

ORIGINAL

Decision No. 66586

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
(Petition for Modification No. 30)

(Order Setting Hearing Dated October 9, 1962)

Arlo D. Poe, J. C. Kaspar and James Quintrall, for California Trucking Association; petitioner in Petition for Modification No. 30, and interested party in Order Setting Hearing dated October 9, 1962.

Warren Goodman, for Ventura Transfer Co., respondent.

Larry Borden, for Safeway Stores, Inc.; Leslie M. Cox, for Western Growers Association; Robert Fisse, for Rushton & Co.; Thomas B. Gallen, for Golden Gate Produce Terminal; Paul O. Helin, for Calavo Growers of California; James F. Hoadley, for Associated Produce Dealers & Brokers of Los Angeles, Inc.; Ralph Hubbard, for California Farm Bureau Federation; E. J. Langhofer, for San Diego Chamber of Commerce; Ralph J. Lehnert, for Blue Goose Growers, Inc.; E. Alan Mills, for California Grape and Tree Fruit League; William A. Ryan, for Sun-kist Growers, Inc.; W. E. Toalson, for Pure Gold, Inc.; interested parties.

Marcel J. Gagnon, R. A. Lubich and R. J. Carberry, for the Commission staff.

O P I N I O N

This decision relates to that phase of Case No. 5438 encompassed by the Commission's Order Setting Hearing dated October 9, 1962, and to Petition for Modification No. 30 in Case No. 5438, insofar as that petition is concerned with the subject matter of said order setting hearing.

Minimum Rate Tariff No. 8 provides minimum rates, charges and rules for the statewide transportation of fresh fruits, fresh vegetables and empty containers. The aforesaid order setting hearing was issued for the receipt of evidence relating to certain changes proposed by the Commission's Transportation Division staff in the rules and other provisions of the above-mentioned minimum rate tariff. The study which resulted in the formulation of these proposals was a part of a general review of all of the provisions of Minimum Rate Tariff No. 8, in which the Commission's staff is now engaged. It is contemplated that hearings for the receipt of evidence on the staff's studies relative to the minimum rates themselves and to such other provisions of the tariff as to which disposition is not made by the decision herein will be scheduled when said studies are completed.^{1/}

Public hearing was held before Examiner Bishop at San Francisco on December 18, 1962, at Los Angeles on January 24, 1963 and again at San Francisco on June 25, 1963. On the last-named date that phase of Case No. 5438 encompassed by the Commission's Order Setting Hearing dated October 9, 1962 was taken under submission, and

^{1/} The studies on which the proposals here immediately in issue are predicated were instituted following a request made in Petition for Modification No. 29 in Case No. 5438, filed on May 12, 1961, by California Trucking Associations, Inc. (now known as California Trucking Association). That petition has been superseded by the above-mentioned Petition for Modification No. 30 which was also filed by said Association. The latter petition, filed on September 16, 1961, contemplates a general review of the minimum rate structure for the transportation of fresh fruits and vegetables. For this reason said petition was scheduled for hearing with the Order Setting Hearing dated October 9, 1962 for consideration of the matters embraced by this opinion. By Decision No. 63122, dated January 16, 1962 and by Decision No. 66199, dated October 22, 1963, both in Petition for Modification No. 30, two successive interim increases in the rates named in Minimum Rate Tariff No. 8 were made, for the purpose of offsetting increased operating costs experienced by the carriers of produce. These adjustments were made pending the completion of the aforesaid comprehensive studies and hearings relative thereto.

Petition for Modification No. 30 was adjourned to a date to be set.^{2/}

An associate rate expert from the Commission's Transportation Division staff testified concerning the staff proposals for modification of the provisions of Minimum Rate Tariff No. 8. These proposals were incorporated in Exhibit No. 30-13-A, which also included a discussion of the background and reasons for the suggested changes. The witness stated that, in the opinion of the staff, the general review of Minimum Rate Tariff No. 8 should be divided into two parts: The first phase would include those rules of the tariff which appeared to merit early attention; the second phase would cover the rates, charges, and other rules. With respect to the latter phase, the witness pointed out that it would be necessary for the staff to observe one or more complete seasons in order to secure sufficient factual data for a proper evaluation of the current minimum rates.

Evidence was also presented by California Trucking Association, petitioner in Petition for Modification No. 30 and an interested party in the Order Setting Hearing. The Association's director of research testified to the effect of the staff proposals and to certain counter-proposals which he had developed.

Prior to the formulation of specific rule changes the staff made a field study of the methods of marketing fresh fruits and vegetables. Field trips were made to the Imperial, Salinas and San Joaquin Valleys and to the San Diego, Los Angeles and San Francisco Bay areas. Interested parties were contacted, including growers, shippers, dealers, brokers, commission merchants and carriers. Harvesting, packing and shipping procedures were observed in the production areas. The sales, shipping, receiving and distribution

^{2/} It is contemplated that adjourned hearings in Petition for Modification No. 30 will be scheduled when the aforesaid over-all studies of staff and of petitioner are completed.

methods employed were studied in the various market areas. Carriers were interviewed regarding their practices and methods of transporting produce. All parties contacted were invited to comment on those tariff provisions with which they were encountering difficulty. ✓

The staff's field survey disclosed that current business practices are such that it is often difficult and sometimes impossible to comply with the existing provisions of Minimum Rate Tariff No. 8. The study showed that, with minor exceptions, every business method or practice, including transportation, involving the commodities in question is governed by the highly perishable nature of the products. Every transaction emphasizes the speed necessary to move the product from the point of growth to the processing plant or the consumer's table.

It is this requirement for expeditious handling, that creates, in many instances, the conflict between practice and tariff rule. The study shows, for example, that most transactions for the purchase, sale or transportation of produce are handled by telephone. Consequently, it is seldom that shipping documentation requirements can be accomplished in advance of shipment, as required by the tariff. The rapidity with which orders, cancellations, diversions and other instructions are effected make it almost impossible to know in advance where any movement of produce might originate or terminate. The points of origin are not definite until the loading is complete, and the points of destination are seldom certain until the shipment is en route to the general area of destination.

The revisions in Minimum Rate Tariff No. 8 which have been suggested by the staff, the rate expert testified, are designed to give recognition to, and are compatible with, current trade practices. The more important of the staff proposals are hereinafter individually discussed.

Multiple Shipments

The minimum rate tariff currently provides for so-called "split pickup" shipments, consisting of several component parts, tendered at one time, received on one day and transported under one shipping document from (a) one consignor at more than one point of origin or (b) from more than one consignor at one or more points of origin. Similarly, the tariff provides for "split delivery" shipments consisting of several component parts delivered to (a) one consignee at more than one point of destination or (b) more than one consignee at one or more points of destination. The weight of both types of shipments (or the weight on which charges are assessed) must be not less than 4,000 pounds, shipping documents for such shipments must be issued in advance of movements, and split pickups and split deliveries may not be combined in a single shipment. Should split pickups and split deliveries be combined in a single shipping document, the tariff provides that each component shall be rated as a separate shipment.^{3/}

The staff witness drew attention to the practical difficulties which arise in connection with the above-mentioned tariff provisions. He pointed out that fresh fruits and vegetables are normally purchased from the producer prior to actual harvest. It is seldom that the volume and quality of a particular crop can be accurately predicted. Consequently, produce dealers rarely know in advance the precise point of origin or the weight of any purchase. In many instances it will be necessary to buy at several points produce which originally had been expected to be purchased at a single point. The buyer, conversely, cannot be sure of the quantity and quality of a purchase until the produce is loaded on a truck and ready to move.

^{3/} The presently effective provisions governing split pickup and split delivery shipments are set forth in the definitions of those terms in Item No. 11 and in the rules in Items Nos. 170 and 180 of Minimum Rate Tariff No. 8.

According to the witness, similar circumstances prevail with respect to the ultimate delivery of the load. When the dealer knows precisely what he has purchased he will start to sell. Due to the perishable nature of the produce he cannot hold the truck at the point or points of origin while the selling is in progress. Therefore, the truck will proceed toward the general area in which the produce is to be sold. When the truck reaches a predetermined point the driver will telephone the dealer for delivery instructions. If the load originated at two or more points or is to be delivered at several points, or both, each component part must be rated as a separate shipment, since either the documentation requirements for split pickup and for split delivery shipments have not been met, or both split pickup and split delivery are involved in a single transaction with the carrier. These circumstances, the witness stated, reduce the lawful application of the split pickup and split delivery provisions in question to a relatively small number of shipments. The net result is reflected in higher transportation costs to the shipper and, assertedly, a reduction in total traffic to the carrier.

Another situation, bearing upon the alleged inadequacy of the above-mentioned tariff provisions, is that in which a dealer has several less-than-truckload purchases located at various points, disposition of which is possible at several other points. Because of competitive market prices, the application of less-than-truckload rates to the individual lots as separate shipments makes it difficult to market such produce at a profit. If the lots could be moved at truckload rates, the witness stated, said lots would be sold and transported to the advantage of dealer and carrier alike.

In order that the pertinent provisions of Minimum Rate Tariff No. 8 might be made consistent with current business practices and the transportation requirements of the produce industry, the

staff's witness presented a proposed "multiple shipment" rule. This provision would permit both multiple pickups and multiple deliveries on shipments of fresh fruits and vegetables weighing 10,000 pounds or more, moving within a 48-hour period. The witness proposed also revision of the documentation requirements of the tariff to permit issuance of a shipping document within 48 hours of final delivery. The same levels of accessorial charges as now apply for split pickups and for split deliveries would be applicable under the proposed multiple shipment rule.

The proposed minimum shipment of 10,000 pounds (as contrasted with minimum of 4,000 pounds contained in the present split pickup and split delivery rules) was arbitrarily selected. Since the proposed rule would liberalize the tariff, the witness was of the opinion that the minimum size of shipment subject to the provision should be increased to adequately compensate the carriers.

According to the staff's witness, the multiple shipment rule would overlap almost entirely the current provisions relating to split pickup and split delivery shipments. He suggested, therefore, that those provisions be canceled. Another rule, for "Shipments Transported in Multiple Lots" (Item No. 185 of the tariff) the witness proposed be retained, with some revision to fit the needs of the industry. Under this rule, when a carrier is unable to pick up an entire shipment of produce at one time, the balance may, under certain specified conditions, be picked up within two days. Investigation revealed that this rule is not extensively used, but that the industry desired that it be continued in effect.

The research director of California Trucking Association, testifying on behalf of that organization, drew attention to features of the proposed multiple shipment rule which, from the standpoint of

the carriers, were objectionable. It would be possible under the proposal, he said to take ten straight shipments, for example, and combine them into one shipment. The service rendered by the carrier would be exactly the same as if handled as separate shipments, but the carriers' revenue would be drastically reduced. In the example cited by the director the charges would be reduced from \$107 under present tariff provisions to \$64.50 under the proposed rule. If the Commission should decide that rule changes should be formulated and established in advance of completion of general cost and rate studies, the director asserted, a rule should be formulated which would provide for a movement that would realize savings to the carriers, which in turn might be passed on to the shippers. In his opinion the staff proposal would not accomplish this.

The director proposed, therefore, a substitute rule, which, to avoid confusion with the staff proposal, he designated a "Produce Service Shipment" rule. As in the staff proposal, his rule would permit multiple pickups and multiple deliveries, the entire movement to be completed within 48 hours. It also provided for the same accessorial charges and for issuance of a shipping document within 48 hours after final delivery. Under the Association's proposal, however, movement would be restricted to one unit of equipment, mileage rates only would be applied, the carrier being compensated for every mile traveled in transporting the shipment, and a minimum weight of 40,000 pounds would be observed.^{4/} This last requirement, the director said, is necessary because the carrier is in effect furnishing the equipment for the exclusive use of the shipper, as multiple pickups and deliveries are made.

^{4/} It was the Association's view, the director stated, that distance rates should be specifically developed for the type of transportation here under consideration, predicated on adequate cost studies. The application of present carload rates, with a minimum weight of 40,000 pounds, was suggested purely as an interim measure, pending the completion of the staff's over-all review of the minimum rate tariff.

The Association, the director testified, was of the opinion that the present split pickup and split delivery rules should be retained, and not cancelled, as proposed by the staff.

Consolidation of Shipments at
Carriers' Established Depots

On movement out of production areas most fruits and vegetables, the record indicates, are accumulated at the various produce markets located in the major cities of the State. From these markets distribution to commercial channels is made. Commission merchants normally provide free delivery service for purchases within certain limits, and where out-of-town consignments are involved it is customary for the merchant to deliver the lot to the carrier's dock for transportation to the out-of-town buyer. Frequently a single buyer will arrange for several lots from various merchants to be delivered on one day to a single carrier's dock for shipment. Each such lot of produce is inspected at the dock by the purchaser or his agent to determine whether or not it is one that was actually purchased.

Under present tariff rules each such lot constitutes a separate shipment and must be rated accordingly. This requirement, the staff witness testified, has caused considerable hardship, particularly for those buyers who deal in commodities that generally move in small quantities. Some shippers, in order to effect consolidation of their purchases into a single large shipment, will arrange for delivery of the produce from the market to a central point. After all the lots have been assembled the purchaser will call the carrier to make the pick up of the property as a single tender. This practice, he said, results in added costs to both shipper and carrier.

In order to accord some relief to shippers in these circumstances, the staff proposes that a provision be incorporated in the minimum rate tariff (in Item No. 50), which would permit the consolidation, at a carrier's established depot, of component parts of

a single shipment of produce, subject to certain conditions. The entire shipment would be tendered to the carrier during the calendar day on which the first component part is delivered to the carrier's depot; written shipping instructions would be furnished the carrier on that same calendar day; the aggregate weight of the composite shipment (or the weight on which transportation charges are assessed) would be not less than 4,000 pounds; and such shipment would not be subject to the rate deductions provided elsewhere in the tariff for shipments which are tendered to a carrier at its depot.

The minimum weight of 4,000 pounds, the rate expert stated, was arbitrarily selected. The carrier would be furnishing storage space during the day and there should be at least 4,000 pounds in a shipment to make it worth the carrier's while. This level, he felt, would be proper, since the individual lots would generally be of small size. In general, it was his view that the proposed rule would not result in higher operating costs to the carriers than prevail under existing provisions and that it might attract business for them.

The Association's research director, testifying with respect to this proposal, was of the opinion that, if the Commission concludes to adopt a consolidation rule, the minimum weight of the consolidated shipment should be 10,000 pounds. It would be to the shipper's advantage he said, to hold the shipment on the carrier's dock until he had accumulated the greatest amount of weight, and not to release the property to the carrier until the very latest moment to make the market or the delivery schedule. It is not economically practicable, he said, for carriers to hold equipment or to make available a new unit of equipment for 4,000 pounds. A weight of 10,000 pounds, he indicated, would come somewhat closer to providing an economical load for a semitrailer, or a so-called "bobtail" truck.

Computation of Distances

Item No. 110 of the tariff contains some rather involved provisions for the computation of distances for split pickup and split delivery shipments from or to a zone or territory having a mileage basing point. The rate expert found during field study that these provisions are generally misunderstood and misapplied by shippers and carriers. He proposed that these provisions be cancelled from the tariff, and, to accommodate the new multiple shipment rule, he suggested that Item No. 110 be amended to provide that distances, for determination of rates applicable to such shipments, be computed by adding three constructive miles for each pickup to the mileage from the origin mileage base point, and a corresponding addition to the mileage to the destination base point when multiple deliveries are involved.

The figure of three miles was selected arbitrarily, but is the same as the smallest distance rate block in the tariff. The witness considered the proposed basis to be a reasonable replacement for the complicated provisions now in effect. The research director testified that the Association was opposed to the use of an arbitrary figure, such as suggested by the staff witness. While strongly endorsing the proposed cancellation of the above-mentioned provisions for computation of split shipments, the Association recommended that distance rates in connection with such shipments be determined by the constructive mileage from point of origin to point of destination which produces the shortest distance via all the points of origin or of destination involved.

Application of Tariff-Commodities

Item No. 40 of Minimum Rate Tariff No. 8 provides that the rates in the tariff apply to transportation of fresh or green fruits and vegetables (not cold pack or frozen), including fresh mushrooms.^{5/}

^{5/} Certain exceptions to these broad descriptions are also set forth in the item.

Items Nos. 40 and 41 of Minimum Rate Tariff No. 2 exempt from the application of rates in that tariff the same commodities. Questions have arisen from time to time as to what constitutes fresh fruits and vegetables and which of the two tariffs names the applicable rates. Questions have been asked, for example, whether sliced apples and cucumbers and cherries in brine, are subject to Minimum Rate Tariff No. 8 or Minimum Rate Tariff No. 2, or are exempt from both. The cost and rate studies upon which the former tariff is based, the staff witness pointed out, related to unprocessed fresh fruits and vegetables. The witness proposed that Item No. 40 be amended to clarify its application in this respect.

The question has been presented as to whether dates are fresh fruit or dried fruit. It was found in the field survey that the relative levels of the rates currently determine whether the commodity is shipped as fresh dates or as dried dates. The staff witness testified that, depending upon various factors, dates may be hydrated or dehydrated. In order to arrive at the desired condition for shipment moisture may be added to or extracted from the dates. According to the staff studies, dates which have been treated only to the extent of modifying their moisture content are marketed as fresh dates. The staff proposes, therefore, that specific reference to dates be made in the description of commodities for which rates are provided in Minimum Rate Tariff No. 8.

The proposed clarifications in Item No. 40 would be accomplished by adding to the description of fresh fruits the words "in their natural form including dates, fresh" and to the vegetable description the words "in their natural form." The staff also proposes the inclusion of a definition reading:

"IN THEIR NATURAL FORM means in the original form at the time of harvest, not further processed for human consumption other than topping, trimming, washing, coloring, fumigating, or such processing which does not alter the natural shape or form of the commodity. This definition does not include slicing, pitting, peeling, shredding, or pickling in a preservative such as brine."

The Association's view was that dates, regardless of their condition, should be included either in one tariff or the other, not in both. This, the director said, would eliminate the above-mentioned practices and would clarify the application of the tariffs with respect to the commodity in question. To amend the fruit entry in Minimum Rate Tariff No. 8 by adding reference to "fresh" dates, in his opinion would not accomplish the desired result. This witness also believed that the last sentence in the proposed definition of the expression "In their natural form" would do more to mislead and to confuse than to clarify. He suggested that if the Commission decided to include such a definition the sentence in question be omitted.

In connection with the proposed clarification of the fruit and vegetable tariff with respect to commodities embraced, the staff proposes a corresponding amendment of Item No. 40 of Minimum Rate Tariff No. 2 to clarify the exclusions therefrom of commodities for which rates are provided in Minimum Rate Tariff No. 8. The research director suggested certain modifications in the proposed language.

Exemptions

Among other exemptions set forth in the aforesaid Item No. 40 of Minimum Rate Tariff No. 8 is a provision to the effect that the rates in that tariff do not apply to the transportation of citrus fruits when the point of destination is within the Los Angeles Drayage Area, as described in Minimum Rate Tariff No. 5; nor to the empty containers used or shipped out for use in connection with such transportation. This exclusion, the record shows, was originally

placed in the tariff effective July 1, 1941, pursuant to Decision No. 34263 (not reported) in Case No. 4293. The exemption was initially established for transportation to the Los Angeles Citrus Auction Market, based upon information that movements to the Auction Market were the same as transportation to canneries and packing and processing plants, for which rates had not been established, and should receive like treatment. Subsequently representations were made to the Commission that the Citrus Auction Market was a private facility of the California Fruit Growers Exchange, and that the exemption of shipments destined to that facility had resulted in discrimination against shippers and carriers serving other wholesale markets. By Decision No. 34486, dated August 18, 1941 (43CRC703) the exemption in question was broadened to apply to citrus fruit transported to any point in the Los Angeles Drayage Area.

The record discloses that the Los Angeles Auction Market, for which the exemption was originally established, is no longer in operation. Minimum rates for the transportation of citrus fruits apply to all points in the State to the same extent and subject to the same limitations as do minimum rates on other fresh fruits and vegetables, except when the point of destination is within the Los Angeles Drayage Area.

The staff witness recommended that, in view of the above-described change in circumstances, the exemption on citrus fruits destined to the Los Angeles Drayage Area be removed from the tariff, and that the minimum rates be made applicable to such transportation. In support of this position, he quoted from Decision No. 34486, above, in which the Commission, in broadening the original exemption to include destinations in the entire Los Angeles Drayage Area, made the following statement:

"It should be understood that this course is taken solely for the purpose of removing discrimination pending the receipt of further testimony and that the rates with the necessary modifications if any are to be restored at an early date."

The witness expected that the question of revision of minimum rates on citrus fruit would be explored thoroughly in the second phase of the general review of Minimum Rate Tariff No. 8. Meanwhile he saw no reason for continuing longer the advantage over other receiving areas enjoyed by movements of citrus fruits to the Los Angeles Drayage Area by reason of the exemption here under consideration.

California Trucking Association supported the staff recommendation. In his closing statement the representative of Sunkist Growers, Inc. pointed out that in response to requests for comment by the industry on the draft of the proposed staff exhibit, distributed on June 27, 1962, Sunkist had written to the Commission on August 16, 1962 setting forth its views relative to the proposed cancellation of the citrus exemption. In its letter Sunkist recommended that a much more thorough investigation be made with respect to the exemption and its effect on all those concerned with citrus, from the grower to the ultimate consumer, before taking any action on the proposal. The representative pointed out that no further investigation into the effects of the proposed cancellation has been made, and he reiterated, for the record in these proceedings, the request for such investigation before taking any steps toward cancellation of the exemption.

Temperature Control Service

Rules and charges for icing and mechanical refrigeration are set forth in Items Nos. 155 and 157, respectively, of Minimum Rate Tariff No. 8. The staff field investigation disclosed that the preponderance of refrigeration service accorded to produce shipments is now accomplished by mechanical means. Ice is still used, but its principal application is for those commodities which require moisture.

The provisions relating to mechanical refrigeration were first published in this tariff effective July 12, 1958, pursuant to Decision No. 56770, in Case No. 5438, and were made uniform with corresponding provisions of Minimum Rate Tariff No. 2 which were then in effect. The additional charges for such refrigeration were stated in cents per 100 pounds and varied with the length of haul. Effective January 28, 1961, pursuant to Decision No. 61177, the rules and charges published in Minimum Rate Tariff No. 2 for refrigeration service were replaced by rules and rates governing shipments accorded Temperature Control Service. The new rates were set forth in conversion tables in which the rates for shipments transported under temperature control service were directly related to the corresponding rates for the same movements where such service was not furnished. Thus the rates for Chilled Temperature Control Service and for Frozen Temperature Control Service were approximately 5 and 10 percent higher, respectively, than the corresponding regular rates.

The staff witness proposed that the current provisions of Minimum Rate Tariff No. 8 relating to mechanical and icing refrigeration be cancelled and in their stead rates for Chilled Temperature Control Service the same as those currently provided in Minimum Rate Tariff No. 2 be adopted with appropriate rules for Minimum Rate Tariff No. 8. In making this suggestion the staff witness expressed the opinion that the service rendered and the operating costs involved in connection with the furnishing of temperature control service are substantially the same for fresh fruits and vegetables as for general commodities. He had made no study, however, to determine whether such is a fact. The witness also suggested concurrent cancellation of the definitions of bunker and vehicle icing presently stated in Items Nos. 10 and 11, and the publication in lieu

thereof of a definition of Temperature Control Service.

The staff proposal was opposed by the Association. The research director testified that the circumstances that determined the above-stated relationships, as set forth in the conversion tables in Minimum Rate Tariff No. 2 would not be valid for the movement of produce transported under the rates in Minimum Rate Tariff No. 8.^{6/} While the Association favored the format of the proposed tariff item, the percentage relationships reflected therein were not proper. Several member carriers had made checks of their freight bills to determine the effect of the proposed temperature control charges. For the carriers reporting, the director said, the total reduction in refrigeration revenues would amount to \$20,000 per month, if the present refrigeration provisions were replaced by those proposed by the staff. It is the position of the Association, accordingly, that present provisions should be retained, pending the outcome of proper studies of the problem, in the second part of the general review of Minimum Rate Tariff No. 8.

The director did suggest, however, certain modifications in the definition of bunker icing and in the present rules in Item No. 155 governing the furnishing of refrigeration service. These changes would be in the nature of clarification.

Routes

Minimum Rate Tariff No. 8 names point-to-point rates between Los Angeles Territory and San Francisco Territory. These rates are intermediate in application via certain routes, specified in Item No. 700 of the tariff. During the staff field study it was found

^{6/} The director pointed out that the above-mentioned percentage relationships of 5 and 10 percent were developed by a careful analysis of the charges per hundredweight, which were indicated by the cost per hundredweight as related to the average revenues per hundredweight for traffic subject to Minimum Rate Tariff No. 2. The produce tariff, he said, does not provide line-haul revenues, mile per mile, per hundredweight, or on any other basis, which are comparable to the revenues generally provided under Minimum Rate Tariff No. 2.

that the areas along State Highway 126 in the vicinity of Santa Paula and Fillmore are important production areas for citrus fruits. While State Highway 118, which parallels State Highway 126 through Saticoy and Moorpark to the south, is included in the routes specified in Item No. 700, the latter route is not so included. This omission, the rate expert stated, deprives the shippers of citrus and other fruits and vegetables along State Highway 126 of the benefit of the aforesaid point-to-point rates. It is the staff's recommendation that State Highway 126 be added to Route 4 in Item No. 700, to correct this deficiency.

The Association opposed the staff's recommendation. It is the position of that organization, the research director testified, that there is no justification for maintaining any point-to-point rates in Minimum Rate Tariff No. 8. The volume of produce moving between San Francisco and Los Angeles, he said, is not at all comparable to the volume of traffic transported between those points under Minimum Rate Tariff No. 2, which latter tariff set the pattern for the point-to-point rates in the produce tariff.^{7/} To add another route to Minimum Rate Tariff No. 8 would, in his opinion, serve to perpetuate and fortify an improper tariff adjustment. He urged, therefore, that the Commission await the outcome of the further general studies before adding any routes to the tariff.

Miscellaneous Provisions

The staff witness suggested several additional minor changes in the provisions of Minimum Rate Tariff No. 8, either for clarification or made necessary if the proposed rule changes hereinabove described should be adopted. These matters included cancellation of various definitions and the addition of others (Items Nos.

^{7/} With one minor exception in the produce tariff, the San Francisco-Los Angeles class rates in M.R.T. No. 2 and produce rates in M.R.T. No. 8 are the same as the corresponding distance rates for the 325-350 mile block.

10 and 11), modification of provisions relating to determination of weights (Item No. 60), alternative application of common carrier rates (Items Nos. 210, 230, 240 and 250), and revision of documentation requirements (Items Nos. 255 and 800).

These proposals need not be individually described except to mention that the staff proposes that, in addition to requiring the issuance of a shipping document, carriers shall be required to issue a freight bill for each shipment transported. Under the proposal a single combined shipping document and freight bill might be issued provided that all the information required of each were included on the single document. It is proposed also to make such changes in the information now required to be shown on the shipping document as are necessitated by the proposed multiple shipment rule. Additionally the staff suggests that Item No. 800, in which is set forth a form of shipping document which purports to satisfy the present requirements of Item No. 255, be cancelled.

Minimum Charge

California Trucking Association, in addition to the counter-proposals hereinbefore mentioned, proposed that certain of the minimum charges provided in Item No. 160 of Minimum Rate Tariff No. 8 be increased. The charges in question are those applicable when the constructive distance from point of origin to destination is not over 150 miles. At the time of hearing these charges ranged from 69 cents for shipments weighing 25 pounds or less to 135 cents for shipments weighing over 100 pounds. By Decision No. 66199, dated October 22, 1963 these charges have since been increased to levels ranging from 74 cents to 145 cents. The Association proposed that said charges be increased to the basis applicable when the constructive distance exceeds 150 miles. At that time this basis was for 100 pounds at the commodity rate applicable thereto but not less

than \$1.55. The figure of \$1.55 has since been increased, by the aforesaid Decision No. 66199 to \$1.65.^{8/}

The present minimum charges in the fruit and vegetable tariff, the director pointed out, are substantially below those in effect in the Commission's other minimum rate tariffs, and were not predicated on cost studies. Gift fruit packs assertedly move in large volume under these low minimum charges. While no cost data bearing on the charges are available at the present time, the director was of the opinion that the Commission could take official notice of the marked discrepancies between the levels of the minimum charges in question and comparable charges in other minimum rate tariffs, as a basis for increasing the former to a more compensatory level.

Positions of the Parties

At the December 18, 1962 hearing, the representative of California Farm Bureau Federation moved that the phase of Case No. 5438 embraced by Order Setting Hearing dated October 9, 1962 be not taken under submission until all the evidence relative to the general review of the rates, rules and regulations in Minimum Rate Tariff No. 8 had been received and that disposition then be made of the entire subject in a single decision. He argued that it was impossible for his organization to take a position with respect to the staff proposals until the rate effect, in the light of such changes in the transportation rates and charges as might be made following the second phase of the review, should be known.

The foregoing motion was supported by counsel for California Trucking Association and by representatives of Western Growers Association, Sunkist Growers, Inc., and California Grape and Tree

^{8/} As hereinbefore mentioned, by Decision No. 66199 the rates and charges in Minimum Rate Tariff No. 8 were generally increased to offset increases in operating costs.

Fruit League.^{9/} Following the Los Angeles hearing of January 24, 1963, the Commission denied the motion. At the request of California Trucking Association an additional hearing was scheduled to enable the parties to further examine the staff witness and to introduce additional evidence on their own behalf. At that hearing on June 25, 1963 such evidence was introduced on behalf of the carriers' organization through their research director. No other parties presented evidence relative to the staff proposals.

The positions of the various parties with respect to particular proposals have been hereinbefore stated. As previously stated, the phase embraced by the Order Setting Hearing was taken under submission at the close of the final session.

Discussion, Findings and Conclusions

The record is clear that certain of the requirements of Minimum Rate Tariff No. 8 do not comport with the exigencies of the produce industry, and that some revision in the rules provided in said tariff is necessary in order to meet the practicalities attendant upon the harvesting, transportation and marketing of fresh fruits and vegetables. The record is persuasive, moreover, that such revision of the rules governing the minimum rates should not wait upon any revision of the rates themselves which may issue eventually from the second part of the general review.

The multiple shipment rule advanced by the staff, coupled with the suggested change in the documentation requirements to permit the issuance of a shipping document within 48 hours of the final delivery, would be of considerable benefit to produce shippers. At the same time, however, by permitting the consolidation of a number of less than carload shipments into a single large shipment, there would be a substantial reduction in revenue to the carriers by reason of the lower rate assessed, with no reduction in operating costs. The rule suggested by the Association as a counterproposal would compensate the carriers, mile for mile, for the services performed,

^{9/} The motion was initially also supported by the representative of Calavo Growers of California. However, at a subsequent hearing he withdrew that support.

and is accordingly desirable from their standpoint. We are of the opinion that the rule proposed by the Association, with certain modifications, should be adopted. The rule should apply in connection both with distance rates and with point-to-point rates. The suggested minimum weight of 40,000 pounds does not appear justified. A minimum weight of 24,000 pounds, the lowest in the tariff for carload shipments, appears reasonable. In order to avoid confusion with the designation "Shipments Transported in Multiple Lots", for which provisions are set forth in Item No. 185, the new multiple shipment rule may properly be designated as one for "Produce Service Shipments".

Closely related to the question of provisions for multiple shipments are the proposed changes in the rule for computation of distances (Item No. 110). The witnesses agreed that the complicated provisions in Notes 1 and 2 of the Item, relating to split pickup or split delivery shipments having one or more points of origin or of destination within zones or territories for which mileage basing points are prescribed, should be cancelled. With this we are in accord, since great difficulty has been experienced in their application. We are of the opinion, however, that the Association's proposal that, in such instances, the shortest constructive distances via all points of origin and all points of destination shall apply, is not justified. The staff proposal that where multiple (or split) pickups or deliveries are involved in zones or territories, three constructive miles should be added to the distance from or to the mileage base point for each pickup or delivery, appears reasonable and should be adopted. This should apply alike to split pickup, split delivery and produce service shipments.

As a part of his proposal to establish a multiple shipment rule, the staff witness suggested cancellation of the present split pickup and split delivery rules on the theory that there would no longer be much use for the latter. The Association's director

testified, however, that such cancellation would, in many instances, result in higher charges to the shipper. This manifestly is so, since the total weight of a split pickup or of a split delivery shipment may be as low as 4,000 pounds, whereas under the staff multiple shipment rule the required weight would at least amount to 10,000 pounds. The necessity of retaining the split pickup and split delivery rules is even more evident in view of the multiple shipment or produce service shipment rule herein found reasonable, with its minimum weight requirement of 24,000 pounds.

Adoption of the proposed rule permitting consolidation of shipments at carriers' depots also will constitute a step toward modernization of the minimum rate tariff in the light of produce marketing practices. The reasons given by the Association's director for observing a minimum weight of 10,000 pounds, rather than 4,000 pounds, in connection with such shipments are persuasive. The adoption of the proposed rule, with this modification, will be reasonable.

The staff proposals for Item No. 40 (Application of Tariff-Commodities) are in the nature of clarification. The suggested addition of the words "in their natural form" to the descriptions of fresh or green fruits and vegetables necessitated the formulation of a definition of the expression. The main sentence in the proposed definition as hereinabove set forth, makes it clear, we believe, how far the produce may be advanced in its preparation for the consumer and remain subject to the provisions of Minimum Rate Tariff No. 8. It does not appear necessary, therefore, to include the second sentence containing a list of operations, the performance of which removes the commodity from "its natural form". The inclusion of such a list will raise questions as to the effect of still other processes which are not specified.

The further amendment of the description of fresh or green fruits by adding thereto the words "including dates, fresh" also appears proper. The view of the Association that all dates, whether fresh or other than fresh, should be included in one tariff, either Minimum Rate Tariff No. 2 or Minimum Rate Tariff No. 8, is not persuasive. The latter tariff is specifically designed for fresh produce only. Whether a particular shipment of dates is properly described as fresh or other than fresh is a question of fact, and such determination should be made, presumably by reference to standards of moisture content, without reference to particular tariff situations such as the circumstance that the rates for a particular movement may be lower for dried dates than for fresh dates or that there may be no published single factor joint rates on fresh dates for movement over two or more common carriers involved in the transportation.

In view of the foregoing, the commodity descriptions in Item No. 40 should be amended as proposed by the staff and the definition of "in their natural form" should be included, omitting, however, the second sentence proposed for the latter. The corresponding clarification of the same entries in Item No. 40 of Minimum Rate Tariff No. 2, as also suggested by the staff, should be adopted in part. Certain of the suggested wording might be construed to make the class rates applicable to all exempt movements named in Minimum Rate Tariff No. 8, and therefore should not be adopted.

The staff proposal to cancel from Item No. 40 of Minimum Rate Tariff No. 8 the provision to the effect that the rates in the tariff do not apply to citrus fruit destined to points in the Los Angeles Drayage Area would have the effect of establishing minimum rates for the movements in question, on the level of the minimum rates, principally distance rates, applicable to fresh fruits and

vegetables, ^{10/} presently maintained in the tariff. In view of the fact that the circumstances which resulted in the establishment of the exemption on movements to the Los Angeles Citrus Auction Market no longer pertain, and since it was the intent, in broadening the exemption to apply to the entire Los Angeles Drayage Area, to restore the minimum rates at equitable levels as soon as practicable, the cancellation proposal appears to have merit. The plan is further given support by the fact that the rates in Minimum Rate Tariff No. 8 apply presently to shipments of all kinds of fresh fruits and vegetables, including citrus fruit, destined to all market areas of the State other than the Los Angeles market area. Moreover, said rates presently apply on shipments of all kinds of fresh fruits and vegetables, except citrus fruits, when the destination point is in the Los Angeles market area. There appears no valid reason for thus according special treatment to movements into said area.

It is to be remembered, however, that the exemption in question has been in effect for 21 years, during which time it may well be that trade practices have grown up, based upon levels of transportation rates to the Los Angeles Drayage Area, which would be seriously disrupted by adoption of the proposal without further study. The record shows that the staff has made no study of the movement and marketing of citrus, as such, anywhere in the State, but only as such functions constitute a part of the distribution of fresh fruits and vegetables in general. We are therefore of the opinion that a more thorough study of the problem is indicated, that such study should be included in the second part of the aforesaid general review,

^{10/} With the exception of certain rates published to docks, wharves and railheads for movements in interstate or foreign commerce and certain rates applicable within the San Francisco and East Bay drayage zones, the rates provided in Minimum Rate Tariff No. 8 for shipments of citrus fruits are those provided for fresh fruits and vegetables of all kinds.

and that on the basis of this record the proposed cancellation is not justified.

The staff proposal to cancel the present charges and rules relating to refrigeration services and to substitute therefor a system of rates and rules for "temperature control service", of the character and scheme currently set forth in Minimum Rate Tariff No. 2, is a commendable step toward the modernization of the produce tariff. The evidence adduced through the Association's research director, however, is persuasive that the proposed 105 percent relationship of rates including "chilled temperature control service" to rates which do not include such service has not been satisfactorily established as the proper relationship to be used in the produce tariff. A specific study should be made to determine what percentage relationship of the respective sets of rates will, on the average, return to the carriers the costs of providing the temperature control service. Such a study should be included in the second phase of the general review of the tariff provisions. Accordingly, the present provisions, including definitions,^{11/} relating to refrigeration service should be retained pending the outcome of the aforesaid study.

We turn now to the staff proposal that a route through Santa Paula and Fillmore be added to the routes over which the point-to-point rates between San Francisco and Los Angeles territories apply. As hercinbefore noted, the Association's objection to this proposal is based on the contention that no point-to-point rates whatsoever, between the territories in question, should be provided in the fruit and vegetable tariff. The validity of such position

^{11/} The research director suggested a clarification of the definition of "bunker icing" to specifically state that such icing service does not include the furnishing of mechanical means for distributing the cool air. The proposal appears reasonable and should be adopted.

obviously has not been established on this record, and there is no assurance at this time that it will be given effect through cancellation of said point-to-point rates at a future date. Meanwhile, it appears that the citrus growers along State Highway 126 are being discriminated against, since the point-to-point rates are not available to them, whereas said rates are enjoyed by competing growers located a short distance to the south along State Highway 118. As compared with the latter route, the proposed route over State Highway 126 is reasonably direct. We are of the opinion that the proposed route addition is reasonable and should be adopted.

The proposed requirement for a "freight bill" and the suggested modifications of present shipping documentation requirements to meet the new multiple shipment rule are reasonable, with the further modification made necessary by the adoption of the term "produce service shipment" for such rule. Certain other minor modifications, which need not be elaborated, also appear proper. It does not appear desirable, however, to adopt the staff suggestion that the form of shipping document provided in Item No. 800 be cancelled. In all of its minimum rate tariffs the Commission has for many years published forms of shipping documents, as an indication to the carriers of what is considered by the Commission to be a suitable and proper form. We see no valid reason for changing this long-established practice. The form should be retained.

As to the remaining tariff changes, of a minor nature, proposed by the staff, these have been considered and will be adopted or disallowed as indicated in the attached tariff pages. Detailed discussion is not necessary.^{12/}

^{12/} Among others, the staff proposed to designate the Golden Gate Produce Terminal, located at South San Francisco, as a single market area in Item No. 290 of the tariff. This adjustment has been made, effective November 23, 1963, by Decision No. 66124, pursuant to Petition for Modification No. 36, filed by California Trucking Association on December 19, 1962.

With respect to the Association's proposal to increase the minimum charges for perishables transported 150 miles or less, it is true that the charges in question are considerably lower than corresponding charges in other minimum tariffs.^{13/} However, there appears to be no basis on this record for eliminating the so-called "grasshopper" scale of charges. By what amounts, if any, these charges should be increased beyond the levels to which they were raised effective October 22, 1963, is a matter for specific study, which we believe should be made a part of the second phase of the general study.

Upon careful consideration of all the facts and circumstances of record the Commission finds:

1. Revision in the provisions of Minimum Rate Tariff No. 8 as indicated in the revised tariff pages attached hereto should be adopted.
2. The minimum rates, rules and regulations so established are the just, reasonable and nondiscriminatory minimum rates, rules and regulations for the transportation governed thereby.
3. Increases resulting from said revision are justified and are necessary to assure the public the maintenance of adequate and dependable service by the carriers affected.
4. The amendment of the commodity descriptions for fresh fruits and fresh vegetables in Items Nos. 40 and 41 of Minimum Rate Tariff No. 2 proposed by the staff, as modified by California Trucking Association, and to be made concurrently effective with the changes to be made in Minimum Rate Tariff No. 8 by the order which follows, are justified.

^{13/} It is to be observed that there is no uniformity among the various minimum rate tariffs as to the levels of their respective minimum charges.

In order to avoid duplication of tariff distribution Minimum Rate Tariff No. 2 will be amended by separate order.

O R D E R

IT IS ORDERED that:

1. Minimum Rate Tariff No. 8 (Appendix "C" to Decision No. 33977, as amended) is further amended by incorporating therein, to become effective February 15, 1964, the revised pages attached hereto and listed in the Appendix also attached hereto, which revised pages and appendix by this reference are made a part hereof.

2. Tariff publications required to be made by common carriers as a result of the order herein may be made effective not earlier than the tenth day after the effective date of this order on not less than ten days' notice to the Commission and to the public and such tariff publications shall be made effective not later than February 15, 1964; and the tariff publications which are authorized but not required to be made by common carriers as a result of the order herein may be made effective not earlier than the tenth day after the effective date of this order, and may be made effective on not less than ten days' notice to the Commission and to the public if filed not later than sixty days after the effective date of the minimum rate tariff pages incorporated in this order.

3. Common carriers in establishing and maintaining the rates, rules and regulations authorized hereinabove, are authorized to depart from the provisions of Section 460 of the Public Utilities Code to the extent necessary to adjust long- and short-haul departures now maintained under outstanding authorizations; such outstanding authorizations are hereby modified only to the extent necessary to comply with this order; and schedules containing the rates, rules

and regulations published under this authority shall make reference to the prior orders authorizing long- and short-haul departures and to this order.

4. That phase of Case No. 5438 embraced by the Commission's Order Setting Hearing dated October 9, 1962 is discontinued.

The effective date of this order shall be twenty days after the date hereof.

Dated at San Francisco, California, this 7th day of JANUARY, 1964.

President

Robert E. Mitchell

Walter A. Page

George E. Crover

Fredrick B. Hallock

Commissioners

Commissioner William M. Bennett, being necessarily absent, did not participate in the disposition of this proceeding.

Appendix to Decision No. 66586

List of Revised Pages to Minimum Rate Tariff No. 8

Authorized by Said Decision

Tenth Revised Page 4

Sixth Revised Page 5

Fourth Revised Page 7

Twenty-fourth Revised Page 8

Original Page 8-A

Seventh Revised Page 9

Ninth Revised Page 12

Tenth Revised Page 13

Thirteenth Revised Page 14

Original Page 15-A

Eleventh Revised Page 16

First Revised Page 16-A

Eleventh Revised Page 21

Original Page 21-A

Fifth Revised Page 44

Third Revised Page 46

Item No.	SECTION NO. 1 - RULES AND REGULATIONS OF GENERAL APPLICATION
	<p style="text-align: center;">DEFINITION OF TECHNICAL TERMS (Items Nos. 10 and 11)</p> <p>§(a) BUNKER ICING means placing ice in bunkers or compartments in carrier's equipment, separate or apart from the cargo area thereof, *but not including the providing of mechanical means for distributing the cool air such as fans.</p> <p>(b) CARRIER'S EQUIPMENT means any motor truck or other self-propelled highway vehicle, trailer, semi-trailer, or any combination of such highway vehicles, operated by the carrier.</p> <p>(c) COMMON CARRIER RATE means any intrastate rate or rates of any common carrier or common carriers, as defined in the Public Utilities Act, lawfully on file with the Commission and in effect at time of shipment; any interstate or foreign rate or rates of any common carrier railroad or railroads applying between points in California by an interstate or foreign route, lawfully in effect at time of shipment; also any interstate or foreign rate or rates of any common carrier or common carriers, as defined in the Public Utilities Act, applying between points in California and in effect at time of shipment and covering transportation exempt from rate regulation of the Interstate Commerce Commission under Section 203(b)(6) or Section 203(b)(8) of Part II of the Interstate Commerce Act.</p> <p>(1) §10</p> <p>*(d) COMPONENT PART means any part of a shipment separately received by the carrier whether or not such part is separately delivered by the carrier; and any part of a shipment separately delivered by the carrier whether or not such part is separately received by the carrier.</p> <p>(e) CONTAINER ICING means placing ice within the package with the fruit or vegetable shipped.</p> <p>(f) DISTANCE TABLE means Distance Table No. 4.</p> <p>(g) DEBTOR means the person obligated to pay the freight charges to the carrier, whether consignor, consignee, or other party.</p> <p>(h) ESTABLISHED DEPOT means a freight terminal owned or leased and maintained by a carrier for the receipt and delivery of shipments.</p> <p>(i) INDEPENDENT-CONTRACTOR SUBHAULER means any carrier who renders service for a principal carrier, for a specified recompense, for a specified result, under the control of the principal as to the result of the work only and not as to the means by which such result is accomplished.</p> <p>(j) PICKUP AND DELIVERY CHARGE means the full charge applicable without the deduction authorized by Item No. 120.</p>

C. 5438 (OSM of 10-9-62)*

(k) POINT OF DESTINATION means the precise location at which property is tendered for physical delivery into the custody of the consignee or his agent. (See also Item No. 120, paragraph 2.)

§(1) POINT OF ORIGIN means the precise location at which property is physically delivered by the consignor or his agent into the custody of the carrier for transportation; except that all locations within a single plant or shipping area of one consignor, and all locations within a radius of 100 yards from a single point, within a single field will be considered as one point of origin. *A single plant or shipping area shall include only contiguous property which shall not be deemed separate if intersected only by a public street or thoroughfare.

(m) POWER EQUIPMENT means any gasoline, diesel, electric or gas driven equipment including electric powered cranes and lift-truck equipment.

(Continued in Item No. 11)

(1) Portion of the definitions formerly shown on this page transferred to Item No. 11, Sixth Revised Page 5.

∅ Change)
* Addition) Decision No.

66586

EFFECTIVE FEBRUARY 15, 1964

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

Correction No. 361

Item No.	SECTION NO. 1 - RULES AND REGULATIONS OF GENERAL APPLICATION (Continued)
	<p data-bbox="531 377 1281 445">DEFINITION OF TECHNICAL TERMS (Concluded) (Items Nos. 10 and 11)</p> <p data-bbox="350 476 1450 861">*(n) PRODUCE SERVICE SHIPMENT means a shipment, transported in one unit of equipment in one continuous movement not exceeding 48 hours in duration, consisting of one or more component parts delivered to, and/or received from, one or more consignee(s) or consignor(s) at one or more points of origin and/or destination. All shipping instructions and freight charges must be assumed by a single party when there is more than one consignee or consignor, and any oral shipping instructions must be confirmed by a single shipping document not later than 48 hours after final delivery. Applies only to truckload shipments subject to a minimum weight of 24,000 pounds or more.</p> <p data-bbox="350 893 1460 1054">(o) RAILHEAD means a point at which facilities are maintained for the loading of property into or upon, or the unloading of property from, rail cars or vessels. It also includes truck loading facilities of plants or industries, located at such rail or vessel loading or unloading point.</p> <p data-bbox="350 1085 1450 1184">(p) RATE includes charges and, also, the ratings, minimum weight, rules and regulations governing, and the accessorial charges applying in connection therewith.</p> <p data-bbox="350 1216 1433 1351">(q) SAME TRANSPORTATION means transportation of the same kind and quantity of property and subject to the same limitations, conditions and privileges, although not necessarily in an identical type of equipment.</p> <p data-bbox="244 1374 1438 1510">(1) (r) SHIPMENT means a quantity of freight tendered by one shipper on one shipping document at one point of origin at one time for one consignee at one point of destination. (See also paragraphs *(n), (s) and (t) of this item.)</p> <p data-bbox="350 1541 1438 1869">(s) SPLIT PICKUP SHIPMENT means a shipment consisting of several component parts, tendered at one time, received during one day and transported under one shipping document from (a) one consignor at more than one point of origin, or (b) more than one consignor at one or more points of origin the composite shipment weighing (or transportation charges computed upon a weight of) not less than 4,000 pounds, said shipment being consigned and delivered to one consignee at one point of destination and charges thereon being paid by the consignee when there is more than one consignor.</p> <p data-bbox="350 1898 1455 2184">(t) SPLIT DELIVERY SHIPMENT means a shipment consisting of several component parts delivered to (a) one consignee at more than one point of destination, or (b) more than one consignee at one or more points of destination, the composite shipment weighing (or transportation charges computed upon a weight of) not less than 4,000 pounds, said shipment being shipped by one consignor on one shipping document at one point of origin at one time and charges thereon being paid by the consignor when there is more than one consignee.</p> <p data-bbox="452 2208 488 2229">**</p>

C. 5438 (OSH of 10-9-62)*

(u) TEAM TRACK means a point at which property may be loaded into, or upon, or unloaded from rail cars by the public generally. It also includes wharves, docks and landings at which the public generally may receive and tender shipments of property from and to common carriers by vessel.

(v) UNIT OF CARRIER'S EQUIPMENT means one or more pieces of carrier's equipment (as defined in paragraph (b) hereof) physically connected so as to form a complete unit.

(w) VEHICLE ICING means placing ice around or over the packages within carrier's equipment.

(1) Portion of the definitions shown herein transferred from Item No. 10, Ninth Revised Page 4.

∅ Change)	
* Addition)	
** Reference to Tail-gate)	Decision No.
Loading and Unloading)	66586
eliminated)	

EFFECTIVE FEBRUARY 15, 1964

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

Correction No. 362

Item No.	SECTION NO. 1 - RULES AND REGULATIONS OF GENERAL APPLICATION (Continued)
	<p data-bbox="563 471 1202 536">APPLICATION OF TARIFF - COMMODITIES (Items Nos. 40 and 41)</p> <p data-bbox="327 567 1433 632">Rates in this tariff apply to transportation of the following commodities (See Exception):</p> <ul data-bbox="398 664 1372 1187" style="list-style-type: none">∅Fruits, fresh or green, *in their natural form, including dates, fresh (not cold pack nor frozen), *subject to Note 2(h);Mushrooms, fresh (not cold pack nor frozen);Nuts, in the shell;Nuts, field shelled, subject to Note 2(g);∅Vegetables, fresh or green, *in their natural form, including mushrooms, fresh (not cold pack nor frozen), *subject to Note 2(h);Containers, empty, second-hand, returning from an outbound paying load, of commodities for which rates are provided herein or forwarded for a return paying load, of commodities for which rates are provided in this tariff, subject to Note 1;Containers, empty, for which rates are provided in Section No. 4 of this tariff. <p data-bbox="332 1218 1433 1447">NOTE 1.-Highway carriers must determine before accepting shipment that said containers were moved filled and are being returned by the same carrier or carriers to consignor of the filled containers; or that containers shipped for return paying load will, when filled, move by the same carrier or carriers to the consignor of the original empty containers.</p> <p data-bbox="211 1453 265 1486">∅40</p> <p data-bbox="335 1479 1285 1544">EXCEPTION.-Rates in this tariff do not apply to transportation of:</p> <ul data-bbox="335 1575 1422 2325" style="list-style-type: none">(a) Fresh or green fruits, nuts (in the shell or field shelled), fresh or green vegetables, or mushrooms, as described herein, when the point of destination of the shipment is a cannery, accumulation station, precooling plant, or winery; nor to the empty containers used or shipped out for use in connection with such transportation, subject to Note 2.(aa) Fresh or green fruits, fresh or green vegetables, or mushrooms, as described herein, moving to a cold storage plant to be held for interim storage for a subsequent movement to a cannery, subject to Notes 2 and 4.(b) Fresh or green fruits, nuts (in the shell or field shelled), fresh or green vegetables, or mushrooms, as described herein, when transported from the field or point of growth to a packing plant, cold storage plant, or a packing shed, nor when transported between packing sheds, subject to Notes 2, 3 and 5.(bb) Empty containers used or shipped out for use in connection with transportation described in paragraph (b) above, subject to Notes 2 and 3.

C. 5438 (OSH of 10-9-62)*

(c) Citrus fruits when the point of destination of the shipment is within the Los Angeles Drayage Area, as described in Minimum Rate Tariff No. 5; nor to the empty containers used or shipped out for use in connection with such transportation.

(d) Sugar beets when the point of destination of the shipment is a beet sugar factory or a railroad loading dump.

(e) Property of the United States, or property transported under an agreement whereby the United States contracted for the carrier's services.

(Continued in Item No. 41)

∅ Change } Decision No. 66586
* Addition }

EFFECTIVE FEBRUARY 15, 1964

Issued by the Public Utilities Commission of the State of California,
San Francisco, California.
Correction No. 363

Item No.	SECTION NO. 1 - RULES AND REGULATIONS OF GENERAL APPLICATION (Continued)
	<p data-bbox="558 497 1422 561" style="text-align: center;">APPLICATION OF TARIFF - COMMODITIES (Concluded) (Items Nos. 40 and 41)</p> <p data-bbox="376 595 1422 659">NOTE 2.--For the purpose of these items, the following definitions will apply:</p> <p data-bbox="376 690 1462 793">(a) Packing Shed or Packing Plant:--Facilities maintained for assembling, sorting, grading, shelling, hulling, or packing the commodity for shipment.</p> <p data-bbox="376 793 1445 883">(b) Precooling Plant:--Facilities maintained for the purpose of precooling commodities for shipment under refrigeration.</p> <p data-bbox="376 883 1409 947">(c) Cold Storage Plant:--Facilities maintained for the storage of commodities under refrigeration.</p> <p data-bbox="376 947 1445 1076">(d) Cannery:--Facilities maintained for the processing of commodities at which the commodities are canned, preserved, dried, frozen, pickled, brined, or otherwise processed into manufactured products.</p> <p data-bbox="376 1076 1445 1166">(e) Winery:--Facilities maintained for the purpose of producing vinous liquors, including wine, champagne and brandy.</p> <p data-bbox="376 1166 1445 1334">(f) Accumulation Station:--Yards or open areas maintained for the receiving of unprocessed commodities from the field, and accumulation and consolidation of such commodities for shipment to a cannery, winery, cold storage plant or precooling plant.</p> <p data-bbox="376 1334 1471 1424">(g) Field Shelled:--Rough shelled, with or without removal of broken shells, dirt, residue, or foreign material, and not cleaned nor further processed.</p> <p data-bbox="376 1424 1471 1591">* (h) In Their Natural Form:--Means in the original form at the time of harvest, not further processed for human consumption than topping, trimming, washing, coloring, fumigating, or such processing as does not alter the natural shape or form of the commodity.</p> <p data-bbox="376 1682 1409 1875">NOTE 3.--Except for the transportation of citrus fruits in field boxes or in bulk, carrots, avocados, or nuts (in the shell or field shelled), exemption does not apply when the distance between the point of origin and point of destination exceeds 50 constructive miles computed in accordance with the provisions of Item No. 110.</p> <p data-bbox="376 1908 1462 1998">NOTE 4.--Exemption applies only when shipper certifies on the shipping document covering the transportation that the ultimate destination of the shipment is a cannery.</p> <p data-bbox="376 2037 1445 2192">NOTE 5.--Exemption applies for the transportation of nuts (in the shell or field shelled) even though shipment is stopped in transit at an accumulation station when moving from the field or point of growth to a packing plant or shed.</p>

ø41

C. 5438 (OSH of 10-9-62)*

(1) Item No. 50 transferred to Original Page 8-A.

o Change)
* Addition) Decision No.

66586

EFFECTIVE FEBRUARY 15, 1964

Issued by the Public Utilities Commission of the State of California,
San Francisco, California.
Correction No. 364

Item No.	SECTION NO. 1 - RULES AND REGULATIONS OF GENERAL APPLICATION (Continued)
(1) ø50	<p style="text-align: center;">SHIPMENTS TO BE RATED SEPARATELY</p> <p>Each shipment shall be rated separately. Shipments shall not be consolidated nor combined by the carrier. (See Exceptions).</p> <p>ø EXCEPTION 1 - Component parts of a split pickup or split delivery shipment or of a produce service shipment as defined in Item No. 11 may be combined under the provisions of Items Nos. 170, 175 and 180.</p> <p>*EXCEPTION 2 - Component parts of a shipment may be consolidated at a carrier's established depot, subject to the following provisions:</p> <p>(a) The transportation charges for such consolidated shipment shall be paid by a single debtor;</p> <p>(b) The entire shipment shall be tendered to the carrier for transportation during the calendar day the first component part is delivered to carrier's established depot;</p> <p>(c) Written shipping instructions shall be furnished to the carrier on the calendar day the first component part is delivered to the carrier's established depot.</p> <p>(d) The composite shipment shall weigh (or transportation charges shall be computed upon a weight of) not less than 4,000 pounds;</p> <p>(e) The deductions set forth in Item No. 120 shall not apply to shipments consolidated under the provisions of this exception.</p>
	<p>(1) Item No. 50 formerly appeared on Twenty-third Revised Page 8.</p> <p>ø Change) * Addition) Decision No. 66586</p>
	EFFECTIVE FEBRUARY 15, 1964
	<p>Issued by the Public Utilities Commission of the State of California, San Francisco, California.</p> <p>Correction No. 365</p>

Item No.	SECTION NO. 1 - RULES AND REGULATIONS OF GENERAL APPLICATION (Continued)																		
	GROSS WEIGHT																		
	<p>(a) Charges shall be assessed on the gross weight of the shipment, including container icing, if any. No allowance shall be made for the weight of containers. (See Exceptions 1, 2 and 3)</p> <p>ø(b) In connection with shipments weighing 18,000 pounds or more, transported for distance in excess of 50 constructive miles, the actual gross weight of the shipments shall be confirmed by a public weighmaster's certificate, which shall be obtained by the carrier prior to or at the time of unloading. (See Note)</p> <p>(c) When the carrier obtains a public weighmaster's certificate, charges shall be based on the weight of the commodities as confirmed by the public weighmaster's certificate. The original and duplicate copy of the public weighmaster's certificate shall be affixed to the shipper's and carrier's copy of the freight bill (see Item No. 255), respectively.</p> <p>EXCEPTION 1: On shipments containing exclusively the commodities provided below, charges shall be assessed on the gross weights as follows:</p>																		
ø60	<p>ø(a) ONIONS, BEETS, TURNIPS, RUTABAGAS, PARSNIPS, CARROTS AND POTATOES</p> <table style="width: 100%; border: none;"> <thead> <tr> <th style="text-align: left;">When Packed and Invoiced as:</th> <th style="text-align: left;">Charges shall be assessed on Gross Weight per Package of:</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>10 Pounds per Sack</td> <td>10½ Pounds per Sack</td> </tr> <tr> <td>15 Pounds per Sack</td> <td>15½ Pounds per Sack</td> </tr> <tr> <td>25 Pounds per Sack</td> <td>25½ Pounds per Sack</td> </tr> <tr> <td>50 Pounds per Sack</td> <td>50½ Pounds per Sack</td> </tr> <tr> <td>100 Pounds per Sack</td> <td>101 Pounds per Sack</td> </tr> <tr> <td>5 10-Pound Consumer Paper Bags per Sack</td> <td>51½ Pounds per Sack</td> </tr> <tr> <td>*50 Pounds per Carton</td> <td>*51 Pounds per Carton</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>(b) ORANGES or LEMONS when packed in standard orange or lemon box with inside depth, width and length dimensions of 10½ x 10-11/16 x 16-3/8", identified as container 58 in Section 828.83 of Agricultural Code of California, charges shall be assessed on the gross weights as follows:</p> <table style="margin-left: auto; margin-right: auto; border: none;"> <tr> <td>ORANGES - 39½ lbs. per box</td> </tr> <tr> <td>LEMONS - 40 lbs. per box</td> </tr> </table> <p>(c) GRAPEFRUIT when packed in standard grapefruit box with inside depth, width and length dimensions of 9½ x 10-11/16 x 16-3/8", identified as container 59 in Section 828.83 of Agricultural Code of California, charges shall be assessed on the gross weight of 35½ lbs. per box.</p>	When Packed and Invoiced as:	Charges shall be assessed on Gross Weight per Package of:	10 Pounds per Sack	10½ Pounds per Sack	15 Pounds per Sack	15½ Pounds per Sack	25 Pounds per Sack	25½ Pounds per Sack	50 Pounds per Sack	50½ Pounds per Sack	100 Pounds per Sack	101 Pounds per Sack	5 10-Pound Consumer Paper Bags per Sack	51½ Pounds per Sack	*50 Pounds per Carton	*51 Pounds per Carton	ORANGES - 39½ lbs. per box	LEMONS - 40 lbs. per box
When Packed and Invoiced as:	Charges shall be assessed on Gross Weight per Package of:																		
10 Pounds per Sack	10½ Pounds per Sack																		
15 Pounds per Sack	15½ Pounds per Sack																		
25 Pounds per Sack	25½ Pounds per Sack																		
50 Pounds per Sack	50½ Pounds per Sack																		
100 Pounds per Sack	101 Pounds per Sack																		
5 10-Pound Consumer Paper Bags per Sack	51½ Pounds per Sack																		
*50 Pounds per Carton	*51 Pounds per Carton																		
ORANGES - 39½ lbs. per box																			
LEMONS - 40 lbs. per box																			

C. 5438 (OSM 10-9-62)*

EXCEPTION 2: When palletized shipments subject to minimum weights of 18,000 pounds or more are loaded or unloaded with power equipment, the weight of the pallets (elevating truck pallets or platforms or lift truck skids) shall not be used in determining the weight of the shipment nor the charges thereon. This exception applies only in connection with rates contained in this tariff, and is not applicable to shipments of empty pallets. When rail rates are used under provisions of Items Nos. 210 and 220 through 240 of this tariff, the weight of the pallets shall be included or excluded in accordance with the provisions of the governing rail tariff.

EXCEPTION 3: The provisions of this item do not apply to transportation for which package rates are provided in Section No. 4 of this tariff.

*NOTE - A single public weighmaster's certificate may be obtained for each unit of carrier's equipment which contains (a) one or more shipments weighing 18,000 pounds or more and other shipments or (b) a portion of a shipment weighing 18,000 pounds or more and other shipments. Such certificate shall show the combined actual weight of all shipments on each such unit of carrier's equipment. The combined weight thus obtained shall be allocated among the shipments in each unit of carrier's equipment. A load manifest or similar document shall be prepared for each such unit which shall set forth the kind and quantity of each commodity in each shipment and the method of allocating the weight to each.

∅ Change)
* Addition) Decision No. 66586

EFFECTIVE FEBRUARY 15, 1964

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

Correction No. 366

Item No.	SECTION NO. 1 - RULES AND REGULATIONS OF GENERAL APPLICATION (Continued)
	COMPUTATION OF DISTANCES
	<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. (See Exception.)</p> <p>§EXCEPTION.-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. 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 Note.)</p>
§110	<p>*NOTE.-In computing distances under the provisions of Item No. 170 or of Item No. 175 on split pickup or produce service shipments originating at two or more points of origin within territories having mileage basing points as described in Items Nos. 280, 281, 282 and 283, add three constructive miles for each pickup to the mileage from the basing point to the point or points of destination. In computing distances under the provisions of Items Nos. 175 and 180 on produce service or split delivery shipments destined to two or more points of destination within the territories having a mileage basing point as described in Items Nos. 280, 281, 282 and 283, add three constructive miles for each delivery to the mileage from point or points of origin to the basing point.</p>
	<p>§ Change) * Addition) Decision No. 66586</p>
	EFFECTIVE FEBRUARY 15, 1964
	<p>Issued by the Public Utilities Commission of the State of California; San Francisco, California.</p> <p>Correction No. 367</p>

Item No.	SECTION NO. 1 - RULES AND REGULATIONS OF GENERAL APPLICATION (Continued)																				
	APPLICATION OF RATES																				
	<p>1. Deductions</p> <p>Δ(a) Rates provided in this tariff are for transportation of shipments, as defined in Item No. 11(r), (s) and (t) from point of origin to point of destination, subject to Items Nos. 130, 140 and 150.</p> <p>(b) Except as provided in Notes 1, 2, 3 and 4 hereof, when point of origin or point of destination is carrier's established depot, the pickup and delivery rates specifically named in this tariff shall be subject to the following deductions:</p> <table style="margin-left: auto; margin-right: auto;"> <thead> <tr> <th style="text-align: left;">When shipment moves under rates subject to minimum weights of:</th> <th colspan="3" style="text-align: center;">Deductions, in cents per 100 lbs. except as shown: Columns</th> </tr> <tr> <th></th> <th style="text-align: center;">(1)</th> <th style="text-align: center;">(2)</th> <th style="text-align: center;">(3)</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Less than 2000 pounds</td> <td style="text-align: center;">15</td> <td style="text-align: center;">5</td> <td style="text-align: center;">20</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2000 but less than 4000 pounds</td> <td style="text-align: center;">10</td> <td style="text-align: center;">5</td> <td style="text-align: center;">15</td> </tr> <tr> <td>4000 but less than 10,000 pounds</td> <td style="text-align: center;">5</td> <td style="text-align: center;">5</td> <td style="text-align: center;">10</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p style="margin-left: 40px;">In cents per shipment when shipment weighs less than 100 pounds.</p> <p>Column (1) - Applies on shipments originating at carrier's established depot.</p> <p>Column (2) - Applies on shipments destined to carrier's established depot.</p> <p>Column (3) - Applies on shipments originating at and destined to carrier's established depots.</p> <p>NOTE 1.-No deduction shall be made under this rule from rates based upon a minimum weight of 10,000 pounds or more, or from minimum charges provided by Item No. 160.</p> <p>NOTE 2.-No deduction shall be made under this rule on shipments transported for persons, companies or corporations upon whose premises depots from or to which the transportation is performed are located.</p> <p>NOTE 3.-Deductions made under this rule on split pickup or split delivery shipments shall be made only on the weight of the component parts having point of origin or point of destination, or both (as the case may be), at the carrier's established depots, subject to Note 2.</p> <p>NOTE 4.-In no case shall the net transportation rate be less than 14 cents per 100 pounds, or less than the pickup and delivery rate, whichever is lower.</p>	When shipment moves under rates subject to minimum weights of:	Deductions, in cents per 100 lbs. except as shown: Columns				(1)	(2)	(3)	Less than 2000 pounds	15	5	20	2000 but less than 4000 pounds	10	5	15	4000 but less than 10,000 pounds	5	5	10
When shipment moves under rates subject to minimum weights of:	Deductions, in cents per 100 lbs. except as shown: Columns																				
	(1)	(2)	(3)																		
Less than 2000 pounds	15	5	20																		
2000 but less than 4000 pounds	10	5	15																		
4000 but less than 10,000 pounds	5	5	10																		
Δ120	<p>2. Deliveries Within a Single Market Area</p> <p>For the purpose of applying the rates in this tariff, multiple deliveries within a single market area as defined in Item No. 290 shall be deemed to be made to one consignee at one point of destination provided charges are paid by a single consignor or a single consignee.</p>																				

APPLICATION OF RATES ON SHIPMENTS SUBJECT TO
MINIMUM WEIGHTS OF 10,000 POUNDS OR LESS

rates in this tariff subject to minimum weights of 10,000 pounds or less, include loading into and unloading from the carrier's equipment, subject to Note 1.

130

NOTE 1.-When shipment is picked up at or delivered to a point not at street level, and no vehicular elevator service or vehicular ramp is provided and made available to the carrier, an additional charge of 12½ cents per 100 pounds shall be assessed for the service of handling shipment beyond carrier's equipment; except that no additional charge shall be made for this service in connection with shipments weighing 100 pounds or less.

Δ Change, neither increase) Decision No. 66586
nor reduction)

EFFECTIVE FEBRUARY 15, 1964

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

Correction No. 368

Cancel

Item No. SECTION NO. 1 - RULES AND REGULATIONS OF GENERAL APPLICATION (Continued)

140 APPLICATION OF RATES ON SHIPMENTS SUBJECT TO MINIMUM WEIGHTS IN EXCESS OF 10,000 POUNDS

Rates in this tariff subject to minimum weights in excess of 10,000 pounds include loading into and unloading from carrier's equipment, subject to Note.

NOTE-When the time consumed in performing loading, unloading or accessorial services exceeds 12 minutes per ton (based on the weight on which transportation charges are computed) a charge of \$5.35 per hour shall be assessed for the time consumed in excess of 12 minutes per ton.

150 ACCESSORIAL CHARGES

An additional charge of \$4.15 per man per hour, minimum charge of \$2.05 shall be made for helpers for any accessorial or incidental service which is not authorized to be performed under the rates named in this tariff and for which a charge is not otherwise provided.

155 REFRIGERATION-ICING

Shipments of fruits, vegetables or mushrooms, as described in Item No. 40, subject to rates governed by minimum weight of 10,000 pounds or more, may be refrigerated by the shipper or his agent, or by the carrier at the request of the shipper or his agent, by means of vehicle icing or bunker icing, subject to the following conditions:

(a) Transportation charges for the weight of the ice used shall be based on the rate from point of origin to point of destination applicable on the commodity shipped.

*Iced shipments shall be weighed at the public scales located nearest the point at which shipments are iced.

(b) Ice shall be furnished by or at the expense of the shipper.

(c) Weight of the ice may be used to make up the applicable minimum weight.

(d) When movement of truck equipment to ice plant is involved the following additional charges shall apply:

Minimum Weight (In Pounds)	Additional Charge (Per Shipment)
10,000	\$3.90
18,000	5.70
24,000	6.80
30,000	7.70
36,000	8.55

(e) When shipments are reiced in transit no additional transportation charges will be assessed for the weight of the added ice. The provisions of paragraph (b) and charges named in paragraph (d) of this item will also apply on reiced shipments.

Change)
* Addition) Decision No. 66585

C. 5438 (OSH of 10-9-63)*

EFFECTIVE FEBRUARY 15, 1964

Issued by the Public Utilities Commission of the State of California,
San Francisco, California.
Correction No. 369

Item No.	SECTION NO. 1 - RULES AND REGULATIONS OF GENERAL APPLICATION (Continued)
*175	<p style="text-align: center;">PRODUCE SERVICE SHIPMENT</p> <p>The rate for the transportation of a produce service shipment shall be determined and applied as follows, subject to Note 1:</p> <p>(a) Distance rates shall be determined by the distance from that point of origin to that point of destination which produces the shortest distance via all point(s) of origin and/or destination.</p> <p>(b) Point-to-point rates for which routes are provided in Items Nos. 700 and 701 shall be applied only when all points of origin and destination are within the territories to which the point-to-point rates apply, or are located between said territories on a single authorized route.</p> <p>(c) For each produce service shipment a bill of lading or other shipping document shall be issued; and the carrier shall be furnished with instructions showing the name of each consignee or consignor, the point or points of origin and/or destination and the description of property in each component part of such shipment.</p> <p>(d) Point-to-point rates determined under paragraph (b) may be combined with distance rates provided in paragraph (a) where lower charges result.</p> <p>NOTE 1.-In addition to the rate for transportation, the additional charges provided in Note 1 of Item No. 170 shall be assessed for each component part for component handling service; except, that such additional charge shall not apply on any shipment involving only a single pickup and a single delivery.</p>
<p>* Addition, Decision No. 66586</p>	
EFFECTIVE FEBRUARY 15, 1964	
<p>Issued by the Public Utilities Commission of the State of California, San Francisco, California.</p> <p>Correction No. 370</p>	

Item No.	SECTION NO. 1 - RULES AND REGULATIONS OF GENERAL APPLICATION (Continued)
	<p style="text-align: center;">SPLIT DELIVERY</p> <p>The rate for the transportation of a split delivery shipment shall be determined and applied as follows, subject to Note 1:</p> <p>(a) Distance rates shall be determined by the distance from point of origin to that point of destination which produces the shortest distance via the other point or points of destination.</p> <p>Δ(b) Point-to-point rates for which routes are provided in Items Nos. 700* and 701 shall be applied only when point of origin and all points of destination are within the territories which the point-to-point rates apply, or are located between said territories on a single authorized route.</p> <p>(c) Point-to-point rates determined under paragraph (b) may be combined with distance rates provided in paragraph (a) where lower charges result. The applicable distance rate factor shall be determined by use of one half the shortest distance from the territory or authorized route and return thereto via the off-route point or points of origin and destination.</p> <p>(d) For each split delivery shipment a single bill of lading or other shipping document shall be issued; and at the time of or prior to the tender of the shipment the carrier shall be furnished with written instructions showing the name of each consignee, the point or points of destination and the description and weight of property in each component part of such shipment.</p> <p>(e) If split pickup is performed on a split delivery shipment or a component part thereof, or if shipping instructions do not conform with the requirements of paragraph (d) hereof, each component part of the split delivery shipment shall be rated as a separate shipment under other provisions of this tariff.</p>

Δ180

NOTE 1: In addition to the rate for transportation, the following additional charges shall be assessed for split delivery service:

Weight of Component Part (In Pounds)		Split Delivery Charge for Each Component Part in Cents
Over	But not over	
0	100 -----	94
100	500 -----	125
500	1,000 -----	155
1,000	2,000 -----	225
2,000	4,000 -----	290
4,000	10,000 -----	415
10,000	20,000 -----	540
20,000	-----	660

See Item No. 120, paragraph 2, for Deliveries Within a Single Market Area.

Δ Change, neither)	Decision No.	66586
increase nor)		
decrease)		
* Addition)		

EFFECTIVE FEBRUARY 15, 1964

Issued by the Public Utilities Commission of the State of California,
San Francisco, California.
Correction No. 371

Cancels

Item No.	SECTION NO. 1 - RULES AND REGULATIONS OF GENERAL APPLICATION (Continued)
	<p style="text-align: center;">SHIPMENTS TRANSPORTED IN MULTIPLE LOTS</p> <p>ø(a) When a *shipment is available to the carrier for immediate transportation at the time of the first pickup at a single point of origin, and the carrier is unable to pick up the entire shipment at one time, the following provisions shall apply in addition to other applicable rules and regulations:</p> <p>ø1. At the time of or prior to the initial pickup, the carrier shall issue to the consignor a single master document for the entire shipment. It shall show the name of the consignor, point of origin, date of the initial pickup, name of the consignee (or consignees), point of destination (or points of destinations), and the kind and quantity of property. In addition, a shipping document shall be issued for each pickup which shall give reference to the single master document covering the entire shipment, by its date and number (if assigned a number), the name of the consignor, and such other information as may be necessary to clearly identify the single master document.</p> <p>2. The entire shipment shall be picked up by the carrier within a period of 2 days computed from 12:01 a.m. of the date on which the first pickup commences, excluding Saturdays, Sundays and legal holidays.</p> <p>ø3. The separate pickups made in accordance with the foregoing provisions shall constitute a shipment which shall be subject to the rates named or provided for in this tariff, including Items Nos. 210, 220, 230 and 240, in effect on the date of the first pickup, for the transportation of a shipment of like kind and quantity of property picked up at one time.</p> <p>(b) Any property separately picked up without complying with the foregoing provisions shall constitute a separate shipment and shall be subject to the rates, rules and regulations applicable thereto.</p>
2185	<p>ø Change) * Addition) Decision No. 66586</p>
	EFFECTIVE FEBRUARY 15, 1964
	<p>Issued by the Public Utilities Commission of the State of California, San Francisco, California.</p> <p>Correction No. 372</p>

Item
No.SECTION NO. 1 - RULES AND REGULATIONS OF
GENERAL APPLICATION (Continued)ACCESSORIAL SERVICES NOT INCLUDED IN
COMMON CARRIER RATES

In the event, under the provisions of Items Nos. 210 to 240. inclusive, a rate of a common carrier is used in constructing a rate for highway transportation, and such rate does not include accessorial services performed by the highway carrier, the following charges for such accessorial services shall be added:

(1) For loading carrier's equipment, 2½ cents per 100 pounds assessed on the weight on which transportation charges are computed (See Note);

(2) For unloading carrier's equipment, 2½ cents per 100 pounds assessed on the weight on which transportation charges are computed (See Note);

(3) For C.O.D. services - charges provided in Item No. 192;

(4) For other accessorial service - charges provided in Item No. 150;

(5) Split pickup or split delivery shall not be accorded unless included in the common carrier rate (See Items Nos. 230 and 240 for exceptions).

A250

NOTE.-The charges for loading and/or unloading shall apply in all circumstances except:

(a) When rates provided in this tariff are applied in combination with common carrier rates under the provisions of:

(1) Paragraph (a) of Item No. 220, only the accessorial charges for unloading shall be assessed;

(2) Paragraph (b) of Item No. 220, only the accessorial charges for loading shall be assessed; and

(3) Paragraph (c) of Item No. 220, no charge for either loading and/or unloading shall be assessed.

(b) When the shipment is loaded into and/or unloaded from the carrier's equipment by the consignor and/or consignee with power equipment as described in Item No. 10.

(c) When the carrier's equipment is a trailer or semitrailer left for loading and/or unloading by the consignor and/or consignee without the presence of carrier's employees.

C. 5438 (OSH of 10-9-62)*

Δ (d) Provided that, on shipments described under subparagraphs (b) or (c) above, the Shipping Document and Freight Bill issued pursuant to Item No. 255 indicate that the shipment was loaded and/or unloaded under one of the circumstances described in subparagraphs (b) or (c) hereinabove.

(1) Item No. 255 transferred to Original Page 21-A

Δ Change, neither increase } Decision No. 66586
nor reduction

EFFECTIVE FEBRUARY 15, 1964

Issued by the Public Utilities Commission of the State of California,
San Francisco, California.
Correction No. 373

Item No.	SECTION NO. 1 - RULES AND REGULATIONS OF GENERAL APPLICATION (Continued)
	<p style="text-align: center;">ISSUANCE OF DOCUMENTS</p> <p>ø1. Shipping Documents. A shipping document shall be issued by the carrier to the debtor for each shipment within 48 hours of the final delivery, computed from 12 o'clock midnight of the day of final delivery. The shipping document shall show the following information: (See Note)</p> <p>øA. Shipment (other than a Split Pickup, Split Delivery or Produce Service Shipment).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">(a) Name of carrier.(b) Name of debtor.(c) Name of consignor.(d) Name of consignee.(e) Point of origin.(f) Point of destination.(g) Date of delivery.(h) Description of shipment (kind and quantity of commodities shipped).(i) Weight of shipment. (See Item No. 60.)(j) Such other information as may be necessary to an accurate determination of the applicable minimum rate and charge. <p>*B. Split Pickup, Split Delivery or Produce Service Shipment.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">(a) Name of carrier.(b) Name of debtor.(c) For each component part:<ul style="list-style-type: none">1. Name of party from whom received.2. Name of party to whom delivered.3. Point of origin.4. Point of destination.5. Date of pickup.

(1)
6 255

C. 5438 (OSH of 10-9-62)*

6. Date of delivery.
7. Weight picked up.
8. Weight delivered.
9. Description of commodities
(kind and quantity).

(d) Weight of multiple shipment.
(See Item No. 60.)

(e) Such other information as may be necessary to an accurate determination of the applicable rate and charge.

*2. Freight Bill. A freight bill (either individual or manifest form) shall be issued by the carrier to the debtor for each shipment transported. The freight bill shall show the following information: (See Note.)

(a) The information required of shipping documents as set forth in paragraph 1 of this item, or in lieu thereof specific reference may be made to the shipping document covering the shipment in question.

(b) Rate and charge assessed.

The form of shipping document in Item No. 800 will be suitable and proper.

∅ A copy of each shipping document, freight bill, public weighmaster's certificate and other documents which support the rate and charge, shall be retained and preserved by the issuing carrier, subject to the Commission's inspection, for a period of not less than 3 years from the date of issue.

* NOTE - A single combined shipping document and freight bill may be issued provided that all the information required of each is included on the single document.

(1) Item No. 255 formerly appeared on Tenth Revised Page 21.

∅ Change)
* Addition) Decision No. 66586

EFFECTIVE FEBRUARY 15, 1964

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

Correction No. 374

Item No.	SECTION NO. 5 - ROUTING
	<p style="text-align: center;">ROUTES (Items Nos. 700 and 701)</p> <p>When applied via the following highway routes, rates making specific reference to this item are intermediate in application. They apply at all points located within a distance of one mile by highway on either side of the highway route and at all points located within incorporated cities through which the highway route passes.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">(The following routes apply in either direction)</p> <p>Route No. 1: From San Francisco Territory, as described in Item No. 283, via Highway U.S. 40 to its junction with unnumbered highway near Crockett; thence unnumbered highway generally paralleling Southern Pacific Company right-of-way located along the shore line of Carquinez Strait and Suisun Bay to Martinez; county road generally paralleling Southern Pacific Company right-of-way through Port Chicago to its junction with State Route 4, four miles west of Pittsburg; State Route 4 to its junction with county road 1.6 miles north of Byron; said county road through Byron to its junction with Highway U.S. 50, 3.9 miles west of Tracy; Highway U.S. 50 to its junction with State Route 120, 5.0 miles west of Manteca; State Route 120 to Manteca; thence via Highway U.S. 99 to Los Angeles Territory, as described in Item No. 281.</p> <p>Route No. 2: From San Francisco Territory, as described in Item No. 283, via Highway U.S. 50 to its junction with State Route 120, 5.0 miles west of Manteca; State Route 120 to Manteca; thence via Highway U.S. 99 to Los Angeles Territory, as described in Item No. 281.</p> <p>Route No. 3: From San Francisco Territory, as described in Item No. 283, via Niles Canyon Highway to Sunol, State Route 21 and unnumbered county road through Pleasanton and Livermore to its junction with Highway U.S. 50 east of Livermore; Highway U.S. 50 to its junction with State Route 120, 5.0 miles west of Manteca; State Route 120 to Manteca; thence via Highway U.S. 99 to Los Angeles Territory, as described in Item No. 281.</p> <p>Route No. 4: From San Francisco Territory, as described in Item No. 283, via Highway U.S. 101 to (a) Gilroy, thence via State Route 152 through Los Banos to its junction with Highway U.S. 99 north of Madera, *or (b) Ventura, thence via State Route 126 through Fillmore to its junction with Highway U.S. 99 at Castaic Junction, thence via Highway U.S. 99 to Los Angeles Territory, as described in Item No. 281.</p> <p>Route No. 5: From Sacramento Territory, as described in Item No. 282, via Highway U.S. 99 to Los Angeles Territory, as described in Item No. 281.</p> <p>Route No. 6: From San Francisco Territory, as described in Item No. 283, via Highway U.S. 101 to its junction with State Route 118, 4.0 miles southeast of Ventura; thence via (a) State Route 118 through Chatsworth, or (b) Highway U.S. 101 through Girard, or (c) Highway U.S. 101 to its junction with Highway U.S. 101-Alternate at El Rio; thence via Highway U.S. 101-Alternate through Oxnard to Los Angeles Territory, as described in Item No. 281.</p>

700

700

Route No. 7: From San Francisco Territory, as described in Item No. 283, via Routes 1, 2 or 3 to the junction of Highway U.S. 50 and State Route 33, 3 miles east of Tracy; via State Route 33 to Los Banos; via State Route 152 to its junction with Highway U.S. 99 north of Madera; via Routes 1, 2 or 3 beyond to Los Angeles Territory, as described in Item No. 281.

(1) Route No. 8: From Delivery Zone 1, as described in Item No. 335, via highways described in Routes Nos. 1, 2, 3, 4 and 7 to Highway U.S. 99; thence via Highway U.S. 99 to Producing Areas, as described in Item No. 335.

(1) Route No. 9: From Sacramento Territory, as described in Item No. 282, via Highway U.S. 99 to Producing Areas, as described in Item No. 335.

(1) Route No. 10: From Producing Areas, as described in Item No. 335, via Highway U.S. 99 to Los Angeles Territory, as described in Item No. 281.

(1) Route No. 11: Via Route No. 10; thence via Highway U.S. 101 to San Diego Territory, as described in Item No. 282.

(1) Applies only in connection with rates named in Item No. 335.

(Continued in Item No. 701)

Change)
* Addition) Decision No.
& Reduction)

66586

EFFECTIVE FEBRUARY 15, 1964

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

Correction No. 375

SECTION NO. 6 - FORM OF SHIPPING DOCUMENT

Item No. 800

SHIPPING ORDER AND FREIGHT BILL

Bill No. _____

Permit No. _____

Name of Carrier _____
 (Carrier's name must agree with name on permit)

Point of Origin _____ Date _____ 19__

*Debtor _____

Consignor _____ Consignee _____

Street Address _____ Street Address _____

City _____ City _____

Packages	Kind	Description of Commodities	(1)Weight	Rate	Charges

Shipper _____ By _____ (Show name in full)	Check here				C.O.D.
	Origin		Destination		
Received by Carrier in good condition except as noted	Terminal	Store Door	Terminal	Store Door	C.O.D. Fee
By _____ Driver (Show name in full)					Advances(2)
					Other Charges(2)
Received by Consignee in good condition except as noted					Prepaid
					Total to Collect
By _____ (Show name in full)					
*Date _____					

(1) Or other factor or unit of measurement upon which charges are based.

(2) Explain what each charge represents.

END OF TARIFF

C. 5438 (OSH of 10-9-62)*

Change)
* Addition) Decision No.

66586

EFFECTIVE FEBRUARY 15, 1964

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

Correction No. 376