

km

Decision No. 87256

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)

In the Matter of Application of  
GREYHOUND LINES, INC., for Authority  
to Modify and Discontinue Operations  
via B, C, F, G, L, M, and Z Routes  
Between San Francisco and Palo Alto.

Application No. 57039  
(Filed January 28, 1977)

W. L. McCracken, Attorney at Law, for Greyhound  
Lines, Inc.  
David Miller, Attorney at Law, for San Mateo  
County Transit District, interested party.  
William Jennings, Attorney at Law, for the  
Commission staff.

O P I N I O N

By Application No. 56099, Greyhound Lines, Inc. (applicant) 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 justification for the request is 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

A. 56099, 57039 km

Public Utilities Code. District is empowered to provide transit service throughout the county. Following a public hearing on May 6, 1976, the matter was continued to February 7, 1977. By Decision No. 86156 dated July 27, 1976, applicant was granted interim authority to discontinue certain schedules between said points.

On January 28, 1977 applicant filed Application No. 57039 to modify and discontinue operations via B, C, F, G, L, M, and Z Routes between San Francisco and Palo Alto.

Both applications were consolidated for the purpose of public hearing, which was held before Examiner Daly at San Francisco on February 7 and 8, 1977, with the matters being submitted on the latter date.

Notice of the consolidated hearing was published in papers of general circulation and was posted in buses operating on the concerned scheduled operations ten days in advance of the hearing. A protest filed by the city of Palo Alto was withdrawn upon the commitment by applicant that it would extend certain scheduled service from its Alma Street station to the El Camino Real. No other appearance was made in protest to the granting of the applications.

The record indicates that subsequent to the initial hearing on Application No. 56099 representatives of applicant and District held numerous meetings during which a comprehensive agreement for the orderly provision of public transit service between San Mateo County and San Francisco was reached.

The agreement which provides for bus transit service, maintenance and repairs, and for the purchase and sale of transit buses was approved by District on January 26, 1977. As a result of the agreement, applicant filed Application No. 57039 requesting Commission authority to modify and discontinue certain scheduled operations between San Francisco and Palo Alto.

It is the intent and purpose of District to consolidate bus operations in San Mateo County under a single public entity and to integrate San Mateo County bus, Southern Pacific commute, BART, and other Bay Area public and private transit services into a complementary and cohesive network of service for inter-county commuters.

To achieve its goal, District established the following three priority steps:

- "1. Begin a phased assimilation of the 11 existing city-operated bus systems as rapidly as proper arrangements can be made for an orderly transition of management functions and operations. . . .
- "2. Replace Northgate Transit service in Daly City and adjoining communities with expanded routes, dependable service, and schedules and with improved equipment.
- "3. Based on Greyhound's current intention to petition the PUC for abandonment, replace Greyhound commuter service on El Camino and create a north-south trunk line which links communities from Palo Alto to Daly City. . . ."

The first two priority steps have already been accomplished. As of July 1, 1976, District had assumed full responsibility for providing transit service in the following communities previously operated by each municipality separately: Menlo Park, Redwood City, San Carlos, Belmont, Foster City, San Mateo, Burlingame, Millbrae, South San Francisco, Pacifica, and Brisbane. In addition, service has been instituted in San Bruno, East Palo Alto, and Portola Valley.

On January 1, 1977, District supplanted, pursuant to a negotiated agreement with the company and individual drivers and owners, the service previously provided in the Daly City area by Northgate Transit.

Consummation of the agreement with applicant will effect its third step in District's plan.

According to the agreement, applicant is committed to providing bus transit service on routes and pursuant to schedules specified by District between the cities of Palo Alto and San Francisco and points intermediate thereto. Service in the coastal areas between Half Moon Bay and San Francisco will be provided directly by District with its own employees.

At all times applicant is to provide transit and qualified drivers, mechanics, and necessary supervisory personnel to provide the service in a safe and efficient manner.

Initially the service will be provided on a cost per mileage basis by 50 buses now used by applicant on its peninsula commuter operations. These buses may be replaced or supplemented with additional buses to be acquired by District. Applicant is committed to a maintenance and repair program to keep all buses operating in a safe, neat, and operable condition at all times.

The agreement is for a term of three years and may be extended at District's option, for one or two additional years. Upon the termination or after a one- or two-year extension by District, District will offer positions of employment to applicant's bus drivers then providing service under the contract.

District plans an immediate overall increase in the level of service provided on both the bayside and coastside routes. On the bayside, applicant now operates 264 schedules daily on weekdays; District will operate 295. On the coastside, applicant now operates 26 schedules daily on weekdays; District will operate 70.

District proposes to increase the number of schedules serving the San Francisco International Airport and will provide residents in both the southern and northern parts of the county with service to the airport without the need of transferring.

The overall commute service to downtown San Francisco will be increased by a combination of existing direct bus service, which will be maintained at its present level, and the institution of a connecting bus service with BART in Daly City. In addition to increasing service to the airport, the frequency of service on El Camino Real will be doubled.

District proposes to replace and supplement applicant's buses with new equipment. On February 8, 1977, the Urban Mass Transportation Administration approved District's application for capital grants in the amount of eight million dollars. District proposes to purchase 74 new buses. At the present time District operates 129 buses. The fleet will be expanded to 350 buses within the next three or four years. A comparison of District's present and staff's proposed fares with those of other existing peninsular services is set forth in Exhibit 15 and is as follows:

COMPARISON OF FULL FARES - DOWNTOWN SAN FRANCISCO AND PENINSULA SERVICE  
SAN MATEO COUNTY TRANSIT DISTRICT

A-56099, 57039 dz

SMTD Zone	Miles From S.P.	City	(a)	(a)	Alt. A	Alt. B	Existing SP 40-Trip	(b)
			Present GH Cash	Present GH-20 Trip	SMTD*	SMTD*		PUC Proposed SP 40-Trip
1A	X	Downtown San Francisco	X	X	X	X	X	X
1	X	Army Street, San Francisco	X	X	X	.50	X	X
2	8	Brisbane - Bayshore	.60	.60	.45	.65	X	X
2	7-8	Daly City - Colma	.60	.60	.45	.65	X	X
2	11	South San Francisco	1.00	.81	.45	.65	.68	.84
3	14	San Bruno	1.20	.85	.55	.80	.68	.84
3	13	San Francisco Airport	1.20	.85	.55	.80	X	X
3	16	Millbrae	1.20	.85	.55	.80	.68	.84
3	19	Burlingame	1.45	.95	.55	.80	.79	.98
4	21-22	San Mateo (2)	1.65	.99	.65	.95	.79	.98
4	25	Belmont	1.80	1.09	.65	.95	.90	1.13
4	27	San Carlos	1.80	1.09	.65	.95	.90	1.13
5	28	Redwood City	1.80	1.09	.75	1.10	.90	1.13
5	31	Atherton	1.90	1.18	.75	1.10	1.01	1.27
5	32	Menlo Park	1.90	1.18	.75	1.10	1.01	1.27
5	36	Palo Alto	2.30	1.27	.75	1.10	1.01	1.27

Alternate A - SamTrans' fares for local and express bus service adopted May 1976; calls for 25¢ for first zone and 10¢ for each additional zone line crossed.

Alternate B - Would require amendment to existing ordinance; still proposes 25¢ for first zone but 15¢ for each additional zone line crossed.

(a) New rate schedule approved by PUC effective July 1, 1976.

(b) Fares proposed in PUC staff report dated September 1976; represent 25% increase.

\* Fare to downtown San Francisco.

According to District it was not possible to state with assurance what final fare structure would be adopted by its Board of Directors. District's staff intends to recommend to the Board's Finance Committee the adoption of Alternate B inter- and intra-county fares as set forth in Exhibit 15. If adopted, the one-way cash fares for all destinations south of Colma would be lower than the present Greyhound 20-trip discount fare. These one-way cash fares would be further reduced by the use of District's monthly discount pass. The proposed fares would also be subject to reduction for elderly and handicapped passengers. District's staff proposal does not contemplate any increase in District's local (single zone) fare which will continue to be 25 cents.

Although the Commission staff at the outset of the hearing raised a question as to adequacy of notice, the record subsequently established that there was sufficient public awareness of District's proposal to provide service.

Representatives of District testified that the proposed agreement with applicant was the subject of numerous public hearings throughout the county and was given extensive coverage by the media. Exhibit 18 consists of a number of newspaper articles from both San Francisco and San Mateo County newspapers covering these meetings. Several of the articles referred to a hearing to be held before the California Public Utilities Commission on February 8, 1977.

After consideration, the Commission finds that:

1. District is empowered to provide transit service throughout San Mateo County.
2. District has commenced local service within various cities within the county of San Mateo and wishes to provide an integrated local and intercity service between points from San Francisco, on the

A.56099, 57039 km

north, to Palo Alto, on the south. A major portion of this service would be operated by applicant pursuant to an agreement to be entered into between applicant and District, the terms and conditions of which would not be adverse to the public interest.

3. Applicant proposes to abandon local and commuter passenger service to, from, and between Palo Alto and San Francisco and intermediate points and between San Francisco and Half Moon Bay and intermediate points upon commencement of service by District through the use of its own vehicles and drivers, and such substituted service would not be adverse to the public interest.

4. Applicant should continue its present passenger service between San Jose and Palo Alto and intermediate points, on the one hand, and San Francisco, on the other hand.

The Commission concludes that applicant should be authorized to discontinue the scheduled service generally as set forth in Exhibits 2 and 3.

#### O R D E R

IT IS ORDERED that:

1. Greyhound Lines, Inc. is hereby authorized to execute an agreement with the San Mateo County Transit District according to the terms and conditions as set forth in Exhibit 7 in these proceedings.

2. After the effective date of the agreement with San Mateo County Transit District and after the effective date hereof and on the same day that San Mateo County Transit District commences operations, Greyhound Lines, Inc. may discontinue the service and shall issue notice to the Commission and to the public of the discontinuance as a passenger stage corporation on Routes 14.26, 14.28, UR 13.14, UR 13.15, UR 13.16, and UR 13.17 and its scheduled service

generally as set forth in Exhibits 2 and 3 in these proceedings subject to all the limitations and restrictions set forth in the certificate granted by Decision No. 55893, and in particular subject to the provisions set forth in Section 3 of Appendix A thereof.

3. For a period of ten days prior to the discontinuance of service authorized by Ordering Paragraph 2 hereof, 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 by Greyhound Lines, Inc. and the schedules of the new service provided by San Mateo County Transit District.

4. Appendix A of Decision No. 55893, as heretofore amended, is further amended by incorporating Sixth Revised Page 39, attached hereto, in revision of Fifth Revised Page 39, Eleventh Revised Page 40, attached hereto, in revision of Tenth Revised Page 40, Third Revised Page 82, attached hereto, in revision of Second Revised Page 82, Third Revised Page 97, attached hereto, in revision of Second Revised Page 97, Second Revised Page 104, attached hereto, in revision of First Revised Page 104, and Second Revised Page 104-A, attached hereto, in revision of First Revised Page 104-A.

5. Applicant shall continue its present passenger service between San Jose and Palo Alto and intermediate points, on the one hand, and San Francisco, on the other hand.

6. In providing service pursuant to the authority granted by this order, applicant shall comply with the following service regulations. Failure so to do may result in a cancellation of the authority.

- (a) Within thirty days after the effective date of this order, applicant shall file a written acceptance of the certificate granted.

A.56099, 57039 km

- (b) Within one hundred twenty days after the effective date of this order, applicant shall establish the authorized service, and file tariffs and timetables, in triplicate, in the Commission's office.
- (c) The tariff and timetable filings shall be made effective not earlier than ten days after the effective date of this order on not less than ten days' notice to the Commission and the public, and the effective date of the tariff and timetable filings shall be concurrent with the establishment of the authorized service by Greyhound Lines, Inc. and San Mateo County Transit District.
- (d) The tariff and timetable filings made pursuant to this order shall comply with the regulations governing the construction and filing of tariffs and timetables set forth in the Commission's General Orders Nos. 79-Series and 98-Series.

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

Dated at San Francisco, California, this 26<sup>th</sup> day of APRIL, 1977.

Robert Belmont  
President

William J. ...

Richard D. ...  
Commissioners

*I dissent*

Vernon L. Sturgeon  
Commissioner

km

Appendix A  
(Dec. 55893)

GREYHOUND LINES, INC.

Sixth Revised Page 39  
Cancels  
Fifth Revised Page 39

14.23 - Between Santa Cruz Junction and Santa Cruz:

From junction U.S. Highway 101 and unnumbered highway (Santa Cruz Junction), over unnumbered highway via Cupertino to Saratoga, thence over California Highway 9 to Los Gatos, thence over California Highway 17 to Santa Cruz.

No local service may be rendered between Los Gatos and Santa Cruz.

14.24 - Between Agnew Junction and Santa Clara:

From junction U.S. Highway 101 and unnumbered highway (Santa Clara-Alviso Road) (Agnew Junction), over unnumbered highway to junction California Highway 82 (Santa Clara), to be operated as an alternate route.

14.25 - Between Alviso Junction and San Jose:

From junction U.S. Highway 101 and First Street, San Jose (Alviso Junction), over First Street to San Jose.

\*14.26 - Intentionally left blank.

Issued by California Public Utilities Commission.

\*Revised by Decision No. 87256, Applications Nos. 56099 and 57039.

km

Appendix A  
(Dec. 55893)

GREYHOUND LINES, INC. Eleventh Revised Page 40  
Cancels  
Tenth Revised Page 40

- 14.27 - Intentionally left blank.
- \*14.28 - Intentionally left blank.
- 14.28-A - Between San Jose and Edgemar Junction: (Alternate Route)  
From San Jose over Interstate Highway 280 to Edgemar Junction (Daly City), to be operated as an alternate route.
- 14.29 - Between Boulder Creek and Felton:  
From Boulder Creek, over California Highway 9 to Felton.  
Service is authorized to be conducted in Special Operations only.
- 14.30 - Between Felton and Scotts Valley:  
From junction California Highway 9 and unnumbered highway (Felton), over unnumbered highway via Mt. Hermon to junction California Highway 17 (Scotts Valley).  
Service is authorized to be conducted in Special Operations only.
- 14.31 - Between Santa Cruz and Monterey:  
From Santa Cruz, over California Highway 1 to Monterey.  
Authority is granted to serve Watsonville over available access highways to California Highway 1.
- 14.32 - Between Rob Roy Junction and Watsonville via Freedom:  
From junction California Highway 1 and unnumbered highway (Rob Roy Junction), over unnumbered highway via Freedom to Watsonville.

Issued by California Public Utilities Commission.

\*Revised by Decision No. 87256, Applications No.s 56099 and 57039.

km

Appendix A  
(Dec. 55893)

GREYHOUND LINES, INC.

Third Revised Page 82  
Cancels  
Second Revised Page 82

- UR-13.10 - From junction Mission Street and Ninth Street, over Ninth Street to Bryant Street, thence over access highway to U.S. Highway 101.
- UR-13.11 - From junction Tenth Street and Bryant Street, over Tenth Street to Potrero Avenue to junction Bayshore Boulevard.
- UR-13.12 - From junction Ninth Street and Bryant Street, over Ninth Street to Brannan Street to Potrero Avenue.
- UR-13.13 - From junction Potrero Avenue and Army Street, over Army Street to junction Mission Street.
- \*UR-13.14 - Intentionally left blank.
- \*UR-13.15 - Intentionally left blank.
- \*UR-13.16 - Intentionally left blank.
- \*UR-13.17 - Intentionally left blank.
- UR-13.18 - From junction Seventh Street and Mission Street, over Seventh Street to Harrison Street to Essex Street to access highway to San Francisco-Oakland Bay Bridge.
- UR-13.19 - From junction Tenth Street and Folsom Street, over Folsom Street to Essex Street to Harrison Street to First Street to access highway to San Francisco-Oakland Bay Bridge.

Issued by California Public Utilities Commission.

\*Revised by Decision No. 87256, Applications Nos. 56099 and 57039.

km

Appendix A  
(Dec. 55893)

GREYHOUND LINES, INC.

Third Revised Page 97  
Cancels  
Second Revised Page 97

(2) The following restriction applies only to schedules which have point of origin or point of destination in San Francisco, on the one hand, and the territory of Temescal Junction-Walnut Creek, on the other hand. On such schedules, no local passengers destined to or from San Francisco shall be transported from or to points in the territory:

- (a) The intersection of Twentieth Street and Broadway (this point excluded) to Temescal Junction (this point included);
- (b) The intersection of MacArthur Boulevard and Grove Street (this point excluded) to the intersection of MacArthur Boulevard and Broadway (this point included).

\*13. General San Francisco - Palo Alto Restriction:

No local passenger service shall be rendered between San Francisco and Palo Alto and intermediate points except that special operations may be performed to Candlestick Park, Bay Meadows Racetrack and other special events if they originate outside San Mateo County and carry no passenger whose entire trip is between the City of Palo Alto and Candlestick Park or intermediate points.

Issued by California Public Utilities Commission.

\*Revised by Decision No. 87256, Applications Nos. 56099 and 57039.

km

Appendix A  
(Dec. 55893)

GREYHOUND LINES, INC. Second Revised Page 104  
Cancels  
First Revised Page 104

B - PENINSULA AREA: (Cont'd)

13. Between Belmont and Palo Alto:  
From Belmont, over California Highway 82 to Palo Alto. (9.1 miles.)
14. Between Palo Alto and San Jose.  
From Palo Alto, over California Highway 82 to San Jose (19.2 miles.)
15. Between Palo Alto and Sunnyvale Junction:  
From Palo Alto, over Alma Street and Alma Road to Mountain View, thence over Evelyn Avenue to Sunnyvale, thence over unnumbered highway to junction California Highway 82 (Sunnyvale Junction). (9.5 miles.)
16. Between Sunnyvale and Fair Oaks Avenue Junction:  
From Sunnyvale, over Evelyn Avenue to Fair Oaks Avenue, thence over Fair Oaks Avenue to junction California Highway 82 (Fair Oaks Avenue Junction). (1.7 miles.)
17. Between East Mountain View Junction and Dana Street Junction:  
From junction Evelyn Avenue and Hope Street (East Mountain View Junction), over Hope Street to California Street to Bryant Street to Dana Street to Bailey Street (Dana Street Junction). (0.8 mile.)
18. Between North Mountain View Junction and West Mountain View Junction:  
From junction Alma Road and Bailey Street (North Mountain View Junction), over Bailey Street to junction California Highway 82 (West Mountain View Junction). (0.8 mile.)
- \*19. Intentionally left blank.

Issued by California Public Utilities Commission.

\*Revised by Decision No. 87256, Applications Nos. 56099 and 57039.

km

Appendix A  
(Dec. 55893)

GREYHOUND LINES, INC. Second Revised Page 104-A  
Cancels  
First Revised Page 104-A

B - PENINSULA AREA: (Cont'd)

20. Between Redwood City and San Jose:

From Redwood City, over U.S. Highway 101 to San  
Jose. (21.5 miles.)

\*21. Intentionally left blank.

Issued by California Public Utilities Commission.

\*Revised by Decision No. 87256, Applications Nos. 56099 and 57039.