

**ORIGINAL**Decision No. 71553

## 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 any and all commodities between and within all points and places in the State of California (including, but not limited to, transportation for which rates are provided in Minimum Rate Tariff No. 2).

Case No. 5432  
(Petition for Modification  
No. 410)

Case No. 5435  
(Petition for Modification  
No. 73)

Case No. 5441  
(Petition for Modification  
No. 102)

## AND RELATED MATTERS.

In the Matter of the Application of SOUTHERN PACIFIC COMPANY, THE ATCHISON, TOPEKA AND SANTA FE RAILWAY COMPANY, MODESTO AND EMPIRE TRACTION COMPANY, NORTHWESTERN PACIFIC RAILROAD COMPANY, PACIFIC MOTOR TRUCKING COMPANY, and PETALUMA AND SANTA ROSA RAILROAD COMPANY for authority to increase charges set forth in Item 410A and other items of Pacific Southcoast Freight Bureau Tariff 294-E.

Application No. 48389

A. D. Poe, J. C. Kaspar and H. F. Kollmyer, for California Trucking Association; petitioner in Cases Nos. 5432, 5435 and 5441 and interested party in Application No. 48389.

Gary S. Anderson and John MacDonald Smith, for Southern Pacific Company, The Atchison, Topeka and Santa Fe Railway Company, Modesto and Empire Traction Company, Northwestern Pacific Railroad Company, Pacific Motor Trucking Company and Petaluma and Santa Rosa Railroad Company; applicants in Application No. 48389 and interested parties in Cases Nos. 5432, 5435 and 5441.

Anthony J. Konicki, for Pacific Motor Trucking Company, applicant in Application No. 48389 and interested party in Cases Nos. 5432, 5435 and 5441.

John T. Reed, for California Manufacturers Association, protestant.

E. R. Chapman, for Foremost Dairies, Inc.; Charles H. Costello, for Continental Can Co., Inc.; K. C. DeLaney, for Los Angeles Chamber of Commerce; A. E. Norrbom, for Traffic Managers Conference of California; David B. Porter, for Cannery League of California; W. Paul Tarter, for Wm. Volker & Co.; interested parties.

Robert E. Walker and J. M. Jenkins, for the Commission staff.

O P I N I O N

Item No. 240 of Minimum Rate Tariff No. 2 (MRT 2) contains accessorial charges and related provisions applicable in connection with the alternative use of common carrier rates.<sup>1/</sup> By Petition for Modification No. 410, as amended, in Case No. 5432, California Trucking Association (CTA) proposes that the charges of 2 cents and 4 cents per 100 pounds named therein for loading or unloading be increased to 3 cents and 5 cents, respectively, and that the text of the item be recast for purposes of clarification, to restore the original intent of certain of its provisions and to meet changing demands of carriers and shippers.

By Petition for Modification No. 73, as amended, in Case No. 5435, and by Petition for Modification No. 102, as amended, in Case No. 5441, CTA proposes to increase the rate of 4 cents per 100 pounds in Item No. 140 of Minimum Rate Tariff No. 5 (MRT 5) and in Item No. 130 of Minimum Rate Tariff No. 1-B (MRT 1-B), respectively, to 5 cents per 100 pounds.<sup>2/</sup> Those items also provide rules for the alternative application of common carrier rates and the rate of 4 cents per 100 pounds is likewise provided for loading or unloading services.

1/ The charges and other provisions in question are applicable when a common carrier rate is used to construct a rate for highway transportation and such common carrier rate does not include accessorial services performed by the highway carrier.

2/ MRT 2 contains rates and rules for the statewide transportation of general commodities. MRT 5 and MRT 1-B set forth corresponding provisions for transportation within the Los Angeles defined drayage area and within the East Bay defined drayage area, respectively.

By Application No. 48389, as amended, certain California railroads and Pacific Motor Trucking Company seek to make adjustments in certain of the rates, charges and rules published in Pacific Southcoast Freight Bureau Tariff No. 294-E, applicable to trailer-on-flat-car service, corresponding to the changes proposed by Petition No. 410, above, for Item No. 240 of MRT 2.

Public hearing of these matters was held on a common record before Examiner Bishop at Los Angeles and San Francisco on June 16 and 28, 1966, respectively. Evidence was presented through the director of the Division of Transportation Economics of CTA, the freight traffic manager-rates and divisions of Southern Pacific Company, a transportation analyst from that company's Bureau of Transportation Research and the assistant regional traffic manager of Continental Can Company. Members of the Commission's Transportation Division staff and various interested parties assisted in the development of the record through examination of the witnesses.

The CTA witness reviewed the history of the charges and other provisions of Item No. 240 of MRT 2 and described the changes in format and language, as well as the revision of charges currently proposed in the item.<sup>3/</sup> The present charge of 2 cents per 100 pounds applies, under the circumstances set forth in Footnote 1, above, when loading or unloading of carrier's equipment is accomplished by consignor or consignee with the physical assistance of a single carrier employee (either a driver or helper) by use of power equipment, to be furnished by the consignor or consignee without expense to the carrier, and provided that the shipping document shall indicate that the shipment was loaded or unloaded under these circumstances. The charge of 4 cents is assessed when loading or unloading is

<sup>3/</sup> The history of the charges provided in item No. 240 is set forth in Decision No. 66981, dated March 17, 1964 in Petition for Modification No. 306 in Case No. 5432, and related matters. By that decision, the most recent general revision of the item was effected.

performed under circumstances other than those specified in connection with the charge of 2 cents.

In previous proceedings, the witness pointed out, the costs of performing the loading and unloading services for which the above-mentioned accessorial charges are provided have exceeded said respective charges. He reiterated the policy of CTA to increase gradually the charges until they approximate the costs incurred, and to consider the fact of said charges as an inducement to shippers to improve the efficiency of their operations.

This witness presented the results of a revised study of carrier costs of performing the services in question. These results are summarized as follows:

	<u>Associated with Services Under</u>	
	<u>Proposed</u>	<u>Proposed</u>
	<u>3-Cent Rate</u>	<u>5-Cent Rate</u>
	<u>(Cents per</u>	<u>(Cents per</u>
	<u>100 Pounds)</u>	<u>100 Pounds)</u>
Cost	4.4	6.4

The revised costs, the witness said, reflect those of the fundamental study made in 1963,<sup>4/</sup> as adjusted to reflect labor costs prevailing as of July 1, 1966. Equipment costs were carried forward unchanged from that study. Expansion factors for indirect expense, insurance and gross receipts expense reflect the same percentages as in the earlier cost study. As will be hereinafter mentioned, in one of the proposals with respect to proposed language revision of the item, CTA seeks to have the item restated to provide clearly that the accessorial charges apply for the services of the driver and that any accessorial help will be compensated under other provisions of the tariff. Accordingly, the witness explained, he has restated the

<sup>4/</sup> Those costs were summarized in Exhibit No. 306-2 in Petition for Modification No. 306 in Case No. 5432. Their totals are set forth in Decision No. 66981, above.

labor cost and the manpower productivity in the terms of a single man; thus, he took the information which was utilized in the 1963 proceeding and recast it in terms of labor cost per hour based on driver cost and in terms of pounds per man hour predicated upon the single man hour operation. Even the proposed increased charges, the witness pointed out, would not return the estimated costs, as developed on this record.

The principal purpose involved in the proposed rearrangement and rewording of the provisions of Item No. 240, the record shows, is to clarify the language to the extent necessary to carry out the intent of petitioner, CTA, in the last revision of the item and what appeared to be the purpose of the Commission as expressed in Decision No. 66981. In this connection the witness drew attention to Informal Ruling No. 127-B, issued by the Commission's Transportation Division under date of November 18, 1964. In that ruling, the staff informally interpreted, in response to inquiries, certain provisions and terms of the item. Assertedly, certain of these interpretations were contrary, in their effect, to the purposes of the 1964 revision of the item. Attention was directed in particular to the meaning of the expression "physical assistance", as construed by the informal ruling, in connection with the application of the 2-cent charge.<sup>5/</sup> According to the ruling this expression includes hand stacking within the body of the truck, and is subject to the 2-cent charge. The witness pointed out that the cost evidence and the separation of the costs between the two types of services (to which the 2-cent and 4-cent charges, respectively, apply) did not contemplate that carrier employees would provide hand stacking in connection with the lower charge.

---

<sup>5/</sup> Paragraph (1)(a) of Item No. 240 provides in part that the accessorial charge of 2 cents per 100 pounds shall apply for either loading or unloading, "when the shipment is loaded into or unloaded from the carrier's equipment by the consignor or consignee with the physical assistance of a single carrier employee (either a driver or a helper) by power equipment ...." (Emphasis supplied.)

Another interpretation made by Informal Ruling No. 127-B which the proposed revision of Item No. 240 would modify is that in which it is stated that shipments of lumber unloaded by the use of rollers are subject to the 4-cent charge. The witness pointed out that such unloading operation is comparable to unloading by gravity from dump truck equipment. Accordingly, CTA proposes that Item No. 240 specifically provide that neither the 3-cent nor the 5-cent accessorial charge shall be assessed on shipments of lumber unloaded by the use of rollers. Similarly, the aforesaid ruling states that the 4-cent charge is applicable on shipments of commodities in pneumatic equipment loaded or unloaded by use of air when the assistance or presence of carrier's employee is required, on the premise that such facilities are not "power equipment", as defined in the tariff. CTA proposes to provide specifically in Item No. 240 that the proposed 3-cent charge (not the 5-cent charge) shall apply on shipments loaded or unloaded by use of carrier's pneumatic equipment with or without assistance of carrier employee.

As hereinbefore mentioned in connection with the CTA witness' development of costs, another purpose of the proposed restatement of Item No. 240 is to provide clearly that the charges set forth therein apply for the services of the driver and that any accessorial help will be compensated under other provisions of the tariff.

The remaining proposed changes in format and language are for purposes of clarification and need not be individually discussed. Basically CTA would rearrange the text into statements of three sets of circumstances under which (a) no charge, (b) 3 cents per 100 pounds, and (c) 5 cents per 100 pounds, respectively, would be assessed for loading or unloading of shipments where common carrier rates are used alternatively under other provisions of the tariff and such rates do not include the services of loading or unloading.

Item No. 130 of MRT 1-B (East Bay drayage area) and Item No. 140 of MRT 5 (Los Angeles drayage area) provide for the alteration of common carrier rates with the rates named therein. Both items specify a charge of 4 cents per 100 pounds for loading or unloading when those services are not included in the common carrier rates. With the exception of repositioning a provision of Item No. 130, for clarification purposes, the only change proposed in either of these items is to increase the 4-cent accessorial charge to 5 cents. In support of this proposal the director testified that the 1963 cost study included operations in the various drayage areas as well as those to which the provisions of MRT 2 are applicable, and that the levels of the expense elements which were utilized in the study were common to both types of carrier operation. Accordingly, the adjustment in costs in the current study was considered applicable to both.

Testifying on behalf of applicants in Application No. 48389, the aforesaid freight traffic manager stated that the railroad trailer-on-flat-car rates that are subject to loading and unloading charges, or which include such charges in the volume of the rates, were established to meet truckload rates assessed by highway carriers under alternative application provisions of the Commission's minimum rate orders. These latter rates were established to meet the competition of rail carload traffic. As in the highway carrier proposal for Item No. 240 of MRT 2, the witness testified, the rail lines propose, in Application No. 48389, to increase the 2-cent and 4-cent charges set forth in Item No. 410 of Pacific Southcoast Freight Bureau Tariff No. 294-E to 3 cents and 5 cents per 100 pounds, respectively. Additionally, said applicants seek to make corresponding increases in those rates in said tariff which include the services of loading or unloading. It is also proposed to recast the language of Item No. 410 to read the same as proposed by

CTA for Item No. 240 of MRT 2.<sup>6/</sup> Applicants also propose to cancel certain provisions of the tariff relating to so-called "unitized" shipments, since, the traffic manager stated, the sought revision in the text of Item No. 410 will make said provisions unnecessary.

The transportation analyst introduced a study purporting to reflect the cost incurred by Southern Pacific in performing the services for which the accessorial charges in Item No. 410 are provided. However, no segregation was made between costs incurred under conditions where power loading or unloading, as specified in connection with the proposed 3-cent charge, is performed and costs associated with other circumstances of loading or unloading. Thus only one cost figure was developed in this study, namely, 7.6 cents per 100 pounds. This purports to be the full cost, without provision for profit. It is to be noted also that this trailer-on-flat-car cost study included a weighted factor for helper labor costs, and therefore does not comport with the proposed revision of the text of Item No. 410, in which the accessorial charges would relate only to the services of driver. However, the record indicates that the circumstances, including wage agreement provisions, under which the loading and unloading of trailers in rail trailer-on-flat car service is performed are comparable to those which obtain in highway carrier transportation subject to the provisions of Item No. 240 of MRT 2, and that the costs incurred in performing the services for which the charges in said item are provided, are a fair measure of the costs experienced in the performance of the same services under the trailer-on-flat-car tariff.

---

<sup>6/</sup> Applicants propose no reference in the rail item to built-in roller conveyors since no such equipment is currently available in trailer-on-flat-car service.



Testifying on behalf of Continental Can Company

(Continental), the assistant regional traffic manager of that company opposed the sought increase from 2 cents to 3 cents per 100 pounds in Item No. 240 of MRT 2 in connection with the loading or unloading of palletized shipments "by use of a roller conveyor when said conveyor is built into and is an integral part of carrier's equipment, and shipment is placed onto or removed from said conveyor by consignor or consignee without expense to the carrier."<sup>7/</sup> He also opposed the sought increase (as he construed the tariff) from 2 cents to 5 cents in the charge for loading or unloading palletized freight by use of portable roller conveyor equipment. In this connection, it is clear that under the proposed revision of Item No. 240, the 5-cent charge would apply, under these latter circumstances. Whether, under the present provisions, the 2-cent or the 4-cent charge is applicable is not clear.

The Continental witness explained that his company operates 18 plants in California and palletizes the majority of its truck-loaded shipments, including various commodities which are transported at rail carload rates and which are therefore subject to the provisions of Item No. 240. He stated that Continental's shipments which move at rail carload rates are all of high density, with weights ranging from 35,000 pounds to 54,000 pounds per unit of equipment. Because of the use of roller conveyor equipment by the carriers, he said, the average loading or unloading time for such shipments is less than one-half hour. These figures, he pointed out, reflect performance factors far more efficient than are exhibited by the figure of 17,200 pounds per man vehicle hour used in the CTA study of traffic which would be subject to the 3-cent charge. He asserted that the loading and unloading time by use of roller equipment is about the same as that experienced under circumstances in which no

---

<sup>7/</sup> The quotation is from paragraph 2(c) of the revision of Item No. 240 as proposed by CTA.

accessorial charge is, or would be, applicable under the item in question.<sup>8/</sup> He felt, therefore, that the 3-cent charge would be discriminatory.

Discussion, Findings and Conclusions

With respect to the proposed increased charges, it is clear that the new levels would not be sufficient to cover the full costs to the carriers of performing the accessorial services to which said charges relate. We recognize the fact, of course, that by applying the same percentage factors for indirect expense, insurance and gross receipts expense as were used in the 1963 study, the CTA witness has included increases in these expense elements, in cents per 100 pounds, in support of which no evidence has been adduced. However, it is also observed that for equipment cost per 100 pounds the current study utilizes the same figures as in the 1963 study, whereas, it is evident that increases have been experienced in this expense element over the past three-year period. In any event, it is apparent that the proposed new charges will still fall short of recovering the costs of performing the services in question.

The proposed rearrangement of the item will tend to clarify the application of its provisions, and the rewording of some of the language in the rule should more satisfactorily define the conditions under which the 3-cent and 5-cent charges, respectively, will apply. The other proposed changes in language, including that designed to provide clearly that said charges apply for the services of the driver and that any additional help will be compensated under other provisions of the tariff, appear appropriate.

---

<sup>8/</sup> These are covered by paragraph 1(a) of the proposed revised rule. They relate to three different forms of unloading accomplished by force of gravity.

It is evident that the loading and unloading arrangements of the highway carriers which serve Continental are highly efficient. It is well established that minimum rates prescribed pursuant to the statutes of this State are to be based on costs reflective of the operations of reasonably efficient carriers. It appears that the performance factors utilized in the CTA studies satisfy this requirement for general conditions. Continental's evidence was limited to its own operations and is not an adequate basis for establishing a rate applicable to carriers generally. The carriers which serve Continental may be able to establish, through applications under Section 3666 of the Public Utilities Code, the reasonableness of charges less than the minimum for the particular transportation operations from Continental's plants.

We find that:

1. The revised charges of 5 cents per 100 pounds and 3 cents per 100 pounds and the other revised provisions sought to be established in Item No. 240 of Minimum Rate Tariff No. 2 are reasonable and justified.
2. The revised charge of 5 cents per 100 pounds sought to be established in Item No. 130 of Minimum Rate Tariff No. 1-B is reasonable and justified.
3. The revised charge of 5 cents per 100 pounds sought to be established in Item No. 140 of Minimum Rate Tariff No. 5 is reasonable and justified.
4. The increases and other tariff revisions sought by applicants in Application No. 48389 are reasonable and justified.

Based upon the foregoing findings of fact we conclude that the petitions herein, as amended, and Application No. 48389, as amended, should be granted. In order to avoid duplication of tariff distribution, Minimum Rate Tariffs Nos. 1-B and 5 will be amended by separate orders.

O R D E R

IT IS ORDERED that:

1. Minimum Rate Tariff No. 2 (Appendix D of Decision No. 31606 as amended) is further amended by incorporating therein, to become effective December 17, 1966, Thirty-eighth Revised Page 2, Twenty-sixth Revised Page 26 and Original Page 26-A, attached hereto and by this reference made a part hereof.

2. Except for tariff publications required to be made by ordering paragraph 6 hereof, 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 December 17, 1966; 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. In all other respects said Decision No. 31606, as amended, shall remain in full force and effect.

4. Applicants in Application No. 48389 are authorized to publish and file changes in tariff provisions proposed in said application, as amended. Tariff publications authorized and required to be made as a result of this ordering paragraph 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.

5. The authority granted by ordering paragraph 4, above, shall expire unless exercised within sixty days after the effective date of this order.

6. Common carriers maintaining, under outstanding authorizations permitting the alternative use of rail rates, rates below the specific minimum rate levels otherwise applicable on the commodities and between the points for which increases are authorized in ordering paragraph 4 hereof, are hereby authorized and directed to increase such rates, on not less than ten days' notice to the Commission and the public, to the level of the rail rates established pursuant to ordering paragraph 4 hereof, or to the level of the specific minimum rates, whichever is lower; such increases shall be made effective not later than thirty days after the effective date of the increased rail rates.

7. Common carriers, in establishing and maintaining the rates and charges authorized or directed 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 modified only to the extent necessary to comply with this order; common carriers in publishing rates under the authority conferred in this ordering paragraph shall make reference in their schedules to the prior orders authorizing the long- and short-haul departures and to this order.

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

Dated at San Francisco, California, this 9th day of NOVEMBER, 1966.

John E. Mitchell  
President

Frederick B. Holdhoff

Augustus

William A. Bernard  
Commissioners

To the extent this decision modifies Decision 66981, it is an improvement and I concur in the opinion and order. I wish to call attention, however, to my earlier reservations concerning Decision 66981 (62 CPUC 509).

George F. Grover

TABLE OF CONTENTS	Item Number Except as Shown (Inclusive)
Abbreviations, Explanation of -----	Page 1-A
Arrangement of Tariff -----	Page 10
Correction Number Checking Sheet -----	Page 1
Forms of Documents (Section No. 5) -----	Pages 68-B - 68-E
Rates:	
Class Rates (Section No. 2) -----	500-520
Commodity Rates (Section No. 3):	
Canned Goods -----	620,630
Feed, Animal -----	620,630
Foodstuffs for Human Consumption -----	620,630
Grain, Rice, Seeds, Grain Products and Related Articles -----	652-654 $\frac{1}{2}$
Hourly Rates, Oil, Water, Gas Well Outfits	720-720-2
Lumber and Forest Products -----	670-710
Petroleum and Petroleum Products -----	723-726
Rice -----	652-654 $\frac{1}{2}$
Soap and Related Articles -----	730-732
Sugar -----	740-755
Temperature Control Service -----	185-186-1
Volume Incentive Service -----	292
Routing(Section No. 4)-----	900-900-1
Rules and Regulations (Section No. 1):	
Accessorial Charges Not To Be Offset by Transportation Charges -----	297
Accessorial Services -----	140
Accessorial Services Not Included in Common Carrier Rates -----	240-241
Advertising on Equipment -----	147
Alternative Application of Combinations with Common Carrier Rates -----	210
Alternative Application of Common Carrier Rates -----	200
Alternative Application of Split Delivery under Rates Constructed by Use of Combinations with Common Carrier Rates --	230
Alternative Application of Split Pickup under Rates Constructed by Use of Combinations with Common Carrier Rates --	220
Application of Class Rates That Are Per- centages, Multiples or Proportions of Specific Class Ratings -----	298
Application of Combinations of Class and Commodity Rates -----	190
Application of Exception Ratings Named in This Tariff -----	285
Application of Rates -----	120
Application of Rates--Deductions -----	110
Application of Tariff-Carriers -----	20
Application of Tariff-Commodities -----	40-42

(Continued)

\* Addition, Decision No. 71553

EFFECTIVE DECEMBER 17, 1966

Issued by the Public Utilities Commission of the State of California,  
San Francisco, California.  
Correction No. 1814



Item No.	SECTION NO. 1 - RULES AND REGULATIONS OF GENERAL APPLICATION (Continued)
	<p data-bbox="483 473 1155 563">ACCESSORIAL SERVICES NOT INCLUDED IN COMMON CARRIER RATES (Items Nos. 240 and *241)</p> <p data-bbox="320 596 1458 817">In the event under provisions of Items Nos. 200 to 230, 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 (except as otherwise provided in Item No. 241 and in connection with individual rates):</p> <ol data-bbox="416 851 1458 1773" style="list-style-type: none"><li data-bbox="416 851 1458 1039">1. No additional charge shall be assessed when the shipment is loaded into and/or unloaded from the carrier's equipment and the Shipping Document issued pursuant to Item No. 255 indicates that the shipment was loaded and/or unloaded under one of the following circumstances:<ol data-bbox="500 1072 1458 1773" style="list-style-type: none"><li data-bbox="500 1072 1458 1421">(a) By gravity:<ol data-bbox="594 1141 1458 1421" style="list-style-type: none"><li data-bbox="594 1141 1458 1200">(1) From or into dump or hopper trucks or trailers other than pneumatic equipment.</li><li data-bbox="594 1233 1458 1319">(2) On truckload shipments of pulpboard in rolls weighing not less than 750 pounds each.</li><li data-bbox="594 1360 1458 1421">(3) On shipments of lumber unloaded by the use of rollers.</li></ol></li><li data-bbox="500 1454 1458 1615">(b) By the consignor and/or consignee with power equipment, as described in Item No. 11, furnished and used without expense to carrier, and when no services are performed at carrier expense, or by carrier personnel.</li><li data-bbox="500 1648 1458 1773">(c) By the consignor and/or consignee when the carrier's equipment is a trailer or semi-trailer left for loading and/or unloading without the presence of carrier's employees.</li></ol></li></ol>

240

2. A charge of 3 cents per 100 pounds shall be assessed on the weight on which transportation charges are determined when the Shipping Document is so annotated to indicate that the shipment was loaded or unloaded from the carrier's equipment under one of the following circumstances:

- (a) By the consignor or consignee by use of power equipment, as described in Item No. 11, furnished by the consignor or consignee without expense to the carrier. Physical assistance of a single carrier employee is restricted to work within or on carrier's equipment and does not include services subject to Paragraph 3 (a) or any assistance in the actual loading or unloading operation.
- (b) By use of carrier's pneumatic equipment with or without assistance of carrier employee.
- (c) By use of a roller conveyor when said conveyor is built into and is an integral part of carrier's equipment, and shipment is placed onto or removed from said conveyor by consignor or consignee without expense to the carrier.

(Continued in Item No. 241)

∫ Change	)	Decision No. 71553
* Addition	)	
◇ Increase	)	
ó Reduction	)	

EFFECTIVE DECEMBER 17, 1966

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

Correction No. 1815

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

(Items Nos. 240 and \*241)

3. A charge of 5 cents per 100 pounds shall be assessed on the weight on which transportation charges are determined when the shipment is loaded into or unloaded from the carrier's equipment with the physical assistance of a single carrier employee as follows, and under all other circumstances not noted in Paragraphs 1 and 2:
- (a) When shipment is loaded into or unloaded from carrier's equipment by power equipment furnished by the consignor or consignee without expense to the carrier and carrier's employee is required:
- (1) To stack or unstack merchandise in the carrier's equipment, or
- (2) To remove merchandise from or place merchandise on pallets.
- (b) When the Shipping Document is not annotated as provided in Paragraphs 1 and 2.
4. If a shipment is partially unloaded at an intermediate point under one circumstance and the unloading is completed at final destination under another circumstance, the higher unloading charge applies on the total weight on which transportation charges are computed.
5. Split pickup or split delivery shall not be accorded unless included in the common carrier rate (see Items Nos. 220 and 230 for exceptions).
6. When rates provided in this tariff are applied in combination with common carrier rates under the provisions of:
- (a) Paragraph (a) of Item No. 210, only the accessorial charge for unloading shall be assessed.
- (b) Paragraph (b) of Item No. 210, only the accessorial charge for loading shall be assessed.
- (c) Paragraph (c) of Item No. 210, no charge for either loading or unloading shall be assessed.
7. A charge shall be assessed for all other accessorial services furnished (including services performed under the provisions of Items Nos. 120, 140, or 142) for which charges are provided in this tariff. Such charges shall be in addition to all charges set forth in Items Nos. 240 and 241.

80  
241

EXCEPTION.--The provisions of Items Nos. 240 and 241 are not applicable to shipments where the minimum weight is less than 10,000 pounds and where the provisions of Item No. 120 will apply.

∅ Change )  
\* Addition )  
◇ Increase )

Decision No. 71553

EFFECTIVE DECEMBER 17, 1966

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

Correction No. 1816