

Decision No. 28731.

BEFORE THE RAILROAD COMMISSION OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

In the Matter of the establishment
of rates, rules, classifications and
regulations for the transportation
of property, exclusive of property
transported in dump trucks, for com-
pensation or hire over the public
highways of the City and County of
San Francisco.

Case No. 4084

ORIGINAL

Joseph F. Vizzard for the Draymen's Association of San
Francisco.

Carl Schulz, for R.M. Steventon, San Francisco Milling Co. Ltd.
Outsen Bros. Milling Co.

Walter A. Rohde, for San Francisco Chamber of Commerce

Harry A. Encell, for The Dodd Warehouses.

J.B. Costello and N.R. Moon for Sperry Flour Company

J.L. Roney, for Sussman Wormser Company and the Equitable Cash
Grocery Co.

George A. Culbert, for General Electric Supply Co.

Richard F. Ahern, for Rosenberg Bros. and Co.

R.C. Fels, for Retail Furniture Association of California, Inc.

E.J. Heartsner, for Haas Bros.

Clifton E. Brooks, for Wholesale Grocers Assn. of California

Sanborn and Roehl, by Claire Mac Leod for Flour Dealers Assn. of
California.

K.W. Coplin, for Chas. J. Worth Drayage Co.

H.W. Hendrick, for Pacific Coastwise Conference

J.E. Lyons, A.L. Whittle, for Pacific Motor-Transport Co. and
Southern Pacific Co.

E.H. Hart, for Draymen's Association of Alameda County

J.E. Mc Curdy, for Poultry Producers of Central California

E.D. Rapp, A.H. Fox, for F.W. Woolworth Co.

N.E. Keller, for Pacific Portland Cement Co.

John J. Parker, for Bemis Bros. Bag Co.

E. Hoffman, for Baker-Hamilton & Pacific Co.

Fitzgerald, Abbott and Beardsley, by Crellin Fitzgerald for Walkup
Drayage and Warehouse Co.

DEVLIN, COMMISSIONER:

FIRST SUPPLEMENTAL OPINION

By Decision No. 28632 of March 16, 1936, in the above entitled proceeding minimum rates for the transportation of property within the limits of the City and County of San Francisco by city carriers were established to become effective April 5, 1936. On March 24, 1936, the Draymen's Association of San Francisco, hereinafter referred to as the Association, represented that certain of the rates were improper and requested a supplemental hearing. Pursuant to this request, the Commission, on March 25, 1936, reopened the proceeding for further hearing insofar as it involved these matters.

Public hearings were held at San Francisco on April 3rd and 4th, 1936.¹

The matters in issue and the Association's proposals follow:

Pool or Distribution Cars.²

The term "pool car" is used to describe a carload or quantity shipment that contains property forwarded by one or more shippers consigned to a carrier or to the shipper's representative in care of the carrier for distribution to two or more sub-consignees. When the property of more than one shipper is included in a pool car, one of the interested shippers arranges for the consolidation and forwarding of the entire lot. By means of the pool car arrangement, shippers obtain the carload or quantity rate from point of origin or consolidation to point of distribution, and thus benefit to the extent of the difference between the charges accruing under this rate and those that would accrue under rates applicable to the smaller separate shipments.

The term "pool car", as used in this proceeding, does not include shipments of concerns engaged in the consolidation and forwarding of property as a business. Such shipments will be designated as "forwarders' cars."

The original decision in this proceeding (No. 28632), did not

1. The hearing in this proceeding was consolidated with App.No.20443 in re, Application of M.S. Dodd which will be disposed of in a separate decision.
2. Throughout the hearing the terms "pool cars" and "distribution cars" were used synonymously.

establish minimum rates for the handling and distribution of pool cars for the reason that the record then before the Commission did not clearly distinguish pool cars from forwarders' cars and did not justify the establishing of specific minimum rates for pool car operations. Such operations were consequently made subject to the general basis of minimum rates. The Association alleges that the failure to provide a specific basis of minimum rates for the handling and distribution of pool cars will "prove to be of serious embarrassment." Establishment³ of the rates originally proposed is sought.

The record upon further hearing shows that pool car shipments are ordinarily consigned to a city carrier or to the shipper's representative in care of the carrier and upon arrival are sorted by the city carrier and delivered to the sub-consignees according to the manifest or list of sub-consignees with which he has been furnished. The disposition of the property by this method involves considerable handling bookkeeping and other clerical work in addition to that necessary in the ordinary drayage operation. The proposed rates are intended to compensate the carrier for the additional expense entailed in this type of operation and to permit the continuance of the handling of pool cars on a satisfactory basis. The handling and distribution of pool cars is most economically effected by confining these operations to one city carrier. The proposed rates are predicated on such handling. However,

3

The proposal contained in Exhibit "3" is as follows:

"Distribution rate- On distribution cars use next highest class. 'Pool car' distribution rates cover sorting, filling orders of two or more sizes or kinds, and/or checking of contents of cars, prorating of freight charges and/or paying and collecting same or other charges or advances. Where one or more of consignees takes delivery of goods out of pool cars at car, dock, or warehouse, a handling charge will be assessed against such goods equal to 50% of distribution charge, minimum 25¢."

to provide a basis of rates when at shipper's or consignee's request a number of carriers participate in the distribution of a pool car, the proposed penalty, amounting to 50 per cent of the distribution charge is said to be necessary to ensure adequate revenue for the carrier performing the sorting, handling and other incidental services. Exclusion of pool car shipments from the tonnages shipped per calendar month or year under rates dependent upon the transportation of certain minimum quantities is likewise asserted to be necessary to secure adequate revenue from pool car operations.

Property Transported in Competition with Railroad Switching.

The Association's proposal that city carriers be permitted to meet rail switching competition was not embodied in the schedule of minimum rates established by Decision No. 28632 supra. Approval of the suggested method of meeting rail competition was withheld until such time as a showing was made as to the volume of the rates sought and the ability of the carriers to meet them without unduly burdening other traffic.

At the further hearing witnesses for the Association testified that they have been transporting property between docks along the San Francisco water front and various locations in San Francisco served by railroad spur track facilities at rates, in many instances, equivalent to the cost of loading or unloading the property in or from cars at the docks plus the railroad switching charge. It is contended that the continuation of this practice will not unduly burden other traffic, that the failure to do so will result in a serious loss of revenue, and that it is in the public interest that the prevailing competitive situation be maintained. Several witnesses testified that the operations are being conducted at a profit. Witness Vizzard submitted as an exhibit a tariff of the Board of State Harbor Commissioners applicable at the Port of San Francisco naming switching and car rental charges of the State Belt

Railroad, and offered by reference other tariffs naming railroad switching⁴ and car loading and unloading rates.

The Association proposes that minimum rates to meet railroad switching competition be established:

- (1) Between docks and public warehouses at the cost of car loading or unloading at the dock plus the railroad switching cost plus the car loading or unloading cost at the public warehouse.
- (2) Between docks and points other than public warehouses at the cost of car loading or unloading at the dock plus railroad switching.

The costs of the loading, switching and unloading services are to be ascertained from the tariffs to which reference has hereinbefore been made.

Hourly Rates.

The record contains testimony to the effect that hourly rates are necessary to provide a suitable basis for transportation and accessorial service in connection with shipments which are described by the carriers as "unusual" and on which the assessing of charges on a weight basis would be impracticable.⁵ Such factors as difficulties in obtaining actual weights, a preponderance of stand-by or delivery time compared with the time involved in transporting property, and lack of knowledge as to a definite destination or when the vehicle will be released were

⁴ These tariffs are: Southern Pacific Company Terminal Tariff No. 230-J, C.R.C. No. 3183; California Stevedore & Ballast Company Tariff No. 1, C.R.C. No. 1 of J.P. Williams, Agent; Pacific Coastwise Freight Tariff Bureau Terminal Tariff No. 14-B, C.R.C. No. 25, of John Byrne, Agent; and California Warehouse Tariff Bureau Tariff No. 1-E, C.R.C. No. 83, of L.A. Bailey, Agent.

⁵ Representative illustrations are: Vehicles assigned to motion picture units "on location" in San Francisco; vehicles assigned to parades; the transportation of the stock and equipment of stores; and transfer of office records.

urged as justifying an hourly basis for these services.

Rule 5(a), Paragraph 1.

Decision No. 28632 supra, does not provide rates on household goods, furniture, personal effects, musical instruments, radios, office and store fixtures and equipment for the reason that rates on these commodities were before the Commission in Case No. 4086. The Association now points out that insofar as San Francisco is concerned the testimony in Case No. 4086 dealt primarily with the transportation of used articles. It seeks the establishment of the rates proposed in Exhibit "3" for these commodities when new. To support the contention that insofar as new articles are concerned, rates should be established in this proceeding rather than in Case No. 4086, witnesses for the Association testified that in San Francisco these articles, when new, are normally transported by draymen rather than by movers, and that a weight basis rather than an hourly basis (as proposed in Case No. 4086) is needed to fit the transportation services performed in handling these commodities.

Rule 65.

Rule 65 of Exhibit "A" in Decision No. 28632 supra, provides a charge to be assessed for the collection of loss and/or damage claims of 1 per cent of the amount involved, minimum charge \$1.00. The Association contends that this minimum charge is too high for the service rendered and requests amendment to a minimum of 25 cents and a maximum of \$1.00, or the establishment of \$1.00 as a maximum charge with no provision for a minimum. It is asserted that 25 cents will cover the cost of handling many of these claims.

Rule 75.

Rule 75 defines technical terms and includes a definition of the term "pick-ups."⁶ This definition is assailed as being improper.

⁶

"Pick-ups, as used in Items 70 and 75, means transportation of property from retailers or consumers to warehouses, wholesale grocery houses or mills."

It is suggested that it be changed to read: "Pick-ups, as used herein, means the picking up of property at one or more places and delivering it to another place or places within the City and County of San Francisco."
Classification.

The classification of articles originally proposed by the Association and established by Decision No. 28632, supra, provides a fourth class rating for green coffee; a third class rating for rough sole leather; and a fifth class rating for flour, cereal products and feed, inhaul. The Commission is now requested to revise these ratings, which are said to have been proposed inadvertently, to the ratings which the Association intended to propose, viz., fifth class on green coffee; second class on rough sole leather; and to limit cereal products to products which require cooking.

The record shows that prior to the establishment of the minimum rates, coffee and leather were transported on the basis of the revised ratings. In the light of past experience these ratings are said to be proper for the transportation of these commodities. Cereal products which do not require cooking because of their transportation characteristics, normally take higher ratings than those assigned to products requiring cooking.

Item 10.

The only change sought in this item is the exclusion of "property out of pool or distribution cars." This matter has been discussed under the heading "Pool or Distribution Cars."

Item 25.

Item 25 establishes minimum rates for steamship transfer and provides a first class rating for heavy lifts. The term "heavy lifts" is not defined in Exhibit "A". The Association requests that it be defined as "package weighing 6,000 pounds or more." This is said to be

in conformity with the usage in steamship tariffs.

Item 30.

Decision No. 28632 supra, provides three rate bases for the transportation of property for wholesale grocery houses, the controlling factor being the quantity handled.⁷ It is contended by the Association that the rating prescribed by Item 30, viz., fifth class, is unduly low; that it should be increased to fourth class; and that paper and paper goods should be excluded from the articles to be transported under this rating. Evidence in support of these contentions is meagre and of little probative value.

Items 35, 40 and 45.

Items 35, 40 and 45 prescribe charges for property transported under class rates as low as 25 cents for small shipments of fourth and fifth class articles. The Association contends that carriers cannot handle this traffic profitably and seeks an increase to a minimum charge of 35 cents.

Shipments of less than 6,000 pounds transported under class rates and containing articles taking different ratings have been transported by city carriers in the past, it was testified, at the rating provided for the highest classed article in the shipment, but not to exceed the charge resulting from rating each article as a separate shipment. The items, however, contain no rule to this effect.

Items 70 and 75.

The Association seeks amendment of Items 70 and 75 to provide a uniform description of "Flour, Cereal Products requiring cooking, and Feed" for the same reasons as advanced for the requested change of classification description hereinbefore discussed.

Item 75 provides a charge of 75 cents for shipments of 1 to

⁷ They are: Item 125, subject to a minimum tonnage of 1,000 tons per calendar month; Item 30, subject to a minimum tonnage of 400 tons per calendar month and the general basis of rates in Exhibit "A", subject to varying minima.

600 points. On shipments of 300 pounds or less this charge is said to be excessive. It is suggested that this be changed to 50 cents for shipments weighing 300 pounds or less and 75 cents for shipments weighing 301 to 600 pounds.

Item 95.

In Item 95, the Commission inadvertently prescribed for "Parcel City Delivery (wholesale)" a rate of 20 cents per 100 pounds for each additional 40 pounds or fraction thereof over the first 40 pounds. The Association seeks revision of this item so as to provide a schedule of rates for this service on the basis of the shipment rather than the package and on shipments of over 40 pounds a charge of 20 cents for each additional 40 pounds. Such a basis is said to have in the past provided a suitable rate structure for this type of service and to have proved remunerative to the carriers engaged in this operation.

Item 110.

Item 110 established rates for the transportation of refrigerators in city delivery service based upon the capacity of the refrigerator. This item provided that on refrigerators of over 6 cu. ft. capacity a minimum rate of \$4.00 each should be assessed. A witness for the Association testified that this charge on large refrigerators is not sufficient to return the cost of performing the service. He stated that the Association's proposed rate basis contemplated inside delivery at the place where the refrigerator is to be installed, that the item should apply only to refrigerators of the mechanical or gas types, and suggested that the \$4.00 rate should be established for refrigerators over 6 cu. ft. and not over 9 cu. ft. He proposes a basis of \$1.25 per man per hour for refrigerators with a capacity of over 9 cu. ft.

We turn now to a discussion of testimony of interested parties other than those represented by the Association.

A witness representing the Pacific Coastwise Conference, a group of steamship operators, endorsed the city carriers' proposal re-

specting the establishing of rates to meet railroad switching, on the theory that a disturbance of the competitive rate situation by increasing drayage rates between the docks and warehouses and industries served by rail facilities would tend to divert property now transported by water to land movement. The proposal was also supported by a shipper forwarding and receiving a large tonnage of water borne traffic. This shipper expressed a preference for delivery by truck but would not pay rates substantially higher than the railroad rates for the convenience of the truck deliveries.

A witness representing the Retail Furniture Association of California, Inc., supported the draymen's contention that the new furniture rates of city carriers should be on a weight basis. He expressed no dissatisfaction with the proposed rates.

Shippers who testified did not agree with the Association's proposal with respect to Item 30; neither do they agree among themselves as to what these rates should be. Exhibit A-4, introduced by a witness for the Wholesale Grocers' Association, shows that only two firms employing city carriers to perform their draying have monthly tonnage within the 400 to 1,000 ton range. In the opinion of this witness, the minimum tonnage specified in Item 30 should be reduced to 200 or preferably to 100 tons per calendar month in order to provide a satisfactory basis for the smaller houses in the Wholesale Grocers' group. The larger houses in the group protested the establishment of rates for city deliveries in Item 30 lower than those provided by Item 125.

In addition to the changes in the rates prescribed in Items 70 and 75 sought by the Association, these rates have been assailed by shippers. They are said to be unsuitable to the prevailing conditions under which these articles are transported. A witness for the Flour Dealers' Association of San Francisco testified that in his opinion unless rates for city deliveries were equalized, the smaller flour dealers would

be subjected to undue discrimination in favor of larger dealers and as a result there would be a tendency to concentrate the flour business in the hands of the large mills. A city carrier performing drayage for some of the smaller flour dealers testified to substantially the same effect.

The propriety of the Association's proposed revision of Item 110 was challenged by a shipper handling mechanical refrigerators of 7 cu. ft. capacity. He seeks the same rate as now obtains on refrigerators of 6 cu. ft. capacity but introduced no evidence to justify this proposal.

A representative of Rosenberg Bros. and Company testified concerning the rating of rice and rice mill products in lots of less than 20,000 pounds. However, this rating is provided in Item 20 which is not in issue in this further hearing.

Proposed charges other than those individually discussed were not opposed.

It is now evident from the record in this proceeding that pool cars and forwarders' cars, as the terms are here used, are of a different character. The question of jurisdiction discussed in the Opinion in Decision No. 28632 supra, citing Adler vs. Railroad Commission LA 15053 appears to be involved only insofar as it relates to drayage performed in connection with the distribution of forwarders' cars. Under the freight forwarding arrangement the shipper contracts with the forwarding company to transport the property to the consignee's store-door, whereas under the pool car arrangement the shipper contracts with the carrier to transport the car to the drayman, or to his representative in care of the drayman. Under such arrangements it seems evident that continuity of movement is broken at San Francisco and that the transportation in San Francisco by city carriers is undoubtedly subject to the jurisdiction of this Commission. The record justifies the establish-

ment of the rates sought.

The testimony at the further hearing has shown the necessity from the city carriers' standpoint of being in a position to compete with railroad switching in the transportation of property between docks and public warehouses or other facilities served by railroad spur tracks.⁸ The record made justifies the establishment of minimum rates between docks and industries and warehouses directly served by railroad spur track facilities, based on the total of the existing car loading or unloading costs at the docks plus the railroad switching rates. When forwarded from or received at a public warehouse the car loading or unloading at public warehouses should also be added. These costs should be the same as those provided in tariffs on file with this Commission, and in the schedule of rates of the State Board of Harbor Commissioners.

The Association's proposal that hourly rates be established for the handling of "unusual shipments" has little to recommend it except that from a practical standpoint it is sometimes difficult to obtain actual weights. In such instances there is a need for this hourly basis. However, it should be limited in such a manner so as to restrict the hourly rates to "unusual shipments" of the type contemplated in the Association's proposal. Such hourly rates should not be permitted to alternate with rates on a weight basis.

The Association's contention that new furniture and related articles have in the past been handled satisfactorily on a weight basis and the further fact that shippers and carriers agree that the weight basis should be continued, leads to the conclusion that the rates proposed by the Association for these articles should be established.

8 The following is a quotation from the original Opinion:
"No showing has been made, however, as to the volume of these switching rates or as to the ability of the carriers herein involved to meet them without unduly burdening other traffic. Unless and until such a showing is made, the Commission should not approve the proposed rule."

The definition of the term "pick-ups" in Rule 75 (c) is limited to the use of that term in Items 70 and 75. The Order herein will amend these items in such a manner as to no longer use this term. The definition should consequently be eliminated.

As observed in the Opinion in Decision No. 26832 supra, there is a necessity for rates of a volume low enough to retain the drayage business of concerns handling large quantities of property to the city carriers. If such rates are not established, the record shows that there would be a tendency for these shippers to make arrangements to transport their property by means of shipper-owned trucks. There is, however, in this record no showing that city carriers' revenue for the transportation of commodities for wholesale grocery houses at the fifth class rating in quantities of 100 or 200 tons per calendar month would return them something above costs. Indeed, it is evident that the city carriers do not believe that 400 ton quantities can be handled profitably at the fifth class rating. It seems obvious that city deliveries for wholesale grocery houses handling 400 tons per calendar month cannot be handled at lower costs than the deliveries of houses handling in excess of 1,000 tons. Insofar as city deliveries are concerned, rates no lower than those prescribed in Item 125 should be established. No justification for the amendment of the other provisions of this item has been shown.

With respect to the rates in Items 70 and 75, a city delivery rate based on the size of the shipments rather than on the minimum quantity transported during a given period of time would apparently be the most satisfactory basis for both carriers and shippers. These rates should be exempted from the provisions of Rule 5(b). As to in-haul drayage, there is a willingness to subscribe to the theory that those shippers transporting these commodities in large quantities are entitled to benefit from the reduced carrier costs resulting from the handling of the larger volume. Throughout the tariff a uniform

description of these commodities is needed, according to the record, the suggested description being "flour, cereal products requiring cooking and feed." On this record a "grasshopper scale" of rates for these commodities applicable to shipping and city deliveries applying on the weight per shipment without regard to the monthly tonnage and not subject to Rule 5(b) should be substituted for the prevailing rates. For inhaul drayage in quantities of not less than 750 tons per calendar month, the established minimum rate of 70 cents per ton should remain unchanged. Except for the above discussed services, the record indicates that the classification basis should prevail for all other operations involving these commodities.

On this record the minimum rates in Item 110 insofar as city deliveries of refrigerators of over 9 cu. ft. storage capacity is concerned are shown to be inadequate and no good reason for extending the rate on refrigerators of 6 cu. ft. storage capacity to 7 cu. ft has been shown. The rates proposed by the Association should be approved. So also should the proposals which have been unopposed.

The following form of Order is recommended.

O R D E R

The matter having been duly heard and submitted,

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that Exhibit "A" of Decision No. 29632, dated March 16, 1936, in the above entitled proceeding be and it is hereby amended as follows:

Original page 5, Rule 5(a), Note 1:

Insert before the word "household" the words
"Used articles, namely,"

Original page 6, Rule 5:

Add new paragraph "(e) When a shipment of 6,000 pounds or less contains articles of different classification, charges will be assessed at the rating provided for the highest classed article in the shipment, but not to exceed charges resulting from rating each article as a separate shipment."

Original page 9, Rule 65:

Substitute the following rule: "A minimum charge of \$1.00 will be made for the handling and collection of loss and/or damage claims against another carrier when the amount involved exceeds \$100.00. When the amount involved is \$100.00 or less, 1% of the amount involved will be charged subject to a minimum of \$.25."

Rule 75(b):

Substitute the following rule: City delivery or city deliveries means transportation of property to retailers or consumers.

Rule 75(c):

Eliminate.

Original Page 10, Rule 75:

Add new paragraph, "(h) Heavy lifts means packages or pieces weighing 6,000 pounds or more."

Original Page 11:

Add entries, "Barbers' Chairs 1," "Cabinets, NOS 1 $\frac{1}{2}$."

Original Page 12:

Change rating of coffee, green, from "4" to "5".
Add entry, "Desks D 1."

Original Page 13:

Change description of articles reading, "flour, cereal products and feed in packages, inhaul," to read "cereal products requiring cooking, feed and flour in packages, inhaul." Add entry "Furniture NOS, wrapped or crated D1."

Original Page 14:

Change rating of leather, rough sole, from "3" to "2".

Original Page 15:

Add entry "Radios 1."

Original Page 18, Item 5:

Add to note a new paragraph, "(c) Will not apply to commodities distributed from pool cars."

Item 10:

Add to note a new paragraph "Will not apply to commodities distributed from pool cars."

Item 25:

Amend "See Rule No. 75(g)" to read "See Rule No.75(g) and (h)."

Item 30:

Add after the word "consignee," subject to note add note "(a) Will not apply to city deliveries. (b) Will not apply to commodities distributed from pool cars."

Original Page 19, Item 35:

Change 4th Class rate for 100 pounds and under from ".30" to ".35"; change 5th Class rate of ".25" for 200 pounds and under and ".30" for over 200 pounds to 350 pounds to ".35".

Original Page 20, Item 40:

Change 4th Class rate for 100 pounds and under from ".30" to ".35"; 5th Class rate of ".25" for 100 pounds and under and ".30" rate for over 100 pounds to 200 pounds to ".35".

Original Page 21, Item 45:

Change 5th Class rate for 100 pounds and under from ".25" to ".35".

Original Page 22:

Under general heading "Commodity Rates" add "Will not apply to commodities distributed from pool cars."

Item 60:

After the word "Commodity" and before the word "transported" insert "exclusive of furniture."

Item 70:

Substitute the following item: "Cereal Products, requiring cooking, Feed and Flour in quantities of not less than 750 tons per calendar month, inhaul, .70 per ton."

Item 75:

Substitute the following item: Cereal Products, requiring cooking, Feed and Flour in packages, City Deliveries, subject to note.

	400 pounds and under	\$.50 per shipment
Over	400 pounds to 800 pounds	\$.75 " "
"	800 " " 1200 "	\$1.00 " "
"	1200 " " 2000 "	\$1.75 " "
"	2000 " " 2800 "	\$2.50 " "
"	2800 " " 4400 "	\$3.50 " "
"	4400 " " 6000 "	\$4.50 " "
"	6000 " "	\$.07 $\frac{1}{2}$ " 100 pounds.

NOTE: (a) Not subject to Rule 5 (b)
(b) Will not apply to sidewalk, platform or truckside city deliveries when lower rates are otherwise provided herein.

Original Page 23, Item 95:

Eliminate "packages" before numeral "1" and after .20 change "per package" to "per shipment"; eliminate "per 100 lbs." following .20 rate for each additional 40 pounds or fraction thereof.

Item 110:

Substitute the following item: "Refrigerators, equipped with cooling or refrigerating apparatus of either mechanical, gas, gasoline, or oil flame type, city delivery, not subject to Rule 5(b)"

6 cu. ft. or less storage capacity	\$3.00 each
Over 6 cu. ft. and not over 9 cu. ft.		
storage capacity	\$4.00 each
" 9 cu. ft. storage capacity	See Note

NOTE: Rate on refrigerators over 9 cu. ft. storage capacity \$1.25 per man per hour.

Original Page 24:

Add to commodity rates a new item:

City Deliveries of New Office Furniture, viz., not subject to Rule 5(b)

	Single	First Additional	Second Additional and over	Additional
36" Desks	\$.75 each	\$.75 each	\$.50 each	
Glass tops for same	.25 "	.25 "	.25 "	
42" Desks	1.00 "	.75 "	.75 "	
Glass tops for same	.50 "	.50 "	.50 "	
50" to 60" Desks	1.25 "	1.00 "	1.00 "	
Glass tops for same	.75 "	.75 "	.50 "	
60" and over Desks	1.75 "	1.50 "	1.50 "	
Glass tops for same	1.00 "	.75 "	.75 "	
Tables 42"	.50 "	.50 "	.50 "	
" 60"	.75 "	.75 "	.50 "	
" 66" and 72"	1.00 "	1.00 "	.75 "	
Glass tops for tables same as Desk Glass Tops.				

Kardex Cabinets (Under 100 lbs.)	\$.50 each	\$.50 each	\$.25 each
Kardex Cabinets (Over 100 lbs.)	.75 "	.50 "	.25 "
Letter Files (1 to 3 drawer)	.50 "	.50 "	.25 "
Letter Files (4 drawer)	.75 "	.75 "	.50 "
Transfer Cases (1 and 2)	.50 "		
Transfer Cases (3 and 4)	.75 "		.15 "
Chairs	.25 "		
Telephone Stands	.25 "		
Costumers	.25 "		

Time placing furniture - - - \$1.00 per quarter hour-
Minimum \$.50

Add to commodity rates a new item:

Commodities transported for Wholesale Grocery Houses
in quantities of not less than 400 tons per calendar
month, city deliveries:

	250 lbs or less	\$.25 per shipment	
Over 250 to and incl. 1,800 lbs.	.10 "	100 lbs.	
" 1800 to and incl. 2,000 lbs.	1.80 "	shipment.	
" 2000 to and incl. 5,000 lbs.	.09 "	100 lbs.	
" 5000 to and incl. 6,000 lbs.	4.50 "	shipment.	
" 6,000 lbs.	.07½ "	100 lbs.	

Original Page 25:

Add a new Item:

Rates for Transportation on Hourly Truck Unit Basis
(Including driver and all other operating expenses)

See Note.

Capacity

1 ton or less.....	\$2.00 per hour
Over 1 " and not over 2½ tons.....	2.25 " "
" 2½ " " " 3½ "	2.50 " "
" 3½ " " " 5 "	3.00 " "
" 5 " " " 7½ "	3.50 " "
" 7½ tons.....	4.00 " "

- NOTE: (a) Rates named in this item apply during regular working hours. See Rule 25.
- (b) Subject to Rule 50 when Labor in addition to the driver is required.
- (c) Rates named in this item apply only on "unusual shipments." An "unusual shipment" is one where no actual or accurate estimated weight can be secured; where there is either no definite point of destination or specific time for loading or unloading and/or releasing the vehicle.

Original Page 25 (Cont'd)

Add a new item:

Property transported by city carriers between docks or wharves on the one hand and warehouses and industries directly served by railroad spur track facilities on the other, inhaul or shipping.

- (1) Between docks or wharves and public warehouses, the minimum charge shall be the sum of the loading or unloading charge at the dock or wharf plus railroad switching and car rental rates plus loading or unloading charge at the public warehouse. See Note.
- (2) Between docks or wharves and industries and between docks or wharves and warehouses, other than public warehouses, the minimum charge shall be the sum of the loading or unloading charge at the dock or wharf plus railroad switching and car rental rates. See Note.

NOTE: (a) Loading or unloading at the dock or wharf: on coastwise traffic shall be at the rates published in Pacific Coastwise Freight Tariff Bureau Terminal Tariff No.14-B, C.R.C. No.25 of John Byrne, Agent, amendments thereto and reissue thereof; other than coastwise traffic shall be at the rates published in California Steve-dore & Ballast Company Tariff No. 1, C.R.C. No. 1, of J.P.Williams, Agent, amendments thereto and reissues thereof.

(b) Railroad switching and car rental rates shall be as published in Board of State Harbor Commissioners Tariff Charges No.2, I.C.C. Tariff No. 1 and the tariffs of rail carriers lawfully on file with the Commission, amendments and supplements thereto and reissues thereof.

(c) Loading or unloading at public warehouses shall be as published in California Warehouse Tariff Bureau Tariff 1-E, C.R.C. No. 83 of L.A.Bailey, Agent, amendments thereto and reissues thereof.

Add a new item:

Handling and Distribution of Pool Cars

(Subject to Note)

Rates for the handling and distribution of pool cars by city carriers shall be as follows:

- (1) When the property is transported to sub-consignees by the carrier performing the sorting and other accessorial services, charges shall be assessed at ratings one class higher than the ratings otherwise applicable.
- (2) When the property is transported to sub-consignee by a city carrier other than the carrier performing the sorting and other accessorial services, a charge for these accessorial services amounting to 50% of the charge provided in paragraph (1) shall be assessed.

NOTE: The term "pool car" as used herein means a carload or quantity shipment consigned to or in care of a city carrier for distribution to two or more sub-consignees.

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that in all other respects
Decision No. 28632 shall remain in full force and effect.

The effective date of this order shall be April 27, 1936.

The foregoing Opinion and Order are hereby approved
and ordered filed as the Opinion and Order of the Railroad
Commission of the State of California.

Dated at San Francisco, California, this 20th day
of April, 1936.

M B Lewis
Leon Anthony
M J Lee
Walter Brown
Frank R. Denny
Commissioners