

**ORIGINAL**Decision No. 40481

BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

In the Matter of the Application of )  
 BAY CITIES TRANSPORTATION COMPANY, a )  
 corporation, for a certificate of )  
 public convenience and necessity as a ) Application No. 27646  
 highway common carrier as an alterna- )  
 tive and supplementary method of opera- )  
 tion to applicant's vessel operation. )

AppearancesScott Elder, for applicant.

Reginald L. Vaughan, for members of Pacific Motor Tariff Bureau, Kellogg Express and Draying Company and Nickols Transportation Company; Douglas Brookman and Clyde L. Eddy for Vallejo Express Company, Sonoma Express Company, Marin-Sonoma Fast Freight, Inc. and Merchants Express Corporation; Berol & Handler by Marvin Handler for Highway Transport, Inc., Valley Motor Lines, Inc. and Valley Express Co.; Frederick W. Mielke for Delta Lines, Inc.; John E. Hennessy and John L. Amos, Jr. for Sacramento Northern Railway and The Western Pacific Railroad Company; William Meinhold for Southern Pacific Company, Pacific Motor Trucking Company, Northwestern Pacific Railroad Company and Petaluma and Santa Rosa Railroad Company; and James M. Souby, Jr. for The Atchison, Topeka and Santa Fe Railway Company, protestants.

J. H. Anderson, for The River Lines, interested party.

O P I N I O N

By this application, Bay Cities Transportation Company seeks a certificate of public convenience and necessity authorizing it to transport property as a highway common carrier between points it now serves as a common carrier by vessel. Public hearings were held before Examiner Bradshaw at San Francisco.

The purpose in applying for highway common carrier operating authority is to make available an alternate means of transportation supplementary to applicant's vessel operations. It is proposed, when shipments are transported by truck, to apply the same rates, rules and regulations as are published in applicant's tariff governing transportation by vessel.

#### Applicant's Vessel Operations

Applicant has engaged in freight transportation on San Francisco Bay since 1916. Its operative rights were defined in the Inland-Vessel Carrier Operative Rights Investigation, 40 C.R.C. 493, as embracing the transportation of "property between San Francisco on the one hand and Oakland and Alameda on the other." In 1943, applicant was authorized to acquire additional rights previously held by Crowley Launch & Tug Boat Co. -- an affiliated company -- and one E. V. Rideout and to merge them with its then existing operative rights. Subject to certain restrictions, these rights cover points and landings on various bays, rivers and sloughs in the area extending roughly from Alviso on lower San Francisco Bay to Sacramento and Stockton, including the so-called Delta region and such points as Petaluma, Napa and

---

<sup>1</sup> Decision No. 36491 in Application No. 25599, July 20, 1943, (not printed).

2

Suisun.

Transportation operations are conducted with the use of barges and tugboats. Service is rendered between San Francisco and Oakland and Alameda, as well as between San Francisco and Mare Island, on five days a week. Barges are also operated between San Francisco and the East Bay on Saturdays when shipments are offered. Between other points operations are conducted on an "on-call" basis.

Pickup-and-delivery and dock-to-dock rates are published on less-than-carload and carload freight between San Francisco and the East Bay Cities, as well as between San Francisco Bay Cities and Vallejo, Mare Island and numerous points and landings on San Pablo Bay, Carquinez Straits and Suisun Bay. Except when zones are specifically defined, as in the San Francisco Bay area, applicant's tariff provides that pickup and delivery service will be

2

The following is a description of the operative rights which Bay Cities Transportation Company now claims to possess as a common carrier by vessel: (1) the transportation of property between San Francisco on the one hand and Oakland and Alameda on the other; (2) the transportation of property between San Francisco and Mare Island Navy Yard; (3) an "on-call" service for the transportation of property between San Francisco on the one hand and Vallejo, points located on the Contra Costa County shore of San Pablo Bay, and points on Suisun Bay (but not tributaries thereof); (4) an "on-call" service for the transportation of lumber, in lots of not less than 20,000 pounds, between San Francisco and points on San Pablo Bay (but not tributaries thereof); (5) an "on-call" service for the transportation of property, in lots of not less than 30 tons, between points on San Francisco, San Pablo and Suisun Bays, San Joaquin, Sacramento and Napa Rivers, Petaluma Creek and their tributaries, except (a) to and from points north of Sacramento, (b) between points on San Francisco, San Pablo and Suisun Bays on the one hand and Sacramento or Stockton on the other, or (c) between Sacramento and Stockton; and (6) the transportation of ship stores and fumigating gear, in any-quantity lots, between San Francisco on the one hand and wharves in San Francisco and Oakland and vessels in the stream on the other. The operative rights designated as (2), (3) and (4), above, are portions of former operative rights of E. V. Rideout, while those numbered (5) and (6) are portions of former rights of Crowley Launch & Tug Boat Co., as defined in the Operative Rights Investigation, 40 C.R.C. 493 at 513 and 517.

performed in the corporate limits of municipalities and within an area of one mile from landings located in unincorporated territory. The rates from, to, and within the balance of the territory are restricted to dock-to-dock traffic, subject in most cases to a minimum weight of 60,000 pounds.

Pickup and delivery service in San Francisco is performed with applicant's own equipment and by various draymen under contract. In Oakland and Alameda the service is rendered by applicant, and also by certain highway common carriers under joint rates. The same highway carriers also pick up and deliver freight under the joint rate arrangement in other East Bay cities located in Alameda County. When pickup and delivery service is required at Mare Island, which applicant claims seldom occurs, an empty truck is dispatched from Oakland to Mare Island. No pickup or delivery trucks are maintained, nor are any arrangements in effect with outside parties for performing store-door service at other points.

It was testified that at times from 2 to 3 barges a day are operated in the transbay service. The preponderance of the tonnage moves between San Francisco piers and Oakland and Alameda terminals and consists of transshipment cargo moving in connection with steamships operating to or from interstate and foreign ports. The local traffic is at present considerably lighter than the transshipment cargo.<sup>3</sup>

From the standpoint of regularity of movement, most of the Mare Island shipments originate at or are destined to

---

<sup>3</sup> For instance, 16,820 tons of transbay freight were transported during April and May, 1946. Of this amount, 1,144 tons consisted of intrastate or local traffic, 797 tons moving under door-to-door rates and 347 tons under dock-to-dock rates.

Hunters Point in San Francisco. They are barged between Mare Island and applicant's terminal at Pier 5 in San Francisco, and trucked between the latter location and Hunters Point. A substantial volume of Mare Island freight also moves to or from the Naval Supply Depot in Oakland. Smaller amounts move to or from various San Francisco piers, the Naval Air Station in Alameda, and East Bay terminals or are picked up or delivered in store-door service in San Francisco.

The record discloses that trips to or from other points have been infrequent. An exhibit lists 95 intrastate shipments as having moved between January 1, 1941 and August 16, 1946. Except for one shipment of about 35 tons from Mare Island to South San Francisco in 1942, and 12 shipments aggregating 1,523 tons from Alameda to Redwood City which moved within a period of 62 days, all of the shipments were transported between points in the area extending from San Francisco and Alameda to and including Pittsburg, and embracing points on San Francisco and San Pablo Bays, Carquinez Straits and Suisun Bay, as well as Mare Island and South Vallejo. They consisted largely of substantial quantities of freight tendered at one time for movement from one point of origin to one destination.

4

The number of instances in which freight of various weights were offered and the aggregate weight transported appear in the following tabulation:

	<u>Number of Instances Freight Tendered</u>	<u>Aggregate Weight Transported (Tons)</u>
Over 10 tons or less . . . . .	15	50
Over 10 tons to and including 50 tons . . . . .	14	499
Over 50 tons to and including 100 tons . . . . .	9	673
Over 100 tons . . . . .	35*	14,325
		<u>15,597</u>

\* In 9 of these cases, the shipments ranged in weight from 500 tons to approximately 1,750 tons.

Showing in Support of Application

Applicant's vice president and general manager testified that applicant's object is to place itself in a position whereby trucks may be used whenever to do so would be more economical or efficient than vessel operations. The utilization of motor vehicles in such cases, the witness stated, will enable applicant to reduce transportation costs by (1) minimizing the operation of barges where the volume of freight does not justify their use, (2) effecting a better distribution of the labor used in vessel operations, and (3) reducing overtime and other costs arising from delays to barges and tugboats in handling certain traffic.

Applicant disclaims any intention to withdraw any vessel service or change its field of operations. Its witness declared that, in the event the desired certificate is granted, trucks will be used only for the sake of economy and that applicant does not intend to go into the trucking business as such by soliciting freight for truck movement.

No attempt was made to show the over-all effect of truck operations as an alternative or substitute for vessel service, or the extent of the resultant economies and consequent savings. Such a showing, applicant's witness contended, is not feasible without taking into consideration the particular operating conditions which may exist or have occurred on a given day and an examination of records of past operations would not reveal the necessary information. Applicant believes, however, that the savings will be substantial. The nature of the advantages in being permitted to transport certain traffic by truck was illustrated by referring to several conditions surrounding present barge operations and pointing out wherein greater efficiency could be attained by the use of trucks.

One example dealt with a barge movement from Mare Island, consisting primarily of freight consigned to Hunters Point with smaller quantities to be delivered at Treasure Island, the Naval Air Station in Alameda and Howard Terminal in Oakland. Under present conditions, the Hunters Point cargo is discharged at Pier 5, San Francisco, for delivery by truck, and the barge is thereafter towed to the other destinations. If permitted to operate trucks, applicant would transport the Treasure Island, Naval Air Station and Howard Terminal shipments by truck from San Francisco. It is estimated that, as compared with a delivery cost by barge of \$116.75, the cost of delivering these shipments by truck would be \$30.52. According to the testimony, there would also be a possibility of moving freight in the same truck on its return to San Francisco. Applicant proposes to use trucking equipment in a similar manner in other cases where barges are now required to pick up or deliver freight at more than one location and where shipments are of a size that would make it economical to do so. A number of instances of this kind were cited.

Applicant also expects to utilize trucks in moving freight from Hunters Point to Mare Island. At present, this traffic moves by truck to Pier 5, San Francisco, thence by barge to Mare Island. It is claimed that frequently shipments are not ready for transportation until late in the day and that considerable overtime and penalty time<sup>5</sup> accrues by reason of the necessity of keeping bargemen and a checker, as well as a tugboat and crew,

---

<sup>5</sup> Penalty time is described as pay which becomes effective when men have worked 5 hours without an opportunity to eat. It amounts to 1½ times straight or overtime pay, as the case may be.

standing by at Pier 5 waiting for the arrival of the freight. For this reason, it is proposed to pick up the "late" shipments the following morning and transport them direct to Mare Island by truck. By so doing, applicant expects to be able to eliminate all of the penalty time and much of the overtime.<sup>6</sup> It was testified that some overtime and penalty time are also encountered at applicant's Oakland terminal and at Mare Island, and that efforts will be made to overcome such conditions wherever it may be possible to do so by taking advantage of truck transportation.

In addition, applicant anticipates using trucks in hauling certain Mare Island freight from Oakland or Alameda to Pier 5 in San Francisco, when a transbay barge movement can be avoided. Similarly, in the event that a barge is being loaded in Oakland with Mare Island freight and small shipments are on hand at San Francisco, it is proposed to truck the San Francisco shipments to Oakland to be loaded on the barge, or trucked direct to Mare Island if the volume justifies. A barge movement from Oakland to San Francisco before proceeding to Mare Island would then be unnecessary. In certain instances, the testimony indicates, it will also be possible to continue loading in the East Bay until a later hour or, if the San Francisco freight is trucked to Mare Island, even until the following day. All of the freight available at the time would then be placed upon the barge, thus obviating the necessity of making a second trip.

Instances are said to occur when the volume of freight at Mare Island requiring prompt transportation is light and the balance

---

6

An exhibit shows that during April and May, 1946, when wage rates were lower than at present, barge-men and checkers at Pier 5 were paid \$219.56 in overtime and \$308.93 in penalty time. Another exhibit indicates, for instance, that the cost occasioned by waiting for a truckload of "late" freight from Funters Point on April 17, 1946, amounted to \$57.33, whereas the cost of transporting the same freight by truck direct to Mare Island would have been \$25.20.



offered on a given day can be handled at applicant's convenience. On such occasions, the freight requiring immediate transportation would be trucked. The same method would be followed in the opposite direction whenever similar conditions exist at San Francisco. There are also times, according to the record, when all of the Mare Island freight offered on a certain day can be handled on a truck. It was estimated that the cost of hauling 20 tons of freight from San Francisco to Mare Island by truck and a like amount on the return trip would be \$36.62, as compared with a cost of transporting the same freight on a barge of \$80.65.

The testimony also discloses that frequently the volume of transbay traffic is very small or, for one reason or another, it is not practicable or advisable to move local transbay freight on the same barge with transshipment freight. In such cases, a barge is operated at considerably less than its carrying capacity.<sup>7</sup> In order to rectify this condition, applicant would transport local transbay traffic by truck when the volume permitted. An instance was cited when there were 4.7 tons of westbound freight to be moved on one day and 9.9 tons of eastbound freight on the following day. Applicant estimates that the cost of handling by barge was \$74.76, while the same shipments could have been trucked for \$24.06.

In the opinion of applicant's witness, trucks would in all probability be operated from two to three times weekly to and from Mare Island and about three times a week between San Francisco and the East Bay. The reason given in support of the proposed use of

---

<sup>7</sup> According to the record, the carrying capacity of applicant's barges ranges from 150 to 500 tons. It appears that, although applicant endeavors to consolidate shipments so that barges will move with capacity loads, there have been instances when a 350-ton barge has been used to transport 15 tons of freight.

trucks to and from points and landings at which a regular service is not maintained is that small shipments, or even a shipment of 30 tons or more, might be tendered which could not be economically transported by barge.

#### Contention of Other Carriers

A number of highway common carriers, express corporations, railroads and one common carrier by vessel protested the granting of the application.

Protestants criticize applicant's evidence as overstating the savings which may be expected from substituting trucks for barge operations. A consulting engineer testified that certain barge movements described by applicant, and upon which a portion of its showing was predicated, had "the appearance of an uneconomical operation." The witness suggested that, by consolidating different classes of freight for movement on the same barge, or holding freight until the following day for additional tonnage, the economy of operation would be greatly increased and the cost reduced. He conceded, however, that there could be circumstances, such as the element of time, nature of the tonnage, and other conditions which would require what appeared to be an uneconomical operation. He also expressed the opinion that, if the particular movements had to be made as depicted by applicant, a truck operation would seem to be more efficient than the use of barges.

Exhibits were presented setting forth this witness' judgment of comparative truck and barge costs for certain movements used in applicant's illustrations of anticipated savings. It was estimated that, for the transportation of the ex-Mare Island shipments from San Francisco to Treasure Island, Naval Air Station, and Howard Terminal, the cost of handling by truck would be \$38.59 less

then by barge, as contrasted with applicant's estimate of \$86.23. On the round-trip movement between San Francisco and Mare Island, which applicant indicated would result in a saving of \$44.03, protestants' witness computed the difference as being \$11.46 in favor of the truck movement. He also computed the cost of handling certain shipments on a round trip between Oakland and San Francisco as being \$23.47 less by truck than by barge, whereas applicant figured there would be a saving of \$50.70. Applicant's witness in rebuttal undertook to show that these estimates were not computed on proper bases.

The manager of Kellogg Express and Draying Company testified that that carrier operates twice a day between San Francisco and East Bay points and between San Francisco Bay points and Vallejo and Mare Island. Competition for transbay traffic he characterized as very keen. He claimed that by obtaining the "cream" of the business, contract carriers have made heavy inroads upon the traffic of common carriers and that notwithstanding increases in rates it will be necessary to retain all of the present traffic to keep existing operations intact. Similar conditions were said to prevail on the Vallejo and Mare Island route. The granting of the application, in the opinion of this witness, will further increase the already acute competitive conditions by reason of applicant placing a large number of trucks in the field, improving its service, and actively soliciting a different class of traffic than that now enjoyed. It was also asserted that the resultant competition would be unfair, because applicant's door-to-door rates are about 6 per cent lower than those of the other transbay carriers, and by offering an identical service it could secure considerable traffic now transported by protestants.

Witnesses for six other transbay carriers subscribed to the views given by the Kellogg Company's manager. They (1) signified that the companies they represented have ample equipment to care for present and prospective demands for transportation, (2) commented upon the highly competitive nature of the business in which they are engaged and (3) indicated considerable fear that, if applicant were permitted to operate trucks, the severity of the competition might reach such proportions as to impair their ability to render satisfactory service. Most of these witnesses stated that the carriers for whom they testified were in a position, upon reasonable notice, to transport whatever traffic applicant may offer them for transbay movement, should it desire to effect economies in barge operations. They urged that the traffic which applicant does not desire to move by barge should be handled in this manner instead of with its own equipment.

The manager of Vallejo Express Company and traffic manager of Marin-Sonoma Fast Freight, Inc. and Sonoma Express Company, outlined the extent of the equipment owned by these and certain affiliated carriers. He stressed their ability to handle such traffic as may be available. The service of Vallejo Express was described as twice a day between San Francisco and once daily between the East Bay, and Vallejo and Mare Island, and "over-night" between San Francisco Bay points and Napa. The Marin-Sonoma service was stated as at least once a day to Marin County points and twice daily to Petaluma. The witness testified that the present downward trend of business had affected the traffic of the several carriers with which he is connected, and evinced concern over ever-increasing competition.

Similar testimony was presented by the general manager of Highway Transport, Inc. The service of this carrier was indicated as "over-night" between San Francisco and San Jose and intermediate points, with a similar service between Oakland and the same points in connection with Canton Transbay Express, Inc. under joint rates. Decrease in traffic and the inability to withstand additional competition were likewise emphasized.

A witness for Southern Pacific Company testified that that carrier or its subsidiaries served by rail the more important points on the bays and tributaries mentioned in the application and in most cases provide pickup and delivery service. He declared that service was performed between all of the points between which it was represented that applicant had transported shipments during the period January 1, 1941 to August 16, 1946. The less-carload service was described as generally affording first day deliveries, with second or third day deliveries at some points. On carloads, according to the witness, the service contemplates first day arrivals, except in two instances where second day deliveries are maintained. It was stated that these carriers were able to transport added traffic without limitation, including any tonnage tendered by applicant.

On brief, protestants urge additional reasons as warranting the denial of the application. It is alleged that an adequate showing of a public need for the proposed operations has not been presented. The contention is advanced that our conclusions in prior cases involving the substitution of one form of transport for another should not be applied to instances where an applicant is not in competition with existing highway common carriers, handles a different class of traffic and does not intend to compete with

such carriers. Attention is called to the absence of proof that applicant has transported shipments within recent years in a large part of the territory it is authorized to serve by vessel and to the small proportion of its transbay traffic which consists of intrastate shipments. It is also argued that applicant may properly perform as a radial highway common carrier all of the trucking operations it intends to render and that the certificate applied for is therefore unnecessary.

#### Conclusions

The proposed operations between San Francisco and the East Bay cities and between San Francisco Bay points and Mare Island do not involve the contemplated entry of an additional carrier into territory already having adequate transportation facilities. Applicant has maintained regular service between these points for many years.

The Commission has in numerous proceedings authorized existing carriers to substitute one form of transportation for another, including the substitution of trucks for vessel operations, upon a showing that the service can be improved and conducted more efficiently. In the instant proceeding, it is clear that the use of trucks in lieu of certain barge movements will permit applicant to effect operating economies and improve the efficiency of its present service, by reducing transportation costs and eliminating certain barge movements with much less than capacity loads without subjecting shipments to delays. Apart from protestants' contention that applicant can improve the efficiency of its transbay barge operations

---

<sup>8</sup>  
Re. Application of Pac. Motor Transport Co., 38 C.R.C. 874; Re. Application of East Bay Street Railways, 39 C.R.C. 252; Re. Application of Pac. Motor Trucking Co., 42 C.R.C. 745; Re. Application of Kellogg Express & Draying Co., 46 C.R.C. 127, and others.

without the use of trucks, which is not persuasive, the only difference in viewpoint between applicant and protestants is with respect to the extent to which savings can be effected in specified instances.

Protestants' suggestion that applicant may effect the desired economies by operating trucks under a radial highway common carrier permit overlooks the fact that such operations would be subject to a published tariff naming point-to-point rates as well as the frequency with which it is anticipated that trucks will be used for moving transbay and Mare Island shipments.

Under the circumstances, it appears that applicant should be permitted to utilize trucks as an adjunct to or substitute for its vessel operations on shipments moving between San Francisco on the one hand, and Oakland and Alameda on the other hand, and between San Francisco, Oakland and Alameda, on the one hand, and Mare Island, on the other hand. However, in view of the difference in the level of rates maintained by applicant and protestants, applicant should not be authorized to transport any shipments by truck at rates which may be lower than the rates authorized by outstanding minimum rate orders governing highway carriers, except under certain conditions hereinafter specified. In our opinion, a restriction of this nature is necessary as a precaution against the creation of unfair competitive conditions.

Although applicant publishes pickup and delivery rates between San Francisco Bay points and Vallejo and various points and landings on San Pablo Bay, Carquinez Straits and Suisun Bay, the evidence shows that no traffic has moved thereunder, except in a few isolated cases. These instances have been confined to some small shipments (transported with larger consignments destined

to two or three industries) on which a pickup service was rendered in the Bay cities and dock delivery accomplished at destination. Applicant does not maintain any trucks in this area, and has no arrangements with other parties whereby store-door pickups or deliveries can be consummated. Its witness admitted that if small shipments had been tendered for store-door delivery they would, in all probability, have been "farmed" out to other carriers operating into the territory. It must, therefore, be concluded that, except as to shipments moving to or from Mare Island, there has been no bona fide holding out on the part of applicant to transport door-to-door traffic in this area. So far as this traffic is concerned, the application cannot be considered as a proposal to operate trucks as an alternative for barge operations.

As hereinbefore indicated, the shipments of other than transbay and San Francisco Bay-Mare Island traffic transported by applicant during a period of slightly over 5½ years were few in number. The record also justifies the conclusion that most of the shipments handled were of a nature which in any event would not likely move by truck. Virtually no showing has been made disclosing the extent or nature of whatever economies might be feasible by utilizing trucks for such transportation. No evidence of a public demand for additional service has been submitted. For these reasons, authority to operate trucks for the transportation of freight other than that moving between San Francisco and the East Bay cities and between those points and Mare Island will be denied.

---

<sup>9</sup> In Re Application of River Lines, Decision No. 27752, Application No. 19088, similar conclusions were reached upon a record showing that no vessel service had been operated for 17 years.



Findings

Upon careful consideration of all of the facts and circumstances of record in this proceeding, the Commission is of the opinion and finds:

1. That public convenience and necessity require that applicant be authorized to engage in the operation of motor vehicles as a highway common carrier (1) between San Francisco on the one hand and Oakland and Alameda on the other hand, and (2) between San Francisco, Oakland and Alameda on the one hand and Mare Island on the other hand, as an alternative or supplementary service to applicant's operations as a carrier by vessel, subject to the condition that no shipments may be transported at rates which may be lower than the rates authorized by outstanding minimum rate orders governing highway carriers, unless such shipments (a) originate at and are destined to applicant's regularly established terminals at San Francisco, Oakland or Mare Island, or (b) receive an immediate prior or subsequent movement by vessel; and

2. That in all other respects the application should be denied.

Bay Cities Transportation Company is hereby placed upon notice that operative rights, as such, do not constitute a class of property which may be capitalized or used as an element of value in rate-fixing for any amount of money in excess of that originally paid to the State as the consideration for the grant of such rights. Aside from their purely permissive aspect, they extend to the holder a full or partial monopoly of a class of business over a particular route. This monopoly feature may be changed or destroyed at any time by the State, which is not in any respect limited to the number of rights which may be given.

O R D E R

Public hearings having been had in the above entitled application and the Commission, upon the evidence received at the hearings, having found that public convenience and necessity so require,

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that a certificate of public convenience and necessity be and it is hereby granted to Bay Cities Transportation Company, a corporation, authorizing the establishment and operation of a service as a highway common carrier, as defined in Section 2-3/4 of the Public Utilities Act, (1) between San Francisco, on the one hand, and Oakland and Alameda, on the other hand, and (2) between San Francisco, Oakland and Alameda, on the one hand, and Mare Island, on the other hand, as an alternative or supplementary service to applicant's operations as a common carrier by vessel, subject to the limitation that applicant shall not transport any shipments at rates which may be lower in volume and effect than the rates authorized by orders of the Commission in effect on the date of shipment between the same points of origin and destination for transportation by highway carriers, unless said shipments (a) originate at and are destined to applicant's regularly established terminals at San Francisco, Oakland or Mare Island, or (b) receive an immediate prior or subsequent movement by vessel.

IT IS HEREBY FURTHER ORDERED that in providing service pursuant to the certificate herein granted applicant shall comply with and observe the following service regulations:

- (a) Applicant shall file a written acceptance of the certificate herein granted within a period not to exceed thirty (30) days from the effective date hereof.

- (b) Applicant shall comply with the provisions of General Order No. 80 and Part IV of General Order No. 93-A by filing, in triplicate, and concurrently making effective appropriate tariffs and time schedules within sixty (60) days from the effective date hereof and on not less than one (1) day's notice to the Commission and the public.
- (c) Subject to the authority of the Commission to change or modify them by further order, applicant shall conduct operations pursuant to the certificate herein granted over and along the following routes:

Between San Francisco, Oakland and Alameda

Via San Francisco-Oakland Bay Bridge and streets and highways within said cities.

Between San Francisco, Oakland and Alameda and Mare Island

From San Francisco to Vallejo Junction via U.S. Highway 40, including connecting streets and highways within Oakland and Alameda;

From Vallejo Junction to Vallejo via California Highway 29;

From Vallejo to Mare Island via Mare Island Causeway.

IT IS HEREBY FURTHER ORDERED that, in all other respects, the application in this proceeding be and it is hereby denied.

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

Dated at San Francisco, California, this 28<sup>th</sup> day of June, 1947.

Harold F. Kube  
Frederic J. Gallivan  
East Knull  
A. J. ...  
...  
 Commissioners