

Decision No. ~~24916~~
35453

BEFORE THE RAILROAD COMMISSION OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

In the Matter of the Application of)
San Francisco Bay Toll Bridge Company) Application No. 24916
to establish experimental rates.)

BY THE COMMISSION:

ORIGINAL

Appearances

Brobeck, Phleger & Harrison by James S. Moore, Jr.
for Applicant.
John J. O'Toole and Paul L. Beck, for City and County
of San Francisco.

O P I N I O N

By this application, San Francisco Bay Toll Bridge Company seeks authority under Sections 15 and 63 of the Public Utilities Act to publish on ten (10) days' notice to the Commission and the public a schedule of "experimental" toll rates, said rates to remain in effect for a period of four months. A public hearing was had before Examiner Knapp at San Francisco on May 11, 1942.

Applicant operates the San Mateo Bridge, a San Francisco Bay toll-bridge crossing, approaches to which are in the vicinity of Hayward on the east and San Mateo on the west. Rates now in effect, and rules and regulations pertaining thereto, are set forth in San Francisco Bay Toll Bridge Company Tariff No. 1, C.R.C. No. 1. In general, this tariff names rates for passenger automobiles and similar vehicles, including driver and passengers, on a one-way, round-trip and monthly commutation basis; sixty-trip student rates; rates for truck units on the basis of the manufacturer's rated capacity of the units, and additional per-ton charges for loads, if any; and rates for trailers, and truck units engaged in hauling brewery mash and livestock, on a one-way-per-vehicle basis.

The proposed rates and attendant rules are set forth in Exhibit "A" of the application, contain both increases and reductions

from the present rates, and as hereinafter explained contemplate a change in the method of determining truck unit toll charges. Due to these circumstances permission is sought to publish the proposed rate schedules for a four months' "experimental" period in order to observe the affect of the rates on the applicant's revenues and to obtain the public reaction to the revised rates.

A civil engineer, qualifying as an expert in toll bridge rate structures, testified in substance that he had designed the proposed rate schedules with the objective of obtaining reasonable rates that would return substantially the same revenue as is obtained from present rates. He compared present and proposed rates, showing the extent of the contemplated changes in the passenger vehicle group to be as reflected in the following tabulation:

Vehicle Types	Except as noted, rates include driver and passengers	
	Present	Proposed
Automobiles:		
Cash Fare, one way	\$ 0.65	\$ 0.50
Cash Fare, round trip	1.20	1.00
Commutation:		
Calendar month, one round trip daily, per ticket	15.00	15.00
90 day, 26 one-way trips, per ticket	-	10.00
3 month, 60 one-way trips, students only, per ticket	13.50	-
Taxis, Station Wagons:		
One way	.65	.50
Round trip	1.20	1.00
Hearses, Ambulances:		
One way	1.00	.50
Round trip	1.55	1.00
Motorcycles, one way	.20	.25
Tricars, including load, one way	.30	.25
Buses, including driver		
One way	.60	.75
Each bus passenger	.05	.05
Trailers drawn by automobiles:		
House or camp equipment type	-	.25
Type used in transportation of property:		
Vehicles	.25	.25
Load on Vehicles:		
Freight, per ton	.25	-
Livestock, per animal	.10	-

From a travel standpoint, major changes are in the automobile cash and commutation fares. Therein, it will be noted, cash fare reductions are proposed, a ninety-day commutation ticket has been added, and the present student commutation rate has been eliminated. The applicant's general manager explained that student patronage on a commute fare basis was infrequent and did not warrant rates different from those accorded other patrons.

The engineer stated that in preparing truck unit toll rates he had discarded the manufacturer's rated capacity as a method for determining toll charges in favor of the gross weight method of computation. An example will serve to illustrate the use of the methods. At present, under Tariff No. 1, a truck having a manufacturer's rated capacity of one ton is subject to a charge of 60 cents. If empty, no additional toll payment is required. If loaded, an additional charge for the load of 25 cents per ton for 6 tons or less is collected and for more than 6 tons, 10 cents per ton, additional. Under the gross weight method, equipment would be weighed and payment made on the basis of the scale weight, loaded or empty. For 12,000 pounds or less a charge per ton of 15 cents would be collected subject to a minimum charge of 50 cents.

The engineer expressed the opinion that the present basis of computing charges is discriminatory in that manufacturers do not express capacity ratings of otherwise comparable truck units on a uniform basis. Bridge patrons, he contended, should be required to pay charges based upon the weight of equipment actually driven over the bridge. The proposed gross weight method of computing bridge tolls, the witness said, is in use on the Golden Gate Bridge and on bridges supervised by the California Toll Bridge Authority, including the Bay Bridge joining San Francisco and Oakland, and has been found

entirely satisfactory to bridge operators and the public. A comparison of present and proposed truck rates is set forth below. The proposed rates, he said, are generally lower in volume than those in effect on the Golden Gate Bridge or the Bay Bridge.

Present Truck Rates:

Trucks, tractor-semitrailer combinations	
1-Ton capacity, one way, each	\$0.60
2-Ton capacity, one way, each70
3-Ton capacity, one way, each80
Over 3-Ton capacity, one way, each90
Trailers drawn by trucks or tractor-semitrailer combinations	
1-axle type, one way, each25
Type having more than one axle, one way, each..	.50
*Load on trucks, semitrailers and trailers	
6 Tons or less, per ton25
Additional load over 6 Tons, per ton10

*Combined load on truck and trailer used in computing load charge.

Proposed Truck Rates:

Trucks, tractors and trailers, including load:	
Gross weight 12,000 pounds, or less, per ton . .	.15
Additional gross weight over 12,000 pounds but not over 24,000 pounds, per ton10
Additional gross weight over 24,000 pounds but not over 36,000 pounds, per ton07
Additional gross weight over 36,000 pounds per ton05
Minimum charge50

A week's check of traffic was made in September, 1941, to observe the effect of the proposed truck toll rates. Thirteen hundred and fifty-nine units were included in the check of which 549 were loaded and 810 were empty. Based thereon, charges for empty equipment would be increased 9.12 per cent as contrasted with a decrease of 16.71 per cent for loaded equipment. An extract from the revenue check upon which these percentages are based is set forth below, showing the effect of the proposed rates for various types of equipment:

1.

Rates for truck equipment engaged in special hauling, stated on a one-way-per-vehicle basis, are not shown.

	Number Units Checked	Revenue Present Rates	Revenue Proposed Rates
		(Single Truck)	
Loaded	183	\$239.25	\$181.85
Empty	432	290.40	253.70
		(Tractor-Semitrailer Combination)	
Loaded	184	\$425.90	\$370.10
Empty	177	139.10	218.30
		(Truck-trailer or Tractor-Semitrailer-Trailer Combination)	
Loaded	182	\$498.40	421.25
Empty	201	262.15	303.45
		(Recapitulation)	
Loaded	549	\$1163.55	\$ 973.20
Empty	<u>810</u>	<u>691.65</u>	<u>775.45</u>
Total	1359	\$1855.20	\$1748.65

Two truck operators, one a private carrier operating small truck units, and the other a for-hire carrier operating heavy equipment, testified that they used the bridge facilities regularly both with loaded and empty equipment, had reviewed the proposed rate changes in light of their respective operations, and had no objection thereto. A rate engineer for the City and County of San Francisco, following an interrogation of the witness with respect to proposed passenger vehicle rates, stated that the City of San Francisco had no objection to the granting of the application. No one expressed opposition to its being granted.

On this record it appears clear that the present toll bridge rate structure of the applicant is in need of revision and that the proposed revisions reflecting increases and reductions in rates and changes in the method of determining truck toll charges are reasonable. Inasmuch as authority is sought to place the proposed rates in effect for a four months trial period, we will be afforded opportunity to inquire into their effect upon traffic and revenue at the expiration of that period should a request then be made to continue such rates in effect. It appears advantageous to the public, moreover, that methods of calculating rates for bridge crossings in this territory be related. The application will be granted.

O R D E R

This application having been duly heard and submitted, full consideration of the matters and things involved having been had and the Commission now being fully advised,

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that San Mateo Toll Bridge Company be and it is hereby authorized to publish on not less than ten (10) days' notice to the Commission and to the public, effective for a period of not to exceed 120 days from the effective date of the rates published under the authority of this order, unless sooner changed, canceled, or extended by the Commission, rates, rules and regulations set forth in Exhibit "A" of the application herein.

IT IS HEREBY FURTHER ORDERED that the authority herein granted is void unless exercised within thirty (30) days from the effective date of this order.

The effective date of this order shall be ten (10) days from the date hereof.

Dated at San Francisco, California, this 9th day of June, 1942.

Justus J. Coakley
Ray A. Riley
H. B. ...
Richard ...
Commissioners