal item will be the agreed value of the plant upon which a return shall be made. It is suggested that this is now the principal item to be considered when a rate is fixed. As you are aware a number of different elements enter into the plant value. A determination of the value requires the services of engineers and accountants who are able and experienced in work of this kind. There is no occasion for municipalities to keep constantly employed experts with these qualifications. There is, however, occasion for State commissions to keep such experts permanently connected with their staff. It would seem, therefore, that it would be unwise for the public to be deprived of the benefit of the service which would come from the co-operation of State commissions, and for the determination of value to be merely a matter of agreement between the municipality and the railway company. It would certainly seem to be better for the value to be fixed by the State Commission after a hearing and full opportunity afforded both the municipality and the railway company to submit their respective plans and arguments as to valuation.

Your letter states that one of the witnesses before your Commission stated that under a cost of service plan there would be no need of State regulation

over rates, securities, extensions or service; that such regulation should be by municipalities. It seems to the Board that because of the opinion generally held that municipal regulation of the matters referred to was ineffective laws were passed providing for regulation by State commissions, and that to trust entirely to municipal regulation in these important matters would be a step backward against the interest of all concerned. Even though a street railway should operate exclusively within the limits of a single municipality and an agreement should be entered into between the municipality and the company that the slate should be wiped clean of all ordinance restrictions, conditions and agreements entered into in the past affecting the company's charges or service; that a service at cost plan should be adopted which would result in the company meeting operating costs and in the allowance of a reasonable profit; that the municipality should have authority to prescribe conditions of service, fix rates, and authorize issues of securities, the street railway company and the municipality, being parties in interest, would be apt to differ with respect to details. In such cases both the municipality and the street railway would be benefited if there was a State Board vested with authority to investigate the matter and make rulings which would be binding.

It is true, as stated in your letter, that many of these utilities extend beyond the confines of a single municipality. As a matter of fact outside the very largest cities in the country there are few, if any, street railways which operate exclusively within one municipality. With a street railway operating in a number of municipalities, and with each municipality vested with authority to fix rates and prescribe conditions of service, there would be every prospect of conflict which would be against the interest of both the utility and the public, and which would prevent the development of reasonable fare zones for service. It is the Board's belief that no scientific system of zone fares could be developed for an electric railway operating through a number of municipalities if the municipal boundary lines mark the limits of zones. It would seem that without State regulation and with authority vested in the municipality to fix rates, and with each municipality acting in its own interest without regard to the interest of municipalities adjoining, undesirable complications would ensue.

It is noted that a hearing of your Commission will begin in Washington on August 11th. This Commission will aim to be represented at the hearing. If there is any change in the date it would be appreciated if you would notify the Board as far in advance of the meeting as possible of the change.

Very truly yours,

(Signed) A. N. BARBER,

Secretary.

Reports of Decisions.

Reports of decisions were filed during the year 1919 in formal proceedings as noted in the following pages. The action of the Board is indicated, but the reference to the case and the Board's decision should not be regarded as completing the published record of the proceeding. Full reports of decisions are published in separate volumes.

Volume VI of "Reports of the Board of Public Utility Commissioners of the State of New Jersey," published in accordance with Section 7 of the Public Utility Act, contains decisions of the Board from March 11th, 1918, to February 9th, 1919. Reports of decisions subsequent to February 9th, 1919, will be published in Volume VII, manuscript for which is now being prepared for the printer.

Complaint—Joseph Shanholtz and Samuel Gindin vs. Public Service Gas Company, In Re Extension of Service.

January 7th, 1919—The Board ordered the Public Service Gas Company to extend its gas main on Florence Street, in the City of New Brunswick, to supply service to six two-family houses owned by Joseph Shanholtz and Samuel Gindin, and located on said street, the length of the extension being approximately 204 feet from the Public Service Gas Company's main now in Somerset Street in the said City of New Brunswick.

Application—Consolidated Gas Company of New Jersey for Further Rate Increase.

January 7th, 1919—The Board determined that the schedule of rates for emergency surcharges as asked for by the company are reasonable and may be filed, subject to the condition that the company shall print on its gas bills the following clause: "Less 10 cents per thousand cubic feet on this bill if paid within ten days after the bill is rendered," and also subject to all other conditions contained in Board's report of April 29th, 1918.

Application—New York Telephone Company, The Delaware and Atlantic Telegraph and Telephone Company and Atlantic Coast Telephone Company for Approval of Merger, etc.

January 7th, 1919—Board declined to act as prayed for in the petition, for the reason that the petition as filed presented serious questions which the Board did not have in contemplation when at an informal conference it stated its readiness to act preliminarily and in a definite advisory way in advance of the actual entry into and presentation of a concluded agreement of consolidation.

In the Matter of the Condition of Bridge of the Belvidere-Delaware Bridge Company, at Belvidere.

January 9th, 1919—The Belvidere-Delaware Bridge Company ordered to make certain repairs to its toll bridge crossing the Delaware River at Belvidere, New Jersey, as outlined in the Board's order; further ordered to close the bridge to public travel until the repairs to the bridge seats and to the back wall are completed.

Application—Atlantic City Gas Company for Increased Rates.

January 9th, 1919—Petition denied, with permission to file schedule of rates in accordance with Board's report.

Application—Standard Gas Company for Further Increase in Rates.

January 9th, 1919—Petition denied, with permission to file schedule of rates in accordance with Board's report, effective as of the date of the report.

December 11th, 1919—Petition for an increase of forty cents per thousand cubic feet of metered gas sold denied, with permission to file schedule of rates in accordance with Board's report, effective beginning with the January, 1920, sales of gas.

Application—Commonwealth Water Company for Increased Rates.

January 14th, 1919—Board recommended the Commonwealth Water Company to file an amendment to the schedule numbered "II, (b) Consumption Charge," indicated in Board's report dated December 30th, 1918.

Application—Electric Company of New Jersey and Bridgeton Electric Company for Approval of Merger and Consolidation.

January 16th, 1919—Approval Withheld, for reasons stated in Board's report.

April 7th, 1919—New agreement of merger and consolidation having been submitted, and same being in proper form and all statutory requirements having been complied with, the agreement was approved.

REPORTS OF DECISIONS.

23

In the Matter of Increased Charges for Use of the Facilities of the New York Telephone Company, the Delaware and Atlantic Telegraph and Telephone Company and the American Telephone and Telegraph Company.

January 20th, 1919—Board ordered all changes and alterations of existing classifications and increases in rates, tolls and charges proposed to be made effective January 1st, 1919, in so far as the said changes, increases and alterations apply to the use of the facilities of the above companies for conversations between places in the State of New Jersey, be suspended.

Application—Lumberton Light, Water and Sewerage Company for Increased Rates.

January 23d, 1919—The Board granted the petition, effective from February 1st, 1919, subject, nevertheless, to the challenge of any interested party.

Application—Tuckerton Gas Company for Further Increases in Rates.

January 23d, 1919—The Board granted the petition of the company to charge \$1.83 per thousand cubic feet of gas sold, effective from February 1st, 1919.

November 12th, 1919—The Board approved a rate of \$2.00 per thousand cubic feet for gas to domestic consumers.

Complaints Against Service Afforded by the New Jersey Northern Gas Company.

January 28th, 1919—The New Jersey Northern Gas Company ordered to reconstruct the reserve boiler unit so that it can be used when necessary; operate its gas compressors at all times so that the pressure supplied by the mains in the outlying districts, such as Pennington and Hopewell, will comply in all respects with Rule XI of the order of the Board dated October 17th, 1911; overhaul and start occasionally the smaller generating unit so that the company can be assured of a relief generating unit in the event of any trouble with the larger set; file with the Board on or before June 1st, 1919, plans for a storage holder to be erected at Flemington having a capacity of not less than 100,000 cubic feet.

Application—Cumberland County Gas Company for Increase in Rates.

January 28th, 1919—Petition as filed dismissed, with leave to file schedule of rates in accordance with Board's report, effective from the date of the report.

24 PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSIONERS' REPORT.

Complaints—Mrs. C. A. Byrd and Paul J. O'Neill vs. Atlantic County Water Company of New Jersey—Refusal to Install Meters, etc.

February 4th, 1919—The Board issued a report which will be found in the been charged for water on a flat rate basis, after application had been made for meters, had not been unduly discriminated against, it appearing that the company was not in a position to immediately supply metered service to all its customers.

Application—Board of Chosen Freeholders of Ocean County for Permission to Extend Hamilton Avenue, in Seaside Heights, Over the Tracks of the Philadelphia and Long Branch Railroad, at Grade.

February 4th, 1919—The Board determined that the complainants, who had section of this volume referring to new crossings at grade.

Application—Lakewood Gas Company for Approval of Increased Rates.

February 4th, 1919—The Board disapproved of schedule of rates as filed, with leave to the company to file a new schedule of rates in accordance with Boards's report.

Complaint—Oscar H. Price vs. Egg Harbor City Water Company, In Re Minimum Charge Collected Semi-Annually.

February 7th, 1919—The Board decided that if the company desires to charge the minimum semi-annually it must submit to the Board for filing its plan for such charging.

Complaint—William B. Loder vs. Egg Harbor City Water Company, In Re Extra Charge for Automobile.

February 7th, 1919—The Board held that where water is supplied to a residence and there is in a yard or separate building on the same premises a separate hydrant charged to the same party at the full hydrant rate, a separate charge for an automobile is not reasonable, and should not be made.

In the Matter of the Petition of the City of Trenton vs. Trenton and Mercer County Traction Corporation, In Re Service.

February 18th, 1919—Order of Board dated November 27th, 1918, modified, in so far as the same affects service on the Hamilton Square Line of the Trenton and Mercer County Traction Corporation, so that the same shall

require the said corporation to maintain during the period of operation on said line an hourly headway, with the addition of a tripper car of large type, which shall leave the corner of State and Broad Streets in the City of Trenton for Hamilton Square at 5:40 P. M., reaching Hamilton Square at 6:20 P. M., and on its return reaching the corner of State and Board Streets at 7 P. M.

May 22d, 1919—Order of Board dated November 27th, 1918, modified so that the periods of one year and two years referred to shall run from the date hereof, and that during the intervening period of time the existing special work will be repaired and maintained by the use of a track welder.

Application—Bridgeton Gas Light Company for Approval of Further Increased Rates.

February 18th, 1919—Company's petition for a uniform flat rate of \$1.30 was denied, with leave to file a schedule of net rates in accordance with Board's report.

Application—Salem Gas Light Company for Approval of Increase in Rates.

February 25th, 1919—Petition as filed was dismissed, with leave to the company to file, within thirty days after the date of Board's report, a new schedule of rates in accordance with its report.

Application—Bergen Aqueduct Company, Bergen Water Company and Glen Rock Water Works, Incorporated, for Approval of Increased Rates.

February 27th, 1919—Application as submitted denied, with the recommendation that the companies merge, and that they file a new schedule of uniform rates applicable to all metered customers on a block system of rates.

In the Matter of Proposed Increase in Rates by the Pemberton Township Water, Sewerage and Light Company.

March 4th, 1919—The Pemberton Township Water, Sewerage and Light Company ordered to suspend increases in existing rates until June 4, 1919.

April 15th, 1919—The Board permitted the company to file a new schedule of rates for its water, sewer and gas services respectively, in accordance with the findings stated in its report.

26 PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSIONERS' REPORT.

Application—Stone Harbor Electric Light and Power Company for Approval of the Sale of Stock of the Neptunus Water Company.

March 11th, 1919—The Board issued a report which will be found in the section of this volume referring to issues of stock, bonds, etc.

Complaint—Borough of Point Pleasant vs. Point Pleasant Water Works Company, In Re Service.

March 11th, 1919—Point Pleasant Water Works Company ordered to do and perform certain things set forth in its report, in order to provide safe, adequate and proper service.

June 10th, 1919—Order modified.

Application—Easton Gas Works for Approval of Issuance of \$44,000 Gold Notes and of the Collateral Trust Indenture Securing Them.

March 11th, 1919—The Board issued a report which will be found in the section of this volume referring to issues of stock, bonds, etc.

Application—Public Service Railroad Company for Approval of the Issuance of its Capital Stock to the Amount of \$60,000 Par Value.

March 14th, 1919—The Board issued a report which will be found in the section of this volume referring to issues of stock, bonds, etc.

In the Matter of Proposed Increase in Rates by the Farmers' Telephone Company.

March 18th, 1919—Farmers' Telephone Company ordered to suspend the proposed increase, change or alteration until June 21st, 1919. Under date of April 2d, 1919, the company withdrew the application.

Complaint—Borough of Beachwood et al. vs. Ocean County Gas Company, In Re Inadequate Service.

March 20th, 1919—The Ocean County Gas Company ordered to install at its plant at Toms River a gas holder with a capacity of one hundred thousand cubic feet; arrange the present holder as a relief holder; install an additional generating unit and a larger steam boiler; the work to be completed before July 1st, 1919.

REPORTS OF DECISIONS.

27

Complaint—Borough of Tuckerton vs. Tuckerton Gas Company, In Re Inadequate Service.

March 20th, 1919—The Board determined that the Tuckerton Gas Company was derelict to its duties in not reporting to the Board the failure of the Ocean County Gas Company to furnish it an adequate supply of gas for the use of its customers, and suggested that if in future the Tuckerton Gas Company finds the supply of gas or the pressure maintained to be insufficient for the use of its customers, it immediately notify the Board, which will promptly take action to remedy the situation.

Application—Millville Traction Company for Increase in Rates.

March 20th, 1919—The Board allowed the new schedule to be filed providing for a charge of seven cents for each passage over each zone in either direction and the withdrawal of all commutation (except school) tickets.

Application—Erie Railroad Company for Authority to Pledge Certain Bonds as Collateral and Issue its Three Year Six Per Cent. Gold Notes to the Amount of \$15,000,000.

March 24th, 1919—The Board issued an order which will be found in the section of this volume referring to issues of stock, bonds, etc

In the Matter of the Plan for a Zone System of Fares Upon the Lines of Public Service Railway Company.

March 28th, 1919—Public Service Railway Company ordered to suspend until July 1st, 1919, increased fares, unless the Board prior thereto shall approve the same.

Application—Morris County Traction Company for Approval of Trackage Agreement with Morris Railroad Company.

April 7th, 1919—Agreement approved.

Complaint—J. A. Souder vs. Paulsboro Water Company, In Re Refusal to Install Meter.

April 8th, 1919—The Board determined that service should be furnished to complainant in accordance with schedule of rates charged; that where meters are used for supplying certain classes of customers any customer falling

28 PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSIONERS' REPORT.

within such classes shall have the right to demand service by meter; rules and regulations laid down by the Board under date of February 13th, 1917, must be observed in all respects by the company, particularly with regard to the taking over of the meter now installed on the premises of Mr. Souder; that the charges for the period since July 1st, 1914, should be paid without further delay in accordance either with the meter ratings as they are available, or by mutual agreement.

Application—Atlantic City Suburban Gas and Fuel Company for Further Increase in Rates.

April 8th, 1919—Petition dismissed.

Application—Mount Holly Water Company for Permission to Increase Its Rates.

April 10th, 1919—Petition as filed dismissed, with leave to the company to file a schedule of rates in accordance with its report.

Application—Bridgeton and Millville Traction Company for Permission to File Tariffs Increasing the Fare in Each Zone of its Line from Five Cents to Seven Cents, and School Tickets from One and One-Quarter Cents to One and One-Half Cents per Mile, and Proposed New Freight Rates.

April 24th, 1919—The Board concluded that no increase was warranted in the school tickets, and that an increase in passengers' fares from 5 cents to 7 cents was not justified, but allowed an increase from 5 cents to 6 cents in each fare zone. The increase in freight was approved.

Application—Washington Gas Company for Approval of Further Increase in Rates.

April 30th, 1919—Petition as filed was dismissed, with leave to the company to file a schedule in accordance with the Board's report, effective from the date of filing.

Ross Miller et al. vs. Merchantville Water Company, In Re Fixing Definite Date When Extension Under Board's Order of March 19th, 1917, is to be Completed.

April 30th, 1919—The Board decided that the time had not yet arrived for the fixing of a definite date when the extension is to be completed.

REPORTS OF DECISIONS.

29

In the Matter of Proposed Stipulation by the New York Telephone Company and the Delaware and Atlantic Telegraph and Telephone Company, In Re Increased Rates.

May 1st, 1919—Board ordered increased rates suspended.

Application—Public Service Railway Company for Modification of Board's Order of September 25th, 1918.

May 2d, 1919—The Board modified its order of September 25th, 1918, in so far as the same provides for a charge of six cents on and after April 1st, 1919, and permitted the charge of seven cents where six cents was charged.

July 30th, 1919—The Board permitted the company to file the following schedule of rates, to take effect September 14th, 1919; based on a zone mile system of fares: Three cents for a ride within a zone mile in which the passenger boards the car; two cents for a ride in each additional zone mile or part thereof traversed on the same car.

October 23d, 1919—Board refused the application of the company to abrogate the zone plan and to permit the company to return to a flat fare of seven cents, with a charge of one cent for a transfer, and RECOMMENDED the continuation of the zone system, with a modification of the schedule of fares thereunder, providing for a charge of five cents for the first two zones and one cent a zone thereafter, with a penny for each transfer.

October 30th, 1919—Board dismissed the application of Public Service Railway Company for renewal of its application for abandonment of the zone system.

December 2d, 1919—The Board allowed the zone plan to be discontinued and the rates of fare in effect before its adoption to be charged, the charging of these rates to be made from and after December 7th, 1919.

Application—Princeton Water Company for Approval of Increased Rates.

May 7th, 1919—Petition dismissed.

Application—Atlantic Coast Electric Light Company for Special Service Charge to Customers Connected for a Period of Less than Six Months.

May 26th, 1919—Petition dismissed.

Application—Atlantic County Water Company of New Jersey for an Increase in Rates.

June 10th, 1919—The Board determined a just and reasonable schedule of rates for water service to be charged by the company, effective July 1st, 1919.

30 PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSIONERS' REPORT.

Complaint—A. H. Higbee et al. vs. Atlantic City Suburban Gas and Fuel Company, In Re Service Cut Off Owing to Rusted Main.

June 12th, 1919—The Board recommended that if satisfactory assurance is given the Receiver of the company that a sum of at least \$25 per year will be paid for service supplied from a relaid main, that such main be replaced and service afforded, the guarantee to cover a period of at least four years.

Application—Merchantville Water Company for Approval of Increase in Rates.

June 19th, 1919—Petition dismissed, but a schedule based upon a proper allocation of costs which will be permitted is indicated by the Board in its report.

Application—Harrison Heights Improvement Company for Permission to Increase Rates.

June 19th, 1919—Petition as filed dismissed, with permission to file a schedule of rates determined by the Board.

Application—Englewood Sewerage Company for Approval of Issuance of its Capital Stock to the Amount of \$100,000 Par Value.

June 25th, 1919—The Board issued a report, which will be found in the section of this volume referring to issues of stock, bonds, etc.

Application—Bridgeton Electric Company and the Electric Company of New Jersey, Companies Merged and Consolidated, for Approval of New Schedule of Rates.

June 30th, 1919—Petitions of Bridgeton Electric Company, and the Electric Company of New Jersey, after merger, dismissed, but a modified rate schedule admitting of additional revenue is approved.

Application—Consolidated Gas Company of New Jersey for Approval of Sale of Equipment and for Permission to Open up "Property Abandoned" Account.

June 30th, 1919—The Board disapproved at this time of the establishment of a "Property Abandoned" account, believing that the amount referred to in the petition should be charged directly to surplus account.

Application—People's Rural Telephone Company for an Increase in Rates.

July 1st, 1919—Petition as filed dismissed, with leave, however, to file before July 10th a schedule of rates in accordance with the Board's report, to become effective August 1st, 1919.

Application—People's Rural Telephone Company for Approval of Issue of \$14,400 Bonds.

July 1st, 1919—The Board issued a report in this matter, which will be found in the section of this volume referring to issues of stock, bonds, etc.

Application—Califon Electric Light and Power Company for Approval of Contract for the Supply of Service by the Hackettstown Electric Light Company.

July 3d, 1919—The Board allowed the contract to be filed subject to investigation at any time by any interested party.

In the Matter of the General Inspection of the Property of the New Jersey Central Traction Company.

July 10th, 1919—Jersey Central Traction Company ordered to make certain repairs to its track and roadway, in order to render safe, adequate and proper service.

In the Matter of the Petition of the City of Trenton for an Order Requiring the Trenton and Mercer County Traction Corporation to Take Up and Replace Its Roadbed on Parts of West State Street, Hamilton Avenue, Olden Avenue and Pennington Avenue.

July 10th, 1919—The Trenton and Mercer County Traction Corporation ordered to do and perform certain work specified in the Board's report.

Hearing on the Inspector's Report, Re the Municipal Electric Power Plant at Madison.

July 10th, 1919—The Board determined that the Borough of Madison should observe the Rules, Regulations and Recommendations for electrical supply utilities and for all utilities owning or using poles and wires, adopted December 9th, 1913, and so ordered.

In the Matter of the Proposed Changes in Rules and Regulations of Tintern Manor Water Company.

July 10th, 1919—The changes or additional rules were taken up separately; the first rule submitted was deemed reasonable and approved; the second rule submitted was disapproved; the third rule submitted was disapproved.

Application—Eastern Pennsylvania Power Company for Approval of Increased Rates—Rehearing.

July 14th, 1919—Petition dismissed.

Application—Eastern Pennsylvania Power Company for Approval of Additions to Property in the Phillipsburg District Made by the Pennsylvania Utilities Company.

July 14th, 1919—Board approved capital expenditures by said company from the first day of June, 1916, to the thirty-first day of December, 1918, to the amount of \$55,413.52.

Application—City Gas Light Company of Ocean City for Approval of Increase in Rates.

July 15th, 1919—The Board permitted the schedule of fixed service charges as filed by the company May 10th, 1919, to become effective.

Complaint—Wildwood Extension Realty Company et al. vs. The Wildwood and Delaware Bay Short Line Railroad Company, the Atlantic City Railroad Company and the United States Railroad Administration, In Re Train Service and Stational Facilities at West Wildwood.

July 16th, 1919—The Board recommended that a flag stop be made at West Wildwood for train No. 435, leaving Camden at 5:40 P. M. on Fridays; train No. 405, leaving Camden at 1:50 P. M. Saturdays, and train No. 404, leaving Wildwood at 8:00 A. M. Mondays. Also recommended that the station building be enclosed for protection from the weather; name of station be placed at both ends of building; flag left at station for passengers to signal trains, etc.

Application—Medford Gas Company for Approval of Increased Rates.

July 17th, 1919—The Board allowed the company to add the following to its existing schedule of rates: A fixed service charge of twenty-five cents a

REPORTS OF DECISIONS.

33

month without gas for each connected customer served through three or five light meters; for customers served through meters of larger capacity the monthly fixed service charge to be increased one cent for each one-light increase in capacity above a five-light meter.

Application—Monmouth County Water Company for Approval of a New Schedule of Rates.

July 17th, 1919—The Board fixed a schedule of rates to be filed by the company based on appropriate allocations of costs of supplying public and fire service to different municipalities and of supplying domestic service.

Application—For Additional Grade Crossing Over White Horse Pike, Amatol, New Jersey.

July 22d, 1919—The Board issued a report in this matter which will be found in the section of this volume referring to New Crossings at Grade.

Application—Hackensack Water Company for Approval of Increased Rates.

July 24th, 1919—The Board allowed a surcharge of 17.5 per cent. to be applied to schedule of rates fixed by the Board for this company April 28th, 1917.

Application—Cape May Court House Light and Water Company for Approval of Purchase of the Property of the Vulcan Electric Light, Heat and Power Company, for the Approval of a First Mortgage of \$20,000, for the Issue of \$7,350 Bonds, etc.

July 29th, 1919—The Board approved the following: Sale of the property of the Vulcan Electric Light, Heat and Power Company for the amount of \$35,072; issuance of \$24,200 of stock which will represent the difference between the value of the electric property, \$31,000, and the \$6,800 to be received from the sale of bonds.

Application—Lakewood and Coast Electric Company for Approval of a Readjustment and Increase in its Rate Schedule.

July 30th, 1919—The Board permitted the rate schedule as filed by the company to become effective for the August consumption.

34 PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSIONERS' REPORT.

Application—Bergen Aqueduct Company, Bergen Water Company and Glen Rock Water Works, Inc., for Approval of an Agreement of Consolidation of Said Corporations into a Corporation to be Known as Bergen Aqueduct Company.

July 30th, 1919—Approval withheld.

Public Service Electric Company in the Matter of the Modification of the Electric Power Rates.

July 31st, 1919—The Board ordered the Public Service Electric Company to amend its tariff filed pursuant to report of the Board dated February 27th, 1918, so that the surcharge of twenty-five per cent. is eliminated from the "Uniform Retail Power Rate" and "Elevator Rate."

Complaint—Eugene Robinson vs. Hillcrest Water Company, In Re Refusal to Supply Service Because of Refusal of Complainant's Wife to Pay Disputed Bill for Services at Same Premises.

October 9th, 1919—Hillcrest Water Company ordered to supply water to Mountain Lakes Inn at Mountain Lakes, N. J.; to charge for all water supplied from May 9th, 1919, at the regular rates of the company to Eugene Robinson; further ordered not to discontinue service to the Mountain Lakes Inn because of any dispute with complainant or his wife over any account for water supplied to the Inn prior to May 9th, 1919, or because of any disagreement with Eugene Robinson as to the amount due the company for water supplied since May 9th, 1919.

Application—Ocean Grove Camp Meeting Association of the Methodist Episcopal Church for Approval of an Issue of Bonds Secured by a Mortgage to the New Jersey Title Guarantee and Trust Company, as Trustees.

October 9th, 1919—The Board issued a report in this matter which will be found in the section of this volume referring to issues of stock, bonds, etc.

In the Matter of the Proposed Increase in the Price to be Paid for Gas by the Public Service Gas Company to the Seaboard By-Products Coke Company.

October 28th, 1919—The Board stated it had no jurisdiction over the Seaboard By-Products Coke Company; that it is the duty of the Public Service Gas Company to supply its patrons with gas, and the Board will not accept as an excuse for failure to do this any inability of the Seaboard By-Products Coke Company to continue to supply gas to the Public Service Gas Company.

REPORTS OF DECISIONS.

35

Application—Boonton Electric Company for Approval of the Proposed Alteration of Power and Lighting Rates.

November 5th, 1919—The Board fixed a schedule of rates applicable to different classes of service, effective November 28th, 1919.

Application—Commercial Power Company for Approval of An Ordinance of the Borough of Bloomsbury.

November 6th, 1919—The Board issued a report in this matter which will be found in the section of this volume referring to Ordinances Resolutions, etc.

Application—Ocean County Gas Company for Further Increase in Rates.

November 6th, 1919—Petition dismissed, but in view of the fact that the Board is satisfied that the company requires additional revenue in order that it may continue to function permission is given to file a schedule of rates in accordance with report of the Board.

In the Matter of the Inspection of the Plant of the Hanover Water Company.

November 6th, 1919—The Hanover Water Company ordered to make certain changes in its rules, regulations and practices to conform to the recommendations included in the report of the Board, and install some protection for the wooden ceiling and roof of the pumping station so designed as to eliminate danger from the smoke-pipe attached to the heating stove.

Application—Public Service Gas Company for Approval of Increase in Rates.

November 18th, 1919—The Board allowed the increased rates requested to go into effect with the December, 1919, sales.

December 1st, 1919—The Public Service Gas Company ordered to appropriate to its reserve for amortization of fixed capital a sum which shall be equal to three cents for each thousand cubic feet of gas sold, beginning with the December, 1919, sales of the company.

Application of Township of Lawrence for Automatic Signal on the Road Leading from the Lawrenceville-Princeton Road, at Bender's Blacksmith Shop, to Rosedale, on the Line of the New Jersey and Pennsylvania Traction Company.

December 2d, 1919—The Board ordered that before the New Jersey and Pennsylvania Traction Company shall operate any of its southbound cars over the crossing of its tracks at Bender's Blacksmith Shop on the road leading from the Lawrenceville-Princeton Road to Rosedale it shall cause such cars to come to a full stop on north side at the crossing before proceeding to pass over the highway; this order to become effective December 24th, 1919.

Complaint—Township of Palmyra vs. Public Service Gas Company, In Re Refusal of Company to Make Certain Extensions of its Distribution System in the Township of Palmyra.

December 2d, 1919—The Board recommended that the Public Service Gas Company run the extension requested without guarantee on the part of the customers now ready to be served.

In the Matter of Complaints Against Service Furnished by the Standard Gas Company.

December 2d, 1919—Standard Gas Company ordered to submit to the Board not later than January 15th, 1920, plans for additional gas generating apparatus, with all necessary accessories, located at the best point in the judgment of the company for economical operation, all things considered; to submit to the Board not later than January 15th, 1920, plans showing such transmission lines either of larger size or in addition to those now in place as may be required to furnish safe, adequate and proper service to all of the company's customers desiring gas service under the rules and regulations regarding pressure and quality promulgated by the Board.

Complaint—John B. Buckalew et al. vs. Public Service Electric Company, In Re Extension of Service.

December 23d, 1919—The Board determined that an assurance by the petitioners of a revenue of \$615 per annum would justify a requirement that the company establish, construct, maintain and operate the extension of its existing facilities as requested. On the giving of such assurance the Board will issue an order to this effect.

In the Matter of the Proceedings for the Separation of the Grades of Certain Streets in the City of East Orange Which Cross and Are Crossed by the Main Line and Montclair Branch of the Delaware, Lackawanna and Western Railroad at the Same Level.

December 23d, 1919—The Board issued a report in this matter, and adopted a plan of elevation for the elimination of the grade crossings through the City of East Orange on the main line and Montclair branch of the Delaware, Lackawanna and Western Railroad Company.

Application—Trenton and Mercer County Traction Corporation for Approval of Increased Rates of Fare.

December 26th, 1919—The Board permitted the company to file, effective January 4th, 1920, a rate of seven cents where six cents is now charged, together with a charge of one cent for each initial transfer issued.

December 30th, 1919—The Trenton and Mercer County Traction Corporation ordered, out of revenue received from said rates, to appropriate annually to maintenance and depreciation an amount equivalent to twenty-five per cent. of the gross revenue received from such rate.

Complaint—C. O. Woodruff of West Orange vs. Public Service Railway Company, In Re Service.

December 26th, 1919—Complaint dismissed.

In Re Petition of the Borough of Roselle Park to Construct Webster Avenue Across Tracks of the Lehigh Valley Railroad Company, Which Tracks Are Used by the Rahway Valley Railroad Company.

December 30th, 1919—Permission was granted to cross the spur track at grade, subject to the following recommendations: That the speed of trains across Webster Avenue be limited to ten miles per hour; that brush and trees on the northeasterly and northwesterly side of the spur track be removed, and that a standard grade crossing sign be located at the crossing.

Application—Hackensack Water Company for Approval of an Issue of "Seven Per Cent. Preferred Stock" of the Par Value of \$2,000,000, and for Approval of a Further Issue of \$375,000 of said "Seven Per Cent. Preferred Stock" to be Issued in Exchange for Preferred Stock of that Amount Now Outstanding.

December 30th, 1919—The Board issued a report in this matter which will be found in the section of this volume referring to issues of stock, bonds, etc.

38 PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSIONERS' REPORT.

**Complaint—Allen C. Middleton vs. Cumberland County Gas Company,
In Re Use of a Two-Dollar Price Wheel in His Gas Meter.**

December 30th, 1919—The Cumberland County Gas Company ordered to remove forthwith the meter upon the premises of Allen C. Middleton in Bricksboro, New Jersey, which meter contains a wheel for measuring gas, resulting in a charge higher than the present filed schedule of rates, and also ordered to remove all similar meters where the same are installed, and to substitute for the meter at the premises of complainant and at the premises of all other parties from which the meters are removed other meters which will measure gas in accordance with the present filed schedule of rates for the Cumberland County Gas Company; also ordered to discontinue the practice of using gas meters for any purpose other than the proper measurement of the gas at the lawful schedule of rates supplied by said company in force at the time said measurement is made.

**Complaint—C. S. Stites vs. Cumberland County Gas Company Against
the Use of a Two-Dollar Price Wheel in His Gas Meter.**

December 30th, 1919—The Board determined that the Cumberland County Gas Company should forthwith remove every meter attached to its system in which there is installed a price wheel measuring gas at a schedule of rates exceeding \$1.45 per thousand; that the complainant in this case should sign the company's usual application for customers taking service from it.

Informal Complaints.

The following complaints were handled informally, usually by reference to inspectors who were instructed to investigate the complaints with a view of obtaining, if practicable, satisfactory adjustment of the same. In all cases where informal treatment of complaints fails to bring such adjustment the complaints are placed on the calendar for formal hearing, if the complainants so desire, or if there appears to be some principle in dispute on which formal ruling should be made.

DATE, 1919	NAME.	SUBJECT.	REPORT.
Jan. 3	West New York Democratic Club vs. Public Service Railway Co.	Failure to run cars of West New York line direct to West Shore terminal while cars on Palisade line are run direct to the terminal.	Conditions improved and Inspector reported service afforded sufficient.
Jan. 3	W. D. Flanders, New York vs. Public Service Electric Co.	Excessive bill.	Charges found to be properly assessed.
Jan. 4	Totowa Social and Improvement League vs. Public Service Gas Co.	Poor quality of gas.	Inspector reported tests and records show pressure conditions within limits allowed by Board's rules.
Jan. 6	Frank S. Macpherson, Haddon Heights vs. Collingswood Sewerage Co.	Separate minimum service charge for each apartment when 5 apartments are served through one service connection.	Inspector reported charge must be made on a fixture basis in accordance with rules filed with the Board.
Jan. 6	A. D. Rathgeber, West Collingswood vs. General Water Supply Co.	Method used by company in rendering bills quarterly for minimum charge for service.	Adjustment of bill recommended by Inspector which company accepted.
Jan. 6	Peter Fleuchaus, Paterson vs. Passaic Water Co.	Discontinuance of service on account of non-payment of bill.	Inspector reported service not discontinued, complaint not pressed.
Jan. 7	Henry Myers, Penns Grove vs. New Jersey Gas Co.	Charge for installing meter and turning on gas.	Inspector reported company within its rights in making charge for guarantee of payments for gas but not in demanding payment for discontinuing and restoring service.
Jan. 8	Mrs. Fred E. Bea, Newark vs. Public Service Gas Co.	Discontinuance of service upon non-payment of excessive bill due to leak in gas pipe.	Service restored and complaint satisfactorily adjusted.

INFORMAL COMPLAINTS.

DATE, 1919	NAME.	SUBJECT.	REPORT.
Jan. 8	Wendell P. McKown, New York vs. Perth Amboy Gas Light Co.	Inadequate service in Coloma due to water collecting in gas pipe.	Complaint satisfactorily adjusted.
Jan. 8	Miss Mercedes Fielding, Ridgewood vs. Public Service Gas Co.	Discontinuance of service upon refusal to pay disputed excessive bill.	Bill adjusted and complaint not pressed.
Jan. 8	R. J. Suits, Ridgewood Park vs. Public Service Gas Co.	Excessive bills.	Charges found to be properly assessed.
Jan. 8	George W. Rother et al., North Long Branch vs. Atlantic Coast Electric Railway Co.	Inadequate trolley service between Asbury Park and North Long Branch.	Formal proceedings held regarding service in general.
Jan. 8	Miss Rose M. Cramer, Glassboro vs. New Jersey Gas Co.	Threat to discontinue service if bill is not paid.	Inspector reported charges properly assessed on disputed bill, which was paid.
Jan. 9	E. M. Goddard, Manasquan vs. Shore Gas Co.	Excessive bill.	Inspector reported company justified in rendering an estimated bill for gas used during period meter did not register.
Jan. 9	Herbert E. Sharp, Turnersville vs. New Jersey Gas Co.	Excessive bill.	Charges found to be properly assessed.
Jan. 10	Elmer E. Royle, Trenton vs. Public Service Electric Co. and Public Service Gas Co.	Deposit required before extending service in Trenton.	Companies accepted recommendations of Inspector to extend gas service upon annual guarantee and electric light service without cost to complainant.
Jan. 10	C. L. Traver, Trenton vs. Adams Express Co.	Claim for suitcase lost in transit between Trenton and Bluefield, N. Y.	Claim paid.
Jan. 11	E. S. Waterbury, Colonia vs. Middlesex Water Co.	Pounding in water pipes, also quality of water.	Inspector reported cause of pounding had been removed and quality of water improved.

DATE, 1919	NAME.	SUBJECT.	REPORT.
Jan. 11	H. D. Lecato, Audubon vs. New Jersey Water Service Co.	Alleged improper charge for service.	Inspector reported charge correct.
Jan. 11	B. A. Levett, New York vs. Toms River Electric Co.	Minimum charge for each meter when more than one meter is installed on premises.	Complaint satisfactorily adjusted.
Jan. 13	A. L. Robeson, New York vs. Public Service Railway Co.	Inadequate service on Union Hill line.	Inspector reported service improved generally.
Jan. 13	Charles Block, Jr. vs. Hackensack Water Co.	Excessive bills and refusal to install meter.	Service supplied over private line; extension of main and separate meters recommended by Inspector.
Jan. 13	Herman Sperling, Newark vs. Public Service Electric Co.	Excessive bills.	No improper charges found.
Jan. 13	Joseph Di Giovanni, Hoboken vs. Public Service Gas Co.	Discontinuance of service and removal of meter.	Inspector reported meter removed through mis understanding on part of the company; service reinstated.
Jan. 13	E. W. Heilig, Upper Montclair vs. Montclair Water Co.	Threat to discontinue service if bill for repairs to meter is not paid.	Inspector reported bill rendered in accordance with rules of the Board owing to meter being damaged by hot water in which case consumer is responsible.
Jan. 13	Mrs. E. C. Reiche, Williamstown vs. New Jersey Gas Co.	Threat to discontinue service upon non-payment of bill.	Error in bill rendered; complaint satisfactorily adjusted.
Jan. 13	Roosevelt Industrial Association, Chrome vs. Public Service Railroad Co.	Inadequate service—overcrowding of cars at Chrome, Carteret and Roosevelt.	Inspector recommended Fast Line car between Chrome Junction and Chrome, which improved service.
Jan. 14	S. Browda, Newark vs. Public Service Electric Co.	Excessive bills.	No improper charges found.

INFORMAL COMPLAINTS.

DATE, 1919	NAME.	SUBJECT.	REPORT.
Jan. 14	L. G. Robinson, Clayton vs. New Jersey Gas Co.	Rendering of bill for gas used through prepayment meter.	Inspector reported bill rendered correctly in accordance with increased rate allowed by the Board.
Jan. 15	J. H. Leddon, Clayton vs. Electric Co. of New Jersey	Discontinuance of service upon non-pay- ment of bills complainant claims were not received.	Inspector reported an error made in the records of the company, which had been satisfactorily adjusted.
Jan. 17	William S. Davidson, West Hoboken vs. Public Service Railway Co.	Fare charged from West Hoboken to Bay- onne 8c. and 15c. to return.	Inspector recommended that a second transfer be issued.
Jan. 18	Jacob K. Shoemaker, Shrewsbury vs. Public Service Electric Co.	Extension of service.	Inspector recommended extension be made upon guarantee of a specified annual reve- nue.
Jan. 20	Vito Mazzacco, Long Branch vs. Consolidated Gas Co. of New Jersey	Extension of service in Long Branch.	Inspector recommended extension be made upon guarantee of specified annual revenue.
Jan. 20	Jacob Adelman, Newark vs. Public Service Gas Co. and Public Service Electric Co.	Excessive bills.	No improper charges found.
Jan. 20	Peddie Institute, Hightstown vs. Electric Light and Power Co. of Hightstown	Extension of service to hospital at Peddie Institute.	Extension made and service supplied upon guarantee of specified annual revenue.
Jan. 20	S. Wilk, Newark vs. Public Service Electric Co.	Excessive bills.	No improper charges found.
Jan. 21	John K. S. Cox, Barnegat vs. Ocean County Gas Co.	Interruption of service.	Governor repaired and service rendered satis- factory.
Jan. 21	T. A. Barton, Maplewood vs. Commonwealth Water Co.	Refusal to pay purchase price of meter owned by consumer.	Inspector reported consumer might accept amount offered by the company or dispose of meter otherwise and compel company to furnish a new meter at its own expense.

DATE, 1919	NAME.	SUBJECT.	REPORT.
Jan. 22	Fred W. Chamberlin, Ridgewood vs. Bergen Water Co.	Extra garage charge added to charge for lawn sprinkling connection on account of alleged washing of automobile.	Complaint satisfactorily adjusted.
Jan. 22	J. W. Rawlee, Demarest vs. Hackensack Water Co.	Delay in repairing leak in water pipe.	Inspector reported leak inside the curb box and line for which complainant is responsible.
Jan. 22	The Newark News Company, Newark vs. Public Service Railway Co.	Excessive rates for special cars which carry daily and Sunday newspapers.	Formal proceedings held.
Jan. 23	Philip W. Hall, Dunellen vs. Cranford Gas Light Co.	Refusal to allow discount on bill received after discount period had expired.	Discount allowed and complaint satisfactorily adjusted.
Jan. 23	Heller Brothers, North Newark vs. Erie Railroad Co.	Claim for overcharge on clay shipped from Long Dock to North Newark.	Rate charged in accordance with sixth class rate, which apparently is correct for said shipment.
Jan. 23	Joseph Teas, Jersey City vs. Public Service Electric Co.	Disputed bill.	Inspector reported error made by bookkeeper, which was rectified and complaint adjusted.
Jan. 24	M. W. Reeves, Philadelphia, Pa. vs. Delaware and Atlantic Telegraph and Telephone Co.	Refusal to allow refund on amount paid when service had been disconnected.	Inspector reported company was within its rights in making charge in accordance with contract signed by complainant.
Jan. 24	John Minns, Audubon vs. Public Service Electric Co.	Extension of service in Audubon.	Extension made.
Jan. 25	Jersey City Machine Co., Jersey City vs. Public Service Electric Co.	Interruption of service and excessive bills.	Inspector reported interruptions due to accidents or equipment troubles beyond the company's control and high bills probably due to low voltage.
Jan. 25	H. L. Graeff, Magnolia vs. Public Service Electric Co.	Discontinuance of service.	Disconnection made in error; service restored.

INFORMAL COMPLAINTS.

DATE, 1919	NAME.	SUBJECT.	REPORT.
Jan. 27	A. R. Calvin, Monmouth Junction vs. Adams Express Co.	Claim for bag of potatoes frozen in transit.	Company unwilling to pay claim but refunded amount realized from sale of the potatoes.
Jan. 27	Mrs. Vanderleenn, Jersey City vs. Publis Service Gas Co.	Threat to discontinue service if bill is not paid.	Company failed to render monthly bills; complaint satisfactorily adjusted.
Jan. 28	William L. Dill, Trenton vs. Atlantic City and Shore Railroad Co.	Continuous ringing of bell at crossing at Poplar St., Linwood.	Operation of bell improved and larger bell installed.
Jan. 28	Forest Hill Protective Association, Newark vs. Public Service Railway Co.	Flat wheels and unnecessary noise in operation of cars on Prospect Ave.	Inspector reported cause of complaint removed at time of inspection.
Jan. 30	Mrs. Charles H. Thomas, Asbury Park vs. Consolidated Gas Co. of New Jersey	Lxtension of service in Interlaken.	Inspector recommended extension be made upon guarantee of specified annual revenue.
Jan. 31	Mayor and Borough Council of Linden vs. Elizabethtown Water Co.	Inadquate water pressure for fire protection.	Complaint satisfactorily adjusted.
Feb. 1	A. L. Smith, Trenton vs. Public Service Electric Co.	Extension of service to two houses at Brookville Point, Trenton.	Inspector recommended extension be made upon guarantee of specified annual amount.
Feb. 3	Charles A. Peters, Ashland vs. New Jersey Gas Co.	Refusal to pay bill rendered after test of prepayment meter.	Inspector reported company allowed use of meter which did not fully register; consumer should not be charged for the additional service after the discovery of same.
Feb. 3	Carl E. Thorbecks, Norwood Station, Pa. vs. Delaware River Water Co.	Excessive charge for damage to meter through freezing.	Charges found to be justified.
Feb. 4	W. Kendall Heite, Blackwood vs. Atlantic City Railroad Co.	Additional train service between Blackwood and Kaighn's Ferry, Camden.	Inspector reported change in schedule unsuitable for majority of commuters.

You Are Viewing an Archived Report from the New Jersey State Library

DATE, 1919	NAME.	SUBJECT.	REPORT.
Feb. 4	Francis V. Dobbins, Rahway vs. Delaware and Atlantic Telegraph and Telephone Co.	Inadequate telephone service between Rahway and Trenton.	Pending.
Feb. 5	Township Committee of Glassboro vs. Clayton-Glassboro Water Co.	Inadequate service in Glassboro.	Inspector reported trouble due to valves leaking, which were repaired as quickly as possible.
Feb. 6	William B. Taber, Fanwood vs. Cranford Gas Light Co.	Refusal to allow discount on bill received after discount period has expired.	Discount allowed and complaint satisfactorily adjusted.
Feb. 8	Westwood Land and Improvement Co. vs. Hackensack Water Co.	Extension of service in Hackensack, reduction of yearly guarantee on same.	Company unwilling to make extension and inspector recommended that matter be held in abeyance.
Feb. 8	William F. Hillpot, Frenchtown vs. New Jersey Telephone Co.	Inadequate long distance telephone service in Frenchtown.	Service improved and complaint satisfactorily adjusted.
Feb. 10	John R. Adams, Woodbury vs. Public Service Electric Co.	Extension of service in Woodbury.	Inspector recommended extension be made upon guarantee of specified annual revenue.
Feb. 11	Clarence D. Levey, New York vs. Tintern Manor Water Co.	Excessive bill.	Bill rendered in accordance with the company's rules.
Feb. 11	Edward Regan, Little Falls vs. Little Falls Water Co.	Extension of service in Little Falls.	Inspector recommended extension to be made upon guarantee of 17c. per lineal foot by consumers.
Feb. 11	Walter Barber, Cape May vs. Cape May Light and Power Co.	Delay in supplying service in Cape May.	Service installed.
Feb. 11	Stokes' Brothers Mfg. Co., Freehold vs. Standard Gas Co.	Excessive rate charged for gas used for gas furnace and inadequate pressure.	Satisfactorily adjusted.

INFORMAL COMPLAINTS.

DATE, 1919	NAME.	SUBJECT.	REPORT.
Feb. 13	V. Sinacure, Elizabeth vs. Elizabethtown Gas Light Co.	Refusal to supply service because of non-payment of disputed excessive bill.	Charges not found to be excessive and Inspector recommended service be resumed upon receipt of proper assurance of payment of future bills.
Feb. 14	Alan M. Johnson, New York City vs. Public Service Gas Co.	Inadequate service in Plainfield.	Trouble remedied and service satisfactorily rendered.
Feb. 14	D. D. Bastian, Riverton vs. Public Service Gas Co.	Removal of Gas meters.	Inspector reported company not unreasonable in requesting the release of meter when same is being used only as an emergency.
Feb. 17	William C. Hendrickson, Belle Mead vs. Central Railroad of New Jersey	Excessive rate charged on shipment of hay.	Inspector reported rate charged in accordance with commodity rates published.
Feb. 17	Emma Grison, Asbury Park vs. Monmouth County Water Co.	Excessive bills.	Bills rendered correctly in accordance with company's filed rates.
Feb. 17	John W. Roberts, Maplewood vs. Commonwealth Water Co.	Refusal to refund full amount of deposit paid for meter.	Inspector reported consumer might accept amount offered by the Co. or dispose of meter otherwise and compel Co. to furnish a new meter at its own expense.
Feb. 17	John Exner, Teaneck vs. Public Service Electric Co.	Extension of service in Cedar Park, Teaneck.	Inspector recommended extension be made without cost which was accepted by the company.
Feb. 18	Hon. Fooder, Williamstown vs. Monroe Water Co.	Inadequate water pressure for fire protection in Williamstown.	Complaint satisfactorily adjusted.
Feb. 18	Henry Becker & Son, Inc., Roseland vs. D., L. and W. R. R. Co.	Refusal to deliver shipments of milk to Harrison Ave. Station over Morristown & Erie R. R.	Inspector reported conditions such that it would be impracticable to deliver cars as requested.
Feb. 19	Walter Zalowitz, Elizabeth vs. New Jersey Gas Company	Refusal to allow discount on bill.	Inspector reported the company was within its rights in refusing discount when bills are paid after the expiration of the time limit.

You Are Viewing an Archived Report from the New Jersey State Library

DATE, 1919	NAME.	SUBJECT.	REPORT.
Feb. 25	Harry E. Eckman, Pitman vs. New Jersey Gas Co.	Discontinuance of service upon refusal to pay service charge.	Inspector reported no improper charges made and complainant is asked to pay for gas which apparently was used.
Feb. 26	M. A. Hillsinger, Elmer vs. W. J. and S. R. R. Co.	Blocking of crossing by freight trains at Main St., Elmer.	Inspector reported condition caused by failure of employees to obey existing instruction.
Feb. 26	Mrs. J. R. Mitten, Laurel Springs vs. Laurel Springs Water Co.	Delay in extension of service in Laurel Springs.	Company unwilling to make extension unless consumers will guarantee a specified annual revenue.
Feb. 28	City National Bank of Salem, Salem vs. Electric Co. of New Jersey	Discontinuance of service, without notice.	Inspector reported wiring not passed by underwriters which entitled the company to discontinue the service.
Mar. 1	J. J. Brown, Carteret vs. Central Railroad of New Jersey	Protection of crossing at Rahway Ave., Carteret.	Pending.
Mar. 1	C. H. Willmot, Cranford vs. Cranford Gas Light Co.	Refusal to extend service in Cranford.	Inspector reported main will be extended and service installed.
Mar. 1*	Mrs. Esther H. Buehrer, Riverside vs. Public Service Railway Co.	Dimming of lights on cars.	Inspector reported no ruling had been made either by the Board or Motor Vehicle Act regarding the turning off of arc lights.
Mar. 1	Henry Eisenman, Waretown vs. Ocean County Gas Co.	Removal of meter upon refusal to pay 25c. service charge.	Company justified in discontinuing service upon refusal to pay service charge, which is in accordance with rate schedule approved by the Board.
Mar. 3	Leonard Keil, Peetzburg vs. Public Service Electric Co.	Extension of service in Peetzburg.	Extension to be made upon guarantee of specified annual revenue.
Mar. 3	Antonio Campanaro, Trenton vs. Public Service Electric Co.	Excessive bills.	No improper charges found.

INFORMAL COMPLAINTS.

DATE, 1919	NAME.	SUBJECT.	REPORT.
Mar. 4	Henry Herbermann, Jersey City vs. Public Service Electric Co.	Excessive bills.	No improper charges found.
Mar. 5	S. Mankowski, Fort Lee vs. Public Service Gas Co.	Excessive bill.	Inspector reported meter registering correctly and gas apparently used as billed.
Mar. 5	Common Council of Pleasantville vs. American Railway Express Co.	Abandonment of express office at Pleasantville.	Inspector reported deliveries would be made from Atlantic City by truck which would provide reasonably prompt service.
Mar. 6	F. V. Laufer et al., Paterson vs. Erie Railroad Company	Restoration of train leaving Newark for Paterson at 3:59 P. M.	Train restored June 1st, 1919.
Mar. 6	Joseph R. Warner, Caldwell vs. Erie Railroad Co.	Inadequate service on the Caldwell Branch of Greenwood Lake Division between Caldwell and Jersey City.	Inspector reported Administration not willing to re-arrange schedule to meet service requested.
Mar. 7	John H. Boyle and John Dulisky, West Roselle vs. Plainfield-Union Water Co. and Public Service Gas Co.	Extension of gas and water service in West Roselle.	Extension of gas and water service made upon application to companies.
Mar. 7	Colonial Realty Development Co., New York vs. Public Service Electric Co.	Extension of service in Glenbrook Park, Hillsdale.	Extension to be made upon guarantee of specified annual revenue.
Mar. 7	John H. Meyer, Haddon Heights vs. New Jersey Water Service Co.	Overcharge for water service.	Inspector reported charges made correctly in accordance with rates filed.
Mar. 7	Mrs. W. H. Suydam, Englewood vs. Hackensack Water Co.	Delay in supplying service in Englewood.	Extension recommended upon guarantee of specified annual revenue per year.
Mar. 7	Mrs. N. Van Wagner, Westfield vs. Plainfield-Union Water Co.	Threat to discontinue service because of non-payment of bill for service to another party in another town.	Inspector reported company not within legal rights; should afford service upon receipt of proper assurance of payment of bills.

DATE, 1919	NAME.	SUBJECT.	REPORT.
Mar. 7	William J. Wilson, Trenton vs. Public Service Gas Co.	Excessive bills.	No improper charges found.
Mar. 7	Mrs. J. Wigglesworth, Bergenfield vs. Hackensack Water Co.	Extension of service in Bergenfield.	Extension to be made upon payment by complainant of excess costs due to ungraded street.
Mar. 10	Joseph R. Warner et al., Caldwell vs. Delaware, Lackawanna and Western Railroad Co. and Erie Railroad Co.	Joint use of tickets between Montclair and stations east of said point for passengers holding Caldwell tickets.	Railroad administration unwilling to allow in interchangeable tickets between said points.
Mar. 11	Miss E. L. Wittemeyer, Jersey City vs. Public Service Gas Co.	Excessive bills.	Inspector reported gas apparently used as registered.
Mar. 11	R. H. F. Kane, Asbury Park vs. Atlantic Coast Electric Light Co.	Excessive charge for power service.	Inspector reported error in charge; credit allowed complainant.
Mar. 12	William F. Kraus, Jersey City vs. Public Service Gas Co.	Removal of meter upon non-payment of bill.	Service resumed; complaint satisfactorily adjusted.
Mar. 13	Mrs. James Corbett, West New York vs. Public Service Gas Co.	Excessive bills.	No improper charges found.
Mar. 15	Hackettstown Electric Light Co. vs. Hackettstown Telegraph and Telephone Co.	Unsafe condition of overhead system—wires and cables causing a menace to lineman.	Inspector's recommendations accepted by complainant and matter satisfactorily adjusted
Mar. 15	Mrs. B. Goldwasser, Woodcliffe vs. Public Service Electric Co.	Excessive bill.	Inspector reported meter overread; corrected bill rendered.
Mar. 17	Butterworth-Judson Corporation, New York vs. Central Railroad Co. of N. J.	Excessive switching charges.	Pending.

INFORMAL COMPLAINTS.

4
R
T

DATE, 1919	NAME.	SUBJECT.	REPORT.
Mar. 17	John R. Jeffrey, Deal vs. Consolidated Gas Co. of New Jersey	Excessive deposit required before extending service in Deal.	Extension to be made upon guarantee of annual specified revenue.
Mar. 17	Charles A. Butz, Clayton vs. Bridgeton Electric Co.	Extension of service in Clayton.	Complaint withdrawn upon work being started upon the extension.
Mar. 17	E. A. Schwerdtle, Jersey City vs. Public Service Electric Co.	Threat to discontinue service if bill is not paid.	Inspector reported shut-off notice sent in error; complaint satisfactorily adjusted.
Mar. 17	Mr. Lavine, Wrightstown vs. Hanover Water Co.	Threat to discontinue service if disputed bill is not paid.	Inspector reported excessive bill rendered due to overreading of meter; adjustment recommended.
Mar. 18	Nutley Realty Company vs. Erie Railroad Co.	Inadequate train service on the Newark Branch between Nutley and Newark.	Train No. 316 restored for morning service.
Mar. 18	Noah Farnham Morrison, Elizabeth vs. Elizabethtown Gas Light Co.	Poor quality of gas furnished by company for heating and lighting—also leak in gas main.	Inspector reported lamps on premises need overhauling and adjusting; that after being done service was satisfactory.
Mar. 18	William Jackson, Atlantic City vs. Atlantic City Gas Co.	Excessive deposit required before supplying service to apartment.	Deposit made in accordance with rule of the company.
Mar. 20	E. C. Collatz, South Glassboro vs. Electric Co. of New Jersey	Extension of service in Glassboro.	Extension to be made upon guarantee of specified annual revenue.
Mar. 20	Lange Automobile Corporation, Tenafly vs. Erie Railroad Co.	Change of gate tower from west to east side of track to afford better protection to crossing in Tenafly.	Inspector recommended change of tower as requested and company advised compliance with the recommendation.
Mar. 20	N. L. Samson, Manasquan vs. Shore Gas Co.	Refusal to install prepayment meter.	Company had no pre-payment meters in stock.
Mar. 22	International Motor Co., Plainfield vs. Central Railroad Co. of New Jersey	Stopping of Train No. 115 at Clinton Ave., Plainfield.	Inspector reported Railroad Administration unwilling to add to present service.

You Are Viewing an Archived Report from the New Jersey State Library

DATE, 1919	NAME.	SUBJECT.	REPORT.
Mar. 24	John McGee, Union Hill vs. Public Service Gas Co.	Excessive bills.	Inspector reported excessive bill due to error in rendering bill which was adjusted.
Mar. 25	Isidor Smith, Flemington vs. New Jersey Northern Gas Co.	Refusal to supply service.	Company agreed to supply service.
Mar. 25	Lester W. Hallock, New York vs. Public Service Gas Co.	Delay in connecting gas heater because gas main is of insufficient size to supply adequate flow of gas for heater.	Heater installed and complaint satisfactorily adjusted.
Mar. 25	Hattie Vail, Palisade Park vs. Hackensack Water Co.	Original guarantee still being paid on an extension in Palisade Park after other consumers were added to the line.	Inspector reported guarantee should be cancelled.
Mar. 25	Alex Warwick, Trenton vs. Public Service Gas Co.	Excessive bills.	Inspector reported tests show meter to be measuring correctly and gas apparently used as billed.
Mar. 26	Charles D. Ledyard, Camden vs. Pennsylvania Railroad Co.	Restoration of "Beideman Station" at 36th St., Camden.	Company unwilling to restore station, which has been abandoned approximately ten years.
Mar. 27	H. C. Weisenstein, Newark vs. Public Service Gas Co.	Discontinuance of service because of refusal to pay disputed bill.	Inspector reported meter readings taken correctly and meter measuring correctly, so that gas was apparently used as measured.
Mar. 28	Charles H. Leonard, New York City vs. Elizabethtown Water Co.	Placing of meter without notice and rendering of excessive bill, due to leak in plumbing.	Inspector reported notice of meter was sent to complainant and upon explanation of facts to complainant the matter was satisfactorily adjusted.
Mar. 31	Richard J. Donnell, East Orange vs. Public Service Railway Co.	Lack of heat on cars in Newark and Jersey City.	Inspector reported equipment in cars satisfactory but crews allowed doors to remain open too long, which trouble has been greatly remedied.
April 1	T. B. Liebstein, Newark vs. Central Railroad Co. of N. J.	Overcharge on carload lots of scrap iron from Rockaway to Wharton.	Inspector reported matter taken up with Director for lower rate.

INFORMAL COMPLAINTS.

DATE, 1919	NAME.	SUBJECT.	REPORT.
April 2	Henry T. Whitton, New York City vs. Public Service Electric Co.	Excessive deposit required before extending service in Bayonne.	Inspector reported service would be extended without cost to complainant.
April 2	Frank Liotta, Elizabeth vs. Elizabethtown Water Co.	Excessive charge for service since the installation of meter.	Inspector reported excessive bills caused by leak in plumbing.
April 3	Alan M. Johnson, New York vs. Plainfield-Union Water Co.	Insufficient notice given and installation of meter refused, because of same.	Inspector recommended installation of meter and company accepted the recommendation, installing meter immediately.
April 3	William Delisa, Long Branch vs. Consolidated Gas Co. of New Jersey	Excessive deposit required before extending service in Long Branch.	Extension to be made upon guarantee of specified annual revenue.
April 4	Walter Howell, Arlington vs. Public Service Gas Co.	Excessive bills.	Refund made and complaint satisfactorily adjusted.
April 5	F. A. Champlin & Co., Newark vs. Morristown and Erie Railroad Co.	Excessive charge on shipment of hay from Essex Fells to Roseland.	Interstate haul and not within jurisdiction of the Board.
April 7	Hopewell Herald, Hopewell vs. New Jersey Northern Gas Co.	Inadequate service due to quantity and poor quality of gas.	Company unwilling to make certain connections recommended by inspector for increased pressure in mains.
April 7	P. E. Reed, Audubon vs. Public Service Gas Co.	Extension of service in Audubon.	Extension to be made upon guarantee of specified annual revenue.
April 7	Ferdinand Johnson, West Englewood vs. Public Service Gas Company	Extension of service in Bogota.	Company entered into an agreement with complainant adjusting matter of extension.
April 8	Mount Holly Fire Department vs. Mount Holly Water Co.	Fire hydrants placed too low in ground for adequate fire protection.	Extension pieces placed on hydrants which satisfactorily adjusted complaint.
April 8	George B. Finck, Elizabeth vs. Elizabethtown Water Co.	Question of water rate on a public garage.	Complaint satisfactorily adjusted.

DATE, 1919	NAME.	SUBJECT.	REPORT.
April 8	Elmer B. Yale, Jersey City vs. Hudson and Manhattan Railroad Co.	Failure to call stations in Jersey City, thus making complainant pay fare to station beyond destination.	Calling of stations is a rule of the company and inspections will be made and any lack of duty will be called to the attention of the company.
April 9	H. E. West, Swedesboro vs. New Jersey Gas Co.	Discrimination alleged upon demand of deposit before installing prepayment meter.	Inspector reported company within its right in asking for deposit in accordance with rule filed with the Board.
April 9	T. C. Wheaton Company, Millville vs. Millville Electric Light Co.	Delay in installing meters.	Formal proceedings held.
April 10	Timothy D. Merwin, New York vs. Pennsylvania Railroad Co. and Delaware, Lackawanna and Western Railroad Co.	Underground tracks of companies at Manhattan Transfer, for transferring passengers from one road to the other.	Inspector reported proposed scheme not feasible.
April 10	Borough of Laurel Springs vs. Electric Co. of New Jersey	Dangerous condition of poles and wires in Laurel Springs.	Inspector recommended trimming of trees and use of special tree wire and replacing of poles which the company agreed to do.
April 11	New Jersey State Hospital, Trenton vs. American Railway Express Co.	Refusal to deliver trunks to the hospital.	Company unwilling to make deliveries and inspector reported nothing further to be done informally.
April 11	E. H. Collins, Philadelphia, Pa. vs. Atlantic City Electric Co.	Dispute over bill for service supplied season previous; company demanding signing of new contract and making of deposit.	Satisfactorily adjusted.
April 14	William Kinney, Ridgewood vs. Public Service Electric Co.	Deposit required before extending service in E. Paterson, Rosemont section.	Extension to be made upon guarantee of specified annual revenue.
April 14	Winfield S. Mackey, Belvidere vs. Public Service Electric Co.	Extension of service in Belvidere.	Satisfactorily adjusted with new company.
April 14	W. R. Paden, Ridgefield Park vs. Hackensack Water Co.	Refusal to place meter in premises where former tenant owed a bill.	Complaint satisfactorily adjusted.

DATE, 1919	NAME.	SUBJECT.	REPORT.
April 14	George T. Musson, New York vs. Monmouth County Water Co.	Excessive bill.	Inspector reported excessive bill due to leak found in plumbing.
April 14	Frank E. Emery, Ashland vs. New Jersey Gas Co.	Discontinuance of service upon non-payment of bill and requirement of deposit before turning on again.	Company within its right in causing discontinuance and demanding deposit.
April 15	John F. Martin, Elizabeth vs. Elizabeth Gas Light Company	Refusal to allow discount when check did not reach office before expiration of discount period.	Company advised discount would be allowed on all bills postmarked any time before midnight on the date bills are due.
April 15	Army and Navy Store Co., Newark vs. Public Service Electric Co.	Excessive bill.	Inspector reported excessive bill due to grounding of circuit and company agreed to make reduction.
April 15	J. H. Borchert, Bloomfield vs. Public Service Electric Co.	Extension of service in Bloomfield.	Company agreed to make extension without cost to complainant.
April 15	Princeton Township School Board vs. Public Service Electric Co.	Excessive deposit asked to make extension to school on Witherspoon St.	Company agreed to make extension without cost.
April 15	Charles F. Rooney, Paterson vs. Public Service Gas Co.	Rendering of bill after payments were deposited in prepayment meter.	Inspector reported robbery of meter and company agreed to change type of meter.
April 16	Francis A. O'Neill, New York City vs. Middlesex Water Co.	Overcharge for water supplied.	Inspector reported company justified in making charge as no notice that premises were vacated by complainant was given.
April 17	G. W. Bristow, West Berlin vs. New Jersey Gas Co.	Deposit required for connection of meter after same was disconnected on account of disputed bill.	Complaint satisfactorily adjusted.
April 17	William H. Morris, Pleasantville vs. Atlantic City Suburban Gas and Fuel Co.	Dispute regarding discontinuance of service notice; charge for turning on service.	Company agreed to waive charge and complaint adjusted.
April 19	A. H. Higbee, Somers Point vs. Atlantic City Suburban Gas and Fuel Co.	Question of cost for replacement of mains rusted and leaking to be paid by owner or company.	Formal proceedings held.

DATE, 1919	NAME.	SUBJECT.	REPORT.
April 19	Adolph Muller, Gloucester vs. Public Service Railway Co.	Failure of conductors to flag cars at rail-road crossings.	Inspector placed at crossing during rush hours and men severely disciplined for violation of the company's rule for flagging crossings.
April 21	Mrs. G. Staats, Keansburg Gardens vs. Keansburg Water Co.	Extension of service.	Service installed and complaint satisfactorily adjusted.
April 22	Mrs. George Schulze, Teaneck vs. Public Service Electric Co.	Excessive deposit required before extending service at Fyke Lane in Teaneck.	Extension to be made upon guarantee of specified annual revenue.
April 22	Broadway Garage, Woodcliff vs. Public Service Electric Co.	Discontinuance of service because of refusal to pay excessive deposit.	Service reinstated and complaint satisfactorily adjusted.
April 23	Borough of Paulsboro vs. West Jersey and Seashore Railroad Co.	Protection of crossings by gates at Delaware St. and Commerce St. in Paulsboro.	Pending.
April 23	Peter A. Kuhn, Lyndhurst vs. Public Service Railway Co.	Objection to skip-stop system in Lyndhurst.	Inspector reported each municipality has power to regulate number of stops in its borders.
April 23	John R. Groves et al., Ocean City vs. Ocean City Water Co.	Right to charge plumbers \$1 for removing and resetting meters which have been disconnected.	Charge made in accordance with rule filed by the company with the Board.
April 24	R. J. O'Crowley, Jr., Newark vs. Public Service Electric Co.	Threat to discontinue service unless disputed bill is paid.	Inspector reported no apparent defects to cause excessive bills which were disputed.
April 26	R. M. Hirst, Philadelphia, Pa. vs. Toms River Electric Co.	Separate minimum charge for each meter.	Inspector reported that charges as made by the company correct.
April 28	A. H. Osborn, Montclair vs. Montclair Water Co.	Poor quality of water.	Complaint caused by backing of hot water from heating apparatus which can only be remedied by changing equipment.
April 29	Keansburg Commuter's Association et al. vs. Central Railroad Co. of N. J.	Train service between Newark, Keyport, Keansburg and Atlantic Highlands.	Improvements made in change of schedule taking effect May 25th.

DATE, 1919	NAME.	SUBJECT.	REPORT.
April 29	John F. Kiner, Mt. Holly vs. Public Service Electric Co.	Extension of service in Mount Holly.	Inspector recommended extension be made without cost to complainant which was accepted by the company.
April 29	Mrs. Charlotte Paine, Treaton vs. Public Service Electric Co.	Extension of service in Trenton.	Extension made without cost to complainant.
April 29	George S. Brooks, Atlantic City vs. Atlantic City Suburban Gas and Fuel Co.	Deposit of \$10 required before supplying service in Pleasantville.	Complaint satisfactorily adjusted.
April 30	Ralph D. Baker, Camden vs. Public Service Gas Co.	Excessive bill due to delay in repairing leak in pipe.	Inspector reported satisfactory explanation made to complainant and complaint withdrawn.
April 30	Mrs. Gertrude E. McCain, Jersey City vs. Public Service Electric Co.	Excessive bill; refusal to test meter.	Inspector reported total bill as rendered apparently correct but recommends a compromise between the company and complainant.
May 1	F. C. Wainwright, Hasbrouck Heights vs. Public Service Gas Co.	Excessive bills.	Inspector reported gas apparently used as charged.
May 1	William S. Davidson, West Hoboken vs. Public Service Railway Co.	Overcrowding of cars on the Bergen line.	Inspector reported additional trips being operated which should furnish adequate service.
May 2	William E. Kastendike, Haworth vs. Hackensack Water Co.	Dispute over excessive service charge.	Satisfactorily adjusted.
May 2	Dr. L. P. Hurley, Hopewell vs. Delaware and Atlantic Telegraph and Telephone Co.	Rate from Rocky Hill to Hopewell.	Inspector reported rate charges differ owing to some subscribers being connected through Middlesex Telephone Co. and others through Hillsborough and Montgomery Telephone Co. exchanges.
May 3	George H. Albright, Elmer vs. New Jersey Gas Co.	Failure to obtain service after depositing money in prepayment meter.	Service discontinued owing to complainant refusing to pay the monthly service charge in accordance with regular rules as filed with the Board.

DATE, 1919	NAME.	SUBJECT.	REPORT.
May 3	B. Lamb, Jersey City vs. Public Service Gas Co.	Threat to discontinue service because of non-payment of bill which complainant claims was paid.	Inspector reported bill apparently due and owing as no record of payment has been made and complainant has no receipt.
May 3	C. D. Wheeler, Bayonne vs. Lakewood Gas Co.	Excessive deposit asked before placing meter.	Company advised deposit asked in accordance with recognized rule of the company.
May 6	John W. Knerr, Belvidere vs. Public Service Electric Co.	Extension of service in Belvidere.	Satisfactorily adjusted with new company.
May 7	William H. Ackerman, Jr., Paterson vs. Public Service Railway Co.	Delay of cars between Paterson and 129th St. Ferry caused by opening of Hackensack Draw Bridge.	Inspector reported operating mechanism of bridge out of repair which caused delay; proper repairs made and no further trouble anticipated.
May 8	William Butscher et al., New York City vs. Public Service Electric Co.	Excessive deposit required before extension of service is made in Woodbridge.	Extension made without cost to complainants.
May 8	George Boyd, Plainfield vs. Plainfield-Union Water Co.	Yearly guarantee demanded before supplying service in Plainfield.	Inspector reported the annual revenue to be derived from the extension would not warrant the Board in ordering the extension made without a guarantee of \$98 per annum.
May 9	Louis Salon, Pennsgrove vs. New Jersey Gas Co.	Extension of service in Pennsgrove.	Extension made and service installed.
May 9	Michael Janker, Paterson vs. Public Service Gas Co.	Extension of service in Paterson.	Extension made upon guarantee of specified annual revenue.
May 9	R. A. Rutherford, West Collingswood vs. Public Service Electric Co.	Excessive bills.	Complaint satisfactorily adjusted.
May 9	George Efinger, Bound Brook vs. New York Telephone Co.	Discontinuance of public telephone without notice.	Complaint satisfactorily adjusted.

DATE, 1919	NAME.	SUBJECT.	REPORT.
May 10	H. A. Rath, Elizabeth vs. Public Service Electric Co.	Extension of service in Elizabeth.	Extension made without cost to complainant.
May 12	City of Garfield vs. Erie Railroad Co.	Discontinuance of train No. 114.	June first train will be operated as formerly which will afford service requested by complainant.
May 12	L. R. Coppage, Nutley vs. Public Service Electric Co.	Extension of service in Nutley.	Service extended without cost to complainant.
May 13	August Herr, New York vs. Consolidated Gas Co. of New Jersey	Rendering of bill for service during previous year when all bills had been paid.	Inspector reported meter was discovered to be defective during the period when minimum bills were rendered which complainant paid and estimated bills were made for this period.
May 13	Mrs. Robert E. Osborne, Carney's Point vs. New Jersey Gas Co.	Discontinuance of service upon refusal to pay disputed bill.	Disputed bill correct in accordance with rates filed with the Board.
May 13	T. C. Weygandt et al., Lyndhurst vs. Public Service Electric Co.	Refusal to supply service on account of overloaded power lines.	Company advised complaint satisfactorily adjusted.
May 13	Elmert V. Clinton, New Brunswick vs. Public Service Electric Co.	Extension of service in New Brunswick.	Pending.
May 13	Henry Benvenga, Asbury Park vs. Monmouth County Water Co.	Disputed bill.	Inspector reported no improper charges found.
May 13	Soldiers' Club, Wrightstown vs. Wrightstown Sewerage Co.	Threat to discontinue service if excessive bill is not paid.	Inspector recommended new schedule of rates and charges adjusted in accordance with same.
May 14	Mrs. C. F. Anderson, Hasbrouck Heights vs. Public Service Electric Co.	Extension of service in Hasbrouck Heights.	Company agreed to make extension.

DATE, 1919	NAME.	SUBJECT.	REPORT.
May 14	William H. Robertson, Clifton vs. Yantacaw Water Co.	Interruption of service in Delawanna.	Company reported interruptions due to trouble at plant which is unavoidable.
May 15	Walter V. Sharrock, Jersey City vs. Public Service Gas Co.	Threat to discontinue service upon non-payment of bills claimed excessive.	Inspector reported meter measuring correctly but that an error was made in placing the meter reading in the ledger and incorrect bills rendered accordingly.
May 15	Nellie Duncan, North Arlington vs. Public Service Gas Co.	Excessive amount required before extending service.	Extension to be made upon guarantee of specified annual revenue.
May 19	Mrs. Ella Althoff, Elizabeth vs. Elizabethtown Gas Light Co. and Elizabethtown Water Co.	Extension of service in Elizabeth.	Extension to be made by gas company; extension recommended over private line for water service.
May 20	William J. Brands, Califon vs. Califon Light and Power Co.	Stringing of bare wires instead of insulated wires on poles near private property.	Complaint satisfactorily settled.
May 22	Samuel Greenberg, Passaic vs. Public Service Gas Co.	Excessive bills.	Inspector reported error in meter readings and complaint satisfactorily adjusted.
May 23	Mrs. William Sickler, Clayton vs. Clayton-Glassboro Water Co.	Refusal to make adjustment on bill for period complainant was without water.	Inspector reported interruption of service due to freezing of service pipe for which complainant is responsible.
May 24	Hodecker Bros., Newark vs. Public Service Electric Co.	Extension of service in Newark.	Extension made. Complaint satisfactorily adjusted.
May 24	Mrs. M. S. Pitts, Plainfield vs. Plainfield-Union Water Co.	Extension of service in Plainfield.	Extension made upon guarantee of specified annual revenue.
May 24	Oliver Kelly, New York vs. Lehigh Valley Railroad Co.	Inadequate train service between New York and So. Plainfield.	Inspector reported arrangement made to re-establish train leaving New York at 6:30 P. M.

INFORMAL COMPLAINTS.

DATE, 1919	NAME.	SUBJECT.	REPORT.
May 31	W. D. Hascy, Clifton vs. Public Service Electric Co.	Excessive deposit required before extending service in Clifton.	Extension run upon guarantee of specified annual revenue.
May 28	Mrs. Millie Satterfield vs. Cape May Light and Power Co. and Cape May Illuminating Co.	Refusal of companies to return \$15 paid for installation of meters.	Deposits refunded and complaint satisfactorily settled.
May 28	A. H. West, Red Bank vs. Public Service Electric Co.	Requirement of deposit before extending service in Red Bank.	Extension made without cost to complainant.
June 2	George W. Steers, Ashland vs. New Jersey Gas Co.	Inadequate service.	Inspector reported company increased the pressure in the main which improved conditions.
June 2	Borough of Fairview, Hudson Heights vs. Public Service Railway Co.	Charge of 7c. fare on Saturdays, Sundays and holidays while on other days an extra 1c. is charged for transfers.	Inspector reported company operates "super-imposed" service which is proper, adequate and safe.
June 4	Stephen Hamer et al. vs. Public Service Gas Co. and Public Service Electric Co.	Extension of service in Audubon.	Extension made without cost to complainant.
June 5	George H. Stevenson, Maplewood vs. Public Service Gas Co.	Excessive bills.	Inspector reported company tested meter and refund was made in accordance with test.
June 5	Mayor and Council of Caldwell vs. Public Service Railway Co.	Condition of tracks and pavement between Erie R. R. Station to Campbell Ave. in Caldwell.	Inspector reported company agreed to make repairs to road. Progress of the work will be kept under observation.
June 6	North Jersey District Water Supply Commission vs. New York Telephone Co.	Inadequate service.	Inspector reported conditions due to inefficient and poorly-trained operators and company doing utmost to improve the admittedly bad conditions.
June 6	Walter H. Atwood, New Brunswick vs. Public Service Gas Co.	Excessive deposit asked before extending service in New Brunswick.	Company agreed to make extension upon application by prospective customers.

DATE, 1919	NAME.	SUBJECT.	REPORT.
June 7	Mrs. H. Bokelman, Hilton vs. Public Service Gas Co.	Rendering of bill which complainant has paid.	Inspector reported the matter was taken up with complainant by the company and satisfactorily adjusted.
June 7	Mrs. Russell, Jersey City vs. Public Service Gas Co.	Excessive bills.	Inspector reported gas apparently used as billed.
June 7	Mrs. J. Henry, Keansburg vs. Monmouth Lighting Co.	Extension of service in Keansburg.	Extension made and complaint withdrawn.
June 7	Board of Commissioners of Asbury Park vs. New York and Long Branch Railroad Co.	Paralleling of trains at Asbury Park Station.	Rules disobeyed by engineer who was reprimanded; arrangements made for further protection of passenger trains by block system.
June 9	Harry Himmelstein, New Egypt vs. New Egypt Light, Heat, Power and Water Co.	Extension of service in New Egypt.	Extension made and complainant satisfied.
June 10	E. J. Webber, Keansburg vs. Central Railroad Co.	Use of commutation ticket to Newark Transfer when same reads Keansburg to New York.	Inspector reported arrangements made with company for use of commutation tickets as requested by complainant.
June 10	John Ruggiero, Guttenberg vs. New York and New Jersey Telephone Co.	Delay in installing telephone after deposit is paid.	Complaint satisfactorily adjusted.
June 10	Stacy M. Robbins, Cape May vs. Cape May Illuminating Co.	Delay in extending service in Cape May.	Service supplied and complaint satisfactorily settled.
June 11	George B. Hitchcock, Inc., Bogota vs. Public Service Electric Co. and Public Service Gas Co.	Extension of services on Tranquillity Road, West Englewood.	Extensions made and complaint satisfactorily settled.
June 11	Clementon Township Committee, Camden vs. New Jersey Gas Co.	Interruption of service.	Inspector reported company increased the pressure on the main which improved conditions.

INFORMAL COMPLAINTS.

DATE, 1919	NAME.	SUBJECT.	REPORT.
June 13	Joseph L. Emmons, Belmar vs. Coast Gas Co.	Rendering of bill for war surcharge for two months when meter had been set but one month.	Bill made in error. Corrected bill rendered.
June 17	Max Westebbe, Weehawken vs. Public Service Electric Co. and Public Service Gas Co.	Threat to discontinue service unless disputed bill is paid.	Inspector reported records apparently correct and complaints satisfactorily adjusted.
June 17	Mrs. C. A. Prickett, Metuchen vs. Middlesex Water Co.	Extension of service in Metuchen.	Complainant unwilling to guarantee specified annual revenue recommended by the Board's inspector.
June 17	Miss Margaret Whitmore, Dover vs. Morris County Traction Co.	Establishment of stop at West End Heights on Dover-Hopatcong line.	Inspector reported arrangements made to re-establish stop so that cause of complaint will be eliminated.
June 17	Carlton Bell, Collingswood vs. Public Service Gas Co.	Extension of service in Westmont.	Extension will be made upon guarantee of specified annual revenue.
June 17	R. Pounds, Paterson vs. Public Service Gas Co.	Bill rendered after money had been deposited in prepayment meter.	Inspector reported that money had evidently been stolen from meter.
June 17	John Bacon et al., Asbury Park vs. Monmouth County Water Co.	Extension of service in Asbury Park.	Inspector recommended extension by company upon specified annual revenue guarantee or installation of private lines by consumers.
June 19	A. J. Mulredy, New Brunswick vs. Public Service Gas Co.	Excessive deposit asked before extending service in New Brunswick.	Extension made without cost to complainant.
June 19	William A. Sullivan et al. vs. Public Service Electric Co.	Extension of service in Farnerville in Burlington.	Company agreed to make extension provided they were assured of seventeen consumers.
June 19	Charles H. Parker et al. vs. Monmouth County Water Co.	Extension of service in Asbury Park.	Pending.

You Are Viewing an Archived Report from the New Jersey State Library

DATE, 1919	NAME.	SUBJECT.	REPORT.
June 19	John B. Stratton, Mt. Royal vs. Electric Co. of New Jersey	Extensions of service to residents in East Greenwich Twp.	Inspector reported company had made arrangements for service connections to individual consumers.
June 19	J. I. Hendrickson, Magnolia vs. Public Service Electric Co.	Extension of service in Magnolia.	Extension made without cost to complainant.
June 20	C. H. Voorhees, Elizabeth vs. Elizabethtown Water Co.	Extension of service in Union.	Extension made and complaint satisfactorily adjusted.
June 20	James A. Brown, Cape May vs. Cape May Light and Power Co.	Requirement of deposit from owner of premises.	Service rendered without cost to complainant.
June 21	Charles L. Wallace, Riverside vs. Public Service Electric Co.	Extension of service in Riverside.	Extension made upon guarantee of specified annual revenue.
June 23	Charles H. Wortham, Parry vs. Riverton and Palmyra Water Co.	Extension of service in Parry.	Inspector recommended extension be made upon guarantee of specified annual revenue.
June 23	Numerous property owners of Lodi Township vs. Hackensack Water Co.	Extension of water service for drinking and fire protection.	Extension to be made upon guarantee of specified annual revenue.
June 23	Charles Thatcher, Belmar vs. Coast Gas Co.	Threat to discontinue service upon refusal to pay disputed bill.	Inspector recommended adjustment of bill in accordance with conditions prevailing on premises and complaint was so adjusted.
June 24	New Point Comfort Property Owners' Association vs. Standard Gas Co.	Inadequate service and failure to repair meters.	Additional facilities to be installed to improve service; new meters purchased and will now be installed promptly.
June 25	Dora Van Horn Murray et al., Trenton vs. Public Service Gas Co.	Extension of service in Trenton.	Extension made upon guarantee of specified annual revenue.

INFORMAL COMPLAINTS.

DATE, 1919	NAME.	SUBJECT.	REPORT.
June 25	J. Rearden, Teaneck vs. Public Service Electric Co.	Extension of service in Teaneck.	Extension made without cost to complainant.
June 25	Miss Mary E. McVoy, Westfield vs. Public Service Gas Co.	Refusal to return deposit but demand that deposit be transferred to new address.	Upon promise of payment of balance due and prompt payment of current bills the company returned deposit.
June 25	H. H. Lenthe, New York vs. Atlantic Coast Electric Light Co.	Delay in extending service in Asbury Park after deposit has been made.	Delay due to inability to locate premises.
June 26	J. C. Weniger, Metuchen vs. Public Service Electric Co.	Extension of service in Metuchen.	Extension made without cost to complainant.
June 26	Linwood Company, Newark vs. Public Service Electric Co.	Excessive deposit asked before extending service.	Extension made without cost to complainant.
June 26	P. Mode, Ridgewood vs. Bergen Aqueduct Co.	Rates for garage and sprinkler service charged when no connection for such service is made.	Inspector reported such practice not authorized by the Board when no rate filed with the Board provides for such a charge.
June 27	Charles Fox, Trenton vs. Public Service Electric Co.	Deposit required before extending service in Trenton.	Inspector recommended extension be made upon guarantee of a specified annual revenue.
June 27	E. H. Bauzenberger, Pitman vs. Electric Co. of New Jersey	Additional deposit required because complainant lost receipt for deposits.	Complaint satisfactorily adjusted.
June 30	Carlton R. Priest, Bayhead vs. American Railway Express Co.	Failure to deliver packages from station without charge.	Service re-established.
June 30	Borough of Woodbury Heights vs. New Jersey Gas Co.	Inadequate service.	Inspector recommended that lights be overhauled and new mantles placed where necessary which the company agreed to do.
June 30	William C. McCarthy, Millville vs. Cumberland County Gas Co.	Collection of service charge in advance for full year.	Not in accordance with the Board's finding allowing a service charge and the company agreed to discontinue same.

DATE, 1919	NAME.	SUBJECT.	REPORT.
June 30	N. C. Davis, Perth Amboy vs. Perth Amboy Gas Light Co.	Excessive bill.	Inspector reported gas apparently used as measured by meter and billed to complainant.
July 1	Morsemere League vs. Public Service Railway Co.	Inadequate service due to cars on Englewood Express line not stopping at Delia Boulevard.	Inspector reported present service adequate and proper.
July 1	L. M. Cowles, Paterson vs. Public Service Gas Co.	Excessive bills.	Inspector reported gas apparently used as billed by the company.
July 1	John A. Baldwin, Inc. vs. Public Service Electric Co.	Extension of service in Ridgefield Park.	Extension of service made without cost to customers.
July 2	Edwin Betts, Dr., Newark vs. Proprietors Morris Aqueduct	Extension of service in Morris Plains.	Company agreed to make extension from main to curb and consumer must make same from curb to premises in accordance with rules of Board.
July 2	George G. Dutton, Penns Grove vs. New Jersey Gas Co. and Electric Co. of New Jersey	Extension of service in Penns Grove.	Service installed.
July 2	Salvation Army, New York vs. Wrightstown Sewerage Co.	Excessive rent for sewerage connections at Camp Dix.	Inspector recommended new schedule of rates and charges adjusted in accordance with same.
July 2	T. B. Liebstein, Newark vs. Pennsylvania Railroad Co.	Minimum rate on carload of scrap iron from Riverside Steel Casting Co., Newark, to Alling St. yard, Newark.	Inspector reported rate charged correctly.
July 3	Charles S. King, Camden vs. Laurel Springs Water Supply Co.	Threat to discontinue service if disputed bill is not paid.	Service re-instated and meter installed.
July 3	Acme Realty Company, Plainfield, vs. Plainfield-Union Water Co.	Requiring a deposit of \$25 for installation of meter.	Inspector reported company within its rights in asking deposit but must pay interest on same.

INFORMAL COMPLAINTS.

DATE, 1919	NAME.	SUBJECT.	REPORT.
July 3	Mrs. Mary Clark, Cape May vs. Cape May Illuminating Co.	Extension of service in Cape May.	Formal proceedings held.
July 5	Mrs. Elitine F. O. McKell, Asbury Park vs. Monmouth County Water Co.	Excessive bill.	Inspector reported excessive bill due to robbery and cutting of pipes in premises while complainant was away.
July 5	Mrs. H. M. Apgar, Plainfield vs. Public Service Electric Co.	Extension of service in Dunellen.	Extension made without cost to complainant.
July 7	George D. Gietjen, Hasbrouck Heights vs. Public Service Electric Co.	Extension of service in Hasbrouck Hts.	Extension made upon guarantee of specified annual revenue.
July 8	Mrs. J. Schumacher et al., Teaneck vs. Bogota Water and Light Co.	Extension of mains; water service cut off through improvements being made by railroad Co.	Extension made and service supplied upon specified yearly revenue being guaranteed.
July 9	William L. Cobb, Newark, vs. Coast Gas Co.	Discontinuance of service because of refusal to pay service charge during period house was closed.	Charge made for service as no notice was given that that service should be discontinued.
July 10	C. O. Woodruff, West Orange vs. Public Service Railway Co.	Extra charge of 1c. for a transfer from P. S. Terminal Bldg. in Newark to Penna. R. R. station.	Formal proceedings held.
July 10	Spranz Embroidery Works, Guttenberg vs. New York Telephone Co.	Delay in supplying service after contract had been signed.	Service installed and complaint withdrawn.
July 11	Mark Reynolds, Mt. Holly vs. Public Service Electric Co.	Extension of service in Mt. Holly.	Extension made upon guaranteed specified annual revenue.
July 11	William A. Kiernan, Newark vs. Public Service Electric Co.	Extension of service in Newark.	Extension made without cost to complainant.
July 11	Charles Koch, Belford vs. Monmouth Lighting Co.	Extension of service in Belford.	Extension made without cost to complainant.

DATE, 1919	NAME.	SUBJECT.	REPORT.
July 11	George Kenderes, Audubon vs. Public Service Electric Co.	Extension of service in Audubon.	Extension made without cost to complainant.
July 12	Magnolia Civic and Improvement Association vs. New Jersey Gas Co.	Inadequate service.	Pending.
July 12	E. Bowcock et al., Toms River vs. Toms River Water Co.	Extension of service in Toms River.	Company unwilling to make extension upon recommendation of inspector.
July 14	Mrs. G. N. Gasau, Jersey City vs. Public Service Electric Co.	Threat to discontinue service.	Notice of discontinuance sent in error.
July 16	W. H. Hagerman, Pitman vs. New Jersey Gas Co.	In re collection of service charge every three weeks instead of once a month.	Company reported service charge collected but once a month regardless of previous date of collection.
July 16	Mrs. Martha Wilson, Keyport vs. Monmouth Lighting Co.	Extension of service in Keyport.	Company unwilling to make extension unless specified annual revenue for five years is deposited.
July 16	Mrs. L. Hasbrouck, Highlands vs. Standard Gas Co.	Inadequate service.	Inspector reported poor service due to stoppage in main which was remedied by the company.
July 16	Mrs. L. Hasbrouck, Highlands vs. Standard Gas Co.	Inadequate service.	Inspector reported inadequate service due to stoppage in pipe which the company has remedied to satisfaction of complainant.
July 16	J. Jackson, Bergenfield vs. Public Service Electric Co.	Extension of service in Bergenfield.	Extension made without cost to complainant.
July 17	Frederick Siman, Elizabeth vs. Public Service Electric Co.	Extension of service in Roselle.	Extension made without cost to complainant.
July 17	John Matthews, New York vs. Public Service Electric Co.	Extension of service in Elmora.	Extension run without cost to complainant.

INFORMAL COMPLAINTS.

DATE, 1919	NAME.	SUBJECT.	REPORT.
July 18	Joseph A. Berk, Metuchen vs. Public Service Electric Co.	Extension of service in Metuchen.	Extension made without cost to complainant.
July 18	Borough of Highlands vs. Monmouth Lighting Co.	Excessive deposit demanded before extending service for street lights on Linden Ave.	Inspector reported company willing to make extension if financed by the borough and covered by the company's note.
July 18	Mrs. C. A. Esser, Dumont vs. Public Service Electric Co.	Extension of service in Dumont.	Extension made without cost to complainant.
July 19	Dinnebeil Brothers, Inc., Metuchen vs. Public Service Electric Co.	Extension of service in Metuchen.	Extension of service without cost to complainant.
July 22	Dorsett's Sanitary Laundry, Toms River vs. American Railway Express Co.	Refusal to make deliveries to laundry in Toms River.	Inspector recommended delivery during summer months and the company agreed to consider same in the spring.
July 22	Damon Tyrell, Perth Amboy vs. Public Service Electric Co.	Refusal of company to return deposit made in connection with extension of service.	Inspector reported complaint not warranted.
July 22	Leroy Hollinshed, Delair vs. Public Service Gas Co.	Placing of quarter in prepayment meter and company changing meter before allotment was used.	Inspector reported meter did not shut off supply of gas when amount paid for had been consumed.
July 22	R. P. Bates, New York vs. Hillcrest Water Co.	Refusal to bill tenant for water—company holding property owner responsible for all bills.	Inspector reported owner responsible when tenant is merely for a summer occupant.
July 22	A. J. Strickland, Dumont vs. Public Service Gas Co. and Public Service Electric Co.	Extension of service in Dumont.	Company agreed to make extension but was delayed owing to certain materials being lacking.
July 23	F. W. Harold, Montclair vs. Hudson and Manhattan Railroad Co.	Train service between Hoboken and 33rd St.	Inspector reported company appreciates fact that additional cars are needed but conditions cannot be improved until Congress has adopted a definite policy with regard to the railroads.

DATE, 1919	NAME.	SUBJECT.	REPORT.
July 23	George A. Rush, Hudson Heights vs. New York Telephone Co.	Delay in removing telephone from address in West New York to address at North Bergen.	Complaint satisfactorily adjusted.
July 23	Walter N. Knauth, New York vs. Cedar Lake Water Co.	In re poor quality of water and inadequate service.	Inspector reported company was not a public utility and not within the jurisdiction of the Board.
July 23	Dr. N. L. Rowe, Beachwood vs. Toms River Electric Co.	Deposit required before extending service in Beachwood.	Inspector reported the deposit required to be reasonable and within the rights of the company.
July 24	Henry Burkauer, Lakeview vs. Public Service Electric Co.	Extension of service in Lakeview.	Extension made and complaint satisfactorily adjusted.
July 24	Clifton Reeves, Toledo vs. Public Service Electric Co.	Deposit required before extending service on Lawrenceville Road, Trenton.	Company agreed to make extension upon guarantee of specific annual revenue.
July 24	G. Sibson, Pensauken vs. Public Service Railway Co.	Inadequate service between Pensauken and Camden.	Inspector reported condition, caused by employees, has been improved.
July 24	George W. Chambers, Delanco vs. Delaware River Water Co.	Charge of \$1.00 for turning on.	Inspector reported the turning on charge has been ruled a legitimate charge to be made by utilities.
July 25	Borough Council of New Providence vs. Delaware, Lackawanna and Western Railroad Co.	Protection of crossing on Springfield Ave. in New Providence.	Inspector reported crossing less dangerous than others in New Providence, which will be eliminated in accordance with classes established.
July 25	Property Owners of Stuyvesant Avenue, Union vs. Elizabethtown Water Co.	Extension of water main along Stuyvesant Ave.	Company advised extension would be made upon guarantee of specified annual revenue whenever practicable.
July 25	Township of Lawrence vs. New Jersey and Pennsylvania Traction Co.	Protection of crossing on Lawrenceville-Princeton road.	Formal proceedings taken.

INFORMAL COMPLAINTS.

DATE, 1919	NAME.	SUBJECT.	REPORT.
July 25	R. M. Sutphen, Dunellen vs. Public Service Gas Co.	Extension of service in Dunellen.	Extension made without cost to complainant.
July 26	Borough of Penns Grove vs. Penns Grove Water Supply Co.	Extension of service for fire protection.	Extension made upon guarantee of specified annual revenue.
July 26	W. J. Ridgeway, West Roselle Park vs. Public Service Electric Co.	Extension of service in Roselle Park.	Extension made without cost to complainant.
July 28	Esther L. Robinson, Boonton vs. Hillerest Water Co.	Threat to discontinue service if bills are not paid, which were contracted by former consumer.	Formal proceedings taken.
July 29	Minotola Advancement League vs. West Jersey and Seashore Railroad Co.	In re stopping of train 1681 arriving at Minotola at 4 P. M.	Inspector reported arrangements made to have a train stop as requested.
July 29	Hann Automobile Co., Bridgeton vs. Electric Co. of New Jersey	Installation of separate meter to furnish power to drive fan in theatre.	Inspector reported but one customer involved and no extra meter necessary.
July 30	Andrew C. Whyte, Ridgefield Park vs. Hackensack Water Co.	Charges for service connection to vacant lots.	Inspector reported charges made in accordance with modification of order of the Board establishing Standards and Regulations for Water Utilities.
July 30	George Sloyer, Marlton vs. West Jersey and Seashore Railroad Co.	Heating of station at Springdale and train service on main line and Medford Branch.	Pending.
July 31	Board of Commissioners of Asbury Park vs. Pennsylvania Railroad Co.	Overcrowding of train leaving New York for Asbury Park at 5:12 P. M.	Inspector reported condition exists to greater extent during fall, winter and spring when an inspection will be made.
July 31	Francis L. Pruyn, et al. vs. Coast Gas Co.	Refusal to extend service in Sea Girt.	Complainant unwilling to meet recommendation of the Board's inspector and complaint withdrawn.

DATE, 1919	NAME.	SUBJECT.	REPORT.
Aug. 1	Wortman's Crescent Launch Line Co., Asbury Park vs. Atlantic Coast Electric Railway Co.	Stopping of cars at Emory St. and Eighth Ave. in Asbury Park.	Inspector reported established stops at both places and all cars should stop at both stops upon signal.
Aug. 1	A. Ciappa, North Bergen vs. New York Telephone Co.	Refusal to install telephone in drug store.	Inspector reported refusal was temporary, caused by cable congestions in North Bergen district.
Aug. 1	John O. Brynildsen, Westfield vs. Public Service Electric Co.	Deposit required before extending service in Westfield.	Extension made without cost to complainant.
Aug. 2	Ralph R. Charlesworth, Millville vs. New York Telephone Co.	Delay in installing telephone.	Complaint satisfactorily adjusted.
Aug. 4	F. W. Joseph, Clementon vs. New Jersey Gas Co.	Extension of service in Clementon.	Extension made upon guarantee of specified annual revenue.
Aug. 4	William H. Boardman, Philadelphia, Pa. vs. West Jersey and Seashore Railroad Co.	Lengthening crossing and installation of gates at Woodbury.	New plan submitted and arrangements made for alteration of crossing.
Aug. 4	Borough of Bradley Beach vs. New York and Long Branch Railroad Co.	Protection of crossings by gates in Bradley Beach.	Pending.
Aug. 5	Town of Irvington, Newark vs. Commonwealth Water Co.	Interruption of service without notice to Town.	Inspector reported interruption due to installation of by-pass unexpectedly made necessary in improving fire service ordered in the Board's report in the matter of increased rates.
Aug. 6	Martin C. Krantz, Audubon vs. Public Service Gas Co.	Extension of service in Audubon.	Extension made upon guarantee of specified annual revenue.
Aug. 6	John Petrillo, Lyndhurst vs. Public Service Gas Co.	Extension of service in Lyndhurst.	Extension made upon guarantee of specified annual revenue.

INFORMAL COMPLAINTS.

DATE, 1919	NAME.	SUBJECT.	REPORT.
Aug. 6	Mrs. Mary E. Golden, Penns Grove vs. New Jersey Gas Co.	Extension of service in Penns Grove.	Extension to be made without cost to complainant.
Aug. 6	Prospect Boiler Co., New Brunswick vs. Public Service Electric Co.	Extension of service in New Brunswick.	Extension made without cost to complainant.
Aug. 6	E. M. Naylor, Pitman vs. New Jersey Gas Co.	Delay in removing leaky governor	Inspector reported location of governor changed to the convenience of complainant.
Aug. 7	Bloomfield Mills Co., Old Bridge vs. Middlesex Telephone Co.	Refusal to extend service to East Spotswood unless poles are erected by complainant.	Installation of poles by complainant due to great cost of the extension and for which the annual revenue will be inadequate to compensate the company for making same.
Aug. 8	Everett Cole, Dumont vs. Public Service Gas Co. and Hackensack Water Co.	Extension of service in Dumont.	Service extended and complaint satisfactorily adjusted.
Aug. 8	Edwards Floral Hall Co., Atlantic City vs. West Jersey and Seashore Railroad Co.	Higher rate charged for top soil for a haul of 7 miles than for a haul of about 50 miles.	Pending.
Aug. 8	Philips O. Potts, Newark vs. Delaware, Lackawanna and Western Railroad Co.	Inadequate service between Harrison and Roseville Ave., Newark.	Inspector reported existing conditions would be more congested by stopping additional trains at Roseville.
Aug. 8	James A. O'Connell, New Brunswick vs. Public Service Gas Co.	Extension of service in New Brunswick.	Extension made without cost to complainant.
Aug. 8	H. H. Alexander, Westfield vs. Cranford Gas Light Co.	Excessive bill.	Inspector reported gas used apparently as measured by meter and bills rendered correctly.
Aug. 8	James P. McKay, Clinton vs. Jersey Electric Co.	Dispute over monthly bill.	Bills correct as rendered.

DATE, 1919	NAME.	SUBJECT.	REPORT.
Aug. 8	Marks Bros., New Brunswick vs. American Railway Express Co.	Shipment of silk lost in transit.	Pending.
Aug. 9	William G. Heaney, Wildwood vs. Public Service Electric Co.	Excessive bills.	Inspector reported current apparently used as billed.
Aug. 9	J. P. Knight, New York vs. Central Railroad of New Jersey, Pennsylvania Railroad Co. and New York and Long Branch Railroad Co.	Morning and evening service between Spring Lake and New York.	Inspector reported matter taken up with the United States Railroad Administration.
Aug. 12	Mrs. E. L. Meyers, Elberon vs. New York Telephone Co.	Delay in repairing telephone.	Satisfactorily adjusted.
Aug. 12	Numerous Petitioners of Keansburg vs. Standard Gas Co.	Interruption of service.	Inspector reported complaint caused by transmission mains being too small but which will be replaced with larger ones.
Aug. 12	Ebert Bros., Ashland vs. New Jersey Gas Co.	Extension of service in Ashland.	Extension to be made upon guarantee of specified annual revenue.
Aug. 13	Mrs. Rosa F. Pyle, Penns Grove vs. Electric Co. of New Jersey	Extension of service in Penns Grove.	Pending.
Aug. 13	Miss Nellie May Rennyson, Stone Harbor vs. Stone Harbor Electric Light and Power Co.	Turning on charge.	Pending.
Aug. 14	F. A. Henning, Bergenfield vs. Public Service Electric Co.	Extension of service in Bergenfield.	Extension of service made without cost to complainant.
Aug. 15	Edward B. Walter, New Brunswick vs. Public Service Electric Co.	Extension of service in New Brunswick.	Extension made without cost to complainant.

INFORMAL COMPLAINTS.

DATE, 1919	NAME.	SUBJECT.	REPORT.
Aug. 15	Silas F. Cronk, Freehold vs. Standard Gas Co.	Interruption of service and poor quality of gas.	Inspector reported company will install new transmission main which will remedy the cause of complaint.
Aug. 15	Morris Gray, New Brunswick vs. Public Service Electric Co. and Public Service Gas Co.	Extension of service in Highland Park.	Extensions made upon deposit made for electric and upon guaranteed annual revenue for gas.
Aug. 15	I. Goodman, Elizabeth vs. Elizabethtown Gas Light Co.	Extension of service in Elizabeth.	Pending.
Aug. 16	Mrs. F. Schaller, Guttenberg vs. Public Service Electric Co.	Damage to trees by wires on poles in front of property.	Inspector reported company maintaining its poles in proper manner and any redress for damage to trees should be given through civil court.
Aug. 16	Mrs. Carrie J. Long, Roselle vs. Elizabethtown Gas Light Co.	Threat to discontinue service upon non-payment of disputed bill.	Inspector reported gas apparently used as measured by meter and bill rendered correctly.
Aug. 16	Henry B. Tawresey, Stone Harbor vs. Stone Harbor Electric Light and Power Co.	Threat to discontinue service upon non-payment of excessive bill.	Held in abeyance for test of meter.
Aug. 18	Andrew C. Whyte, Ridgefield Park vs. Public Service Gas Co.	Charge made for extension of service in Ridgefield Park to vacant lots.	Complaint satisfactorily adjusted.
Aug. 18	Board of Commissioners of City of Rahway vs. Pennsylvania Railroad Co.	Unnecessary blowing of whistles during night.	Inspector reported several crews had been disciplined for disobeying rules regarding the blowing of whistles.
Aug. 18	Robert A. Sibbald, Hackensack vs. Public Service Electric Co.	Extension of service in Hackensack.	Extension made without cost to complainant.
Aug. 18	J. E. Miller, Hohokus vs. Public Service Electric Co.	Extension of service.	Extension made without cost to complainant.

DATE, 1919	NAME.	SUBJECT.	REPORT.
Aug. 19	Mayor and Council of the Borough of Dumont vs. Public Service Electric Co.	Installation of street lamps.	Lights installed and complaint withdrawn.
Aug. 19	Property Owners Residing on George Street, Plainfield vs. Public Service Gas Co.	Extension of service.	Extension made upon guarantee of specified annual revenue.
Aug. 20	Borough of Brielle vs. Lakewood and Coast Electric Co.	Discontinuance of service to fire house due to refusal to pay disputed bill.	Service reconnected and complaint satisfactorily adjusted.
Aug. 20	Carl Griesbach, West New York vs. Public Service Gas Co.	Extension of service.	Extension made without cost to complainant.
Aug. 22	C. L. M. D. Lamborn, Penns Grove vs. West Jersey and Seashore Railroad Co.	Reckless operation of trains over Maple Ave. crossing at So. Penns Grove.	Inspector reported responsibility lay with the DuPont Company and the company advised that further instructions to enginemmen would be made.
Aug. 22	Ed. J. Murphy, National Park vs. Public Service Railway Co.	Service at Washington Park—turning of cars before reaching destination.	Inspector reported turning of cars made necessary to regain schedule after a hold-up on the line.
Aug. 22	Henry Kieselback, Englewood vs. Hackensack Water Co.	Extension of service.	Pending.
Aug. 25	William H. Osborn, Philadelphia vs. New Jersey Gas Co.	Interruption of service.	Pending.
Aug. 25	Charles M. Freeman, Metuchen vs. Metuchen Gas Light Co.	Extension of service.	Extension made upon guarantee of specified annual revenue.
Aug. 25	Louis Lombardi, Elizabeth vs. Public Service Electric Co.	Extension of service in Elizabeth.	Extension made without cost to complainant.

INFORMAL COMPLAINTS.

DATE, 1919	NAME.	SUBJECT.	REPORT.
Aug. 25	Laura V. Camp vs. New Jersey Gas Co.	Interruption of service.	Inspector reported pressure was increased and service improved thereby.
Aug. 26	Miss Sadie Hecht, Maywood vs. Atlantic City Railroad Co.	Departure of train from station before time scheduled.	Inspector reported train in question was an excursion which required four sections, the sections leaving terminal as they were loaded.
Aug. 26	E. O. Clark, Bayonne vs. Public Service Gas Co.	Demand of deposit by property owner having previously established his credit.	Inspector reported deposit asked through error on the part of the clerk.
Aug. 26	James F. Maury, New York vs. Hackensack Water Company	Separate service connections to each side of double house.	Separate service connections made to main for two separate consumers.
Aug. 26	Paul F. Richter, Ocean City vs. City Gas Light Co.	Inadequate service.	Inspector reported company installing new main which should remedy complaint.
Aug. 27	J. C. Mount, Mt. Holly vs. Public Service Gas Co.	Extension of service in Mt. Holly.	Extension made upon guarantee of specified annual revenue.
Aug. 27	Otto W. Will, Perth Amboy vs. Middlesex Water Co.	Rendering of bill for estimated amount for period during which meter was out of order, instead of for minimum amount.	Inspector reported company made charge in accordance with standards and regulations established by the Board.
Aug. 27	Lecato Realty Co., Audubon vs. Laurel Springs Water Co.	Excessive charge for service connections.	Inspector reported charge made for connection from main to curb in accordance with recommendations of this Board.
Aug. 27	William A. Kitts, Maywood vs. Public Service Electric Co.	Extension of service in Maywood.	Extension made without cost to complainant.
Aug. 28	John B. Madden, Millville vs. Delaware and Atlantic Telegraph and Telephone Co.	Charge for removing telephone and changing name in directory.	Error made in the charge which has been adjusted.

You Are Viewing an Archived Report from the New Jersey State Library

DATE, 1919	NAME.	SUBJECT.	REPORT.
Aug. 28	Charles Lewis, Asbury Park vs. Monmouth County Water Co.	Separate meter charge for each house supplied when several houses are supplied through one meter.	Inspector reported a separate service charge for each meter according to the size of the meter should be made.
Aug. 28	L. H. Dittler, Newark vs. Monmouth Lighting Co.	Extension of service in Keansburg.	
Aug. 28	Frank A. Banville, Cliffside vs. Public Service Co.	Extension of service in Grantwood.	Extension made upon guarantee of specified annual revenue.
Aug. 29	Charles A. Mathews, Philadelphia vs. City Gas Light Co.	Collection of service charge for full year when house is occupied but part of the year.	Inspector reported refund made when premises are occupied by another tenant.
Aug. 30	Mrs. L. Wallace, Woodlynne vs. Public Service Gas Co.	Excessive bills.	Inspector reported that records show that gas used as indicated by meter readings is correct.
Aug. 30	Dr. William Bates, Philadelphia, Pa. vs. City Gas Light Co.	Removal of meter without notice and demand of \$10 before reinstating same.	Inspector reported demand for \$10 improper and company made refund.
Aug. 30	C. B. Cole, Califon vs. Califon Electric Light and Power Co.	Extension of service in Califon.	Complaint withdrawn.
Aug. 30	James H. Bahney, Trenton vs. Public Service Electric Co.	Extension of service in Trenton.	Extension made upon guarantee of specified annual revenue.
Aug. 30	Isabel Johnson, Bradley Beach vs. Monmouth County Water Co.	Separate service charge for each house when two houses are built on one lot and served through the same meter.	Inspector reported premises in question should be classed as one service in as much as the property is incapable of subdivision.
Sept. 2	Township Committee of Waterford, Atco vs. West Jersey and Seashore Railroad Co.	Protection of crossings at Cooner Road and Bartram Ave., Atco.	Pending.
Sept. 2	Susie E. Hassell, New Brunswick vs. Public Service Electric Co.	Extension of service in Highland Park.	Extension made without cost to complainant.

INFORMAL COMPLAINTS.

DATE, 1919	NAME.	SUBJECT.	REPORT.
Sept. 2	Mayor and Council of the Borough of Kenilworth vs. Plainfield-Union Water Co.	Extension of service in Plainfield.	Extension made upon guarantee of specified annual revenue.
Sept. 2	Charles D. Shuldham, Maplewood vs. Delaware, Lackawanna and Western Railroad Co.	Switching of westbound freight on siding in violation of order.	Inspector reported rule violated and conductor suspended in consequence.
Sept. 3	Board of Education of Piscataway Township vs. Public Service Railway Co.	Refusal to sell school tickets until after zone system is in operation.	Formal proceedings held.
Sept. 3	Thomas W. Alburger, Westmont vs. Public Service Railway Co.	Trolley service between Haddonfield and Westmont.	Pending.
Sept. 3	Oscar Bleier, Atlantic Highlands vs. Standard Gas Co.	Excessive bill.	Inspector reported meter tested fast; allowance made in accordance with result of test.
Sept. 3	Alfred von K. Holm, Hillsdale vs. New York Telephone Co.	Discontinuance of service because of non-payment of bill for extra call.	Complaint withdrawn.
Sept. 3	Russell Playing Card Co., Milltown vs. American Railway Express Co.	Proposed discontinuance of express service at Milltown.	Inspector reported no change in service to be made and complaint satisfactorily settled.
Sept. 3	J. A. Kennedy, Trenton vs. Public Service Electric Co.	Extension of service in Trenton.	Extension made upon guarantee of specified annual revenue.
Sept. 4	George L. Yakey, Irvington vs. Public Service Electric Co.	Extension of service in Irvington.	Extension made without cost to complainant.
Sept. 4	J. P. Ballinger, Roselle vs. Public Service Electric Co.	Extension of service in Roselle.	Extension made without cost to complainant.

DATE, 1919	NAME.	SUBJECT.	REPORT.
Sept. 4	Mrs. Annie E. Brady, Oceanic vs. Standard Gas Co.	Excessive bill.	Inspector reported complaint caused by incorrect application of meter readings.
Sept. 4	William A. Kirk, New York vs. Public Service Gas Co.	Extension of service in Short Hills.	Extension made upon guarantee of specified annual revenue.
Sept. 4	General Ceramics Co., New York vs. Lehigh Valley Railroad Co.	Overcharge on shipment of clay.	Pending.
Sept. 4	Michael Chiaccio, Riverside vs. Delaware River Water Co.	Refusal to continue service because present owner refused to pay for period before he took possession of premises.	Inspector reported complainant responsible for period during which he had possession of property only.
Sept. 5	James A. O'Connell, New Brunswick vs. Public Service Gas Co.	Extension of service in New Brunswick.	Pending.
Sept. 5	Township of Cranford vs. Cranford Gas Light Co.	Extension of service in Cranford.	Extension recommended upon guarantee of specified annual revenue.
Sept. 5	H. K. Read, Philadelphia, Pa. vs. Farmers' Telephone Co.	Inadequate telephone service in Brown's Mills.	Pending.
Sept. 5	Frank S. Katzenbach, Jr., Trenton vs. Spring Lake Electric Co. and Atlantic Coast Electric Co.	Excessive bill.	Error made in bill and credit made in accordance therewith.
Sept. 5	Woodstown Ice and Coal Co., Woodstown vs. Electric Co. of New Jersey	Charges for electric power by addition of coal clause which is contrary to contract with complainant.	Charges made in accordance with rates found by this Board to be reasonable.
Sept. 6	M. L. Jones, Westmont vs. Public Service Gas Co. and Public Service Electric Co.	Extension of service in Audubon.	Extensions made upon guarantee of specified annual revenue.

DATE, 1919	NAME.	SUBJECT.	REPORT.
Sept. 6	Borough of Roosevelt, Chrome vs. Middlesex Water Co.	Inadequate water supply and lack of pressure.	Inspector reported condition existing owing to Government uses, etc., and recommended new equipment which the company has installed.
Sept. 6	Alex Lipa vs. Middlesex Water Co.	Failure to extend mains at Fords Corner.	Company unwilling to make the extension in accordance with the Inspector's recommendation.
Sept. 6	Bernard Corn, Highland Park vs. Public Service Gas Co.	Extension of service in Highland Park.	Extension made upon guarantee of specified annual revenue.
Sept. 6	Jefferson T. Hopkins, Highland Park vs. Public Service Gas Co. and Public Service Electric Co.	Extension of service in Highland Park.	Extensions made upon guarantee of specified annual revenue.
Sept. 7	J. W. Daniels, Paterson vs. Passaic Water Co.	Separate service charge when two houses are built on one lot and served through one meter.	Inspector reported occupants were separate customers and separate service pipes should supply each house.
Sept. 7	Edward Harker, Pensauken vs. Public Service Gas Co.	Extension of service in Pensauken and refusal to refund overcharge.	Extension made upon guarantee of specified annual revenue; credit given on company's books for overcharge.
Sept. 8	Mrs. J. W. Hobson, Bayonne vs. Public Service Gas Co.	Refusal to return deposit made in 1884 to preceding company	Inspector reported company has no record of deposit but will make refund upon production of proof of payment of same.
Sept. 9	Tri-County Electric Co., Pompton Lakes vs. Erie Railroad Co.	Refusal to allow complainant to run wires over tracks.	Inspector reported that arrangements made with the company to allow the wires to be placed overhead.
Sept. 10	Board of Education of Sayreville vs. Public Service Railway Co.	Refusal to accept school tickets before 8 A. M.	Satisfactorily adjusted.
Sept. 11	A. H. West, Bayonne vs. Public Service Railway Co.	Inadequate lights on cars of Greenville and Jackson lines.	Company advised order issued to replace lights removed under the fuel order for conservation.

DATE, 1919	NAME.	SUBJECT.	REPORT.
Sept. 11	Walter J. Mading, Irvington vs. Public Service Gas Co.	Deposit required before extending service.	Extension made without cost to complainant.
Sept. 11	Miss M. E. Bierne, Passaic vs. Public Service Gas Co.	Threat to discontinue service if disputed bill is not paid.	Company advised service continued and disputed bill satisfactorily adjusted.
Sept. 11	P. C. Doyle, Philadelphia vs. City Gas Light Company	Collection of service charge for one year from two tenants for the same premises.	Inspector reported collection made from second tenant is refunded to first tenant.
Sept. 11	Resident of North Bergen vs. Public Service Gas Co.	Deposit required before extension of service.	Pending.
Sept. 11	Edw. J. Gleason vs. Public Service Electric Co.	Extension of service.	Pending.
Sept. 11	H. B. Spackman, Tuckerton vs. Tuckerton Water Co.	Refusal to pay bill because of inadequate water supply.	Inspector reported investigation showed that service had been clogged which was cleaned out by the company.
Sept. 12	Joseph Argentieri, Philadelphia vs. Ideal Gas Co.	Discontinuance of service and refusal to return deposit because of non-payment of disputed bill.	Pending.
Sept. 12	Alonzo B. Morris, Maplewood vs. Public Service Electric Co.	Extension of service in Maplewood.	Extension made.
Sept. 12	J. O. Hearnen, Trenton vs. Lebanon Telephone Co.	Refusal to install private wire at complainant's Flemington station.	Pending.
Sept. 12	S. B. Dobbs, Philadelphia vs. Collingswood Sewerage Co.	Excessive rates charged laundry tubs.	Inspector reported Bill rendered under New rate filed with the Board but should not be applied on bills rendered before the rate was filed.

INFORMAL COMPLAINTS.

DATE, 1919	NAME.	SUBJECT.	REPORT.
Sept. 13	I. E. Ireland, Asbury Park vs. Monmouth County Water Co.	Charge for four services when there is but one meter in house.	Inspector reported that premises would be capable of subdivision and separate service charges are correct.
Sept. 16	Board of Education of Princeton vs. Princeton Water Co.	Extension of service to school.	Extension made upon guarantee of specified annual revenue.
Sept. 16	Ira Barrows, New York vs. Standard Gas Co.	Inadequate service due to poor pressure.	Inspector reported stoppage in main which was remedied by the company.
Sept. 16	Wilson Sales Agency, New Brunswick vs. Public Service Gas Co.	Extension of service in Highland Park.	Extension made upon guarantee of specified annual revenue.
Sept. 16	Arthur Nichols, Rutherford vs. Public Service Electric Co.	Extension of service in Rutherford.	Extension made upon deposit to the company for cost of financing the same.
Sept. 16	Frank Hughs, Riverside vs. Public Service Electric Co.	Extension of service in Riverside.	Extension made without cost to complainant.
Sept. 16	Mrs. E. I. Hinchliffe, Leonardo vs. Standard Gas Co.	Threat to discontinue service because of refusal to pay readiness to serve charge.	Charge made in accordance with rates filed and inspector reported company justified in demanding payment.
Sept. 17	B. Impastato, Elizabeth vs. Elizabethtown Gas Light Co.	Refusal to install meter.	Complaint satisfactorily adjusted.
Sept. 18	John A. Lindblad, Bergenfield vs. Public Service Electric Co.	Deposit required before extending service in Bergenfield.	Extension made without cost to complainant.
Sept. 18	Luigi Vecchi, Hazlet vs. Monmouth Lighting Co.	Refusal to extend service to factory.	Pending.
Sept. 19	A. L. Hand, Newark vs. Public Service Electric Co.	Extension of service in Newark.	Extension made upon guarantee of specified annual revenue.

DATE, 1919	NAME.	SUBJECT.	REPORT.
Sept. 19	Hugh Carr, Trenton vs. Public Service Electric Co.	Extension of service in Trenton.	Extension made without cost to complainant.
Sept. 19	M. J. Sineay, Westmont vs. West Jersey and Seashore Railroad Co.	Condition of drain along right of way adjoining premises of complainant.	Inspector reported company not responsible for drain.
Sept. 20	Ludwig V. Lauther, Passaic vs. Eric Railroad Co.	Protection of crossing at Van Houten Ave. near Athenia.	Pending.
Sept. 22	Rudolph Nordhaus, New Brunswick vs. Public Service Gas Co.	Deposit required before extending service on Central Ave., Highland Park.	Complaint withdrawn.
Sept. 23	Louis E. Eden, Hasbrouck Heights vs. Public Service Electric Co.	Deposit required before extending service on Washington Place, Hasbrouck Heights.	Extension made without deposit or cost to complainant.
Sept. 23	E. H. Bornaman, Rutherford vs. Public Service Gas Co.	Extension of service in Rutherford.	Extension made upon guarantee of specified annual revenue.
Sept. 23	Mrs. J. L. Heilenman, Matawan vs. Standard Gas Co.	Refusal to extend service in Matawan.	Extension made upon receipt of shipment of pipe,
Sept. 26	Ideal Quilting Co., Jersey City vs. Public Service Electric Co.	Rendering two bills of different amounts for same period, refusing to explain reason.	Rebate made in accordance with recommendation of inspector.
Sept. 26	Edward Bauer, Elizabeth vs. Public Service Railway Co.	Refusal to accept school tickets before 8 A. M.	Inspector reported no heavy traffic on lines in question and recommends tickets be accepted before 8 A. M.
Sept. 26	Howard Marshall, East Orange vs. Hudson and Manhattan Railway Co.	Inadequate service during rush hours on underground line between New York and Erie Station in New Jersey.	Inspector reported company appreciates fact that additional cars are needed but conditions cannot be improved until Congress has adopted a definite policy with regard to the railroads.

DATE, 1919	NAME.	SUBJECT.	REPORT.
Sept. 26	George V. P. Scheu, New York vs. Public Service Gas Co.	\$10 deposit asked before installing service for business purposes when \$5 is required for dwelling purposes.	Inspector reported deposit asked apparently not excessive for the amount of gas to be used.
Sept. 26	John F. McCullough, Jr., Plainfield vs. Central Railroad Co. of New Jersey	Refusal to accept ticket marked New York-Newark-Plainfield between Plainfield, E. Ferry St., Newark, and Newark Transfer.	Inspector reported company unwilling to accede to request for acceptance of New York-Newark-Plainfield ticket between Plainfield and Newark.
Sept. 27	Mrs. Jennie Nodes, New Brunswick vs. Public Service Electric Co.	Extension of service on Townsend St., New Brunswick.	Extension made without cost to complainant.
Sept. 27	H. Foster, Asbury Park vs. Consolidated Gas Co.	Bills rendered for service when complainant has prepayment meter.	Inspector reported gas used in excess of amount placed in meter and bills rendered correctly.
Sept. 27	K. Van Peer, Paterson vs. Passaic Water Co.	Dispute regarding bill not in accordance with contract.	Inspector reported bill rendered in accordance with rules recommended by the Board and adjustment should be made between the company and complainant.
Sept. 29	A. C. Groenendale, Highland Park vs. Public Service Gas Co.	Extension of service in Highland Park.	Extension made upon guarantee of specified annual revenue.
Sept. 29	C. Hoffman, Audubon vs. Public Service Electric Co.	Deposit before extending service in Audubon.	Extension made without cost to complainant.
Sept. 30	William Walther, Jr., Barrington vs. Public Service Gas Co.	Extension of service in Barrington.	Extension made upon guarantee of specified annual revenue.
Oct. 1	Continental Paper Co., Bogota vs. Erie Railroad Co.	Overcharge on shipment of paper.	Pending.
Oct. 1	Mrs. E. Sutton, Dunellen vs. Public Service Electric Co.	Extension of service in Dunellen.	Extension made without cost to complainant.

DATE, 1919	NAME.	SUBJECT.	REPORT.
Oct. 2	F. B. Engler, Pitman vs. New Jersey Gas Co.	Poor quality of gas and inadequate pressure furnished to consumers at Pitman.	Pending.
Oct. 2	Montclair Federation of Women's Organizations vs. Public Service Railway Co.	Reduced rates for school teachers of Montclair public schools.	No law by which the Board would be justified in creating a discrimination in favor of school teachers.
Oct. 3	Thomas Martin, Millville vs. Millville Electric Co.	Delay in extending service in Millville.	Inspector reported company agreed to make extension as soon as possible.
Oct. 4	H. J. Klein, Woodridge vs. Public Service Electric Co.	Extension of service in Woodridge.	Extension made without cost to complainant.
Oct. 4	A. S. Wilson, New York vs. Monmouth Lighting Co.	Extension of service in Keansburg, Beacon Beach.	Pending.
Oct. 7	Jones & Lloyd, Millville vs. Delaware and Atlantic Telegraph and Telephone Co.	Delay in extending service in Millville.	Service installed and complaint satisfactorily adjusted.
Oct. 7	Allen C. Middleton, Philadelphia, Pa. vs. Millville Gas Light Co.	Excessive bills—dispute regarding bill owed by former owner of property.	Formal proceedings held.
Oct. 7	Morgan General Ordnance Depot South Amboy vs. Morgan Heights Land Co. and Jersey Central Realty Co.	Excessive rate charged for water supplied to above Depot.	Inspector reported Rate charged in accordance with contract and bill should be paid as rendered.
Oct. 7	Gustav Rees, Elizabeth vs. Public Service Electric Co.	Extension of service in Elizabeth.	Extension made without cost to complainant.
Oct. 7	John B. Morton, Merchantville vs. Public Service Railway Co.	Dangerous conditions in connection with the operation of the new trolley terminal at Camden.	Inspector reported plans were submitted for bettering the conditions which will be settled early.

INFORMAL COMPLAINTS.

DATE, 1919	NAME.	SUBJECT.	REPORT.
Oct. 8	S. C. Moore, Camden vs. Public Service Gas Co.	Discontinuance of service because of refusal to pay excessive bill.	Complaint satisfactorily adjusted.
Oct. 8	Mrs. Julius Melcer, Mt. Holly vs. Public Service Electric Co.	Extension of service in Mt. Holly.	Extension made upon guarantee of specified annual revenue.
Oct. 8	C. H. Weidenbacher, Audubon vs. Public Service Electric Co.	Extension of service in Logan Ave., Audubon.	Extension made without cost to complainant.
Oct. 9	Claude S. Stites, Millville vs. Millville Gas Light Co.	Delay in removing meter which is registering incorrectly.	Formal proceedings held.
Oct. 9	T. F. Carrow, Philadelphia, Pa. vs. Ideal Gas Co.	Refusal to return deposit because no duplicate copy of receipt can be produced.	Pending.
Oct. 9	Lewis C. Stanton et al., Barrington vs. Public Service Gas Co.	Extension of service in White Horse Pike, in Barrington.	Extension made upon guarantee of specified annual revenue.
Oct. 10	Charles Pepper, Millville vs. Cumberland County Gas Co.	Service charge made for full year for both summer and winter residences.	Inspector reported service charge is made on a monthly basis and when service charge is paid in advance a refund must be made when notice is given to discontinue service.
Oct. 10	Bradley Beach, Board of Commissioners vs. Monmouth County Water Co.	Delay in extension of mains.	Pending.
Oct. 10	R. S. Cottene, Asbury Park vs. Monmouth County Water Co.	Separate service charge for house and bungalows on same lot.	Inspector reported charges made by the company correct.
Oct. 10	Mrs. George Bevins, Trenton vs. Public Service Gas Co.	Discontinuance of service owing to disputed bill caused by robbery of prepayment meter.	Inspector reported meter readings correct and gas apparently used as billed.

You Are Viewing an Archived Report from the New Jersey State Library

DATE, 1919	NAME.	SUBJECT.	REPORT.
Oct. 11	W. E. Foley, Irvington vs. Commonwealth Water Co.	Service charge of \$1 when customers are required to keep service pipes in repair.	Inspector reported charge made in accordance with rules filed with the Board; customers required to keep service pipes between curb and premises in repair.
Oct. 14	T. B. Liebstein, Newark vs. Central Railroad Co. of New Jersey	Excessive rate charged shipment of scrap iron.	Inspector reported rate charged was fixed by the R. R. Administration and complaint should be lodged in Washington.
Oct. 14	William B. Lundie et al., Dunellen vs. Public Service Electric Co., Public Gas Co. and Watchung Water Co.	Extension of service in Plainfield and Dunellen.	Formal proceedings held.
Oct. 14	Joseph F. McGann, Newark vs. Atlantic Coast Electric Light Co.	Threat to discontinue service if disputed bill is not paid.	Inspector reported energy apparently supplied premises as billed, but wiring was found to be faulty.
Oct. 14	Robert F. Hepburn, Bloomfield vs. Public Service Electric Co.	Extension of service in Bloomfield.	Extension made without cost to complainant.
Oct. 14	Miss D. H. Noe, Peetzburg vs. Hackensack Water Co.	Extension of service in Peetzburg.	Extension made upon guarantee of specified annual revenue.
Oct. 14	Mrs. E. Blackwood, Bradley Beach vs. Monmouth County Water Co.	Separate service charge for each house when two houses are built on one lot.	Inspector reported but one charge should be made to complainant and company advised adjustment would be made.
Oct. 14	Peter McInnes, Bradley Beach vs. Monmouth County Water Co.	Separate service charge for each house when two houses are built on one lot.	Inspector reported separate meters should be placed and separate service charges made which the company agreed to do.
Oct. 14	Charles C. Simmington, Philadelphia vs. Cape May Light and Power Co.	Disputed bill.	Inspector reported bill incorrect and company agreed to write off the excessive charge.
Oct. 14	Mrs. Clarkson Pettit, Salem vs. Salem Gas Light Co.	Inadequate service.	Inspector reported trouble was being remedied by the company.

INFORMAL COMPLAINTS.

DATE, 1919	NAME.	SUBJECT.	REPORT.
Oct. 15	Residents of North Bergen vs. West Shore Railroad and Erie Railroad Co.	Re-establishment of Granton Station in Twp. of North Bergen.	Pending.
Oct. 15	Collingswood Churches vs. Collingswood Sewerage Co.	Petition for reduced rates.	Rates reduced.
Oct. 15	B. Wagstaff, Cranford vs. Cranford Gas Light Co.	Excessive bills.	Inspector reported Gas apparently used as billed.
Oct. 15	William Whiteford, Bradley Beach vs. Monmouth County Water Co.	Separate service charge for two houses built on one lot.	Inspector recommended separate meters be installed and company agreed to install same.
Oct. 16	Edwin E. Sterns, East Orange vs. Coast Gas Co.	Delay in returning deposit.	Delay due to company losing receipt which has been satisfactorily adjusted.
Oct. 16	Board of Commissioners of Ridgewood, Pat- erson vs. Public Service Railway Co.	Installation of electric light at station on Highland Ave.	Pending.
Oct. 16	Charles A. Butz, Clayton vs. Clayton-Glassboro Water Co.	Excessive bills.	Inspector reported meter should be removed and tested which the company agreed to do.
Oct. 18	Edward A. Lee, Trenton vs. Public Service Gas Co. and Public Service Electric Co.	Extension of service on Nottingham Way, Trenton.	Extensions made without cost to complainant.
Oct. 18	O. H. Hanemann, Delanco vs. Public Service Railway Co.	Removal of track to center of streets from side.	Pending.
Oct. 18	George W. Pittenger, Asbury Park vs. Monmouth County Water Co.	Separate service charge for each house when two are built on one lot and served through one meter.	Inspector reported separate customers involved and separate meters and separate charges should be made.

DATE, 1919	NAME.	SUBJECT.	REPORT.
Oct. 18	John Armstrong, Philadelphia vs. Atlantic City Railroad Co.	Further protection of crossing on road between Hammonton and Buena Vista.	Inspectors reported trees would be trimmed and approach signs erected to protect crossing.
Oct. 18	Karl Weidel, Trenton vs. Public Service Electric Co.	Noisy transformer on pole close to residence.	Inspector reported the transformer would be removed and there would be no further cause for complaint.
Oct. 20	W. D. Bedell, Ocean Grove vs. Coast Gas Co.	Question regarding addition of 30c. to bill.	Pending.
Oct. 20	Mason Sutts, Bradley Beach vs. Monmouth County Water Co.	Separate service charge for each house when two are built on one lot and served through the same meter.	Inspector reported separate meters would be installed to measure the use of the water in each of the premises.
Oct. 20	Mrs. M. S. T. Werner, Bradley Beach vs. Monmouth County Water Co.	Separate service charge for each house when two are built on one lot and served through one meter.	Inspector reported charges correct and recommended separate meters be installed which the company agreed to do.
Oct. 21	R. A. Rockhill, Wood Lynne vs. General Water Supply Co.	Excessive bills after installation of meters.	Inspector reported meters being installed in accordance with rules, recommendations, etc., for water utilities by the Board.
Oct. 22	Charles M. Simerson, Ringoes vs. New Jersey Telephone Co.	Delay in extending service in Ringoes.	Inspector reported service installed; delay due to labor and material shortage.
Oct. 22	East Orange and Ampere Land Co., Newark vs. Public Service Gas Co.	Refusal to enter into contract for cost of installing service stubs to curb line opposite vacant lots in Bloomfield.	Inspector reported company's charge in accordance with rule filed with the Board.
Oct. 22	Roxbury Township Committee vs. New Jersey Power and Light Co.	Extension of street lighting—refusal of property owners to allow construction of poles in front of their property.	Pending.
Oct. 23	J. C. Francis, Elizabeth vs. Public Service Electric Co.	Extension of service in Elizabeth.	Extension made without cost to complainant.

DATE, 1919	NAME.	SUBJECT.	REPORT.
Oct. 23	Buchanon & Smock Lumber Co., Asbury Park vs. Monmouth County Water Co.	Excessive rate charged for sprinkling system.	Inspector reported rate charged complainant correct.
Oct. 24	George Holt, Cranford vs. Public Service Electric Co.	Extension of service in Cranford.	Extension made without cost to complainant
Oct. 24	Township Committee of Haddon Township vs. General Water Supply Co.	Method used in rendering bills quarterly for excess consumption of water over the minimum.	Inspector reported bills rendered in accordance with rates filed with the Board.
Oct. 24	Abraham Spinard, New York City vs. Coast Gas Co.	Delay in refunding balance of deposit.	Company advised delay due to rush of season and complaint satisfactorily adjusted.
Oct. 28	John A. Corwin, Elizabeth vs. Public Service Electric Co.	Extension of service in Elizabeth.	Extension made without cost to complainant
Oct. 30	Mrs. John MacCabe, Trenton vs. Public Service Gas Co.	Extension of service in Trenton.	Extension made upon guarantee of specified annual revenue.
Oct. 30	T. H. Shott, Jersey City vs. New York Telephone Co.	Rendering of bill for changing location of phone in premises when company did not do the work.	Company agreed to cancel the charge.
Oct. 30	R. F. Parker, Red Bank vs. Tintern Manor Water Co.	In re installation of meter.	Pending.
Oct. 30	Welding Ring, New York vs. Standard Gas Co.	Bill rendered for service during period when house was closed.	Pending.
Oct. 30	Russell Playing Card Co., Milltown vs. Public Service Railway Co.	Overcrowding of cars from New Brunswick, South River and Sayreville to Milltown.	Pending.

DATE, 1919	NAME.	SUBJECT.	REPORT.
Oct. 31	A. H. Blell, Murray Hill vs. Commonwealth Electric Co.	Deposit held and refusal to allow prompt payment discount if bill is paid one day after time limit.	Company reported its willingness to refund deposit; and inspector reported allowance of discount after time limit would be discrimination.
Nov. 1	R. M. Udall, New York City vs. Public Service Electric Co.	Extension of service in Bergenfield, N. J.	Extension made upon advancement of cost to finance the same by complainant.
Nov. 1	Alex. Linkis, Elizabeth vs. Elizabethtown Water Co.	Extension of service in Elizabeth.	Formal proceedings held.
Nov. 1	L. R. Dutton, Jenkintown, Pa. vs. City Gas Light Co.	Collection of more than one service charge when two parties occupy same premises in one year.	Inspector reported refund should be made to first customer if a second customer occupies the premises for a portion of the year.
Nov. 3	Leonard DiCurti, Richland vs. West Jersey and Seashore Railroad Co.	Stopping of electric train which leaves Atlantic City at 7 P. M. at Richland.	Inspector reported train No. 1712 a fast train and would lengthen schedule if stop was made.
Nov. 5	D. L. Rossell, New York City vs. Monmouth County Water Co.	Separate service charge for four small bungalows built on one lot and served by two meters.	Inspector reported each bungalow served a separate customer for which a separate charge should be made.
Nov. 5	Residents of Farmingdale, vs. Monmouth Lighting Co.	Poor service in Farmingdale.	Pending.
Nov. 5	Township of East Greenwich vs. West Jersey and Seashore Railroad Co.	Protection by flagman at Hoffman's grade crossing at Clarkshoro and grade crossing at Mt. Royal.	Pending.
Nov. 5	Russell H. Smith, Keyport vs. Monmouth Lighting Co.	Extension of service in Keyport.	Extension made upon guarantee of specified annual revenue.
Nov. 5	Alan N. Lukens, Elizabeth vs. Public Service Electric Co.	Delay in extending service after complainant has paid necessary guarantee.	Inspector reported extension made and service supplied.

INFORMAL COMPLAINTS.

DATE, 1919	NAME.	SUBJECT.	REPORT.
Nov. 6	League for Motorists Protection, New York vs. Lehigh Valley Railroad Co.	Failure to have light on crossing gate when train was approaching.	Inspector reported watchman failed to have supply of oil on hand for lamp and that watchman was duly reprimanded.
Nov. 7	Earnest A. Adams, East Orange vs. Public Service Electric Co.	Extension of service in East Orange.	Extension made upon guarantee of specified annual revenue.
Nov. 7	Frank Linke, Plainfield vs. Watchung Water Co.	Installation of meter in Dunellen.	Inspector recommended meter be installed and company advised installation would be made.
Nov. 8	George Waters, Asbury Park vs. Monmouth County Water Co.	Excessive bills.	Excessive bills due to leak in plumbing.
Nov. 8	Lawler Brothers, Bayonne vs. New York Telephone Co.	Delay in installing new phone at residence.	Inspector reported complaint satisfactorily adjusted.
Nov. 8	Forest Land Co., Newark vs. New York Telephone Co.	Refusal to supply service to various offices in the Aldine Bldg., Newark.	Service installed and complaint withdrawn.
Nov. 10	Egbert Close, Wanamassa vs. Mrs. Enma L. Smock	Refusal to connect sewer system to residences on Camp Ave.	Formal proceeding held.
Nov. 11	John Abel, Jersey City vs. American Railways Express Co.	Delay in settling claim.	Pending.
Nov. 11	Louis L. Pund, Collingswood vs. General Water Supply Co.	Excessive bill.	Inspector reported company could not justify its contention that water charged for was used and adjustment should be made.
Nov. 11	Joseph Schumaker, Trenton vs. Delaware and Atlantic Telegraph and Telephone Co.	Refusal to supply service because no cable is near residence.	Complaint withdrawn.

DATE, 1919	NAME.	SUBJECT.	REPORT.
Nov. 11	H. G. Murphy, Kearney vs. Public Service Railway Co.	Refusal to give change on trolley.	Inspector reported conductor in error in overcharging passenger; proper instructions given conductor.
Nov. 12	Ralph E. Smith, Newark vs. Public Service Electric Co.	Extension of service in Lyndhurst.	Company reported complainant agreed to finance extension and complaint adjusted.
Nov. 12	F. J. Rupp, Audubon vs. Public Service Electric Co.	Extension of service in Audubon.	Pending.
Nov. 12	Borough Council of Barrington vs. Atlantic City Railroad Co.	Protection of crossing at Clements Bridge Road near Barrington.	Pending.
Nov. 13	Arthur F. Foran, Flemington vs. New Jersey Northern Gas Co.	Excessive bills.	Pending.
Nov. 14	Gustav Quist, Bergenfield vs. Public Service Electric Co.	Extension of service in Bergenfield.	Extension made upon guarantee of specified annual revenue.
Nov. 14	John Cochran, Elizabeth vs. Public Service Electric Co.	Extension of service in Elizabeth.	Extension made without cost to complainant
Nov. 14	Buhl & Caffrey, Newark vs. New York Telephone Co.	Refusal to supply service in complainant's place of business.	Inspector reported complaint satisfactorily adjusted and service supplied.
Nov. 14	Samuel Lotueso, Bergenfield vs. Public Service Electric Co.	Extension of service in Bergenfield.	Inspector reported wiring not in accordance with rules of Natl. Fire Underwriters.
Nov. 15	Township of Northampton vs. Mount Holly Water Co.	Delay in replacing defective fire hydrant which has been out of order for two months.	Company advised shipment of parts to repair hydrants received and complaint satisfactorily adjusted.
Nov. 17	William C. Budd, Wenonah vs. Electric Co. of New Jersey	Extension of service in Wenonah.	Pending.

INFORMAL COMPLAINTS.

DATE, 1919	NAME.	SUBJECT.	REPORT.
Nov. 18	E. Eaton, Cranford vs. Baltimore and New York Railroad Co.	blocking of crossing by freight trains at South Ave., East Dranford Junction.	Pending.
Nov. 19	C. Rieger, Ridgfield Park vs. New York Telephone Co.	Delay in installing telephone.	Service installed and complaint withdrawn.
Nov. 21	W. C. Simpson, Dumont vs. Public Service Gas Co., Public Service Electric Co. and Hackensack Water Co.	Extension of service on Brook St., Dumont.	Complainant advised services installed and complaints satisfactorily adjusted.
Nov. 21	E. J. Dixon, Keansburg vs. Keansburg Water Co.	Extension of service in Keansburg.	Pending.
Nov. 22	E. H. Eakin, Paterson vs. Public Service Gas Co.	Extension of service in Trenton.	Extension made upon guarantee of specified annual revenue.
Nov. 22	William S. Walker, Wildwood vs. American Railways Express Co.	Claim for damage done to suit case in transit.	Claim paid and complaint satisfactorily settled.
Nov. 22	Arnold Sutterline, West Philadelphia vs. Ideal Gas Co.	Delay in returning balance of deposit.	Pending.
Nov. 22	Walter E. McClatchey, Roselle Park vs. Public Service Electric Co.	Demand of deposit of \$25 before extending service in Roselle Park.	Pending.
Nov. 22	E. H. Lee, Moorestown vs. Public Service Railway Co.	Stopping of cars before reaching destination, transferring passengers to another car where an extra fare is collected.	Formal proceeding held.
Nov. 25	Great Atlantic and Pacific Tea Co., New York vs. New York Telephone Co.	Delay in removing telephones from stores and refusal to supply service to two stores in Newark.	Complaint withdrawn.

DATE, 1919	NAME.	SUBJECT.	REPORT.
Nov. 25	J. R. Helm, Glassboro vs. Clayton-Glassboro Water Co.	Question as to who should pay for repair of stop cock between main and curb.	Company repaired stop cock broken and complaint satisfactorily adjusted.
Nov. 25	Township of Middletown vs. Monmouth Lighting Co.	Deposit required before extending service for street lights.	Pending.
Nov. 25	Ralph Burgess, Trenton vs. Public Service Electric Co.	Extension of service in Trenton.	Extensions made upon guarantee of specified annual revenue.
Nov. 25	Economical Homes Association vs. Public Service Electric Co.	Extension of service in Elizabeth.	Pending.
Nov. 25	Edward S. Rogers, Trenton vs. Public Service Electric Co.	Extension of service in Trenton.	Pending.
Nov. 25	Joseph D. Krout, Audubon vs. New Jersey Water Service Co.	Muddy condition of water.	Pending.
Nov. 25	Francis Gilbert, East Orange vs. Public Service Gas Co.	Excessive bills.	Inspector reported total amount of gas apparently used as indicated by meter readings and test of meter indicated meter measuring correctly.
Nov. 25	David Goldsmith, Newark vs. Public Service Gas Co.	Failure to allow quantity discount.	Inspector reported a credit would be allowed for quantity discount as set forth in company's rates.
Nov. 26	W. S. Brown, North Hackensack vs. Hackensack Water Co.	Discrimination in charging old flat rate instead of new rate.	Charges made in accordance with guarantee given when extension was made.
Nov. 28	Mrs. Kate Rowe, Keansburg vs. Standard Gas Co.	Leak in gas pipes affecting quality of water.	Pending.

INFORMAL COMPLAINTS.

DATE, 1919	NAME.	SUBJECT.	REPORT.
Nov. 28	James Licari, Brooklyn vs. Standard Gas Co.	Extension of service in Keansburg.	Pending.
Nov. 28	Rev. N. M. Simmonds, Elizabeth vs. Public Service Railway Co.	Overcrowding of car between Newark and Elizabeth, leaving the terminal at 5:10 P. M.	Company advised of arrangements for better service.
Nov. 29	Isaac Miller, Roselle vs. Public Service Electric Co.	Deposit required before connecting service.	Extension made without cost to complainant.
Nov. 29	Charles Senitsky, Elizabeth vs. Public Service Electric Co.	Extension of service in Roselle.	Extension made without cost to complainant.
Nov. 29	A. I. Skriloff and Joseph H. Lee, New Brunswick vs. Metuchen Gas Light Co.	Extension of service in Metuchen.	Pending.
Nov. 29	George Combes, Elizabeth vs. Public Service Railway Co.	Inadequate service in Elizabeth.	Pending.
Nov. 29	Leader Silk Company, Paterson vs. Public Service Electric Co.	Extension of service in Paterson.	Inspector reported delay in making extension due to strike of lineman.
Dec. 1	Mrs. Charles Hamell, Camden vs. Public Service Electric Co.	Extension of service in Bellmawr.	Pending.
Dec. 1	Alfred F. Fleischmann, Ridgefield Park, vs. Public Service Electric Co.	Extension of service in Ridgefield Park.	Extension made without cost to complainant.
Dec. 2	C. P. Jennings, New York vs. Public Service Electric Co.	Extension of service in Bayonne.	Extension made without cost to complainant

You Are Viewing an Archived Report from the New Jersey State Library

DATE, 1919	NAME.	SUBJECT.	REPORT.
Dec. 3	F. S. Tainter, New York vs. New Jersey Power and Light Co.	Excessive bills.	Pending.
Dec. 3	P. S. Weir, Asbury Park vs. Atlantic Coast Electric Light Co.	Inadequate service.	Pending.
Dec. 3	City Council of Camden vs. Stockton Water Co.	Extension of service in Camden.	Pending.
Dec. 4	Delair Improvement Association vs. Pennsylvania Railroad Co.	Protection of crossings at Delair.	Pending.
Dec. 4	Arthur P. Ryon, Pleasantville vs. Atlantic County Water Co.	Extension of service in Pleasantville.	Pending.
Dec. 4	W. T. Gould, Upper Montclair vs. Public Service Gas Co.	Depreciation allowed in Board's report in- creasing rates.	Pending.
Dec. 5	Sarah Skinner, Phillipsburg vs. Easton Gas Works	Refusal to supply service because of non- payment of bills at former residence.	Pending.
Dec. 5	Warren Foundry and Machine Co., Phillips- burg vs. Central Railroad of New Jersey	Excessive rate on cast iron pipe.	Pending.
Dec. 5	John W. Smith, Bergenfield vs. Public Service Electric Co.	Extension of service in Englewood.	Service supplied and complaint withdrawn.
Dec. 5	Borough of Audubon, Camden vs. New Jersey Water Service Co.	Failure of company to maintain pressure for fire hydrants.	Inspector reported complaint satisfactorily ad- justed.

INFORMAL COMPLAINTS.

DATE, 1919	NAME.	SUBJECT.	REPORT.
Dec. 6	Charles E. Crate, Collingswood vs. Public Service Electric Co.	Extension of service in Collingswood.	Extension made without cost to complainant.
Dec. 6	Shaffer Bros., Swedesboro vs. Electric Company of New Jersey	Delay in extending service in Swedesboro.	Pending.
Dec. 6	W. J. Williams, New York vs. Public Service Electric Co.	Extension of service in Dunellen.	Extension made without cost to complainant.
Dec. 8	J. E. Taylor & Son vs. Cape May Illuminating Co.	Rendering of bill for service during period when stable was closed.	Pending.
Dec. 9	William E. Crowther, Gloucester City vs. Public Service Gas Co.	Bill rendered after payments were deposited in prepayment meter.	Pending.
Dec. 9	John H. Brewer, Philadelphia, Pa. vs. Laurel Springs Water Co.	Payment for cost of extension of service in Stratford.	Inspector reported company would press builder of premises for cost of extension.
Dec. 10	J. William Richardt, Newark vs. New York Telephone Co.	Delay in installation of telephone.	Service installed and complaint satisfactorily settled.
Dec. 10	Carl Wennland, Bergenfield vs. Public Service Electric Co.	Excessive deposit required before extending service in Bergenfield.	Pending.
Dec. 10	J. M. Framme et al. vs. Delaware and Atlantic Telegraph and Telephone Co.	Extension of service in Trenton.	Pending.
Dec. 10	Trenton Tool Company vs. Public Service Electric Co.	Extension of service in Trenton.	Extension made without cost to complainant.

DATE, 1919	NAME.	SUBJECT.	REPORT.
Dec. 10	H. E. Patterson, Asbury Park vs. Atlantic Coast Electric Light Co.	Excessive bills.	Pending.
Dec. 11	Mrs. A. Nelson, New York vs. Public Service Electric Co.	Extension of service in Westfield.	Extension made without cost to complainant.
Dec. 12	Board of Education of Haddon Heights vs. Public Service Electric Co.	Question of responsibility for bill caused by error in making connection to meters.	Pending.
Dec. 12	Council of West Orange vs. Public Service Railway Co.	Extension of service in West Orange.	Inspector reported company unwilling to make extension, at present.
Dec. 12	Henry S. Scull, Linwood vs. Atlantic City Suburban Gas and Fuel Co.	Extension of service in Linwood.	Pending.
Dec. 13	Fred W. DeVoe, New Brunswick vs. Central Railroad Co. of New Jersey	Protection of crossing in Boro of Middle- sex.	Pending.
Dec. 13	William T. Laing, Little Falls vs. Public Service Gas Co.	Excessive bill.	Pending.
Dec. 13	David S. Forman, Newark vs. Public Service Electric Co.	Extension of service.	Pending.
Dec. 15	Middlesex Aniline Co., Inc., Lincoln vs. Central Railroad Co. of New Jersey	Protection of crossing by gates in Lincoln.	Pending.
Dec. 16	William C. Raynor, Ocean City vs. City Gas Light Co.	Extension of service in Ocean City.	Delay in making extension due to paving of street: Inspector reported same may be made now as soon as desired.
Dec. 16	M. J. Bickerton, New York City vs. Public Service Electric Co.	Extension of service in Delanco.	Pending.

INFORMAL COMPLAINTS.

DATE, 1919	NAME.	SUBJECT.	REPORT.
Dec. 16	A. H. Wilkins et al., Collingswood vs. Public Service Electric Co.	Delay in installing lights on Park Ave., Collingswood.	Pending.
Dec. 16	Herman Franklin, Paterson vs. Public Service Gas Co. and Public Service Electric Co.	Excessive bills.	Pending.
Dec. 17	Woodbury Heights Street and Light Com. vs. Public Service Electric Co.	Extension of service in Woodbury Heights.	Pending.
Dec. 17	George Penck, Summit vs. New York Telephone Co.	Refusal of service owing to non-payment of previous bill owed by complainant's wife.	Complaint withdrawn.
Dec. 17	N. Ellis, Palisades Park vs. Public Service Railway Co.	Issuance of transfers.	Pending.
Dec. 17	Trainers Business College, Perth Amboy vs. Public Service Railway Co.	Refusal to issue school tickets from Perth Amboy to Chrome and Carteret.	Pending.
Dec. 18	Frank Kirby, Woodstown vs. Electric Company of New Jersey	Refusal to supply service on account of disputed bill.	Pending.
Dec. 18	E. M. J. Morel, Roselle vs. Public Service Electric Co.	Extension of service in Roselle.	Pending.
Dec. 18	Gustav A. Bolt, Elizabeth vs. Public Service Electric Co.	Extension of service in Elizabeth.	Extension made without cost to complainant.
Dec. 18	M. R. Faulkner, Dr. vs. New Jersey Gas Co.	Excessive bills.	Pending.

DATE, 1919	NAME.	SUBJECT.	REPORT.
Dec. 19	Thomas A. Levinge, Collingswood vs. Public Service Electric Co.	Discontinuance of service because of dispute over excessive bill.	Pending.
Dec. 19	H. W. Slaughter, Metuchen vs. Public Service Electric Co.	Extension of service in Metuchen.	Pending.
Dec. 19	Edward H. Cutler Co., Maple Shade vs. Public Service Electric Co.	Extension of service in Maple Shade.	Pending.
Dec. 19	New Point Comfort Chemical Engine Co. No. 1, Keansburg vs. Keansburg Water Co.	Discontinuance of service.	Inspector reported discontinuance of service due to laying of new mains.
Dec. 19	Jacob M. Feinsten, Red Bank vs. Monmouth County Electric Co.	Failure to restore stop in front of store which is used as a waiting room.	Pending.
Dec. 22	Adolph Korschok, Millville vs. Millville Electric Light Co.	Extension of service in Millville.	Pending.
Dec. 23	Edward R. Carman, Burlington vs. Public Service Electric Co.	Extension of service in Burlington.	Pending.
Dec. 23	R. Anderson, Bradley Beach vs. Monmouth County Water Co.	Inadequate service.	Complaint not warranted.
Dec. 23	Dominick J. Livelli, Lyndhurst vs. Public Service Railway Co.	Condition of cars on Hackensack line.	Pending.
Dec. 24	John A. Newman, New Brunswick vs. Public Service Electric Co.	Extension of service in New Brunswick.	Pending.

DATE, 1919	NAME.	SUBJECT.	REPORT.
Dec. 24	American Materials Co., New York vs. Central Railroad Co. of New Jersey	Overcharge on shipment of sand.	Pending.
Dec. 26	Borough of Hopewell vs. New Jersey Northern Gas Co.	Inadequate service.	Pending.
Dec. 26	Gaspara Duisit, Hoboken vs. Public Service Gas Co.	Extension of service in West Hoboken.	Pending.
Dec. 26	Borough Council of Westwood vs. Public Service Electric Co.	Delay in installing street lights.	Pending.
Dec. 26	Claude Hiles, Millville vs. Millville Electric Light Co.	Delay in extending service.	Pending.
Dec. 26	Township of Northampton vs. Mt. Holly Water Co.	Refusal to install meters in private houses.	Pending.
Dec. 26	Tuckerton Railroad Co. vs. Tuckerton Water Co.	In re service.	Pending.
Dec. 26	Thomas R. Tate, Westfield vs. New York Telephone Co.	Threat to discontinue service because of non-payment of disputed bill.	Pending.
Dec. 26	Albert Rietmann, North Bergen vs. New York Telephone Co.	Delay in installing telephone.	Pending.
Dec. 26	Buttler-Howell Co., New Brunswick vs. Public Service Electric Co.	Refusal to allow wiring together of lights and power to come through same meter.	Pending.
Dec. 29	Property Owners of Woodlawn Terrace vs. Public Service Electric Co.	Extension of service in Piscataway Township.	Pending.

You Are Viewing an Archived Report from the New Jersey State Library

DATE, 1919	NAME.	SUBJECT.	REPORT.
Dec. 30	Mrs. A. L. Klein, Audubon vs. Public Service Electric Co.	Extension of service in Audubon.	Pending.
Dec. 30	Board of Health of Roselle Park vs. Plainfield-Union Water Co.	Extension of service in Roselle Park.	Pending.
Dec. 31	Samuel L. Walden, Atlantic City vs. Atlantic City Electric Co.	Disputed bill.	Pending.

INFORMAL COMPLAINTS.

Applications for Approval of Mortgages and Issues of Bonds and Stock.

The following pages contain in tabular form a record of applications, granted during the year, for the Board's approval of issues of securities and of transfer of capital stock to other corporations.

All certificates approving issues of stock or bonds are subject to Conference Order Number Seven, which provides for semi-annual reports of the disposition of the proceeds realized from such issues.

In some cases reports stating the Board's reasons for action taken by it on applications for approval were filed. These are published in full at the end of the section following the tabular matter.

Below is given a summary showing by classes of utilities the par value of capital stock and funded debt authorized to be issued, and also the total amount thereof for each of four general purposes for which the issues were to be made:

	<i>Capital Stock.</i>	<i>Funded Debt.</i>	<i>Total.</i>
*7 Electric Companies,	\$411,000	\$132,960	\$543,960
*1 Gas Companies,	32,000	32,000
*9 Water Companies,	2,081,950	169,400	2,251,350
*2 Steam Railroads,	65,000,000	65,000,000
*6 Electric Railways,	30,000	1,429,000	1,459,000
*1 Sewer Companies,	28,000	28,000
*3 Telephone Companies,	2,500	8,200	10,700
*29 Total,	\$2,553,450	\$66,771,560	\$69,325,010

Purpose of Issue.

To capitalize current improvements,	\$1,357,100	\$441,279	\$1,798,379
To capitalize improvements of prior years,	839,000	46,200,011	47,039,011
To refund prior issues of securities,	341,400	20,122,920	20,464,320
To acquire properties of other utilities,	15,950	7,350	23,300
Total,	\$2,553,450	\$66,771,560	\$69,325,010

*Number of applications

Date of Approval. (1919)	Name of Applicant.	Amount and Kind of Security Approved.	Purpose of Issue and Remarks.
Jan. 7	Penn. R. R. Co.,	\$50,000,000 general mtg. bonds,	To be issued at not less than 96½ per cent. of par value for the purpose of reimbursing the company for the following capital expenditures already made: \$40,045,565 net additions to way and structures including leased lines; \$6,395,151, ninety per cent. of net additions and betterments to equipment; \$3,549,105, ninety per cent. of matured equipment trust obligations; \$765,912, real estate mortgages retired.
Jan. 14	Penn. & N. J. R. R. Co.,		Approval having been granted by the Board on March 14th 1916, of \$50,000 first mortgage bonds, and having also on the 9th of October, 1917, approved the issuance of \$50,000 additional bonds, and it appearing that none of these bonds have been issued or were likely to be issued in the near future, the Board revoked the approval given by it upon the aforesaid dates.
Jan. 28	Bridgeton Elec. Co.,	\$40,000 preferred stock,	To be issued for the purposes set forth in the Board's report in this matter of January 16th, 1919, given in full at the end of this section. Application was made for the approval of the issuance of \$50,000, in lieu of which the Board approved the issuance of \$40,000. Approval was also given of the transfer of the \$40,000 stock to the American Railways Co.
Jan. 28	Vincentown & Tabernacle Tel. Co.,	\$2,000 5 per cent. debenture bonds,	For refunding a like amount of 4½ per cent. bonds which matured in the latter part of the year 1918.
Feb. 25	Tintern Manor Water Co.,		To extend the date of maturity for three years of the \$100,000 first mortgage bonds of the Long Branch Water Supply Co., due March 1st, 1919.
Mar. 6	Trenton & Mercer County Trac. Corp.,	\$121,000 car trusts certfs.,	To be issued in part payment for the purchase of 20 "one-man safety" cars.
Mar. 11	Cape May Court House L. & W. Co.,	\$7,350 debenture bonds,	For acquisition of the capital stock of the Neptunus Water Co. in accordance with the Board's report of even date in this matter given in full at the end of this section.
Mar. 11	Stone Harbor Elec. Lt. & P. Co.,		For approval of the sale and transfer of the capital stock of the Neptunus Water Co. to the Cape May Court House Light and Power Co, in accordance with the Board's report of even date in this matter given in full at the end of this section.
Mar. 14	Public Service R. R. Co.,	\$30,000 capital stock,	For reimbursement of current construction expenditures. The application was for the approval of \$60,000, in lieu of which the Board approved the issuance of \$30,000, for the reasons set forth in the Board's report of even date in this matter given in full at the end of this section.

APPLICATION FOR APPROVAL OF MORTGAGES, ETC. 105

Date of Approval. (1919)	Name of Applicant.	Amount and Kind of Security Approved.	Purpose of Issue and Remarks.
Mar. 18	Easton Gas Works,	\$32,000 first consolidated mtge. bonds,	To be issued at not less than 86 per cent. of par value for reimbursement of construction expenditures already made.
Mar. 24	Erie Railroad Co.,	\$15,000,000 6 per cent. 3-year gold notes,	For refunding a like amount of maturing 5 per cent. notes. For further particulars see the Board's order in this matter given in full at the end of this section.
Mar. 28	Trenton & Mercer County Trac. Corp.,	\$200,000 6 per cent. 5-year gold notes,	To reimburse the company for current construction expenditures of approximately \$100,000, and to liquidate floating debts of the same amount representing unpaid taxes which were in litigation but which now must be met. The entire issue of notes are to be paid off out of income during the five-year period, the lessor companies agreeing to defer their rentals, if necessary, to enable the lessee to retire the notes.
May 1	Trenton, Hamilton & Ewing Trac. Co.,	\$14,000 first mtge. bonds,	To be issued at not less than 85 per cent. of par value for reimbursement of current construction expenditures by the lessee, Trenton & Mercer County Traction Corporation. The application was for the approval of \$40,000, in lieu of which the Board approved the issuance of only \$14,000 for the reason that the lessee could not immediately undertake the construction work for which the balance of the bonds was sought to be issued.
May 1	Atlantic City R. R. Co.,		To extend from May 1st, 1919, to May 1st, 1929, the date of maturity of the company's first mortgage bonds dated May 1st, 1889, amounting to \$2,200,000 par value, and to increase the rate of interest from 5 per cent. to 5½ per cent.
May 15	Newton Electric & Gas Co.,	\$23,608.75 6 per cent. promissory notes,	To provide funds for making contemplated extensions.
May 22	Trenton & Mercer County Trac. Corp.,		Approval having been granted by the Board on March 6th, 1919, of the issuance of \$121,000 trust certificates, and it appearing that these certificates have not been issued and that it is now proposed to issue in place thereof a promissory note secured by a purchase money chattel mortgage, the Board revoked its approval of the issuance of the certificates, with leave to the company to renew its application for approval of the latter in case it became desirable to issue same after cancellation of the aforesaid chattel mortgage.

Date of Approval. (1919)	Name of Applicant.	Amount and Kind of Security Approved.	Purpose of Issue and Remarks.
May 22	Trenton & Mercer County Trac. Corp.,		For approval of a chattel mortgage to secure the company's four months' promissory note to the amount of \$95,288 given in part payment of the purchase price of 20 "one-man safety" cars.
June 5	Hudson & Manhattan Railroad Co.,	\$1,036,000 first lien and ref'g mtge. bonds,	To be issued at not less than 80 per cent. of par value for reimbursing the company to the extent of \$232,400 for construction expenditure already made and to the extent of \$596,400 for meeting maturing obligations.
June 5	Erie Railroad Co.,		For modification of the Board's order of June 20th, 1917, authorizing the pledging of \$15,000,000 Series A Refunding and Improvement Mortgage bonds as security for short term loans, so as to also authorize the company to pledge not exceeding \$5,400,000 of said Series A Refunding and Improvement Mortgage bonds as security for its note or notes running for not more than two years on the basis of not more than \$150 in amount of bonds for each \$100 in amount of loan.
June 25	Englewood Sewerage Co.,	\$28,000 capital stock,	For the purpose set forth in the Board's report of even date in this matter given in full at the end of this section. The application was for \$100,000 capital stock, in lieu of which the Board approved the issuance of only \$28,000, which amount had already been previously issued without the Board's approval.
July 3	Califon Electric Lt. & P. Co.,	\$10,000 capital stock,	For reimbursement of current construction expenditures.
July 10	Peoples Rural Tel. Co.,	\$6,200 first mtge. bonds,	To be issued for the purpose set forth in the Board's report of July 1st, in this matter given in full at the end of this section. The application was for the approval of \$25,000 bonds in lieu of which the Board approved the issuance of \$6,200.
July 16	Hackettstown Tel. & Telg. Co.,	\$2,500 capital stock,	To provide funds for current construction expenditures. The application was for the approval of \$3,750 capital stock, in lieu of which the Board approved the issuance of \$2,500.

Date of Approval. (1919)	Name of Applicant.	Amount and Kind of Security Approved.	Purpose of Issue and Remarks.
July 29	N. J. Power & Lt. Co.,	\$55,000 first mtge. bonds, \$161,000 common stock, \$200,000 7 per cent. preferred stock, ..	The bonds to be issued at not less than 83 per cent. par value and the proceeds therefrom together with \$19,600 of the 7 per cent. preferred stock to reimburse the company for current construction expenditures and the balance of the preferred stock to retire an equal amount of short term notes secured by pledging of \$214,000 6 per cent. general mortgage bonds, both of which are to be canceled. The \$161,000 common stock is to be issued to retire an equal amount of 6 per cent. preferred stock which is also to be canceled.
Aug. 12	Woodbourne Electric Lt. & P. Co.,	\$12,000 6 per cent. promissory notes,	To raise funds for making extensions to the company's plant and equipment.
Aug. 12	Buckhorn Springs Water Co.,	\$15,950 capital stock,	For acquisition of the capital stock of the Belvidere Water Supply Co.
Aug. 12	Belvidere Water Supply Co.,		For approval of transfer on its books of its outstanding capital stock to the Buckhorn Springs Water Co.
Aug. 12	Merchantville Water Co.,	\$25,000 first mtge. bonds,	To be issued at par to reimburse the company to the extent of \$11,731 for construction expenditures already made and to provide funds for further extensions.
Sept. 9	Atlantic County Electric Co.,	\$35,000 first mtge. bonds,	To be issued at par for refunding \$20,000 matured bonds and to reimburse the company for construction expenditures already made.
Sept. 9	Atlantic County Electric Co.,		For approval of a mortgage dated August 1st, 1919, to the Atlantic Safe Deposit and Trust Company, trustee, to secure the above said issue of bonds.
Sept. 17	New York Central R. R. Co.,		For approval of the pledging of \$20,000,000 of its 4½ per cent. Refunding and Improvement Mortgage bonds as part collateral for its one year, 6 per cent. collateral trust notes aggregating \$15,000,000.
Oct. 16	N. J. Power & Light Co.,		For modification of the Board's certificate of July 29th, 1919, approving the issuance of \$55,000 first mortgage bonds, \$161,000 common stock, \$200,000 7 per cent. of preferred stock, so as to show approval of only the \$55,000 first mortgage bonds, the approval in said certificate of the said amounts of common and preferred stocks being revoked.

Date of Approval. (1919)	Name of Applicant.	Amount and Kind of Security Approved.	Purpose of Issue and Remarks.
Oct. 16	N. J. Power & Light Co.,	\$161,000 common stock, \$200,000 7 per cent. preferred stock, ..	To be issued for the same purpose as were the same amounts of stocks referred to in the Board's certificate of July 9th, 1919.
Oct. 28	Commonwealth Water Co.		For modification of the Board's certificate of August 20th, 1918, approving the issuance of \$78,000 certificates of indebtedness and of \$19,000 capital stock, so as to show approval of only \$76,000 certificates of indebtedness.
Oct. 28	Commonwealth Water Co.	\$55,000 certs. of indebtedness, \$20,000 capital stock,	Both issues to be made at par for the purpose of reimbursing the company for construction expenditures already made.
Nov. 5	Hackensack Water Co., .	\$2,000,000 7 per cent. preferred stock,	To pay off \$785,000 of floating indebtedness incurred for construction purposes and to provide additional funds for making further extensions and improvements.
Nov. 13	Atlantic County Water Co.,	\$60,000 first mtge. bonds,	For the purpose of reimbursing the company for construction expenditures already made.
Nov. 18	Ideal Beach Water Co., .	\$13,000 capital stock,	To raise funds for making extensions and improvements.
Nov. 18	Sea Isle Water Co.,	\$8,000 capital stock,	To raise funds for making extensions and improvements.
Nov. 20	N. J. Water Service Co.,	\$29,400 first mtge. bonds,	To be issued at not less than 90 per cent. of par value for raising funds to make extensions.
Dec. 9	Morris County Trac. Co.,	\$58,000 car trust certs.,	For part payment of 14 "one-man" traction cars.
Dec. 18	Hudson & Manhattan R. Co.,		For modification of the Board's certificate of June 5th, 1919, approving the issuance of \$1,036,000 par value of bonds, which approval applied only to bonds issued by the company on or before December 31st, 1919, so as to extend the time for the issuance of bonds to and including June 30th, 1920.
Dec. 30	Bound Brook Water Co.,	\$25,000 capital stock,	To provide funds for current and future construction work to the extent of \$13,000 and to retire floating indebtedness, incurred for construction purposes to the extent of \$12,000.

110 PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSIONERS' REPORT.

Application of Bridgeton Electric Company for Approval of the Issuance and Transfer of Stock to the American Railways Company.

REPORT.

C. L. S. Tingley, for the Petitioner.

L. Edward Herrmann, for the Board.

On December 5th, 1917, there was filed with this Board a petition by the Bridgeton Electric Company and the American Railways Company, both corporations of this State, for an order authorizing the issuance of 500 shares of its preferred capital stock at par to the American Railways Company, which has agreed to take and pay for the same in cash at par.

The Bridgeton Electric Company maintains and operates a plant in the city of Bridgeton and its vicinity for the manufacture, sale and distribution of electricity for lighting, heating and power purposes. It has an authorized capital stock of \$300,000, of which 2,000 shares of the aggregate par value of \$200,000 are preferred capital stock and 1,000 shares of the aggregate par value of \$100,000 are common capital stock.

There are now issued and outstanding 500 shares of said preferred capital stock and 1,000 shares of common capital stock.

The petition alleges that the Bridgeton Electric Company is indebted in the sum of \$50,000 for moneys advanced to it from time to time and used by it in payment for additions and extensions of its power plant. It proposes to issue 500 shares of its preferred capital stock at par for the purpose of providing funds for the payment and extinguishment of said indebtedness. It alleges that the American Railways Company now owns substantially all of the capital stock, both common and preferred, of the Bridgeton Electric Company, and much in excess of the majority thereof; that the said American Railways Company is not engaged in the business of furnishing light, heat or power, nor does it own any of the capital stock or other securities of any other corporation engaged in said business in said territory, and that the effect of such purchase will not lessen any competition in the territory.

The petition was filed simultaneously with another petition in which the said Bridgeton Electric Company and the Electric Company of New Jersey sought approval of a merger agreement made and entered into by these two companies.

The two matters were heard together because the merger agreement sought to be approved was predicated upon this Board's approval of the issuance and transfer of the shares of stock, the subject matter of the present petition.

Two hearings were held. The first on July 2d, 1918, and the last on November 10th, 1918. The length of time which elapsed between hearings was because of the failure of the petitioner to furnish information required by the Board's engineers and necessary for a proper consideration of the case.

An examination of an inventory and appraisal of the company's property as of December 31st, 1917, submitted by the company indicates that the major portion of the indebtedness represents money borrowed to pay for materials

APPLICATION FOR APPROVAL OF MORTGAGES, ETC. 111

and supplies and other items of working capital, and also construction work in progress on December 31st, 1917, rather than additions to fixed capital account.

The total outstanding securities of the company amount to \$50,000 in preferred stock, \$100,000 in common stock and \$250,000 in bonds.

Practically all of the stock issued is held by the American Railways Company.

The inventory and appraisal submitted by the company shows a total value of \$397,465.99.

The expenditures sought to be capitalized, having been made for materials and supplies and other working capital, and for some construction work then in progress, our consideration is therefore confined to the determination of the reasonable amount of working capital which should be allowed and the amount of construction work in progress on December 31st, 1917.

The company's working capital, as obtained from its report made to this Board for the year 1917, is \$34,003.99, or slightly over eight per cent. of the total fixed capital. This is obtained by taking the difference between the current assets (materials and supplies, cash, consumers' accounts receivable, other accounts receivable) and current liabilities (taxes accrued, other accrued liabilities and other accounts payable).

The construction work in progress as shown by the same report amounts to \$5,660.67. The company's working capital as found above probably includes some items in materials and supplies account, which will subsequently be charged to fixed capital account, and the cost of carrying such items as well as the construction work in progress, would, in a rate case, be considered as interest during construction.

It seems desirable because of the pending merger of the Bridgeton Electric Company with the Electric Company of New Jersey, that the floating assets of the former should be capitalized before any merger is effected.

From the calculation made by the Board's engineers, however, the approval of the issuance of \$50,000 par value of the preferred stock of the company cannot be authorized. Based on these calculations we will allow the company to issue 400 shares of the preferred stock of the aggregate value of \$40,000 to be issued and transferred to the American Railways Company at par for cash; of the proceeds we will allow \$35,000 for working capital and \$5,000 for construction work in progress as of December 31st, 1917.

Dated January 16th, 1919.

In the Matter of the Application of the Stone Harbor Electric Light and Power Company for Approval of the Sale of Stock of the Neptunus Water Company.

REPORT.

Walter Carson, for the Petitioners.

The Vulcan Electric Light, Heat and Power Company, owning an electric plant in Cape May Court House, was placed in the hands of a receiver, and the property is about to be sold to satisfy a mortgage.

The building in which the plant of the Vulcan Company is located houses also the plant of the Neptunus Water Company, and steam for the Neptunus plant is furnished from the boiler belonging to the Vulcan Company.

Efficiency in operation requires that these two companies be maintained and operated as one physical plant.

The property of the Vulcan Company is about to be sold at foreclosure sale, and the Committee of Bondholders has formed a company known as the Cape May Court House Light and Water Company for the purpose of taking over the property of the Vulcan Company. In order that the Neptunus Water Company may be operated jointly with the new electric company the Cape May Company desires to purchase the stock of the Neptunus Water Company. This stock is now owned by the Stone Harbor Electric Light and Power Company, which latter company is the petitioner in this case, approval being asked for the sale by the Stone Harbor Company of the stock of the Neptunus Water Company.

For the sake of economy in operation the petition ought to be approved and the Stone Harbor Company allowed to sell the stock of the Neptunus Water Company. The amount to be paid for this stock by the Cape May Company is the sum of \$7,350.

In September, 1912, the Stone Harbor Electric Light and Power Company issued bonds in the amount of \$19,375 at 80, netting the sum of \$15,500. This is the amount paid for the stock of the Neptunus Water Company and the stock of the Vulcan Electric Light, Heat and Power Company, and part of these funds were used in paying off a mortgage of \$1,500.

The approval of the sale by the Stone Harbor Company of the stock of the Neptunus Water Company must be accompanied by a condition that the proceeds be turned over to the trustee under the mortgage of the Stone Harbor Company, to be applied by him either in retirement of bonds or to be later turned over by him to the company and utilized for additional construction if and when same may be necessary.

The foreclosure sale of the Vulcan Company results in making the stock of the Vulcan Company now in the hands of the Stone Harbor Company worthless, and the amount represented by the balance of the bonds which were issued by the Stone Harbor Company, approximately \$12,025, in purchasing these stocks must be amortized. This can best be done by setting up a proper amount in a suspense account to be written off within the term of the bonds in a similar manner to that by which bond discount is amortized.

CONCLUSIONS.

The Board will approve the sale of the Neptunus Water Company's stock by the Stone Harbor Company upon condition (1) that the proceeds be turned over to the trustee for use in the manner above indicated; and (2) that an amount equal to the difference between the sum received by the Stone Harbor Company in this proceeding and the face value of the bonds issued in 1912 be amortised in the manner above indicated.

Dated March 11th, 1919.

APPLICATION FOR APPROVAL OF MORTGAGES, ETC. 113

Application of Easton Gas Works for Approval of Issue of \$44,000 Gold Notes and of the Collateral Trust Indenture Securing Them.

REPORT.

Hedley V. Cooke, for Petitioner.

L. Edward Herrmann, for Board of Public Utility Commissioners.

Easton Gas Works petitions for the approval by this Board of the issue of \$44,000 five-year five per cent. gold notes, and of an indenture securing them, made by said Easton Gas Works with Easton Trust Company.

The petition states that the petitioner has agreed with the holders of \$44,000 principal amount first mortgage fifteen-year five per cent. gold bonds of the Nazareth Illuminating Gas Company, a Pennsylvania corporation, to purchase said bonds at the face value thereof, and in payment of the purchase price to issue to said holders ratably according to their respective holding \$44,000 principal amount of the petitioner's five-year five per cent. gold notes, to be dated December 1st, 1918, and to be secured by a collateral trust indenture with Easton Trust Company as trustee, pledging the said purchased bonds as security for the said notes. A copy of the proposed collateral trust indenture was submitted. The petitioner further alleges that the offer of petitioner to purchase the said bonds was made for the following reasons.

In 1912 the Nazareth Illuminating Gas Company, operating at Nazareth, Pennsylvania, authorized and sold \$50,000 principal amount of its bonds. That the payment of the bonds was guaranteed by the Pennsylvania Utilities Company, a Pennsylvania corporation, which is the owner of all of the capital stock of the petitioner. That said bonds were secured by first mortgage on the franchises and property of the said the Nazareth Illuminating Gas Company to the Easton Trust Company; that the Nazareth Illuminating Gas Company was merged into the Interurban Gas Company on March 15th, 1913, and that \$6,000 principal amount of the bonds of said Nazareth Illuminating Gas Company have been paid, leaving a balance of \$44,000 thereof unpaid; that the Interurban Gas Company allowed the interest on the aforesaid bonds to default, and so remain in default from June 1st, 1918, to July 1st, 1918, and that under the terms of the mortgage the principal amount of the bonds thus became due; that the trustee under the mortgage of the Nazareth Illuminating Gas Company holds a paper purporting to be a guarantee to it by the petitioner, the Easton Gas works, of the payment of principal and of the interest on said bonds, and has threatened to bring suit to enforce the same; that the petitioner has been advised by counsel that the guarantee may be enforceable, and in order to avoid litigation and postponement of the payment of the bonds has acquired the stock of the Interurban Gas Company, and has entered into the arrangement for the purchase of the bonds of the Nazareth Illuminating Gas Company, for which it purposes issuing the \$44,000 gold notes for which approval of this Board is sought.

A hearing was held on February 20th, 1919, at which there were produced as witnesses the attorney for the petitioner and its assistant treasurer. Sum-

114 PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSIONERS' REPORT.

marized, the testimony of the former is to the effect that there is in existence what purports to be a guarantee by the Easton Gas Works and the Pennsylvania Utilities Company of the payment of the principal and interest of the issue of \$50,000 bonds of the Nazareth Illuminating Gas Company, and that upon this guarantee the successor company of the Nazareth Illuminating Gas Company, defaulted on June 1st last, in the payment of the interest then due on the bonds, and permitted the default to continue for a period of thirty days thereafter. Suit on this alleged guarantee has been threatened. The witness is uncertain as to the validity of the guarantee if one exists, and is also in doubt as to the liability of the Easton Gas Works under any such alleged guarantee. To avoid a threatened suit, the plan was proposed to purchase the bonds and give in payment therefor the gold notes of the Easton Gas Works, the approval to issue which is sought in the present application, the bonds to be deposited as collateral security for the payment of the notes.

The following extract from the testimony of the witnesses is pertinent:

Q. What did the Easton Gas Works ever get for its obligation for the payment of these bonds?

A. I am not able to say they got anything.

Q. What do you seek to capitalize by the issuance of these notes—a liability?

A. That is all. It is not a thing I am anxious, as an attorney, to do. I am simply forced to the conclusion it is the best policy to pursue.

Q. What will the Easton Gas Works get for this \$44,000?

A. It is released from a present liability; simply substitutes one liability for another, as I see it.

Q. But by your own statement the liability is not accurately determined. There is some doubt in your mind?

A. There is some doubt in my mind as to the existence of it, but after reading from the Pennsylvania authorities on corporation guarantees, I am rather disposed to think that these guarantees would be upheld because they had been taken in apparent good faith by the present owners of the bonds and a good consideration given for them, as between them and the guarantor.

Q. Will the Easton Gas Works become the owner of these bonds by issuing these notes?

A. It will.

It is not claimed by the petitioner that the purchase of these bonds and the issuance of the collateral gold notes is desirable as an investment. Nor has it been shown that the liability of the Easton Gas Works as guarantor of the payment of the bonds sought to be acquired is definite and certain.

Under these circumstances no justification appears to this Board to warrant its approval to the issuance of the gold notes applied for. The Board, therefore, withholds its approval.

Dated March 11th, 1919.

APPLICATION FOR APPROVAL OF MORTGAGES, ETC. 115

In the Matter of the Application of Public Service Railroad Company for the Approval of the Issuance of its Capital Stock to the Amount of \$160,000 Par Value.

REPORT.

L. D. H. Gilmour, for Public Service Railroad Company.

L. Edward Herrmann, for the Board of Public Utility Commissioners.

Public Service Railroad Company is a corporation formed by the merger and consolidation, approved by the Board in 1913, of the Trenton Terminal Railroad Company and the Elizabeth, New Brunswick and Trenton Railroad Company, both of which were organized under the General Railroad Act, and as the successor to the former operates under lease, also approved by this Board, the road of the Elizabeth and Trenton Railroad Company extending from the City of Elizabeth, in Union County, to the junction with the line of the Public Service Railway Company at Bonhamtown and Metuchen Road near Metuchen, in Middlesex County, and from the Borough of Milltown, in the latter county, to a point just outside the City of Trenton, in Mercer County. Between Bonhamtown Junction and Milltown, a distance of approximately seven and one-half miles, the lessor owns a right of way, but this portion of its road has never been completed, the lessee operating its cars between these two points by a detour over the tracks of the Public Service Railway Company through the City of New Brunswick. For the completion of said portion of the road there still remains on deposit with the State Treasurer the sum of \$15,280.

In addition to the expenditures made by the lessor and its predecessor companies the Trenton and New Brunswick Railroad Company and the New Jersey Short Line Railroad Company, in building the road now operated by the Public Service Railroad Company as lessee, the latter has made improvements to and extensions thereof amounting, on December 31st, 1917, to \$1,212,629.60. Of these expenditures \$856,354.09 were made from the proceeds of the \$990,000 par value of bonds of the Elizabeth and Trenton Railroad Company, approved by the Board in 1912, and the amortized discount thereon up to the close of 1917. Of the \$356,275.51 remaining expenditures \$285,000 are covered by the present outstanding capital stock of the lessee, leaving a balance of \$71,275.51 against which permission is sought in the application now before the Board to issue \$60,000 par value of additional stock.

All the expenditures made by Public Service Railroad Company from the proceeds of the bonds of the Elizabeth and Trenton Railroad Company have been charged to the lessee's fixed capital accounts, and on the liability side of its balance sheet the par value of the lessor's bonds is carried under the head of "Other Permanent Reserves." In this account is also included \$100,743.80, representing the excess of the current assets over the current liabilities of the lessor assigned to the lessee at the time the lease was made. The greater part of this amount consists of the cash and other current assets comprising "Schedule A," referred to in the lease, according to the fifteenth paragraph of which the sum of money included in said Schedule A, together with the proceeds from the sale of the lessor's bonds, is to be available from time to time to the lessee for the restoration, rebuilding and extending of the

lessor's railroad property. The net amount of cash covered by said schedule and thus far received by the lessee is a little over \$64,000, and if this sum is accounted for in the same manner as the proceeds from the sale of the lessor's bonds, it should likewise be deducted from the lessee's fixed capital expenditures in determining the amount thereof that should properly be represented by the latter's capital stock.

In the petitioner's present application there is not applied against its construction expenditures any part of the aforesaid cash turned over by the lessor to the lessee, and in support of the latter's contention that it is not required under the lease to account for this money in that way, its Comptroller quoted at the hearing the seventh section of the lease, which states that the lessor "will forthwith, upon the execution hereof, assign, transfer and deliver to the lessee absolutely the cash, bills, notes, accounts receivable and other property enumerated and contained in said Schedule A." In the opinion of this witness the fifteenth section does not in any way nullify the provisions of the seventh, but is merely indicative of the manner in which the said sum of money may be applied by the lessee.

That the latter regards this money, however, as an amount for which it is accountable under the lease, and as thus having at least some limitations to the way in which it can properly be used would clearly appear from the fact of its being carried on the books of the lessee in the manner above stated along with the bonds of the lessor. In the first two annual reports made to the Board by the lessee the said sum of money forms part of the amount reported as a deduction from the lessee's total fixed capital expenditures.

According to the testimony given by the petitioner's Comptroller and the exhibits submitted at the hearing, the \$991,650 outstanding capital stock of the Elizabeth and Trenton Railroad Company was issued for physical property having a present value of \$912,852 and \$78,452 cash, which, with the exception of about \$10,000, had all been spent by the lessor for improvements to its road before it was leased to the Trenton Terminal Railroad Company. Besides the \$78,452 a further sum of \$35,000 was provided by the stockholders as working capital.

Under the reorganization plan, whereby the Elizabeth and Trenton Railroad Company acquired the property of the Trenton and New Brunswick Railroad Company and the New Jersey Short Line Railroad Company, the bondholders of the latter two companies who received preferred stock of the new company, as also shown by the testimony, sold this stock and deposited the proceeds thereof with trustees to pay off certain claims against the properties of the old companies and to defray other reorganization expenses. The proceeds from the sale of this stock appears to have been greater than was required for the purposes just mentioned and as representing the balance thereof there was eventually turned over to the new company a sum of a little more than \$38,000 as shown by its annual reports to this Board for the years 1911 and 1912, which amount was credited to its surplus account together with \$39,464 deposited with the State Treasurer by the old companies.

The total value of the assets thus acquired by the Elizabeth and Trenton Railroad Company in the reorganization of the old companies, to the owners of whose property was issued the former's capital stock of \$991,650, was approximately \$1,102,000, or \$110,000 in excess of the par value of the stock.

APPLICATION FOR APPROVAL OF MORTGAGES, ETC. 117

The last-named amount would accordingly appear to constitute premium on capital stock, which, in the judgment of the Board, should be applied to only such purposes as are proper for the use of any portion of the remaining proceeds from the issue of stock.

The total amount of cash assets obtained by the lessor in the manner above stated exceeded the par value of its issued capital stock by about \$120,000, and as no part of this sum had been expended by the lessor for improvements to its property, the entire \$100,744 excess of current assets over current liabilities which it turned over to the lessee must have formed part of the aforesaid premium on the lessor's capital stock. The Board is therefore of the opinion that the whole of the last-named amount, less the \$15,280 included therein that is on deposit with the State Treasurer as above explained, ought to be accounted for by the lessee in exactly the same manner as should the proceeds from the sale of its own capital stock or of the lessor's bonds.

The two general purposes for which the Board's approval of the issuance of capital stock or funded debt is ordinarily given are to raise funds for fixed capital expenditures and to provide working capital.

The total net fixed capital expenditures of Public Service Railroad Company up to the close of 1917 amounted to.....	\$1,212,629 60
Of this sum there was obtained from the sale of the lessor's bonds \$841,500, and the amortized discount thereon up to December 31st, 1917, was \$14,854.09, making a total of.....	856,354 09
<hr/>	
which deducted from the total expenditures leaves.....	\$356,275 51
to be otherwise accounted for. The amount of the lessee's issued and outstanding capital stock is.....	285,000 00
<hr/>	
which the above balance of expenditures exceeds by.....	\$71,275 51
For the completion of authorized construction work there is required, as per the company's application,	7,767 20
Adding to the two latter amounts an allowance of.....	36,421 09
for working capital, which slightly exceeds the amount above stated that was provided for this item when the operation of the road was begun by the Elizabeth and Trenton Railroad Company, and also the average amount, namely, \$34,645, carried by the Public Service Railroad Company in the accounts covering working capital at the close of each year from 1913 to 1917, inclusive, makes a total of.....	\$115,463 80
Deducting from this sum the above stated \$100,743.80 excess of current assets over current liabilities of the lessor, less the \$15,280 thereof on deposit with the State Treasurer, namely,	85,463 80
leaves as an amount against which additional stock of the lessee may be issued a balance of.....	\$30,000 00

A certificate of approval of the issuance by Public Service Railroad Company of its capital stock to this amount will accordingly issue.

Dated March 14th, 1919.

In the Matter of the Application of the Erie Railroad Company for Authority to Pledge Certain Bonds as Collateral and Issue its Three-Year Six Per Cent. Gold Notes to the Amount of \$15,000,000.

ORDER.

Application being made to the Board of Public Utility Commissioners by the Erie Railroad Company, a corporation of the State of New York, by petition in writing (which petition is by reference thereto herein made part hereof) for an order authorizing the pledging of \$8,372,000 face value series "D" bonds, issued under its general mortgage dated April 1st, 1903, as collateral security for the proposed issue of its three-year six per cent. collateral gold notes to the amount of \$15,000,000, and a hearing having been held before said Board and said Erie Railroad Company having appeared, and the Board having taken proof of the facts set forth in the petition and having examined such witnesses and papers as it deemed necessary to enable it to reach a conclusion in the matter,

Now THEREFORE, after due deliberation, this Board

1. Hereby authorizes the Erie Railroad Company to execute and deliver to the Bankers' Trust Company, as trustee, a corporation organized and existing under the laws of the State of New York, a certain collateral trust indenture to be dated April 1st, 1919, in the form filed herein on the 20th day of March, 1919, to secure an authorized issue of three-year notes bearing interest at the rate of six per cent. per annum, to the aggregate face amount of \$15,000,000.

2. Hereby requires that upon the execution and delivery of said indenture so authorized there shall be filed with this Board a copy of the indenture in the form in which it was executed and delivered, together with an affidavit by the president or other executive officer of the company, stating that the indenture as executed and delivered is the same as that herein approved by this Board.

3. Hereby authorizes the Erie Railroad Company to issue \$15,000,000 face value of its three-year six per cent. collateral gold notes secured by the aforesaid indenture.

4. Hereby requires that said notes of the total face value of \$15,000,000, or their proceeds in so far as they may be applicable, shall be used for the purpose of refunding a like face amount of two-year five per cent. notes secured by an indenture dated April 1st, 1917, which notes mature April 1st, 1919, upon the basis of par for the latter and ninety-eight per cent. of their par value for the notes herein authorized to be issued provided that a commission of one-half of one per cent. upon the notes taken by holders of the notes which mature on April 1st, 1919, and by the public may be paid to the individuals or corporations placing them.

5. Hereby requires that such portion, if any, of the notes herein authorized to be issued as shall not be required for the purpose of accomplishing the refunding of the notes maturing on April 1st, 1919, pursuant to the terms of Clause No. 4 hereof, shall be taken at not less than ninety-eight per cent. of their par value by the War Finance Corporation, and the proceeds thereof

APPLICATION FOR APPROVAL OF MORTGAGES, ETC. 119

used to redeem such notes of the issue maturing on April 1st, 1919, as shall not have been otherwise refunded, it being expressly provided that there shall be no banker's commission upon the notes which may be taken pursuant to the authority contained in this clause.

6. Hereby requires that none of the said notes herein authorized shall be hypothecated or pledged as collateral by the Erie Railroad Company unless any such pledge or hypothecation shall have been expressly approved and authorized by this Board.

7. Hereby requires that the Erie Railroad Company shall for each six months period ending June 30th and December 31st file not more than thirty days from the end of such period a verified report which shall show:

- (a) What notes have been sold or otherwise disposed of during such period.
- (b) The dates of such sales or disposition.
- (c) What proceeds were realized from such sale.
- (d) Any other terms and conditions of such transactions.
- (e) In detail the amount of notes or their proceeds expended during such period for the purpose specified in Clause No. 4.

Such reports shall continue to be filed until all of said notes shall have been sold or disposed of and the proceeds expended in accordance with the authority contained herein, and if during any period no notes were sold or disposed of or proceeds expended, the report shall set forth such fact.

8. Hereby authorizes the Erie Railroad Company to pledge the following long-term debt as collateral security for the payment of the notes herein authorized to be issued:

- \$18,217,000 Erie Railroad Company First Consolidated Mortgage General Lien 4% Gold Bonds, which are now pledged as collateral security for \$15,000,000 two-year five per cent. collateral gold notes due April 1st, 1919.
- 8,372,000 Erie Railroad Company General Mortgage 4% Convertible 50-year Gold Bonds, Series "D," which are now also pledged as collateral security for the above two-year notes due April 1st, 1919.
- 5,400,000 Erie Railroad Company Refunding and Improvement Mortgage 20-year 6% Gold Bonds, Series "B." authorized to be issued by this Board under date of July 9th, 1918.

9. Hereby requires that if the \$8,371,000 face value of First Consolidated Mortgage General Lien Gold Bonds and the \$5,720,000 face value of General Mortgage 4% Fifty-Year Convertible, Series "D," Bonds (being a portion of the \$18,000,000 face value authorized to be issued by order dated March 14th, 1916), aggregating \$14,091,000 in amount, which said \$14,091,000 of bonds are to be pledged as provided in Clause No. 8 herein, shall be released from said collateral indenture through substitution of other collateral as therein provided and sold prior to the payment of the notes herein authorized, the proceeds of such sale shall not be used or applied by the Erie Railroad Company without the further order of this Board.

10. The authority contained in this order to issue notes is upon the express condition that the petitioner accepts and agrees to comply in good faith with the provisions hereof, and before any notes are issued pursuant hereto and

120 PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSIONERS' REPORT.

within thirty days of the service hereof the company shall advise the Board whether or not it accepts the same with all its terms and conditions, and such order shall be of no force or effect until such acceptance has been filed.

FINALLY IT IS DETERMINED AND STATED, That in the opinion of this Board the money to be procured by the issue of said notes herein authorized is reasonably required for the purpose specified in this order, and that such purpose is not in whole or in part reasonably chargeable to Operating Expenses or to Income.

Dated March 24th, 1919.

In the Matter of the Application of the Englewood Sewerage Company for the Approval of the Issuance of its Capital Stock to the Amount of \$100,000 Par Value.

REPORT.

E. W. Wakelee, for the Petitioner.

Application is made by the Englewood Sewerage Company for the approval of the issuance of an additional \$100,000 of its capital stock, the proceeds thereof to be used in part for the reimbursement of plant and equipment expenditures already made and partly to provide funds for additional extensions and improvements. The petition also states that the company is under obligation to purchase certain sewer lines built by private parties under agreements with the company, after the revenue therefrom amounts to a certain percentage of their cost, and that it is expected a portion of the proceeds from the proposed issue of capital stock will be required for such purpose

Of the said \$100,000 capital stock \$28,000 has already been issued inadvertently without authorization by this Board. The proceeds therefrom were used to the extent of \$19,500 to reimburse the company for uncapitalized plant expenditures already made and \$8,500 for working capital. The last-mentioned amount, the petition states, will be applied toward meeting the company's obligations to purchase sewer lines built by private parties as above explained.

Exhibit D attached to the petition contains a schedule showing in detail the plant and equipment expenditures of which the aforesaid \$19,500 forms a part. Included in this list of expenditures is a total of slightly more than \$3,000 as the cost of lowering and rebuilding certain lines. No evidence was produced to show to what extent, if any, this amount exceeds the cost of the old mains that were replaced. The company appears to have no records or vouchers to give any light on this subject. In the absence of proof that the expenditure of this sum actually increased the value of the property the capitalization thereof will be denied.

Accordingly the issuance of only \$16,500 capital stock for the reimbursement of the plant expenditures already made will be approved.

APPLICATION FOR APPROVAL OF MORTGAGES, ETC. 121

The total amount which the company has agreed to repay private parties for building sewer lines, after the revenue therefrom equals a certain percentage of their cost, is shown in the petition to be \$37,990.67, comprising nine separate items. All of the latter were included in the company's application of 1914 for the approval of the issuance of \$50,000 capital stock, the total amount of these obligations on that date being \$45,588.39. From this it appears that during a period of five years not quite \$8,000 was expended by the company for the above-stated purpose.

It is unlikely that very large expenditures will be made during the current year for such purposes. As a rule the Board is not inclined to authorize the issuance of securities for financing construction for more than one year in advance of the execution of the work.

The proceeds from \$8,500 of the \$28,000 stock already issued have been used for working capital and are to be applied toward meeting obligations or contracts for taking over existing extensions, constructed by private capital.

For additional extensions and improvements \$55,000 is stated in the application to be the estimated expenditures, but there is nothing therein to indicate that all or even the greater part of these are likely to be made in the near future, nor is the testimony given at the hearing in this matter very definite on this point. Further proof must be furnished as to the amount of work that is reasonably certain to be done during the next twelve months before approval will be given to the issuance of capital stock to provide funds therefor.

The Board will therefore approve only the issuance of \$28,000 capital stock, which is the amount heretofore issued without authorization.

Dated June 25th, 1919.

Application of the People's Rural Telephone Company for Approval of an Issue of Bonds.

REPORT.

Francis B. Davis, for the Petitioner.

On January 2d, 1919, People's Rural Telephone Company made application for approval of issue of \$25,000 bonds.

February 28th, 1919, the company submitted a revised application asking that the amount of bonds to be approved be \$14,400 instead of \$25,000.

People's Rural Telephone Company was organized in 1903 with an authorized capital stock of \$200,000, and commenced the construction of a telephone system in Swedesboro. The original plans contemplated the building of a plant in Woodstown and Mullica Hill as well as in Swedesboro.

Stock was sold for cash, at par, to the extent of \$39,735, and the proceeds used entirely in connection with the construction work. The proceeds from the stock sold, however, were not sufficient to complete the construction as planned.

122 PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSIONERS' REPORT.

A mortgage of \$200,000 was subsequently executed by the company and during the years 1905 and 1906 bonds to the amount of \$90,000 issued. The proceeds therefrom were also used for the construction of the plant. From time to time other additions have been made to the system which appear to have been paid for from earnings.

During the early years of the company its officers not only assisted in financing extensions to the plant and system from their private funds without receiving securities to represent such contribution, but also furnished their services for very nominal salaries. The result was the building of a plant and system having an original cost considerably in excess of the proceeds of all the securities issued. The securities now outstanding are:

Stock,	\$39,735
Bonds,	90,000
	<hr/>
Total,	\$129,735

In addition the company has certain floating debts which it desires to liquidate through the issuance of further securities.

As will be shown later only a portion of these debts can be liquidated through the issuance of fixed capital securities. The balance should be met through the issuance of serial notes, the payment of which should be provided for as they mature from time to time, without renewals. In such case no permanent capitalization will result.

Mr. E. W. Sutton presented an appraisal of the company's property made by him as of February 1st, 1919, although the work appears to have been done in 1915. This inventory and appraisal has been carefully checked by the engineers of the Board and indicates that the value new of the property, at the time of the appraisal, was.....

.....	\$159,879
Accrued depreciation was estimated at.....	47,560
	<hr/>

Leaving a present value of..... \$112,319

Testimony concerning the appraisal of the condition of the property shows that the property nominally should have a present value approximating 85 per cent. of its value new. Based on Mr. Sutton's appraisal the present value should be approximately \$136,000.

Further evidence of value is given in the report based upon an examination made by Baker, Vawter & Wolf, certifying public accountants, covering the five-year period ending December 31st, 1917. According to this report the total book value of the property December 31st, 1917, is \$172,173.10.

The accumulated reserves are as follows:

Depreciation,	\$33,511 72
Amortization of Bond Discount,	3,862 80
	<hr/>

Total Reserves are, \$37,374 52

Leaving a present value of \$134,798 58

APPLICATION FOR APPROVAL OF MORTGAGES, ETC. 123

Comparison should be made between the present book value and the present value as found by assuming a present value equivalent to 85 per cent. of the cost to reproduce the property new. The Board for the purposes of this matter concludes the present value to be \$135,000. From this should be deducted the amount of securities outstanding amounting to \$129,735, which leaves an excess of value for capitalization at the present time of \$6,265.

Based upon the excess in the value of property over and above the amount of outstanding securities the company is warranted in issuing bonds to the extent of \$6,200. The balance of the debts which the company proposed to liquidate through the issuance of bonds must be cared for in some other way, preferably as suggested in this report, by the issuance of some form of serial notes covering a period of years and which will be retired from earnings at maturity.

The Board will, therefore, only approve the issuance of bonds to the amount of \$6,200.

Petition of the Ocean Grove Camp Meeting Association of the Methodist Episcopal Church for Approval of an Issue of Bonds Secured by a Mortgage to the New Jersey Title Guarantee and Trust Company, as Trustees.

REPORT.

James H. Isbills, for Petitioner.

The petitioner is a private corporation incorporated March 8th, 1870, under a special act of the Legislature of this State entitled "An act to incorporate the Ocean Grove Camp Meeting Association of the Methodist Episcopal Church," Pamphlet Laws 1870, page 397.

The objects and purposes expressed in the charter is that "of providing and maintaining for members and friends of the Methodist Episcopal Church a proper, convenient and desirable permanent camp meeting ground and Christian seaside resort." It has the power to purchase and hold real and personal estate and to acquire such lands in this State as it might deem necessary, proper or desirable for the purposes and objects of the association, and to dispose of the same or any part thereof in parcels or otherwise in fee-simple or otherwise, on such terms, conditions and restrictions as they might deem fit.

The third section of the act provides as follows: "And be it enacted, That it shall be lawful for said corporation to construct and provide all necessary works to supply the said premises with water and artificial light, and to provide all other conveniences and make all other improvements which may be deemed necessary or desirable."

The management of the corporation is vested by said act in a self-perpetuating board of trustees. The real and personal property of the association, not to exceed an annual value of five thousand dollars, was exempted all assessments and taxation, and any surplus funds remaining to the corporation after defraying the necessary expenses thereof for improvements or

otherwise, shall be devoted to such charitable, benevolent or religious objects or purposes as may be agreed on by the said board of trustees.

The trustees have power to appoint such peace officers as may be deemed necessary for the purpose of keeping order on the camp grounds and premises of the corporation, which officers have the same power, authority and immunities which constables and other peace officers, when on duty, possess and enjoy as such; and also the power to enforce obedience on the camp ground and premises of the association to any rule or regulations of the board of trustees for the preservation of quiet and good order.

In the year 1870 the association acquired the title to a tract of land between Asbury Park on the north and the Borough of Bradley Beach on the south, fronting on the Atlantic Ocean, which is known as "Ocean Grove." This tract was laid out into streets and avenues, lots and plots, which were disposed of by the association under leases for said lots or plots for the term of ninety-nine years, for a yearly rental specified. The premises are leased subject to the rules and regulations which may from time to time be adopted by the association, as to the character of building permitted to be erected, etc. The association also acquired and owns title to certain land in the Borough of Bradley Beach outside of the tract known as Ocean Grove, and it also holds title to certain lands in the Township of Neptune at Bradley Park, Monmouth County, New Jersey, which are also in the vicinity of, but outside of, Ocean Grove.

The petition alleges: as incidental to its ownership and use of said lands or camp grounds at Ocean Grove, and as a convenience to its said property there situate, and as improvements thereto for the benefit of its said lands and itself and the lessees of its lands, has constructed and maintains a power house and plant and electric lighting plant or system including all buildings, works machinery, electric generators, conductors, switches and switchboards, poles, wires, lamps, pumps, meters, conduits, subways, superstructures, connections, engines, apparatus, appliances, poles, necessary and needed in and about such electric lighting plant or system for the supplying or light and electric current to its said tract of land and for the benefit thereof, and if its lessees who purchase such light or current from your petitioner; and also has constructed and maintains a water plant or system including all the buildings, shops, engines, pumps, standpipes, reservoirs, tanks, water mains, water pipes, hydrants, meters, gates, valves, connections, apparatus, appliances, necessary or needful for such water plant or system, and which water is supplied by means of artesian wells drilled upon the property of your petitioner, and which wells are owned by your petitioner as part of its said water plant or system and the water is supplied for the benefit of your petitioner's said lands and itself and also of its aforesaid lessees who purchase the same from your petitioner; and also has constructed and maintains a sewerage system including a septic tank, and all sewers, main, lateral or branch, sewer pipes, drain pipes, connections, basins, manholes necessary or needful in and about such sewerage system, and which sewerage system is constructed through the said lands of your petitioner at Ocean Grove, and is used for the benefit of its said lands and premises.

APPLICATION FOR APPROVAL OF MORTGAGES, ETC. 125

For the purpose of paying the outstanding debts and obligations, and for other corporation purposes, the association made a mortgage or deed of trust securing its forty-year five per cent. bonds of denomination of \$1,000 each for the aggregate principal amount of \$750,000. The principal and interest of all of said bonds is secured by mortgage or deed of trust to the New Jersey Title Guarantee and Trust Company, covering all of the lots, plots and tracts of land and premises, shore-front property and riparian rights situated at Ocean Grove, together with all buildings, improvements, structures and piers which are upon the lands and premises including the Northend Hotel owned and operated by the association, and other buildings, stores, booths, fishing piers, pavilion, office building, commercial building, as well as the lands where the power house of the association is located, situated in the Borough of Bradley Beach, as well as the lands and premises situated at Bradley Park. There is also included in said mortgage or deed of trust the power plant and electric plant or system, the artesian wells and water plant or system and the sewerage plant and system including the septic tank.

The approval of this mortgage or deed of trust and the bonds issued or to be issued thereunder is sought.

The pertinent power of this Board is found in Chapter 195 of the Laws of 1911—"18. No public utility herein defined shall * * * without the approval of the Board sell, lease, mortgage or otherwise dispose of, or encumber its property, franchises, privileges or rights, or any part thereof. * * * If sale, lease, mortgage, disposition, encumbrance, merger or consolidation made in violation of provisions hereof, it shall be void and of no effect * * *."

The mortgage or deed of trust covers all of the property of the association, including the utilities properties. The revenues received from the operation of the utilities are mingled with the revenues received from the other properties of the association, and disbursements for the maintenance of all properties and expenses of the association are paid out of the common fund. Under the circumstances it could not be ascertained, in the event of default of payment of interest on the bonds, whether the default was due to the operation of the utilities or to the operation of the other properties.

Public policy requires the segregation of utilities properties so that any lien placed thereon may be commensurate with its value. The Board therefore declines to approve of the mortgage presented.

Dated October 9th, 1919.

N.J. STATE LIBRARY
P.O. BOX 520
TRENTON, NJ 08625-0520

Application of the Hackensack Water Company for Approval of an Issue of "Seven Per Cent. Preferred Stock" of the Par Value of \$2,000,000, and for Approval of a Further Issue of \$375,000 of Said "Seven Per Cent. Preferred Stock" to be Issued in Exchange for Preferred Stock of that Amount Now Outstanding.

REPORT.

Henry L. DeForest appeared for Petitioner.

L. Edward Herrmann, for the Board.

On October 28th, 1919, the Hackensack Water Company presented its petition setting forth that at a special meeting of the stockholders held October 20th, 1919, by unanimous vote of the meeting the capital stock of the company was increased by \$4,000,000, "seven per cent. preferred stock," as in the petition set forth; and by unanimous vote it was further decided, subject to the approval of the Board of Public Utility Commissioners, to give holders of the present preferred stock (which was issued to the extent of \$375,000 in 1881 and 1887) the authority, prior to January 1st, 1925, to exchange said stock for the new "seven per cent. preferred stock."

That on October 22d, 1919, the directors of the company unanimously decided (subject to the approval of this Board) to issue the said "seven per cent. preferred stock" to an amount of par value of \$2,000,000, to be used for the following purposes: (1) To pay the floating indebtedness of the company as detailed in the said petition aggregating \$785,000; (2) to provide for extensions and additions to plant made since July 1st, 1919, and still in the course of construction and for working capital in connection therewith; (3) to provide for a further development of the company's so-called Alpine plant, involving a further extension of its new main eastwardly from Madison and Washington Avenues, Dumont, to Palisades Boulevard on the top of the Palisades; then southerly connecting with the company's present distribution system and to the company's Weehawkin high service reservoir, and to provide suitable pumps at New Milford for supplying the said new main; (4) to provide for a new sedimentation basin at New Milford; (5) to provide for a new dam at the southerly end of the reservoir at Oradell, and the further development of such reservoir; (6) to provide for meters, service connections and other necessary additions to its distribution system.

That the directors of the company had unanimously decided that it was advisable to retire the amount of preferred stock now outstanding, which was issued in 1881 and 1887 as aforesaid, and recommended to the stockholders that the holders of the old preferred stock be given the right to exchange it for the "seven per cent. preferred stock."

The matter was heard before the Board at Newark, October 30th, 1919. After due investigation and consideration the Board on November 5th, 1919, granted its approval (subject to Conference Order Number Seven) to the said proposed issue of preferred stock by said company to the amount of \$2,000,000, the proceeds to be used for the purposes set forth in said petition.

The outstanding preferred stock pays six per cent. annually and participates

APPLICATION FOR APPROVAL OF MORTGAGES, ETC. 127

equally with the holders of the common stock in any surplus earnings of each year.

The authorization to exchange the old preferred stock for the new is at the rate of par for par. This exchange appears to be desired for the purpose of having all preferred stock that of one issue, and is principally for the purpose of uniformity.

The company having complied with the statutory requirements, the Board will approve the issue of all or any portion of \$375,000 of "seven per cent. preferred stock" as and when the old preferred stock is offered for exchange (all preferred stock so exchanged to be canceled), provided, however, that such exchange shall be made prior to January 1st, 1925.

Dated December 30th, 1919.

Ordinances.

Date of Approval.	Name of Applicant.	Subject.
Jan. 28, 1919,	Delaware and Atlantic Tel. and Tel. Co.,...	For approval of ordinance of the City of Lambertville, passed November 21st, 1918, authorizing the construction, reconstruction, etc., of poles, wires, cables, crossarms, etc., for its local and through lines, in, upon, along, over, across and under each of the public roads, streets, alleys and highways within the limits of the City of Lambertville; also regulating the use of the public roads, streets, alleys, etc., by said company.
Jan. 28, 1919,	Delaware and Atlantic Tel. and Tel. Co.,...	For approval of ordinance of the Borough of Wrightstown, passed November 11th, 1918, granting permission and consent to erect, construct, maintain and operate all necessary poles, wires, cables, cross-arms, etc., for its local and through lines, in, upon, along and over each and every of the public roads, streets, alleys and highways within the limits of the Borough of Wrightstown, to use the property of other companies and to permit other companies to use its property upon such arrangements as the two companies may agree, and regulating the use of the public roads, streets, etc., by said company.
Feb. 11, 1919,	Egg Harbor City Tel. Company,.....	For approval of ordinance passed by the Township of Mullica, September 27th, 1918, authorizing the erection of poles and stringing of wires or cables on any of the public avenues, streets or roads in Mullica Township for the purpose of erecting, maintaining and operating telephone lines upon terms and conditions herein specified for a period of 25 years.
July 16, 1919,	Atlantic Coast Telephone Company,.....	For approval of ordinance of the City Commission of the City of Atlantic City, passed April 17th, 1919, granting consent of the City of Atlantic City to the transfer and assignment of all the physical property, rights and franchises of the Atlantic Coast Telephone Company to the Delaware and Atlantic Tel. and Tel. Company.
Sept. 9, 1919,	Delaware and Atlantic Tel. and Tel. Co.,...	For approval of ordinance of the Borough of Stockton, passed by the Mayor and Council of the Borough of Stockton, April 26th, 1919, authorizing the company to erect, construct and operate all necessary poles, wires, etc., in, along, over, across and under each and every of the public roads within the limits of the Borough of Stockton; prescribing the manner of placing the same; to use the property of other companies and to permit other companies to use its property.
Sept. 23, 1919,	Delaware and Atlantic Tel. and Tel. Co.,...	For approval of combination ordinance of the Borough of Stone Harbor, passed by the Council of the Borough of Stone Harbor, July 7th, 1919, granting permission and consent to erect, construct, maintain, lay and operate all necessary poles, etc., across, over, along and under each and every of the public roads, streets, alleys and highways in the Borough of Stone Harbor, County of Cape May, State of New Jersey, for the conduct of its business.

9
U
P

Date of Approval.	Name of Applicant.	Subject.
Oct. 2, 1919,	Mercer County Traction Company and Trenton and Mercer County Traction Corp., Lessee,	For approval of ordinance of the City of Trenton, passed by the Board of Commissioners May 2d, 1919, authorizing the Mercer County Traction Company to re-locate its tracks upon certain streets and highways in the City of Trenton.
Oct. 2, 1919,	Trenton, Hamilton and Ewing Traction Company and Trenton and Mercer County Traction Corporation, Lessee,.....	For approval of ordinance of the City of Trenton, passed by the Board of Commissioners May 2d, 1919, authorizing the Trenton, Hamilton and Ewing Traction Company to re-locate its tracks upon certain streets and highways in the City of Trenton.
Oct. 14, 1919,	National Park Water Company,.....	For approval of ordinance of the Borough of National Park, passed by the Borough Council, October 21st, 1918, granting permission to use the streets and alleyways of the Borough of National Park in the County of Gloucester, State of New Jersey, for the purpose of laying water pipes and water mains and other constructions necessary for the operation and maintenance of a water plant in the said Borough of National Park.
Nov. 10, 1919,	Public Service Railway Company,.....	For approval of ordinance of City of Paterson, passed by the Board of Street and Water Commissioners September 23d, 1919, providing for removal of certain street railway tracks on Summer Street between Clay and Essex Streets, Essex Street between Summer and Beech Streets, Beech Street between Essex and Market Streets and Market Street between Beech and Straight Streets.

ORDINANCES.

130 PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSIONERS' REPORT.

In the Matter of the Application of the Commercial Power Company for Approval of an Ordinance of the Borough of Bloomsbury.

REPORT.

William M. Seufert, for the Petitioner.

In the matter of the application of the Commercial Power Company for approval of an issue of securities to provide funds for the construction of its plant and distribution system in the Borough of Bloomsbury, it appeared that the ordinance enacted in 1916 under which the company proposed to operate had not been presented to this Board for approval as is required by the statute. The approval of this ordinance is thus now being sought.

The proofs of the proceedings observed in the enactment of the ordinance were filed. The requirements of Chapter 36, P. L. 1906, known as the Limited Franchise Act, have not been complied with in the following particulars:

(1) The petition does not state the time for which permission is sought nor the uses for which the streets, etc., are desired, nor whether the use desired is for above, below or on the surface of the streets, etc.

(2) No resolution fixing a date for consideration of the application was passed by the governing body nor were the notices given by advertisements and posting public notices as required.

(3) No notice by advertisement in newspapers as is required by the act of the passage of the ordinance was given.

It is fundamental that the ordinance granting permission to a utility to operate should be legally unassailable. The procedure by which the ordinance was enacted clearly did not comply with the requirements of law. Approval thereof is, therefore, withheld. Consideration of the application for approval of securities will be postponed until an ordinance appropriately and legally enacted is filed and approved.

Dated November 6th, 1919.

Leases, Agreements and Sales of Property.

Date of Approval.	Name of Applicant.	Nature of Petition.
Jan. 14, 1919,	Penna. Tunnel & Terminal Railroad Company,	For approval of the sale of a strip of land situate in the Town of Kearny, containing 740/1000 of an acre.
Jan. 21, 1919,	New York Telephone Company,	For approval of agreement with the Western Union Telegraph Company dated September 5th, 1918, providing for the sale of five poles in the Borough of Highlands, New Jersey.
Jan. 28, 1919,	New York Telephone Company,	For approval of agreement with the Monmouth Lighting Company dated December 18th, 1918, providing for the sale of one pole in the Borough of Keyport, New Jersey.
Feb. 7, 1919,	Trenton & Mercer County Traction Corporation,	For approval of the sale of certain equipment and for authority to set up a "property abandoned account" to cover the loss therefrom.
Mar. 13, 1919,	Morris County Traction Company,	For authority to set up a "property abandoned account" and charge thereto the loss resulting from the sale of its power plant equipment.
Mar. 20, 1919,	Belvidere Railroad Company,	For approval of the sale of a parcel of land situate in the Town of Phillipsburg, Warren County, N. J., containing 8,198.499 square feet, more or less.
Mar. 20, 1919,	Penna. Railroad Company, Lessee of the United New Jersey Railroad & Canal Company,	For approval of the sale of a parcel of land situate in the City of South Amboy, Middlesex County, N. J., containing 5,550 square feet, more or less.
Apr. 14, 1919,	Morris County Traction Company,	For approval of trackage agreement dated October 1st, 1918, between said Morris County Traction Company and the Morris Railroad Company, providing for the operation of cars over the road and tracks of the Railroad Company.
Apr. 14, 1919,	Public Service Gas Company and the South Jersey Gas, Elec. and Trac. Company, ..	For approval of the sale and conveyance of certain land and premises in the City of Trenton, N. J., to the Hildebrecht Ice Cream Company.
Apr. 17, 1919,	New York Telephone Company,	For approval of agreement dated September 12th, 1918, between the Postal Tel. Cable Company of New Jersey and the said New York Tel. Company, providing for the joint ownership of 28 poles located on Maple Avenue, City of Elizabeth, N. J.
May 1, 1919,	Public Service Gas Company and the South Jersey Gas, Elec. and Trac. Company, ..	For approval of the sale and conveyance of certain land situate in the City of Woodbury, N. J., to John C. Curry, more particularly described in the petition.

Date of Approval.	Name of Applicant.	Nature of Petition.
May 29, 1919,	New York Telephone Company,	For approval of agreement dated April 2d, 1919, with the Consolidated Gas Company providing for the sale of three poles located in the City of Long Branch, N. J.
June 10, 1919,	Tuscarora Oil Company,	For approval of agreement dated February 15th, 1919, with the Standard Oil Company, providing for the leasing of three tanks and one pipe line located at Bayway, N. J.
June 10, 1919,	Del. & Atl. Tel. & Tel. Company,	For approval of agreement dated September 18th, 1918, with the Ocean City Electric Railroad Company and the Atlantic City Electric Company for joint use of poles on Atlantic Avenue, Ocean City, N. J.
June 10, 1919,	E. R. Collins & Son,	For approval of the sale by Harry Searles, Receiver, Warren Woodworking Company, of the electric lighting plant of said company at Belvidere, made in compliance with an order of the Court of Chancery of the State of New Jersey.
June 19, 1919,	West Jersey & Seashore Railroad Company,	For approval of the sale of a parcel of land situate on the north side of Madison Street, in the Borough of Paulsboro, N. J., containing 5,868.6 square feet, more or less.
June 19, 1919,	West Jersey & Seashore Railroad Company,	For approval of the sale of a parcel of land situate on the north side of Kaighn Avenue, 40 feet east of Tenth Street, in the City of Camden, N. J., containing 1,210 square feet, more or less.
June 26, 1919,	West Jersey & Seashore Railroad Company,	For approval of the sale of a parcel of land situate on the west side of Atlantic Avenue, 150 and 1/10 of a foot south of Dayton Avenue in Dunbarton, Camden, N. J., containing 3,432 square feet, more or less.
June 26, 1919,	Penna. Railroad Company, Lessee, United New Jersey Railroad and Canal Company,	For approval of the sale of a tract of land situate in the City of Jersey City, Hudson County, N. J., containing 773 square feet, more or less.
July 3, 1919,	Passaic Water Company,	For approval of the sale of certain tracts of land situate in the Township of Pompton and in the City of Paterson, N. J.
July 3, 1919,	Camden & Burlington Railway Company, ..	For approval of the sale of a parcel of land situate on the southwest corner of Grant and King Streets in Mt. Holly, N. J., containing 2,433 square feet, more or less.
July 3, 1919,	Penna. Railroad Company, Lessee, United New Jersey Railroad and Canal Company,	For approval of the sale of a parcel of land situate on the northeasterly side of Olden Avenue, in the City of Trenton, N. J., containing 8,659 square feet, more or less.
July 10, 1919,	Trenton & Mercer County Trac. Corp., Lessee, Trenton Street Railway Company, ..	For approval of the sale of a tract of land situate in the Township of Hamilton, Mercer County, N. J., containing 37.524 acres.

Date of Approval.	Name of Applicant.	Nature of Petition.
July 16, 1919,	United States Railroad Administration, Erie Railroad,	For permission to discontinue Llewellyn Station in the Town of West Orange, N. J.
July 16, 1919,	Del. & Atl. Tel. & Tel. Company,	For approval of agreement dated March 4th, 1919, providing for the sale of the franchises, rights and property of the Atlantic Coast Telephone Company.
July 22, 1919,	Eastern Penna. Power Company of New Jersey,	For approval of additions to property in the Phillipsburg district made by the Pennsylvania Utilities Company.
Aug. 12, 1919,	Kennedy Electric Company,	For approval of lease dated July 1st, 1919, providing for the leasing of a pond known as the "Kennedy Electric Company Pond" in the Township of Washington, Morris County, New Jersey, to E. J. Neighbour.
Aug. 12, 1919,	Feltville Water Company,	For approval of the sale of certain lots of land situate in the Townships of North Plainfield, New Providence and Scotch Plains, the Borough of Mountainside and the City of Summit, N. J.
Sept. 17, 1919,	Public Service Railway Company and the Riverside Trac. Company,	For approval of the sale of certain land and premises situate in the City of Trenton, Mercer County, New Jersey, to the Trenton Banking Company.
Sept. 17, 1919,	Proprietors of the Morris Acqueduct,	For approval of the sale of a tract of land containing four acres, more or less, situate in Morris Township, Morris County, N. J., to William P. Jenks.
Sept. 23, 1919,	Atlantic City Railroad Company,	For approval of the sale of a strip of land situate in the City of Gloucester, Gloucester County, New Jersey.
Sept. 30, 1919,	Middlesex Water Company,	For approval of the sale of certain parcels of land situate in the Township of Clark, Union County, and Township of Raritan, Middlesex County, New Jersey.
Sept. 30, 1919,	New York Telephone Company,	For approval of an agreement with the Rockland Electric Company dated October 23d, 1912, providing for the joint use of poles in Bergen County, New Jersey.
Sept. 30, 1919,	New York Telephone Company,	For approval of an agreement with the Monmouth Lighting Company dated July 28th, 1919, providing for the sale of 214 poles located in the Townships of Marlboro and Manalapan and in the Borough of Englishtown, Monmouth County, New Jersey.
Sept. 30, 1919,	New Jersey Power & Light Company,	For approval of the sale of two certain lots and buildings erected thereon in the Borough of Rockaway, Morris County, New Jersey.

Date of Approval.	Name of Applicant.	Nature of Petition.
Oct. 2, 1919,	New York Telephone Company,	For approval of an agreement with the Consolidated Gas Company of New Jersey dated August 27th, 1919, providing for the sale of one pole in the City of Long Branch, Monmouth County, New Jersey.
Oct. 9, 1919,	Public Service Railway Company,	For approval of the sale and conveyance of certain tracts of land owned by the Camden Horse Railroad Company, situate in the Township of Stockton, Camden County, N. J., to the City of Camden.
Oct. 28, 1919,	Pemberton Township Water, Sewerage & Light Company,	For approval of an agreement dated October 15th, 1919, with the Common Council of Borough of Pemberton, providing for the leasing of its plant located in Borough of Pemberton, Burlington County, N. J.
Nov. 10, 1919,	Del. & Atl. Tel. & Tel. Company,	For approval of an agreement dated September 24th, 1919, with the City of Egg Harbor, providing for the sale of 31 poles located in the City of Egg Harbor, N. J.
Nov. 13, 1919,	Del. & Atl. Tel. & Tel. Company,	For the approval of an agreement dated October 4th, 1919, with the Western Union Telegraph Company, providing for the joint use of certain poles in the Township of Hamilton, Mercer County, N. J.
Nov. 13, 1919,	West Jersey & Seashore Railroad Company,	For approval of the sale of a parcel of land situate on Pearl Street in the City of Bridgeton, N. J., containing 0.146 of an acre, more or less.
Nov. 13, 1919,	Public Service Railway Company,	For approval of the sale of a tract of land owned by New Jersey and Hudson River Railway and Ferry Company, situate in the Borough of Edgewater, Bergen County, New Jersey.
Nov. 18, 1919,	Del. & Atl. Tel. & Tel. Company,	For approval of an agreement dated October 3d, 1919, with the City of Trenton, providing for the sale of 15 poles located on the south side of Broad Street between Beatty and Liberty Streets, in the City of Trenton, Mercer County, N. J.
Nov. 18, 1919,	Ocean City Electric Railway Company,	For permission to surrender its franchise and abandon its track on Wesley Avenue from Ninth Street to First Street, and on First Street from Wesley Avenue to Bay Avenue in the City of Ocean City, New Jersey.
Nov. 25, 1919,	Central Railroad Company of New Jersey,...	For the approval of the sale by the West Side Connecting Railroad Company of a certain tract of land situate in the City of Bayonne, Hudson County, New Jersey.
Dec. 9, 1919,	Morris County Traction Company,	For approval of the sale of ten cars.

Date of Approval.	Name of Applicant.	Nature of Petition.
Dec. 9, 1919,	Penna. Railroad Company, Lessee, United New Jersey Railroad & Canal Company, .	For approval of the sale of a parcel of land situate on the easterly side of Dark Lane, Township of Linden, Union County, N. J., containing 4.987 acres, more or less.
Dec. 9, 1919,	New York Telephone Company,	For approval of an agreement with the Sayreville Electric Light and Power Company dated July 25th, 1918, providing for the joint use of 31 poles located on the Bordentown and South Amboy Turnpike in the Township of Sayreville, Middlesex County, N. J.
Dec. 9, 1919,	Electric Company of New Jersey and the Salem and Pennsgrove Traction Company,	For approval of an agreement dated October 23d, 1919, providing for the joint use of pole line of the Traction Company by the Electric Company and the joint operation of the sub-station of the Traction Company.
Dec. 30, 1919,	West Jersey & Seashore Railroad Company,	For approval of the sale of a parcel of land situate on southeasterly side of Wright Street east of Carteret Street in the City of Camden, N. J., containing 17,647 square feet, more or less.
Dec. 30, 1919,	Penna. Railroad Company, Lessee, United New Jersey Railroad and Canal Company,	For approval of the sale of a parcel of land situate on westerly side of Essex Street, 75 feet south of Bridge Street, in the City of Rahway, Union County, N. J., containing 4,438 square feet, more or less.
Dec. 30, 1919,	Penna. & Newark Railroad Company,	For approval of the sale of a parcel of land situate on the southeasterly side of Fresh Pond Road, in East Brunswick Township, Middlesex County, N. J., containing 15.521 acres, more or less.
Dec. 30, 1919,	Penna. Railroad Company, Lessee, United New Jersey Railroad and Canal Company,	For approval of the sale of a parcel of land lying northwest and northeast of Hudson Boulevard, near Summit Avenue Station, in the City of Jersey City, Hudson County, N. J., containing 6,260 square feet, more or less.
Dec. 30, 1919,	Public Service Electric Company,	For approval of the sale of a parcel of land owned by the Bordentown Electric Co. and in possession of Public Service Electric Co. as lessee, situated in the City of Bordentown, Burlington County, N. J., to George W. Swift, Jr.
Dec. 30, 1919,	Public Service Gas Company,	For approval of the sale of two lots of land owned by the Gas Light Company of the City of New Brunswick, and in possession of Public Service Gas Company as lessee, situate on Senior Street near Wyckoff Street, in the City of New Brunswick, N. J., to Matthias P. Gross and Barbara Gross his wife.

Date of Approval.	Name of Applicant.	Nature of Petition.
Dec. 30, 1919,	Penna. Railroad Company, Lessee, United New Jersey Railroad and Canal Company,	For approval of the sale of a parcel of land situate on the easterly side of St. George Avenue, 275 feet and 41 hundredths of a foot south of Murray Street, in the City of Rahway, Union County, N. J., containing 38,400.13 square feet, more or less.
Dec. 30, 1919,	Theo. E. DeBow, Receiver of the Seashore Gas Company of Sea Isle City, N. J.,...	For approval of the sale of all property, effects and franchises of said company to the American Gas Generator Company, made in compliance with an order of the Court of Chancery of the State of New Jersey.
Dec. 30, 1919,	Woodbourne Electric Light, Heat and Power Company,	For approval of the sale of a steam boiler located in its steam plant at Sussex, N. J.
Dec. 30, 1919,	Delaware River Railroad and Bridge Company,	For approval of the sale of a parcel of land situate on the westerly side of its railroad south of the Borough of Merchantville, in Delaware Township, Camden County, N. J., containing 1,371 acres, more or less.
Dec. 30, 1919,	Penna. & Newark Railroad Company,	For approval of the sale of a parcel of land situate on easterly side of King's Creek, Township of Linden, Union County, N. J., containing 3.7 acres, more or less.

New Crossings at Grade.

Date of Permission.	Name of Applicant.	Nature of Petition.	Conditions.
Jan. 20, 1919,	Penna. Railroad Co., Lessee, United New Jersey Railroad and Canal Company,	For permission to construct an industrial siding at grade across public road between Cranbury and Hightstown to connect with property of Chamberlin & Barclay, Middlesex County, New Jersey.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. That all train movements over the highway be limited to a speed of not more than six miles per hour. 2. That grade crossing sign be erected in the highway. 3. That all train movements be protected by a flagman before movements are made over the crossing. 4. That a derail be placed in the track sufficient distance south of the southerly highway line if it is intended to unload or load or leave cars standing in said space.
Feb. 25, 1919,	Penna. Railroad Co., Lessee, United New Jersey Railroad and Canal Company,	For permission to construct an additional track at grade across State Street in the City of Camden, New Jersey.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. That all train movements over the highway be preceded by a flagman. 2. That train movements over said siding be limited to a speed of not more than six miles per hour.
Mar. 18, 1919,	Director General of Railroads and the Penna. R. R. Co., Lessee, United New Jersey R. R. and Canal Company,.....	For permission to construct a siding at grade across a public highway known as the Essex and Middlesex Turnpike at a point approximately 2,000 feet west of Colonia Passenger Station, also across a public highway known as Middlesex Road in Woodbridge Township, N. J.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. That all train movements over said highways be protected by a flagman. 2. That movements over said highways be limited to a speed of not more than six miles per hour. 3. That standard grade crossing signs be erected at the highways.
Apr. 8, 1919,	Asbury Company,.....	For permission to construct siding track at grade across Main Street or Snowhill Road in the Borough of Spotswood, New Jersey, to connect with tracks of the Camden and Amboy Division of the Penna. R. R.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. That all train movements be protected by a flagman on the crossing before movement is made. 2. That train over the highway be limited to a speed of not more than six miles per hour. 3. That standard grade crossing sign be erected at the crossing.

Date of Permission.	Name of Applicant.	Nature of Petition.	Conditions.
May 1, 1919,	Boynton Lumber Company,.....	For permission to construct siding at grade across State Street and tracks of the Public Service Ry. Co. at Sewaren, Township of Woodbridge, to connect with tracks of the Central R. R. Co. of New Jersey.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. That all train movements over said street be protected by flagman in the highway before train reaches westerly or easterly approach of the highway. 2. That all train movements over the trolley track be protected also by flagman stationed on trolley track before train reaches said track. 3. That speed of trains over the highway and the track of the Public Service Railway Co, be limited to 6 miles per hour. 4. That the speed of trolley cars be limited to 4 miles per hour approaching and passing over the siding track. 5. That no buildings nor lumber piles be located nearer the point of intersection of the proposed siding track and the trolley track than 75 feet; so as to provide an unobstructed view of movements on the opposite tracks of 75 feet in either direction. 6. That grade crossing sign be located near siding track on State Street also on trolley track. 7. That slow board be erected near point of intersection for movements on trolley track.
May 29, 1919,	Wheeler Condenser & Engineering Company,	For permission to construct a siding at grade across Woodbridge Avenue, Cartaret, New Jersey.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. That all train movements over the highway be protected by flagman who shall stand in the middle of the crossing with red flag before train approaches the highway line.
May 29, 1919,	New York Shipbuilding Corporation,	For permission to construct a siding at grade across King Street or King's Highway in the City of Gloucester, N. J., to connect with tracks of the Atlantic City R. R.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. That train movements over the siding track on King Street be protected by flagman. 2. That train movements over said highway be limited to a speed of not more than 6 miles per hour.
June 17, 1919,	Sprague Electrical Works of General Electric Co.....	For permission to construct a siding at grade across Arlington Avenue in the Town of Bloomfield, Essex County, New Jersey, to connect with tracks of the Delaware, Lackawanna & Western R. R. Co.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. That standard grade crossing signs be erected at said highway. 2. That train movements over said highway be limited to a speed of not more than 6 miles per hour. 3. That flagman protect all movements over the crossing, displaying a red flag during the day and a red lantern at night.

Date of Permission.	Name of Applicant.	Nature of Petition.	Conditions.
July 10, 1919,	Director General of Railroads and West Jersey & Seashore R. R. Company,	For permission to construct siding at grade across Chestnut Street in the Borough of Paulsboro.	1. That all train movements across Chestnut Street be protected by a flagman. 2. That train movements over said highway be limited to a speed of not more than 6 miles per hour.
July 10, 1919,	Director General of Railroads and Penna. R. R. Co., Lessee of the United New Jersey R. R. and Canal Company,.....	For permission to construct siding at grade across Enterprise Avenue in the City of Trenton, N. J., to reach the plant of the Atlas Tire & Rubber Co.	1. That all train movements over said highway be protected by a flagman. 2. That train movements over said highway be limited to a speed of not more than 6 miles per hour.
July 16, 1919,	Board of Chosen Freeholders of Sussex County,.....	For permission to construct new crossing at grade over tracks of the N. Y. S. & W. R. R., involving the elimination of grade crossings known as "Easton Crossing" and "Cory Crossing" on highway between Sparta and Ogdensburg, N. J.	1. That a loud-toned bell be installed at the new crossing as soon as the road is to be used by the public. 2. That standard grade crossing signs be erected and advance signs placed in the highway with words thereon "Railroad Crossing 250 Feet Distant."
July 25, 1919,	Board of Chosen Freeholders of Hudson County,.....	For permission to construct temporary highway crossing at grade over the main line tracks of the D. L. & W. R. R., in the Town of Kearny, N. J.	1. That gates be installed at the temporary crossing and operated continuously. 2. That standard grade crossing signs be erected at both approaches to the crossing.
Sept. 18, 1919,	City of Trenton.....	For permission to construct a spur track or siding at grade across Federal and South Warren Streets, in the City of Trenton, N. J.	1. That movements over S. Warren Street be limited to a speed of not more than 6 miles per hour. 2. That all train movements over S. Warren Street be protected by a flagman. 3. That clearance between center of track and fence of baseball park be at least 8 feet.
Sept. 30, 1919,	Safety Insulated Wire & Cable Co.,	For permission to construct a siding at grade across West First Street, in the City of Bayonne, N. J.	1. That all train movements over the right of way be limited to a speed of not more than 6 miles per hour. 2. That all train movements be protected by a flagman standing in the highway before movements pass beyond either highway line.

Date of Permission.	Name of Applicant.	Nature of Petition.	Conditions.
Oct. 7, 1919,	Lehigh Valley R. R. Company,....	For permission to construct a siding at grade across Sherman Avenue, in the City of Newark, Essex County, N. J.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. That all train movements over said siding be protected by a flagman. 2. That train movements over said siding be limited to a speed of not more than 6 miles per hour.
Oct. 7, 1919,	Cook & Swan Company, Inc.,.....	For permission to construct additional track at grade across South Front Street, and re-locate an existing track in said highway in the City of Elizabeth, Union County, New Jersey.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. That all train movements across South Front Street be protected by a flagman. 2. That train movements over said siding be limited to a speed of not more than 6 miles per hour.
Oct. 14, 1919,	United States Navy, H. M. Eddy, Lt. Commander, Naval Air Station, Lakehurst, New Jersey,....	For permission to construct siding at grade across Ridgway Avenue, Manchester Township, Lakehurst, New Jersey.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. That flagman be stationed in the highway before movements are made. 2. That crossing sign be erected at point of crossing. 3. That trees and brush be cleared 200 feet on both sides of the approaches. 4. That train movements over said siding be limited to a speed of not more than 6 miles per hour.
Oct. 16, 1919,	Midland Linseed Products Company,	For permission to re-locate siding track at grade across River Road, in the Borough of Edgewater, Bergen County, N. J.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. That train movements over River Road be limited to a speed of not more than six miles per hour. 2. That all train movements be protected by flagman in the highway. 3. That the fence line on the southerly side of Edgewater Road be constructed on an angle to afford a view of movements out of the yard located on the westerly side of River Road. 4. That sign be placed on fence "Danger, Railroad Crossing" for pedestrian travel proceeding eastwardly on Edgewater Road.
Oct. 16, 1919,	Flintkote Company,.....	For permission to construct two tracks at grade across Maple Street and one track at grade across Central Avenue, in the Borough of East Rutherford, Bergen County, N. J.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. That train movements over Central Avenue and Maple Street be limited to a speed of not more than six miles per hour. 2. That all train movements over said highways be protected by a flagman in the highway before movement is made. 3. That grade crossing signs be erected in Central Avenue and Maple Street at point of crossing.

Date of Permission.	Name of Applicant.	Nature of Petition.	Conditions.
Nov. 18, 1919,	John N. Hillyer Company,.....	For permission to construct siding at grade across Church Street in Township of Middletown, Monmouth County, N. J.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. That deraill be placed in existing siding track at a point west of the westerly line of the highway. 2. That train movements over said siding be limited to a speed of not more than 6 miles per hour. 3. That flagman be stationed in the highway before train movements are made over same. 4. That standard grade crossing sign be located near point of crossing.
Nov. 25, 1919,	N. B. Fairclough,.....	For permission to construct siding at grade across East 27th Street, in the City of Paterson, Passaic County, New Jersey, to connect with tracks of N. Y. S. & W. R. R.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. That gates be relocated in order that proposed siding track will come within gate protection for all movements over proposed track.
Dec. 30, 1919,	Director General of Railroads and West Jersey & Seashore Railroad Company,	For permission to construct siding at grade across Maryland Avenue, in the City of Atlantic City, Atlantic County, N. J., to reach property of Charles Levin.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. That all train movements over the highway be protected by a flagman. 2. That train movements over said highway be limited to a speed of not more than 6 miles per hour. 3. That standard grade crossing sign me located near siding track. 4. That deraill be installed on proposed track in the yard. 5. That the portion of track in Maryland Avenue be laid with girder grooved rail.
Dec. 30, 1919,	Frank Monyek,.....	For permission to construct siding at grade across Broadway, in the City of Elizabeth, Union County, N. J., to connect with tracks of Central Railroad Company of New Jersey.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. That all train movements over said siding be protected by a flagman. 2. That all train movements over said siding be limited to a speed of not more than 6 miles per hour.

NEW CROSSINGS AT GRADE.

Application of Board of Chosen Freeholders of the County of Ocean for Permission to Extend Hamilton Avenue, in Seaside Heights, Over the Tracks of the Philadelphia and Long Branch Railroad, at Grade.

REPORT.

Berry & Riggins, for Petitioner.

Alan H. Strong, for Philadelphia and Long Branch Railroad Company.

Ward Kremer, for Borough of Seaside Heights.

On May 1st, 1918, the Board of Chosen Freeholders of the County of Ocean filed a petition with this Board, alleging Hamilton Avenue, in the Borough of Seaside Heights, to be a county road; that the vehicular traffic on said avenue and on the County Boulevard in the said Borough is very heavy, especially during the summer season, and that it is a source of great inconvenience to the general public to be obliged to use West Central Avenue and Sumner Avenue instead of crossing the railroad tracks at Hamilton Avenue. Permission was asked for the extension of Hamilton Avenue across the said railroad tracks and the establishment of a grade crossing at the intersection of Hamilton Avenue and the railroad.

On October 15th, 1918, the original petition was amended by adding:

“The railroad crossing at Sumner Avenue, in the Borough of Seaside Heights, is on a level with the railroad, and is dangerous to the public safety because of the large amount of vehicular traffic over the said crossing, and the fact that practically all of said traffic is directed either to or from the bridge across Barnegat Bay hereinbefore referred to, and to the fact that in making said crossing two or three right angle turns are necessary. Thousands of automobiles traverse Sumner, West Central and Hamilton Avenues each day, and especially during the summer season, either to and from said bridge, and it is a source of great inconvenience to the general public to be obliged to use a railroad crossing at Sumner Avenue, and public travel on said Sumner Avenue is very much impeded.

Your petitioner, therefore, prays that Sumner Avenue, where it crosses the railroad tracks, be vacated, and that the said crossing be abolished, and that a new crossing in the place of the crossing now at Sumner Avenue be relocated at Hamilton Avenue across said railroad tracks.”

Hearings were held at Trenton July 11th and November 19th, 1918, but briefs of counsel were not filed until December 10th, 1918, and January 20th, 1919.

The Board of Chosen Freeholders' petition to have that part of Sumner Avenue over the right of way of the Philadelphia and Long Branch Railroad vacated and a new grade crossing established at Hamilton Avenue, which is located about 450 feet from the present crossing on Sumner Avenue. Hamilton Avenue is an opened street extending to the line of the right of way of said railroad on both sides thereof.

NEW CROSSINGS AT GRADE.

143

The Borough of Seaside Heights does not object to the additional grade crossing at Hamilton Avenue, but insists on the maintenance of the existing one at Sumner Avenue.

Counsel for the petitioner rely on Chapter 57, Laws of 913, known as the Fielder Grade Crossing Act, to support their claim that this Board has the power to relocate or vacate public highways.

Section 1 of the said act reads as follows:

"1. Whenever a public highway and a railroad cross each other at the same level, and it shall appear to the Board that such crossing is dangerous to public safety, or that the public travel on such highway is impeded thereby, the Board of Public Utility Commissioners may order the company operating such railroad, within such time as said board may fix, to alter such crossing according to plans to be approved by said Board by substituting therefor a crossing not at a grade of such public highway either by carrying such public highway under or over such railroad or by reconstructing such railroad under or over such public highway, or by vacating, relocating or changing the lines, width, direction or location of such highway and the opening of a new highway in the place of the one ordered vacated."

The said act in a subsequent section sets forth that the board or body having charge of the finances of any municipality wherein a dangerous grade crossing exists may present to this Board a petition in writing, setting forth the facts upon which relief under the act is sought, or upon the petition of any railroad company whose tracks cross or are crossed at grade, or the Board of Public Utility Commissioners may, of its own motion, proceed with respect to any such crossing; whereupon the Board shall fix a time and place for a hearing before it, and shall give notice to the municipality and all other parties interested therein; and after such hearing shall determine or order what alterations to or changes shall be made. Other sections of the act relate to the manner in which the expense and damage incident to such change or relocation shall be paid.

The petition does not refer to the grade crossing act, and it could not be successfully claimed that the Board of Chosen Freeholders of Ocean County is the "body having charge of the finances of the municipality" (Seaside Heights) wherein the alleged dangerous crossing exists. The required notice of the desired change in the streets has not been given to the parties interested, and no satisfactory plan of elimination or substitution is submitted. We are asked to arbitrarily vacate that portion of Sumner Avenue which crosses the railroad tracks and open a new highway (where none now exists) across the same railroad right of way at Hamilton Avenue.

The Board is without power to so act in the pending proceedings, and the petition must, therefore, be dismissed.

Dated February 4th, 1919.

**Petition for Additional Grade Crossing Over White Horse Pike, AmatoI,
New Jersey.**

REPORT.

Captain Arthur Cobb, for commanding officer of AmatoI Arsenal.

A letter from the commanding officer at AmatoI Arsenal, New Jersey, bearing date June 28th, 1919, requests the consent of this Board to the establishment of an additional grade crossing over White Horse Pike as part of a plan, and "in connection with the northwesterly part of a loop extending from the AmatoI railroad platform near the West Jersey and Sea Shore Railroad's tracks and extends to Switch M-14 as shown on said plan." The petition further says "this northwesterly loop will not be regularly used for traffic and will be held in reserve as an emergency track only. The government is willing that a condition of the permit be that the two crossings shall never be in use at the same time."

On March 11th, 1918, on application of the United States Government, Atlantic Loading Company, agent, the Board gave permission to construct a crossing at grade over White Horse Pike between East Hammonton and Elwood, New Jersey (AmatoI Arsenal), subject to conditions specifically referred to in the certificate of permission. The consent given by the Board of Chosen Freeholders of the County of Atlantic contained this condition precedent:

"6. That this privilege is granted upon the express understanding that the tracks shall be removed when the United States Government shall no longer need them unless further grant is given by the then existing Board of Freeholders or proper representatives of the county."

At that time all of the parties considered the crossing a temporary one of great emergency during the war. It was granted as such.

On January 6th, 1919, the commanding officer of AmatoI Arsenal requested an additional grade crossing at a point approximately 2,300 feet northwesterly of the present crossing erected by the government. After hearing and investigation the last-mentioned petition was on March 25th, 1919, withdrawn.

The present application is a renewal of the petition withdrawn on the date last mentioned. Hearing was held July 10th, 1919, at Newark. Captain Arthur Cobb there stated that on February 20th, 1919, the AmatoI Arsenal was taken over by the United States Government, and will be maintained as a permanent standby plant; that the trackage there from now on will amount to very little; that changed conditions at the arsenal remove most of the previous dangerous conditions; that it is desired only as an emergency crossing to connect with the northwestern loop, and, if permitted, would not be used at any time while the present track is in condition.

The Board must, however, bear in mind that the plant has been taken over by the Federal Government, and the laying of any track across the said highway will become a permanent menace, instead of a temporary one, which was justified during the period of the war. This turnpike has been chosen as

State Highway Route 3, and forms a direct line between Philadelphia and Atlantic City by way of Camden. The traffic on it has been exceedingly heavy, and it forms probably the highest speed motor route in the State. At the present time it is under reconstruction, and all grade crossings on it have been avoided, excepting the one at Amatol and another small siding near Absecon, near the end of the route, which is not used. The State Highway Department, therefore, vigorously protests against the establishment of any additional grade crossing in this highway.

It being the declared policy of this Board to deny all applications for grade crossings wherever possible, it seems to us that the present application, while desirable to the plan of track layout, is neither necessary nor essential.

The report of James Maybury, Jr., Chief Inspector, Railroad Division, dated February 5th, 1919 (a copy of which is hereto attached), shows a thorough and careful investigation of the hazardous situation at this plant, with a recommendation of a proposed substituted track plan, which, in our opinion, is more in public interest. The application is, therefore, denied.

Dated July 22d, 1919.

STATE OF NEW JERSEY
BOARD OF PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSIONERS.
INSPECTOR'S REPORT.

Date: February 5th, 1919.

Company: Atlantic Loading Company.

Nature: Petition for crossing at grade, White Horse Pike.

Place: Atlantic County, New Jersey.

REMARKS.

Referring to the petition of the Atlantic Loading Company (United States Government Ammunition Plant) regarding additional track at grade over White Horse Pike, Atlantic County, the plant of the petitioner is located at Amatol, and proposed track is required to provide additional track facilities.

Trains are now operated over the highway on a single track located south of the administration building, at point "A" on attached plan, which building is located at the northerly end of the plant. It is claimed that the present track facilities are inadequate to properly and conveniently transport employees from Amatol and the several loading points in the plant to Amatol Junction, where train connections are made with the West Jersey and Seashore Railroad. The Junction is located about 700 feet west of White Horse Pike, point "B" on plan.

The proposed track crossing at "C" over the highway is part of a scheme permitting loading passengers at the respective gates on trains from Amatol which would move in a northerly direction over curve track to main track connection at point "D," thence circling around the administration building over the highway to Amatol Junction, thence over existing track, moving in a southerly direction through yard track to Amatol. Such plan would permit practically a double track movement through the main portion of the plant, and the scheme would be entirely feasible were it not for the necessity

of an additional crossing of one of the principal thoroughfares in the State. The White Horse Pike is the main highway to Atlantic City. The State Highway Department is improving the highway, and it is the intention of said department to make it one of the best improved highways in the State. Objection is therefore raised by said department to the construction of any additional crossings at grade on said highway. With the exception of the existing track across the White Horse Pike at Amatol there is only one industrial siding track located at Absecon, which track is seldom used.

It would appear from an investigation of the present track layout that a movement could be arranged similar to that desired by the petitioner without the necessity of the additional crossing at grade. The substitute plan consists of a movement from the respective gates around the administration building, thence along the easterly side of the highway and parallel therewith to an additional track shown in dotted lines paralleling the existing track, which latter track crosses the highway and connects with tracks through the classification yard.

It was stated at the hearing that all track curves in the plant have been arranged on a minimum 500' radius. The solid white lines shown on plan represent existing tracks, dotted lines, proposed tracks. To provide for the 500' radius required for curves, to construct such curve north of the administration building, the present "Y" track could be rearranged as shown on the plan. Freight movements from the store houses located in the northerly end of the plant would move over the northerly track to main track; thence on curve at point "E" to the existing track leading across the highway and connecting with the West Jersey and Seashore Railroad. Some trains are operated between Amatol and Camden, also Atlantic City, and these movements could be handled by backward movement from loading gates to switch connection with track to Amatol Junction.

In connection with the objection of the State Highway Department to any crossing at grade over White Horse Pike, if the plant is to be permanent it is suggested that an elevated track be constructed with bridge over highway permitting operation on a one per cent. grade as shown on attached plan. To provide for the required circle movement if the track is elevated over the highway the track on the easterly side of the highway could be extended from point "F" paralleling the elevated track to a junction with yard track as shown on plan. The latter scheme would avoid any track at grade in connection with the plant. It is contemplated that the improvement of the White Horse Pike through Amatol will be reached this year, and the elevated track could be constructed later if there is objection to such construction at present.

To handle employees it is claimed a movement each half hour will be required over petitioner's proposed loop line, permitting employees to be carried direct to Amatol Junction. The suggested substitute plan would involve the location of a platform or station in the plant east of the highway and 730 feet east of Amatol Junction station. While the distance may be deemed inconvenient for employees to walk, which, however, is less than for employees in the administration buildings, the danger likely to arise from an additional track at grade should be considered as an offset against such

NEW CROSSINGS AT GRADE.

147

inconvenience. If the additional crossing is constructed, two crossings would exist on same highway 2,300 feet apart. As the travel on the highway is extremely heavy, it would seem that an extra hazardous situation would be created by establishing crossings so close, especially when it is considered that high explosives are transported across the highway.

In view of the above statement I am of the opinion that the proposed substitute track plan shown in dotted lines with two tracks at grade across the highway at present location, point "A" on plan, would be the most practical scheme under existing conditions, especially as all movements required could be conveniently handled. I would, therefore, recommend said plan as a substitute for proposed additional track across the highway. If the suggested two-track crossing of the highway at point "A" is determined upon, and permission is granted therefor, I would recommend that gates be installed and operated for all train movements; that illuminated signs with wording thereon "Railroad Crossing 300 Feet Distant" be located north and south of the crossing; that standard grade crossing signs, which could be constructed with arms smaller than the standard size and placed to be readily observed, located 50 feet north and south of the nearest rail; also that all train movements over the highway be limited to six miles per hour.

Respectfully submitted,

(Signed) JAMES MAYBURY, JR.,
Chief Inspector, Railroad Division.

Mergers.

Date of Approval.	Name of Applicant.	Nature of Petition.
Apr. 14, 1919,	Electric Company of New Jersey and Bridgeton Electric Company,	For approval of an agreement of merger and consolidation dated February 5th, 1919.
Sept. 17, 1919,	Bergen Aqueduct Company, Bergen Water Company and Glen Rock Water Works, Inc.,	For approval of an agreement of merger and consolidation dated August 8th, 1919.
Dec. 4, 1919,	Keystone Coal Company and R. H. Perry Company,	For approval of an agreement of merger and consolidation into corporation to be known as "R. H. Perry Company."

Miscellaneous Certificates.

Date of Approval.	Name of Applicant.	Nature of Petition.
May 15, 1919,	Bergen Aqueduct Company,	For approval of certificate of desire to come under the act of April 21st, 1876.
Dec. 4, 1919,	General Water Supply Company,	For approval of a certificate under the provisions of Chapter 194 of the Laws of 1919.
Dec. 23, 1919,	Bogota Water Company,	For approval of certificate of desire to come under the act of April 21st, 1876.

Inspections, Gas Utilities.

The following, referring to inspections of the plants, equipment and conditions pertaining to the operating of public utilities in New Jersey, is submitted:

Under date of October 17th, 1911, the Board issued an order establishing standards and regulations to be followed by utilities engaged in the production, sale and distribution of gas. This order established standards of quality and pressure and also prescribed conditions under which customers' meters should be tested.

In accordance with the Board's order:

"No gas company shall allow a gas meter to remain in service for a period longer than six years without checking it for accuracy and readjusting it if found to be inaccurate,"

the company is required to keep a record of tests made of meters before installation and after they are removed from service. It is also required that the original record shall be kept in the meter shop and available for examination at any time by inspectors of the Board; further, that reports shall be made to the Board at stated intervals giving a summary of the results obtained.

The Board's order also provides that the company equip itself with a standard meter prover with which to test customers' meters, and that all provers must be inspected and tested by the Board and furnished with an inspection tag or plate.

In compliance with the rules mentioned above, the Board's gas inspector and his assistants have tested and sealed all gas meter provers in the State of New Jersey. These tests were made with a standard cubic foot bottle which had been previously calibrated and certified by the National Bureau of Standards at Washington. In addition to testing the provers the condition under which customers' meters were being tested by the company was considered before the certificate of inspection was given to the company.

The Board's rules prescribe that:

"Each gas company shall, without charge, make a test of the accuracy of a meter upon request of a consumer, provided such consumer does not make a request for a test more frequently than once in six months";

also that a report giving the results of such test shall be made to the customer and that:

"A complete record of such tests shall be kept on file in the office of the company."

If, however, any consumer desires a test made by an inspector of the Board, the test is made upon receipt of a formal application and a fee of \$1.00 is charged. If the meter is found to be fast beyond the allowable two per cent. limits, the fee is returned to the customer and collected from the company. The Board's inspectors have made numerous tests of consumers' meters in accordance with the above rule. In each case the meter is first

sealed by the complainant with a paper seal provided by the Board so that the meter cannot be tested or opened by the company, and the test is made with a prover which has been tested and sealed as described above.

In connection with the quality of gas, the Board's rules prescribe that:

"The company furnishing gas, which, within a one mile radius of the distribution center, gives a monthly average total heating value of not less than 600 B. t. u. with a minimum which shall never fall below 550 B. t. u., may be considered as giving adequate service as far as the heating value of the gas is concerned."

It is also required that:

"Each gas company whose output exceeds twenty million cubic feet a year shall equip itself with a standard calorimeter outfit, constructed and calibrated as approved by the National Bureau of Standards, with which periodical tests upon the gas shall be made. A record of these tests shall be made and kept on file in the office of the company."

In accordance with the above, all gas companies whose output exceeds 20,000,000 cubic feet a year have equipped themselves with the standard calorimeter outfits and regular tests are being made of the heating value of the gas furnished by the company. The Board's inspector has visited all of the testing rooms and approved the testing apparatus and also the conditions under which the tests are made.

In connection with general inspections of the various gas plants in the State, the Board's inspector has made tests of the heating value of the gas, using the companies' instruments, and he has also made tests at various points in the State without the companies' knowledge, using the Board's standard calorimeter outfit. These tests are usually made on the premises of some customer or in the town hall or city hall of the municipality.

The Board's inspector also examines the companies' original records showing the results of tests made by the companies' engineers or superintendents, and each company having a calorimeter equipment files a monthly report with the Board showing the daily result obtained by that company. These reports are carefully examined each month by the Board's inspector and are on file at the Newark office.

At the request of the Board's inspector the smaller companies, *i. e.*, the companies whose output is less than 20,000,000 cubic feet per year, have provided a room in which tests may be made at short notice by the inspectors of the Board with the Board's calorimeter outfit. In addition to providing a suitable room for these tests the companies have provided a water and gas supply located so that the test may be properly made and without any loss of time in preparing for the test.

During the past six weeks tests have been made by the Board's inspector at the testing rooms of the Public Service Gas Company located in Paterson, Newark, Jersey City, Trenton and Camden, and tests have also been made at the laboratories of the city inspectors at Newark and Trenton. Both of these laboratories are located in the City Hall of the respective cities. The results obtained are as follows:

INSPECTIONS, GAS UTILITIES.

<i>Location of Test.</i>	<i>Date.</i>	<i>Heating Value —B. T. U.</i>
Paterson,	Nov. 3, 1919	610
Newark City Hall,	Nov. 6, 1919	592
Jersey City,	Nov. 7, 1919	602
Trenton City Hall,	Nov. 10, 1919	623
Newark City Hall,	Nov. 11, 1919	596
Newark (Company Laboratory),	Nov. 13, 1919	591
Paterson,	Nov. 17, 1919	580
Trenton (Company Laboratory),	Nov. 20, 1919	632
Jersey City,	Nov. 21, 1919	572
Paterson,	Nov. 28, 1919	620
Camden,	Dec. 9, 1919	562

All of the above results indicate total heating value that is above the minimum allowed by the Board's rules, but in a number of cases the result of the test made by the Board's inspector indicated heating value below the monthly average of 600 B. t. u. The lowest result obtained by the Board's inspector was at Camden on December 9th. The company's records show that the average of the tests made on the following day, December 10th, was 555 B. t. u., on December 11th the average was 579 B. t. u., December 12th, 589 B. t. u., and December 13th, 599 B. t. u.

It appears that the low heating value of the gas sent out from the Camden plant during the past week was due primarily to the recent strike of the bituminous coal miners. The company appealed to the Fuel Administration for a supply of coal and, through an error on the part of the Regional Committee, a shipment of steam coal was made to the Camden works in place of gas coal, and this resulted in a very decided drop in the heating value of the gas sent out from the Camden Coke Company plant. As this gas is mixed with the water gas manufactured at the Public Service Gas Company's plant at Camden the heating value of the gas delivered to the mains at Camden was considerably lower than it should have been. The company has now obtained a supply of gas coal and, as shown above, the heating value of the gas sent out has increased up to December 13th, and the company does not expect any further difficulty in maintaining the heating value in accordance with the Board's rules.

The monthly reports filed by the Public Service Gas Company during the present year show the following as the result of tests made by the company's engineer, the first figure being the monthly average and the second figure the minimum daily average.

<i>Location</i>	<i>Jan.</i>	<i>Feb.</i>	<i>Mar.</i>	<i>Apr.</i>	<i>May</i>	<i>June</i>	<i>July</i>	<i>Aug.</i>	<i>Sept.</i>	<i>Oct.</i>	<i>Nov.</i>	<i>Dec.</i>
Newark,	606	604	601	602	604	603	600	602	606	603	605	...
	597	594	596	581	586	599	591	589	592	584	592	...
Jersey City,	600	603	603	604	600	601	604	600	600	601	601	...
	578	579	574	581	579	587	582	562	587	568	584	...
Paterson,	606	600	601	602	604	600	600	600	600	604	602	...
	596	590	590	592	590	584	580	577	577	595	600	...
Trenton,	586	605	602	602	601	604	601	601	601	601	600	...
	559	590	580	585	582	578	580	576	573	569	570	...
Camden,	587	600	600	601	601	600	600	602	602	601	601	...
	565	577	567	578	566	566	586	574	588	600	600	...

152 PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSIONERS' REPORT.

The monthly reports filed by the other companies whose output exceeds twenty million cubic feet per year, show the following:

<i>Company</i>	<i>Jan.</i>	<i>Feb.</i>	<i>Mar.</i>	<i>Apr.</i>	<i>May</i>	<i>June</i>	<i>July</i>	<i>Aug.</i>	<i>Sept.</i>	<i>Oct.</i>	<i>Nov.</i>	<i>Dec.</i>
Atlantic City Gas Com- pany,	600 594	600 596	600 591	600 599	600 595	600 596	600 592	601 590	601 596	...	600 594	...
Consolidated Gas Com- pany of N. J.,	601 576	600 574	599 562	600 564	600 551	603 576	601 540	600 571	600 566	598 560
Cumberland County Gas Company,	619 587	615 594	621 597	624 600	627 603	630 605	621 600	608 590	609 593	609 595	...
Elizabethtown Gas Light Company,	601 589	602 587	601 589	600 590	602 594	603 593	606 595	604 585	606 597	608 601	604 593	...
New Jersey Gas Com- pany,	604 593	603 554	602 571	610 579	602 591	600 570	600 578	603 571	608 589
Perth Amboy Gas Light Company,	599 589	609 586	597 588	601 591	601 591	603 596	603 593	600 592	601 596

Complaints are received by gas companies and by the Board that the gas furnished is of a poor quality. Investigation of the complaint very often shows that the cause of the complaint is not due to the quality of the gas, but to a variable gas pressure or an inadequate supply of gas. The Board's rules prescribe that:

"Gas pressure as measured at meter inlets shall never be less than 1½ inches nor more than 6 inches of water pressure; and the daily variation of pressure at the inlet of any one meter on the system shall never be greater than 100% of the minimum pressure."

Each company is required to make frequent measurements of gas pressure and gas pressure variations, and these records must be kept on file in the office of the company.

With the exception of a few of the very small companies in the State, the gas companies have installed recording pressure gauges with which daily measurements are made of the gas pressure at various points on the companies' distribution systems. The records obtained are kept on file, usually in the company's office, and are examined by the Board's inspector when inspections are made of the company's plant.

The Board's inspectors have on numerous occasions installed the Board's recording pressure gauges on the premises of customers in connection with complaints of poor service, and, where it has been found that the pressure conditions are not within the limits prescribed by the Board's rules, the company's attention has been called to the fact, and usually suggestions are made by the Board's inspector as to what should be done to remedy the conditions complained of.

An examination has been made by the Board's inspector of the pressure records taken by the Public Service Gas Company, which are on file at the company's office in each division. The pressure conditions at various points on the company's distribution system have been recorded by the inspector, and are kept among the Board's records.

Inspections of Public Utilities.

During the year 1919 the Board's inspector of utilities supplying electric service inspected the following power plants and substations to determine their general condition and ability to supply adequate service.

Atlantic City Electric Company's power plant at Atlantic City was inspected on May 23d and August 27th, and the substation in Ocean City on April 30th and August 27th.

Atlantic Coast Electric Light Company's plant in Allenhurst was inspected on November 5th. The company's electric meter standards were tested on November 5th and 6th.

Atlantic County Electric Company's plant in Egg Harbor City was inspected on August 27th.

Blair Electric Light Company's power plant in Blairstown was inspected on August 7th.

Boonton Electric Company's substation in Boonton was inspected on August 6th.

Branchville Electric Power, Water and Light Company's power plant in Branchville, was inspected on August 7th.

Browns Mills in the Pines Electric Company's plant in Browns Mills was inspected on August 21st.

Cape May Light and Power Company's power plant in Cape May was inspected on January 14th, February 4th and 5th, March 25th, April 29th, June 30th and October 10th. These inspections were necessary because the quality of service rendered was not satisfactory to the consumers, and numerous recommendations were made in order to put the plant into proper operating condition in order to supply adequate service. These recommendations included the installation of a new smokestack, repairs on the boilers and steam piping, the installation of proper lighting in the plant, and necessary instruments for determining load and uniformity of voltage. It was also necessary to make an investigation of certain apparent discriminations in rates charged certain customers.

Commonwealth Electric Company's power plant in Summit was inspected on November 14th, and the electric meter standards tested on November 12th and 14th.

Electric Company of New Jersey's power plant at Bridgeton was inspected January 13th, March 26th, April 3d, June 4th, August 23d, October 1st and 7th, December 10th and 11th. The substation in Pitman was inspected January 28th; substation in Laurel Springs January 29th and June 5th; combination power plant and substation in Salem on March 27th, August 22d and December 11th; substation in Clementon on June 20th and August 22d; substation in Woodstown on August 22d and substation in Pennsgrove December 11th. During the entire year the Board's inspector had a recording volt meter installed on the premises of one of the company's customers in order that definite information as to the momentary changes in voltage might be recorded and be retained for future reference in the Board's files. This investigation also included the inspection of practically all of the com-

pany's transmission lines and a large portion of the distribution system. The recommendations included putting into operation automatic voltage regulators in the substations, together with graphic volt meters, the installation of a new cable across the Delaware river from a plant in Wilmington, Delaware, the installation of a voltage regulator in the Wilmington power plant, increase in capacity of the power plant in Wilmington, installation of a different type of automatic switches at the substations in the New Jersey territory, with the result that service has been materially improved.

Eastern Pennsylvania Power Company's power plant in Easton was inspected on August 8th.

Flemington Electric Light, Heat and Power Company's power plant in Flemington was inspected December 9th.

Hackettstown Electric Light Company's power plant in Hackettstown was inspected March 20th and August 9th. The Board's inspector also assisted in the appraisal of this company's property.

Harrison Heights Improvement Company's power plant in Mullica Hill was appraised with the assistance of the Board's electrical inspector.

Electric Light and Power Company of Hightstown substation was inspected on January 30th.

Hunterdon Electric and Power Company's power plant in High Bridge was inspected on August 8th.

Lakewood and Coast Electric Company's electric meter standards were tested November 7th.

Lambertville Public Service Company's plant in Lambertville was inspected December 9th.

Millburn Electric Company's plant in Millburn was inspected on April 14th and June 25th, and the electric meter standards were tested April 14th.

Millville Electric Company's power plant in Millville was inspected April 29th and August 23d.

Monmouth Lighting Company's electric meter standards were tested May 15th. The power plant in Keyport was inspected on July 30th and the substations in Freehold and Farmingdale were inspected on November 17th and recommendations made to improve the service.

Morris and Somerset Electric Company's power plant in Morristown was inspected February 17th and the meter standards tested the same day.

New Egypt Electric Light and Power Company's plant in New Egypt was inspected August 21st.

New Jersey Power and Light Company's plant in Dover was inspected August 6th and the electric meter standards were tested in Dover December 4th and in Bernardsville on December 3d.

Newton Electric and Gas Company's power plant in Newton was inspected February 19th, July 15th, August 6th and December 5th, and the electric meter standards were tested February 19th and December 5th. This power plant has been giving inadequate service to its consumers for a number of years, and the Board practically forced a receiver's sale of the plant in 1918, and as the service did not improve, recommendations were made for the company to either install additional apparatus or obtain power from another source. The company adopted the latter recommendation and a transmission line is about completed and the power will be purchased from

the New Jersey Power and Light Company's plant in Dover, which should result in adequate service to the consumers in Newton.

Ocean Grove Camp Meeting Association's power plant in Ocean Grove was inspected on March 12th.

Public Service Company's Marion power station in Jersey City was inspected February 14th, the Metuchen Station on July 17th, and the Board's inspector kept in close touch with the operation of the other plants and substations operated by this company, through the company's records and officials in Newark and the company's representatives in the local divisions.

Sea Isle City Electric Light, Power and Water Company's power plant in Sea Isle City was inspected August 26th.

Toms River Electric Company's power plant in Toms River was inspected April 17th, May 29th and August 28th, and the electric meter standards were tested April 16th. Recommendations were made to this company to improve the quality of service and also add to the convenience and safety of the employees in the power plant.

Vulcan Electric Light and Power Company's plant in Cape May Court House was inspected on April 30th and August 25th. These inspections were necessary in order to follow up recommendations made the previous year, as the company, during 1918, rendered inadequate service but which service is now greatly improved.

Warren Wood Working Company's power plant in Belvidere was inspected June 7th and August 8th and the new owner agreed to put the power plant in better operating condition in order that adequate service might be furnished.

Washington Electric Company's power plant in Washington was inspected on January 16th and the new owner of this plant was interviewed August 9th and agreements made to put the plant into adequate operating condition and make the plant safe for the employees. Assistance was also rendered in the valuation of the company's plant and distribution system.

Woodbourne Electric Heat, Light and Power Company's power plants in Sussex and Woodbourne were inspected on August 7th and on the suggestion of the Board's inspector the steam power plant in Sussex will be shut down and have the plant operated by one force of operators in Woodbourne where the water power plant will have as an auxiliary motive power an oil engine to be used when there is insufficient water for generating purposes. This will eliminate the necessity for interrupting the service when the change from power generated by the water plant to the auxiliary power, which interruptions were necessary when the company operated the two power plants. It should also result in the decreased cost of operation.

Kennedy Electric Company's substation in Long Valley was inspected on July 15th, on the same date the Califon substation and transmission line was inspected.

A new power plant in Bloomsbury was inspected on July 10th and August 9th and the Board's inspector assisted in the appraisal of the plant.

Willsbrook Electric Light Company's substation in Netcong was inspected on July 14th and on investigation learned that the service now rendered is considered adequate since the old power plant operated by the company was shut down on a recommendation of the Board's inspector, because

156 PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSIONERS' REPORT.

it was in such condition as could not longer be depended upon to furnish adequate service.

A power plant operated by the Taylor Stiles Company in Finesville was inspected and it was found that this company is not incorporated as a utility although rendering service for the past four years to about thirty consumers. The necessary steps were taken to inform the company that it is necessary for it to comply with the Board's Rules and Regulations and to keep its accounts in accordance with the Board's Uniform System of Accounts.

The municipal plants operated by the Boroughs of Madison, Sea Side Heights, Sea Side Park, Vineland, were inspected on January 8th, August 15th, and January 27th respectively, and reports rendered requiring these municipalities to comply with the Board's Rules and Regulations and the electric meter standards in Madison and Vineland were tested.

In order that the Board's recommendations, that all secondary distribution lines and services be grounded, the Board's inspector kept in close touch with the inspectors of the National Board of Fire Underwriters of the Middle Department, and city inspectors and co-operated with them in requiring the utilities and electric contractors to comply with the Board's rules.

The inspection of the companies' electric meter standards is a very important duty of the Board's inspector, and according to the Board's Rules, these standards should be tested and approved by the Board's inspector at least once a year. The standards used by the companies in testing consumers' meters are subject to the same causes of inaccuracy as ordinary consumers' meters and all but one company in this State, which has primary standards, are absolutely dependent upon the accuracy submitted in the inspector's reports after a test of the instruments. In order to see that the Board's standards are maintained, it is necessary to have these checked up by the Bureau of Standards at Washington, D. C., and cross-checked with the company having primary standards which are also tested by the Bureau of Standards at Washington, and further check is made with the manufacturers of the meters.

Inspections of Water Utilities.

Aside from the usual problems involved in the regulation of any public utility devoted to the production of gas or electricity, such as insistence on adequate plant capacity, standard quality of product or service, proper operation and maintenance of the distribution system and accessories, and systematic tests of the meters on consumers' premises, a water utility presents two additional problems, which are extended sciences in themselves. First, the water must be pure when leaving the source and must not be allowed to become polluted to a dangerous degree by leaving it too long in the mains or reservoirs before being served to the consumer. Second, the capacity of plant, and reservoirs, and the size and arrangement of mains and hydrants, should be such as to enable the company to render the necessary protection against fire consistent with the size and character of the community served.

As to the first, the Board and its staff have relied implicitly on the analyses made by the State Department of Health for any information as to bacteriological or chemical constituents of the water furnished by water utilities, especially before it enters the mains, reserving for themselves the investigations needed in connection with the physical qualities of such water. Premising a supply of water pure at the source, the rules regarding periodic cleaning of reservoirs, flushing of hydrants and dead ends, etc., imposed by the Board are designed to keep the water pure until it reaches the consumer. As to the second, the determination of the character of fire service, actual tests have been made by opening hydrants and measuring, simultaneously, flow and pressures in ninety-six municipalities throughout the State.

Concerning the other features of the requirements exacted from or imposed upon water utilities, included in the "Rules, Regulations and Recommendations for Water Utilities" issued by the Board in 1917, a printed questionnaire has been compiled covering the one side of six pages. One of these has been filled out in connection with an inspection of practically all private water utilities in the State (numbering 105 to date). It contains a record of every minute feature entering into the facilities provided, their method of operation and their adequacy, for service. In addition to a record of the hydrant tests above mentioned, direct references are made therein (in some cases amplified) to the compliance of the utility with all the rules of the Board. These reports include almost a complete inventory in themselves and are available for use as reliable data in both appraisal and service investigations.

LIST OF WATER UTILITIES INSPECTED.

Atlantic County Water Co.	Medford Water Co.
Barnegat Water Co.	Merchantville Water Co.
Bay Head Water Co.	Middlesex Water Co.
Belvidere Water Co.	Millington Water Co.
Bergen Water Co.	Millville Water Co.
Bernards Water Co.	Mine Springs Water Co.
Blackwood Water Co.	Monmouth County Water Co.
Bloomsbury Water Co.	Monroe Water Co.
Bogota Water and Light Co.	Morris Aqueduct Co.
Bound Brook Water Co.	Mount Holly Water Co.
Bridgeport Water Co.	Neptunus Water Co.
Buckhorn Springs Water Co.	New Egypt Lt. Ht. Pr. & Water Co.
Butler Water Co.	New Jersey Coast Water Co.
Califon Water Co.	New Jersey Water and Light Co.
Clayton-Glassboro Water Co.	New Jersey Water Service Co.
Clementon Springs Water Co.	Normandy Water Co.
Clinton Water and W. Supply Co.	Ocean City Water Co.
Columbus Water Co.	Ocean Grove Camp Meeting Assn.
Corsons Inlet Water Co.	Passaic (Montclair) Water Co.
Cranbury Water Co.	Paulsboro Water Co.
Crosswicks Water Co.	Pemberton Twp. W. S. & Lt. Co.
Delaware River Water Co.	Pennington Springs Water Co.
Egg Harbor City River Co.	Pennsgrove Water Supply Co.
Elizabethtown Water Co.	Peoples (Millville) Water Co.
Elmer Water Co.	Peoples (Phillipsburg) Water Co.
Essex Fells El. Lt. and Water Co.	Piscataway Water Co.
Flemington Water Co.	Pitman Grove Camp Meeting Assn.
Frenchtown Water Co.	Plainfield-Union Water Co.
General Water Supply Co.	Point Pleasant Water Works Co.
German Valley Water Co.	Princeton Water Co.
Glen Gardner Water Co.	Riverton and Palmyra Water Co.
Glen Lake Water Plant	Rumson Improvement Co.
Hackensack Water Co.	Sea Isle City Water Co.
Harrison Heights Improvement Co.	Sewell Water Co.
Ideal Beach Water Co.	Somerville Water Co.
Jamesburg Water Co.	Stirling Water Supply Water Co.
Junction Water Co.	Stockton Water Co.
Keansburg Beach Water Co.	Tintern Manor Water Co.
Keansburg Water Co.	Toms River Water Co.
Lakeside Park Water Co.	Tuckerton Water Co.
Lakewood Water Co.	Vincetown Water Co.
Lambertville Water Co.	Washington Water Co.
Laurel Springs Water Co.	Watchung Water Co.
Little Falls Water Co.	Westville and Newbold Water Co.
Lumberton Lt. Water & Sewerage Co.	F. B. Allen (Bernardsville).
Maple Shade Water Co.	Whippany Water Co.
Marlton Water Co.	Wharton (Private) Water Co.

INSPECTIONS OF WATER UTILITIES.

159

Woodbury Heights Water Co.	Water Witch Plant (Margaret Johnson).
Woolwich Water Co.	
Hanover Water Co.	West Monmouth Water Co.
Yantacaw Water Co.	Ramsey Boro Water Co.
C. J. Justice Water Co.	Browns Mills Water Co.
M. T. Welch Water Co.	Gravity Water Supply Co.

LIST OF MUNICIPALITIES AT WHICH FLOW TESTS WERE MADE.

- | | |
|------------------------|-----------------------|
| 1. Edgewater. | 40. New Brunswick. |
| 2. Basking Ridge. | 41. Highland Park. |
| 3. Bernardsville. | 42. Swedesboro. |
| 4. Clayton. | 43. Mullica Hill. |
| 5. Glassboro. | 44. Tuckerton. |
| 6. Kearney. | 45. Milford. |
| 7. Peapack-Gladstone. | 46. Frenchtown. |
| 8. Far Hills. | 47. Stockton. |
| 9. Bedminster. | 48. Flemington. |
| 10. Milltown. | 49. Clinton. |
| 11. New Egypt. | 50. Annandale. |
| 12. Margate City. | 51. High Bridge. |
| 13. Irvington. | 52. Hampton. |
| 14. Totowa. | 53. Bloomsbury. |
| 15. Linden Boro. | 54. Merchantville. |
| 16. Linden Twp. | 55. Pensauken Twp. |
| 17. Pedricktown. | 56. Woodlyne. |
| 18. Pennsgrove. | 57. Collingswood. |
| 19. Moonachie. | 58. Haddon Twp. |
| 20. Clifton (City). | 59. Palisades Twp. |
| 21. Dunellen. | 60. Bergenfield. |
| 22. Middlesex (Boro.). | 61. Tenafly. |
| 23. Piscataway Twp. | 62. Cresskill. |
| 24. Hawthorne. | 63. Dumont. |
| 25. Wrightstown. | 64. Haworth. |
| 26. Pennington. | 65. Demarest. |
| 27. Dover. | 66. Closter. |
| 28. Ramsey. | 67. Harrington Park. |
| 29. Allendale. | 68. Norwood. |
| 30. West Paterson. | 69. Fairview. |
| 31. Little Falls Twp. | 70. Cliffside Park. |
| 32. Hopewell. | 71. Fort Lee. |
| 33. Lakewood Twp. | 72. Englewood Cliffs. |
| 34. Essex Fells. | 73. Ridgefield. |
| 35. Verona. | 74. Palisades Park. |
| 36. Caldwell. | 75. Mount Holly. |
| 37. West Caldwell. | 76. Manasquan. |
| 38. Plainfield. | 77. Sea Bright. |
| 39. North Plainfield. | 78. Rumson. |

- | | |
|-------------------------------------|------------------------|
| 79. Fair Haven. | 89. Absecon. |
| 80. Shrewsbury Twp. | 90. Bogota. |
| 81. Eatontown Twp. | 91. Ridgefield Park. |
| 82. Monmouth Beach. | 92. Teaneck. |
| 83. West Long Branch. | 93. Little Ferry. |
| 84. Union, Union Twp., Union Co. | 93. Hasbrouck Heights. |
| 85. Vauxhall, Union Twp., Union Co. | 94. Leonia. |
| 86. Bellville. | 95. Woodridge. |
| 87. Pleasantville. | 96. Carlstadt. |
| 88. Somers Point. | |

Traffic Inspections, Street Railways.

During the past year the three inspectors of the Board (Detailed to the Street Railway Department) have made traffic observations and inspections of the methods of operation and of the equipment of every street railway property in the State. In some instances the inspections were general but in the majority of cases detailed inspections were made. The results of these inspections were submitted in detail in reports to the Board, making such recommendations as were thought to be necessary in order to provide safe, proper and adequate service. Appropriate action was taken by the Board upon these.

It has been the practice to make traffic observations on the various properties at times and places when the companies' officials were unaware of the presence of the inspectors. The same practice was followed in connection with equipment inspections. This method was pursued because it was believed that it had a tendency to impress upon the officials the fact that any slight relaxation in the degree of service furnished might be detected during an investigation of this character and thus encourage a higher degree of operation and maintenance. These investigations occurred during all hours of the day but particularly during the rush hours, as far as traffic was concerned and included not only the securing of traffic data but in a great majority of instances the inspectors observed the manner in which the companies' rules were being obeyed by trainmen, violations of which very often result in improper and unsafe service. The results of such investigations were usually taken up informally with the companies' officials at conferences and very often resulted in improving the service.

In a few instances where special investigations of traffic conditions and the quality of the service being furnished were made, additional inspectors were temporarily employed to assist the regular force.

Traffic inspections where necessary have included detailed traffic counts, a permanent record of all data thus obtained being kept in the office files. Equipment inspections included detailed inspections of track, over-head construction, rolling stock and power stations.

Inspections of Railroads and Bridges.

The regular steam railroad inspections and special investigations have been made and reports filed as usual. The steam railroads have been covered by special train, regular train and on foot. Where it could be arranged the annual inspections were made at the time the companies were making their regular inspections, thus affording opportunity for more detailed work than in the usual way. Few recommendations have resulted from these inspections and the various companies involved have either complied with them or plan to do the work before the time specified.

Practically no change in railroad main line mileage has been made during the year. The regular inspections covered 191 main and branch lines aggregating 2,261 miles. Of these main and branch lines 54 lines totalling 364 miles were covered on foot. Four bridges have been eliminated and one new bridge has been built, leaving the number of them as follows: 2,458 fixed undergrade bridges having an aggregate length of 221,486 feet; 128 movable and float bridges aggregating 18,147 feet; 521 overhead highway and railway bridges and 2,076 unclassified undergrade openings.

Inspections of all of the bridges on the electric railway lines have been made on foot. Recommendations in the reports of these inspections have generally been complied with. Seven hundred and forty-three bridges of five feet span and over have been inspected; also seventy special inspections have been made and reports filed thereon.

The interstate toll bridges along the Delaware River and the toll bridges at Ocean City, at Manahawken and at Seaside Heights have been inspected and the recommendations made concerning them have either been carried out or the work recommended is in progress. Bridge Street bridge at Trenton, an interstate bridge, and the interstate toll bridge at Byram have been purchased by the Interstate Bridge Commission and made free bridges.

The Albany Street Bridge at New Brunswick became so weakened that to prevent the failure of this structure the Board issued an order suspending trolley traffic across it. This action hastened the letting of a contract for a new bridge by the County authorities. The new structure consists of two deck girder spans, one being a lift draw span. It is nearing completion and will be placed in service in the near future. During the construction work on this bridge the traffic is being carried on a temporary structure on the south side of the permanent bridge. The temporary structure consists of a timber structure on pile bents with a lift draw span.

Recommendations made concerning the Elizabeth Trestle of the Baltimore and New York Railroad are being complied with. This trestle is 1,266'-5" in length with an average height of 30'. This structure was in a dangerous condition. During the war only the temporary work necessary to make the trestle safe could be done owing to the scarcity of labor and materials. Permanent repairs are now being made and the company plans to complete this work in the near future. A part of this structure has been recently filled in with cinders.

The New York, Susquehanna and Western Railroad bridge over the Delaware River at Water Gap is inspected by the railroad company every

INSPECTIONS OF RAILROADS AND BRIDGES. 163

month and reports of these inspections are submitted to this office. Frequent inspections are also made by inspectors of this Division. This bridge is limited to light loading at a very low speed.

Work on the following grade crossing eliminations has been completed during the past year:

1—Elm Street, Madison with the D. L. & W. R. R. A reinforced concrete bridge has been built carrying the railroad over the street. The crossing at grade is eliminated.

2—East Clinton Avenue, Mercer County, just outside of the city limits of Trenton. The grade crossing with the Pennsylvania Railroad has been eliminated by carrying the railroad over the street.

3—Whitehead's Road, the next crossing on the Pennsylvania Railroad east of E. Clinton Avenue. This grade crossing has been eliminated by carrying the highway over the railroad.

4—At Ewing station the highway undercrossing has been widened and the bridge carrying the railroad over the highway has been rebuilt. The grade crossing west of the station has been closed and the traffic diverted to the undergrade crossing at the station.

5—A dangerous grade crossing in the vicinity of West State Street, Trenton, has been eliminated by carrying the highway under the tracks of the Pennsylvania Railroad and Delaware and Raritan Canal Feeder by a reinforced concrete structure.

6—At Passaic and Van Houten Avenue, Passaic on the D. L. & W. R. R., two grade crossings have been eliminated by being merged into one. In this case the railroad is carried over the highway.

The work of eliminating the following grade crossings is in progress:

1—The grade crossing of the Asylum Road, with the Philadelphia & Reading Railroad at Trenton Junction, is being eliminated by carrying the railroad over the highway at a location just west of the old crossing.

2—The New Ferry Road grade crossing with the New Jersey Junction Railroad at West New York.

3—Sandfords Crossing on the meadows, the crossing of the Newark Turnpike with the D. L. & W. R. R. just west of the junction of the Belleville Turnpike with the Newark Turnpike.

Grade Crossing Elimination Cases under consideration:

1—The most important grade crossing elimination problem is the one at Elizabethport, on the Central Railroad of New Jersey. This problem involves the separation of grades of fifteen crossings on the Elizabethport and Perth Amboy Branch, one on the main line and seven on the Broadway Branch. The pre-war estimated cost of this work is \$6,375,000. This case is now under consideration for report and final order.

2—On December 23d the Board filed a report in the proceedings which involved the proposed separation of grades along the line of the Delaware, Lackawanna and Western Railroad in the City of East Orange. It was decided that the grade crossings should be eliminated and a plan providing for this was approved.

3—An application has been received from the Borough of Haddonfield for the elimination of five grade crossings in that Borough along the main line of the West Jersey & Seashore Railroad. A thorough investigation of all the conditions has been made on the ground. Complete preliminary surveys have been made for about one and a half miles along the railroad and for 600 feet on each side of the railroad. Various schemes for the elimination of the crossings at grade have been made and estimates of cost computed for each scheme. A traffic count has been made and compiled. This case will be ready for a hearing in the near future.

Reports on the following cases for grade crossing elimination have been "delayed because of the general policy of the Board to fully co-operate with the representatives of the Federal Government in not requiring the railroad companies to make large expenditures of money for materials and in the employment of men in construction work during the war period; or while the railroads are under Government control." The cases referred to are Perth Amboy, Somerville, Malaga and Pleasantville.

Work of construction has not been begun in the Rutherford case.

The Paterson case is pending before the U. S. Supreme Court.

Construction of Dayton Road bridge over the Pennsylvania Railroad was deferred until the close of the war.

Accidents at Grade Crossings.

Accidents at grade crossings this year, compared with previous years, have increased owing in a measure to the increase of automobile travel on the highways. All accidents of such nature requiring investigations have been investigated as to crossing conditions, and recommendations were made in a number of cases for protection, or additional protection, where the conditions warranted.

During the year accidents have occurred involving auto busses carrying passengers. To prevent accidents of this character, the question of requiring auto busses to stop at grade crossings before proceeding over, was taken up with the Commissioner of Motor Vehicles. A communication was forwarded to all municipalities in which auto busses are operated, with the suggestion that they be regulated by an ordinance requiring them to stop at grade crossings. Several municipalities have adopted such an ordinance, and compliance therewith will undoubtedly eliminate this class of collision.

A serious accident occurred November 1st on the Swedesboro Road crossing of the Salem Branch of the West Jersey and Seashore Railroad, near Clarksboro. A covered auto truck containing thirty-two persons was struck by a northbound train, resulting in the killing of fourteen and injuring fourteen occupants, the majority of the latter seriously. While the crossing can reasonably be termed "an open view crossing," as the traffic on the highway is heavy, it was concluded that some type of automatic visible signal should be afforded and until such protection is installed, the railroad company is required to reduce speed of trains over crossing to fifteen miles per hour. As many accidents occur where the view can reasonably be considered fair, it would appear that the question of grade crossing protection must be considered in a more comprehensive manner than heretofore, especially with the increasing number of heavy type auto trucks operating on the highways. The serious character of collisions at highway grade crossings involving this class of vehicle is apparent owing to the possibility of locomotive and cars being derailed.

A collision between a train and a large auto truck occurred at a crossing on the Freehold Branch of the Central Railroad in which the engine and tender were overturned and two cars derailed. The train was moving at a speed of thirty miles per hour and the engineer was scalded in the cab and died. Passengers in the train were thrown from the seats, but none were injured.

Grade Crossing Protection.

With respect to grade crossing protection, the number of additional crossings protected during the past year is not in proportion to that of previous years, owing to the apparent inability of railroad operating officials to secure from the Federal Railroad Administration authority to expend the amount necessary for additional installations as recommended. An order of the Railroad Administration to reduce to the minimum all expenses other than those necessary for the safe operation of trains has delayed, in some cases, installation of crossing protection. The importance of installing reasonable protection at crossings should be called to the attention of the Railroad Administration, unless the railroads are returned to private control in the very near future, to the end that grade crossing protection be afforded as early as practicable.

Conferences have been held with railroad officials relative to standardizing protection for the different classes of crossings, and some features have already been determined.

Additional Protection Installed Nov. 1, 1918, to Nov. 1, 1919.

Crossings eliminated,	10
Private crossings removed,	8
Private crossings installed,	1
Gates,	5
Bells,	7
Gatemen,	5
Flagmen,	20
Standard Signs,	19
Extended hours gate protection,	4
Extended hours flagmen,	18

Express Facilities and Service.

The principle express companies operating in the United States since the period of Government control of railroads have been merged by Federal authority under the name of the American Railway Express. The Director General of Railroads controls the operation of express transportation and the duty of such operation assigned to a Director of Service. The merging of the express companies eliminated competition heretofore existing between companies serving the same territory. During the past year the Director of Service has petitioned this Board to permit the reduction of expense of operation by eliminating collection and delivery service, or curtailing such service, in a number of municipalities in New Jersey. The reason for such curtailment, as stated in the petitions is, that the total gross revenue was out of proportion to the expense necessary to maintain collection and delivery service, which apparently at some points was afforded during the separate operation of the companies when they competed for business.

Route Agents of the American Railway Express investigated conditions in New Jersey and reported to the Federal Director of Service the points where it was concluded, owing to amount of business handled, collection and delivery service could be reasonably dispensed with, or curtailed. Subsequent to the filing of such petitions investigations were made by Inspectors of the Board and in cases wherein it appeared that collection and delivery facilities could reasonably be changed, recommendations were made in some instances covering elimination of the service; in others, maintaining service during certain months of the year.

Considerable difficulty has been experienced with draymen who performed collection and delivery service. Draymen were paid, either on basis of percentage of the gross business, or a fixed sum monthly irrespective of the amount of business. Where draymen could not be secured to perform the service at a reasonable compensation, this feature was considered in connection with investigation of petitions. In some municipalities the aggregate yearly business did not appear to warrant maintaining collection and delivery service, especially summer resorts during the months other than the summer months, but the necessity of express facilities during the summer season seems to warrant the continuance of the service and recommendations were made covering the continuance of the service during said period. The reasons advanced apparently met with the approval of the Director of Service as the recommendations were accepted.

Accidents on Street Railways.

Accidents resulting in deaths or injuries from the causes noted were reported by Street Railways from December 1, 1918, to December 1, 1919, as follows:

	<i>Killed.</i>	<i>Injured.</i>
Derailments—		
Passengers,	61
Employees,	5
Officers,	6
Struck by Cars—		
Passengers,
Employees,	3
Others,	51	223
Collision of Cars—		
Passengers,	163
Employees,	2	27
Others,	4
Collision of Cars with Automobiles, Wagons, etc.—		
Passengers,	13
Employees,	15
Others,	11	389
	<hr/>	<hr/>
	64	909

ACCIDENTS ON STEAM RAILROADS.

Accidents on Steam Railroads.

The causes of accidents which occurred on steam railroads from December 1, 1918, to December 1, 1919, were as follows:

Collision—

	<i>Killed.</i>	<i>Injured.</i>
Passengers,	1	84
Employees,	3	36
Others,

Crossing Track at Highway—

Passengers,
Employees,	1
Others,	87	180

Deraillments—

Passengers,	23
Employees,	7	13
Others,

At Bridges and Tunnels—

Passengers,	1	3
Employees,	1	6
Others,	2	1

Struck by Locomotives or Cars—

Passengers,	3	2
Employees,	32	35
Others,	68	29

Getting on or off Trains—

Passengers,	13	120
Employees,	4	88
Others,

Coupling or Uncoupling Cars—

Passengers,
Employees,	4	30
Others,

Trespassing on Right of Way—

Passengers,
Employees,	3	1
Others,	76	29

Other Causes—

Passengers,	9	67
Employees,	21	479
Others,	4	22

339 1,249

You Are Viewing an Archived Report from the New Jersey State Library

INDEX

A	PAGE.
ACCIDENTS AT GRADE CROSSINGS,	165
ACCIDENTS ON STEAM RAILWAYS, LIST OF,	169
ACCIDENTS ON STREET RAILWAYS, LIST OF,	168
AGREEMENTS—SEE LEASES, ETC.	
B	
BONDS, STOCK, MORTGAGES, ETC., <i>in re</i> —	
Atlantic City Railroad Co.,	106
Atlantic County Electric Co.,	108
Atlantic County Water Co.,	109
Belvidere Water Supply Co.,	108
Bridgeton Electric Co.,	105, 110
Bound Brook Water Co.,	109
Buckhorn Springs Water Co.,	108
Califon Electric Light and Power Co.,	107
Cape May Court House Light and Water Co.,	105
Commonwealth Water Co.,	109
Easton Gas Works,	106, 113
Englewood Sewerage Co.,	107, 120
Erie Railroad Co.,	106, 107
Hackensack Water Co.,	109, 126
Hackettstown Telephone and Telegraph Co.,	107
Hudson and Manhattan Railroad Co.,	107, 109
Ideal Beach Water Co.,	109
Merchantville Water Co.,	109
Morris County Traction Co.,	109
New Jersey Power and Light Co.,	108, 109
New Jersey Water Service Co.,	109
Newton Electric and Gas Co.,	106
New York Central Railroad Co.,	108
Ocean Grove Camp Meeting Asso.,	123
Pennsylvania and New Jersey Railroad Co.,	105
Pennsylvania Railroad Co.,	105
Peoples Rural Telephone Co.,	107, 121
Public Service Railroad Co.,	105, 115
Sea Isle City Water Co.,	109
Stone Harbor Electric Light and Power Co.,	105, 111
Tintern Manor Water Co.,	105
Trenton and Mercer County Traction Corp.,	105, 106, 107
Trenton, Hamilton and Ewing Traction Co.,	106
Vincentown and Tabernacle Telephone Co.,	105
Woodbourne Electric Light and Power Co.,	108
SUMMARY OF,	104

C

CERTIFICATE OF DESIRE—SEE MISCELLANEOUS CERTIFICATES.	
COMPLAINTS, FORMAL—REPORTS OF—SEE DECISIONS.	PAGE.
COMPLAINTS, INFORMAL,	39-103
COST OF SERVICE PLAN,	19

D

DECISIONS—REPORTS OF—	
AMERICAN TELEPHONE AND TELEGRAPH COMPANY—	
Rates, increased, <i>in re</i> ,	23
ATLANTIC CITY GAS COMPANY—	
Rates, increased, <i>in re</i> ,	22
ATLANTIC COAST TELEPHONE COMPANY—	
Merger with New York Telephone Company and Delaware and Atlantic Telegraph and Telephone Co.,	22
ATLANTIC CITY RAILROAD COMPANY—	
Wildwood Extension Realty Co., et al., <i>vs.</i> ,	32
ATLANTIC CITY SUBURBAN GAS AND FUEL COMPANY—	
Higbee, A. H., et al., <i>vs.</i> ,	30
Rates, further increase, <i>in re</i> ,	28
ATLANTIC COAST ELECTRIC LIGHT COMPANY—	
Special service change, <i>in re</i> ,	29
ATLANTIC COUNTY WATER COMPANY—	
Byrd, Mrs. C. A., et al., <i>vs.</i> ,	24
Rates increased, <i>in re</i> ,	29
BELVIDERE DELAWARE BRIDGE COMPANY—	
Bridge, condition of, <i>in re</i> ,	22
BERGEN AQUEDUCT COMPANY—	
Consolidation with Bergen Water Co. and Glen Rock Water Works, Inc., <i>in re</i> ,	34
Rates, increased, <i>in re</i> ,	25
BERGEN WATER COMPANY—	
Rates, increased, <i>in re</i> ,	25
BOONTON ELECTRIC COMPANY—	
Rates, power and lighting, <i>in re</i> ,	35
BRIDGETON AND MILLVILLE TRACTION COMPANY—	
Rates, increased, <i>in re</i> ,	28
BRIDGETON ELECTRIC COMPANY—	
Rates, increased, <i>in re</i> ,	30
BRIDGETON GAS LIGHT COMPANY—	
Rates, increased, <i>in re</i> ,	25
CALIFON ELECTRIC LIGHT AND POWER COMPANY—	
Contract with Hackettstown Electric Light Co., <i>in re</i> ,	31
CAPE MAY COURT HOUSE LIGHT AND POWER COMPANY—	
Purchase of property of Vulcan Electric Light, Heat and Power Co. and approval of mortgage, <i>in re</i> ,	33
CITY GAS LIGHT COMPANY—	
Rates, increased, <i>in re</i> ,	32

INDEX.

173

	PAGE.
COMMERCIAL POWER COMPANY—	
Ordinance, Borough of Bloomsbury, <i>in re</i> ,	35
COMMONWEALTH WATER COMPANY—	
Rates, increased, <i>in re</i> ,	22
CONSOLIDATED GAS COMPANY OF NEW JERSEY—	
Rates, increased, <i>in re</i> ,	21
Sale of equipment, etc., <i>in re</i> ,	30
CUMBERLAND COUNTY GAS COMPANY—	
Middleton, Allen C., <i>vs.</i> ,	38
Rates, increased, <i>in re</i> ,	23
Stites, C. S., <i>vs.</i> ,	38
DELAWARE AND ATLANTIC TELEGRAPH AND TELEPHONE COMPANY—	
Merger with New York Telephone Co., and Atlantic Coast Tele. Co.,	22
Rates, increased, <i>in re</i> ,	23, 29
DELAWARE, LACKAWANNA AND WESTERN RAILROAD COMPANY—	
Grade Crossings, elimination of in East Orange, <i>in re</i> ,	37
EASTERN PENNSYLVANIA POWER COMPANY—	
Additions to property, <i>in re</i> ,	32
Rates, increased, <i>in re</i> ,	32
EASTON GAS WORKS—	
Securities, <i>in re</i> , issuance of,	26
EGG HARBOR CITY WATER COMPANY—	
Loder, William B., <i>vs.</i> ,	24
Price, Oscar H., <i>vs.</i> ,	24
ELECTRIC COMPANY OF NEW JERSEY—	
Merger with Bridgeton Electric Co., <i>in re</i> ,	22
Rates, increased, <i>in re</i> ,	30
ENGLEWOOD SEWERAGE COMPANY—	
Stock, <i>in re</i> issuance of,	30
ERIE RAILROAD COMPANY—	
Notes, <i>in re</i> issuance of,	27
FARMERS' TELEPHONE COMPANY—	
Rates, increased, <i>in re</i> ,	26
GLEN ROCK WATER WORKS, INC.—	
Consolidation with Bergen Aqueduct Co. and Bergen Water Co., <i>in re</i> ,	34
Rates, increased, <i>in re</i> ,	25
HACKENSACK WATER COMPANY—	
Rates, increased, <i>in re</i> ,	33
Stock, <i>in re</i> issuance of,	37
HANOVER WATER COMPANY—	
Plant, <i>in re</i> inspection of,	35
HARRISON HEIGHTS IMPROVEMENT COMPANY—	
Rates, increased, <i>in re</i> ,	30
HILLCREST WATER COMPANY—	
Robinson, Eugene, <i>vs.</i> ,	34
JERSEY CENTRAL TRACTION COMPANY—	
Property, inspection of, <i>in re</i> ,	31

	PAGE.
LAKESWOOD AND COAST ELECTRIC COMPANY—	
Rates, increased, <i>in re</i> ,	33
LAKESWOOD GAS COMPANY—	
Rates, increased, <i>in re</i> ,	24
LEHIGH VALLEY RAILROAD COMPANY—	
Roselle Park, Borough of, grade crossing, Webster Avenue, <i>in re</i> ,	37
LUMBERTON LIGHT, WATER AND SEWERAGE COMPANY—	
Rates, increased, <i>in re</i> ,	23
MADISON, BOROUGH OF—	
Municipal Electric Power Plant, inspection of, <i>in re</i> ,	31
MEDFORD GAS COMPANY—	
Rates, increased, <i>in re</i> ,	32
MERCHANTVILLE WATER COMPANY—	
Miller, Ross, et al, <i>vs.</i> ,	28
Rates, increased, <i>in re</i> ,	30
MILLVILLE TRACTION COMPANY—	
Rates, increased, <i>in re</i> ,	27
MONMOUTH COUNTY WATER COMPANY—	
Rates, <i>in re</i> ,	33
MORRIS COUNTY TRACTION COMPANY—	
Agreement with Morris Railroad Co., <i>in re</i> ,	27
MOUNT HOLLY WATER COMPANY—	
Rates, increased, <i>in re</i> ,	28
NEW JERSEY AND PENNSYLVANIA TRACTION COMPANY—	
Lawrence, Township of, <i>vs.</i> ,	36
NEW JERSEY NORTHERN GAS COMPANY—	
Service, <i>in re</i> ,	23
NEW YORK TELEPHONE COMPANY—	
Merger with Delaware & Atlantic Tel. & Tel. Co. and Atlantic Coast Tele. Co., <i>in re</i> ,	22
Rates, increased, <i>in re</i> ,	23, 29
OCEAN COUNTY GAS COMPANY—	
Beachwood, Borough of et al, <i>vs.</i> ,	26
Rates, increased, <i>in re</i> ,	35
OCEAN GROVE CAMP MEETING ASSOCIATION— . . .	
Securities, <i>in re</i> issuance of,	34
PAULSBORO WATER COMPANY—	
Souder, J. A., <i>vs.</i> ,	27
PEMBERTON TOWNSHIP WATER, SEWERAGE AND LIGHT COMPANY—	
Rates, increased, <i>in re</i> ,	25
PEOPLE'S RURAL TELEPHONE COMPANY—	
Bonds, <i>in re</i> issue of,	31
Rates, increased, <i>in re</i> ,	31
PHILADELPHIA AND LONG BRANCH RAILROAD COMPANY—	
Ocean County, Freeholders of, <i>vs.</i> ,	24
POINT PLEASANT WATER WORKS COMPANY—	
Point Pleasant, Borough of, <i>vs.</i> ,	26
PRINCETON WATER COMPANY—	
Rates, increased, <i>in re</i> ,	29

INDEX.

175

	PAGE.
PUBLIC SERVICE ELECTRIC COMPANY—	
Buckalew, John B., et al, <i>vs.</i> ,	36
Electric Power Rates, <i>in re</i> modification of,	34
PUBLIC SERVICE GAS COMPANY—	
Palmyra, Township of, <i>vs.</i> ,	36
Rates, increased, <i>in re</i> ,	34
Rates, increased, to Seaboard By-Products Coke Co., <i>in re</i> ,	34
Shanholtz, Joseph, et al, <i>vs.</i> ,	21
PUBLIC SERVICE RAILROAD COMPANY—	
Stock, <i>in re</i> issuance of,	26
PUBLIC SERVICE RAILWAY COMPANY—	
Woodruff, C. O., <i>vs.</i> ,	37
Zone System of Fares, <i>in re</i> ,	27, 29
SALEM GAS LIGHT COMPANY—	
Rates, increased, <i>in re</i> ,	25
STANDARD GAS COMPANY—	
Rates, increased, <i>in re</i> ,	22
Service, <i>in re</i> ,	36
STONE HARBOR ELECTRIC LIGHT AND POWER COMPANY—	
Stock, sale of, to Neptunus Water Co., <i>in re</i> ,	26
TINTERN MANOR WATER COMPANY—	
Rules and Regulations, <i>in re</i> changes in,	32
TRENTON AND MERCER COUNTY TRACTION CORPORATION—	
Rates, increased, <i>in re</i> ,	37
Trenton, City of, <i>vs.</i> ,	24, 31
TUCKERTON GAS COMPANY—	
Rates, increased, <i>in re</i> ,	23
Service, <i>in re</i> ,	27
WASHINGTON GAS COMPANY—	
Rates, increased, <i>in re</i> ,	28
WILDWOOD AND DELAWARE BAY SHORT LINE RAILROAD COMPANY—	
Wildwood Extension Realty Co, et al., <i>vs.</i> ,	32

E

EXPRESS FACILITIES AND SERVICE,	167
---------------------------------------	-----

F

FORMAL PROCEEDINGS—*See Decisions.*

G

GRADE CROSSINGS—ACCIDENTS AT,	165
GRADE CROSSING PROTECTION,	166

I

INFORMAL COMPLAINTS—*See Complaints.*

INSPECTIONS—

Electric Utilities,	153-156
Gas Utilities,	149-152

	PAGE.
Railroads and Bridges,	163-164
Street Railways—Traffic,	161
Water Utilities,	157-160

L

LEASES, AGREEMENTS, ETC.—

Delaware and Atlantic Telegraph and Telephone Co. and Atlantic Coast Telephone Co.,	133
Delaware and Atlantic Telegraph and Telephone Co. and City of Egg Harbor City,	134
Delaware and Atlantic Telegraph and Telephone Co. and Ocean City Electric R. R. Co. and Atlantic City Electric Co.,	132
Delaware and Atlantic Telegraph and Telephone Co. and City of Trenton,	134
Delaware and Atlantic Telegraph and Telephone Co. and Western Union Telegraph Co.,	134
EASTERN PENNSYLVANIA POWER COMPANY OF NEW JERSEY—	
Additions to property,	133
Electric Company of New Jersey and Salem and Pennsgrove Traction Company,	135
ERIE RAILROAD COMPANY—	
Discontinuance of Llewellyn Station,	133
KENNEDY ELECTRIC COMPANY—	
Lease of Pond to E. J. Neighbour,	133
Morris County Traction Company and Morris Railroad Co.,	131
MORRIS COUNTY TRACTION COMPANY—	
Property Abandoned Account,	131
New York Telephone Co. and Consolidated Gas Co.,	132, 134
New York Telephone Co. and Monmouth Lighting Co.,	131, 133
New York Telephone Co. and Postal Telegraph-Cable Co.,	131
New York Telephone Co. and Rockland Electric Co.,	133
New York Telephone Co. and Sayreville Electric Light and Power Co.,	135
New York Telephone Co. and Western Union Telegraph Co.,	131
OCEAN CITY ELECTRIC RAILWAY COMPANY—	
Surrender of Franchise,	134
Pemberton Township Water, Sewerage and Light Co. and Borough of Pemberton,	134
Tuscarora Oil Co. and Standard Oil Co.,	132

M

MERGERS—

Bergen Aqueduct Co., Bergen Water Co., and Glen Rock Water Works, Inc.,	148
Electric Company of New Jersey and Bridgeton Electric Co.,	148
Keystone Coal Company and R. H. Perry Co.,	148

MISCELLANEOUS CERTIFICATES—	PAGE.
Bergen Aqueduct Company,	148
Bogota Water Company,	148
General Water Supply Company,	148

MORTGAGES—SEE BONDS, STOCKS, ETC.

N

NEW CROSSINGS AT GRADE, <i>in re</i> —	
AMATOL ARSENAL—	
White Horse Pike, Amatol,	144
ASBURY COMPANY—	
Spotswood, Main Street,	137
BOARD OF CHOSEN FREEHOLDERS OF HUDSON COUNTY—	
Kearny,	139
BOARD OF CHOSEN FREEHOLDERS OF OCEAN COUNTY—	
Seaside Heights, Hamilton Avenue,	142
BOARD OF CHOSEN FREEHOLDERS OF HUDSON COUNTY—	
Sparta and Ogdensburg, highway between,	139
BOYNTON LUMBER COMPANY—	
Sewaren, State Street,	138
COOK AND SWAN COMPANY, INC.—	
Elizabeth, South Front Street,	140
FAIRCLOUGH, N. B.—	
Paterson, East 27th Street,	141
FLINTKOTE COMPANY—	
East Rutherford, Maple Street and Central Avenue,	140
HILLYER, JOHN N. COMPANY—	
Middletown Township, Church Street,	141
LEHIGH VALLEY RAILROAD COMPANY—	
Newark, Sherman Avenue,	140
MIDLAND LINSEED PRODUCTS COMPANY—	
Edgewater, River Road,	140
MONYEK, FRANK—	
Elizabeth, Broadway,	141
NEW YORK SHIPBUILDING COMPANY—	
Gloucester, King Street,	138
PENNSYLVANIA RAILROAD COMPANY—	
Camden, State Street,	137
Cranbury and Hightstown, Public Road between,	137
Trenton, Enterprise Avenue,	139
Woodbridge Township, Essex and Middlesex Turnpike, etc.,	137
SAFETY INSULATED WIRE AND CABLE COMPANY—	
Bayonne, West First Street,	139
SPRAGUE ELECTRICAL WORKS OF GENERAL ELECTRIC COMPANY—	
Bloomfield, Arlington Avenue,	138
TRENTON, CITY OF—	
Trenton, Federal and South Warren Streets,	139
UNITED STATES NAVY—	
Lakehurst, Ridgway Avenue,	140

	PAGE.
WEST JERSEY AND SEASHORE RAILROAD COMPANY—	
Atlantic City, Maryland Avenue,	141
Paulsboro, Chestnut Street,	139
WHEELER CONDENSER AND ENGINEERING COMPANY—	
Carteret, Woodbridge Avenue,	138

O

ORDINANCES—

ATLANTIC COAST TELEPHONE COMPANY—	
Atlantic City,	128
DELAWARE AND ATLANTIC TELEGRAPH AND TELEPHONE CO.—	
Lambertville,	128
Stockton,	128
Stone Harbor,	128
Wrightstown,	128
COMMERCIAL POWER COMPANY—	
Bloomsbury,	130
EGG HARBOR CITY TELEPHONE CO.—	
Mullica Township,	128
MERCER COUNTY TRACTION CO. AND TRENTON AND MERCER COUNTY TRACTION CORP.—	
Trenton,	129
NATIONAL PARK WATER CO.—	
National Park,	129
PUBLIC SERVICE RAILWAY CO.—	
Paterson,	129
TRENTON, HAMILTON AND EWING TRACTION CO. AND TRENTON AND MERCER COUNTY TRACTION CORP.—	
Trenton,	129

P

PROTECTION AT GRADE CROSSINGS,	166
--------------------------------------	-----

R

REPORTS OF DECISIONS—*See Decisions.*

S

SALES OF LANDS, FACILITIES, ETC.—

ATLANTIC CITY RAILROAD COMPANY—	
Gloucester,	133
BELVIDERE RAILROAD COMPANY—	
Phillipsburg,	131
CAMDEN AND BURLINGTON RAILWAY COMPANY—	
Mount Holly,	132
CENTRAL RAILROAD COMPANY OF NEW JERSEY—	
Bayonne,	134
DELAWARE RIVER RAILROAD AND BRIDGE COMPANY—	
Merchantville,	136

INDEX.

179

	PAGE.
FELTVILLE WATER COMPANY—	
Mountainside,	133
North Plainfield Twp.,	133
New Providence Twp.,	133
Scotch Plains Twp.,	133
Summit,	133
MIDDLESEX WATER COMPANY—	
Clark Twp.,	133
Raritan Twp.,	133
MORRIS COUNTY TRACTION COMPANY—	
Cars, sale of, <i>in re</i> ,	134
NEW JERSEY POWER AND LIGHT COMPANY—	
Rockaway,	133
PASSAIC WATER COMPANY—	
Pompton Twp.,	132
Paterson,	132
PENNSYLVANIA AND NEWARK RAILROAD COMPANY—	
East Brunswick Twp.,	135
Linden Twp.,	136
PENNSYLVANIA RAILROAD COMPANY—	
Jersey City,	132, 135
Linden Twp.,	135
Rahway,	135, 136
South Amboy,	131
Trenton,	132
PENNSYLVANIA TUNNEL AND TERMINAL RAILROAD COMPANY—	
Kearny,	131
PROPRIETORS OF THE MORRIS AQUEDUCT—	
Morris Twp.,	133
PUBLIC SERVICE ELECTRIC COMPANY—	
Bordentown,	135
PUBLIC SERVICE GAS COMPANY—	
New Brunswick,	135
Trenton,	131
Woodbury,	131
PUBLIC SERVICE RAILWAY COMPANY—	
Edgewater,	134
Stockton Twp.,	134
Trenton,	133
SEASHORE GAS COMPANY OF SEA ISLE CITY—	
Plant to American Gas Generator Co.,	136
TRENTON AND MERCER COUNTY TRACTION CORPORATION—	
Equipment, etc.,	131
Hamilton Twp.,	132
WARREN WOODWORKING COMPANY—	
Plant to E. R. Collins & Son,	132

INDEX.

	PAGE.
WEST JERSEY AND SEASHORE RAILROAD COMPANY—	
Bridgeton,	134
Camden,	132, 135
Paulsboro,	132
WOODBOURNE ELECTRIC LIGHT, HEAT AND POWER COMPANY—	
Equipment at Sussex,	136
SERVICE, EXPRESS—FACILITIES, <i>In Re</i> ,	167
SERVICE PLAN—COST OF,	19
STOCKS— <i>See Bonds, Stocks, Mortgages, Etc.</i>	

You Are Viewing an Archived Report from the New Jersey State Library

You Are Viewing an Archived Report from the New Jersey State Library