

Decision No. 33265

BEFORE THE RAILROAD COMMISSION OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

In the Matter of the Establishment )  
of maximum or minimum, or maximum )  
and minimum rates, rules and regu- )  
lations of all common carriers as )  
defined in the Public Utilities Act )  
of the State of California, as )  
amended, and all highway carriers )  
as defined in Chapter 223, Stat- )  
utes of 1935, as amended, for the )  
transportation, for compensation )  
or hire, of any and all commod- )  
ities. )

ORIGINAL

Case No. 4246

BY THE COMMISSION:

SUPPLEMENTAL OPINION

Decision No. 31606, as amended, in the above entitled proceeding, established minimum rates for transportation of property within California by common, radial highway common and highway contract carriers. These rates were set forth in a tariff designated as Highway Carriers' Tariff No. 2. This decision deals with certain proposed amendments of that decision and tariff. Evidence concerning the matter first considered was received at public hearings held in San Francisco and Los Angeles before Commissioners Wakefield and Craemer and Examiner Freas. The second matter was heard in Los Angeles and San Francisco before Examiner Bryant. The petitions last discussed herein appear to involve a matter as to which public hearing is not necessary.

Elimination of Rate Arbitrary

Item No. 241-A of Highway Carriers' Tariff No. 2 provides that a rate arbitrary of 4 cents per 100 pounds shall be added to the mileage rates set forth under the "any quantity" weight bracket, in connection with shipments originating in or destined to specified zones which, generally, embrace the San Francisco-East Bay metropolitan area and the Los Angeles metropolitan area. It is based upon evidence received at public hearings held in San Francisco and Los Angeles before Commissioners Wakefield and Craemer and Examiner Freas.

The rule here involved was not included in the tariff originally. It was added by Decision No. 31995, following strenuous representations made to the Commission by major highway and express carriers that the rates established in Decision No. 31606 would not be compensatory and that the carriers would be compelled to discontinue or curtail their services if forced to operate thereunder. It appeared from the evidence then before the Commission that one of the most important factors contributing to the need of the carriers for additional revenue was the extra cost of performing pickup and delivery services in the metropolitan areas, occasioned by the traffic congestion there encountered, and that, therefore, addition of a rate arbitrary rather than an increase in the basic rates was proper.

Numerous shippers in the metropolitan areas affected filed petitions seeking removal of the rate arbitrary, relying principally on the ground that it prejudiced them in competing with shippers whose places of business were located in outlying districts. In addition, certain carriers filed similar petitions alleging that the arbitrary would react to the detriment of shippers served by them in the metropolitan areas and would thus tend to re-

---

1

In Decision No. 31995, in explaining the reasons justifying the rate arbitrary, it was said:

"While objections made to the volume of the prescribed rates are varied, they come in a large measure from carriers transporting general merchandise in small quantities from and to the more densely populated areas of the state in which, because of traffic conditions, operating costs are relatively high. \* \* \* Considering that the costs upon which these rates are based embrace transportation throughout the entire state, the prescribed rates are undoubtedly low, for this particular transportation. On the other hand, there is nothing in this record indicating that the rates for this type of hauling are too low for use in other portions of the state. In order, therefore, that adequate service may be maintained and that, at the same time, no needless burden will be placed upon shippers, an arbitrary should in some instances be added to the prescribed rates for shipments transported from or to the areas mentioned."

2

duce their traffic volume. In response to these petitions, further public hearings were held for the purpose of determining whether the arbitrary should be retained, whether it should be eliminated, or whether some other form of rate adjustment should be substituted in its stead.

More than thirty shippers and representatives of shippers' organizations testified in support of the proposed elimination of the rate arbitrary. These shippers stated that they distributed goods from the San Francisco-East Bay or the Los Angeles metropolitan areas in competition with manufacturers or distributors having plants or warehouses in smaller communities; that by reason of the rate arbitrary they were required to pay more for "any quantity" shipments, mile for mile, than were their competitors, in order to place products in the hands of their customers; and that this rate disadvantage was a serious competitive handicap. Examples were given of specific instances in which the rate arbitrary assertedly would tend to encourage manufacturers and distributors in other parts of California or in adjacent states to the detriment of those located in or around San Francisco or Los Angeles.

Many of the shipper witnesses asserted, moreover, that the traffic congestion encountered in transporting shipments between their places of business and common carrier depots was no

---

2

Petitioners are Baker, Hamilton & Pacific Company; Dunham, Carrigan & Hayden Co.; M. Sellar Co.; Sellar Bros. & Co.; Sloss & Brittain; Liggett & Myers Tobacco Co.; The Atchison, Topeka and Santa Fe Railway Company; Pacific Electric Railway Company; Southern Pacific Company; Union Pacific Railroad Company; The Western Pacific Railroad Company; The Paper Trade Conference; Valley Express Company; Valley Motor Lines Inc.; Warehousemen's Association of the Port of San Francisco; Allied Drug Distributors Association; Loose Wiles Biscuit Company; Pacific Motor Tariff Bureau; Grocery Distributors Association of Northern California; Los Angeles Traffic Managers' Conference; Pioneer Division - The Flintkote Company; R. J. Reynolds Tobacco Company; San Francisco Chamber of Commerce; Oakland Chamber of Commerce; Draymen's Association of San Francisco; and Associated Jobbers and Manufacturers.

greater than existed in smaller communities in which the rate arbitrary was not applicable. In any event, they said, any added costs due to traffic congestion in the metropolitan areas were more than offset by the heavy volume of traffic there available. In this connection, they showed that a number of "any quantity" shipments were usually tendered to the carriers at one time and were picked up in one truck, so that the cost per pickup was considerably less than if each such "any quantity" shipment were picked up separately.

The majority of the shippers said they were more interested in having the rate disadvantage removed rather than in obtaining a rate reduction. They explained that prompt and dependable service was of the utmost importance to them, and that they were willing to pay rates sufficient to insure that the carriers would be able to render such service.

The carriers did not urge the retention of the rate arbitrary and, in fact, themselves objected to it. Carriers serving wide territories throughout the state asserted, however, that the rate arbitrary had furnished revenue without which they would have been unable to continue to operate, and strongly urged that some other means of returning equivalent revenue be accorded them. Mainly, these were carriers whose traffic consisted largely of small shipments averaging around 300 pounds in weight and to whom, therefore, a reduction in the "any quantity" weight bracket would mean an almost equal reduction in their gross revenues. These carriers agreed with the shippers that costs due to traffic congestion in the metropolitan areas were offset by the added volume of tonnage available. They claimed, though, that the basic rates were inadequate for transportation in these metropolitan areas as well as for

transportation between points in outlying districts. In this connection, they showed that the cost studies of record contemplated movements between the larger traffic centers, whereas the most expensive operations were between the smaller communities which require common carrier service but from and to which shipments move only occasionally. Several exhibits were introduced showing that, in order to serve these small communities, it was often necessary to pick up with or deliver from line-haul equipment; to pick up or deliver by use of a truck sent out from the nearest agency point; or to back haul the freight from a more distant agency point. Performance records were introduced for representative periods, for the purpose of demonstrating that the added traffic available in the metropolitan areas made it possible to achieve better performance than in rural communities, despite the traffic congestion encountered in the former instance.

As before indicated, most of the parties were in accord that good service was of more importance to shippers of small shipments than the volume of the rates and that, therefore, revenue equivalent to that now accruing under the rate arbitrary should be allowed the carriers if curtailments of service would otherwise result. However, the views as to how this should be accomplished were many and divergent. Certain carriers operating in central and northern California appeared inclined to the view that the rate arbitrary should be removed from the "any quantity" rates and equivalent revenue obtained by increasing the rates for minimum weights of 2,000, 4,000 and 10,000 pounds. It was explained that the heavier shipments were believed to be best able to bear added rates. Southern California carriers, on the other hand, advocated for the most part the adding of 4 cents per 100 pounds to the

basic "any quantity" rates for statewide transportation and the reducing of rates for minimum shipments of 2,000 pounds by extending the 2,000 pound weight bracket to all mileages.<sup>3</sup> They argued that rates in each weight bracket should be related closely to the cost of performing transportation in that weight bracket, and, moreover, that any increase in the quantity lot rates would tend to encourage the operation of proprietary trucks. The latter proposal appeared to be most satisfactory to the interested shippers, although a witness for the Sacramento Chamber of Commerce urged that northern California rates be left undisturbed and the increased rates be made applicable only in southern California.

There appears to be little doubt from the record now before us that the major highway, express and rail carriers require the additional revenue produced by the 4 cent rate arbitrary if they are to continue to render adequate and dependable service.<sup>4</sup> If, then, the rate arbitrary is to be eliminated, some other means of returning equivalent revenue to the carriers must be found. Analysis of the cost studies and other evidence of record indicates that any material increase in the rates for "quantity" lots would result in rates in excess of the estimated cost of performing the services and would promote the use of proprietary trucks; hence, the spreading of the revenue over the "quantity" weight brackets, as advocated by certain carriers, does not appear proper. On the

---

<sup>3</sup> At present, the 2,000 pound weight bracket rates are graduated into the "any quantity" rates at 100 miles.

<sup>4</sup> Although the rail carriers did not specifically advocate adding the rate arbitrary to the basic rates, they made it clear that their petition seeking removal of the rate arbitrary was not to be construed as indicating that they did not need or desire equivalent revenue from some other source.

other hand, the present basic rates in the "any quantity" bracket are, in general, well below the costs developed for this type of transportation, and would still be somewhat below those costs in many instances with the arbitrary added. Under these circumstances, an increase of the basic rates in the "any quantity" weight bracket seems to be the only proper and satisfactory solution of the problem. This action is supported by the evidence to the effect that costs of picking up and delivering freight in the smaller communities are at least as high as, if not higher than, the costs for the same services in San Francisco and Los Angeles, due to the lesser volume of freight available in the smaller communities.

Extension of the 2,000 pound weight bracket would not appear to serve any useful purpose. As stated in previous decisions, the number of weight brackets necessary to give adequate recognition to the differences in the costs of transporting shipments of different sizes cannot be determined with mathematical precision. It seems evident, however, that as the length of haul increases and proprietary competition in the small shipment field lessens, the need for the 2,000 pound weight bracket is reduced. Beyond 100 miles proprietary competition in this field does not seem to be intense and, therefore, extension of the 2,000 pound weight bracket would only serve to complicate the rate structure.

Addition of the full 4 cents per 100 pounds to the basic rates, for statewide transportation, would manifestly result in revenue in excess of that now accruing under the rate arbitrary, since the arbitrary now applies only from and to the metropolitan areas. The extension of the 2,000 pound weight bracket for distances beyond 100 miles was proposed as an offsetting decrease, but

since, for the reasons hereinbefore explained, such proposed extension is not being adopted, it appears proper to add something less than 4 cents per 100 pounds to the basic rates. The full amount of the arbitrary will be added to the 1st class "any quantity" rates and proportionately lower amounts will be added to the 2nd, 3rd and 4th class rates, based upon the present percentage relationship of 100, 90, 80 and 70 now existing between the four classes.

Proposed Amendment of Minimum Charge Rule

Certificated Highway Carriers, Inc., an association of highway common carriers, urged that Item No. 150 of Highway Carriers' Tariff No. 2, which provides minimum charges per shipment, be amended so as to provide a revised and somewhat higher basis of minimum charges in connection with shipments transported more than 150 constructive miles. The major rail lines made a similar proposal, under which the proposed revised charges would be made applicable to all lengths of haul.

The present item provides that the minimum charge per shipment shall be as follows:<sup>5</sup>

<u>Weight of Shipment</u>	<u>Minimum Charge</u>
25 pounds or less	40 cents
Over 25 pounds but not over 50 pounds	50 cents
Over 50 pounds but not over 75 pounds	60 cents
Over 75 pounds but not over 100 pounds	70 cents
Over 100 pounds	75 cents

Under the revised rule proposed by Certificated Highway Carriers, Inc. for distances of more than 150 miles, the minimum charge per shipment would be as follows, (but subject to the provision that it shall in no case be less than that now in effect):

(a) If classified 1st class or lower, for 100 pounds at the class or commodity rate applicable thereto;

(b) If classified higher than 1st class, for 100 pounds at the 1st class rate; or

---

<sup>5</sup> The item provides also that the charge on shipments having origin or destination on steamship wharves or docks at Los Angeles Harbor shall in no event be less than \$1.00.



(c) If shipment contains different articles and no article is rated higher than 1st class, for 100 pounds at the class or commodity rate applicable to the article taking highest rate, or if any of the articles are rated higher than 1st class for 100 pounds at the 1st class rate.

The rule recommended by the major rail lines is the same, except that it would apply on short as well as long hauls, and except that it would apparently not be subject to the present charges as a minimum.

The vice-president of Certificated Highway Carriers, Inc., testifying as a cost and rate expert, pointed out that under the present rule the charges remain constant regardless of the length of haul involved. He said that in his opinion these charges are unreasonably low for shipments moving in excess of 150 constructive miles, and are in many instances below the cost of handling and transporting such shipments. He explained that the proposed rule would have the effect of establishing minimum charges related to the distance involved, inasmuch as under this rule the charges vary with the class or commodity rate applicable to the shipment, and the rates in turn vary with the constructive distance from point of origin to point of destination.

Apparently in justification of increases which would result under his proposal, the witness stated that small shipments transported by motor carriers ordinarily require and receive more handling through intermediate terminals than larger shipments; that on the average the commodities that move in small shipments have a higher value per pound than commodities offered in larger shipments; that the small shipments are subject to excessive loss and damage claims, involve the same billing and collection expense as larger ones, and ordinarily require careful and expensive watching, checking and sometimes tracing. He conceded that most of these elements of

cost were present in connection with shipments moving less than 150 miles as well as those moving over greater distances, but stated that any material increase in minimum charges for short distances would produce charges in excess of those maintained by United States Parcel Post, and by Railway Express Agency, Inc. and several other common carriers which are not subject to the minimum charges here involved. He believed that if it were not for these competitive factors the proposed minimum charge rule would be proper for all lengths of haul, but said that in his opinion these factors made it impracticable and inadvisable to apply the proposed charges for the shorter distances.<sup>6</sup>

An expert rate witness testifying for the rail lines stated that he, too, believed the minimum charges should be properly related to the length of haul involved, and cited examples to show that under the present rule a small shipment would in some cases be transported any distance up to 1100 miles at a charge of 40 cents. He said, however, that in his opinion it would be impracticable and inconsistent to provide one basis of charges for distances up to 150 miles and an entirely different basis for greater distances. He believed the proposal of Certificated Highway Carriers, Inc. would, if adopted, result in undue complication in computing minimum charges on small shipments moving approximately 150 constructive miles. He thought that the proposed revised basis of charges should be made applicable for all lengths of haul, and expressed the belief that the provisions of Highway Carriers' Tariff No. 2, which permit alternative application of common carrier rates, would be sufficient to enable all for-hire

---

6

The witness proposed no change in the minimum charge of \$1.00 now provided for shipments having origin or destination on steamship wharves at Los Angeles Harbor. He explained that he believed this charge to be fully justified and required by expensive delays to which the harbor traffic was subject.

carriers to compete with Railway Express Agency, Inc. and with other exempted carriers.<sup>7</sup>

The president of Allied Drug Distributors Association testified that rates for the transportation of drugs within California had been materially increased in the past several years, and that his association was therefore opposed to any change which would result in increased rates or charges on this traffic.

The question of minimum charges for transportation of small shipments has been the subject of consideration in earlier phases of this proceeding. The minimum-charge rule now proposed by Certificated Highway Carriers, Inc. and by the rail lines is substantially the same as that provided in Rule 13 of the current Western Classification. A similar rule was recommended by the examiners in their proposed report prior to the issuance of Decision No. 31606, supra. At that time, however, certain highway carriers operating principally in Southern California objected to the adoption of this rule, asserting that it would cause a diversion of small shipments to the United States Parcel Post and to exempted carriers; and the Commission, upon considering the proposed report and the exceptions thereto, established for state-wide application the sliding scale of minimum charges now in effect. In its decision (Decision No. 31606, supra) the Commission said: "While the principle of varying the minimum charge according to the volume of the class rate is no doubt sound in the absence of competition from carriers publishing charges for shipments of less than 100 pounds in the form of sliding scales, the giving of full effect to such principle here would, according to the evidence, prejudice for-hire carriers to some extent in competing with exempted carriers and with the United States Parcel Post."

---

<sup>7</sup> He was not concerned, apparently, with the competition of United States Parcel Post.

On the record now before the Commission it appears that the highway common carriers and the rail lines are in agreement that, for longer distances at least, the principle of applying as minimum the charge for 100 pounds at the applicable rate should be adopted. Except for the general objection of the Allied Drug Distributors Association, which apparently did not challenge the reasonableness of the particular charges here proposed, no one opposed the establishment of minimum charges upon this principle for distances in excess of 150 constructive miles. As pointed out in Decision No. 31606, this principle is no doubt sound in the absence of competition, and if, as the record indicates, the for-hire carriers are now satisfied that they will not be prejudiced in meeting competition by the establishing of the proposed charges, no good reason appears why the principle should not be given effect.

The question remains, however, whether the minimum charges should be revised for all distances, or only for distances in excess of 150 constructive miles. On the one hand, it appears that the first alternative, as proposed by the rail lines, has the merit of providing a uniform basis of minimum charges for use throughout the state, and obviates any complications and possible misunderstandings which might result from a dual basis of charges. On the other hand, this proposal would apparently result in charges higher than those named by United States Parcel Post and by exempted carriers, and would unquestionably result in some diversion of traffic to those agencies, particularly for the short distances. No method appears under the rail proposal by which for-hire carriers may compete with lower Parcel Post charges; and tariff difficulties involved in publishing minimum charges equivalent to those maintained by the Railway Express Agency, Inc., for example, would preclude common carriers from taking full advantage of rules providing for alternative application of rates of exempted carriers. Moreover, it may be pointed

out that the nuisance of classifying all small shipments moving over short distances, as necessitated by the rail proposal, would be perhaps more objectionable than any complications which might result from adoption of the dual basis proposed by Certificated Highway Carriers, Inc.

Upon consideration of the full record now before the Commission we are of the opinion and find that it fully supports the establishment of the proposed basis of minimum charges for distances in excess of 150 constructive miles, but does not justify any change in the minimum charges heretofore established and now in effect for shorter distances.

Exemption of Transportation between Sierra  
Railroad Company's Depot and Sonora

Frank R. Miller and Ulysses E. Sims, have filed petitions seeking exemption from the established minimum rates, in connection with transportation between the Sonora freight depot of the Sierra Railroad Company on the one hand and points within the city of Sonora on the other hand. Petitioners allege that the depot referred to is located approximately 100 yards outside of the city limits but that transportation to and from the depot has all the characteristics of ordinary drayage. They state, moreover, that the Sierra Railroad Company maintains its own pickup and delivery service and that the exemption is necessary in order to enable petitioners to compete. The circumstances set forth appear to justify the exemption. Appropriate amendment of the territorial application of Highway Carriers' Tariff No. 2 will be made.

O R D E R

Adjourned public hearings having been held in the above entitled proceeding and based on the evidence received at the hear-

ings and upon the conclusions and findings contained in the preceding opinion,

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that Highway Carriers' Tariff No. 2 (Appendix "D" of Decision No. 31606, as amended) be and it is hereby amended by substituting therein the revised pages attached hereto and hereby made a part hereof, which revised pages are numbered as follows, the changes thereby made to become effective as shown on said pages:

- Fourth Revised Page 3 (Cancels Third Revised Page 3)
- Second Revised Page 13 (Cancels First Revised Page 13)
- First Revised Page 20 (Cancels Original Page 20)
- Fourth Revised Page 26 (Cancels Third Revised Page 26)
- Second Revised Page 41 (Cancels First Revised Page 41)

IT IS HEREBY FURTHER ORDERED that the tariff filings required to be made by common carriers, as a result of the amendments made by the preceding ordering paragraph hereof, shall be made effective on August 20, 1940, on not less than ten (10) days' notice to the Commission and to the Public.

IT IS HEREBY FURTHER ORDERED that in all other respects the petitions referred to in the preceding opinion be and they are hereby denied.

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

This order shall become effective twenty (20) days after the date hereof.

Dated at San Francisco, California, this 3rd day of July, 1940.

*Ray C. King*  
*Stanley D. Wood*  
*Raymond H. ...*  
*Alfred ...*  
*Justus F. ...*  
 Commissioners.

Fourth Revised Page....3  
 Cancels  
 Third Revised Page.....3

HIGHWAY CARRIERS' TARIFF NO. 2

TABLE OF CONTENTS (Concluded)	Item Number (Series) Except as shown
<b>*Rules and Regulations (Concluded)</b>	
Application of Tariff - Territorial .....	30
Application of Western Classification and Exception Sheet .....	50
Collection of Charges .....	250
Collect on Delivery Shipments .....	180
Computation of Distances .....	100
Exceptions to Western Classification and Exception Sheet .....	230 to 400, incl.
Cross Weight .....	70
Intermediate Application (See Routing)	
Minimum Charge .....	150
Mixed Shipments .....	90
Pickup and Delivery Zones .....	260
Rates Based on Varying Minimum Weights .....	80
Shipments to be Rated Separately .....	60
Split Delivery .....	170-252
Split Pickup .....	160-251
Technical Terms, Definition of .....	10-11
Territorial Descriptions .....	270-271
<b>*Change.</b>	
<b>EFFECTIVE AUGUST 20, 1940</b>	
Issued by The Railroad Commission of the State of California, San Francisco, California.	
Correction No. 124	

Second Revised Page....13

Cancels

First Revised Page....13

HIGHWAY CARRIERS' TARIFF NO. 2

Item No.	SECTION NO. 1 -- RULES AND REGULATIONS OF GENERAL APPLICATION (Continued)
20 8-7-39	<p style="text-align: center;">APPLICATION OF TARIFF - CARRIERS</p> <p>Rates provided in this tariff are minimum rates, established pursuant to the Highway Carriers' Act (Chapter 223, Statutes of 1935, as amended) and apply for transportation of property by radial highway common carriers and highway contract carriers, as defined in said Act.</p> <p>When property in continuous through movement is transported by two or more such carriers, the rates (including minimum charges) provided herein shall be the minimum rates for the combined transportation.</p>
30-B Cancels 30-A	<p style="text-align: center;">APPLICATION OF TARIFF - TERRITORIAL</p> <p>Rates in this tariff apply for transportation of shipments between all points within the State of California, except:</p> <p>(a) Shipments having point of origin in Alameda, Albany, Berkeley, Emeryville, Oakland or Piedmont, and point of destination in another of those cities;</p> <p>(b) Shipments between San Francisco and South San Francisco;</p> <p>(c) Shipments having point of origin in San Diego, Chula Vista, Coronado or National City, and point of destination in another of those cities;</p> <p>(d) Shipments having both point of origin and point of destination within the Los Angeles Drayage Area, as described in Items Nos. 30 to 33 series, inclusive, of City Carriers' Tariff No. 4 and Highway Carriers' Tariff No. 5 (Appendix "A" of Decision No. 32504 in Case No. 4121);</p> <p>(e) Shipments (1) between Sacramento and North Sacramento; (2) between Sacramento and West Sacramento; (3) between said cities on the one hand and the adjacent plants of the Lumbermen's Supply, Inc., Swanston &amp; Son, Sacramento Wool Company, Sacramento Feed Company and Essex Lumber Company on the other hand; and (4) between said cities and plants on the one hand and the Sacramento Air Depot on the other hand;</p> <p>(f) Shipments between Marysville and Yuba City and between said cities on the one hand and the adjacent plant of the Harter Packing Company on the other hand;</p> <p>↓(g) Shipments between the Sonora freight depot of the Sierra Railroad Company and Sonora.</p>
↓Reduction, Decision No.	
EFFECTIVE JULY 23, 1940	
<p style="text-align: center;">Issued by The Railroad Commission of the State of California, Correction No. 125 <span style="float: right;">San Francisco, California.</span></p>	



Item No.	SECTION NO. 1 - RULES AND REGULATIONS OF GENERAL APPLICATION (Continued)												
<p>*150-A Cancels 150</p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>MINIMUM CHARGE</b></p> <p>The minimum charge per shipment shall be as follows:</p> <p>▲ (a) In the event the constructive distance from point of origin to point of destination does not exceed 150 miles:</p> <table border="0" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <thead> <tr> <th style="text-align: left; border-bottom: 1px solid black;">Weight of Shipment</th> <th style="text-align: right; border-bottom: 1px solid black;">Minimum Charge in Cents (Subject to Note 1)</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>25 pounds or less .....</td> <td style="text-align: right;">40</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Over 25 pounds but not over 50 pounds .....</td> <td style="text-align: right;">50</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Over 50 pounds but not over 75 pounds .....</td> <td style="text-align: right;">60</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Over 75 pounds but not over 100 pounds .....</td> <td style="text-align: right;">70</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Over 100 pounds .....</td> <td style="text-align: right;">75</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>NOTE 1-In no event shall the minimum charge on shipments having point of origin or point of destination on steamship wharves or docks within the Los Angeles Harbor Pick-up and Delivery Zone, as described in Item No. 260 series, be less than \$1.00.</p> <p>◆ (b) In the event the constructive distance from point of origin to point of destination exceeds 150 miles:</p> <p>(1) If classified 1st class or lower, for 100 pounds at the class or commodity rate applicable thereto; or</p> <p>(2) If classified higher than 1st class, for 100 pounds at the 1st class rate; or</p> <p>(3) If shipment contains different articles, and no article is rated higher than 1st class, for 100 pounds at the class or commodity rate applicable to the article taking highest rate; or if any of the articles is rated higher than 1st class, for 100 pounds at the 1st class rate; but</p> <p>(4) In no event shall the minimum charge be less than that computed under the provisions of paragraph (a) of this item.</p>	Weight of Shipment	Minimum Charge in Cents (Subject to Note 1)	25 pounds or less .....	40	Over 25 pounds but not over 50 pounds .....	50	Over 50 pounds but not over 75 pounds .....	60	Over 75 pounds but not over 100 pounds .....	70	Over 100 pounds .....	75
Weight of Shipment	Minimum Charge in Cents (Subject to Note 1)												
25 pounds or less .....	40												
Over 25 pounds but not over 50 pounds .....	50												
Over 50 pounds but not over 75 pounds .....	60												
Over 75 pounds but not over 100 pounds .....	70												
Over 100 pounds .....	75												
<p>160 8-7-39</p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>SPLIT PICK-UP</b></p> <p>The charge for a split pick-up shipment, as defined in Item No. 10(1) series, shall be the charge applicable for transportation of a single shipment of the same kind and quantity of property for the distance from that point of origin of a component part which produces the shortest constructive mileage to point of destination, using the shortest constructive highway route via the points of origin of the several other component parts (or using point-to-point class or commodity rate applying from first point of origin to point of destination via the several points of origin) plus an added charge as provided in Paragraph (1):</p>												

(1) Table of added charges:

Number of Pick-ups	Added Charge
2 .....	150 cents
3 to and including 5 .....	200 cents
6 to and including 10 .....	250 cents
11 or more .....	25 cents per pick-up

(2) At the time of or prior to the first pick-up, the carrier shall be furnished with manifest or written shipping instructions showing the name of each consignor, the point of origin, and the kind and quantity of property in each component part;

(3) No split pick-up shipment shall be accorded split delivery;

(4) In the event a lower aggregate charge results from treating one or more component parts as a separate shipment, such lower basis may be applied.

(See also Item No. 220 series.)

- \* Change, Decision No.
- ▲ Change, neither increase nor reduction
- ◆ Increase

EFFECTIVE AUGUST 20, 1940

Issued by The Railroad Commission of the State of California,  
San Francisco, California

Correction No. 125

(1) Table of added charges:

Number of Pick-ups	Added Charge
2 .....	150 cents
3 to and including 5 .....	200 cents
6 to and including 10 .....	250 cents
11 or more .....	25 cents per pick-up

(2) At the time of or prior to the first pick-up, the carrier shall be furnished with manifest or written shipping instructions showing the name of each consignor, the point of origin, and the kind and quantity of property in each component part;

(3) No split pick-up shipment shall be accorded split delivery;

(4) In the event a lower aggregate charge results from treating one or more component parts as a separate shipment, such lower basis may be applied.

(See also Item No. 220 series.)

\* Change, Decision No.

▲ Change, neither increase nor reduction

◆ Increase

EFFECTIVE AUGUST 20, 1940

Issued by The Railroad Commission of the State of California,  
San Francisco, California

Correction No. 126

Item No.	SECTION NO. 1 - RULES AND REGULATIONS OF GENERAL APPLICATION (Continued)
<p>240-A Cancels 240 12-25-39</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">ACCESSORIAL SERVICES NOT INCLUDED IN COMMON CARRIER RATES</p> <p>In the event under the provisions of Items Nos. 200 to 230 series, inclusive, a rate of a common carrier is used in constructing a rate for highway transportation, and such rate does not include accessorial services performed by the highway carrier, the following charges for such accessorial services shall be added (except as otherwise provided in connection with individual rates):</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(1) For tailgate loading or tailgate unloading - no additional charge;</li> <li>(2) For loading or unloading other than tailgate loading or tailgate unloading - 2 cents per 100 pounds. (See Note);</li> <li>(3) For C.O.D. service - charges provided in Item No. 180 series;</li> <li>(4) For other accessorial services - charges provided in Item No. 140 series;</li> <li>(5) Split pickup or split delivery shall not be accorded unless included in the common carrier rate. (See Items Nos. 220 and 230 series for exception.)</li> </ol> <p>NOTE.-For loading or unloading other than tailgate loading or tailgate unloading of Lumber and Forest Products as described in Item No. 660 series or of hay and related articles as described in Items Nos. 657 and 658 series, the charge will be one cent per 100 pounds.</p>
<p>241-A Cancels 241 8-9-39</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">* * *</p>
<p>* * * Eliminated, Decision No.</p>	
<p>EFFECTIVE AUGUST 20, 1940</p>	
<p style="text-align: center;">Issued by The Railroad Commission of the State of California, San Francisco, California.</p> <p>Correction No. 123</p>	

Second Revised Page....41

Cancel

First Revised Page.....41

HIGHWAY CARRIERS' TARIFF NO. 2

Item No.	SECTION NO. 2				CLASS RATES (In cents per 100 Pounds)									
	MILES		Any Quantity				Minimum Weight 2,000 Pounds				Minimum Weight 4,000 Pounds			
	Over	But not over	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4
	0	3	44	39½	35	31	30	27	24	21	24	21½	19	17
	3	5	45	40½	36	31½	31½	28½	25	22	25	22½	20	17½
	5	10	46	41½	37	32	33	29½	26½	23	26	23½	21	18
	10	15	47	42½	37½	33	34½	31	27½	24	27	24½	21½	19
	15	20	48	43	38½	33½	36	32½	29	25	28	25	22½	19½
	20	25	49	44	39	34½	37½	34	30	26½	29	26	23	20½
	25	30	50	45	40	35	39	35	31	27½	30	27	24	21
	30	35	51	46	41	35½	40½	36½	32½	28½	31	28	25	21½
	35	40	52	47	41½	36½	42	38	33½	29½	32	29	25½	22½
	40	45	53	47½	42½	37	43½	39	35	30½	33	29½	26½	23
	45	50	54	48½	43	38	45	40½	36	31½	34	30½	27	24
	50	60	56	50½	45	39	48	43	38½	33½	36	32½	29	25
	60	70	58	52	46½	40½	51	46	41	35½	38	34	30½	26½
	70	80	60	54	48	42	54	48½	43	38	40	36	32	28
500-B Cancel	80	90	62	56	49½	43½	57	51½	45½	40	41½	37½	33	29
500-A	90	100	64	57½	51	45	60	54	48	42	43	38½	34½	30
	100	110	66	59½	53	46	--	--	--	--	44½	40	35½	31
	110	120	68	61	54½	47½	--	--	--	--	46	41½	37	32
	120	130	70	63	56	49	--	--	--	--	47½	43	38	33½
	130	140	72	65	57½	50½	--	--	--	--	49	44	39	34½
	140	150	74	66½	59	52	--	--	--	--	50½	45½	40½	35½
	150	160	76	68½	61	53	--	--	--	--	52	47	41½	36½
	160	170	78	70	62½	54½	--	--	--	--	53½	48	43	37½
	170	180	80	72	64	56	--	--	--	--	55	49½	44	38½
	180	190	82	74	65½	57½	--	--	--	--	56½	51	45	39½
	190	200	84	75½	67	59	--	--	--	--	58	52	46½	40½
	200	220	88	79	70½	61½	--	--	--	--	61	55	49	42½
	220	240	92	83	73½	64½	--	--	--	--	64	57½	51	45
	240	260	96	86½	77	67	--	--	--	--	67	60½	53½	47
	260	280	100	90	80	70	--	--	--	--	70	63	56	49
	280	300	104	93½	83	73	--	--	--	--	73	65½	58½	51
	300	325	108	97	86½	75½	--	--	--	--	76½	69	61	53½
	325	350	112	101	89½	78½	--	--	--	--	80	72	64	56
	350	375	116	104½	93	81	--	--	--	--	83½	75	67	58½
	375	400	120	108	96	84	--	--	--	--	87	78½	69½	61
	400	425	124	111½	99	87	--	--	--	--	90½	81½	72½	63½
	425	450	128	115	102½	89½	--	--	--	--	94	84½	75	66
	450	475	132	119	105½	92½	--	--	--	--	97½	88	78	68½
	475	500	136	122½	109	95	--	--	--	--	101	91	81	70½
	500	525	140	126	112	98	--	--	--	--	104½	94	83½	73

525	550	144	129½	115	101	--	--	--	--	108	97	86½	75½
550	575	148	133	118½	103½	--	--	--	--	111½	100½	89	78
575	600	152	137	121½	106½	--	--	--	--	115	103½	92	80½
600	625	156	140½	125	109	--	--	--	--	118½	106½	95	83
625	650	160	144	128	112	--	--	--	--	122	110	97½	85½
650	675	164	147½	131	115	--	--	--	--	125½	113	100½	88
675	700	168	151	134½	117½	--	--	--	--	129	116	103	90½
700	725	172	155	137½	120½	--	--	--	--	132½	119½	106	93
725	750	176	158½	141	123	--	--	--	--	136	122½	109	95
750	775	180	162	144	126	--	--	--	--	139½	125½	111½	97½
775	800	184	165½	147	129	--	--	--	--	143	128½	114½	100
800	850	192	173	153½	134½	--	--	--	--	150	135	120	105
850	900	200	180	160	140	--	--	--	--	157	141½	125½	110
900	950	208	187	166½	145½	--	--	--	--	164	147½	131	115
950	1000	216	194½	173	151	--	--	--	--	171	154	137	119½
1000	1050	224	201½	179	157	--	--	--	--	178	160	142½	124½
1050	1100	232	209	185½	162½	--	--	--	--	185	166½	148	129½
1100	1150	240	216	192	168	--	--	--	--	192	173	153½	134½
1150	1200	248	223	198½	173½	--	--	--	--	199	179	159	139½

\* Increase, Decision No.

EFFECTIVE AUGUST 20, 1940

Issued by The Railroad Commission of the State of California,  
 San Francisco, California.  
 Correction No. 122