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BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILIMIES COMMISSION OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA.

In the Matter of the Application of United Parcel Service for authority to establish certain increased rates applicable to wholesale service within Southern California only.

Application No. 35017
Appearances
Roger Ramsey and Preston Davis, for applicant.
Grant L. Malquist and Leonard Diamond, of the stafi
of the Public Utilities Commission of the State
of California.

## OPINION

By this application United Parcel Service, a California corporation, seeks authority to establish increased rates for certain transportation services which it performs within Southern California.

A public hearing was held before Examiner Bryant at Los Angeles on May 26, 1954. The matter 18 ready for dgcision.

United Parcel Service performs various transportation services within the state of California as a highway common carrier, a highway contract carrier and a city carrier. The present application involves only the rates published by applicant as a highway common carrier for the transportation of packages for manufacturers, wholesalers, jobbers and commercial distributors from Los Angeles, Long Beach, and Pasadena to points in Southern California bounded generally by Santa Barbara on the north, San Bernardino on the east, and San Ysidro on the south. This service may be referred
to sometimes hereinafter as "the Southern California certificated wholesale servicen. Applicant's other services are not involved directly in this proceeding. ${ }^{1}$

The present basic rate 1 s 16 cents per package, plus one and threemquarters cents for each pound or fraction thereof of its weight. Applicant proposes to increase the rate to 16 cents per package plus 2 cents for each pound or fraction thereof. ${ }^{2}$ The company would also increase its charge for making C.O.D. collections from 15 cents to 20 cents for each $\$ 100$ or fraction thereof.

United Parcel Service alleges that since the present ratea were established in Fobruary, 1951 it has been subjected to substantial increases in labor wage rates, in the cost of materials and supplies, in gasoline prices, in vebicle taxes and licenses, in occupancy expense, and in other items outside $1 t s$ control. It alleges, among other things, that the sought rate adjustments are necessary to permit a compensatory operation.

Evidence in support of the application was introduced by a vicempresident of the applicant company and by the treasurer of an affiliated company. A transportation engineer of the Commission staff introduced a report on the estimated results of operation under the present and proposed rates.

Applicant's vice-president testified that applicant deems

[^0]the proposed rates to be reasonable and justified on several grounds, which may be sumarized as follows:
(1) They are necessary from the standpoint of operating costs to compensate for unavoidable expense increases which have been incurred since the present rates were established.
(2) They are reasonable and justified by comparison with rates assessed by the United States postal service for transportation of the same merchandise between the same points.
(3) They are reasonable and justified in comparison with rates that the Commiscion has approved as minimum for the transportation of parcels within the Los Angeles area, the San Francisco area, and the East Bay area. .
(4) They are necessary to protect a relationship that has existed historically between parcel delivery rates and general trucking rates, so as to prevent unwarranted diversion of traffic from truck sexvice to parcel delivery service.

In support of various of these contentions the vicem president introduced a number of exhibits, showing in detail the hourly wage increases to appilcant's employees since the present rates were established, comparing the proposed rates with the rates for parcel post service for packages of various weiphts, showing and comparing the rates for packaces of various welghts under applicant's tariff and under the Commission's minimum rate tariffs, and illustrating the "break point" on various. dates. 3 He teatifiod that the relationship of applicant's rates to those of other carriers is important in that as the broak point becomes higher

[^1]applicant tends to receive a larger number of the heavier packages for which its services are not economically designed. He pointed out, through his exhibits, that the break point was 20 pounds in February, 2951, and has now crept up to 42 pounds as the result of 1ncreases in the truck rates for general carriers. Under applicant's proposal herein the break point would be reduced to 37 pounds. The treasurer introduced and explained exhibits consisting principaliy of balance sheets, income statements, a description of the operating properties, and various calculations and adjustments designed to show the operating results which would obtain under the present and proposed rates for the Southern California certificated wholcsale service and for the applicant corporation as a whole. He introduced also supporting exhibits and tegtimony explaining the allocations and the methods by which they were made. Another exhibit introduced by the treasurer analyzed the cost of handiang C.O.D. bills on parcel deliveries from wholesalers, jobbers, and the manuracturers.

The exiabits introduced by the Commission engineer similarly were designed to show the effect that the proposed rate increase would have on the results of operation of applicant's Southern Califormia certificated wholesale service and also upon the operating results of the corporation as a whole.

The following table summarizes applicant's operating experience for the year 2953 as recorded in 1 ts books and submitted in evidence in the exhibits of record:

## TABLE I

- Book Recora -

Year Ending December 31, 1953
Southern California Certificated

Wholesale
System
$\$ 1,904,470$. $\$ 11,501,602$
$\$$. 156 ;,930
1,284;707 175,279 827
68;392
. 146,749
41,832;884
\$ 74;721
. 74,566
\$1,982,171
$\frac{\$\left(\frac{(77,701)}{2}\right.}{\phi(\underline{20}, 776)}$
\$. 833,636 6,869;021 782,087 4,164 393,754 $1,247,078$
$\$ 10,129 ; 740$ \$ $516 ; 677$ . 464,864
\$11,111,281.
\$ 390;321
$\frac{218: 541}{\$ 152,889}$

* After interest paid and other deductions.
$\qquad$ - Loss
A. $35017-\mathrm{MM}$

Table 2 sumarizeo the estimated operating results under the proposed rates as submitted by applicant and by the Commssion engineer:

| TABLE 2 |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Estimated Operating Results for the rate year under the proposed rates (I) |  |  |  |
|  | Southern Callfornsa Certificated Wholesale |  | System |  |
|  | Applicant | Commission Engineer | Applicant | Commission Engineer |
| Operating Revenue | \$2,057,569 | \$2,173,150 | \$11,719,751 | \$12,345,570 |
| Operating Expense: |  |  |  |  |
| Equip. Maint. |  | \$ 167 ; 120 |  | \$ -895;920 |
| Transportation |  | 1,407,150 |  | 7,577,220 |
| Terminal |  | 192,760 |  | 859:950 |
| Trartic |  | 830 |  | 4,160 |
| Ins. \& Sarety |  | 71;140 |  | 412,200 |
| Admin. \& Gen'I. |  | 204;720 |  | 1;082;660 |
| Total Op. \& Maint. | \$1,899;195 | \$2,043;720 | \$20,427,327 | \$10,832;110 |
| Depreciation | 74;721 | 69;600 | 516:677 | 414,970 |
| Taxes \& Iic. | 86;604 | 89;290 | 524; 629 | 537:120 |
| Total Expenses \# | \$2,060,520 | \$2,202,610 \$11,468,633 \$11,784,200 |  |  |
| Net Op. Revenue | \$ (2,951) | \$ (29,460 | \$ 257,118 | 561;370 |
| Income Taxes |  |  | (a) | 279;080 |
| Net Income | \$ (2;951) | \$ (29;460) | - (a) | \$ $\cdot 282 ; 290$ |
| Est. Rate Base Rate of Return * | \$ 456,361 | \$ 712,400 | \$ 3,028,775 | \$4,103,400 |
|  | - | - | (a) | 6.9\% |
| Operating Ratio * | 200.14\% | 101.4\% | (a) | 97.7\% |
| (a) - Loss |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| * --Arter provi | orision for 1 | ncome taxes |  |  |
| --Non-opera <br> income, shown 1 | rating items | interest a | and other ded | ductions from |
|  | in applicant le. | $s$ exinibits a | $s$ expenses, | are excluded |
| (1) adjusted for kn | nt's estimates | represent r | evenues and | expenses |
|  | known increase | s that becam | e effective | In 2953, |
|  | tment for an 1 | ncrease or d | decrease in | the annual |
|  | cigineer's est | 1mates repre | aent a forec | cast for the |
|  | 4, with all kr | own increase | from 1953 | projected. |
|  | year with adju | ustments for | an anticipe | ted increase |
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No other witnesses testified. No one opposed the graniling of the application. The record shows that the usual advance notices of the hearing were given to persons and organizam tions believed to be interested.

The authority herein sought is identical to that which was sought by United Parcel Service in its Appication No. 34058, filed on January 28, 1953 and denied by the Commisaion in Decision No. 48591 dated May 12, 1953 (52 Cal. p.U.C. 519). The denial at that time was based upon a lack of justification. ${ }^{4}$

The present record is substantially more comprehensive than the one developed on the earlier application. The evidence in this proceeding establiches clearly that the, increased rates and charges herein proposed will produce litile, if any, net revenue from the Southern California certificated wholesale services and will not have the offect of producing exceselve earnings in the overall operations of the company. These conclusions are apparent from examination of the studies made separately and independently by the applicant company and by the Commission engineer, as summarized in the foregoing Table 2. Although these studies differ in important respects it will be seen that they

[^2]A. $35017 \sim \mathrm{MM}$
reach similar conclusions so far as the final results are concerned. 5 The record shows also that the proposed rates are reasonable and not excessive by comparison with rates for somewhat similar services maintained by other carriers and other transportation agencies and with rates established by the Commission as minimum for the transportation of small parcels within certain local drayage areas.

Upon careful consideration of all of the evidence of record the Commission concludes and finds as a fact that the increased rates and charges sought by the applicant in this proceeding are justified. The application will be granted.

$$
\underline{O} \underline{\square} \underline{E}
$$

Public hearing having been held in the above-entitled proceeding, the evidence having been fully consldered and good cause appearing,

## IT IS HEREBY ORDERED:

(1) That United parcel Service be, and it is hereby, authorized to make the following changes in its Local parcel

[^3]Tariff, CaI. P.U.C. No. 14 (P.U.C. No. 14), on not less than ten days' notice to the Commission and to the public:
(a) Amend Item 150-A to provide a charge of 20 cents for the first $\$ 100.00$ or fraction thereof, and 20 cents for each additional $\$ 100.00$ or fraction thereof, for each C.O.D. received for collection, in place of the present charge of 15 cents;
(b) Amend Item 160 A by increasing the poundage charge from 1-3/4 cents per pound to 2 cents per pound:
(c) Amend Item 210 A by increasing the poundage charge, in connection with each rate published therein, from $1-3 / 4$ cents per pound to 2 cents per pound.
(2) That the authority herein granted shall expire unless. exercised within 60 days after the effective date of this order.

This order shall become effective twenty days after the
date hereof.
day of


Comm18810ners
Commissionor....Konnath latite:.,_being
necessarily absent. did not participate
in the disposition of this procectine.


[^0]:    1 The applicant delivers parcels from retail stores in the San Francisco area and the Los Angeles area as a highway contract carrier and city carrier; it transports packages for manufacturers, wholesalers, jobbers, and commercial distributors within the Los Angeles and San Francisco areas as a city carrier, and from and between these areas as a highway common carrier.
    2 Applicant 2180 has pacicage rates of $19 \%$, $24 \%$, and $34 \%$, depending upon the percentage of deliveries consigned to places of business. To 211 of the pachage rates there is added 1-3/4\% per pound which, under this appilcation, would be increased to $2 \not \subset$ per pound. Accord1ng to the evidence, more than $95 \%$ of the packages move at the basic 164 rate.

[^1]:    3 As used by appiscant the term "break point" refers to the weight of the package in pounds at which it becomes cheaper for the shipper to utilize a general truck carrier rather than United Parcel Service.

[^2]:    Applicant sought and was granted rehearing. On rehearing it requested dismissal of the proceeding without prejudice because of changed conilitions. The company then indicated that it would wish to file another application after its labor wages had been determined and after it had an opportunity to observe the effect upon its business of then recentiy authorized increases in statewide minimum rates and in parcel post rates.

[^3]:    5 The applicant adjusted its 1953 experience to the basis of current expenses and proposed rates; the Commission engineer expanded operating revenues and oxpenses based on an increased volume of packages and annual mileages as determined by the use of a trend curve. The company based its administrative and general expenses upon the amounts accruing under a contract between it and an affiliated management corporation; the Commission engineer, finding that the detalis of management expense were not available, allowed administrative and general expenses in accordance with a formula which placed them upon bases similar to those of a sampling of other highway common carriers. Applicant based its depreciation expense for vehicles upon a diminishing value method amounting to one-tinird of the book value at the beginning of each year; the commiesion engineer, for the purpose of his report, used a straight inne dopreciation schedule using a service ilfe for depreciation of 12 years for vehicles purchased new and 7 years for vehicles which were used when purchased. There are other differences in the methods used by the applicant and the Commission engineer.

