

Application Decision

Application:	X1209-08
Applicant:	Greyhound Canada Transportation Corp.
Address:	877 Greyhound Way SW, Calgary, AB, T3C 3V8
Principals:	GORMAN, Stephen FARMER, Cheryl W. GLOVER, Mary E. LALANI, Karim SHEPHARD, Brad WHITTAKER, Susan HAUGLAND, Jack ENSENBERGER, Christopher KENDRICK, Stuart J. LEACH, David SOUTHERST, Mark
Current Authorization:	Passenger Transportation Licence 70414. The special authorization of Greyhound Canada Transportation Corp. ("Greyhound Canada") respecting the inter-city bus routes that Greyhound Canada seeks to amend can be viewed in the <i>PT Board Bulletin</i> of March 15, 2006 at www.th.gov.bc.ca/ptb/bulletins.htm .
Type of Application:	Amendment of Licence <i>(Section 31 of the Passenger Transportation Act)</i>
Application "in brief":	Greyhound Canada is applying to the Passenger Transportation Board to amend Part B of its passenger transportation licence respecting 7 inter-city bus routes in British Columbia. Proposed changes are summarized below: <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Eliminate Winfield as a Route Point on Route A2(a) between Enderby and Vancouver.<ul style="list-style-type: none">• At present, the minimum service for Winfield is 2 trips daily in each direction.2. Eliminate Winfield as a Route Point on Route B1.3 between Vernon and Kelowna.<ul style="list-style-type: none">• At present, the minimum service for Winfield is 4 trips daily in each direction, and a total of 56 trips per week in either direction.3. Eliminate Peachland as a Route Point on Route B2 between Kelowna and Penticton.<ul style="list-style-type: none">• At present, the minimum service for Peachland is 2 trips daily in each direction, and a total of 35 trips per week (either direction).4. Reduce minimum frequency on Route C between Penticton and Vancouver<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Reduce westbound minimum service from 11 trips weekly to 1 trip daily (i.e. eastbound minimum service will remain as is).5. Reduce minimum frequency on Route E2(b) between Cache Creek and Vancouver<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Reduce minimum service from 2 trips daily to 1 trip daily (both directions).6. Reduce minimum route frequency on Route J between Dawson Creek and Prince George

- a) Reduce minimum service frequency along this route from a total of 28 to 24 trips weekly (both directions).
 - b) Reduce minimum service frequency for the *Mackenzie* route point from 2 trips daily to 1 trip daily.
7. Reduce frequency on Highway 16 (Route L2) between *Prince George and the Alberta Border*.
- Reduce service frequency along this route from a total of 20 to 14 trips weekly (both directions) or 1 trip daily (both directions).

Details of the changes proposed by the applicant are set out in notices published in the *PT Board Weekly Bulletin*.

The Board notes that the applicant proposal constitutes an increase in minimum service level for two route points. The increases are in line with the proposed minimum service levels for other points along the same route. On route C, the applicant proposes an increase at Hope in the total number of westbound trips (from 4 to 7 trips weekly). On route E the applicant proposes an increase at Yale in the minimum number of daily trips from 0 to 1 "flag/drop" in each direction. For this same route point, the applicant proposes to change the total weekly trips from 7 scheduled stops to 14 on a flag/drop basis. This creates an increase in frequency without the requirement to stop if there are no passengers embarking or disembarking.

Publication:

The application was published in the PT Board *Weekly Bulletin* on January 21, 2009. On February 4, 2009, the application was published again to extend the deadline for submissions. On March 4, 2009, the applicant's proposal respecting route J was republished to correct the proposed weekly service level at the Mackenzie route point.

Board Considerations:

The Board may approve an application forwarded to it by the Registrar of Passenger Transportation if the Board considers, as set out in section 28(1) of the Passenger Transportation Act, that:

- (a) there is a public need for the service the applicant proposed to provide under any special authorization.
- (b) the applicant is a fit and proper person to provide that service and is capable of providing that service, and
- (c) the application, if granted, would promote sound economic conditions in the passenger transportation business in British Columbia.

The Board may approve a special authorization if all three provisions are answered in the affirmative. The Board may refuse a licence if any one provision is answered in the negative.

Decisions:

On routes A2(a), B1.3, and B2, the Board grants the route point eliminations as proposed. On routes C, E2(b), J and L2, the reductions in minimum route frequency are approved as proposed by the applicant.

At least 30 days before implementing a schedule change, GCTC must publish a notice of the change and the effective date in newspapers in affected communities. Copies of such notices must be provided to the Registrar, Passenger Transportation Branch, prior to the issuance of an amended licence.

Background:

Greyhound Canada Transportation Corp. (GCTC) made application to the Passenger Transportation Board (the "Board") to amend its terms and conditions of licence to eliminate a route point on three different routes and to reduce the minimum frequency on four of its routes within the province of British Columbia.

With inter-city bus licences, the Board establishes route points (usually municipalities) and minimum frequency for service to each point. The Board generally refrains from setting or approving time schedules, although all inter-city bus operators must publish and maintain a scheduled service. The Board is not prescriptive in setting detailed route descriptions and specific pick up and drop off locations. Further, rates for inter-city buses are not subject to Board approval.

With respect to their application the Board required GCTC to:

- post notification of the proposed elimination of route points and Minimum Route Frequency (MRF) reductions at all route points to be affected if the application is granted,
- advertise the proposed reductions in newspapers in the communities potentially impacted and
- provide written notice to specified levels of local government.

In each of these notifications, interested parties were invited to provide comments to assist the Board in its decision making on the application.

Before proceeding to discuss individual routes, I am making a general note regarding the context in which inter-city buses are operated in the province. Many of the public comments relate to the important and necessary role that the applicant plays in providing transportation for a variety of social purposes, including medical and work-related purposes. The comments indicate that a certain segment of the population use GCTC for long and short trips throughout the province.

Greyhound Canada is a private, commercial, unsubsidized company. The applicant points out that it competes with publicly-subsidized, inter-city travel options that are provided in some communities through the Health Connections non-emergency travel services and through BC Transit.

The Board notes that neither the Health Connections travel services nor the BC Transit services are subject to the regulatory requirements set out in the Passenger Transportation Act. Board application decisions, especially with respect to public need, must be made in light of the realities of the mix of transportation providers throughout the province. In this application, these issues have been addressed for each individual route where they arise.

As general reference and background information, the Board is including some information that is presently available on websites for the Health Connections and BC Transit services. The following information is posted on the "[Health Connections](#)" [webpage](#) of the Ministry of Health Services:

Health Connections is a regional travel assistance program that offers subsidized transportation options to help defray costs for rural residents who must travel to obtain non-emergency medical care outside their home communities. Health Authorities, through funding from the Ministry of Health, have implemented Health Connections programs to meet the unique needs of selected communities in their regions.

On its website, [BC Transit](#) identifies itself as a Health Connections partner with respect to non-emergency, inter-city medical travel in [some of the communities](#) (such as those in the Fraser Canyon and Okanagan) which are relevant to this application.

Reasons:

I. *Is the applicant a fit and proper person to provide that service and is the applicant capable of providing that service?*

In dealing with an application for MRF reduction, the Board will presume that a licensee seeking a reduction is a fit and proper person to provide the service proposed unless there is compelling evidence to the contrary. Other than some quality of service references, applicant fitness was not an issue in the comments received. The Board finds in the absence of any evidence to the contrary that GCTC is fit, proper and capable of delivering the service proposed.

II. *Would the application, if granted, promote sound economic conditions in the passenger transportation business in British Columbia?*

The Board must consider the promotion of sound economic conditions in the passenger transportation business in British Columbia. This includes, but is not limited to, the financial health of the applicant seeking a reduction in MRF. This could include the overall financial health of the applicant or the financial health of specific routes.

The Board in applying section 28 (1)(c) of the Passenger Transportation Act has no jurisdiction over competing transportation interests in the public realm such as short or long-haul publicly subsidized medical travel services or those provided by B.C. Transit. As a result, it has confined its review of this application to private passenger transportation businesses in British Columbia.

GCTC has provided financial and ridership information indicating that each or most of the individual proposals are justified because they are below or substantially below its revenue per passenger mile (RPM) breakeven point for British Columbia. However, it is important to point out that for one part of a route or network this does not, on its own, justify a reduction or elimination in service and that public need must be considered in every case. The unprofitable routes that GCTC seeks to change in this application are justified and approved as the service reductions should help minimize the financial drain on the company and improve the financial viability of the company and its intercity network as a whole.

There is no evidence that granting the application will have any offsetting negative impact elsewhere in the passenger transportation business in the province. Thus, approval would promote sound economic conditions in the passenger transportation industry.

III. *Is there a public need for the service that the applicant proposes to provide under special authorization?*

Under Section 28(1)(a) the Board, in determining whether to grant in whole or in part or to refuse the application, must decide what level of service meets the public need. If the Board determines that a proposed elimination of a route point is justified or the proposed minimum route frequency will meet the public need, it may grant the application. If the Board determines that a proposed elimination of a route point is not justified or the proposed MRF will not meet the public need, then it may refuse the application or grant the application in part in a manner that meets the public need. Matters respecting public need have been considered individually for each of the seven routes that GCTC proposes to change.

Winfield (Proposed route point elimination)

Route A2(a):

City of Vancouver - Alberta Border at Highway 1

Route B1.3:

City of Kamloops - Kelowna

For both of the above two routes, the applicant proposes to eliminate the route point of Winfield which is located between Vernon and Kelowna. For Route A2(a), the MRF is two trips daily in each direction and a total of 28 trips weekly (regardless of direction). For Route B1.3, the MRF is 4 trips daily in each direction, and a

total of 56 trips weekly (regardless of direction).

The Board is considering the proposal for both routes together because, in each case, the same route point is proposed for elimination, and because most of the submissions were of relevance to both routes.

With respect to the Greyhound proposal to eliminate Winfield as a route point, the Board received 9 submissions from individuals, 3 from local governments and 1 from a person representing a local health planning society. Several issues and concerns were raised in the submissions. One was the problem for seniors and youth regarding access to the depot in Kelowna and the availability of the regional transit service only 4 times daily, the lack of availability on weekends and nights and the related limitations respecting luggage. Other comments discussed the reliance of seniors on volunteers, friends or expensive taxis to drive them to Kelowna. They also communicated the perspective of seasonal farm workers who rely on the service and of other travelers who use Greyhound services for access to other destinations in British Columbia. Several letters represented individuals or communities who would not be impacted but were seeking clarification of the service change. They outline that seniors use the somewhat limited volunteer services to get them to Kelowna to combine shopping and medical appointments and the impact on indigent orchard and farm workers who use the service during the harvest season. However, no letters were received regarding the impact of the application by any individual farm worker or anyone representing the farming industry. The Board found the submissions to be general in nature as opposed to providing details of actual use of the GCTC Winfield service.

The applicant has provided ridership data for a 12 month period ending September 30, 2008 on its southbound and northbound schedules through Winfield for both of the routes in question. Southbound, the number of passengers per day averaged 2.18 inbound and .83 outbound. Northbound, the average was 1.55 passengers inbound and 1.51 outbound.

BC Transit has established a regional transit service now operating between Winfield and Kelowna at the UBC Okanagan Campus with connections to downtown Kelowna twice each morning and twice each afternoon Monday to Friday. Although this service is unavailable on weekends and evenings the overall ridership data provided by GCTC demonstrates a weak usage for GCTC's current service in Winfield.

On balance and, as a result, the availability of public transit and private transportation options can and should provide members of the public with the necessary means to connect with GCTC's service from Kelowna. The Board, therefore, finds that the proposed elimination of Winfield as a route point on A2(a) and B1.3 is justified as the maintenance of the route point is not equitably matched with any viable level of public need.

Peachland (*Proposed route point elimination*)

Route B2:

City of Kelowna - City of Penticton

On Route B2, the applicant is required to stop in Peachland at least 2 times daily in each direction, and at least 35 trips weekly (regardless of direction). The applicant proposes to eliminate Peachland as a route point between the cities of Kelowna and Penticton.

The Board received 3 submissions from individuals and only one of these came from a resident of Peachland: the other 2 represented a resident in Penticton and another in Winfield. Two (2) submissions came from local governments.

The concerns expressed by individuals include inconvenience, the essential nature of the service for residents and visitors as a link to other communities, and the inability of some people to travel by private car. Another felt that GCTC has an obligation to provide service which reduces the use of individual vehicles, and that GCTC should look to ways to increase ridership. The 2 submissions from local government expressed concerns regarding the impact of the proposal on residents who use the service and that the goal should be to enhance public transportation options for the community, not see them reduced.

The Board finds the small number of submissions as corroborating the ridership data submitted by GCTC. GCTC has provided ridership data for a 12 month period ending September 30, 2008 on its 3 southbound and

northbound schedules through Peachland. Southbound, the number of passengers per day averaged .2 inbound and .06 outbound. Northbound, the average was .18 passengers inbound and .07 outbound. GCTC also notes that the BC Transit community bus service connects at the BC Transit Westbank Bus Exchange with Kelowna Transit service for access to downtown Kelowna.

Based on the limited submissions, low traffic count for current users, and the availability of private and public transportation options for short trips to Kelowna (and elsewhere in the Okanagan), the Board finds an insufficient level of public need for GCTC to be required to maintain inter-city bus service to Peachland.

Route C: Vancouver – Rock Creek

Affected Route Points (*MRF Reduction Proposal*)

City of Vancouver	City of Abbotsford	Eastgate
City of Coquitlam	City of Chilliwack	Town of Princeton
District of Maple Ridge	Allison Pass	Hedley
District of Mission	Manning Park	Village of Keremeos

From Penticton to Vancouver, the applicant seeks to reduce the minimum number of westbound trips from 11 each week to 7. The applicant is not seeking any change to the requirement to provide a minimum of 1 westbound trip each day.

Currently GCTC operates 1 trip per day over the Hope-Princeton Highway between Penticton and Vancouver (Schedule 3009) and an additional trip (Schedule 3017) is operated westbound on the same highway 4 days per week (Thursday to Sunday) for a total 11 westbound trips per week. As set out in Greyhound Canada's passenger transportation licence, scheduled pick ups in Osoyoos, Oliver and Okanagan Falls must enable passengers to be carried through to the City of Vancouver for scheduled drop off by 18:00 hours on the same day. GCTC has indicated that, if its application is approved, that it would eliminate Schedule 3017.

The Board received 1 submission from the local MLA who expressed concern that the applicant's request would disrupt the lives of residents living along the corridor. In particular, the MLA made reference to seniors, persons with disabilities, Aboriginal people and people with low income who need access to health services in the lower mainland.

The Board also received 4 submissions from local governments (the Towns of Osoyoos and Princeton, the District of Hope and the City Abbotsford) and 1 from the Regional District of Okanagan-Similkameen (RDOS). From these submissions, the main points can be summarized as follows:

Residents, especially seniors, students and persons with disabilities from smaller villages and towns rely and depend on same-day bus service to commute to larger municipalities in the Similkameen and South Okanagan; the proposed changes would require overnight trips.

Other transportation providers should be afforded the opportunity to provide transportation to the smaller villages, towns and rural areas.

The bus service is vital to residents in assisting them to make an environmental choice to reduce carbon emissions.

Thirteen submissions came from individuals which included residents in Princeton (1), Abbotsford (6), Osoyoos (1), Olalla near Keremeos (1), Penticton(3) and New Westminister (1). These submissions discussed reliance on the bus service to make connections with other communities in their regional district and/or Vancouver to visit family and friends, and to attend specialist medical appointments. Also received was a petition signed by residents of Hope. The petition includes 2 sentences indicating a strong objection to the reduction in services that would cut off the ability of seniors to go to Vancouver. This petition, as well as the letters and emails, generally provided few usage details or other relevant evidence.

South Okanagan

The application does not propose any changes in route frequency for points south of Penticton (Okanagan Falls, Oliver, Osoyoos). However, concerns were raised with respect to the ability of people in these communities to travel to and from Vancouver.

A submission from the 2 GCTC drivers who are part of a Vancouver route advisory committee, (the Vancouver Runs Committee) discussed a previous Board decision (780-05) that ordered GCTC to maintain "at least four trips per week will be operated in a manner that enables passengers traveling from Oliver, Osoyoos and OK Falls to arrive in Vancouver no later than 18:00 hours."

With respect to the 4 westbound trips each week (schedule 3017) which GCTC says it will eliminate if its proposed reduction is approved for this route, the drivers submitted that GCTC purposely chose the wrong days of the week to schedule the westbound service in order to depress passenger traffic. This committee suggests a schedule adjustment that could be made if schedule 3017 is eliminated on the Hope-Princeton highway. That is, they submit that GCTC should delay, by 15 minutes, the current daily departure at 14:30 from Kelowna (bound for Vancouver) in order for the run to connect with a schedule at Westbank at 15:05.

GCTC responded by stating that schedule 3017 has operated historically with low passenger loads. Its current average load for the 12 months ending September 30, 2008 is only 12.5 passengers per day and that the revenue per passenger mile (RPM) is well below its breakeven RPM in B.C. It also maintains that its bus service to South Okanagan communities such as Osoyoos, Okanagan Falls, and Oliver will not be impacted and that it will maintain 2 trips per day in each direction. The Board notes that GCTC has not applied to eliminate the requirement to provide at least four trips each week that arrive in Vancouver by 18:00. Further, GCTC categorically denies the above allegations by the "Vancouver Runs Committee" but responds that it will adjust schedules so that passengers on Schedule 1681 (that connects Rock Creek and Kelowna) who currently transfer to Schedule 3017 at Penticton for ongoing travel to Vancouver can instead transfer at Westbank to Schedule 39 (Vernon to Vancouver). GCTC states that for a passenger from Osoyoos this change, which is precisely that proposed by the "Vancouver Runs Committee" above, will reduce their travel time to Vancouver by 20 minutes. With the scheduling changes that the applicant said it would implement, the Board finds that the residents of South Okanagan communities will continue to receive a bus service that is comparable to what they have been accustomed to. The Board is not imposing terms and conditions that relate to this commitment, although it has a high expectation that GCTC will sustain its commitment over the long term. As well, at least two trips daily will be maintained by GCTC, and South Okanagan residents will not be adversely affected by the proposed MRF on this route.

Hope - Penticton

The applicant states that the B.C. Government, in an effort to reduce expenditures on health service, has centralized major diagnostic and treatment facilities for the area in Penticton and Kelowna. The Interior Health Authority entered an arrangement with B.C. Transit to operate a subsidized, non-emergency "Health Connections" transportation service for a one-way fare of \$10.00 or less between the smaller communities in the Okanagan-Similkameen, Penticton and Kelowna. Schedule information on the B.C. Transit website shows bus services available at Princeton, Hedley, Keremeos, Kaleden, Osoyoos, Oliver, Okanagan Falls and Summerland. These services operate on various weekdays in the morning and/or afternoon.

The submissions from individuals expressed concerns of a general nature, rather than details of usage of the service.

Further, the Board finds the public Health Connections bus service, operated for residents in Princeton, Hedley, Keremeos, Kaleden, Osoyoos, Oliver, Okanagan Falls and Summerland who require medical access to larger and centralized medical facilities at Penticton and Kelowna is a reasonable alternative to GCTC services.

Fraser Valley

Seven individual submissions respecting Route E2 (b) related to the elimination of the 8:35 a.m. GCTC service from Chilliwack. In other submissions, individuals note their reliance on the service to attend post secondary

education in Abbotsford, to attend work or medical appointments in Vancouver, or to make early ferry connections to Vancouver Island. One writer outlines the need for a commuter service between Hope and Vancouver. Another submission notes the limited public transportation services in the valley and the need for a transit service out of the central valley. Several feel the reduction will result in fewer buses and longer waits for westbound services, particularly for those who want to travel to Vancouver and back to Abbotsford the same day.

The applicant outlines that the municipalities of Abbotsford, Hope and Chilliwack, even with the proposed reduction on Route C, receive more service than any other area in B.C. The following chart shows the existing number of trips that are being provided and the expected impacts if this application is approved:

	Daily Trips (Present)		Daily Trips (Proposed by GCTC)	
	Eastbound	Westbound	Eastbound	Westbound
Hope	9	10	8	8
Chilliwack	17	16	16	14
Abbotsford	12	16	11	14

The Board finds that the Fraser Valley corridor is adequately serviced to meet public need by the variety of schedules that GCTC operates and also with the variety of public and private transportation options in the area. Overall, the Board finds sufficient evidence that the public need can be met when considering the above evidence at this time for Route C.

Route E2(b): Prince George – Vancouver

Affected Route Points (*MRF Reduction Proposal*)

Spences Bridge	Boston Bar	Laidlaw
Shaw Springs	Spuzzum	Bridal Falls
Village of Lytton	Yale	
North Bend	District of Hope	

Overview of Submissions

Submissions were received from local governments including the Village of Clinton, Village of Ashcroft, Village of Cache Creek, District of Lillooet, Village of Lytton, City of Abbotsford, the District of Hope as well as the Cook’s Ferry Indian Band at Spences Bridge and the Thompson-Nicola Regional District.

The Board received 25 submissions from individuals: Boston Bar (6), 108 Mile Ranch (1), Chilliwack/Abbotsford/Coquitlam (10), Cache Creek (4), unidentified areas (2) and two (2) from the GCTC drivers referenced earlier as “The Vancouver Runs Committee” under Route C above.

The Board received 3 submissions from Chambers of Commerce: the Lillooet and District Chamber of Commerce, the Lytton and District Chamber of Commerce and the Clinton and District Economic Development Society.

Six submissions were received from businesses in the Fraser Canyon.

The Board received 2 submissions from MLAs who expressed concern that the applicant’s request would disrupt the lives of residents living along the corridor. These submissions make reference to seniors, persons with disabilities, Aboriginal people and people with low income or who are unemployed, who rely on bus services for needed access to health services in Kelowna, Kamloops and the Lower Mainland.

Three (3) petitions were received by the Board; 1 described earlier as part of Route C from 26 residents in Hope and 2 others with the signatures of 664 residents of the Ashcroft/Cache Creek Senior Centre.

Clinton/108 Mile Ranch

The Village of Clinton expressed concerns about GCTC reducing its schedules in the Cariboo. A letter from an individual at 108 Mile Ranch raised concerns about GCTC’s monopoly in the area and its freight service which, the individual suggests, should be disallowed when GCTC cuts its passenger service. The Clinton and District Economic Development Society discusses the adverse effect of the reduction on service to the area and that the service is used for passengers, freight and helps reduce its carbon footprint. The Board does not regulate freight and points out that this application does not reduce service to Clinton.

Cache Creek / Ashcroft

The Villages of Cache Creek and Ashcroft expressed their opposition and concerns with the GCTC proposed reduction in service as residents make use of the 2 trips per day to get to medical appointments or for other reasons. The Village of Cache Creek suggests that better timing of service could improve passenger counts and that if the application is approved, competitive operators should be allowed to bid on a similar service between Vancouver and Prince George. It adds that the timing of the remaining service should be a topic of consultation with the affected communities. The Board observes that anyone can apply to the Passenger Transportation Board to operate an inter-city bus service, regardless of whether or not there are existing carriers on a route.

The 4 submissions from individuals in Cache Creek expressed concerns about the reliance of seniors, students and children on the GCTC service and that reduction in service will cause harmful environmental impacts and greater use of personal vehicles. Several also reference the convenience of GCTC courier and parcel service. The Board does not regulate freight.

Residents of Ashcroft currently access GCTC bus service in Cache Creek. The petition from the Ashcroft/Cache Creek Senior Centre outlines a general opposition to the reduction of the minimum route frequency on the Trans-Canada Highway from Vancouver to Cache Creek to one round trip per day. The Board accorded this petition little weight. It was not informative as it gives no indication or details of how many petitioners use the service or how often.

The applicant points out that Cache Creek will not experience a reduction in service. GCTC states that, in the event this application is approved, it would continue to accommodate passengers traveling on the existing schedule 1254 northbound to Cache Creek and points north. It would replace schedule 1254 with a new combination of existing schedules 6 and 1826 that connect at Kamloops and continue northbound to Cache Creek and Prince George. This new schedule arrangement will add 10 minutes to the total travel time between Vancouver and Prince George. GCTC also states that it will accommodate passengers who now use schedule 1255 traveling southbound from Cache Creek via a transfer to schedule 1327 in Kamloops. This new scheduling arrangement would add 1 hour and 10 minutes to the total travel time between Prince George and Vancouver. These current and planned schedules are summarized below:

	Northbound Schedules		Southbound Schedules	
	Current 1254	Planned 1826	Current 1255	Planned 1327
Vancouver	5:45 pm	6:45 pm	11:05 am	12:15 pm
Cache Creek	11:30 pm	1:05 am	5:15 am	5:15 am
Prince George	6:15 am	7:25 am	11:15 pm	11:15 pm

With the revised schedules that GCTC is prepared to make and implement, residents in Ashcroft/Cache Creek would continue to receive a comparable level of service and would not be adversely affected by the proposed reduction on this route.

Fraser Canyon

The applicant seeks to reduce existing minimum service levels from 2 to 1 trip daily in each direction. These route points may be scheduled stops, flag/drop (“fd”) services, or “on call” (“oc”) services. Currently GCTC operates 2 trips per day northbound between Vancouver and Cache Creek on schedules 1252 and 1254, and 2

trips per day southbound between Cache Creek and Vancouver on schedules 1251 and 1255. GCTC has indicated that, if its application is approved, it would eliminate Schedules 1254(northbound) and 1255(southbound). GCTC outlines in its application that these schedules, on the section of the route that runs through the Fraser Canyon from Spences Bridge to Yale, will be reduced from 2 trips to 1 trip per day in each direction. GCTC maintains that these route points, along with the communities in between (Shaw Springs, Lytton, North Bend, Boston Bar, Spuzzum) are the only communities that would experience a reduction in service. GCTC contends that it cannot maintain schedules 1254 and 1255 due to low ridership on this portion of the route. On schedules 1254 and 1255, from October 1, 2007 to September 30, 2008, GCTC states that it carried a total of 892 passengers (2.44 passengers/day) originating from these route points and a total of 433 passengers (1.19 passengers/day) arriving at these route points.

Of all the communities affected by the reduction in minimum route frequency in the Fraser Canyon, the only local government to write a submission was the Village of Lytton. This submission describes the dependency on the bus service for medical appointments or to conduct business in larger centers and return home to Lytton the same day. The Board, with respect to connections from Lytton and Spences Bridge to Kamloops, notes on the BC Transit website that "Health Connections" offers a same-day transit service for access to non-emergency medical appointments on Thursday. This service gives priority to medical appointments, although anyone can use the service when space is available. For Lytton to Kamloops, the one way fare with NHC is \$5.00, and with Greyhound Canada, a regular ticket is as low as \$32.45 plus tax. (The GCTC rates were obtained at www.greyhound.ca).

A submission from the District of Lillooet and the Lillooet and District Chamber of Commerce both report concerns that it does not have any bus services and that its residents rely on the service out of Lytton. Another submission from the Thompson-Nicola Regional District in Kamloops stresses the importance of regular bus service in the Fraser Canyon and, in the event of a reduction in bus service between Cache Creek and Vancouver, that the route be opened to competitors. The Board notes that anyone seeking to operate an inter-city bus can apply for a licence.

A submission from the Cook's Ferry Indian Band at Spences Bridge states that the applicant's proposal is a continuation of a dramatic reduction in their service since the Coquihalla Highway was established. The submission notes the need for its members to have same-day service to Kamloops to receive basic government services.

Six submissions from individuals were received, all from Boston Bar. In each one, the major issue is the need and reliance to travel back and forth on a same-day basis between Boston Bar and Hope or between Chilliwack and Abbotsford for medical/dental appointments, or for shopping without the cost of overnight accommodation or expensive return taxi fares.

Five (5) submissions were received from businesses. Hells Gate Airtram near Boston Bar and Kumsheen Rafting near Lytton are late spring and summer operations. They argue that the current service is used by visitors from the Lower Mainland to access their attractions and is the only means in the summer for students to commute to Boston Bar, Hope or Chilliwack on the same day. No details in these submissions were provided regarding the numbers of clients or visitors using the GCTC service. A submission from Kal Tire gives no indication regarding its use of the GCTC service. The Lytton Hotel (a GCTC agent) and the Log Cabin Pub in Spences Bridge express their dependence on GCTC for shipment of supplies and goods and that the proposed reduction will have negative impacts on the community and for tourists who use the service for day trips in and out of the Fraser Canyon. The Lytton and District Chamber of Commerce stated similar concerns and the impact the service reduction will have on the economic viability in the area. While freight is beyond the jurisdiction of the Passenger Transportation Board, GCTC clarifies that it will continue to pick up and deliver freight at its licensed route points in the Fraser Canyon regardless of the decision that is made on this application.

The submission from the 2 GCTC drivers who represent the "Vancouver Runs Committee," as referred to with respect to Route C above, acknowledges that ridership in the Fraser Canyon is low but that it is the only means for people to get to Hope or Chilliwack for family or medical visits. The authors instead focus on the portion of this route between Hope and Vancouver which is discussed below.

GCTC traffic count statistics for Lytton and Boston Bar demonstrate the existence of low ridership in the Fraser Canyon. According to GCTC, Lytton and Boston Bar are the most used route points in the Fraser Canyon.

For schedule 1254 (northbound), from October 1, 2007 to September 30, 2008, at Lytton, 35 passengers (0.096 passengers/day) originated and 492 passengers (1.35 passengers/day) disembarked. At Boston Bar, 26 passengers (0.07 passengers /day) originated and 282 passengers (0.77 passengers per day) disembarked. For Schedule 1255 (southbound) during the same period, the traffic count at Lytton was 166 trips originating (0.45 passengers/day) and 95 (0.26 passengers/day) disembarking. At Boston Bar, there were 76 originating (0.21 passengers per day) and 67 (0.18 passengers per day) disembarking. On the other route points in the Fraser Canyon, such as Spuzzum, Yale, Spences Bridge, Shaw Springs and North Bend, total trips per year are either minimal or zero.

Hope - East Fraser Valley

Many of the submissions received from people and organizations between the City of Abbotsford and the District of Hope also relate to Route E2(b). The major issues raised for both on this section of the route is the dependency of residents on this transportation option to access health care, education and shopping in Hope or larger centers in the Fraser Valley at Abbotsford and Chilliwack.

A two-sentence petition was received from 26 residents in Hope to indicate opposition to the proposed reduction for Route C and this route. The petition was given little weight as it offered no details as to actual service usage other than to say, in general terms, that the reduction in services would “cut off a lot of seniors to be able to go to Vancouver”.

The individual submissions pertaining to this portion of the route raise concerns related to the impact of this MRF and the elimination of the 8:35 a.m. service from Chilliwack needed for commuting westbound to work, university, etc.

A submission from the 2 GCTC drivers who are part of a Vancouver route advisory committee, (the Vancouver Runs Committee) reports that the major issue on Route E2 (b) “is what occurs from Hope into Vancouver” and the lack of transit through the eastern portion of the Fraser Valley. It states that GCTC has become “the regional transit system of the Eastern Fraser Valley” and refers to the high volume of commuters traveling through the valley early in the morning from Chilliwack to Abbotsford and points west. Because of capacity issues, they suggest that GCTC should receive a subsidy until a viable transit system is in place. The applicant, in this regard, refers to a study funded by the B.C. Government and B.C. Transit with respect to transportation and transit within the FVRD and between the FVRD and Vancouver as discussed in Route C. A study, the Mayor of Abbotsford hopes, “will address some of our more pressing transportation/transit problems and offer some potential solutions”.

Conclusion

The Board finds that the proposed reduction for Route E2 (b) will establish a minimum route frequency that meets the level of public need for inter-city bus service. It finds that the communities north of Ashcroft/Cache Creek (e.g. Clinton) will not be directly affected by this reduction in MRF. The Board also finds that Ashcroft/Cache Creek will have no reduction in the frequency of GCTC service because of GCTC's stated commitment to implement, on approval of this application, a new combination of existing schedules to accommodate both northbound and southbound travel. Although the Board is not setting terms and conditions respecting these alternate routes, it does have high expectations that the new arrangement will be maintained for the long term. There were few submissions with respect to the Fraser Canyon portion of the route and limited details respecting the use of GCTC services. Submissions from business focused on freight services which the Board has no jurisdiction over and which the applicant contends will be maintained at its current level. For residents in Lytton and Spences Bridge, same day transportation options to Kamloops are available through the Health Connections on Thursdays, particularly for access to medical care.

Based on these points and the low passenger traffic in the Fraser Canyon, the Board finds an insufficient level of public need for the GCTC bus service as currently required. With respect to Hope and the Eastern Fraser

Valley the Board finds, as noted above in Route C, that the Fraser Valley corridor is adequately serviced to meet public need by the variety of schedules that GCTC operates, and also with the variety of public and private transportation options in the area. Overall, the Board finds that the public need can be met when considering the evidence at this time for Route E2(b). The Board, however, encourages GCTC to consult with the communities impacted on this route with respect to timing of its reductions in MRF and/or the start up of new schedules in order to allow appropriate and reasonable adjustments to users of the bus service.

Route J: Dawson Creek – Prince George

Affected Route Points (*MRF Reduction Proposal*)

City of Dawson Creek	Pine Valley	McLeod Lake Lodge
Arras	Azouzetta Lake	Bear Lake
Groundbirch	Kennedy	Salmon River
District of Chetwynd	Mackenzie Junction	City of Prince George
Commotion Creek	District of Mackenzie	
Pine Creek	Windy Point	

Between Dawson Creek and Prince George, the applicant seeks to reduce the daily minimum service levels (in each direction) for all route points from 2 trips to 1 trip. The exception is Bear Lake which already has a daily minimum of 1 trip in each direction.

For most points on the route, the applicant also seeks to reduce the total weekly minimum (regardless of direction) from 28 to 24 trips. In addition to a minimum of 1 daily trip in each direction, there would be a total of 10 trips weekly in either direction.

With respect to the proposal for a reduction in the weekly minimum, there are two exceptions. For the District of Mackenzie, located about 29 kilometers off the main Highway 97 corridor, the applicant proposes a reduction in the total weekly minimum from 28 to 14 trips (which is equivalent to 1 daily trip in each direction). The other exception is Bear Lake for which a reduction is proposed from a total of 21 to 19 trips each week.

At present, some services must be provided on a scheduled stop basis, and others may be provided as a flag pickup or requested drop (“fd”) service; the applicant proposes no changes in this regard.

On route J, the applicant is proposing a service reduction that will impact Mackenzie more than any other route point. More public comments were received with respect to Mackenzie than all other route points combined. In light of these facts, and the off-highway location of Mackenzie, this decision addresses the Mackenzie route point separately from the rest of the route. The discussion starts with the proposed reductions for points along the main corridor, followed by the proposal for Mackenzie.

Route J (other than District of Mackenzie)

On the route J corridor, GCTC says it would implement the proposed reduction by eliminating the westbound schedule #207 on Sunday and Monday and the eastbound schedule #208 on Saturday and Sunday. GCTC claims that the two above schedules, #207 and 208, have operated well below its breakeven Revenue Per Mile (RPM) level for B.C. respectively for the 12 month period October 2007-September 2008.

The Board received one submission from the GCTC agent in Chetwynd who suggests the continuance of an early departure schedule in winter from Dawson Creek to Prince George so passengers can connect more easily to eastbound routes. The agent remarks that sometimes with the later departure, passengers are forced to overnight in Prince George. Apart from this there were 3 individual submissions which expressed general concerns about GCTC’s overall service quality, decreases in services by GCTC particularly those that go westbound and eastbound from Prince George and the variety of needs for GCTC’s service for those who do not drive.

GCTC notes that it will continue to operate one trip daily in each direction on Route J between Prince George and Dawson Creek and a second westbound trip Tuesday through Saturday and a second eastbound trip Monday through Friday for a total weekly minimum route frequency of 24 trips. Based on this continuance of service at a reasonable level of frequency and the few submissions, the Board finds that GCTC is maintaining a sufficient level of service to meet public demand and need.

Mackenzie

GCTC is proposing a reduction for Mackenzie that is greater than what it is proposing for Route J as a whole. Mackenzie residents would be required to travel to Mackenzie Junction (where Highways 97 and 39 intersect) to access the additional trips provided along the Highway 97 corridor.

GCTC has specified that if the reduction is approved, it would eliminate Mackenzie as a route point on schedules 207 westbound and 208 eastbound. These schedules generated total traffic counts in a 12 month period ending September 30, 2008 of 1.92 originating passengers/day and .65 destined passengers/day for schedule 207 and .82 originating passengers/day and 1.19 destined passengers/day for schedule 208.

The Board received a letter from the Mayor of Mackenzie who notes that the service reduction will likely require overnight stays in Prince George for those who have personal or medical appointments, particularly the elderly traveling southbound into Prince George. The Mayor also states that the reduction in frequency will not accommodate individuals receiving dialysis treatments where they require more than one weekly visit to Prince George. This letter also points out that, while most residents of Mackenzie have personal vehicles, some do not and therefore rely on GCTC services.

Two letters from the Northern Health Authority (NHA) representing the Regional Manager of Passenger Transportation in Prince George and an Administrator at the Hospital in Mackenzie refer to two residents in Mackenzie who travel to Prince George three times weekly for dialysis treatments. Both point out that these 2 residents, who do not drive, use the dedicated Northern Health Connections (NHC) bus service 1 day each week on Wednesday and rely on GCTC the other 2 days each week. One of the NHA letters points out that the low cost of NH Connections is of value to patients on social assistance and GCTC reductions may add further costs to assist them with accommodation, etc. The other letter notes also that dropping the 2 residents at Mackenzie Junction will require taxis to accommodate them into Mackenzie at night.

One of the individual submissions was from a resident referred to by the NH Authority above who goes to Prince George three times per week (Monday, Wednesday and Friday) for haemodialysis treatments. (The resident states he uses the GCTC service on Monday and Friday and the NH Connections service on Wednesday each week. He also states that he cannot leave his vehicle at the Mackenzie Junction as treatments leave him too weak to drive and that he cannot afford taxis to and from the Junction or accommodation in Prince George twice a week.)

Of the remaining 22 submissions from individuals, the main points can be summarized as follows:

The general detriment to Mackenzie of the proposed reduction in frequency and the inconvenience for those who use and need the bus service for medical, employment and personal reasons for travel to Prince George.

The use of GCTC services in winter months and for long distances related to safety.

GCTC should maintain at least 1 same-day return trip service each week that allows people to travel from Mackenzie early in the morning and return at a reasonable time in the evening.

The submission above from the resident on haemodialysis dialysis treatments and the reference in the NHA letters of this resident and another dialysis patient receiving similar treatments 3 days a week in Prince George indicate each resident uses the GCTC service twice a week on Mondays and Fridays (each use the NH Connections service on Wednesday). Outside of this, only 8 of the individual submissions acknowledged any use of the GCTC service at all. The majority of these described this use in broad terms. Several individual submissions indicated they believed that GCTC was abandoning all of its service at Mackenzie. In fact, GCTC is proposing a reduction in half, with additional trips being accessible at Mackenzie Junction.

GCTC, however, points out that NH Connections, in addition to its Wednesday same day service (via mini bus) does in fact provide a pick-up and drop-off service (via coach bus) from Fort St. John to Prince George via Mackenzie 4 days a week on Monday, Wednesday, Thursday and Saturday. GCTC adds that NH Connections also provide a reverse eastbound service via Mackenzie on Monday, Wednesday, Friday and Sunday each week. Although these services are not a same day service, an additional run provides a same-day return trip from Mackenzie to Prince George to Mackenzie. The service gives passengers about 6 hours in Prince George.

The Board reviewed the schedules at the [NH Connections website](#) to confirm they are current and in effect. As well, the Board confirmed the rates for trips between Mackenzie and Prince George, including, for comparison purposes, rates information at the [GCTC site](#). To travel by Greyhound, a regular, adult one-way trip is \$32.95 (non-refundable) to \$37.95 (unrestricted). For NH Connections, a one-way trip between Mackenzie and Prince George is \$10.00. According to the NH Connections website, "...the actual cost of travel is 80-90 per cent subsidized by Northern Health... There are no taxes or fees on any NH Connections fares." [NHC] While precedence is given to clients with medical needs, the Board notes that NH Connections service will accommodate anyone on a space-available basis.

The letters from the NHA refer to the connections that GCTC provides between Prince George and Mackenzie for workers, for others regarding medical specialist appointments, for 2 residents receiving dialysis care and others who do not like to drive in winter and for delivering pharmacy supplies and related shipments between hospitals. With respect to hospital shipments and businesses in Mackenzie that use and rely on GCTC for shipments of freight, it is important to note again that the Board does not regulate freight.

The Board finds the somewhat low numbers and generality of the submissions to be consistent with the low traffic count statistics that GCTC has provided for the scheduled stops it proposes to eliminate on this route point. GCTC proposes to maintain one trip daily in each direction in and out of Mackenzie, plus, at Mackenzie Junction, an additional flag or drop ("fd") service (thus adding a total of 10 trips weekly to the daily scheduled service). The Board is satisfied that the proposal for reduced service into Mackenzie is sufficient to meeting public need. The Board recognizes the challenges of coordinating the schedules of multiple bus runs on a large network. Although the Board is not stipulating any requirements respecting the scheduling of services between Mackenzie and Prince George, the Board does entreat GCTC to be cognizant and sensitive to the passenger benefits of same day schedules from Mackenzie to Prince George and return.

Route L2: Prince George – Alberta Border (at Highway 16)

Affected Route Points (MRF Reduction Proposal)

City of Prince George	Lamming Mills	Tete Jaune Cache Junction
Bowron River	Village of McBride	Mount Robson
Dome Creek	Tete Jaune Cache Junction	Alberta Border & Highway 16
Crescent Spur	Village of Valemout	

GCTC currently operates 1 daily schedule in each direction on Highway 16 between Prince George and the B.C./Alberta border (schedules 1531 and 1632). It also operates a schedule in each direction on Friday, Saturday and Sunday (schedules 1533 and 1634). GCTC proposes to reduce service frequency by 6 trips per week from a total of 20 to 14 trips weekly. In summary, it seeks to provide only 1 daily trip in each direction, and to do this by eliminating schedules 1533 and 1634.

The Board received a submission from the Village of Valemout that opposes the application based on the hardship it could pose for citizens who have limited public transportation services available in rural communities. It also received a submission from the Village of McBride who expressed a similar concern and which states students, seniors and residents who do not drive rely on the bus as their only mode of transportation, particularly those who need to get to medical appointments in the urban centers. This submission also refers to NH Connections services for people to get to their medical appointments but notes that it doesn't always fit

everyone's schedules. GCTC responds by referring to the NH Connection schedule. The Board considered the GCTC response and checked the NH Connection website to confirm a same-day scheduled return bus service that connects Valemount and McBride with Prince George every Tuesday and Kamloops every Thursday. The Board also notes that GCTC's unrestricted, one-way, unsubsidized fare to McBride and Valemount respectively is \$44.40 and \$60.15 plus tax as compared to the one way subsidized fare of \$10.00 charged by NH Connections.

The Board also received 9 submissions from individuals. Five were from residents in Prince George, one of which mistakenly believed that GCTC seeks to eliminate its daily service to only 8 trips a week (4 in each direction) and who uses the service to visit family and friends in Alberta. The other four submissions were from Prince George. These outlined a reliance on bus service for trips to work or travel within B.C., Alberta and Saskatchewan. With the exception of one resident who uses the service 5 to 8 times a year, none of the submitters indicated how often they use the GCTC service to and from Prince George to the Alberta border.

Four submissions were from residents in McBride. These expressed concerns over the remaining 12:10 a.m. departure south and the layover in Valemount in the middle of the night. The writers desire a daytime bus southbound. One reported the use of the service to attend medical appointments in Prince George and alluded to a problem that the NH Connections service doesn't always match with their appointments. Several described, in general terms, the recession that has impacted the forest industry in the area and the need people now have for a bus service to travel to work in Alberta.

The applicant responds that schedules 1533 and 1634 operate significantly below its current breakeven revenue per mile for B.C, with average daily passenger loads of 9.90 and 10.12 passengers respectively.

The Board received few submissions from individuals. The Board also confirmed, via the NH Connections [schedule for Prince George – Valemount](#), that same day service is provided to Prince George every Tuesday. This service gives passengers 5 hours and 45 minutes in Prince George. The MRF proposed for Route L1 will preserve a minimum level of service of 1 daily schedule in each direction between Prince George and the Alberta Border on Highway 16. The Board finds that this proposed minimum is sufficient to meet the current public need.

Conclusion:

In reaching its decision, the Board has reviewed all the comments received from the public and the information provided by the applicant. With respect to many of the routes and route points that were the subject of this application, the Board notes that there are subsidized transportation services available, low ridership levels and limited information was provided from individuals and local governments regarding actual usage. The Board acknowledges that there will be instances where individuals will be inconvenienced by a reduction of transportation options, and that they will be required to arrange alternative transportation. The Board must exercise careful judgment respecting minimum route frequencies where a company has shown that a service is generally underutilized and unprofitable, especially when other services are available.

Special**Authorization:****Inter-City Bus (ICB)****Terms &
Conditions:**

The following terms and conditions relate only to the routes for which a decision has been made in this decision. That is, they do not represent all the terms and conditions respecting the special authorization passenger transportation licence for Greyhound Canada Transportation Corp.

Route Number: A

Terminating Point 1: Alberta Border & Highway 1

Terminating Point 2: City of Vancouver

Authorized Route:	Route Points	Daily Minimum (each direction)	Total Weekly Minimum
	A1:		
	Alberta Border & Highway 1	n/a	n/a
	West Louise Lodge	2 fd	35 fd
	Field Junction	4 fd	56 fd
	Town of Golden	4	56
	Glacier Park East Gate	1 fd	28 fd
	Rogers Pass(Glacier Pass-Summit)	3	42
	City of Revelstoke	4	56
	District of Sicamous	4	56
	City of Salmon Arm	5	70
	A2(a):		
	City of Enderby	2	28
	City of Armstrong	2	28
	City of Vernon	2	28
	Oyama	2 fd	28 fd
	City of Kelowna	2	28
	City of Vancouver	2	28
	A2(b):		
	Sorrento	2	28
	Village of Chase	2	35
	Monte Creek	1 fd	14 fd
	City of Kamloops	4	56
	City of Merritt	3	56
	District of Hope	2	35
	Agassiz	alt	alt
	District of Mission	alt	alt
	District of Maple Ridge	alt	alt
	City of Chilliwack	4	70
	City of Abbotsford	2	35
	City or Township of Langley	1	28
	City of Surrey	alt	alt

District of Delta	alt	alt
City of Richmond	alt	alt
City of Coquitlam	1	49
City of Vancouver	4	63

Route Number: B1

Terminating Point 1: City of Kamloops

Terminating Point 2: City of Kelowna

Authorized Route:	Route Points	Daily Minimum (each direction)	Total Weekly Minimum
	B1.1:		
	City of Kamloops	3	42
	Monte Creek	1	14
	B1.2(a):		
	Monte Lake	0	7 fd
	Westwold	0	7 fd
	Falkland	2	28
	B1.2(b):		
	Village of Chase	1	14
	Sorrento	1	14
	City of Salmon Arm	1	14
	City of Enderby	1	14
	City of Armstrong	1	14
	B1.3:		
	City of Vernon	4	56
	Oyama	4 fd	56 fd
	City of Kelowna Airport	0	14 fd
	City of Kelowna	4	56

Route Number: B2

Terminating Point 1: City of Kelowna

Terminating Point 2: City of Penticton

Authorized Route:	Route Points	Daily Minimum (each direction)	Total Weekly Minimum
	City of Kelowna	4	56
	Westbank	4	56
	District of Summerland	4	56
	City of Penticton	4	56

Route Number: C

Terminating Point 1: City of Vancouver

Terminating Point 2: Rock Creek

Scheduled Service Times Requirement: On a minimum of four westbound trips weekly, scheduled pick ups in Osoyoos, Oliver and Okanagan Falls must enable passengers to be carried through to the City of Vancouver for scheduled drop off by 18:00 hours on the same day.

Route Connection Layover Time: On a minimum of four eastbound trips weekly, this route must connect in Rock Creek with eastbound trips on Route D so that the layover time for connecting passengers does not exceed 2.5 hours in Rock Creek.

Authorized Route:	Route Points	Daily Trips (each direction)	Total Weekly Trips (Westbound only)	Total Weekly Trips (Eastbound only)
	City of Vancouver	1	7	14
	City of Richmond	alt	alt	alt
	City of Surrey	alt	alt	alt
	District of Delta	alt	alt	alt
	City of Coquitlam	1	7	14
	District of Maple Ridge	1	7	7
	District of Mission	1	7	7
	Agassiz	alt	alt	alt
	City of Abbotsford	1 fd	7	7 fd
	City of Chilliwack	1	7	14
	District of Hope	1 fd	7	7
	Allison Pass	1 fd	7 fd	14 fd
	Manning Park	1	7	7
	Eastgate	1	7	7
	Town of Princeton	1	7	14
	Hedley	1	7	7
	Village of Keremeos	1	7	14
	Kaleden Junction	1 fd	7 fd	14 fd
	City of Penticton	2	14	14
	Kaleden Junction	2 fd	14 fd	14 fd
	Okanagan Falls	2	14	14
	Town of Oliver	2	14	14
	Town of Osoyoos	2	14	14
	Bridesville	1 fd	7 fd	7 fd
	Rock Creek	1	7	7

Route Number: E

Terminating Point 1: City of Prince George

Terminating Point 2: City of Vancouver

Service Limitation: No service may be operated solely between the City of Prince George and the City of Prince George Airport.

Authorized Route:	Route Points	Daily Minimum (each direction)	Total Weekly Minimum
	E1:		
	City of Prince George	3	42
	City of Prince George Airport	2	28
	Hixon	2	35
	City of Quesnel	3	42
	McLeese Lake	1 fd	14 fd
	City of Williams Lake	3	42
	Lac La Hache	2	28
	District of 100 Mile House	3	42
	70 Mile House	3	42
	Village of Clinton	3	42
	Village of Cache Creek	3	42
	E2(a):		
	Savona	1 fd	14 fd
	City of Kamloops	1	14
	City of Vancouver	1	14
	E2(b):		
	Spences Bridge	1	14
	Shaw Springs	1 fd	14 fd
	Village of Lytton	1	14
	North Bend	1 oc	14oc
	Boston Bar	1	14
	Spuzzum	1 fd	14 fd
	Yale	1 fd	14 fd
	District of Hope	1	14
	Laidlaw	1 oc	14 oc
	Bridal Falls	1 oc	14 oc
	Aggasiz	alt	alt
	District of Mission	alt	alt
	District of Maple Ridge	alt	alt
	City of Chilliwack	2	35
	City of Abbotsford	1	28
	City or Township of Langley	1	21
	City of Surrey	alt	alt

District of Delta	alt	alt
City of Richmond	alt	alt
City of Coquitlam	1	28
City of Vancouver	2	28

Route Number: J

Terminating Point 1: City of Dawson Creek

Terminating Point 2: City of Prince George

Service Exception: No service is required on statutory holidays.

Authorized Route:	Route Points	Daily Minimum (each direction)	Total Weekly Minimum
	City of Dawson Creek	1	24
	Arras	1 fd	24 fd
	Groundbirch	1 fd	24 fd
	District of Chetwynd	1	24
	Commotion Creek	1 fd	24 fd
	Pine Valley	1 fd	24 fd
	Azouzetta Lake	1 fd	24 fd
	Kennedy	1 fd	24 fd
	Mackenzie Junction	1 fd	24 fd
	District of Mackenzie	1	14
	Mackenzie Junction	1 fd	24 fd
	Windy Point	1 fd	24 fd
	McLeod Lake Lodge	1 fd	24 fd
	Bear Lake	1	19
	Salmon River	1 fd	24 fd
	City of Prince George	1	24

Route Number: L2

Terminating Point 1: City of Prince George

Terminating Point 2: Alberta Border & Highway 16

Authorized Route:	Route Points	Daily Minimum (each direction)	Total Weekly Minimum
	City of Prince George	1	14
	Bowron River	0	7 fd
	Dome Creek	1 fd	14 fd
	Crescent Spur	0	7 fd
	Lamming Mills	0	7 fd
	Village of McBride	1	14
	Tete Jaune Cache Junction	1 fd	14 fd
	Village of Valemount	1	14
	Tete Jaune Cache Junction	1 fd	14 fd
	Mount Robson	1 fd	14 fd
	Alberta Border & Highway 16	n/a	n/a

Board Panel Chair:

William H. Bell

Determination Date:

July 16, 2009