

ORIGINAL

Decision No. 80545

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

In the Matter of the Application  
of GREYHOUND LINES-WEST, DIVISION  
OF GREYHOUND LINES, INC., for an  
order authorizing a statewide  
increase in intrastate passenger  
fares and express rates and GREYHOUND  
LINES-WEST, DIVISION OF GREYHOUND  
LINES, INC., LAS VEGAS-TONOPAH-  
RENO STAGE LINES, INC., ORANGE  
BELT STAGES, PEERLESS STAGES, INC.,  
SAN PEDRO TRANSIT LINES, and VACA  
VALLEY BUS LINES for an order  
authorizing a statewide increase  
in interline express rates.

Application No. 52591  
(Filed April 30, 1971;  
Amended April 14, 1972  
and April 18, 1972)

(For Appearances see Decision No. 78939)

Additional Appearances

S. B. Ringwood, for Greyhound Lines-West, Division  
of Greyhound Lines, Inc., applicant.  
Thomas J. Whitten, Attorney at Law, for Contra Costa  
County Commuters Association, protestant.  
Donald C. Meany, Attorney at Law, and Milton J. DeBarr,  
for the Commission staff.

FINAL OPINION

Greyhound Lines, Inc. (Greyhound) is a wholly owned subsidiary of The Greyhound Corporation. Greyhound, through its Greyhound Lines - West Division, transports passengers, baggage and express in twenty-six western states including California. In California it performs mainline intercity passenger and express service generally statewide. It also conducts local commute passenger operations in the San Francisco Bay Area, between Long Beach and Santa Monica, and between Sacramento and Woodland.<sup>1/</sup>

<sup>1/</sup> Pursuant to Decision No. 79479, in Application No. 52929, Greyhound transferred its Marin-Sonoma Counties commute operations to the Golden Gate Bridge and Transportation District effective January 1, 1972.

In this application, as amended, Greyhound seeks a two-step increase in its fares and express rates. Decision No. 78939, dated July 27, 1971, authorized an interim increase of 6-1/2 percent in mainline and commute fares and in express rates.<sup>2/</sup> The purpose of the first-step increase was to immediately reflect in Greyhound's fare structure the additional wage expenses incurred by Greyhound since fares were last adjusted pursuant to Decision No. 76455, dated November 18, 1969, in Application No. 51326.

A prehearing conference was held on November 19, 1971, at which the parties agreed as to the nature and extent of the further studies to be conducted by applicant and Commission staff with respect to the final increase sought herein.<sup>3/</sup>

The application, as originally filed, sought a total increase of 15 percent, including the first-step adjustment of 6-1/2 percent heretofore authorized. The amendment filed April 14, 1972 seeks a second-step increase of 13.5 percent, as more specifically set forth in Appendix A. Greyhound alleges that a further increase of 13.5 percent is necessary to afford a rate of return of 7 percent. A rate of return of 7.0 percent was found reasonable in Decision No. 75939

---

<sup>2/</sup> Decision No. 79036, dated August 17, 1971, in this proceeding, suspended said increases because of the freeze on price increases imposed by the Executive Order of the President announced August 15, 1971. Said suspension was lifted by Decision No. 79368, dated November 22, 1971.

<sup>3/</sup> Decision No. 78354, dated February 22, 1971, in Case No. 9168, adopted the separations and allocations procedures set forth in Exhibit 1-A in Case No. 9168 as a basis for the development of California intrastate revenues, expenses, investment and taxes in studies presented to support revisions of the fares of Greyhound Lines, Inc. (West Division), and California Parlor Car Tours, Inc. (subsidiaries of The Greyhound Corporation) until further order of the Commission. Exhibit 1-A (the so-called "separations manual") served as the basis for the development of the studies of applicant and the staff in this proceeding, except as noted.

of July 22, 1969 (69 Cal. P.U.C. 761, at page 769). Said decision is the latest in which the Commission specifically considered the reasonableness of a rate of return for Greyhound's California intrastate operations.

A duly noticed public hearing on Greyhound's request for a second-step increase was held before Examiner Mallory on May 1, 2, 8 and 9, 1972 in San Francisco, and the matter was submitted. Evidence was adduced on behalf of Greyhound, the Commission staff, and protestant Contra Costa County Commuters Association.

Historical Operating Data

Using the methods set forth in the separations manual, the Commission staff and Greyhound developed operating results for Greyhound's California intrastate operations for the year 1970. Applicant and the Commission staff selected 1970 as the base year for their separations studies inasmuch as 1970 was the latest full year for which complete data were available when such studies were begun.

The following table sets forth a summary of the operating results of Greyhound Lines, Inc. (Greyhound Lines-West Division) for the year 1970. As may be noted from this table, California intrastate operations of Greyhound in 1970 resulted in a rate of return of 1.1 percent, and an operating ratio of 99.4 percent.

TABLE 1  
GREYHOUND LINES, INC.  
(Greyhound Lines - West Division)

Statement of Operations for the Twelve  
Months Ended December 31, 1970  
(Exhibit 5 - Appendix A-5)

	<u>Greyhound Lines-West</u>	<u>California Total</u>	<u>Total Cal. Intrastate</u>	<u>California Mainline</u>	<u>Intrastate Local</u>
<u>Operating Revenues</u>					
Passenger	\$138,056,139	\$59,722,120	\$41,385,500	\$30,749,660	\$10,635,840
Charter	14,265,903	5,386,918	3,206,297	3,206,297	-
Express	27,794,384	6,760,724	4,358,475	4,358,475	-
Other	4,169,140	1,987,043	1,414,593	1,090,068	324,525
	<u>\$184,285,566</u>	<u>\$73,856,805</u>	<u>\$50,364,865</u>	<u>\$39,404,500</u>	<u>\$10,960,365</u>
<u>Operating Expenses</u>					
Equip. Maint. & Garage	\$ 23,492,550	\$ 9,899,635	\$ 7,041,116	\$ 4,948,351	\$ 2,092,765
Transportation	62,247,192	27,031,617	19,651,804	12,989,239	6,662,565
Station	29,284,115	11,217,555	8,151,876	6,714,509	1,437,367
Traf. & Adv.	5,023,127	2,133,256	1,362,492	1,116,755	245,737
Ins. & Safety	4,145,047	1,506,177	1,028,960	816,397	212,563
Admin. & General	20,847,257	8,827,561	6,411,280	4,488,135	1,923,145
Depreciation	7,174,325	3,107,765	2,183,756	1,756,344	427,412
Oper. Taxes & Licenses	13,146,400	5,724,602	4,010,635	3,154,903	855,732
Oper. Rents (Net)	(13,164)	(39,403)	(80,238)	(76,079)	(4,159)
	<u>\$165,346,849</u>	<u>\$69,408,765</u>	<u>\$49,761,681</u>	<u>\$35,908,554</u>	<u>\$13,853,127</u>
Operating Income	\$ 18,938,717	\$ 4,448,040	\$ 603,184	\$ 3,495,946	\$(2,892,762)
Federal & State Income Taxes	\$ 8,291,335	\$ 2,123,939	\$ 288,027	\$ 1,669,777	\$(1,381,750)
Net Income After Income Taxes	\$ 10,647,382	\$ 2,324,101	\$ 315,157	\$ 1,826,169	\$(1,511,012)
Rate Base	\$ 90,267,861	\$39,378,220	\$28,903,340	\$22,615,195	\$ 6,288,145
Operating Ratio After Taxes	94.2%	96.9%	99.4%	95.4%	113.8%
Rate of Return	11.8%	5.9%	1.1%	8.1%	-

( ) = Negative Amount

Test Year Operating Results

The test year selected by applicant and the staff for the purposes of this phase of the proceeding is the year ended December 31, 1972. It was agreed at the prehearing conference that the test year operating expenses would reflect a 5-1/2 percent increase in wages for drivers and other employees subject to the collective bargaining agreement between Greyhound Lines-West and the Amalgamated Transit Union.<sup>4/</sup> Pursuant to agreements reached at the prehearing conference, adjustment in 1970 operating data was made to reallocate certain overhead expenses as a result of discontinuance of commute operations in Marin and Sonoma Counties. It was also agreed that trending for changes in passenger traffic volume and express service would be based on actual 1971 operating statistics, modified only to reflect major changes in operations not known at the time of the conference. The studies of Greyhound and the staff assertedly were developed using the methods and procedures set forth in the separations manual, except as hereinafter noted.

---

<sup>4/</sup> The collective bargaining agreement effective March 1, 1969 expired February 29, 1972. At the prehearing conference it was agreed that if the terms of the agreement which superseded the expired agreement were known prior to the date of hearing, said terms would be reflected in the exhibits of Greyhound and the staff; if not, the 5-1/2 percent contained in the Greyhound Line-East agreement would be used, inasmuch as said amount would represent the lowest increase possible in the circumstances. At the time of hearing negotiations were not concluded.

In the development of their test-year operating revenues, expenses and rate base, Greyhound and the staff differ with respect to the following:

1. The appropriate level of California intrastate express revenues for the test year.
2. The appropriate amount to be included in operating expenses for:
  - (a) Maintenance labor.
  - (b) Maintenance materials
  - (c) The 1972 increase in drivers' wages.
3. Whether charter revenues, expenses and related rate base items should be excluded from California intrastate operating results in determining Greyhound's intrastate revenue needs.
4. Whether 1971 additions to structures, shop equipment, and other facilities should be reflected in test-year rate base; and whether the cost of acquiring franchises should be included in rate base.
5. Whether interest expense should be assigned to Greyhound's California intrastate operations as a deduction from income in computing federal income taxes applicable to California intrastate operations.

In other respects the estimates of the Commission staff and Greyhound of the test-year operating results are not materially different.

#### Express Revenues

The Commission staff witness based his estimates of California intrastate express revenues on his analyses of agency and station reports for Greyhound's Western Division for the year 1970. Summaries were made for stations and agencies in California and for all stations and agencies outside of California. The resulting ratio was applied to Greyhound Lines-West total express revenues of \$27,795,000, which resulted in estimated California collections of \$9,124,000. Total California revenues were distributed between California intrastate and California interstate operations based on an analysis of one month's collections furnished by Greyhound.

The staff witness testified that express revenues are recorded on applicant's books at the system level (Greyhound Lines-West), and that determination of express revenues at the "California-total" and "California-intrastate" levels must be accomplished by allocation procedures.

Applicant's witness testified that the analysis of express revenues developed by the staff did not give effect to settlements of interline accounts. The witness also testified that staff method failed to consider the difference between gross revenues (sales) as recorded on applicant's books for its systems operations, and the manner in which express revenues are accounted for at individual stations. He stated that the staff witness considered only the revenue from shipments forwarded prepaid from individual stations, and did not consider the revenue from shipments received collect at the same stations.

Applicant's witness presented Exhibit 26, which shows that in 1970 system net express revenues were 91.5 percent of system gross sales, the balance representing settlements of interline accounts. The witness stated that the company did not have sufficient time to make a complete analysis of 1970 revenues, but that the system-level percentage was similar to that arrived at in its 1965 study, which study also developed a percentage relationship between system revenues and California revenues. Because of such similarity, the Greyhound witness used the 1965 study as a basis for his allocation of 1970 system express revenues to California operations.

It appears that the methods of allocation of express revenues from system to California operations used by both applicant and the staff have certain infirmities. The record indicates that applicant relied upon an out-of-date study for its development, and that the staff may have overlooked the fact that station revenues include collect as well as prepaid shipments. Therefore, the accuracy of each analysis is subject to question. It appears that Exhibit 1-A in Case No. 9168 (separations manual) does not adequately

treat the subject of allocating express revenues to California traffic, and that preliminary to the next Greyhound general fare proceeding the manual should be revised to provide an accurate method. For the purposes of this proceeding, the estimates arrived at in applicant's study will be adopted, inasmuch as it appears that the staff overlooked certain features of applicant's methods of recording express revenues in its analysis.

Maintenance Expenses

The staff and applicant differ with respect to the appropriate method to be used to trend maintenance expenses. Applicant and the staff both gave effect to a reduction in bus miles to be operated in the test-year, as a result of Greyhound's decrease in traffic from 1970 to 1971. Greyhound developed estimated unit expenses for maintenance labor and maintenance wages based on the difference between such unit expenses in 1970 and 1971. The Commission staff compared unit expenses for a three-year period, 1969 through 1971.

The Commission staff witness testified that unit expenses for some classes of buses were higher in 1970 than in 1971 or in 1969; while for other classes of buses unit expenses were higher in 1969 than either 1970 or 1971. The staff witness used the average unit costs for the three-year period, so as to normalize the peaks and valleys of unit maintenance costs for the various classes of buses in service in California.

Applicant's witness assertedly followed the agreement reached at the prehearing conference, that trending would be based on the differences in costs between 1970 and 1971, except that major changes in trends that were not known at the time of the prehearing conference could be considered.

It is the staff's position that it did not recognize at the time of the prehearing conference that unit costs for bus maintenance would not reflect a level trend and, thus, the agreement reached at the conference did not preclude the use of trends over a different period.

It appears, and we find, that maintenance unit costs for the various types of buses used in California service have not presented a consistent pattern in the most recent three-year period; therefore, the use of average unit costs for this period, as developed in the staff study, will provide a reasonable basis for estimating unit costs for maintenance in the test year.

#### Drivers' Wages

The collective bargaining agreement between Greyhound Lines-West and the Amalgamated Transit Union expired March 1, 1972. At the time of hearing a new contract was being negotiated, which was ultimately approved by the union membership after the close of the hearing. At the prehearing conference it was agreed that the settlement reached between Greyhound Lines-East and the union governing operations in Greyhound's East Division would be used to develop drivers' wages for test-year operating results in the event that a settlement for the West Division was not reached before the conclusion of the hearing.<sup>5/</sup>

Greyhound and the staff increased drivers' wages by 5-1/2 percent in the test year in accordance with said agreement. However, a dispute arose as to the proper base on which the 5-1/2 percent increase should be determined. The dispute revolved around an interpretation of the expiring wage agreement with respect to the manner in which cost-of-living increases should be computed.

It is clear that Greyhound has computed increased drivers' wage costs in the test year based on actual cost-of-living increases paid to the drivers, irrespective of the terms embodied in the wage contract; therefore, we find that wage costs determined in Greyhound's test-year operating results are appropriate for this proceeding.

---

<sup>5/</sup> Said agreement called for a 5-1/2 percent increase in wages in the first year. This amount was incorporated in Greyhound's offer for its West Division. Five and one-half percent also is the maximum wage increase permissible under current Price Control Commission rules, which may be reflected in price increases in the test year.

Charter Operating Results

In developing its historical and test-year operating results, the Commission staff showed charter operations separately from other operations, and excluded charter operating results from the total California intrastate operations on which Greyhound seeks to earn a 7 percent rate of return. Because charter operations are less profitable than other intrastate main-line operations, exclusion of charter operating results from total operations reduces the amount of additional revenues required to produce said rate of return. The staff witness testified that the basis for exclusion of charter operations was that the fares for said operations are not subject to regulation by this Commission; thus, said operations should not be used in determining Greyhound overall revenue needs for its California operations.

Charter operations have not been excluded from the determination of Greyhound's revenue needs in prior Greyhound proceedings. Inasmuch as the foregoing staff recommendation has not been considered heretofore, the staff witness alternatively recommended that if charter revenues are included in the test-year operating result, they be increased to reflect the average charter revenues per-mile for the three-month period consisting of December, 1971 and January and February, 1972. The staff witness testified that charter revenues per-mile in said period exceeded the average per-mile revenues for charter operations in the year 1971. The staff witness stated that charter revenues should be increased in this manner so that charter operations would bear their full share of increased operating costs. The staff witness recognized that charter operations are highly competitive, and that charter revenues in the test year could not be raised by the same percentage as the proposed increased main-line fares without excessive loss of charter business to other charter operators. The witness testified that the increase reflected in his test-year charter operating revenues were therefore at a substantially lower percentage than the sought increase in main-line fares.

Greyhound opposed both the exclusion of charter operating results from California intrastate operating results and the staff's alternative proposal embodying a slight increase in test-year charter operating revenues. Greyhound pointed out that past Commission decisions have included charter operations in test year California intrastate operating results, and that Greyhound's revenue needs were determined on the basis of the inclusion of charter operations. Greyhound also pointed out that the recently adopted separations manual includes charter operations under California intrastate main-line operations. Greyhound stated that it relied upon the methods approved by the Commission in Case No. 9168, in preparing its request in this proceeding; and indicated that its sought rate of return on its total California intrastate operations would have been different if it understood before filing its application that charter operations would be excluded therefrom.

Greyhound also opposed the staff's adjustment to charter revenues in test-year operating results. A witness for Greyhound testified that California charter bus operators had met in 1972 and could not agree with respect to an increase in charter rates in the forthcoming year. The witness further stated that competition between charter operators is so strong that no charter operator, even one as large as Greyhound, could unilaterally increase charter rates without a loss of business which would negate the charter rate increase. The witness further testified that Greyhound had placed no increase on its charter rates in late 1971 or early 1972 for the foregoing reason; and that the increased per-mile revenues in the three-month period used by the staff apparently resulted from a change in the types of charters performed in that period.

We conclude that, for the purposes of this proceeding, charter operations should be included in the total California intrastate operating results on which Greyhound's test-year revenue needs are determined. The allocations manual recently adopted by the Commission in Decision No. 79368 in Case No. 9168 includes charter

operations in California main-line operations, indicating that it was the intention in that proceeding not to consider charter operations separately. It would have been appropriate to recommend that charter operations be considered separately in the proceeding dealing with the adoption of the separations manual if that practice was to be followed in the succeeding fare proceeding.

The record is not clear as to why the revenue per-mile for charter operations increased in the three-month test period used by the staff. Inasmuch as charter rates were maintained on the same level in that period as were in effect during the whole of 1971, it appears that the revenue increase stems from some change in the characteristics of Greyhound's charter operations. There is no evidence in the record to show whether said change in the character of Greyhound's operations was merely a result of seasonal variation, nor whether the trend of higher per-mile revenues will continue over a longer period. We find, therefore, that the increase in charter revenues projected by the staff has not been shown to be reasonable for the purposes of this proceeding.

#### Test-Year Rate Base

The historical-year rate base development of applicant and the staff is similar. However, the test-year rate base calculations of staff differ from Greyhound in the following material respects:

- (a) The staff witness projected test-year rate base for buildings and structures, shop and office equipment, and leasehold improvements based on recorded 1970 data and the related adjusted depreciation reserves for the accumulated depreciation accruing from the end of 1970 to the mid-point of the test year. Greyhound's witness projected test-year rate base for these accounts based on recorded data for the year 1971, and adjusted depreciation reserves for the additional depreciation accruing from the end of 1971.
- (b) The recorded data for 1970 include an amount in the account for unfinished construction. The staff witness projected the same amount in his

test-year rate base. Inasmuch as there was no accrual in that account at the end of 1971, Greyhound's witness projected no amount for unfinished construction in the test year.

- (c) The staff and Greyhound projected the same amount in test-year rate base for materials and supplies based on 1970 recorded data except that the staff reduced the total amount by the portion allocated to the discontinued Marin-Sonoma commute operations, whereas Greyhound reallocated that portion to mainline operations.
- (d) The greatest difference in test-year rate base results from the manner in which the data for buses are projected. Greyhound developed total investment and related depreciation reserve for buses at the "system" level based on bus usage expected in the test year, and allocated said investment and related reserves to "California total" and "California intrastate" operations in the same relationships as in the 1970 recorded year. The Commission staff witness also based his projections on the expected bus usage in 1972, but allocated investment and depreciation reserves to the "California total" and "California intrastate" levels based on detailed analyses of bus-miles to be operated in each level of service in the test year.

- (e) Included in Greyhound's test-year rate base is an item for "cost of acquiring franchises", in the amount of \$150,000 at the system level. The Commission staff witness eliminated said item from his test-year rate base calculation for the reason that said amount will be fully amortized in the test year.

In order to reflect the most recent available data in test-year operating results, we find that reasonable test-year projections of rate base should reflect the data set forth in Greyhound's exhibits for buildings and structures, shop and office equipment, and leasehold improvements. The corresponding elimination of unfinished construction in Greyhound's exhibits should also be adopted. We find that the staff's projection for material and supplies will be reasonable as it eliminates the allocated portion of said account related to services discontinued by Greyhound. We also find that the staff's projection for buses should be adopted as it reflects the more detailed analyses of bus-mile operations in the test year. We find that no provision should be made in test-year rate base for cost of acquiring franchises as such account has been fully amortized in prior years.

Income Taxes

The income tax calculations of Greyhound and the staff in connection with test-year operating results differ in only one material respect. The Commission staff financial witness recommended that a portion of the total interest expense on the books of Greyhound's parent company (Greyhound Corporation) should be assigned to Greyhound Lines-West. Interest expense allocated to Greyhound Lines-West would be used as a deduction from net operating income in determining Greyhound's income tax liability in the test year.

The staff financial witness testified that only a nominal amount of long-term debt and related interest expense is reflected on the books of Greyhound Lines-West, whereas there is a substantial amount of long-term debt and related interest recorded on the books of the Greyhound Corporation, the parent company. It is the view of the staff witness that Greyhound Corporation's cost of financing such long-term debt is directly related to the strength of its consolidated financial statement. Therefore, he concluded that Greyhound Lines-West should benefit from any interest expense of its parent in determining the income tax liability of said operating division. The staff witness pointed out that Greyhound Lines-West, as an operating division, files no separate tax return; income tax returns are filed by the parent company for its consolidated operations, including Greyhound Lines-West. The income tax calculations for Greyhound Lines-West operations made herein are solely for the purpose of assigning to the operating division a reasonable amount for income tax expense in test year operating results.<sup>6/</sup>

Greyhound opposes the allocation of interest expense in the manner advocated by the staff on the basis that Greyhound Lines-West generates ample working cash and depreciation reserves to

---

6/ The manner in which interest expense on the books of the Greyhound Corporation would be assigned to Greyhound Lines-West is explained in the staff's Exhibit 13.

acquire new land and capital equipment without recourse to the use of borrowed funds. Therefore, Greyhound has allocated no portion of the parent company's long-term debt or related interest expense to Greyhound Lines-West operations. Greyhound asserts that inasmuch as it believes that none of its long-term debt is required to service the capital needs of Greyhound Lines-West, none of the interest expense for such debt should be attributed to Greyhound Lines-West in determining its test-year income tax liability.

We have considered the representations of the staff and Greyhound and conclude that the allocation of a portion of Greyhound Corporation's interest expense to Greyhound Lines-West for the sole purpose of determining the income tax liability of that operating division is appropriate to the purposes of this proceeding. As pointed out in City of Los Angeles, et al. v. Public Utilities Commission, et al., SF 22832, et al., decided June 9, 1972 (7 Cal. 3d 331), the utility enterprise (in this case Greyhound Corporation) should be viewed as a whole without regard to separate corporate identities, in determining prorations of expenses incurred by the parent company for its subsidiaries (supra, at pages 348-9). In the situation before us the parent company files an income tax return embracing all of its subsidiaries, and the parent company's tax liability is determined, in part, on the total interest expense incurred by it on behalf of all of its activities, including the busline operations conducted by Greyhound Lines-West. While it is contended that none of long-term debt underlying the interest expense is generated by Greyhound Lines-West, there is no specific assignment of such long-term debt to any subsidiary on the books of the parent corporation; thus, the debt is incurred on behalf of all activities of the parent company.

Affiliated Interests Adjustment

Decision No. 75939 (69 Cal. P.U.C. 761, at page 769) contains the following findings:

- "4. Test-year operating results developed by the Commission staff contain adjustments which reduce the cost of buses purchased from affiliated bus manufacturing companies. This type of adjustment has not been made by this Commission in deciding prior fare applications of Greyhound. The adjustments proposed by the staff should be adopted as reasonable for the purpose of an interim decision herein, without prejudice to other or different findings or conclusions after further hearing and receipt of additional evidence."<sup>7/</sup>

The foregoing finding was bottomed on a study of Greyhound's affiliated companies presented as Exhibit 4 in Application No. 50792. The staff, in that study, proposed that an adjustment be made to Greyhound's recorded operating property accounts to reflect a reduction in the profits of said affiliates. The exhibit describes in detail the rationale used by the Commission in making similar adjustments to the operating properties of other utilities which purchase materials and services from affiliates.

In that report alternate adjustments on MCI bus purchases were presented for the consideration of the Commission. One adjustment was proposed showing a 7 percent rate of return on average net plant investment for these affiliates (Motor Coach Industries, Inc., and Motor Coach Industries, Ltd.). This rate of return proposal and adjustment was based on the rationale adopted by the Commission in making the so-called "Western Electric" adjustments in The Pacific Telephone and Telegraph Company, Decision No. 74917 (69 Cal. P.U.C. 53, at page 59). As an alternative to the above, an adjustment at a 12 percent rate of return on net plant investment for the MCI companies was also proposed, based, in part, on the rationale set forth in the Proposed Report of the Presiding Commissioner and Examiner, dated April 15, 1969, in General Telephone Company of California,

---

<sup>7/</sup> Decision No. 75939 also concluded that further hearings should be held in Application No. 50792 for the receipt of additional evidence concerning the so-called "affiliated interest" adjustments proposed therein. The increases authorized in Decision No. 75939 were subsequently made final without the further consideration of the "affiliated interest" adjustment contemplated by the Commission in Decision No. 75939.

Application No. 49835. No specific recommendation as to the adoption of either alternate was made by the Finance and Accounts Division in the exhibit or by its witness in that proceeding.

In Application No. 50792, Greyhound did not present evidence with respect to "affiliated interests" adjustments and did not contest the staff's adjustments, but did not concede their merits. Decision No. 75939 adopted, as an interim measure, the method of adjustment set forth in the staff's report calculated at a 7 percent rate of return.

At the prehearing conference herein, it was agreed that the subject matter of "affiliated interest" adjustments for bus purchases would be an issue in this proceeding. Pursuant to this agreement a staff financial examiner presented in evidence a current study of Greyhound's affiliated interests and the staff's recommendations based thereon.

The staff report recites that since the last report there are no new facts regarding the operation of the two affiliates, Motor Coach Industries, Inc. and Motor Coach Industries, Ltd., that change their relationship with Greyhound as it is detailed in the previous report. The report further states that the staff has reviewed the premises used in the prior application necessary to

arrive at a specific affiliated adjustment and found them to be appropriate for this study.<sup>8/</sup>

The study states that the total buses sold to Greyhound Lines, Inc. and assigned to the Western Division of Greyhound for the years included in the staff's study are as follows:

<u>Year</u>	<u>Buses Sold to Greyhound Lines, Inc.</u>	<u>Assigned to Western Division</u>
1963	50	50
1964	213	197
1965	252	127
1966	392	195
1967	328	69
1968	314	152
1969	220	98
1970	365	162

<sup>8/</sup> The premises are as follows:

- (a) Rate base was developed on an average beginning and end-of-year basis for the periods involved utilizing recorded plant investment and reserves for depreciation.
- (b) No consideration was given to either working cash or other working capital requirements because of a clear indication of several years reviewed that, in fact, a negative working capital position was constantly maintained.
- (c) Operating results of both companies were adjusted to reflect income taxes (Federal or Canadian) on an "as paid or actual liability" basis giving current year immediate flow-through effect to tax reductions arising from accelerated depreciation and investment tax credit.
- (d) The several operations of each company were treated as being equally profitable in the ratio of sales volume with the following exception. In the case of MCI, Ltd., cost accounting procedures and records were tested and found to be reliable to support the 10 percent markup over actual cost used as a basis for billing MCI, Inc. for body shells. Such recorded costs to MCI, Inc. were adopted for purposes of determining profit on transactions resulting from bus sales to Greyhound.

The study shows that the rate of earnings on net plant investment by Motor Coach Industries rose from 10.79 percent in 1963 to a peak of 18.08 percent in 1966, and then declined in each year since 1966 until the return in 1970 was 1.30 percent. The following table sets forth the adjustments of sales price to Greyhound Lines-West of MCI buses sold to it to reflect a 7 percent return on net plant investment of the manufacturing entity:

TABLE 2  
GREYHOUND LINES - WEST

Adjustment to Bus Prices of MCI Inc.  
Assuming 7 Percent Rate of Return

Year	Buses Assigned Greyhound-West	Actual Sales Price	Adjusted Sales Price	Adjustment Per Bus
1963	50	\$40,977	\$46,140	\$ 5,163
1964	197	41,375	36,926	(4,449)
1965	127	41,797	35,710	(6,056)
1966	195	42,335	33,216	(9,119)
1967	69	43,461	35,222	(8,239)
1968	152	46,063	43,417	(2,646)
1969	98	60,562	68,375	7,813
1970	162	60,989	66,740	5,751

( ) - Negative Amount

The staff study states that the above tabulation indicates that, since the report on this subject in Application No. 50792, earnings have declined for the two MCI companies. In the years 1969 and 1970 an upward adjustment in the range of six to eight thousand dollars per bus would have to be made if the affiliated company adjustment used in Decision No. 75939 is continued. The staff concluded, therefore, that no adjustment should be made in this proceeding because of the reduced or negative earnings level experienced in the recent years, and the relative immateriality of any possible adjustment. The staff recommended that it continue to review MCI's earnings on bus sales to Greyhound and reserved the right to make recommendations on reasonable earnings for the two MCI companies in any future proceedings when deemed appropriate.

Greyhound introduced no evidence in this proceeding with respect to "affiliated interests" adjustments.

We concur in the conclusions and recommendations of the Commission's Finance and Accounts Division, and conclude that no specific adjustment to operating expenses is required herein for MCI buses, because such adjustment would have no material result on earnings in the test year.

Adjusted Test Year Operating Results

The following table depicts the test year operating results under interim fares, as developed by the Commission staff, adjusted to reflect the changes found reasonable and described in the previous discussion.

TABLE 3

GREYHOUND LINES, INC.  
(Greyhound Lines - West Division)

Adjusted  
Statement of Operations for the Twelve  
Months Ended December 31, 1972  
at Present Fares (+000)

	<u>Greyhound Lines-West</u>	<u>California Total</u>	<u>Total Cal. Intrastate</u>	<u>California Mainline</u>	<u>Intrastate Local</u>
<u>Operating Revenues</u>					
Passenger and Charter	\$160,208	\$64,772	\$42,256	\$34,278	\$ 7,978
Express	29,846	7,584	4,615	4,615	-
Other	4,101	1,923	1,380	1,103	277
	<u>\$194,155</u>	<u>\$74,279</u>	<u>\$48,251</u>	<u>\$39,996</u>	<u>\$ 8,255</u>
<u>Operating Expenses</u>					
Equip. Maint. & Garage	\$ 21,191	\$ 8,532	\$ 5,972	\$ 4,324	\$ 1,648
Transportation	66,426	27,917	19,677	14,172	5,505
Station	32,399	13,294	8,981	7,665	1,316
Traf. & Adv.	5,155	2,170	1,372	1,168	204
Ins. & Safety	4,091	1,416	902	757	145
Admin. & General	21,201	8,836	6,174	4,692	1,482
Depreciation	7,735	3,019	2,000	1,769	231
Oper. Taxes & Licenses	13,786	6,048	3,973	3,406	567
Oper. Rents (Net)	(37)	(123)	(121)	(97)	(24)
	<u>\$171,947</u>	<u>\$71,109</u>	<u>\$48,930</u>	<u>\$37,856</u>	<u>\$11,074</u>
Operating Income	\$ 22,208	\$ 3,170	\$ (679)	\$ 2,140	\$(2,819)
Federal & State Income Taxes	\$ 8,728	\$ 1,319	\$ (284)	\$ 891	\$(1,175)
Net Income After Income Taxes	\$ 13,480	\$ 1,851	\$ (395)	\$ 1,249	\$(1,644)
Rate Base	\$ 98,684	\$40,188	\$28,243	\$24,284	\$ 3,959
Operating Ratio After Taxes	93.1%	97.5%	100.8%	96.9%	119.9%
Rate of Return	13.7%	4.6%	-	5.1%	-

( ) = Negative Amount

The foregoing table indicates that Greyhound's California intrastate operations at current (interim) fares and current levels of expenses will result in an operating ratio (after taxes) of 100.8 percent. Such level of earnings indicates that Greyhound is in need of additional revenues from its California intrastate operations.

None of the parties to this proceeding recommended a rate of return less than the seven percent rate of return on California intrastate operations sought in the most recent amendment to the application. The original application sought a rate of return of eight percent on California intrastate operations. Greyhound indicated that a reduction to seven percent was made in consideration of Price Commission regulations. It appears, and we so find, that use of a rate of return of seven percent as a basis for determining Greyhound's California intrastate revenue requirements for the test year ending December 31, 1972 will be reasonable.

Test Year Operating Results  
Adjusted to a Seven Percent  
Rate of Return

The following table shows the net operating revenues required to produce a seven percent rate of return for Greyhound's California intrastate operations for the 1972 test year.

TABLE 4

GREYHOUND LINES, INC.  
(Greyhound Lines - West Division)

California Intrastate  
Operating Revenues and Expenses  
In Table 3, Adjusted to  
Provide a Rate of  
Return of Seven Percent  
(+000)

<u>California Intrastate Gross Revenues</u>	<u>Table 3</u>	<u>Adjusted</u>
Intercity Passenger	\$31,337	\$35,035
Express	4,615	5,160
Transit	7,978	8,919
Other	1,380	1,380
Charter	2,941	2,941
Total	\$48,251	\$53,435
<u>Additional Expenses</u>		
Commissions Paid	-	\$ 239
Regulatory Taxes	-	64
Total		\$ 303
Total Operating Expenses	\$48,930	\$49,233
Income Taxes	\$ (224)	\$ 2,235
Net Income	\$ (395)	\$ 1,967
Rate Base	\$28,243	\$28,243
Rate of Return	-	7.0%
Operating Ratio	100.8%	96.3%

( ) = Negative Amount

As indicated in the above table, a further increase of 11.8 percent in passenger fares and express rates is required in order to provide a rate of return of seven percent on Greyhound's total California intrastate operations in the 1972 test year. Said increase in passenger fares and express is 18.06 percent over fares and express rates in effect prior to the interim increase granted herein.

Interline Express Rates

Las Vegas-Tonopah-Reno Stage Line, Inc.; Orange Belt Stages, Peerless Stages, Inc.; San Pedro Transit Lines, and Vaca

Valley Bus Lines join with Greyhound in seeking increases in express rates applicable to interline shipments which move, in part, over routes of Greyhound and, in part, over routes of one or more of said passenger stage corporations. The same level of express rates is sought for interline as for local express services.

The application herein alleges the following: Increases from the interline express rates sought in this proceeding will have only a small effect on the revenues of the carriers, including Greyhound. The precise amount of additional revenue which will accrue to applicants from the increase in interline express rates can only be determined by special, detailed studies. However, based upon preliminary information, applicants believe that such total increase in gross revenue from interline express rates will not exceed \$7,832 annually from the amended second-step increase.

In view of the minimal nature of the increased revenues to be derived by all applicants from an increase in interline express rates, applicants other than Greyhound request that, pursuant to Rule 87 of its Rules of Practice and Procedure, the Commission waive the informational requirements of Rule 23, to the extent such information is not included herein, as this Commission did in the initial phase of this proceeding.

The Commission finds that reasonable cause has been made to appear for the requested waiver of the provisions of Rule 23 of its Rules of Procedure, and concludes that such waiver should be granted.

#### Additional Findings and Conclusions

We further find:

1. Greyhound Lines, Inc. (Greyhound Lines-West Division) was authorized an interim increase in passenger fares and express rates of six and one half percent by Decision No. 78939, dated July 27, 1971, pending determination of the final relief to be accorded to applicant in this proceeding.

2. By the amendment filed on April 18, 1972, Greyhound seeks as final relief herein an increase in passenger fares and express rates sufficient to provide gross revenues on its California intrastate operations which will yield a rate of return of seven percent on depreciated rate base for a test year ending December 31, 1972.

3. The rate of return of seven percent sought herein will not result in excessive earnings for Greyhound's California intrastate passenger and express services, inasmuch as said rate of return is the same as that previously found reasonable by the Commission in Decision No. 75939 (69 Cal. P.U.C. 761) and reaffirmed in Decision No. 76455 (70 Cal. P.U.C. 429). Said rate of return will be reasonable for a test year ending December 31, 1972.

4. Results of operations for an historical year ended December 31, 1970 were presented in evidence by applicant and by the Commission staff. The operating results so presented are not materially different, and the data set forth in Table 1 hereof accurately represent Greyhound's results of operations for that period.

5. Greyhound and the Commission staff presented in evidence estimated results of operations for a test year ending December 31, 1972. The data presented by applicant and staff differ in several material respects.

6. Results of operations for the 1972 test year under the interim fares and express rates as presented by the staff, adjusted as indicated in the prior opinion, are summarized in Table 3. Said operating results give effect to known increases and reductions in expenses, and to the current trends in patronage of Greyhound's services.

7. The results of operations set forth in Table 3 reasonably represent Greyhound's California intrastate revenues, expenses, rate base, rate of return and operating ratio under interim fares for a future year. Said data indicate that Greyhound's California intrastate operations would be conducted at a loss, as represented by

an operating ratio after provision for income taxes of 100.8 percent. This indicates that Greyhound is in immediate need of additional revenues from its California intrastate operations.

8. Table 4 in the preceding opinion sets forth the revenue increases from mainline and commute fares and express rates necessary to produce a rate of return of seven percent on depreciated rate base for Greyhound's California intrastate operations in the test year used herein. The increased fares and express rates resulting from the additional revenues necessary to produce said rate of return are justified, and said fares and express rates will be just and reasonable. Increased interline express rates on the same level as increased local express rates are justified.

9. The specific increased fares and express rates resulting from finding 8 above are those set forth in Appendix B to the order herein.

10. In compliance with Rule 23.1 of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure, promulgated pursuant to the Economic Stabilization Act of 1970, as amended, the evidence in this proceeding demonstrates that:

- (a) The present intrastate passenger fares and express rates of Greyhound Lines, Inc. (Greyhound Lines-West Division) are set forth in detail in Appendix A hereof. Said passenger fares and express rates are currently subject to an interim increase of 6-1/2 percent. Said interim increase will be cancelled and passenger fares and express rates will be increased by 18.06 percent. The increase authorized by the order to which this is attached results in an increase of 11.8 percent over interim fares and express rates.
- (b) The increase authorized in this phase of the proceeding is expected to increase Greyhound's California intrastate annual gross revenues by \$5,184,000.

- (c) The increase granted by this order will result in a California intrastate rate of return of 7 percent on depreciated rate base, which is the rate of return previously found reasonable for Greyhound's California operations in prior orders of the Commission cited in the opinion. Said rate of return is less than the rate of return for Greyhound's Western Division operations as a whole and is the minimum required to assure continued, adequate and safe service.
- (d) Sufficient evidence was taken in the course of the Commission proceeding to determine whether or not the price increase meets the criteria of the rules of the Price Commission.
- (e) The increase authorized is cost justified and does not reflect future inflationary trends.
- (f) The increase does not reflect labor costs in excess of those allowed by Price Commission policies.
- (g) There are no known productivity gains which could offset the sought wage and related expense increases.
- (h) Reasonable opportunity for participation by all interested parties was afforded.
- (i) No other carrier or carriers appeared at the hearings in this matter to present evidence expressing a willingness and capacity to provide service at the existing levels of Greyhound's intrastate express rates or fares.

#### Conclusions

1. The increased fares and express rates set forth in Appendix B should be granted.
2. Applicants should be authorized to publish such fares and express rates on five days' notice to the Commission and the public.
3. Pending the reissuance of passenger tariffs containing fares on a point-to-point basis, Greyhound should be authorized to place in effect the increases authorized herein by use of a conversion table. This relief should expire six months after the effective date of the order herein.

4. Long- and short-haul relief necessary to establish the increased fares and express rates should be authorized.

O R D E R

IT IS ORDERED that:

1. Greyhound Lines, Inc. (Greyhound Lines-West Division) is hereby authorized to establish the increased mainline and commute fares and express rates specifically set forth in Appendix B hereto in lieu of the interim fares and express rates authorized by Decision No. 78939.

2. Pending establishment of the specific fares authorized in paragraph 1 hereof, Greyhound Lines, Inc. is authorized to make effective increases in passenger fares published on a point-to-point basis by means of appropriate conversion tables, provided that said increased fares do not exceed the fares authorized in paragraph 1 hereof, and that tariffs containing said fares are republished within six months after the effective date of this order to eliminate the use of said conversion tables.

3. Greyhound Lines, Inc. and the passenger stage corporations named in the application herein are authorized to increase interline express rates to levels of the express rates set forth in Appendix B hereto.

4. Tariff publications authorized to be made as a result of the order herein may be made effective not earlier than five days' notice to the Commission and the public.

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

6. In addition to the required posting and filing of tariffs, Greyhound Lines, Inc. shall give notice to the public by posting in its buses and terminals a printed explanation of its fares. Such notice shall be posted not less than five days before the effective date of the fare changes and shall remain posted for a period of not less than thirty days.

7. Applicants, in establishing and maintaining the fares and express rates authorized hereinabove, are hereby authorized to depart from the provisions of Section 460 of the Public Utilities Code to the extent necessary to adjust long- and short-haul departures now maintained under outstanding authorization; such outstanding authorization is hereby modified only to the extent necessary to comply with this order; and schedules containing the rates published under this authority shall make reference to the prior orders authorizing long- and short-haul departures and to this order.

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

Dated at San Francisco, California, this 16<sup>th</sup> day of SEPTEMBER, 1972.

James L. Stinson  
President  
William J. Rogers  
William J. Rogers  
John J. Rogers  
John J. Rogers  
Commissioners

APPENDIX A  
Page 1 of 8GREYHOUND LINES, INC.  
PRESENT AND PROPOSED  
FARES AND EXPRESS RATESMAINLINE FARES

The present Greyhound mainline fare structure in the State of California was established in the first-step of this proceeding by Decision No. 78939 issued July 27, 1971, in Application No. 52591. That fare structure and the fare structure proposed by this amendment are as follows:

One-Way Distance Fares

<u>Miles</u>		<u>Rate Per Mile</u>		<u>With No Fare Less Than Fare for</u>
<u>Over</u>	<u>- But not Over</u>	<u>Present</u>	<u>Proposed</u>	
0	25	\$0.0463	\$0.0522	
25	50	0.0433	0.0488	25 miles
50	100	0.0409	0.0461	50 "
100	150	0.0372	0.0419	100 "
150	200	0.0357	0.0402	150 "
200	250	0.0347	0.0391	200 "
250	300	0.0341	0.0384	250 "
300	400	0.0332	0.0374	300 "
400	-	0.0326	0.0367	400 "
Minimum Fare		0.45	0.50	
Round trip		180%	190%	

Any increased one-way fares resulting in figures less than \$0.50 and not ending in "0" or "5" may be further increased to the next "0" or "5".

Any increased one-way fares resulting in figures greater than \$0.60 shall be rounded to the nearest cent, 0.5 cent being considered nearest to the next higher cent.

In the case of a ticket covering travel over both branchline and mainline routes, the fare will continue to be based upon the combination of fares as authorized by Decision No. 71787 on Application No. 48962.

In the case of a ticket covering travel over the San Francisco-Oakland Bay Bridge, the Golden Gate Bridge, the Carquinez Straits Bridge or any combination thereof, the fare will continue to be based upon mileage computations including full constructive mileage over each bridge, as authorized by Decision No. 43081 in Application No. 29608, dated June 29, 1949, and Decision No. 57650 in Application No. 40532, dated November 25, 1958.

Greyhound requests authority to put the increased mainline fares into effect by means of a conversion table.

APPENDIX A  
Page 2 of 8

COMMUTE AND TRANSIT OPERATIONS

Greyhound's present fare structure for its local transit and commute operations, as established by Decision No. 78939, is set forth in the tariffs listed in Exhibit A attached to the Amendment to Application No. 52591 filed April 14, 1972. Comparisons of present and proposed commute fares between representative points are set forth in the Supplement attached hereto.

Greyhound proposes to increase the foregoing 20-ride and one-way single ride fares by a second-step 13.5 percent. Any increased fare not ending on "0" or "5" may be further increased to the next "0" or "5".

The requested minimum one-way fare is \$0.50 cents.

The round-trip fares are proposed to be 200 percent of the one-way fares where the one-way fares are \$1 or less; and 190 percent of the one-way fares where the one-way fares are \$1.05 or more, subject to a minimum round-trip fare of \$2.00.

If the one-way fares when increased by 13.5 percent do not end in a multiple of 5 cents, the fares are to be rounded to the next highest multiple of 5 cents.

Transit and commute 20-ride fares are proposed to be increased a second-step 13.5 percent, subject to the condition that if the 20-ride fares when so increased do not end in a multiple of 5 cents, the 20-ride fares are to be rounded to the next highest multiple of 5 cents.

APPENDIX A  
Page 3 of 8

EXPRESS RATES

The present express rates were established by Decision No. 78939 issued July 27, 1971, in Application No. 52591. Greyhound also proposes to increase express rates by a second-step 13.5 percent. Present and proposed express rates are set forth below. Any increase not ending in "0" or "5" would be further increased to the next "0" or "5".

The following passenger stage corporations join with Greyhound Lines, Inc., in seeking an increase in intrastate express rates applicable to shipments moving on an interline basis, i.e., in part over the route or routes of Greyhound and over the route or routes of one or more of the following applicants:

Las Vegas-Tonopah-Reno Stage Line, Inc., a Nevada corporation, having its principal place of business at 922 Stewart Street, Las Vegas, Nevada 89101.

Orange Belt Stages, a corporation, having its principal place of business at 529 East Acequia Street, Visalia, California 93278.

Peerless Stages, Inc., a California corporation, having its principal place of business at 2040 Castro Street, Oakland, California 94612.

San Pedro Transit Lines, a partnership, having its principal place of business at 507 W. 8th Street, San Pedro, California 90731.

Vaca Valley Bus Lines (Horace Simmons, d/b/a), a sole proprietorship, having its principal place of business at 321 State Street, Fairfield, California 94533.

APPENDIX A  
Page 4 of 8

PRESENT TABLE OF EXPRESS RATES AS AUTHORIZED BY  
DECISION NO. 78939 AND MADE EFFECTIVE NOVEMBER 23, 1971

Where Mileage Is:

POUNDS

<u>Over</u>	<u>Not Over</u>	<u>Not Over 2</u>	<u>Over 2 Not Over 10</u>	<u>Over 10 Not Over 20</u>	<u>Over 20 Not Over 30</u>	<u>Over 30 Not Over 40</u>	<u>Over 40 Not Over 50</u>
		\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$
0	25	1.50	1.50	1.60	1.70	1.85	1.95
25	50	1.50	1.50	1.70	1.85	1.95	2.20
50	75	1.50	1.65	1.85	2.05	2.35	2.50
75	100	1.50	1.80	2.05	2.35	2.60	2.90
100	125	1.50	1.90	2.20	2.45	2.85	3.15
125	150	1.60	2.05	2.30	2.60	3.00	3.35
150	175	1.65	2.20	2.40	2.80	3.15	3.60
175	200	1.70	2.35	2.45	2.90	3.20	3.70
200	250	1.80	2.40	2.60	3.05	3.40	3.80
250	300	1.90	2.45	2.80	3.10	3.55	3.85
300	400	2.15	2.50	2.90	3.20	3.75	4.20
400	500	2.40	2.60	3.05	3.55	4.00	4.60
500	600	2.70	2.70	3.15	3.80	4.45	5.10
600	700	2.85	2.85	3.40	4.10	4.85	5.55
700	800	2.90	2.90	3.55	4.40	5.15	6.10
800	900	3.00	3.00	3.75	4.65	5.60	6.65
900	1000	3.05	3.05	3.85	4.90	6.00	7.00
1000	1100	3.10	3.10	4.00	5.15	6.25	7.45
1100	1150	3.20	3.20	4.25	5.45	6.65	7.80

APPENDIX A  
Page 5 of 8

Where Mileage is:POUNDS

<u>Over</u>	<u>Not Over</u>	<u>Over 50 Not Over 60</u>	<u>Over 60 Not Over 70</u>	<u>Over 70 Not Over 80</u>	<u>Over 80 Not Over 90</u>	<u>Over 90 Not Over 100</u>
		\$	\$	\$	\$	\$
0	25	2.15	2.30	2.40	2.50	2.70
25	50	2.35	2.45	2.60	2.80	3.00
50	75	2.80	3.00	3.15	3.50	3.70
75	100	3.15	3.55	3.60	4.10	4.40
100	125	3.50	3.80	4.10	4.45	4.80
125	150	3.70	4.00	4.40	4.70	5.10
150	175	3.95	4.40	4.70	5.15	5.55
175	200	4.10	4.45	4.85	5.25	5.60
200	250	4.20	4.60	5.00	5.35	5.75
250	300	4.30	4.65	5.10	5.50	5.90
300	400	4.60	5.10	5.50	6.00	6.35
400	500	5.10	5.55	6.10	6.55	7.05
500	600	5.65	6.25	6.90	7.55	8.15
600	700	6.25	7.00	7.70	8.50	9.20
700	800	6.90	7.70	8.60	9.45	10.25
800	900	7.55	8.50	9.45	10.40	11.25
900	1000	8.10	9.15	10.20	11.20	12.30
1000	1100	8.50	9.60	10.80	11.85	13.00
1100	1150	8.95	10.20	11.40	12.55	13.75

APPENDIX A  
Page 6 of 8

PROPOSED TABLE OF EXPRESS RATES

Where Mileage Is:

POUNDS

<u>Over</u>	<u>Not Over</u>	<u>Not Over 2</u>	<u>Over 2 Not Over 10</u>	<u>Over 10 Not Over 20</u>	<u>Over 20 Not Over 30</u>	<u>Over 30 Not Over 40</u>	<u>Over 40 Not Over 50</u>
		\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$
0	25	1.70	1.70	1.80	1.95	2.05	2.20
25	50	1.70	1.70	1.95	2.05	2.20	2.50
50	75	1.70	1.90	2.05	2.30	2.65	2.85
75	100	1.70	2.00	2.30	2.65	2.90	3.25
100	125	1.70	2.10	2.50	2.80	3.20	3.55
125	150	1.80	2.30	2.60	2.90	3.40	3.75
150	175	1.90	2.50	2.70	3.15	3.55	4.05
175	200	1.95	2.65	2.80	3.25	3.60	4.15
200	250	2.00	2.70	2.90	3.45	3.80	4.30
250	300	2.10	2.80	3.15	3.50	4.00	4.35
300	400	2.40	2.85	3.25	3.60	4.20	4.70
400	500	2.70	2.90	3.45	4.00	4.50	5.20
500	600	3.00	3.00	3.55	4.30	5.00	5.70
600	700	3.20	3.20	3.80	4.65	5.50	6.25
700	800	3.25	3.25	4.00	4.95	5.80	6.85
800	900	3.40	3.40	4.20	5.25	6.30	7.45
900	1000	3.45	3.45	4.35	5.55	6.75	7.90
1000	1100	3.50	3.50	4.50	5.80	7.05	8.35
1100	1150	3.60	3.60	4.75	6.15	7.45	8.80

APPENDIX A  
Page 7 of 8

Where Mileage Is:POUNDS

<u>Over</u>	<u>Not Over</u>	<u>Over 50 Not Over 60</u>	<u>Over 60 Not Over 70</u>	<u>Over 70 Not Over 80</u>	<u>Over 80 Not Over 90</u>	<u>Over 90 Not Over 100</u>
		\$	\$	\$	\$	\$
0	25	2.40	2.60	2.70	2.85	3.00
25	50	2.65	2.80	2.90	3.15	3.40
50	75	3.15	3.40	3.55	3.90	4.15
75	100	3.55	4.00	4.05	4.65	4.95
100	125	3.90	4.30	4.65	5.00	5.40
125	150	4.15	4.50	4.95	5.30	5.70
150	175	4.45	4.95	5.30	5.80	6.25
175	200	4.65	5.00	5.50	5.90	6.30
200	250	4.70	5.20	5.60	6.00	6.50
250	300	4.80	5.25	5.70	6.20	6.60
300	400	5.20	5.70	6.20	6.75	7.15
400	500	5.70	6.25	6.85	7.40	7.95
500	600	6.40	7.05	7.75	8.50	9.20
600	700	7.05	7.90	8.65	9.55	10.35
700	800	7.75	8.65	9.70	10.65	11.55
800	900	8.50	9.55	10.65	11.70	12.70
900	1000	9.15	10.30	11.50	12.60	13.90
1000	1100	9.55	10.80	12.15	13.35	14.65
1100	1150	10.10	11.50	12.85	14.10	15.50

APPENDIX A  
Page 8 of 8PRESENT AND PROPOSED  
RATES ON DAILY SHIPMENTS

<u>Where Mileage is:</u>		<u>PRESENT</u>	<u>PROPOSED</u>
<u>Over</u>	<u>Not Over</u>	<u>Rates Per</u> <u>Calendar Month</u>	<u>Rates Per</u> <u>Calendar Month</u>
0	50	\$18.00	\$20.40
50	100	20.25	22.95
100	125	22.50	25.50
125	150	24.00	27.00
150	175	24.75	28.50
175	200	25.50	29.25
200	250	27.00	30.00
250	300	28.50	31.50
300	400	32.25	36.00
400	500	36.00	40.50

(See Supplement for examples of present and proposed commute fares.)

SUPPLEMENT TO APPENDIX A  
Page 1 of 7

PENINSULA  
COMPARISON OF PRESENT AND PROPOSED  
ADULT ONE-WAY AND TWENTY-RIDE COMMUTATION FARES

To Zone	From San Francisco-Zone 1 Points Included	Miles	One-Way Fares		Cost of 20-Ride Commutation Book			Cost Per Ride	
			Present \$	Proposed \$	Present \$	Proposed \$	Amount of Increase \$	Present \$	Proposed \$
2	Bayshore	6	.45	.50	7.90	8.90	1.00	.395	.445
	Colma	8							
3	South San Francisco	11	.60	.70	10.30	11.60	1.30	.515	.58
	Baden	12							
4	San Francisco Airport	13	.75	.85	10.95	12.30	1.35	.548	.615
	Millbrae	16							
5	Burlingame	19	.90	1.00	12.10	13.65	1.55	.605	.683
6	San Mateo	21	1.00	1.10	12.75	14.35	1.60	.638	.718
7	Redwood City	28	1.15	1.30	13.90	15.70	1.80	.695	.785
8	Menlo Park	32	1.25	1.40	15.10	17.00	1.90	.755	.85
9	Palo Alto	33	1.40	1.60	16.30	18.40	2.10	.815	.92
10	Mountain View	40	1.65	1.90	18.15	20.40	2.25	.908	1.02
11	Sunnyvale	43	1.85	2.05	19.35	21.80	2.45	.968	1.09
12	Santa Clara	48	1.95	2.20	20.55	23.10	2.55	1.028	1.155
13	San Jose	50	2.10	2.35	21.75	24.50	2.75	1.038	1.225

Tariff Authority - Adult One-Way Fares - Local Passenger Tariff No. L-412-L, Cal. P.U.C. No. 303, Effective 11-23-71.

Commutation Fares - Local Passenger Tariff No. L-490-H, Cal. P.U.C. No. 317, Effective 11-23-71.

SUPPLEMENT TO APPENDIX A

Page 2 of 7

OCEAN AND OCEAN-SKYLINE  
COMPARISON OF PRESENT AND PROPOSED  
ADULT ONE-WAY AND TWENTY-RIDE COMMUTATION FARES

A. 52591 jmd

To Zone	From San Francisco-Zone 1 Points Included	Miles	One-Way Fares		Cost of 20-Ride Commutation Book			Cost Per Ride	
			Present \$	Proposed \$	Present \$	Proposed \$	Amount of Increase \$	Present \$	Proposed \$
2	Westlake (Alemany Blvd.)	8	.45	.50	7.90	8.90	1.00	.395	.445
3	Westlake (Skyline Blvd.)	10							
	Edgemar (Pacific Manor)	12	.60	.70	10.30	11.60	1.30	.515	.58
	King Drive (Serramonte)	13							
4	Sharp Park	13							
	College Drive	15	.75	.85	10.95	12.30	1.35	.548	.615
5	Rockaway Beach	16	.80	.90	11.55	13.00	1.45	.578	.65
6	Pedro Valley (Linda Mar)	17	.90	1.00	12.10	13.65	1.55	.605	.683
7	Montara	21							
	Moss Beach	23	1.05	1.15	12.75	14.35	1.60	.638	.718
8	Princeton Hwy. Stop	25							
	Miramar Hwy. Stop	27	1.15	1.30	13.90	15.70	1.80	.695	.785
9	Half Moon Bay	28	1.15	1.30	13.90	15.70	1.80	.695	.785

Tariff Authority - Adult One-Way Fares - Local Passenger Tariff No. L-577-F, Cal. P.U.C. No. 310, Effective 11-23-71.

Commutation Fares - Local Passenger Tariff No. L-489-H, Cal. P.U.C. No. 316, Effective 11-23-71.

SUPPLEMENT TO APPENDIX A  
Page 3 of 7

CONTRA COSTA COUNTY  
COMPARISON OF PRESENT AND PROPOSED  
ADULT ONE-WAY AND TWENTY-RIDE COMMUTATION FARES

			<u>One-Way Fares</u>		<u>Cost of 20-Ride Commutation Book</u>			<u>Cost Per Ride</u>	
<u>From San Francisco-Zone 1</u>			<u>Present</u>	<u>Proposed</u>	<u>Present</u>	<u>Proposed</u>	<u>Amount of Increase</u>	<u>Present</u>	<u>Proposed</u>
<u>To Zone</u>	<u>Points Included</u>	<u>Miles</u>	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$
3	Orinda	18	1.00	1.10	14.30	16.10	1.80	.715	.805
4	Lafayette	22	1.10	1.20	16.75	18.85	2.10	.838	.943
5-5C	Walnut Creek	26	1.20	1.35	17.90	20.20	2.30	.895	1.01
6-6A 6B-6C	Pleasant Hill	29	1.30	1.45	19.15	21.55	2.40	.958	1.078
7-7A 7B-7C	Concord	32	1.50	1.70	20.30	22.90	2.60	1.015	1.145
<u>From Oakland/Berkeley-Zone 2</u>									
<u>To Zone</u>	<u>Points Included</u>	<u>Miles</u>							
3	Orinda	8	.55	.60	9.10	10.20	1.10	.455	.51
4	Lafayette	12	.65	.75	11.55	13.00	1.45	.578	.65
5-5C	Walnut Creek	16	.80	.90	13.35	15.00	1.65	.668	.75
6-6A 6B-6C	Pleasant Hill	19	.95	1.05	14.50	16.35	1.85	.725	.818
7-7A 6B-7C	Concord	22	1.05	1.15	15.75	17.70	1.95	.788	.885

Tariff Authority - Adult One-Way Fares - Local Passenger Tariff No. L-554-H, Cal. P.U.C. No. 307, Effective 11-23-71.  
Commutation Fares - Local Passenger Tariff No. L-556-I, Cal. P.U.C. No. 319, Effective 11-23-71.

A. 52591 jmd

SUPPLEMENT TO APPENDIX A

Page 4 of 7

VALLEJO - OAKLAND - SAN FRANCISCO  
COMPARISON OF PRESENT AND PROPOSED  
ADULT ONE-WAY AND TWENTY-RIDE COMMUTATION FARES

A. 52591 Jmd

<u>To</u>	<u>From Vallejo</u> <u>Miles</u>	<u>One-Way Fares</u>		<u>Cost of 20-Ride Commutation Book</u>			<u>Cost Per Ride</u>	
		<u>Present</u> \$	<u>Proposed</u> \$	<u>Present</u> \$	<u>Proposed</u> \$	<u>Amount of Increase</u> \$	<u>Present</u> \$	<u>Proposed</u> \$
Oakland	27	1.20	1.35	17.65	19.90	2.25	.883	.995
San Francisco	34	1.65	1.90	21.05	23.70	2.65	1.053	1.185
<u>To</u>	<u>From Crockett Jct.</u> <u>Miles</u>							
Oakland	23	1.10	1.20	15.75	17.70	1.95	.788	.885
San Francisco	30	1.40	1.60	19.15	21.55	2.40	.958	1.078

Tariff Authority - Adult One-Way Fares - Local Passenger Tariff No. L-590-B, Cal. P.U.C. No. 312, Effective 11-23-71.

Commutation Fares - Local Passenger Tariff No. L-536-H, Cal. P.U.C. No. 318, Effective 11-23-71.

SUPPLEMENT TO APPENDIX A  
Page 5 of 7

WOODLAND - DAVID - SACRAMENTO  
COMPARISON OF PRESENT AND PROPOSED  
ADULT ONE-WAY AND TWENTY-RIDE COMMUTATION FARES

		<u>One-Way Fares</u>		<u>Cost of 20-Ride Commutation Book</u>			<u>Cost Per Ride</u>	
<u>To</u>	<u>From Woodland</u> <u>Miles</u>	<u>Present</u> \$	<u>Proposed</u> \$	<u>Present</u> \$	<u>Proposed</u> \$	<u>Amount of Increase</u> \$	<u>Present</u> \$	<u>Proposed</u> \$
Sacramento	20	.95	1.05	12.10	13.65	1.55	.605	.683
<u>To</u>	<u>From Davis</u> <u>Miles</u>							
Sacramento	14	.65	.75	9.70	10.95	1.25	.485	.548

Tariff Authority - Adult One-Way Fares - Local Passenger Tariff No. L-589-C, Cal. P.U.C. No. 311, Effective 11-23-71.

Commutation Fares - Local Passenger Tariff No. L-191-E, Cal. P.U.C. No. 313, Effective 11-23-71.

A. 52591 jmd

SUPPLEMENT TO APPENDIX A  
Page 6 of 7

LONG BEACH - SANTA MONICA  
COMPARISON OF PRESENT AND PROPOSED  
ADULT ONE-WAY AND TWENTY-RIDE COMMUTATION FARES

<u>From Long Beach</u> <u>To</u>	<u>Miles</u>	<u>One-Way Fares</u>		<u>Cost of 20-Ride Commutation Book</u>			<u>Cost Per Ride</u>	
		<u>Present</u> \$	<u>Proposed</u> \$	<u>Present</u> \$	<u>Proposed</u> \$	<u>Amount of Increase</u> \$	<u>Present</u> \$	<u>Proposed</u> \$
West Wilmington	7	.45	.50	7.90	8.90	1.00	.395	.445
San Pedro	14	.45	.50	7.90	8.90	1.00	.395	.445
South Lomita	10	.55	.60	9.10	10.20	1.10	.455	.51
Santa Monica	36	1.50	1.70	20.55	23.10	2.55	1.028	1.155

Tariff Authority - Adult One-Way Fares - Local Passenger Tariff No. L-442-L, Cal. P.U.C. No. 305, Effective 11-23-71.

Commutation Fares - Local Passenger Tariff No. L-301-F, Cal. P.U.C. No. 314, Effective 11-23-71.

SUPPLEMENT TO APPENDIX A  
Page 7 of 7

MARIN COUNTY  
COMPARISON OF PRESENT AND PROPOSED  
ADULT ONE-WAY COMMUTATION FARES

<u>From San Francisco</u>		<u>One-Way Fares</u>	
<u>Points Included</u>	<u>Miles</u>	<u>Present</u>	<u>Proposed</u>
San Rafael	19	\$ 1.10	\$ 1.20
Novato	30	1.25	1.40
Petaluma	41	1.85	2.05
Cotati	49	2.00	2.25
Santa Rosa	57	2.30	2.60

Tariff Authority - Adult One-Way Fares - Local Passenger Tariff  
No. L-596, Cal. P.U.C.  
No. 368, Effective 1-1-72

Note: Passengers will be transported locally to, from or between intermediate points on such schedules between San Francisco and Santa Rosa after the last departure and before the first departure of the Golden Gate Bridge, Highway and Transportation District Schedules.

APPENDIX B  
Page 1 of 25

GREYHOUND LINES, INC.  
AUTHORIZED FARES AND EXPRESS RATES

MAINLINE FARES

The fare structure authorized by the decision to which this Appendix is attached is as follows:

		<u>One-Way Distance Fares</u>	
<u>Over</u>	<u>Miles But not Over</u>	<u>Rate Per Mile</u>	<u>With No Fare Less Than Fare for</u>
0	25	\$0.0518	
25	50	0.0484	25 miles
50	100	0.0457	50 "
100	150	0.0416	100 "
150	200	0.0399	150 "
200	250	0.0388	200 "
250	300	0.0381	250 "
300	400	0.0371	300 "
400	-	0.0364	400 "
Minimum Fare		0.50	
Round Trip		190%	

Any increased one-way fares resulting in figures less than \$0.60 and not ending in "0" or "5" may be further increased to the next "0" or "5".

Any increased one-way fares resulting in figures greater than \$0.60 shall be rounded to the nearest cent, 0.5 cent being considered nearest to the next higher cent.

In the case of a ticket covering travel over both branchline and mainline routes, the fare will continue to be based upon the combination of fares as authorized by Decision No. 71787 on Application No. 48962.

In the case of a ticket covering travel over the San Francisco-Oakland Bay Bridge, the Golden Gate Bridge, the Carquinez Straits Bridge or any combination thereof, the fare will continue to be based upon mileage computations including full constructive mileage over each bridge, as authorized by Decision No. 43081 in Application No. 29608, dated June 29, 1949, and Decision No. 57650 in Application No. 40532, dated November 25, 1958.

Greyhound is granted authority to put the increased mainline fares into effect by means of a conversion table.

APPENDIX B  
Page 2 of 25

AUTHORIZED TABLE OF EXPRESS RATES

Where Mileage Is:

POUNDS

<u>Over</u>	<u>Not Over</u>	<u>Not Over 2</u>	<u>Over 2 Not Over 10</u>	<u>Over 10 Not Over 20</u>	<u>Over 20 Not Over 30</u>	<u>Over 30 Not Over 40</u>	<u>Over 40 Not Over 50</u>
		\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$
0	25	1.70	1.70	1.80	1.95	2.10	2.20
25	50	1.70	1.70	1.95	2.10	2.20	2.50
50	75	1.70	1.85	2.10	2.30	2.65	2.80
75	100	1.70	2.05	2.30	2.65	2.95	3.25
100	125	1.70	2.15	2.50	2.75	3.20	3.55
125	150	1.80	2.30	2.60	2.95	3.40	3.75
150	175	1.85	2.50	2.70	3.15	3.55	4.05
175	200	1.95	2.65	2.75	3.25	3.60	4.15
200	250	2.05	2.70	2.95	3.45	3.85	4.25
250	300	2.15	2.75	3.15	3.50	4.00	4.35
300	400	2.45	2.80	3.25	3.60	4.20	4.70
400	500	2.70	2.95	3.45	4.00	4.50	5.15
500	600	3.05	3.05	3.55	4.25	5.00	5.75
600	700	3.20	3.20	3.85	4.60	5.45	6.25
700	800	3.25	3.25	4.00	4.95	5.80	6.85
800	900	3.40	3.40	4.20	5.20	6.30	7.45
900	1000	3.45	3.45	4.35	5.50	6.75	7.85
1000	1100	3.50	3.50	4.50	5.80	7.00	8.35
1100	1150	3.60	3.60	4.80	6.10	7.45	8.75

APPENDIX B  
Page 3 of 25

AUTHORIZED EXPRESS RATES (Cont.)

Where Mileage Is:

POUNDS

<u>Over</u>	<u>Not Over</u>	<u>Over 50 Not Over 60</u>	<u>Over 60 Not Over 70</u>	<u>Over 70 Not Over 80</u>	<u>Over 80 Not Over 90</u>	<u>Over 90 Not Over 100</u>
		\$	\$	\$	\$	\$
0	25	2.45	2.60	2.70	2.80	3.05
25	50	2.65	2.75	2.95	3.15	3.40
50	75	3.15	3.40	3.55	3.95	4.15
75	100	3.55	4.00	4.05	4.60	4.95
100	125	3.95	4.25	4.60	5.00	5.40
125	150	4.15	4.50	4.95	5.30	5.75
150	175	4.45	4.95	5.30	5.80	6.25
175	200	4.60	5.00	5.45	5.90	6.30
200	250	4.70	5.15	5.60	6.00	6.45
250	300	4.85	5.20	5.75	6.15	6.60
300	400	5.15	5.75	6.15	6.75	7.10
400	500	5.75	6.25	6.85	7.35	7.90
500	600	6.35	7.00	7.75	8.45	9.15
600	700	7.00	7.85	8.65	9.55	10.30
700	800	7.75	8.65	9.65	10.60	11.50
800	900	8.45	9.55	10.60	11.65	12.60
900	1000	9.10	10.25	11.45	12.55	13.80
1000	1100	9.55	10.75	12.10	13.25	14.55
1100	1150	10.05	11.45	12.75	14.05	15.40

APPENDIX B  
Page 4 of 25EXPRESS RATES ON DAILY SHIPMENTS

<u>Where Mileage Is:</u>		<u>Rates Per Calendar Month</u>
<u>Over</u>	<u>Not Over</u>	
0	50	\$20.40
50	100	22.95
100	125	25.50
125	150	27.00
150	175	27.75
175	200	29.25
200	250	30.75
250	300	32.25
300	400	36.75
400	500	40.50

ZONE GROUP 61 CONTRA COSTA  
ADULT ONE-WAY FARES

Between and Zone	1	2	3	4	5	5-C	6	6-A	6-B	6-C	7	7-A	7-B	7-C
	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$
3	1.15	0.65	0.55											
4	1.25	0.75	0.55	0.55										
5	1.35	0.90	0.65	0.55	0.55									
5-C	1.35	0.90	0.65	0.55	0.55	0.55								
6	1.50	1.10	0.75	0.65	0.55	0.55	0.55							
6-A	1.50	1.10	0.75	0.65	0.55	0.55	0.55	0.55						
6-B	1.50	1.10	0.75	0.65	0.55	0.55	0.55	0.65	0.55					
6-C	1.50	1.10	0.75	0.65	0.55	0.55	0.55	0.65	0.55	0.55				
7	1.70	1.20	0.90	0.75	0.65	0.65	0.55	0.75	0.75	0.75	0.55			
7-A	1.70	1.20	0.90	0.75	0.65	0.65	0.75	0.55	0.75	0.75	0.90	0.55		
7-B	1.70	1.20	0.90	0.75	0.65	0.65	0.75	0.75	0.55	0.65	0.90	0.90	.55	
7-C	1.70	1.20	0.90	0.75	0.65	0.65	0.75	0.75	0.55	0.55	0.90	0.90	.90	0.55
8	1.85	1.30	1.10	0.90	0.75	0.75	0.65	0.90	0.90	0.90	0.55	1.10	1.10	1.10
8-A	1.85	1.30	1.10	0.90	0.75	0.75	0.65	0.90	0.90	0.90	0.55	1.10	1.10	1.10
8-B	1.85	1.30	1.10	0.90	0.75	0.75	0.90	0.65	0.90	0.90	1.10	0.55	1.10	1.10
9	2.05	1.40	1.20	1.10	0.90	0.90	0.75	1.10	1.10	1.10	0.65	1.20	1.20	1.20
9-A	2.05	1.40	1.20	1.10	0.90	0.90	0.75	1.10	1.10	1.10	0.65	1.20	1.20	1.20
9-B	2.05	1.40	1.20	1.10	0.90	0.90	0.75	1.10	1.10	1.10	0.65	1.20	1.20	1.20
10	2.15	1.60	1.30	1.20	1.10	1.10	0.90	1.20	1.20	1.20	0.75	1.30	1.30	1.30
11	2.25	1.75	1.40	1.30	1.20	1.20	1.10	1.30	1.30	1.30	0.90	1.40	1.40	1.40

Between and Zone	8	8-A	8-B	9	9-A	9-B	10	11
	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$
8	0.55							
8-A	0.65	0.55						
8-B	1.20	1.20	0.55					
9	0.55	0.75	1.30	0.55				
9-A	0.65	0.75	1.30	0.55	0.55			
9-B	0.65	0.55	1.30	0.55	0.55	0.55		
10	0.75	0.65	1.40	0.65	0.65	0.55	0.55	
11	0.90	0.75	1.60	0.75	0.75	0.65	0.55	0.55

Refer to pages 7 and 8 (Appendix B)  
for Zone Fare Limits

APPENDIX B  
Page 6 of 25

ZONE GROUP 61, CONTRA COSTA  
ADULT 20-RIDE COMMUTATION FARES

Between: Zone: and Zone	1	2
3	\$16.00	\$10.20
4	18.75	12.95
5	20.05	14.95
5-C	20.05	14.95
6	21.45	16.25
6-A	21.45	16.25
6-B	21.45	16.25
6-C	21.45	16.25
7	22.70	17.65
7-A	22.70	17.65
7-B	22.70	17.65
7-C	22.70	17.65

Refer to pages 7 and 8 (Appendix B)  
for Zone Fare Limits.

APPENDIX B  
Page 7 of 25

ZONE GROUP 61, CONTRA COSTA  
ZONE FARE LIMITS

Zone No.	Stations Within Zone	Zone Fare Limit
1	San Francisco	West-Bus Depot - (7th St.) East-Bay Bridge Toll Plaza
2	Oakland Berkeley Temescal Jct.	West-Bay Bridge Toll Plaza West-Addison & Shattuck St. East-Broadway & Landvale Road
3	East Portal Orinda	West-Broadway & Landvale Road East-Davis Road
4	Charles Hill Hidden Valley Road Upper Happy Valley Road Lafayette Lafayette Orchards	West-Davis Road  East-Willow Drive
5	Acalanes Saranap Road Walnut Creek S.O.S. Drive	West-Willow Drive  East-Third Avenue & North Main St.
5-C	Walnut Boulevard Shepard Road	West-North Broadway Avenue East-Bancroft Road & Walnut Avenue
6	Crystal Pool Mayhew Way (Mumson Tract) Pleasant Hill	West-Third Avenue & North Main St. East-Monument Boulevard & Lisa Lane
6-A	Reliez Valley Road Geary Road West Monument	South-Stanley Boulevard North-Gregory Lane
6-B	Alamo	North-Lilac Drive South-Las Trampass Road
6-C	Via Monte Treat Boulevard	West-Bancroft Road & Walnut Avenue East-Oak Grove Road & Risdon Road

APPENDIX B  
Page 8 of 25

ZONE GROUP 61, CONTRA COSTA  
ZONE FARE LIMITS

Zone No.	Stations Within Zone	Zone Fare Limit
7	Four Corners Concord	West-Monument Boulevard & Lisa Lane East-Colfax St. & Concord Blvd.
7-A	Muir Oak Junction	South-Gregory Lane North-Truitt Avenue
7-B	Danville	North-Las Trampass Road South-Bus Stop
7-C	Keswick Lane	West-Oak Grove Road & Risdon Road East-Oak Grove Road & Monument Blvd.
8	Adeline Ohmer Clyde	West-Salvio Street East-Essex Street
8-A	Concord Vista 3 Miles East of Concord	West-Colfax Street & Concord Blvd. East-Contra Costa Canal
8-B	Martinez	South-Truitt Avenue North-Bus Depot
9	Port Chicago	West-Essex Street East-Minnesota & Mereen Avenue
9-A	Nichols	West-Minnesota & Mereen Avenue East-Pacifica Avenue
9-B	Willow Pass Junction Belia Vista	West-Contra Costa Canal East-Highway Avenue
10	Pittsburg	West-Highway Avenue East-East 9th Street
11	Los Medanos Antioch	West-East 9th Street East-Bus Depot

ZONE GROUP 64 EAST BAY (VALLEJO)

ADULT ONE-WAY FARES

Between And	San Francisco	Oakland	Emeryville	Berkeley and West Berkeley	Albany	El Cerrito	Richmond	San Pablo (23rd St.) and San Pablo Jct.	Tank Farm	Pinole	Franklin Canyon Jct.	Rodeo	Oleum	Tormey	Crockett Jct.	North Bridgehead	Morrow Cove	South Vallejo (Lemon St.)
Oakland	\$ 0.75																	
Emeryville	\$ 0.75	\$ 0.55																
Berkeley & West Berkeley	\$ 1.05	\$ 0.55	\$ 0.55															
Albany	\$ 1.10	\$ 0.55	\$ 0.55	\$ 0.55														
El Cerrito	\$ 1.15	\$ 0.55	\$ 0.55	\$ 0.55	\$ 0.55													
Richmond	\$ 1.15	\$ 0.70	\$ 0.70	\$ 0.55	\$ 0.55	\$ 0.55												
San Pablo (23rd St.) & San Pablo Jct.	\$ 1.20	\$ 0.70	\$ 0.70	\$ 0.55	\$ 0.55	\$ 0.55	\$ 0.55											
Tank Farm	\$ 1.25	\$ 0.75	\$ 0.75	\$ 0.65	\$ 0.55	\$ 0.55	\$ 0.55	\$ 0.55										
Pinole	\$ 1.30	\$ 0.90	\$ 0.90	\$ 0.75	\$ 0.70	\$ 0.70	\$ 0.55	\$ 0.55	\$ 0.55									
Franklin Canyon Jct.	\$ 1.35	\$ 1.05	\$ 1.05	\$ 0.85	\$ 0.75	\$ 0.70	\$ 0.55	\$ 0.55	\$ 0.55	\$ 0.55								
Rodeo	\$ 1.40	\$ 1.15	\$ 1.05	\$ 0.90	\$ 0.85	\$ 0.85	\$ 0.70	\$ 0.55	\$ 0.55	\$ 0.55	\$ 0.55							
Oleum	\$ 1.50	\$ 1.15	\$ 1.10	\$ 1.05	\$ 0.90	\$ 0.85	\$ 0.70	\$ 0.65	\$ 0.55	\$ 0.55	\$ 0.55	\$ 0.55						
Tormey	\$ 1.60	\$ 1.20	\$ 1.15	\$ 1.05	\$ 1.05	\$ 0.90	\$ 0.75	\$ 0.70	\$ 0.55	\$ 0.55	\$ 0.55	\$ 0.55	\$ 0.55					
Crockett Jct.	\$ 1.60	\$ 1.25	\$ 1.15	\$ 1.10	\$ 1.05	\$ 1.05	\$ 0.85	\$ 0.70	\$ 0.65	\$ 0.55	\$ 0.55	\$ 0.55	\$ 0.55	\$ 0.55				
No. Bridgehead	\$ 1.70	\$ 1.25	\$ 1.25	\$ 1.15	\$ 1.10	\$ 1.10	\$ 0.90	\$ 0.85	\$ 0.75	\$ 0.55	\$ 0.55	\$ 0.55	\$ 0.55	\$ 0.55	\$ 0.55			
Morrow Cove	\$ 1.70	\$ 1.30	\$ 1.30	\$ 1.20	\$ 1.15	\$ 1.10	\$ 1.05	\$ 0.90	\$ 0.75	\$ 0.65	\$ 0.55	\$ 0.55	\$ 0.55	\$ 0.55	\$ 0.55	\$ 0.55		
South Vallejo (Lemon St.)	\$ 1.85	\$ 1.35	\$ 1.35	\$ 1.25	\$ 1.20	\$ 1.15	\$ 1.05	\$ 0.90	\$ 0.85	\$ 0.70	\$ 0.70	\$ 0.55	\$ 0.55	\$ 0.55	\$ 0.55	\$ 0.55	\$ 0.55	
Vallejo	\$ 1.85	\$ 1.35	\$ 1.35	\$ 1.30	\$ 1.25	\$ 1.20	\$ 1.10	\$ 1.05	\$ 0.90	\$ 0.75	\$ 0.70	\$ 0.55	\$ 0.55	\$ 0.55	\$ 0.55	\$ 0.55	\$ 0.55	\$ 0.55

A. 52591 ok

APPENDIX B  
Page 9 of 25

APPENDIX B  
Page 10 of 25

ZONE GROUP 64, EAST BAY (VALLEJO)  
ADULT 20-RIDE COMMUTATION FARES

Between and	Vallejo	Crockett Jct.
Oakland	\$19.75	\$17.65
San Francisco	23.55	21.45

ZONE GROUP 65 PENINSULA (BAY)

Between and Zone	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13
	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$
<u>ADULT ONE-WAY FARES</u>													
1	0.55												
2	0.55	0.55											
3	0.70	0.55	0.55										
4	0.85	0.70	0.55	0.55									
5	1.05	0.85	0.70	0.55	0.55								
6	1.15	1.05	0.85	0.70	0.55	0.55							
7	1.30	1.15	1.05	0.85	0.70	0.55	0.55						
8	1.40	1.30	1.15	1.05	0.85	0.70	0.55	0.55					
9	1.60	1.40	1.25	1.15	1.05	0.85	0.70	0.55	0.55				
10	1.85	1.60	1.35	1.30	1.20	1.05	0.85	0.70	0.55	0.55			
11	2.10	1.75	1.50	1.40	1.30	1.20	1.05	0.85	0.70	0.55	0.55		
12	2.20	2.05	1.75	1.60	1.40	1.30	1.20	1.05	0.85	0.70	0.55	0.55	
13	2.35	2.15	1.95	1.75	1.60	1.40	1.30	1.15	1.05	0.85	0.70	0.55	0.55
<u>ADULT TWENTY-RIDE COMMUTATION FARES</u>													
1	8.85												
2	8.85	8.85											
3	11.55	8.85	8.85										
4	12.25	11.55	8.85	8.85									
5	13.55	12.25	11.55	8.85	8.85								
6	14.25	13.55	12.25	11.55	8.85	8.85							
7	15.55	14.25	13.55	12.25	11.55	8.85	8.85						
8	16.90	15.55	14.25	13.55	12.25	11.55	8.85	8.85					
9	18.25	16.90	15.55	14.25	13.55	12.25	11.55	8.85	8.85				
10	20.30	18.25	16.90	15.55	14.25	13.55	12.25	11.55	8.85	8.85			
11	21.65	20.30	18.25	16.90	15.55	14.25	13.55	12.25	11.55	8.85	8.85		
12	23.00	21.00	20.30	18.25	16.90	15.55	14.25	13.55	12.25	11.55	8.85	8.85	
13	24.35	21.65	21.00	20.30	18.25	16.90	15.55	14.25	13.55	12.25	11.55	8.85	8.85

Refer to pages 12 and 13 (Appendix B) for Zone Fare Limits

APPENDIX B  
Page 12 of 25

ZONE GROUP 65 PENINSULA (BAY)

ZONE FARE LIMIT ROUTE MISSION - EL CAMINO	ZONE NUMBER AND STATIONS WITHIN ZONE	ZONE FARE LIMIT ROUTE BAYSHORE
North: Depot (7th St.) South: Regent St..	ZONE 1 San Francisco	North: Depot (7th St.) South: Raymond Ave.
North: Regent St.  South: "C" Street	ZONE 2  Daly City                      Bayshore Colma                          Brisbane Rd.	North: Raymond Ave.  South: Brisbane So. City Limits (at over- pass to enter old Bayshore Freeway)
North: "C" Street  South: Brentwood Dr.	ZONE 3  Lawndale                      South San Baden                          Francisco	North: Brisbane So. City limits (at over- pass to enter old Bayshore Freeway) South: Mitchell Ave.
North: Brentwood Dr.  South: Irwin Pl.	ZONE 4  Tanforan                      San Francisco San Bruno                      Airport Lomita Park Millbrae	North: Mitchell Ave.  South: East Millbrae Ave.
North: Irwin Pl.  South: State St. & San Mateo Dr.	ZONE 5  Burlingame (Adeline Ave.) Burlingame (Broadway) Burlingame	North: East Millbrae Ave.  South: Peninsular Ave.
North: State St. & San Mateo Dr. South: Anita Ave.	ZONE 6  San Mateo Hillsdale (Bay Meadows)	North: Peninsular Ave.  South: San Mateo So. City Limit
North: Anita Ave.  South: James St.	ZONE 7  Belmont San Carlos Redwood City	North: San Mateo So. City Limit  South: Middlefield Rd. & Veterans Blvd.
North: James St.  South: Harvard Ave.	ZONE 8  Atherton Menlo Park	

APPENDIX B  
Page 13 of 25

ZONE GROUP 65 PENINSULA (BAY)

ZONE FARE LIMIT ROUTE MISSION - EL CAMINO	ZONE NUMBER AND STATIONS WITHIN ZONE	ZONE FARE LIMIT ROUTE ALMA AND EVELYN STREETS
North: Harvard Avenue  South: Vista Avenue	ZONE 9  Palo Alto So. Palo Alto Fernando Avenue Barron Park	North: Harvard Avenue  South: Ely Place
North: Vista Avenue  South: Stevens Creek Freeway Overpass	ZONE 10  Alta Mesa Junction Mountain View Junction Mountain View Naval Air Station	North: Ely Place  South: Calhoun Avenue
North: Stevens Creek Freeway Overpass  South: Henderson Avenue	ZONE 11  Sylvan Avenue Sunnyvale Junction Sunnyvale Dawson Junction Butchers	North: Calhoun Avenue  South: Henderson Avenue
North: Henderson Avenue  South: San Jose North City Limits	ZONE 12  Milliken Santa Clara	
North: San Jose North City Limits South: Depot	ZONE 13  San Jose	

APPENDIX B  
Page 14 of 25

ZONE GROUP 66 PENINSULA (OCEAN)

Between:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:
Zone :	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:
and :	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:
Zone :	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	
	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$

ADULT ONE-WAY FARES

1	0.55									
2	0.55	0.55								
3	0.70	0.55	0.55							
4	0.85	0.55	0.55	0.55						
5	0.90	0.55	0.55	0.55	0.55					
6	1.05	0.55	0.55	0.55	0.55	0.55				
7	1.20	0.85	0.75	0.65	0.55	0.55	0.55			
8	1.30	1.10	1.05	0.85	0.70	0.65	0.55	0.55		
9	1.30	1.10	1.05	0.85	0.70	0.70	0.55	0.55	0.55	

ADULT TWENTY-RIDE COMMUTATION FARES

2	8.85									
3	11.55									
4	12.25	8.85								
5	12.95	8.85								
6	13.55	8.85								
7	14.25	12.25	11.55	10.20	8.85					
8	15.55	14.25	13.55	12.25	11.55	10.20				
9	15.55	14.25	13.55	12.25	11.55	11.55	8.85			

ZONE FARE LIMITS

Zone Number	Station Within Zone	Zone Fare Limit
1	San Francisco	North - Bus Depot (7th Street) South - Junipero Serra Blvd.
2	Westlake (Alemany Blvd.)	North - Junipero Serra Blvd. South - Jct. of Skyline Blvd. & Alemany Blvd.
3	Westlake (Skyline Blvd.) Edgemar (Pacific Manor)	North - Jct. of Skyline Blvd. & Alemany Blvd. South - Paloma Ave. Overcrossing
4	Sharp Park	North - Paloma Ave. Overcrossing South - Clarendon Road Undercrossing
5	Fairway Park Valleamar Rockaway Beach	North - Clarendon Road Undercrossing South - Sea Bowl Ave.
6	Pedro Valley (Linda Mar)	North - Sea Bowl Ave. South - San Pedro Ave.
7	Moss Beach	North - San Pedro Ave. South - Half Moon Bay Airport Road
8	Princeton (HS) El Granada Miramar (HS)	North - Half Moon Bay Airport Road South - San Mateo Beaches State Park Road
9	Half Moon Bay	North - San Mateo Beaches State Park Road South - Bus Depot (Main and Mills Street)

APPENDIX B  
Page 15 of 25

SACRAMENTO-DAVIS-WOODLAND  
ADULT ONE-WAY AND 20-RIDE COMMUTATION FARES

and	Between	Sacramento	One-Way	20-Ride
			Fare	Commute
				Fare
Davis			\$0.85	\$10.85
Woodland			1.20	13.55

APPENDIX B  
Page 16 of 25

ZONE GROUP 68 LONG BEACH

ADULT ONE-WAY FARES

Between And	Long Beach	West Long Beach	Wilmington	Wilmington Jct. (West Wilmington)	Harbor City (San Pedro Jct.)	South Harbor City
	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$
Wilmington	0.55					
Wilmington Jct. (West Wilmington)	0.55	0.55	0.55			
Harbor City (San Pedro Jct.)	0.55	0.55	0.55	0.55		
South Harbor City	0.55	0.55	0.55	0.55	@	
San Pedro	0.55	0.55	0.55	0.55	@	@
South Lomita	0.65	0.55	0.55	0.55	0.55	0.55
Lomita	0.70	0.55	0.55	0.55	0.55	0.55
Torrance	0.75	0.55	0.55	0.55	0.55	0.55
West Torrance	0.90	0.70	0.65	0.55	0.55	0.55
Redondo Beach	1.05	0.75	0.70	0.70	0.55	0.65
Hermosa Beach	1.10	0.90	0.85	0.85	0.70	0.70
Manhattan Beach	1.15	1.05	0.85	0.85	0.70	0.75
East Manhattan Beach	1.25	1.10	1.05	1.05	0.85	0.90
East El Segundo	1.25	1.10	1.05	1.05	0.85	0.90
El Segundo	1.30	1.15	1.10	1.05	0.90	1.05
Inglewood Jct.	1.30	1.15	1.10	1.05	0.90	1.05
Los Angeles International Airport	1.30	1.25	%	%	%	%
Westchester	1.30	1.25	1.20	1.15	1.10	1.10
University City	1.40	1.30	1.25	1.20	1.15	1.20
East Venice	1.50	1.35	1.30	1.30	1.25	1.30
Venice	1.50	1.35	1.30	1.30	1.25	1.30
Ocean Park	1.60	1.40	1.30	1.30	1.30	1.30
Santa Monica	1.70	1.50	1.50	1.35	1.30	1.30

@ No fares in effect.

% Restricted Territory, no fare in effect.

APPENDIX B  
Page 17 of 25

ZONE GROUP 68 LONG BEACH

ADULT ONE-WAY FARES

And Between	San Pedro	South Lomita	Lomita	Torrance	West Torrance	Redondo Beach
	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$
South Lomita	0.55					
Lomita	0.55	0.55				
Torrance	0.55	0.55	0.55			
West Torrance	0.70	0.55	0.55	0.55		
Redondo Beach	0.85	0.55	0.55	0.55	0.55	
Hermosa Beach	0.90	0.65	0.55	0.55	0.55	0.55
Manhattan Beach	1.05	0.70	0.65	0.55	0.55	0.55
East Manhattan Beach	1.10	0.85	0.75	0.70	0.55	0.55
East El Segundo	1.10	0.85	0.75	0.70	0.55	0.55
El Segundo	1.15	0.85	0.85	0.70	0.55	0.55
Inglewood Jct.	1.15	0.85	0.85	0.70	0.55	0.55
Los Angeles International Airport	1.25	1.05	1.05	0.85	0.70	0.65
Westchester	1.25	1.05	1.05	0.85	0.70	0.65
University City	1.30	1.10	1.10	1.05	0.85	0.70
East Venice	1.35	1.20	1.20	1.10	1.05	0.85
Venice	1.35	1.20	1.20	1.10	1.05	0.85
Ocean Park	1.40	1.25	1.20	1.15	1.05	0.90
Santa Monica	1.50	1.30	1.30	1.20	1.10	1.05

APPENDIX B  
Page 18 of 25

ZONE GROUP 68 LONG BEACH

ADULT ONE-WAY FARES

Between And	Hermosa Beach	Manhattan Beach	East Manhattan Beach	East El Segundo	El Segundo	Inglewood Jct.
	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$
Manhattan Beach	0.55					
East Manhattan Beach	0.55	0.55				
East El Segundo	0.55	0.55	0.55			
El Segundo	0.55	0.55	0.55	0.55		
Inglewood Jct.	0.55	0.55	0.55	0.55	0.55	
Los Angeles International Airport	0.55	0.55	0.55	0.55	0.55	0.55
Westchester	0.55	0.55	0.55	0.55	0.55	0.55
University City	0.65	0.55	0.55	0.55	0.55	0.55
East Venice	0.75	0.70	0.55	0.55	0.65	0.55
Venice	0.75	0.70	0.55	0.55	0.65	0.55
Ocean Park	0.85	0.75	0.65	0.65	0.70	0.55
Santa Monica	0.90	0.85	0.70	0.70	0.75	0.70

Between And	Los Angeles International Airport	Westchester	University City	East Venice
	\$	\$	\$	\$
Westchester	%			
University City	%	0.55		
East Venice	%	0.55	0.55	
Venice	%	0.55	0.55	%
Ocean Park	0.55	0.55	0.55	%
Santa Monica	0.65	0.55	0.55	0.55

% Restricted Territory, no fare in effect.

APPENDIX B  
Page 19 of 25ZONE GROUP 68 LONG BEACHLOCAL ZONE FARES

City	Defined Fare Limits	One-Way Cash Fare
South Lomita	EAST: Bellporte Avenue & Pacific Coast Highway WEST: Narbonne Avenue & Pacific Coast Highway	\$ 0.55
Lomita	SOUTH: Pacific Coast Highway NORTH: Sepulveda Blvd. & Narbonne Ave.	0.55
Torrance	SOUTH: Sepulveda Blvd. & Narbonne Ave. WEST: Crenshaw Blvd. & Torrance Blvd.	0.55
Redondo Beach	EAST: City Limits on Torrance Blvd. NORTH: Redondo St. & Hermosa Ave.	0.55

APPENDIX B  
Page 20 of 25

ZONE GROUP 68 LONG BEACH

ADULT TWENTY-RIDE COMMUTATION FARES

Between And	Long Beach	Wilmington	San Pedro	Harbor City (San Pedro Jct.)	South Lomita Lomita	Torrance	Redondo Beach	Hermosa Beach
	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$
West Wilmington	8.85							
San Pedro	8.85							
South Lomita	10.20							
Torrance			8.85					
Redondo Beach		11.55	12.25	8.85	8.85			
Hermosa Beach						8.85		
Manhattan Beach						8.85		
Santa Monica	23.00					17.65	15.55	14.95

TWENTY-RIDE SCHOOL FARES

Between And	Long Beach	San Pedro	South Lomita	Lomita	Torrance
	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$
Wilmington	4.45				
South Lomita	5.10				
Lomita	6.25	4.45	4.45		
Torrance	6.85	4.45			
Redondo Beach	8.75			4.45	4.45

APPENDIX B  
Page 21 of 25

ZONE GROUP 69 SAN DIEGO

ONE-WAY ADULT FARES

Index No.	Index No.	1	2	3	4	5	6
	Between And	San Diego	National & City (8th & National)	National & City (18th & National)	National & City (24th & National)	Duck Pond (29th & National)	National & E Street
		\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$
2	National City (8th & National)	%					
3	National City (18th & National)	%	%				
4	National City (24th & National)	.55	.55	.55			
5	Duck Pond (29th & National)	.55	.55	.55	.55		
6	National & E Street	.55	.55	.55	.55	.55	
7	Highland & E Street	%	%	%	%	%	%
8	Chula Vista (3rd & Davidson)	%	%	%	%	%	%
9	Chula Vista (3rd & K Street)	%	%	%	%	%	%
10	Castle Park (3rd & Moss)	.65	.55	.55	.55	.55	.55
11	Castle Park (3rd & Emerson)	.65	.55	.55	.55	.55	.55
12	Otay (3rd & Main)	.65	.55	.55	.55	.55	.55
13	National & K Street	.60	.55	.55	.55	.55	.55
14	National & L Street	.60	.55	.55	.55	.55	.55
15	Harborside	.60	.55	.55	.55	.55	.55
16	Otay Junction	.65	.55	.55	.55	.55	.55
17	Overhead Bridge	.70	.55	.55	.55	.55	.55
18	Palm City	.70	.55	.55	.55	.55	.55
19	Nester	.70	.55	.55	.55	.55	.55
20	Dairy Mart Farms	.80	.60	.55	.55	.55	.55
21	San Ysidro	.85	.65	.60	.60	.55	.55
22	San Ysidro Port of Entry	.90	.70	.65	.65	.60	.55

% Restricted Territory.

See page 24 of 25 for Restrictions.

APPENDIX B  
Page 22 of 25

ZONE GROUP 69 SAN DIEGO

ONE-WAY ADULT FARES

Index No.	Index No.	7	8	9	10	11	12
	Between And	Highland & E Street	Chula Vista (3rd & Davidson)	Chula Vista (3rd & K Street)	Castle Park (3rd & Moss)	Castle Park (3rd & Emerson)	Otay (3rd & Main)
8	Chula Vista (3rd & Davidson)	%					
9	Chula Vista (3rd & K Street)	%	%				
10	Castle Park (3rd & Moss)	.55	.55	.55			
11	Castle Park (3rd & Emerson)	.55	.55	.55	.55		
12	Otay (3rd & Main)	.55	.55	.55	.55	.55	
13	National & K Street	.55	.55	.55	.55	.55	.55
14	National & I Street	.55	.55	.55	.55	.55	.55
15	Harborside	.55	.55	.55	.55	.55	.55
16	Otay Junction	.55	.55	.55	.55	.55	.55
17	Overhead Bridge	.55	.55	.55	.55	.55	.55
18	Palm City	.55	.55	.55	.55	.55	.55
19	Nester	.55	.55	.55	.55	.55	.55
20	Dairy Mart Farms	.55	.55	.55	.55	.55	.55
21	San Ysidro	.55	.55	.55	.55	.55	.55
22	San Ysidro Port of Entry	.55	.55	.55	.55	.55	.55

% Restricted Territory.

See page 24 of 25 for Restrictions.

APPENDIX B  
Page 23 of 25

ZONE GROUP 69 SAN DIEGO

ONE-WAY ADULT FARES

Index No.	Index No.	13	14	15	16	17	18
	Between And	National & K Street	National & L Street	Harborside	Otay Junction	Overhead Bridge	Palm City
		\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$
14	National & L Street	.55					
15	Harborside	.55	.55				
16	Otay Junction	.55	.55	.55			
17	Overhead Bridge	.55	.55	.55	.55		
18	Palm City	.55	.55	.55	.55	.55	
19	Nester	.55	.55	.55	.55	.55	.55
20	Dairy Mart Farms	.55	.55	.55	.55	.55	.55
21	San Ysidro	.55	.55	.55	.55	.55	.55
22	San Ysidro Port of Entry	.55	.55	.55	.55	.55	.55

  

Index No.	Index No.	19	20	21
	Between And	Nester	Dairy Mart Farms	San Ysidro
		\$	\$	\$
20	Dairy Mart Farms	.55		
21	San Ysidro	.55	.55	
22	San Ysidro Port of Entry	.55	.55	.55

APPENDIX B  
Page 24 of 25

ZONE GROUP 69 SAN DIEGO

ONE-WAY ADULT FARES

RESTRICTIONS:

No Passenger may be transported whose point of origin and point of destination are between:

- (a) San Diego terminal, on the one hand, and the intersection of Third Avenue and the southerly city limits of Chula Vista, on the other hand, EXCEPT that passengers may be transported:
  - (1) Between points north of the intersection of 18th Street and National Avenue in National City, on the one hand, and points on National Avenue and Broadway south of the intersection of 18th Street, on the other hand, and
  - (2) Between any two points on National Avenue and Broadway both of which are south of the intersection of 18th Street and National Avenue in National City.
- (b) San Diego terminal and the intersection of 25th Street and National Avenue in National City.

APPENDIX B  
Page 25 of 25

MARIN COUNTY  
AUTHORIZED  
ADULT ONE-WAY COMMUTATION FARES

<u>From San Francisco</u>		
<u>Points Included</u>	<u>Miles</u>	<u>One-Way Fares</u>
San Rafael	19	\$1.25
Novato	30	1.40
Petaluma	41	2.10
Cotati	49	2.25
Santa Rosa	57	2.60

Note: Passengers will be transported locally to, from or between intermediate points on such schedules between San Francisco and Santa Rosa after the last departure and before the first departure of the Golden Gate Bridge, Highway and Transportation District Schedules.