

**ORIGINAL**Decision No. 71610

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 property  
 within San Diego County (including  
 transportation for which rates are  
 provided in Minimum Rate Tariff  
 No. 9-B).

Case No. 5439  
 (Order Setting Hearing Dated  
 January 4, 1966)

E. J. Langhofer, for San Diego Chamber of Commerce;  
A. D. Poe, J. C. Kaspar and H. F. Kollmyer, by  
H. F. Kollmyer, for California Trucking Associa-  
 tion; John Robert Chamberlain, for Aztec  
 Transportation Co., Inc.; E. B. Gould, for Lyon  
 Van & Storage Co.; Robert F. Harding, for City  
 of Escondido, Escondido Chamber of Commerce and  
 Harding's Freight Service; Michael H. McKiernan,  
 for San Marcos Chamber of Commerce, San Marcos  
 Moving and Storage and Palomar Van & Storage Co.;  
R. J. Taylor, for Pacific Transfer Van and Truck;  
 interested parties.  
Norman Haley, for the Commission staff.

O P I N I O N

Minimum Rate Tariff No. 9-B (MRT 9-B) contains rates and rules for the transportation of general commodities between points within the San Diego drayage area. That area is divided into various zones, numbered consecutively from 301 to 312, the metes and bounds of which are prescribed in Distance Table No. 5 (DT 5). By its Order Setting Hearing dated January 4, 1966, in Case No. 5439, the Commission directed that a hearing be held to receive evidence concerning a proposal of its Transportation Division Rate Branch staff to add certain new zones to, and revise the boundaries of certain existing zones in said drayage area.

Public hearing was held before Examiner Bishop at San Diego on March 10 and 11, 1966. The matter was submitted on the latter date.

The record discloses that the most recent general review of the minimum rate structure of the San Diego drayage area was made in 1955. Since that time, periodic adjustments have been made in the rates to compensate for increases in operating costs, some miscellaneous tariff modifications have been made, and the outer limits of some of the exterior zones have been extended to include new city areas and commercial developments. Four new zones were added in 1959, by Decision No. 59336 (57 Cal. P.U.C. 416).

It is the plan of the Commission's staff, the record further shows, to carry out comprehensive cost and rate studies, such as were made in 1955, with a view to making such adjustments in the minimum rate structure in the San Diego drayage area as are necessary to reflect current conditions. Before such studies may be completed, however, it is necessary to determine what, if any, changes are appropriate in the defined limits of the San Diego drayage area, either by modifications in the boundaries of existing zones or by the addition of new zones to give recognition to changes in city boundaries, and in other pertinent factors, which have occurred since adjustments in zone descriptions were last made.

An associate transportation rate expert testified concerning the staff proposals. His presentation revealed the following facts: MRT 9-B applies to city carriers and to certain classes of highway carriers. Beyond the limits of that tariff, transportation of general commodities is governed by the rates and other provisions set forth in Minimum Rate Tariff No. 2 (MRT 2). The latter tariff

applies to highway carriers, but not to city carriers. Since January 1960, there has been great expansion of the corporate limits of the City of San Diego, particularly to the north and northeast. Transportation from downtown San Diego, for example, to these extended areas is now performed under the City Carriers' Act. Since MRT 2 does not apply to city carriers, and since the areas in question are beyond the geographical scope of MRT 9-B, such transportation, merely by the relocation of city boundaries, has been removed from minimum rate regulation.

Additionally, there are areas outside the present corporate limits of San Diego but adjacent thereto, which, since the last zone revision, have developed to the degree that they might well be included in the San Diego commercial area.<sup>1/</sup>

The rate expert spent a total of 21 days in the field, viewing all the area in and around San Diego County tributary to San Diego and contacting various shippers, carriers, public officials, and chambers of commerce. The factual data thus developed gave him a basis from which to formulate proposed drayage area boundary changes which, in his opinion, would fairly reflect the current extent of the San Diego commercial and industrial community. The field studies were made during the period from November 1964 through February 1965.

<sup>1/</sup> The record shows that in Petition for Modification No. 32 in Case No. 5439 California Trucking Association sought the inclusion, in the San Diego drayage area, of the portions of the City of San Diego here in issue. By Decision No. 67444, dated June 26, 1964, the Commission found insufficient basis in the record for revision of zones at that time. Precise redefinition of the drayage area and drayage zones properly may be accomplished, the Commission said, when general revision of MRT 9-B should next be under consideration.

A preliminary copy of his report, the witness said, was mailed in May 1965 to known interested parties for comments and suggestions. In the following month staff members met with carrier and shipper representatives to discuss the proposals. Subsequently, written comments were received from interested parties. These were evaluated and the conclusion reached that the preliminary proposals should be presented at the public hearing without change.

The City of San Diego currently extends, in a very irregular pattern, from the Mexican border, on the south, to Lake Hodges and the San Pasqual Valley, on the north, an airline distance of nearly 40 miles. A recent southerly extension of the corporate limits of Escondido has made that city contiguous with the City of San Diego in the vicinity of Lake Hodges. The present drayage area zones embrace roughly the area south of: (1) the northerly limits of Del Mar, on the coast, (2) the southern boundary of Rancho Los Penasquitos westerly of U.S. Route 395, and (3) the San Diego River, Prospect Avenue and Pepper Drive, easterly of U.S. Route 395.<sup>2/</sup>

The staff proposes to enlarge the present drayage area by six additional zones. Two of these, Nos. 313 and 314, are now defined in DT 5 but have no application to MRT 9-B. Zones Nos. 315, 316, 317 and 318 would be entirely new.<sup>3/</sup> Under the staff proposal, the rate expert said, the metes and bounds of Zones 313 and 314, as

<sup>2/</sup> The San Diego drayage area presently includes the Cities of Del Mar, El Cajon, La Mesa, National City, Chula Vista, Coronado and Imperial Beach as well as certain unincorporated areas.

<sup>3/</sup> A map on which are delineated the corporate limits of San Diego and of neighboring cities, the boundaries, present and as proposed to be revised, of Zones 301-314, inclusive, and the proposed boundaries of Zones 315-318, inclusive, is contained in Appendix A of Exhibit 1 in this proceeding.

set forth in the distance table, would be adopted for the drayage tariff, but with minor modifications in the easterly boundaries of each. These were made for the purpose of taking cognizance of new man-made features or of the elimination of old ones.

Substantially all of Zone 313 is within the corporate limits of San Diego. This zone, consisting largely of hills, valleys and gullies, is undeveloped. Zone 314 is located almost entirely outside the corporate limits of San Diego, but includes the unincorporated communities of Santee and Lakeside. These are long-established towns which appear to be experiencing some growth. Near the westerly boundary of this zone is a substantial housing development.

The proposed new zones do not follow the corporate limits of San Diego, but, as a group, embrace the most northerly extension of those limits as far as the south shore of Lake Hodges. In this area the city boundary is very irregular; on the other hand, the proposed zone boundaries are fairly regular, following natural features, public roads and highways or section lines. Proposed Zone 315 is almost entirely within the City of San Diego; Zones 317 and 318 are about half in and half out of the city; while Zone 316 is almost entirely outside the city.

Zone 315, the rate expert stated, has no development of any consequence. It consists primarily of a high mesa, which is suitable for future growth of the city. Zone 316 consists largely of hills and valleys, with some rather restricted farming activity. The community of Poway is located in this zone, with a scattered population of 2,000 people. This part of the zone is growing. Most of Zone 317 is rugged, rocky, hilly country, where a few cattle can graze. In the northwesterly portion, near the San Dieguito

River, some farming is carried on. In Zone 318 the predominant features are the Rancho Bernardo and Green Valley developments. The former is a huge project, with hundreds of homes and apartments, shopping centers, and a hospital. The population of Rancho Bernardo is expected to reach 30,000, and it is anticipated that light industry will be established there.

The northerly boundary of proposed Zones 317 and 318 is the south shore of Lake Hodges. The city limits include the entire lake and its shores. However, the staff witness felt that no useful purpose would be served by including the lake in the enlarged drayage area, since no commerce would develop from and to the lake area. Northeastly of Lake Hodges the city limits extend to, and include, the San Pasqual Valley and watershed. The valley portion of this section is devoted to farming. The remainder of the area is mountainous and nonproductive. The witness explained that he had excluded this section of San Diego from the proposed drayage area expansion because (1) such commerce as may be involved would be covered by minimum rate tariffs other than MRT 9-B (such as MRT 8 - fresh fruits and vegetables); (2) the normal, practicable route between the San Pasqual Valley and the rest of San Diego lies partially outside that city; and (3) the rough terrain and the lack of natural or man-made boundaries would make definition of zone boundaries difficult.

The witness had visited the north county communities located beyond the San Diego corporate limits and considered the possibility of including them in the enlarged drayage area.<sup>4/</sup> He excluded those communities because transportation between them and

<sup>4/</sup> Among these were the Cities of Escondido, San Marcos, Vista and Oceanside and the unincorporated community of Fallbrook.

San Diego did not appear to have the characteristics of a metropolitan cartage movement. He pointed out that MRT 9-B is a cartage or drayage tariff, designed for the commerce of San Diego and its environs.

As hereinbefore stated, the boundary descriptions for the zones constituting the present San Diego drayage area are set forth in the distance table. Since the proposed Zones Nos. 315-318 are to relate solely to rates to be established in MRT 9-B, the rate expert contemplated that the descriptions of those zones would be published in that tariff. Later they could be published in the distance table for general application. Similarly those zones now published in the distance table which he proposes to modify would be reproduced in MRT 9-B with the modifications. Subsequently the descriptions in the distance table could be revised to conform to the descriptions in MRT 9-B.

It is the view of the staff witness that such new and modified zones as the Commission may establish by this decision should not be published at this time and that publication should be deferred until the intrazone and interzone rates resulting from the aforementioned comprehensive cost and rate studies shall be established by a subsequent decision in another phase of Case No. 5439. At that time the zone descriptions could be published in MRT 9-B concurrently with the new and revised rates. Meanwhile, the zone descriptions adopted by this decision would serve as a basis for said cost and rate studies.

Evidence on behalf of the San Diego Chamber of Commerce (Chamber) was presented through seven witnesses. These included a newspaper publisher and broadcaster, three officers of warehousing

and distributing concerns, the traffic supervisor of a manufacturer of gas turbine engines and other aerospace products, the senior planner of the San Diego County planning department, and the manager of the industrial development department of the San Diego Chamber of Commerce.<sup>5/</sup>

The position of the Chamber in this matter is stated in a resolution which its board of directors adopted on October 13, 1965, to the effect that the Chamber favors expansion of MRT 9-B to incorporate the area "within the north county bounded by the cities, communities, and/or area of Oceanside northern city limits, the communities of Vista, San Marcos and Escondido."<sup>6/</sup> The testimony of most of the Chamber's witnesses was designed to establish the reasonableness of this proposal.

Those Chamber witnesses who were concerned with shipments from the primary commercial and industrial section of San Diego to Oceanside, Escondido and other cities in the northern portion of San Diego County testified that the rates from San Diego to said cities are the same as the rates on like shipments from Los Angeles to the same points. It appears from other evidence that the witnesses had reference to small shipments which are subject to the minimum charge provisions of MRT 2. Those charges are statewide in application, exclusive of movements within defined drayage areas; thus, they result, under certain circumstances, in the same charge from Los Angeles as from San Diego to the aforementioned north county points on like shipments of certain weight ranges.

---

<sup>5/</sup> The publisher is also a member of the Chamber's board of directors and chairman of the Industrial Development Commission of the City of San Diego. The traffic supervisor is also chairman of the Chamber's transportation steering committee.

<sup>6/</sup> The resolution was read into the record by the Chamber's first witness, the publisher.



The Chamber witnesses expressed the view that the north county points, being much closer to San Diego than to Los Angeles, are properly to be considered a part of the San Diego market area and that freight rates to said points should consequently be more favorable from San Diego than from Los Angeles. Inclusion of the north county points in the San Diego drayage area, they indicated, would assist in the accomplishment of that objective. Such action would result in increased traffic from San Diego to the area in question, and since the north county communities are expanding they might eventually develop into a separate distribution center. The witnesses further pointed out that San Diego has had considerable difficulty in competing successfully with Los Angeles as a manufacturing and distribution center due to other factors over which its people have no control. Inclusion of their proposed enlarged area in the drayage tariff, these witnesses felt, would assist in counteracting these inherent disadvantages.

The senior planner testified concerning the increase in population and housing which has taken place in San Diego County since 1960, the year of the most recent census. His department had estimated population increases as of the end of 1965, as follows: Escondido - San Marcos area, 37 percent; Tri-City area (Vista, Oceanside and Carlsbad), 34 percent; San Dieguito area (Leucadia, Encinitas, Solana Beach, Rancho Santa Fe), 22.5 percent. The total increase for the three areas was approximately 18,000 persons, or a total estimated population of 163,000. The planner estimated an equal increase in the second half of the decade, which would reflect a population of 181,000 people in the area by 1970.

The manager of the Chamber's industrial development department introduced a map of the western half of the county, on

which were depicted the areas zoned for industry. He also described the commercial and industrial development in the north county communities which the Chamber proposes be included in the enlarged San Diego drayage area. He also introduced the results of an "Industrial Climate Audit" made by the Chamber early in 1965. Replies to the Chamber's inquiries were received from 230 San Diego County manufacturers. More than three-fourths of these indicated that they could recommend San Diego County to any firm seeking a site; 70 percent of those replying to the audit have increased their personnel since 1960; 70 percent plan to expand their operations within the county, 92 percent of these latter expect to do so by 1970; and 86 percent plan at least one expansion by 1967.

The vice president of Harding's Freight Service, testifying on behalf of that company, the City of Escondido and the Escondido Chamber of Commerce, expressed the views of those entities concerning the proposals of the Commission's staff and of the San Diego Chamber. His principals, he said, favor the staff proposal. They are, at this time, against the Chamber's plan to include Oceanside, Vista, San Marcos and Escondido. If, however, the Commission extends the drayage area beyond the boundaries proposed by the staff, they believe the new limit should not stop there but, in the north, coincide with the San Diego County - Riverside County line from the Pacific Ocean to U.S. Route 395. The boundary would then follow that highway southerly to the San Luis Rey River, thence easterly and southeasterly through Pala and Pauma Valley to Lake Henshaw and Santa Isabel; thence southwesterly through Ramona to a junction with the staff boundary northeast of Poway. In the northwest, this alternate proposal would embrace Camp Pendleton and Fallbrook. The witness introduced a map showing the details of the boundary. <sup>7/</sup>

7/ It is to be observed that in neither the Chamber proposal nor in that of the Escondido interests were the boundaries of the individual zones which would be necessary for reasonable rate proposals defined.

According to the witness, the suggested areas include sections which are growing in economic importance. Fallbrook and Camp Pendleton, he said, are heavy shippers. He believed that to include the Oceanside-Escondido group in MRT 9-B, while excluding Fallbrook and other consuming areas in the northernmost part of the county would be discriminatory.

Harding Freight Service, the witness further testified, is one of the two remaining local carriers in the county. It provides regular, same-day service between San Diego and the north county. It has pioneered this service, until it now provides 16 daily deliveries to the area with a 22-truck operation. The bulk of this business is in the small-shipment category. He asserted that the MRT 2 rates, now applicable to the above-described traffic, are too high, and that the zone rates presently applicable within the San Diego drayage area, as now defined, are too low. He also suggested revision of the minimum charge structure in MRT 2.

The president of Aztec Transportation Co., the other local carrier operating between San Diego and north county points, likewise opposed any extension of the scope of MRT 9-B beyond the limits proposed by the Commission's staff. In his opinion, the Chamber's proposal is premature, since the north county area is not sufficiently developed to be considered logically a part of the San Diego drayage area. He supported the staff proposal, as constituting an adjustment of the drayage area and zone boundaries which will properly reflect the economic and political changes in western San Diego County since early 1960.

A representative of California Trucking Association (CTA), among others, assisted in the development of the record by cross-

examination of the witnesses. He stated that his organization's position in the matter at issue is: (1) CTA is in general accord with the policy and methods that the staff has employed. (2) The entire City of San Diego should be included in the drayage area.<sup>8/</sup> This could be done by extending either Zone 317 or 318 into the San Pasqual area, or by creation of a new Zone 319. Correlatively, the present zone boundaries would be retained in those zones in which the staff proposes to make certain changes which would remove minor portions of the city from the drayage tariff. (3) The drayage limits should not be extended to include the Oceanside-Escondido area, as proposed by the Chamber. Transportation between San Diego and this area is not a drayage operation; additionally, there is no appreciable for-hire carrier traffic within the area in question. (4) The zone descriptions in DT 5 should be identical with those that may be published in MRT 9-B. Thus, if an existing zone description is modified on publication in the latter tariff, the description for that zone as set forth in the distance table should be concurrently revised.<sup>9/</sup>

Discussion, Findings and Conclusions

As the record clearly shows, this phase of Case No. 5439 is for the purpose of determining what changes should be made in present zone boundaries, and what new zones should be created, in the San Diego minimum drayage tariff, MRT 9-B, to give recognition to the facts that since early 1960 over 100 square miles have been annexed to the City of San Diego which are not embraced by said

<sup>8/</sup> Since early 1960 the City of San Diego has, by various annexations, increased its area by 102 square miles. The CTA representative pointed out that the staff proposal would bring only 85 percent of this area into MRT 9-B.

<sup>9/</sup> The vehicle for changes in DT 5 is Case No. 7024. Consideration of proposed changes in the distance table should properly be considered in a proceeding in that case.

tariff, and that the commercial and industrial development of San Diego has, in recent years, spread to sections which are outside both the corporate limits of that city and the present scope of the drayage tariff. Such determination is to be made also to give recognition to the probable development, in the near future, of other sections which are similarly situated but which are now largely undeveloped.

It is not intended in this phase, the record further shows, to determine what changes in present zone rates shall be made or what new intrazone and interzone rates shall be established in MRT 9-B to reflect current conditions. Evidence regarding rate proposals will be introduced at future hearings in another phase of Case No. 5439. The decision herein will define the areas within which and between which cost studies will be conducted and proposed minimum rates formulated. The revised zone boundaries and new zones established by this decision will be those within and between which such new and revised rates as may be established by a subsequent decision will apply.

Historically, the practice has been for a tariff, such as MRT 9-B, to embrace an area within which carrier operations, exclusive of movements into or out of the area, are largely those which are generally described as drayage. One party described a drayage operation as a random pickup and delivery service in which shipments are picked up in one of the zones and delivered within that zone or in another zone. The staff witness conceived a drayage operation as one in which pickups and deliveries are made with small trucks in which the driver operates out of a terminal, returning to that terminal at the end of the day. Shipments may, or may not, pass through the terminal during the course of transportation.

It may be deemed a reasonable assumption that where an area is annexed to a city such area will eventually, if it has not already done so, develop urban or suburban characteristics and attain economic integration with the city, and that transportation of property between the annexed area and the city will exhibit the characteristics of a drayage operation. It is recognized that large portions of the San Diego annexations which the staff seeks to include in the drayage tariff are not at all developed, and that some parts, because of their mountainous terrain, are not likely to see any substantial economic growth for many years. However, the staff has so defined the boundaries for the new zones as to include in each (with the exception of proposed Zone 317) at least one section which is now developing and in all of them there is the prospect of future development of other portions.

As to those zones, existing or new, in which the staff proposes to include within the scope of MRT 9-B substantial areas outside the corporate limits of San Diego, there are long-established communities, such as La Mesa, El Cajon, Santee and Lakeside, or newly developed sections, which are economically tied to San Diego and sufficiently near that city for traffic between said outside areas and the city to reflect drayage characteristics. The proposal of the staff to include these areas in the drayage tariff appears reasonable.

In defining drayage zone boundaries, it is the position of the staff that such boundaries need not necessarily coincide with city boundary lines. One reason for this is that in an area which is growing in population and economic activity the corporate limits are not static but often move outward at short intervals. Also the

corporate limits often embrace areas which are very irregular in shape and frequently do not follow readily identifiable natural or man-made features. The staff has, therefore, endeavored to create zones, or proper modifications in existing zones, which avoid the above-mentioned difficulties. The few instances in which this procedure would result in exclusion from the San Diego drayage area of portions of that city which are now a part of said area would be minor and actually unimportant.

We turn now to the proposal of the San Diego Chamber of Commerce to include in the drayage area the territory north of the northerly limits of the staff proposal to and including the Cities of Escondido, Vista, San Marcos and Oceanside.<sup>10/</sup> The record discloses that there is a substantial volume of traffic between this north county section and San Diego, while the for-hire carrier movements within said section appear to be of small magnitude. The record also indicates that San Diego is the commercial center of the county, including the northern section immediately being considered. The commercial ties of the latter area with San Diego are manifestly stronger than the ties with Los Angeles. The record shows also that the north county area continues to increase in population and in commercial importance.

The record is persuasive that the geographical scope of MRT 9-B should be expanded to include not only the areas proposed by the staff, but also the further extension proposed by the Chamber. As hereinbefore mentioned, the Escondido group of parties are of the

---

<sup>10/</sup> The Chamber proposal would include also the City of Carlsbad and the unincorporated communities of Leucadia, Encinitas, Solana Beach and Rancho Santa Fe, as well as certain other unincorporated areas not embraced by the staff proposal.

opinion that if the San Diego drayage area is to include Oceanside, Escondido and points between it should extend northward to the Orange and Riverside County lines, taking in Camp Pendleton and Fallbrook, among others, in order to avoid unjust discrimination and to recognize that these entities are also commercially important. The record supports such an extension, and the suggested new boundaries of the drayage area, as depicted in Exhibit No. 9, introduced by the Escondido witness, subject to certain modifications, should be adopted. <sup>11/</sup>

It seems obvious that an enlarged area, such as is here envisioned for MRT 9-B, cannot properly be designated as a drayage area. Much of the for-hire carrier traffic within it clearly reflects typical line-haul service. However, there appears no valid objection to converting the tariff from its historical function of serving as a vehicle for drayage charges to that of a San Diego regional tariff which shall contain rates responsive to carrier costs and other pertinent elements typically experienced within the enlarged area. What the levels of those rates will be cannot, of course, be known at this time.

As previously mentioned, neither the San Diego Chamber nor the Escondido group introduced any evidence relative to the establishment of additional zones in the areas beyond those contemplated in the staff proposal. However, it does not appear

---

11/ The expanded area should extend somewhat farther east in the vicinity of the Riverside County line than proposed in Exhibit No. 9, to clearly include the entire community of Pala, but not so far east, in the central portion of said area, as to include Santa Isabel. The eastern boundary, however, should include the entire community of Ramona. The boundary in Exhibit No. 9 would place the town partly within, and partly outside the drayage area.



necessary to divide said areas into zones in order to bring them into the tariff. Rates between points in the present and proposed zones, on the one hand, and points in the aforesaid areas, on the other hand, as well as rates between points within said areas, could be established in MRT 9-B on a mileage basis, utilizing the system of routes and points contained in Distance Table No. 5, or its successor, in conjunction with constructive mileages from, to or between the metropolitan zones.

The Commission finds that:

1. The San Diego drayage area, as presently constituted by provisions of Minimum Rate Tariff No. 9-B and Distance Table No. 5, does not give appropriate effect to changes in economic and transportation conditions which have occurred in recent years.

2. The geographical scope of Minimum Rate Tariff No. 9-B should be expanded to include all points within the boundary defined in Appendix A, hereof.

3. The revised descriptions of Zones 301, 302, 303, 304, 307, 308, 309, 311, 313 and 314, as proposed by the Commission's staff in Exhibit 1, as amended by Exhibit 2 in this proceeding, and the inclusion in said drayage area of said revised Zones 313 and 314 and of new Zones 315, 316, 317 and 318, as described in the aforesaid Exhibit 1, as amended by Exhibit 2, will be just, reasonable and nondiscriminatory.

4. The record provides no basis for the definition of rate zones in the adopted areas located beyond the geographical limits of the staff proposal and the prescription of such zones is not necessary for the purposes of this decision.

We conclude that:

1. Minimum Rate Tariff No. 9-B should be amended by including, in Item No. 30, reference to Zones 313 to 318, inclusive, and to an item of said tariff which shall reproduce the geographical boundary set forth in Appendix A, hereof, as defining the scope of said tariff. Said tariff should also be amended by reproduction therein of the geographical descriptions of the revised and new zones identified in Finding 3, above.

2. Amendment of Minimum Rate Tariff No. 9-B in accordance with Conclusion 1 should not be made at this time, but should be deferred until the issuance of a decision pursuant to the receipt of evidence relating to the general cost and rate studies hereinabove mentioned. At that time publication of the revised and new zone descriptions should be made concurrently with publication of the new rates.

3. Disposition of the question as to whether geographical descriptions of those San Diego drayage zones which are not changed by this decision, and which are now published in Distance Table No. 5, should be reproduced in Minimum Rate Tariff No. 9-B should be deferred until the issuance of the decision prescribing the revised rates.

O R D E R

IT IS ORDERED that:

1. Minimum Rate Tariff No. 9-B (Appendix "A" of Decision No. 67766, as amended) shall be further amended to effectuate the findings and conclusions set forth in the preceding opinion.

2. Issuance of tariff pages in accordance with numbered paragraph 1 of this order shall be deferred until such time as a decision shall be issued pursuant to receipt of evidence relating to the general cost and rate studies mentioned in the preceding opinion. Said tariff pages shall be made effective concurrently with the tariff pages which shall incorporate the revised and new rates.

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

Dated at San Francisco, California, this 29th day of NOVEMBER, 1966.

\_\_\_\_\_  
President

Fredrick B. Holloff

William L. Bennett

Augusta

\_\_\_\_\_  
Commissioners

Commissioner Peter E. Mitchell, being necessarily absent, did not participate in the disposition of this proceeding.

Commissioner George G. Grover did not participate in the disposition of this proceeding.

## APPENDIX A

Beginning at the intersection of the San Diego Orange County line and the shore line of the Pacific Ocean; northerly and along the San Diego Orange County line to the Riverside San Diego County line; easterly and along the Riverside San Diego County line to the eastern boundary of R2W; southerly and along the eastern boundary of R2W to the southern boundary of T10S; east and along the southern boundary of T10S to the eastern boundary of R1E; south and along the eastern boundary of R1E to the grant boundary of Rancho San Vicente; easterly, southerly and westerly along the grant boundary of Rancho San Vicente to the northeast corner of the Barona Indian Reservation boundary; southerly and along the Barona Indian Reservation boundary to the eastern boundary of R1E; south and along the eastern boundary of R1E to the intersection of Interstate 8; southwest along Interstate 8 to Greenfield Drive; southeasterly along Greenfield Drive to La Cresta Road; northeasterly along La Cresta Road to the northwesterly prolongation of Valley Rim Road; southeasterly along the northwesterly prolongation of Valley Rim Road and Valley Rim Road to Orchard Avenue; westerly along Orchard Avenue to Valley View Boulevard; southerly along Valley View Boulevard to Euclid Avenue; due south in a direct line to Dehesa Road; westerly along Dehesa Road to Granite Hills Drive; southerly and westerly along Granite Hills Drive to Alveda Avenue; southerly along Alveda Avenue to Vallea Street; easterly along Vallea Street to Cosmo Avenue; southerly along Cosmo Avenue to Lisbon Lane; southeasterly along Lisbon Lane to Vista Del Valle Boulevard; westerly along Vista Del Valle Boulevard to Jamacha Road; southerly along Jamacha Road to Campo Road; westerly along Campo Road to Jamacha Boulevard; southwest along Jamacha Boulevard to Omega Street; southerly along the southerly prolongation of Omega Street to the northern bank of Sweetwater Reservoir; southwest along the northern bank of Sweetwater Reservoir to Sweetwater River at Sweetwater Dam; southwest along the Sweetwater River to the northerly prolongation of Conduit Road; southerly along the northerly prolongation of Conduit Road and Conduit Road to San Miguel Road; easterly along San Miguel Road to Proctor Valley Road; southerly along Proctor Valley Road to the easterly boundary of Rancho La Nacion; southerly along the easterly boundary of Rancho La Nacion to the northerly boundary line of Rancho Otay (Estudillo); westerly and southerly along the boundary line of Rancho Otay (Estudillo) to its intersection with Heritage Road; southerly along Heritage Road to the southerly boundary of Rancho Otay (Estudillo); easterly along the southerly boundary of Rancho Otay (Estudillo) to the northerly prolongation of La Media Road; southerly along the prolongation of La Media Road and La Media Road to Otay Mesa Road; westerly along Otay Mesa Road to the San Diego city limits at Heritage Road; southerly along the San Diego city limits to the International Boundary; westerly along the International Boundary to the shore line of the Pacific Ocean; northerly along the shore line of the Pacific Ocean to the point of beginning.