Decision No. 86156

ORIGINAL

BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

Application of GREYHOUND LINES, INC.,)
for Authority to Revise, Modify
and Abandon Specific Routes of Route)
Group 14 and Urban Route Group UR-13,)
San Francisco and San Mateo Counties and)
to Concurrently Therewith Discontinue)
Related Regular Route Operations.

Application No. 56099 (Filed December 1, 1975)

W. L. McCracken, Attorney at Law, for applicant.

Arthur Bridgett and Bruce McDonaugh, Attorneys
at Law, for San Mateo County Transit District,
protestant.

William Jennings, Attorney at Law, for the
Commission staff.

INTERIM OPINION

By the instant application, Greyhound Lines, Inc. requests authority to discontinue its passenger stage service between San Francisco, on the one hand, and the Westlake District of Daly City, Skyline Boulevard, Pacifica, and the Half Moon Bay area, on the other hand. The authority to discontinue is requested because of the formation of the San Mateo County Transit District (District) which was approved by an election held in November 1974, and which was formally constituted on January 13, 1975 pursuant to Section 103000 of the Public Utilities Code. District is empowered to provide transit service throughout the county.

A public hearing was held before Examiner Daly on May 6, 1976, and the matter was continued to July 22, 1976. During the course of hearing, applicant requested an interim order authorizing a reduction in service pending final determination of its application.

Applicant proposes to reduce its weekday service, non-commute hour, as well as its Saturday service between San Francisco and Pacifica. There would be no reduction in the Half Moon Bay, San Bruno-Skyline, or Sunday services.

Applicant presently operates 23 schedules southbound, Monday through Friday, and 11 schedules on weekends. It operates 19 schedules northbound, Monday through Friday, and 9 schedules on weekends.

Applicant proposes to discontinue 9 weekday and 4 Saturday schedules southbound and 7 weekday and 4 Saturday schedules northbound.

The following is a passenger count for the schedules to be discontinued for selected days in March 1976:

			Weekd	ays			
Schedule No. Southbound	Leave Time	3/22 Mo Lv.		7	31/76 Wed. Total	Ţ	11/76 hurs.
8871-N 8875-N 8879-N 8883-N 8885-N 8889-0 8897-0 8949-0	7:30 a.m. 9:30 a.m. 11:30 a.m. 1:30 p.m. 2:00 p.m. 3:00 p.m. 4:00 p.m. 7:00 p.m.	204704999	404705599	Lv. 222128615	4 2 3 4 6 9 13 1 6	Lv. 622117428	Total 8 2 5 3 9 15 12 8
Northbound 8924-0 8930-0 8936-N 8940-N 8944-N 8946-N 8952-N	8:20 a.m. 9:20 a.m. 1:20 a.m. 1:20 p.m. 3:30 p.m. 4:20 p.m. 6:20 p.m.	5405301	5 15 2 5 5 0 2	1410311	6692342	1231300	6 11 36 6 1

Weekends

Schedule No.	Leave		0/76 t.	3/21/76 Sun.	
Southbound	Time	Lv.	Total	Lv.	Total
8873-0 8883-N 8893-N 8903-0	8:30 a.m. 1:30 p.m. 3:30 p.m. 4:30 p.m.	0 14 0 29	0 15 0 36	2 0 9 0	3 9 0
Northbound					
8930-0 8938-N 8946-0 8856-0	9:20 a.m. 12:20 p.m. 4:20 p.m. 5:00 p.m.	6 3 3 0	31 11 7 4	2 2 0 0	14 7 4 0

If the requested interim authority is granted, the weekday and Saturday service would be as follows:

Southbound Weekdays Northbound											
Schedule No.	<u> </u>		Schedule No.		v. .	Schedule No.	• _		Schedule	• _ <u>L</u> y	٧.
8881-N 8887-0 8853-0	10:30 12:30 2:30 3:30 4:25	a.m. p.m. p.m. p.m.	8981-S 8919-0 8985-S 8855-0 8947-0 8951-N 8955-N	5:10 5:10 5:20 5:30 6:20 8:00		8872-0 8980-S 8852-0 8378-0 8884-0 8984-S	6:04 6:41 6:21 6:59 7:14	a.m. a.m. a.m. a.m.	8922-0 8854-0 8940-N 8942-N 8856-0	7:50	a.m. a.m. p.m. p.m.

Saturdays

Sout	nbound	<u>northbound</u>				
Schedule No.	Lv.	Schedule No.	Lv.			
8851-N 8875-N 8879-N 8887-0 8853-0 8855-0 8945-0	8:30 a.m. 9:30 a.m. 11:30 a.m. 2:30 p.m. 3:30 p.m. 5:30 p.m. 6:20 p.m.	8888-0 8852-0 8854-N 8942-N 8858-0	6:44 a.m. 7:05 a.m. 10:00 a.m. 2:20 p.m. 7:00 p.m.			

The average number of passengers transported on the schedules to be discontinued is 6 southbound and 5.2 northbound. The only schedule that poses a problem would be Schedule No. 8903-0, which operates southbound on Saturdays. Exhibit 7 indicates that a total of 36 passengers were transported on March 20, 1976 and a total of 27 passengers were transported on the next schedule (Schedule No. 8855-0), which departed at 5:30 p.m. Discontinuance of Schedule No. 8903-0 could result in an overload of Schedule No. 8855-0.

Six public witnesses testified, five of them use the commute service and would not be affected by an off-peak reduction in service. The sixth witness, who resides in the Palisades area of Daly City, uses the 9:30 a.m. schedule northbound and occasionally the 6:20 p.m. schedule southbound. If the interim authority is granted, applicant would continue to operate northbound at 7:50 a.m. and 10:00 a.m. There would be no change in the 6:20 p.m. southbound schedule.

District opposes the interim request to reduce service. It argues that it intends to provide an overall integrated system of transportation within the county; that on several occasions it has met with representatives of applicant in an effort to negotiate an agreement for the incorporation of all service presently provided by applicant within the county into the District's system; and that a curtailment of service at this time will force District later to assume responsibility for the service at a lower base, requiring District to build passenger bus usage up to existing levels and beyond.

In the absence of a definitive plan agreed to by the parties, the only concern of the Commission at this time is the public need for service between San Francisco and Pacifica. The record clearly demonstrates that there is very little use of applicant's service during the off-peak schedules. Applicant does not propose to

discontinue all off-peak schedules, but does propose to operate such service every two hours rather than every hour. The proposed reductions will have little effect upon the public and should have little, if any, effect upon the proposed negotiations between applicant and the District.

After consideration the Commission finds that:

- 1. Applicant is presently providing a passenger stage service between San Francisco, San Bruno, Skyline, Half Moon Bay, and intermediate points.
- 2. Applicant is in the process of negotiating with the newly instituted San Mateo County Transit District for the taking over of applicant's passenger stage operation within the county of San Mateo by its District. To date a definitive plan has neither been formulated nor agreed upon. Pending execution of an agreement between the parties, applicant requests interim authority to discontinue certain off-peak weekday and Saturday schedules between San Francisco and Pacifica.
- 3. The southbound schedules to be discontinued average 6 passengers and the northbound schedules average 5.2 passengers.
- 4. With the exception of Saturday Schedule No. 8903-0, public convenience and necessity no longer require operations of the schedules for which applicant seeks interim authority to discontinue.
- 5. Discontinuance of Schedule No. 8903-0 could result in an overload of Schedule No. 8855-0, and, therefore, the request to discontinue Schedule No. 8903-0 should be denied.

The interim request should be granted to the extent hereinafter set forth.

INTERIM ORDER

IT IS ORDERED that:

- 1. On not less than ten days' notice to the Commission and to the public, Greyhound Lines, Inc. may amend its timetables presently on file with this Commission to reduce service on an interim basis as proposed at the hearing pending final determination of its request, except for Schedule No. 8903-0, between San Francisco and Pacifica.
- 2. For a period of ten days prior to reduction of such service, applicant shall post notice at its terminals and on its equipment and on two occasions within said time shall provide written notice to each passenger boarding the schedules to be discontinued.

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

		Dated	at	San Francisco	California,	this	27/2
day	of		JULY	, 1976.	·		

William Lymown Jr.

Commissioners

Commissioner Leonard Ross, being necessarily absent, did not participate in the disposition of this proceeding.

Commissioner Robert Batinovich, being necessarily absent, did not participate in the disposition of this proceeding.