

ORIGINALDecision No. 55043

BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

In the Matter of the Investigation into)
 the rates, rules, regulations, charges,)
 allowances and practices of all common)
 carriers, highway carriers and city)
 carriers relating to the transportation)
 of fresh or green fruits and vegetables)
 and related items (commodities for which)
 rates are provided in Minimum Rate Tariff)
 No. 8).

Case No. 5438
 Order Setting Hearing
 dated August 21, 1954

In the Matter of the Investigation into)
 the rates, rules, regulations, charges,)
 allowances and practices of all common)
 carriers, highway carriers and city)
 carriers relating to the transportation)
 of fresh or green fruits and vegetables)
 and related items (commodities for which)
 rates are provided in Minimum Rate Tariff)
 No. 8).

Case No. 5438
 (Petition No. 11)

Alan Mills, for California Grape and Tree Fruit League, interested party and petitioner.

Lonnie Case, for Lonnie Case Trucking; Tom Clark, for Inland Transportation Co.; Walter Dennison, for Merrifield Trucking Co.; Frances McNeil, for Citizens Transportation Co., and Rudolph Perez, for Shippers Express Co., various respondent carriers.

Arlo D. Poe and J. C. Kaspar, for California Trucking Associations, Inc., interested carrier organization.

J. J. Deuel and Joe Joynt, for California Farm Bureau Federation; Harry H. Ross, for California Packing Corporation; Robert C. Neill and James C. Uhler, for Sunkist Growers, Inc.; H. C. DesJardin, for American National Growers Corporation; and R. K. Sanderson, for Lake County Fruit Exchange, various interested shippers or shipper organizations.

C. W. Phelps, for the Port of Stockton, interested party.

T. H. Grinstead, for the Port of San Francisco, interested party.

James Quintrall, for the Western Motor Tariff Bureau, interested party.

J. T. Phelps, Grant Malquist, Robert Lane, J. W. Mallory, F. P. Hughes, and Norman Haley, for the Commission's staff.

OPINION ON FURTHER HEARING

By Decision No. 53840, dated October 1, 1956, minimum rates were established for the transportation of fresh fruits and vegetables in interstate and in foreign commerce between points within this State. For shipments of grapes and deciduous tree fruits from designated areas in the San Joaquin Valley to specified ports "flat" rates (rates which are the same irrespective of the quantity shipped) were prescribed on a zone basis. For shipments of citrus fruits special commodity distance rates were provided. In other respects this transportation was made subject to the same rates, rules and regulations in Minimum Rate Tariff No. 8 as those which govern the transportation of fresh fruits and vegetables in intrastate commerce.

By petitions filed October 17, 1956, and March 4, 1957, the California Grape and Tree Fruit League seeks rehearing and reconsideration of matters covered by Decision No. 53840 as they relate to deciduous fruits. It alleges that the decision is unduly discriminatory in effect inasmuch as it provides special rates for the transportation of deciduous fruits from certain areas but subjects like transportation from other areas to the general provisions of Minimum Rate Tariff No. 8. It states that as a consequence growers of deciduous fruits in the other areas are suffering direct financial hardship for the reason that they are producing, selling, and shipping deciduous fruits in direct competition with growers who are located in zones from which special rates have been made applicable. On November 19, 1956, and on March 12, 1957, the Commission granted the petitions for rehearing and reconsideration.¹

¹

The order of November 19, 1956, reopened the proceedings as to deciduous tree fruits; the order of March 12, 1957, broadened the scope of the matters to be considered to include all deciduous fruits.

Public hearings on the petitions were held before Examiner C. S. Abernathy at San Francisco on January 22, 1957, and at Los Angeles on March 13, 1957. Evidence was submitted by petitioner's assistant traffic manager, by the manager of the Lake County Fruit Exchange, and by the director of research of the California Trucking Associations, Inc. Representatives of the American National Growers Corporation and of Sunkist Growers, Inc., participated in the proceedings as interested parties. Members of the Commission's staff also participated in the development of the record.

Through exhibits and testimony, petitioner's assistant traffic manager recommended three main adjustments in the present minimum rates for deciduous fruits. These recommendations, he asserted, "should be considered as this industry's opinion of the rate levels that will insure for the trucking industry a continued volume of the traffic in question and that will result in the least possible disruption of the distribution of California fresh deciduous fruit in interstate and foreign commerce." The recommended adjustments are as follows:

(a) The establishment of zone rates for export shipments to apply from principal areas in the State where deciduous fruits are grown, said rates to correspond with zone rates which have been established heretofore for deciduous fruits originating in San Joaquin Valley producing areas.

(b) The establishment of reduced carload rates for export shipments of apples and pears moving in quantities of 36,000 pounds or more.

(c) The exemption from minimum rate regulation of shipments of fresh fruits and vegetables to railheads.

With reference to his zone rate proposals, petitioner's assistant traffic manager described fourteen areas in various parts of the State which he said represent principal producing areas for deciduous fruits. He proposed that these areas be designated as rate zones and that zone rates be made applicable therefrom accordingly.² He submitted a scale of rates which he had developed to correspond to zone rates now in effect and which he proposed be made applicable to all shipments of deciduous fruits except shipments of apples and pears in quantities of 36,000 pounds or more. He said that deciduous fruits generally are tendered for shipment in quantities in all ranges of weights but that apples and pears are tendered principally in carload or truckload lots. He declared that recognition of these heavier loads of apples and pears should be given in the form of reduced rates, and he recommended rates which are 3 cents per 100 pounds less than the zone rates otherwise proposed for deciduous fruits.

As has been indicated, the above proposals were recommended for application to export shipments of deciduous fruits. With reference to similar shipments moving in interstate commerce the proposals of petitioner's assistant traffic manager would result in the virtual exemption from minimum rates for much of this class of traffic. The recommendations of petitioner's witness in this

²

The fourteen zones are in addition to the five zones prescribed by Decision No. 53840 for deciduous fruit movements.

regard were developed largely in connection with pears. Interstate shipments of pears, he testified, move principally by rail carriers. Under prevailing shipper practices, the pears are brought from orchards to packing and cooling plants and are packed and chilled for shipment and transported by truck to railhead for further shipment or they are brought to packing plants, packed, transported by truck to cooling plants at railheads, chilled, and then forwarded by rail.³ He pointed out that under present rules of Minimum Rate Tariff No. 8 shipments to cooling plants are exempt from the minimum rates.⁴ The practical effect is, he said, that shippers who utilize cooling plants at railheads are exempted from minimum rate regulations, while those who utilize cooling plants at packing sheds must observe the minimum rate provisions on the subsequent movements to the railheads. To remedy this assertedly discriminatory situation he proposed that the exemption be extended to all shipments of fruits and vegetables moving to railheads.

Petitioner's proposals were opposed on several grounds by the director of research of the California Trucking Associations, Inc., who testified on behalf of that organization. First, he said that the proposals do not make provision for all of the areas where deciduous fruits are grown, and that shipments from the areas for which zone rates are not provided will continue to be subject to the same type of discrimination that petitioner assails in these

³ Similar testimony was submitted on petitioner's behalf by the manager of the Lake County Fruit Exchange.

⁴ Item No. 40 series of Minimum Rate Tariff No. 8.

matters. Second, he pointed out that certain of the proposed zones are of substantial size. This circumstance, he said, tends to result in carrier discrimination, inasmuch as those permitted carriers that may solicit traffic selectively seek the relatively more remunerative hauls from the near sides of the zones and leave to the highway common carriers, who are bound by their holding-out to transport all freight, the relatively less profitable traffic from the far sides of the zones. The witness urged that such rates as are established for the traffic involved in these matters be on a distance and weight basis in order to avoid discrimination of that nature. To that end he urged also that the zones and zone rates which were established by Decision No. 53840 be canceled and that distance and weight rates be made applicable instead. He recommended further that should rates for carload movements of apples and pears be established, the carload minimum weight should be set at 40,000 pounds instead of 36,000 pounds as requested by petitioners in order to permit the attainment of lesser costs and rates that would result under heavier loading of the carriers' vehicles. As an additional point, he urged that the sought exemption on shipments to railheads not be established. He said that from his investigation into this proposal he could not find sound reason for distinguishing such traffic from that moving to ports for export. He asserted that essentially the same transportation conditions apply both to export shipments and to interstate shipments.

Discussion, Conclusions, and Findings

On this more extensive record the evidence shows that for the transportation involved herein Minimum Rate Tariff No. 8 should

be amended to set forth specific commodity rates for deciduous fruits to apply in lieu of the more general rates which now apply. The principal matters to be considered relate to the form that the rates should take and whether in light of the further showings herein the form of the rates which was adopted in Decision No. 53840 should be modified for state-wide application.

As has been stated above, the rates for deciduous fruits which were prescribed by Decision No. 53840 were flat rates and were established on a zone basis. The flat form of rates was adopted in view of showings that rates in such form had been proved by experience as permitting the freedom of movement of the traffic involved, as meeting the needs of shippers, and as being satisfactory to the carriers who have been actually engaged in the transportation. Notwithstanding the objections of the California Trucking Associations, Inc., to this form of rates, it appears that in the establishment of rates for deciduous fruits for state-wide application the flat basis of rates should be retained. The objections of the Associations to rates of this type are not without merit. It is recognized that the reasonableness of flat rates is dependent in part on whether individual carriers are tendered a representative cross-section of shipments, both large and small, so that their over-all revenues are reasonably compensatory for their total services under the rates. Unless this circumstance is taken into account in the allocation of traffic, flat rates cannot reasonably be maintained. Although flat rates are subject to this infirmity, the evidence indicates that under the carrier-and-shipper arrangements which have prevailed heretofore the rates have been mutually satisfactory. In the absence of

evidence of change of underlying circumstances which would make the rates inequitable, their continuance appears justified.

Somewhat different conclusions apply in connection with publication of the rates on a zone basis. Factors which led to the adoption in Decision No. 53840 of zone rates for deciduous fruits were representations that the production of grapes for export, the principal deciduous fruit then under consideration, is concentrated mainly within a few designated areas in the San Joaquin Valley and that competitive equality amongst shippers within those areas had been and should be maintained. It was concluded, furthermore, that for these zones, rates could be prescribed which would reasonably reflect the costs of the services performed.

On this record, however, it appears that the transportation of deciduous fruits other than grapes is subject to somewhat different considerations; that in various respects the zones which are proposed are not suitable for adoption for minimum rate purposes, and that the proposed rates and zones would not produce reasonable and nondiscriminatory charges in the range of circumstances in which they would apply. Some of the zones overlap other zones. Conflicting zone descriptions raise question as to what zones are intended. The propriety of the basing points of the proposed zones was not established. Some of the zones would cover such extended areas that it is questioned whether a single rate would be reasonable for transportation from all points within the zones. It appears, moreover, that deciduous fruits are produced in numerous areas throughout California, some of which would not be subject to zone rates under petitioner's proposal. Thus it appears that these latter areas

would be subject to the same sort of discrimination as that assailed by petitioner in its petition for reconsideration in these matters. For these reasons it is concluded that petitioner's zone proposals should not be adopted but that, instead, rates for deciduous fruits (other than grapes for which zone rates were prescribed by Decision No. 53840) should be on a distance basis corresponding in level to the zone rates now in effect. In conformity with this conclusion the distance rates will be made to apply also in lieu of the zone rates for deciduous fruits (other than grapes) which were prescribed by Decision No. 53840.

Petitioner's recommendations that reduced rates for carload shipments of apples and pears be established as exceptions to the rates which would otherwise apply to deciduous fruits appear well founded inasmuch as the evidence shows that apples and pears move predominantly in carload or truckload quantities. Reduced rates for carload or truckload shipments of potatoes, onions, and citrus fruits have heretofore been established in Minimum Rate Tariff No. 8 in recognition of lower costs which apply to such shipments. Like action for apples and pears appears justified on this record. The minimum carload weight which should govern such reduced rates should be 36,000 pounds notwithstanding the fact that utilization of a 40,000-pound minimum as recommended by the witness for California Trucking Associations, Inc., would tend to result in lower rates. The evidence shows that 36,000-pound quantities have long been the prevailing sales unit for apples and pears. The truckload minimum weight which should be prescribed herein for minimum rate purposes should reflect these commercial considerations.

Establishment of reduced rates for truckload or carload shipments of apples and pears in turn entails consideration of the rates that should apply to lesser quantities. Testimony of petitioner's traffic manager in this regard indicates that these quantities likewise are not subject to the same considerations as those which are applicable to other deciduous fruits moving in foreign commerce and that deviation from general minimum rate provisions in connection with these shipments is not so necessary. Accordingly, it is concluded that shipments of apples and pears in quantities of less than 36,000 pounds should be governed by the same rates in Minimum Rate Tariff No. 8 as those which govern the transportation of fruits and vegetables generally.

The exemption from minimum rate regulation which petitioner seeks to have established for shipments to railheads should be denied. The proposal is so broad in scope that if adopted it would apply to intrastate transportation as well as to interstate transportation or to transportation in foreign commerce. The record does not justify the adoption of an exemption of such consequence. Establishment of such an exemption to apply only to transportation of apples and pears, the transportation with which this proposal mainly is concerned, likewise does not appear justified. As pointed out in Decision No. 53840, purposes of minimum rate regulation are the stabilization of transportation and, in connection with the movements involved herein, the providing of reasonable and nondiscriminatory minimum rate structures. Establishment of the exemption which petitioner seeks would not be consistent with these purposes. With respect to the asserted discrimination between shipments to

cooling plants and shipments to other destinations -- discrimination for which the sought exemptions are urged as a cure -- it appears that to the extent that any discrimination exists in relation to the described shipments the matters should be dealt with specifically in the proper circumstances rather than by the extension of exemptions, a matter which in itself would give rise to further problems of discrimination.

Upon careful consideration of all of the facts and circumstances of record, it is concluded and found that existing minimum rates, rules and regulations in Minimum Rate Tariff No. 8 for the transportation of deciduous fruits in interstate or in foreign commerce should be revised to the extent provided in the order which follows.

O R D E R

Based on the evidence of record and upon the conclusions and findings contained in the preceding opinion,

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that:

1. Minimum Rate Tariff No. 8 (Appendix "C" to Decision No. 33977 as amended) be and it is hereby further amended by incorporating therein to become effective on June 16, 1957, the revised pages attached hereto and listed in Appendix 1, also attached hereto, which pages and appendix by this reference are made a part hereof.

2. In all other respects Decision No. 33977, as amended, shall remain in full force and effect.

3. Common carrier tariff publications required or authorized to be made as a result of the amendments herein of Minimum Rate

Tariff No. 8 shall be made effective on or before June 16, 1957, on not less than five days' notice to the Commission and to the public.

4. Except as otherwise provided herein, the several proposals of the California Grape and Tree Fruit League which were submitted in connection with its petition for rehearing or reconsideration filed October 17, 1956, and its petition for modification filed March 4, 1957, be and they hereby are denied.

This order shall become effective ten days after the date hereof.

Dated at Los Angeles, California, this 28th day of MAY, 1957.

Walter E. Mitchell
President

Ralph W. Reiser

H. H. ...

E. L. Fox

Commissioners

Commissioner Matthew J. Dooloy, being necessarily absent, did not participate in the disposition of this proceeding.

APPENDIX "1" TO DECISION NO. 55043

Revised and Original Pages to Minimum Rate Tariff
No. 8 Authorized by Said Decision

Seventh Revised Page 12 Cancels Sixth Revised Page 12

Eighth Revised Page 29 Cancels Seventh Revised Page 29

Seventh Revised Page 30 Cancels Sixth Revised Page 30

Original Page 30-C

First Revised Page 36-A Cancels Original Page 36-A

Item No.	SECTION NO. 1-RULES AND REGULATIONS OF GENERAL APPLICATION (Continued)
	<p style="text-align: center;">COMPUTATION OF DISTANCES</p> <p>Distances to be used in connection with distance rates named herein shall be the shortest constructive highway mileages provided in the Distance Table, amendments thereto or reissues thereof, subject to the following exceptions:</p> <p>*1. Distances from or to points located within zones as described in Items Nos. 270, 271 and 272 or within territories described in Items Nos. 280, 281, 282 and 283 having mileage basing points shall be computed from or to the mileage basing point designated in connection with such descriptions. (See Exception 2.) The provisions of this exception will not apply in computing mileages to be used in connection with distance commodity rates named in Item No. 307, nor will it apply in computing mileages between points located within a single zone or territory having a mileage basing point. (See Notes 1 and 2.)</p> <p>2. (a) Distances to be used from points of origin or to points of destination located within the San Francisco pickup and delivery zone, or from points of origin or to points of destination located within the Oakland pickup and delivery zone, shall be the average of the constructive mileage from or to both the San Francisco and Oakland zones. The provisions of this paragraph apply only in connection with points of origin or destination more than 70 constructive miles distant from both the San Francisco and Oakland zones.</p> <p>(b) When applied in connection with split pickup or split delivery shipments, the average mileage shall be used only when the distance computed under the provisions of Items Nos. 170 and 180, as the case may be, from or to both the San Francisco and Oakland pickup and delivery zones is more than 70 constructive miles</p> <p>(c) In the event the average mileage is less than the mileage computed from or to an intermediate point via the shortest constructive route, such lesser mileage shall apply from or to such intermediate point.</p> <p>NOTE 1.-In computing distances under the provisions of Item No. 170 on split pickup shipments originating at two or more points of origin within the zones or territories having mileage basing points as described in Items Nos. 270, 271, 272, 280, 281, 282 and 283 add to the mileage from the basing point to point of destination, the difference, if any, between the distances computed under the first paragraph hereof or Exception 2, whichever applies: (1) from point of origin or any component part to point of destination via the point or points of origin of the other component parts, and (2) from the first point of origin used in (1) to point of destination as if no split pickup has been performed.</p>

*110-G
Cancels
110-F

NOTE 2.- In computing distances under the provisions of Item No. 130 on split delivery shipments destined to two or more points of destination within a zone or territory having mileage basing points as described in Items Nos. 270, 271, 272, 280, 281, 282 and 283 add to the mileage from point of origin to the basing point the difference, if any, between the distance computed under the first paragraph hereof or Exception 2, whichever applies: (1) One-half the distance from point of origin to point of destination of any component part via the point or points of destination of the other component parts and return to point of origin, and (2) from point of origin to the last point of destination used in (1) as if no split delivery has been performed.

*Change, Decision No. 55043

EFFECTIVE JUNE 16 , 1957 ✓

Issued by the Public Utilities Commission of the State of California,
San Francisco, California.

Correction No. 187

Item No.	SECTION NO. 2 - DISTANCE COMMODITY RATES (In Cents Per 100 Pounds)									
	FRUITS AND VEGETABLES, INCLUDING MUSHROOMS, as described in Item No. 40. (Items Nos. 300 and 301.)									
MILES		MINIMUM WEIGHT							636,000	
Over	But not Over	Any Quantity	2,000 Pounds	4,000 Pounds	10,000 Pounds	18,000 Pounds	24,000 Pounds	(1)	(2)	
	0	3	68	45	39	21 ¹ / ₂	19	16	14 ¹ / ₂	
	3	5	68	45	39	21 ¹ / ₂	19	16	14 ¹ / ₂	
	5	10	69	45	40	25	20	17	15	
	10	15	70	45	41	26 ¹ / ₂	21	18	15 ¹ / ₂	
	15	20	71	46	42	27 ¹ / ₂	22	19	16	
	20	25	72	46	43	28 ¹ / ₂	23	20	17	
	25	30	73	47	44	29 ¹ / ₂	24	21	18	
	30	35	74	48	45	30 ¹ / ₂	25	22	19	
	35	40	75	49	46	31 ¹ / ₂	26 ¹ / ₂	23	19 ¹ / ₂	
	40	45	76	50	47	32 ¹ / ₂	27 ¹ / ₂	24	20 ¹ / ₂	
	45	50	79	51	48	33 ¹ / ₂	28 ¹ / ₂	25	21	
	50	60	81	53	49	34 ¹ / ₂	29 ¹ / ₂	26 ¹ / ₂	22	
	60	70	82	55	51	36	30 ¹ / ₂	27 ¹ / ₂	23 ¹ / ₂	
	70	80	84	57	52	37	31 ¹ / ₂	28 ¹ / ₂	24 ¹ / ₂	
	80	90	85	59	53	38	32 ¹ / ₂	29 ¹ / ₂	26	
	90	100	87	61	55	41	33 ¹ / ₂	30 ¹ / ₂	27 ¹ / ₂	
	100	110	89	63	57	43	34 ¹ / ₂	31 ¹ / ₂	29 ¹ / ₂	
	110	120	91	65	59	45	35 ¹ / ₂	32 ¹ / ₂	29 ¹ / ₂	
	120	130	93	67	61	47	36 ¹ / ₂	33 ¹ / ₂	31	
	130	140	94	69	63	49	37 ¹ / ₂	34 ¹ / ₂	32	
	140	150	96	71	64	52	38 ¹ / ₂	35 ¹ / ₂	33	
	150	160	98	74	66	54	41	36 ¹ / ₂	34 ¹ / ₂	
	160	170	101	77	67	56	43	37 ¹ / ₂	35 ¹ / ₂	
	170	180	103	78	68	57	45	38 ¹ / ₂	36 ¹ / ₂	
	180	190	104	79	69	58	47	40	37 ¹ / ₂	
	190	200	106	80	70	59	48	41	39	
	200	220	107	81	71	60	50	42	40	
	220	240	109	83	73	62	52	44	43	
	240	260	111	85	76	64	54	46	45	
	260	280	113	87	78	66	56	48	47	

*300-H
Cancel
300-C

(Continued in Item No. 301)

- (1) Applies only to transportation of apples and/or pears moving in inter-state or in foreign commerce.
 - (2) Rates in this column are not subject to the provisions of Supplement No. 12.
- * Change & Reduction) Decision No. **55043**

EFFECTIVE JUNE 16, 1957

Issued by the Public Utilities Commission of the State of California,
San Francisco, California.

Correction No. 188

Item No.	SECTION NO. 2 - DISTANCE COMMODITY RATES (In Cents per 100 Pounds)								
	FRUITS AND VEGETABLES, INCLUDING MUSHROOMS, as described in Item No. 40. (Item Nos. 300 and 301.)								
	MILES		MINIMUM WEIGHT						
	Over	But not Over	Any Quantity	2,000 Pounds	4,000 Pounds	10,000 Pounds	18,000 Pounds	24,000 Pounds	30,000 Pounds (1) (2)
	280	300	116	89	80	68	59	50	49
	300	325	118	92	83	70	61	52	51
	325	350	122	94	85	74	63	55	54
	350	375	124	98	88	76	66	58	57
	375	400	127	100	90	79	69	61	60
*301-G	400	425	130	103	93	82	71	63	62
Cancels	425	450	133	106	97	84	74	66	65
301-F	450	475	136	109	100	87	77	68	67
	475	500	139	112	102	90	80	71	70
	500	525	141	114	105	93	83	73	72
	525	550	145	117	108	96	86	76	75
	550	575	148	121	111	99	88	79	77
	575	600	151	124	114	102	91	82	80
	600	625	154	127	116	105	94	84	82
	625	650	157	129	120	107	97	87	84
	650	675	160	132	123	110	99	90	87
	675	700	163	135	126	113	103	92	89
	For distances over 700 miles add for each 25 miles or fraction thereof		3½	3½	3	3	2½	2½	2½

- (1) Applies only to transportation of apples and/or pears moving in interstate or in foreign commerce.
- (2) Rates in this column are not subject to the provisions of Supplement No. 12.

* Change } Decision No. 55043
 & Reduction }

EFFECTIVE JUNE 16, 1957

Issued by the Public Utilities Commission of the State of California,
 San Francisco, California.
 Correction No. 189

Item No.	SECTION NO. 2 - DISTANCE COMMODITY RATES (In Cents per 100 Pounds)					
	DECIDUOUS FRUITS, including Apricots, Berries, Cherries, Figs, Loquats, Nectarines, Peaches, Persimmons, Plums, Prunes and Quinces. (See Notes 1, 2, 3 and 4.)					
	MILES		Minimum Weight	MILES		Minimum Weight
	Over	But Not Over	Any Quantity	Over	But Not Over	Any Quantity
#307	0	3	18	190	200	42½
	3	5	18½	200	220	41½
	5	10	19	220	240	47
	10	15	19½	240	260	49½
	15	20	20	260	280	52
	20	25	21	280	300	54½
	25	30	21½	300	325	57
	30	35	22	325	350	59½
	35	40	23	350	375	62
	40	45	23½	375	400	65
	45	50	24	400	425	67½
	50	60	25	425	450	70
	60	70	26	450	475	72½
	70	80	27½	475	500	75
	80	90	28½	500	525	77½
	90	100	30	525	550	80
	100	110	31	550	575	82½
	110	120	32½	575	600	85
	120	130	33½	600	625	87½
	130	140	35	625	650	90
	140	150	36	650	675	92½
	150	160	37½	675	700	95
	160	170	38½	For distances over 700 miles add for each 25 miles or fraction thereof		
	170	180	40			
180	190	41				

NOTE 1.-Applies for the transportation of deciduous fruits, moving to steamship docks, piers, or wharves, when such movements are in interstate or in foreign commerce and are exempt from rate regulation by the Interstate Commerce Commission under the provisions of Section 203(b)(6) of the Interstate Commerce Act.

NOTE 2.-Carriers may quote and assess charges upon a different unit of measurement than that provided herein, provided:

- (1) The freight charges assessed are not less than those which would have been assessed had the rates herein been applied; and
- (2) That the carrier's shipping documents contain all the information necessary to compute the freight charges on the basis of the unit of measurement provided herein.

NOTE 3.-Rates named in this item do not alternate with rates provided in other items or sections of this tariff.

NOTE 4.-Rates do not apply for the transportation of apples or pears. For rates for these fruits, see Items Nos. 300 and 301.

Addition, Decision No. 55043

EFFECTIVE JUNE 16, 1957

Issued by the Public Utilities Commission of the State of California,
San Francisco, California.
Correction No. 190

RATES ON THIS PAGE ARE NOT SUBJECT TO PROVISIONS OF SUPPLEMENT NO. 12
 First Revised Page...36-A

Cancels

Original Page 36-A

C. 5438 (Pet. 11)*

MINIMUM RATE TARIFF NO. 8

Item No.	SECTION NO. 2-POINT TO POINT COMMODITY RATES (In Cents Per 100 Pounds)					
	TO	FROM: (See Note 4)				
	Docks, Piers and Wharves at:	Lodi Zone	Reedley Zone	Exeter Zone	Richgrove Zone	Arvin Zone
	San Francisco, Alameda, Oakland, Richmond	31	46	50	54	58
	Los Angeles Harbor (San Pedro, Wilmington, Terminal Island) and Long Beach	63	51	47	43	39
	Stockton	20	37	41	45	50

*360-A
 Cancels
 360

NOTE 1.-Applies for the transportation of grapes moving to steamship docks, piers, or wharves, when such movements are in interstate or in foreign commerce and are exempt from rate regulation by the Interstate Commerce Commission under the provisions of Section 203(b)(6) of the Interstate Commerce Act.

NOTE 2.-Carriers may quote and assess charges upon a different unit of measurement than that provided herein, provided:

- (1) The freight charges assessed are not less than those which would have been assessed had the rates herein been applied; and
- (2) That the carrier's shipping documents contain all the information necessary to compute the freight charges on the basis of the unit of measurement provided herein.

NOTE 3.-Rates named in this item do not alternate with rates provided in other items or sections of this tariff.

NOTE 4.-For description of origin zones see Items Nos. 365 and 366.

- (1) Rates for Deciduous Tree Fruits canceled from this item. For rates on apples or pears, see Items Nos. 300 and 301. For rates on other fruits previously named in this item, see Item No. 307.

* Change, Decision No. 55043

EFFECTIVE JUNE 16, 1957

Issued by the Public Utilities Commission of the State of California,
 San Francisco, California.

Correction No. 191