

EIGHTH ANNUAL REPORT

OF THE

Board of
Public Utility Commissioners

FOR THE

STATE OF NEW JERSEY

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

FOR THE YEAR 1917

Union Hill, N. J.
HUDSON PRINTING COMPANY

1918

COMMISSIONERS

RALPH W. E. DONGES, President,

JOHN W. SLOCUM,

JOHN J. TREACY,*

ALFRED S. MARCH.*

ALFRED N. BARBER, Secretary.

*By appointment of Governor Walter E. Edge, Mr. March qualified May 1st, 1917, as the successor of Mr. Treacy, whose term had expired.

REPORT

To the Honorable Walter E. Edge, Governor of the State of New Jersey:

SIR—The Board of Public Utility Commissioners respectfully submits its report for the year ending December 31, 1917.

Reports of the Board's decisions are published from time to time in separate volumes as required by the public utility act. Four such volumes have been published to date and a fifth volume will be published during the coming year.

There is submitted herewith a list of the formal proceedings in which decisions were filed during the year 1917. As some of these decisions have been of exceptional importance and far reaching in their effect, special reference to them is deemed appropriate.

THE HACKENSACK WATER COMPANY CASES.

One such decision deals with the Board's investigation of the reasonableness of the rates charged by the Hackensack Water Company. Another filed at the same time deals with the quality of the company's service. These decisions, which contain much data with supporting maps and charts, followed studies of the conditions of service in the fifty-one municipalities served by the company as well as studies of the value of the company's property and the amount of the return thereon.

In the rate investigation the Board caused a complete inventory and appraisal to be made by its engineers. A separate inventory and appraisal was submitted by the company. After taking testimony with respect to the valuations, the Board authorized a con-

ference between its engineer, that of the company, and the expert specially employed by the municipalities. This resulted in an agreement upon the value of the company's physical property, exclusive of land. To this was added the land value ascertained by the Board and the cost of developing the business. The total value used as a rate base was fixed at \$9,500,000. A thorough check of the company's earnings and operating expenses was also made. The Board found the net return to the company, at its existing schedule of rates, to be excessive and material reductions were ordered. Minimum rates of \$10 and \$20 per annum were abolished and a flat service charge of \$4 per annum substituted. The existing schedule was also found to be unjust, unreasonable and unjustly discriminatory against ordinary domestic consumers and unduly favorable to wholesale customers and with regard to fire service. Increased charges to cover cost of fire service were ordered. These, however, were much less in total than the reductions, the net result being an annual saving to the customers of the company in their positions as direct users and taxpayers of approximately \$97,000.

The cost of maintaining service for fire protection was carefully calculated and the charges fixed were based on this cost, which included the cost of increases in pumping capacity, of larger mains and distributing reservoirs, and of the hydrants necessary for fire service.

In this connection the Board took the position that a large part of the water plant in any town where fire protection is furnished is held in readiness for fire purposes, and that the plant must be in constant readiness to serve these purposes; that the question of the cost of fire service is one of fair and just distribution of the total expenses of the plant between the taxpayer as such and the customer as such; and that as the entire community derives a benefit from adequate fire protection its cost should be borne by the taxpayers.

The schedule of the Hackensack Water Company was held to be entirely inequitable, since the charges for fire service appeared to be but a fraction of what the service cost the company, while the domestic customers were required to carry a burden which should

be borne by all the taxpayers as such. Six dollars per hydrant was fixed by the Board to cover interest and depreciation on the cost of installing each hydrant, plus the cost of repairs, maintenance and taxes. The additional service charge is made dependent upon the amount of pipe line in the distributing district based on a charge of .52 of a cent per unit inch foot of pipe in the district. This results in a uniform distribution of the fire charge in each municipality, dependent upon the extent of mains and number of hydrants in each district. A schedule was fixed for the number of hydrants a municipality could maintain on a uniform spacing of 500 feet between each hydrant. The additional hydrants must be furnished by the company at a rate of \$6 per hydrant without any additional service charge.

The new rates are to become effective January 1, 1918.

In its report of the investigation of the company's service, the report refers to many complaints of insufficient pressures in portions of the territory served. A complete pressure survey was made, the results were recorded upon a map, and studies made to determine the best method of improvement. Two plans developed by the company's engineer were submitted for reinforcement of the present system. One of these involves an expenditure of \$1,600,000; the other an expenditure of \$1,700,000. Under the first plan, available pressures in all the territory now served could be increased but this would involve the installation of booster stations which would increase the cost of supplying service. Under the second plan the cost of operation would be reduced and service could be afforded to some portions of the territory which are not now supplied. The plan involves the construction of an additional reservoir, the laying of a number of new mains and the installation of additional pumps.

The company was ordered to do the following:

1. To make such additions and extensions to its pumping plant, its transmission system and its distribution mains as will result in the increases of pressures to limits fixed by the Board for each municipality served.

2. To install upon application therefor by municipalities the necessary hydrants in the various municipalities in order that the lengths of hose required in extinguishing fires may not be excessive. A schedule giving the required number of hydrants to make an average spacing of 500 feet was fixed by the Board.

3. To modify its rule requiring a deposit of \$10 to guarantee payment of repairs to a meter damaged by freezing so as to provide for a deposit of a sum not exceeding \$5 for the ordinary house type of meter.

4. (a) To reconstruct of noncombustible material the floor in the main pumping station at New Milford.

(b) To remove all wooden closets or lockers from the engine and boiler rooms.

(c) To install non-return valves on all boilers not now so equipped.

5. To file with the Board:

(a) A list of all individual customers and locations where pressures are insufficient to provide continuous service to all the fixtures in the buildings, together with a statement of the circumstances under which service was established in each case.

(b) A list of all localities where the pressures and quantities available for fire purposes fall measurably short of the requirements fixed.

(c) As changes are made, resulting in improvement in the conditions of service, information with regard to such changes.

INVESTIGATION OF TELEPHONE RATES.

In its last annual report the Board directed attention to the fact that it had initiated on its own motion investigations of the reasonableness of the rate schedules of the New York Telephone Company and the Delaware and Atlantic Telegraph and Telephone Company.

These investigations have been completed and decisions thereon filed. While the two companies are part of the "Bell System," they

are separate corporations and were treated as such in the investigations.

As in other rate proceedings, determination of the value of the companies' properties was essential. The Board's force was increased temporarily by the employment for these inquiries of experts specially qualified to assist the Board in valuing the properties and determining the return thereon.

Numerous hearings were held at which testimony of the Board's experts and of experts in the employ of the company was submitted. From a review of the testimony the Board reached the conclusion that the value of the property of the New York Telephone Company in New Jersey, taken as of June 30, 1916, was \$30,000,000. The net earnings for the year were found to be approximately \$3,288,000. The Board held that the rates could be reduced so as to lessen the charges to subscribers \$800,000 annually and still leave the company a return of eight per cent. on the value of its property. At the conclusion of its report on this investigation the Board said:

"The exercise of the State's rate regulatory power involves not merely the consideration of questions of law, but matters of business administration under the law, as well.

Since the rates to be prescribed by order are to be operative in the future it follows that, in the exercise of the power of regulation, past conditions and experience thereunder alone cannot be taken into account. The future and the conditions under which the rates prescribed are in fact to be applied must be considered.

As was said by Mr. Justice Harlan in *Smyth vs. Ames*, 169, U. S. 466,

'the probable earning capacity under particular rates prescribed * * * and the sum required to meet operating expenses are * * * matters for consideration.'

Especially is this so where, as here, a long period of time necessarily elapsed in making the inventory and appraisalment of the property and in hearings, and, consequently, the data which forms the basis of the exercise of the power relates to a date already some time in the past. In the meantime conditions have materially changed, annual taxes have been increased, special war taxes have been and will be imposed, the trend of the cost of labor and materials has been substantially upward, and the proof in fact shows that operating expenses have been and are on steadily ascending scale.

Having regard for these considerations, the judgment of the Board, on the entire record, is that, in holding the balance even between the utility and its patrons, protecting the company in a fair return in the future and its patrons against the exaction of unreasonable rates,—the rates of the company should be readjusted so as to effect a reduction of \$800,000 in its annual net earnings.”

The company has been ordered to file tariffs which will effect this reduction.

With respect to the Delaware and Atlantic Telegraph and Telephone Company, the investigation showed the return to the company to be less than three per cent. upon the physical value alone of its property (\$6,000,000). The Board held that no reduction could be reasonably required with so low a rate of return.

LONG BRANCH VS. TINTERN MANOR WATER COMPANY.

Another important case which required much work by the Board's engineers and accountants and many hearings by the Board to determine the facts was that of the City of Long Branch vs. The Tintern Manor Water Company. In its report in this case the Board stated:

“The present complaint arises from a feeling on the part of the citizens of Long Branch that the rates now charged by the Tintern Manor Water Company are too high and the cause of the excessive rates is due to the necessity, on the part of the company, of carrying the very large investment involved in the new Tintern Manor plant at Swimming River. Their contention is largely based upon the allegations that although the population of Long Branch has not increased to any great extent, the revenues of the Water Company have steadily increased and complainants point to this great increase as indicating an increasing and unreasonable burden upon the citizens of Long Branch.”

A detailed inventory and appraisal of all of the property of the company was made and classified with respect to its location in various municipalities.

The Board found the cost to reproduce new the company's tangible property as of July 1, 1916, would be \$1,855,000, and the value

on that date with depreciation calculated on a straight line basis would be \$1,545,000.

The returns covering a period of six years from 1911 to 1916 were calculated. It was found that the maximum return on the depreciated tangible value of the company's property did not in any one year equal five per cent., the highest return being 4.76 per cent. in 1912. The Board concluded that the gross revenues collected by the company from its territory as a whole have not been unreasonable.

The Board concluded also that if the City of Long Branch should be considered by itself and a proper allowance made for the value of the property necessary to supply it, the company could not be reasonably required to reduce its rates in the city. It was found that certain features of the company's schedule, notably its application to the New York and Long Branch Railroad Company, were discriminatory, and the correction of these was required.

STANDARDS FOR WATER COMPANIES.

Following many hearings and conferences which were attended by representatives of water companies and municipalities, the Board adopted rules, regulations and recommendations applying to such companies. These were embodied in orders served upon the companies, and as they affect the relations of many thousands of our citizens with a public utility, the service of which is indispensable, they are submitted for publication in this report.

Before adopting the rules and regulations, there was much discussion of the extent to which the utilities should bear the cost of installing services.

This was made the subject of a separate report and order by the Board.

The investigation showed that no uniformity of practice or opinion prevailed among the utilities of the State. In this connection, the Board stated:

"Some install and pay for the service and connections from the main to the curb; some require the owner of the premises to pay

the entire cost thereof, and some, indeed, have sought to impose in addition the initial cost of supplying and setting the meter on the consumer.

Nor is there uniformity of rulings on this question by the regulatory bodies of the country. Probably because of varying conditions and resultant practices that have grown up in different sections of the country, we find that commissions have, for a variety of reasons assigned, adopted rules providing, in some instances, that the utility shall bear the cost of service installations, and, in other instances, that the consumer shall bear the cost in part or whole.

In the discussions on this subject, both orally at the hearings and subsequently in writing, the representatives of the utilities of this State appear unanimous in the conclusion that, after it is installed, the service should be under the control of the utility and that it should be charged with the duty of maintaining and, when necessary, of replacing it. Some of them argued that, after installation at the expense of the consumer, the service should immediately become the property of the utility, which should thereafter assume all responsibility therefor.

It would appear from these lines of reasoning that the utilities recognize generally the desirability, if not the necessity, of the service being under the control of the utility with respect to its original installation and maintenance in order that proper service may be assured.

There can be no question of the desirability of the utility controlling in these matters. Conditions that have arisen by reason of improper services have been repeatedly brought to our attention by complaints of consumers. Conflicts arise as to responsibility for inadequate service where the consumer installs the service and the company disclaims responsibility therefor. These would all be obviated if the utility, which is the only one having the privilege to use public highways for the purpose, installs the line.

It is the practice of some of the largest utilities to install services at their own expense.

The Public Service Electric Company installs the service from the curb to the house, provided it does not exceed thirty feet in length.

In *Stein vs. Consolidated Gas Co.*, decided April 5th, 1916, this Board decided that the utility should pay the cost of the conduit and cable from the curb line into the building, if the distance is not greater than thirty feet.

It has been the practice with gas companies operating in cities and towns to bear the entire cost of installing the service to the house, unless it should be of unusual length.

In *Titus vs. New Jersey Gas Co.*, Vol. 3, N. J. Utility Board Reports, p. 179, this Board said:

'After hearing, and full consideration of all the facts brought out, the Board is of the opinion that any charge for that portion of the service connection lying between the curb lines is improper, and that the entire cost of that portion of the service must be borne by the gas company. With reference to the portion of the service connection from the curb line into the building, it is not so clear that the company is in duty bound to pay the entire cost. This distance varies considerably, some buildings being located but a short distance from the curb line and others being located some distance back. It does not appear entirely just to burden all of the customers of a company with an excessive cost for a service connection occasioned by the location of the building at some distance back from the curb.'

In *Lane vs. Tuckerton Water Co.*, June 15th, 1915, this Board concluded that the Water Company should clean out the service as part of its duty to supply water.

In *Gilmore vs. Hackensack Water Company*, December 7th, 1915, this Board decided that the practice of the utility in requiring the owner of the property to pay for the installation of the service within the street lines and the stop-cock could not be approved as a just and reasonable charge.

From the foregoing it will appear that the Board has given consideration to the question here discussed as applied to various kinds of public utilities, and has uniformly found that so much of the service as lies within the curb lines should be paid for by the utility. After further consideration, we are unable to conclude that this rule is unfair and unreasonable. It appears to us to be manifestly just and reasonable and in accord with good utility practice and calculated to result more advantageously both to the utility and the consumer than any other rule.

It follows, of course, that expenditures actually made for the installation of services may be capitalized, and should be given due consideration in a proceeding for the ascertainment of just and reasonable rates."

An order consistent with the conclusions expressed in the report was entered.

INCREASED PASSENGER RATES.

In September the Board filed a report on re-hearing in the matter of proposed increases in passenger fares by important carriers operating in the State. The roads which submitted the tariffs show-

ing general increases were the Pennsylvania Railroad Company, West Jersey and Seashore Railroad Company, and Atlantic City Railroad Company. The chief increases proposed were the cancellation of excursion tickets at less than double the one way rate, except to seashore points, where double the one way fare would be higher than from Camden to the seashore points. Sixty trip commutation tickets were advanced twenty-five cents and forty-six trip tickets twenty cents. Some other increases were proposed but the foregoing were the more important. In the evidence submitted at the first hearing there was not a sufficient distinction between the inter-state and intra-state traffic to admit of a determination as to the reasonableness of the rates in question. On re-hearing much additional testimony was submitted as to the revenues and cost of intra-state New Jersey travel. A careful and thorough analysis was made of all the testimony and documentary evidence produced. As a result the Board found the carriers to be entitled to increased passenger revenue, but not in the form proposed. The Philadelphia and Reading Railway Company, the Atlantic City Railroad Company, and the West Jersey and Seashore Railroad Company were permitted to make effective tariffs increasing the commutation rates as proposed and to increase the excursion fares to a level approximately 175% of one way fares. The Pennsylvania Railroad Company was permitted to make effective tariffs increasing the commutation fares on its Trenton Division as proposed.

WEST SIDE AVENUE STATION.

Report was filed on the re-hearing of the application of Jersey City and certain interests therein for an order requiring the Pennsylvania Railroad Company to build and maintain a station at West Side Avenue, Jersey City, on the electric line running from Newark to New York. That a strong local desire for the additional station existed was evident. On the other hand numerous protests were made by and on behalf of those travelling to and from New York against another stop in Jersey City. On the original hearing the

Board concluded that the conditions were not such as to justify an order requiring the building of the station.

Further consideration of the matters submitted at the first hearing and a careful consideration of the testimony submitted on re-hearing failed to show any good reason for departing from the position taken at the conclusion of the first hearing.

PROPOSED MODIFICATION OF GAS STANDARDS.

In February of this year application was made by fifteen gas companies for an alteration or amendment of the Board's rule fixing a calorific standard for gas. The rule is as follows:

"The company furnishing gas which within a one mile radius from 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 gas is concerned."

It was asked that the Board reduce the requirement to a monthly average of 550 B. T. U., and a minimum of 525 B. T. U. While this petition was pending the Public Service Gas Company filed a petition praying that the requirements as to calorific value of gas be suspended, or reduced, or that the company be permitted to increase the price charged for gas.

Upon consideration of the petitions the Board decided to call a general hearing to determine whether its requirement as to the calorific value of gas should be suspended or amended. Notice of the hearing was given to all gas utilities, municipalities and the public. Following the hearing and review of the record the Board filed a report of which the following is a part:

"In the pending proceeding there is, therefore, a single question to be considered, namely, does the present rule require too high a calorific value, and should it be reduced.

The reasons urged by the companies were, First: the increased cost of manufacturing and distributing gas. Second: that the consumer can burn more efficiently in ordinary appliances, a leaner gas than one having a value of 600 B. T. U. And, Third: that the necessities of war require furnishing additional quantities of

benzol and toluol for the manufacture of explosives, which substances can be secured only by washing the gas of the light oils, and reducing the gas to a calorific value of less than 600 B. T. U.

This proceeding is intentionally not a rate case. It is obvious that it is impossible to fix rates for a number of companies except on the evidence necessary to determine just and reasonable rates for each of such companies.

The question of cost, therefore, is related to the present proceeding only in so far as the purpose of establishing a standard is to provide a calorific value that is practicable and economic, having regard to the necessities of the consumer and the expense and difficulties of manufacture. It is undoubtedly true that a gas of higher value than is reasonably required for the uses of the consumer, or of higher value than can be efficiently used, at higher cost for manufacture, should not be demanded. In other words, if it costs more to get an increased heat value than it is worth to have it, ordinary prudence and common sense dictate that it should not be required.

The proof on the question of cost is meagre and not sufficient to satisfy us that the cost of producing the gas of the present standard is, under ordinary conditions, excessive. Nor does the proof lead to the conclusion that, under ordinary operating conditions, any difficulty is encountered in manufacturing gas of 600 B. T. U. If, therefore, there is a temporary increase in the cost of manufacture, and, because of such increase, and apparent 'lack of harmony' between costs and the standards and rates, it should clearly appear that the standard, and not the other factors, should be the subject of adjustment.

We conclude, therefore, that the proofs do not show that the standard should be reduced merely because of fluctuations in the cost of manufacture. * * *

A review of the testimony leads to the conclusion that 600 B. T. U. gas is not so rich as to be likely to cause much annoyance and loss of efficiency in consumption. The fixtures are now generally adjusted to the present standard. There is no testimony before us to show that the present standard has resulted in carbonization troubles or other conditions making for inefficient service.

On the other hand, it is apparent that, if the present standard is lowered, confusion and difficulty would be experienced until new adjustments were made. This is particularly true in view of the fact, as was testified, that it is more difficult to maintain a low burning flame with gas below 600 B. T. U., and that flashing back is likely to occur.

The present rule requires a 'monthly average total heating value of not less than 600 B. T. U., within a one-mile radius

from the distribution center.' Much gas in New Jersey is transmitted for long distances—in some cases for many miles—and delivered to the consumers from the transmission mains. It is not unlikely that under the existing rule much gas reaches the consumer of a value under 600 B. T. U.

The proofs do not satisfy us that the present calorific value is so high as to be inefficient and uneconomical.

The other insistent of the companies is that the need of toluol in the manufacture of explosives makes it necessary to recover the light oils and sell the residuals for the making of ammunitions.

No one can resist such an appeal, if supported by proof. In fact, one is led unconsciously to weigh every consideration most heavily in favor of supplying to the Government and its Allies every possible aid. Every needful sacrifice must be made in order that there may be no interruption of or embarrassment to governmental agencies in the prosecution of the war.

While our people must make every necessary sacrifice, no needless discomfort or expense should be imposed.

The Board unhesitatingly asserts that if the proofs showed that necessary materials could be supplied by granting this application, which otherwise would be denied to the Federal authorities, we would promptly grant the petition.

After such action we should, however, in protection of consumers, be obliged to consider with respect to each company availing itself of the lowered standard the question of whether, under the new conditions, the existing rate would be just and reasonable.

It is an undoubted fact that toluol is useful and, perhaps, necessary in the manufacture of shell filling. It appears to be a fact that these substances are recovered from the light oils washed from some kind of gas. The questions arise as to whether they are actually recovered by the companies; and, if they are, is their recovery incompatible with supplying gas of 600 B. T. U. * * *

It is reasonable to assume that if the available supply of toluol was inadequate to meet the needs of the Federal Government, and if the need of augmenting the supply demanded the lowering of the standard of the heating value of gas set in this State, direct representation to that effect would have been made to us by the Federal Government. No such representation has been made.

The proofs before us indicate that if the existing standard was lowered many of the companies of the State would not possess, and would not reasonably be expected to provide, the facilities necessary to the recovery of toluol.

transportation conditions have been given consideration in each case. Modifications suggested by the Board with respect to certain details have been made when these appeared to be reasonable and they have been accepted by the railroads.

It is believed that the additions made to facilities for the class of transportation which is now of primary importance have been obtained with a minimum of interference with important passenger traffic.

It is of course true that the passenger train service is not up to the standard of normal times. This has led to many complaints to the Board. In some cases the complaints showed a due regard for the abnormal conditions existing, but called attention to what the complainants believed would be reasonable adjustments which might be made. Other complainants apparently did not appreciate these conditions. The Board, therefore, deemed it advisable to issue a statement defining its position. In this attention was directed to the complaints made to the Board and with respect thereto the following was stated:

"The protests and complaints received apply not to any one road nor any one train, but collectively to practically all of the changes which have been made.

Many of those who complain to the Board, with respect to the abridgment of passenger train service, apparently entertain the opinion that trains have been arbitrarily removed because the railroad companies desire to add to their revenues by subverting passenger operation to more profitable traffic. In such cases there seems to be lack of knowledge of the fact that the removal of a train serving a particular locality is part of a general movement by the railroads, not only in New Jersey, but in other States as well; that the claim is made, and is reasonably supported, that the withdrawal of a number of passenger trains is the only way in which the railroads can give efficient aid to the government in prompt handling of government supplies and troops, and provide the engines, train crews and track facilities necessary for the expeditious movement of perishable and other freight, the transportation of which is of great public importance.

The Board must recognize the fact that railroad facilities have been for some time insufficient to meet the needs of shippers, and that the requirements of the government because of the war will place an additional tax on freight facilities as well as on passenger facilities for the movements of troops. It is the

opinion of the Board, which opinion is arrived at after due consideration, that it would be impracticable for the railroads to properly conserve their resources, be in a position to perform a service indispensable to the government and expeditiously handle such freight as must be moved without delay, if the passenger service in effect prior to the recent changes should be now insisted upon and maintained. Yet if the Board should respond to every complaint made, and by exercising its authority should compel the railroad companies to afford service which would satisfy the objectors, it would require practically the restoration of the service which was in effect before the country became engaged in war, when the railroad companies were not expected to do more than respond to the requirements of normal times and conditions.

The Board does not regard the passenger train service now in effect as suited to normal conditions, and will expect a service in many respects better than that now prevailing to be established when normal conditions again prevail. The Board feels, however, that it should be recognized that abnormal conditions now exist, and that the exigencies of such conditions, as well as the convenience of passengers must be given consideration in arranging train schedules.

In passing upon the schedule recently put into effect, it has been the aim of the Board to prevent such withdrawal of trains as would seriously affect the welfare of any municipality. It seems to the Board that if in any municipality there is a general impression that, with due allowance given to the existing conditions, the service is not such as the people of the municipality should receive, it is not unreasonable to expect the governing body of the municipality to be prepared to show at a hearing to be held by the Board, if the same is desired, that facts not heretofore considered by the Board will be submitted, and that it will be reasonably shown by evidence submitted to the Board that the local public need for additional service is such that it should be regarded as outweighing in importance service in any other direction.

Informal complaints of individual passengers, if they do not relate to details of service already passed upon by the Board, will be taken up with the railroad companies with a view of ascertaining whether through informal negotiations the causes of the complaints can be removed. If it appears that this cannot be done, and a complainant desires to press the matter, the Board is of the opinion that this should be done through the submission of formal complaint, which complaint should reasonably show that the party complaining has given consideration not only to the question of individual convenience with respect to the provision of passenger train facilities, but also to the

other questions involved. This is regarded as advisable, for the reason that the Board believes that it would not be in the public interest, in order that objections based upon inconvenience caused by existing passenger train service may be removed, to require additions to or changes in such service unless it is shown that this may be done without impairment of the efficiency of operation in other directions, which efficiency of operation it is highly important should be maintained."

Since the foregoing statement was issued the Board has investigated numerous complaints which alleged that certain details of operation had resulted in unwarranted inconvenience. In many cases improvements have been effected without the sacrifice of efficiency referred to. In other cases, while the complaints directed attention to conditions of service which under normal conditions could not be regarded as reasonable and proper, it has not been practicable to bring about the desired local improvements without detriment to the broader public interest entitled to prior consideration. In such cases the Board has adhered to its position that the question of local convenience must yield.

THE FULL CREW LAW.

At the last session of the legislature a law was enacted which provided that the Board of Public Utility Commissioners should have power, in addition to the powers and duties now vested in it, to direct any common carrier by railroad in the State to employ such number of employees on any of its trains as the Board shall deem necessary to afford safe, adequate and proper service. The second section of this law repealed what is popularly known as the "Full Crew" law which prescribed the minimum number of men who should be employed in the operation of trains containing a certain number of cars. The third section of the law reads as follows:

"No reduction shall be made by any railroad, because of the passage of this act, in any train crew as constituted by law prior to the passage of this act, without authorization of the Board of Public Utility Commissioners as provided in Section one of this act."

The law became effective July 4. Prior to that date the Board directed the Chief Inspector of its Railroad Division to arrange for and attend informal conferences between representatives of the railroad companies and the trainmen. It was thought it might be admitted that conditions of operation were such with respect to some of the trains coming within the provisions of the "Full Crew" law that the extra man need not be required. It was also anticipated that with respect to some trains the trainmen would ask that the crews be increased.

It was hoped that as a result of informal conferences, differences might be adjusted in a number of cases and that in the formal proceedings the issue would be narrowed to comparatively few trains about which there would be disagreement. At the first of the conferences it developed that agreements could not be reached and that formal proceedings would be necessary before the number of men constituting the crew of any train could be changed. The Board has received from ten railroad companies formal applications for permission to withdraw men from train crews.

The petition of the Central Railroad Company of New Jersey was the first taken up for hearing. Thirteen days were necessary to hear the testimony of the witnesses called by the railroads and the trainmen, and to admit of arguments by counsel thereon. The company announced that relief was not sought as to any particular train enumerated in its petition but it was asked that the Board's order should be broad enough to reduce the number of men employed in operating "all through, fast and drag freights." In announcing its conclusion following the hearing the Board stated in part:

"The statute requires a crew of a given number of men unless the Board authorizes a reduction thereof. We take this to be a legislative direction that freight trains containing more than thirty cars shall have a crew of six men, unless the Board finds that fewer men can operate the trains with safety to the public and the employees of the railroad. If it is sought to deal with the trains by classes, the proof should be satisfactory that the characteristics of such classes are substantially uniform and applicable to all trains within the class. Further, the classification

should be related to and serve as a guide regarding the size of the crew required to handle such trains.

We are unable, on the proofs submitted, to conclude that all 'through freights,' all 'fast freights' and all 'drag freights' do not require a sixth man. To make the order sought by the company would result in permitting the company to exercise its judgment as to the size of the crew of all 'through' 'fast' and 'drag freights,' and thereby wholly nullify the provisions of the statute.

We are unable to deal with the particular trains specified in the company's petition, because it offered no testimony to show that these individual trains do not require the sixth man. It relies entirely upon establishing the classification above mentioned, which would include the trains specified, as well as other trains.

We conclude, therefore, that the Board cannot under the proof submitted authorize the withdrawal of the sixth man from all 'through, fast and drag freights,' as petitioned by the petitioner, and that the petitioner should continue to operate such trains with crews of the size now required by law."

If it were practicable to consider trains in classes; to determine certain conditions applicable to a limited number of trains typical of a class and, because of these conditions, to adopt a single rule prescribing the size of the crew required to operate each train in the class, the task which has been placed upon the Board probably could be promptly disposed of.

However that may be, by no construction of the existing law can any such rule be applied.

Following the decision in the Central Railroad case most of the railroads asked for postponements of hearing dates until after the first of the year. The Lehigh and New England Railroad Company was ready to proceed and its application was the next called for hearing. This being one of the smaller roads, with few trains involved, it was thought it would not be necessary for prolonged hearings to be held and was hoped that in a comparatively short proceeding definite information could be placed before the Board, which would enable it to rule promptly upon the application. In this the Board has been disappointed, for instead of its being practicable to conclude the hearing promptly it has been greatly prolonged. This was not due to lack of effort made by the Board to expedite it, but to the fact that an attempt to prove that a freight

train operated over a number of miles of track does or does not need a crew of six men requires, and apparently not unreasonably, in the judgment of those whose interests are affected, testimony as to multitudinous details of operation at different points and under different conditions. To take this testimony, none of which could be held to be irrelevant, has required with respect to four trains only on the Lehigh and New England Railroad eleven days for formal hearings.

The Board has before it, waiting hearing, petitions of the other and larger roads, each of which applies to many more trains than are involved in the application of the Lehigh and New England. The questions at issue are really details of operation. Frequently differences with respect to such details, as they relate to public utilities, are adjusted on a basis mutually acceptable to the parties in interest as a result of reference to inspectors in the employ of the Board, whose training and experience especially qualify them to pass upon the merits of the questions involved.

The question whether a train operating under certain conditions should have a crew of five or six men cannot be so settled. The trainmen insist, and they are within their lawful rights in so doing, that men shall not be taken from train crews, the complement of which is prescribed by the "Full Crew" act, unless the railroads affirmatively show that the services of such men are unnecessary.

The Board charged with the duty of passing upon the question cannot deny to the railroad companies opportunity to submit testimony in support of their contention that the men are not needed; nor can it deny to the men opportunity to submit testimony to the contrary.

The Board believes that the legislature passed a repealer of the "Full Crew" act containing a proviso that no reduction should be made in any train crew as constituted by the act without authorization of the Board of Public Utility Commissioners, upon the theory that under the existing law the crews of some trains are too large; that, without placing an undue burden upon the railroads or their employees, the facts could be placed before the Board of Public

Utility Commissioners and relief promptly obtained, without withdrawals of men in cases which would be unwarranted.

The Board regrets to state that it does not appear to be practicable to accomplish this in accordance with the procedure which necessarily must be followed by the Board under existing law. During the year just past the Board held formal hearings in 441 proceedings in which hearings were necessary before action could be taken. Many of these proceedings were in matters of great importance, and with respect to some of them the hearings necessarily extended over a number of days.

As noted heretofore, 11 hearing days have been taken in the presentation to the Board by a railroad company and its employees of the facts with respect to the number of men which it is contended are reasonably required to operate four freight trains. When it is considered how few these are, compared with the number of trains included in the petitions of the larger roads, it would seem that for the railroads and their employees to place before the Board, with respect to these trains, the facts which up to date both sides have regarded as essential for the proper protection of their interests will take so many days in hearings that it is doubtful whether without some change in the statute governing hearings, it will be practicable for the Board to hear and dispose of the petitions of the railroads and of the many other important proceedings pending with the promptness and thoroughness of consideration with which they should be treated. The Board would respectfully suggest, therefore, that consideration be given to authorizing the Board to refer to special examiners appointed by it petitions brought to increase or reduce the number of men on train crews; such examiners to conduct the hearings and report to the Board.

It would seem that such examiners could be selected that proceedings under them would be fairly and intelligently conducted, and the applications could be disposed of more promptly than is practicable with the procedure required under existing law. If the legislature should deem it advisable to adopt this suggestion, a reasonable sum should be appointed to pay for the services of such examiners.

In the Board's opinion it is advisable that this be given consideration, notwithstanding the operation of the railroads by the federal government.

In announcing the appointment of a railroad director President Wilson said:

"Until and except so far as said director shall from time to time otherwise by general or special orders determine, such systems of transportation shall remain subject to all existing statutes and orders of the Interstate Commerce Commission and to all statutes and orders of regulating Commissions of the various States in which said systems or any part thereof may be situated. But any orders general or special hereafter made by said director shall have paramount authority and be obeyed as such."

Unless, therefore, the railroad director should direct the operation of trains in New Jersey with fewer men than the statute now permits this statute will remain in effect and the petitions brought under it will require action by the Board.

OPERATION OF STREET RAILWAYS.

Recommendations have been made recently by the Board dealing with certain conditions now existing and materially affecting transportation by street railways. Copies of these have been distributed through channels where it is hoped a consideration of the matters discussed may be of benefit.

In a statement accompanying the recommendations the Board says:

"In ordinary times the street railways are severely taxed during what are termed the morning and evening commission hours, when a large number of workers in every field of activity must be moved within a short period of time. Now, when extraordinary conditions prevail, the facilities available are entirely inadequate to meet the demands that are being and will continue to be made upon them. Nor can immediate relief be obtained in the usual way, by adding to the facilities at hand, because, owing to war demands for materials and labor, the agencies which normally supply the railway companies with equipment are otherwise engaged or are themselves so short of materials they are unable to make deliveries or even to promise when orders may be filled.

If it were possible to secure a reasonable amount of additional equipment, the problem could not be readily solved, from a financial standpoint, because the demands which confront the carriers are unprecedented in their magnitude.

A very important consideration in this connection is the necessity for saving fuel.

The Federal Fuel Administration, in its General Letter No. 18, dated December 1st, 1917, says:

'An investigation convinces us that electric railways offer a chance for large savings, particularly through reductions in schedules. We are not suggesting changes in railway schedules which will seriously inconvenience the public, but it is a well known fact that the pressure of private interests has, in many instances, led the electric railways to provide cars and service which represent a wastage that should be prevented in time of scarcity.'

Reference is also made to the heating of cars, which

'it has been stated represents nearly 30% of the current used by these companies.'

The Letter further states

'We have found that in many cases the system of power stations could be revised with large savings of fuel, as is said to have been done in Great Britain. There are, along the lines of railway companies operating in thickly populated districts, company power stations with more or less obsolete or inefficient equipment which could, we judge, be discontinued or reserved as relay stations through arrangements for the railway companies to obtain their power from other more efficient stations of other public utilities operating in the same localities and having large relay capacity.

We would like to add that all of these companies should be urged to renewed vigilance in the matter of scientific economy in firing their power plants and the cutting off of every kind of leakage and wastage, especially in their transmission system.'

It is highly desirable that the greatest economy in operation be effected, without undue and unnecessary inconvenience to those who wish to be transported. We hope that no curtailment of travel will be necessary, by reason either of shortage of power fuel or lack of equipment. To avoid such a situation should be the aim of all.

It is recommended, therefore, that the railway companies immediately consider how economies may be effected, both in fuel and facilities, without inconvenience to the public, and that they make prompt surveys of conditions to ascertain whether power

can be more economically secured from other power stations, and make report to the Board.

Fuel is directly related to the movement of cars in producing the necessary motive power. To avoid waste of fuel the movement of more equipment than is reasonably necessary, even if procurable, should not, in the present situation, be required. How may the conditions be best met to prevent hardships and at the minimum of inconvenience?

Government contracts alone are bringing into the state plants for the building of ships and the manufacture of munitions and other materials which will add tens of thousands of men to the working forces which have to be transported at least twice daily, and if these plants are to be efficiently operated so as to supply the Government's needs, it is obvious that ways must be found to handle the labor that will be required to man them. Without transportation facilities the plants cannot be kept going, as their character makes it necessary that they be situated, in many instances, in localities which do not permit of employees living within convenient walking distance of their work. Several of the larger industrial centers in the State are especially affected, as for instance, Newark, Jersey City and Camden. In the cities so affected the number of plants under construction, either actually within their limits or near by, is larger and the increases in working forces more pronounced than in the other towns. The Newark and Hackensack Meadows have developed a most perplexing transportation problem, owing to the building of ship yards and large warehouses for the engineering and quartermaster departments of the army. Several thousand men of the building trades are now engaged in the construction of these plants, and the present number is only a regiment or so compared to the industrial army that will be employed when the establishments are in full swing. One of these plants reports that it will have at least 15,000 men working on Government ship contracts.

In the central part of the State munition plants require their quota of help, and the National Government has acquired an option on a large tract of land located on Raritan Bay. Presumably, this will be put to some use in the near future, but for what purpose has not been made public. Camden, already a center of industrial activity, is witnessing preparations for the enlargement of present, and the establishment of new, ship yards which will require thousands of additional workers, who will have to be transported daily. In all probability, twenty-four hours' operation will be necessary.

While transportation in these cities, owing to the proximity of the great plants referred to, is directly and materially affected

during the commission hours, in other important cities the high pressure under which their industries are working has made more difficult the problem of providing adequate transportation facilities during these hours.

After a careful study of present and prospective conditions, by Inspectors of the Board, the conclusion has been reached that the time is at hand for closer co-operation between the employers of help, their employees, and the railways to the end that industrial efficiency may be promoted and the man power of the State conserved. As the industrial plants must have more men than ever, and as it will be impossible for the railways to carry them all practically at one time, it would seem that the problem would have to be solved by an arrangement which would necessitate some readjustment of the working periods in the shops and ship yards so that all would not start and stop at virtually the same time or within the same hours. For instance, it would appear to be practicable for certain of the establishments, in given localities, to agree to either advance or set back the beginning of their working periods, say one hour or more, with a corresponding change for the closing time. This would benefit the thousands of workmen who would save time and have better accommodations getting to and from work, and it would benefit the employers, who would have less difficulty in keeping their working forces to maximum capacity, if some of the discomforts of transportation are eliminated. This applies particularly to those large plants operating throughout the twenty-four hours. It would seem that some such arrangement will be absolutely necessary, and the suggestion is worth a trial.

In this connection it might be well to add that the women of the State, the wives and mothers of the male workers, and all others whose duties do not require them to travel during the commission hours, could help materially in relieving the congestion of the rush hours on the street cars. This might well be applied in all the cities and larger towns in the State, whether or not they be centers of unusual industrial activity. If the women would endeavor to do their shopping earlier in the day so as not to have their homebound trips coincide with the riding of those persons whose hours of labor and business require them to ride during certain fixed periods of the day, the result would be tantamount to an increase in transportation facilities. If part of the capacity of street cars is utilized by shoppers and others during the commission hours it necessarily curtails the facilities available for the men and women who are anxious to and must needs return home after their day's work. There are hours during the day when the mercantile establishments are not at all busy and other hours when they have a rush of business.

If their trade could be more uniformly distributed it would result in economies that would redound to the benefit of buyers and merchants alike.

Industry is essential to the success of the war, transportation is essential to the efficiency of industry, conservation of fuel and energy is imperative, and it is only urging the performance of a patriotic duty to ask that everybody heartily co-operate, even at the cost of slight personal inconvenience, if necessary, in the utilization of existing industrial, mercantile and transportation facilities in a manner that will be most helpful to the country."

The recommendations following the foregoing statement are as follows:

"(1) That the street railways throughout the State adopt such means as may be considered most efficient to induce such of their patrons as can do so to ride on the cars during other periods than the commission hours.

(2) That the street railways of the State which are not provided with sufficient equipment and other facilities to properly handle the present and prospective traffic make every effort to secure such equipment and facilities, as far as may be practicable, at the earliest possible date.

(3) That the attention of the officials of industrial and government plants be directed to the necessity of full co-operation in the matter in order that the street railways may be facilitated in the work of transporting their employees, which will result advantageously to all concerned.

(4) That the attention of the managers of department stores and other commercial establishments be directed to this matter in the hope that they will adopt such means as may be considered most efficient to induce their patrons to co-operate in the movement to secure a more even distribution of traffic.

(5) That the newspapers of the State join in the movement, in order that the widest publicity may be obtained.

(6) That the hearty co-operation of the authorities of the various municipalities in the State be given to the movement.

(7) That the Boards of Trade and Chambers of Commerce give their assistance to accomplish the result sought."

The Board directed attention also to the question of provision of relief by electric railways for congestion in the transportation of freight. It was suggested that some measure of relief may be afforded if the street and interurban railways could make deliveries of local freight, the Board stating:

"These companies should give thought to this question, and should ascertain what expenditures would be necessary for facilities, and whether the carriage of freight by them is practicable. Enabling legislation may be necessary, but it is assumed this could be secured, if the electric railways could aid in relieving the delays and difficulties now encountered by the steam roads in moving freight."

RATES OF PUBLIC SERVICE ELECTRIC COMPANY.

The Board has completed its inventory and appraisal of the tangible property of the Public Service Electric Company, in the investigation upon the Board's own motion of the reasonableness of the company's rates.

There remains to be placed upon the record evidence as to operating expenses and intangible values. This will necessitate the taking of the testimony of witnesses employed in the company's engineering and accounting departments and the production for critical examination of its records.

Owing to complications caused by our entry into the war, and directly affecting the company, the Board deemed it advisable to postpone temporarily the taking of testimony upon the matters referred to rather than proceed on the date fixed to receive the same.

It is intended to resume the hearings at an early date and to close the record in the case unless it clearly appears that owing to the unsettled conditions existing further postponement would be reasonable and in the interest of the public.

ADMINISTRATION.

Reference has been made to the fact that during the year hearings were held in 441 formal proceedings. These covered applications to the Board for its approval of issues of securities by public utilities, of grants to them of privileges by municipalities, of sales of property, of leases and mergers, of the construction of new crossings at grade as well as formal complaints brought against public utilities with respect to matters subject to the Board's jurisdiction.

In addition to the formal proceedings, 710 informal complaints were handled by correspondence or by reference to inspectors for investigation and report. Where informal treatment of the complaints did not result in removing the causes thereof to the satisfaction of the complainants, opportunities were afforded for hearing.

ISSUES OF SECURITIES.

During the year the Board has approved 51 applications for approval of issues of stock, bonds and other securities. These aggregated in par value \$201,123,740. The purposes of the issues, kind of security and the classes of utilities making the applications are given in the following table:

PAR VALUE APPROVED.

<i>Purpose of Issue.</i>	<i>Stock.</i>	<i>Funded Debt.</i>	<i>Total.</i>
(1) To capitalize current im- provements	\$8,055,200	\$61,195,400	\$69,250,600
(2) To capitalize improvements of prior years	3,640,800	32,270,200	35,911,000
(3) To refund prior issues of securities	1,131,400	91,036,300	92,167,700
(4) To acquire properties of other companies	737,440	3,057,000	3,794,440
	<u>\$13,564,840</u>	<u>\$187,558,900</u>	<u>\$201,123,740</u>
(1)	\$1,000,000	\$12,000	\$1,012,000
(2)	149,000	149,000
(3)	385,000	385,000
*4 Gas Companies (4)	469,400	469,040
Total.....	\$1,469,400	\$546,000	\$2,015,400
(1)	\$5,175,200	\$385,000	\$5,560,200
(2)	681,000	681,000
*13 Electric Compa- nies (3)	409,000	409,000
(4)	267,000	440,000	707,000
Total.....	\$5,442,200	\$1,915,000	\$7,357,200
(1)	\$1,250,000	\$946,000	\$2,196,000
(2)	2,000,000	2,000,000
*6 Street Railways (3)	1,131,400	1,979,000	3,110,400
Total.....	\$4,381,400	\$2,925,000	\$7,306,400
(1)	\$591,000	\$59,742,000	\$60,333,000
(2)	1,115,800	30,660,000	31,775,800
(3)	87,991,000	87,991,000
*11 Steam Railroads (4)	2,617,000	2,617,000
Total.....	\$1,706,800	\$181,010,000	\$182,716,800
(1)	\$39,000	\$99,400	\$138,400
*15 Water Compa- nies (2)	525,000	780,000	1,305,200
(3)	272,300	272,300
Total.....	\$564,000	\$1,151,900	\$1,715,900
*1 Telephone Companies (4)	\$1,040	\$1,040
*1 Sewer Companies (1)	\$11,000	\$11,000

*51

*Number of applications.

ENGINEERING.

There is submitted herewith a list of the inspections made during the year of the properties of railroads and other public utilities. Conditions resulting from the war have made more difficult the railroad companies' task of keeping track and bridges in proper condition. Labor has been scarce; materials particularly for bridge construction and repairs have commanded high prices and frequently have been hard to obtain except for emergency work. Notwithstanding this, the recommendations of the Board's engineers as contained in their reports have been accepted. Railroad tracks and bridges have been properly maintained but there has been a lessening of activity in undertaking certain improvements not essential for safe operation which under normal conditions would have been made.

The inspections of railroads have covered 191 main and branch lines, aggregating 2261 miles. On these lines there are 2461 fixed undergrade bridges having an aggregate length of 221,346 feet; 128 movable and float bridges, aggregating 18,147 feet; 521 overhead highway and railway bridges and 2075 unclassified openings.

On the trolley lines 742 bridges, five feet and over in length, have been inspected and recommendations made and adopted for necessary repairs.

The usual inspections have been made of the toll bridges crossing the Delaware River.

At the request of the State Highway Department an arrangement has been made whereby the bridge work of that department is performed by the division of bridges of this Board. A systematic examination is under way for all the bridges on the fifteen routes designated in "Highway Act" aggregating 833 miles. 463 bridges five feet long and over have been located on these routes. The State Highway Department has been furnished a report giving preliminary estimates of the cost of rebuilding all these bridges for trucks of twenty tons capacity and for trucks of ten tons capacity where their strengths at present are insufficient for such loadings.

The Adjutant General has been furnished with a report giving the safe carrying capacity for the railroad and intra-state toll bridges.

Periodical inspections are made by the Board's mechanical and electrical engineers of plants of gas and electric utilities with particular attention given to the appliances maintained for testing customers' meters. Strict accuracy with respect to these is at all times required.

GRADE CROSSINGS.

Because of the unusual demand for men and materials in work of great importance to the country since our entry into the war, progress in the separation of railroad grade crossings necessarily has been to a considerable extent delayed. The substitution of crossings not at grade for hazardous crossings on the Pennsylvania Railroad, two on the New York Division, one on the Belvidere Division and another on the Philadelphia and Reading Railroad, all near Trenton, has been in progress practically throughout the year. With respect to one of these the work is completed and the over-grade crossing is in use. Under normal conditions all of these grade crossings would have been eliminated before the close of the year.

At Passaic and Van Houten Avenues in Passaic two crossings at grade of the tracks of the Delaware, Lackawanna and Western Railroad are being abolished and a single undergrade crossing is being substituted therefor. The work of eliminating twenty-three crossings at grade over the tracks of the Delaware, Lackawanna and Western Railroad in the City of Orange has progressed to an extent that trains now operate over the greater part of the new line and no longer cross the streets at grade.

The Board has now before it plans for the elimination of the crossings at grade of the Central Railroad of New Jersey in Elizabethport and of those of the Delaware, Lackawanna and Western Railroad in East Orange. These plans have been submitted in formal proceedings involving the proposed elimination of the crossings, and opportunity has been afforded interested parties to be heard thereon.

The same is true of crossings in a number of other municipalities with respect to which proceedings have been initiated by the Board or petitions have been brought under the grade crossing act.

Under normal conditions, consideration of the records in these proceedings would involve only the questions whether the conditions are such as to warrant the issuance of orders requiring the elimination of the crossings; if so, the plans which should be adopted and the time which should be allowed to do the work. Conditions are, however, much changed by the operation of the railroads by the federal government. The Board understands that in the absence of orders from the railroad director which would have the effect of setting aside the authority vested in this Board under the grade crossing act, such authority will remain and should be reasonably exercised. The Board feels, however, that though no order directly affecting the Board's authority under such act may be issued, requirements should not be made by the Board of railroad companies involving material expenditures and the employment of a number of men in construction work without conforming to such general policy with respect to this as the government may adopt.

In disposing of the grade crossing cases, therefore, the Board in the absence of any specific instructions from the federal government with respect to these particular matters will conform to such general policy as may be publicly announced or otherwise be made known to the Board.

COURT DECISIONS.

During the year a decision was filed by the Court of Errors and Appeals which affirmed the decision of the Supreme Court upholding the constitutionality of the grade crossing act and the order of the Board thereunder in the Paterson Grade Crossing case. An order of the Board, which directed the Trenton and Mercer County Traction Corporation to continue the sale of six tickets for twenty-five cents (each good for a trip in lieu of a five cent fare) was upheld on appeal by the Supreme Court.

The Court of Errors and Appeals in a decision filed March 5, over-ruled the Supreme Court on the appeal taken by the Erie Railroad Company from an order of the Supreme Court directing that the record in a case which had been heard by the Board of Public Utility Commissioners be remitted to the Board for modification of an order made by it. In the opinion of the Court of Errors and Appeals, delivered by Mr. Justice Black, it was stated:

“The Supreme Court having concluded there was no evidence to support a certain part of the order, the order of the Board of Public Utility Commissioners should have been set aside *in toto*, without directing or ordering the Board of Public Utility Commissioners to either revise or modify the order.”

The Board would respectfully suggest that in view of the lack of authority in the Supreme Court to remit to the Board its record in a case on appeal, consideration should be given to amending the law to vest such authority with the Court.

Under the existing law if the Board, after a prolonged investigation involving the hearing of many witnesses and the consideration of much conflicting testimony should enter an order which in the opinion of the Court is not in some part sustained by the evidence, unless agreement can be arrived at between the parties in interest, it would be necessary to re-examine all witnesses previously called and conduct hearings which in most respects would duplicate those previously held. That this would be a hardship upon the person seeking relief by an order of the Board is apparent. If the Supreme Court could exercise the authority which before the decision of the Court of Errors and Appeals it had assumed it possessed, such hardship could be avoided, and a material expense to the State avoided.

RECOMMENDATIONS.

For the reasons stated in the foregoing the Board would respectfully recommend

1. That Chapter 94, P.L. 1917, entitled

“An Act to empower the Board of Public Utility Commissioners to require any common carrier by railroad to employ a sufficient

number of men in the management of any of its trains, and to repeal an act entitled 'An act to promote the safety of travelers and employees upon railroads by compelling common carriers by railroad to properly man their trains,' approved April first, one thousand nine hundred and thirteen."

be amended so that the Board may appoint special examiners to conduct hearings and report to the Board the records thereof on applications made to the Board under the act.

2. That Section 39 of Chapter 195, P. L. 1911 (The Public Utility Act) be amended so that subject to the conditions now existing on review by the Supreme Court, any order of the Board may be set aside in whole or in part and that if in the judgment of the Supreme Court a re-hearing should be had before the Board, the Court may order the re-hearing and prescribe the terms and conditions thereof, and the Board may re-adopt the order or modify the same. The amendment should provide also that when a judgment of the Supreme Court upon certiorari to review an order made by said Board shall be appealed to the Court of Errors and Appeals and the Court of Errors and Appeals shall deem it just that a re-hearing should be had before the Board, the Court shall remit the record and proceedings before it to the Supreme Court to the end that said Court may order such rehearing.

Dated December 31, 1917.

Respectfully submitted,

RALPH W. E. DONGES,

President.

JOHN W. SLOCUM,

ALFRED S. MARCH,

Commissioners.

ALFRED N. BARBER,

Secretary.

Reports of Decisions

Reports of decisions were filed during the year 1917 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 IV 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 July 27th, 1915, to December 29th, 1916. Reports of decisions subsequent to December 29th, 1916, will be published in Volume V, manuscript for which is now with the printer.

Application—Township of Ewing for Alteration of Grade Crossing at Asylum Turnpike, near Trenton Junction—Philadelphia and Reading Railway Company.

January 9th, 1917—Philadelphia and Reading Railway Company ordered to alter the grade crossing at Asylum Road, near Trenton Junction, by relocating and carrying the public highway under the railroad, as shown on a plan approved by the Board.

John Johnstone vs. Hackensack Water Company—In Re Extension of Mains.

January 15th, 1917—Hackensack Water Company ordered to extend its mains from Anderson Avenue as follows: On Central Boulevard from Central Avenue westward to 10th Street, 2,450 feet; on 10th Street from Central Boulevard northward to Palisade Boulevard, 635 feet; on Palisade Boulevard from 10th Street westward to 7th Street, 750 feet; on 7th Street from Palisade Boulevard southward to Homestead Avenue, 1,700 feet; on 13th Street from Central Boulevard southward to Homestead Avenue, 1,050 feet; on 11th Street from Central Boulevard southward to Brinkerhoff Avenue, 525 feet; on 8th Street

from Brinkerhoff Avenue southward to Homestead Avenue, 550 feet; on Brinkerhoff Avenue from 7th Street eastward to 8th Street, 250 feet, within four months after contracts returning annual revenue of at least one thousand five hundred and seventy-seven dollars for five years (including any fire hydrants which may be established along the line of said proposed extension) have been tendered to it.

George A. Marr vs. Point Pleasant Water Works Company—In Re Rates, also Refusal to Install Meter.

January 30th, 1917—The Board determined that if the complainant desired and would give reasonable notice to the company requesting the installation of a meter, and the company should decline to make the installation, the Board would order metered service. The Board did not find the rates to be excessive or unreasonable.

Application—City of Pleasantville for Permission to Construct Glendale Avenue Across the Tracks of the West Jersey and Seashore Railroad Company.

January 30th, 1917—Application dismissed.

Application—City of Pleasantville for Permission to Construct Wright Street at Grade Across the Tracks of the West Jersey and Seashore Railroad Company.

January 30th, 1917—Application dismissed.

In the Matter of Establishing Standards and Regulations to be Followed by Utilities Supplying Water for Public Use.

February 13th, 1917—All water utilities operating in the State ordered to observe and follow general rules and regulations fixed by the Board.

February 19th, 1917—All water utilities operating in the State ordered to observe and follow a special rule fixed by the Board regarding service connections. This was amended May 28th.

Mayor and Council of the Borough of Point Pleasant vs. Point Pleasant Water Works Company—In Re Requiring of Payment of Water Rent in Advance, etc.

February 27th, 1917—Requirement of payment in advance held not to be unreasonable. The Board recommended that the company install

meters before June 1st, in hotels, large boarding houses, saloons, laundries, bathing establishments, liveries, boarding stables, garages, greenhouses, and all commercial and manufacturing establishments, and residences where unusual conditions of use prevail.

Borough of Bradley Beach vs. Monmouth County Water Company—In Re Rules and Regulations of the Company.

February 27th, 1917—The Board issued a report containing the following conclusions: Each separate building facing on a public street shall be served through its own separate service pipe which shall be run from the building to the curb line at the expense of the consumer. The connections in all streets, including the service connections and the curb stop and box shall be laid at the entire expense of the company. Where a building is located on the rear of an interior (not a corner) lot but one service shall be required. Where a building on a rear end of a lot is a garage, stable, private laundry or other building used by the family occupying the residence in front, no additional charge shall be made to the regular minimum charge, but where the bungalow or cottage in the rear is occupied by a separate family or tenant, an additional minimum shall be charged. Builders desiring water for building purposes shall have the option to take water on flat rates or by meter on depositing \$15.00 to insure the return of the meter in good order. The cost of inspecting and repairing the meter plus the charge of \$2.00 for installing and removing the meter may be deducted from the deposit of \$15.00 before returning the balance to the builders. The right to discontinue service for non-payment of current bills and to charge for making a connection other than an original connection is well established. The right to discontinue service where water has been diverted for purposes not called for in the original application is a proper regulation. The company may safeguard the fire protection system by refusing to allow hydrants to be used for purposes other than fire, where proper and sufficient water cranes are furnished and erected by the company at its own expense to meet municipal sprinkling requirements.

Bernards Township vs. Bernards Water Company—In Re Rates for Fire Protection Service.

February 27th, 1917—The Board concluded that the principal charges due to fire protection ought to be levied in some way upon the distribution system itself. A charge per inch diameter per foot of main was approved. The amount of it, however, must be so calculated as to bring to the company per annum upon the existing system a sum approximating \$854. The Board fixed as a just and reasonable rate an amount of

one-half cent per inch diameter per foot of main plus a charge of \$6 per annum for each hydrant owned and maintained by the company.

**Mrs. J. C. Atwater, of Montclair, vs. Montclair Water Company—
In Re Charges for Repairs to Leaking Service Pipe.**

February 27th, 1917—The Board recommended the Montclair Water Company to pay one-half of the cost of making the necessary repairs to the service pipe, and that in similar cases in the future, where a leak is found to be within the street lines, the company make its own arrangements for repairing service connections.

City of Perth Amboy vs. Perth Amboy Gas Light Company—In Re Service.

February 27th, 1917—The gas company was directed to file with the Board plans for putting all of its property and system into condition to furnish safe, adequate and proper service, these plans to include additional holder capacity, the coupling of dead ends to secure circulation, the installation of automatic district governors, and a method by which coal gas and water gas may be mixed and result in uniform quality of gas, furnished under a range of pressures that will comply with the Board's requirements.

In the Matter of Proceedings for the Separation of the Grades of Park Avenue and Union Avenue, Located in Part in the Borough of Rutherford and in Part in the Borough of East Rutherford which Cross and are Crossed by the Railroad of the Paterson and Hudson River Railroad Company, Erie Railroad Company, Lessee, at the Same Level.

February 27th, 1917—The Board assented to the execution of an agreement between the boroughs of Rutherford and East Rutherford and the railroad company, providing for changes at the crossing in question, reserving jurisdiction over the subject matter.

Application—City of Perth Amboy for Permission to Extend Easton Street at Grade Across the Perth Amboy and Woodbridge Railroad, now Leased and Operated by the Pennsylvania Railroad Company.

February 28th, 1917—The Board issued a report which will be found in the section of this volume referring to New Crossings at Grade.

Application—Egg Harbor City Water Company for Approval of New Schedule of Rates.

March 6th, 1917—The proposed schedule with respect to minimum charge was not approved. The proposed change in rates for measured service was approved.

In the Matter of Hearing with Regard to Water Pressure Supplied in Glassboro by the Clayton-Glassboro Water Company.

March 12th, 1917—The Board issued a report containing its conclusions following hearing held, advising the company of changes and improvements required to be made to increase the water pressure.

In the Matter of Carrying by the Burlington County Transit Company of a Depreciation Account and the Fixing of Proper and Adequate Rates of Depreciation.

March 13th, 1917—The Burlington County Transit Company ordered to set aside \$9,625.00 as a proper and adequate annual rate of depreciation of its property.

City of South Amboy vs. Public Service Gas Company—In Re Extension of Service.

March 19th, 1917—The Board recommended that the Public Service Gas Company, upon receipt by the company of bona fide applications for service, to extend its mains to supply certain applicants, as set forth in the Board's report.

Ross Miller, et al., vs. The Merchantville Water Company—In Re Extension of Service.

March 19th, 1917—The Merchantville Water Company ordered to extend its existing facilities in the Township of Pensauken, as follows: Out Westfield Avenue, across Derousse Avenue to Morrisville Avenue, thence northerly on Morrisville Avenue to the last house now built in the Morrisville section of said Township.

October 30th—Time for completing extended until May 1st, 1918.

B. J. Whittaker vs. Hackensack Water Company—In Re Discontinuance of Service.

March 20th, 1917—The Board recommended the Hackensack Water Company to make an adjustment with complainant so that the amount

of his annual guarantee shall be reduced to 10c per lineal foot for the 144 feet of main used and necessary for service to his Brook Street property.

Application—Burlington Sewerage Company for Rehearing on the Question of Approval by the Board of a New Schedule of Rates.

March 21st, 1917—The Board reaffirmed its report expressing disapproval of the schedule of rates heretofore filed, except to the extent of allowing an increase sufficient to pay the increased tax referred to in the petition, and advised the company that it may file a new schedule in accordance with its report. Commissioner Donges filed a dissenting opinion in this matter.

April 4th, 1917—The Board dismissed application for approval of new schedule of rates.

Application—Collingswood Sewerage Company for Approval of a New Schedule of Rates.

March 21st, 1917—The Board reaffirmed its order heretofore entered, denying the increase in rates, except to the extent of allowing an increase sufficient to pay the increased taxes referred to in the petition. Petitioner to file a new schedule as suggested in the Board's report was granted. Commissioner Donges filed a dissenting opinion in this matter.

April 4th, 1917—The Board dismissed the application for approval of new schedule of rates.

Application—Erie Railroad Company for Permission to Pledge Certain Bonds as Collateral and Issue \$15,000,000 Two Year Five Per Cent. Gold Notes.

March 21st, 1917—The Board issued an order which will be found in the section of this volume referring to issues of stocks, bonds, etc.

F. J. Crick vs. The Rockland Electric Company—In Re Refusal to Supply Service.

March 27th, 1917—The Board recommended the Rockland Electric Company to make the necessary extension from the south, if Mr. Crick will assure, for a period of at least five years, an annual revenue of \$45.00. If Mr. Crick desires to accept the recommendation and the company is not willing to do so the Board will order the extension made upon receiving evidence that an application has been made to the company, accompanied by satisfactory guarantees in regard to the revenue.

Symon Hirsh vs. Plainfield-Union Water Company—In Re Excessive Bills.

April 2nd, 1917—The Board is of the opinion that this case apparently involves a dispute of the merits of a charge which should be settled in a court of law.

Application—Clayton-Glassboro Water Company for Approval of New Schedule of Rates.

April 2nd, 1917—Application denied, with leave, however, to renew later if the company desires.

C. Craig Tallman, et al. vs. The Delaware and Atlantic Telegraph and Telephone Company—In Re Refusal to Supply Service.

April 2nd, 1917—The Delaware and Atlantic Telegraph and Telephone Company ordered to supply, on application, service to C. Craig Tallman, Clayton Hancock and Harry Fort from its Mount Holly Exchange, upon the same terms and under the same conditions that other subscribers to its service from said exchange are supplied.

Application for Approval of Agreement Between the Delaware and Atlantic Telegraph and Telephone Company and Vincentown and Tabernacle Telephone Company.

April 2nd, 1917—Approval given, with the understanding that such approval does not carry with it implied approval of the arbitrary division by the companies, in existing operating agreement of the territory to be served.

Application—Farmers' Telephone Company for Approval of Proposed Increased Rates.

April 16th, 1917—The Farmers' Telephone Company ordered to maintain the same rates and areas of service as were in effect on the sixteenth day of January, Nineteen Hundred and Seventeen. April 28th, 1917—The Board issued a report giving its reasons for allowing the increased rates.

In the Matter of Increased Rates for Transportation of Passengers Between Points in the State of New Jersey, on the Line of the Raritan River Railroad, Effective May 1st, 1917.

April 24th, 1917—The Raritan River Railroad Company ordered to suspend all such increases in rates, as set forth or referred to in Local Passenger Tariff First Class Zone Fares between stations on its railroad, pending hearing and determination by this Board.

The Proprietors of the Morris Aqueduct—Proposed Increased Rates.

April 24th, 1917—The proprietors of the Morris Aqueduct ordered to suspend proposed increased rates until the first day of July, Nineteen Hundred and Seventeen.

May 29th, 1917—The Board allowed filing of proposed changes with regard to the minimum charge and the discontinuance of the prompt payment discount; the proposal to charge the consumer the cost of installing so much of the service as the company is required to pay, by the rules and regulations governing water utilities adopted by the Board, was not approved. The order of suspension was vacated.

The Manufacturers and Property Interests Association, et al. vs. Pennsylvania Railroad Company, et al.—Rehearing.

April 24th, 1917—Application dismissed—Commissioner Treacy filed a dissenting opinion in this matter.

In the Matter of Application for Extension of Trolley on North Avenue, Elizabeth.

April 28th, 1917—Application dismissed.

F. Wilbur Fithian vs. Erie Railroad Company—In Re Service on the Greenwood Lake Division.

April 28th, 1917—Complaint dismissed, the complainant not appearing at the hearing called.

F. S. Holmes vs. Erie Railroad Company—In Re Service on Greenwood Lake Division from Jersey City to Pequannock.

April 28th, 1917—Complaint dismissed.

In the Matter of the Operation of Train No. 617, New Jersey and New York Division.

April 28th, 1917—The Board filed a report recommending to the company certain changes designed to relieve the conditions complained of.

Application—People's Water Company for the Approval of an Ordinance of the Township Committee of the Township of Raritan, in Monmouth County.

April 28th, 1917—Approval withheld. If the ordinance is amended to exclude territory served by the Keansburg Water Company it would in the present situation be approved.

In the Matter of Investigation of the Service Afforded by the Hackensack Water Company.

April 28th, 1917—The Board issued a report in this matter reviewing conditions of service, and on May 16th, 1917, ordered the Hackensack Water Company to make such additions and extensions to its pumping plant, its transmission system and its distribution main as would result in said company being ready at all times to supply water for fire purposes in addition to that required to meet the maximum daily consumption for all other uses, in quantities and under pressures set forth in the order.

In the Matter of Hearing as to Whether the Existing Schedule of Rates of the Hackensack Water Company is Just and Reasonable.

April 28th, 1917—The Board found the company's schedule of rates to be unjust and unreasonable and unduly discriminatory against the ordinary domestic customers, and unduly favorable to the large wholesale customers and its rates for fire protection to be out of proper proportion to its other charges, and fixed as just and reasonable a schedule of rates to be followed by the company.

Application—Western Union Telegraph Company for Approval of Ordinance of the City of Trenton.

April 28th, 1917—See report in the section of this volume referring to Ordinances, etc.

48 PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSIONERS' REPORT.

Application—Lambertville Public Service Company for Approval of a Mortgage and the Issue of \$80,000. in Bonds.

May 7th, 1917—See report in the section of this volume referring to issues of stocks and bonds.

In the Matter of the Withdrawal from Service of Passenger Trains by the Erie Railroad Company and the New York, Susquehanna and Western Railroad Company.

May 11th, 1917—The Board permitted the proposed schedules, as amended by a stipulation with respect to particular trains, to go into effect, but if it should appear that operation under the new schedules results in a disadvantage to those dependent on the companies for passenger train service, which disadvantage is not counter-balanced by a broader and more important service in a critical period to the government and the general public, the company will be expected and, if necessary, required to modify its schedules so as to provide such additional service as should be reasonably afforded.

In the Matter of the Application of the Rates of the Hackensack Water Company to Consumers in West Hoboken.

May 16th, 1917—In view of the lack of satisfactory evidence upon which to base a conclusion as to the effect of an agreement referred to in the application of the Town of West Hoboken, the Board did not determine the validity of the agreement as to the application of rates in West Hoboken.

Application—New Jersey Water Service Company for Approval of Sale of \$25,300 Par Value of Treasury Stock.

May 16th, 1917—Upon condition that the proceeds from the issue of bonds heretofore approved be used solely for the liquidation of floating indebtedness, representing uncanceled plant expenditures at the time of the consolidation, approval was given to the sale of treasury stock for the purpose of paying a dividend to be declared out of accumulated surplus.

Application—Jersey Central Traction Company for Approval of Lease to Central Jersey Traction Company, and Sale of Certain Personal Property.

May 21st, 1917—The Board authorized the execution of the lease and the sale of the property, as prayed for in the petition, the proceeds

received by the Jersey Central Traction Company to be credited to the proper capital accounts.

Application—Jersey Central Traction Company for Approval of a Proposed Agreement of Merger and Consolidation.

May 21st, 1917—Approval granted to the consolidation of the Jersey Central Traction Company and the Central Jersey Traction Company, forming the Jersey Central Traction Company; the terms of the consolidation being that the capital stock of the Central Jersey Traction Company will be duly canceled, as a result of the consolidation.

Application—Jersey Central Traction Company for Leave to Sell Certain Real Estate and Personal Property.

May 21st, 1917—The Board approved the sale in accordance with the application, the proceeds to be used by the traction company in the retirement of outstanding securities.

Application—Monmouth Lighting Company for Authority to Issue Capital Stock in the Par Value of \$261,000 and Bonds in the Face Value of \$440,000.

May 21st, 1917—Approval granted.

Application—Monmouth Lighting Company and Middlesex & Monmouth Electric Light, Heat and Power Company for Approval of Merger and Consolidation.

May 21st, 1917—Consolidation approved.

Application—Jersey Central Traction Company for Approval of a Mortgage and the Issuance of Bonds.

May 21st, 1917—The Board authorized certificates to issue, approving the following: (1) The creation of a mortgage in the amount of \$5,000,000. (2) The issuance of bonds thereunder in the amount of \$800,000. (3) The issuance of preferred stock in the amount of \$600,000. (4) The issuance of common stock in the amount of \$531,400.

50 PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSIONERS' REPORT.

Application—Toms River Electric Company for Approval of the Issuance of Stock Dividend to the Amount of \$15,000.

May 28th, 1917—Application dismissed.

Application—Jersey Central Traction Company and of Monmouth Lighting Company for Approval of a Transfer on the Books of Those Companies of Capital Stock to the American Railways Company.

May 29th, 1917—Approval granted of the transfers.

In the Matter of Proposed Increase in Rates by the Proprietors of the Morris Aqueduct.

May 29th, 1917—To meet abnormal conditions, the Board allowed the company to increase, temporarily, its minimum charge and to discontinue giving a 10 per cent prompt payment discount. A proposal to make an annual charge to customers for whom the company installs street service connections of 10 per cent per annum was disapproved.

In the Matter of Proposed Withdrawal of Passenger Trains by the New York, Susquehanna and Western Railroad Company.

June 8th, 1917—The New York, Susquehanna and Western Railroad Company ordered to continue the operation of trains Nos. 902, 904, 905, 907, 915 and 923 (unless train No. 943, on schedule to be effective June 10th, is operated between North Paterson and Butler, making stops as shown on table of May 6th, for train No. 923), as shown on the schedule effective under date of May 6th, 1917, between stations in the State of New Jersey.

In the Matter of Proceedings under Chapter 57, Pamphlet Laws of 1913, Relating to Certain Public Highways in the Cities of East Orange, Orange and Newark, which Cross and are Crossed by the Railroad Operated by the Delaware, Lackawanna and Western Railroad Company, at the Same Level.

June 8th, 1917—The Board initiated proceedings in the above matter, and fixed Wednesday, June 20th, 1917, as the time for hearing same.

E. F. Price vs. American Express Company—In Re Excessive Rates on Milk in Cans Between South Jersey Points and Atlantic City.

June 12th, 1917—In the investigation of this complaint it developed that the Central Railroad Company of New Jersey could handle the transportation of milk between points on its line and Atlantic City in conjunction with the Philadelphia and Reading Railway, and at a conference with the representatives of the railroad companies a scale of rates was considered representing a reduction in the rates charged by the express company; as this scale appeared to be a reasonable rate basis for the service, and it being satisfactory to the complainant, the companies agreed to put it into effect, and tariff was issued accordingly. The proceeding was discontinued.

In the Matter of Proposed Increase in its Charge for Gas by the New Jersey Gas Company.

June 19th, 1917—The New Jersey Gas Company ordered to suspend, until October 1st, 1917, the proposed increase in existing rate.

Application—Hillcrest Water Company for Approval of a Mortgage for \$150,000 and Issue of Bonds Thereunder.

June 19th, 1917—See report in the section of this volume referring to issues of stock, bonds, etc.

Application—Electric Light and Power Company of Hightstown for Approval of Mortgage and Issue of Bonds.

June 26th, 1917—See report in the section of this volume referring to issues of stock, bonds, etc.

Application—New York Telephone Company and Atlantic Coast Telephone Company for Approval of a Merger and Consolidation of the Two Companies.

June 26th, 1917—Approval granted.

Application—Easton Gas Works for Approval of Mortgage and Issue of Stock and Bonds.

June 26th, 1917—See report in the section of this volume referring to issues of stock, bonds, etc.

52 PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSIONERS' REPORT

Application—Maple Shade Water Company for Approval of Increased Rates.

July 3rd, 1917—Increase in rates disapproved.

In the Matter of Filing Reports of Finances and Operations, by Robert F. Oram, Wharton, New Jersey.

July 6th, 1917—Robert F. Oram ordered to file reports with the Board.

In the Matter of Filing Reports of Finances and Operations by the West Jersey Toll Line Company.

July 6th, 1917—The West Jersey Toll Line Company ordered to file reports with the Board.

In the Matter of Filing Reports of Finances and Operations by the Stewartville Telephone Company.

July 6th, 1917—The Stewartville Telephone Company ordered to file reports with the Board.

In the Matter of Objections to Withdrawals from Operation of Passenger Trains.

July 6th, 1917—The Board issued a Memorandum setting forth its opinion in the above matter.

In the Matter of Filing Reports of Finances and Operations by the Patrons Telephone Company.

July 12th, 1917—The Patrons Telephone Company ordered to file reports with the Board.

Application—Millville Gas Light Company, et al. for Approval of Merger and Consolidation, etc.

July 16th, 1917—See report in the section of this volume referring to Mergers.

Application—Henry H. Parmelee, Receiver, North Jersey Rapid Transit Company, for Approval of Increase in Rates.

July 16th, 1917—The Board allowed the new schedule of rates to be filed, providing for a charge of six cents for passage over each fare zone in either direction.

Application—Northampton, Easton and Washington Traction Company for Approval of Increase in Rates.

July 16th, 1917—Application denied.

Horace J. Malott vs. Wildwood and Delaware Bay Short Line Railroad Company and the Atlantic City Railroad Company, In Re Inadequate Service.

July 17th, 1917—Complaint dismissed.

City of Passaic vs. Erie Railroad Company, In Re Stational Facilities at Passaic Park.

July 18th, 1917—The Board directed the Erie Railroad Company to advise it within ten days, whether it would, and within what time, build a station in substantial accord with the plans submitted and agreed between the parties as adequate and proper at the place in question. The company made application for rehearing to submit evidence as to the effect upon it of the war and reasons why in view of this the building of the station should be postponed. Rehearing was granted, and the Board on November 5th, 1917, issued a report, in which it stated that it would, temporarily, relieve the Erie Railroad Company of its duty to provide additional station facilities at Passaic Park. As early, however, as conditions warrant, the Board would require the building of the station.

Application—West Jersey and Seashore Railroad Company for Permission to Change the Location of the Townsends Inlet Passenger Station.

July 25th, 1917—The Board recommended that the station be maintained at its present site.

Application—West Monmouth Water Company for Permission to Issue \$8,000 First Mortgage Six Per Cent. Bonds.

July 25th, 1917—See report in the section of this volume referring to issues of stock, bonds, etc.

Application—Butler Water Company for Approval of Issue of \$5,000 Bonds and \$10,000 Stock.

August 7th, 1917—See report in the section of this volume referring to issues of stock, bonds, etc.

Application—Bridgeton Electric Company for Approval of Proposed Increase in Rates.

August 7th, 1917—Approval withheld.

Application—Electric Company of New Jersey for Approval of Proposed Increase in Rates.

August 7th, 1917—Approval withheld.

Application—New Jersey Northern Gas Company for Approval of Increase in Rates.

August 14th, 1917—Approval withheld.

Application—Pennsylvania Railroad Company, Lessee of the Works and Property of the United New Jersey Railroad and Canal Company, and the Wheatena Company, for Permission to Construct and Lay at Grade a Spur Track or Siding Crossing Grand Street, in the City of Rahway.

August 28th, 1917—Permission was granted, under certain conditions, for the construction of the crossing at grade over Grand Street, to serve the new buildings of the Wheatena Company, when constructed.

City of Asbury Park vs. New York and Long Branch Railroad Company—Extension of Cookman Avenue Over Company's Tracks.

September 10th, 1917—Application dismissed.

In the Matter of Re-Hearing on Proposed Increased Rates for Transportation of Passengers Between Points in the State of New Jersey, by the Pennsylvania Railroad Company, West Jersey and Seashore Railroad Company, Philadelphia & Reading Railway Company and the Atlantic City Railroad Company.

September 10th, 1917—Increases permitted in commutation rates and to a partial extent in the round trip rates.

In the Matter of Filing Reports of Finances and Operations by the Mount Holly Water Company.

September 17th, 1917—The Mount Holly Water Company ordered to file reports with the Board.

City of Millville vs. West Jersey and Seashore Railroad Company, Petition for Additional Protection at Main Street Crossing, Millville.

September 17th, 1917—The West Jersey and Seashore Railroad Company ordered to arrange its system for operating the warning bell at Main Street crossing so that such bell will ring automatically on the approach of all trains; that beginning with the year 1918, including said year and each year thereafter, from June 1st to October 1st, a flagman be stationed at the crossing, each day in the week, during the hours passenger trains are operated over the crossing.

Woodstown Chamber of Commerce vs. West Jersey and Seashore Railroad Company, Petition for Additional Protection at Grade Crossing, East Avenue, Borough of Woodstown.

September 17th, 1917—The West Jersey and Seashore Railroad Company ordered to install at the crossing at East Avenue an audible visible signal with automatic alarm bell, and arrange the track circuit so that the signal will operate for passenger train movements on both tracks; to have a member of the crew stationed in the highway to give warning of drill movements on siding track west of the main track before movements are made across the highway.

Elwood Board of Trade vs. West Jersey and Seashore Railroad Company, Petition for Additional Protection at Grade Crossing, Union Avenue, Elwood.

September 17th, 1917—The West Jersey and Seashore Railroad Company ordered to substitute a bell of louder tone for the one now in use at Union Avenue crossing, and to arrange its track circuit so that the said bell will ring at the approach of trains operated in either direction on the northbound and southbound tracks; that beginning with the year 1918, including said year and each year thereafter, during the period the summer schedule for the operation of passenger trains by said company is in effect, to station a flagman at the said crossing, each day in the week, during the hours from Six A. M. to Seven P. M.

Application—Commonwealth Water Company to Suspend the General Rules and Regulations Adopted by the Board of Public Utility Commissioners February 13th and February 19th, 1917, Concerning Water Companies.

September 17th, 1917—Application denied.

Application—New Jersey Gas and Electric Company for Approval of New Schedule of Rates.

September 18th, 1917—A schedule of rates was fixed for the New Jersey Gas and Electric Company, and the company ordered to charge the same, notwithstanding claim made by a municipality that the rates were fixed by ordinance, there being no specific delegation of authority to the municipality to fix rates.

City of Long Branch vs. Tintern Manor Water Company, Complaint Excessive and Unreasonable Rates and Schedules.

September 18th, 1917—The Board filed a report containing an analysis of revenues and operating expenses and stating the value of the company's property as determined after investigation and hearing. The return to the company was held not to be excessive, and the rate schedule in general found to be reasonable.

In the Matter of the Failure to Operate Cape May, Delaware Bay and Sewell's Point Railroad and Ocean Street Passenger Railroad.

October 12th, 1917—Proceeding dismissed.

Application—Bridgeton Gas Light Company, et al. for Modification of Board's Rule No. IX, Fixing Standard for Heating Value of Gas.

October 15th, 1917—The petition was merged in an inquiry by the Board on its own motion conducted to include all gas companies in the State. The Board held that the existing standard should be maintained.

In the Matter of Filing Reports of Finances and Operations by the Wildwood and Delaware Bay Short Line Railroad Company.

October 23rd, 1917—The Wildwood and Delaware Bay Short Line Railroad Company ordered to file reports with the Board.

In the Matter of Filing Reports of Finances and Operations by the Raritan River Railroad Company.

October 23rd, 1917—The Raritan River Railroad Company ordered to file reports with the Board.

Application—Board of Chosen Freeholders of the County of Passaic for an Increase in Height and Width of the Opening of the Bridge of the New York, Susquehanna and Western Railroad Company, Over the Paterson and Hamburg Turnpike Road, and for the Reconstruction of the Culvert Near the Same, in Accordance Therewith.

October 24th, 1917—The Board held that there is not sufficient proof that the roadway is inadequate to accommodate the traveling public, and that the clearance afforded by the bridge, or width of the culvert, is a menace to the traveling public, and the application was dismissed.

Application—Pennsylvania Railroad Company for Abandonment as an Agency Station and Elimination of Passenger Service at Lewistown.

October 24th, 1917—The Board permitted the abandonment of Lewistown as an agency station, also the elimination of stops for all passenger trains; this arrangement to be effective until there is a change in the conditions now existing in the Camp Dix territory.

Anita L. Bassford, et al., vs. Borough of Madison, In Re Refusal to Supply Electric Current.

October 29th, 1917—The Board recommended that the Morris and Somerset Electric Company make the necessary extensions to supply the petitioners with service.

Board of Education of West Long Branch, et als. vs. Tintern Manor Water Company, In Re Extension of Mains.

October 30th, 1917—Upon the submission of satisfactory proofs that contracts assuring the company certain annual revenues have been entered into, the Board will order the extensions to be made.

In the Matter of Proposed Discontinuance of Service by Seashore Gas Company of Sea Isle City.

November 3rd, 1917—The Seashore Gas Company of Sea Isle City ordered to continue to operate its plant at Sea Isle City and to con-

tinue to supply gas to the Borough of Sea Isle City and to the inhabitants of said borough.

Application—The Junction Water Company for Validation of Issue of Capital Stock to the Amount of \$5,000.

November 5th, 1917—The Board approved the issue of Three Thousand Dollars of the stock heretofore issued, upon condition that the balance, namely, Two Thousand Dollars, is cancelled.

Application—Central Railroad Company of New Jersey for Permission to Decrease the Number of Men Constituting the Train Crews Operating Certain Trains Covered by the Full Crew Law.

November 7th, 1917—Application denied.

In the Matter of Filing Reports of Finances and Operations by the New Egypt Water Company.

November 13th, 1917—New Egypt Water Company ordered to file reports with the Board.

In the Matter of Filing Reports of Finances and Operations by the New Egypt Light, Heat, Power & Water Company.

November 13th, 1917—New Egypt Light, Heat, Power and Water Company ordered to file reports with the Board.

In the Matter of Filing Reports of Finances and Operations by the Blairstown Water Company.

November 13th, 1917—Blairstown Water Company ordered to file reports with the Board.

In the Matter of Filing Reports of Finances and Operations by the Blairstown Electric Light Company.

November 13th, 1917—The Blairstown Electric Light Company ordered to file reports with the Board.

William Hanley vs. The Point Pleasant Water Works Company, In Re Excessive Charge and Request for Metered Service.

November 13th, 1917—Complaint dismissed, with the understanding, however, that the Board will keep in touch with the situation at Point Pleasant, and prior to the opening of the summer season for 1918 will require a report to be made as to the conditions then existing with respect to the installation of meters, and if it appears, prima facie, that the plans of the company will not make reasonable progress in this direction the matter will be re-opened for further hearing.

J. Chapman vs. Pennsgrove Water Supply Company, In Re Extension of Service.

November 13th, 1917—The Board is of the opinion that if prospective customers to be served will enter into an agreement, assuring a fair return upon the required additional capital expenditure for a period of five years, the extension should be made.

Application—Atlantic City Suburban Gas and Fuel Company to Accept the Surrender of the Lease Made with the Pleasantville Heat, Light & Power Company.

November 13th, 1917—Board's approval granted, upon the express condition that the Atlantic City Suburban Gas and Fuel Company will immediately operate both the gas plant and the electric plant.

Application—City of Ocean City for Permission to Extend 55th Street Across the Tracks of the West Jersey and Seashore Railroad Company at Grade.

November 13th, 1917—Certificate of approval to issue upon satisfactory proof that 55th Street is a legal highway where it crosses the tracks of the West Jersey and Seashore Railroad Company.

Application—Riverton and Palmyra Water Company for Permission to Issue \$125,000 of Capital Stock as a Stock Dividend.

November 19th, 1917—See report in the section of this volume referring to issues of stock, bonds, etc.

In the Matter of the Proposed Discontinuance by the Bridgeton and Millville Traction Company of the Sale of Tickets at a Reduced Rate.

November 19th, 1917—The Board permitted the proposed tariff as submitted to become effective.

Application—Clinton Water and Water Supply Company for Approval of Mortgage and Issue of Bonds Thereunder.

November 20th, 1917—See report in the section of this volume referring to issues of stock, bonds, etc.

Application—Millville Electric Light Company for Permission to File a Tariff Carrying Increases in Charge for Electricity. *

November 20th, 1917—Permission at the present time withheld.

Application—New York Telephone Company and the Delaware and Atlantic Telegraph and Telephone Company for the Approval of a Merger and Consolidation of the Two Companies.

November 20th, 1917—The Board held the petition, with leave either to amend in accordance with the views expressed in the Board's report, or to file a new petition in conformity therewith.

In the Matter of the Inquiry as to the Justice and Reasonableness of the Rates of the New York Telephone Company.

November 20th, 1917—The New York Telephone Company ordered to file, within sixty days, for action thereon by the Board, tariffs which will effect annually a reduction of net revenue of not less than Eight Hundred Thousand Dollars.

In the Matter of the Inquiry as to the Justice and Reasonableness of Rates of the Delaware and Atlantic Telegraph and Telephone Company.

November 20th, 1917—It appearing that the return to the company at its existing rates is not excessive or unreasonable it was held that these rates should not be reduced. .

Mountain Ice Company vs. Delaware, Lackawanna and Western Railroad Company—On Re-Argument.

REPORTS OF DECISIONS.

61

November 22nd, 1917—The Board denied the prayer of the petitioner for a change in its finding that the rate challenged is not unreasonable.

In the Matter of Filing Reports of Finances and Operations by the Wharton and Northern Railroad Company.

December 3rd, 1917—The Wharton and Northern Railroad Company ordered to file reports with the Board.

Board of Education of Middlesex Borough vs. Public Service Railway Company, In Re Refusal to Accept School Tickets Before 8 A. M.

December 3rd, 1917—The Board held that a regulation of the company that tickets sold at a reduced fare for the transportation of school children shall not be accepted before 8 A. M. and after 5 P. M. is not unreasonable, provided the running schedule of cars is fairly arranged to provide proper service for those attending schools.

In the Matter of Street Railway Transportation and Operation.

December 11th, 1917—A report dealing with conditions generally affecting street railways and containing recommendations relating thereto was adopted.

James T. Ackerman vs. Public Service Electric Company, In Re Dangerous Poles and High Tension Wires on Complainant's Property.

December 12th, 1917—Complaint dismissed.

In Regard to Rules to be Observed by Each Utility Which Has Filed or May Hereafter File a Coal Clause as a Secondary Charge to be Added to Any of Its Existing Schedules of Rates.

December 12th, 1917—The Board adopted a Conference Ruling referring to the above.

Application—Morris County Traction Company for Authority to Issue Income Debenture Bonds.

December 18th, 1917—See report in the section of this volume referring to issues of stock, bonds, etc.

62 PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSIONERS' REPORT.

Application—Atlantic County Electric Company for an Increase in Rates.

December 18th, 1917—The Board withheld its permission to the company to file its amended coal clause to be applied to commercial metered lighting and power rates. The Board recommended the Atlantic County Electric Company to install such additional watt-hour meter or meters as will enable it to ascertain the total number of kilowatt hours generated by all its units, and that its steam-piping shall be properly insulated.

Application—Central Passenger Railway Company for Approval of Agreement Between Venice Park Company and the Central Passenger Railway Company.

December 19th, 1917—Application dismissed.

Application—New Jersey Northern Gas Company for Approval of Increase in Rates—Re-Hearing.

December 19th, 1917—The Board stated that it would permit the filing of a rate schedule consistent with the conclusions announced in its report, the schedule admitting of increased revenue reasonably required by the company.

Application—Jamesburg Water Company for Permission to Increase Minimum Charge.

December 28th, 1917—Application denied.

Application—Tuckerton Water Company for Permission to Increase Minimum Charge.

December 28th, 1917—Application denied.

Rules, Regulations and Recommendations for Water Utilities

Following hearings and a number of conferences at which water companies and municipalities of the State were represented, the Board adopted rules and regulations for utilities supplying water for public use. The utilities were directed by the Board's order to adopt the rules and regulations. These rules and regulations are as follows: Where the same are underlined it is understood that such parts are not formally ordered but their adoption is recommended. The Board adopted a separate report and order dealing with the question of the installation of service pipes. This is referred to and the substance is quoted in the introductory part of this report.

PART I.

GENERAL.

DEFINITION.

The term utility as used in these Rules, Regulations and Recommendations includes every individual, copartnership, association, corporation, or joint stock company, their lessees, trustees or receivers appointed by any court whatsoever, that now or hereafter may own, operate, manage or control within the State of New Jersey, any water plant or equipment for public use under privileges granted by the State of New Jersey or any political subdivision thereof.

I. DUTY OF THE UTILITY.

- (a) It shall be the duty of every utility to furnish and maintain such service, including facilities, as will be in all respects proper, reasonably adequate and practically sufficient for the accommodation and safety of its patrons. These rules neither enlarge nor limit the

64 PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSIONERS' REPORT

duties now imposed upon the utilities, but merely serve to define such duties and to determine methods for their performance. Each utility shall inform its prospective customers where peculiar or unusual conditions prevail as to the conditions under which service may be obtained from its system.

- (b) *In proposed Rules, Regulations and Recommendations submitted for hearing, a rule was included dealing with cost of service connections. No such rule is prescribed in this Order, but such a rule will be made the subject of a Supplemental Order.*
- (c) The company may require a written application for service connection before same is made.

II. IDENTIFICATION OF PROPERTY.

- (a) Each group of buildings or structures shall be provided with such signs as will definitely display the name of the operating company.
- (b) Each public hydrant is to be marked with a serial number and one or more initials, indicating the municipality in which it is located, and where there are two or more systems operating in the same territory, or in the borderland between two utilities where there may be doubt as to ownership, each hydrant shall be so marked as to readily identify its ownership.

III. CONSTRUCTION.

Buildings must be constructed and machinery and accessory apparatus installed and maintained in accordance with good standard practice.

IV. INSPECTION.

- (a) Each utility shall inspect its equipment and facilities at sufficiently frequent intervals to disclose conditions, if existing, which would interfere with safe, adequate and proper service. A periodical test of every hydrant shall be made to determine its working condition, and an inspection shall be made of each valve in the distribution system to determine its accessibility for operation, and its operating condition. Such inspections and tests shall be made at least once a year or oftener, if required.
- (b) Each utility shall keep in its operating department a record of the location of each valve box in its system. This record shall consist of a sketch or other record

showing its position in the street, with measurements from some fixed object.

- (c) Each utility shall formulate and put in practice a comprehensive and definite plan for flushing hydrants and dead ends of mains. This plan for flushing may be combined with the periodical inspection of hydrants.
- (d) A complete record of all inspections and tests shall be kept in accordance with Rule XVII.

V. OPERATING RECORDS.

- (a) Each utility shall keep a record of the time of starting and shutting down the principal units in its pumping and filtering plants, together with records of quantities of water pumped or filtered and amounts used for washing of filters. These records shall also include information as to pressures maintained at pumping stations.
- (b) Each utility shall keep a record of all interruptions to service on its entire system or on any portion thereof, which record shall contain the time, cause, extent and duration of the interruption.
- (c) Each utility shall keep a record of all accidents happening in or about or in connection with the operation of its property, filters or service, wherein any person shall have been killed or injured or property damaged or destroyed, with a full statement, as far as possible, of the causes of such accidents and the precaution, if any, taken as prevention against future accidents of similar character.
- (d) Each utility furnishing water service shall maintain a graphic recording pressure gauge at its plant, downtown office, or at some central point in the distributing system or each subdivision thereof, where continuous records shall be made of the pressure in the mains at that point.

Utilities operating in municipalities of five thousand or more inhabitants shall equip themselves with one or more graphic recording pressure gauges in addition to the foregoing, and shall make frequent records, each covering intervals of at least 24 hours' duration, of the water pressure at various points on the system. All records or charts made by these meters shall be identified, dated and kept on file, available for inspection for a period of at least two years.

These records shall be kept as specified in Rule XVII.

VI. PROPERTY ON CONSUMERS' PREMISES.

- (a) A utility may refuse to connect with any customer's piping system when it is not in accordance with the plumbing rules of the municipality or the reasonable rules of the utility.

The utility will not be held responsible for resulting inadequacy of service if customers make additions or alterations to the equipment on their premises without notifying the utility of the changes or additions, and the installation must comply with the plumbing rules of the municipality or of the utility furnishing the service, unless such rules have been, after investigation by the Commission, declared to be unreasonable.

- (b) The utility should have the right of access to customer's premises and to all property furnished by the utility at reasonable times for the purpose of reading meters or inspecting or replacing appliances used in connection with the supply of service, or for the removal of its property at the time service is to be terminated. The customer should obtain or cause to be obtained all necessary permits needed by the utility in giving it access to the appliances referred to. The customer should not permit access to the meter and other appliances of the utility except by authorized employees of the utility or properly qualified State or local inspectors. In case of defective service, customers should not interfere with the apparatus belonging to the utility, but should immediately notify the proper authorities to have the defect remedied.

PART II.

METERS.

VII. OWNERSHIP.

The utility shall, without charge, furnish and install each customer supplied with water on a measured basis, with a suitable meter and such service appliances as are customarily furnished by the utility in order to connect the customer's equipment with its mains.

Note—Any utility now furnishing service through meters owned by customers must arrange to take over the same by

RULES, REGULATIONS, ETC., FOR WATER UTILITIES. 67

January 1st, 1918, and thereafter own and maintain all service meters. This rule does not apply to service furnished other water-supply systems.

VIII. LOCATION.

All meters hereafter placed in buildings shall be located in the cellar or first floor, as near as possible to the point of entrance of the service, in a clean dry, safe place, not subject to great variation in temperature, so located as to be easily accessible for installation or disconnection and for reading, and of a type suitable for the purpose and location. The installation of meters and connections shall be in accordance with the reasonable rules of the utility furnishing the service.

IX. TESTING EQUIPMENT.

Each utility having more than one hundred meters in use shall provide and maintain suitable and adequate facilities for testing its water service meters, including a complete testing equipment of a form approved by the Commission. Utilities may co-operate in arranging for such facilities. A representative of the Commission will examine and calibrate the testing apparatus and provide same with a serial number and a seal having the date of the inspection clearly shown. After July 1st, 1918, tests made with uncertified equipment shall not be deemed authoritative.

X. ALLOWABLE ERROR.

No water meter shall be placed in service, nor allowed to remain in service, if it registers more than 103% of the water passed or less than 97% on full capacity.

XI. PERIODICAL TESTS.

(a) No utility furnishing metered water service shall allow a meter to remain in service for a period longer or for a registration greater than that specified in the following table without checking it for accuracy and readjusting it if found to be incorrect beyond the limits established in Rule X.

$\frac{5}{8}$ -inch meter, 10 years or 750,000 gals.

$\frac{3}{4}$ -inch meter, 8 years or 1,000,000 gals.

1-inch meter, 6 years or 2,000,000 gals.

All meters above 1 inch 4 years.

(b) All water meters in service on or after July 1st, 1917, for which there is no record of test within five years, must be tested as soon thereafter as circumstances

will permit, and in all cases within two years from July 1st, 1917.

- (c) Each water service meter installed after July 1st, 1917, shall have been tested for accuracy by the utility within one year prior to its installation. It shall also be inspected by the utility for proper connections, mechanical conditions and suitability of location within thirty days after installation.

XII. REQUEST TESTS.

Each utility shall, without charge, make a test of the accuracy of a meter upon request of a customer, provided such customer does not make a request for test more frequently than once a year. A report giving the results of such tests shall be made to the customer and a complete record of such tests shall be kept in accordance with Rule XVII.

XIII. TESTS BY COMMISSION.

Upon formal application by any customer to the Board of Public Utility Commissioners, a test will be made of the customer's meter by an inspector employed by the Board, such test to be made as soon as possible after receipt of the application. For such test a fee of one dollar shall be paid by the customer at the time application is made for the test; this fee to be retained if the meter is found to be slow or correct within the allowable limits. If the meter is found to be fast beyond the allowable limits, the fee of one dollar will be returned to the customer and collected from the utility owning the meter. Each meter to be so tested is to be removed, and will be tested by an inspector of the Board, using the nearest certified testing apparatus. In certain cases, tests will be made with portable test meters. In cases of dispute, however, as to the accuracy of such meter, the test made with the certified testing apparatus shall be considered the correct one. The customer will be notified when the test is to be made, and should have a representative present to witness the test.

XIV. CHANGING METERS.

No utility shall make any charge for replacing a meter where such replacement is requested by a customer unless the meter first referred to has been in use less than one year, in which case a reasonable charge may be made to cover the actual expense of making the change.

XV. METER DIALS.

Meter dials shall read in United States gallons or in cubic feet.

Note—It is RECOMMENDED that, wherever possible in future, meters be used which indicate gallons instead of cubic feet.

XVI. METER TEST RECORDS.

Whenever a water service meter is tested, the original test record shall be kept as specified in Rule XVII, giving the information necessary for identifying the meter, the reason for making the test, the reading of the meter before being disturbed and the accuracy of the meter, together with all data taken at the time of the test. This record must be sufficiently complete to permit the convenient checking of the methods employed and the calculations made. A record shall also be kept showing the full history of each meter and indicating the date of the purchase, manufacture, size, serial number, various places of installation with dates of installation and removal and the reason for such removal, and the date and general results of all tests. A report shall be made to the Board at quarterly intervals giving a summary of the results of the tests. Blank forms will be furnished by the Board on which reports are to be made.

XVII. RECORDS AND REPORTS.

All records required by these rules shall be kept within the State at an office or offices of the utility located in the territory served by it, unless otherwise specially authorized by the Commission, and shall be open for examination by the Commission or its inspectors. Each utility shall notify the Commission of the office or offices at which the various classes of records are kept.

PART III.

BILLS FOR SERVICE.

XVIII. METERED SERVICE.

Bills for metered service shall be rendered at least once each quarter, and shall show the readings of the meter at the beginning and end of the period for which the bill is rendered, and shall give the dates on which the readings were taken.

Bills shall also show the gross amount charged and the net amount after deducting the discount, if any, allowed for prompt payment.

When a bill is rendered a second time, covering a period for which a bill has been rendered, the period shall be clearly stated on the bill.

The basis of computing bills for metered service shall be the same as indicated by the meter dials, that is, if meters register in cubic feet, the bills shall be made out in cubic feet or if the indication is in gallons, the bills shall be made out in gallons, unless otherwise authorized by the Commission.

XIX. INSTRUCTION.

Each utility supplying service through meters shall adopt some method to inform its customers as to the methods of reading meters, either by printing on bills a description of the method of reading meters or a notice to the effect that the methods will be readily explained on application. It is RECOMMENDED that an exhibition meter be kept on display in each office maintained by a water utility.

XX. FLAT RATE SERVICE.

Bills for service on a flat or fixture rate basis shall be based upon inspection. This inspection shall be made at least once in three years, and shall be sufficiently comprehensive to determine what changes, if any, have been made in the fixtures served. The record of this inspection shall be kept upon cards, slips, or in a book especially provided for this purpose, and shall show—

1. The customer's name.
2. The address.
3. The description of the property, whether store, factory, residence, fountain, hydrants etc.
4. A list of the fixtures with the rate charged for each.

Bills for flat rate service may be rendered annually, semi-annually, or quarterly.

In addition to the foregoing rules, regulations and recommendations, the Board submitted to the water utilities a set of separate rules, which the Board suggested should be adopted, so far as applicable, by the companies in order that they might conduct their relations with their customers with the least amount of friction, and with equity to both the utility and the

RULES, REGULATIONS, ETC., FOR WATER UTILITIES. 71

customer. The attention of the utilities was directed to the conditions under which the Board suggested service might be discontinued. In this connection it was stated that "Such discontinuance should not be arbitrary, but reasonable notice should be given in every case in order that the customer may have opportunity to correct or remove the condition giving cause for discontinuance, or, in the event of disagreement, to submit the matter in dispute to this Board." The utilities were advised furthermore that the Board did not intend that adoption of the rules and regulations should preclude the Board from issuing orders inconsistent therewith when it appeared that enforcement of a rule or rules, under circumstances existing in particular cases, would be inequitable.

PROPOSED RULES AND REGULATIONS TO BE ADOPTED BY
WATER UTILITIES

1. APPLICATION FOR SERVICE CONNECTION.

Written application for service connection shall be made to the utility before any such connection shall be installed.

2. SERVICE CONNECTION.

A service line will be used to supply a single customer only, and no customer shall be supplied by more than one service line unless agreed upon between the customer and utility.

"Customer" as used herein shall be the party contracting for service to a property as hereinafter classified, *i. e.*,

(a) A building under one roof owned by one party and occupied as one business or residence, or

(b) A combination of buildings owned by one party in one common enclosure occupied by one family or business, or

(c) The one side of a double house, having a solid vertical partition wall, or

(d) A building owned by one party of more than one apartment and using in common one hall and one entrance, or

(e) A building owned by one party having a number of apartments or offices and using in common one hall and one or more means of entrance.

Where two or more customers are supplied through a single service line any violation of the rules of the utility with reference to either or any of said customers shall be deemed a violation as to all, and the utility may take such action as can be taken for a single customer.

Stop-cocks at curb line and in branch service are for exclusive use of the utility, and attention is directed to the following provision of the statute of the State of New Jersey, approved April 8th, 1903, forbidding interference with a utility's property, to wit:

"Any person or persons who shall, without permission, connect or disconnect the meter pipe or conduits of any gas or water utility, or in any other manner without such permit tamper, or interfere with the meters, pipes or conduits, or who shall without permit connect with the meter pipe or conduit of such company by pipes, conduits or other instruments for the purpose of obtaining power or electrical current or gas or water, with intent to defraud such company or companies, shall be guilty of a misdemeanor."

Service pipes will not be installed when the service pipe passes over or through premises which at the time may be the property of persons other than the owner of the premises to be supplied, unless the owner of the premises supplied assumes the liability.

3. SERVICE.

Where a water connection has been previously installed and water is desired, a proper application must be signed by the person occupying the premises to be supplied, or by the owner, if charges for service are to be paid by him.

All contracts or agreements covering water supply shall expire on the first day of next succeeding the date of said contract or agreement, but all contracts or agreements shall continue in force from year to year after the expiration of that date, unless thirty days' notice in writing is given by either party of a desire to terminate the contract on next succeeding first day of.....; provided, that nothing herein shall be construed to prevent the making of contracts for extensions of service or other special conditions.

When the supply of water is to be temporarily cut off, notice will be given, when practicable, to all customers affected by the shutting off, stating the probable duration of the interruption of service, and also the purpose for which the shut-off is made.

RULES, REGULATIONS, ETC., FOR WATER UTILITIES. 73

A supply of water for building or other special purposes, except on a lot or premises already supplied with water by meter, must be specially applied for.

All use of water other than by the applicant, or for any purpose or upon any premises not stated or described in the application, must be prevented by him. The applicant will be liable for the amount of water used in conformity with the schedule of rates or tariffs of the utility.

Service under an application may be discontinued for any of the following reasons:

- (a) For the use of water for any other property or purpose than that described in the application.
- (b) Under the flat-rate service, for addition to such property or fixtures, or increase in the use to be made of water supply without notice to the utility.
- (c) For wilful waste of water through improper or imperfect pipes, fixtures or otherwise.
- (d) For failure to maintain, in good order, connections, service lines or fixtures owned by the applicant.
- (e) For molesting any service pipe, meter, curb stop-cock or seal or any other appliance of the company.
- (f) In case of vacancy of premises.
- (g) For neglecting to make or renew advance payments or for non-payment for water service, or any other charges accruing under the application.
- (h) For refusal of reasonable access to property for purposes of inspecting or for reading, caring for or removing meters.

Water will be turned off from any premises upon the written order of the applicant without in any way affecting the existing agreement for service.

As necessity may arise, in case of breakdown, emergency, or for any other unavoidable cause, the company shall have the right to temporarily cut off the water supply to make necessary repairs, connections, etc.; but the utility will use all reasonable and practicable measures to notify the consumer of such discontinuance of service. All persons having boilers within their premises not supplied by a tank or cistern are hereby cautioned against collapse. In such case the utility will not be liable for any damage or inconvenience suffered.

Service will be renewed under a proper application when the conditions under which such service was discontinued are corrected, and upon the payment of all proper charges, provided in the schedule of rates or tariffs of the utility, due from the applicant.

4. METER.

Meters shall be conveniently located at the point approved of by the utility so as to control the entire supply, and a proper place and protection for the meter shall be provided by the applicant, unless the meter is to be installed at the curb. A way stop-cock or gate valve shall be placed on the service line on the street side of and near the meter, and a stop and waste cock or valve on the other side of the meter. A suitable check valve shall be placed between the stop and waste cock or valve and the meter if required by the utility.

If a check valve is required, a safety valve should be inserted at some convenient point on the house piping to relieve excess pressure due to heating water.

Meter will be maintained by the utility so far as ordinary wear and tear are concerned, but damage due to freezing, hot water or external causes shall be paid for by the customer.

The charge for the reinstallation or changing of a meter when removed because damaged in any way, due to negligence of customer, shall be \$1.00 for meters 1" in diameter and smaller, and \$2.00 per inch in diameter or fraction thereof for meters larger than 1", which charge shall include testing of the repaired meter.

In case of a disputed account involving a question as to the accuracy of a meter, such meter will be tested upon the request of the applicant, in conformity with the provisions of the rules and regulations pertaining to water service utilities of the Board of Public Utility Commissioners of New Jersey. In the event that the meter so tested is found to have an error in the registration in excess of three per cent., the bills will be corrected accordingly.

Customers may test the accuracy of a meter at any time by drawing water until the meter registers one or more cubic feet. Each cubic foot of water equals approximately $7\frac{1}{2}$ gallons or weighs $62\frac{1}{2}$ pounds.

Where water is furnished by flat rate, the utility shall have the right to install, maintain and inspect a meter to determine the quantity supplied, and the applicant shall provide a suitable location therefor. The utility reserves the right to change from flat-rate service to metered service at any time under uniform, nondiscriminatory rules.

Where water is furnished by a meter the quantity recorded by it shall be taken to be the amount passing the meter, except where the meter has been found to be registering inaccurately or has ceased to register. In such cases the quantity may be determined by the average registration of the meter when in order, or by such fair and reasonable method as shall be based upon the best information obtainable. Where excessive leakage has been found adjustments may be made.

5. FLAT-RATE CONTRACTS.

Customers supplied with water under a flat-rate contract will not be permitted to use the water for any other purpose than stated in the application or agreement; nor to supply water in any way to any other person, house or premises without a written permit from the utility. No additions, alterations or extensions shall be made or caused to be made in any water pipes or fixtures without giving notice of such proposed addition or alteration, and the rate charged will be proportioned from the date on which the additions and extensions are made.

"Customer" as referred to herein is defined as follows:

- (a) A building under one roof owned by one party and occupied as one business or residence, or
- (b) A combination of buildings owned by one party in one common enclosure occupied by one family or business, or
- (c) The one side of a double house having a solid vertical partition wall, or
- (d) A building owned by one party of more than one apartment and using in common one hall and one entrance, or
- (e) A building owned by one party having a number of apartments or offices and using in common one hall and one or more means of entrance.

Water will not be furnished where pipes are inferior, the plumbing defective, or the faucets, water-closets or other fixtures leaky or imperfect, and when such conditions are discovered the supply of water will be cut off or a meter installed, unless immediate repairs are made.

No rebate will be allowed customers using water under a flat-rate contract for temporary discontinuance of service, unless the water is turned off and on by an agent of the utility upon written application to the utility office, for which service a charge of \$1.00 will be made. Customers will be held responsible for all charges accruing for water service until written notice has been given to the office of the utility to discontinue the supply or notice has been given of a change of occupancy of said premises.

The paragraph relating to rebates is not to apply to seasonal resorts where the flat-rate contracts are for the season or contract period, and where houses are only occupied during a portion of the contract period.

6. BILLS.

If a bill remains unpaid for a period of over 15 days after mailing or presentation, notice will be served or mailed that unless the bill is paid within seven days from date of such notice the water supply will be discontinued. When the water is turned off under such conditions,

it will remain off until the amount owing is paid in full or until satisfactory arrangements for payment have been made.

7. DISCOUNT FOR PROMPT PAYMENT.

(1) Where the published schedule of rates provides for a discount for prompt payment of bills the discount shall be allowed:

(a) Where the net amount due is paid or tendered, on or before the last day provided by such schedule, at an office of the utility during ordinary business hours. If such last day shall fall upon a holiday, the discount period shall extend to the next ensuing business day.

(b) When the net amount due is mailed to an office of the utility in time to arrive at such office during ordinary business hours on or before such last day allowed by such schedule, the time of transit by mail is to be assumed to be in accordance with Post Office schedule or time-table. The Post Office date stamped by the sending office will determine the date and time of mailing. The envelope in which such payment has been mailed will be preserved by the utility in each case in which it may refuse to allow a discount on the ground that the time allowed by the schedule of rates has been exceeded.

(2) If payment, as above provided, be made by a check which is dishonored, the customer shall forfeit his right to claim the discount.

(3) Where the published schedule of rates provides for a penalty for non-payment of bills, this penalty shall be imposed:

(a) When the net amount is not paid or tendered on or before the last day provided by such schedule at an office of the utility during ordinary business hours. If such last day fall upon a holiday, the penalty period shall not begin until after the next ensuing business day.

(b) When the net amount due is not mailed to an office of the utility in time to arrive at such office during ordinary business hours or before such last day allowed by such schedule, the time of transit by mail is to be assumed to be in accordance with Post Office schedule or time-table. The Post Office date stamped by the sending office will determine the time and date of mailing. The envelope in which such payment has been mailed will be preserved by the utility in each case in which it may impose the penalty on the ground that the time allowed by the schedule of rates has been exceeded.

(c) If payment, as above provided, be made by a check which is dishonored.

8. COMPLAINTS.

Complaints with regard to the character of the service furnished or the reading of meters or of the bills rendered must be made at the utility's office, either verbally or in writing, and a record of such complaint will be kept by the utility, giving the name and address of the complainant, the date, the nature of the complaint and the remedy.

9. FIRE SERVICE.

No person, except the superintendent or other authorized person, shall take water from any public fire hydrant, hose plug, street washer or fountain pipe, except for fire purposes or for the use of the fire department in case of fire; and no public fire hydrant shall be used for sprinkling streets, flushing sewers or gutters or for any other than fire purposes, except with the approval of the utility.

10. PRIVATE FIRE SERVICE.

When, in the judgment of the utility, it is practical, private fire service mains may be allowed for which a flat or meter rate, at the option of the utility, will be charged, subject to special contract and special rules and regulations governing such service.

11. GENERAL.

All pipes, meters and fixtures shall be subject at all reasonable hours to inspection by employees of the utility, identified by proper badges. No water fixture will be considered cut off until it is disconnected, so that it cannot be used again or sealed in a manner satisfactory to the utility. No plumber, owner or other unauthorized person shall turn the water on or off at any corporation stop or curb stop, or disconnect or remove the meter without the consent of the utility. No agent or employee of the utility shall have authority to bind it by any promise, agreement or representation not provided for in these rules.

The utility reserves the right, subject to the approval of the Public Utility Commission, to change, take from or add to the foregoing rules and regulations.

A copy of these rules will be delivered to each new customer upon beginning service of water, and to connected customers on request.

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, 1917.	Name.	Subject.	Disposal.
Jan. 2	A. T. Ellis, Mahwah vs. Erie Railroad Co.	Ferry Boats not connecting with trains.	Operation of train schedules maintained. No jurisdiction over ferry service.
Jan. 2	I. Rittenberg, Passaic vs. N. Y. S. & W. RR. Co.	Demurrage Charges.	Allowance of extra time recommended.
Jan. 4	W. S. Ray, Salem vs. Elec. Co. of New Jersey	Service.	Satisfactory service established.
Jan. 4	Richard Martin, New York City vs. Hackensack Water Co.	Guarantee paid in connection with extension of service.	No discrimination found.
Jan. 4	Cyrus V. Moore, Washington vs. New Jersey Telephone Co.	Extension of service.	Service installed.
Jan. 5	Miss Carrie B. Rhodabeck, Newark vs. Adams Express Co.	Claim for goods damaged in transit.	Claim paid.
Jan. 6	F. C. Maley, Roselle vs. Adams Express Co.	Claim for non-delivery of goods.	Claim paid.

INFORMAL COMPLAINTS.

Date, 1917.	Name.	Subject.	Disposal.
Jan. 8	Mrs. E. S. Mills, Geiman Valley vs. New Jersey Telephone Co.	Extension of service.	Service installed.
Jan. 8	Paul Belden, Mountain Lakes vs. New York Telephone Co.	Service—Telephone out of order.	Wire trouble corrected.
Jan. 8	Ignazio T. Reves, New York City vs. Public Service Elec. Co.	Refusal to set meter without underground pipe installed.	Wiring changed in accordance with rules and regulations of the Board.
Jan. 8	Woodbury Heights, Borough vs. Public Service Elec. Co.	Extension of service in Woodbury Heights Borough.	Service installed.
Jan. 8	E. W. Potter, South Amboy vs. Raritan River R.R. Co.	Service—seating capacity insufficient no lights.	Satisfactorily settled.
Jan. 9	Harry Welch, et als., Millville vs. Millville Water Co.	Extension of service in Millville.	Service installed.
Jan. 9	F. A. Linaberry, Vienna vs. Hackensack Elec. Lt. Co.	Changing electric system from 133 cycles to 60 cycles.	Not pressed.
Jan. 9	C. F. Meßenkopf, East Orange vs. Public Service Elec. Co.	Extension of service in East Orange.	Extension made.
Jan. 10	Mrs. H. Thompson, Englewood Cliffs vs. Public Service Gas Co.	Excessive bills.	Error in record; refund made.
Jan. 10	Rock Spring Farm, Leonardo vs. Standard Gas Co.	Excessive bills.	Application for meter test made.

Date, 1917.	Name.	Subject.	Disposal.
Jan. 10	Borough of Franklin vs.	Stational facilities at Franklin—change of station site.	Transferred to formal complaint.
Jan. 10	D.,L.W. RR., N.Y.S. & W. RR. and Lehigh and Hudson River RR.		
Jan. 11	Board of Health of Newark vs. Public Service Rly. Co.	Service on suburban lines.	Reported on with recommendation for improvement.
Jan. 12	Wm. C. Hendrickson, Melle Mead vs. Rahway Valley RR. Co.	Rates on hay and straw.	Not settled.
Jan. 13	H. F. Weber, New York City vs. Hackensack Water Co.	Water supply inadequate in Leonia.	Inspector reported no merit in complaint.
Jan. 13	Charles D. Leech, Weehawken vs. Public Service Rly. Co.	Service on Union Hill, West New York and Hoboken lines.	Satisfactorily settled.
Jan. 13	Walter S. Coombs, et als, Paterson vs. Public Service Rly. Co.	Service on Ridgewood-Paterson line.	Service improved.
Jan. 15	Charles Hartman, Millville vs. Millville Elec. Light Co.	Refusal to supply current for wireless outfit.	Installation of service recommended.
Jan. 16	Township of Florence vs. Public Service Rly. Co.	Elimination of stop.	Stop re-established.
Jan. 16	R. S. Hoskins, New York City vs. Erie Railroad Co.	Service on train No. 112 to Jersey City.	Satisfactorily adjusted.
Jan. 16	Joseph Taylor, Mount Holly vs. Public Service Elec. Co.	Extension of service in Mount Holly.	Service installed.

INFORMAL COMPLAINTS.

Date, 1917.	Name.	Subject.	Disposal.
Jan. 16	George A. Banner, et als, Boonton vs. Boonton Elec. Co.	Extension of service in Boonton.	Service to be installed.
Jan. 17	Hudson Iron & Metal Co., Bayonne vs. Central RR. Co. of N. J.	Rates on scrap iron.	Lower commodity rate established.
Jan. 17	T. B. Liebstein, Newark vs. Central RR. Co. of N. J.	Delay in placing and unloading cars and charge therefor.	Not within Board's jurisdiction.
Jan. 19	Frederick R. Candee, Westfield vs. Public Service Elec. Co.	Excessive bills.	Refund made.
Jan. 19	H. Eddowes, Merchantville vs. Public Service Elec. Co.	Extension of service in Merchantville.	Extension made.
Jan. 21	Mrs. Ida A. Stiles, Tuckerton vs. Tuckerton Water Co.	Rental charge for meter when owned by complainant.	Satisfactorily adjusted.
Jan. 21	Howard F. Townes, Millville vs. Millville Elec. Lt. Co.	Extension of service in Millville.	Extension promised.
Jan. 22	Thomas F. Hueston, Chrome vs. Public Service RR. Co.	Station at Chrome; commutation ticket between Chrome and Elizabeth.	Agreed to establish station. Ticket com- plaint without merit.
Jan. 23	William Graves, Trenton vs. Public Service Elec. Co.	Extension of service in Trenton.	Extension recommended upon guarantee of annual revenue.
Jan. 23	L. J. Taylor, et als, Wood Lynne vs. General Water Supply Co.	Refusal to install meters.	Meters installed.
Jan. 23	Archie Rice, Parlin vs. Public Service Rly. Co.	Inadequate service on Rahway-Perth Amboy line.	Reported service improved.

Date, 1917.	Name.	Subject.	Disposal.
Jan. 25	Mrs. Vernon Wortman, Pottsville vs. New Jersey Telephone Co.	Extension of service in Pottersville.	Service provided.
Jan. 25	F. A. Peaty, Essex Falls vs. Erie Railroad Co.	Seating capacity on train between Essex Fells and Upper Monclair.	Extra service afforded.
Jan. 26	John Farrell, Metuchen vs. Lehigh Valley RR. Co.	Train service between So. Plainfield and Perth Amboy.	Additional service provided.
Jan. 26	Lura E. Repper, Jersey City vs. Central RR. Co. of New Jersey	Train service on Newark Branch—In re delays.	Delays found to be unavoidable.
Jan. 29	Paterson Board of Health vs. Erie RR. Co.	Trains running from New York to Jersey City through Paterson unsanitary.	Arrangements made to have cars cleaned.
Jan. 29	Middletown Twp. in the County of Monmouth vs. Jersey Central Traction Company	Condition of trestle over Navesink River.	Repairs made.
Jan. 30	G. A. MacLachlen, Jersey City vs. Public Service Rly Co.	Traffic conditions at Hoboken Terminal.	Reported that every effort is made to safeguard lives of passengers.
Jan. 30	J. W. DeYoe, Paterson vs. Public Service Rly. Co.	Absence of Station signs on Hudson River Line.	Station stop signs erected.
Jan. 30	Butterworth-Judson Corp., N. Y. City vs. Central RR. Co., of N. J.	Excessive switching charges.	Respondent unwilling to change its rates. Not pressed.
Jan. 31	Alfred Neulenzky, New York City vs. N. Y. S. & W. RR. Co.	Train service delayed; no notice given to passengers.	Accident caused delay. Order issued to advise passengers.

INFORMAL COMPLAINTS.

Date, 1917.	Name.	Subject.	Disposal.
Feb. 5	M. B. Atkinson, Bogota vs. Hackensack Water Co.	Yearly payments on extension of service.	Inspection reported. Company justified in making charge.
Feb. 6	John Uhazie, Trenton vs. Public Service Elec. Co.	Extension of service in Trenton, Chambers St.	Extension recommended upon guarantee of annual revenue.
Feb. 7	Horace Markley, Allendale vs. Erie RR. Co.	Train service reduced.	Service re-established.
Feb. 7	James Murray, Jersey City vs. New York Telephone Co.	In re cutting off of service.	Arbitrary action on part of employee; called to account.
Feb. 7	William M. Austin, Elizabeth vs. Public Service Elec. Co.	Excessive bills.	Meter found to be registering correctly and bill rendered in accordance with same.
Feb. 7	Edward I. Berry, Camden vs. West Jersey & Seashore RR. Co.	Production of ferry ticket in order to enter Camden Terminal.	No merit in complaint.
Feb. 8	Charles A. Moore, Jersey City vs. Public Service Rly. Co.	Service on Greenville line.	Larger type cars placed on line.
Feb. 8	Max J. Herzberg, South Orange vs. Public Service Rly Co.	Service on South Orange line. In re delays and changing of cars.	Reported to have been unavoidable.
Feb. 8	S. Weinberg, Paterson vs. Public Service Gas Co.	Excessive bills.	Company unwilling to make refund. Not pressed.
Feb 9	T. W. Dynan, New York City vs. Public Service Rly. Co.	Service on Union Hill line, regular stops not being made.	Specific cases reprimanded.
Feb. 10	M. H. Burke & Co., Somerville vs. Public Service Elec. Co.	Rates on commercial light service.	Held pending decision on general investigation of all rates.

Date, 1917.	Name.	Subject.	Disposal.
Feb. 10	D. H. Litter, Bound Brook vs. Central RR. Co. of N. J.	Use of return ticket beyond station named thereon.	No merit in complaint.
Feb. 13	John J. Buswell, Lumberton vs. Public Service Gas Co.	Extension of service in Lumberton.	Extension recommended upon guarantee of annual revenue.
Feb. 13	Hopewell Township Committee vs. Penna. RR. Co.	Protection of crossing at Titusville.	Flagman installed at crossing.
Feb. 14	H. P. Conover, Holmdel vs. Monmouth & Middlesex Ltg. Co.	Extension of service in Holmdel.	Extension recommended upon guarantee of annual revenue to cover costs.
Feb. 14	Albert Schaible, East Orange vs. Erie Railroad Co.	Closing of station at night at Forest Hill.	Station to be kept open.
Feb. 15	Fire and Water Committee of Butler Borough vs. Butler Water Co.	Freezing of water pipes and responsi- bility for thawing same.	Water Co. and Borough agreed to stand the costs.
Feb. 15	Pensauken Improvement Association vs. Public Service Rly. Co.	Trolley service between Pensauken and Camden.	New service schedule put into effect.
Feb. 16	Mrs. F. Fisher, Jersey City vs. Public Service Gas Co.	Excessive bills.	Meter overread.
Feb. 16	A. T. Brady, Westfield vs. Plainfield-Union Water Company	Mains freezing and responsibility for thawing same.	Company to pay cost of thawing pipes.
Feb. 16	John Cummings, Jersey City vs. Public Service Elec. Co.	Excessive bills.	Fault of lights used.

INFORMAL COMPLAINTS.

Date, 1917.	Name.	Subject.	Disposal.
Feb. 17	F. H. Jones, New York City vs. Western Union Telegraph Company	Telegrams delivered over telephone not confirmed.	Reported telegrams delivered by messenger.
Feb. 17	Milton R. Dougherty, Wood Lynne vs. Public Service Elec. & Gas Companies	Extension of service in Wood Lynne.	Services installed.
Feb. 19	John Cummings, Westmont vs. General Water Supply Co.	Deposit to cover cost of repairing meter.	Satisfactorily adjusted.
Feb. 19	East End Civic Association of Plainfield vs. Public Service Rly. Co.	School tickets refused on holidays.	Company unwilling to allow use of tickets on holidays. Not pressed.
Feb. 20	George H. Potter, New Egypt vs. Union Transportation Co.	Freight rate charged on wagon.	Charge assessed on proper basis.
Feb. 21	A. L. Dietrich, New York City vs. Central RR. Co. of N. J.	Train service at Elizabeth Ave., Elizabeth.	Satisfactorily adjusted.
Feb. 23	P. E. Lirio, Vineland vs. Central RR. Co., of N. J.	Reduction of rate on berries.	Reported complaint not warranted.
Feb. 24	Rudolph Malth, et als., vs. Central RR., Co., of N. J.	Closing of draw bridge for repairs.	Better accommodations promised.
Feb. 24	Peter Pisecco, Camden vs. Public Service Gas Co.	Excessive bills.	Refund made.
Feb. 26	J. M. Sherrerd, Jr., Clinton vs. New Jersey Telephone Co.	Extension of service in Clinton.	Service afforded.
Feb. 27	Board of Health of Englewood vs. Public Service Elec. Co.	Charging half cost for changing place of meters.	Satisfactorily adjusted.

Date, 1917.	Name.	Subject.	Disposal.
Feb. 27	Bertha L. Whitney, Delawanna vs. Yantacaw Water Co.	Freezing of pipes and refusal to thaw same.	Service pipes privately owned by complainant.
Feb. 27	Township Committee, Haddon Twp. vs. Public Service Rly. Co.	Service on Haddonfield line.	Service improved.
Feb. 28	Charles McClaskey, Red Bank vs. Public Service Elec. Co.	Extension of service in Red Bank.	Extension recommended upon guarantee of annual revenue.
Mar. 1	Clifford Dare, Elmer vs. Dela. & Atl. Tele. & Tele. Co.	Extension of service in Elmer.	Service installed.
Mar. 1	L. R. Alexander, West Hoboken vs. Hackensack Water Co.	Stoppage in main.	Satisfactorily adjusted.
Mar. 1	John G. Buehrer, Riverside vs. Public Service Elec. Co.	Extension of service in Riverside.	Extension recommended upon guarantee of annual revenue specified.
Mar. 1	Haddon Township Committee vs. Public Service Rly. Co.	Service on Haddonfield-Camden line.	Conditions to be improved upon delivery of new cars ordered.
Mar. 2	Ella Davis, et als, Penns Grove vs. Penns Grove Water Co.	Extension of service in Penns Grove.	Extension recommended upon minimum charge guaranteed.
Mar. 5	C. E. Barker & Co., Newark vs. Central RR. Co. of N. J.	Rate charged for shipment of live poultry.	Charge made correctly.
Mar. 6	F. H. Ihlhock, Bogota vs. Bogota Water & Lt. Co.	Refusal of service because former tenant did not pay bill.	Service installed.
Mar. 7	Cross Road Farms, Far Hills vs. New York Tele. Co.	Rate for telephone facilities.	Rate charged found to be incorrect.

INFORMAL COMPLAINTS.

Date, 1917.	Name.	Subject.	Disposal.
Mar. 7	William Van Horn & Son, Paterson vs. Wells Fargo and Co.	Poor service for delivery of poultry and meats.	Better service established.
Mar. 7	Charles J. Allen, Philadelphia, Pa. vs. Public Service Gas Co.	Extension of service in Moorestown.	Extension recommended upon guarantee of specified annual revenue.
Mar. 9	Louis Mazzucca, et als, Red Bank vs. Erie RR. Co.	Protection of Beach St. crossing at Red Bank.	Flagman stationed at crossing.
Mar. 9	John Carberry, New York City vs. Public Service Elec. Co.	Changing of wiring before current is supplied.	Service installed upon grounding of sec- ondary.
Mar. 10	Laurie Young, et als, Hanover Neck vs. Morristown and Erie RR. Co.	Stational facilities at Beaufort.	Station established.
Mar. 10	Harry C. Mahnken, New York City vs. Public Service Rly. Co.	Refusal to stop car at Christie Street in Leonia late at night.	Satisfactorily settled.
Mar. 12	Sarah E. Gedney, Morsemere vs. Public Service Gas Co.	Excessive bills.	Error in bookkeeping made and Company adjusted matter satisfactorily.
Mar. 12	C. E. M. Raleau, Bloomfield vs. Erie Railroad Co.	Trains blocking crossing at Bloomfield Ave. station.	Satisfactorily settled.
Mar. 13	Totowa Improvement League and Social Centre, Paterson vs. Public Service Rly. Co.	Rush hour service on Totowa line.	Better service promised.
Mar. 13	L. E. Mack, Daretown vs. Pennsylvania RR. Co.	Crossings for ingress and egress to prop- erty over tracks.	A 10-foot crossing recommended.

Date, 1917.	Name.	Subject.	Disposal.
Mar. 14	Frank C. Clark, Ridgefield Park vs. New York Central RR. Co.	Poor condition of cars used for local service.	Improvement in conditions reported.
Mar. 15	Middlesex Borough Board of Trade vs. Public Service Railway Co.	Change in headway.	Existing service reported adequate.
Mar. 16	William C. Hendrickson, Belle Mead vs. Phila. & Reading Rly. Co.	Rate increased on hay and straw.	Unsettled. Not pressed.
Mar. 16	Alexis L. Clark, Trenton vs. Farmers Telephone Co.	Inefficient service in Burlington County.	Service improved.
Mar. 16	William H. Sonntag, Lod vs. Public Service Gas Co.	Threat to discontinue service, on account of non-payment of excessive bills.	Refund made on account of meter registering incorrectly.
Mar. 17	Mrs. Frances A. Smith, Millville vs. Peoples Water Co. of Millville	Extension of service in Millville.	Company unable to act until City Commissioners act.
Mar. 19	M. V. Vibert, Bound Brook vs. Public Service Elec. Co.	Joint use of poles with New York and New Jersey Telephone Co.	Service recommended upon guarantee of specified annual revenue.
Mar. 19	Thomas Williams, Jersey City vs. Public Service Rly. Co.	Service on Pacific Ave., in Jersey City.	Occasional delays unavoidable—general service improved.
Mar. 19	Hubert Gasc, Lakewood vs. Lakewood Gas Co.	Excessive bills.	No improper charges found.
Mar. 20	William F. Taubel, Inc., Riverside vs. Atlantic County Water Company	Rate charged for sprinkler service.	Lower rate recommended.
Mar. 20	William Van Buskirk, Jersey City vs. Public Service Rly. Co.	Service on Greenville-Bayonne line.	Satisfactorily settled.

INFORMAL COMPLAINTS.

Date, 1917.	Name.	Subject.	Disposal.
Mar. 20	W. E. Cooper, Bogota vs. Bogota Water & Light Company	Extension of service in Bogota.	Service to be supplied upon installation of separate service pipe.
Mar. 20	Wm. Hann, Jersey City vs. Public Service Gas Co.	Excessive bills.	Meter found to be registering fast—refund made.
Mar. 21	Mrs. Annie Evans, New York City vs. New York Telephone Co.	Extension of service outside of Rahway.	Extension recommended upon guarantee of annual revenue.
Mar. 22	J. Hanrahan, Jersey City vs. Public Service Gas Co.	Excessive bills.	Charges found to be properly assessed.
Mar. 22	L. R. Butler, Pitman vs. Pitman Water Co.	Charge for changing size of meter.	Company will take over all meters and reimburse.
Mar. 23	F. A. Gentieu, Penns Grove vs. Salem and Penns Grove Trac. Co.	Treatment accorded public by employees on trolleys.	Complaint abandoned.
Mar. 24	Wm Mungle & Sons Co., Newark vs. Adams Express Co.	Delay in delivery of eggs.	Instructions given for prompt delivery.
Mar. 26	R. O. Huson, East Orange vs. Public Service Elec. Co.	Bill rendered for service during time house was closed.	Complaint reported to be unwarranted.
Mar. 26	Stanly H. Burr, Westville vs. Public Service Gas Co.	Excessive bills.	Complaint reported to be unwarranted.
Mar. 26	H. B. Davis, Ridgewood vs. Erie Railroad Co.	Crossing blocked by freight at Hohokus Station when passenger train arrives.	This instance reported unavoidable on account of slippery track. Special attention to be given hereafter.
Mar. 27	Borough of Ramsey vs. Erie Railroad Co.	Expense of keeping lights for protection of crossings.	Formal proceedings taken.

Date, 1917.	Name.	Subject.	Disposal.
Mar. 27	Spanjer Bros., Newark vs. Pennsylvania RR. Co.	Placing of shipment in storage and cost of redemption of same.	Unsettled.
Mar. 29	Thos. A. Loughran, Jr., Jersey City vs. Public Service Elec. Co.	Extension of service in Jersey City.	Extension recommended upon guarantee of specified annual revenue.
Mar. 30	Donald M. Wallace, South Orange vs. Public Service Gas Co.	Extension of service in Maplewood.	Service installed.
Mar. 31	Charles S. Von Wagonen, et al., N. Y. vs. Hackensack Water Co.	Extension of service in Hillsdale.	Extension of service recommended upon guarantee of specified annual revenue.
Mar. 31	Clarence D. Meyer, Elizabeth vs. Elizabethtown Gas Light Company	One meter to supply church and parish house.	Satisfactorily adjusted.
April 2	Charles H. Rieger, Gloucester vs. Public Service Gas Co.	Excessive bills—threat to discontinue service.	Complaint reported not merited.
April 2	Frank Black & Son, Swedesboro vs. Electric Co., of N. J.	Minimum rate charged for power.	Satisfactorily adjusted.
April 3	Mrs. J. L. Ely, West Allenhurst vs. Consolidated Gas Co.	Extension of service in West Allenhurst.	Extension recommended upon guarantee of specified annual revenue.
April 3	Herman Niehaus, Ridgefield Park vs. Public Service Gas Co.	In re charge for permit to open street.	Satisfactorily adjusted.
April 3	Charles W. Crook, Kearny vs. Morris County Traction Company	Fare charged on Sundays between Maple- wood and Madison.	Refund made.
April 3	John Abel, Jersey City vs. Point Pleasant Water Works Co.	Extension of service, Point Pleasant.	Extension recommended if guarantee equal to 15 cents per lineal foot is made.

INFORMAL COMPLAINTS.

Date, 1917.	Name.	Subject.	Disposal.
April 3	Henry Baumann, East Paterson vs. N. Y. S. & W. RR. Co.	Train service at East Paterson.	Change in service reported impracticable.
April 3	J. R. Hunter, West Berlin vs. New Jersey Gas Co.	Extension of service.	Extension recommended upon guarantee of annual revenue to cover costs.
April 3	Miss Grace Rooney, Lakewood vs. Tintern Manor Water Co.	Refusal to install meter.	Satisfactorily adjusted.
April 4	Miss Mary C. Belknap, Hackettstown vs. Hackettstown Electric Light Co.	Changing of motors and allowance on same.	Motor repaired and replaced.
April 10	Town of Clinton vs. Clinton Water and Water Supply Co.	Extension of service in Clinton.	Hearing held, complaint dismissed without prejudice.
April 10	Inhabitants of West Palisade vs. Public Service Rly Co.	Stopping of Englewood cars at Bergen Boulevard.	Complaint reported as not warranted.
April 11	Steiner & Son, Asbury Park vs. Monmouth County Water Co.	Excessive bill.	Allowance made by company.
April 11	Atlas Powder Co., Wilmington vs. Pennsylvania RR. Co.	Rate on Nitroxylene.	Company unwilling to reduce the rate. Not pressed.
April 12	Efficient Contractors, Inc., Perth Amboy vs. Central RR. Co. of N. J.	Rates on commodities between Jersey City and Rahway.	Rate charged in accordance with rate published in tariff. Not pressed.
April 12	Annie R. V. Shannon, Paterson vs. New York Telephone Co.	Discontinuance of service.	Complaint reported not merited.
April 12	John W. Connolly, West Orange vs. Commonwealth Water Co.	Installation of two meters for one building.	Adjusted satisfactorily.

Date, 1917.	Name.	Subject.	Disposal.
April 13	Board of Health of Paterson vs. Erie Railroad Co.	Toilet facilities at South Paterson Station.	Improved facilities recommended.
April 14	W. A. Wehmann, Jersey City vs. Public Service Elec. Co.	Excessive bills.	Error in overreading meter. Corrected.
April 14	Atlantic County vs. West Jersey and Seashore RR. Co.	Alteration of grade crossing at 12th St., Hammonton.	No adjustment made through informal negotiations. Not pressed.
April 14	A. G. Green, Newark vs. Public Service Gas Co.	Discontinuance of service upon refusal to pay bill twice.	Satisfactorily adjusted.
April 16	H. B. Williams, Morristown vs. Proprietors of Morris Aqueduct Co.	Refusal to supply service until bill of former owner was paid.	Service installed.
April 16	Carl Alber, Egg Harbor City vs. Egg Harbor City Water Co.	Overflowing of stand pipe.	Company agreed to install device to regulate overflow.
April 16	Mrs. E. Ransom, Jr., Jersey City vs. Public Service Gas Co.	Excessive bills.	Complaint reported not warranted.
April 20	Mrs. W. J. Benzing, Westville vs. Westville and Newbold Water Co.	Responsibility for maintenance of water service pipe.	Adjusted satisfactorily by company.
April 20	Mathew Mattarocchio, Kingsland vs. Public Service Gas Co.	Extension of service in Kingsland.	Service recommended upon guarantee of specified annual revenue.
April 21	George B. Hitchcock, Inc., Bogota vs. Hackensack Water Co.	Extension of service in Bogota.	Service installed.
April 23	Harry W. Bealer, Wood Lynne vs. Collingswood Sewerage Co.	Extension of service in Wood Lynne.	Extension recommended upon deposit from complainant.

INFORMAL COMPLAINTS.

Date, 1917.	Name.	Subject.	Disposal.
April 23	Lloyd Hoffman, Pottersville vs. New Jersey Telephone Co.	Inadequate service.	Complaint dismissed.
April 23	Sadie O. R. McKenna, New York vs. New Jersey Water and Light Co.	Refusal to supply water until payment is made for bills due from former owner.	Service installed.
April 24	Little & Wilson, et als, Pittstown vs. Lehigh Valley, Erie, Central RR. Companies	Discontinuance of allowance of 8 per cent on wet grains.	Advised to adjust matter with the breweries.
April 24	Alex. C. Thompson, Elizabeth vs. Public Service Rly. Co.	Service on Bloomfield line.	Increased tripper service established.
April 24	Joseph F. Kennelley, West New York vs. Public Service Gas Co.	Excessive bill—refusal to pay and discontinuance of service.	Complaint reported not warranted.
April 26	Birtwhistle & Livingston, New York City vs. Hackensack Water Co.	Extension of service in Englewood.	Extension recommended upon guarantee of specified annual revenue.
April 27	Horace Markley, Allendale vs. Erie Railroad Co.	Train service between Waldwick and Newark.	Reported as impracticable to make stops asked for. Not pressed.
April 28	H. R. Heinicke, Inc., New York City vs. Lehigh Valley RR. Co. and Pennsylvania RR. Co.	Rate on brick.	Complaint reported not warranted.
May 1	James I. Wolverton, Trenton vs. Dela. & Atl. Tele. & Tele. Co.	Poor service and temporary discontinuance of service.	Adjusted satisfactorily.
May 1	War Department, Washington, D. C. vs. Delaware River Water Co.	Rate for water service in National Cemetery.	1- or 2-inch meter recommended for use of water in cemetery.

Date, 1917.	Name.	Subject.	Disposal.
May 2	Morris County Children's Home, Parsippany vs. Boonton Electric Co.	Extension of service in Parsippany.	Extension recommended upon payment of cost per pole length.
May 3	William Murphy, Jersey City. vs. New York Telephone Co.	Itemized statement of calls made.	Complaint reported not warranted.
May 3	William F. Barkalow, Freehold vs. Monmouth Lighting Co.	Rates charged for lighting service.	Complaint reported not warranted.
May 3	H. D. Bushnell, New York City vs. Montclair Water Co.	Holding of deposit indefinitely after credit is established.	Deposit returned.
May 4	H. F. Smaltz, Hampton vs. D., L. & W. RR. Co.	Train service between Washington and Hampton.	Satisfactory service established.
May 7	H. Woolman, Beverly vs. Delaware River Water Co.	Contract and payment in advance for one year's service.	No discrimination found. Not pressed.
May 7	L. C. Stansberry vs. Public Service Elec. Co.	Excessive bills.	Complaint reported not warranted.
May 7	Cedar Knolls Improvement Association, Whippany vs. Morristown and Erie RR. Co.	Change in train schedule.	Service reestablished.
May 7	Alexander J. Higgins, Jersey City vs. Hackensack Water Co.	Discontinuance of service on account of disputed bill.	Service continued upon payment of current bills.
May 8	Charles Guernson, New York City vs. Central RR. Co. of N. J.	Rate on berries.	Not pressed.

INFORMAL COMPLAINTS.

Date, 1917.	Name.	Subject.	Disposal.
May 8	Robert Moers, New York City vs. D., L. & W. RR. Co.	Rate on scrap brass delivered on Central tracks.	Satisfactorily adjusted.
May 8	Charles DeLong, Egg Harbor City vs. Egg Harbor City Water Co.	Excessive bill.	Excessive charge cancelled.
May 9	Frederick T. Warner, Hackensack vs. Public Service Gas Co.	Extension of service in Teaneck Borough.	Satisfactorily adjusted.
May 9	Linwood Company, East Orange vs. Public Service Elec. Co.	Extension of service in East Orange.	Extension made upon guarantee of minimum amount per annum.
May 10	George W. Sloan, Merchantville vs. Easton Tele. & Tele. Co., et als.	Removal of poles.	Satisfactorily adjusted.
May 10	William H. McMillan, Orange vs. D., L. & W. RR. Co.	Congestion of traffic at crossings where grades are being separated.	Complaint reported not warranted.
May 11	Oak Crest Poultry Farm vs. Toms River Electric Light Co.	Extension of service in Island Heights.	Formal complaint advised to adjust satisfactorily.
May 14	Egg Harbor Board of Education, Egg Harbor City vs. Egg Harbor City Water Co.	Fire service statement on bills rendered.	Recommended that statement be left off bills.
May 16	Standard Water Systems Co., Hampton vs. N. J. Telephone Co.	Toll charges excessive.	Charges corrected and credit made.
May 18	Bertha Czerwinski, Bogota vs. Bogota Water and Light Co.	Extension of service in Bogota.	Complainant agreed to pay cost of extension and same was made.

Date, 1917.	Name.	Subject.	Disposal.
May 18	Electric Light & Power Co. of Hightstown vs. Public Service Elec. Co.	Voltage low—Installation of regulator to correct uneven pressure.	Higher voltage upon re-insulated lines.
May 19	Hollstein Brothers, Hoboken vs. Penna. RR. Co.	Delay in delivery of cars.	No jurisdiction.
May 21	R. T. Johnson, Erma vs. Cape May Light and Power Co.	Charge for power for electric motor.	No discrimination; proper charge made.
May 22	Newark Metal Co., Newark vs. Penna. RR. Co.	Demurrage charge after bill of lading was signed.	Charge for demurrage correct.
May 23	Peter B. Byrnes, New York City vs. Hackensack Water Co.	Extension of service in Woodridge.	Extension recommended upon guarantee of specified amount per year.
May 22	Peter B. Byrnes, New York City vs. Public Service Gas Co.	Extension of service in Woodridge.	Extension made.
May 22	Bogart & Harris, Ridgewood vs. Hackensack Water Co.	Service Connection charge.	Charge made only when Company installs the service connection.
May 25	William Meyer, New York City vs. Keansburg Water Co.	Extension of service in Keansburg.	Service extended.
May 25	Donato Cuozzo, New York City vs. Middlesex & Monmouth Elec. Lt., Ht. & Power Co.	Minimum rate paid in advance and collection of monthly bills also.	Complaint satisfactorily adjusted.
May 25	W. I. Schnepf, Bogota vs. Hackensack Water Co.	Rates, Service charge and size of service pipes.	Satisfactorily adjusted.

INFORMAL COMPLAINTS.

Date, 1917.	Name.	Subject.	Disposal.
May 26	Jerome J. Danzy, New York City vs. Atlantic Coast Electric Light Co.	Connection to summer residence refused until contract was signed.	Special consideration to be given in case of sickness.
May 26	A. Teitelbaum, Newark vs. Pennsylvania RR. Co.	Overcharge in weight of car of coke.	Refund made.
May 26	Nelson C. Smith, New York City vs. Public Service Elec. Co.	Extension of service in East Orange.	Extension made upon placing of deposit.
May 28	Abe Davidson, Perth Amboy vs. Perth Amboy Gas Lt. Co.	Discontinuance of service upon dispute over return of deposits.	Service reinstated.
May 28	Henry V. Browfsky, North Bergen vs. Hackensack Water Co.	Discontinuance of service on account of nonpayment of bills rendered after foreclosure on property.	Service continued upon signing of contract as tenant and making deposit.
May 29	Wildwood Extension Realty Co. vs. Wildwood and Delaware Bay Short Line RR. Co.	Stational facilities at West Wildwood.	Space east and west of station recommended leveled off and improved.
May 29	I. Greenbaum, Newark vs. New York Telephone Co.	Charge for greater number of calls than was made.	Allowance made.
May 29	W. B. Lunn, Weehawken vs. Hackensack Water Co.	Excessive bills.	Credit allowed for overreading of meter.
May 31	H. J. Malott & Co., Philadelphia, Pa. vs. Wildwood & Delaware Bay Short Line RR. Co.	Discontinuance of stop at Wildwood, Annex station.	Formal proceeding taken.
May 31	Morrisey & Walker, Inc., Keansburg vs. Keansburg Water Co.	Extension of service in Keansburg.	Service extended

Date, 1917.	Name.	Subject.	Disposal.
June 1	William Pisaloro, Trenton vs. Public Service Elec. Co.	Deposit demanded for connection of service.	Service established without deposit.
June 1	Monmouth Beach Fish Co., Monmouth Beach vs. Adams & American Express Cos.	Extension of service to Monmouth Beach.	Company agreed to deliver at Monmouth Beach.
June 1	Abel Chas, Coytesville vs. Public Service Elec. Co.	Extension of service in Coytesville.	Extension recommended upon guarantee of specified annual revenue.
June 1	Nathan Myres, Newark vs. Public Service Elec. Co.	Installation of double wiring for second service for uninterrupted service in case of trouble to local line.	Formal proceedings taken.
June 1	Saddle River Township Board of Trade vs. N. Y. S. & W. RR. Co.	Lights at Dundee Lake Station.	Electric lights to be installed.
June 2	Charles B. Dutcher, Newark vs. Keansburg Water Co.	Extension of service in Keansburg.	Extension made and service installed.
June 2	George Lacmann, Westville vs. Public Service Elec. Co.	Extension of service in Westville.	Company unwilling to comply with recommendation for the extension. Not pressed.
June 4	David L. Mathews, Lambertville vs. Public Service Gas Co.	Extension of service in Trenton.	Extension recommended upon payment of pipe in excess of 50 feet used.
June 4	Mrs. A. M. Rich, Camden vs. Dela. & Atl. Tel. & Tel. Co.	Use of one line of poles for several companies instead of three separate lines.	Satisfactorily adjusted.
June 4	George W. Hardy, Highlands vs. Middlesex & Monmouth Elec. Lt., Heat & Power Co.	Refusal to give service on account of disputed bill.	Accounts corrected and service recommended.

INFORMAL COMPLAINTS.

Date, 1917.	Name.	Subject.	Disposal.
June 6	William Tredway, Chester vs. New Jersey Telephone Co.	Refusal to give service.	Service installed.
June 6	J. Chapman, Penns Grove vs. Penns Grove Water Supply Co.	Extension of service in Penns Grove.	Extension of service recommended upon guarantee of specified amount per annum.
June 6	L. E. Bailey, Hawthorne vs. Public Service Rly. Co.	In re service on Hawthorne line and issuance of transfer for Passaic.	Extra cars for rush hours and changing of signs on Passaic cars.
June 7	Brock's Garage, Trenton vs. Phila., & Reading Rly. Co.	Difference in rate charged on two cars of automobiles.	Error in billing. Corrected.
June 8	William N. Cooper, Trenton vs. Public Service Gas Co.	Gas escaping in house.	Conditions remedied.
June 9	Wyanoak Publishing Co., Inc., New York City vs. Public Service Elec. Co.	Meters for arc lamps and incandescent lamps; power rate for arc lamps.	Complaint withdrawn.
June 10	Charles Thompson, Island Heights vs. Ocean County Gas Co.	Extension of service in Island Heights.	Company unwilling to make extension without deposit. Not pressed.
June 11	C. H. Bihlmaier, Woodcrest vs. Public Service Elec. Co.	Extension of service to Woodcrest.	Company unwilling to make extension. Not pressed.
June 11	F. L. Schafer, Mt. Arlington vs. New Jersey Power and Light Co.	Rates charged for lighting service.	Satisfactorily adjusted.
June 12	H. Virag, Passaic vs. Public Service Gas Co.	Excessive bills.	Caused by leaky plumbing. Company not at fault.

Date, 1917.	Name.	Subject.	Disposal.
June 13	Mrs. Laura Lincoln, Camden vs. Public Service Gas Co.	Refusal to reinstate meter unless deposit is made when deposit was originally made on meter taken out.	No record of deposit made; amount of deposit reduced.
June 13	Daniel W. Faunce, et als, Barrington vs. Public Service Gas Co.	Extension of service in Barrington.	Company unwilling to make extensions. Not pressed.
June 13	Crucible Steel Co. of America, Pitts- burgh. vs. Pennsylvania R.R. Co.	Rate charged for moving cars of coal to intermill points at plant in Harrison, N. J.	Company unwilling to reduce rate. Not pressed.
June 14	Federal Iron and Steel Co., Newark vs. Lehigh Valley Railroad Co.	Rate charged for demurrage.	Charge made in accordance with agreement plan.
June 15	Captain Arthur G. Jaggard, Woodbury vs. Adams Express Co.	Claim for damage to typewriter shipped to Sea Girt.	Repairs to be made by company.
June 15	Arrowsmith Mfg. Co., Inc. vs. Public Service Elec. Co.	Break down service charge for electrical starter used each day.	Improper classification of charge reported.
June 15	Louis A. Hagen, Cranford vs. Cranford Gas Light Co.	Excessive bill.	Allowance made for fast meter.
June 15	Mrs. Elizabeth Wagner, Riverside vs. Public Service Gas Co.	Extension of gas at Riverside.	Company unwilling to make extension. Not pressed.
June 15	C. P. Cann, Palmyra vs. Riverton & Palmyra Water Co.	Charge for permit to open street to repair pipe.	Company to stand charge.
June 16	John V. Laddy, Newark vs. Public Service Elec. Co.	Extension of service in Cedar Grove.	Service recommended upon guarantee of specified annual amount.

INFORMAL COMPLAINTS.

Date, 1917.	Name.	Subject.	Disposal.
June 16	A. T. Whitehead, Frenchtown vs. Frenchtown Water Co.	Extension of service in Frenchtown.	Extension recommended upon guarantee of specified annual revenue.
June 18	Township Committee of Orvil vs. New York Telephone Co.	Public Telephone at Waldwick.	Not found to be a public necessity.
June 18	C. L. Guss, Phila., Pa. vs. Collingswood Sewerage Co.	Increase in rate.	Complaint reported without warrant.
June 18	George L. Fitzgerald, Phila., Pa. vs. West Jersey & Seashore RR. Co.	Last train not stopping for passengers and refusal to accept excursion ticket the following day.	Refund made.
June 18	Horace Markley, Allendale vs. Erie Railroad Co.	Increased commutation rate between Allendale and Newark.	Error; refund made.
June 18	Mrs. K. Scheurer, West Fort Lee vs. Hackensack Water Co.	Excessive bill.	Complaint reported without merit.
June 19	G. Donato, Plainfield vs. Public Service Gas Co.	Extension of service in North Plainfield.	Service extended.
June 19	Millstone Valley Grange vs. Phila. & Reading Rly. Co.	Widening of roadway under bridge at Weston.	Satisfactorily adjusted.
June 19	J. E. Grape, New York City vs. Public Service Elec. Co.	Refusal to reinstate service for new tenants after house was vacant.	Complaint reported without merit.
June 20	George J. Murray, Jersey City vs. Standard Gas Co. of Atlantic Highlands	Extension of service in Keansburg.	Formal hearing held.
June 20	Thomas Lowe, Elizabeth vs. Elizabethtown Water Co.	Responsibility for digging street to lay service pipe.	Responsibility placed on company.

Date, 1917.	Name.	Subject.	Disposal.
June 21	Mrs. A. M. Davis, Wyckoff vs. Pennsylvania RR. Co.	Refusal to accept excursion ticket on return trip via Philadelphia to Jersey City from Atlantic City.	Refund made for part of ticket not used.
June 21	D. O'Brien, Trenton vs. Public Service Elec. Co.	Refusal to supply service.	Service afforded.
June 22	James H. Tully, Keansburg vs. Standard Gas Co. of Atlantic Highlands	Refusal to supply service in Keansburg.	Formal hearing held.
June 22	Mrs. Isaac L. Shoemaker vs. Public Service Gas Co.	Extension of service in Hilton.	Extension made upon payment of deposit agreed upon by complaint.
June 23	Borough of Hasbrouck Heights vs. Public Service Rly. Co.	Stational facilities at Williams Ave., Hasbrouck Heights.	Formal proceedings taken.
June 23	Fred J. Pettengill, Rahway vs. Public Service Rly. Co.	Service and condition of cars on Union Line between Newark and Bound Brook.	Car overhauled and placed in good repair.
June 23	Cyrus Prosch, Coytesville vs. Public Service Rly. Co.	Trackage at terminal in Coytesville.	Trackage extended to accommodate unloading and loading of more cars.
June 25	J. H. Zecher, Jersey City vs. Public Service Gas Co.	Excessive bill.	Complaint reported without merit.
June 25	Elizabeth Stackhouse, Hightstown vs. Union Transportation Co. and Penna. RR. Co.	Service between Hightstown and Trenton.	Reported service improved.
June 26	N. Drake, Newark vs. Central RR. Co. of N. J.	Reconsignment charge.	Refund made.

INFORMAL COMPLAINTS

Date, 1917.	Name.	Subject.	Disposal.
June 26	Borough of Point Pleasant Beach vs. Point Pleasant Water Works Co.	Service and inadequate water pressure.	Stand pipe damaged, allowing water to escape. Repairs made and service improved.
June 27	Klump & Son, Union vs. Hackensack Water Co.	Charge for permit to open street.	Recommended that the utility be responsible for street charge.
June 27	J. R. C. Smith, Westwood vs. Public Service Gas Co.	Threat to discontinue service on account of disputed bill.	Meter registering fast; refund made.
June 28	Rochelle Park Co-operative Association vs. Erie Railroad Co.	Stopping of train No. 955 at Rochelle Park on Saturdays.	No change in schedule recommended.
June 29	George A. Mills, Morristown vs. Proprietors of Morris Aqueduct Co.	Separate service pipe and meter for barn.	Separate service recommended.
June 29	Borough Council of Seaside Heights vs. Pennsylvania RR. Co.	Toilet facilities at station at Seaside Heights.	Facilities to be installed.
June 29	Borough Council of Haledan vs. Public Service Gas Co.	Extension of service to Borough of Haledan.	Company unwilling to make extension. Not pressed.
June 30	M. L. VanThuyne, Stone Harbor vs. Pennsylvania RR. Co. and Adams Express Co.	No telephone in station and no express delivery service.	Pending.
June 30	Elizabethtown Gas Light Co. vs. Pennsylvania RR. Co.	Rates on cast iron pipe.	Refund made to complainant.
July 2	Harry Ketts, Trenton vs. Public Service Elec. Co.	Refusal of service unless \$20 is paid.	Extension made without deposit.

Date, 1917.	Name.	Subject.	Disposal.
July 3	C. W. Faltoute, Summit vs. Pennsylvania RR. Co.	Refusal of return portion of excursion ticket.	Refund made for ticket.
July 5	Pitman Cottagers' Assoc., Inc., Pitman vs. Electric Co. of N. J.	Discontinuance of service.	Service reinstated.
July 5	Mayor and Council of Boro. of Fort Lee vs. Wells Fargo Express Co.	Refusal to deliver packages for Fort Lee.	Pending.
July 6	James L. Garabrant, Newark vs. Erie Railroad Co.	Discharging of passengers wishing to transfer on southerly track of Terminal.	Transfer rules violated if change in practice is made.
July 6	E. S. Dickerson, Longport vs. W. J. & S. RR. Co.	Discontinuance of ticket agent and baggage service.	Formal proceedings taken.
July 6	George Brueninger, Newark vs. Standard Gas Co. of Atlantic Highlands	Extension of service to Port Monmouth.	Formal hearing held.
July 6	William W. Chambers, Asbury Park vs. New York Telephone Co.	Rate for service for 3 months, minimum rate being for 6 months.	Charge made in accordance with rates filed.
July 7	Bernard Redding, Newark vs. Public Service Elec. Co.	Extension of service in Upper Montclair.	Service established.
July 7	Edward J. Hahn, Newark vs. Standard Gas Co. of Atlantic Highlands	Extension of service in East Keansburg.	Formal hearing held.
July 7	William L. Dill, Trenton vs. New York & Long Branch RR. Co.	Protection of grade crossing at Hazlet.	Crossing to be protected by gates.

INFORMAL COMPLAINTS.

Date, 1917.	Name.	Subject.	Disposal.
July 7	William Hanley, Hoboken vs. Point Pleasant Water Works Co.	Rate charged for summer season.	Satisfactorily adjusted.
July 9	Harry DeGrass, Wyckoff vs. N. Y. S. & W. RR. Co.	Dispatching of No. 902 to make schedule of No. 938.	Practice discontinued.
July 9	John Felcin, Rutherford vs. Hackensack Water Co.	Change in location of meter from cellar to street and installation of service pipe.	Complaint withdrawn.
July 9	Borough of Avalon vs. Stone Harbor Electric Lt. & Power Co.	Poor lighting service.	Poor service due to electric storms.
July 10	Borough Council of Island Heights vs. Ocean County Gas Co.	Extension of service in Island Heights.	Extension should be made in accordance with provision of franchise.
July 10	Daniel Turner, et als, Camden vs. Public Service Gas Co.	Extension of service on Hillside Ave., Camden.	Company unwilling to make extension. Not pressed.
July 10	Princeton Ice Co., Princeton vs. D., L. & W. RR. Co., C. RR. Co. of N. J. and P. & R. Rly. Co.	Delay in delivery of cars of ice.	Better connections promised and every effort made to avoid delays.
July 10	J. Frank Miller, South Amboy vs. C. RR. Co. of N. J. and Raritan River RR. Co.	Discharge of soft coal smoke and blow- ing of whistles.	Further complaint unnecessary upon proper compliance with instructions given to employees.
July 11	J. Flannery, Jersey City vs. Public Service Elec. Co.	Refusal to supply service to school in West Hoboken until wiring is changed.	Service installed.
July 11	J. Morgan, Guttenberg vs. Hackensack Water Co.	Low water pressure in mains.	New service pipes recommended.

Date, 1917.	Name.	Subject.	Disposal.
July 11	Terry Marten, Highlands vs. Middlesex & Monmouth Elec. Lt., Heat & Power Co.	Refusal to replace rotten poles.	Rotten pole removed and new pole placed in accordance with complainant's direction.
July 11	Benjamin Cohn, Paterson. vs. Hackensack Water Co.	Rate charged for two separate build- ings on one lot.	Separate meter installed for second house.
July 11	M. C. Poinier, East Orange vs. Adams Express Co.	No deliveries to No. 18th St. E. Orange.	Satisfactorily adjusted.
July 11	Frank Jennings, Jamesburg vs. Jamesburg Water Co.	Rent charged for meter.	Charge for meter rent discontinued.
July 12	Dr. James R. Hunter, Jr. vs. Westville and Newbold Water Co.	Payment of quarterly minimum in ad- vance.	In accordance with rule allowed by Board.
July 12	A. T. Landmesser, New Brunswick vs. Adams Express Co.	Non-delivery of express matter to 8th Ave., Highland Park, New Brun- swick.	Delivery limits extended to Eighth Ave.
July 12	A. C. Winant, South Amboy vs. Raritan River RR. Co.	Carrying of passengers on engine to finish trip, while coaches are stored.	Coach to be carried for use of pas- sengers to end of destination.
July 13	John Scott, Point Pleasant vs. Point Pleasant Water Works Co.	Placing of meter outside and destroying lawn.	Satisfactorily adjusted.
July 13	Katharine W. Carmichael, Lyons Farms vs. Elizabethtown Water Co.	Excessive bill and water turned off upon refusal to pay bill.	Charges made in accordance with rates filed with the Board. Not pressed.
July 14	Herman Asendorf, Red Bank vs. Monmouth Electric Co.	Operation of cars with flat wheels.	New wheels placed on car.

INFORMAL COMPLAINTS.

Date, 1917.	Name.	Subject.	Disposal.
July 14	John H. Blake, Upper Montclair vs. Public Service Elec. Co.	Extension of service in East Orange.	Company unwilling to make the extension. Not pressed.
July 16	M. Heffron, New York City vs. Public Service Gas Co.	Extension of service in Jersey City.	Service afforded upon installation of house piping.
July 17	W. H. Mapes, Philadelphia, Pa. vs. City Gas Light Co.	Excessive bills.	Allowance made for meter registering fast.
July 17	Hoven Land Co., Ridgewood vs. Bergen Aqueduct Co.	Extension of service in Ridgewood.	Temporary service afforded upon installation of service pipe.
July 17	Mrs. H. M. Ellis, Ashland vs. New Jersey Gas Co.	Insufficient service.	Service to be improved.
July 18	Vincent Bivona, Plainfield vs. American Express Co.	Delay in delivery of fish.	Service improved upon investigation.
July 18	Edgar R. Alpaugh, Jersey City vs. Public Service Rly. Co.	Destination signs on cars; cars being turned back before destination is reached.	Cars turned back to keep schedule on account of unavoidable delays in traffic.
July 18	Waterford Township Committee vs. Pennsylvania RR. Co.	Protection by temporary flagman at crossing in Atco.	Protection of crossing by flagman at all hours.
July 19	C. R. Blades, Avon vs. Coast Gas Co.	Extension of service in Avon.	Satisfactorily adjusted.
July 19	J. Warren Davis, Trenton vs. Westville & Newbold Water Co.	Excessive bill and test of meter.	Leak found in plumbing.
July 20	Palmyra Moravian Church vs. Riverton & Palmyra Water Co.	Excessive charges for extension of service.	Complaint reported without merit.

Date, 1917.	Name.	Subject.	Disposal.
July 20	Edgar W. Chipman, Pensauken vs. Merchantville Water Co., and Public Service Electric Co.	Extension of service in Pensauken.	Company unwilling to make the extension. Not pressed.
July 20	Louis Thomae, Elizabeth vs. Hackensack Water Co.	Extension of service in Town of Union.	Extension made by use of long service pipe.
July 21	Phillips Brothers, Paterson vs. New York Telephone Co.	Discontinuance of service for non-payment of bill claimed paid.	Satisfactorily adjusted.
July 21	J. W. Brennan, Winslow vs. Penna. RR. Co. & C. RR. Co. of N. J.	Protection of crossing at Winslow Junction by erection of footpath.	Central R. R. Co. promises to keep track clear.
July 23	Warwick J. Price, Avalon vs. Stone Harbor Elec. Co.	Turning on of current earlier in evening.	Current to be turned on earlier in evening.
July 23	John R. Elley, Toms River vs. Toms River Electric Co.	Connection of pump and replacing of wiring for changing meter.	Satisfactorily adjusted.
July 24	F. J. Weis, et als, Trenton vs. Trenton and Mercer County Traction Corp.	Condition of tracks on Hamilton Ave., Trenton.	Condition of tracks remedied.
July 24	Chas. Baker, Cape May vs. Cape May Light & Power Company	Extension of service in Cold Spring.	Extension recommended upon guarantee of specified annual revenue.
July 24	Bleak House Club, Avalon vs. Stone Harbor Elec. Lt. & Power Co.	Extension of service in Avalon.	Service extended.
July 25	F. Swift Gibson, Phila, Pa. vs. City Gas Co.	Poor quality of gas.	Tests show that gas gives heating value required by State standard.

INFORMAL COMPLAINTS.

Date, 1917.	Name.	Disposal.	Subject.
July 25	Mrs. C. C. Bankard, Camden vs. Public Service Gas Co.	Refusal to install prepayment meter.	Prepayment meter installed.
July 25	H. E. Hayward, Avalon vs. Stone Harbor Elec. Lt. & Power Co.	Service afforded earlier in evening.	Satisfactorily adjusted.
July 25	A. J. Auth, Newark vs. Public Service Elec. Co.	Rates and discount for power and lighting service combined.	Combination rate allowed for lighting from power service.
July 25	Charles Lewis, Asbury Park vs. Monmouth County Water Company	Advance payment of minimum charge.	Charge made in accordance with rules filed with the Board. Complaint not pressed.
July 26	William Matthews, Kearny vs. New York & Long Branch RR. Co.	Passenger train being held up while freight was loaded at Long Branch station.	Better service promised.
July 26	Boynton Real Estate Co., Perth Amboy vs. Middlesex Water Co.	Charge for repairs on meter frozen when same is placed in street.	Charge appears reasonable; company to receive notice of vacant premises.
July 26	Borough of Belmar vs. Atlantic Coast Elec. Rly. Company	Condition of tracks at F Street in Belmar.	Tracks lowered; complaint satisfied.
July 27	A. C. Stahl, Phila., Pa. vs. Public Service Elec. Co.	Extension of service in Audubon.	Service extended.
July 27	D. S. MacMullen, Rochelle Park vs. N. Y. S. & W. RR. Co.	Continuous ringing of bell at crossing.	Instructions given for elimination of bell ringing except for crossover.
July 27	John Meigs, Ventnor vs. Phila. & Reading Rly. Co.	Overcrowded condition of excursion trains from Camden to Atlantic City.	Railroad Co. agreed to stop sale of tickets beyond proper accommodations.
July 27	Dr. John Lewis Lane, Tuckerton vs. Tuckerton Water Co.	Payment of minimum meter charge 6 months in advance.	Charge made in accordance with rules.

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

Date, 1917.	Name.	Subject.	Disposal.
July 28	W. S. Colfax, Jr., Pennsgrove vs. Pennsgrove Traction Co.	Passengers entering and leaving cars by same door.	This method found best in this particular vicinity.
July 28	M. A. Disbrow, Plainfield vs. Public Service Gas Co.	Extension of service in Plainfield.	Company unwilling to make extension. Not pressed.
July 28	Edward H. Cutler, Phila., Pa. vs. Public Service Gas Co.	Extension of service in Collingswood.	Service extended.
July 28	Mrs. L. T. Warrington, Island Heights vs. Ocean County Gas Co.	Extension for service to rear of premises.	Service extended.
July 28	J. C. Vail, Morristown vs. Rahway Valley RR. Co. and D., L. & W. RR. Co.	Failure to maintain switch connection between tracks of the two roads at Summit.	Investigation showed refusal of D., L. & W. R. R. to permit connection has been upheld by U. S. Supreme Court.
July 30	W. W. Pendleton, Newark vs. Coast Gas Co.	Refusal to supply service on account of disputed bill of another tenant.	Service afforded.
Aug. 2	Vulcan Detinning Co., Sewaren vs. New York Telephone Co.	Service—long distance calls being cut off.	New Switchboard and equipment to be installed.
Aug. 2	Borough of Linden vs. Elizabethtown Water Co.	Extension of service in Linden.	Service established.
Aug. 2	Marcus Goodbody, New York vs. Hackensack Water Co.	Insufficient water pressure in Tenafly.	Pressure improved.
Aug. 2	Wooley Fish Co., Bradley Beach vs. American Express Co.	Failure to deliver fish at station in time to get train.	Failure due to misunderstanding; instructions for prompt service issued.

INFORMAL COMPLAINTS.

Date, 1917.	Name.	Subject.	Disposal.
Aug. 2	John W. Courter, Hackensack vs. Passaic Water Co.	Refusal to supply water until bill of former owner is paid.	Complaint satisfactorily adjusted.
Aug. 2	John R. Brinley, New York vs. Monmouth County Water Co.	Charge for turning on and off water excessive bills.	Charge made in accordance with rules filed with Board. Complaint not pressed.
Aug. 2	John B. Engle, West Collingswood vs. Pennsylvania RR. Co.	Charge for Excursion ticket from Camden and Philadelphia to Atlantic City	Not within the jurisdiction of the Board.
Aug. 3	Herman Conrow, Cream Ridge vs. Farmers Telephone Co.	Discontinuance of service on account of non-payment of bill for time when 'phone was out of order.	Bill paid and allowance made for time during which service was interrupted.
Aug. 4	Harvey Mentzer, et als, Almonesson vs. Public Service Rly. Co.	Extension of fare zone and station facilities at Lakeview Heights.	Station stop recommended but extension of fare zone not warranted.
Aug. 4	Frank H. Elsworth, New York vs. Philadelphia & Reading Rly. Co.	Stopping of train at 4:30 P. M. at Stoutsburg.	Arrangement made for stopping of Train No. 659 at 5:57.
Aug. 4	Mrs. H. W. Baymore, Grassy Sound vs. Pennsylvania RR. Co.	Train not stopping at Grassy Sound carrying passenger on to Camden.	Company refused to be responsible owing to complainant receiving information from non-employee of company.
Aug. 6	E. S. Longstreet, Asbury Park vs. Monmouth County Water Co.	Minimum rate and payment of minimum charge in advance.	Company within its rights in collecting charge.
Aug. 6	Andrew Willgoos, New Brunswick vs. Public Service Elec. Co.	Extension of service in New Brunswick.	Extension made in accordance with recommendation.
Aug. 6	F. M. Gress, Pitman vs. Electric Co. of N. J.	Minimum charge.	Satisfactorily adjusted.
Aug. 7	Mrs. C. A. Byrd, Pleasantville vs. Atlantic County Water Co.	Excessive bills and refusal to install meter.	Meter installed and bills rendered upon metered rate basis.

Date, 1917.	Name.	Subject.	Disposal.
Aug. 7	Herbert R. Crane, Newark vs. Pennsylvania RR. Co.	Overcrowded trains between Newark and Allenhurst.	Satisfactorily adjusted.
Aug. 8	Curtis Gandy, Ridgefield vs. Public Service Gas Co.	Excessive bills.	Meter reported as measuring gas within the limits allowed.
Aug. 8	F. F. Chadwick, Passaic vs. Acquackanonk Water Co.	Excessive charge for installing service pipes.	Charge found to be fair in comparison with other similar work.
Aug. 9	William S. Fanshawe, New York vs. Pennsylvania RR. Co.	Underground roadway under tracks at South Amboy.	Plans in operation for new highway.
Aug. 10	Reliance Building Co., Camden vs. Public Service Gas Co.	Extension of service in Camden.	Company unwilling to make the exten- sion. Not pressed.
Aug. 10	Charles D. Cooke, Ocean City vs. Ocean City Gas Co.	Excessive bills.	Meter registering fast; allowance made.
Aug. 10	Robert B. Smith, Hillside Township vs. Public Service Elec. Co.	Refusal to supply service unless de- posit was paid.	Company agreed to waive deposit.
Aug. 11	H. T. Borden, Mickleton vs. Adams Express Co.	Delay in returning empty milk cans.	Satisfactorily adjusted.
Aug. 13	E. H. Lippincott, Columbus vs. Dela. & Atl. Tele. & Tele. Co.	Removal of old poles.	Not within the jurisdiction of the Board.
Aug. 13	G. A. Hollinger, North Bergen vs. Hackensack Water Co.	Separate minimum charges for two houses served through one meter.	Charges made in accordance with rules filed.
Aug. 14	M. W. Reeves, Philadelphia, Pa. vs. Public Service Rly. Co.	Fare paid for child 4 years of age when age limit is 5 years.	Refund made by company.

INFORMAL COMPLAINTS.

Date, 1917.	Name.	Subject.	Disposal.
Aug. 15	Frank Cowell, Garwood vs. American Express Co.	Claim for non-delivery.	Claim settled satisfactorily.
Aug. 15	James R. Shurz, Avon vs. Atlantic Coast Elec. Co.	Discontinuance of service on account of non-payment of disputed bill.	Refund recommended.
Aug. 15	M. E. Connors, Jersey City vs. Public Service Gas Co.	Changing of meter without notice while premises were vacant.	Company admits wrong and employee reprimanded.
Aug. 16	Mrs. G. Freschi, Keansburg vs. Standard Gas Co. of Atlantic Highlands	Extension of service in Keansburg.	Formal proceedings taken.
Aug. 16	Carl C. Lantz, New York City vs. Jersey Central Traction Co.	Service and condition of cars running between Atlantic Highlands and Highlands.	Complaint satisfied.
Aug. 17	Harrington Park Tax Reform Assoc. vs. Hackensack Water Co.	Guarantee charged after other consumers were added to extension.	Satisfactorily adjusted.
Aug. 17	W. P. More, Union vs. Public Service Gas Co.	Rendering bill monthly with admitted error carried in balance.	Error corrected and complaint satisfactorily adjusted.
Aug. 17	William H. Leupp, New York City vs. New York Telephone Co.	Charge for service when house was vacant.	Allowance made.
Aug. 17	P. J. McCoy & Co., Newark vs. New York Telephone Co.	Poor service.	Better service promised.
Aug. 17	John E. Howland, Keansburg vs. Keansburg Water Co.	Yearly rate charged for 8 months' service.	Not within the jurisdiction of Board.
Aug. 20	Esther F. Dean, Bloomfield vs. Erie Railroad Co.	Holding of passenger trains while freight trains pass.	Freight schedule re-arranged so as to eliminate cause for complaint.

Date, 1917.	Name.	Subject.	Disposal.
Aug. 20	Lemuel Cox, Millville vs. Millville Gas Co.	Extension of service in Millville.	Extension made.
Aug. 20	W. D. Lutz, Allendale vs. Erie Railroad Co.	Train service and station facilities at Jersey City.	Train service handicapped on account of troop movements; station facilities adequate.
Aug. 21	H. P. Worster, New York vs. Coast Gas Company	Discontinuance of service on account of non-payment of bill.	Company endeavored to collect bill before expiration of 10 days' period.
Aug. 21	H. Halliday, Mountain View vs. Erie Railroad Co.	Continuous ringing of bell at Boonton Crossing.	Present bell to be replaced with automatic bell.
Aug. 21	Edwin S. Mahoney, Flemington vs. New Jersey Telephone Co.	Extension of service in Flemington.	Extension made.
Aug. 21	Anglesea Supply Company, et als vs. Atlantic City RR. and Central RR. Co. of N. J.	Service provided for shipments of seafood from Wildwood to New York and Philadelphia.	Inspector reported that reasonable service is afforded. Complaint not pressed.
Aug. 22	Amelia F. Emgarth, Palmyra vs. Riverton & Palmyra Water Co.	Charge for service during period house was unoccupied.	Allowance made for 3 months' period.
Aug. 23	Ernest W. Hanson, Roselle vs. Elizabethtown Gas Light Co. and Plainfield-Union Water Co.	Extension of service in Roselle.	Companies unwilling to make extensions. Not pressed.
Aug. 23	Arthur Knauer, Elizabeth vs. Elizabethtown Gas Light Co.	Overcharge for gas in order to make minimum.	Complaint reported without merit.
Aug. 24	John J. Kennedy, Morristown vs. Public Service Gas Co.	Extension of service in Morristown.	Extension made.

INFORMAL COMPLAINTS.

Date, 1917.	Name.	Subject.	Disposal.
Aug. 25	A. Ratkowsky, New York vs. Diamond Spring Water Co.	Charge for water for one year when used only two months.	Not a public utility as defined by statute. No jurisdiction.
Aug. 25	Mrs. Evelyn Stringham, Keansburg vs. Keansburg Water Co.	Extension of service in Keansburg.	Formal proceedings taken.
Aug. 27	Mrs. Lewis Frazee, Keansburg vs. Keansburg Water Co.	Extension of service in Keansburg.	Formal proceedings taken.
Aug. 27	Joseph Ahlers, Newark vs. Public Service Gas Co.	Refusal to supply service.	Company unwilling to make extension. Not pressed.
Aug. 27	Borough of Clayton vs. Clayton-Glassboro Water Co.	Extension of service and fire protection.	Formal proceedings taken.
Aug. 27	Mrs. E. B. Gardner, Keansburg vs. Keansburg Water Co.	Extension of service in Keansburg.	Formal proceedings taken.
Aug. 27	A. J. Surges, Newark vs. Public Service Elec. Co.	Extension of service in Newark.	Service extended; complaint withdrawn.
Aug. 28	J. M. Gellespie, Arlington vs. Public Service Gas Co.	Quality of Gas.	Improvement upon adjustment of appliances.
Aug. 30	H. M. O'Connor, Princeton vs. Public Service Elec. Co.	Extension of service in Princeton.	Extension made.
Aug. 30	Tantum Brothers, Cream Ridge vs. Pemberton & Hightstown RR. Co.	Refusal to place empty cars on siding at Davis.	Negligence of conductor; instructions issued which should eliminate further cause for complaint.
Aug. 30	J. C. Bentley, Elizabeth vs. Plainfield-Union Water Co.	Refusal to pay excessive bill.	Formal proceedings taken.

Date, 1917.	Name.	Subject.	Disposal.
Aug. 30	Mrs. Frank Whitney, Bound Brook vs. Watchung Water Co.	Complaint of excessive charges for service afforded on flat rate basis.	Investigation showed fixtures installed not being used. Recommended same be disconnected.
Aug. 31	J. W. Campbell, Leonia vs. Hackensack Water Co.	Extension of service in Leonia.	Pending.
Aug. 31	Clifton F. Trimble, Westwood vs. Hackensack Water Co.	Extension of service in Westwood.	Pending.
Sept. 1	Arthur E. Brower, Bay Head vs. Bay Head Water Co.	Extension of service in Bay Head.	Extension recommended upon assurance of adequate revenue to cover cost of extension.
Sept. 1	Stengel & Rothchild, Newark vs. Pennsylvania RR. Co.	Rate charged for switching.	Rate charged in accordance with published tariff.
Sept. 1	Wm. LeRoy Robertson, Narberth, Pa. vs. Pennsylvania RR. Co.	Charge of full fare in cash on excursion train.	No merit in complaint.
Sept. 1	C. C. Campbell, Verona vs. Public Service Elec. Co.	Extension of service in Verona	Extension made upon deposit being made with the company.
Sept. 1	W. P. Corbett, New York vs. American Express Co.	Claim for shipment of poultry.	Claim settled.
Sept. 4	A. S. Case, Three Bridges vs. Lehigh Valley Railroad Co.	Excessive charge for feeding horses during transportation and loading.	Refund made.
Sept. 4	Geo. W. Megnin, Allendale vs. Erie Railroad Co.	Paralleling of trains at Allendale station.	Conductor disregarded rules of company preventing paralleling.
Sept. 4	L. R. Alexander, West Hoboken vs. Hackensack Water Co.	Water pressure and costs for installation of service pipe.	Company agreed to install service pipe from main to curb.

INFORMAL COMPLAINTS.

Date, 1917.	Name.	Subject.	Disposal.
Sept. 4	Cape May County Times, Sea Isle City vs. Adams Express Co.	Failure to make prompt deliveries from Ocean City.	Improvement in service after instructions were issued to employees.
Sept. 5	Denes Engelsz, Linden vs. Elizabethtown Water Co.	Extension of service in Linden.	Extension made.
Sept. 6	A. E. Brower, Bay Head vs. Bay Head Water Co.	Extension of mains outside franchise limits.	Recommended company consider exten- sion upon guarantee of annual revenue.
Sept. 6	E. J. Clinton, Jamesburg vs. Public Service Gas Co. and Jamesburg Water Co.	Extension of service in Jamesburg.	Company unwilling to make the exten- sion. Not pressed.
Sept. 6	Benjamin Warren, Princeton vs. Public Service Elec. Co.	Extension of service in Princeton.	Extension made.
Sept. 7	O. K. Crewtain, Keansburg vs. Jersey Central Trac. Co.	Service between Perth Amboy and Red Bank.	Condition complained of unavoidable.
Sept. 7	Patrick Connelly, West Berlin vs. W. J. & S. RR. Co.	Overcharge for fare paid in cash on train.	Refund made to complainant.
Sept. 7	Board of Health of Borough of Wood- lynne vs. General Water Supply Co.	Extension of service in Woodlynne.	Service to be installed upon filing of proper applications with the company.
Sept. 7	Edward S. Griffing, Ashland vs. New Jersey Gas Company	Poor service in Ashland.	New Booster station installed. Service improved.
Sept. 8	Mrs. Max Wurtzel, Perth Amboy vs. Perth Amboy Gas Light Co.	Discontinuance of service threatened upon non-payment of bill.	Pending.

Date, 1917.	Name.	Subject.	Disposal.
Sept. 8	C. Taylor, Matawan vs. N. Y. & L. B. RR. Co.	Delay in delivery of perishable goods.	Delay reported unavoidable; every effort to be made toward prompt delivery of cars.
Sept. 8	Carl Heinle, Dover vs. Central RR. Co. of N. J.	Refusal to accept shipments of milk at Barley on Sundays.	Arrangements made for transportation of milk on Sundays.
Sept. 8	Elvin I. Powell, Palmyra vs. Public Service Elec. Co.	Extension of service in Palmyra.	Company unwilling to make extension. Not pressed.
Sept. 10	Mrs. Josephine Jenks, Ridgefield Park vs. Public Service Elec. Co.	Extension of service in Hackensack.	Company unwilling to make the extension. Not pressed.
Sept. 11	The Paragon Silk Co., Paterson vs. N. Y. S. & W. RR. Co.	Train service for accommodation of silk mill operatives.	Reported inadvisable to change schedule.
Sept. 11	Frank L. Wright, New York vs. Central RR. Co. of N. J.	Rate on shipment of lumber.	Refund made.
Sept. 12	Mrs. Mary J. Williams, Trenton vs. Public Service Elec. Co.	Extension of service in Trenton.	Extension made.
Sept. 12	Albert V. Kershaw, Plainfield vs. Public Service Elec. Co.	Extension of service in Plainfield.	Service installed. Complaint withdrawn.
Sept. 13	P. E. Wardwell, Mizpah vs. Adams Express Co.	Delay in delivery of bread.	Company issued orders for prompt handling of shipments of bread.
Sept. 13	Mrs. L. Henry Cobb, Long Branch vs. Consolidated Gas Co.	Excessive bill.	Allowance made for meter not measuring correctly.
Sept. 13	Frederick E. Anderson, New York City vs. Standard Gas Co.	Service in Freehold.	Pending.

INFORMAL COMPLAINTS.

Date. 1917.	Name.	Subject.	Disposal.
Sept. 14	E. A. Wakefield, Phila., Pa. vs. Public Service Rly. Co.	Condition of tracks and turnouts in Merchantville.	New switch installed and track repaired.
Sept. 14	John Wooley Fish Co., Bradley Beach vs. Adams Express Co.	Service at Bradley Beach.	Inspector recommended collection by company of complainant's shipments in time to reach early train.
Sept. 17	Peter DeMaria, Bogota vs. Public Service Gas Co.	Low pressure at Teaneck.	Satisfactorily adjusted.
Sept. 18	Lawrence W. Rice, Merchantville vs. Del. & Atl. Tel. & Tel. Co.	Refusal to supply direct wire; discontinuance of service on account of non-payment of bill.	Satisfactorily adjusted.
Sept. 18	August Leichty, Clifton vs. Public Service Gas Co.	In re service.	Poor service due to house piping or faulty appliances.
Sept. 20	James L. Garabrant, Newark vs. Central Railroad Co. of New Jersey	Further protection of grade crossing in Kenvil.	Bell to be installed for further protection.
Sept. 20	S. S. Middletown, East Orange vs. Public Service Elec. Co.	Extension of service in East Orange.	Extension will be made upon guarantee of specified annual revenue of \$60.
Sept. 21	S. H. Lovering, Island Heights vs. Adams Express Co.	Delay in delivery of trunk.	Trunk delivered on day of complaint.
Sept. 24	Nell M. Fee, Trenton vs. New Jersey and Pa. Trac. Co.	In re service—operation of cars with flat wheels.	Noise made owing to bad joints in rails which have been repaired.
Sept. 24	Edward L. Miller, et als, Cedar Grove vs. Erie Railroad Co.	Continuance of train No. 533 leaving Jersey City at 5.42 P. M.	Satisfactorily adjusted.
Sept. 25	Barnes Chemical Works, Paterson vs. Central RR. Co.	Transfer of shipments to Erie R. R. instead of D., L. & W. R. R. as requested.	Misrouted through error on part of clerk.

Date. 1917.	Name.	Subject.	Disposal.
Sept. 25	Town of Freehold vs. Monmouth Lighting Co.	In re stringing of high voltage wires through streets of Freehold.	Company to place wires higher and to install automatic protectors.
Sept. 25	L. Bracken, Hoboken vs. Public Service Gas Co.	Extension of service in Hoboken.	Recommended that extension be made when street is in proper condition.
Sept. 25	Half Hour Reading Club, Merchantville vs. Public Service Rly. Co.	Waiting room at Penna. Terminal at Camden.	Waiting car to be established for convenience of passengers.
Sept. 25	Boro of Wenonah vs. New Jersey Gas Co.	Gas escaping from Governor at Wenonah.	New governor installed.
Sept. 27	William Van Horn & Son, Paterson vs. New York, S. & W. RR. Co.	Discontinuance of service for shipment of pork.	Pending.
Sept. 27	K. H. Logue, Ashland vs. New Jersey Gas Co.	Service.	Service improved.
Sept. 28	Pensauken Township Committee vs. Public Service Rly. Co.	Trolley service between Pensauken and Camden; cars turning back before reaching destination.	Superintendent to keep watch that order for no turning back of cars is obeyed.
Sept. 28	Westfield Board of Park Commissioners vs. Public Service Elec. Co.	Extension of service in Westfield for park lighting.	Extension to be made if town bears expense of installing conduit and cable.
Sept. 28	A. Senner, Audubon vs. Public Service Gas Co.	Excessive bill; threat to discontinue service.	Reported no merit in complaint.
Sept. 29	Woodbridge Township vs. Public Service RR. Co.	Additional stop at Green Street between Woodbridge and Iselin stations.	Pending.
Sept. 29	Woodbridge Township vs. Middlesex Water Co.	Extension of service in Fords.	Pending.

INFORMAL COMPLAINTS.

Date, 1917.	Name.	Subject.	Disposal.
Sept. 29	Leon M. Livingston, Plainfield vs. Public Service Gas Co.	Extension of service in Plainfield.	Extension of service to be made.
Oct. 1	William Van Horn & Son, Paterson vs. Pennsylvania RR. Co.	In re delay in delivery of car of potatoes.	Pending.
Oct. 1	William Wright, et als vs. Wharton & Northern RR. Co.	Train service from various points to U. S. Arsenal Government works at Piccatinny.	Arrangement to be made to have Train No. 9 leave on schedule time.
Oct. 2	John McKechnie, Newark vs. Public Service Rly. Co.	Use of transfer at terminal instead of Mulberry Street, Newark.	Employees instructed to announce at intersections what transfers should be made.
Oct. 2	Mrs. Edna B. Bishop, Butler vs. Butler Water Co.	Refusal to supply service on account of disputed bill.	Satisfactorily adjusted.
Oct. 2	G. L. Scharring-Hausen, Newark vs. Public Service Gas Co.	Poor quality of gas.	Poor quality of gas caused by "sticky meter" which was changed.
Oct. 2	Mrs. Peter Voorhees, East Orange vs. Standard Gas Co.	Extension of service in Keansburg.	Service to be installed.
Oct. 3	Clarence H. Brush, Mount Airy, Phila., Pa. vs. Adams Express Co.	Extension of delivery limit beyond 20th Street, Ocean City.	Extension of delivery limit to Twenty-second Street.
Oct. 3	John R. Reardon, Hoboken vs. Public Service Rly. Co.	Congestion at Public Service Terminal on account of but one entrance being open.	Condition due to illness of operator for second entrance.
Oct. 4	General Lead Batteries Co., Newark vs. Public Service Elec. Co.	Power rates.	Rate charged in accordance with schedule filed.

Date. 1917.	Name.	Subject.	Disposal.
Oct. 5	Conover & Matthews, Princeton vs. Pennsylvania RR. Co.	Placing of rail across siding which prevents storage of empty cars.	Arrangements to be made for delivery of but one car at a time.
Oct. 5	Teresa Murray, Hillsdale vs. Hackensack Water Co.	Extension of service in Hillsdale.	Service installed.
Oct. 5	Jas. R. McClyment, Haddon Heights vs. Public Service Elec. Co.	Extension of service in Audubon.	Company unwilling to make extension. Not pressed.
Oct. 6	H. B. Boland, Monmouth Beach vs. Consolidated Gas Co. of N. J.	Excessive bill.	Corrected bill rendered and satisfactory. adjustment made.
Oct. 6	William H. Hesser, New York vs. Central RR. Co. of N. J.	Sidetracking of train No. 374 to allow other trains to pass.	New schedule put into effect and cause for complaint removed.
Oct. 6	S. C. Bougher, Delanco vs. Delaware River Water Co.	Condition of water and poor service.	Company to flush dead ends regularly in accordance with rules of the Board.
Oct. 9	Wm. W. Bauchelle, Newark vs. Public Service Gas Co.	Quality of Gas.	Condition due to "sticky meter" which was removed.
Oct. 9	Mrs. Helen K. Paul, Phila., Pa. vs. City Gas Light Co.	Refusal to return deposit until gas is actually turned off in Ocean City, although house is vacant.	Deposit returned as soon as meter reading was taken.
Oct. 10	James L. Garabrant, Newark vs. Public Service Gas Co.	Quality of gas.	Heating value improved; mantle burners recommended to complainant.
Oct. 10	F. F. Good, New York vs. Public Service Gas Co.	Extension of service in Edgewater, N. J.	Extension to be made.
Oct. 10	J. J. Drasba, Jersey City vs. Public Service Rly Co.	No destination sign on Newark-Jersey City car; no transfer issued for continuous journey.	Crew disobeyed orders in turning back without discharging passengers to a follow up car; crew reprimanded.

INFORMAL COMPLAINTS

Date, 1917.	Name.	Subject.	Disposal.
Oct. 10	F. B. Moore, Trenton vs. Dela. & Atl. Tele. & Tele. Co.	Extension of service in Trenton and Ewing Township.	Company willing to make extension upon granting of right of way by property owner.
Oct. 10	M. W. Dalrymple, Carteret vs. American Express Co.	Claim for goods damaged in transit.	Claim settled.
Oct. 11	Karl A. Suelke, Phila., Pa. vs. Cape May Light & Power Co.	Rate charged for service used in moving picture theatre.	Rate charged in accordance with schedule filed with Board.
Oct. 11	Glassboro Township Committee vs. New Jersey Gas Co.	Excessive smoke and soot from manufacture of gas at plant.	Not within the jurisdiction of the Board.
Oct. 11	Milton Lake Manor Co. vs. Public Service Elec. Co.	Extension of service in Rahway.	Company unwilling to extend service.
Oct. 11	Jos. Kleinberg, Hoboken vs. New York Tele. Co.	Extension of service and installation of public telephone in cafe in Hoboken.	Company unwilling to install public telephone.
Oct. 13	Interboro Realty Co. vs. Collingswood Sewerage Co.	Extension of service in Collingswood.	Pending.
Oct. 15	Charles N. Pelonze, Camden vs. West Jersey and Seashore RR. Co.	Passenger train service between Medford and Mt. Holly.	Service improved.
Oct. 15	B. Topinka, New York City vs. Public Service Elec. Co.	Extension of service in Cranford.	Extension to be made.
Oct. 16	Henry Kraan, Westville vs. Westville & Newbold Water Co.	Lowering of service pipes to prevent freezing in winter.	Company agrees to lower pipes to curb line.
Oct. 16	C. Hungerford, Ocean City vs. Adams Express Co.	Extension of delivery service.	Delivery limit extended to Twenty-second Street.

Date. 1917.	Name.	Subject.	Disposal.
Oct. 17	David Glick, Laurel Springs vs. Clementon Springs Water Co.	Discrimination in charge for guarantee made on extension of service.	Charge discontinued.
Oct. 18	E. J. Johnson, et als., Freehold, N. J. vs. Monmouth Lighting Co.	Extension of service in Freehold.	Service installed.
Oct. 19	Dr. George Car, by W. W. Price, Newark vs. Public Service Elec. Co.	Rate charged for X-ray apparatus.	Complaint satisfactorily adjusted.
Oct. 19	Henry Rose, Bergenfield vs. Public Service Elec. Co.	Extension of service in Bergenfield.	Service installed.
Oct. 19	Joseph Beck Tyler, Camden vs. Riverton & Palmyra Water Co.	Rate charged for service. Metered service refused.	Rate filed for metered service and agreement by company to install meters to domestic consumers.
Oct. 20	Beach Arlington Improvement Assoc. vs. Penna. R. R. Co.	Station wanted at Beach Arlington.	Company unwilling to establish station. Not pressed.
Oct. 20	James G. Sigafos, Phillipsburg vs. Penna. Utilities Co.	Extension of service in Phillipsburg.	Transferred to formal complaint.
Oct. 20	Thomas F. Mullins, Jersey City vs. Public Service Elec. Co.	Excessive bill.	Ground found in wiring. Allowance made by company.
Oct. 22	Borough of Clayton vs. West Jersey and Seashore Railroad Co.	Further protection of crossing at Clayton Avenue, Clayton.	Flagman placed at crossing.
Oct. 22	J. M. Schwerin, Hoboken vs. Public Service Elec. Co.	Non-payment of bill for service rendered during period house was closed and notice given to disconnect service.	Charge cancelled.

INFORMAL COMPLAINTS.

Date. 1917.	Name.	Subject.	Disposal.
Oct. 22	Gustave Leimbacher, Paterson vs. Public Service Gas Co.	Bill rendered for shortage on prepayment meter after payments were deposited in meter.	Satisfactorily adjusted.
Oct. 23	John Clyner, Camden vs. Public Service Gas Co.	Extension of service in Camden.	Company unwilling to make extension. Not pressed.
Oct. 23	Jane Roberts, Newark vs. Public Service Gas Co.	Quality of gas poor.	Poor quality of gas caused by "sticky meter" which was removed.
Oct. 23	William H. Fisher, Toms River vs. Penna. R. R. Co.	Curtailment of train service between Toms River and Trenton in the forenoon.	Service re-established.
Oct. 23	Asbury Park Chamber of Commerce vs. Atlantic Coast Elec. Lt. Co.	Refusal to supply current for street lighting.	Complaint withdrawn.
Oct. 24	Union County Board of Chosen Freeholders vs. Rahway Valley R. R. Co.	Planking at Westfield Ave. crossing, Roselle Park.	Pending.
Oct. 25	Charing L. Tricker, Arlington vs. Public Service Gas Co. and Public Service Elec. Co.	Extension of service in Arlington.	Electric service established. Company unwilling to make gas extension. Not pressed.
Oct. 25	Frank C. Clark, Ridgefield Park vs. New York Central R. R. Co.	No sale of tickets at Little Ferry Station after closing of station at 7 P. M.	Arrangements made for sale of tickets for all trains leaving station.
Oct. 25	Harrisons, Inc., Phila., Pa. vs. Penna. R. R. Co. and Lehigh Valley R. R. Co.	Claim for overcharge for switching cars of lead between points in Newark.	Pending.
Oct. 26	A. E. Williams, Dumont vs. West Shore R. R. Co.	Protection of grade crossings at Madison Ave. and Maple Ave., Dumont.	Pending.

Date, 1917.	Name.	Subject.	Disposal.
Oct. 27	Board of Education of Morristown vs. Proprietors of Morris Aqueduct	Discontinuance of service to school building upon non-payment of bill.	Satisfactorily adjusted.
Oct. 27	P. C. Doyle, Millville vs. Millville Gas Lt. Co.	Poor quality of gas.	Formal proceedings held.
Oct. 27	Alfred Borden, N. Y. City vs. New York Tele. Co.	Refusal to discontinue connection with certain numbers designated by complainant.	Company unwilling to establish special operator service. Not pressed.
Oct. 29	George W. Harrold, Haddon Heights vs. Public Service Elec. Co.	Extension of service in Haddon Heights.	Extension made.
Oct. 29	Helen E. Bodwell, East Orange vs. Adams Express Co.	Claim for shipment of goods shipped from Andover, Mass., to East Orange.	Not within the jurisdiction of the Board.
Oct. 30	Harry Yeager, Phila., Pa. vs. Electric Co. of N. J.	Refusal to return deposit when service was disconnected.	Deposit returned.
Oct. 30	Walter M. Fowler, Dunellen vs. Watchung Water Co.	Refusal to supply metered service.	Company unwilling to supply meter. Not pressed.
Nov. 1	E. L. Hedenberg, Cranford vs. P. S. Elec. Co.	Extension of service in Cranford.	Extension made.
Nov. 1	Alexander John, Palisades Park vs. Public Service Gas Co.	Discontinuance of service.	Pending.
Nov. 1	Mrs. L. Dawson, Haddon Heights vs. Public Service Elec. Co.	Extension of service in Audubon.	Company unwilling to make the extension. Not pressed.
Nov. 2	Jos. Stokes Rubber Co., Trenton vs. Public Service Elec. Co.	Rate for power service under coal clause.	Pending.

INFORMAL COMPLAINTS.

Date, 1917.	Name.	Subject.	Disposal.
Nov. 3	C. Keeler Gifford, Paulsboro vs. W. J. & S. R. R. Co.	Stational facilities at Penns Grove and Paulsboro. Poorly lighted and not heated well.	Electric lights being installed and station well heated on day of inspection.
Nov. 3	Joseph M. Rowland, Ocean City vs. Ocean City Sewer Co.	Charge for service at stores and picture theatre which are not connected to main.	Pending.
Nov. 5	W. K. Blodgett, Point Pleasant vs. Pennsylvania R. R. Co.	Train service and stational facilities at Sea Girt Junction.	Satisfactorily adjusted.
Nov. 5	Bell Locomotive Works, Inc., Lincoln vs. American Express Co.	Collection and delivery service in Lincoln.	Pending.
Nov. 5	E. S. Williamson, Haddon Heights vs. New Jersey Water Service Co.	Removal of meter owned by complainant and installation of company's meter without allowance to complainant.	Pending.
Nov. 5	Pemberton Township Board of Education, et als. vs. Penna. R. R. Co.	Curtaillment of train service at South Pemberton.	Condition made necessary on account of war.
Nov. 7	Rev. Francis Gross, Perth Amboy vs. Perth Amboy Gas Light Co.	Threat to discontinue service on account of non-payment of disputed bill.	Matter adjusted satisfactorily.
Nov. 7	P. S. Weir, Asbury Park vs. Atlantic Coast Electric Ry. Co.	No heat in cars.	Cars to be heated.
Nov. 7	J. C. Brescher, Haddon Heights vs. Public Service Elec. Co.	Extension of service in Haddon Heights.	Extension to be made.
Nov. 7	J. R. DeMott, Paterson vs. Erie Railroad Company	Claim for shortage in shipment.	Interstate movement not within jurisdiction of the Board.

Date, 1917.	Name.	Subject.	Disposal.
Nov. 7	A. Hess, Audubon vs. Public Service Elec. Co.	Extension of service in Audubon.	Extension to be made.
Nov. 8	Cornelius A. Foust, Mullica Hill vs. Harrison Heights Improvement Co.	Poor service and low pressure.	Company to install recording pressure gauge to improve the service.
Nov. 8	Mrs. Louisa Baker, Guttenberg vs. Public Service Gas. Co.	Change in service pipe.	Change made after unavoidable delay.
Nov. 9	R. Lehman, Jersey City vs. Public Service Gas Co.	Excessive bills.	Pending.
Nov. 9	Francis Leon Chrisman, Verona vs. Wells Fargo Express Co.	Extension of delivery service to Verona.	Not enough business to warrant maintaining agency at Verona.
Nov. 10	Young Apartment House Co. vs. P. S. Elec. Co.	Extension of service in Trenton.	Service installed.
Nov. 10	August Thiel, Guttenberg vs. Hackensack Water Co.	Excessive bill.	Satisfactorily adjusted.
Nov. 10	W. C. Spring, Glen Ridge vs. Public Service Elec. Co.	Monthly minimum rate.	Pending.
Nov. 12	Henry A. Cohendet, Jersey City vs. Public Service Elec. Co.	Refusal to inspect electric meter which was registering fast.	Pending.
Nov. 12	C. S. Jenks, N. Y. City vs. Jersey Central Trac. Co.	Service between Matawan and Keyport.	Pending.
Nov. 12	Mrs. John Tully, Chrome vs. American Express Co.	Delay in settlement of claim.	Settlement made in accordance with contract on receipt.

INFORMAL COMPLAINTS.

Date, 1917.	Name.	Subject.	Disposal.
Nov. 12	Jaenecke-Ault Co., Newark vs. Central R. R. Co. of N. J.	Demurrage charged on registration day.	Registration day not a legal holiday.
Nov. 13	Board of Chosen Freeholders of County of Burlington vs. Penna. R. R. Co.	Further protection at Shinn's crossing, Columbus.	Flagman to be stationed at crossing.
Nov. 14	Burrough V. Angelow, Berlin vs. Phila. & Reading Rly. Co.	Protection of crossing at Williamstown Junction.	Pending.
Nov. 14	Haworth Fire Co. and Mayor and Coun- cil of Boro of Haworth vs. Hackensack Water Co.	Change of fire hose connections on fire hydrant in Boro. of Haworth.	Connections to be changed in compliance with complainants' request.
Nov. 14	Fort Lee, Mayor and Council of vs. Public Service Rly. Co.	No heat in cars on the Palisade line.	Cars to be heated.
Nov. 16	Woolwich Water Co. vs. Electric Co. of N. J.	Threat to discontinue service on account of non-payment of bill pending settle- ment of claim.	Complaint reported without merit.
Nov. 16	Howard K. Strickler, Phila., Pa. vs. Public Service Rly. Co.	Service on Haddon Ave. line in Collings- wood.	Pending.
Nov. 17	Peter Smith, Long Branch vs. Central R. R. Co. of N. J.	Stational facilities at Highland Beach.	Additional facilities afforded.
Nov. 19	Marie B. Griffin, East Orange vs. Public Service Gas Co.	Gas pressure.	Test shows that gas pressure is in ac- cordance with rules of Board.
Nov. 19	Albert E. Scheffen, et als., Camden vs. Public Service Rly. Co.	Trolley service on Westfield-Pensauken line.	Pending.

Date. 1917.	Name.	Subject.	Disposal.
Nov. 19	W. T. Welch, Camden vs. Public Service Gas Co.	Excessive bill.	Meter test by company shows correct registration.
Nov. 20	Harry Kohn, Plainfield vs. Plainfield-Union Water Co.	Refusal to return deposit paid on water meters.	Recommended that deposit be returned upon establishment of credit.
Nov. 20	Edward H. Cutler, Collingswood vs. Public Service Gas Co. and P. S. Elec. Co.	Extension of services in Collingswood.	Formal proceedings taken.
Nov. 21	Wm. L. Dill, Trenton vs. Pemberton & Hightstown R. R. Co.	Further protection of Pointville Crossing at Wrightstown.	Pending.
Nov. 21	F. E. Gibble, Dunnfield vs. New York, Susquehanna and Western R. R. Co.	Charge for maintaining light at switch for siding.	Pending.
Nov. 21	Borough of Elmer vs. Dowler Sign Co. of Vineland	Removal of advertising sign at Front St. Crossing, Elmer.	Pending.
Nov. 21	Margaretta V. Landmann, Prospect Plains vs. Penna. R. R. Co.	Entrance to Jamesburg station being through porch of hotel where bar room opens.	Pending.
Nov. 22	Alfred Woolley, Matawan vs. Penn. RR. Co.	Excessive rates on milk shipments.	Pending.
Nov. 22	Edward A. Bennett, Swedesboro vs. Electric Co. of N. J.	Extension of service in Swedesboro.	Extension made upon guarantee of specified annual revenue.
Nov. 23	Mrs. Margaret Anthony, New Brunswick vs. Public Service Elec. Co.	Extension of service in Highland Park.	Extension made.

INFORMAL COMPLAINTS.

Date. 1917.	Name.	Subject.	Disposal.
Nov. 23	George C. Martin, Asbury Park vs. Atlantic Coast Electric Lt. Co.	Removal of meter from premises with- out notice.	Error on part of company.
Nov. 23	Borough of Cliffside Park vs. Hackensack Water Co.	Extension of service for fire hydrant and rate charged for same.	Extension to be made upon guarantee of specified annual revenue.
Nov. 24	Ira Apgar, Cranford vs. Public Service Elec. Co.	Extension of service in Cranford.	Extension made.
Nov. 24	Frank Russo, Trenton vs. Public Service Elec. Co.	Extension of service in Trenton.	Extension made.
Nov. 26	Philander Betts, Washington, D. C. vs. Pennsylvania R. R. Co.	Sparks emitting from locomotives at Camp Dix.	Pending.
Nov. 26	W. I. Runcie, Maplewood vs. Public Service Gas Co.	Service.	Test shows pressure within the limits prescribed by Board.
Nov. 26	Freehold Chamber of Commerce vs. Standard Gas Co.	Service in Freehold.	Pending.
Nov. 27	Roxbury Township Committee vs. New Jersey Power & Light Co.	Extension of service through Succasunna and Ledgewood to Roxbury Township.	Formal proceedings taken.
Nov. 27	Alfred H. Porter, New York vs. New York Telephone Co.	City rates charged for service in Rum- son.	Pending.
Nov. 30	L. C. Case, Jr., Trenton vs. Public Service Gas Co.	Extension of service in Trenton.	Extension to be made upon agreement of five year deposit plan.
Nov. 30	Central Trust Co., Camden vs. Sewell Water Co.	Service.	Pending.

Date, 1917.	Name.	Subject.	Disposal.
Dec. 1	C. E. Denman, Belford vs. Jersey Central Traction Co.	Overcrowded cars between Keyport and Atlantic Highlands.	Pending.
Dec. 1	Borough Council of Bogota vs. Public Service Elec. Co.	Service.	Pending.
Dec. 3	Anna Griffith, Jersey City vs. Public Service Gas Co.	Discontinuance of gas on account of non-payment of disputed electric bill.	Error made in transferring account. Satisfactorily adjusted.
Dec. 3	Adam Henzi, Union Hill vs. Hackensack Water Co.	Excessive bills.	Reported no merit in complaint.
Dec. 3	A. P. Richardson, New York vs. Lakewood and Coast Elec. Co.	Excessive bill.	Charge made in accordance with rates filed.
Dec. 3	L. R. Carhart, et al., Phillipsburg vs. Eastern Pa. Power Co.	Extension of service in Phillipsburg.	Formal proceedings taken.
Dec. 3	Fred K. Straub, New York vs. Hackensack Water Co.	Removal of meter box from existing location.	Matter appeared to be one involving individual property right. Not within the Board's jurisdiction.
Dec. 4	Board of Chosen Freeholders of County of Gloucester vs. Phila. & Reading Rly. Co.	Protection of crossing at south end of Glassboro.	Pending.
Dec. 4	Clarence G. Stout, et als., Phillipsburg vs. Pennsylvania Utilities Co.	Extension of service in Phillipsburg.	Formal proceedings taken
Dec. 4	Ludwig Karl Hille, Hasbrouck Heights vs. Hackensack Water Co.	Continued payment of guarantee for extension after company lays main in street.	Charge correct.

INFORMAL COMPLAINTS.

Date, 1917.	Name.	Subject.	Disposal.
Dec. 5	Williamstown Grange vs. New Jersey Gas Co.	Excessive bill.	Pending.
Dec. 5	W. E. Blythe, Newark vs. Public Service Rly. Co.	Issuance of a transfer on a transfer.	Pending.
Dec. 5	Pauline I. Keller, Phila., Pa. vs. Penna. R. R. Co.	Refusal to allow \$200 on claim for suitcase lost in transit which was checked on tickets with paying special valuation fee.	Pending.
Dec. 6	Charles H. Nicoll, Jersey City vs. New York Tele. Co.	Rate for extension telephone service.	Pending.
Dec. 6	Joseph Rusciano, New Brunswick vs. Public Service Gas Co.	Extension of service in New Brunswick.	Pending.
Dec. 6	Board of Education of Township of Shrewsbury vs. Monmouth County Elec. Co.	Re-establishment of 20 minute service between Red Bank and Long Branch.	Pending.
Dec. 6	Charles Hersey, New York vs. Long Branch Sewer Co.	Small mains; unsanitary mains.	Pending.
Dec. 6	William H. Bartholomew, Haddon Heights vs. N. J. Water Service Co.	Increase in minimum rate and change of privately owned meters to meters owned by company.	Pending.
Dec. 6	Roxbury Township Board of Education, Succasunna vs. New Jersey Power & Light Co.	Extension of service for school purposes.	Formal hearing held.
Dec. 7	Elizabeth I. Weaver, Jersey City vs. New York Telephone Co.	Discontinuance of service on account of non-payment of disputed bill.	Satisfactorily adjusted.

Date, 1917.	Name.	Subject.	Disposal.
Dec. 8	Mrs. T. Miller, Collingswood vs. Public Service Elec. Co.	Extension of service in Collingswood.	Formal hearing held.
Dec. 10	Dr. M. F. Graver, Trenton vs. Penna. R. R. Co.	Stopping of 5:56 train at Lower James- burg Station.	Pending.
Dec. 10	W. H. C. Lee, Florida vs. United Water Supply Co.	Charge made for repairs to service main.	Pending.
Dec. 10	F. C. Clark, Ridgefield Park vs. West Shore R. R. Co.	Stational facilities at Little Ferry.	Pending.
Dec. 11	George Veghte, Plainfield vs. Plainfield-Union Water Co.	Excessive bill.	Pending.
Dec. 12	J. H. Hartmeier, Paterson vs. Public Service Elec. Co.	Extension of service in Paterson.	Pending.
Dec. 12	W. S. Picken, Pedricktown vs. Electric Co. of N. J.	Extension of service in Pedricktown.	Service afforded.
Dec. 12	Snyder's, Inc., Newark vs. Public Service Elec. Co.	Separate rate charged for two stores.	Rate charged in accordance with rules.
Dec. 12	Borough Council of Bloomsbury vs. Central R. R. Co. of N. J.	Continuous ringing of gong at crossing and removal of same.	Pending.
Dec. 13	Board of Health of Morristown vs. Morristown & Erie Railroad Co.	Further protection of Abbott Avenue crossing in Morristown.	Pending.
Dec. 13	Charles N. King, Jersey City vs. Public Service Rly. Co.	Heating of cars in Jersey City.	Pending.

INFORMAL COMPLAINTS.

Date. 1917.	Name.	Subject.	Disposal.
Dec. 13	M. E. Chalmers, Rutherford vs. Public Service Rly. Co.	Issuance of transfers.	Recommended that no transfers be issued as repairs to be completed in few days.
Dec. 13	A. and M. Karagheusian, Freehold vs. Central R. R. Co. of N. J. and P. R. R. Co.	Embargo on shipment of rugs.	Satisfactorily adjusted.
Dec. 13	Daniel Brooks, et als., Rockaway vs. Morris County Traction Co.	Service between Boonton and Dover.	Pending.
Dec. 14	Edward G. Pringle, New York City vs. Commonwealth Water Co.	Deposit required for service connection.	Satisfactorily adjusted.
Dec. 14	Central Commercial and Manual Training High School, Newark vs. P. S. Ry. Co.	Refusal to accept school tickets before 8 o'clock in the morning.	Complaint reported not warranted.
Dec. 14	A. Livingstone, Pennsgrove vs. New Jersey Gas Company	Poor service.	Pending.
Dec. 14	J. H. Neill, Jersey City vs. Central R. R. Co. of N. J.	Train service between Newark and New York.	Pending.
Dec. 15	George Kunz, New York City vs. Public Service Rly. Co.	Fort Lee trolleys not making connections with ferry.	Pending.
Dec. 15	E. A. Schwerdtle, Jersey City vs. Public Service Gas Co.	Notice of discontinuance of service while company held deposit.	Pending.
Dec. 17	Board of Commissioners of Nutley vs. Public Service Rly. Co.	Trolley service between Belleville and Nutley.	Pending.

Date. 1917.	Name.	Subject.	Disposal.
Dec. 17	Mrs. J. J. Knodell, Highlands vs. Monmouth Lighting Co.	Excessive bills.	Pending.
Dec. 17	L. G. Robinson, Clayton vs. Electric Company of N. J.	Extension of service in Clayton.	Pending.
Dec. 18	Harold W. Taylor, Highwood vs. Public Service Gas Co.	Excessive bill.	Pending.
Dec. 18	G. E. Ryder, Leonia vs. Hackensack Water Co.	Change in pressure necessitating change in service pipe or installation of re- ducing valve.	Pending.
Dec. 18	Joseph F. Lynch, Westmont vs. Public Service Elec. Co.	Extension of service in Westmont.	Pending.
Dec. 18	A. Chlebnikow, Paterson vs. Passaic Water Co.	Excessive bill.	Pending.
Dec. 19	W. W. Bird, Great Meadows vs. Knickerbocker Ice Co.	Refusal to pay bill on account of de- murrage charge by Central R. R. Co.	Pending.
Dec. 20	H. W. Peapack, Jr., Cape May vs. West Jersey & Seashore R. R. Co. and Atlantic City R. R. Co.	Switching charge.	Pending.
Dec. 20	John W. Connolly, West Orange vs. Erie Railroad Co.	Station at West Orange closed at night.	Pending.
Dec. 20	M. K. Thornton, Jr., Dover vs. Wharton & Northern R. R. Co.	Passenger train service.	Pending.

INFORMAL COMPLAINTS.

Date, 1917.	Name.	Subject.	Disposal.
Dec. 21	Clarence E. Tasher, New York City vs. Elizabethtown Gas Light Co.	Refusal to allow discount.	Pending.
Dec. 22	Beattie Mfg. Co., et als., Little Falls vs. Public Service Rly. Co.	Trolley service between Little Falls and Paterson.	Pending.
Dec. 24	William C. Finck, Elizabeth vs. Public Service Elec. Co.	Extension of service in Elizabeth.	Pending.
Dec. 24	Howard A. Smith, Newfield vs. Penna. R. R. Co.	Overweight charged on carloads of manure.	Pending.
Dec. 27	Percival Wilds, New York City vs. D., L. & W. RR. Co.	Collection of war tax on return trip tickets costing 45 cents.	Pending.
Dec. 27	M. F. Gano, Plainfield vs. Plainfield-Union Water Co.	Refusal to make service connection.	Pending.
Dec. 28	Emerson C. Eachel, Trenton vs. Public Service Rly. Co.	Danger signal or light placed where trolley tracks leave highway.	Pending.
Dec. 28	Harry Christianson, Plainfield vs. Public Service Rly. Co.	Trolley service on Bayway-Elizabeth line.	Pending.
Dec. 29	Wm. D. Martin, Hasbrouck Hts. vs. Hackensack Water Co.	Charge for setting meter.	Pending.
Dec. 29	Hyatt Roller Bearing Co., Newark vs. Penna. R. R. Co.	Clearance required between fence around plant and rail of R. R. Co.	Pending.
Dec. 29	Haworth Fire Department vs. Hackensack Water Co.	Pressure on water mains.	Pending.

Date. 1917.	Name.	Subject.	Disposal.
Dec. 29	William A. Grace, Jersey City vs. Public Service Rly. Co.	Service on Jackson line.	Pending.
Dec. 29	Allen St. Clair, Oaklyn vs. Public Service Gas Co. and New Jersey Water Service Co.	Extension of service in Oaklyn; charge for water service connection.	Pending.
Dec. 29	H. Strimpler, Audubon vs. P. S. Elec. Co.	Extension of service in Audubon.	Pending.
Dec. 29	Kenilworth Board of Trade vs. D., L. & W. R. R. Co. and R. V. R. R. Co.	Connection of two companies' tracks at Summit.	Pending.
Dec. 31	Irvington Varnish & Insulator Co. vs. P. S. Elec. Co.	Refusal to supply additional power.	Pending.

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

Applications for Approval of Mortgages and Issues of Bonds and Stock

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

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.

Date of Approval. (1917)	Name of Applicant.	Amount and Kind of Security Approved.	Purpose of Issue and Remarks.
Jan. 9.	Atlantic City Electric Co.,	\$137,000 first & refunding mtge. bonds,	To be issued for the purpose of reimbursing the company for construction expenditures made in prior years.
Jan. 9.	Hudson & Manhattan R. R. Co.,		For amendment of certificate granted by the Board in 1915, approving the issue of \$615,500 first lien and refunding mortgage bonds, by extending date for the issuance thereof to June 30, 1917.
Jan. 16.	New Jersey Power & Light Co.,		For approval of transfer on its books of \$161,000 cumulative preferred and \$123,800 common stock to General Gas & Electric Co.
Feb. 6.	New Jersey Water Service Co.,		For approval of transfer on its books of 191 shares of its capital stock to the Eastern Light & Fuel Co.
Feb. 6.	New Jersey Water Service Co.,		For approval of sale and transfer of capital stock scrip in the amount of \$37.50.
Feb. 7.	Wharton & Northern R. R. Co.,		For approval of transfer on its books of 4,978 shares of its capital stock from the Wharton Steel Co. to J. Leonard Replogle.
Feb. 27.	Bergen Aqueduct Co., ..	4,000 first mtge. bonds,	To be issued for the purpose of reimbursing the company for construction expenditures already made and to provide additional funds for completing work in progress or about to be undertaken.

Date of Approval. (1917)	Name of Applicant.	Amount and Kind of Security Approved.	Purpose of Issue and Remarks.
Mar. 13,	Gas & Electric Co. of Bergen County,.....	\$500,000 general mtge. 5% gold bonds,	To be issued for the purpose of reimbursing the lessee, Public Service Electric Co., for additions and betterments made to the lessor's property in prior years.
Mar. 20,	Haddonfield Rural Tel. Co.,	1,040 capital stock,	To be issued for purchase of telephone plant of an unincorporated company of the same name.
Mar. 21,	Erie Railroad Co.,.....	15,000,000 two-year 5% gold notes, A	certificate in this matter was granted by the Board, specifying in detail the purposes of the issue and containing several provisions in regard thereto, which is given in full at the end of this section.
Mar. 27,	Electric Co. of New Jersey,		For approval of a \$5,000,000 mortgage dated February 15, 1917, to Commercial Trust Co., Trustee.
Mar. 27,	Electric Co. of New Jersey,	319,000 first mtge. 5% gold bonds,	To be issued for the purpose of refunding all outstanding funded debt heretofore issued, including that of constituent companies and \$20,303 outstanding judgment against the property of the Clementon Tp. U. E. I. Co.
Apr. 2,	Public Service Railway Co.,	2,000,000 capital stock,	To be issued for the purpose of reimbursing the company for construction expenditures already made and to provide additional funds for completing work in progress or about to be undertaken.
Apr. 4,	New York Bay R. R. Co.,	960,000 first mtge. 4% bonds, ..	To be issued for the purpose of repaying advances from the Pennsylvania R. R. Co. for additions and betterments to the applicant's property.
Apr. 4,	Standard Gas Co.,.....	12,000 first mtge. 5% bonds, ..	To be issued at not less than 88½ for the purpose of reimbursing the company for construction expenditures already made. The application was for the approval of bonds in the amount of \$17,949, in lieu of which the Board approved the issue of \$12,000.
Apr. 4,	West Monmouth Water Co.,		For approval of a \$100,000 mortgage dated July 1st, 1917, to American Trust Co., trustee.
Apr. 4,	West Monmouth Water Co.,	12,000 first mtge. 6% bonds, 4,000 capital stock,	Both issues to be made for the purpose of reimbursing the company for construction expenditures already made.

Date of Approval. (1917)	Name of Applicant.	Amount and Kind of Security Approved.	Purpose of Issue and Remarks.
Apr. 10,	Pennsylvania R. R. Co.	\$60,000,000 general mtge. bonds,	To be issued at not less than 94½ for the purpose of reimbursing the company for the following capital expenditures, in part already made and in part to be made: \$2,472,120 acquisition of capital stock of subsidiary company; \$862,000 redemption of bonds of a constituent company; \$6,723,862 of maturing equipment obligations; \$51,792,700 of net additions and betterments to road and equipment.
Apr. 17,	Commonwealth Electric Co.,	60,000 certificates of indebtedness,	
		15,000 capital stock,	Both issues to be made at par for the purpose of reimbursing the company for construction expenditures already made.
May 1,	Trenton & Mercer County Trac. Corp.,	66,000 equipment trust (5%) notes,	To be issued under terms of an equipment agreement of conditional sale dated August 1, 1917, by and between Edward C. Stokes and the applicant for the purchase of ten electric passenger cars.
May 1,	Warren Woodworking Co.,	25,000 second mtge. bonds,	To be issued at par for the purpose of retiring \$18,000 floating indebtedness, and to provide additional working capital.
May 9,	Black River Power Co.,	1,000 capital stock,	To be issued for organization purposes.
May 15,	Ocean City Sewer Co.,	11,000 first mtge. bonds,	To be issued at 83½ for the purpose of providing funds to enable the company to make additions to its plant and equipment.
May 15,	West Wildwood Water & Power Co.,	3,900 capital stock,	To be issued for the purpose of reimbursing the company for construction expenditures already made. The application was for the approval of \$6,000 capital stock, in lieu of which the Board approved \$3,900 thereof.
May 15,	Public Service Railway Co.,	880,000 equipment trust (5%) certificates, Series D.	To be issued under the terms of an equipment trust agreement between Arthur E. Newbold of the city of Philadelphia and the applicant for the purchase of additional equipment.
May 22,	Lambertville Public Service Co.,		For approval of a \$1,000,000 mortgage dated February 1, 1917, to Logan Trust Co. of Philadelphia, trustee.
May 22,	Lambertville Public Service Co.,	80,000 mtge. bonds,	To be issued at par under the above mentioned mortgage for the purpose of retiring a like amount of outstanding bonds of the Lambertville Ht., Lt. & Fr. Co.
May 28,	Jersey Central Traction Co.,		For approval of a \$5,000,000 mortgage dated March 1, 1917, to Commercial Trust Co., trustee.

MORTGAGES, STOCKS AND BONDS.

Date of Approval. (1917)	Name of Applicant.	Amount and Kind of Security Approved.	Purpose of Issue and Remarks.
May 28, ..	Jersey Central Traction Co.,	\$800,000 mtge. bonds, 600,000 preferred stock, 531,400 common stock,	All issues to be made under a merger agreement approved by the Board on this date for the purpose of retiring all outstanding securities heretofore issued by the old Jersey Central Traction Co. The application was for the approval of an issue of \$1,000,000 capital stock, in lieu of which the Board approved the issue of \$531,400.
May 28, ..	Monmouth Lighting Co.	440,000 mtge. bonds, 267,000 capital stock,	Both issues for the purpose of acquiring the property of the Middlesex & Monmouth E. L., H. & P. Co., as provided for in merger agreement approved by the Board on this date.
May 28, ..	New York Central R. R. Co.,	10,000,000 refunding & Improvement 4½% mtge. bonds,	A certificate in this matter was granted by the Board, specifying in detail the purposes of the issue and containing several provisions in regard thereto, which is given in full at the end of this section.
May 29, ..	Jersey Central Traction Co.,		For approval of transfer on its books of 5,314 shares of its capital stock to the American Railways Co.
May 29, ..	Monmouth Lighting Co.		For approval of transfer on its books of 3,050 shares of its capital stock to the American Railways Co.
May 29, ..	Commonwealth Water Co.,	55,000 certificates of indebtedness, 20,000 capital stock,	Both issues at par for the purpose of reimbursing the company for construction expenditures already made.
May 29, ..	New York Central R. R. Co.,	70,000,000 consolidation mtge. 4% gold bonds, Series A.,	A certificate in this matter was granted by the Board, specifying in detail the purposes of the issue and containing several provisions in regard thereto, which is given in full at the end of this section.
June 12, ..	Hillcrest Water Co.,		For approval of \$150,000 mortgage dated May 1, 1917, to Fidelity Trust Co., trustee.
June 18, ..	West Wildwood Water & Power Co.,		For approval of \$20,000 mortgage dated May 1, 1917, to Broadway Trust Co., trustee.
June 18, ..	West Wildwood Water & Power Co.,	3,400 first mtge. bonds,	To be issued at 80 for the purpose of reimbursing the company for construction expenditures already made. The application was for the approval of \$3,750 bonds, in lieu of which the Board approved \$3,437.50.

Date of Approval (1917)	Name of Applicant.	Amount and Kind of Security Approved.	Purpose of Issue and Remarks.
June 19,	Raritan River R. R. Co.,	\$200,000 capital stock,	To be issued for the purpose of reimbursing the company for construction expenditures already made and to provide additional funds for completing work in progress or about to be undertaken.
June 19,	Hillcrest Water Co.,	93,000 mtge. bonds,	To be issued under the mortgage approved by the Board under date of June 12, 1917, and in accordance with a report rendered by the Board in this matter, which is given in full at the end of this section.
June 26,	Middlesex Water Co.,	200,000 consolidated mortgage bonds,	To be issued at not less than 95 for the purpose of refunding a like amount of first mortgage bonds.
July 3,	Lehigh & New England R. R. Co.,	1,491,000 capital stock,	To be issued for the purpose of reimbursing the company for construction expenditures already made, and to provide additional funds for work in progress or about to be undertaken.
July 6,	Easton Gas Works,		For approval of \$1,000,000 mortgage dated July 1, 1910, revised January 24, 1912, to Girard Trust Co., trustee.
July 6,	Easton Gas Works,	385,000 first consolidated 5% gold bonds,	To be issued for the purpose of refunding \$305,000 bonds of the Delaware Gas Light Co. and \$80,000 bonds of the Peoples Lt., Ht. & Pr. Co. Approval of this issue was granted upon condition that the deficit of \$123,125 referred to in the Board report under date of June 26, 1917, be written off from the company's fixed capital and set up in a suspense account to be amortized during the period from July 1, 1917, to the date when the bonds mature, in the same manner as the Board has prescribed for debt discount and expense.
July 6,	Easton Gas Works,	269,400 common stock, 200,000 preferred stock, 149,000 first consolidated 5% gold bonds,	All these securities had been previously issued without the approval of the Board, which rendered a report on this matter under date of June 26, 1917, which report is given in full at the end of this section. Approval was given to these issues upon condition that the deficit of \$123,125 referred to in that report be written off from the company's fixed capital and set up in a suspense account to be amortized during the period from July 1, 1917, to the date when the bonds mature, in the same manner as the Board has prescribed for debt discount and expense.

MORTGAGES, STOCKS AND BONDS.

Date of Approval. (1917)	Name of Applicant.	Amount and Kind of Security Approved.	Purpose of Issue and Remarks.
Aug. 7.	Lakewood & Coast Electric Co.,	\$6,500 capital stock, 14,000 certificates of indebtedness,	To be issued for the purpose of reimbursing the company for construction expenditures already made. The application was for the approval of an issue of \$34,000 certificates of indebtedness and \$26,000 capital stock, in lieu of which the Board approved the issue of certificates of indebtedness to the amount of \$14,000 and capital stock to the amount of \$6,500.
Aug. 7.	Eric Railroad Co.,		For approval of its proposed refunding and improvement mortgage, dated December 1, 1916, to Bankers Trust Co., trustee.
Aug. 14.	West Monmouth Water Co.,	2,000 capital stock, 6,000 first mtge. bonds,	To be issued for the purpose of reimbursing the company for construction expenditures already made.
Sept. 10.	Butler Water Co.,	5,000 capital stock, 2,000 first mtge. bonds,	To be issued for the purpose of reimbursing the company for construction expenditures already made. The application was for the approval of \$5,000 bonds and \$10,000 capital stock, in lieu of which the Board approved an issue of \$2,000 bonds and \$5,000 capital stock.
Sept. 17.	New York Central R. R. Co.,	15,000,000 collateral trust (5%) notes,	A certificate in this matter was granted by the Board specifying in detail the purposes of the issue and containing several provisions in regard thereto, which is given in full at the end of this section.
Sept. 25.	Public Service Electric Co.,	5,000,000 capital stock,	To be issued for the purpose of reimbursing the company for construction expenditures already made, and to provide additional funds for work in progress or about to be undertaken. In giving its approval to this issue the Board reserved for future consideration the matter of charging to "capital account" requirements for sinking funds, approval of which was withheld.
Sept. 25.	Public Service Gas Co.,	1,000,000 capital stock,	To be issued for the purpose of reimbursing the company for construction expenditures already made, and to provide additional funds for work in progress or about to be undertaken. In giving its approval to this issue the Board reserved for future consideration the matter of charging to "capital account" requirements for sinking funds, approval of which was withheld.

Date of Approval. (1917)	Name of Applicant.	Amount and Kind of Security Approved.	Purpose of Issue and Remarks.
Sept. 25,	Bay Shore Connecting R. R. Co.,	\$15,800 capital stock,	To be issued for the purpose of repaying advances from the Central R. R. Co. of New Jersey and the Lehigh Valley R. R. Co. for additions and betterments to the applicant's property.
Sept. 26,	New Jersey Power & Light Co.,	149,000 preferred stock, 246,000 first mtge. bonds,	To be issued for the purpose of reimbursing the company for construction expenditures already made and to provide additional funds for work in progress or about to be undertaken; \$136,000 of bonds to be sold at not less than 87 and \$110,000 to be sold at not less than 84, and to be pledged as collateral for promissory note payable four months after its date, with the understanding that the said \$110,000 of bonds shall not be pledged at less than 80. The application was for the approval of \$152,700 of preferred stock, in lieu of which the Board approved the issue of only \$149,000 thereof.
Oct. 9,	Atlantic City Electric Co.,	58,000 first & refunding mtge. bonds,	To be issued at not less than 85 for the purpose of reimbursing the company for construction expenditures already made.
Oct. 9,	Woolwich Water Co.,	6,500 first mtge. bonds,	To be issued at not less than 90 for the purpose of providing funds to enable the company to make additions to its plant and equipment.
Oct. 9,	Pennsylvania & New Jersey R. R. Co.,	50,000 first mtge. bonds,	To be issued at not less than 85 for the purpose of reimbursing the company for construction expenditures already made and to provide additional funds for work in progress or about to be undertaken.
Oct. 15,	Electric Light & Power Co. of Hightstown,		For approval of a \$75,000 mortgage dated July 1, 1917 to West Jersey Trust Co., trustee.
Oct. 15,	Electric Light & Power Co. of Hightstown,	36,000 mtge. bonds,	\$10,000 of these bonds to be issued for the purpose of retiring a like amount of outstanding funded debt heretofore issued, and the balance to be used for reimbursing the company for construction expenditures already made, and to provide additional funds for work in progress or about to be undertaken.
Oct. 30,	Butler Water Co.,	4,100 capital stock,	To be issued for the purpose of reimbursing the company for construction expenditures already made. The application was for the approval of an issue of \$5,000 bonds and \$10,000 capital stock, in lieu of which the Board approved the issue of \$4,100 capital stock.

Date of Approval (1917)	Name of Applicant.	Amount and Kind of Security Approved.	Purpose of Issue and Remarks.
Nov. 19...	Riverton & Palmyra Water Co.,	\$25,000 capital stock,	To be issued as a stock dividend, representing surplus earnings of this company invested in additions to its plant and equipment. The application was for the approval of \$125,000 capital stock to be issued for such purpose, in lieu of which the Board approved the issue of \$25,000 capital stock.
Nov. 20...	Clinton Water & Water Supply Co.,	For the approval of \$50,000 mortgage dated November 1, 1917, to Somerville Trust Co., trustee.
Nov. 20...	Clinton Water & Water Supply Co.,	20,000 mortgage bonds,	To be issued under the above mentioned mortgage for the purpose of refunding a like amount of maturing funded debt. Approval was granted upon condition that the company set aside not less than \$500 each year to provide a reserve for depreciation and carry this amount under the proper account on its books. See report at the end of this section.
Nov. 20...	Erie Railroad Co.,	15,000,000 refunding & improvement mtge. 6% bonds, series A,	An order in this matter was issued by the Board specifying in detail the purpose of the issue and containing several provisions in regard thereto, which is given in full at the end of this section.
Nov. 27...	New Jersey Power & Light Co.,	For modification of certificate granted in this matter under date of September 26, 1907 so as to reduce the amount of bonds authorized to be sold at not less than 87 from \$136,000 to \$119,000, and to authorize the pledging of an additional \$17,000 par value of bonds at not less than 80 as collateral security for promissory notes payable four months after the dates of issue thereof. Said bonds to be sold at not less than 84% of their par value.
Dec. 5...	Ocean County Electric Co.,	The Board's certificate of March 27, 1916, approving the issue of \$246,000 preferred stock and \$124,000 common stock was modified so as to limit the Board's approval to \$9,000 of common stock which already had been issued, inasmuch as it was quite apparent that the company would not in the immediate future issue the balance of the stock for which approval had originally been given.
Dec. 18...	Morris County Traction Co.,	1,179,000 income debenture bonds,	To be issued for the purpose of retiring a like amount of general mortgage bonds.
Dec. 19...	Hackensack Water Co.,	500,000 common stock,	To be issued for the purpose of reimbursing the company for construction expenditures made in prior years.

Date of Approval. (1917)	Name of Applicant.	Amount and Kind of Security Approved.	Purpose of Issue and Remarks.
Dec. 28,	Hackensack Water Co.,	\$750,000 first mtge. bonds,	To be sold at not less than par or to be pledged as collateral security for the repayment of money borrowed for construction purposes, approval being given upon the condition that in the event that the pledgee shall be required to sell the bonds to pay the debt the bonds shall not be sold for less than 80% of the par value thereof, so that not less than that amount shall be applied to extinguish the debt. The application was for the approval of \$1,250,000 of bonds, in lieu of which the Board approved the issue of \$750,000.
Dec. 28,	Public Service Railway Co.,	1,250,000 capital stock,	To be issued for the purpose of reimbursing the company for construction expenditures already made and to provide additional funds for completing work in progress.

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

ORDER.

The Erie Railroad Company, a corporation of the State of New York, having on March 1st, 1917, filed its petition with this Board (which petition is by reference thereto herein made part hereof) praying for an order authorizing the pledging of \$8,372,900 face value Series "D" bonds, issued under general mortgage dated April 1, 1903, as collateral security for proposed issue of its two year five per cent. collateral gold notes to the amount of \$15,000,000, and a hearing having been had 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 on or before April 1, 1917, in the form filed herein on the twenty-first day of March, 1917, to secure an authorized issue of two year notes, bearing interest at the rate of five per cent per annum, to the aggregate face value of \$15,000,000.

2. HEREBY REQUIRES that upon the execution and delivery of said indenture so authorized there shall be filed with this Commission a copy of said 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 Commission.

3. HEREBY AUTHORIZES the Erie Railroad Company to issue \$15,000,000 face value of notes secured by the aforesaid indenture.

4. HEREBY REQUIRES that said notes of the total face value of \$15,000,000 shall be sold for not less than 98½% of their face value and accrued interest at which rate sale of the entire amount of said notes, after payment of a commission of two per cent. on the face value thereof (the payment of such a commission to the underwriting syndicate and to the bankers at not to exceed two per cent. being hereby approved) will net the Erie Railroad Company \$14,475,000.

5. HEREBY REQUIRES that said notes of the face value of \$15,000,000 so authorized or the proceeds thereof shall be used and applied solely and exclusively towards the following purposes:

(a) For the discharge or lawful refunding of outstanding three year 5½% notes, due April 1, 1917.....\$9,280,000

(b) For the reimbursement of the treasury of the petitioner for expenditures made therefrom for capital purposes, being the reinvestment in assets of the proceeds of notes, for the reimbursement of the treasury of the Company for expenditures made therefrom for capital purposes for the period from December 31, 1906 to December 31, 1911\$9,750,000

6. HEREBY REQUIRES that none of said notes herein authorized shall be hypothecated or pledged as collateral by the Erie Railroad Company.

7. HEREBY REQUIRES that the Erie Railroad Company shall for each six months' period ending June 30 and December 31, file not more than thirty days from the end of such period a verified report showing:

(a) What notes have been sold or otherwise disposed of in accordance with the authority contained herein.

(b) The date of such sale or disposition.

(c) To whom such notes were sold.

(d) What proceeds were realized from such sale.

(e) Any other terms and conditions of such sale.

(f) With respect to subdivision (a) of Clause No. 5 of this order there shall be shown in detail the amount expended for such purpose during such period of the proceeds of the notes herein authorized.

(g) With respect to subdivision (b) of Clause No. 5 of this order there shall be shown the amount used for the purpose specified therein during such period of the proceeds of the notes herein authorized.

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

\$14,839,000 face value of First Consolidated Mortgage General Lien 4% Gold Bonds, which are now pledged as collateral security for \$9,280,000 face value of Three Year 5½% collateral gold notes, due April 1, 1917.

1,000,000 face value of First Consolidated Mortgage General Lien 4% Gold Bonds.

2,378,000 face value of First Consolidated Mortgage General Lien 4% Gold Bonds authorized to be issued by order Sept. 12, 1916.

8,372,900 face value of General Mortgage 4% Fifty Year Convertible Series "D" bonds authorized to be issued by order dated March 14, 1916, and hereby modifies its order of said date to admit of such pledge.

It is understood that in addition to the above mentioned bonds to be pledged as collateral security for the payment of the notes herein authorized, certain treasury assets of the Erie Railroad Company are also to be hypothecated as additional collateral as provided for in the collateral indenture authorized and approved herein.

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 14, 1916) aggregating \$14,091,000 in amount, which said \$14,091,000 of bonds are to be pledged as provided in Clause 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 Commission.

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 within thirty days of the service hereof, the said company shall file with this Commission a satisfactory verified stipulation over the signatures of its president and secretary, accepting this order with all its terms and conditions and such order shall be void and of no force or effect until such stipulation shall have been filed as last above provided.

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

Dated March 21st, 1917.

Lambertville Public Service Company Petition for Approval of a Mortgage and the Issue of \$80,000 in Bonds.

REPORT.

W. Holt Apgar, appeared for the Company.

This is the second application received from this Company for approval of a mortgage and the issuance of bonds. The relations between the value of the property and the bonds to be issued are set forth in a report in the previous application in which the application was denied. It was indicated in the previous report, which was issued in July, 1916, that consideration could be given later to the creation of a mortgage and the issuance of bonds thereunder. The second petition was heard by the Board at its meeting in Trenton on Tuesday, October 24, 1916. The proposed mortgage has been examined and, after some changes suggested by the Board's Counsel, is in such shape as to meet with the approval of the Board and approval is therefore given to the creation of a mortgage in the amount of \$1,000,000.

In the previous application it was indicated that the Board would not give consideration to the creation of a new mortgage until a considerable amount of money had been expended in additions to the plant and distribution system of the company which should not be represented by the proceeds of bond issues. Examination of the property shows that the company has in good faith carried out the plan involving a considerable amount of reconstruction and rebuilding and the service rendered by the company in Lambertville now appears to be reasonably adequate and satisfactory to the people of that town.

At the hearing on October 24th, it was testified that it would be impracticable to finance the construction of the additions to this plant and system until the outstanding bonds could be refunded by an issue of bonds, secured by a mortgage of sufficient size to admit of further and additional issues thereunder.

The application now before the Board is for the approval of the issue of bonds in the amount of \$80,000 which are to be exchanged at par for the bonds now outstanding. This plan appears to be the only one which under all the circumstances presents a practical solution of the problem facing this company. In order that extensions and additions may be properly financed as they are required from time to time, the Board will approve the issue of bonds in the amount and for the purpose asked for in the pending application. In the testimony submitted in connection with the first application it was clearly shown that the value of the property is very little, if anything, in excess of the face value of the present bonds, leaving practically nothing to be represented by stock or free capital. The Board does not consider the position of the company in this respect a safe one in so far as

assuring a continuance of service in the future is concerned. A very slight financial embarrassment might again result in a deterioration in service such as this company has already experienced in 1912, 1913 and 1914.

Conservative financing would limit the amount of bonds which ought to be outstanding in connection with the property now in existence at not exceeding \$60,000 and the Board considers it necessary in connection with the approval of the present issue that a plan be adopted which will result in amortizing the difference in value between the amount of bonds now to be issued, \$80,000 and the figure of \$60,000 referred to above.

Upon the filing with the Board of a stipulation by which the company will agree to amortize, within the life of this issue of \$80,000 of bonds, the amount of \$20,000, a certificate will be issued, approving the mortgage and the issuance of bonds in accordance with the petition.

Dated May 7th, 1917.

In the Matter of the Application of the New York Central Railroad Company for Authority to Issue $4\frac{1}{2}\%$ Refunding and Improvement Mortgage Bonds to the Amount of \$10,000,000.

CERTIFICATE.

The New York Central Railroad Company on March 31st, 1917, filed with this Board its petition praying that the Board give its consent and approval to the issuance by the company, of its Refunding and Improvement Mortgage Bonds, Series A, to the amount of \$10,000,000, bearing $4\frac{1}{2}\%$ interest and redeemable on any interest day at the election of the company at 110% of par, for the purpose of reimbursing its treasury for capitalizable expenditures to the total amount of \$7,778,503.23 made during the period from January 1, 1915, to January 31, 1917, but not heretofore capitalized, and to pay for additions and betterments to be made to the property of the company and which are now in progress, and this Board, at its office in the City of Trenton, on April 17th, 1917, having taken proof of the facts set forth in the petition and after having heard Albert C. Wall and G. Lynd on behalf of the petitioner upon the aforesaid petition, the papers and schedules which accompanied it, and upon the evidence taken at such hearing.

Now, THEREFORE, after due deliberation, it is

ORDERED (1) That the New York Central Railroad Company is hereby authorized to issue \$10,000,000 face value of its $4\frac{1}{2}\%$ Refunding and

MORTGAGES, STOCKS AND BONDS.

Improvement Mortgage Bonds, Series A, under a certain indenture, deed of trust or mortgage, dated October 1, 1913, given to the Guaranty Trust Company of New York, as Trustee.

ORDERED, (2) That said bonds of the total face value of \$10,000,000 may be sold for not less than 93½% of their face value and accrued interest to give net proceeds of at least \$9,350,000.

ORDERED (3) That said bonds of the face value of \$10,000,000 so authorized or the proceeds thereof to the amount of at least \$9,350,000.00 shall be used solely and exclusively for the following purposes:

(a) For the reimbursement of the treasury of the petitioner for moneys actually expended from income for capitalizable purposes from January 1, 1915, to January 31, 1917, not obtained from the issue of stocks, bonds, notes or other evidence of indebtedness of such corporation\$7,778,503.23

(b) For additions and betterments made or to be made during the calendar year 1917 or subsequently to the following lines of the petitioner as detailed in Schedules A and B filed with the papers herein:
 New York Central Railroad..\$2,933,820.59
 West Shore Railroad..... 28,974.32
 New Jersey Junction Railroad 124,673.92 3,092,468.83
 \$10,870,972.06

Amount unprovided for..... \$1,520,972.06
 in so far as the same may be applicably provided:

(1) That such bonds or the proceeds thereof shall be applied on such additions and betterments summarized in subdivision (b) hereof only in so far as the same is a real increase in the Road and Equipment of the petitioner and not a replacement of any part of such Road and Equipment or substitution for wasted capital or other loss property chargeable to Income in accordance with the definitions contained in the Classification of Investment in Road and Equipment of Steam Roads adopted by this Board.

(2) That there shall be no charges to Road and Equipment on account of Engineering services in connection with such additions and betterments unless such engineering services shall have been rendered either by other than the regular officers and employees of the corporation, or, in a proper case, where such services may have been rendered

by certain of such officers or employees under an express assignment to such additions and betterment work.

(3) That if there shall be required for the aforesaid purpose subject to the limitations herein contained, a sum less than an amount equal to the face value of the bonds herein authorized, no portion of the proceeds of the bonds herein authorized over the actual proceeds thereof so required shall be used for any purpose without the further order of this Board.

ORDERED, (4) That if the said bonds of a total face value of \$10,000,000 herein authorized shall be sold at such price as will enable the company to realize net proceeds of more than \$10,870,972.06 no portion of the proceeds of such sale in excess of the last aforesaid sum shall be used for any purpose without the further order of the Board.

ORDERED, (5) That none of the said bonds herein authorized shall be hypothecated or pledged as collateral by The New York Central Railroad Company unless any such pledge or hypothecation shall have been expressly approved and authorized by this Board.

ORDERED, (6) That the New York Central Railroad Company shall for each six months period ending June 30 and December 31 file not more than thirty days from the end of such period a verified report showing:

(a) What bonds have been sold or otherwise disposed of during such period in accordance with the authority contained herein.

(b) The date of such sale or disposition.

(c) To whom such bonds were sold.

(d) What proceeds were realized from such sale.

(e) Any other terms and conditions of such sale.

(f) The amount used during such period of the proceeds of the bonds herein authorized for subdivision (a) of Clause 3 of this order.

(g) In detail the amount expended during such period of the proceeds of the bonds herein authorized for subdivision (b) of Clause 3 of this order, and the account or accounts under the Classification of Investment in Road and Equipment of Steam Roads to which the expenditures therefor have been charged, giving all details of any credits to Road and Equipment in connection with such expenditures.

(h) A summary showing the expenditures during such period for said last mentioned purpose by the prescribed accounts.

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

ORDERED, (7) That the authority contained in this order to issue bonds is upon the express condition that the petitioner accepts and agrees to comply in good faith with the provisions hereof and before any bonds are issued pursuant hereto and within thirty days from the service hereof, the said company shall file with the Board a satisfactory verified stipulation over the signatures of its President and Secretary accepting this order with all its terms and conditions, and such order shall be void and of no force or effect until such stipulation shall have been filed as last above provided.

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

Dated May 28th, 1917.

In the Matter of the Application of the New York Central Railroad Company for Authority to Issue 4% Consolidation Mortgage Gold Bonds, Series "A," to the Amount of \$70,000,000.

CERTIFICATE.

The New York Central Railroad Company on April 28th, 1917, filed with this Board its petition praying that the Board give its consent and approval to the issuance by the Company of its 4% Consolidation Mortgage Gold Bonds, Series "A," to the amount of Seventy Million Dollars (\$70,000,000), for the purpose of retiring an equal amount of 3½% Lake Shore Collateral Gold Bonds of the New York Central & Hudson River Railroad Company, the predecessor of the New York Central Railroad Company, and this Board, at its office in the City of Trenton, on May 15th, 1917, having taken proof of the facts set forth in the petition and after having heard John Hartpence and G. P. Lyon on behalf of the petitioner upon the aforesaid petition, the papers and schedules which accompanied it, and upon the evidence taken at such hearing.

Now, therefore, after due deliberation, it is

ORDERED, (1) That the New York Central Railroad Company be and it hereby is authorized to issue not to exceed \$70,000,000 par value of its 4% Consolidation Mortgage Gold bonds, Series A, under a certain indenture executed and delivered to the Bankers Trust Company

of New York, as Trustee, dated the 20th day of June, 1913, on condition, however, that said bonds herein authorized shall be used solely and exclusively for the purpose of even exchange on the basis of par for par and accrued interest for the New York Central and Hudson River Railroad Company's 3½% Gold Bonds Lake Shore Collateral, according to the provisions of section 2, Article Four, of said indenture, and that if only a portion of such bonds of the total par value of \$70,000,000 herein authorized shall be used for such purpose, the said partial exchange shall likewise be on the basis of par for par and accrued interest.

ORDERED, (2) That the New York Central Railroad Company shall for each six months period, ending June 30 and December 31, file not more than fifteen days from the end of such period a verified report showing:

(a) What securities have been exchanged during such period in accordance with the authority contained herein and the date of such exchange.

(b) With whom such exchange was made.

(c) The basis of such exchange, including all material terms and conditions thereof.

Such reports shall continue to be filed until said bonds, to an amount not exceeding \$70,000,000, and whose owners shall be entitled thereto, shall have been exchanged in accordance with the authority contained herein, and if during any period no bonds were exchanged the report shall set forth such fact.

ORDERED, (3) That the New York Central Railroad Company be and it hereby is authorized to execute a supplement to the Refunding and Improvement Mortgage dated October 1, 1913, executed by the New York Central and Hudson River Railroad Company to the Guaranty Trust Company of New York, as Trustee, so as to include therein the franchises, railroads, and other property acquired by it on such consolidation which are not already subject to said mortgage.

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

Dated May 29th, 1917.

In the Matter of the Application of the Hillcrest Water Company for Approval of a Mortgage for \$150,000 and Issue of Bonds Thereunder.

REPORT.

H. J. Hapgood, for the Company.

The Hillcrest Water Company was organized May 19th, 1911, for the purpose of taking over the water system installed by the Development Company in the tract known as Mountain Lakes, just west of Boonton, Morris County.

Under date of June 4th, the company submitted applications for approval of an issue of stock and approval of a mortgage and the issuance of 6% bonds thereunder; and under date of August 29th, 1911, the Board approved the issue of \$50,000 in stock, a mortgage in the amount of \$50,000 and an issue of bonds thereunder in the amount of \$10,000.

Under date of June 4th, 1912, the company submitted an application for approval of the issue of bonds in the amount of \$20,000 to pay for further construction work in Mountain Lakes; and under date of June 17th, 1912, certificate was issued, approving the issue of \$20,000 in bonds.

Under date of March 6th, 1913, the company submitted an application for approval of the issue of additional \$20,000 in bonds to pay for additions to plant and system and this was approved in a memorandum dated April 29th, 1913. These bonds bore interest at 6% and were issued at par.

Under date of May 27th, 1914, the company applied for the approval of an issue of capital stock in the amount of \$50,000 to provide for additional construction. Prior to this application there was outstanding capital stock in the amount of \$50,000 and bonds in the amount of \$50,000. As a result of this application the expenditures of the company were carefully analyzed by the engineers of the Board and some criticisms were made of the prices paid to the general contractors for the work. A certificate, however, was issued under date of February 16th, 1915, approving the issue of capital stock in the amount of \$15,000, it having been determined by the Board that expenditures to that amount had been completed prior to that date.

Under date of April 21st, 1917, the company has submitted a new application providing for the placing of a new mortgage upon its property for the purpose of refunding and retiring bonds now outstanding under the original mortgage and in order to pay for certain additional items of construction work. The authorized capital stock at present is \$150,000. Of this there has been issued and is outstanding \$50,000. In addition, a certificate was issued, approving the further

issue of capital stock in the amount of \$15,000 but up to the present time this has not been issued and the company now asks that this certificate be cancelled. There is issued and outstanding bonds in the amount of \$50,000 under the old mortgage.

The application now before the Board asks the approval (1) of a new mortgage in the amount of \$150,000; (2) an issue of bonds in the amount of \$112,000, the proceeds of which are to be used as follows:

- (a) Bonds in the amount of \$52,500 to provide for the retirement at 105 of the bonds now outstanding, amounting to \$50,000; and
- (b) \$50,500 to be issued at about 80 so as to obtain the sum of \$47,375.

This latter figure is based upon a statement of the company that the total bond discount would amount to \$14,625.

The holder of these bonds stipulated that if exchange of these bonds was permitted at 105, he would waive interest on outstanding bonds from April, 1916.

Expenditures by the company up to May 1st, 1917, not so far capitalized, amount to \$34,068.22 and the balance of \$10,806.78, is the amount available for new construction which the company estimates will cost approximately \$10,700. The proposed construction work will consist of small extensions, service connections, and additional meters to serve approximately 100 additional houses. It is expected that approximately 100 hydrants will also be installed, the expenditures for which are included in the estimate of \$10,700.

In the report issued by the Board April 29th, 1913, attention is called to the fact that the company was not then able to pay its full interest charges, but that, as the company was in the developmental stage, having been organized less than two years before, it was not to be expected that interest could be earned at that time, but that it was reasonably expected that money for the payment of interest would be available in later years. In the testimony submitted May 8th, 1917, in connection with the present application, it is also shown that the company is not fully able to pay all of its interest but expected to be fully able to do this as soon as hydrants were installed for fire protection purposes. This may be entirely true, but in order that the Hillcrest Water Company may furnish adequate fire protection, it will undoubtedly be necessary to replace some of the present mains by means of larger sizes and this will involve a still larger investment and a cost for replacement which cannot be entirely capitalized.

If approval is given to the issue of bonds as prayed for in the present petition, there would then be outstanding capital stock in the amount of \$50,000 and bonds in the amount of \$112,000. In view of the fact that the company is not yet fully able to meet its interest charges, the Board is unwilling to approve an issue of bonds which would bring about such a great disparity between the amount of bonds and the amount of stock outstanding.

CONCLUSIONS.

The Board will therefore not cancel the present outstanding certificate by which the company now has the right to issue stock in the amount of \$15,000, but will give its approval to the creation of a mortgage of \$150,000 and the approval thereunder of bonds in the amount of \$93,000, to be issued as follows:

\$52,500 in bonds to be issued to take up the present bonds amounting to \$50,000 and the balance of \$40,500 to be issued at not less than 80 which will yield the amount of \$32,400. This, with the proceeds of the stock, will yield the amount of \$47,400 which is practically the same as would have been obtained from the bond issue.

Dated June 19th, 1917.

In the Matter of the Application of Electric Light and Power Company of Hightstown for Approval of Mortgage and Issue of Bonds.

REPORT.

Andrew P. Maloney and *F. J. Thron*, for the petitioner.

This company was incorporated in 1898 and constructed a small steam generating plant together with a distribution system, located entirely within the limits of Hightstown.

In connection with the construction of this plant, the company issued capital stock to the amount of \$16,250, and \$10,000 first mortgage five per cent. bonds. Since the plant was first constructed, additions have been made to the distribution system partly from earnings and partly from proceeds of loans, so that at the present time the property of the company has a value considerably in excess of the outstanding capitalization. The company, has, however, a large number of debts which were purchased by Mr. Maloney and are held by him.

The purpose of the present application is to provide the funds for the liquidation of the outstanding indebtedness and the refunding of the present bonds.

The company's application asks for the approval of a mortgage in the amount of \$75,000, and the issuance of bonds thereunder in the amount of \$41,000. Of these bonds, \$10,000 are to be used for an even exchange of the bonds now outstanding. The balance of the bonds, to be issued at 80 or a trifle better, to realize an amount of money which would be used, as follows:

\$4,000 for working capital.

\$1,000 for additions made between January 1st and March 20th, 1917, and the balance to pay off all outstanding obligations which were stated to be for the amount realized, \$20,800.

In support of the application, the company submitted an inventory and appraisal from which they claimed a total fixed capital value as of March 20th, 1917, of \$53,207.82. This inventory had been checked in the field and prices were revised by the Commission's Appraisal Engineers, who found the total fixed capital to be \$52,072, with additions of \$1,000 for property constructed in the early part of 1917.

The accrued depreciation to December 1st, 1916, is estimated at \$10,136. Deducting this from the cost, new, gives a present value of \$41,936, for the fixed capital, December 31st, 1916. Deducting from this amount the par value of stock and bonds already outstanding, \$26,250 leaves \$15,786, not now represented by outstanding securities. To this amount should be added \$4,000 for working capital and \$1,000 for work done in 1917, which gives a total of \$20,786 cash to be realized from the bonds in addition to those required for refunding purposes.

If the bonds are sold at 80, this would require approximately \$26,000 in bonds. Adding to this the \$10,000 of bonds for refunding, makes a total of \$36,000 in bonds, which is all that in the opinion of the Board should be issued in connection with the presently existing property.

CONCLUSIONS.

Board will, therefore, give its approval to the mortgage in the amount of \$75,000, and will approve the issuance of bonds in the amount of \$36,000. \$10,000 of the bonds are to be issued par for par, for the outstanding bonds, and the balance of \$26,000 in bonds are to be issued and sold on such basis as will pay all of the outstanding debts of the company. The difference between the first value of bonds and the net proceeds is to be amortized within the life of the bonds.

Dated June 26th, 1917.

In the Matter of the Application of the Easton Gas Works for Approval of
Mortgage and Issue of Bonds and Stock.

REPORT.

William Buchsbaum and E. G. Holzer, for the petitioner.

The Easton Gas Company was incorporated under a special act of the Legislature of Pennsylvania, March 14th, 1850, for the purpose of supplying gas light to the Borough of Easton, Pennsylvania. By a special act of the Legislature of New Jersey on March 16th, 1854, the Easton Gas Company was authorized to supply gas light to the Village of Phillipsburg, New Jersey, and the New Jersey Legislature further provided that the Easton Gas Company should in all Courts of Law in the State of New Jersey be deemed and taken to be an existing corporation in the State of New Jersey. The Legislature of Pennsylvania, April 20th, 1854, assented to the arrangement by which the Easton Gas Company became a joint New Jersey-Pennsylvania corporation.

September 29th, 1903, the Easton Gas Light Company was consolidated with the Delaware Gas Light Company, a Pennsylvania corporation, the West Easton Gas Light Company, a Pennsylvania corporation, the Palmer Gas Light Company, a Pennsylvania corporation, the Williams Gas Light Company, a Pennsylvania corporation, and the Forks Gas Light Company, a Pennsylvania corporation, forming the Easton Gas Light Company.

June 24th, 1910, the Easton Gas Light Company consolidated with the Easton Fuel Gas Company, a Pennsylvania corporation, and the Easton Power Company, a Pennsylvania corporation, forming the Easton Gas and Electric Company.

The Warren County Gas Light Company was organized under a special act of the New Jersey Legislature, March 25th, 1875, for the purpose of selling gas in the County of Warren, New Jersey. The Peoples Light, Heat and Power Company of Phillipsburg, a New Jersey corporation, was incorporated December 19th, 1899, for the purpose of manufacturing and selling both gas and electricity for light, heat and power purposes in the County of Warren, State of New Jersey. The Warren County Gas Light Company was consolidated with the Peoples Light, Heat and Power Company, December 26th, 1899. September 15th, 1903, the Peoples Light, Heat and Power Company of Phillipsburg, a New Jersey corporation, the Phillipsburg Electric Lighting, Heating and Power Company, a New Jersey corporation, and the Easton Power Company, a New Jersey corporation, were consolidated, forming the Easton Gas and Electric Company, a New Jersey corporation.

July 1st, 1910, the Easton Gas and Electric Company, a Pennsylvania corporation, holding a controlling stock interest in the Easton Gas and Electric Company, the New Jersey corporation, caused the New Jersey corporation to transfer all of its gas and electric properties to the Pennsylvania corporation.

The Easton Gas and Electric Company of Pennsylvania, on January 16th, 1912, sold all of its electrical properties then owned by it in New Jersey and Pennsylvania to the Eastern Pennsylvania Power Company, a Pennsylvania corporation, and by a decree of the Court of Common Pleas of Northampton County, Pennsylvania, dated January 18th, 1912, surrendered all of the said Company's electrical franchise rights in the State of Pennsylvania and by a certificate issued by the Secretary of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, dated January 22d, 1912, changed its name from Easton Gas and Electric Company to Easton Gas Works.

The Easton Gas Works has an authorized capital stock of \$1,000,000, \$500,000 thereof being 7% cumulative preferred stock and \$500,000 being common capital stock. There is now issued and outstanding \$200,000 of the said 7% cumulative preferred stock and \$269,400 of the common capital stock.

On July 1st, 1910, the Easton Gas and Electric Company, the Pennsylvania corporation, executed a first mortgage to the Fidelity Trust Company of Newark, New Jersey, as Trustee, covering all of its property and franchises in the City of Easton, Pennsylvania, and Town of Phillipsburg, New Jersey, in the amount of \$7,500,000. The term of the mortgage was forty years and the rate of interest 5%.

After the Easton Gas and Electric Company of Pennsylvania changed its name to Easton Gas works on January 22d, 1912, the said Easton Gas Works revised the mortgage referred to above, making the Girard Trust Company the Trustee of said revised mortgage but reducing the authorized issue of bonds to \$1,000,000, the said new issue of bonds being likewise known as first consolidated mortgage 40 year 5% gold bonds. The said revised mortgage covered all the gas plant property and franchise of the said Easton Gas Works in the City of Easton, Pennsylvania, and in the Town of Phillipsburg, New Jersey. Said mortgage is recorded in both Pennsylvania and New Jersey. There are now issued and outstanding bonds in the amount of \$366,000, \$223,000 thereof having been issued pursuant to paragraph A, Article 2 of said mortgages; \$142,000 thereof having been issued pursuant to Paragraph B of Article 2 of said mortgage; and \$1,000 having been issued October 30th, 1916, pursuant to Paragraph C of Article 2 of said mortgage, in exchange for 2 of the said \$500 bonds of Peoples Light, Heat and Power Company, above referred to. In addition to the above, there have been cancelled, pursuant to the sinking fund provisions of said mortgage, \$7,000 of said bonds, \$3,000 thereof having been cancelled August 1st, 1915, and \$4,000 thereof August 1st, 1916.

MORTGAGES, STOCKS AND BONDS.

The total securities now outstanding amount to \$1,219,400. Of these securities it appears that the transactions which have taken place requiring the approval of the Board, but which have not been approved by the Board, are as follows:

(1) The execution of the revised mortgage.

(2) The issuance of bonds thereunder to the extent of \$385,000 for the purpose of refunding Delaware Gas Light Company bonds in the amount of \$305,000 and Peoples Light, Heat and Power Company bonds in the amount of \$80,000. With reference to the latter item, it should be noted that one thousand dollar bond has been retired since the issue so that the actual amount outstanding is \$79,000.

(3) The issue of preferred stock in the amount of \$200,000, issued on March 18, 1912.

(4) The issue of common stock in the amount of \$200,000 which was issued March 18th, 1912.

NOTE: Items (3) and (4) were issued in exchange for stock of the older company, much greater in amount.

(5) An issue of common stock in the amount of \$53,200, which was issued December 17th, 1913, to the Pennsylvania Utilities Company.

(6) An issue of common stock in the amount of \$16,200, issued December 26th, 1913, to the Pennsylvania Utilities Company.

(7) The issue of bonds under the new mortgage now outstanding, in addition to the \$385,000 held for refunding, amounts to a total of \$372,000. Of these \$223,000 were issued July 1st, 1910, prior to the time the Public Utility Commission came into existence. The following issues do require the Board's approval:

January 24, 1912.....	\$92,000
January 22, 1913	6,000
December 26, 1913	5,000
December 10, 1915	26,000
April 13, 1916	20,000
Total	\$149,000

Of these bonds, \$6,000 have been retired by means of the sinking fund, leaving outstanding \$366,000. The total bonds now outstanding amount to \$750,000, including those held for redemption of older bonds.

The total stock outstanding at the present time is:

Preferred stock	\$200,000
issued in exchange for much larger amount of stock of the Easton Gas and Electric Co.	
Common stock, issued in exchange	200,000
Common stock	53,200
Common stock	16,200
	<hr/>
Total common stock.....	\$269,400

The aggregate of stock and bonds outstanding against the property is as follows:

Preferred Stock.....	\$200,000
Common Stock	269,400
Bonds	750,000
	<hr/>
Total	\$1,219,400

This property has been inventoried and appraised by the company. The inventory has been checked and prices revised by the appraisal engineers of the Commission. The engineers of the Commission have arrived at the conclusion that the cost to reproduce the property as of January 31st, 1916, is \$1,089,649. This is based upon general average normal prices for the previous ten year period and does not take into account excessive costs prevalent at the present time. The Book Value corresponding to the Fixed Capital is \$1,212,774; this indicates a deficit in Fixed Capital of \$123,125.

Due to changes in the management and control of this property and to insufficient records, it is not known at what figure the bonds now outstanding were issued. If issued at 80 the lowest figure allowed by the Law of New Jersey for the bond, discount would amount to \$150,000. The total deficit, as stated, is \$123,125, and if this deficit is treated in the same way that is required for bond discount and amortized within the term of the mortgage, the result contemplated by New Jersey Law will be attained; that is, the bringing of the value of the property to a parity with the face value of outstanding securities.

The bulk of the property involved in this matter is located outside of the State of New Jersey, but the law under which the New Jersey Commission acts provides that all securities issued by a company operating within the State of New Jersey must meet with the Board's approval before they are issued. This requirement was disregarded by the predecessors in the management of the Easton Gas Works, and securities, as stated above, were issued without the Board's approval. The mortgage also, as amended in 1912, should have been submitted to the Board for its criticism and approval before being executed.

CONCLUSIONS.

Upon the facts now presented, the Board will approve the issues of stock made since July 4th, 1910, as follows:

Preferred Stock	\$200,000
Common Stock	269,400

The Board will also approve the mortgage as amended in 1912 and will approve also the issuance thereunder of bonds in the amount of \$149,000, which bonds have been issued at various times since the Public Utility Commission of New Jersey took jurisdiction in this matter.

The Board will also approve the issuance of \$385,000 in bonds under the new mortgage for the purpose of refunding a like amount of bonds of subsidiary companies, the bond discount to be amortized during the life of the bonds.

Dated June 26th, 1917.

In the Matter of the Application of the West Monmouth Water Company
for Permission to Issue \$8,000 First Mortgage 6% Bonds.

REPORT.

William J. Lansley, for Petitioner.

Application is made by The West Monmouth Water Company for approval of the issue of \$8,000 bonds to cover expenditures heretofore made. The Board approves the purpose of the issue.

Heretofore we have approved the issue of \$5,000 of stock and \$12,000 of bonds. The present issue would result in a capitalization of \$20,000 bonds and \$5,000 stock. We are of opinion that there should be more stock issued, in an enterprise of this kind. We will approve the issue of \$6,000 bonds and \$2,000 stock if the application is amended to petition therefor.

Dated July 25th, 1917.

In the Matter of the Application of the Butler Water Company for Approval of Issue of Five Thousand Dollars (\$5,000) Bonds and Ten Thousand Dollars (\$10,000) Stock.

REPORT.

Thomas J. Hillery, for the Company.

Under date of June 15th, the Butler Water Company submitted a petition for approval of an issue of bonds to the amount of \$5,000, and an issue of 100 shares of its capital stock par value \$100 each, amounting to \$10,000, it being stated that these amounts represented assets against which no securities have as yet been issued.

The principal items in the application are as follows:

Amount of money expended for new developments to	
January 1st, 1917.....	\$41,060.01
For extensions from January 1st, 1917, to June 1st, 1917.....	1,202.83
Purchase of automobile,	422.00
Current bills for new development,.....	250.00
Pipe system to be purchased by Co.....	750.00
Expense of development on Capitoline Hill (contemplated)	1,850.00
Unpaid bills for promotion, engineering and general supervision for the past 3 years and 3 months	8,000.00
	<hr/> \$53,534.84
Appraisal made by Board, March, 1st, 1916, amount expended to March 1st, 1916 (Apshawa)	20,429.00
For completion of same (estimated)....	13,000.00
For Valley Road and other extensions in Butler,	5,000.00
	<hr/> 38,429.00
Difference	<hr/> 15,105.84

The expenditures for additions to the physical property have all been checked by engineers representing the Board. Testimony at the hearing, submitted by W. L. McCue, President of the Company, was explanatory of the item of "Unpaid bills for promotion engineering and general supervision for the past 3 years and 3 months, \$8,000." Of this amount, \$4,500 represented a bill presented by Mr. McCue for services largely legal in character. There had been several applica-

tions to the Water Supply Commission which involved attendance at hearings in Trenton and in Butler, and investigations of numerous property titles, and it was testified that Mr. McCue's office had been given over for the almost exclusive business of the Water Company for more than three years. It is impossible from the testimony to divide the charge between operation and capital accounts.

Very little testimony was submitted concerning the balance of the \$8,000. A bill for \$2,000 had been presented by the members of the Executive Committee, for services in connection with general supervision of the construction of the company, and for services rendered in carrying on negotiations for the financing of the company. Another bill for \$1,500 was submitted by another member of the Board of Directors, who had rendered services in securing the franchise rights in Bloomingdale.

Some of the items referred to above are chargeable to Capital Account, but it must be remembered that the Butler Water Company has been a going concern, and that much of the new construction carried on in the past two years has been in the nature of reconstruction, due to the necessity for obtaining another and more adequate water supply. Much of the work of negotiation carried on by Mr. McCue was due to the transfer to new owners of the Butler Water Company, which took place on the death of the former owner of the company's stock.

After full consideration of all the matters involved in this application, the Board is of the opinion that a policy of conservatism should be adopted by the Butler Water Company, with regard to increases in its capital securities due to the present large investment per unit of output, made necessary by the conditions under which the company operates.

As to the item of \$8,000 the Board withholds approval until more specific and definite testimony is produced indicating what allowance should be charged against capital. Approval will, if desired, be given to an issue of bonds in the amount of \$2,000, and stock in the amount of \$5,000, for the other capital purposes referred to in the petition, excepting the item of \$8,000 above mentioned.

Dated August 7th, 1917.

In the Matter of the Application of the Butler Water Company for Approval of Issue of \$5,000 Bonds and \$10,000 Stock.

SUPPLEMENTAL REPORT.

Thomas J. Hillery, for the Company.

Under date of June 15th, the Butler Water Company submitted a petition asking approval of an issue of bonds to the amount of \$5,000 and of an issue of 100 shares of its capital stock, par value \$100, amounting to \$10,000. After hearing, this Board by its report dated August 7, 1917, approved the issue of bonds in the amount of \$2,000 and of stock in the amount of \$5,000 for capital purposes referred to in the petition, expressly reserving action upon items of claimed capital expenditures aggregating \$8,000.

These items included claims of William L. McCue, for \$4,500; Charles G. Wilson, for \$1,500; and F. R. Casterlin, for \$2,000. The testimony submitted concerning the services rendered and the details thereof was unsatisfactory.

Further hearing was held October 3rd for the purpose of ascertaining whether the charges making up these several claims were fair and reasonable for the services rendered; and further whether the company should be permitted to charge them to capital account. It now appears that undoubtedly a portion of them should be charged to operation. The matter should have been properly brought to the Board's attention in the previous application of the company for the issue of securities.

The gentlemen whose claims are now under consideration acted as a committee of the board of directors and claim to have performed the different services enumerated in their respective bills. They are large stockholders and directors of the company and were from June 1, 1914 to June 1, 1917, when the services were performed.

It does not appear that any of the work performed by them was arduous or very difficult. Except for the title searches against tracts of land owned by the company in Morris and Passaic Counties for which Mr. McCue charges \$250 and the sale of bonds amounting to \$120,000 and for which an allowance of \$2,250 is asked, the work was not different from the usual duties required of directors of small companies without much compensation.

We are of opinion that a portion of the charges under consideration may properly be capitalized. These items in our judgment, amount to \$4,100. We will, therefore, approve the issue of capital stock for this purpose to the amount of \$4,100.

In arriving at this figure, we conclude that the allowances for services of Mr. McCue covering items which may be capitalized is \$2,500, of Mr. Casterlin \$900, and of Mr. Wilson \$700. In these amounts there is no allowance for services not properly chargeable to capital account.

We have not passed upon the value of the services in general. Whether further allowances should be made, and charges against operation we leave to the sound discretion of the Directors of the Company.

Dated October 24, 1917.

In the Matter of the Application of the New York Central Railroad Company for Authority to Issue Its Collateral Trust Notes, Bearing Interest at the Rate of Not Exceeding Five per cent. (5%) Per Annum, to the Amount of \$15,000,000, and to Pledge as Collateral Security Therefor \$20,000,000 of its Four and One-Half per cent. Refunding and Improvement Mortgage Bonds Series "A".

CERTIFICATE.

The above entitled matter having come on for hearing before the Board upon application filed by the New York Central Railroad Company under the provisions of Chapter 195 of the Laws of 1911 of the State of New Jersey for the approval of the Board to the issue, by said Company, of its certain Refunding and Improvement Mortgage Bonds Series A, to the amount of \$10,000,000 face value bearing date October 1, 1913, payable on the first day of October, 2013, to bear interest at the rate of four and one-half per cent. per annum payable semi-annually, to be redeemable on any interest day by the election of said Railroad Company, at 110 per cent. of par, and all of the same to be issued pursuant to the terms and conditions of, and to be secured, by a certain refunding and improvement mortgage heretofore executed, dated October 1, 1913, made by the New York Central and Hudson River Railroad Company, (Predecessor of New York Central Railroad Company) to Guaranty Trust Company of New York, Trustee, and the certain indenture supplemental thereto, heretofore executed dated June 15, 1915, made by New York Central Railroad Company to the same Trustee; and a hearing having been duly held upon said application before the Board and the petitioner herein having presented its testimony and evidence at said hearing, and it appearing to the satisfaction of the Board:

(1) That the money to be procured by the issue of said Refunding and Improvement Mortgage Bonds, Series A, of said The New York Central Railroad Company to the amount of \$10,000,000, face value is necessary, and reasonably required for the following purposes, viz.:

(a) To reimburse its treasury for expenditures heretofore made during the period from February 1, 1917, to June 30, 1917, in the amount of \$3,209,331.36 for the acquisition of property, the construction, extension, improvement and addition to facilities, and

(b) To pay in the amount of \$6,790,668.64 for additions, extensions, betterments and improvements to the property of said Railroad Company which are now in progress or have been authorized:

(2) That the purposes for which said bonds are to be issued are not in whole or in part reasonably chargeable to operating expenses or to income:

And it further appearing that the Board of Public Utility Commissioners of the State of New Jersey, by its order made on May 29th, 1917, authorized the New York Central Railroad Company to issue its four and one-half Refunding and Improvement Mortgage bonds, Series A, to the amount of \$10,000,000, and to sell the same so as to net said Company not less than 93½ per cent. of par value of the principal thereof with accrued interest:

And it further appearing that the market conditions have been, and now are, such that the New York Central Railroad Company has not been able to sell said bonds authorized by said order at the price therein fixed, and the said Company is not now able to dispose of said last mentioned bonds or of the bonds for the issue of which the approval of this Board is at present applied for, on advantageous terms; and it has therefore applied to the Board for leave to provide temporarily a portion of the moneys which it expects to eventually realize from the sale of said \$20,000,000 of its bonds by the issue and sale of its two year five per cent. collateral gold trust notes to the amount of \$15,000,000 to be dated September 15, 1917, and to be secured by pledge under trust agreement with the Guaranty Trust Company of New York, substantially in the form now filed with the Board for the pledge of the said \$10,000,000 of bonds heretofore authorized to be issued by order of this Board; and also of the \$10,000,000 of bonds for which approval to issue is now being applied for. And the Board being satisfied from the proofs presented to it, that such application should be granted:

IT IS NOW, THEREFORE, AFTER DUE DELIBERATION, ORDERED BY THE BOARD OF PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSIONERS OF THE STATE OF NEW JERSEY, AS FOLLOWS:

First. That it does hereby authorize the New York Central Railroad Company to issue \$10,000,000 face value of principal of its Refunding and Improvement Mortgage Bonds Series A, bearing date October 1, 1913, to be payable on the first day of October, 2013, to bear interest at the rate of four and one-half per cent per annum, payable semi-annually, to be redeemable on any interest day at the election of said Railroad Company, at 110 per cent. of par, and all of the same to be issued pursuant to the terms and conditions of, and to be secured, by the certain Refunding and Improvement Mortgage heretofore executed, dated October 1, 1913, made by the New York Central and Hudson River Railroad Company (predecessor of New York Central Railroad Company) to Guaranty Trust Company of New York, Trustee, and the certain indenture supplemental heretofore executed, dated June 15, 1915, made by the New York Central Railroad Company.

Second. It does hereby authorize the New York Central Railroad Company to issue \$15,000,000 face value amount of principal of its two year five per cent. collateral trust gold notes to bear date September 15, 1917, to be executed with Guaranty Trust Company of New York, as Trustee, a trust agreement to be dated September 15, 1917, in the form now filed with the Board, which form is hereby approved, and to pledge with said Trustee under and upon the terms set forth in said trust agreement, its four and one-half per cent. Refunding and Improvement Mortgage Bonds, Series A, to the principal amount of \$20,000,000 being the bonds, the issue of which was authorized by the order of this Board on May 29th, 1917, and by this order upon the conditions following, and not otherwise, to wit:

(a) That said notes shall not be sold at a price which will net it less than ninety-six per cent. of the par value of principal thereof with accrued interest:

(b) The proceeds realized from the sale thereof shall be applied as follows:

(1) To reimburse the treasury of the New York Central Railroad Company for expenditures heretofore made during the period from February 1, 1917, to June 30, 1917, for the acquisition of property, construction, extension, improvement and addition to facilities amounting to \$3,209,331.36.

(2) Payment of indebtedness incurred for the like purposes to the amount of \$9,500,000 and now represented by notes of said Railroad Company, \$5,000,000 of which became due September 7, 1917, and \$4,500,000 of which became due October 21, 1917, such purposes being the purposes for which said Refunding and Improvement Mortgage Bonds were authorized to be issued by said Order of May 29, 1917, and by this Order.

(3) For additions, extensions, betterments and improvements to the property of said Railroad Company in the amount of \$6,790,668.64, which are now in progress or which have been authorized as aforesaid.

Third. That when said Bonds pledged under said Trust Agreement as aforesaid, or any part thereof, shall be released or redeemed from said pledge, they may be sold by the New York Central Railroad Company at a price which will net the Company not less than 90 per cent. of the face value and accrued interest; and the proceeds of the bonds so sold shall be used only for the payment and redemption of an equal amount of said two year five per cent. collateral trust gold notes, and for the payment of the balance of expenditures remaining unprovided for by the sale of said notes.

Fourth. It is further ordered that the New York Central Railroad Company shall keep separate, true and accurate accounts showing the receipt and application in detail of the proceeds of the sale or disposal of the bonds and not as hereby authorized to be issued, and within sixty days after the end of each quarter year beginning with January 1, 1918, within which any of said bonds or notes shall have been sold or the proceeds thereof used, said Company shall make verified report, in duplicate, to the Board, stating, as the case may be, the sale or sales of said bonds or notes during said period, the terms and conditions of the sale, the moneys realized therefrom, and the use and application of said moneys; and said accounts and the vouchers and records of the Company shall be open to audit and may be audited from time to time by accountants and examiners designated for that purpose by the Board. Such report shall continue to be filed until all of said securities shall have been sold or disposed of, and the proceeds expended in accordance with the authority contained hereunder.

Dated September 17th, 1917.

In the Matter of the Application of the Riverton and Palmyra Water Company for Permission to Issue \$125,000 of Capital Stock as a Stock Dividend.

REPORT.

Thomas J. Hillery and *John G. Horner*, for the Petitioner.

Under date of June 14, 1917, the Riverton & Palmyra Water Company filed a petition with this Board requesting the approval of an

issue of \$125,000 of capital stock, "representing assets of the company against which no securities have heretofore been issued."

A hearing was held on this petition on October 9th, the Company being represented by J. W. Ledoux as expert witness and the Board by H. E. Carver, of the Board's Appraisal Department.

With its petition the company submitted a written report on the value of its property made by Mr. Ledoux, subsequently marked as Exhibit P-1 for identification when the matter came to be heard. From the facts given therein, confirmed by the Board's Inspector, is taken the following:

BRIEF HISTORY OF THE COMPANY AND ITS PLANT.

The Water Company was incorporated on July 20, 1888, and works were constructed by contract in 1889 to supply water to the Borough of Riverton, Palmyra Township and Cinnaminson Township. One private line has been laid in Delran Township and one in Chester Township for which no franchise is held.

In the original plant the water was obtained from a large brick curb well, sunk about 60 feet from the Delaware River, on the theory that the river water would be collected by infiltration. This well was 13 feet inside and 16 feet outside diameter by 22 feet 6 inches deep. The quality of the water found was excellent and so much superior to the river water as to lead to the conclusion that the supply was derived from a water-bearing stratum coming from the land side, and not from the river by infiltration. The proximity and the small cost of this collection system has been a decided element in the economical operation of the plant.

The original pumping station was a brick structure 18 feet by 42 feet outside with a slate, gable roof, wooden floors and mill work, built in 1889. The first equipment consisted of a 1,000,000 gallon duplex pump, a 60 h. p. return tubular boiler and a duplex feed pump and accessories. The brick stack was 69 feet high, 26 inch bore, connected to the boiler by a steel flue.

The original piping system was of patent cement-lined pipe. Connected with same and just outside of the Riverton Borough line, a 75,000 gallon wooden water tower, 75 feet high was built on brick substructure.

In order to obtain additional room for another boiler and coal storage the old station was extended, in 1892, by an L at the boiler room end and a new 60 h. p. safety boiler was installed, the original boiler being moved to form a battery. In the same year an additional 1,000,000 gallon compound duplex pump was installed.

In 1895 the well was deepened four feet, and 125 feet of 18 inch open joint Terra Cotta pipe was laid from the bottom of the well in the water bearing stratum westwardly parallel with the river to increase

the infiltration area. In 1907 a second extension was made eastwardly 300 feet with the same kind of pipe, both extensions being parallel to and about 60 feet from the river. As the water rises in the well, at times, 8 feet above the river level, it is apparent that the water does not come from the river.

In 1897 an additional distribution 397,000 gallon wrought iron standpipe, 30 feet in diameter and 75 feet high, was erected on the same lot as the original water tower; in 1904, the latter was demolished and a new 177,000 gallon wrought iron standpipe, 20 feet in diameter and 75 feet high, was erected on its substructure.

In 1906 and 1907 another addition was made to the station building, the pumphouse being extended to complete the rectangular shape of the building, and a new 2,500,000 gallon vertical triple expansion duplex pump was installed. The original 60 h. p. return tubular boiler and duplex feedpump were junked and a new 126 h. p. water tube boiler was installed. A masonry wall was also built along the company's water front to prevent infiltration of river water and erosion of the river banks. In 1912 the original 60 h. p. safety boiler was scrapped and replaced by a 125 h. p. water tube boiler, which is now doing service with 126 h. p.

To increase the station facilities, an additional pumping station was erected on the river bank about 200 feet below the main pumping station during the year 1915. The building is of brick, 12 by 17 feet outside, on concrete foundations and has a flat slag roof. It houses a triplex power pump geared to a 30 h. p. induction motor so arranged that the latter will automatically start or stop according to the required pressure. The water for this pump is obtained by suction from driven wells, two of which are 10 inches in diameter and 54 feet deep and a third 8 inches in diameter and 52 feet deep; two additional 8 inch wells have been built for future use but not connected with the pumps. During 1916 was constructed a new radial brick stack, 11 feet 7 1/4 inches outside diameter at the bottom and 4 feet diameter at the top and 125 feet high; this will soon replace the brick stack originally built.

From the beginning it has been the policy of the company to require their customers to pay for the installation of service pipes and their maintenance.

From a consideration of the above it will be noted that the conditions for low plant and operating costs are very favorable. The collection and pumping system are concentrated on one small plot of land, the pumping equipment is simple, no difficult engineering problems were encountered, the original plant was designed and built by the Pennsylvania Pipe Manufacturing Company, now the American Pipe & Construction Company, under contract, presumably covering engineering and interest.

FINANCIAL HISTORY.

OUTSTANDING STOCK, The following issues of capital stock, duly authorized by the Board of Directors, have heretofore been made:

On July 20th, 1888, an issue of \$50,000 of stock was authorized and \$42,000 issued at par for cash; and 8,000 additional issued in 1890 for cash.

On May 26th, 1899, an issue of \$25,000 was issued as a stock dividend.

On Jan. 9th, 1908, an issue of \$25,000 was issued as a stock dividend.

On June 10th, 1910, an issue of \$25,000 was issued as a stock dividend.

Of a total authorized capital stock of \$300,000, \$125,000 of capital stock has therefore been issued and is now outstanding, of which \$50,000 was sold for cash, and the remainder of \$75,000 issued as stock dividends. No bonds have been issued.

Knowing the amount of capital stock which has been issued, it now becomes necessary to determine.

THE VALUE OF THE COMPANY'S PROPERTY WHICH IS USED AND USEFUL.

In his testimony before the Board in this case, Mr. Ledoux followed the report which he had made to the Company, marked P-1 for identification. He considered the value of the property from three points of view:

1. By the Wisconsin method of determining "development cost," assuming 9% basis and modified book figures for extensions, revenue and operating expenses: his value of total investment on 9% return was\$241,170.11

2. By inventory and appraisal of tangible and intangible property.

(a) The tangible values were determined by the usual method of assigning unit values, based on costs for past ten years to all the items inventoried, and to the total so ascertained adding 7½% for Promotion, Organization, Preliminary Engineering and Legal Expense, and 6% for Engineering and Legal Expense during Construction, a total overhead of 13½%. By this method his

Base value new was\$235,447
 Depreciation accrued on same..... 28,150

Base value, present value.....	\$207,297
13½% overheads,	27,968

Total present value of tangible property,.....	\$235,265
(b) Going value ascertained by the Alvord method,	41,478

Total present value of all property,, including services,	\$276,743
---	-----------

3. By taking the "present worth" of the estimated revenue for the next thirty years (allowing 1% for depreciation charge annually) arrived at by discounting each year's net revenue at 8% compound interest. The value so deduced is stated to be..... \$270,000

We will consider these values in order above stated, all as of January 1st, 1917.

1. ACTUAL INVESTMENT AS SHOWN BY THE BOOKS adjusted to eliminate errors in classification.

In his Tables I and II Mr. Ledoux set forth the original investment of \$42,000 in 1889 and the improvements and extensions thereto annually, as adjusted by him, amounting to an aggregate of \$162,398.57 gross, no withdrawals being deducted; the sum of these two amounts would indicate \$204,398.57 cost. These figures were checked by the Board's witness and found to be substantially correct for the years 1889 to 1910 inclusive, but incorrect for the subsequent years, not agreeing either with the company's books or the company's annual reports to this Board. Table 1 has, therefore, been prepared to make the necessary corrections in capital account and to show in a condensed form the original investment, the annual extensions and withdrawals, the average investment, operating revenues, expenses and net revenues, dividends actually paid in cash and in stock and the annual net earnings in percentage of average capital; no depreciation is taken into account in this percentage except that included in operating as indicated.

TABLE I—BOOK STATISTICS (Adjusted).

Year Jan. 1	Investment	Extension during 12 months	Withdrawals during 12 months	Average Investment	Operating Expenses	Operating Revenues	Net Earnings	Depreciation	Dividends	Surplus above Dividends.	Stock issued for Cash	Issued for Dividends	Per cent Earnings
1889											42,000		
1890	42,000	6,535		45,268	2,075	2,250	175			175			0.386
1891	48,535	2,880		49,976	1,885	3,607	1,722			1,722	8,000		3.44
1892	51,515	6,936		54,884	1,820	5,101	3,281			3,281			5.98
1893	58,851	1,904		59,304	1,956	6,187	4,231			4,231			5.13
1894	60,255	1,426		60,969	2,618	7,129	4,511		2,000	2,511			7.4
1895	61,681	7,781		65,572	2,021	8,153	6,132		2,000	4,132			9.35
1896	69,462	1,608		70,266	3,438	9,056	5,618		2,000	3,618			8.00
1897	71,070	10,747		76,444	3,026	9,716	6,691		2,000	4,691			8.75
1898	81,817	1,290		82,463	2,940	9,565	6,625		2,000	4,625			8.03
1899	83,107	2,863		84,539	3,189	10,414	7,225		2,000	5,225		25,000	8.55
1900	85,970	533		86,237	3,480	10,803	7,323		3,000	4,323			8.49
1901	86,503	2,871		87,939	4,597	12,774	8,177		3,700	4,477			9.3
1902	89,374	3,279		91,014	4,152	11,627	7,475		4,125	3,350			8.21
1903	92,653	2,780		94,044	5,253	13,207	7,954		4,500	3,454			8.46
1904	95,433	4,323	1,604	96,793	7,898	14,363	6,465		4,500	1,965			6.68
1905	98,152	1,632		98,968	5,885	14,272	8,387		4,500	3,887			8.47
1906	99,784	7,263		103,416	6,197	16,258	10,061		4,500	5,561			9.73
1907	107,047	26,413	1,200	119,654	9,409	17,773	8,364		4,500	3,864			6.99
1908	132,260	218		132,369	7,330	17,904	10,574		4,125	6,449		25,000	7.99
1909	132,478	523		132,740	6,631	19,254	12,623		4,500	8,123			9.51
1910	133,001	6,543		136,273	7,585	19,278	11,693		4,500	7,193			8.58
1911	139,544	11,859		145,474	8,113	22,150	14,037	3,000*	4,500	9,537		25,000	9.65
1912	151,403	5,539	1,937	153,204	9,698	23,790	14,092		6,250	7,842			9.2
1913	155,005	4,660		157,335	9,912	28,596	18,684	4,723*	6,250	12,434			11.88
1914	159,665	12,878		166,104	9,737	26,975	17,238	1,000*	6,250	10,988			10.38
1915	172,543	9,419		177,253	10,339	27,197	16,858	1,000*	6,250	10,608			9.51
1916	181,962	9,378	700	186,302	11,496	28,719	17,223	1,000*	11,250	5,973			9.24
1917	190,640												
Totals..	2,931,110	154,081	5,441	2,814,804	152,679	396,118	243,439	10,723	99,200	144,239	50,000	75,000	8.65

*Also included in Operating Expenses.

MORTGAGES, STOCKS AND BONDS.

Table I shows that the original plant cost \$42,000, to which net additions of \$154,081 have been added, making a total of \$190,640 after deducting \$5,441 of property withdrawn from service, all as of January 1st, 1917. This is taken to represent the adjusted book cost of the property of the company when new. It is shown hereinafter that the accrued depreciation of the property, reproduction cost new, is about 20%, which may be taken to fairly represent the accrued depreciation of the property on the basis of adjusted book cost; this amounts to \$38,128 which deducted from \$190,640 value new leaves \$152,512 present value after providing for accrued depreciation.

A development cost calculation, using the data given in Table I, page 6, and 7.8% interest will show that the resulting present worth of the required investment would be at least equal to \$152,512. The present value of the property, then, is sufficient on this basis to have provided for all depreciation (20%) and to have afforded a return of 7.8% on the investment. As this Board has determined in other cases involving water utilities that 7% is a fair return, this calculation shows that there is no addition to be made to intangible capital to provide for unearned profits or unearned depreciation.

On page 7 of P-1 Mr. Ledoux states, "There seems to be a tendency among progressive Public Utility Commissions to consider this method as the fairest to the utility and to the public, especially in the case of establishing rates." This remark should be predicated on a showing that the rates actually charged by the utility during the period covered by the investigation have not been extortionate or even unduly high. The company has had but one set of rates since it began operations. They are neither the highest nor the lowest but have produced a profitable return on the investment of the stockholders, partly owing to economical management and partly owing to low capital costs, especially in the collection system, and to moderate pressures pumped against.

The Board, therefore, finds that on the basis of adjusted book costs the value of the property new of the company for the purposes of this investigation is \$190,640, that the accrued depreciation thereon is \$38,128, and the present value is \$152,512.

MORTGAGES, STOCKS AND BONDS.

181

(Exhibit P-1)

TABLE II.

SUMMARY OF REPRODUCTION VALUE, APRIL 7th, 1917.

By J. W. Ledoux, C.E.

	<i>Total Cost</i>	<i>Amount of* Depreciation</i>	<i>Present Value</i>
Distribution Piping—159923	\$123,189.00	\$3,756.00	\$199,433.00
Distribution Piping Specials 1201	1,456.00	36.00	1,420.00
Distribution Piping Valves 203..	3,071.00	473.00	2,598.00
Distribution Piping Hydrants 158	4,819.00	1,629.00	3,180.00
Distribution Piping Meters 15...	736.00	147.00	589.00
Distribution Services 1577.....	18,683.00	6,006.00	12,677.00
Machinery and Plant.....	23,026.00	6,167.00	16,859.00
Steam and Exhaust Piping.....	988.00	244.00	744.00
Suction and Discharge Piping....	1,699.00	620.00	1,079.00
Steam Pumping Station.....	9,914.00	2,280.00	7,634.00
Electric Pumping Station.....	995.00	36.00	959.00
Collecting Well and Infiltration Pipes	5,993.00	1,840.00	4,153.00
Artesian Wells.....	1,345.00	30.00	1,315.00
Radial Brick Stack.....	3,269.00		3,269.00
Improvements (Paving and Road- ways)	1,100.00	63.00	1,037.00
Dwelling and Stable.....	4,275.00	1,988.00	2,287.00
Shop and Garage.....	440.00	52.00	388.00
River Retaining Wall and Fill...	4,203.00	92.00	4,111.00
Improvements to Standpipe Lot..	220.00	35.00	185.00
Two Standpipes and Foundations	10,104.00	2,646.00	7,458.00
Small Equipment on Hand....	2,047.00		2,047.00
Real Estate and Right of Way..	13,875.00		13,875.00
	\$235,447.00	\$28,150.00	\$207,297.00
Promotion, Organization, Preliminary Engineering and Legal Expenses 7½%.....			\$15,530.00
Engineering and Legal Expenses During Construction Up to Date 6%.....			12,438.00
Going Value 17.6%.....			41,478.00
			\$276,743.00

*On basis of 4% Sinking Fund.

TABLE III.

GRAND SUMMARY OF THE PROPERTY OF THE COMPANY, AS APPRAISED BY THE BOARD'S VALUATION DEPARTMENT, SHOWING

			COST TO REPRODUCE		ACCRUED DEPRECIATION		PRESENT VALUE (Ex. C-1, p. 1)		
Ref.	Acc. No.	Description	Net Cost Total	%	Addition Amount	Cost to Reproduce	Depreciation %	Amount	Present Value
1	106	Reservations	\$6,662	12.5	\$833	\$7,495			\$7,495
1	109	Springs and Wells.....	6,779	13.85	941	7,720	17.4	\$1,345	6,375
1	110	Infiltration Gallery.....	4,480	12.5	560	5,040	17.45	879	4,161
2	121	Pumping Station.....	16,518	13.0	2,148	18,666		1,820	16,846
2	122	Steam Power Pumping Equipment..	20,959	11.3	2,372	23,331	41.7	9,313	14,018
1	124	Electric Power Pumping Equipment..	3,325	7.5	250	3,575	3.33	119	3,456
1	128	Storage Reservoirs, Tanks and Stand-pipes	16,417	12.5	2,052	18,469	30.0	5,541	12,928
1	129	Distribution Mains.....	117,132	12.5	14,643	131,775	19.4	25,561	106,214
1	131	Meters	900	2.56	23	923	10.5	97	826
1	132	Hydrants	5,767	12.5	721	6,488	37.3	2,420	4,068
1	134	General Structures.....	5,097	12.5	635	5,732	21.1	1,209	4,523
1	135	General Equipment.....	1,220	5.0	60	1,280	10.2	131	1,149
			\$205,256	12.3	\$25,238	\$230,494	21.0	\$48,435	\$182,059
14	129	Expenditures January 1st to April 1st, 1917, per company's books.....				1,669			1,669
Total Tangible Fixed Capital as of 4-1-1917						\$232,163		\$48,435	\$183,728

2. VALUE OF PROPERTY ON BASIS OF REPRODUCTION NEW.

The Board's appraisal engineer assembled his inventory and appraisal in accordance with the Uniform System of Accounts for Water Utilities prescribed by the Board, whereas Mr. Ledoux did not follow this system. The summary of each is, therefore, given, Mr. Ledoux's being shown in Table II, and that of the Board's engineer in Table III.

Reference to Table II will show that the total cost of labor and material on the basis assumed is \$235,447; from this the amount of accrued depreciation on a 4% sinking fund basis is \$28,150, leaving \$207,297 as the present value cost new of labor and materials. To this he adds 7½% overheads for Promotion, Organization, Preliminary Engineering and Legal Expenses and 6% for Engineering and Legal Expenses during Construction, the total overheads being \$27,968 and the total present value of tangible property being \$235,265. In this, however, is included the estimated cost of 1,577 services not installed nor paid for by the company, the present value of which, with overheads of 13.5%, is \$14,388. Omitting the services, the present value of the tangible property, by Mr. Ledoux's estimate, is \$220,877.

INTANGIBLE VALUES.

Following the method of Alvord & Metcalfe, Mr. Ledoux worked out a Going Concern Value of \$41,478 on a six year program. This method involves the assumption that the revenue received by the utility is a reasonable one. Very frequently this is the very fact to be determined. Moreover, so many factors have to be assumed that no two experts working independently would give the same answer. The presiding commissioner criticised this method in the following words (Testimony, page 33): "It seems to me, under this method, the greater the value, the greater the earnings, and it would be constantly building up, because the more the company earned the greater the value of the property when added to the going value. Therefore, he would have greater value and greater earnings. When one would increase the other would go up correspondingly and go on pyramiding 'as high as the traffic would bear.'" Mr. Ledoux stated, "It is one of the methods of figuring which a great many courts and commissions think is the right method. I have my doubts about it myself. Personally, I don't believe in it." Under the theory of regulation this method would appear to have only a limited value.

In this connection attention is directed to the fact that this Board is of the opinion that intangible values must have some reasonable relation to the tangible values with which associated.

In the more recent decisions rendered by this Board, such as that of Township of Mantua vs. New Jersey Gas Company, and in the matter of hearing as to whether the schedule of rates of the Hackensack

Water Company was just and reasonable, the intangible values as found did not, in either case, exceed five per cent. of the value new of the tangible property, excluding from intangible development cost, which, as before shown, does not enter into the case under consideration.

THE TOTAL PRESENT VALUE, then, of the tangible and intangible property as shown by Mr. Ledoux, including services, by this method, was \$276,743, or excluding services, \$262,355.

Reference to Table III. will show that the Board's Engineer estimated the cost to reproduce new the tangible property of the company at \$230,494, including overheads of 12.3%; the accrued depreciation thereon, on the straight line basis, was \$48,435, leaving a present value of \$182,059, as compared with Mr. Ledoux's figure of \$220,877 with depreciation on the sinking fund basis. If Mr. Ledoux had taken 21% on the straight line basis for depreciation (omitting services also) his present value would have been \$194,388. The difference would be about 5%

With \$194,388 as the upper limit and \$182,059 as the lower limit, the Board is of the opinion that the mean of these two values, that is to say, \$188,000 is the fair present value of the tangible property of the company on January 1st, 1917, on the basis of reproduction new.

As to intangible values, the evidence before the Board is of such an indefinite character that no conclusion will be presented with respect thereto.

3. PRESENT WORTH BASED ON THIRTY YEARS ASSUMED FUTURE
NET REVENUE (8% DISCOUNT).

On pages 28 and 29 of Exhibit P-1, the company's witness assumes that the net revenues experienced in the past may be projected forward for thirty years and the present value of this revenue taken to be the "market value" (P-1, p. 12). This calculation does not appear to have much evidential value. The result will be changed if we take more or less than thirty years or if, under regulation, the net revenue be decreased or increased as compared with historical net revenue from which Mr. Ledoux deduces his future revenue.

THE BASIS TO BE TAKEN FOR STOCK ISSUE ASKED.

In view of the above recapitulation of the facts developed in this case, the question now becomes pertinent as to which of the three bases shall be taken for the purposes of arriving at the value of the property upon which the issue of stock shall be predicated?

Basis No. 3 will be discarded for the reason that it does not take into consideration either the property which is used and useful, or the

proper relation of net revenue to a fair return on the property used and useful. Furthermore, it assumes that the revenue of the utility is to be continued on the present basis, whether found just, deficient or excessive.

Basis No. 2 is frequently considered in rate cases but does not necessarily or usually represent the investment in dollars made by the stockholders.

Basis No. 1, as nearly as the Board can determine from the facts before it, represents the investment value of the property of the company. If the approval now sought were for an issue of stock based on extensions made during the last two or three years it is doubtful if any other figures than those representing the actual costs would be submitted by the company for the Board's consideration. It appears reasonable, therefore, to extend the same theory so as to cover the longer term of year involved in this application. This leads to the selection of basis No. 1 by the Board.

The Board accordingly finds as follows, as of January 1st, 1917:

The Investment cost new of the company's prop- erty was	\$190,640
The accrued depreciation thereon was	38,128
	<hr/>
The present value of same as a basis for a stock issue was	\$152,512
The stock heretofore issued and outstanding is....	125,000
	<hr/>
Excess of investment over stock issued	\$ 27,512

It appears to be undoubtedly a fact that the company's net revenue will be sufficient to guarantee a reasonable dividend on a total stock issue of \$150,000.

Now, therefore, after due consideration of the record and of all the facts in this case, the Board will approve the issue by the River-ton and Palmyra Water Company of \$25,000 of its capital stock to re-imburse it for the additions and betterments to plant and system not heretofore capitalized, with the understanding that its books of account shall be made to reflect the findings as to capital and the accrued depre-ciation thereon above set forth.

A certificate of approval consistent herewith will issue.

Dated November 19, 1917.

In the Matter of the Application of the Clinton Water and Water Supply Company for Approval of Mortgage and Issue of Bonds Thereunder.

REPORT.

Foster M. Voorhees, for Petitioner.

Grover C. Richman, for the Board.

The Clinton Water & Water Supply Company (a corporation of the State of New Jersey), located at Clinton, N. J., supplying water in Clinton and the neighboring territory of Annandale, applies for the approval of a mortgage bearing date Nov. 1, 1917, made to the Somerville Trust Company, and the issuance of bonds in the amount of \$20,000 thereunder.

It appears that the proposed mortgage covering the property of the company is given to secure bonds in the amount of \$50,000, of which bonds in the amount of \$20,000 are to be issued for the purchase payment and retirement of bonds in the amount of \$20,000 previously issued by the Clinton Water & Water Supply Company, bearing date Nov. 1, 1897, and due Nov. 1, 1917, and secured by mortgage dated the same day, covering its property and franchises made to the Manhattan Trust Company; and that the proposed mortgage is for said purpose and also for the further purpose of paying the costs of extensions, improvements, reconstruction of equipment and betterment and enlargement of the company's plant, and the acquirement of lands, water and water rights in connection therewith.

It further appears that the proposed issue of the bonds in the sum of \$20,000 will bear interest at five per cent. and will mature in twenty years, with interest payable in May and November of each year, and that the present issue is for the sole purpose of retiring outstanding bonds in a similar amount, sold for par, and maturing on November 1, 1917, by exchanging the same for the new bonds at par.

The book value of the company's plant was given at the hearing as \$41,007.57, but no appraisalment of the plant had been made for the purpose of the application and the matter was taken into conference, subject to the report of the accounting department as to the value of the plant and other necessary matters pertinent to the application. It appears from the report of the Board's statistician and accountant that the financial data given in the application agrees entirely with the company's annual reports previously filed, and that the book value of the entire property is reported to be \$41,007.57, as testified at the hearing which amount is slightly in excess of the present total outstanding capitalization, namely, \$40,000, consisting of \$20,000 par value of capital stock, and \$20,000 par value of mortgage bonds, which

it is now proposed to refund by a new issue of an equal amount; that the company's annual report contains a fairly good inventory of its physical property, and by applying normal unit prices, an approximate reproduction value new would amount to \$42,641, or about \$1,600 in excess of the book value of the property; that the company is not overcapitalized, and that there have been invested in the plant expenditures equal to the par value of the present outstanding securities, all of which had been issued prior to the existence of the Board; that the bonds of the proposed new issue bear interest at the rate of five per centum per annum, the same as the old bonds, and as testified to at the hearing, are to be sold or taken at par, resulting in the company's fixed annual charge of \$1,000 for bond interest, or its equivalent, to continue as heretofore.

It appears further from the reports of the company on file with this Board, that the company has during each of the past six years paid 7% dividends on this capital stock, and has had left, after the payment thereof, an average of \$600 per year, most of which it has invested in extensions or additions to its plant and equipment. This amount is somewhat in excess of a proper allowance for estimated annual depreciation, for which the company, however, has not made any provision in its account, as should be done in strict compliance with the accounting regulations prescribed by the Board for water utilities.

There is doubtless no question of the company's ability to earn the interest on the proposed new issue of the bonds.

The Board will, therefore, approve the mortgage given as security for bonds in the amount of \$50,000 as submitted, and the issuance thereunder of bonds in the amount of \$20,000 at par, for the purpose of retiring outstanding bonds in a similar amount, maturing Nov. 1, 1917, and which, with the mortgage given to secure the same, are to be surrendered and cancelled. Approval, however, is made upon condition that the company set aside not less than \$500 each year to provide a reserve for depreciation, and carry this amount under the proper account on its books.

Dated November 20, 1917.

In the Matter of the Application of the Erie Railroad Company for Authority to Issue Fifteen Million Dollars (\$15,000,000.) of Twenty Year Six per cent Bonds, Series "A", Under Its Refunding and Improvement Mortgage, Dated December 1st, 1916, to the Bankers Trust Company, Trustee.

ORDER.

The Erie Railroad Company, a corporation of the State of New York, having on November 2nd, 1917, filed its petition with this Board (which petition is by reference thereto herein made part hereof) praying for an order authorizing the issuance of Fifteen Million Dollars (\$15,000,000) of twenty year six per cent. bonds, Series "A," under its Refunding and Improvement Mortgage, dated December 1st, 1916, to the Bankers Trust Company, Trustee, and a hearing having been had 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 ORDERS:

1. That the Erie Railroad Company be and is hereby authorized to issue \$15,000,000 face value of its 6% 20 year Series A refunding and improvement mortgage bonds under a certain indenture, deed of trust or mortgage dated the first day of December, 1916, given to the Bankers Trust Company, as Trustee, to secure an authorized issue of bonds of a total face value of \$500,000,000.

2. That said bonds of the total face value of \$15,000,000 may be sold for not less than 90% of their face value and accrued interest to give net proceeds of at least \$13,500,000.

3. That said bonds of the face value of \$15,000,000 so authorized, or the proceeds thereof to the amount of \$13,500,000 shall be used solely and exclusively for the reimbursement of the treasury of the petitioner for moneys actually expended for the acquisition of fixed assets within five years prior to the filing of the petition herein and which were not obtained from the issue of stocks, bonds, notes or other evidence of indebtedness of such corporation.

4. That the Erie Railroad Company be and is hereby authorized to forthwith pledge \$8,750,000 in amount of the bonds herein authorized to be issued as collateral security for the payment of a short term loan aggregating \$5,000,000 principal amount; and is authorized without further application to this Board to pledge the remaining \$6,250,000 in amount of said bonds as collateral security for the payment of other and additional loans, upon the basis of not more than \$175 in amount of bonds for each \$100 in amount of loan. Provided, nevertheless, that any such additional loan as to its rate

of interest, net return to the borrower, period of duration and otherwise shall be made upon terms not less advantageous to the company than shall result from the above mentioned loan of \$5,000,000. It being the intent hereof that no loan upon less advantageous terms to the petitioner than of the said \$5,000,000 loan shall be made and consummated herein unless the approval and permission of this Board shall have been first and expressly given and granted.

5. That the Erie Railroad Company shall make verified reports to the Board covering each pledging of bonds which it shall make under the authority of this order within twenty-four hours after such pledging shall have been made, which reports shall show the amount of the loan or loans, the rate of interest thereupon, and the amount of bonds pledged as collateral security therefor. Any additional information in regard to said loans, or any of them, which thereafter may be required by this Board shall upon its request therefor be promptly supplied by the corporation.

6. That the proceeds of the loans to secure which bonds herein authorized may be pledged as collateral security shall be used solely and exclusively for the purpose for which the bonds or their proceeds are herein authorized to be used.

7. That the Erie Railroad Company shall for each six months period following the date of this order file not more than thirty days from the end of such period a verified report showing:

(a) What bonds have been sold or otherwise disposed of or pledged during such period in accordance with the authority contained herein.

(b) The date of such sale or pledging.

(c) To or with whom such bonds were sold or pledged.

(d) What proceeds were realized from such sales or pledging.

(e) The principal of each loan for which such bonds are pledged.

(f) The total face value of bonds which remain pledged as collateral security for said loans on the closing date of such period.

(g) Any other terms and conditions of such transactions.

(h) The amount used during such period of the proceeds of the bonds herein authorized for the purpose specified herein.

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

8. That the authority contained in this order to issue bonds is upon the express condition that the petitioner accepts and agrees to comply in good faith with the provisions hereof and before any bonds are issued pursuant hereto and within thirty days of the service hereof,

the said company shall file with the Board a satisfactory verified stipulation over the signatures of its President and Secretary accepting this order with all its terms and conditions, and such order shall be void and of no force or effect until such stipulation shall have been filed as last above provided.

FINALLY IT IS DETERMINED AND STATED, that in the opinion of the Board the money to be procured by the issue of said bonds 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 November 20th, 1917.

**In the Matter of the Application of the Morris County Traction Company
for Authority to Issue Income Debenture Bonds.**

REPORT.

King and Vogt, for the petitioner.

The amended petition of the Morris County Traction Company, filed November 23rd, 1917, says it proposes to issue, subject to the approval of the Board, "income debenture bonds to the amount of \$1,179,000 in denominations of \$1,000 each payable June 16th, 1948, with interest on the principal sum thereof at such rate, not exceeding 5% per annum, as the Board of Directors of the Traction Company from time to time shall ascertain, determine and declare, to be payable thereon, out of available surplus income of the said Traction Company as defined in a certain deed of trust or agreement dated June 18th, 1917, made by and between the holders of the Morris County Traction Company five per cent. first mortgage gold bonds, issued under its mortgage dated June 15th, 1906, and holders of the Morris County Traction Company five per cent, general mortgage gold bonds issued under its mortgage dated June 16th, 1913." The said general mortgage gold bonds are to be retired by the new debenture bonds and the said new debenture bonds are not to be a lien upon the property of the Traction Company.

The petitioner intends to issue in place of coupons numbered 25 to 34 both inclusive, now attached to the first mortgage bonds, new coupons payable at the same time and bearing the same numbers as the coupons now attached to said bonds, the only difference being that the new coupons call for the payment of interest at the rate of 1% semi-annually instead of 2½% semi-annually; that such new coupons

will only be attached to the bonds owned by the persons who agree to such change.

There has been no objection made to this plan of financing excepting a letter received from T. K. Van Dyke, dated November 22nd, 1917, in which he claims to be the owner of \$10,000 of the first mortgage bonds and protests against the adoption of this plan. He did not appear further in the proceeding.

At the present time the Morris County Traction Company has outstanding \$3,000,000 par value of first mortgage bonds and \$1,179,000 par value of second mortgage bonds, each issue bearing interest at the rate of 5% per annum whereby the Company incurs each year a total liability for bond interest amounting to \$208,950. In no year thus far have the net earnings (i. e., gross revenue less operating expenses and taxes) equaled this amount, being \$91,960 thereunder in 1916, the most prosperous year the Company has yet had. There appears to be no reasonable certainty in the immediate future that there will be sufficient net revenues to meet all the present fixed charges for bond interest.

For the purpose of reducing the latter to a point where there can reasonably be no question as to the company's ability to meet its fixed interest charges it proposes to adopt the plan as above outlined, namely, (1) to retire the \$1,179,000 of second mortgage bonds by issuing in place thereof a like amount of income debenture bonds bearing the same rate of interest, which, however, does not become a liability unless it is actually earned, thus reducing the fixed charges by \$58,950; (2) to further reduce these charges by \$90,000 per annum during the coming five years through the substitution of new coupons bearing interest at the rate of 1% semi-annually in place of those now attached to the first mortgage bonds bearing interest at the rate of 2½% semi-annually, which fall due during this period.

By the adoption of this plan the company's fixed annual charges for bond interest during each of the next five years will be only \$60,000 which amount its net earnings during each of the past four years have exceeded, being almost double that sum in 1916. All net earnings in excess of \$60,000 after the payment of interest on equipment obligations and floating indebtedness amounting to a total of only \$6,796.37 in 1916 and the payment of rentals which will amount to approximately not more than \$30,000, will be deposited with the trustee under the agreement of June 18th, 1917, to be distributed by him pro rata among the first mortgage bondholders until each one of them has received in full 5% interest on the face value of his bond from the date of its issue to the time full payment is made. Not until such time will any interest become payable on the income debenture bonds now proposed to be issued.

The Company has made application for the approval of a lease or trackage agreement between the petitioner and the Morris Railroad Company, dated November 2nd, 1913. This will be passed upon by

the Board later and an independent report filed. The approval of the present issue of securities must not be construed as in any manner approving the terms of the said lease or trackage agreement.

We find and conclude that the proposed plan of the Traction Company is reasonable and in no manner prejudicial to public interest. The rights of no bond holder can be affected thereby except with his consent. We, therefore, approve the proposed issue of income debenture bonds applied for.

A certificate will accordingly issue.

Dated December 18th, 1917.

Ordinances and Resolutions

<i>Date of Approval.</i>	<i>Name of Applicant.</i>	<i>Subject.</i>
Feb. 13, 1917,....	New York Telephone Company	For approval of ordinance, Borough of Seaside Heights, adopted July 25, 1916, authorizing the use of various streets, roads, etc., both above and below the surface for the construction and maintenance, etc., of local and through lines and systems.
Feb. 13, 1917,....	New York Telephone Company	For approval of amendatory ordinance, Borough of Avon-By-the-Sea, passed May 22, 1916, original ordinance having been passed March 19, 1906, designating streets, alleys, etc., through and upon which posts, poles, and underground cables of the New York and New Jersey Telephone Company might be placed, etc.
Feb. 13, 1917,....	New York Telephone Company	For approval of ordinance, Borough of Somerville, passed June 5, 1916, granting permission for use of portions of certain streets in the Borough of Somerville, below the surface thereof, for the construction, maintenance, etc., of local and through lines and systems.
Feb. 13, 1917,....	Delaware and Atlantic Telegraph and Telephone Company	For approval of ordinance, Township of Maurice River, passed December 5, 1916, authorizing the erection, construction, etc., of terminal and distributing poles and other necessary fixtures and appliances for local and through lines in, upon and along, over and under each and every of the public roads, streets, alleys and highways of the Township of Maurice River.
Mar. 20, 1917,....	New York Telephone Company	For approval of ordinance, Board of Chosen Freeholders, Bergen County, passed November 15, 1916, granting permission for use of parts of certain streets, roads, avenues, etc., under the jurisdiction and control of the Board of Chosen Freeholders in Bergen County, both above and below the surface thereof, for construction, maintenance, etc., of local and through lines and systems.

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

194 PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSIONERS' REPORT.

<i>Date of Approval.</i>	<i>Name of Applicant.</i>	<i>Subject.</i>
Mar. 20, 1917,....	Haddonfield Rural Telephone Company	For approval of ordinance, Delaware Township, Camden County, passed November 25, 1916, authorizing construction, etc., of poles, wires, etc., on, upon, along, over and under each and every of the public roads, streets, alleys and highways of the Township.
April 4, 1917,....	Sussex Telephone Company	For approval of ordinance, Borough of Franklin, passed January 2, 1917, granting permission for use of various streets, roads, etc., and parts thereof, both above and below the surface, for construction, maintenance, etc., of local and through lines and systems.
April 4, 1917,....	West Monmouth Water Company	For approval of ordinance, Borough of Farmingdale, passed December 5, 1916, granting right to construct, maintain and operate a water supply system in Farmingdale, and use all streets, avenues, parks, highways and other public places.
April 24, 1917,....	Delaware and Atlantic Telegraph and Telephone Company	For approval of ordinance, Borough of Merchantville, passed March 6, 1917, authorizing construction and maintenance of conduits, lines, terminal and distribution poles, etc., for local and through lines, in, upon, along, over and under each and every public street and avenue within limits of the Borough of Merchantville.
July 3, 1917,....	New York Telephone Company	For approval of ordinance, Board of Chosen Freeholders of Bergen County, passed May 2, 1917, authorizing the use of various streets, roads, avenues, highways and bridges, above and below the surface, for the construction, maintenance, etc., of its local and through lines and systems.
July 3, 1917,....	New York Telephone Company	For approval of ordinance, Township of North Bergen, passed May 10, 1917, authorizing construction and maintenance of local and through lines and systems on portions (except where otherwise specified) of certain streets, roads, avenues and highways, also granting permission and consent to use poles and posts of other companies and corporations.
July 3, 1917,....	Eureka Power Company	For approval of resolution, Board of Chosen Freeholders of Mercer County, passed May 3, 1917, granting permission to erect and maintain poles and wires along various highways named in the resolution.
Aug. 14, 1917,....	New York Telephone Company	For approval of ordinance of Borough of Westwood, passed April 20, 1915, and amendatory ordinance, passed May 15, 1917, authorizing construction, maintenance, etc., of local and through lines and systems and granting permission for use of various streets, roads, avenues and highways and parts thereof, above and below the surface in the Borough of Westwood, New Jersey.

In the Matter of the Application of the Western Union Telegraph Company for Approval of Ordinance of the City of Trenton.

REPORT.

H. B. Gill for the Western Union Telegraph Company.

L. Edward Herrmann and *Grover C. Richman* for the Board of Public Utility Commissioners.

Application is made to this Board for approval of an ordinance of the City of Trenton which purports to be a supplement to an ordinance entitled "An ordinance granting to the Western Union Telegraph Company, its successors and assigns, the right to construct and maintain lines, conduits and underground ways in, under and across the streets, alleys and public places of the City of Trenton, in the State of New Jersey, and to place and operate therein wires and cables necessary to carry on all branches of business in connection with the telegraph, ticker and messenger service and to erect and maintain distributing poles in alleys and other places," passed September 19th, 1913.

The enacting part is as follows:

"The Board of Commissioners of the City of Trenton do ordain:

1. That the authority conferred by Section 1 of the above entitled ordinance be and the same is hereby extended to include West Hanover Street from Chancery Street to Willow Street; Willow Street from Chancery Street to Quarry Street; Quarry Street from Willow Street to Calhoun Street and Calhoun Street from Quarry Street to Calhoun Street Bridge, subject to all the terms, conditions and limitations contained in the ordinance, to which this is a supplement. Passed October 18, 1916."

Hearing was had upon the application April 17th, 1917, at Trenton; testimony was taken and a brief filed by the petitioner. The approval of the supplemental ordinance is asked under Chapter 195, Article III, Section 24, Laws of 1911, as follows:

"No privilege or franchise hereafter granted to any public utility as herein defined, by any political subdivision of this state, shall be valid until approved by said Board, such approval to be given when, after hearing, said Board determines that such privilege or franchise is necessary and proper for the public convenience and properly conserves the public interest

and the Board shall have power in so approving, to impose such conditions as to construction, equipment, maintenance, service or operation, as the public convenience and interest may reasonably require."

The question raised is whether the provisions of the statute commonly designated The Limited Franchise Act, Chapter 36, Laws 1906, and the acts supplemental thereto and amendatory thereof, should have been complied with in the enactment of the supplemental ordinance.

It appears that the procedure adopted in the enactment of the original ordinance to which the ordinance submitted is a supplement, was in compliance with the provisions of that act, and was approved by this Board. The purpose of the supplemental ordinance is not to change the use of or in any way alter the original grant, but to add additional streets not included in the original ordinance, subject, however, to the terms, conditions and limitations thereof.

The petitioner contends that the provisions of the Limited Franchise Act have no application, and in obtaining the municipal consent, if such it be, compliance therewith is not requisite. The petitioner bases its contention mainly on Section 5263 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, which provides:

"Any telegraph company now organized, or which may hereafter be organized, under the Laws of any State, shall have the right to construct, maintain, and operate lines of telegraph through and over any portion of the public domain of the United States, over and along any of the military or post roads of the United States which have been or may hereafter be declared such by law, and over, under or across the navigable streams or waters of the United States;" &c.

The petitioner alleges that it has in all respects complied with the provisions of said statute and now actually has its poles, cross-arms and wires in the streets covered by the supplemental ordinance and that the only effect of the ordinance passed September 19th, 1913, and the supplemental ordinance passed October 18th, 1916, is merely to permit the petitioner to place its wires now on the poles in the streets covered by the supplemental ordinance, in conduits either of the Delaware and Atlantic Telegraph Company or in its conduits constructed by the petitioner itself.

The Board, however, feels that the statute cited does not dispose of the question raised, but, rather that the determination depends upon the application of Section 8 of the Telegraph Act as amended, Chapter 195, Laws of 1909. The Act in part provides:

"Sec. 8. Any telegraph company organized under the laws of this or any other state or of the United States, or any company

organized by virtue of this act, shall have full power to erect, construct, lay and maintain the necessary poles, wires, conduits and other fixtures for its lines in, upon, along, over or under any of the public roads, streets and highways upon first obtaining the consent in writing of the owner of the soil, to the erection of any such pole or poles, and through, across or under any of the waters within the limits of this State and upon, through or over any other land, subject to the right of the owner thereof, to the full compensation for the same; provided, however, that no pole shall be erected, nor shall any conduit, wire, or other fixture be constructed or erected in, upon, along, over or under any of the public roads, streets, or highways of any municipality in this State, *without first obtaining from the governing body of such municipality permission therefor by ordinance or resolution and a designation therein of the street or streets, road or roads, highway or highways, in, upon, along, over or under which the same shall be erected or constructed.*

* * * * *

“And provided also that nothing herein contained shall require permission by ordinance or resolution to be obtained from the governing body of any municipality to erect, construct, lay and maintain the necessary poles, wires, conduits and other fixtures which are to be used as a part of a through line or system as distinguished from a local line or system but for all such through lines or systems it shall be the duty of such governing body on written application therefor, being made as now required by law, to designate by resolution the street or streets, road or roads, highway or highways, in, upon, along, over or under which such poles, wires, conduits or other fixtures shall be constructed, laid, or erected, &c. * * * *

“And provided also that such a through line or system as is herein mentioned shall be construed to be *used strictly for through business* which line or system shall in no event *be thereby used for local business* or in any case as a local line or system or as a part of any local line or system without having first obtained permission by ordinance or resolution for such local use or as such a local line or system as hereinbefore provided.”

The Board, in re application of Eastern Telephone Company for approval of ordinance, Public Utility Reports, Vol. I, p. 733, and Eastern Telephone Company vs. Board of Public Utility Commissioners, 85 N. J. L., (56 Vr.) 511; 93 Atl. 1084, in speaking of Section 8 of the Telegraph Act as amended, used this language, page 737:

“This is the construction we adopt:

It seems to us to accord with the general legislative intent.

As to the through line or system, it denies to the municipality the power to refuse to designate a route.

As to the local line or system, it recognizes the possession of such power by the municipality.

As to the through line or system it requires designation by the municipality of a feasible route.

As to the local line or system, it requires that where the municipality in its discretion makes designation of a route the route shall be feasible.

It leaves the designation of a route by the municipality for a through line or system, outside the scope of the Limited Franchise Act, but brings the action of the municipality, as to a local line or system within the operation of that act.

Such construction likewise accords with the uniform practice of companies and municipalities with respect to grants or permission for the construction of local lines or systems since the enactment of the Limited Franchise Act. As in the case of the ordinances under consideration, the provisions of that act have been uniformly observed."

The construction adopted in this case was followed by the Board in the matter of the application of the New York Telephone Company for approval of a resolution granted by the Board of Freeholders of Middlesex County, New Jersey.

The inquiry, therefore, narrows to whether the grant or privilege embraced in the supplemental ordinance is to be *used strictly for through business* and *in no event to be thereafter used for local business or as a part of any local line or system*, or, whether it is to be *used for local business or as part of a local line or system*.

The petitioner proceeds on the assumption that the grant or privilege contained in the supplemental ordinance is to be used *strictly for through business* and *in no event* for local business and if the supplemental ordinance has any effect at all it is merely a designation of the streets included in the supplemental ordinance.

It appears, however, (testimony pp. 21, 22, 23) that part at least of the poles and wires now erected in the streets included in the supplemental ordinance are used in connection with *local business*, the character of which is clock service. It may well be that the *local business* carried on in, over and long poles and wires erected in the streets included in the supplemental ordinance, is infinitesimal as compared with the through business, and also the local business as such may be different in character. That is to say, messenger service as compared with clock service. Yet the Legislature in defining a through line or system declared in definite terms that it should be "construed to be used strictly for through business" and "in no event be thereafter used for local business."

The Board cannot escape the conclusion that the Legislature in using such definite terms as "strictly" and "in no event" had no intent other than that a through line or system should be used for through business to the exclusion of local business of every character and description and therefore it follows that the grant or privilege contained in the supplemental ordinance as a fact used for local business brings the action of the municipality in granting the privilege within the operation of the Limited Franchise Act.

The procedure adopted in the enactment of the supplemental ordinance being that which is merely incident to the formal passage thereof, should, therefore, be in accordance with the provisions of the Limited Franchise Act.

The Board, therefore, withholds its approval of the supplemental ordinance and the petition will be dismissed. An order will so enter.

Dated April 28th, 1917.

Mergers

<i>Date of</i>	<i>Approval. Name of Applicant.</i>	<i>Nature of Petition.</i>
May 28, 1917..	Jersey Central Traction Company.	For approval of merger and consolidation with Central Jersey Traction Company, forming Jersey Central Traction Company.
May 28, 1917..	Monmouth Lighting Company and Middlesex and Monmouth Electric Light, Heat and Power Company.	For approval of merger and consolidation forming Monmouth Lighting Company.
June 26, 1917..	New York Telephone Company and Atlantic Coast Telephone Company.	For approval of agreement of merger and consolidation, to be known as New York Telephone Company.
Oct. 2, 1917..	United Shoe Machinery Company and United Shoe Machinery Corporation.	For approval of merger and consolidation under Chapter 19, P. L. 1913.
Oct. 16, 1917..	Central Railroad Company of New Jersey and Buena Vista Railroad Company, et als.	For approval of merger and consolidation to be known as The Central Railroad Company of New Jersey.

In the Matter of the Application of the Millville Gas Light Company, Et Al. for Approval of Merger and Consolidation. Etc.

REPORT.

Joseph H. Gaskill, for Petitioners.

Under date of April 10th, 1917, petition was submitted to the Board for its approval of the consolidation of the Millville Gas Light Company, Citizens Gas Company of Landis Township, Citizens Gas Company of Vineland, Commercial Gas Company, Maurice River Gas Company, Downe Township Gas Company, Lawrence Gas Company, Fairfield Gas Company, Deerfield Gas Company, Pittsgrove Gas Company, all of the County of Cumberland and State of New Jersey.

The newly formed company proposes to take the name of the Cumberland County Gas Company.

The Millville Gas Light Company owns and operates a gas manufacturing plant in the city of Millville and sells and distributes gas in that city through its own mains. It sells and distributes gas through the mains of the other companies referred to in this report. All of the companies named above other than the Millville Company are leased to and operated by the Millville Gas Light Company.

The Millville Gas Light Company has outstanding stock in the amount of \$200,000 and bonds in the amount of \$500,000. The subsidiary companies have outstanding stock in the amounts according to the following table. All of the stock of these companies is owned by the Millville Gas Light Company.

Citizens Gas Company of Landis Township.....	\$30,000
Citizens Gas Company of Vineland.....	25,000
Commercial Gas Company.....	25,000
Maurice River Gas Company.....	25,000
Downe Township Gas Company.....	30,000
Lawrence Gas Company.....	30,000
Fairfield Gas Company.....	30,000
Deerfield Gas Company.....	30,000
Pittsgrove Gas Company.....	30,000
Total	<u>\$255,000</u>

The subsidiary properties referred to above have no mortgages and no debts outside of those owing to the Millville Gas Light Company for construction purposes.

The entire financing of this group of properties has been accomplished through the securities of the Millville Gas Light Company, which, as stated above, consist at the present time of capital stock in the par value of \$200,000 and bonds in the par value of \$500,000. In addition, however, the Millville Gas Light Company has outstanding certain construction debts which are more than offset by current assets.

The application of the company asks the approval of a consolidation to be carried out in the following manner:

For the \$200,000 stock of the Millville Gas Light Company now outstanding, the Cumberland County Gas Company is to issue an equal amount of stock. For the stock of the subsidiary companies the Cumberland County Gas Company proposes to issue stock in the amount of \$100,000, but as the subsidiary stocks are owned by the Millville Gas Light Company, this would result in bringing into the treasury of the newly formed company capital stock in the amount of \$100,000. Such a transaction results in unnecessary complications with reference to the issue of stock without corresponding advantages. This stock could not be sold without the approval of the Board. No advantage can result

from allowing it to be issued as proposed. The Board will, therefore, deny approval of the issue of the \$100,000 stock by the Cumberland County Gas Company for the exchange of the \$255,000 of stock of the subsidiary companies. All of the subsidiary companies' stocks are owned by the Millville Gas Light Company and upon consolidation must be cancelled.

All of the properties concerned in this proceeding have been constructed by a construction company under such conditions that nearly all of the overhead and carrying charges were met by this company and not directly charged to the operating company. The testimony shows that the actual net cost of the construction, including only such overhead or other carrying charges as were paid, was \$802,302.98. These properties were appraised by the company, and it was claimed that the cost to reproduce the property now is \$1,108,100. Examination of this appraisal by the Board's engineer showed that a number of the unit prices used reflected the abnormal costs prevalent at the present time. A new appraisal was submitted, made by Day and Zimmerman, using prices that were more nearly normal. This appraisal showed a cost to reproduce new of \$930,020, and a present value after deducting depreciation, of \$800,350. This latter appraisal has been checked by the engineers of the Board and appears to be made up on a reasonable basis.

In addition to the exchange of stock referred to above, the newly formed company proposes to create a new mortgage of \$1,100,000 and approval is asked for the issue of bonds in the amount of \$600,000 thereunder.

To show the financial status of the consolidated company, if the proposed merger and consolidation had taken place on January 1, 1917, in the manner set forth in the petition as amended under date of June 19, 1917, there was submitted by the petitioners a constructed balance sheet as of the former date, which in condensed form is as follows:

<i>Assets.</i>		<i>Liabilities.</i>	
Plant	\$800,350	Funded debt.....	\$600,000
Working capital and other current assets....	263,337	Capital stock.....	300,000
Investments	23,900	Current liabilities.....	115,957
		Optional reserves.....	8,988
		Surplus	62,642
 Total	 \$1,087,587	 Total	 \$1,087,587

In the above the \$800,350 shown for plant is the present value of the property, including an allowance of \$35,890 for materials, supplies and other working capital as shown by the valuation thereof hereinabove referred to. To the extent of \$35,890 there would clearly be a duplication in the first two items of the balance sheet. The latter fails to show any item for unamortized debt discount and expense, which it is stated

MERGERS.

in the petition would be approximately \$60,000, and in making up the above balance sheet this amount has been written off at once against surplus. By excluding the \$35,890 of working capital from the plant account and setting up thereunder the "value new" of the remaining property instead of its present value, the amount of accrued depreciation being shown as a separate item on the liabilities' side of the balance sheet, and setting up on the assets' side \$60,000 for unamortized debt discount and expense, the result will be as follows:

<i>Assets.</i>		<i>Liabilities.</i>	
Plant (or fixed capital) ..	\$894,130	Funded debt.....	\$600,000
Working capital and other current assets....	263,337	Capital stock.....	300,000
Unamortized debt dis- count and expense.....	60,000	Current liabilities.....	115,957
Investments	23,900	Depreciation reserve.....	129,670
		Optional reserve.....	8,988
		Surplus	86,752
Total	\$1,241,367	Total	\$1,241,367

On the liabilities' side the first three items, and on the assets' side the second item, remain the same. According to the testimony regarding the latter it is expected \$115,957 thereof will be used in liquidating floating debts of this amount, and the balance, over and above what is actually required for working capital, amounting to more than \$100,000 and consisting entirely of accounts receivable from the company which has built the greater part of the plant now in use, and is at the present time under contract to make additions thereto, will make it possible to finance the latter to the extent of that amount without the issuance of more securities than the \$900,000 par value thereof included in the above balance sheet.

If there are thus at the present time \$100,000 of current assets which can be used for financing additions to the plant and equipment covered by the inventory, upon which the proposed merger and consolidation is to be based, it would seem that these assets ought to be available also for the same purpose as that for which it is now proposed to issue bonds and stock. By reducing the amount of the latter \$100,000, and using current assets in place of the proceeds therefrom, the following balance sheet will result:

<i>Assets.</i>		<i>Liabilities.</i>	
Fixed capital.....	\$894,130	Funded debt.....	\$600,000
Working capital and other current assets....	163,337	Capital stock.....	200,000
Investments	23,900	Current liabilities.....	115,957
Unamortized debt dis- count and expense.....	60,000	Depreciation reserve.....	129,670
		Optional reserve.....	8,988
		Surplus	86,752
Total	\$1,141,367	Total	\$1,141,367

In the above balance sheet, working capital and other current assets are given as \$163,337. This should be used to pay off current liabilities amounting to \$115,957. This would leave a balance of \$47,380. In the appraisal there is included \$35,890 for materials and supplies and other working capital. Deducting this from \$47,380 leaves \$11,490, which may be used for financing further construction. Add to this the amount of \$23,900 which, it appears, has been invested in stock of the Electric Company, we have a total of \$35,390 available for future construction work.

Among notes receivable are loans made to the Water Company by the Gas Company amounting to \$52,740. There does not appear to be warrant for the investment by the Gas Company in stocks or notes of the Electric Company and the Water Company, and the Board will not at this time approve the issue of securities which would, in effect, refund securities issued, the proceeds of which had been used in such transactions.

Stocks, bonds or other securities of other companies held by the Millville Gas Light Company are "property" in the sense referred to in that section of the Public Utility Act in which a public utility is forbidden to dispose of its "property" without the approval of the Board. At the earliest practicable moment the securities now held by the gas company of other companies should be sold and the proceeds used for proper financing of the gas company, but before disposing of such proceeds petition must be made to the Board and proper consideration given thereto.

All the bonds of the Millville Gas Light Company at present outstanding were issued on July 1st, 1910, just three days prior to the effective date of the act requiring approval of the Board of Public Utility Commissioners for the issuance of securities. These bonds were handed over to a Trustee for issuance from time to time in payment for construction work which has not all been completed at the present time, although more than seven years have passed since the date of this issuance.

The action of the Millville Gas Light Company on July 1st, 1910, apparently was an attempt to evade the law which was to take effect three days later requiring approval by the Board of Public Utility Commissioners of issues of securities. There seems to be no reason why the company should not have waited until after July 4th and applied for the Board's approval of the issue unless it was in doubt as to its ability to justify it to the satisfaction of the Board.

Chapter 195 of the pamphlet laws of 1911, which became effective May 1st of that year, provides that the Board of Public Utility Commissioners shall approve the purpose of issues of securities authorized by it.

Funds obtained from the proceeds of the bonds referred to were used for the purpose of constructing mains in the Borough of Vineland paralleling the existing mains of a company against which there does not appear to have been reasonable complaint as to rates or service.

If the Millville Gas Light Company had not taken in 1910 the precipitate action referred to, and if application had been made to the Board for its approval of issues of the company's securities at times when the amounts proposed appeared to be reasonable it is probable that, in material part thereof, such securities would have come within the purview of the act of 1911. Had this been the case it would have been the Board's duty to consider the purpose of the issue and approve it before authorizing such issue. In this event, such consideration would have brought before the Board a question of similar purport to that considered later in the application of the Consumers' Gas Company of Millville for approval of an ordinance of that city. In that case a new gas company was seeking to lay parallel mains throughout the City of Millville and applied to the Board for its approval of the competing franchise. It appeared that the existing company was furnishing adequate and proper service at reasonable rates and that no benefit would result from the proposed competition, and the application was denied.

It appears that one of the subsidiary companies of the Millville Gas Light Company, the Citizens Gas Company of Vineland, expended upwards of \$47,000 in laying mains in Vineland. It may be that some of these mains were laid prior to the decision of the Board above mentioned in April, 1913, but a very large proportion were laid after that decision was rendered. Upon the record before us, we are not satisfied that approval covering such expenditures should be given and will withhold approval of issues of securities covering such expenditures.

CONCLUSIONS.

(1) The Board will give its approval to the consolidation of the companies referred to in this report, upon filing of executed copies of the agreements of merger and consolidation with proof of notice to stockholders and compliance with statutory requirements.

(2) The Board will not approve the amount of securities which would result in refunding securities to which the Board would not have originally given its approval.

(3) The Board will approve the issue of stock in the amount of \$200,000 in exchange for a like amount of stock of the Millville Gas Light Company.

(4) The Board will approve the proposed mortgage in the amount of \$1,100,000.

(5) The Board will approve the issue of bonds under the new mortgage of a par value of \$600,000, these bonds to be issued at not less than 90 per cent of par.

(6) A suspense account must be set up by the company to cover the amount of debt discount and expense; same to be written off from earnings during the term of the bonds.

Dated July 16th, 1917.

Leases, Agreements and Sales of Property

<i>Date of Approval.</i>	<i>Name of Applicant.</i>	<i>Nature of Petition.</i>
Jan. 9, 1917....	Essex Fells Electric, Light & Water Co.,...	For approval of agreement with Essex Fells Country Club, dated October 10, 1916, providing for lease of 16,869 acres of land in Essex Fells and West Orange.
Jan. 9, 1917....	Delaware & Atlantic Tele. & Tele. Co., ...	For approval of agreement with Borough of Paulsboro, dated November 28, 1916, for joint use of poles in Paulsboro, Gloucester County.
Jan. 9, 1917....	Pennsylvania R. R. Co., Lessee, United New Jersey R. R. & Canal Co.,	For approval of sale of land west of Carroll Street and south of Perry Street, Trenton, containing 3,995 square feet.
Jan. 9, 1917....	Pennsylvania R. R. Co., Lessee, United New Jersey R. R. & Canal Co.,	For approval of sale of land on southeast side of 5th Street, 196 feet northeast of Thompson Street, South Amboy, containing 5,328 square feet.
Jan. 9, 1917....	Pennsylvania R. R. Co., Lessee, United New Jersey R. R. & Canal Co.,	For permission to sell land on easterly side of Broadway, south of First Street, South Amboy, known as lot No. 29, block No. 105, containing 2,925 square feet.
Jan. 16, 1917....	Lakewood and Coast Electric Company ..	For approval of sale to Township of Lakewood of strip of land 20 feet in width.
Jan. 16, 1917....	Lakewood and Coast Electric Company ..	For approval of sale to Lakewood Hotel and Land Association of triangular piece of land in Lakewood Township.
Jan. 23, 1917....	Lakewood and Coast Electric Company ..	For approval of sale of various items of equipment located at Lakewood and Point Pleasant, more particularly described in the Company's petition.
Jan. 23, 1917....	Morris County Traction Company	For approval of sale of three electrical units in its power plants in Chatham and Township of Randolph, Morris County, more particularly described in the Company's application.
Jan. 23, 1917....	Raritan River R. R. Co.	For approval of sale of triangular piece of land being part of lots 5 and 6 in block No. 34, City of South Amboy.

LEASES, AGREEMENTS AND SALES.

<i>Date of Approval.</i>	<i>Name of Applicant.</i>	<i>Nature of Petition.</i>
Feb. 6, 1917....	Pennsylvania R. R. Co., Lessee, United New Jersey R. R. & Canal Co.	For approval of sale of tract of land in Princeton, containing 3.924 acres.
Feb. 6, 1917....	Pennsylvania R. R. Co., Lessee, United New Jersey R. R. & Canal Co.	For permission to change location of its passenger station at Princeton, to a point 1,000 feet south of the site of the present station.
Feb. 7, 1917....	New Jersey & Hudson River Ry. & Ferry Co.	For approval of sale of tract of land in Hasbrouck Heights, more particularly described in the Company's petition.
Feb. 13, 1917....	New York Telephone Co.	For approval of agreement with Borough of Seaside Heights, dated July 25, 1916, covering joint use of poles in Seaside Heights.
Feb. 13, 1917....	Joseph J. Summerill, et al, Committee of Bond Holders of Moore Bros. Mfg. Company.	For approval of sale to Electric Company of New Jersey of certain personal property located in the Borough of Clayton, more particularly described in the petition submitted to the Board.
Mar. 6, 1917....	Lehigh Valley Railroad Company of New Jersey	For approval of sale of tract of land on Stockton Street, Newark, containing 0.81 of an acre.
Mar. 6, 1917....	Public Service Railway Company	For approval of sale by Camden Horse Railroad Company of a lot of land on 27th Street, Camden.
Mar. 6, 1917....	New York Telephone Co.	For approval of agreement with Consolidated Gas Company of New Jersey for sale of 5 poles in Borough of West Long Branch.
Mar. 6, 1917....	New York Telephone Co.	For approval of agreement, dated December 22, 1916, with Consolidated Gas Company, providing for joint use and ownership of 174 poles in Long Branch, West Long Branch, and Township of Eatontown, Monmouth County.
Mar. 6, 1917....	New York Telephone Co.	For approval of agreement with Commonwealth Water and Light Company, dated September 30, 1912, providing for joint use of poles in Summit, N. J., New Providence, Township of New Providence, Union County, and Southern Election District in Passaic Township, Morris County.
Mar. 6, 1917....	New York Telephone Co.	For approval of agreement, dated January 19, 1917, with Postal Telegraph & Cable Company of N. J., providing for joint use of 12 poles on Freehold Turnpike, and road to Crawford's Corners, west of Freneau Railroad Station, Matawan Township.

208 PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSIONERS' REPORT.

<i>Date of Approval.</i>	<i>Name of Applicant.</i>	<i>Nature of Petition.</i>
Mar. 20, 1917....	New York Bay R. R. Co.	For approval of sale of land in Newark at west corner of St. Charles and Barlin Streets containing 2,484.7 square feet.
Mar. 20, 1917....	New York Telephone Co.	For approval of agreement with Everett L. Brown of Red Bank, providing for sale of property known as 182-184 Smith Street, Perth Amboy.
Mar. 20, 1917....	Public Service Electric Company	For approval of sale and conveyance by South Jersey Gas, Electric and Traction Company of tract of land in Haddonfield, more particularly described in the company's application.
Apr. 4, 1917....	Pennsylvania Railroad Company, Lessee....	For approval of dedication to Board of Chosen Freeholders of Middlesex County of strip of land on northerly side of Washington Avenue, partly in Sayreville Township and partly in South Amboy, containing .573 of an acre.
Apr. 4, 1917....	Pennsylvania Railroad Company, Lessee....	For approval of sale of tract of land on east side of Knickerbocker Road, in Florence Township, Burlington County, containing 4,148 square feet.
Apr. 4, 1917....	West Monmouth Water Co.	For approval of sale of land on west side of Main Street, Farmingdale, more particularly described in the company's application.
Apr. 10, 1917....	Pennsylvania Railroad Company, Lessee....	For approval of sale of land in North Brunswick Township, Middlesex County, containing 13,000 square feet.
Apr. 10, 1917....	Pennsylvania Railroad Company, Lessee....	For approval of sale of land between George Street and Delaware & Raritan Canal, New Brunswick, containing 15,594 square feet.
Apr. 10, 1917....	West Jersey & Seashore Railroad Company...	For approval of sale of land in Millville, on east side of 4th Street, containing 7,982 square feet.
Apr. 24, 1917....	Delaware and Atlantic Tele. & Tele. Co.....	For approval of agreement with Cape May Light and Power Company, dated February 24, 1916, covering joint use of poles in the City of Cape May, Boroughs of South Cape May, Cape May Point, and Township of Lower.
Apr. 24, 1917....	Public Service Gas Co.	For approval of sale and conveyance by South Jersey Gas, Electric and Traction Company of tract of land and premises in Trenton, more particularly shown in the petition submitted to the Board.
May 1, 1917....	Trenton and Mercer County Traction Corporation	For approval of sale of 20 old summer car bodies without electrical equipment.

LEASES, AGREEMENTS AND SALES.

<i>Date of Approval.</i>	<i>Name of Applicant.</i>	<i>Nature of Petition.</i>
May 1, 1917....	West Jersey & Seashore Railroad Company...	For approval of sale of land southwest side of Washington Avenue, northwest of Georgia Avenue, Pleasantville, containing 16,600 square feet.
May 1, 1917....	West Jersey & Seashore Railroad Company...	For approval of sale of land at southeast corner of New Hampshire and Baltic Avenues, Atlantic City, containing 1.27 acres.
May 1, 1917....	Pennsylvania R. R. Co., Lessee, United New Jersey R. R. & Canal Co.	For approval of sale of land on southeast side of Fifth Street, 244 feet northeast of Thompson Street, South Amboy, containing 5,328 square feet.
May 8, 1917....	Pennsylvania R. R. Co., Lessee, United New Jersey R. R. & Canal Co.	For approval of sale of land on southwest side of Suydam Street, having a frontage on Suydam Street of 24.95 feet, more or less, and extending to Seaman Street, New Brunswick, containing 5,123 square feet, more or less.
May 8, 1917....	Delaware and Atlantic Tele. & Tele. Co.....	For approval of agreement with Salem and Pennsgrove Traction Company, dated April 3, 1917, providing for construction of new line of poles in Borough of Pennsgrove, Township of Upper Penns Neck, Township of Lower Penns Neck, Salem County, New Jersey.
May 8, 1917....	Public Service Railway Company	For approval of conveyance to Board of Chosen Freeholders of Middlesex County of strip of land located in Township of Sayreville, Middlesex County.
May 15, 1917....	Atlantic Coast Electric Light Company	For approval of agreement with New York Telephone Company, dated May 3, 1917, providing for sale of 4 poles in block bounded by Ocean Avenue, Highland Avenue, Brighton Avenue, and Phillips Avenue, in Borough of Deal.
May 15, 1917....	Public Service Railway Company	For approval of equipment trust agreement between Arthur E. Newbold and Public Service Railway Company.
May 22, 1917....	Delaware and Atlantic Tele. & Tele. Co.....	For approval of agreement, dated March 7, 1917, with Western Union Telegraph Company, providing for joint use of poles in City of Trenton and Hamilton Township.
May 22, 1917....	Delaware and Atlantic Tele. & Tele. Co.....	For approval of agreement with Atlantic Coast Telephone Company, dated April 25, 1917, providing for leasing of two rooms on second floor of No. 16 S. Tennessee Avenue, Atlantic City.

210 PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSIONERS' REPORT.

<i>Date of Approval.</i>	<i>Name of Applicant.</i>	<i>Nature of Petition.</i>
May 22, 1917....	Delaware and Atlantic Tele. & Tele. Co.....	For approval of agreement with Farmers' Telegraph and Telephone Company, dated April 25, 1917, providing for sale of certain property in Mt. Laurel Township, Burlington County.
May 22, 1917....	Delaware and Atlantic Tele. & Tele. Co.....	For approval of agreement with Farmers' Telephone Company, dated April 9, 1917, providing for sale of certain property along public highways in Chesterfield, Mansfield, Springfield and Pemberton Townships, Burlington County.
May 22, 1917....	Public Service Gas Co..	For approval of sale to South Jersey Gas, Electric & Traction Company of land situate in Trenton.
May 28, 1917....	Jersey Central Traction Company	For approval of lease, dated May 23, 1917, to Central Jersey Traction Company, covering all franchises and property.
May 28, 1917....	Jersey Central Traction Company	For permission to sell to Monmouth Lighting Company, power station, transmission lines and substations, also stocks, bonds and construction debts of Middlesex & Monmouth Electric Light, Heat & Power Company, now owned by Jersey Central Traction Company, proceeds of sale to be applied to purchase of 9,686 shares of capital stock of Jersey Central Traction Company.
June 4, 1917....	Camden & Burlington County Railway Co..	For approval of sale of land located in vicinity and northwardly of Branch Street, Medford, in Township of Medford, Burlington County, containing 1.443 acres.
June 12, 1917....	Pennsylvania & Newark Railroad Company ..	For approval of sale of land on northwest side of Fresh Pond Road, in East Brunswick Township, Middlesex County, containing 13.123 acres, more or less.
June 26, 1917....	Pennsylvania R. R. Co., Lessee, United New Jersey R. R. & Canal Co.	For approval of sale of land situate north of Hudson Boulevard, 438.54 feet more or less east of Tonnelle Avenue, measuring along southerly line of Magnolia Avenue, Jersey City, containing 10,418 square feet, more or less.
July 3, 1917....	Freehold & Jamesburg Agricultural R. R. Co.	For approval of sale of land situate west of Gatzmer Avenue, in Township of Jamesburg, Middlesex County, containing 18,817 square feet, more or less.

LEASES, AGREEMENTS AND SALES.

211

<i>Date of Approval.</i>	<i>Name of Applicant.</i>	<i>Nature of Petition.</i>
July 3, 1917....	Pennsylvania R. R. Co., Lessee, United New Jersey R. R. & Canal Co.	For approval of sale of land on east side of Broadway, 275 feet south of Front Street, measured on east side of Broadway, known as Lot 17, Block 105, City of South Amboy, containing 3,455 square feet, more or less.
July 3, 1917....	Pennsylvania R. R. Co., Lessee, United New Jersey R. R. & Canal Co.	For approval of sale of land on east side of Broadway, 300 feet south of Front Street, measured on east side of Broadway, known as lot 18, block 105 in South Amboy, containing 1,875 square feet, more or less.
July 3, 1917....	Pennsylvania R. R. Co., Lessee, United New Jersey R. R. & Canal Co.	For approval of sale of land on northeasterly side of Burnett Street, along southeasterly side of land conveyed to Catherine Blaney, in City of New Brunswick, containing 450 square feet, more or less.
July 3, 1917....	Robert Carson, Re- ceiver of the Hudson & Middlesex Tele- phone and Telegraph Co.	For approval of sale of all property, effects and franchises to William MacHarg, made in compliance with an order of the Court of Chancery.
July 3, 1917....	Eastern Telephone & Telegraph Company..	For approval of sale of land and premises in Camden, to Herman Olden.
July 25, 1917....	Delaware and Atlantic Tele. & Tele. Co.....	For approval of agreement with Farmers' Telephone Company, dated June 13, 1917, covering sale of certain telephone facilities in Townships of Florence, Mansfield and Bordentown, Borough of Fieldsboro and City of Bordentown.
July 25, 1917....	Union Transportation Co., Lessee, Pember- ton & Hightstown R. R. Co.	For approval of sale of 1.22 acres of land adjoining station lot at Imlaystown station, Monmouth County.
Aug. 6, 1917....	Pennsylvania & New Jersey Railroad Co...	For approval of sale of 6 miles of old rail in track between Mendham and Watnong.
Aug. 14, 1917....	New York Bay R. R. Co.	For approval of sale of 0.736 of an acre of land, more or less, situate on the northwest side of the Waverly and Passaic Branch, about 1,300 feet southwest of South Street or Bay Avenue.
Sept. 10, 1917....	Proprietors of the Mor- ris Aqueduct	For approval of sale of tract of land situate in Mendham Township, Morris County, containing 11 acres, more or less.
Sept. 11, 1917....	Delaware and Atlantic Tele. & Tele. Co.....	For approval of agreement with Electric Company of New Jersey, providing for sale of 33 poles located in Salem.

212 PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSIONERS' REPORT.

<i>Date of Approval.</i>	<i>Name of Applicant.</i>	<i>Nature of Petition.</i>
Oct. 2, 1917	Lehigh Valley R. R. Co., a corporation of the State of Pennsylvania for itself and on behalf of the Lehigh Valley R. R. Co. of N. J., Lessor	For approval of sale of tract of land situate on Stockton Street, Newark, containing 0.81 of an acre, more or less.
Oct. 2, 1917	West Jersey & Seashore Railroad Company	For approval of sale of parcel of land west of Richland Station, situate on south side of Railroad Boulevard, 50 feet east of Elm Avenue, Buena Vista Township, containing 20,000 square feet, more or less.
Oct. 2, 1917	West Jersey & Seashore Railroad Company	For approval of sale of parcel of land having a frontage of 13 feet on north side of Kaighn Avenue, with a depth of 105.5 feet and width of 109 feet in the rear, Camden, containing 5,404 square feet, more or less.
Oct. 2, 1917	West Jersey & Seashore Railroad Company	For approval of sale of parcel of land on southwest side of petitioner's railroad, distant, 75 feet southeast of Sycamore Street, Camden, containing 2,081 square feet, more or less.
Oct. 2, 1917	West Jersey & Seashore Railroad Company	For approval of sale of parcel of land situate on easterly side of petitioner's railroad, 623 feet north of the center of Seaville Station, Dennis Township, containing .244 of an acre, more or less.
Oct. 2, 1917	Central Railroad Company of New Jersey	For approval of sale to The Electric Launch Company of strip of land situate in City of Bayonne.
Oct. 9, 1917	Electric Company of New Jersey	For approval of sale of certain real and personal property situate in Borough of Penns Grove.
Oct. 23, 1917	The Pennsylvania Tunnel and Terminal R. Co.	For approval of agreement with Pennsylvania Railroad Company, for operation of the railroad and appurtenances of the Pennsylvania Tunnel & Terminal Railroad Company by the Pennsylvania Railroad Company as agent from October 31, 1917, until and including the 30th day of September, 1918.
Oct. 30, 1917	Port Reading R. R. Co.	For approval of sale of land partly in Bridgewater Township and partly in Borough of Bound Brook, containing 180.61 acres, more or less, and for the sale of a tract of land in Borough of Middlesex, containing 6 acres, more or less.
Nov. 13, 1917	Pitman Water Co.	For approval of sale of all rights, privileges, franchises, estates, leaseholds, contracts and property, real and personal, in the Borough of Pitman, not including any of its rights, privileges, franchises, estates, leaseholds, contracts and property, real and personal, whatsoever, of any kind located outside of the limits of said Borough to Pitman, for the sum of \$48,000.

NEW CROSSINGS AT GRADE.

213

<i>Date of Approval.</i>	<i>Name of Applicant.</i>	<i>Nature of Petition.</i>
Nov. 20, 1917....	Trenton and Mercer County Traction Corporation	For approval of sale of certain equipment.
Nov. 20, 1917....	Pennsylvania R. R. Co., Lessee, United New Jersey R. R. & Canal Co.	For approval of sale of land situate between Assanpink Creek and land of John E. Thropp's Sons Company, Trenton, containing 4,500 square feet, more or less.
Nov. 20, 1917....	Pennsylvania R. R. Co., Lessee, United New Jersey R. R. & Canal Co.	For approval of sale of land situate east of the Delaware & Raritan Canal feeder, and 124 feet and 5 inches north of the center line of Elm Street, Lambertville, containing 86 square feet, more or less.
Nov. 20, 1917....	Pennsylvania R. R. Co., Lessee, United New Jersey R. R. & Canal Co.	For approval of sale of two parcels of land situate in Town of Harrison, one of them on Fourth Street north from Cape May Street, containing 19,548 acres, the other at northeast corner of Sixth and Summer-set Streets, containing 1.082 acres.
Nov. 20, 1917....	Pennsylvania R. R. Co., Lessee, United New Jersey R. R. & Canal Co.	For approval of sale of three parcels of land situate between Pavonia Avenue and Hudson County Boulevard, Jersey City, containing 21,397 square feet, more or less, 10,648 square feet, more or less, 9,958 square feet, more or less.
Nov. 20, 1917....	Pennsylvania R. R. Co., Lessee, United New Jersey R. R. & Canal Co.	For approval of sale of two parcels of land located within the block bounded by Bergen, First and Essex Streets, and the Passaic River, Harrison, one containing 17,913.75 square feet, more or less, the other containing 11,655 square feet, more or less.
Nov. 20, 1917....	Delaware and Atlantic Tele. & Tele. Co.....	For approval of agreement, dated October 18, 1917, with Merchantville Water Company, providing for leasing by Merchantville Water Company to Delaware and Atlantic Tele. & Tele. Company of certain space in building situate at No. 11 West Maple Avenue, Merchantville.
Nov. 20, 1917....	Delaware and Atlantic Tele. & Tele. Co.....	For approval of agreement, dated October 6, 1917, with Walter H. Felmev, providing for sale by Delaware and Atlantic Tele. & Tele. Company to Walter H. Felmev of certain real estate situate at No. 109 Pine Street, Millville.
Nov. 20, 1917....	New Jersey & Hudson River Railroad and Ferry Company	For approval of sale of tract of land situate in Borough of Leonia.

PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSIONERS' REPORT.

<i>Date of Approval.</i>	<i>Name of Applicant.</i>	<i>Nature of Petition.</i>
Nov. 27, 1917....	Lehigh Valley Railroad Company	For permission to discontinue the sale of passenger tickets at Grandin Station.
Dec. 4, 1917....	New York Telephone Co.	For approval of agreement, dated October 15, 1917, with the Atlantic Coast Electric Railway Company, providing for the sale of two poles in the Borough of Belmar.
Dec. 18, 1917....	Union Transportation Company	For approval of the sale of parcel of land on the west side of right of way of company, near Imlaystown Station, Upper Freehold Township, containing 1.44 acres, more or less.
Dec. 19, 1917....	New Jersey Power and Light Company	For approval of sale of property and for approval of setting up on the company's books a "Property Abandoned Account."
Dec. 28, 1917....	Pennsylvania R. R. Co., Lessee, United New Jersey R. R. & Canal Co.	For approval of sale of parcel of land situate on Linden Avenue, Linden Township, containing .366 of an acre.

New Crossings at Grade

Date of Permission.	Name of Applicant.	Nature of Petition.	Conditions.
Jan. 16, 1917...	Hydraulic Press Brick Company.	For permission to construct a narrow gauge railroad track across public highway known as Iron Mill Road or Flemington Turnpike in Winslow Township, Camden County.	All movements over the highway be protected by a member of the train crew standing in the highway before each movement is made.
Jan. 23, 1917...	Delaware, Lackawanna & Western Railroad Company.	For permission to construct additional track at grade across Bloomfield Avenue, Passaic.	
Jan. 23, 1917...	Pennsylvania & New Jersey R. R. Company.	For permission to construct siding track at grade across Whitehouse—New Germantown Public road south of New Germantown, to connect with tracks of Pennsylvania and New Jersey R. R. Co.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. That derail be installed above the road. 2. That standard grade crossing signs be installed. 3. Train movements not to exceed 6 miles per hour. 4. Flagman to stand in highway to protect travel before each movement is made.
Mar. 20, 1917...	Pennsylvania R. R. Company, Lessee, Camden & Amboy R. R. Co.	For permission to construct additional track at grade across public road at Yardville.	
Apr. 4, 1917...	Pennsylvania Railroad Company, Lessee.	For permission to construct siding at grade across public road east of Hightstown to reach lands of George A. Bennett.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. That all train movements be preceded by a flagman. 2. That train movements be restricted to a speed of not more than 6 miles per hour.
Apr. 4, 1917...	Delaware, Lackawanna & Western Railroad Company.	For permission to construct industrial siding at grade across Colfax Avenue, Acquackanonk Township, to serve Magor Car Company.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. That train movements be protected by flagman. 2. That train movements be restricted to speed of not more than 6 miles per hour.

NEW CROSSINGS AT GRADE.

Date of Permission.	Name of Applicant.	Nature of Petition.	Conditions.
Apr. 4, 1917...	West Jersey & Seashore Railroad Company.	For permission to extend its tracks on Delaware Avenue, Camden, crossing Cooper Street, Market Street and tracks of Public Service Ry. Co. to reach lands of Victor Talking Machine Co. and Joseph Campbell Co.	<p>1. That all train or locomotive movements approaching the intersection of Market Street and Delaware Ave., from the north shall stop 50 feet north of the north line of said street, and movements from the south shall stop 50 feet south of the south line of said street before crossing the tracks of the Public Service Railway Company, and shall proceed only upon signal from a flagman on the crossing indicating that travel on Market St., has been notified of the approach of locomotive or trains; also that bell shall be rung or whistle sounded immediately before the locomotive or train starts from stop position.</p> <p>2. That no locomotive or train movement shall be made across the intersection of Delaware Ave., and Market St., between the hours of 6 A. M. and 8 P. M.</p> <p>3. That the track in Delaware Ave., south of Market St., shall not be used for railroad purposes other than movements of cars to and from the plant of Joseph Campbell Co.</p> <p>4. That the crossing shall not be blocked by any locomotive car or cars of the railroad company for a period exceeding two minutes.</p> <p>5. That the Girder type rail shall be used for track construction within the limits of Delaware Ave.</p> <p>On September 19, 1917, condition No. 2 was amended to read: "That no locomotive or train movement shall be made across the intersection of Delaware Avenue and Market Street between the hours of 6 o'clock and 9 o'clock A. M. and 4:30 o'clock and 8 o'clock P. M."</p> <p>1. Flagman be stationed in the highway before any train movement is made across same. 2. Train movements not to exceed 6 miles per hour.</p>
Apr. 17, 1917...	Pennsylvania Railroad Company, Lessee, United N. J. Railroad & Canal Co.	For permission to construct siding at grade across St. Joes Ave., Trenton, to reach lands of Lenox Incorporated.	<p>1. Flagman be stationed in the highway before any train movement is made across same. 2. Train movements not to exceed 6 miles per hour.</p>

Date of Permission.	Name of Applicant.	Nature of Petition.	Conditions.
Apr. 17, 1917...	Arthur McMullen Company.	For permission to construct temporary narrow gauge track at grade across Avenue R and tracks of the Bay Shore Connecting Railroad Company in Newark.	1. Train movements across Avenue R be protected by flagman. 2. Speed of train movements be limited to speed of 6 miles per hour.
Apr. 17, 1917...	New York & Long Branch Railroad Company.	For permission to construct two tracks at grade across Osborne Avenue in the Borough of Bay Head.	All train movements to be protected by flagman, such protection not to be withdrawn until application has been made to the Board and granted.
May 1, 1917...	Lehigh Valley Railroad Co.	For permission to construct siding at grade across Sherman Avenue, Newark, to reach plant of Pittsburg Plate Glass Company.	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.
May 7, 1917...	Bethlehem Steel company.	For permission to construct siding at grade across highway leading from Ocean City to Tuckahoe by way of Marmora, Upper Township connecting with tracks of Atlantic City R. R. Co.	1. That standard grade crossing signs be erected at said highway. 2. That all train movements over said highway be preceded by a flagman. 3. Train movements over said highway to be limited to a speed of not more than 6 miles per hour.
May 9, 1917...	Delaware, Lackawanna & Western Railroad Company.	For permission to construct siding at grade across certain unnamed road at Delaware, Knowlton Township, New Jersey, to reach lands of Wm. J. Burd.	1. All train movements over the highway to be protected by flagman. 2. Train movements over said highway to be limited to a speed of not more than 6 miles per hour.
May 16, 1917...	Henry F. Banta.	For permission to construct siding at grade across Kingsland Avenue, Nutley, to connect with track of Erie R. R. Company.	1. That girder type rail be laid within the highway lines. 2. All train movements over highway be protected by flagman. 3. All train movements over said highway not to exceed 6 miles per hour.
May 29, 1917...	Central Railroad Company of N. J.	For permission to construct single-track railroad across Avenue R, Newark.	1. All train movements over highway be protected by flagman. 2. Train movements over said highway be limited to speed of not more than 6 miles per hour.

Date of Permission.	Name of Applicant.	Nature of Petition.	Conditions.
May 29, 1917...	Union Transportation Company, Lessee, Pemberton & Hightstown Railroad Company.	For permission to construct additional siding at grade across Sharon Road, at Sharon Station, Township of Upper Freehold, Monmouth County.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. That standard grade crossing sign be placed at both approaches on the Clarksboro Road. 2. That private crossing south of Clarksboro-Sharon Road be closed. 3. That all train movements over the present siding track and additional siding track crossing Clarksboro Road be protected by a flagman. 4. Speed of train movements over siding be limited to 6 miles per hour.
May 29, 1917...	Union Transportation Company, Lessee, Pemberton & Hightstown Railroad Company.	For permission to construct siding at grade over Allen's Road in Township of East Windsor, Mercer County.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. No car be permitted to stand closer to the highway than 50 feet on the siding track north of the highway. 2. That derails be installed at both ends of siding track. 3. That all train movements over said siding do not exceed 6 miles per hour. 4. Standard grade crossing signs be erected.
June 4, 1917...	Pennsylvania R. R. Company, Lessee, United New Jersey R. R. & Canal Company.	For permission to construct two additional tracks at grade across 36th Street, Camden, and for permission to construct temporary single track across River Road, Township of Pensauken, to Petty Island.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. That all train movements over River Road be protected by a flagman. 2. All train movements over River Road be limited to 6 miles per hour. 3. Flagman be placed on 36th St. crossing during the period of construction and at the termination of such work the matter of permanency of flag protection will be determined.
June 8, 1917...	Central R. R. Co. of New Jersey.	For permission to construct siding at grade across Price's Alley, Elizabeth, to reach plant of F. L. Hersh & Brother.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. That all train movements over said siding be protected by flagman. 2. That all train movements over said siding be limited to a speed of not more than 6 miles per hour.
June 18, 1917...	Lieutenant M. G. Belknap, U. S. Naval Reserve Force, acting on behalf of the Department of the Navy of the U. S. of America.	For permission to construct new crossing at grade to connect with tracks of the Atlantic City Railroad near Schellenger's landing, to a farm about eight-tenths of a mile distant therefrom, known as "Physick Farm," Township of Lower, County of Cape May.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. All train movements over said siding be protected by flagman. 2. Train movements over said siding be limited to a speed of not more than 6 miles per hour.

Date of Permission.	Name of Applicant.	Nature of Petition.	Conditions.
June 19, 1917...	Pennsylvania R. R. Company, Lessee, Pennsylvania & Atlantic R. R. Company.	For permission to construct at grade siding and "Y" track crossing public road running between Juliustown and Browns Mills at two points near Lewistown Station, Township of Pemberton, Burlington County.	1. Train movements over siding to be protected by flagman. 2. Train movements over siding crossing be limited to a speed of 6 miles per hour.
July 3, 1917...	Pennsylvania R. R. Company, Lessee, United New Jersey R. R. & Canal Company.	For permission to construct siding at grade crossing Trenton and New Brunswick Turnpike and Howe's Lane in North Brunswick Township, Middlesex County to reach lands of Unexcelled Manufacturing Company.	Train movements over Trenton and New Brunswick Turnpike to be protected by flagman on the crossing before any movement is made across the highway; speed of trains over highway be limited to 5 miles per hour.
July 3, 1917...	Pohatcong Railroad Company.	For permission to construct two sidings at grade crossing in two places a certain highway called Hazen-Buttville Road, White Township, Warren County.	1. Train movements over highways to be protected by flagman. 2. Train movements over said crossings to be limited to a speed of 6 miles per hour.
July 3, 1917...	Philadelphia & Reading Ry. Company.	For permission to construct temporary siding at grade crossing Asylum Road, Township of Ewing, Mercer County.	1. Crossing to be protected by flagman during time the temporary highway is in use.
July 3, 1917...	Elton Risely & Hill Dredging Company.	For permission to construct temporary narrow gauge track or tramway at grade across tracks of Atlantic & Suburban Railway Company on Delliah Road, Pleasantville.	1. Train movements over siding track or tramway be protected by flagman. 2. Train movements over siding track or tramway to be limited to speed of 5 miles per hour.
July 3, 1917...	Armour & Company.	For permission to construct 5 sidings at grade across tracks of Erie Railroad Company and D. L. & W. Railroad Company at Monmouth St., Coles St., 16th St., 17th St., and along 18th St., Jersey City.	1. Train movements over sidings to be protected by flagmen. 2. Train movements over sidings be limited to speed of 6 miles per hour.
July 6, 1917...	Philadelphia & Reading Railway Company, Lessee, Delaware & Bound Brook Railroad Company.	For permission to construct two additional tracks at grade over three grade crossings located between Belle Mead and Manville, Township of Hillsboro, Somerset County, as follows: 2400 feet east of Belle Mead, 4900 feet east of Hamilton and 3200 feet west of Weston.	1. Crossing 3200 feet west of Weston be protected by automatic alarm bell. 2. Crossing 4900 feet east of Hamilton to have audible wig-wag signals installed at both approaches, such signals to have red light indication at night.

NEW CROSSINGS AT GRADE.

Date of Permission.	Name of Applicant.	Nature of Petition.	Conditions.
July 16, 1917...	General Electric Company.	For permission to construct siding at grade across Central Avenue, and Cross Street, in Town of Harrison, Hudson County.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. That train movements over Central Avenue and Cross Street be limited to a speed of not more than six miles per hour. 2. That train movements over Central Avenue and Cross Street be protected by flagman.
July 25, 1917...	West Jersey and Seashore Railroad Company.	For permission to construct two temporary tracks at grade across Ferry Avenue, Borough of Collingswood, Camden County.	Flagman to be maintained at Ferry Avenue crossing until elimination work is completed.
Aug. 14, 1917...	New York and Long Branch Railroad Company.	For permission to construct siding at grade across Casler's Crossing, Township of Eatontown, Monmouth County.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. That no car be permitted to stand between building and highway lines. 2. All train movements over highway to be protected by flagman. 3. Train movements over highway be limited to a speed of not more than six miles per hour.
Sept. 10 1917...	New Jersey Ship-building Company.	For permission to construct track at grade across tracks of Public Service Railway Company, in the City of Gloucester, Camden County.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. That no movements be made eastbound until flagman shall flag the crossing before train leaves the yard. 2. That all movements over crossing, in each direction, be preceded by flagman. 3. That train movements over the crossing be limited to a speed of not more than six miles per hour.
Sept. 10, 1917...	Constructing Quartermaster of the United States Army.	For permission to construct temporary crossings at grade at Grant Avenue and Madison Avenue, about 1,000 feet west of Knickerbocker Road, and at or about the junction of Grant Avenue and Knickerbocker Road and of Madison Avenue, 200 feet east of Knickerbocker Road, near Dumont, New Jersey, connecting with tracks of the West Shore Railroad.	It is understood that the roads crossed are not at the places of crossings open for general public use.
Sept. 19, 1917...	B Frank & Son, or the Linden Tanning Company.	For permission to construct siding at grade across Butler Street and along the west side of Second Avenue, to South Second Street, in City of Elizabeth, Union County.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. That all train movements over Butler Street and along Second Avenue be protected by a flagman. 2. That all train movements over siding be limited to a speed of not more than six miles per hour.

Date of Permission.	Name of Applicant.	Nature of Petition.	Conditions.
Sept. 25, 1917...	City of Atlantic City.	For permission to construct siding at grade across Drexel Avenue and Adriatic Avenue, in the City of Atlantic City.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. All train movements over Drexel Avenue to be protected by flagman in the highway before movements in either direction are made. 2. That flagman shall be in the highway and signal to the engineer of approaching train before train movements are made over Adriatic Avenue. 3. That train movements over Drexel Avenue and over Adriatic Avenue be limited to a speed of not more than six miles per hour.
Sept. 25, 1917...	Board of Chosen Freeholders of Mercer County.	For permission to construct road known as "River Road" over tracks of the Pennsylvania R. R. Company, at Moore's Station, in the Township of Hopewell.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. That all movements into the quarry stop before engine reaches the highway crossing, and that flagman protect crossing while movements are being made. 2. That trains out of the quarry be protected by flagman on the crossing before movements reach the crossing.
Oct. 15, 1917...	West Jersey and Seashore Railroad Company.	For permission to construct temporary track at grade across State Street, Camden, to reach property of the Victor Talking Machine Company.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. That all train movements over siding be protected by flagman. 2. That train movements over siding be limited to a speed of not more than six miles per hour.
Oct. 15, 1917...	Joseph Campbell Company.	For permission to construct tracks at grade across Front Street, between Market and Arch Streets, in the City of Camden.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. That all car, engine or other motive power movements across the highway be protected by flagman stationed in the highway before such movements are made. 2. That all train movements over said highway be limited to a speed of not more than six miles per hour.
Oct. 23, 1917...	Pennsylvania Railroad Company.	For permission to construct additional track at grade, across Hanover Street, North Pemberton, Burlington County.	That crossing be protected by gates for all train movements.
Oct. 23, 1917...	Constructing Quartermaster of the United States Army.	For permission to construct siding, crossing at grade Washington Avenue, Larch Street, Central Avenue, Fairview Avenue, Lenox Avenue, Lexington Avenue and Knickerbocker Road, connecting with tracks of West Shore Railroad.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. That all train movements over said crossings be protected by a flagman. 2. That train movements over said crossings be limited to a speed of not more than six miles per hour.

Date of Permission.	Name of Applicant.	Nature of Petition.	Conditions.
Oct. 30, 1917...	Delaware, Lackawanna & Western R. K. Co.	For permission to construct new crossing at grade across Division Street in the Town of Boonton.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. That all train movements over siding be protected by flagman. 2. That train movements over siding be limited to a speed of not more than six miles per hour.
Nov. 20, 1917...	Pennsylvania Railroad Company.	For permission to construct an additional track at grade across public road .9 of a mile west of Smithville Station, Easthampton Township, Burlington County.	That brush be removed at crossing to afford better view of trains for travel from the northerly side.
Nov. 20, 1917...	Pennsylvania Railroad Company.	For permission to construct an additional track at grade, across County Road or Street at Smithville, Easthampton Township, Burlington County.	That the highway be protected by gates operated day and night.
Nov. 20, 1917...	Pennsylvania Railroad Company.	For permission to construct siding at grade across Pine Street, Mt. Holly, Burlington County.	That the highway be protected by gates operated day and night.
Dec. 3, 1917...	Pennsylvania Railroad Company.	For permission to construct track at grade across public road one-half mile east of Ewansville Station, Burlington County.	That standard grade crossing signs be erected at approaches to the crossing.
Dec. 11, 1917...	Pennsylvania Railroad Company, Lessee, United New Jersey Railroad and Canal Company.	For permission to construct a spur track crossing Piscataway Road to reach lands of the Ordnance Department of the United States Government.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. That standard grade crossing signs be erected at crossing. 2. That train movements over siding be protected by a flagman who shall be stationed at the trolley track in advance of all movements reaching the southerly or northerly highway line. 3. That train movements over siding be limited to a speed of not more than six miles per hour.

Date of Permission.	Name of Applicant.	Nature of Petition.	Conditions.
Dec. 12, 1917...	T. A. Gillespie Loading Company, Agents for the Ordnance Department of the United States Government.	For permission to construct a railroad spur across the South Amboy and Old Bridge Road, and to cross the South Amboy and Cheesequake Road, Ernston Station, Madison Township, Middlesex County.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. That speed of movements over the highway be limited to six miles per hour. 2. That standard grade crossing signs be erected at both approaches to the crossing. 3. That flagman be stationed in the highway before each movement across the same.
Dec. 18, 1917...	Delaware, Lackawanna & Western Railroad Company.	For permission to construct an industrial side track at grade across the public highway known as Langdon Street, Town of Bloomfield, to reach the plant of the Baylis Company.	<p>If Langdon Street is required and used for highway purposes in the future, when said improvement is made and the highway used for travel, speed of trains be limited to six miles per hour, and all train movements be protected by a flagman.</p>
Dec. 18, 1917...	Pennsylvania Railroad Company.	For permission to construct two sidings at grade across State Street, in the City of Camden, to reach property of the Victor Talking Machine Company.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. That all train movements over sidings be protected by a flagman. 2. That train movements over sidings be limited to a speed of six miles per hour.
Dec. 18, 1917...	New York Lubricating Oil Company and Pennsylvania and Delaware Oil Company.	For permission to construct siding at grade across Third Avenue, between S. First Street and S. Second Street, in the City of Elizabeth, to connect with tracks of the Central R. R. Co.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. That train movements over siding be limited to a speed of six miles per hour. 2. That all train movements over siding be protected by flagman.
Dec. 19, 1917...	City of Ocean City.	For permission to extend 55th Street across the tracks of the West Jersey and Seashore Railroad.	
Dec. 24, 1917...	Borough of Seaside Heights.	For permission to extend Kearny Avenue at grade across the tracks of the Pennsylvania Railroad.	

In the Matter of the Application of the City of Perth Amboy for Permission to Extend Easton Street at Grade Across the Perth Amboy and Woodbridge Railroad Company, Now Leased and Operated by the Pennsylvania Railroad Company.

REPORT.

Andrew J. Wight for the City of Perth Amboy.

Alan H. Strong and *J. F. Chandler* for the Pennsylvania Railroad Co.

This is an application for the establishment of a grade crossing in the City of Perth Amboy at Easton Street crossing the tracks of the Perth Amboy and Woodbridge Railroad Company, now leased and operated by the Pennsylvania Railroad Company. The said Easton Street is a public thoroughfare and has been open and used by the public for a number of years. In the summer of 1916 a temporary railroad crossing was established by order of this Board and protected by a flagman. The whole expense was borne by the city. It has been planked for its full width.

Easton Street runs east and west, joining State Street (which is the principal thoroughfare in the city) one hundred feet east of the railroad track. At the crossing there is only a single main line track curving from a point south of the crossing and beyond the crossing in a north-westerly direction. The first railroad crossing south of Easton Street is Hall Avenue, about 1,000 ft. distant. To the north from Easton Street to the tracks of the New Jersey Central Railroad, a distance of 2,000 ft., no highway crosses the railroad tracks.

Easton Street west of the railroad track, north and south, is practically entirely built up on both sides. The same condition exists from a point about 40 ft. west of the tracks at State Street. The right of way from Easton Street to the point where the Perth Amboy and Woodbridge branch passes under the overhead crossing of the Central Railroad tracks is open.

Approaching the intersection of Easton Street and the tracks, from State Street, at a point about 50 ft. east of the tracks, there is an unobstructed view to the Central Railroad bridge on the north, and an unobstructed view south to a point beyond Hall Avenue. The view approaching from the west side is obstructed and very limited and protection should be afforded on account of existing physical conditions there.

The view of approaching trains from the westerly side of the crossing is limited and might require either a flagman or gate protection for the train movements. There are eight trains out and nine in passing over this crossing daily.

The regulations of the company require the speed of trains passing this point to be reduced to 10 miles per hour, but in the opinion of Mr. Maybury, an inspector of this Board, they travel at the rate of between 15 and 20 miles per hour.

The petitioner alleges that there was an average daily count for fourteen consecutive days of 490 wagons, 297 automobiles, 136 bicycles and 1097 pedestrians crossing Easton Street at said point during the month of September last, but the person making such count was not produced as a witness; however, it was conclusively proved that the city in the immediate vicinity of Easton Street is well developed and there is a great deal of vehicular and pedestrian traffic over the said street at this proposed crossing.

There are three large schools on this street, one public and two parochial. The parochial schools are conducted in conjunction with churches in that vicinity. Both the schools and the churches are largely attended.

The large manufacturing plants of the Barber Asphalt Paving Company, American Smelting and Refining Company, United Lead Company, Standard Underground Cable Company, Raritan Copper Works and Roessler & Husslucher Chemical Company are in this region and a great number of their employees live in the vicinity of Easton Street and use it in going to and from their work.

There seems to be no serious dispute that this section of the city requires an additional crossing for its necessary growth and development. The density of the population in the vicinity makes a crossing at Easton Street a public necessity.

At present Hall Avenue is the only crossing over said railroad tracks north of William Street and the crossing at William Street is a distance of 1,800 ft. southerly from the crossing at Hall Avenue. Easton Street is about 860 ft. northerly from Hall Avenue.

Without the crossing at Easton Street it is necessary for all travel from the northerly or Maurer section of Perth Amboy to travel south as far as Hall Avenue to cross the railroad tracks to reach any point on the westerly side. This necessitates their traveling more than 1,700 ft. further than the proposed grade crossing over Easton Street would require.

Another matter of great importance is that fire protection for all this section of the city is furnished by fire apparatus housed east of the railroad track. The grade of the bridge over the Central Railroad is so steep as to make it impossible for the fire engines to go over it.

This leaves Hall Avenue as the only thoroughfare for use by the fire department at times of fire.

It has frequently happened, according to W. C. Wilson, that the fire apparatus has been blocked at Hall Avenue. Such happenings make the fire hazard great and should be relieved. The crossing would help considerably in that particular.

The Board after consideration of the testimony produced at the hearing grants permission for the construction of the public highway known as Easton Street, in the City of Perth Amboy, across the tracks of the Perth Amboy and Woodbridge Railroad Company, now leased and operated by the Pennsylvania Railroad Company at grade.

Dated February 28th, 1917.

Inspections

During the year numerous inspections have been made by the Board's engineers and inspectors of the properties and appliances of public utilities. The nature of these is indicated below.

ELECTRIC COMPANIES.

- Atlantic City Electric Company,
Test of Portable Watt Hour Meter,
Test of Wall Standard.
- Atlantic Coast Electric Light Co.
Test of Portable Watt Hour Meter,
Test of Wall Standard.
- Atlantic County Electric Company,
Test of Portable Watt Hour Meter,
Test of Wall Standard.
- Boonton Electric Company,
Test of Portable Watt Hour Meter,
Test of Wall Standard.
- Bridgeton Electric Company,
Test of Portable Watt Hour Meter,
Test of Wall Standard.
- Cape May Illuminating Co.
Test of Portable Watt Hour Meter.
- Commonwealth Electric Company,
Test of Wall Standard.
- Eastern Pennsylvania Power Co.
Test of Portable Watt Hour Meter.
- Electric Company of New Jersey,
General Inspection.
- Electric Light & Power Company of Hightstown,
Test of Portable Watt Hour Meter,
Test of Wall Standard.

Flemington Electric Light, Heat & Power Co.
Test of Portable Watt Hour Meter.

Hackettstown Electric Light Company,
Test of Portable Watt Hour Meter,
Test of Wall Standard.

Hammonton & Egg Harbor City Gas Company.
Test of Portable Watt Hour Meter,
Test of Wall Standard.

Hunterdon Electric & Power Company,
Test of Portable Watt Hour Meter,
Test of Wall Standard.

Lakewood & Coast Electric Company,
Test of Portable Watt Hour Meters,
Test of Wall Standards.

Lambertville Public Service Company,
Test of Portable Watt Hour Meter,
Test of Wall Standard.

Middlesex & Monmouth Light, Heat & Power Co.,
Test of Portable Watt Hour Meter,
Test of Wall Standard.

Millville Electric Light Company,
Test of Portable Watt Hour Meter,
Test of Wall Standard.

Morris & Somerset Electric Company,
Test of Wall Standard.

New Egypt Light, Heat, Power and Water Company,
General Inspection.

Newton Electric & Gas Company,
General Inspection.

New Jersey Power & Light Company,
Test of Portable Watt Hour Meters,
Test of Wall Standards.

Ocean Grove Camp Meeting Association,
Test of Portable Watt Hour Meter,
Test of Wall Standard.

Pleasantville Heat, Light & Power Co.,
Test of Portable Watt Hour Meter,
Test of Wall Standard.

INSPECTIONS.

229

- Public Service Electric Company,
The different stations of this company are under constant
supervision and checks are kept on all testing appliances.
- Sea Isle City Electric Light, Power & Water Co.,
Test of Portable Watt Hour Meter,
Test of Wall Standard.
- Warren Wood Working Company,
Test of Portable Watt Hour Meter,
Test of Wall Standard.
- West Jersey Electric Company,
Test of Portable Watt Hour Meter,
Test of Wall Standard.
- Willsbrook Electric Light Co.
Test of Portable Watt Hour Meter,
Test of Wall Standard.

GAS COMPANIES.

- Atlantic City Gas Company,
General Inspection.
- Cape May Illuminating Company,
General Inspection.
- City Gas Light Company,
General Inspection.
- Coast Gas Company,
General Inspection.
- Consolidated Gas Company of N. J. Electric Dept.,
Test of Portable Watt Hour Meter,
Test of Wall Standards.
- Enterprise Gas Company,
General Inspection.
- Millville Gas Light Company,
General Inspection.
- New Jersey Gas Company,
General Inspection.
- Newton Electric & Gas Company,
General Inspection.
- Perth Amboy Gas Light Company,
General Inspection.

230 PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSIONERS' REPORT.

Public Service Gas Company,
The different plants of this company are under constant
supervision.

Seashore Gas Company of Sea Isle City,
General Inspection.

Standard Gas Company,
General Inspection.

Wildwood Gas Company,
General Inspection.

WATER COMPANIES.

Bayhead Water Company,
General Inspection.

Bernards Water Company,
General Inspection.

Bound Brook Water Company,
General Inspection.

Elizabethtown Water Company,
General Inspection.

German Valley Water Company,
General Inspection.

Gravity Water Company,
General Inspection.

Hackensack Water Company,
General Inspection.

Millington Water Company,
General Inspection.

Middlesex Water Company,
General Inspection.

New Jersey Water & Light Company,
General Inspection.

Sea Girt Water Company,
General Inspection.

Tintern Manor Water Company,
General Inspection.

STREET RAILWAYS.

- Atlantic City & Shore Railroad Company,
General Inspection.
- Atlantic & Suburban Railway Company,
General Inspection.
- Atlantic Coast Electric Railway Company,
General Inspection.
- Bridgeton & Millville Traction Company,
Bridge Inspection.
- Burlington County Transit Company,
General Inspection.
- Central Passenger Railway Company,
General Inspection.
- Five Mile Beach Electric Railway Company,
General Inspection.
- Jersey Central Traction Company,
General Inspection.
- Millville Traction Company,
Bridge Inspection.
- Monmouth County Electric Company,
General Inspection.
- Morris County Traction Company,
General Inspection.
- New Jersey & Pennsylvania Traction Company,
Bridge Inspection.
- New Jersey Rapid Transit Company,
Bridge Inspection.
- Northampton, Easton & Washington Traction Co.,
Bridge Inspection.
- North Jersey Rapid Transit Co.,
General Inspection.
- Ocean City Electric Railroad Company,
General Inspection.
- Phillipsburg Horse Car R. R. Company,
Bridge Inspection.

PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSIONERS' REPORT.

Point Pleasant Traction Company,
General Inspection.

Public Service Railway Company,
Numerous inspections were made of rolling stock, track and
bridges.

Salem and Penns Grove Traction Company,
General Inspection.

Trenton & Mercer County Traction Corporation.
Bridge Inspection.

RAILROAD COMPANIES.

Atlantic City Railroad Company,
General Inspection.

Barnegat City Railroad Company,
General Inspection.

Central Railroad Company of New Jersey,
General Inspection.

Delaware, Lackawanna & Western R. R. Company,
General Inspection.

Erie Railroad Company,
General Inspection.

Lehigh & Hudson River Railway Company,
General Inspection.

Lehigh & New England Railroad Company,
General Inspection.

Lehigh Valley Railroad Company,
General Inspection.

Morristown & Erie Railroad Company,
General Inspection.

Mount Hope Mineral Railroad Company,
General Inspection.

New York & Long Branch Railroad Company,
General Inspection.

New York Central & Hudson River R. R.—West Shore Railroad
Company,
General Inspection.

INSPECTIONS.

233

- New York, Susquehanna & Western Railroad Co.,
General Inspection.
- Pennsylvania Railroad Company,
General Inspection.
- Pennsylvania & New Jersey Railroad Company,
General Inspection.
- Philadelphia & Reading Railway Company,
General Inspection.
- Rahway Valley Railroad Company,
General Inspection.
- Raritan River Railroad Company,
General Inspection.
- Stone Harbor Railroad Company,
General Inspection.
- Tuckerton Railroad Company,
General Inspection.
- Union Transportation Company,
General Inspection.
- West Jersey & Seashore Railroad Company,
General Inspection.
- Wharton & Northern Railroad Company,
General Inspection.
- Wildwood & Delaware Bay Short Line R. R. Co.,
General Inspection.

Accidents on Steam Railroads

The causes of accidents which occurred on steam railroads from December 1, 1916, to December 1, 1917, were as follows:

	<i>Killed.</i>	<i>Injured.</i>
Collisions—		
Passengers,	32
Employees,	6	49
Others,	1
Crossing Track at Highway—		
Passengers,
Employees,	3	1
Others,	42	157
Derailments—		
Passengers,	10
Employees,	1	15
Others,	1	2
At Bridges and Tunnels—		
Passengers,	2
Employees,	4	19
Others,	1	1
Struck by Locomotives or Cars—		
Passengers,	8	11
Employees,	49	64
Others,	93	62
Getting on or off Trains—		
Passengers,	6	99
Employees,	4	119
Others,	1	4
Coupling or Uncoupling Cars—		
Passengers,	8
Employees,	3	66
Others,	2
Trespassing on Right of Way—		
Passengers,	1	4
Employees,	9	10
Others,	135	97

ACCIDENTS ON STEAM RAILROADS. 235

Other Causes—		
Passengers,	1	79
Employees,	27	335
Others,	9	46
	<hr/>	<hr/>
	405	1294

Accidents on Electric Railways

The causes of the accidents which occurred on electric railways from December 1, 1916, to December 1, 1917, were as follows:

	<i>Killed.</i>	<i>Injured.</i>
Derailments—		
Passengers,	85
Employees,	2
Others,	1	8
Struck by Cars—		
Passengers,
Employees,	1
Others,	20	164
Collision of Cars—		
Passengers,	104
Employees,	3	17
Others,	1	10
Getting on or off Cars—		
Passengers,	4
Employees,
Others,
Collision of Cars, Automobiles, Wagons, etc.—		
Passengers,	6
Employees,	1	4
Others,	3	315
Other Causes—		
Passengers,	2	14
Employees,	1
Others,	1	1
	38	735

INDEX

A.		PAGE.
Accidents on Electric Railways, List of.....		236
Accidents on Steam Railroads, List of.....		234
AGREEMENTS—SEE LEASES, ETC.		
B.		
BONDS, STOCK, MORTGAGES, ETC., <i>In Re</i> —		
Atlantic City Electric Co.....	141, 147	
Bay Shore Connecting Railroad Co.....		147
Bergen Aqueduct Co.....		141
Black River Power Co.....		143
Butler Water Co.....	146, 147, 168,	170
Clinton Water & Water Supply Co.....		148, 186
Commonwealth Electric Co.....		143
Commonwealth Water Co.....		144
Easton Gas Works.....		145, 163
Electric Company of New Jersey.....		142
Electric Light & Power Company of Hightstown.....		147, 161
Erie Railroad Company.....	142, 146, 148, 150,	188
Gas & Electric Co. of Bergen County.....		142
Hackensack Water Co.....		148, 149
Haddonfield Rural Telephone Co.....		142
Hillcrest Water Co.....	144, 145,	159
Hudson & Manhattan Railroad Co.....		141
Jersey Central Traction Co.....	143, 144	
Lakewood & Coast Electric Co.....		146
Lambertville Public Service Co.....		143, 153
Lehigh & New England Railroad Co.....		145
Middlesex Water Co.....		145
Monmouth Lighting Co.....		144
Morris County Traction Co.....		148, 190
New Jersey Power & Light Co.....	141, 147,	148
New Jersey Water Service Co.....		141
New York Bay Railroad Co.....		142
New York Central Railroad Co.....	144, 146, 154, 157,	171
Ocean County Electric Co.....		148
Ocean City Sewer Co.....		143
Pennsylvania & New Jersey Railroad Co.....		147
Pennsylvania Railroad Co.....		143
Public Service Electric Co.....		146
Public Service Gas Co.....		146

	PAGE.
Public Service Railway Co.....	142, 143, 149
Raritan River Railroad Co.....	145
Riverton & Palmyra Water Co.....	148, 174
Standard Gas Co.....	142
Trenton & Mercer County Traction Corporation.....	143
Warren Woodworking Co.....	143
West Monmouth Water Co.....	142, 146, 167
West Wildwood Water & Power Co.....	143, 144
Wharton & Northern Railroad Co.....	141
Woolwich Water Co.....	147
C.	
COMPLAINTS, FORMAL REPORTS OF—SEE DECISIONS.	
COMPLAINTS—INFORMAL	79-139
D.	
DECISIONS—REPORTS OF—	
AMERICAN EXPRESS COMPANY—	
Price, E. F., <i>vs.</i>	50
ATLANTIC CITY RAILROAD COMPANY—	
Rates, proposed increase, <i>in re</i> ,	54
ATLANTIC CITY SUBURBAN GAS & FUEL COMPANY—	
Lease made with Pleasantville Heat, Light & Power Co., <i>in re</i> ,	59
ATLANTIC COAST TELEPHONE COMPANY—	
Merger and consolidation, <i>in re</i> ,	51
ATLANTIC COUNTY ELECTRIC COMPANY—	
Rates, increased, <i>in re</i> ,	62
BERNARDS WATER COMPANY—	
Bernards Township, <i>vs.</i>	41
BLAIRSTOWN ELECTRIC LIGHT COMPANY—	
Report, <i>in re</i> filing,	58
BLAIRSTOWN WATER COMPANY—	
Report, <i>in re</i> filing,.....	58
BRIDGETON ELECTRIC COMPANY—	
Rates, proposed increased, <i>in re</i> ,	54
BRIDGETON GAS LIGHT Co. ET AL.—	
Standards for gas, <i>in re</i> rule No. 9,.....	56
BRIDGETON & MILLVILLE TRACTION COMPANY—	
Tickets at a reduced rate, <i>in re</i> sale of,	60
BOROUGH OF MADISON—	
Bassford, et al., Anita L., <i>vs.</i>	57
BURLINGTON COUNTY TRANSIT COMPANY—	
Depreciation account, <i>in re</i> ,	43
BURLINGTON SEWERAGE COMPANY—	
Rates, new schedule of, <i>in re</i> re-hearing,	44

	PAGE.
BUTLER WATER COMPANY—	
Bonds and stock, <i>in re</i> ,	54
CAPE MAY, DELAWARE BAY & SEWELLS POINT R. R. CO. ET AL.—	
Failure to operate, <i>in re</i> ,	56
CENTRAL RAILROAD COMPANY OF NEW JERSEY—	
Train Crews, <i>in re</i> reduction of,	58
COLLINGSWOOD SEWERAGE COMPANY—	
Rates, new schedule of, <i>in re</i> re-hearing,	44
COMMONWEALTH WATER COMPANY—	
Rules and regulations, <i>in re</i> suspension of,	56
CLAYTON-GLASSBORO WATER COMPANY—	
Rates, new schedule of,	45
Water pressure, <i>in re</i> ,	43
CENTRAL PASSENGER RAILWAY COMPANY—	
Agreement with Venice Park Co. et al.....	62
CLINTON WATER & WATER SUPPLY COMPANY—	
Mortgage and issuance of bonds, <i>in re</i> ,	60
DELAWARE & ATLANTIC TELEGRAPH & TELEPHONE COMPANY—	
Agreement with Vincenttown & Tabernacle Telephone Co...	45
Merger and consolidation with New York Telephone Co...	60
Tallman, C. Craig, et al., <i>vs.</i>	45
Rates, <i>in re</i> ,	60
DELAWARE, LACKAWANNA & WESTERN RAILROAD COMPANY—	
Mountain Ice Co. <i>vs.</i>	60
Public highways in E. Orange et al., <i>in re</i> ,	50
EASTON GAS WORKS—	
Stock and bonds, <i>in re</i> ,	51
EGG HARBOR CITY WATER COMPANY—	
Rates, new schedule of, <i>in re</i> ,	43
ELECTRIC COMPANY OF NEW JERSEY—	
Rates, <i>in re</i> ,	54
ELECTRIC LIGHT & POWER COMPANY OF HIGHTSTOWN—	
Mortgage and bonds, <i>in re</i> ,	51
ERIE RAILROAD COMPANY—	
Bonds, in re-pledging of, and issuance of gold notes.....	44
Fithian, F. Wilbur, <i>vs.</i>	46
Grade crossings in Rutherford and E. Rutherford, <i>in re</i> , ..	42
Holmes, F. S., <i>vs.</i>	46
Passaic, City of, <i>vs.</i>	53
Passenger service, <i>in re</i> withdrawal of,.....	48
FARMERS TELEPHONE COMPANY—	
Rates, <i>in re</i> ,	45
HACKENSACK WATER COMPANY—	
Johnstone, John, <i>vs.</i>	39
Rates, <i>in re</i> ,	47
Rates in West Hoboken, <i>in re</i> ,	48

	PAGE.
Service, <i>in re</i> ,	47
Whittaker, B. J., <i>vs.</i>	43
HILLCREST WATER COMPANY—	
Mortgage and bonds, <i>in re</i> ,	51
JAMESBURG WATER COMPANY—	
Minimum charge, <i>in re</i> ,	62
JERSEY CENTRAL TRACTION COMPANY—	
Agreement of merger and consolidation	49
Bonds and mortgage, <i>in re</i> ,	49
Lease to Central Jersey Traction Co.....	48
Real estate and personal property, sale of,	49
Stock, transfer of, <i>in re</i> ,	50
JUNCTION WATER COMPANY—	
Stock, <i>in re</i> ,	58
LAMBERTVILLE PUBLIC SERVICE COMPANY—	
Bonds and mortgage, <i>in re</i> ,	48
MAPLE SHADE WATER COMPANY—	
Rates, <i>in re</i> ,	52
MERCHANTVILLE WATER COMPANY—	
Miller, et al., Ross, <i>vs.</i>	43
MIDDLESEX & MONMOUTH ELECTRIC LIGHT, HEAT & POWER COMPANY—	
Merger and consolidation, <i>in re</i> ,	49
MILLVILLE ELECTRIC LIGHT COMPANY—	
Rates, <i>in re</i> ,	60
MILLVILLE GAS LIGHT COMPANY—	
Merger and consolidation, <i>in re</i> ,	52
MONMOUTH COUNTY WATER COMPANY—	
Borough of Bradley Beach <i>vs.</i>	41
MONMOUTH LIGHTING COMPANY—	
Bonds and stock, <i>in re</i> ,	49
Merger and consolidation, <i>in re</i> ,	49
Stock, transfer of, <i>in re</i> ,	50
MONTCLAIR WATER COMPANY—	
Atwater, Mrs. J. C., <i>vs.</i>	42
MORRIS COUNTY TRACTION COMPANY—	
Income debenture bonds, <i>in re</i> ,	61
MOUNT HOLLY WATER COMPANY—	
Reports, <i>in re</i> filing,	55
NEW EGYPT LIGHT, HEAT & POWER COMPANY—	
Reports, <i>in re</i> filing,	58
NEW EGYPT WATER COMPANY—	
Reports, <i>in re</i> filing,	58
NEW JERSEY & NEW YORK RAILROAD COMPANY—	
Operation of train No. 617, <i>in re</i> ,.....	47

	PAGE.
NEW JERSEY GAS & ELECTRIC COMPANY—	
Rates, new schedule of.....	56
NEW JERSEY GAS COMPANY—	
Rates, <i>in re</i> ,	51
NEW JERSEY NORTHERN GAS COMPANY—	
Rates, increase in,	54, 62
NEW JERSEY WATER SERVICE COMPANY—	
Treasury stock, <i>in re</i> ,	48
NEW YORK & LONG BRANCH RAILROAD COMPANY—	
City of Asbury Park <i>vs.</i>	54
NEW YORK, SUSQUEHANNA & WESTERN RAILROAD COMPANY—	
Board of Freeholders County of Passaic, <i>vs.</i>	57
Passenger service, withdrawal of,	48, 51
NEW YORK TELEPHONE COMPANY—	
Merger and consolidation with Atlantic Coast Telephone Co., <i>in re</i> ,	51
Merger and consolidation with Delaware & Atlantic Tele- graph & Telephone Co., <i>in re</i> ,	60
Rates, <i>in re</i> ,	60
NORTHAMPTON, EASTON & WASHINGTON TRACTION COMPANY—	
Rates, <i>in re</i> ,	53
NORTH JERSEY RAPID TRANSIT COMPANY—	
Rates, <i>in re</i> ,	52
OCEAN STREET PASSENGER RAILROAD COMPANY—	
Failure to operate, <i>in re</i> ,	56
ORAM, ROBERT F.—	
Reports, <i>in re</i> filing,	52
PATRONS' TELEPHONE COMPANY—	
Reports, <i>in re</i> filing,	52
PENNSGROVE WATER SUPPLY COMPANY—	
Chapman, J., <i>vs.</i>	59
PENNSYLVANIA RAILROAD COMPANY—	
Abandonment of Agency Station at Lewistown, <i>in re</i> ,	57
City of Perth Amboy, permission to extend Easton Street..	42
Manufacturers' & Property Interests Association, et al. <i>vs.</i>	46
Rates, proposed increase, <i>in re</i> ,	54
Siding across Grand Street, Rahway, <i>in re</i> ,	54
PEOPLE'S WATER COMPANY—	
Ordinance, Township of Raritan, <i>in re</i> ,	47
PERTH AMBOY GAS LIGHT COMPANY—	
City of Perth Amboy <i>vs.</i>	42
PHILADELPHIA & READING RAILWAY COMPANY—	
Ewing Township, <i>in re</i> grade crossing,	39
Rates, proposed increase, <i>in re</i> ,	54
PLAINFIELD-UNION WATER COMPANY—	
Hirsh, Symon, <i>vs.</i>	45

	PAGE.
POINT PLEASANT WATER WORKS COMPANY—	
Hanley, Wm., <i>vs.</i>	59
Marr, Geo. A., <i>vs.</i>	40
Point Pleasant Borough <i>vs.</i>	40
PROPRIETORS OF THE MORRIS AQUEDUCT—	
Rates, proposed increase, <i>in re</i> ,	46, 50
PUBLIC SERVICE ELECTRIC COMPANY—	
Ackerman, James T., <i>vs.</i>	61
PUBLIC SERVICE GAS COMPANY—	
City of South Amboy <i>vs.</i>	43
PUBLIC SERVICE RAILWAY COMPANY—	
Extension on North Avenue, Elizabeth.....	46
Middlesex Borough, Board of Education, <i>vs.</i>	61
RAILROAD COMPANIES—	
Passenger trains, <i>in re</i> withdrawal of,	52
RARITAN RIVER RAILROAD COMPANY—	
Rates, increased, <i>in re</i> ,	45
Report, <i>in re</i> filing,.....	57
RIVERTON & PALMYRA WATER COMPANY—	
Stock, <i>in re</i> ,	59
ROCKLAND ELECTRIC COMPANY—	
Crick, F. J., <i>vs.</i>	44
SEASHORE GAS COMPANY OF SEA ISLE CITY—	
Service, <i>in re</i> discontinuance of,	57
STEWARTSVILLE TELEPHONE COMPANY—	
Report, <i>in re</i> filing,	52
STREET RAILWAYS—	
Transportation and operation, <i>in re</i> ,	61
TINTERN MANOR WATER COMPANY—	
Board of Education of West Long Branch et al. <i>vs.</i>	57
City of Long Branch, <i>vs.</i>	56
TOMS RIVER ELECTRIC COMPANY—	
Stock dividend, <i>in re</i> ,	50
TUCKERTON WATER COMPANY—	
Minimum charge, <i>in re</i> ,	62
UTILITIES—	
Rules, <i>in re</i> coal clause,	61
WATER UTILITIES—	
Rules and regulations, <i>in re</i> ,	40
WESTERN UNION TELEGRAPH COMPANY—	
Ordinance, City of Trenton.....	47
WEST JERSEY & SEASHORE RAILROAD COMPANY—	
City of Millville, <i>vs.</i>	55
Elwood, Board of Trade, <i>vs.</i>	55
Ocean City, for permission to extend 55th Street.....	59
Pleasantville, new crossing at Glendale Avenue.....	40
Pleasantville, new crossing at Wright Street.....	40

INDEX.

243

	PAGE.
Rates, proposed increase, <i>in re</i> ,	54
Townsend's Inlet Station, <i>in re</i> change in,	53
Woodstown Chamber of Commerce <i>vs.</i>	55
WEST JERSEY TOLL LINE COMPANY—	
Reports, <i>in re</i> filing,	52
WEST MONMOUTH WATER COMPANY—	
Bonds, <i>in re</i> ,	53
WHARTON & NORTHERN RAILROAD COMPANY—	
Reports, <i>in re</i> filing,	61
WILDWOOD & DELAWARE BAY SHORT LINE RAILROAD COMPANY—	
Malott, Horace J., <i>vs.</i>	53
Reports, <i>in re</i> filing,	56
F.	
FORMAL PROCEEDINGS—SEE DECISIONS.	
I.	
INFORMAL COMPLAINTS—SEE COMPLAINTS.	
INSPECTIONS—	
Electric Companies	227-229
Gas Companies	229-230
Water Companies	230
Street Railways	231-232
Railroad Companies	232-233
L.	
LEASES, AGREEMENTS, ETC.—	
Atlantic Coast Electric Light Co. and New York Telephone Co.	209
Delaware & Atlantic Telegraph & Telephone Co. and Atlantic Coast Telephone Company.....	209
Delaware & Atlantic Telegraph & Telephone Co. and Borough of Paulsboro	206
Delaware & Atlantic Telegraph & Telephone Company and Cape May Light & Power Co.....	208
Delaware & Atlantic Telegraph & Telephone Co. and Electric Company of New Jersey.....	211
Delaware & Atlantic Telegraph & Telephone Co. and Farmers' Telegraph & Telephone Co.....	210
Delaware & Atlantic Telegraph & Telephone Co. and Farmers' Telephone Co.	210, 211
Delaware & Atlantic Telegraph & Telephone Company and Walter H. Felmey	213
Delaware & Atlantic Telegraph & Telephone Co. and Merchant- ville Water Co.	213
Delaware & Atlantic Telegraph & Telephone Co. and Salem & Pennsgrove Traction Co.....	209
Delaware & Atlantic Telegraph & Telephone Co. and Western Union Telegraph Co.	209

	PAGE.
Essex Fells Electric Light & Water Co. and Essex Fells Country Club	206
Jersey Central Traction Co.—Lease to Central Jersey Traction Co.	210
Lehigh Valley Railroad Co.—Discontinuance of sale of tickets at Grandin Station	214
New York Telephone Company and Atlantic Coast Electric Railway Company.....	214
New York Telephone Company and Commonwealth Water & Light Company	207
New York Telephone Company and Consolidated Gas Company of New Jersey	207
New York Telephone Company and Everett L. Brown.....	208
New York Telephone Company and Postal Telegraph-Cable Company of New Jersey	207
New York Telephone Company and Borough of Seaside Heights	207
Pennsylvania Railroad Company—Change in location of passenger station at Princeton	207
Pennsylvania Tunnel & Terminal Railroad Company and Pennsylvania Railroad Company	212
Public Service Railway Company and Arthur E. Newbold.....	209
M.	
MERGERS—	
Central Railroad Company of N. J. & Buena Vista Railroad Co. et al., forming The Central Railroad Company of New Jersey	200
Jersey Central Traction Company and Central Jersey Traction Co., forming Jersey Central Traction Co.....	200
Millville Gas Light Co. et al., forming Cumberland County Gas Company	201
Monmouth Lighting Company and Middlesex & Monmouth Electric Light, Heat & Power Co., forming Monmouth Lighting Co.	200
New York Telephone Company and Atlantic Coast Telephone Company, forming New York Telephone Company.....	200
United Shoe Machinery Company and United Shoe Machinery Corporation	200
MORTGAGES—SEE BONDS, STOCK, ETC.—	
N.	
NEW CROSSINGS AT GRADE, <i>In Re.</i> —	
ATLANTIC & SUBURBAN RAILWAY—	
Pleasantville, Delilah Road,	219
ATLANTIC CITY RAILROAD—	
Lower Township, Schellenger's Landing.....	218
Upper Township, Highway leading from Ocean City to Tuckahoe	217

	PAGE.
BAY SHORE CONNECTING RAILROAD—	
Newark, Avenue R,	217
CAMPBELL COMPANY, JOSEPH, —	
Camden, Front Street,	221
CENTRAL RAILROAD OF NEW JERSEY—	
Elizabeth, Butler Street,	220
Elizabeth, Price's Alley,	218
Elizabeth, Third Avenue,	223
Newark, Avenue R,	217
DELAWARE, LACKAWANNA & WESTERN RAILROAD—	
Acquackanonk Township, Colfax Avenue,	215
Boonton, Division Street,	222
Bloomfield, Langdon Street,	223
Delaware, Unnamed Road,	217
Jersey City, Monmouth Street, Coles Street, 16th Street, 17th Street and 18th Street,	219
Passaic, Bloomfield Avenue,	215
ERIE RAILROAD—	
Harrison, Central Avenue & Cross Street,	220
Jersey City, Monmouth Street, Coles Street, 16th Street, 17th Street and 18th Street,	219
Nutley, Kingsland Avenue,	217
HYDRAULIC PRESS BRICK COMPANY—	
Winslow Township, Iron Mill Road,	215
LEHIGH VALLEY RAILROAD—	
Newark, Sherman Avenue,	217
NEW YORK & LONG BRANCH RAILROAD—	
Bay Head, Osborne Avenue,	217
Eatontown Township, Casler's Crossing,	220
PENNSYLVANIA & NEW JERSEY RAILROAD—	
New Germantown, Whitehouse-New Germantown Road, ...	215
PENNSYLVANIA RAILROAD—	
Bonhamptown, Piscataway Road,	222
Camden, State Street,	223
Ernston Station, South Amboy & Old Bridge Road,	223
Ewansville Station, Public Road,	222
Hightstown, Road east of,	215
Lewistown Station, Public Road near,	219
Moore's Station, River Road,	221
Mount Holly, Pine Street,	222
North Brunswick Township, Trenton & New Brunswick Turnpike,	219
North Pemberton, Hanover Street,	221
Pensauken Township, River Road,	218
Perth Amboy, Easton Street,	224
Seaside Heights, Kearny Avenue,	223
Smithville, County Road,	222

	PAGE.
Smithville, Public Road west of,	222
Trenton, St. Joe's Avenue,	216
Yardville, Public Road,	215
PHILADELPHIA & READING RAILWAY—	
Ewing Township, Asylum Road,	219
Hillsboro Township, grade crossings between Belle Mead and Manville,	219
POHATCONG RAILROAD—	
White Township, Hazen-Buttville Road,	219
PUBLIC SERVICE RAILWAY—	
Gloucester, Camden County,	220
UNION TRANSPORTATION COMPANY—	
East Windsor Township, Allen's Road,	218
Sharon Station, Sharon Road,	218
WEST JERSEY & SEASHORE RAILROAD—	
Atlantic City, Drexel Avenue and Adriatic Avenue,	221
Camden, Delaware Avenue,	216
Camden, State Street,	221
Ocean City, 55th Street,	223
WEST SHORE RAILROAD—	
Dumont, Grant Avenue, Madison Avenue et al.,	220
Dumont, Washington Avenue, Larch Street, Central Ave- nue, Fairview Avenue, Lenox Avenue, Lexington Ave- nue and Knickerbocker Road,	221
O.	
ORDINANCES, RESOLUTIONS, ETC.—	
DELAWARE & ATLANTIC TELEGRAPH & TELEPHONE Co.—	
Maurice River Township	193
Merchantville	194
EUREKA POWER COMPANY—	
Mercer County	194
HADDONFIELD RURAL TELEPHONE COMPANY—	
Delaware Township	194
NEW YORK TELEPHONE COMPANY—	
Avon-By-The-Sea	193
Bergen County	193, 194
North Bergen Township	194
Seaside Heights	193
Somerville	193
Westwood	194
SUSSEX TELEPHONE COMPANY—	
Franklin	194
WESTERN UNION TELEGRAPH COMPANY—	
Trenton	195
WEST MONMOUTH WATER COMPANY—	
Farmingdale	194

INDEX. 247

R. PAGE.

REPORTS OF DECISIONS—SEE DECISIONS.

RESOLUTIONS—SEE ORDINANCES, ETC.

Rules, Regulations & Recommendations for Water Utilities.. 63

S.

SALES OF LAND, FACILITIES, ETC.—

CAMDEN & BURLINGTON COUNTY RAILWAY COMPANY—

Medford 210

CENTRAL RAILROAD COMPANY OF NEW JERSEY—

Bayonne 212

EASTERN TELEPHONE & TELEGRAPH COMPANY—

Camden 211

ELECTRIC COMPANY OF NEW JERSEY—

Pennsgrove 212

FREEHOLD & JAMESBURG AGRICULTURAL RAILROAD Co.—

Jamesburg Township 210

HUDSON & MIDDLESEX TELEPHONE & TELEGRAPH COMPANY—

Property, effects and franchises 211

JERSEY CENTRAL TRACTION COMPANY—

Power station, transmission lines, etc. 210

LAKESWOOD & COAST ELECTRIC COMPANY—

Equipment at Point Pleasant and Lakewood..... 206

Lakewood Township 206

LEHIGH VALLEY RAILROAD COMPANY OF NEW JERSEY—

Newark 207, 212

MORRIS COUNTY TRACTION COMPANY—

Electrical units in power plants at Chatham and Township
of Randolph 206

NEW JERSEY & HUDSON RIVER R. R. & FERRY COMPANY—

Hasbrouck Heights 207

Leonia 213

NEW JERSEY POWER & LIGHT COMPANY—

Sale of property and setting up Property Abandoned
Account 214

NEW YORK BAY RAILROAD COMPANY—

Newark 208, 211

PENNSYLVANIA & NEW JERSEY RAILROAD COMPANY—

Six miles of old rail in track between Mendham and Wat-
nong 211

PENNSYLVANIA & NEWARK RAILROAD COMPANY—

East Brunswick Township 210

PENNSYLVANIA RAILROAD COMPANY—

Florence Township 208

Harrison 213

Jersey City 210, 213

Lambertville 218

	PAGE.
Linden Township	214
New Brunswick	208, 209, 211
North Brunswick Township	208
Princeton	207
Sayreville Township	208
South Amboy	206, 208, 209, 211
Trenton	206, 213
PITMAN WATER COMPANY—	
Rights, privileges, etc., in Pitman Borough.....	212
PORT READING RAILROAD COMPANY—	
Bound Brook	212
Bridgewater Township	212
PROPRIETORS OF THE MORRIS AQUEDUCT—	
Mendham Township	211
PUBLIC SERVICE GAS COMPANY—	
Trenton	208, 210
PUBLIC SERVICE RAILWAY COMPANY—	
Camden	207
Sayreville Township	209
RARITAN RIVER RAILROAD COMPANY—	
South Amboy	206
SUMMERILL, JOSEPH J., ET AL., COMMITTEE OF BOND HOLDERS OF MOORE BROTHERS MFG. COMPANY—	
Personal property in Borough of Clayton	207
TRENTON & MERCER COUNTY TRACTION CORPORATION—	
Certain equipment	213
Twenty old summer car bodies	208
UNION TRANSPORTATION COMPANY—	
Imlaystown	211
Upper Freehold Township	214
WEST JERSEY & SEASHORE RAILROAD COMPANY—	
Atlantic City	209
Buena Vista Township	212
Camden	212
Dennis Township	212
Millville	208
Pleasantville	209
STOCK—SEE BONDS, STOCK & MORTGAGES.	

W.

WATER UTILITIES—SEE RULES, REGULATIONS, ETC.