

ORIGINAL

Decision No. 76116

BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

Application of AIR WEST, INC. under the)
 Shortened Procedure Tariff Docket to)
 make changes simplifying family plan) (SPT) Application No. 51259
 rules which will result in increases) (Filed July 16, 1969)
 in some types of family plan travel and)
 reductions in other types of family)
 plan travel.)

O P I N I O N A N D O R D E R

By this application, Air West, Inc. seeks authority to amend Rule 44 (Family Fares) as published in Agent S. J. Rogers' Intrastate Local and Joint Passenger Rules Tariff No. 1, Cal. P.U.C. No. 1, to provide for a uniform scale of percentages applicable to either first class or coach fares for the spouse, and children two through 21 years of age accompanying the head of the family when traveling under the terms of this rule.

The percentages as proposed to be published within said rule are as follows:

Spouse - 75%

Children

12 through 21 years of age - 50%

2 through 11 years of age - 33-1/3%

If no spouse is accompanying the head of the family, the proposed charge will be:

First child - 2 through 21 years of age - 75% of the regular adult first class or coach fare.

Each additional child - 12 through 21 years of age - 50% of the adult fare.

Any additional child - 2 through 11 years of age - 33-1/3% of the adult fare.

It is further proposed to make uniform the periods of the week when family travel is permitted, as follows:

Not Earlier Than

12:00 Noon Local Time Monday
Midnight Local Time Friday

Not Later Than

12:00 Noon Local Time Friday
12:00 Noon Local Time Sunday

The applicant alleges as a result of the merger of Bonanza Air Lines, Inc., Pacific Air Lines, Inc. and West Coast Airlines, Inc., and the adoption by Air West, Inc. of the tariff rules, fares and rates of the three companies, a condition has resulted in conflicting and confusing provisions in this rule which governs family plan travel within the State of California, not only causing the reservations and ticketing procedures to be unduly complicated, but also adversely affects the service which can be rendered to the public.

Applicant further alleges that at present there are five different periods of time stated when family plan travel discounts may be applied, some of which are in complete conflict with each other. Also, that there are nine possible combinations of discounts applicable differing according to each of the named air carriers, as now published in S. J. Rogers, Agent's tariff.

The applicant asserts that the revised schedule of family plan fares is in effect for interstate traffic.

The proposed family fare schedule results in both increases and reductions in fares. The applicant alleges that the charges tend

