



FILED
7-13-16
11:23 AM

HSY/ek4 7/13/2016

BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

Application of PropSF, LLC for authority to operate as a scheduled vessel common carrier between points in Redwood City, Alameda City, San Rafael, Emeryville, Oakland, San Leandro, and San Francisco and to establish a Zone of Rate Freedom.

Application 15-08-014
(Filed August 17, 2015)

And Related Matter.

Application 15-12-021

ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE'S RULING SEEKING ADDITIONAL INFORMATION REGARDING TIDELINE MARINE GROUP, INC.'S REQUEST FOR AUTHORITY TO PROVIDE WATER TAXI SERVICE

In addition to authority to operate as a scheduled vessel common carrier, Tideline Marine Group, Inc. (Tideline) seeks authority to operate as an unscheduled, on-call water taxi service. I direct Tideline to address the following questions regarding this matter.

1. In its application at footnote 2 and repeated at page 5, Tideline states, "The Commission has awarded [certificates of public convenience and necessity (CPCNs)] to applicants seeking to provide 'water taxi' service, comparable to [transportation charter party carrier (TCP)] service in the context of ground transportation, even though by any application of the traditional criteria governing the distinction between common and contract carriage, 'water taxi' service is embraced in the latter group."
 - a. What is the "traditional criteria governing the distinction between common and contract carriage" to which Tideline refers? Provide citation to appropriate authority.

- b. Provide citations to the referenced Commission decisions awarding CPCNs to applicants seeking to provide “water taxi” service.
2. Tideline states that it “does not believe that it currently provides any common carrier services for which authority would be required pursuant to [Pub. Util. Code] Section 1007. To the extent any doubt exists on that point, it would be rendered moot by the provision of the authority sought herein.” (Application, p.4.) Tideline also states that it has been operating in the San Francisco Bay as a for-hire vessel carrier registered with the Commission since August 21, 2012. (Application, p. 14.)
 - a. What are the differences, if any, in the water taxi service that Tideline has been operating since 2012 and the water taxi service for which it seeks authority in this application?
 - b. What is the basis for Tideline’s belief that its current services do not require authority pursuant to Section 1007? Please include citation to Commission decisions that may support Tideline’s belief.

Tideline is directed to file a response to this ruling by no later than July 22, 2016.

IT IS SO RULED.

Dated July 13, 2016, at San Francisco, California.

/s/ HALLIE YACKNIN
Hallie Yacknin
Administrative Law Judge