

Decision No. 31309

BEFORE THE RAILROAD COMMISSION OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

In the Matter of the Establishment of maximum or minimum, or maximum and minimum rates, rules and regulations of all Radial Highway Common Carriers and Highway Contract Carriers operating motor vehicles over the public highways of the State of California, pursuant to Chapter 223, Statutes of 1935, for the transportation for compensation or hire of any and all commodities and accessorial services incident to such transportation.

Case No. 4068

In the Matter of the Investigation and Establishment of rates, charges, classifications, rules, regulations, contracts and practices, or any thereof, of Common Carriers of property.

Case No. 4145

Additional Appearances

Charles L. Dickman, for Stockton Draymen's Association
Ted Luedtke, for Pacific Coastwise Conference
R. E. Wedekind, for Southern Pacific-Golden Gate Ferries, Ltd.
E. Frasher, for Valley Motor Lines, Valley Express, and
E. Frasher Truck Lines
Geo. Harm, for Geo. Harm Truck Lines
Harry A. Encell, for General Truck Company; P. L. Musser
L. R. McNamara and E. V. Macon, for The Texas Company
A. E. Patton, for Richfield Oil Corporation
C. E. Ziegler, for General Petroleum Corporation of California
R. T. Potts, for Shell Oil Company
Sanborn, Roehl & MacLeod by Clair MacLeod, for Belyea Truck Co.
J. L. Stewart, for Armour & Company
P. R. Patten, for Coggeshall Launch Company
Sande Quattrin, for Wholesale Liquor Dealers' Association and
Distilled Spirits Rectifiers' Association
Willis Kleinenbroich, for Modesto Riverbank Oakdale Stage Line
Gwyn H. Baker, for United Boat Lines, Nickols Transportation
Co., and Rio Vista Lighterage Company, Inc.
Thos. O'Hara, for W. H. Riske
F. A. Sommers, for San Francisco Grain Exchange
L. C. Faus, for American Carriers
C. J. Riedy, for California Packing Corporation
A. H. Valentine, for Interstate Bakeries Corporation, Ltd.
J. J. Novitch, for Pomona Pump Company
F. A. Wedemeyer, for McKesson-Robbins, Inc.
R. J. Jones, for General Foods Corporation
Jackson W. Kendall, for Hollywood Storage Company
Arlo D. Poe, for Lumber Eaulers' Association of Southern
California

Herman A. Smith, lumber broker
 Max A. Vener, for Vener Truck Lines
 L. Saits, for Saits Trucking Company
 E. H. Ford, for Los Angeles Pool Car Distributing Company
 Owen S. Dalton, for Dalton Lumber Company
 J. E. Nosler, for Nosler Trucking Company
 O. H. Sweet, for Sweet Trucking Company
 John O. Moran, for Berkeley Transportation Company, and
 Richmond Navigation and Improvement Company
 Gunther Carlberg, for National Wooden Box Association
 Gus A. Dreier, for Lumber Haulers' Association of Southern
 California
 Marvin Handler, for Truck Owners' Association of California
 Albert L. Black, for Monolith Portland Cement Company
 Edwin G. Wilcox, for Cannery League of California, and
 Dried Fruit Association of California
 H. A. Gillis, for Western Pine Association
 L. M. Fites, for S & W Fine Foods Company

The foregoing appearances are those entered in the
 above entitled proceedings in addition to those
 referred to in Decisions Nos. 30404, 30410, 30738,
 30746, 30788 and 30961.

BY THE COMMISSION:

THIRD SUPPLEMENTAL OPINION

Case No. 4088, Part "K"
 - Case No. 4145

EIGHTH SUPPLEMENTAL OPINION

- Case No. 4088, Part "M"
 Case No. 4145, Part "B"

SIXTEENTH SUPPLEMENTAL OPINION

- Case No. 4088, Parts "U"- "V"
 Case No. 4145, Parts "F"- "G"

Following extensive public hearings in the above entitled
 proceedings, the Commission established minimum rates, rules and
 regulations for the transportation of property within a substantial
 portion of this state. Thereafter, in response to petitions filed
 by various interested parties, further hearings were had at San Francisco
 and Los Angeles before Examiner Mulgrew for the purpose of determining
 what, if any, modifications should be made in the established rates
 or in the accompanying rules and regulations. ¹ The instant deci-
 sion is based on the evidence adduced at the further hearings.

¹
 During these hearings, had on June 28, July 7, 20 and 21, evidence
 was also taken in Case No. 4246 in re, Establishment ** of rates **
 for the transportation for compensation or hire of any and all com-
 modities. An Examiners' Proposed Report has issued in that proceed-
 ing, but the matters involved, with certain exceptions, have not yet
 been disposed of by the Commission. For this reason no supplemental
 order will issue in Case No. 4246 at this time.

Petitions for Modification, Interpretation and
Clarification of the Liberalized Packing Rule

Several of the outstanding rate orders in these and other proceedings contain rules which provide, in effect, that articles shall be classified according to the ratings shown in the Western Classification or Pacific Freight Tariff Bureau Exception Sheet, but shall not be subject to the packing requirements thereof. In addition, the rules uniformly state as follows:

"If two or more ratings are provided for an article in the form in which it is shipped (e.g., set up or knocked down, nested or not nested, compressed or not compressed, folded flat or not folded flat) subject to different packing requirements, the lowest of such ratings will apply." 2

Certificated Highway carriers, Inc., The Atchison, Topeka and Santa Fe Railway Company, Northwestern Pacific Railroad Company, Southern Pacific Company, and The Western Pacific Railroad Company sought an order substituting Western Classification and Exception Sheet packing requirements for the liberalized requirements contained in the rules mentioned. In addition, they asked that the provision above quoted be interpreted and clarified.

A witness for Certificated Highway Carriers, Inc., testified that Western Classification and Exception Sheet packing requirements are the result of extensive studies and long experience in classification problems. He asserted that such ratings and packing requirements

2

The provisions referred to were first set forth in Decision No. 29480 of January 25, 1937, in Case No. 4088, Part "M", and Case No. 4145, Part "B", establishing rates for transportation of general merchandise, in quantities of 15,000 pounds and less, within defined territory in southern California. They were subsequently adopted in Decision No. 30021 of August 9, 1937, in Case No. 4088, Part "K", Case No. 4135 and Case No. 4139, involving transportation in the San Diego drayage area; in Decision No. 30370 of November 29, 1937, in Case No. 4088, Parts "U" and "V", and Case No. 4145, Parts "F" and "G", covering rates for the transportation of general merchandise, in quantities of 20,000 pounds and less within central and northern California and between Part "M" territory on the one hand and central California territory on the other hand; and in Decision No. 30785 of April 11, 1938, in Case No. 4121, establishing rates for transportation in the Los Angeles drayage area.

should be observed strictly; that the disregarding thereof resulted in unreasonably low and discriminatory ratings;³ and that such low ratings if employed should be compensated for by an increase in the rate level.

This witness also contended that the provision for the use of different ratings dependent upon the form in which an article was shipped was ambiguous. He claimed that the reasonable interpretation was that the "form" referred to was the form of the property itself, together with the container (outer as well as inner) in which it was tendered for shipment. He stated that this interpretation was supported by the dictionary definition of the word "form"⁴ and by the fact that the examples cited in the rule related to density rather than to color, texture or substance.

A witness for the rail petitioners also advocated strict observance of Western Classification and Exception Sheet packing requirements. He insisted that uniformity between intrastate and interstate rates was desirable and asserted that carriers with which the rails interchanged interstate traffic were reluctant to adopt what he termed an innovation confined to this state.

The interpretation placed upon the controversial provision by the rails' witness was that the form of the article, as therein

3

The witness presented a study contrasting ratings applicable under a strict observance of Western Classification packing requirements with ratings which would result from a classification of the property without regard to the manner in which it is packed. This study indicates that ratings on the latter basis are frequently several classes lower than those applicable under the Western Classification basis; and that they are often lower than ratings on other articles which are otherwise classed the same or lower but which, due to differences in packing requirements, are not affected to the same degree by the differences in the bases used.

4

Webster's dictionary defines the word "form" as meaning "the shape and structure of anything as distinguished from the material of which it is composed; particular disposition or arrangement of matter, giving it individuality or distinctive character; the aspect under which it appears as distinguished from substance or color."

used, was the form of the property in the inner container (if any) in which it was tendered for shipment, without regard to the type of outer container used. In support of this interpretation he asserted that inner containers were ordinarily used to serve some trade convenience rather than to satisfy the carriers' packing requirements and that hence the property in its inner container should be viewed as constituting a complete "article." He also claimed that such an interpretation was consistent with the examples set forth in the rule, asserting that if the setting up or knocking down of a given piece or kind of property changed "the form in which it is shipped," it followed that the use of different types of inner containers likewise changed such form.

Representatives of shippers and shippers' organizations vigorously opposed the abolition of liberalized packing provisions, as sought by the carriers. They contended that the establishment of minimum rates in these proceedings has resulted in substantial increases in transportation charges despite the adoption of such provisions. They argued that while the Western Classification and Exception Sheet ratings and packing requirements may be proper for rail transportation they are not necessarily so for truck transportation. The shippers stated, moreover, that the packing requirements observed by truck carriers prior to the establishment of minimum rates were much more liberal than those specified in connection with Western Classification ratings. They claimed that the rule was not therefore an innovation, but that, on the contrary, it was consistent with past practices of contract and proprietary carriers.

Insofar as interpretation was concerned, the shippers and their representatives took the position that the form of the article was influenced only by the inherent nature of the property itself,

without regard to its inner or outer container. This was the interpretation placed upon the rule by the Commission in its recent decision dealing with rates for the transportation of drugs and related articles.⁵

It is evident from the several decisions in which the liberalized packing provisions were employed that the intent was to permit both truck and rail carriers to require only such packing as appeared essential to the safe carriage of the property, thus relieving, in a measure, the competitive disadvantage attending for-hire transportation by reason of the ability of a shipper operating his own equipment to transport property with a minimum of packing. It was considered that the certificated carriers had maintained rather stringent packing requirements during the period prior to the establishment of minimum rates for truck carriers and should be able to do so in the future, except to the extent that relaxed provisions might be found necessary to meet proprietary competition. Accordingly, the liberalized packing provisions were made minimum in application, and neither rail nor truck carriers were precluded from maintaining more stringent requirements if they were reasonable and if they deemed their maintenance feasible.

Nothing appears on this record to indicate that previous conclusions, that Western Classification and Exception Sheet packing re-

5

In Decision No. 30961 of June 13, 1938, in Part "X" of Case No. 4088 and Part "J" of Case No. 4145, the Commission said: . .

"It was apparently assumed throughout the hearings that the rating established by this Commission for drugs was first class. As a matter of fact, however, all of the minimum rate orders to which the drug interests objected specify that when two or more ratings are provided in the Western Classification or Exception Sheet for an article in the form in which it is shipped, subject to different packing requirements, the lowest of such ratings will apply, without regard to the type of container actually used. Drugs and medicines not otherwise classified, as well as many drug items which are named specifically in the Western Classification, are rated at second class or lower in some forms of shipment. Under the provision mentioned the lowest rating provided for such form of shipment would be applicable regardless of the type of package actually used."

quirements were not necessarily appropriate for truck transportation and would prejudice for-hire carriers in competing with proprietary operations, were erroneous. Moreover, the fact that the liberalized packing provisions would result in lower ratings than would otherwise be applicable was expressly recognized in the several opinions in which their use was authorized;⁶ hence the claim that a compensatory rate increase would be required is not justified. The proposed elimination of liberalized packing provisions will not be adopted.

It appears manifest that the wording employed in the rules involved is consistent with the evident intent that packing requirements of any kind whatsoever are to be disregarded for rating purposes. As before pointed out, the controversial provision is employed in conjunction with a statement that articles will not be subject to the packing requirements of the Western Classification or Exception Sheet. Packing requirements are therefore not to be considered in determining the applicable rating. That inner containers, as well as outer containers, are "packing" and when specified in connection with classification ratings are "packing requirements," is evident when it is noted that the packing of property in the type of inner container specified in connection with the rating therefor is a prerequisite to the application of that particular rating and penalties are sometimes provided when another form of inner container is used. Consequently, neither outer containers nor inner containers are to be considered in applying minimum rates on any given article of merchandise under the rules here in issue. It follows that the phrase "form in which it (the article)

6

In Decision No. 29480, supra, the Commission said:

"Moreover the rates and rules contained in Appendix "A" hereof will have the effect of reducing materially certain classification ratings and of liberalizing packing requirements, and these factors will, at least in a large measure, compensate for many of the rates (commodity rates) that have been eliminated."

Decision No. 30370, supra, contains somewhat similar language.

is shipped" must relate, not to the form of packing, but to the shape and structure of the property itself.

This interpretation is further supported by the fact that the Western Classification and Exception Sheet name different ratings for property of a given kind in different "forms," such as liquid, solid or paste, set up, knocked down, nested or not nested. The use of the phrase "form in which it (the article) is shipped" serves an essential purpose as a limitation prohibiting the application of a rating on property in one "form," on the same kind of property in other forms possessing entirely different transportation characteristics.

In view of the foregoing, the wording used to express the meaning and intent of the assailed rule appears to be unambiguous; however, it will be revised in the hope of eliminating all controversy in this regard for the future.

Petition for Grouping of Los Angeles Harbor Points

The rates now provided in Decision No. 29480, supra, for transportation within southern California, are set forth in the form of a mileage scale. Equated distances between the more important points are shown specifically and distances between unnamed points are determinable by adding to the named distances the actual or equated mileages established by Decision No. 29253 in Part "N" of Case No. 4088. Thus, under the existing basis, rates on shipments originating at or destined to Wilmington, San Pedro, East San Pedro and Long Beach vary according to the locations of the precise points between which each movement is made. Southern Pacific Company, Pacific Motor Transport Company, Pacific Motor Trucking Company, Union Pacific Railroad Company, The Atchison, Topeka and Santa Fe Railway Company and Pacific Electric Railway Company sought a revision of this basis by the grouping of the communities mentioned and allowing rates based upon the equated mileage from and to Wilmington to apply from and to all points within the group.

In support of the foregoing proposal petitioners' witness asserted that Wilmington, San Pedro, East San Pedro and Long Beach were integral parts of, and collectively constituted, the district ordinarily referred to as Los Angeles Harbor. He stated that all points within that district had long enjoyed uniform rates prior to the issuance of Decision No. 29480, supra, and that transportation conditions were such as to justify a similar grouping for the future. This witness testified, moreover, that the dock facilities at Wilmington were among the most important in the district from a tonnage standpoint and that by reason of its geographical location the equated mileages from and to Wilmington were generally lower than those from and to the other harbor points. He claimed that these circumstances influenced the recommendation that Wilmington be adopted as the mileage basing point for the group.

The Motor Truck Association of Southern California sought a similar grouping of Los Angeles Harbor points, but suggested that the grouping be made applicable only for the purpose of computing rates in connection with water-borne traffic. The Association also urged that, in the event the equated mileage between the Los Angeles Harbor group and Los Angeles be fixed at less than 20 miles, Los Angeles be divided into two zones and rates in the 20-30 mile bracket of Decision No. 29480, supra, be made applicable from and to the more distant zone. The witness for this petitioner reaffirmed the testimony of the witness previously referred to, as to the rate parity formerly enjoyed within the area involved. However, he asserted that water-borne traffic differed from local traffic in that the assignment of vessel berths by the harbor authorities was subject to change on short notice; that the precise dock at which property would be interchanged between the vessel and land carrier was beyond the control of both shippers and carriers; and that, therefore, charges could not be determined definitely in advance of shipment when the rates varied

according to the dock at which interchange is made. The witness pointed out that these conditions did not attend land transportation. He did not make a recommendation as to what basing point should be used in computing distances from and to the proposed group; however, he did state that water-borne traffic centered at Wilmington.

The Los Angeles Chamber of Commerce and various interested shippers endorsed the proposed grouping of Los Angeles Harbor points as sought by the rail carriers but strenuously opposed the zoning of Los Angeles for the purpose of computing rates on harbor traffic. They claimed that shippers located in the higher rated zone would be unduly prejudiced and that the 20-30 mile bracket rates of Decision No. 29480, supra, would be excessive for the transportation involved.

The record is convincing that although divided by political boundaries the Los Angeles Harbor area is composed of a number of vessel berths and dock facilities which are used by different shippers and vessel carriers competitive with each other and which are, of necessity, used interchangeably by the same shippers and carriers. Conditions encountered in transportation from and to the various dock facilities appear to be similar and, prior to the issuance of Decision No. 29480, supra, the district had long been treated as a unit for rate making purposes. Under these circumstances, the proposed grouping of Los Angeles Harbor points as to traffic moving through dock facilities finds ample support in the record.

While there appears to be some merit in the contention of the Motor Truck Association that water-borne traffic is inherently different from local traffic, practical difficulties seem to make the limiting of the application of the grouping to the former type of traffic inadvisable. Among the obstacles is that of tariff publication. Perhaps the foremost difficulty, however, is that of de-

fining "water-borne" traffic. Presumably, petitioner had in mind traffic which moves by vessel over the high seas for some portion of its transit. In a great many instances, however, the question of whether a shipment is a part of a continuous through movement or whether it is local in nature can be determined only after full consideration is given to the shipper's intention, the shipping documents, the ownership of the property and to all other matters surrounding the transportation. These are not matters which can be set forth by rule. Under these circumstances the proposed distinction as to rates for water-borne and local traffic will not be made.

The grouping herein established will cause the Los Angeles Harbor-Los Angeles rates to fall within the 10-20 mile bracket. However, aside from so asserting, The Motor Truck Association introduced no testimony or evidence which would indicate that the rezoning of Los Angeles for the purpose of computing rates from and to Los Angeles Harbor is necessary or desirable or that the rates proposed to the higher rated zone would be reasonable and nondiscriminatory. The proposed zoning of Los Angeles will not be adopted.

Petitioners have not requested that the proposed grouping of Los Angeles Harbor be made applicable in connection with rates provided in Decision No. 30370, supra; however, the conditions shown in justification of the grouping are not local in nature and no reason appears why a similar provision for grouping should not be included in the latter decision.

Petition of Willis M. Kleinenbroich for Modification
of Decision No. 30370, supra.

Willis M. Kleinenbroich, doing business as Modesto Riverbank Oakdale Stage Line (a common carrier engaged in the operation of a passenger stage service between Modesto and Oakdale via Riverbank and an auxiliary express service), sought a modification of Decision No. 30370, supra, as amended, to permit him to establish a rate of $\frac{1}{2}$ cent per pound, minimum 25 cents per shipment, for transportation of express shipments weighing 100 pounds or less, between the points which he serves. Petitioner claimed that he was faced with keen competition from the United States parcel post service and from proprietary truck operations and that the loss of a substantial share of his express business would result unless the relief prayed for was granted. He testified that the rate basis sought had proved compensatory in the past and should continue to be so in the future. No one opposed the granting of the petition.

It appears that petitioner's operations, insofar as shipments of 100 pounds or less are concerned, are essentially different from those for which the minimum rates involved were designed, that they are not seriously competitive with other for-hire carriers and that they are similar to those as to which exemptions have heretofore been made. The petition will be granted.

Petition of A. W. Way for Modification of Split Delivery
Charge in Decision No. 30370, supra.

A. W. Way, a common carrier engaged in transporting fresh meats and packing house products in refrigerated trucks from San Francisco to Eureka and certain intermediate points, sought a reduction of the split delivery charge provided in Decision No. 30370, supra, from 85 cents to 25 cents per delivery in excess of one.

According to petitioner, the shipments of meat and meat products which he carries require the making of numerous split deliveries, the weight of each component part delivered being seldom in excess of 200 pounds. He asserted that the service rendered was of a specialized nature and hence not competitive with other for-hire carriers. He presented a study of cost and revenues indicating that, based on past experience, the proposed modification would permit a compensatory operation. In addition, Way asserted that his two principal shippers would abandon distribution of their products by means of his service in favor of proprietary operations unless the sought basis of charges was authorized.

The traffic here in issue appears to be substantially similar to the "scheduled peddler services" of certain contract carriers who have heretofore been authorized under Section 11 of the Highway Carriers' Act to observe a split delivery charge of one cent per 100 pounds, minimum charge 25 cents per delivery, in lieu of the 85-cent charge established by Decision No. 30370, ⁷supra, for each delivery in excess of one. It appears that authority similar to that granted said contract carriers will not be substantially different from that sought here; that it will provide a reasonable basis of rates for the service involved; and that it will tend to forestall a diversion of the traffic to proprietary operations. The order herein will grant such authority.

Petitions for Modification of Decision No. 30370,
supra, as to Dock-to-Dock Transportation by Vessel

Coggeshall Launch Company, Bay Cities Transportation Company, Berkeley Transportation Company and Richmond Navigation and

⁷

See Decision No. 30593 of February 7, 1938, in Applications Nos. 21663, 21701 and 21708, involving operations of George A. Leal, C. B. McLain and E. L. Richardson, respectively.

Improvement Company filed petitions seeking modification of Decision No. 30370, as amended, in Case No. 4088, Part "U" and Case No. 4145, Part "F", as it affects dock-to-dock transportation by vessel between points on the inland waters. However, the taking of evidence with respect to the petitions of the last three carriers has not been concluded, and, as the matters involved in the four petitions are similar, consideration thereof will be deferred until the taking of evidence has been completed as to all.

Upon consideration of all the facts of record, the Commission is of the opinion and finds that modifications of outstanding orders in these proceedings have been justified only to the extent indicated by this opinion, and that in all other respects the petitions considered should be denied.

O R D E R

Further public hearings having been held in the above entitled proceedings, and based upon the evidence received at the hearings and upon the conclusions and findings set forth in the preceding opinion,

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that Decision No. 29480 of January 25, 1937, as amended, in Case No. 4088, Part "M", and Case No. 4145, Part "B"; Decision No. 30021 of August 9, 1937 in Case No. 4088, Part "K", Case No. 4135 and Case No. 4139; and Decision No. 30370 of November 29, 1937, as amended, in Case No. 4088, Parts "U" and "V", and Case No. 4145, Parts "F" and "G", be and they are hereby further amended to the extent shown in Appendix "A" attached hereto and by this reference made a part hereof.

IT IS HEREBY FURTHER ORDERED that A. W. Way be and he is hereby authorized to depart from the requirements of Decision No. 30370, as amended, in Case No. 4145, Part "F", to

the extent necessary to permit the publication of a split-delivery charge computed on the basis of 1 cent per 100 pounds for the weight of the composite shipment but in no case less than 25 cents per delivery for application in connection with transportation of meat and meat products, edible, except canned goods, as described in and between the points named in his Local Freight Tariff No. 2, C.R.C. No. 2.

IT IS HEREBY FURTHER ORDERED that all common carriers as described in the Public Utilities Act maintaining lower rates, rules and regulations be and they are hereby ordered and directed to establish on or before fifteen (15) days from the effective date of this order, on not less than five (5) days' notice to the Commission and to the public, rates, rules and regulations no lower in volume or effect than those heretofore established by Decisions Nos. 29480, 30021 and 30370, as amended, in the above entitled proceedings and as further amended by the order herein.

IT IS HEREBY FURTHER ORDERED that all common carriers as defined in the Public Utilities Act and all radial highway common carriers and highway contract carriers as defined in the Highway Carriers' Act, be and they are hereby ordered to cease and desist on or before fifteen (15) days from the effective date of this order and thereafter abstain from charging, collecting or observing rates, rules or regulations lower in volume or effect than those established in the decisions referred to in the preceding ordering paragraph hereof as amended.

IT IS HEREBY FURTHER ORDERED that in all other respects the petitions referred to and considered in the preceding opinion be and they are and each of them is hereby denied.

In all other respects said Decisions NOS. 29480, as amended, 30021, as amended, and 30370, as amended, shall remain in full force and effect.

This order shall become effective twenty (20) days from the date hereof.

Dated at San Francisco, California, this 26th day of September, 1938.

Ralph W. Hefner
James D. Hefner
W. L. Riley

Commissioners.

APPENDIX "A"

1. Substitute the following for paragraph (c) of Rule No. 50 of Appendix "A" to Decision No. 29480, as amended; for paragraph (c) of Rule No. 40 of Appendix "A" to Decision No. 30021, as amended; and for paragraph (c) of Rule No. 50 to Decision No. 30370, as amended:

"(c) Except as otherwise provided in Section No. 2, class rates contained herein are subject to ratings (but not packing requirements) shown in the current Classification and current Exception Sheet for L.C.L. (less carload) or any-quantity rates only. If two or more ratings, subject to different packing requirements, are provided for property in a given form (e.g., set up or knocked down, nested or not nested, compressed or not compressed, folded flat or not folded flat, liquid, paste, solid or powdered), the lowest of such ratings applicable to property in such given form will apply."

2. Eliminate equated mileages shown in Section No. 4 of Appendix "A" to Decision No. 29480, as amended, between Long Beach, Signal Hill, East San Pedro, Fort McArthur, Harbor City, Los Angeles Harbor, Point Firmin, San Pedro, Wilmington and Terminal Island on the one hand and all other points named in said Section No. 4 on the other hand, and add the following equated mileages:

| <u>Between Los Angeles Harbor (1) and</u> | | <u>Between Los Angeles Harbor (1) and</u> | | <u>Between Los Angeles Harbor (1) and</u> | |
|---|------|---|-------|---|-------|
| Alta Loma | 55.4 | Carlsbad | 72.5 | Encinitas | 81.5 |
| Anaheim | 23.0 | Casa Blanca | 56.5 | Escondido | 100.0 |
| Anaheim Landing | 12.0 | Chatsworth | 50.0 | Etiwanda | 59.4 |
| Alberhill | 67.5 | Chino | 46.9 | Fallbrook | 96.5 |
| Alhambra | 24.0 | Chula Vista | 115.7 | Flintridge | 30.5 |
| Altadena | 31.0 | Claremont | 46.9 | Florence | 15.0 |
| Arcadia | 31.5 | Clearwater | 11.0 | Fontana | 62.7 |
| Arlington | 54.0 | Colton | 67.4 | Fullerton | 25.0 |
| Artesia | 15.0 | Compton | 9.0 | Gardena | 8.0 |
| Athens | 10.0 | Corona | 46.5 | Garden Grove | 19.0 |
| Atwood | 29.5 | Coronado | 108.5 | Garvanza | 24.5 |
| Azusa | 37.1 | Costa Mesa | 25.0 | Girard | 43.5 |
| Balboa Beach | 26.0 | Covina | 34.5 | Glendale | 27.0 |
| Baldwin Park | 32.0 | Cucamonga | 53.9 | Glendora | 37.5 |
| Bassett | 28.0 | Culver City | 22.5 | Grenada | 44.5 |
| Bell | 15.5 | Cypress | 16.0 | Guasti | 51.9 |
| Bellflower | 12.0 | Dana Point | 42.5 | Hansen | 18.0 |
| Belvedere | 19.0 | Del Mar | 89.0 | Hawthorne | 14.0 |
| Beverly Hills | 24.6 | Dominguez | 10.0 | Hemet | 108.0 |
| Bloomington | 63.4 | Downey | 15.0 | Hermosa | 12.0 |
| Bonsall | 86.5 | Duarte | 33.5 | Highgrove | 63.8 |
| Brea | 27.0 | Dyer | 27.5 | Highland Park | 24.0 |
| Bryn Mawr | 73.0 | Eagle Rock | 27.0 | Highlands | 76.7 |
| Buena Park | 19.5 | East Highlands | 74.7 | Hollydale | 9.0 |
| Burbank | 30.0 | El Modena | 27.7 | Hollywood | 26.0 |
| Cahuenga Park | 34.5 | El Monte | 28.5 | Home Gardens | 12.0 |
| Canoga Park | 46.0 | El Segundo | 16.5 | Huntington Beach | 19.0 |
| Capistrano | 46.5 | Elsinore | 76.5 | Huntington Park | 15.5 |
| Cardiff | 83.5 | El Toro | 39.5 | Hynes | 10.0 |

| <u>Between Los Angeles Harbor (1) and</u> | | <u>Between Los Angeles Harbor (1) and</u> | | <u>Between Los Angeles Harbor (1) and</u> | |
|---|-------|---|-------|---|-------|
| Inglewood | 16.0 | Olinda | 31.0 | Santa Ana | 24.5 |
| Irvine | 33.5 | Olive | 27.0 | Santa Fe Springs | 17.8 |
| La Canada | 31.0 | Ontario | 48.4 | Santa Monica | 24.0 |
| La Crescenta | 32.5 | Orange | 25.0 | Sawtelle | 25.5 |
| Laguna Beach | 34.5 | Pachappa | 58.0 | Seal Beach | 11.0 |
| La Habra | 24.7 | Pacific Beach | 101.6 | Sepulveda | 40.5 |
| La Jolla | 97.7 | Pacific Palisades | 27.0 | Serra | 43.5 |
| Lake Hodges | 108.5 | Palms | 22.8 | Shorman | 24.5 |
| Lake View Jct. | 81.0 | Palm City | 119.0 | Sierra Madre | 33.0 |
| Lamanda Park | 28.5 | Palos Verdes | 9.0 | Solano Beach | 86.0 |
| La Verne | 41.7 | Pasadena | 28.5 | Southgate | 13.5 |
| Las Flores | 61.0 | Perris | 83.5 | So. Pasadena | 26.5 |
| Lawndale | 12.5 | Pico | 21.5 | Sparrland | 59.0 |
| Lennox | 15.0 | Placentia | 27.0 | Stanton | 18.0 |
| Leucadia | 79.5 | Playa del Rey | 19.0 | Studio City | 32.0 |
| Loma Linda | 71.0 | Point Loma | 109.0 | Sunland | 37.5 |
| Lomita | 4.5 | Pomona | 42.4 | Sunnyside | 118.1 |
| Los Alamitos | 12.0 | Poway Park | 112.5 | Sunset Beach | 14.0 |
| Los Angeles | 19.0 | Prado | 42.5 | Talbert | 22.0 |
| Los Nietos | 18.8 | Prenda | 59.0 | Temecula | 101.5 |
| Lynwood | 11.5 | Puente | 31.5 | Torrance | 6.0 |
| Manhattan Beach | 13.5 | Rainbow | 108.5 | Tujunga | 35.5 |
| Marchfield | 71.0 | Rancho Santa Fe | 91.5 | Tustin | 27.5 |
| Mar Vista | 24.5 | Redlands | 76.4 | Univorsal City | 29.5 |
| Maywood | 16.0 | Redondo | 10.5 | Upland | 50.4 |
| Mentone | 78.9 | Reseda | 41.5 | Van Nuys | 37.4 |
| Mira Loma | 54.4 | Rialto | 66.2 | Venice | 21.0 |
| Miramar | 103.9 | Riviera | 18.0 | Vernon | 17.0 |
| Mission Beach | 103.1 | Riverside | 60.0 | Villa Park | 28.3 |
| Moneta | 8.5 | Rockwell Field | 109.5 | Vista | 81.5 |
| Monrovia | 32.0 | Romoland | 86.0 | Walnut Park | 14.0 |
| Montebello | 21.5 | Roscoe | 35.0 | Walteria | 6.5 |
| Monterey Park | 23.0 | Rosemead | 26.5 | Watson | 2.0 |
| Montrose | 31.0 | San Bernardino | 71.2 | Watts | 10.5 |
| Murielita | 92.0 | San Clemente | 47.0 | West Hollywood | 24.6 |
| Naples | 9.0 | San Diego | 107.0 | West Los Angeles | 25.5 |
| National City | 112.0 | San Dimas | 39.0 | Westminster | 16.5 |
| Newport Beach | 24.5 | San Fernando | 41.0 | Westwood | 25.5 |
| N. Hollywood | 31.5 | San Gabriel | 26.5 | Whittier | 23.8 |
| N. Island | 109.5 | San Jacinto | 104.0 | Willowbrook | 10.0 |
| N. Long Beach | 9.0 | San Luis Rey | 74.5 | Winchester | 102.0 |
| N. Los Angeles | 43.5 | San Marcos | 91.0 | Wintersburg | 19.0 |
| Norwalk | 15.8 | San Marino | 27.5 | Yorba | 30.5 |
| Ocean Beach | 104.6 | San Onofre | 50.5 | Yorba Linda | 31.5 |
| Ocean Park | 22.5 | San Ysidro | 122.6 | Yucaipa | 88.4 |
| Oceanside | 70.0 | | | | |

(1) Los Angeles Harbor includes all points located within the following boundaries:

Beginning at the point where the Los Angeles County-Orange County boundary line intersects the shore-line of the Pacific Ocean; thence northeasterly along said boundary line to the point where the corporate

boundary of the City of Long Beach diverges therefrom (Hathaway Avenue); thence northwesterly and following the corporate boundary of the City of Long Beach to the point where it meets 223rd Street at Caspian Avenue; thence westerly along 223rd Street to its intersection with the corporate boundary of the City of Los Angeles (Hesperian Avenue); thence northwesterly and following the corporate boundary of the City of Los Angeles to the intersection of Frampton Avenue and Lomita Boulevard; thence westerly along Lomita Boulevard to its intersection with the western corporate boundary of the City of Los Angeles; thence southerly along said corporate boundary to its intersection with the shore-line of the Pacific Ocean at Weymouth Avenue; thence easterly along the shore-line of the Pacific Ocean to point of beginning.

3. Add to Rule No. 45 of Appendix "A" of Decision No. 30370, as amended, the following sub-paragraph:

"bb Los Angeles Harbor: Mileage Point, Wilmington: Includes all points located within the following boundaries:

Beginning at the point where the Los Angeles County-Orange County boundary line intersects the shore-line of the Pacific Ocean; thence northeasterly along said boundary line to the point where the corporate boundary of the City of Long Beach diverges therefrom (Hathaway Avenue); thence northwesterly and following the corporate boundary of the City of Long Beach to the point where it meets 223rd Street at Caspian Avenue; thence westerly along 223rd Street to its intersection with the corporate boundary of the City of Los Angeles (Hesperian Avenue); thence northwesterly and following the corporate boundary of the City of Los Angeles to the intersection of Frampton Avenue and Lomita Boulevard; thence westerly along Lomita Boulevard to its intersection with the western corporate boundary of the City of Los Angeles; thence southerly along said corporate boundary to its intersection with the shore-line of the Pacific Ocean at Weymouth Avenue; thence easterly along the shore-line of the Pacific Ocean to point of beginning."

4. Add to paragraph (c) of Rule No. 20 of Appendix "A" to Decision No. 30370, as amended, the following:

"Shipments weighing 100 pounds or less transported by Willis M. Kleinenbroich, doing business as Modesto Riverbank and Oakdale Stage Line."