

ORIGINAL

Decision No. 58125

## BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

In the Matter of the Application of )  
 PACIFIC GREYHOUND LINES, a corpora- )  
 tion, for an order authorizing )  
 increases in commutation fares in )  
 Marin County service. )

Application No. 34362  
 (As amended)

In the Matter of the Application of )  
 PACIFIC GREYHOUND LINES, a corpora- )  
 tion, for an order authorizing )  
 increases in commutation fares in )  
 Sonoma County Service. )

Application No. 34363  
 (As amended)

In the Matter of the Application of )  
 THE GREYHOUND CORPORATION (Western )  
 Greyhound Lines Division), formerly )  
 Pacific Greyhound Lines, for an )  
 order authorizing increases in )  
 certain fares applicable to its )  
 Peninsula service. )

Application No. 36532  
 1st Supplemental

## Appearances in Application No. 36532, 1st Supplemental:

Gerald H. Trautman, for The Greyhound Corporation  
 (Western Greyhound Lines Division), applicant.  
Axel E. Christiansen, Assistant City Attorney,  
 for the City of Redwood City.  
J. L. Pearson and W. Roche, for the Commission  
 staff.

(for other appearances in Applications Nos. 34362, 34363  
 and 36532 see Appendix "C" to Decision No. 52813 issued  
 herein on March 27, 1956.)

## O P I N I O N

By Decision No. 52813, issued herein on March 27, 1956,  
 applicant was ordered (1) to make a study to determine the feasibility  
 of reducing the number of fare points in the Peninsula service and  
 establishing a more efficient cash-fare collection system in this  
 service and to file a report of the results of such study with the  
 Commission, and (2) to make a study of its Peninsula and Marin and

Sonoma County services for the purpose of determining the adequacy of buses in relation to traffic volume and the appropriate load standards which should be established in these services and to file a report thereof together with recommendations respecting the adequacy of buses and the load standards which should be established.

Applicant filed its report regarding the adequacy of service and the establishment of load standards for its Peninsula, Marin and Sonoma services on July 16, 1956, and its final report regarding the feasibility of reducing the number of fare points in the Peninsula service and establishing a more efficient cash-fare collection system in this service on February 4, 1958. On July 23, 1958, applicant filed its First Supplemental Application No. 36532 requesting authority for applicant to establish fare zones in its Peninsula service as shown on Exhibit A attached thereto and to publish 20-ride zone commutation fares and one-way zone fares as proposed in Exhibit B attached thereto.

Public hearing was held on First Supplemental Application No. 36532 before Examiner Wilson E. Cline on September 10, 1958. At the close of the hearing the matter was taken under submission.

I. Proposed Reduction in  
Number of Fare Points and  
Improvement in Cash-Fare  
Collection System

A. Present Fare Structure on Peninsula:

Greyhound's one-way fares on the Peninsula are presently on a point-to-point schedule based on a mileage formula established by the Commission with a minimum fare of 20 cents and a maximum fare of \$1.32 which is the fare between San Francisco and San Jose. There are 48 stations or fare points served by the local Peninsula operation.

The commutation fares are similarly set up in the tariff naming point-to-point 20-ride fares between all stations. They start

with a minimum of \$4 and scale up to a maximum of \$10 which is the San Francisco to San Jose fare. Both a north and south zone limit for each fare point must be established, which, in effect, makes a total of about 96 zone limits with which drivers and the public must become acquainted. Ofttimes an override is permitted because a driver may fail properly to identify a zone point.

B. Proposed Zone Fares:

Thirteen proposed zones have been established as shown on the map attached to the First Supplemental Application No. 36532. The proposed one-way fares start with a minimum fare of 20 cents within any single zone or between any two adjacent zones. There is a 10-cent increment for each succeeding zone, except where there is a tax involved, in which case the fare has been fixed so that the fare plus tax ends in zero or five. The maximum fare of \$1.32 plus tax between San Francisco and San Jose remains unchanged. The proposed commutation fares start with the present minimum of \$4 within any zone and to and from the next adjacent zone. A 50-cent increment is then added for each succeeding zone, with one exception: that being between San Francisco and Zones 10 and 11 where a \$1 increment has been provided to retain the presently established commute fare of \$10 between San Francisco and San Jose.

A problem arises in the proposed new zone tariffs in trying to flag whether a fare may be an increase or a decrease. It will be noted that applicant is showing a multiple number of stations within the zone compared to its present tariff. As some of them may be increases and some of them may be decreases, it would be difficult to identify on the tariff whether they are increases or whether they are decreases. For that reason applicant is asking to be relieved of the requirement set forth in General Order No. 79, Item 4-N.

C. Effect of Proposed Fares  
on Operating Results:

Exhibit No. 28 shows the estimated annual increase in passenger revenue from the use of the proposed new zone fares to be \$72,900.

Exhibit No. 29 shows estimated adjustments to operating expenses of applicant's Peninsula service as reflected in Decision No. 52813 herein, to increase various expenses to cost levels at June 30, 1958. These adjustments show an estimated increase in expenses of \$207,000 and reflect a 16% increase in the cost of materials and supplies, a 20% increase in mechanics' wages, a 20.9% increase in drivers' wages, a 25% increase in station salaries, a 31.7% increase in office employees' salaries, and \$6,000 depreciation on 75 new cash-fare boxes to be purchased at a cost of \$60,000.

D. Present Method of Collecting  
Cash Fares on Buses:

The Johnson-type J electric fare box is used at the present time. These boxes were purchased in 1937, 1942 and 1947.

The J box is fast in registering coins but each individual coin must be inserted one at a time in the slot provided. This makes the box slow and is an annoyance to the passenger having to insert the coins. The box does not have a built-in money changer. It is noisy, as fares are registered by a series of gongs. A penny registers as a dime. A nonmetallic coin or slug will not register and may jam the box.

After the coins are inserted in the box the driver punches out a Form 2329 twice if the fare is nontaxable and a Form 2337 three times if the fare is taxable. Part of the form is given to the passenger as an identification check.

The present fare collection system is slow and cumbersome and puts a definite burden on the driver. When new drivers enter

the service, the buses run late and there are overcharges and undercharges.

E. Proposed Method of Collecting Cash Fares on Buses:

In the event the Commission authorizes applicant to put the zone fare structure proposed herein into effect, applicant proposes to buy and equip the Peninsula service with the Grant-type box.

The Grant box requires very little maintenance and has had good passenger acceptance. It is fast and all types of coins go into the box. When the box jams it simply becomes a vault-type box and money is still collected.

HOLDERS for hat-checks will be acquired to go along with the new coin boxes. When the coins are in the box, the driver will simply reach into his hat-check holder and pick out the appropriate zone check. As there is no punching, it is a one-handed operation.

There is a removable money changer which is built into the fare box. The coins which are placed in the box pass through a counting device and finally come to rest in the money changer without any counting or distribution by the driver.

If the driver gets a bent coin or slug or something that will not go through the box, he simply flips a lever and it goes into the locked vault of the box. It is almost impossible to jam the box. Anything that will go through the entrance at the slot can be handled either through the counting mechanism or go into the locked vault.

The witness for applicant stated that he did not believe that the use of the Grant-type box would actually take anything out of the scheduled running time but that it would improve the on-time performance.

F. Conclusion:

We hereby find and conclude that the fares and the fare increases proposed by applicant as set forth in Exhibit B to the First Supplemental Application No. 36532 herein and in Exhibits Nos. 26 and 27 are justified and should be authorized by this Commission with the understanding that applicant will install the new Grant-type fare collection boxes on the buses used in the Peninsula service, as proposed by applicant, concurrently with the establishment of the fares authorized herein.

In filing tariffs pursuant to this authorization applicant cannot be relieved of the requirement set forth in General Order No. 79, Item 4-N because of the provisions of Section 491 of the Public Utilities Code.

II. Adequacy of Buses in  
Relation to Traffic Volume  
and Need for Load Standards

In connection with the preparation of its report regarding adequacy of service and the establishment of load standards for its Peninsula, Marin and Sonoma services, applicant made load checks as follows:

1. For the seven-day period April 2 to 8, 1956, inclusive, cordon checks were made for the entire operating day of the Marin and Sonoma services. A similar cordon check was made of the Peninsula service for the period April 9 to 15, 1956, inclusive.
2. Subsequently, maximum load point checks for the entire operating day were conducted for the period June 4 to 10, 1956, inclusive, of the Peninsula service and for the period June 11 to 17, 1956, inclusive, of the Marin and Sonoma services.

The checks made in April 1956 give a picture of the services and patronage experienced prior to the rate increase authorized by

Decision No. 52813, and the second check in June 1956 shows the situation subsequent to the rate increase. A copy of the details of both checks has been furnished to the Commission staff.

Applicant urges that there is no need for the establishment of formal load standards as a means of assuring the public adequate and proper service and recommends that no load standards be imposed.

Applicant in its report points out certain improvements which it has voluntarily made in its Peninsula schedules and routings and in the Marin and Sonoma schedules and routings and contends that the imposition of load standards will not insure better service but may well constitute a deterrent to service improvements such as applicant has consistently made in the past.

Exhibit No. 30 of the Commission staff shows the load factors operated on Wednesday, April 23, 1958, on local Peninsula routes and the load factors operated on these routes on Wednesday, April 27, 1955. This exhibit states that it appears that applicant is presently providing approximately the same, or in some instances a little better, standard of service than in 1955, and concludes that in view of the service currently provided there is no pressing need for the establishment of load standards at the present time. However, the staff urges that load standards ultimately be established.

In view of the record herein the Commission will not establish load standards for applicant's local Peninsula, Marin and Sonoma services in this proceeding.

In order to facilitate the handling of service complaints by the Commission staff representatives, the staff witness recommended that all local service be placed under the supervision of

the same regional manager instead of under two as at present. The determination of who shall handle service complaints submitted by the Commission staff representatives is a matter to be decided by applicant's officials. We assume that appropriate inquiry will satisfactorily resolve this matter for the Commission staff representatives.

O R D E R

Based on the evidence of record and on the conclusions and findings set forth in the preceding opinion,

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that:

1. The Greyhound Corporation (Western Greyhound Lines Division), the applicant herein, be and it is hereby authorized to establish, on not less than five days' notice to the Commission and to the public, fare zones in its Peninsula service as shown on Exhibit A and 20-ride zone commutation fares and one-way zone fares as set forth in Exhibit B, both of which exhibits are attached to the First Supplemental Application No. 36532 herein, and to establish, file and publish tariffs in the form set forth in Exhibit No. 26, which is local Passenger Tariff No. L-412-C, cancels Local Passenger Tariff No. L-412-B, cancels Cal. P.U.C. No. 15, and in Exhibit No. 27, which is Local Passenger Tariff No. L-490-B, cancels Local Passenger Tariff No. L-490-A, cancels Cal. P.U.C. No. 26. In filing and publishing such tariffs applicant shall comply with Item 4-N of General Order No. 79.

2. Applicant is directed to post and maintain in its vehicles and depots affected a notice of the fares herein authorized. Such



notice shall be posted not less than five days prior to the effective date of such fares and shall remain posted for a period of not less than thirty days.

3. The authority herein granted shall expire unless exercised within sixty days after the effective date of this order.

4. No further hearings in these matters will be held pursuant to ordering paragraph No. 11 of Decision No. 52813, issued herein on March 27, 1956.

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

Dated at San Francisco, California, this 17th day of March, 1959.

*E. Lynn Fox* President  
*J. L. Mitchell*  
*Matthew G. ...*  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Commissioners

Theodore H. Jenner  
Commissioner S. Everett C. McKeage, being necessarily absent, did not participate in the disposition of this proceeding.