JM *

Decision No-

79881

BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

Investigation on the Commission's own motion of a General Order which will require Highway Common Carriers, Radial Highway Common Carriers and Highway Contract Carriers, excluding Highway Contract Carriers authorized to conduct operations on a seasonal basis for agricultural commodities, to provide and thereafter continue in effect adequate protection against liability imposed by law upon such carriers for the payment of loss or damage to cargo.

Case No. 9238 (Filed June 22, 1971)

Kenneth C. Delaney, for Los Angeles Area Chamber of Commerce; Don B. Shields, for Highway Carriers Association; Richard W. Smith and A. D. Poe, Attorneys at Law, and H. F. Kollmyer, for California Trucking Association; William D. Mayer, for Canners League of California; Ronald M. Zaller, for Continental Can Company; Howard Haage, for Can Manufactures Institute; J. C. Deadman, for Fireman's Fund Insurance Company-Inland Marine Underwriters Association; Richard L. Bottini, for Motor Truck Cargo Committee of IMUA; Carl R. Rehbock, for California Fertilizer Association; E. H. Griffiths, for Aero Special Delivery Service, Inc.; <u>G. Ralph Grago</u>, by <u>James R. Foote</u>, for Associated Independent Owner Operators, Inc.; Robert L. McCue, for Kenneth C. Delaney - Los Angeles Chamber of Commerce; James S. Corazze, for Highway Carriers Association; and James Quintrall, for Los Angeles Warehousemen's Association, interested parties. G. R. Dougherty, Attorney at Law, and Theodore H. Peceimer, for the Commission staff.

<u>O P I N I O N</u>

This investigation was filed June 22, 1971 to determine whether certain highway carriers should be required to provide a minimum amount of cargo insurance.

Public hearing was held before Examiner Porter on July 13, 1971 at San Francisco and on July 20, 1971 at Los Angeles when the matter was submitted.

-1-

C. 9238 JM

The evidence presented was to the effect that all carriers contacted carried cargo insurance although the amount varied.

The proposed general order would be regulation by the Commission of an existing industry practice, assuring all shippers involved of reasonable minimum cargo insurance protection.

The staff estimated that an initial augmentation of 14 positions will be required to handle the initial phase if regulation was adopted with nine of these positions to be retained on a permanent basis.

While there were numerous appearances other than the staff, there was no strong support either for or against the proposed regulation.

Based on these facts, the Commission finds that the proposed regulation is not necessary at this time and concludes that the investigation should be discontinued.

$\underline{O} \ \underline{R} \ \underline{D} \ \underline{E} \ \underline{R}$

IT IS ORDERED that Case No. 9238 is discontinued.

		The effec	tive date of	E this order shall be twenty days after
the	date	hereof. Dated at	San Francisco	, California, this day
of .	<u>k</u> A	PRIL	, 1972.	William Chairman William Muray
				Commissioners

-2-