



Title: 96" or 102" Wide Bus

Post by: Gary Hatt - Publisher BCM

If you were to buy another bus, would you buy a 96" wide bus or would you buy a 102" wide bus if the price and everything else were the same, and why?

Post by: HB of CJ

Ninety six inches wide. I also, after much consideration, would like a 35 foot bus conversion and nothing longer. Very narrow roads; the first half of the old Bakersfield, CA highway going East to Lake Isabella comes to mind. Not much road width to correct instant mistakes. I think the turning radius comes into it also. My old Crown 40 footer had a very wide turning radius. Kinda like the Queen Mary or Titanic. Lots of times tight right hand turns cannot be attempted. One has to make several left hand turns instead. Takes pre-planning. The little extra inside room is not missed.

Post by: lvmci

102 wide, not only is it wider but the feeling and visual effect of those 6" is noticeable. That feeling is enhanced by a raised roof, like a 102C3.

Post by: chessie4905

I'll wait till 108" wide becomes legal. I'm sure regulators will approve it in a couple of years as trucking keeps trying to take a bigger bite out of the railroads business. Are any of the newer major coaches still available in 96"? If you run mostly divided or interstate highways, 102" is probably preferred. Same as with the taller coaches. Since so many owners are now 7' or taller, 10 foot ceilings seem to be the goal.

Post by: Lin

I once drove that road (...the first half of the old Bakersfield, CA highway going East to Lake Isabella "...)

from Lake Isabella to Bakersfield in our MC 5A. I was glad I was on the outside lane and not the lane close to the rock face. That rock face is so close to the road that I could easily see a mishap. As I remember it (correct me if I am wrong) Don Fairchild said he would not drive that road in his Country Coach and would have to take a much longer route around it.

Post by: Mike

I've had 96" and 102" and I think wider is better. The 6 inch wider dimension is profoundly noticeable, especially in the salon. In our opinion it greatly diminishes the need for slide outs. But as with all things, it's usually a matter of personal choice. YMMV.

Post by: edvanland

Wish we had a 102 wide bus. Our enclosed trailer is 102"

Post by: richard5933

Two sides to this one. I'd love to have the extra width inside the bus, especially on a bus without slides. But, I've driven 102" wide trucks and that few inches can make a huge difference trying to maneuver the vehicle through tight roads, even more so through construction zones with narrow lanes and concrete barriers. In the end it would depend on intended use - mainly on the Interstate I'd take the wider width. Back roads, urban driving, etc. I'd stick with the 96".

Post by: benherman1

I'd love to have the space inside of a 102 but with where I want to go and where it has to go (my driveway) 96 is the limit. Even with a 96 my clearance is measured in inches on my driveway. I'm going to have to trim the trees back again before I make my first attempt to drive back out.

Post by: luvrbus

The standards for highways is 12 ft. wide lanes minimum. It would need to be very old road for lanes to be less than 12 ft. wide, Gary Hatt should know 1st hand. His bus, like most all the MCI's and Eagles in the early years were 96 wide on the front and behind the driver was 102 wide, the MC-6 and the Eagle 07 were 102 wide from front to the rear but not many were made. All the newer buses are 102 wide from bumper to bumper. You are not talking but 3 inches on each side, mirrors don't count in the width. They are just something to get knocked off. I am at 118"

