

ORIGINAL

Decision No. 88776 MAY 2 1978

BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

Application of AIR CALIFORNIA )  
 for a certificate of public )  
 convenience and necessity to )  
 provide passenger air service )  
 between Fresno, on the one )  
 hand, and Orange County, )  
 Ontario, San Jose, Oakland, )  
 and South Lake Tahoe, on the )  
 other hand. )

Application No. 56566  
 (Filed June 17, 1976)

Graham and James, by David J. Marchant and  
Boris H. Lakusta, Attorneys at Law, for  
 applicant.

Brownell Merrell, Jr., Attorney at Law, for  
 Pacific Southwest Airlines, protestant.

John E. Nolan and Jack Robertson, Attorneys  
 at Law; Stephen C. Larson; Charles G.  
 Wiswell; Wilmer J. Garrett; Paul E.  
 Regalado; Donald F. Morrissey; Terrance E.  
 Cedar; and Dennis H. Marks; interested  
 parties.

Thomas F. Grant, Attorney at Law, and James R.  
Panella, for the Commission staff.

### O P I N I O N

This is an application by Air California for a certificate of public convenience and necessity authorizing it to conduct passenger air carrier operations over several routes so as to provide direct single plane service between Fresno Air Terminal (FAT), on the one hand, and Orange County Airport (SNA), Ontario International Airport (ONT), San Jose Municipal Airport (SJC), Oakland International Airport (OAK), and Lake Tahoe Airport (TVL), on the other hand. After hearing

before Administrative Law Judge Thomas Daly on July 16, 1976 on a motion to consolidate this application with proceedings in Applications Nos. 56095 (Marin Aviation, Inc.) and 54327 (Swift Aire Lines, Inc.), it was ordered that the three applications be consolidated for the limited purpose of considering the proposals relating to service between FAT and SJC. Public hearings were held in the consolidated proceeding on December 15, 16, and 17, 1976 before Administrative Law Judge Thompson at San Francisco, and continued hearing in Application No. 56566 was held February 17, 1977 with regard to Air California's other proposed routes. This application was submitted on briefs filed April 18, 1977.

As a result of the hearings in the consolidated matters, the Commission entered Decision No. 87550 dated July 6, 1977 in Application No. 54327, in which it granted Swift Aire Lines, Inc., a certificate authorizing operations between FAT and SJC. We found therein that there is a need for large plane service between FAT and SJC such as proposed by Air California but that type of service would not be an economically viable operation unless Air California included the service between SJC and FAT as a segment of a longer route as it proposes in its application. In view of the fact that the consolidated proceedings covered only service between SJC and FAT, the consideration of Air California's proposed service was deferred so as to include the record made at the hearings held on February 17, 1977.

At present there is no direct single large plane service between FAT, on the one hand, and SNA, ONT, SJC, OAK, and TVL, on the other hand. Air California presently serves all of the latter

points on certificated routes. The evidence shows that there is a need for such service; indeed, there was no evidence to the contrary.

Applicant proposes five additional routes: between FAT and SJC, between FAT and OAK nonstop and one stop via SJC, between FAT and SNA, between FAT and ONT, and between FAT and TVL. In actual operations applicant intends to combine routes in most instances to provide service over a longer route with FAT as an intermediate point. The initial basic flight schedules proposed by applicant are set forth in Appendix B.<sup>1/</sup>

We have already stated that the evidence shows a need for air transportation service by large aircraft between FAT and the other points involved. We consider now the nature of the needs and whether the service proposed by applicant would be adequate for those needs. The evidence shows that the principal motivation of the traveler between FAT and TVL is for recreation purposes, and that while a number of persons travel between FAT and SNA because of Disneyland, and between FAT and OAK because of the international charter flights out of OAK,

---

<sup>1/</sup> For the most part Air California's passenger air carrier service is designed for the convenience of the business traveler and also for the holiday traveler. The basic schedule sets forth flights which meet the needs of the business traveler and would be operated on Mondays through Thursdays except during holidays. It is the practice of applicant to schedule more flights on Friday and Sunday evenings and fewer flights on Saturdays than on Mondays through Thursdays. Holidays also result in changes in the basic schedule. An examination of any timetable of applicant will show that the flights for Mondays through Thursdays, Fridays, Saturdays, and Sundays are listed separately and that there are differences in the number of flights in the aircraft routings, departures, and arrivals among those listings. Applicant made it clear that it intends to follow the same practice in connection with operations over the proposed routes.

transportation between FAT and the points other than TVL is mainly motivated by business reasons. A travel agent with offices in Fresno testified that he has a large business of arranging travel and/or hotel reservations for persons desiring to go to Lake Tahoe. He also arranges charter transportation for groups. He said that ordinarily the parties desire to depart Fresno early in the morning and to leave Lake Tahoe around 5:00 p.m. and that he arranges for group and individual transportation accordingly. Applicant proposes a departure from FAT at 9:15 a.m. and a departure from TVL at 4:05 p.m. That service would satisfy most of the passengers desiring travel between those points and would be an adequate service between the communities.

With respect to the adequacy of applicant's proposed service as a whole, the evidence in this proceeding is entirely supportive of a statement in the testimony of the aviation consultant to the city of Fresno, which we quote:

"In my opinion to provide adequate service, a minimum adequate service for the business travelers, you must have two round trips a day between city pairs. That is so that people can go from Point A to Point B and return and/or B to A and return and conduct a day's business and return. Minimum service for recreational purposes would be one round trip a day. Those are the minimums that Air California has proposed in the schedule. Anything less than this admittedly would be better than what we presently have, but anything less than this, in my opinion, would not be adequate." (R.T. 364).

In Appendix B it may be noted that applicant's proposed schedule calls for departures and arrivals at FAT, OAK, SJC, and SNA which will permit the business traveler to depart FAT, conduct a day's business at any of the other points and return the same day, and permit a business traveler to depart one of the other points, conduct a

day's business at Fresno and return the same day. Applicant's proposed service is convenient to the business traveler and is an adequate service between the points involved.

With respect to service between FAT and ONT, applicant proposes a mid-morning departure at FAT and a mid-afternoon departure at ONT. That is something less than ideal service for the businessman; however, the demand for service between FAT and ONT is substantially less than between FAT, on the one hand, and SNA, SJC, and OAK, on the other hand; it is also somewhat less than the demand for service between FAT and TVL. Applicant proposes to provide service by adding a schedule in each direction onto its existing ONT-SJC/OAK route with service to FAT as an intermediate point. It currently operates six flights in each direction between ONT and SJC with three in each direction originating or terminating at OAK. The FAT-ONT service depicted in Appendix B provides for departures at times in between existing SJC-ONT flights which currently enjoy good load factors. The manner in which applicant proposes to operate between FAT and ONT is the only practical way it can do it. While that service is something less than ideal, it is better than no service at all.

The next consideration is whether applicant can economically provide adequate service between the points. Applicant has proposed fares which bear relationships to existing fares between other points

it serves.<sup>2/</sup> It made an analysis of the results of operations set forth in Appendix B; that is to say, it estimated the number of passengers that it would transport under those schedules between the various points and applied the proposed fares (including a 5 percent dilution for special fares and promotional fares) to obtain the gross revenue, and it estimated the costs of the operation via the routes and for the flight operations depicted in Appendix B to obtain the expenses of the operation. The revenue and expense estimates appear to be reasonable and they show that for the first year of operation under those schedules the proposed service would provide an operating ratio of 94.0 percent before income taxes. Applicant's proposed operation as a whole would be economically viable. PSA argues that applicant has not shown that the operation of each individual route it proposes is economically viable. That is true; in fact, the evidence shows that service solely between SJC and FAT, solely between FAT and TVL, and solely between ONT and FAT would not be viable. Applicant was uncertain of whether service over a route ONT-FAT-TVL would be practical. It has shown, however, that the manner in which it proposes to operate via the various routes would be practical and

---

2/ The "existing fares" are the fares which were in effect at the time of hearing. At that time applicant had an application before the Commission to increase those fares. We note that applicant's fares were increased during 1977. If the authority sought is granted, the fares which would be published by applicant for transportation over the proposed routes would have to be somewhat higher than set forth in the application and in the exhibits for the reason that a passenger air carrier is required by law to maintain fares between points it serves which are reasonable in comparison with the fares for transportation between other points that it serves. Even though the actual fares and actual expenses for future operations may be different from those considered here, the evaluation set forth above is probative on the issue of whether the operation proposed by applicant will be economically viable.

viable. PSA hints that a result where the whole does not equal the sum of its parts should be suspect. The Euclidean axiom is not applicable here. Applicant has shown that operations via the routes it will fly will be economically viable. In other words, the TVL-FAT, TVL-SNA, and FAT-SNA passengers will support the SNA-FAT-TVL route, and the ONT-FAT, ONT-OAK, ONT-SJC, FAT-OAK, FAT-SJC, SNA-FAT, and SNA-OAK will support the other routings shown in Appendix B.

Staff and PSA assert that by reason of the restrictions on the number of takeoffs allowed applicant at SNA, the service proposed by applicant could not be maintained without diminishing Air California's service between SNA and other points it serves. The contentions have their bases in the terms of a lease entered into between applicant and SNA on April 1, 1972 which provides that the average number of scheduled passenger flight operations computed on an annual basis shall not exceed 24.6 takeoffs per day. That lease expired April 1, 1977 but has been renewed on a month-to-month basis pending an environmental study and report being considered by the Board of Supervisors for Orange County. At the time of hearing, a draft environmental report had been submitted to the supervisors but had not been acted upon. We are informed that the board has not yet adopted and filed a final environmental report nor has it entered into a new lease with applicant.

SNA only includes jet aircraft (applicant's B-737's) in the takeoff limitation; takeoffs with propeller aircraft (applicant's L-188 aircraft) are not included. For the past several years, applicant has maintained jet-aircraft operations at SNA up to the prescribed limitation. By Decision No. 85594 dated March 23, 1976 in Application No. 55011 Air California was authorized to operate not exceeding two flights in any one day on the route SAN-ONT-SJC in substitution for flights on the

route SAN-SNA-SJC which partially alleviated its operational problem at SNA. Subsequent thereto applicant was granted a certificate in Decision No. 88449 dated January 31, 1978 in Application No. 55011 authorizing it to extend its operations to Monterey which involves additional operations at SNA. The evidence discloses that under present conditions, applicant will not be able to institute two round trips daily between FAT and SNA with jet aircraft without downgrading its service between SNA and other points. Air California's proposed basic operation at SNA set forth in Appendix B calls for only one round trip with jet aircraft and the other with propeller aircraft. It is doubtful that applicant could even provide only the one round trip with jet aircraft within the limitations imposed by the lease without injury to its service to SNA on other routes.

Exhibit 31 is the staff's environmental analysis of the operations proposed in the application. It states that the impact of aircraft noise upon residential population surrounding airports is potentially the most critical of all environmental factors associated with aircraft operation. It refers to the environmental impact report on air service to TVL dated December 30, 1976 which concluded that a high frequency of L-188 operations would result in only a minor contribution to the TVL noise environment and states, "Needless to say, Tahoe Valley Airport has more stringent environmental standards than the other airports of the proposed route." The conclusion in Exhibit 31 regarding the proposed operations at SNA is that they will not increase the noise contour because the airline is approaching the maximum number of operations permitted, meaning inter alia that there would not be any increase in noise because the proposed jet aircraft operations would be substituted for some existing operations. As the record in this proceeding presently stands, there is sufficient evidence



for us to find that additional L-188 operations by applicant at SNA would not have a significant effect on the environment but we cannot find that operations with jet aircraft in addition to the 24.6 average daily departures by Air California would or would not have an adverse effect on the environment at SNA. We would have preferred to have the advantage of the environmental impact report of the Board of Supervisors<sup>3/</sup> but it is not absolutely necessary. In its brief applicant asserts that if the Commission requires it, it can and will operate the FAT-SNA route with L-188 aircraft. City of Fresno asserts that service with that aircraft will be adequate and satisfactory. The evidence shows that with the use of L-188 aircraft applicant can institute and maintain additional operations at SNA without any significant effect upon the environment and without impairing its other passenger air carrier service at SNA.

PSA also contends that applicant does not have sufficient equipment to provide the proposed service. Actually, applicant admits that it will need an additional B-737 or L-188 to provide the proposed service. It had already undertaken steps to arrange for the acquisition of additional aircraft and it has the financial capability to acquire it.

A matter to be discussed is precisely what operations are to be certificated. The application speaks to service between points with routes only between the pairs of points with authority to tack any of those routes together, e.g. the route TVL-FAT, the route SJC-FAT and the route SNA-FAT operated separately or combined. It has been

---

<sup>3/</sup> It is possible that the Board of Supervisors prefers to have the advantage of having our decision in this matter before them prior to negotiations with applicant relative to a new lease.

shown that regular service between some of the points involved will be economically viable only as a segment of a longer route described in Appendix B. At the same time, however, there are occasions during weekends and holidays or because of special events when turnaround operations between pairs of points would not only be necessary and convenient to meet peak traffic requirements but would also result in more efficient operations by the carrier. In order to provide the greatest flexibility for Air California to adjust and revise its schedule to meet the public demand at Fresno and to continue to provide optimum service on its other routes, we do not propose to establish time provisions in the schedules in this certification.

Operations on Route 21 should be restricted to the use of L-188 aircraft and operations from SNA on Route 20 should be restricted to the use of L-188 aircraft.

#### Findings

1. Air California is a passenger air carrier with extensive experience in the field of air operations in the transportation of passengers as a common carrier between numerous points in California. It currently provides service to OAK, SJC, TVL, ONT, SNA, SFO (San Francisco International Airport), SMF (Sacramento Metropolitan Airport), SAN (San Diego International Airport), and PSP (Palm Springs Municipal Airport) with B-737 and L-188 aircraft.
2. By this application it seeks authority to conduct passenger air carrier operations over the following routes: FAT-TVL nonstop, FAT-SNA nonstop, FAT-SJC nonstop, FAT-ONT nonstop, and FAT-OAK nonstop, and one stop via SJC, with B-737 and L-188 aircraft.
3. Applicant has the insurance coverage and the financial stability to initiate and maintain the proposed operations.
4. The only direct single-plane service between the points proposed to be served by Air California is a service provided by Swift Aire Lines, Inc., between FAT and SJC with aircraft having capacity not exceeding 30

passengers for which authority was granted in Decision No. 87550 dated July 6, 1977 in Application No. 54327. The only intrastate passenger air carrier service provided with large aircraft at FAT is offered by PSA to SFO, SCK (Stockton Municipal Airport), and LAX (Los Angeles International Airport); by United Air Lines, Inc., to SFO and LAX; and by Hughes Airwest to SFO and SMT.

5. Passenger traffic between FAT and TVL is recreationally oriented. Greatest service demand will be for morning arrivals and evening departures at Tahoe.

6. Passenger traffic between FAT, on the one hand, and OAK, SJC, and SNA, on the other hand, is mainly business oriented. Greatest service demand will be for a morning departure and an evening return for each of the points. This allows the business traveler the opportunity to transact a day's business and return the same day.

7. There is a need by the communities involved of the passenger air carrier service described in Findings 5 and 6.

8. Applicant proposes to provide a minimum of one round trip daily, Mondays through Fridays exclusive of holidays and the day preceding and the day following a holiday, between FAT and ONT over the route ONT-FAT-SJC-OAK. It will provide a service where currently none exists.

9. The operations proposed by applicant are depicted in Appendix B and will be economically viable and are adequate to meet the minimum requirements of the communities served by FAT, TVL, SNA, SJC, and OAK.

10. The operations described in Appendix B will be directly competitive only with the operation by Swift Aire Lines, Inc., and that only between FAT and SJC. It will not have the effect of impairing the ability of any airline to continue to provide service.

11. The operation by applicant of B-737 aircraft to and from ONT, FAT, SJC, and OAK will not have any significant effect upon the environment. The operation by applicant of B-737 aircraft to and from TVL will have an adverse effect upon the environment. It cannot be ascertained from the evidence herein whether takeoffs with B-737 aircraft in excess of an average of 24.6 per day at SNA will have an effect upon the environment. The operation by applicant of L-188 air

craft between FAT and TVL and between FAT and SNA will not have any significant impact upon the environment.

12. Applicant's present operations at SNA involve a daily average of almost 24.6 takeoffs with B-737 aircraft. It has not been shown that any of such operations are no longer required by public convenience and necessity.

13. Public convenience and necessity require the operation by Air California as a passenger air carrier to provide direct single plane service between FAT, on the one hand, and SNA, ONT, SJC, OAK and TVL, on the other hand. The proposed schedule depicted in Appendix B will provide adequate service at each of these points.

14. It can be seen with certainty that the operations as proposed herein will have no significant effect on the environment, provided, however, that the applicant comply to the environment restrictions imposed at Tahoe and Santa Ana.

#### Conclusion

Based on the following findings of fact, the Commission concludes that a certificate of public convenience and necessity should be issued to Air California, to provide direct single plane service between FAT, on the one hand, and SNA, ONT, OAK, ANT, TVL, on the other hand.

Air California is placed on notice that operative rights, as such, do not constitute a class of property which may be capitalized or used as an element of value in rate fixing for any amount of money in excess of that originally paid to the State as the consideration for the grant of such rights. Aside from their purely permissive aspect, such rights extend to the holder a full or partial monopoly of a class of business. This monopoly feature may be modified or canceled at any time by the State, which is not in any respect limited as to the number of rights which may be given.

O R D E R

IT IS ORDERED that:

1. A certificate of public convenience and necessity is granted to Air California, a corporation, authorizing it to operate as a passenger air carrier, as defined in Section 2741 of the Public Utilities Code, between the points and over the routes designated, Route 19, Route 20, and Route 21, as set forth in Appendix A of this decision.

2. Appendix A of Decision No. 80439, as amended, is further amended by incorporating therein the revised pages included in Appendix A hereto, and by this reference made a part hereof.

3. 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. By accepting the certificate applicant is placed on notice that it will be required, among other things, to file annual reports of its operations and to comply with the requirements of the Commission's General Orders Nos. 120-Series and 129-Series.
- (b) Within one hundred twenty days after the effective date of this order, applicant shall establish the authorized service and file tariffs, in triplicate, in the Commission's office.
- (c) The tariff filings shall be made effective not earlier than five days after the effective date of this order on not less than five days' notice to the Commission and the public, and the effective date of the tariff filings shall be concurrent with the establishment of the authorized service.

(d) The tariff filings made pursuant to this order shall comply with the regulations governing the construction and filing of tariffs set forth in the Commission's General Order No. 105-Series.

4. In all other respects Application No. 56566 is denied.

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

Dated at San Francisco, California, this 2nd day of MAY, 1978.

*Robert Bateman*

President

*William J. Quinn*

*Vernon L. Sturgeon*

*Joseph D. Howell*

*Clare J. DeWitt*

Commissioners

SD

Appendix A  
(Dec. 80439)

AIR CALIFORNIA  
( a corporation)

Third Revised Page 1  
Cancels  
Second Revised Page 1

The authority stated herein to Air California supersedes all previously granted certificates of public convenience and necessity.

Air California is authorized to operate over the routes described as follows:

- Route 1 - Between Orange County Airport, on the one hand, and San Jose Municipal Airport, Oakland International Airport and San Francisco International Airport, on the other hand, with each of the last three named airports being either a terminal or intermediate point for this route.
- Route 2 - Between Orange County Airport and Ontario International Airport, on the one hand, and San Jose Municipal Airport and Oakland International Airport, on the other hand, with each of the first two named airports and each of the last two airports, respectively, being either a terminal or intermediate point for this route.
- Route 3 - Nonstop service between San Diego International Airport and San Jose Municipal Airport.
- Route 4 - Between San Diego International Airport, on the one hand, and San Jose Municipal Airport and Oakland International Airport, on the other hand, via the intermediate point of Orange County Airport or Ontario International Airport, with San Jose Municipal Airport and Oakland International Airport being either a terminal or intermediate point for this route; and provided that the number of flights via Ontario International Airport in each direction shall not exceed two in any one day.
- #Route 5 - Between Palm Springs Municipal Airport, on the one hand, and San Jose Municipal Airport, Oakland International Airport and San Francisco International Airport, on the other hand, with each of the last three named airports being either a terminal or intermediate point for this route. Either Orange County Airport or Ontario International Airport may be an intermediate point for this route.
- #Route 6 - (No Route 6.)
- #Route 7 - Between San Jose Municipal Airport and Sacramento Metropolitan Airport.
- #Route 8 - Between Orange County Airport and Sacramento Metropolitan Airport.

Issued by California Public Utilities Commission.

#Transferred from Page 2 by Decision No. 88776, Application No. 56566.

- Route 9 - Between Orange County Airport and Sacramento Metropolitan Airport via the intermediate point of San Jose Municipal Airport.
- Route 10 - Between San Diego International Airport and Sacramento Metropolitan Airport via the intermediate points of Orange County Airport and San Jose Municipal Airport.
- Route 11 - Between Ontario International Airport and Sacramento Metropolitan Airport via the intermediate point of San Jose Municipal Airport.
- Route 12 - Between Palm Springs Airport and Sacramento Metropolitan Airport via the intermediate point of San Jose Municipal Airport.
- #Route 13 - Between Ontario International Airport and Sacramento Metropolitan Airport via the intermediate point of Orange County Airport.
- #Route 14 - Between San Diego International Airport and Orange County Airport.
- #Route 15 - Nonstop service between San Diego International Airport and Oakland International Airport.
- #Route 16 - Between Lake Tahoe Airport, on the one hand, and Sacramento Metropolitan Airport, San Francisco International Airport, Oakland International Airport, San Jose Municipal Airport, and Orange County Airport, on the other hand, with each of the last five named airports being either a terminal or intermediate point for this route with the exception that no nonstop flights shall be operated between Sacramento Metropolitan Airport and San Francisco International Airport. Operations at Lake Tahoe Airport shall be conducted with Lockheed L-188 Electra aircraft only.
- #Route 17 - Between San Francisco International Airport and Oakland International Airport.
- #Route 18 - Between Monterey Peninsula Airport, on the one hand, and San Francisco International Airport, Sacramento Municipal Airport, Orange County Airport, Ontario International Airport and San Diego International Airport, with each of the last five named airports being either a terminal or intermediate point for this route with the exception that no nonstop flights shall be operated between Sacramento Metropolitan Airport and San Francisco International Airport.

Issued by California Public Utilities Commission.

-#Transferred from Page 3 by Decision No. 88776, Application No. 56566.



fc

Appendix A  
(Dec. 80439)

AIR CALIFORNIA  
(a corporation)

Sixth Revised Page 3  
Cancels  
Fifth Revised Page 3

#Route 19 - Between Ontario International Airport, Fresno Air Terminal,  
San Jose Municipal Airport and Oakland International Airport.

#Route 20 - Between Orange County Airport, Fresno Air Terminal and  
Oakland International Airport.

#Route 21 - Between Lake Tahoe Airport, Fresno Air Terminal and Orange  
County Airport.

Issued by California Public Utilities Commission.

#Added by Decision No. 88776, Application No. 56566.

SD

Appendix A  
(Dec. 80439)

AIR CALIFORNIA  
( a corporation)

Second Revised Page 6  
Cancels  
First Revised Page 6

\*Restrictions

I. No passenger shall be accepted for transportation solely between the following pairs of points:

- a. San Francisco International Airport/Oakland International Airport - Sacramento Municipal Airport.
- b. San Francisco International Airport - Ontario International Airport.
- c. San Diego International Airport - San Francisco International Airport.

II. The following restrictions relate to the routes indicated:

Route 17 - Operations between San Francisco International Airport and Oakland International Airport shall be conducted with multi-engine aircraft of the same type as operated on Air California's Routes 1 through 16, as described in Appendix A to Decision No. 80439, as amended.

#Route 20 - All departures on this route at Orange County Airport shall be operated with L-188 (Electra) aircraft.

#Route 21 - All operations on this route shall be conducted with L-188 (Electra) aircraft.

Issued by California Public Utilities Commission.

\*Transferred from Page 5.

#Added by Decision No. 88776, Application No. 56566.

APPENDIX B

AIR CALIFORNIA

Proposed Flight Schedule

<u>City</u>		<u>Flight 1</u>	<u>Flight 3</u>	<u>Flight 5</u>	<u>Flight 7</u>
(Southbound)					
Oakland	(Lv)	7:00 A	8:30 A		6:00 P
Lake Tahoe	(Lv)			4:05 P	
San Jose	(Ar)		8:45 A		6:15 P
San Jose	(Lv)		9:00 A		6:30 P
Fresno	(Ar)	7:30 A	9:30 A	4:45 P	
Fresno	(Lv)	7:45 A	9:45 A	5:00 P	<u>7:00 P</u>
Ontario	(Ar)		<u>10:30 A</u>		
Orange County	(Ar)	<u>8:30 A</u>		<u>5:55 P</u>	
		<u>Flight 2</u>	<u>Flight 4</u>	<u>Flight 6</u>	<u>Flight 8</u>
(Northbound)					
Orange County	(Lv)		8:05 A		7:00 P
Ontario	(Lv)			3:00 P	
Fresno	(Ar)		9:00 A	3:45 P	7:45 P
Fresno	(Lv)	7:00 A	9:15 A	4:00 P	<u>8:00 P</u>
San Jose	(Ar)	7:30 A		4:30 P	
San Jose	(Lv)	7:45 A		4:45 P	
Lake Tahoe	(Ar)		<u>9:55 A</u>		
Oakland	(Ar)	<u>8:00 A</u>		<u>5:00 P</u>	<u>8:30 P</u>