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BEFORE THE PUBLIC UUILITIES COMMISSION OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNLA

In the Matter of the Appifcation of CONTINENTAL TRAITNAYS, INC., a Delaware COYporation; AMERICAN BUSIINES, INC., a Delaware corporation; and CONTINENTAL PACIFIC IINES, a California corporation, for authority to increase one-way and round trip LEtrastate passenger fares and express enarges pursuant to Sections 454 and 491 of the Pubilc Utilities Code.)

Application No. 53740 (Filed December 7, 1972)

## OPINION

Continentel Trailways, Inc. (Irailweys), American Buslines, Inc. (American), and Continental Pacific Ifnes (Continental Peciffc) seek an ex parte ordex authorizing increases in their intiastate, local, and joint passenger fares, and express charges. The proposed fare snd express rate schedules ere the same as were authorized to Greybound Ifnes in Decision No. 80545 dated September 26, 1972 in Appilcarion No. 52591. The proposed increase is about 11.8 percent.

Irailways operetes generally between San Francisco and Los Angeles and intermediate points via Stockton, Fresno, and Bakersfield, and between Los Angeles and the California-Arizona state Inne at Needles and Biythe via San Rernerdino and Riverside, respectively. Anerican operates between Los Angeles and San Diege, and between Sacremento and the Californfa-Nevada state Ine. Continental Racific conducts operations between San Francisco and Stockton and the Calffornia-Oregon state line. Applicants serve most intermediate points along their various routes. There are zestrictions against local service within certain areas of higher population density along authorized routes.

Applicants" present and proposed fare scales are set forth it: the following table.

TABLE I
Present and Proposed One-Way Distance Fares

Miles
But
Ovex
0
25
50
100
150
200
250
300
400
Not Over
25
50
100
150
200
250
300
400

- 0.0326

Minimum Fare

Rate Per Mile

| Present | Proposed |
| :--- | ---: |
| $\$ 0.0463$ | $\$ 0.0518$ |
| 0.0433 | 0.0484 |
| 0.0409 | 0.0457 |
| 0.0372 | 0.0416 |
| 0.0357 | 0.0399 |
| 0.0347 | 0.0388 |
| 0.0341 | 0.0381 |
| 0.0332 | 0.0371 |
| 0.0326 | 0.0384 |
| $\$ 0.45$ | $\$ 0.50$ |

With No Fare Less Than Fare For:

Minfmm fare 25 miles 50 "
100 "
150 "
200 "
250 "
$300 \quad \pi$
400

Present Round-trip Fare 180\% of One-Way Fare. Proposed Round-trip Fare 190\% of One-Way Fare.

Applicants request authority to depart from the proposed mileage scale of rates set forch above to such extent as may be necessary to permit them to continue to establish rates on a point-to-point basis at the same level as the presently effective rates of Greyhound Ifnes - West Division of Greyhound Iines, Inc. (Greyhound), as authorized in Decision No. 80545 between points served by both applicants and Greyhound. Such authority was granted applicants in Decisions Nos. 73087, 75154, 77027, and 79567. Applicants further request that in the case of a ticket covering travel over both branchifine and mainline routes, the fare will be based upon the full combination of fares. This is the same basis of constructing rates that has heretofore been authorized for applicants and Greybound.

Applicants propose that any increase in one-way fares resciting in amounts less than 60 cents and not ending in " 0 " or "5" cents be ralsed to the next higher "O" or " 5 " cents. Applicants further propose that any increase in one-way fares resulting in amounts greater than 60 cents shall be rounded to the nearest cent, one-holf being considered nearest to the next higher cent.

Applicants tetend to continue all of their present rules and regulations in conjunction with the proposed fare structure set forth herefn.

Applicants allege that if the sought fare increases are authorized, approxtmately six months' time will be required to rework all of the point-to-point fares within the State over the lines of applicants. Applicants request that the Commission also authorize them to place the proposed increased fares into effect by means of a conversioa table.

The local and joint fares and express rates of applicants historically have been maintained on the same mileage scale as that authorized to Greybound for its Califormia fatrastate operations. I/

The application alleges that wages paid to drivers and other personnel subject to collective bargaining agreements entered into prior to November 8, 1971 have increased since the last fare and express rate adjustments were authorized and that they have experienced increases in costs of materials, suppiles, and equipment.

Applicants are competitive with Greyhound at substantialiy 211 points they serve. The application states that pest experience has demonstwated that an increase in fares to Greyhound without a corresponding increase in the fares of applicants results in

[^0]A. $53740 \quad 1 \mathrm{~mm}$
increased losses to applicants because any increase in the volume of traffic handled by applicants as a result of the disparity in rates does not offset the added costs of performing such additional transportation service. The application alleges that it is therefore necessary for applicants to increase thetr fares to a parity with those of Greyhound.

There are a number of companies that comprise the nationwide Continental Trailways System. Applicants are the thrce companies in the system organization that operate in Califomia. They are under comon control and manaqement and their consolidated reports of operations have heretofore been considered in matters involving a general increase in passenger fares for all of three companies. Each applicant operates within and outside of Caliñornia and their individual books and ledgers reflect revenues and expenses of their respective total operations. In the tables that follow, and benceforth in this opinion umless specifically designated otherwise, when the word "System" is used it refers to the total operations conducted by the three applicants; when the word "California" is used it refers to all operations whether interstate or intrastate orfginating in the State of Callfomia; when the word "Intrastate" is used it refers to operations in California intrastate comerce.

The determination of the results of fntrastate operations necessaxily requites the separation and allocation of revenues and expenses from System to California and then a further separation or allocation from Californa to Intrastate. In going from System to Calffornia applicants were able to separate the Calffornfa revenues for passenger, charter, and express operations; all other revenues and all expenses were allocated from System to Califorafa on the basis of the ratios of efther total miles or total passenger miles operated in California to the System. In going from Califoraia to Intrastate applicants were able to separate the charter revenues; all other revenues were allocated according to ratios of the mount
of present passenger revenues, amount of present express revenues, or amount of passengex miles operated Intrastate as compared to Californfe; and expenses were allocated on the comblned ratios of intrastate present passengers and present passenger revenues to Califomia. Those ratios were ascertained from studies made by applicants from samples of traffic. The following is a sumary of those studfes:

TABLE 2
Ratios of Incrastate and Interstate Passengers, Passenger Revenues, Passenger Miles; Express Shipments, and Express Revenues for California Operations

|  | Pezcent |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Intrastate | Interstate | California |
|  | 27.7 | 72.3 | 100 |
| Passengers | 20.4 | 79.6 | 100 |
| Passenger Revenue | 20.9 | 79.1 | 100 |
| Passenger Miles | 22.1 | 77.9 | 100 |
| Express Shrpments | 8.7 | 91.3 |  |

Table 3 is a sumary of the consolidated revenues and expenses of applicants for operations for the twelve months ended Ausust 31, 1972 together with projected results at the proposed rate increases and at current expense levels.

TABLE 3
Continental Trailways, Inc. American Buslines, Inc. Continental Pactific Lines
Sumary of Combined Revenues and Expenses From California Intrastate Operations for The Twelve Months Ended August 31, 1972 and Projected Results of Operations Under Proposed Fares and Rates and at Current Expense Levels


Applicants presented data showing the effect of the proposed intrastate fare and rate increases (as well as charter rate increases) upon its System results of operation and compared those results with System results for the years 1965 through 1971.

TABLE 4
COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF OPERATING REVENUES AND EXPENSES For the Years 1965 Tbrough 1971, The Average of the Best Three (3) Years of the Five (5) Years Prior to 1970 and a Projected Year Based on Known Increases in Expenses and Anticipated Increase in Revenues


Notice of the proposal to increase fares and rates was served by applicants in accordance with Rule 24 of the Comaission's Rules of Practice and Procedure. Notice of the filing of the application appeared in the Comaission's Daily Calender of December 11, 1972. The Comission has recelved no commaications other than Erom applicants concerning this application.

The Comission finds that:

1. Applicants heretofore have been authorized to melntain their local and joint oneway and rounctrip fares and express rates on the same level as that authorized to Greyhound Innes, Inc. Preseat fares and express rates are below the fare levels authorized to Greyhound in Decision No. 80545. Increases in applicants' local and joint fares and express zates to the levels authorized to Greyhound will be reasonable and such lares and express rates will not result in an operating profit for applicants: California intrastate operations.
2. The increases in fares and express rates proposed in the application are justified.
3. Pending amendment of tariffs to reflect the increased fares, the publication of the increased fares by means of a conversion table is justified.
4. In compliance with Rule 23.1 of the Comolssion's Rules of Practice and Procedure, promigated pursuant to the Economic Stabilization Act of 1970, as amended, the application contains data demonstrating that:
(a) The present passenger fares and proposed passenger fares of applicants are as described in this opinion and the present and proposed express rates are as set forth in Appendix A attached hereto. The proposed fares and rates represent an increase of 11.8 percent over the present fares and rates.
(b) The fncreases resulting from the proposed fares is expected to provide the three applicants with $\$ 175,154$ additional passenger revenues annualiy and the proposed increase in express rates is expected to provide addicional aminal express revenues of \$10,502.
(c) The increases in passenger fares and express rates will not result in an operating profit of applicants: Califoraia intrastate operations, and will not provide applicants with a margin of profit from system operations in excess of that earned during the year 1971 or in excess of the average of applicants" three best years from 1965 through 1970, inclusive. The increases are the minimum required to assure continued, adequate, and safe service.
(d) The increases authorized are cost justified and do not reflect future inflationary trends.
(e) The facreases do not reflect labor costs in excess of those allowed pursuant to Ruie 23.1 .
(E) There are no known productivity gains which coule offset the increases in expenses.
(g) Reasomable opportuntty for participation by all interested parties was afforded.
We conclude that the application should be granted. A public hearing is not necessary.

$$
\underline{O R} \underline{\underline{D} E R}
$$

II IS ORDERED that:

1. Continental Irailways, Inc., American Businnes, Inc., and Continental Pacific ilnes are authorized to establish the increased fares proposed in Application No. 53740, and are authorized to depart from the mileage scale of fares to the extent necessary to establish fares on a point-to-point basis at the level currently authorized to Greyhound Lines, Inc. between points served both by applicants and Greyhound. Tariff publications authorized to be made as a result of this order may be made effective not earlifer than five days after the effective date of this order, on not less than five days' notice to the Comission and to the public.
2. Pending the filing of tariffe to refiect the increases authorized in paragraph 1 hereof, applicants are authorized to make effective increases in their passenger fares by means of appropriate conversion tables, provided the increased fares do not exceed the fares authorized in paragraph I bereof. Within $s i x$ months after the
effective diane hereof, applicants bhaij rajecec to inntiner amend their tariffs so that the increased fares may be determined without use of conversion tables.
3. The authority herein granted shall expire unless exercised within ninety days after the effective date of this order.
4. In addition to the required posting and filing of tariffs, applicants shall give notice to the public by posting in their buses and terminals a printed explanation of their fares. Such notices 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.

The effective date of this order shall be twenty days after the date hereof.
Dated at
San Francisco $\qquad$ . California, this
 MARCH day of , 1973.




Founds
Where Mileage Is:

|  | Not | Not | Ovor 2 Not | Over 10 Not | Ovor 20 Not | Over 30 Not | Over 40 Not | Over 50 Not | Over 60 Not | Over 70 Not | Over 80 Not | Over 90 Not |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Oror | Ovas: | Over 2 | Over 10 | Over 20 | Over 30 | Over 40 | Over 50 | Over 60 | Over 70 | Oyer 80 | Over 90 | Over 100 |
| 0 | 25 | \$1.50 | \$1.50 | \$1.60 | \$1.70 | \$1.85 | \$1.95 | \$2.15 | \$2.30 | \$ 2.40 | \$ 2.50 | \$2,70 |
| 25 | 50 | 1,50 | 1.50 | 1.70 | 1,85 | 1.95 | 2,20 | 2.35 | 2.35 | 2.60 | 2.80 | 3.00 |
| 50 | 75 | 1,50 | 1.65 | 1.85 | 2.05 | 2.35 | 2.50 | 2.80 | 3.00 | 3.15 | 3.50 | 3.70 |
| 75 | 100 | 1.50 | 1,80 | 2.05 | 2.35 | 2.60 | 2.90 | 3.15 | 3.55 | 3.60 | 4.10 | 4.40 |
| 100 | 125 | 1,50 | 1.90 | 2.20 | 2.45 | 2.85 | 3.15 | 3.50 | 3.80 | 4.10 | 4.45 | 4.80 |
| 125 | 150 | 1,60 | 2.05 | 2.30 | 2.60 | 3.00 | 3.35 | 3.70 | $4 . \infty$ | 4.40 | 4.70 | 5.10 |
| 150 | 175 | 1.65 | 2.20 | 2.40 | 2.80 | 3,15 | 3.60 | 3.95 | 4.40 | 4.70 | 5.15 | 5.55 |
| 175 | 200 | 1.70 | 2.35 | 2.45 | 2.90 | 3.20 | 3.70 | 4.10 | 4.45 | 4.85 | 5.25 | 5.60 |
| 200 | 250 | 1.80 | 2.40 | 2,60 | 3.05 | 3.40 | 3.80 | 4.20 | 4.60 | 5.00 | 5.35 | 5.75 |
| 250 | 300 | 1.90 | 2.45 | 2.80 | 3.10 | 3.55 | 3.85 | 4.30 | 4.65 | 5.10 | 5.50 | 5.90 |
| 300 | 400 | 2.15 | 2.50 | 2.90 | 3.20 | 3.75 | 4.20 | 4.60 | 5.10 | 5.50 | 6.00 | 6.35 |
| 400 | 500 | 2.40 | 2.60 | 3.05 | 3.55 | 4.00 | 4.60 | 5.10 | 5.55 | 6.10 | 6.55 | 7.05 |
| 500 | 600 | 2,70 | 2.70 | 3,15 | 3.80 | 4.45 | 5.10 | 5.65 | 6.25 | 6.90 | 7.55 | 8.15 |
| 600 | 700 | 2.85 | 2.85 | 3.40 | 4,10 | 4.85 | 5.55 | 6.25 | 7.00 | 7.70 | 8.50 | 9.20 |
| 700 | 800 | 2.90 | 2.90 | 3.55 | 4.40 | 5.15 | 6.10 | 6.90 | 7.70 | 8.60 | 9.45 | 10.25 |
| 800 | 900 | 3,00 | 3.00 | 3.75 | 4.65 | 5.60 | 6.65 | 7.55 | 8,50 | 9.45 | 10.40 | 11.25 |
| 900 | 1000 | 3.05 | 3.05 | 3.85 | 4.90 | 6.00 | 7.00 | 8.10 | 9.15 | 10.20 | 11,20 | 12,30 |
| 1000 | 1100 | 3.10 | 3.10 | 4.00 | 5.15 | 6.25 | 7.45 | 8,50 | 9.60 | 10.80 | 11.85 | 13.00 |
| 1100 | 1150 | 3.20 | 3,20 | 4.25 | 5.45 | 6.65 | 7.80 | 8.95 | 10,20 | 11.40 | 12.55 | 13.75 |

APPERDIX A
Page 2 of 3
TABLE OF PROTOSED EXPRESS RATES

| Ghero Mileage Is: |  |  | POUNDS |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Not | Not | Over 2 Not. | Over 10 Not | Ovor 20 Not | Over 30 Not | Orer 40 Not | Over 50 Not | Over 60 Not | Ovor 70 Not | $\begin{gathered} \text { Ovor } 80 \\ \text { Not } \end{gathered}$ | over 90 Not |
| Over | Over | Over 2 | Over 10 | Over 20 | Ovar 30 | Over 40 | Over 50 | Over 60 | Over 70 | Over \$0 | Over 90 | Over 100 |
| 0 | 25 | \$1.70 | \$1.70 | \$1.80 | \$1.95 | \$2,10 | \$2,00 | \$2.45 | \$2.60 | \$ 2.70 | \$ 2.60 | \$ 3.05 |
| 25 | 50 | 1.70 | 1,70 | 1.95 | 2,10 | 2,20 | 2.50 | 2.65 | 2.75 | 2.95 | 3.15 | 3.40 |
| 5 | 75 | 1,70 | 1.85 | 2.10 | 2.30 | 2.65 | 2.80 | 3.15 | 3.40 | 3.55 | 3.95 | 4.15 |
| 75 | 100 | 1,70 | 2.05 | 2,30 | 2.65 | 2.95 | 3.25 | 3.55 | 4.00 | 4.05 | 4.60 | 4.95 |
| 100 | 125 | 1,70 | 2.15 | 2.50 | 2.75 | 3.20 | 3.55 | 3.95 | 4.25 | 4.60 | 5.00 | 5,40 |
| 125 | 150 | 1.80 | 2,30 | 2.60 | 2.95 | 3.40 | 3.75 | 4.15 | 4.50 | 4.95 | 5.30 | 5.75 |
| 150 | 175 | 1.85 | 2.50 | 2.70 | 3.15 | 3.55 | 4.05 | 4.45 | 4.95 | 5.30 | 5.80 | 6.25 |
| 175 | 200 | 1.95 | 2.65 | 2.75 | 3.25 | 3.60 | 4.15 | 4.60 | 5.00 | 5.45 | 5.90 | 6.30 |
| 200 | 250 | 2.05 | 2.70 | 2.95 | 3.45 | 3.85 | 4.25 | 4.70 | 5.15 | 5,60 | 6.00 | 6.45 |
| 250 | 300 | 2.15 | 2.75 | 3.15 | 3.50 | $4 . \infty$ | 4.35 | 4.85 | 5.20 | 5.75 | 6.15 | 6.60 |
| 300 | 400 | 2.45 | 2.80 | 3.25 | 3.60 | 4.20 | 4.70 | 5.15 | 5.75 | 6.15 | 6.75 | 7.10 |
| 400 | 500 | 2.70 | 2.95 | 3.45 | 4,00 | 4.50 | .5,15 | 5.75 | 6.25 | 6.85 | 7.35 | 7,90 |
| 500 | 600 | 3.05 | 3.05 | 3.55 | 4,25 | 5.00 | 5.75 | 6.35 | 7.00 | 7.75 | 8.45 | 9.15 |
| 600 | 700 | 3.20 | 3.20 | 3.85 | 4.60 | 5.45 | 6.25 | 7,00 | 7.85 | 8.65 | 9.35 | 10.30 |
| 700 | 800 | 3.25 | 3.25 | 4.00 | 4.95 | 5.80 | 6.85 | 7.75 | 8.65 | 9.65 | 10.60 | 11.50 |
| 800 | 900 | 3.40 | 3.40 | 4.20 | 5.20 | 6.30 | 7.45 | 8.45 | 9.55 | 10.60 | 11.65 | 12.60 |
| 900 | 1000 | 3.45 | 3.45 | 4.35 | 5.50 | 6.75 | 7.85 | 9.10 | 10.25 | 11.45 | 12.55 | 13.80 |
| 1000 | 1100 | 3.50 | 3.50 | 4.50 | 5.80 | 7.00 | 8.35 | 9.55 | 10.75 | 12.10 | 13.25 | 14,55 |
| 1100 | 1150 | 3,60 | 3.60 | 4.80 | 6,10 | 7.45 | 8.75 | 10,05 | 11,45 | 12.75 | 14.05 | 15.40 |
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PRESENT AND PROPOSED EXPRESS
RATES ON DAIIY SETPMENTS



[^0]:    $1 /$ Decision No. 77027 dated March 31, 1970 in Application No. 51715, Decision No. 75154 dated December 27, 1968 In Application No. 50672, Decision No. 73087 dated September 19, 1967 In Application No. 49543, Decision No. 71629 dated November 29,1966 in Application No. 47847, Decision No. 70407 dated March 1, 1966 in Application No. 47847, and Decision No. 65989 dated September 10, 1963 in Application No. 44747.

