

Decision No. 29723.

BEFORE THE RAILROAD COMMISSION OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

In the Matter of the Investigation and Suspension by the Commission on its own motion of reduced rates published by The Atchison, Topeka and Santa Fe Railway Company, Southern Pacific Company, and Pacific Freight Tariff Bureau, L. F. Potter, Alternate Agent, for the transportation of beverages and tonics between San Francisco and Los Angeles and other points in California.)

ORIGINAL

Case No. 4137.

In the Matter of the Investigation and Suspension by the Commission on its own motion of reduced rates published by Pacific Freight Tariff Bureau, L. F. Potter, Alternate Agent, for the transportation of beverages and tonics between San Francisco and Los Angeles and other points in California.)

Case No. 4141.

In the Matter of the Establishment of maximum or minimum, or maximum and minimum rates, rules and regulations of all Radial Highway Common Carriers and Highway Contract Carriers, operating motor vehicles over the public highways of the State of California, pursuant to Chapter 223, Statutes of 1935, for the transportation for compensation or hire of any and all commodities, and accessorial services incident to such transportation.)

Case No. 4088

Part "B".

Appearances in Cases Nos. 4137 and 4141

James E. Lyons and Gerald E. Duffy, for respondents.
Edward M. Berol and Roy B. Thompson, for Truck Owners' Association of California.
W. G. Stone, for Sacramento Chamber of Commerce.

H. W. Hendrick for Pacific Coastwise Conference.
F. J. Wible for California State Brewers Institute.
G. E. Crocker for Rainier Brewing Company.
M. H. Murray for Golden West Brewing Company.

BY THE COMMISSION:

O P I N I O N

In Cases Nos. 4137 and 4141, the Commission suspended certain schedules filed by The Atchison, Topeka and Santa Fe Railway Company, Southern Pacific Company and Pacific Freight Tariff Bureau, L. F. Potter, Alternate Agent,¹ naming reduced rates for the transportation of beverages and tonics² between San Francisco, Oakland, Alameda, Sacramento and Stockton on the one hand and San Diego and points in the Los Angeles Area³ on the other hand.

In Part "B" of Case No. 4088 the Commission heretofore established minimum rates for the transportation of the same commodities by radial highway common and highway contract carriers between

1

The particular schedules involved are:

(a) Items 1490-G, 1490-B and 1510-A of The Atchison, Topeka and Santa Fe Railway Company Tariff No. 12375-0, C.R.C. No. 690; Items 1155-J, 1160-P and 1170-V of Southern Pacific Company Tariff No. 730-D, C.R.C. No. 3353; and Items 1260-B, 1270-B, 1280-B, 1290-B, 1310-B and 1340-B, Supplement No. 17, of Pacific Freight Tariff Bureau Tariff No. 30-N, C.R.C. No. 592, of L. F. Potter, Alternate Agent, in Case No. 4137.

(b) Items 1485-B, 1490-A, 1495-B, 1500-A, 1505-A, 1510-A, 1560-A and 1570-A, Supplement No. 97, of Pacific Freight Tariff Bureau Tariff No. 34-0, C.R.C. No. 556, of L. F. Potter, Alternate Agent, in Case No. 4141.

The above schedules were suspended upon representation made by the Pacific Coastwise Conference that the proposed rates were unduly low and detrimental to their interests.

² The beverage and tonic group involved in these proceedings includes a number of commodities, but the principal ones from the standpoint of volume and traffic importance are malt beverages, particularly beer.

³ The term "Los Angeles Area" as used in this decision includes Los Angeles, Wingfoot, Long Beach, Los Angeles Harbor, Wilmington, Redondo Beach, Los Nietos, Anaheim, Santa Ana, Alhambra, Pasadena, South Pasadena, East Whittier, Bastanchury, Duarte, Pomona, Colton, Riverside, San Bernardino, Beverly Hills, Covina, Fullerton, Harlem Springs, Ocean Park, Olive, Orange, Santa Monica, Stern, Temple City, Venice, Hollywood, El Segundo, Torrance, East Long Beach, Hermosa Beach, Motordrome, Culver City, Alsace, Mesmer, Inglewood, Valley Glen, Glendora, Lone Hill, San Dimas and Teague.

San Francisco and Oakland on the one hand and Los Angeles and Fresno on the other hand.

All three of these matters were heard before Examiner Howard G. Freas at San Francisco on March 18 and 20, 1937. The hearings in the suspension proceedings were had for the purpose of determining the reasonableness, lawfulness and propriety of the suspended rates; those in Part "B" of Case No. 4088 for the purpose of determining what changes or modifications, if any, were necessary and justified in the rates heretofore established.

The rates prescribed and in effect for transportation by radial highway common and highway contract carriers, those now in effect for transportation by the rail lines and those under suspension, are shown in the following tabulation:

(Rates are in cents per 100 pounds.)

BETWEEN San Francisco, Oakland, Alameda, Sacramento and Stockton -----	Minimum rates established by Dec. No. 29530 for radial highway common and highway contract carriers.		Present Rail Rates		Suspended Rail Rates	
	Rate	Min. Wt. (Pounds)	Rate	Min. Wt. (Pounds)	Rate	Min. Wt. (Pounds)
AND						
Los Angeles	* 25	18,000	# 25	30,000	# 20	40,000
Fresno	* 12	18,000	-	-	-	-
San Diego	-	-	30	30,000	25	40,000

* Applies from and to San Francisco and Oakland.

Applies from and to points in the Los Angeles Area.

The rail lines made no attempt to justify the rates under suspension, but proposed to withdraw them and to publish in lieu thereof rates of the same volume based upon a minimum weight of 50,000 pounds.

They contend that rates lower than those established for highway carriers are necessary to enable the rail lines to secure a fair share of the traffic. They assert that at a parity of rates truck carriers have several definite advantages, due to the fact that they may,

without additional charge, (1) render a split delivery or stopping in transit service, (2) render a more flexible and rapid service, and (3) carry the shippers' advertising on their vehicles. The rates proposed, they argue, are sufficiently high to return the cost of transportation and are necessary to meet proprietary competition. They introduced an exhibit (No. 15) purporting to show that, because of their alleged disadvantages, they handled only a small part of the tonnage available between the points herein involved.⁴

Witness Nelson, testifying for the rail lines, stated that the use of split delivery service by motor truck affords the breweries an expanded distribution of their products at point of destination without additional expense over the transportation rate, whereas by rail the same distribution could only be accomplished at an added expense through the use of rail car switching service at published tariff rates or by local drayage service. He directed attention to the contrast between the on-call overnight truck service between San Francisco Bay cities and Los Angeles and the slower rail service, but expressed no opinion as to what monetary value if any this difference in time represents to the shipper.

In an effort to develop the cost or value of motor truck advertising, witness Nelson caused a study to be made by the rail carriers. Based upon this study he expressed the opinion that advertising of the shipper's product upon a motor truck unit has a value, founded upon circulation, of approximately \$93.00 per month. Engaging

⁴ The figures shown by the exhibit are as follows:

<u>Shipper</u>	<u>Per cent of Traffic by Water Carriers</u>	<u>Per cent of Traffic by Rail Carriers</u>	<u>Per cent of Traffic by Truck Carriers</u>
General Brewing Co.	---	10	90
Regal Amber Brewing Co.	---	12	88
Rainier Brewing Co.	20	75	5
San Francisco Brewing Co.	25	5	70
Golden West Brewing Co.	5	19	76

in the assumption that such a motor vehicle unit would be in actual operation on the road approximately two-thirds of each month, he suggested as an accessorial charge for this advertising service the sum of \$62.00 per vehicle per month. The witness pointed out that stationary highway billboards, which his study disclosed have a lower advertising value than moving signs, cost the advertiser at least \$23.75 per board per month.⁵

As additional justification for the proposed rates, the rails assert that brewery shippers have represented to them that if the proposed reductions are not effected the traffic will be diverted from the rail lines. It is said that the northern California breweries are considering the erection of brewing plants in southern California; the shipping of unfermented brew (wort) in tank cars for bottling at destination; and the purchase of trucks for proprietary transportation.

Clarence E. Day, Engineer of the Bureau of Transportation Research of the Southern Pacific Company, introduced an exhibit (No. 21) showing the estimated costs of transporting beverages and tonics in lots of 50,000 pounds between San Francisco, Oakland and Sacramento on the one hand and Long Beach (used as a representative point beyond Los Angeles) on the other hand. This study indicates that the proposed rates are more than sufficient to return the out-of-pocket cost of transportation by Southern Pacific Company.

Witnesses for the northern California breweries testified that if the proposed rates are not permitted to become effective they will consider the erection of breweries in southern California, or the purchase of trucks for proprietary hauling. They stated that split delivery service and advertising as rendered by truck carriers are of

5

This is the figure paid by the Southern Pacific Company for stationary highway billboards and is based upon a large number of signs maintained by a commercial firm under a three year contract.

value to them, and that these factors are given consideration in selecting the mode of transportation.⁶

The proposed rail rates were opposed by the Pacific Coastwise Conference and by The Truck Owners Association of California. Witness Hendrick, testifying for the Conference, stated that if the proposed rates, which he believes to be non-compensatory, are permitted to become effective the coastwise steamer lines will be deprived of the beverage traffic they now enjoy between San Francisco Bay cities and Los Angeles Harbor and San Diego, as none of these lines is in a financial position to publish rates sufficiently low to meet the proposed rates. He also called attention to the additional handling required, with consequent additional cost to the shipper, when movement is by vessel and shipper or consignee is not located directly on the waterfront.

The Truck Owners Association of California contend that the proposed rates are materially below the cost of performing the same transportation service by motor truck. Witness Kentner, called on behalf of the Association, introduced an exhibit showing the cost to the Ruber Transportation Company, one of the larger highway contract carriers engaged in this service, of transporting beer between San Francisco and Los Angeles during the year 1936. This carrier operates diesel-powered semi-trailer units. A load factor of 78.5 per cent was experienced. In this study a cost of 25.95 cents per 100 pounds is shown. In the light of other studies introduced in this phase of Case No. 4088 the cost developed in this study does not seem to be excessive.⁷

⁶ A witness for Rainier Brewing Company stated that they would not permit a truck to leave their plant without such advertising, and other witnesses said that preference was always given to vehicles carrying their advertising. It appears that shippers do not hesitate to pay the cost of painting advertising on the truck equipment, which is estimated to be not less than \$75.00 per unit.

⁷ In addition, see Decision No. 29529 (Application No. 20535 and related proceedings) showing an estimated cost of 32 cents per 100 pounds for the transportation of beverages in lots of not less than 40,000 pounds in diesel equipment between San Francisco and Los Angeles.

The record is far from convincing that the proposed reductions in the rail rates on beverages and tonics between the points involved in these proceedings will have the desired effect of placing the rails in a better position to secure a greater share of this traffic. They concede that under a parity of transportation rates with the trucks they cannot hope to improve their competitive position. If the proposed rates are permitted to become effective, a corresponding adjustment in the level of the established minimum rates for the trucks must also be made.⁸ Thus the present relationship in transportation rates as between the rails and trucks will remain the same. Moreover, the coastwise carriers could not hope to compete profitably with the rails and trucks under the proposed rates.⁹ The only reasonable assumption that is supported by the evidence and can be engaged in under these circumstances is that if the proposed rates were permitted to become effective the water lines would lose the portion of the traffic they now enjoy, leaving the trucks and rails to divide the total tonnage in about the same ratio as the latter carriers now participate in the land-borne tonnage.

It is apparent, therefore, that if appropriate charges be established for the accessorial services customarily performed by radial highway common and highway contract carriers the proposed rates are not justified by actual competitive transportation rates of competing for-

8

Section 10 of Chapter 223, Statutes of 1935, provides " * * * In event the Commission establishes minimum rates for transportation services by highway carriers, such rates shall not exceed the current rates of common carriers for the transportation of the same kind of property between the same points * * *."

9

Commenting on the financial condition of these carriers in Decision No. 29529, supra, the Commission said: "The seriousness of the situation is supported by the fact that in 1934, there were seven water carriers operating solely in the California intrastate trade, while at the time of filing this application (No. 20535) only one remained. * * *." Four interstate lines were providing service at the time the application was filed, two of which were operating under the protection of Section 77(B) of the National Bankruptcy Act, and in July, 1936, one of the latter ceased operating altogether.

hire carriers.¹⁰

Furthermore, it is not apparent that the proposed rates are necessary to dissuade the breweries from erecting plants at consuming points. The record shows that the traffic is moving freely under the present rates, and it seems highly questionable whether the proposed adjustment, standing alone, would have a material effect upon a shipper's decision to establish additional plants.¹¹

Finally, the possibility of proprietary hauling cannot on this record be said to justify the establishment of rates as low as those proposed. It is significant that there is no indication in this record that any of the shippers are transporting any beverage and tonic traffic between the points in issue at the present time.

Reasonable and proper charges should be established for accessorial services rendered by highway carriers. Indeed, the Highway Carriers' Act directs the Commission to do so. Such services are of value to the shippers, are an added expense to the carriers, and are an important influence in the routing of traffic.

This record does not suggest that so-called split pick-up service is rendered in connection with the transportation here involved, but it does show that split delivery is a service that is frequently required. Minimum charges for split delivery service have heretofore been established upon adequate records in other phases of Case No. 4088, and no reason appears why uniform charges for the same service would not be proper here.

¹⁰ Minimum rates for the transportation of beverages and tonics by radial highway common and highway contract carriers have not as yet been established between all of the points from and to which the suspended common carrier rates were published to apply. However, minimum rates have been established between San Francisco and Oakland on the one hand and Los Angeles on the other hand, and this record indicates that these are the points between which the preponderance of the traffic moves. It appears that rates from and to the other points are ordinarily governed by the San Francisco-Los Angeles adjustment.

¹¹ Since the conclusion of hearings in these matters respondents have informed the Commission of the purchase of a Los Angeles brewery by Grace Brothers, Santa Rosa, California.

Advertising on the panels of motor truck equipment has a definite monetary value to the shipper and is an important consideration in the routing of traffic, and it seems inevitable that unless a proper charge is made for this accessorial service, or the competitive opportunity equalized in some other way, substantially all of the available traffic will, at transportation rates otherwise equal, gravitate to the highway contract carriers. Such an inequality of competitive opportunity is unfair to other carriers and contrary to the public interest.

If the trucks and the rail carriers are to compete under equal transportation conditions, several alternatives present themselves so far as vehicle advertising is concerned: (1) encourage the rails to carry advertising on their freight cars; (2) prohibit the trucks from carrying advertising; or (3) require the trucks to make a reasonable additional charge therefor.

A rail freight car is used in intrastate and interstate commerce for the transportation of the many classes of freight for which the car is designed. The car is employed to haul the property of any shipper, at the option of the carrier, and if it carried a local shipper's advertising upon it, the value of the advertising would depend almost entirely on the circumstance of whether the car was located in the territory in which the advertiser's product is marketed or consumed. Furthermore, under the Interstate Commerce Act and the Public Utilities Act it is unlawful for any common carrier to make or give any undue or unreasonable preference or advantage to any particular person or any particular traffic. For these reasons and in view of the decision of the Interstate Commerce Commission in I. & S. Docket 3887, Use of Privately Owned Refrigerator Cars, 201 I.C.C. 323¹² it

¹² The Interstate Commerce Commission found that "a shipper who pays only the published rates and uses private cars displaying advertising matter receives something of value in addition to the transportation of his traffic not available to those using cars furnished by the railroads and that the practice should be prohibited".

hardly seems practicable to encourage the rails to engage in this practice. Nor does it appear advisable on this record, embracing only a limited number of points and commodities, to prohibit the trucks from carrying shippers' advertising on their equipment. Until more mature consideration on a more comprehensive record can be given the broad question of advertising as it relates to the transportation of the many thousands of other articles of commerce, the third alternative seems to be the logical course to pursue.

As has hereinbefore been seen, neither the cost nor the value of vehicle advertising has been definitely shown. The uncontradicted testimony offered by the rails is to the effect that the value to the advertiser is not less than \$62.00 per vehicle unit per month. However, the Commission should be fully assured that minimum rates and charges established by it are not too high. It may well be that upon a more complete record a higher charge would be found justified, but upon the evidence here before us a minimum charge of \$40.00 per month for each vehicle unit (truck, truck and trailer, or tractor and semi-trailer) appears to be reasonable.

In other phases of Case No. 4088 radial highway common and highway contract carriers have been directed to issue a freight bill for each shipment received for transportation, and to retain and preserve a copy thereof. A similar direction should and will be issued here.

Upon consideration of all of the facts of record the Commission is of the opinion and finds:

1. That neither the rates under suspension in Cases Nos. 4137 and 4141 nor the rates proposed in lieu thereof by respondent common carriers have been shown to be justified;

2. That respondent common carriers will not be justified in establishing rates lower than those now in effect for the transportation involved in these proceedings;

3. That upon this record no change should be made in the minimum rates heretofore established for radial highway common and highway contract carriers, except that reasonable minimum charges should be fixed for the accessorial services of split delivery and vehicle advertising;

4. That radial highway common and highway contract carriers should issue a shipping order or freight bill substantially in the form set forth in Appendix "P", hereof, for each shipment received for transportation and that a copy of such bill should be retained and preserved for a period of not less than three (3) years from the date of its issuance.

O R D E R

Public hearings having been held in the above entitled proceedings, and based upon the evidence received at the hearings and upon the conclusions and findings set forth in the preceding opinion,

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that The Atchison, Topeka and Santa Fe Railway Company, Southern Pacific Company and Pacific Freight Tariff Bureau, L. F. Potter, Alternate Agent, be and they are hereby ordered and directed to cancel Items 1480-G, 1490-B and 1510-A of The Atchison, Topeka and Santa Fe Railway Company Tariff No. 12375-0, C.R.C. No. 690; Items 1155-J, 1160-P and 1170-V of Southern Pacific Company Tariff No. 730-D, C.R.C. No. 3353; Items 1260-B, 1270-B, 1280-B, 1290-B, 1310-B and 1340-B, Supplement No. 17 of Pacific Freight Tariff Bureau Tariff No. 30-N, C.R.C. No. 592 and Items 1485-B, 1490-A, 1495-B, 1500-A, 1505-A, 1510-A, 1560-A and 1570-A, Supplement No. 87 of Pacific Freight Tariff Bureau Tariff No. 34-0, C.R.C. No. 556 of L. F. Potter, Alternate Agent, on or before May 7, 1937, on not less than one day's notice to the Commission and to the public, and that upon cancellation of said schedules the orders of suspension and investigation in Cases Nos. 4137 and 4141 be vacated and the proceedings discontinued.

IT IS HEREBY FURTHER ORDERED that the rates, rules and regulations set forth in Appendix "A" attached hereto and made a part hereof, be and they are hereby established and approved, effective five (5) days from the effective date of this order, as the just, reasonable and non-discriminatory minimum rates, rules and regulations to be charged by any and all radial highway common carriers and highway contract carriers as defined in the Highway Carriers' Act (Chapter 223, Statutes of 1935) for the transportation or service for which rates or charges are provided in said Appendix "A".

IT IS HEREBY FURTHER ORDERED that the rates, rules and regulations set forth in Appendix "A", hereof, supersede those established in and by Decision No. 28762, as amended by Decision No. 29530, in Part "B" of Case No. 4088.

IT IS HEREBY FURTHER ORDERED that all radial highway common carriers and highway contract carriers be and they are hereby ordered to cease and desist on or before five (5) days from the effective date of this order, and thereafter abstain, from charging, collecting or observing rates, rules and regulations lower in volume or effect than those set forth in Appendix "A".

IT IS HEREBY FURTHER ORDERED that every radial highway common carrier and highway contract carrier shall issue to the shipper, for each shipment received for transportation, a freight bill in substantially the form set forth in Appendix "B" hereof, but may include in said freight bill, in addition to the provisions appearing in said form, such other reasonable and lawful provisions as may be deemed proper, and shall retain and preserve for reference, subject to the inspection of the Commission, a copy of said freight bill for a period of not less than three (3) years from the date of its issuance.

IT IS HEREBY FURTHER ORDERED that the Commission shall have and it does hereby retain jurisdiction of Case No. 4088 for the purpose of establishing or approving the just, reasonable and non-discrimina-

tory maximum or minimum or maximum and minimum rates, charges, classifications, rules and regulations to be charged, collected and observed by radial highway common carriers and highway contract carriers both for the transportation service hereinabove described and for such other transportation and accessorial service as may from time to time appear proper in the light of other or further evidence received herein.

The effective date of this order shall be May 5, 1937.

Dated at San Francisco, California, this 26th day of April, 1937.

Walter H. Hall
Leon C. Miller
Frank R. Newell
Robert W. ...
Ray & Wiley
Commissioners.

APPENDIX "A"

NAMING JUST, REASONABLE AND NON-DISCRIMINATORY
MINIMUM RATES FOR RADIAL HIGHWAY COMMON
CARRIERS AND HIGHWAY CONTRACT CARRIERS
(AS DEFINED IN THE HIGHWAY CARRIERS' ACT)
FOR THE
TRANSPORTATION OF BEVERAGES AND TONICS AND
EMPTY CONTAINERS AS DESCRIBED HEREIN
BETWEEN
POINTS IN CALIFORNIA AS INDICATED HEREIN
TOGETHER WITH
RULES AND REGULATIONS

ITEM NO. 10 - DEFINITION OF TECHNICAL TERMS

(a) POINT OF ORIGIN means the precise location at which property is picked up or to be picked up and loaded in or on equipment of the carrier for transportation.

(b) POINT OF DESTINATION means the precise location at which property is discharged or to be discharged from the equipment of the carrier.

(c) SHIPMENT means a quantity of property received from one shipper on one shipping order or one bill of lading at one point of origin at one time for one consignee at one destination. (See Item No. 40 for exception.)

(d) UNIT OF EQUIPMENT means any motor truck, tractor, or other self-propelled vehicle used for transportation of property over the public highways, and any trailer, semi-trailer, dolly or other vehicle drawn thereby, or any combination of such highway vehicles.

ITEM NO. 20 - RULES AND REGULATIONS

(a) Rates provided in Item No. 60 apply from and to all points within incorporated city limits, but do not include loading or unloading or other accessorial services.

(b) ASSESSMENT OF CHARGES: Charges will be assessed upon the gross weight of the shipment. No allowance or deduction will be made for the weight of containers.

(c) MINIMUM RATES VERSUS COMMON CARRIER RATES: In the event the application of the common carrier rates, rules and regulations for the same transportation of the same shipment of property from and to the same points results in a lower aggregate charge than the charge resulting from the application of the minimum rates provided herein, such lower charge shall apply.

ITEM NO. 30 - COMMODITIES FOR WHICH RATES ARE PROVIDED IN THIS APPENDIX

(a) BEVERAGES AND TONICS, VIZ.:

Beverages made from cereals (not distilled), carbonated or not carbonated, fermented or unfermented;

Beverages (other than beverages made from cereals, not distilled), carbonated, flavored, or phosphated (not including extracts, syrups, or de-alcoholized or non-alcoholic cordials and liqueurs);

Extracts, viz.: Malt Extract, liquid;

Fruit Juice (unfermented, not syrup), artificial or natural, sweetened or unsweetened, ginger ale;

Liquors, malt, viz.: Ale, Beer, Beer Tonic, Porter, Stout;

Liquors, vinous, containing not more than 3.2% alcohol by weight;

Syrup, viz.: Grape Juice, Malt;

Water, viz.: Distilled, plain, mineral, salt;

Soda (flavored or not flavored).

(b) USED OR SECOND-HAND EMPTY CONTAINERS for the transportation of Beverages and Tonics as described in paragraph (a).

ITEM NO. 40 - SPLIT DELIVERY SERVICE AND CHARGES

(a) Under the conditions set forth in paragraph (c) hereof, at the charges provided in paragraph (b) hereof, shipments may be delivered to more than one consignee, and/or at more than one destination (providing the first and succeeding destinations are intermediate between the point of origin and the last destination).

(b) Charges upon split delivery shipments as described in paragraph (a) hereof shall be computed upon the weight of each component part at the rate applicable for the entire shipment from point of origin to the highest rated point of destination, plus a sum equal to one cent per 100 pounds for the weight of each delivery but in no case less than 60 cents per delivery.

(c) Shipments shall originate on one shipping order or one bill of lading on one day.

ITEM NO. 50 - ACCESSORIAL SERVICES AND CHARGES

(a) LOADING AND UNLOADING

When loading or unloading is performed by the carrier, an additional charge of not less than $\frac{1}{2}$ cent per 100 pounds shall be assessed by the carrier.

When loading and unloading is performed by the carrier, an additional charge of not less than 1 cent per 100 pounds shall be assessed by the carrier.

(b) ADVERTISING ON EQUIPMENT

A charge of not less than \$40.00 per calendar month or fraction thereof per unit of equipment shall be assessed by the carrier for the placing of any sign, or signs, or advertising matter upon such unit of equipment.

(c) For stacking, sorting or any other accessorial service not otherwise provided for in this rule, an additional charge of 75 cents per man per hour shall be made.

ITEM NO. 60 - COMMODITY RATES

Column 1 rates apply for the transportation of Beverages and Tonics as described in Item No. 30 (a), in lots of not less than 18,000 pounds.

Column 2 rates apply for the transportation of Used or Second-Hand Empty Containers as described in Item No. 30 (b), in lots of not less than 10,000 pounds.

<u>BETWEEN</u>				
San Francisco	:	<u>Rates are in Cents per 100 Pounds</u>		
Oakland	:	:	:	
<u>AND</u>				
	:	<u>Column 1</u>	:	<u>Column 2</u>
Los Angeles	:	25	:	27
Fresno	:	12	:	14

APPENDIX "B"

SHIPPING ORDER AND FREIGHT BILL					
Name of Carrier _____ (Name of Carrier must be same as shown on Permit)			Bill No. _____ Permit No. _____		
City _____	Date _____	, 193 _____			
Shipper _____	Consignee _____				
Street Address _____		Street Address _____			
City _____		City _____			
Packages	Kind	Description of Commodities	**Weight	Rate	Charges
Shipper _____			C.O.D. _____		
By _____ (Show name in full)			C.O.D. Fee _____		
Received by Carrier in good condition except as noted:			*Advances _____		
By _____ Driver (Show name in full)			*Other Charges _____		
Received by Consignee in good condition except as noted:			Prepaid _____		
By _____ (Show name in full)			Total to collect		

*Show each charge separately and what it represents.

**If other unit of charges, show per hour, box, crate, bundle, bag, head, etc.