

ORIGINAL 379

Decision No. 35201

BEFORE THE RAILROAD COMMISSION OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

In the Matter of the Establishment)
of maximum and minimum, or maximum)
or minimum rates, rules and regula-)
tions of all common carriers, as)
defined in the Public Utilities Act)
of the State of California, as amend-)
ed, and all highway carriers, as)
defined in Statutes 1935, Chapter 223,)
as amended, for the transportation,)
for compensation or hire, of any and)
all agricultural products.)

Case No. 4293

BY THE COMMISSION:

Additional Appearances

- Roy B. Thompson, Edward M. Berol and Fred H. Chesnut,
for The Truck Owners Association of California.
- John Curry, for California Cattlemen's Association
and California Wool Growers' Association.
- L. N. Bradshaw and J. L. Amos, for Western Pacific
Railroad Company, Sacramento Northern Railway,
Tidewater and Southern Railway and Delta Finance Co.
- Starr Thomas and George T. Hurst, for The Atchison,
Topeka and Santa Fe Railway Company.
- Phil Jacobsen, for Fontana Farms Company.
- I. T. Thurber, in propria persona.
- Garet W. Beckley, for Bordenave and Beckley.
- Edward Brackney, in propria persona.
- Walter Fuchslin, for Valley Livestock Transportation
Service.

SUPPLEMENTAL OPINION

By prior orders in this proceeding (Decision No. 31924, 41 C.R.C. 836, as amended) minimum rates, rules and regulations have been prescribed for the transportation of livestock by highway carriers. By petition, The Truck Owners Association of California seeks the establishment of increased rates for that transportation and the modification of rules and regulations applicable

thereto. Responsive to the association's petition public hearings were scheduled for the receipt of evidence concerning the nature of the changes, if any, that should be made in the prescribed rate structure. These hearings were had at San Francisco on January 19 and February 16, 1942, before Examiner Mulgrew.

The established rates, rules and regulations are set forth in Highway Carriers' Tariff No. 3 (Appendix "C" of Decision No. 31924, supra). Revision of the truckload rates¹ and of the rules and regulations relating to mixed shipments, computation of distances and accessorial charges,² and establishment of rules covering weights on shipments requiring less equipment than that ordered by the shipper and extension of credit in collecting charges are sought by the association. A reduction in the rate on cattle from a feed lot at Collinsville to Los Angeles is sought by Fontana Farms Company.

At the initial hearing petitioner submitted estimates of the cost of transporting livestock in truckloads under prevailing conditions and, based largely upon these estimates, proposed the establishment of revised scales of truckload rates. Counsel for petitioner indicated that proposals relating to the rules and regulations would be offered later. At the adjourned hearing petitioner withdrew the proposals it had formerly made and asked that instead the existing truckload minimum rates be uniformly increased 12½ per cent. It also proposed the establishment of rules and regulations further increasing charges or imposing limitations upon service.

As shown in Appendix "A" hereof, petitioner's cost estimates are, generally speaking, substantially higher than the present

¹ Item 170-A of the tariff.

² They are contained in Items 70-A, 80-A and 100, respectively.

rates. In most cases these estimates exceed the proposed rates, in many instances by substantial amounts. Although in the main the proposed rates appear to be lower than those necessary to return the expenses disclosed by petitioner's cost estimates, petitioner asked that its proposals be adopted, and that further consideration be given to still higher rates and accessorial charges and more stringent rules and regulations if, after a trial period, the proposed bases fail to return adequate revenues. Counsel for petitioner explained that after its original proposals had been submitted, negotiations between carrier and shipper interests were undertaken to explore the possibility of proposing other or different modifications of the present rate structure which would produce the additional revenue required by the carriers with less disturbance of shipper practices. The proposals submitted at the adjourned hearing, he said, resulted from these negotiations and are designed to conform as nearly as possible to shipper needs. The revised proposals, he also said, would cause fewer changes in marketing arrangements than those initially submitted and in this and other respects are preferable from the shippers' standpoint.

Petitioner contends that operating costs have greatly increased since the establishment of the present rates and that the revenues of highway carriers of livestock have been seriously depleted. Many carriers are said to be experiencing losses from their operations, some of which have already been so severe as to cause the carriers to discontinue operations. The increased revenues which would result from the granting of petitioner's requests are claimed to be essential to the continued maintenance of adequate highway carrier facilities for the transportation of livestock.

In support of these contentions, four witnesses testified that their operations as highway carriers of livestock could not be continued unless the proposed rate increases and changes in rules and regulations were established. These witnesses said that they sustained losses from their operations during the past year and that they were faced with even more severe losses because of subsequent increases in labor expense and in other factors of operating cost. One of them also said that to his knowledge about 10 highway carriers of livestock had recently gone out of business. The witnesses engaged in radial highway common carrier operation testified that whenever possible they charged rates in excess of the established minimum rates. They said, however, that they were generally precluded by competitive influences from obtaining greater revenues than those produced by the minimum rates.

In regard to the rules and regulations, it is claimed that the proposed changes, in addition to providing increased revenues, would also discourage practices which have caused inefficient and wasteful use of equipment and prevent the assessment of unduly low charges for particular services.

Under the first of the five proposed rules, cattle rates would be applied to mixed shipments of cattle and calves when the average weight of the animals comprising the mixed shipment is more than 450 pounds and the calf rates would be applied when the average weight is 450 pounds or less. Cattle rates are lower than calf rates and are now applicable to all such mixed shipments regardless of the average weight of the animals. According to the record it is not uncommon for shippers to include one or two head of cattle in shipments of calves in order to obtain the benefit of the lower cattle rates. This, it is claimed, unjustifiably reduces carrier earnings

and results in the assessment of charges which are not commensurate with carrier expenses. On the other hand the proposed rule, it is claimed, would not permit abuse of mixed shipment arrangements and would provide suitable charges for mixed lots.

In the second proposal petitioner recommends that when deviations are made from normal highway routes because of "posted" restrictions limiting the weight which may be transported over such routes, charges shall be assessed on the basis of the higher rate established for the distance between point of origin and destination via the shortest route which would avoid use of highways where such restrictions would be encountered. The recommended rule would be operative only in instances where the shipping document specifies that "due to posted bridges on highways it is necessary to deviate from the normal to a more circuitous route." It is claimed that the use of many bridges and highways is not permitted, particularly in outlying areas, when vehicles carry loads equivalent to or greater than the established truckload livestock minimum weights. To avoid these so-called "posted" bridges or highways carriers must take circuitous routes resulting in operating costs greater than those which would prevail over the direct route. The proposed rule is said to be intended to provide compensation for the additional operating expenses attributable to necessary diversions from direct routes. It is pointed out that the shipper will always have notification of the higher basis of charges in advance of shipment because of the condition of the proposed rule requiring that the shipping document be so endorsed.

Thirdly, petitioner urges that for shipments stopped in transit for two hours or less at the request of the shipper for weighing, sorting, feeding or any other reason, charges be required

to be assessed on the basis of \$5 per stop for equipment with one loaded deck and \$7.50 per stop for equipment with more than one loaded deck. Shipments stopped for more than two hours are to be subject to an additional charge of \$3 per hour. Specific accessorial charges are not now provided for stopping in transit but the general accessorial charge rule provides for the collection of an additional charge of \$1 per man per hour, minimum 50 cents, for any accessorial or incidental service not authorized to be performed under the tariff rates. Carriers are said frequently to be required by shippers to stop livestock in transit for various purposes. It is represented, however, that the present accessorial charge rule is not generally applied to such stops because it is not clear to the parties whether or not this charge must be assessed. The stops, it is claimed, are sometimes of several hours duration and in some cases stock has been held on the shipper's orders for as long as twelve hours for purposes such as the completion of a sale. Delays to loaded trucking equipment during the livestock shipping season are said to tend to cause equipment shortages and to result in other delays in furnishing equipment to shippers. The proposed bases of charges for stopping in transit are designed, petitioner claims, to discourage unnecessary delays to carriers' equipment and to provide suitable charges for the added service when it is ordered by the shipper.

The fourth of these proposals is a recommendation that shippers be required to order equipment for truckload lots on the basis of specified net minimum carrying capacities of vehicles and that charges be determined on said minimum carrying capacities in instances where those capacities exceed the weight of the stock transported in the vehicles. The specified carrying capacities

correspond with minimum weights prescribed for truckload transportation and are as follows:

	<u>Truck Only</u>	<u>Truck and Trailer</u>
Cattle	14,000 Pounds	24,000 Pounds
Sheep (Double Deck)	12,000 "	20,000 "
Hogs (Double Deck)	16,500 "	24,000 "

There is no comparable provision in effect, and, petitioner claims, shippers often overestimate their requirements, resulting in either light loading of the carrier's vehicles or return of excess equipment empty from the loading point. In such cases the minimum weights proposed to be made applicable are intended to provide compensation to the carrier for the light or empty movement of its vehicles. The proposed rule is also intended to encourage more careful ordering of equipment by the shippers and to avoid unnecessary and wasteful use of equipment.

In its fifth and last proposal, affecting the rules and regulations, petitioner seeks to limit to a seven-day period the extension of credit in connection with the payment of freight charges on livestock shipments. The proposed rule is identical with the rules heretofore prescribed by this Commission for the transportation of general commodities and fresh fruits and vegetables. (Decision No. 32606, as amended, in re Rates of Common and Highway Carriers and Decision No. 33977, as amended, in this proceeding.) No credit rule has thus far been established for livestock transportation but a seven-day credit period is said to be now voluntarily observed by some livestock shippers.

California Cattlemen's Association, California Wool Growers' Association, California Farm Bureau Federation, Sacramento Chamber of Commerce, Armour and Company, and Swift and Company supported, and no

one opposed, the establishment of the increased truckload rates and the revisions in rules and regulations proposed by petitioner. Representatives of these shipper interests stated that the additional revenue which would result from such action is believed to be necessary to prevent diversion of for-hire carrier equipment from livestock hauling and serious impairment of that service. They asked, however, that these matters receive further consideration should the proposals now before the Commission be adopted and experience thereunder indicate that the rates so established are too high or the rules too burdensome.

The representative of California Cattlemen's Association said that some of the stockmen thought the Commission should establish an alternate scale of hourly rates for movements of 30 miles or less. Such a scale, he contended, would be particularly desirable in instances where continuous operations are involved. Specific hourly rates were not recommended.

Fontana Farms Company seeks the establishment of a truckload minimum rate of 41 cents per 100 pounds for the transportation of cattle from its Collinsville (Solano County) feed lot to Los Angeles by highway carrier. The proposed rate is the same as the present rail rate from Montezuma, the rail station for the feed lot, and would supersede a truck rate of $44\frac{1}{2}$ cents.³ Under outstanding orders the rail rate could be used for highway transportation if, and only if, the shipments move between the same points of origin and destination.⁴ Although the Collinsville feed lot is served by both

³ This is a combination rate composed of a 41-cent common carrier rail rate and a $3\frac{1}{2}$ -cent highway carrier rate. Such combination rates are authorized in Item 160(a) of Highway Carriers' Tariff No. 3.

⁴ See Item 150 of the highway carriers' tariff. "Point of origin" is defined in Item 10-A(g) as meaning "the precise location at which livestock is physically delivered by the consignor or his agent into the custody of the carrier for transportation."

rail and highway carriers, the rail and truck loading facilities are approximately 1 mile apart and because there is no road leading to the rail loading chute, that chute cannot be used by highway carriers. It is contended that the free flow of traffic to the Los Angeles market is impeded by the volume of the truck rate. Counsel for the company argued that the rule limiting the alternative application of rail rates to precise locations is a harsh rule and that although it may well be justified under other conditions, the conditions prevailing at Collinsville warrant a deviation from it to the extent herein proposed.

Sacramento Northern Railway, the rail carrier serving the feed lot, contends that there is no important difference between conditions surrounding transportation therefrom and conditions surrounding transportation from other rail points where livestock is driven to railroad loading chutes. Counsel for the railway pointed out that extension of the application of railroad rates to highway carrier transportation from off-rail points nearby, as here proposed, has previously been considered and that such extension was found not justified in Decision No. 31924, supra.⁵ He predicted that adoption of the proposed modification would result in demands being made for numerous other similar modifications. Protestant asks that the Commission adhere to its previous findings and deny the farm company's request.

5

In that decision the Commission disposed of such requests in the following language:

"The cost of driving livestock to or from railheads cannot be determined definitely on this record but it seems reasonable to conclude that this cost is no lower than the volume of the highway carriers' rates established herein as a minimum for distances up to 3 miles. To ignore this cost, by extending railhead rates to points located even as close as 3 or 5 miles from the rail loading point, would extend an unfair concession to highway carriers, result in unequal competitive relationship between rail lines and highway carriers, and perhaps create a discrimination as between shippers."

Perhaps the most important and certainly the most far-reaching of the matters in issue is the level of truckload minimum rates for highway carriers. On this record it is not questioned and it is reasonably clear that under existing conditions highway carriers of livestock cannot maintain adequate facilities and provide satisfactory service on a compensatory basis under the present minimum rate structure. Indeed, the showing made indicates that unless the carriers derive substantially greater revenues from their operations there will be a serious curtailment in the highway carrier service available to livestock shippers. It is also not disputed and reasonably clear on this record that truckload rates at least $12\frac{1}{2}$ per cent higher than the existing minimum rates are now necessary for the maintenance of adequate transportation service. The facts and circumstances here of record justify the establishment of the proposed increased rates.

In regard to the proposed revision of the rule relating to mixed shipments it has been established that the inclusion of one or two head of cattle with shipments of calves as a means of obtaining the lower cattle rates causes an unwarranted loss of carrier revenues. However, the association's proposal, while it appears to provide a means of curing the abuses complained of, also would provide for the exaction of unreasonable and discriminatory charges in connection with other shipments. For example, where more than one or two head of cattle are included in the mixed shipments, charges on shipments consisting of a number of animals of specified weight would often be greater than charges on other shipments between the same points consisting of a greater number of both cattle and calves and of heavier animals.⁶ The proposal has not been justified.

⁶ To illustrate these differences, the charges on 10 cattle weighing 1,100 pounds each and 45 calves weighing 300 pounds each (total weight 24,500 pounds, average weight 445 $\frac{1}{2}$ pounds) transported over 5 but not over 10 miles at the rates proposed by petitioner would be \$18.38 (24,500 pounds at the 7 $\frac{1}{2}$ cent calf rate); and charges on 11 cattle weighing 1,150 pounds each and 47 calves weighing 325 pounds each (total weight 27,925 pounds, average weight 481 $\frac{1}{2}$ pounds) would be \$13.96 (27,925 pounds at the 5-cent cattle rate).

Petitioner has shown that conditions beyond the control of the carriers cause deviations from normal routes and that no added compensation is provided for in connection with such deviations under the present rate structure. However, with respect to the proposed rule providing for computation of charges on the basis of the rates applicable for the distance via the shortest available route, it appears that no means of determining the shortest available route would be readily available and that, moreover, the provisions restricting the application of the higher rates so determined to instances where the shipping document specifies that this deviation from the normal route will be made leaves room for discrimination between shippers. For these reasons the proposed rule should not be established.

Charges for stopping in transit at the shipper's request, on the other hand, appear to be justified as a necessary means of insuring that there will be no unwarranted delays attributable to such stops with the result that needed equipment would not be available for other shippers. The proposed basis appears to provide reasonable charges for this service and should be adopted.

Petitioner's showing indicates that establishment of a rule relating to the ordering of trucks and designed to penalize shippers ordering an excessive amount of equipment may well be justified so as to avoid the improvident use of equipment. However, the proposed rule appears to provide no reasonable basis for use in connection with quantities in excess of full truckloads and in connection with equipment of such character that the minimum quantity of stock cannot be loaded therein. The proposed rule has not been justified.

The proposal relating to the extension of credit, identical with the credit rule established for other transportation, appears equally well suited to livestock hauling and should be adopted.

In regard to the suggestion of the California Cattlemen's Association that alternate hourly rates be prescribed for distances of 30 miles and less, it appears that action should not be taken thereon unless and until a more definite recommendation is made and justification offered in support thereof.

The state-wide mileage rate scale established for the transportation of livestock by highway carriers was prescribed after extensive hearings and gives effect to the rate-making elements of record except the element of carrier competition. In order that the highway carriers might compete with the rail lines the former have been authorized to meet the latter's rates for like transportation between the same points. For the same reason highway carriers have been permitted to observe combinations of rail and highway carrier rates for through truck movement to and from points beyond the railheads. Here, Fontana Farms Company seeks, for the transportation of cattle by highway from Collinsville to Los Angeles, establishment of the same rate as the rail rate from a railhead point situated in the vicinity of the highway carrier loading point. The record shows, however, that truck shipments cannot be made from the same point as rail shipments and there is, therefore, no direct competition between highway and rail carriers. The record also shows that competition between through truck transportation and the driving of cattle to the railhead point for rail movement beyond is reflected in the 44 $\frac{1}{2}$ -cent combination rate now applicable. It has not been shown that a greater deviation from the normal rate level is necessary in order for highway carriers to meet the competition in question. The farms company's proposal has not been justified.

Upon consideration of all the evidence of record, we are of the opinion and find that Highway Carriers' Tariff No. 3, Appendix "C" of Decision No. 31924, supra, as amended, should be further amended as shown in the revised pages attached to and made a part of the order herein; and that in all other respects said Decision No. 31924, as amended, should remain in full force and effect.

Should experience under the revised rate structure indicate that further consideration of these matters is necessary or should those parties whose requests were found not justified on this record have additional evidence to offer such matters may be brought to the Commission's attention.

O R D E R

Based upon the evidence of record and upon the conclusions and findings set forth in the preceding opinion,

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that Highway Carriers' Tariff No. 3 (Appendix "C" of Decision No. 31924, as amended,) be and it is hereby amended by substituting therein and adding thereto, to become effective April 20, 1942, the revised and new pages attached hereto and by this reference made a part hereof, which pages are numbered as follows:

Second Revised Page 2	Original Page 5-A	First Revised Page 2
First Revised Page 9	Second Revised Page 10	Original Page 9
		First Revised Page 10

IT IS HEREBY FURTHER ORDERED that the tariff publications to be made by common carriers as a result of the amendment herein of the aforesaid Highway Carriers' Tariff No. 3 shall be made on or before April 20, 1942, on not less than three (3) days' notice to the Commission and to the public.

APPENDIX "A"

CONSISTING OF TABULATIONS OF ESTIMATED COSTS AND EXISTING AND PROPOSED MINIMUM RATES
(Costs and Rates are Stated in Cents Per 100 Pounds)

Table I - Costs from engineer's estimates for so-called "half-truckloads" (shipments involving the use of a truck only as distinguished from "full-truckloads," those involving the use of truck-trailer units) and based upon loadings equivalent to the minimum weights provided for the rate scales involved; and existing and proposed minimum rates subject to the minimum weights indicated.

MILES *	But Not Over Over	Cattle Minimum Weight 14,000 Pounds				Sheep or Calves Minimum Weight 12,000 Pounds				Hogs Minimum Weight 16,500 Pounds			
		(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
5	10	6.38	5½	6	6	9.24	8	8½	9	6.59	5½	6½	6
20	25	9.35	7½	9	8½	12.66	11	12	12½	9.21	7	9	8
45	50	14.30	10	14	11½	18.39	16	18	18	13.40	10	13	11½
90	100	24.51	17½	23½	19½	30.21	23½	29	26½	22.01	16½	21	18½
190	200	44.93	31½	44	35½	53.86	38½	52½	43½	39.23	30	38½	34
280	300	65.40	46	63½	52	77.60	53½	75	60	56.50	42½	55	48
475	500	108.42	70	105½	79	127.20	81½	124	91½	92.66	66	90½	74½
675	700	151.55	94	149	106	176.80	106	173½	119½	128.88	90	126½	101½

Table II - Costs from engineer's estimates for so-called "full-truckloads" (truck and trailer units) and based upon the average loadings of Cattle 28,900 pounds, Sheep or Calves 24,000 pounds, Hogs 29,100 pounds; and existing and proposed minimum rates subject to the minimum weights indicated.

MILES *	But Not Over Over	Cattle Minimum Weight 24,000 Pounds				Sheep or Calves Minimum Weight 20,000 Pounds				Hogs Minimum Weight 24,000 Pounds			
		(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
5	10	4.77	4½	4½	5	7.05	6½	6½	7½	5.63	4½	5½	5
20	25	6.73	6	6½	7	9.39	8	9	9	7.57	6	7½	7
45	50	10.00	8½	9½	9½	13.30	12	13	13½	10.80	8½	10½	9½
90	100	16.60	12½	16	14	21.22	17	20½	19	17.35	11½	16½	13
190	200	29.80	22½	29	25½	37.06	27½	36½	31	30.43	20½	30	23
280	300	43.00	32½	41½	36½	52.90	40	51½	45	43.50	30	42	34
475	500	70.32	48½	68½	54½	85.62	60	83½	67½	70.52	46	69	52
675	700	97.66	64½	96	72½	118.36	80	116½	90	97.52	62	96	70

Explanation of Symbol * and Column Headings Used in Tables I and II

* The mileage brackets shown in these tabulations correspond with those of the existing and proposed rate scales. The estimated costs, Columns (1) of the tabulations, are those submitted for the maximum distance in each bracket. Costs for lesser distances may be judged by comparison with the costs for the next lower mileage bracket (See Table III of this appendix) or may be developed more exactly from petitioner's Exhibit No. 130, as amended, by interpolation.

- Columns (1) - Petitioner's estimated costs.
- Columns (2) - Existing minimum rates.
- Columns (3) - Rates initially proposed.
- Columns (4) - Rates under proposed 12½ per cent increase.

Table III - Comparisons of estimated costs for various distances illustrating the cost range within mileage brackets.

MILES	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
20	8.36	11.52	8.37	8.08	8.61	6.32
25	9.35	12.66	9.21	6.73	9.39	7.57
90	22.47	27.85	20.29	15.28	19.54	16.04
100	24.51	30.21	22.01	16.60	21.22	17.35
280	61.27	72.78	53.01	40.36	49.73	40.93
300	65.40	77.60	56.50	43.00	52.90	43.50
675	146.15	170.60	124.36	94.24	114.27	94.14
700	151.55	176.80	128.88	97.66	118.36	97.52

Explanation of Column Headings of Table III

- Column (1) - Cattle, weight 14,000 pounds.
- Column (2) - Sheep or calves, weight 12,000 pounds.
- Column (3) - Hogs, weight 16,500 pounds.
- Column (4) - Cattle, weight 28,900 pounds.
- Column (5) - Sheep or calves, weight 24,000 pounds.
- Column (6) - Hogs, weight 29,000 pounds.

(END OF APPENDIX)

TABLE OF CONTENTS	Item No. (series) Except as shown
Correction Number Checking Sheet	Page 1
Rates	170-200
Rules and Regulations:	
Accessorial Charges	100
Alternative Application of Combinations with Common Carrier Rates	160
Alternative Application of Common Carrier Rates	150
Application of Tariff - Carriers	20
Application of Tariff - Commodities	40
Application of Tariff - Territorial	30
*Collection of Charges	115
Computation of Distances	80
Definition of Technical Terms	10
Loading and Unloading	90
Method of Determining Livestock Weights	120
Mixed Shipments	70
Rates Based on Varying Minimum Weights	60
Shoop Camp Outfits	110
Shipments to be Rated Separately	50
Split Delivery	140
Split Pickup	130
*Stopping in Transit	145
Technical Terms, Definition of	10
Weights, Livestock, Method of Determining	120
Zones, Territorial	210-220

*Change, Decision No. 35201

EFFECTIVE APRIL 20, 1942

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

Correction No. 12

Item No.	SECTION NO. 1 - RULES AND REGULATIONS (Continued)
115 Added	<p style="text-align: center;">(1) COLLECTION OF CHARGES</p> <p>(a) Except as otherwise provided in this rule, transportation and accessorial charges shall be collected by the carriers prior to relinquishing physical possession of shipments entrusted to them for transportation.</p> <p>(b) Upon taking precautions deemed by them to be sufficient to assure payment of charges within the credit period herein specified, carriers may relinquish possession of freight in advance of the payment of the charges thereon and may extend credit in the amount of such charges to those who undertake to pay them, such persons herein being called shippers, for a period of 7 days, excluding Sundays and legal holidays other than Saturday half-holidays. When the freight bill covering a shipment is presented to the shipper on or before the date of delivery, the credit period shall run from the first 12 o'clock midnight following delivery of the freight. When the freight bill is not presented to the shipper on or before the date of delivery, the credit period shall run from the first 12 o'clock midnight following the presentation of the freight bill.</p> <p>(c) Where a carrier has relinquished possession of freight and collected the amount of charges represented in a freight bill presented by it as the total amount of such charges, and another freight bill for additional charges is thereafter presented to the shipper, the carrier may extend credit in the amount of such additional charges for a period of 30 calendar days to be computed from the first 12 o'clock midnight following the presentation of the subsequently presented freight bill.</p> <p>(d) Freight bills for all transportation and accessorial charges shall be presented to the shippers within 7 calendar days from the first 12 o'clock midnight following delivery of the freight.</p> <p>(e) Shippers may elect to have their freight bills presented by means of the United States mail, and when the mail service is so used the time of mailing by the carrier, as evidenced by the postmark, shall be deemed to be the time of presentation of the freight bills.</p> <p>(f) The mailing by the shipper of valid checks, drafts, or money orders, which are satisfactory to the carrier, in payment of freight charges within the credit period allowed such shipper may be deemed to be the collection of the charges within the credit period for the purpose of these rules. In case of dispute as to the time of mailing, the postmark shall be accepted as showing such time.</p>
	<p>(1) Will not apply to the transportation of property for the United States, state, county or municipal governments. *Change, Decision No. 35201</p>
	EFFECTIVE APRIL 20, 1942
Correction No. 13	Issued by The Railroad Commission of the State of California, San Francisco, California.

Item No.	SECTION NO. 1 - RULES AND REGULATIONS (Concluded)
<p>♦ 145 Added</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">STOPPING IN TRANSIT</p> <p>When a shipment is unloaded in transit for the purpose of weighing, sorting, feeding or for any other reason, the following additional charges shall be assessed:</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">\$5.00 per stop for equipment with one loaded deck, \$7.50 per stop for equipment with more than one loaded deck, and \$3.00 per hour in addition to the stop charge when the stop is of more than two hours' duration.</p>
<p>150 11-7-39</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">ALTERNATIVE APPLICATION OF COMMON CARRIER RATES</p> <p>(a) Common carrier rates may be applied in lieu of the rates provided in this tariff, when such common carrier rates produce a lower aggregate charge for the same transportation from the same point of origin to the same point of destination than results from the application of the rates herein provided. (See Note.)</p> <p>NOTE.-When a rail carload rate is subject to varying minimum weights, dependent upon the size of the car ordered or used, the lowest minimum weight obtainable under such minimum weight provisions may be used in applying the basis provided in this item.</p>
<p>160 11-7-39</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">ALTERNATIVE APPLICATION OF COMBINATIONS WITH COMMON CARRIER RATES</p> <p>When lower aggregate charges result, rates provided in this tariff may be used in combination with common carrier rates for the same transportation as follows:</p> <p>(a) When point of origin is located beyond railhead and point of destination is located at railhead, add to the common carrier rate applying from any team track to point of destination the rate provided in this tariff for the distance from point of origin to the team track from which the common carrier rate used applies. (See Notes 1 and 2.)</p> <p>(b) When point of origin is located at railhead and point of destination is located beyond railhead, add to the common carrier rate applying from point of origin to any team track the rate provided in this tariff for the distance from the team track to which the common carrier rate used applies to point of destination. (See Notes 1 and 2.)</p> <p>(c) When both point of origin and point of destination are located beyond railhead, add to the common carrier rate applying between any railheads the rate provided in this tariff for the distance from point of origin to the team track from which the common carrier rate used applies, plus the rate provided in this tariff for the distance from the team track to which the common carrier rate used applies to point of destination. (See Notes 1 and 2.)</p> <p>NOTE 1.-If the route from point of origin to the team track or from the team track to point of destination is within the corporate limits of a single incorporated city, the rates provided in this tariff for transportation for distances of 3 miles or less, or rates established for transportation by carriers as defined in the City Carriers' Act (Chapter 312, Statutes of 1935, as amended), whichever are the lower, shall apply from point of origin to team track or from team track to point of destination, as the case may be.</p>

NOTE 2.-When a rail carload rate is subject to varying minimum weights, dependent upon the size of the car ordered or used, the lowest minimum weight obtainable under such minimum weight provisions may be used in supplying the basis provided in this item.

♦ Increase, Decision No. 35201

EFFECTIVE APRIL 20, 1942

Correction No. 14 Issued by The Railroad Commission of the State of California,
San Francisco, California.

Item No.	SECTION NO. 2									
	RATES (IN Cents per 100 Pounds)									
For Application of Rates, See Notes 1, 2 and 3 of Item No. 40 series.										
MILES		CATTLE			SHEEP			HOGS		
But not Over	Over	Any Quantity	Minimum Weight 14,000 Pounds	Minimum Weight 24,000 Pounds	Any Quantity	Minimum Weight 12,000 Pounds	Minimum Weight 20,000 Pounds	Any Quantity	Minimum Weight 16,500 Pounds	Minimum Weight 24,000 Pounds
0	3	12	4½	4	12	7	5½	12	4½	4
3	5	12½	5	4½	12½	8	7	12½	5½	4½
5	10	13	6	5	13	9	7½	13	6	5
10	15	13½	7½	5½	13½	10	8	13½	7	5½
15	20	14	8	6	14	11½	8½	14	7½	6
20	25	14½	8½	7	14½	12½	9	14½	8	7
25	30	15	9	7½	15	13½	9½	15	8½	7½
30	35	15½	9½	8	15½	14½	10	15½	9	8
35	40	16	10	8½	16	16	11½	16	9½	8½
40	45	16½	10½	9	16½	17	12½	16½	10	9
45	50	17	11½	9½	17	18	13½	17	11½	9½
50	60	18	12	10	18	20½	14½	18	12	10
60	70	19	14½	10½	19	21½	16	19	14	10½
70	80	21	16½	12	21	23	17	21	16	11½
80	90	23	18	13	23	25	18	23	17½	12½
90	100	25	19½	14	25	26½	19	25	18½	13
100	110	27	21½	15	27	28	20½	27	20½	14
110	120	29	22½	16½	29	30	21½	29	22	15
120	130	31	24	17½	31	31½	22½	31	23	16
130	140	33	26	18½	33	33	23½	33	25	17
140	150	35	27½	19½	35	35	24½	35	26½	18
150	160	37	29½	21	37	36½	26	37	27½	19
160	170	39	30½	22	39	38½	27	39	29½	19½
170	180	41	32	23	41	40	28	41	30½	21
180	190	43	34	24	43	41½	29½	43	32	22
190	200	45	35½	25½	45	43½	31	45	34	23
200	220	49	39	27½	49	46½	34	49	36½	25
220	240	53	41½	30	53	50	36½	53	39½	27
240	260	57	45	32	57	53½	39½	57	42	29½
260	280	61	48½	34½	61	57	42	61	45	31½
280	300	65	52	36½	65	60	45	65	48	34
300	325	69	55	39	69	64	48	69	50½	36
325	350	73	58½	41	73	68	50½	73	54	38½
350	375	77	62	43½	77	72	53½	77	57½	40½
375	400	81	65½	45½	81	76	56½	81	61	43
400	425	85	68½	48	85	80	59	85	64	45
425	450	89	72	50	89	84	62	89	67½	47½
450	475	93	75½	52½	93	88	64½	93	71	49½
475	500	97	79	54½	97	91½	67½	97	74½	52
500	525	101	82	57	101	95½	70½	101	77½	54
525	550	105	85½	59	105	99	73	105	81	56½
550	575	109	89	61½	109	102½	76	109	84½	58½
575	600	113	92½	63½	113	106	79	113	88	61
600	625	117	95½	66	117	109	81½	117	91	63
625	650	121	99	68	121	112½	84½	121	94½	65½

170-B
Cancel
170-A

650	675	125	102½	70½	125	116	87	125	98	67½
675	700	129	106	72½	129	119½	90	129	101½	70
For distances over 700 miles add for each 25 miles or fraction thereof										
		3½	3½	2½	3½	3½	3	3½	3½	2½
♦Increase, Decision No. 35201										
EFFECTIVE APRIL 20, 1942										
Correction No. 15					Issued by The Railroad Commission of the State of California, San Francisco, California.					