

ORIGINAL

Decision No. 68232

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 sand, rock, )  
gravel and related items (commodi- )  
ties for which rates are provided )  
in Minimum Rate Tariff No. 7).

Case No. 5437  
(Order Setting Hearing  
dated March 24, 1959)

Eric Mohr, M. J. Gagnon and Edward E. Tanner,  
for the Transportation Division of the  
Commission's staff.

Edward M. Berol and Edwin S. Acker, for  
Miles & Sons Trucking Service, respondent.

Eugene R. Booker, for the Rock, Sand and  
Gravel Producers Association of Northern  
California.

E. O. Blackman, for the California Dump Truck  
Owners Association, Inc., interested party.

James Quintrall, J. C. Kaspar and Arlo D. Poe,  
for the California Trucking Association,  
interested party.

George I. Bentley, for Santa Cruz Aggregates  
Company, interested party.

Emil J. Bertana, for Pacific Cement & Aggregates,  
interested party.

Don Blewett, for himself, interested party.

INTERIM OPINION

On June 11, 1963, public hearing was held before  
Examiner Abernathy at San Francisco on certain adjustments which

representatives of the Transportation Division of the Commission's staff have recommended be made in the minimum rates, rules and regulations that apply for the transportation of specified rock products in northern California by for-hire carriers operating dump truck equipment. The rates in issue are the interplant distance rates (except those for lightweight aggregates) and the zone rates set forth in Items Nos. 148 and 294, respectively, of Minimum Rate Tariff No. 7. Under the staff's recommendations increases ranging from about 5 to 45 percent would be made in said rates. Also various revisions would be made in the zone descriptions. Evidence in support of the recommendations was submitted by staff witnesses to show the costs of the services and present circumstances in which the transportation is performed.

Representatives of the Rock, Sand and Gravel Producers Association of Northern California, of the California Dump Truck Owners Association, Inc., of the California Trucking Association and of Miles & Sons Trucking Service participated in the hearing. They stated that they would subsequently have evidence to submit on the staff's proposals and would seek further hearings for that purpose. They proposed that pending the further hearings and decision thereon an interim increase of 5 percent be made. The rates were so increased by Decision No. 65681, dated July 9, 1963.

On October 29, 1963, and on January 7, 1964, further hearings were held before Examiner Abernathy at San Francisco. Staff witnesses submitted additional evidence. At the hearing on January 7, a representative of the Rock, Sand and Gravel Producers Association (RPA) opposed the adoption of the increased rates which the staff recommended. He stated that the rates had been reviewed by the Association; that the Association had concluded that such rates are greater than those which the traffic can bear, and that, if adopted, shippers would be compelled to develop facilities of their own for the transportation of their shipments. He said that the RPA had entered into negotiations with the California Trucking Association (CTA) and had developed rates which would be acceptable to both associations. He proposed that said rates be adopted in lieu of those recommended by the staff. Examples of the rates proposed by the rock products association witness and by the staff, are set forth in Tables Nos. 1 and 2 below, together with the corresponding present minimum rates.

Table No. 1  
 Examples of  
 Present and Proposed Interplant Distance Rates  
 (In Cents per Ton)

More Than	Miles		Present Rates		Proposed Rates			
	But Not More Than	Not More Than	(a)	(b)	Staff (a)	(c)	Association (a)	(d)
4	---	5	39	35	48	42	45	36
9	---	10	59	50	68	57	64	51
14	---	15	78	66	85	73	81	66
19	---	20	92	79	102	88	101	81
24	---	25	108	91	121	104	120	96
29	---	30	125	105	141	120	135	108
34	---	35	139	118	161	135	151	121
43	---	45	166	141	191	164	183	146
55	---	60	208	175	239	206	233	186
65	---	70	235	198	271	234	270	216
75	---	80	263	222	305	262	305	244
85	---	90	288	245	339	290	338	270
95	---	100	313	268	373	318	369	295

- (a) Minimum weight, 18 tons  
 (b) Minimum weight, 23 tons  
 (c) Minimum weight, 24 tons  
 (d) Minimum weight, 25 tons

Table No. 2  
 Examples of  
 Present and Proposed Zone Rates  
 (In Cents per Ton)

<u>From</u>	<u>Present Rates</u>		<u>Proposed Rates</u>		
	(a)	(b)	<u>Staff</u> (c)	<u>Association</u> (a)	(d)
Alameda County Production Area "A"					
<u>To</u>					
Alameda County Delivery Zone					
1	112	99	104	124	99
2	106	92	100	115	92
3	96	84	95	105	84
4	89	78	90	98	78
5	89	78	89	98	78
<u>To</u>					
San Mateo County Delivery Zone					
1	80	70	76	-	-
2	91	80	91	100	80
3	95	82	97	103	82
4	100	85	104	106	85
5	-	104	119	130	104
<u>To</u>					
Santa Clara County Delivery Zone					
1	91	80	91	100*, 115	80*, 92
2	96	84	97	105*, 113	84*, 90
3	93	76	93	95	76
4	91	80	89	100	80
5	84	72	76	90	72

- (a) Minimum weight, 18 tons  
 (b) Minimum weight, 23 tons  
 (c) Minimum weight, 24 tons  
 (d) Minimum weight, 25 tons

\*Applicable when route of movement is via Lytton Avenue or Oregon Avenue, Palo Alto.

Changes in or cancellation of certain of the delivery zones were also recommended by the witness for the rock products association. These changes were in addition to those proposed by the staff. No exception was taken by the association witness to the staff's proposals in this respect.

The representative of the California Dump Truck Owners Association (CDTOA) urged that the staff recommended rates be adopted instead of those proposed by the witness for the RPA and CTA. He opposed the latter rates on the ground that they do not include adequate provision for the costs of the services performed. Also, he took issue with the statement of the witness that said rates are acceptable to the carriers. The position of the CDTOA's representative was that the proposals do not reflect the views of subhaulers, the carriers most directly affected.

The staff rate proposals were well supported. The underlying cost data were a product of extensive studies of the operations and records of dump truck carriers engaged in the transportation of rock, sand and gravel under the rates in issue. Performance data to reflect the carriers' loading and unloading operations and operations enroute were developed by checks made under the engineer's direction. The carriers' labor contracts were analyzed to develop the applicable costs of labor. The carriers' records were also analyzed to determine the financial factors bearing upon the costs of the units of service performed.

The recommended rates and other recommendations of the staff's rate witness were also developed after extensive studies which included, amongst other things, analyses of the carriers' freight bills and numerous interviews to ascertain present practices in the transportation of rock, sand and gravel. The level of the proposed rates was established at that which would produce a ratio of about 93 to 95 percent between the rates and the applicable costs of service exclusive of provision for income taxes.

On the other hand RPA and CTA did not undertake to show that the rates which they proposed are justified by costs. Admittedly, the rates were advanced solely upon the basis of judgment. Although the associations' witness stated that higher rates would result in an increased use of shipper-owned transportation facilities, he presented no specific cost evidence by which the costs of shipper-operated service could be measured. The record provides no means of determining whether in the development of the associations' proposal due consideration was given to the costs of service as required by Section 3662 of the Highway Carriers'

---

The associations' witness presented some testimony concerning cost approximations which he said are used by shippers as guides in evaluating charges for various hauls. However, he was unable to explain the bases for these approximations or to show how they might constitute appropriate measures of the rates that should be prescribed in this matter.

Act or whether the costs of transportation by shipper-owned facilities are so much lower than those developed by the staff engineer for for-hire transportation that the necessity of meeting the actual or potential competition of shipper transportation facilities justifies the retention of the minimum rates at the level urged by associations.

The lower rates which the RPA and CTA proposed rest in part upon a recommendation that the minimum weight per shipment be established at 25 tons instead of 23 tons as at present. This recommendation is not sufficient to justify preferral of the associations' proposed rates over those recommended by the Commission's staff. The costs developed by the Commission engineer were computed on an average weight of 25.7 tons. A greater provision for the effect of an increase in minimum weight has already been included in the staff's proposed rates.

The statements of the witness for the RPA and CTA that the rates proposed by the staff are greater than the traffic can bear also were not supported by evidence by which the validity of such statements could be tested.

The fact that the rates proposed by the witness for the RPA and CTA were reached by negotiations might be taken to imply that the rates represent a balance of interests between the shippers and carriers, and hence are reasonable. We do not accept such an implication as valid in this instance. The witness was unable to give any information concerning the CTA's representation of the carriers who are engaged in performing the transportation. Neither did the CTA, itself, undertake to disclose the identity of the



carriers, by types, who were represented in the negotiations. This deficiency in the associations' presentation is a defect of consequence.

In order to arrive at a proper evaluation of the fact that the associations' proposed rates were reached by inter-association negotiation, it is necessary to know whether the interests of all carriers concerned were appropriately represented. This information is of importance inasmuch as the transportation in question may be performed either by a carrier working directly for a shipper, or by a carrier for another carrier under an overlying carrier - underlying carrier relationship.

Minimum Rate Tariff No. 7 defines an overlying carrier as "a carrier which contracts with a shipper to provide transportation service for the latter, but which carrier in turn employs another carrier, known as the underlying carrier, to perform that service." The tariff also specifies that "charges paid by any overlying carrier to an underlying carrier and collected by the latter carrier from the former for the service of said underlying carrier shall be not less than 95 percent of the charges applicable under the minimum rates ... and less gross revenue taxes applicable and required to be paid by the overlying carrier."

Since the underlying carrier is the carrier that actually performs the transportation services it is evident that whether the rates that apply are sufficient to return the costs of service is a matter of much greater moment to the underlying carrier than to the overlying carrier. If the rates are insufficient to cover the costs, the brunt of the losses are borne by the underlying carrier. The overlying carrier may even realize

a small profit in connection with a particular haul that is not compensatory to the underlying carrier. In such circumstances a rate which may be acceptable to an overlying carrier may be wholly unacceptable to the underlying carrier.

For the foregoing reasons the unsupported declaration of the witness for the RPA and the CTA that the associations' proposed rates are negotiated rates has little significance in establishing the reasonableness of the rates.

We find and conclude that the evidence does not show that the rates proposed on behalf of the RPA and CTA would be reasonable minimum rates and the rates will not be adopted.

On the other hand, the increased rates recommended by the staff rate witness may not be adopted in full, notwithstanding the cost justification therefor. Official notice is taken of the fact that since the close of the record in this phase of Case No. 5437 reductions have been made by the Federal Government in the applicable income tax rates. In view of this action, a corresponding reduction should be made in the provision which was included in the staff proposed rates for income taxes. Such a reduction would amount to about 1.4 percent. The rates should be adjusted accordingly.

A further limiting factor upon the increases in rates which may be ordered on this record lies in the distance rates set forth in Item No. 130 series of Minimum Rate Tariff No. 7 for the transportation of various specified commodities, including rock, sand and gravel. Said rates, and the interplant distance and the interplant zone rates in issue in this matter, were originally established by Decision No. 52952 (55 Cal. P.U.C. 2). The interplant zone rates were designed for regular and substantial movements of rock, sand, gravel and cold road oil mix from commercial producing plants of said commodities to railheads, hot plants

(asphaltic concrete plants), batching plants, sewage disposal plants, concrete article factories or distributing yards located within defined zones. The interplant distance rates were designed for interplant movements not covered by the zone rates -- said movements being described in the decision as "fairly substantial". The distance rates set forth in Item No. 130 series are rates of a more general nature, and apply from commercial producing plants, railheads, and distributing yards, or to cement, cement or glass factories, hot plants, and distributing yards. The distance rates in Item No. 130 series were established at a level of about 10 percent higher than the interplant distance rates.

Although the general distance rates were established at a higher level than the interplant distance rates, this relationship would be reversed in part under the rates recommended by the rate witness. Comparison of the interplant rates proposed by the rate witness shows that said rates are higher for some distances ~~than~~ the corresponding general distance rates. In general, the proposed interplant distance rates exceed the rates in Item No. 130 series by about 25 percent for distances of less than five miles. The differences diminish as the distances increase. For distances of between 22 and 55 miles the proposed rates are the same as, or less than, the present rates. However, for greater distances the proposed interplant distance rates exceed the present general distance rates by percentages ranging up to 6 percent.

Under the provisions of Minimum Rate Tariff No. 7 the general distance rates may be assessed for transportation subject to the interplant distance rates. Since the general distance rates

are maintained as reasonable minimum rates for the transportation to which they apply, it is clear that while said rates are being so maintained, higher interplant distance rates cannot be found to be reasonable minimum rates, notwithstanding the cost evidence presented in support thereof. The increases which should be prescribed in the interplant distance rates on this record should be limited to those which would not produce higher rates than the distance rates in Item No. 130 series for the corresponding distances.

This anomalous consequence whereby due consideration to the costs of service may not be adequately reflected in the rates is one that should not be permitted to prevail. Since, as indicated earlier herein, the interplant distance rates reflect movements of fairly substantial volume, it may be inferred reasonably that the costs of said transportation are less than the costs of the transportation subject to the general distance rates. This inference is supported by the fact that when originally established, higher rates for transportation under the general distance rates than for that under the interplant rates were found to be reasonable. Inasmuch as the costs of record in this matter show that increases in the interplant distance rates are justified, the conclusion seems inescapable that were the costs of service under the general distance rates before us, increases in the general distance rates should either be also found to be justified or the underlying relationships between the general distance rates, the interplant distance rates and the interplant zone rates should be re-evaluated and such further adjustments be made in the rates as are then found to be appropriate.

In view of these conclusions the record in this phase of Case No. 5437 should be continued for further hearings for the purpose of receiving evidence on whether adjustments should be made in the Northern Territory distance rates in Item No. 130 of Minimum Rate Tariff No. 7 in conformity with present costs and the interplant distance and interplant zone rates. Consideration should also be given at the further hearings to what additional increases should be made in the interplant distance rates in the light of the evidence and any such increases as are prescribed in the aforesaid distance rates in Item No. 130 series. The Commission's staff should undertake to present evidence for the purposes indicated and to the end that the rates to be ultimately prescribed may be determined with due consideration to the interrelationships between the general distance, the interplant distance and the interplant zone rates, as was done when said rates were originally established.

One other matter with respect to the proposed interplant zone rates which should be touched upon is a recommendation made by the rate witness that a present scale of rates which is subject to a minimum weight of 18 tons per shipment be discontinued, leaving the rates which would be subject to a minimum weight of 24 tons per shipment to apply. This recommendation was based on the fact that in his field studies the rate witness had not found instances where the present 18-ton rates were being used. The staff engineer stated that in his initial field investigations he also had not encountered shipments to which the 18-ton rates would apply.

He said, however, that later checks had disclosed instances of such shipments. The Rock, Sand and Gravel Producers Association, together with the California Trucking Association, recommended that the 18-ton rate scale be retained. Consideration of the record in this respect results in the conclusion that the rate scale in question should not be canceled, but that the rates should be continued at the same relative level in relation to the 24-ton interplant zone rates which are prescribed hereinafter as now exists between the present 18-ton and the 23-ton zone rates.

The changes recommended by the rate witness in connection with the tariff descriptions of the production areas from which, and the delivery zones to which, the zone rates apply, have for their purpose the adjustment of the area and zone descriptions to conform to current conditions. Some of the changes reflect changes in street names. Other changes of more consequence are adjustments to take into consideration new production facilities which have been established or production facilities which have been discontinued. These and similar changes also recommended by the witness for the rock association should be adopted.<sup>2</sup>

---

<sup>2</sup> A proposal of the witness for the rock association to cancel rates to Contra Costa Delivery Zone 2 will not be adopted. The reason given for the proposed cancellation is that "the area is too large for the number of plants there." Such reason of itself -- without evidence that the rates are not reasonable or proper for the services provided -- is not sufficient grounds for the cancellation of rates when there is traffic moving under said rates.

Based upon the evidence we find that:

1. The increased rates which are prescribed by the following order have been justified;
2. Pending further investigation into said rates, and the Northern Territory distance rates set forth in Item No. 130 series of Minimum Rate Tariff No. 7, said increased rates are and will be just and reasonable rates for the services to which they apply;
3. The changes in production area and/or delivery zone descriptions, the establishment of new production areas or delivery zones, and the cancellation of various production areas and/or delivery zones which are effected by the following order have been justified.

We conclude that said increased rates and said changes in production areas and/or delivery zones (including the establishment of new production areas and zones or the cancellation of present production areas and zones) should be incorporated in Minimum Rate Tariff No. 7. We also conclude that further investigation should be made into the zone and distance rates which apply under the provisions of Minimum Rate Tariff No. 7 (as amended by the following Order) for the transportation of rock, sand, gravel and cold road oil mixture within Northern Territory, as defined in said tariff, and that further hearings should be held thereon for the general purposes previously indicated herein. To this end this phase of Case No. 5437 should be continued for further hearing.

INTERIM ORDER

IT IS ORDERED that:

1. Minimum Rate Tariff No. 7 (Appendix "A" of Decision No. 32566, as amended) is further amended by

incorporating therein, to become effective December 19, 1964, the revised pages attached hereto and listed in Appendix A, also attached hereto, which pages and appendix are made a part hereof.

2. This phase of Case No. 5437 be continued for further hearings for the purposes set forth in the above opinion.

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

Dated at San Francisco, California, this 17<sup>th</sup> day of NOVEMBER, 1964.

Frederick B. Holcroft  
President  
George L. Grover  
William M. Bennett  
Commissioners



APPENDIX A TO DECISION NO. 68232

List of Original and Revised Pages to Minimum Rate Tariff No. 7  
Authorized by Said Decision

Fifteenth Revised Page 2

Seventh Revised Page 9-A

First Revised Page 33-M

First Revised Page 33-M-1

First Revised Page 33-N

First Revised Page 33-O

First Revised Page 33-P

First Revised Page 33-Q

Second Revised Page 33-R

Second Revised Page 33-S

First Revised Page 33-T

First Revised Page 33-U

Seventh Revised Page 38-S

Original Page 38-S-1

Original Page 38-S-2

(END OF APPENDIX A LIST)

TABLE OF CONTENTS	Item No. Except as Shown (Inclusive)
Arrangement of Tariff _____	Page 3
Correction Number Checking Sheet _____	Page 1
<b>RATES:</b>	
Distance (Section No. 2) _____	\$127 to 150
From Production Areas to Delivery Zones (Section No. 3)-	210 to 295
From Production Areas to Delivery Points (Section No. 3-A)-	298
Hourly (Section No. 4) _____	360 to 365
<b>RULES AND REGULATIONS:</b>	
Additional Charge for Service Performed on Sundays and Holidays _____	206
Alternative Application of Distance Rates with Combination Rates Based upon Zone Rates _____	125,208
Alternative Application of Common Carrier Rates _____	70
Alternative Application of Combinations with Common Carrier Rates _____	85,90
Application of Hourly Rates _____	300
Application of Interplant Rates _____	142
Application of Tariff - Carriers _____	20
Application of Tariff - General _____	25
Application of Tariff - Territorial _____	30
Application of Zone Rates _____	205
Bridge and Ferry Tolls _____	80
Collection of Charges _____	45
Collect on Delivery (C.O.D) Shipments _____	48
Computation of Distances _____	40
Interdistrict Movements _____	315
Interterritorial Movements _____	120,310
Issuance of Shipping Document _____	93
Method of Determining Weight of Shipment _____	60
Minimum Charge _____	50
Payments to Underlying Carriers _____	94
Rates Based on Varying Minimum Truckload Weights _____	96
References to Items and Other Tariffs _____	35
Rules Governing Boundary Descriptions _____	200
Technical Terms - Definition of _____	10,11
Territorial Descriptions _____	100,110
Units of Measurement To Be Observed _____	47
<p>Change, Decision No. 68232</p>	
<p>EFFECTIVE DECEMBER 19, 1964</p>	
<p>Issued by the Public Utilities Commission of the State of California,          San Francisco, California.</p>	
<p>Correction No. 1064</p>	

Cancel

Item No.	SECTION NO. 2 - DISTANCE RATES (Continued) In Cents Per Ton					
	NORTHERN TERRITORY INTERPLANT DISTANCE RATES					
MILES Over	But Not Over	RATES(1)				
		Commodities as described in:				
		Item No. 114		Item No. 116		
		0(18)	20(24)	(8)	(13)	(18)
0	1	30	23	43	34	30
1	2	35	26	50	40	34
2	3	38	29	55	44	39
3	4	43	33	62	50	43
4	5	47	35	67	54	46
5	6	51	39	74	59	51
6	7	55	42	79	64	55
7	8	59	46	86	69	59
8	9	63	49	91	74	64
9	10	67	53	98	79	68
10	11	71	56	103	84	73
11	12	74	60	110	89	77
12	13	77	63	116	94	80
13	14	80	67	121	98	85
14	15	84	70	125	101	88
15	16	88	74	131	106	91
16	17	92	77	135	109	95
17	18	95	81	141	113	98
18	19	98	84	145	118	101
19	20	101	87	151	121	105
20	21	104	91	155	125	108
21	22	107	94	161	130	112
22	23	111	97	166	134	116
23	24	115	100	171	138	119
24	25	119	103	176	142	122
25	26	123	106	182	146	127
26	27	127	109	186	151	130
27	28	131	112	191	155	133
28	29	135	115	197	158	136
29	30	139	118	201	162	140
30	31	143	121	207	166	143
31	32	147	124	212	171	147
32	33	151	127	217	175	151
33	34	155	130	222	179	154
34	35	159	133	227	183	157
35	37	165	138	235	189	163
37	39	171	143	244	197	169
39	41	176	149	253	205	176
41	43	182	156	262	211	182
43	45	188	162	271	219	188

118

45	50	204	176	293	237	204
50	55	220	189	315	254	219
55	60	235	203	337	272	234
60	65	250	216	360	290	250
65	70	264	228	382	308	265
70	75	278	240	404	326	281
75	80	293	252	426	343	296
80	85	306	264	448	362	311
85	90	319	276	470	380	327
90	95	332	288	492	397	342
95	100	346	300	514	415	358
(2)		o13	o12	22	17½	15½

- (1) Rates are subject to Items Nos. 96 and 142. Except as otherwise provided in Item No. 96 and in the explanation of (8), the minimum weight must be transported in one unit of equipment at one time.
- (2) For each additional 5 miles, add to the rate for 100 miles the amount shown opposite this reference.
- (8) Minimum weight, 8 tons per shipment.
- (13) Minimum weight, 13 tons.
- (18) Minimum weight, 18 tons.
- o(24) Minimum weight, 24 tons.

ø Change  
 ◇ Increase, except as noted  
 o No Change

Decision No. 68232

EFFECTIVE DECEMBER 19, 1964

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

Correction No. 1065

Zone No.	SECTION NO. 3 - RATES FROM PRODUCTION AREAS TO DELIVERY ZONES
1	<p style="text-align: center;">APPLICATION OF TARIFF-TERRITORIAL ALAMEDA COUNTY-DELIVERY ZONES</p> <p><b>PERALTA:</b> Beginning at the point where U. S. Highway 50 crosses Wood Street, easterly along U. S. Highway 50 and West MacArthur Boulevard to Peralta Street, southerly along Peralta Street in Oakland to Thirty-fourth Street, easterly along Thirty-fourth Street to San Pablo Avenue, southeasterly along San Pablo Avenue to Market Street, along Market Street to Third Street, westerly along Third Street to Campbell Street, northerly along Campbell Street to Atlantic Street, westerly along Atlantic Street to Wood Street, and return northerly along Wood Street to the point of beginning.</p>
2	<p><b>BROADWAY:</b> Beginning at the point where Market Street meets the Oakland Inner Harbor, northerly along Market Street to Twelfth Street, easterly along Twelfth Street to its intersection with Fallon Street, along Fallon Street and its prolongation to its meeting with Oakland Inner Harbor and return along the Oakland shore line of Oakland Inner Harbor to point of beginning, all in the City of Oakland.</p>
3	<p><b>FIFTH AVENUE:</b> Beginning at the point at which the extension of Fallon Street meets Oakland Inner Harbor, along said extension and Fallon Street to Twelfth Street, along Twelfth Street to First Avenue, along First Avenue to East 15th Street, along East 15th Street to Fifth Avenue, along Fifth Avenue to East 21st Street, along East 21st Street to 19th Avenue, along 19th Avenue and its prolongation to Brooklyn Basin and return along Oakland shore line of Brooklyn Basin and Oakland Inner Harbor to point of beginning, all being in the City of Oakland.</p>
4	<p><b>23RD AVENUE:</b> Beginning at the point where the prolongation of 19th Avenue meets Oakland Inner Harbor, along said extension and 19th Avenue to East 21st Street, along East 21st Street to Foothill Boulevard, along Foothill Boulevard to 35th Avenue, along 35th Avenue and its extension to Tidal Canal, and return along the Oakland shore line of Tidal Canal and Brooklyn Basin to the point of beginning, all being in the City of Oakland.</p>
5	<p><b>PEARL:</b> Beginning at the point where the extension of Oak Street meets the shore line of San Francisco Bay, along said extension and Oak Street and its further extension to the shore line of Tidal Canal, southerly, easterly and northerly along the Alameda shore of Tidal Canal, San Leandro Bay and San Francisco Bay to the point of beginning, all being in the City of Alameda.</p>
6	<p><b>HIGH:</b> Beginning at the point at which the prolongation of 35th Avenue meets the Oakland shore line of Tidal Canal, easterly along said extension and 35th Avenue to Foothill Boulevard, southerly along Foothill Boulevard to 51st Avenue, along 51st Avenue to Wentworth Avenue, along Wentworth Avenue and Edgerley Street to 57th Avenue, westerly along 57th Avenue and its prolongation to the shore line of San Leandro Bay, and return northerly along the Oakland shore line of San Leandro Bay and Tidal Canal to point of beginning, all being in the City of Oakland.</p>

7 66TH AVENUE: Beginning at the point where the prolongation of 57th Avenue meets Oakport Street, easterly along said prolongation and 57th Avenue to East 17th Street, southerly along East 17th Street to 64th Avenue, westerly along 64th Avenue to East 14th Street, southerly along East 14th Street to 82nd Avenue, westerly along 82nd Avenue and its prolongation to Oakport Street, and return northerly along Oakport Street to point of beginning, all being in the City of Oakland.

ø8 92ND AVENUE: Beginning at the point where the prolongation of 82nd Avenue intersects Oakport Street, easterly along said extension and 82nd Avenue to East 14th Street, southerly along East 14th Street to 105th Avenue, westerly along 105th Avenue to Nimitz Freeway (State Highway 17), northerly along Nimitz Freeway (State Highway 17) to Hegenberger Road, westerly along Hegenberger Road to Oakport Street, and return northerly along Oakport Street to point of beginning, all being in the City of Oakland.

ø9 SAN LEANDRO: Beginning at the point at which 105th Avenue in Oakland meets Nimitz Freeway (State Highway 17), easterly along 105th Avenue to East 14th Street, southerly along East 14th Street to San Leandro Creek, easterly along San Leandro Creek to Foothill Boulevard, southerly along Foothill Boulevard to Sybil Avenue, westerly along Sybil Avenue to East 14th Street, northerly along East 14th Street to Castro Street, westerly along Castro Street and its prolongation to Nimitz Freeway (State Highway 17) and return northerly along Nimitz Freeway (State Highway 17) to the point of beginning.

---

(1) Alameda County Delivery Zones 10 and 11 formerly shown  
on this page transferred to First Revised Page 33-M-1.

ø Change, Decision No. 68232

---

EFFECTIVE DECEMBER 19, 1964

---

Issued by the Public Utilities Commission of the State of California,  
San Francisco, California.  
Correction No. 1066

Zone No.	SECTION NO. 3 - RATES FROM PRODUCTION AREAS TO DELIVERY ZONES (Continued)												
APPLICATION OF TARIFF - TERRITORIAL (Continued) ALAMEDA COUNTY - DELIVERY ZONES													
ϕ10	<p>SAN LORENZO: Beginning at the intersection of the prolongation of Castro Street and Nimitz Freeway (State Highway 17) in San Leandro, easterly along said prolongation and Castro Street to East 14th Street, southerly along East 14th Street to Sybil Avenue, easterly along Sybil Avenue to Foothill Boulevard, southerly along Foothill Boulevard to Grove Way, westerly along Grove Way to Meekland Avenue, northerly along Meekland Avenue to Blossom Way, westerly along Blossom Way to Hathaway Avenue, southerly along Hathaway Avenue to Bartlett Avenue, westerly along Bartlett Avenue to Hesperian Boulevard, northerly along Hesperian Boulevard to Nimitz Freeway (State Highway 17), and return northerly along Nimitz Freeway (State Highway 17) to the point of beginning.</p>												
Δ11	<p>HAYWARD: Beginning at the intersection of Bartlett Avenue and Hesperian Boulevard, easterly along Bartlett Avenue to Hathaway Avenue, northerly along Hathaway Avenue to Blossom Way, along Blossom Way to Meekland Avenue, southerly along Meekland Avenue to Grove Way, easterly along Grove Way ** to Foothill Boulevard, southerly along Foothill Boulevard and ϕState Highway 238 to Harder Road, westerly along Harder Road to Jackson Street, southwesterly along Jackson Street to Hesperian Boulevard, and return northerly along Hesperian Boulevard to the point of beginning.</p>												
ϕ12	<p>NILES-CENTERVILLE: Beginning at the intersection of Fremont Boulevard and Decoto Road, northerly along Decoto Road to Niles Boulevard, easterly along Niles Boulevard and Niles Canyon Road to Mission Boulevard, easterly along Mission Boulevard to Peralta Boulevard, westerly along Peralta Boulevard to Fremont Boulevard and return northwesterly along Fremont Boulevard to the point of beginning.</p>												
*13	<p>BERKELEY: Beginning at the intersection of Eastshore Freeway (U.S. Highway 40) and Gilman Street, easterly along Gilman Street to Hopkins Street, easterly along Hopkins Street to Sacramento Street, southerly along Sacramento Street to Ashby Avenue, westerly along Ashby Avenue to Eastshore Freeway (U.S. Highway 40), and return northerly along Eastshore Freeway (U.S. Highway 40) to the point of beginning.</p>												
<p>(1) Alameda County Delivery Zones 10 and 11 shown hereon formerly appeared on Original Page 33-M.</p> <table style="width: 100%; border: none;"> <tr> <td style="border: none;">ϕ Change</td> <td style="border: none;">)</td> <td style="border: none;"></td> </tr> <tr> <td style="border: none;">Δ Change, neither increase nor reduction</td> <td style="border: none;">)</td> <td style="border: none;"></td> </tr> <tr> <td style="border: none;">* Addition</td> <td style="border: none;">)</td> <td style="border: none;"></td> </tr> <tr> <td style="border: none;">** Street name eliminated</td> <td style="border: none;">)</td> <td style="border: none;"></td> </tr> </table> <p style="text-align: right; margin-right: 50px;">Decision No. 68232</p>		ϕ Change	)		Δ Change, neither increase nor reduction	)		* Addition	)		** Street name eliminated	)	
ϕ Change	)												
Δ Change, neither increase nor reduction	)												
* Addition	)												
** Street name eliminated	)												
EFFECTIVE DECEMBER 19, 1964													
<p>Issued by the Public Utilities Commission of the State of California, San Francisco, California.</p> <p>Correction No. 1067</p>													

Area No.	SECTION NO. 3 - RATES FROM PRODUCTION AREAS TO DELIVERY ZONES (Continued)
----------	---

APPLICATION OF TARIFF - TERRITORIAL (Continued)

ALAMEDA COUNTY - PRODUCTION AREAS

\*A NILES-CENTERVILLE: Beginning at the intersection of Fremont Boulevard and Decoto Road, northerly along Decoto Road to Niles Boulevard, easterly along Niles Boulevard and Niles Canyon Road to Mission Boulevard, easterly along Mission Boulevard to Peralta Boulevard, westerly along Peralta Boulevard to Fremont Boulevard and return north-westerly along Fremont Boulevard to the point of beginning.

\*B RADUM-ELIOT: Beginning at the intersection of Ray and Main Streets in Pleasanton, northerly along Main Street and Santa Rita Road to Stanley Boulevard, easterly along Stanley Boulevard to Isabel Avenue, southerly along Isabel Avenue to Vineyard Avenue, and return westerly along Vineyard Avenue and Ray Street to the point of beginning. Also the plant of Henry J. Kaiser Company located north of Stanley Boulevard at Radum.

\*C SUNOL: A radius of 1½ miles from the intersection of Mission Road (State Highway 680) and Calaveras Road.

/ Change            )  
 \* Addition         )     Decision No.    68232

EFFECTIVE DECEMBER 19, 1964

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

Correction No. 1068



Zone No.	SECTION NO. 3 - RATES FROM PRODUCTION AREAS TO DELIVERY ZONES (Continued)
----------	---

APPLICATION OF TARIFF-TERRITORIAL (Continued)  
CONTRA COSTA COUNTY-DELIVERY ZONES

21 WALNUT: Beginning at the intersection of Mount Diablo Boulevard and Main Street, easterly along Mount Diablo Boulevard to San Miguel Drive, southerly along San Miguel Drive to Blackwood Drive, southerly along Blackwood Drive to Murwood Drive, southwesterly along Murwood Drive and its prolongation to Danville Highway (State Highway 21), northerly along Danville Highway to its intersection with Main Street, and return northerly along Main Street to the point of beginning.

22 CONCORD: Beginning at the intersection of Port Chicago Highway and Arnold Industrial Highway, southerly along Port Chicago Highway to Salvio Street, northeasterly along Salvio Street to Sixth Street, southeasterly along Sixth Street to Willow Pass Road, northeasterly along Willow Pass Road to Farm Bureau Road, southeasterly along Farm Bureau Road to Clayton Road, easterly along Clayton Road to Treat Lane, southwesterly along Treat Lane to Oak Grove Road, northwesterly along Oak Grove Road and Meadow Lane and its prolongation to Walnut Creek, northerly along Walnut Creek to Arnold Industrial Highway, and return easterly along Arnold Industrial Highway to point of beginning. Also the plant of Gallagher and Burk located on Solano Way just north of Arnold Industrial Highway and the plant of Rhodes and Jamieson Limited located just north of Arnold Industrial Highway.

Area No.

\*CONTRA COSTA COUNTY-PRODUCTION AREAS

\*A CLAYTON: A radius of 2 miles from the intersection of Clayton Road, Ygnacio Valley Road and Kirker Pass Road.

∅ Change )  
\* Addition ) Decision No. 68232

EFFECTIVE DECEMBER 19, 1964

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

Correction No. 1069

Zone  
No.

SECTION NO. 3 - RATES FROM PRODUCTION AREAS  
TO DELIVERY ZONES (Continued)

~~APPLICATION OF TARIFF~~ -- TERRITORIAL (Continued)

\*\* Fresno County Delivery Zone No. 1 (THORNE) canceled.

\*\* Fresno County Production Area A (ROCKFIELD) canceled.

\*PLACER COUNTY -- DELIVERY ZONES

\*1 ROSEVILLE (South): All of the City of Roseville lying south of the mainline of the Southern Pacific Company between Sacramento and Truckee.

\*2 ROSEVILLE (North): All of the City of Roseville lying north of the mainline of the Southern Pacific Company between Sacramento and Truckee.

~~Change~~ )  
\* Addition ) Decision No. 68232  
\*\* Eliminated )

EFFECTIVE DECEMBER 19, 1964

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

Correction No. 1070

Zone No.	SECTION NO. 3 - RATES FROM PRODUCTION AREAS TO DELIVERY ZONES (Continued)
	<p style="text-align: center;">APPLICATION OF TARIFF-TERRITORIAL (Continued) SACRAMENTO COUNTY-DELIVERY ZONES</p> <p>A STREET: Beginning at the East Bank of the Sacramento River where it is crossed by U.S. Highway 40, along Capitol Avenue in Sacramento to 10th Street, northeasterly along 10th Street to I Street, southeasterly along I Street to The Western Pacific Railroad Company right-of-way, northeasterly along said right-of-way to the American River, along the south bank of the American River to the Sacramento River, and return along the east bank of the Sacramento River to the point of beginning.</p> <p>BRIGHTON: Beginning at 39th Street and M Street in Sacramento, southeasterly along M Street and its extension to the Southern Pacific Company right-of-way, southeasterly along the Southern Pacific Company right-of-way to the Central California Traction Company right-of-way, along Central California Traction Company right-of-way to Stockton Boulevard, northwesterly along Stockton Boulevard to 39th Street, and return northerly along 39th Street to the point of beginning.</p>
Area No.	<p style="text-align: center;">SACRAMENTO COUNTY--PRODUCTION AREAS</p> <p>A FAIR OAKS: All the area on the south bank of the American River within a one-half mile radius of the intersection of Bridge Street and Citrus Road.</p> <p>*B PERKINS: All of the area within a radius of 2 miles from the intersection of Jackson Road and Florin-Perkins Road.</p>
	<p>Change ) *Addition ) Decision No. 68232</p>
	EFFECTIVE DECEMBER 19, 1964
	<p>Issued by the Public Utilities Commission of the State of California, Correction No. 1071 <span style="float: right;">San Francisco, California.</span></p>

Zone No.	SECTION NO. 3--RATES FROM PRODUCTION AREAS TO DELIVERY ZONES (Continued)
	<p data-bbox="464 497 1323 541">øAPPLICATION OF TARIFF--TERRITORIAL (Continued)</p> <p data-bbox="227 593 1364 666">** San Joaquin County Delivery Zones Nos. 1 (FLORA) and 2 (TAYLOR) canceled.</p> <p data-bbox="227 919 1433 958">** San Joaquin County Production Area A (KERLINGER) canceled.</p>
øChange **Eliminated	) Decision No. 68232
EFFECTIVE DECEMBER 19, 1964	
Issued by the Public Utilities Commission of the State of California, San Francisco, California. Correction No. 1072	

Zone No.	SECTION NO. 3 - RATES FROM PRODUCTION AREAS TO DELIVERY ZONES (Continued)
	<p style="text-align: center;">APPLICATION OF TARIFF - TERRITORIAL (Continued) SAN MATEO COUNTY - DELIVERY ZONES</p> <p>** San Mateo County Delivery Zone No. 1 (RAVENSWOOD) canceled.</p> <p>Δ2 MIDDLEFIELD: Beginning at El Camino Real (State Highway 82) and Watkins Avenue (in Atherton), northeasterly along Watkins Avenue to Middlefield Road, northwesterly along Middlefield Road to Marsh Road, northeasterly along Marsh Road to Bayshore Freeway (U.S. Highway 101), southeasterly along Bayshore Freeway to the underpass of Southern Pacific Company Dumbarton Line, easterly along said Southern Pacific Company Dumbarton Line to the crossing at Willow Road in Menlo Park, southwesterly along Willow Road to Alberini Street, southeasterly along Alberini Street to Ralmar Avenue, southerly along Ralmar Avenue to Bay Road, easterly along Bay Road to Pulgas Avenue, southerly along Pulgas Avenue to San Francisco Creek, westerly along San Francisco Creek to El Camino Real, and return northwesterly along El Camino Real to the point of beginning.</p> <p>Δ3 REDWOOD: Beginning at El Camino Real (State Highway 82) and Watkins Avenue (in Atherton), northwesterly along El Camino Real to Whipple Avenue in Redwood City, northeasterly along Whipple Avenue to the Bayshore Freeway (U.S. Highway 101), southeasterly along said Bayshore Freeway to the east bank of Redwood Creek, along the south bank of Redwood Creek to the north line of Section 17, Township 5, South, Range 3 West; east along said north line of Sections 17 and 16 to the east line of Section 16, south along said east line of Section 16 and its prolongation to a point on Haven Avenue, southeasterly along Haven Avenue to Marsh Road, southwesterly along Marsh Road to Middlefield Road, southeasterly along Middlefield Road to Watkins Avenue, and return southwesterly along Watkins Avenue to the point of beginning.</p> <p>Δ4 SAN CARLOS: Beginning at Whipple Avenue and El Camino Real (State Highway 82) in Redwood City, northwesterly along El Camino Real to Holly Street in San Carlos, northeasterly along Holly Street to Bayshore Freeway (U.S. Highway 101), southeasterly along said Bayshore Freeway to Whipple Avenue, and southwesterly along Whipple Avenue to the point of beginning.</p> <p>Δ5 SAN MATEO: Beginning at 19th Avenue and El Camino Real (State Highway 82) in San Mateo, easterly along 19th Avenue to Bayshore Freeway (U.S. Highway 101), southerly along Bayshore Freeway to East Hillsdale Blvd., easterly along East Hillsdale Blvd. and its prolongation to Angelo Slough, easterly along Angelo Slough to the shore line of San Francisco Bay, easterly and northerly along the shore line of San Francisco Bay to San Mateo-Hayward Bridge, westerly along San Mateo-Hayward Bridge approach and East Third Avenue to Bayshore Freeway, northerly along Bayshore Freeway to Peninsular Avenue, westerly along Peninsular Avenue to El Camino Real, and return southerly along El Camino Real to the point of beginning.</p>

\*6

MILLBRAE: The plant of Millbrae Materials Company located on Linden Avenue.

\*7

SOUTH SAN FRANCISCO: Beginning at the intersection of Chestnut Avenue and Commercial Avenue, easterly along Commercial Avenue and its extension to Airport Boulevard, southerly along Airport Boulevard and Freeway Street to San Mateo Avenue, southerly along San Mateo Avenue to Tanforan Avenue, southwesterly along Tanforan Avenue and its prolongation to the right-of-way of the Southern Pacific Company (San Bruno Branch), northwesterly along said Southern Pacific Company right-of-way to its intersection with Chestnut Avenue, and return northerly along Chestnut Avenue to point of beginning. Also the plant of Consumer Rock Company located on Belle Air Road, east of Bayshore Freeway.

∅ Change	)	
Δ Change, neither increase	)	
nor reduction	)	Decision No. 68232
* Addition	)	
** Eliminated	)	

EFFECTIVE DECEMBER 19, 1964

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

Correction No. 1073

Zone No.	SECTION NO. 3 - RATES FROM PRODUCTION AREAS TO DELIVERY ZONES (Continued)
	<p>APPLICATION OF TARIFF - TERRITORIAL (Continued)</p> <p>SANTA CLARA COUNTY - DELIVERY ZONES</p>
Δ1	<p>UNIVERSITY AVENUE: Beginning at the bridge over San Francisquito Creek (Santa Clara-San Mateo County line) on El Camino Real (State Highway 82), easterly along San Francisquito Creek to Bayshore Freeway (U.S. Highway 101), southeasterly along Bayshore Freeway to Embarcadero Road; southwesterly along Embarcadero Road to El Camino Real and return northwesterly along El Camino Real to the points of beginning, being all in Palo Alto.</p>
Δ2	<p>ALMA STREET: Beginning at the intersection of Embarcadero Road and El Camino Real (State Highway 82), northeasterly along Embarcadero Road to Bayshore Freeway (U.S. Highway 101), southeasterly along Bayshore Freeway to San Antonio Avenue, southerly along San Antonio Avenue to El Camino Real (State Highway 82) and return along El Camino Real to the point of beginning.</p>
Δ3	<p>MOUNTAIN VIEW: Beginning at the intersection of San Antonio Avenue and El Camino Real (State Highway 82) along San Antonio Avenue to Bayshore Freeway (U.S. Highway 101), along Bayshore Freeway to Alviso-Mountain View Road, along Alviso-Mountain View Road to El Camino Real and return along El Camino Real to point of beginning. Also the plant of H. Casey located northeast of San Antonio Avenue and Bayshore Freeway.</p>
Δ4	<p>SUNNYVALE: Beginning at the intersection of Alviso-Mountain View Road and El Camino Real (State Highway 82), along Alviso-Mountain View Road to Bayshore Freeway (U.S. Highway 101), along Bayshore Freeway to Lawrence Station Road, along Lawrence Station Road to El Camino Real and return along El Camino Real to the point of beginning.</p>
Δ5	<p>NORTH TENTH STREET: Beginning at the intersection of Bayshore Freeway (U.S. Highway 101) and Brokaw Road, along Brokaw Road and its continuation as Schallenberger Avenue to the Coyote River, along Coyote River to East Taylor Street in San Jose, along East Taylor Street to North Fourth Street, along North Fourth Street to Bayshore Freeway and return along Bayshore Freeway to the point of beginning.</p>
6	<p>ALUM ROCK AVENUE: Beginning at the point at which Mabury Road meets the east bank of Coyote River, northeasterly along Mabury Road to King Road, southeasterly along King Road to Story Road, southwesterly along Story Road and its extension as Keyes Street to South 12th Street, northwesterly along South 12th Street to East Taylor Street, northeasterly along East Taylor Street to the Coyote River, and return northwesterly along Coyote River to the point of beginning.</p>
Δ7	<p>STOCKTON AVENUE: Beginning at the intersection of Brokaw Road and Southern Pacific Company right-of-way, northeasterly along Brokaw Road to Bayshore Freeway (U.S. Highway 101), easterly along Bayshore Freeway to North Fourth Street, southeasterly along North Fourth Street to East Taylor Street in San Jose, southwesterly along East and West Taylor Streets ** to Stockton Avenue, northwesterly along Stockton Avenue to the Southern Pacific Company right-of-way and return northwesterly along said right-of-way to the point of beginning.</p>

68 PHELAN AVENUE: Beginning at Almaden Avenue and Goodyear Street in San Jose, northeasterly along Goodyear Street and Keyes Street to Senter Road, southeasterly along Senter Road to Tully Road, southwesterly along Tully Road to Monterey Road (State Highway 82), northwesterly along Monterey Road to Curtner Avenue, southwesterly along Curtner Avenue to Stone Avenue, northwesterly along Stone Avenue to San Jose Avenue, southwesterly along San Jose Avenue to Almaden Road, northeasterly along Almaden Road and Avenue to the point of beginning.

\*\*

Santa Clara County Delivery Zone No. 9 (CUPERTINO) canceled.

∅ Change	}	Decision No. 68232
Δ Change, neither increase nor reduction		
** Eliminated		

EFFECTIVE DECEMBER 19, 1964

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

Correction No. 1074



Zone No.	SECTION NO. 3 - RATES FROM PRODUCTION AREAS TO DELIVERY ZONES (Continued)
	<p style="text-align: center;">APPLICATION OF TARIFF - TERRITORIAL (Continued) SANTA CLARA COUNTY-- DELIVERY ZONES</p> <p>DOWNER AVENUE: Beginning at the intersection of Almaden Road and Downer Avenue, northerly along Almaden Road to Branham Lane, easterly along Branham Lane to Pearl Avenue, southerly along Pearl Avenue to Downer Avenue, and westerly along Downer Avenue to the point of beginning.</p>
Area No.	<p style="text-align: center;">SANTA CRUZ COUNTY -- PRODUCTION AREAS</p>
*A	<p>MT. HERMON: All of the area located along Mt. Hermon Road and within one and one-half (1½) miles laterally thereof between the community of Mt. Hermon and the intersection of Scotts Valley Drive and Mt. Hermon Road. Also includes the plant of Santa Clara Sand &amp; Gravel Co. located at Scotts Valley.</p>
*B	<p>ZAYANTE: All of the area located along Zayante Road and within one (1) mile laterally thereof between its intersections with Mt. Hermon Road and Lompico Road.</p>
Zone No.	<p style="text-align: center;">YOLO COUNTY -- DELIVERY ZONES</p>
41	<p>BRYTE: Beginning at the intersection of Sycamore Avenue and U.S. Highway 40, northerly along Sycamore Avenue and its extension to the west levee of the Sacramento River, easterly and southerly along said levee to the point where it meets the Barge Canal, westerly along the Barge Canal to Jefferson Boulevard, northerly along Jefferson Boulevard to U.S. Highway 40, and return westerly along said highway to the point of beginning.</p>
Area No.	<p style="text-align: center;">YOLO COUNTY -- PRODUCTION AREAS</p>
A	<p>EAST CACHE: Beginning at the intersection of Roads 20 and 96, west along Road 20 to Cache Creek, north along an imaginary line across Cache Creek to a point on Road 18A, east along Road 18A and its prolongation to Cache Creek, southwesterly along Cache Creek to Road 96, and return south along Road 96 to the point of beginning.</p>

Change )  
\*Addition ) Decision No. 68232

EFFECTIVE DECEMBER 19, 1964

Issued by the Public Utilities Commission of the State of California,  
San Francisco, California.  
Correction No. 1075

- 33-U -

Item No.	SECTION NO. 3 - RATES FROM PRODUCTION AREAS TO DELIVERY ZONES (Continued) IN CENTS PER TON						
COMMODITIES as described in Item No. 207 (See Notes 1 and 2).							
♦ R A T E S							
FROM (1) Alameda County Production Areas							
TO (1) Alameda County Delivery Zones	A		B		*C		
	Minimum Weight		Minimum Weight		Minimum Weight		
	15 Tons	24 Tons	18 Tons	24 Tons	18 Tons	24 Tons	
		116	103	113	124	151	128
2	113	99	135	118	144	122	
3	106	94	129	113	140	119	
4	102	89	126	110	135	115	
5	101	88	124	108	133	113	
6	99	86	123	107	128	109	
7	93	81	117	103	126	107	
8	90	78	113	100	122	105	
9	86	74	108	94	117	100	
10	76	66	96	84	106	91	
(5) 294	71	59	94	80	96	82	
12	—	—	87	74	66	56	
*13	135	115	160	136	164	139	
TO (2) Contra Costa County Delivery Zones							
	1	—	—	113	100	126	107
	2	—	—	113	124	155	132
TO (3) San Mateo County Delivery Zones							
	**						
	2	103	90	—	—	—	—
	3	110	96	—	—	—	—
	4	120	103	—	—	—	—
	5	138	117	—	—	—	—
	*6	153	130	—	—	—	—
*7	171	145	—	—	—	—	

TO (4) Santa Clara County Delivery Zones							
1	103	90	--	--	--	--	--
2	108	96	--	--	--	--	--
3	113	92	--	--	--	--	--
4	101	88	--	--	--	--	--
5	87	75	115	101	88	75	
6	94	81	124	108	98	83	
7	94	81	124	108	95	81	
8	106	92	138	119	108	93	
**							
*10	141	120	174	148	144	122	

NOTE 1.-Rates include bridge and ferry tolls.

NOTE 2.-The minimum weight shall be transported in one unit of dump truck equipment at one time subject to Item No. 96.

- (1) For descriptions of Alameda County Production Areas and Delivery Zones see Pages 33-M, 33-M-1 and 33-N.
- (2) For descriptions of Contra Costa County Delivery Zones see Page 33-O.
- (3) For descriptions of San Mateo County Delivery Zones see Page 33-S.
- /(4) For descriptions of Santa Clara County Delivery Zones see Pages 33-T and 33-U.
- (5) Portion of the rates formerly shown in this item transferred to Item No. 294.6 on Original Page 38-S-2.

/Change )  
 \*Addition )  
 /Increase )  
 \*\*Elimination )

Decision No. 68232

EFFECTIVE DECEMBER 19, 1964

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

Correction No. 1076

Item No.	SECTION NO. 3 - RATES FROM PRODUCTION AREAS TO DELIVERY ZONES (Continued) IN CENTS PER TON				
COMMODITIES as described in Item No. 207 (See Notes 1 and 2).					
TO (2) Alameda County Delivery Zones		RATES			
		FROM (1) Santa Cruz County Production Areas			
		A		B	
		Minimum Weight		Minimum Weight	
		18 Tons	24 Tons	18 Tons	24 Tons
*294.3	1	274	234	284	243
	2	267	228	277	237
	3	265	226	275	235
	4	257	221	267	230
	5	256	220	266	229
	6	251	216	261	225
	7	250	214	260	223
	8	247	211	257	220
	9	241	207	251	216
	10	233	198	243	207
	11	226	192	236	201
	12	197	168	207	177
	13	284	243	294	252
TO (3) Contra Costa County Delivery Zones					
	1	282	241	292	250
	2	308	262	318	271
	2	170	145	180	154
	3	182	156	192	165
	4	190	162	200	171
	5	213	181	223	190
	6	226	192	236	201
7	242	207	252	216	

TO (5) Santa Clara County Delivery Zones				
1	166	141	176	150
2	162	138	172	147
3	149	127	159	136
4	139	118	149	127
5	138	117	148	126
6	139	118	149	127
7	129	110	139	119
8	132	112	142	121
10	122	104	132	113

NOTE 1.-Rates include bridge and ferry tolls.

NOTE 2.-The minimum weight shall be transported in one unit of dump truck equipment at one time subject to Item No. 96.

- (1) For descriptions of Santa Cruz County Production Areas see Page 33-U.
- (2) For descriptions of Alameda County Delivery Zones see Pages 33-M and 33-M-1.
- (3) For descriptions of Contra Costa County Delivery Zones see Page 33-O.
- (4) For descriptions of San Mateo County Delivery Zones see Page 33-S.
- (5) For descriptions of Santa Clara County Delivery Zones see Pages 33-T and 33-U.

\* Addition, New Item )  
 ◇ Increase ) Decision No. 68232

EFFECTIVE DECEMBER 19, 1964

Issued by the Public Utilities Commission of the State of California,  
 San Francisco, California.  
 Correction No. 1077

Item No.	SECTION NO. 3 - RATES FROM PRODUCTION AREAS TO DELIVERY ZONES (Continued) IN CENTS PER TON				
COMMODITIES as described in Item No. 207 (See Notes 1 and 2).					
TO (1) Contra Costa County Delivery Zones		◇ R A T E S			
		FROM (1) Contra Costa County Production Area			
		A			
		Minimum Weight			
		18 Tons	24 Tons		
1	55	47			
2	49	42			
TO (3) Placer County Delivery Zones		FROM (2) Sacramento County Production Areas			
		A		B	
		Minimum Weight		Minimum Weight	
		1	59	50	1
2	65	55	18 Tons	87	
1	84	73	24 Tons	69	
2	68	58	18 Tons	74	
2	68	37	24 Tons	31	
1	89	76	18 Tons	52	
1	89	52	24 Tons	44	
1	113	101	18 Tons	101	
2	127	110	24 Tons	110	
1	105	91	18 Tons	91	
1	105	91	24 Tons	91	

(5)  
\*29+6

NOTE 1.-Rates include bridge and ferry tolls.

NOTE 2.-The minimum weight shall be transported in one unit of dump truck equipment at one time subject to Item No. 96.

- (1) For descriptions of Contra Costa County Production Area and Delivery Zones see Page 33-0.
- (2) For descriptions of Sacramento County Production Areas and Delivery Zones see Page 33-Q.
- (3) For descriptions of Placer County Delivery Zones see Page 33-P.
- (4) For descriptions of Yolo County Production Area and Delivery Zone see Page 33-U.
- (5) Rates shown in this item, except those newly established, formerly appeared in Item No. 29<sup>4</sup> on Sixth Revised Page 38-S.

\* Addition, New Item) Decision No. 68232  
◇ Increase

EFFECTIVE DECEMBER 19, 1964

Issued by the Public Utilities Commission of the State of California,  
San Francisco, California.  
Correction No. 1078