

ORIGINAL

Decision No. 71953

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 (commodities for which rates are provided in Minimum Rate Tariff No. 17).

Case No. 5437
Petition No. 118
Filed October 21, 1965.
Amended December 20, 1965.

- E. O. Blackman, for California Dump Truck Owners Association, petitioner.
- Richard W. Smith, H. F. Kollmyer and J. C. Kaspar, for California Trucking Association, interested party.
- H. Randall Stoke, for Southern California Rock Products Association, interested party.
- Fred Imhof, for Southern California Rock Products Association, interested party.
- Harry C. Phelan, Jr., for California Asphalt Pavement Association, interested party.
- G. Ralph Grago, for Associated Independent Owner-Operators, Inc., interested party.
- W. F. Webster, for Rodeffer Industries, Inc., interested party.
- Robert L. Payan, for Payan Trucking, Inc., interested party.
- R. A. Lubich and Bill T. Farris, for the Transportation Division of the Commission's staff.

O P I N I O N

Petitioner, the California Dump Truck Owners Association, seeks increases in the rates in Minimum Rate Tariff No. 17 -- which tariff sets forth zone rates for the transportation of rock, sand and gravel, and cement with rock, sand and gravel, by dump truck-and-trailer equipment within the portion of southern California

which is comprised of Orange County and parts of Los Angeles, Riverside, San Bernardino, San Diego, Santa Barbara and Ventura Counties. Petitioner alleges that some of the costs of the transportation services involved were not taken into account in the development of the rates in Minimum Rate Tariff No. 17. It also alleges that increases have since occurred in some of the other costs. Petitioner seeks, in addition, an increase in the minimum charge per shipment to that for the transportation of 14 tons at the applicable rate instead of 12 tons at the applicable rate as at present.

Public hearings on the petition were held before Examiner Abernathy on June 28, 29 and 30, 1966, and on August 2, 3 and 4, 1966. Evidence was presented by petitioner's general manager and by a transportation engineer of the Commission's staff whom petitioner had called as a witness. Representatives of the California Trucking Association (CTA), the Associated Independent Owner-Operators, Inc. (AIOO), the Southern California Rock Products Association (RPA), the California Asphalt Pavement Association (CAPA) and of the Transportation Division of the Commission's staff participated in the development of the record. Closing statements were filed on September 26, 1966, by the CTA, RPA, CAPA, and by the representatives of the Commission's Transportation Division.¹ The matter was taken under submission on that date.

¹ A closing statement also was filed by petitioner on September 27, 1966.

Evidence which petitioner submitted as justification for the sought rate increases consists mainly of

- a. A comparison of revenues under the rates in Minimum Rate Tariff No. 17 and under the rates in Minimum Rate Tariff No. 7 (the predecessor tariff to Minimum Rate Tariff No. 17);
- b. A study of terminal-end times in Orange, San Bernardino, Ventura and Santa Barbara Counties;²
- c. A report on the time costs of hauling rock, sand and gravel in southern California, and
- d. A calculation of certain non-revenue expense incurred in connection with transportation under Minimum Rate Tariff No. 17.

The comparison of revenues was developed by computing the revenues which a carrier earned from its services during the months October through December, 1964, under rates in Minimum Rate Tariff No. 7, and comparing said revenues with those which the carrier would have earned from the same transportation had the rates in Minimum Rate Tariff No. 17 been in effect at the time and had they been assessed. According to this comparison, the establishment of Minimum Rate Tariff No. 17 has resulted in an increase of about three percent in the carriers' revenues for hauling within Los Angeles County, a decrease of about eleven percent in revenues for hauling within Orange and Santa Barbara Counties, and a decrease of about three percent in revenues for hauling within Ventura and Santa Barbara Counties. Petitioner alleges that the showing of increased revenues for transportation within Los Angeles County and of decreased revenues for the other

² "Terminal-end times" means the combined times required in the processes of loading and unloading of shipments into and from the carriers' vehicles.

transportation covered by the study demonstrates that the transportation of rock, sand and gravel within Los Angeles County requires less terminal end time than is required in connection with the other transportation which is involved.

By its study of terminal end times petitioner undertook to show that in contrast to an average terminal end time of 27.67 minutes per shipment which was used as a factor in the development of the present rates in Minimum Rate Tariff No. 17, the terminal end times which apply to the transportation of rock, sand and gravel between points outside of Los Angeles County average 31.67 minutes per shipment. On this basis petitioner asserts that an additional charge of two cents a ton should apply to the transportation originating at production areas outside of Los Angeles County in order that the carriers be compensated for the additional terminal end time required for said transportation.

The report on time costs which petitioner submitted sets forth various fixed or non-variable costs (depreciation expense, insurance, taxes and licenses), reduced to a per ton, per minute basis, which assertedly apply at present to the transportation of rock, sand and gravel which is subject to Minimum Rate Tariff No. 17. Most of the data upon which this report was developed were derived by petitioner from an exhibit (Exhibit No. 1) which had been prepared and submitted by a Commission engineer in connection with Order Setting Hearing of March 22, 1966, in Case No. 5437, a phase of Case No. 5437 which deals in part with the hourly costs of transportation service by dump truck equipment within the area defined and designated in Minimum Rate Tariff

No. 7 as Southern Territory.³ The Commission engineer who had prepared said exhibit was called as a witness for petitioner and testified concerning details thereof. Petitioner's general manager also presented testimony relative to some of the same matters. On the basis of the data thus developed, petitioner asks that the rates in Minimum Rate Tariff No. 17 be increased to reflect the present level of the fixed or non-variable costs specified.

Petitioner's presentation concerning certain non-revenue expenses deals with expenses which the carriers incur for drivers' wages, fuel, oil, tires and maintenance and repairs in the operation of their vehicles between their terminals and the points where their transportation services begin and end. These expenses were not included in the costs upon which the rates in Minimum Rate Tariff No. 17 were developed.⁴ According to petitioner's calculations, said expenses, in total, are the equivalent of about two cents per ton on the tonnage transported by the carriers annually. Petitioner seeks an increase of two cents a ton in the rates in Minimum Rate Tariff No. 17 in order that the carriers may be compensated for these non-revenue expenses.

In proposing that the minimum weight per shipment be increased from twelve to fourteen tons, petitioner basically is seeking the establishment of a minimum weight per shipment for carriers operating 3-axle dump trucks which will enable those carriers to obtain a minimum charge per shipment which is more consistent with the full loading of their vehicles.

³ "Southern Territory" means the counties of Santa Barbara, Ventura, Los Angeles, Orange, San Diego, Imperial, Riverside, San Bernardino, Inyo and Mono.

⁴ Fixed costs related to non-revenue operations are included in the present cost formula.

Petitioner's manager stated that the present minimum of twelve tons per shipment was originally established in recognition of the fact that the legal carrying capacity of a number of the 3-axle dump trucks which are in operation is approximately twelve tons. However, experience under that minimum weight has indicated that carriers who operate 3-axle dump trucks having greater carrying capacities are unnecessarily foregoing revenues under the twelve-ton minimum.⁵ He said that petitioner has given further consideration through its board of directors and rate committee to whether a change should be made in the minimum weight to make greater provision for the larger vehicles, and that petitioner is now of the opinion that in present circumstances the proposed minimum of fourteen tons would be a more reasonable minimum weight for the 3-axle vehicles as a group than is the minimum of twelve tons.

Petitioner's proposals in this matter were supported or partially supported by the CTA, by the RPA and by the representatives of the Commission's Transportation Division. They were opposed by CAPA. The CTA asserted in its closing statement that the record supports greater rate increases for increased terminal end time and increased time costs than the rate increases which petitioner seeks, and urged that the greater rate increases be granted accordingly. The RPA opposed the proposals to the extent that they would result in an increase in rates for increased terminal end time from production areas outside of Los Angeles

⁵ Some of the 3-axle dump trucks which are in operation have legal carrying capacities of as much as 16 tons.

County. It questions whether the record is sufficient to justify the increases sought. The representatives of the Commission's Transportation Division concurred in the increase which is proposed to cover certain non-revenue expenses, but asserts that the record does not support rate increases to cover the alleged increases in time and terminal end costs.⁶ CAPA opposed all of the sought increases on the grounds that they constitute adjustments of Minimum Rate Tariff No. 17 on a piecemeal basis. It asserts that the Commission's staff should study the matters involved from a standpoint of the zone rates as a whole, and should submit recommendations at further hearings which should be held in this connection.

The increases in the zone rates which petitioner seeks to compensate for certain non-revenue expenses not now reflected in the rates should be ordered. The expenses which are involved are expenses for which provision in the rates is proper. Also, the minimum charge per shipment should be increased to that for the transportation of a shipment of 14 tons at the applicable rate. We find that in these respects the sought increases have been justified. In all other respects the sought increases have not been justified, and should be denied.

The record does not support petitioner's allegation that shipments originating outside of Los Angeles County require more terminal end time than do shipments originating within Los Angeles County, and that higher rates should therefore apply

⁶ Neither the staff representatives nor the other parties indicated any specific position regarding the sought increase in minimum charge.

to the shipments from outside of Los Angeles County. The data which petitioner submitted to show that the establishment of the rates which are set forth in Minimum Rate Tariff No. 17 has resulted in greater increases in revenues for carriers transporting shipments which originate in Los Angeles County than for carriers transporting other shipments have no direct relevancy to whether the terminal end times applicable to Los Angeles County shipments are more or less than the terminal end times applicable to other shipments. Of much greater import in the evaluation of petitioner's revenue study are the lengths of the various hauls which were included in said study.

Comparison of the development of the rate structure in Minimum Rate Tariff No. 17 with that of the rates which formerly applied under Minimum Rate Tariff No. 7 shows that the latter rates were relatively higher for distances of less than 10 miles than for 10 miles or more; that this differential was not carried forward into Minimum Rate Tariff No. 17, and that as a consequence the establishment of the rates which are set forth in Minimum Rate Tariff No. 17 resulted in greater increases in the rates for shipments of 10 miles or more than for shipments for lesser distances. Obviously, any conclusions which are to be drawn from petitioner's revenue study should take into account the differences in increases in rates, according to length of haul, which resulted from the establishment of Minimum Rate Tariff No. 17. No analysis along this line was made by petitioner.

The study of terminal end times which petitioner made in connection with shipments originating outside of Los Angeles

County also does not support the prescription of increased rates for said shipments. By this study petitioner developed an average terminal end time which is about four minutes a load more than the terminal end time used in the computation of the rates in Minimum Rate Tariff No. 17. Petitioner concluded, therefore, that the terminal end time which applies to shipments originating outside of Los Angeles County is also four minutes more than the terminal end time applicable to shipments which originate within Los Angeles County. However, this conclusion is not correct.

If petitioner's study is to be construed as measuring the average terminal end time applicable to shipments transported outside of Los Angeles County under the same conditions as those which prevailed when the terminal end time used in the calculation of the rates in Minimum Rate Tariff No. 17 was developed, the terminal end time applicable to shipments having Los Angeles County origins would be less than the figure used in the calculation of the rates in Minimum Rate Tariff No. 17. Hence, it would follow that if the rates for shipments originating outside of Los Angeles County are to be increased, those for shipments originating within Los Angeles County should be reduced.

On the other hand, if petitioner's study is to be construed as measuring the terminal end time applicable to shipments transported outside of Los Angeles County under present conditions, a study should also be made of the terminal end time applicable under present conditions to Los Angeles County originated shipments. Since petitioner made no study of Los Angeles County

shipments, there is no basis for concluding whether the terminal end time for such shipments is less than, the same as, or more than the time which petitioner developed for shipments outside of Los Angeles County.

For a further reason petitioner's study of terminal end times does not provide a basis upon which increases in the rates in Minimum Rate Tariff No. 17 should be prescribed. As applied to the Orange County and San Bernardino County areas, the study covers a total of about 170 shipments. About 84 percent of these shipments were transported by tractor, semitrailer and pull trailer (bottom-dump equipment) and the remainder, 16 percent, were transported by truck and transfer trailer. This relationship between the hauls by bottom-dump equipment and those by truck and transfer trailer does not conform to, nor does it even approximate, the relationship in equipment usage upon which the rates in Minimum Rate Tariff No. 17 were developed. Said rates were constructed on a basis that approximately 30 percent of the shipments move by bottom-dump equipment and that 70 percent of the shipments move by truck and transfer trailer. In view of these differences, petitioner's study cannot be accepted as representative of the transportation which is involved in this matter. Parenthetically, it should be pointed out that if, since the establishment of Minimum Rate Tariff No. 17, the character of the transportation has changed as radically as petitioner's study suggests, other changes in the structure of the rates, in addition to those sought by petitioner, are also indicated, and should be considered.

One other matter which should be touched upon in connection with the rate increases which petitioner seeks on the basis of terminal end time is that of undue discrimination. It would seem that the terminal end conditions at any given destination would be substantially the same for all deliveries to that destination. Hence, if terminal end conditions at a group of destinations justify increases in rates, the increases should apply to all deliveries to those destinations. Under petitioner's proposals, however, the increases in rates would not be so applied. Shipments which originate in Los Angeles County and which are delivered to destinations either within or outside of Los Angeles County would not be subject to rate increases. On the other hand, increases would apply to rates for like shipments to the same destinations from origins outside of Los Angeles County. We find that as so applied, the rate increases (to the extent they are based on terminal end conditions at destination) would be unduly discriminatory and unlawful. For this reason, as well as for those reasons set forth above, said increases should not be ordered.

There remains for discussion the rate increases which petitioner seeks on the grounds of increases which have allegedly occurred in depreciation expense, insurance costs and in taxes and licenses since the development of the data upon which the rates in Minimum Rate Tariff No. 17 are based.

As stated earlier above, the specific figures which petitioner submitted as denoting current costs of depreciation,

insurance, taxes and licenses were derived from an exhibit that a Commission engineer had prepared to show the costs which apply on an hourly basis to the transportation of rock, sand and gravel in dump truck equipment throughout Southern Territory. In general, the engineer had developed this study on the basis of data taken from an earlier study which had been made to arrive at the costs upon which the rates in Minimum Rate Tariff No. 17 were predicated. In utilizing said data, however, the engineer made various changes therein to adapt the data to the later period, the greater area and the type of service embraced by his study. For example, the engineer calculated depreciation expense on dump truck equipment on the basis of service lives of nine years for trucks, eight years for tractors, twelve years for transfer trailers and ten years for semitrailer and pull trailer combinations. In contrast, the vehicle service lives which were used in the computation of the costs upon which the rates in Minimum Rate Tariff No. 17 were projected were ten years for trucks and tractors and twelve years for trailers. Also, the truck and tractor valuations which the engineer used for his calculations of depreciation expense are about \$1,000 per vehicle more than the corresponding valuations used in the computation of costs for the rates in Minimum Rate Tariff No. 17.⁷ Insurance costs were computed by the engineer as being about 15 percent higher than those which are reflected in the present rates in Minimum Rate Tariff No. 17. This percentage

⁷ The engineer's trailer valuations about \$500 more for transfer trailers and about \$600 less for semitrailer and pull trailer combinations than the corresponding valuations used in the cost computations for Minimum Rate Tariff No. 17:

figure was reached by the engineer after discussions with other members of the Commission's staff and with agents or employees of insurance companies to ascertain their views as to what would constitute a reasonable adjustment of the former insurance costs to bring them to a representative level for the purposes of his study.

The same figures which the engineer used as representing current insurance costs, taxes and licenses in Southern Territory were submitted by petitioner as also representing the current insurance costs, taxes and licenses applicable to the transportation of rock, sand and gravel under the zone rates in Minimum Rate Tariff No. 17. Petitioner's manager stated that these figures had been considered and approved by the CDTOA as a basis of petitioner's proposals herein.

Petitioner also adopted the engineer's figures for historical costs of carrier's vehicles, the vehicle salvage values and the net depreciable values. However, depreciation expense on the vehicles was computed by petitioner on the basis of ten-year service lives for all vehicles. Regarding the service lives of ten years and the uniform use thereof for computing depreciation expense on all vehicles, whether power equipment or trailing, petitioner's manager testified that,

"A great many members of the California Dump Truck Association who are engaged in . . . transportation . . . under Tariff 17 rates have discussed extensively the . . . depreciation as between power equipment and trailing equipment . . . They believe that . . . the technological obsolescence of the trailing equipment is obtained before that of the power equipment, and it is the universal

practice of those with whom I have discussed the matter and those whose discussions have occurred in meetings which I have attended, that the depreciation of the trailing and trucking equipment is over the same number of years . . ."

Petitioner's manager further stated that the carriers all depreciate their vehicles over periods of about eight years or less. However, after consideration of the applicable factors which had come to his attention over a number of years, he had concluded that a service life of ten years would be a reasonable basis for computing depreciation expense for the purposes of this proceeding. In this connection petitioner's manager stated that he did not have any information concerning the vehicle service lives which are actually attained by the carriers in the operation of their equipment.

As stated at the outset of this opinion, the area for which petitioner is here seeking rate increases is the area which is comprised of Orange County and parts of Los Angeles, Riverside, San Bernardino, San Diego, Santa Barbara and Ventura Counties. However, the evidence upon which petitioner principally relies to justify the increases sought on the basis of increased time costs deals with transportation services which are performed in an area almost wholly outside of that for which the zone rates have been prescribed. Said evidence is that which was developed by the Commission engineer to show the hourly costs of the transportation of rock and sand within Southern Territory. Although by definition, "Southern Territory" includes the area within which the zone rates in Minimum Rate Tariff No. 17 apply, in practical effect it does

not include said area, insofar as the transportation of rock, sand and gravel on an hourly basis is concerned. Minimum Rate Tariff No. 17 provides that the rates in said tariff supersede, and apply to the exclusion of, rates applicable to the same transportation under other minimum rate tariffs of the Commission.

The record shows that the difference in the area studied affected the results and conclusions of the engineer's investigations. The difference was a consideration in his computations of depreciation expense which led to his selection of lesser vehicle service lives than those used in the development of the costs upon which the zone rates are based. This same consideration affected the valuations which he developed for the carriers' vehicles. Moreover, his estimates of insurance expense were also affected. Since the data which were derived from the engineer's studies were developed primarily for transportation that is performed under various cost factors which are different than the corresponding cost factors applicable to the transportation involved herein, it must be concluded that but little if any probative value, for the purposes of this matter, can be attached to the data taken from the engineer's studies.

The opinion testimony by which petitioner undertook to relate the engineer's cost data more directly to the transportation subject to the zone rates in Minimum Rate Tariff No. 17 must also be viewed as failing to provide a basis upon which the sought rate increases may be ordered. The record is clear that such opinion testimony as the engineer was called upon to provide stemmed from, and was colored by, his study of the hourly costs of transportation

within Southern Territory. Hence, such testimony cannot be regarded as having a direct and material bearing on whether the sought rate increases are justified by increased time costs. The opinion testimony which petitioner's manager presented as representing the opinions of various members of the CDTOA concerning vehicle valuations and vehicle service lives for depreciation purposes also cannot be given much weight in the absence of testimony by the members involved. A fundamental consideration in the evaluation of costs in proceedings directed toward the establishment or revision of minimum rates is whether the costs are minimum reasonable costs applicable to services performed in reasonably efficient circumstances. The record does not show whether, or to what extent, the opinions cited by petitioner's manager represent expressions of costs which are acceptable for minimum rate purposes.

The opinion evidence which petitioner's general manager submitted relative to the carrier's **investment costs** per vehicle also will not be accepted as a basis for increases in the rates in Minimum Rate Tariff No. 17. As stated above, petitioner's manager took his figures for vehicle investment costs (historical costs) directly from the exhibit which the Commission engineer had prepared on hourly costs of transporting rock and sand within Southern Territory. However, he assigned different service lives to the equipment for the computation of depreciation expense. Although under the method used in developing historical costs the change in service lives would ordinarily evoke concomitant changes in the vehicle cost figures,

petitioner's manager argued that any reduction which might be made in the costs as a result of the inclusion of lower cost data for earlier years would be more than offset by increases in equipment costs which have taken place since the engineer's cost figures were developed. In making this argument, he did not undertake to show by any supporting factual data the extent that the asserted increases in vehicle costs have actually occurred.

Even though it should be conceded that some increases in vehicle costs have become effective since the development of the data upon which the rates in Minimum Rate Tariff No. 17 are based, increases in the rates should not be predicated on the increased vehicle costs without consideration of what impact the cost increases have had upon the carriers' ultimate costs of service. If, for example, some of the increased investment costs result in improved and more efficient operation of the carriers' vehicles with lower operational costs, consideration should be given to the extent that the increased investment costs are offset by the lower operational costs.

Petitioner's proposal that depreciation expense on trailing equipment be computed on the basis of service lives of ten years will not be adopted. A period of twelve years has been found heretofore to be a reasonable period for such equipment in connection with the zone rates in Minimum Rate Tariff No. 17. Although it appears that various members of the CDTOA and petitioner's manager are of the opinion that both powered equipment and trailing equipment should be depreciated on the same service lives, the record does not show that the twelve-year period which

is reflected in the present rates is inconsistent with the carriers' actual operating experience. In the absence of further information on this subject, the present twelve-year period should be retained.

In view of our findings and conclusions concerning the extent that the increases which petitioner seeks in the rates and charges in Minimum Rate Tariff No. 17 have been shown to be justified, discussion of the further increases sought by the CTA in said rates and charges is not necessary. We find that said further increases have not been justified.

Based on the evidence of record we find that the increases in the rates and charges in Minimum Rate Tariff No. 17 which would be effected by the following order have been justified. We further find that as so increased the rates and charges in said tariff will constitute just, reasonable and nondiscriminatory minimum rates and charges for the transportation to which they would apply.

O R D E R

IT IS ORDERED that:

1. Minimum Rate Tariff No. 17 (Appendix B to Decision No. 69469, as amended) is further amended by incorporating therein, to become effective March 11, 1967, the supplement and the revised page attached hereto, which supplement and revised page are made a part hereof by this reference and are identified as follows:

Supplement 1
Seventh Revised Page 1-2
Second Revised Page 1-16

2. In all other respects said Decision No. 69469, as amended, shall remain in full force and effect.

3. Except as is otherwise provided herein, Petition No. 118 in Case No. 5437 and the collateral requests of the California Trucking Association are hereby denied.

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

Dated at San Francisco, California, this 31st
day of JANUARY 1967.

John E. McMill
President

William W. Bennett

August

William Symons, Jr.

Fred P. Morrison
Commissioners

SPECIAL INCREASE SUPPLEMENT

SUPPLEMENT 1
TO
MINIMUM RATE TARIFF 17

NAMING

MINIMUM ZONE AND AREA-TO-POINT

RATES, RULES AND REGULATIONS

FOR THE

TRANSPORTATION OF PROPERTY

IN DUMP TRUCK EQUIPMENT FROM

DEFINED PRODUCTION AREAS TO DESIGNATED DELIVERY ZONES

AND POINTS IN SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA

BY

RADIAL HIGHWAY COMMON CARRIERS

HIGHWAY CONTRACT CARRIERS

AND

CITY CARRIERS

APPLICATION OF INCREASE

Determine the applicable rate per ton from Section 4, 5, 6, 7 or 10 and increase the rate so determined by 2 cents per ton.

EFFECTIVE MARCH 11, 1967

◊ Increase, Decision No. **71953**

Issued by the
PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA
State Building, Civic Center
San Francisco, California

SECTION 1 - RULES AND REGULATIONS (CONTINUED)

ØTARIFF PAGES CHECK SHEET

ORIGINAL AND REVISED PAGES AS NAMED BELOW AND *SUPPLEMENT 1 CONTAIN ALL CHANGES FROM THE ORIGINAL TARIFF IN EFFECT ON THE DATES SHOWN THEREON.

PAGE NUMBER	REVISION NUMBER	PAGE NUMBER	REVISION NUMBER	PAGE NUMBER	REVISION NUMBER	PAGE NUMBER	REVISION NUMBER
TITLE	1ST	4-A	1ST	5-B-2	1ST	7-M-1	1ST
1	ORIGINAL	4-A-1	1ST	5-D	1ST	7-M-2	1ST
1-1	ORIGINAL	4-A-2	1ST	5-D-1	1ST	8	ORIGINAL
1-2	Ø7TH	4-B	1ST	5-D-2	1ST	9	ORIGINAL
1-2.1	ORIGINAL	4-B-1	1ST	5-D-3	1ST	10	1ST
1-3	2ND	4-B-2	1ST	5-F	1ST	10-B	1ST
1-3.1	ORIGINAL	4-CC	1ST	5-G	2ND	10-C	1ST
1-4	1ST	4-CC-1	1ST	5-G-1	ORIGINAL	10-E	1ST
1-4.1	ORIGINAL	4-E	1ST	5-G-2	ORIGINAL	10-G	1ST
1-5	2ND	4-E-1	1ST	5-G-3	ORIGINAL	10-I	1ST
1-6	2ND	4-E-2	1ST	5-G-4	ORIGINAL	10-J	1ST
1-7	2ND	4-F	1ST	5-I	1ST	10-K	1ST
1-8	1ST	4-F-1	1ST	5-L-1	1ST	10-L	1ST
1-9	1ST	4-F-2	1ST	5-M	1ST	10-M	1ST
1-10	1ST	4-F-3	1ST	5-M-1	1ST	10-N	ORIGINAL
1-11	ORIGINAL	4-G	1ST	5-O	1ST	10-N-1	ORIGINAL
1-12	ORIGINAL	4-G-1	1ST	5-P	1ST	10-O	ORIGINAL
1-13	ORIGINAL	4-G-2	1ST	5-P-1	1ST	10-O-1	ORIGINAL
1-14	1ST	4-G-3	1ST	6	1ST	10-P	ORIGINAL
1-15	2ND	4-HH	1ST	6-F	1ST	10-P-1	ORIGINAL
1-16	Ø2ND	4-HH-1	1ST	6-G	1ST	11	1ST
1-17	ORIGINAL	4-I	1ST	6-G-1	1ST	11-1	1ST
1-18	ORIGINAL	4-II	1ST	7	1ST	11-2	1ST
1-19	ORIGINAL	4-II-1	1ST	7-A	1ST	12	ORIGINAL
1-20	ORIGINAL	4-JA	1ST	7-A-1	1ST	13	ORIGINAL
1-21	1ST	4-JJ	1ST	7-B	1ST	14	ORIGINAL
2	1ST	4-JJ-1	1ST	7-B-1	1ST	14-A	ORIGINAL
2-1	ORIGINAL	4-L	1ST	7-D	1ST	14-A-1	ORIGINAL
2-2	ORIGINAL	4-L-1	1ST	7-D-1	1ST	14-A-2	ORIGINAL
2-3	ORIGINAL	4-L-2	1ST	7-E	1ST	14-B	ORIGINAL
2-4	ORIGINAL	4-M	1ST	7-E-1	1ST	14-B-1	ORIGINAL
2-5	ORIGINAL	4-M-1	1ST	7-H	1ST	14-B-2	ORIGINAL
2-6	ORIGINAL	4-M-2	1ST	7-H-1	1ST	14-C	ORIGINAL
2-7	ORIGINAL	4-M-3	1ST	7-H-2	1ST	14-C-1	ORIGINAL
2-8	ORIGINAL	5	1ST	7-I	1ST	14-C-2	ORIGINAL
2-9	ORIGINAL	5-A	1ST	7-I-1	1ST	14-CC	ORIGINAL
2-10	ORIGINAL	5-A-1	1ST	7-L	1ST	14-CC-1	ORIGINAL
2-11	ORIGINAL	5-A-2	1ST	7-L-1	1ST	14-D	ORIGINAL
3	ORIGINAL	5-B	1ST	7-L-2	1ST		
4	1ST	5-B-1	1ST	7-M	1ST		

(CONTINUED ON ORIGINAL PAGE 1-2.1)

Ø CHANGE
 * ADDITION

DECISION NO. 71953

EFFECTIVE MARCH 11, 1967

ISSUED BY THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA,
 SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA.

CORRECTION 259

MINIMUM RATE TARIFF 17

SECTION 1--RULES AND REGULATIONS(Continued)	Item
<p style="text-align: center;">DELAY TIME</p> <p>When, in connection with the transportation of a shipment of asphaltic concrete, a carrier is delayed through no fault of its own in the unloading of said shipment, and when the unloading time exceeds one hour, a charge at the rate of \$2.85 for each half hour, or fraction thereof, of excess delay time shall be assessed against the debtor.</p> <p>In computing unloading time under this rule, said time shall commence when the carrier arrives at point of destination.</p>	310
<p style="text-align: center;">RATE FOR DRY MIXTURES OF ROCK, SAND, AND GRAVEL (WITH OR WITHOUT CEMENT) IN BATCHES</p> <p>Rates for the transportation of dry mixtures of two or more of the commodities listed in Item 60, in batches, shall be 15 cents per ton more than the rates otherwise provided in this tariff for the transportation of rock, sand and gravel between the same points.</p>	320
<p style="text-align: center;">METHOD OF DETERMINING WEIGHT OF SHIPMENT</p> <p>Actual weight of the shipment shall be used when furnished by the shipper or when obtained by the carrier at the shipper's direction and expense.</p> <p>Otherwise, charges for commodities listed in:</p> <p>a. Items 60 and 70 shall be computed upon the basis of 2,800 pounds per cubic yard when loaded in dump truck equipment.</p> <p>b. Item 65 shall be computed on the basis of 3,200 pounds per cubic yard when loaded in dump truck equipment.</p>	340
<p style="text-align: center;">MINIMUM CHARGE</p> <p>The minimum charge per shipment shall be the charge for:</p> <p>a. 14 tons at the applicable rate for commodities described in Item 60.</p> <p>b. 12 tons at the applicable rate for commodities described in Items 65 and 70. (See Exception)</p> <p>EXCEPTION: When a shipment of asphaltic concrete or cold road oil mixture (also cold liquid asphalt in containers) is transported in a two-axle dump truck, and when the freight bill is so noted and the truck is identified on the freight bill, the minimum charge for the transportation of the shipment shall be the charge for transporting 8 tons at the applicable rate.</p>	\$360
<p style="text-align: center;">UNITS OF MEASUREMENT TO BE OBSERVED</p> <p>Rates or accessorial charges shall not be quoted or assessed by carriers based upon a unit of measurement different from that in which the minimum rates and charges in this tariff are stated.</p>	380
<p>⧫ Change } Decision No. 71953 ⧫ Increase }</p>	
EFFECTIVE MARCH 11, 1967	
<p style="text-align: center;">Issued by the Public Utilities Commission of the State of California, San Francisco, California.</p> <p>Correction 260</p>	