

Decision No. 70677

**ORIGINAL**

BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

Investigation into the operations,  
rates of fare, practices, routes,  
schedules, tariffs, service, equip-  
ment and facilities of GREYHOUND  
LINES, INC., WESTERN GREYHOUND  
LINES DIVISION in the San Francisco  
Bay Area.

Case No. 8009  
Order Setting Hearing  
Dated January 11, 1966

Additional Appearances:

McCutcheon, Doyle, Brown, Trautman & Enersen,  
by William W. Schwarzer, for respondent.

FINAL OPINION

By order dated January 11, 1966 the Commission directed that a hearing be held for the receipt of evidence for the following purposes:

1. To inquire into the circumstances surrounding the failure of Greyhound Lines, Inc., Western Greyhound Lines Division (Greyhound) to provide adequate service to Contra Costa County on the evening of January 3, 1966 and the causes of such failure.
2. To determine steps to prevent a recurrence of such failure, including but not limited to assigning certain equipment for exclusive use in the Contra Costa County operation.
3. To determine such order or orders as might be advisable in the circumstances.

A duly noticed public hearing was held before Examiner Mallory, at San Francisco, on March 9, 1966, and this phase of the investigation in Case No. 8009 was submitted on that date.

Greyhound presented evidence through its Western Greyhound Lines Division Vice Presidents of Maintenance and of Traffic, the Division's Director of Transportation, and the Manager of its San Francisco Bay Area commutation operations. These witnesses explained

the events occurring on January 3, 1966 and the remedial measures taken by Greyhound to prevent a recurrence of similar delays in its Contra Costa commutation operations. This presentation is summarized hereinafter.

The Events of January 3, 1966

The events of January 3 occurred at the end of a period of unusually intensive utilization of Greyhound's equipment. Beginning with a movement of 231 busloads of troops out of Ford Ord on December 22, Greyhound operated at peak loads through January 4. This involved heavy civilian holiday travel over the Christmas and New Year holidays as well as heavy military traffic. As a result, Greyhound was facing maximum demand and all of its equipment was heavily committed.

In addition Greyhound, on January 3 (Monday), was required to meet certain unexpected emergency transportation demands. One was for a movement of seven busloads of draftees from Martinez to Oakland on the morning of that day; these moves usually occur on Tuesday or Wednesday. The other was a request from Southern Pacific Company, received at 2:30 p.m. of that day, for 10 buses for a movement from Oakland to Oregon because Southern Pacific's train service had been disrupted by weather conditions.

Nevertheless, Greyhound was able to operate the Contra Costa commute service on the morning of January 3 on a nearly normal basis.

The major problem encountered by Greyhound arose in the afternoon of January 3 in the operation of the service lanes at its maintenance facility. All buses must ordinarily be processed through the service lanes for cleaning, fueling and servicing before being dispatched. Of the 43 cleaners on the day shift, 8 were absent that day without prior notice. Three more cleaners were absent from

the evening shift which began at 4:00 p.m. In addition, the evening shift foreman failed to report, without advance notice, on account of illness.

This unforeseen absenteeism caused critical delays in the service lanes between 4:00 p.m. and 5:00 p.m. because an unusually large number of buses returned from mainline service in the course of the afternoon, rather than earlier as expected. This delay was due largely to weather conditions disrupting over-the-road schedules. Until other personnel could be assigned to the service lanes, buses were backed up and were delayed in returning to service. To relieve the congestion, Greyhound not only assigned additional men to the service lanes, but inspected waiting buses and dispatched any buses which could be put into service without further processing.

Equipment assigned to commute operations has traditionally been used for mainline operations when not in commute use, principally on weekends and holidays. Ordinarily this creates no problem because the equipment is returned to commute service well before the time when it is needed. If Greyhound, in these other operations, were precluded from using this equipment (which otherwise is normally used only for brief periods during the week), the resulting financial cost would be onerous. Such assignment of equipment is essential for the generation of the intrastate mainline revenue to which the Commission looks to underwrite the unprofitable commute operations.

#### REMEDIAL MEASURES TAKEN

The following actions have been taken and procedures initiated to prevent recurrence of the events of January 3:

1. The superintendent on duty in the evening at Transbay terminal has been directed to call Central Dispatch at 2:00 p.m. each day to determine the equipment situation and anticipate any shortage.

2. Central Dispatch has been directed to make, under the supervision of the Regional Manager or his assistant, an early count each day of equipment available for the Contra Costa and other operations, to anticipate any shortage.
3. If any shortage is anticipated, Central Dispatch has been instructed immediately to attempt to reserve mainline buses to cover the need.
4. Maintenance personnel on the evening shift now report one hour earlier, at 3:00 p.m. instead of 4:00 p.m., thus providing a one-hour overlap of the day and evening shifts.
5. Shifts have been rearranged and personnel added so as to provide two additional mechanics on the day and night shifts on Sundays and Mondays, and at other peak times, and four additional mechanics and an additional service man on the evening shifts on those days.
6. Eleven buses have been added to Division 5 equipment (commute operations).
7. Shop foremen and supervisors have been instructed not to leave their posts at the end of their shifts until their replacements have reported for duty.
8. All personnel have been instructed to be alert to early indications of equipment shortage or other operating problems so that such difficulties will be promptly communicated to management and timely action can be taken to assure satisfactory service.

The staff is satisfied that the remedial measures undertaken by Greyhound will prevent a recurrence of the type of service failure which took place on January 3, 1966, except in the most unusual circumstances. The staff recommended that Greyhound be directed to continue such measures.

Based upon the record, the Commission finds as follows:

1. A failure of Greyhound to provide adequate commutation service to Contra Costa County occurred on the evening of January 3, 1966.
2. Such failure occurred because of a combination of events, which included unusually heavy demands made for service over the New Year holiday period, including military transport; absenteeism on January 3, 1966 of shop maintenance employees required to service

equipment; and disruptions due to weather conditions.

3. Greyhound has taken remedial measures to prevent recurrence of similar service failures in the future, as outlined in the narrative above.

4. Such remedial measures should prevent future service failures in commutation operations similar to that which occurred on January 3, 1966.

5. No necessity has been shown for the exclusive assignment of equipment to respondent's Contra Costa commutation operations.

This record does not demonstrate the need for an order directing respondent to institute additional or further changes in its operations at this time and none will be issued.

FINAL ORDER

IT IS ORDERED that the proceeding instituted by the Commission's Order in Case No. 8009 is discontinued.

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

Dated at San Francisco, California, this 10<sup>th</sup> day of MAY, 1966.

Frederick B. Hallock  
President

George T. Crow

Augusta

William C. Baird  
Commissioners

Commissioner Peter E. Mitchell, being necessarily absent, did not participate in the disposition of this proceeding.