

ORIGINAL

Decision No. 77493

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  
Order Setting Hearing No. 564  
(Filed November 12, 1969)

And Related Matters.

Cases Nos.  
5330, 5433, 5435, 5436  
5437, 5438, 5439, 5440  
5603, 5604, 6008, 6322  
7857 and 8808  
OSH Nos. 45, 31, 137, 93,  
193, 75, 106, 65, 77, 21,  
12, 2, 27 and 6  
(Filed November 12, 1969)

Armand Karp, for Nielsen Freight Lines; E. E. Eyring, for Pacific Motor Trucking; J. McSweeney, for Delta Lines; F. C. Winans and Grant A. Winans, for Winans Bros. Trucking; and Gordon S. Raney, for DiSalvo Trucking Co., respondents.  
William M. Larimore, and John T. Reed, for California Manufacturers Association; Richard W. Smith, A. D. Poe, H. F. Kollmyer, for California Trucking Association; Russell Bevans, Draymen's Association of San Francisco; Peter J. Coyle, for Bethlehem Steel Corp.; George E. Dill, in propria persona; W. R. Donovan, for C & H Sugar; E. H. Griffiths, for Cal-Western Traffic and Trans-State Motorlines, Inc.; Meyer Kapler, for American Forest Products Corp.; Sheldon K. King, for Kaiser Steel Corp.; Calvin S. Mather and Robert C. Christie, for Etiwanda Steel Producers, Inc.; Kenneth C. O'Brien, for Container Corp. of America and Donald Marken, Exec. Secty., for Traffic Managers Conference of California; Hugh N. Orr, for Reliable Traffic Service; Charles R. Taff, for Kimberly-Clark Corp.; Milton A. Walker and R. A. Morin, for Fibreboard Corporation; and Ronald M. Zaller, for Continental Can Company, Inc., interested parties.  
Robert E. Walker, for the Commission staff.

O P I N I O N

Several of the minimum rate tariffs published by the Commission contain rules governing the for-hire highway carrier transportation of split pickup and split delivery shipments and provisions for the alternative application of common carrier rates. In Decision No. 76282, dated October 21, 1969, in Case No. 8772, the Commission questioned the application of the current provisions set forth in Items 160, 170, 200, 210, 220 and 230 of Minimum Rate Tariff No. 2 (MRT 2) governing the alternative application of common carrier rates in connection with split pickup and split delivery shipments. It was subsequently determined that public hearings should be held for the receipt of evidence concerning adjustments, if any, that may be appropriate to MRT 2 in the light of Decision No. 76282. Since several other minimum rate tariffs published by the Commission also contain split pickup, split delivery and alternative application of common carrier rate provisions, it was also concluded that hearings should be held concurrently in all of the appropriate minimum rate investigation cases for the purpose of determining to what extent the minimum rate tariffs should be modified.

Public hearing was held before Examiner Gagnon at San Francisco on February 10, 1970, on which date the matters were submitted. The Commission's Transportation Division staff presented a rate proposal (Exhibit 1) designed to clarify the minimum rate provisions involved. Suggested revisions to the staff rate proposal were also submitted by other interested parties and a respondent carrier. The California Trucking Association supports the adoption of the staff rate proposal.

Staff Rate Proposal

The staff witness explained that the split pickup, split delivery and alternative use of common carrier rate provisions of the various minimum rate tariffs were first reviewed for clarity and uniformity of application. In addition, the current tariff rules were evaluated in the light of Commission objectives enunciated in prior underlying decisions and current traffic conditions. The staff study revealed that in recent Commission investigation proceedings questions had arisen which could be resolved through clarification of the split shipment and alternative use of common carrier rate provisions of the various minimum rate tariffs involved without making substantive changes in the scope of application of said tariff rules. The staff witness explained that no new concepts were considered in the development of the staff rate proposal.

The suggested tariff amendments are common to all of the minimum rate tariffs in question and are generally self-explanatory. Further comments herein relative to the split delivery and alternative use of common carrier rate provisions of Minimum Rate Tariff No. 2 will apply equally to the split pickup, split delivery and alternative application of common carrier rate provisions of all the minimum rate tariffs under consideration.

Most of the minimum rate tariffs issued by the Commission do not contain provisions comparable to those set forth in Item 171(e) of MRT 2 which authorizes the rating of component parts of a split delivery shipment as though said component parts were a separate shipment. The staff proposal does not suggest that such tariff provisions be added to the other minimum rate tariffs. As in the case of MRT 2, the staff rate proposal for the other minimum rate tariffs involved are designed to clarify or provide, where warranted,

appropriate tariff language. With respect to MRT 1-B, 4-B, 5, 9-B and 11-A, the staff witness stated that the rules contained in said tariffs appear to be adequate to implement the statutory requirement involved and no modification to these provisions is recommended.<sup>1/</sup> Similarly, no changes are proposed for MRT 15 which does not provide for the alternative application of common carrier rates and no such tariff provision appears necessary.<sup>2/</sup>

The staff study states that when a given shipment composed of two or more component parts is embraced within the definition of a "Split Delivery Shipment", as set forth in Item 12 of MRT 2, said shipment retains this classification for rating purposes regardless of the fact that a common carrier rail rate may be assessed for all or a portion of the transportation service. Where the rail rate is entirely applicable to the transportation services performed by the highway carrier, the staff maintains that the movement is a split delivery shipment for which rail rates and charges were assessed. Similarly, where a rail rate is applied to only a portion of the carrier's services, such rate application does not invalidate the basic character of the split delivery shipment. The balance of the transportation services must be assessed charges under the methods provided in the minimum rate tariff for a split shipment. The shipper may elect to have the minimum rate apply to the entire weight of the composite shipment (including the weight of component parts delivered under the rail rate) or to the component parts as separate shipments, based upon the individual weight of such component parts. (Item 170, Paragraph (a) or (e) of MRT 2.)

---

<sup>1/</sup> Section 3663 of the Public Utilities Code.

<sup>2/</sup> Minimum Rate Tariff 15 contains yearly, monthly and weekly vehicle unit rates and rules.

The staff witness explained that, in actual practice, the shipper can tender the composite load, under a single shipping document, to a railroad with instructions for transportation via rail to a railhead or established depot. Separate instructions would be issued to one or more highway carriers for delivery of the goods from the rail point or points as split deliveries, separate shipments or a combination of both, with the rail facilities as origin points. The aggregate transportation charges for such transportation would be determined by the rail rate including stop-in-transit charges, if applicable, plus the minimum rate for the off-rail service including accessorial services. The rates charged for the off-rail transportation will, in addition to the usual physical factors, vary in accordance with the type of written instructions issued by the shipper. If the provisions of Item 171(e) of MRT 2 are observed, the off-rail traffic is rated as a separate shipment based upon the actual weight thereof.

In the event the documentation requirements of Item 171(e) of MRT 2 have not been fully observed in connection with a rail-truck rated split delivery shipment, the staff witness notes that the off-rail transportation portion of the composite shipment is subject to Item 170(a) of MRT 2. This rule, in concert with the definition of a Split Delivery Shipment, provides that the entire weight of the composite shipment shall be used in the computations of charges (including any weight delivered under the railroad rate). This method is not unlike the application of a point-to-point transportation rate to a shipment which includes a partial delivery under a stop-in-transit privilege at an intermediate point. Although only part of the load is delivered to the final destination, the total weight of the entire shipment is assessed at the through rate for the entire length of haul.

The staff submits that under the concept envisioned by the Commission in establishing Item No. 171(e)<sup>3/</sup> the shipper should be able to construct separate shipments at any point or points where it has the right and ability to receive and forward traffic.<sup>4/</sup> In addition to the point or points along the highway carrier split delivery route referred to in the tariff, all team tracks and established depots covered by the alternatively applied railroad rate should be available for this purpose. A further consideration is the construction of separate shipments moving from a private rail facility which is not generally available to the public. In this connection the Commission has stated that a combination of railroad and minimum rates may not be made over a private noncarrier facility such as a spur track (Decision No. 57829) with the exception of a private railhead over which the shipper has the right and ability to receive or ship property (Decision No. 72684). In light of the Commission decisions referred to herein, relative to the manner in which the split pickup, split delivery and alternative use of common carrier rate provisions contained in the several minimum rate tariffs are to be applied, the staff has concluded that said tariff rules are in need of further clarification. Accordingly, the staff rate proposal is designed to insure that the tariff rules involved will be uniformly applied and interpreted in harmony with the Commission's announced objectives with respect thereto.

The staff's recommended revisions in Items Nos. 210 and 230 of MRT 2 are typical of the overall tariff changes proposed by the staff for the purpose of clarifying the existing provisions of the

---

<sup>3/</sup> Decision No. 57829, dated January 6, 1959, in Case No. 5330 et al.

<sup>4/</sup> Decision No. 72684, dated July 7, 1967, in Case No. 8316 (67 Cal.P.U.C. 350).

several minimum rate tariffs involved herein. A summary of said tariff suggestions are hereinafter set forth:

1. Item 210 - MRT 2 This item currently provides for the use of rail rates, applying from and to any railhead or established depot, in combination with the truck rates named in MRT 2 applicable from or to any team track or established depot. The staff suggests that the reference to "railhead" from or to which the MRT 2 rates are to be applied be amended so as to refer to a private railhead which is owned or leased by the shipper. It is also recommended that the tariff rule be so amended as to make it perfectly clear that the combination rail-minimum truck rate is to be predicated upon the weight of the entire shipment.<sup>5/</sup>

2. Item 230 - MRT 2 This item concerns the alternative application of split delivery service under rates constructed by use of combinations of common carrier rates with the minimum truck rates named in MRT 2. It is proposed that this item be amended so as to make it clear that:

- (a) The common carrier rate factor may be computed over any team track, established depot or private railhead which is owned or leased by the shipper.
- (b) The minimum truck combination rate factor(s) to be applied from such team track, established depot or private railhead is to be for a split delivery shipment, computed either upon (1) the composite weight of the split shipment; or (2) the component parts of such split delivery shipment may be rated as separate shipments, subject to the individual weight of each component part.
- (c) The component parts of a split delivery shipment may be rated as separate shipments from any team

---

<sup>5/</sup> Item 11 of MRT 2 defines railhead as "a point at which facilities are maintained for the loading of property into or upon, or the unloading of property from rail cars or vessels. It also includes truck loading facilities of plants or industries located at such rail or vessel loading or unloading point."

tracks, established depots or private railheads which are owned or leased by the shipper provided the split delivery provisions contained in Rule 171(e) of MRT 2 are observed.

#### Alternative Proposals

A traffic consultant on behalf of the California Manufacturers Association, while generally concurring in the staff proposal, presented a substantive alternative thereto. The traffic consultant's proposal stems from a basic difference of opinion as to the appropriate method for determining the character of a given shipment to be transported by a highway carrier. For example, it is the staff's general position that the kind or character of a truck shipment subject to the provisions of Minimum Rate Tariff No. 2 is, in the first instance, determined by the tariff rules contained in said tariff. The rules of MRT 2 which permit the alternative use of rail rates do not change or alter the basic character of the truck shipment. A composite truck shipment classified as a split delivery shipment would, in the staff's view, remain a split delivery shipment even though rail rates and accessorial charges only were assessed.

Since we are in full accord with the staff's position relative to the determination of the character of a truck shipment for minimum rate purposes, no additional commentary is necessary here relative to the traffic consultant's opposing views which have been carefully considered. Other relatively minor alternative or supplementary tariff proposals presented by an interested shipper representative and a respondent carrier have also been fully considered and are adopted to the extent set forth in the Commission's order herein.

#### Findings and Conclusions

The Commission finds that:



1. Several of the minimum rate tariffs published by the Commission for the transportation of property by for-hire highway carriers contain rules governing the application of such tariffs in connection with split pickup and split delivery shipments, including provisions for the alternative use of common carrier rates.

2. Under the existing format of the minimum rate tariff rules referred to in paragraph 1 hereof, it is not certain whether such rules can be applied in accordance with the objectives enunciated by the Commission in Decisions Nos. 57829 and 72684, supra.

3. The established split pickup and split delivery rules and the provisions governing the alternative use of common carrier rates named in the several minimum rate tariffs of the Commission should be modified in order to insure that their application will be clearly understood and consistently utilized within the framework of the Commission's announced objectives.

4. The tariff amendments recommended by the staff, as modified herein, plus reflection of certain interested shippers' suggested tariff clarification proposals are in full accord with Finding 3 hereof, have been shown to be just and reasonable and should be adopted.

We conclude that the tariff rules contained in the Commission's several minimum rate tariffs, pertaining to the highway transportation of split pickup and split delivery shipments and the alternative application of common carrier rates, should be further revised to reflect the Commission staff and interested shipper rate proposals to the extent indicated in Finding 4 hereof. It is further concluded that, since no tariff amendments are recommended or shown to be necessary with respect to Minimum Rate Tariffs Nos. 1-B, 4-B, 5, 9-B, 11-A and 13, Orders Setting Hearing Nos. 45, 137, 106, 77,

C. 5432 (OSH 564), et al. ms

12 and 2 in Cases Nos. 5330, 5435, 5439, 5603, 6008 and 6322, respectively, should be discontinued.

In order to avoid duplication of tariff distribution, Minimum Rate Tariff No. 2 will be amended by the order herein and the several other minimum rate tariffs involved will be amended by separate order.

O R D E R

IT IS ORDERED that:

1. Minimum Rate Tariff No. 2 (Appendix D to Decision No. 31606, as amended) is further amended by incorporating therein, to become effective August 22, 1970, the revised pages attached hereto and listed in Appendix A, also attached hereto, which pages and appendix by this reference are made a part hereof.
2. Common carriers subject to the Public Utilities Act, to the extent that they are subject also to Decision No. 31606, as amended, are hereby directed to establish in their tariffs the increases necessary to conform with the further adjustments ordered herein.
3. Common carriers maintaining rates on a level other than the minimum rates for transportation for which rates are prescribed in Minimum Rate Tariff No. 2 are authorized to increase such rates by the same amounts authorized for Minimum Rate Tariff No. 2 rates herein.
4. Common carriers maintaining rates on the same level as Minimum Rate Tariff No. 2 rates for the transportation of commodities and/or for transportation not subject to Minimum Rate Tariff No. 2 are authorized to increase said rates by the same amounts authorized for Minimum Rate Tariff No. 2 rates herein.

5. Common carriers maintaining rates at levels other than the minimum rates for the transportation of commodities and/or for transportation not subject to Minimum Rate Tariff No. 2 are authorized to increase said rates by the same amounts authorized for Minimum Rate Tariff No. 2 rates herein.

6. Tariff publications required to be made by common carriers as a result of the order herein shall be filed not earlier than the effective date of this order and 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 August 22, 1970; and the tariff publications which are authorized but not required to be made by common carriers as a result of the order herein may be made effective not earlier than the tenth day after the effective date of this order, and may be made effective on not less than ten days' notice to the Commission and to the public if filed not later than sixty days after the effective date of the minimum rate tariff pages incorporated in this order.

7. Common carriers, in establishing and maintaining the rates authorized hereinabove, are hereby authorized to depart from the provisions of Section 460 of the Public Utilities Code to the extent necessary to adjust long- and short-haul departures now maintained under outstanding authorizations; such outstanding authorizations are hereby modified only to the extent necessary to comply with this order; and schedules containing the rates published under this authority shall make reference to the prior orders authorizing long- and short-haul departures and to this order.

8. In all other respects Decision No. 31606, as amended, shall remain in full force and effect.

C. 5432 (OSH 564), et al. ms

9. Orders Setting Hearing Nos. 45, 137, 106, 77, 12 and 2 in Cases Nos. 5330, 5435, 5439, 5603, 6008 and 6322, respectively, are hereby discontinued.

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

Dated at San Francisco, California, this 14<sup>th</sup> day of JULY, 1970.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Chairman

\_\_\_\_\_  
*William Sprouer, Jr.*  
\_\_\_\_\_  
*James [unclear]*  
\_\_\_\_\_  
*Yessie L. Sturgeon*  
Commissioners

Commissioner J. P. Vukasin, Jr., being necessarily absent, did not participate in the disposition of this proceeding.

Commissioner A. W. Gatov, being necessarily absent, did not participate in the disposition of this proceeding.

APPENDIX A TO DECISION NO. 77493

LIST OF ORIGINAL AND REVISED PAGES TO MINIMUM RATE TARIFF 2  
AUTHORIZED BY SAID DECISION

SIXTH REVISED PAGE 20-C

FIRST REVISED PAGE 20-G

FOURTEENTH REVISED PAGE 24

NINTH REVISED PAGE 25

ORIGINAL PAGE 25-A

(END OF APPENDIX A LIST)

SECTION 1--RULES OF GENERAL APPLICATION (Continued)

ITEM

SPLIT PICKUP (Continued)  
 (Items 160, 161, 162 and 163)

2. The carrier shall not transport a split pickup shipment unless at the time of or prior to the initial pickup of any portion of the shipment, an appropriate written document is issued by the consignor for each component part, said document containing all of the information required to prepare a bill of lading in compliance with provisions of Item 360 of the Governing Classification. In addition, the consignor shall provide the carrier with a single document containing written information setting forth in summary the total numbers and kind of packages, description of articles, and total weight of all commodities described on the bills of lading for each component part. Said document shall also reflect total number of pieces and total weight of all commodities in the shipment and must make reference, by number or other individual identity, to each bill of lading issued for a component part.
3. A bill of lading form may be utilized as the single document referred to in paragraph 2 hereof, however, such bill of lading will have no effect except to consolidate, for the purpose of determining freight charges, information on the bills of lading covering each component part of the shipment.
4. If split delivery is performed on a split pickup shipment, or if written information does not conform with the requirements of paragraph 2 or 3 hereof, or if all of the shipment is not received at the carrier's established depot within one calendar day or picked up by carrier during two calendar days or does not comply with the provisions of paragraph A hereof, each component part of the split pickup shipment shall be rated as a separate shipment under other provisions of this tariff.
65. In determining the charge for a split pickup shipment, component parts may be rated as separate shipments from point or points of origin of such component parts to any point on the split pickup route provided that the written instructions furnished to the carrier under paragraph 2 hereof show (1) the component parts to be treated as separate shipments and (2) the points between which the separate shipment rates are to be applied. The additional charges provided in Note 1 shall apply to all component parts of the split pickup shipment rated in accordance with the provisions of this paragraph, provided, however, where two or more component parts are rated under rates provided in this tariff as separate shipments to the same point on the split pickup route, the aforesaid two or more components shall be considered as one split pickup and the charge therefor shall be at the combined weight of the aforesaid component parts.

6162

(Continued in Item 163)

6 Change, Decision No. 77493

EFFECTIVE

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

Correction 2287

SECTION 1--RULES OF GENERAL APPLICATION (Continued)

ITEM

SPLIT DELIVERY (Continued)  
 (Items 170, 171, 172 and 173)

2. The carrier shall not transport a split delivery shipment unless at the time of or prior to the initial pickup of any portion of the shipment, an appropriate written document is issued by the consignor for each component part, said document containing all of the information required to prepare a bill of lading in compliance with provisions of Item 360 of the Governing Classification. In addition, the consignor shall provide the carrier with a single document containing written information setting forth in summary, the total numbers and kind of packages, description of articles, and total weight of all commodities described on the bills of lading for each component part. Said document shall also reflect total number of pieces and total weight of all commodities in the shipment and must make reference, by number or other individual identity, to each bill of lading issued for a component part.
3. A bill of lading form may be utilized as the single document referred to in paragraph 2 hereof, however, such bill of lading will have no effect except to consolidate, for the purpose of determining freight charges, information on the bills of lading covering each component part of the shipment.
4. If split pickup is performed on a split delivery shipment, or if written information does not conform with the requirements of paragraph 2 or 3 hereof, or if all of the shipment is not received at the carrier's established depot or picked up by carrier during one calendar day (see Exception in multiple lot shipment), or does not comply with the provisions of paragraph A hereof, each component part of the split delivery shipment shall be rated as a separate shipment under other provisions of this tariff.
65. In determining the charge for a split delivery shipment, component parts may be rated as separate shipments from any point or points on the split delivery route to point or points of destination of such component parts provided that the written instructions furnished to the carrier under paragraph 2 hereof show (1) the component parts to be treated as separate shipments and (2) the points between which the separate shipment rates are to be applied. The additional charges provided in Note 1 shall apply to all component parts of the split delivery shipment rated in accordance with the provisions of this paragraph, provided, however, where two or more component parts are rated under rates provided in this tariff as separate shipments from the same point on the split delivery route, the aforesaid two or more component parts shall be considered as one split delivery and the charge therefor shall be at the combined weight of the aforesaid component parts.

6172

(Continued in Item 173)

Change, Decision No. **77493**

EFFECTIVE

Correction 2288

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

SECTION 1--RULES OF GENERAL APPLICATION (Continued)	ITEM
<p style="text-align: center;">ALTERNATIVE APPLICATION OF COMBINATIONS WITH COMMON CARRIER RATES</p> <p>When lower aggregate charges result, rates provided in this tariff may be used in combination with common carrier rates, except rates of coastwise common carriers by vessel, for the same transportation as follows:</p> <p>6(a) When point of origin is located beyond railhead or an established depot and point of destination is located at railhead or an established depot, add to the common carrier rate applying from any (1) team track, (2) established depot or (3) private railhead which is owned or leased by the party who contracts with the carrier for the performance of the transportation service, to point of destination the rate provided in this tariff, applicable to the weight of the entire shipment, for the distance from point of origin to such team track, depot or private railhead from which the common carrier rate applies. (See Notes 1, 2, 3 and 4)</p> <p>6(b) When point of origin is located at railhead or an established depot and point of destination is located beyond railhead or an established depot, add to the common carrier rate applying from point of origin to any (1) team track, (2) established depot or (3) private railhead which is owned or leased by the party who contracts with the carrier for the performance of the transportation service, the rate provided in this tariff, applicable to the weight of the entire shipment, for the distance from such team track, depot or private railhead to which the common carrier rate used applies to point of destination. (See Notes 1, 2, 3 and 4)</p> <p>6(c) When both point of origin and point of destination are located beyond railhead or an established depot, add to the common carrier rate applying between any railheads or established depots the rate provided in this tariff, applicable to the weight of the entire shipment, for the distance from point of origin to any (1) team track, (2) depot or (3) private railhead which is owned or leased by the party who contracts with the carrier for the performance of the transportation service, from which the common carrier rate used applies, plus the rate provided in this tariff, applicable to the weight of the entire shipment, for the distance from any (1) team track, (2) depot or (3) private railhead which is owned or leased by the party who contracts with the carrier for the performance of the transportation service, to which the common carrier rate used applies to point of destination. (See Notes 1, 2, 3 and 4)</p> <p>NOTE 1.--If the route from point of origin to railhead, or from railhead to point of destination, is within the corporate limits of a single incorporated city or established drayage area, the rates provided in this tariff for transportation for distances of 3 miles or less (if within a city), or the minimum rates established by the Commission for transportation within the established drayage area, whichever are lower, shall apply from point of origin to railhead or from railhead to point of destination as the case may be; except that if the route from railhead is within the limits of the Los Angeles Drayage Area (see Item 30 for reference), rates no lower than those established for transportation therein shall apply in connection with shipments of alcoholic liquors originating in San Francisco Territory.</p> <p>NOTE 2.--When a rail carload rate is subject to varying minimum weights, dependent upon the size of the car ordered or used, the lowest minimum weight obtainable under such minimum weight provisions may be used in applying the basis provided in this item.</p> <p>NOTE 3.--In applying the common carrier rate or charge under this item, a rate no lower than the common carrier rate and a weight no lower than the actual weight or published minimum weight (whichever is the higher) applicable in connection with the common carrier rate shall be used.</p> <p>NOTE 4.--For the purpose of applying the provisions of this item, the definitions of Point of Destination and Point of Origin set forth in Item 11 will be applicable.</p>	6210
<p>6 Change, Decision No. <span style="margin-left: 150px;"><b>77493</b></span></p>	
EFFECTIVE	
<p>Correction 2289</p>	<p>ISSUED BY THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA,                  SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA.</p>



SECTION 1--RULES OF GENERAL APPLICATION (Continued)

(1)  
 ITEM

ALTERNATIVE APPLICATION OF SPLIT PICKUP UNDER RATES  
 CONSTRUCTED BY USE OF COMBINATIONS WITH  
 COMMON CARRIER RATES

Charges on split pickup shipments may be computed by use of combinations with common carrier rates as follows, if a lower aggregate charge than that accruing under the basis provided in Items 160, 161, 162 and 163 results (See Note 1):

(1) Compute the charge applicable under the rates named in this tariff for the composite weight of a split pickup shipment, except as provided in paragraph 5 of Item 162, from the point or points of origin of the several component parts (See Items 160, 161, 162 and 163) to any (a) team track, (b) established depot or (c) private railhead which is owned or leased by the party who contracts with the carrier for the performance of the transportation service. (See Exception and Note 2)

EXCEPTION.--Subject to the documentation requirements of Item 162, component parts of a split pickup shipment may be rated as separate shipments, subject to the individual weight of such separate shipments, to any (a) team tracks, (b) established depots or (c) private railheads which are owned or leased by the party who contracts with the carrier for the performance of the transportation service, from which the common carrier rate applies. (See Note 2)

(2) Add to such charge the charge applicable under Items 200 and 210 for the weight of the composite shipment from such team track, established depot or private railhead, to point of destination.

NOTE 1.--For the purpose of applying the provisions of this item, the definitions of Point of Destination and Point of Origin set forth in Item 11 will be applicable.

NOTE 2.--If the points of origin of all component parts are within the limits of an incorporated city within which the railhead is located, and no rate for transportation to the railhead from such points of origin is named in this tariff, the rates named in this tariff for transportation for the combined distances of 3 constructive miles from the first of such points of origin, plus a distance of 2 constructive miles for each such additional point of origin, or the minimum rates established by the Commission for transportation within that city, whichever are lower, shall apply to the composite shipment to such railhead from such points of origin.

6220

(1) Item 230 transferred to Original Page 25-A.

6 Change, Decision No. 77493

EFFECTIVE

Correction 2290

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

SECTION 1--RULES OF GENERAL APPLICATION (Continued)	ITEM
<p style="text-align: center;"><b>ALTERNATIVE APPLICATION OF SPLIT DELIVERY UNDER RATES CONSTRUCTED BY USE OF COMBINATIONS WITH COMMON CARRIER RATES</b></p> <p>Charges on split delivery shipments may be computed by use of combinations with common carrier rates as follows, if a lower aggregate charge than that accruing under the basis provided in Items 170, 171, 172 and 173 results (See Note 1):</p> <p>(1) Compute the charge applicable under Items 200 and 210 for the weight of the composite shipment from point of origin to any (a) team track, (b) established depot or (c) private railhead which is owned or leased by the party who contracts with the carrier for the performance of the transportation service.</p> <p>(2) Add to such charge the charges applicable under the rates named in this tariff for the composite weight of a split delivery shipment (See Items 170, 171, 172 and 173), except as provided in paragraph 5 of Item 172, from such team track, established depot or private railhead, to the point or points of destination of the several component parts. (See Exception and Note 2)</p> <p><b>EXCEPTION.</b>--Subject to the documentation requirements of Item 172, component parts of a split delivery shipment may be rated as separate shipments, subject to the individual weight of each such separate shipment, from any (a) team tracks, (b) established depots or (c) private railheads which are owned or leased by the party who contracts with the carrier for the performance of the transportation service, to which the common carrier rate applies. (See Note 2)</p> <p><b>NOTE 1.</b>--For the purpose of applying the provisions of this item, the definitions of Point of Destination and Point of Origin set forth in Item 11 will be applicable.</p> <p><b>NOTE 2.</b>--If the points of destination of all component parts are within the limits of an incorporated city within which the railhead is located, and no rate for transportation from the railhead to such points of destination is named in this tariff, the rates named in this tariff for transportation for the combined distances of 3 constructive miles to the first of such points of destination, plus a distance of 2 constructive miles for each such additional point of destination, or the minimum rates established by the Commission for transportation within that city, whichever are lower, shall apply to the composite shipment from such railhead to such points of destination.</p>	<p>(1) 6230</p>
<p>(1) Item transferred from Eighth Revised Page 25.</p> <p>of Change, Decision No. <b>77493</b></p>	
<b>EFFECTIVE</b>	
<p>Correction 2291</p>	<p>ISSUED BY THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA, SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA.</p>