

ORIGINALDecision No. 50297

BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

In the Matter of the Investigation into
 the rates, rules, regulations, charges,
 allowances and practices of all common
 carriers, highway carriers and city
 carriers relating to the transportation
 of general commodities (commodities for
 which rates are provided in Highway
 Carriers' Tariff No. 2).

Case No. 5432
 (Pet. No. 17)

Appearances

Arlo D. Poe for Truck Owners Association of California
 and The Motor Truck Association of Southern
 California, petitioners.

J. C. Kaspar for The Motor Truck Association of Southern
 California, petitioner.

R. D. Boynton for Truck Owners Association of California,
 petitioner.

H. P. Merry, Harry S. Moser, D. A. Miller, C. R. Anderson,
D. E. Meyers, Donald M. Cooper, Lester M. Grainger,
Harold M. Brake, Fred Kenny, Roger L. Ramsey,
Preston W. Davis, Wm. Meinhold, Walt A. Steiger,
James F. Bartholomew, E. L. Carley, Thomas R. Dwyer,
Harold M. Hays, George T. Hurst, Frederick Pfommer
and H. J. Bischoff, for various for-hire carriers,
 respondents.

Earl S. Williams for Department of Finance, State of
 California, interested party.

B. F. Maddux, James C. McQuaid, Lester A. Bey, Douglas O.
Day, P. J. Arturo, C. L. Wadsworth, David J. Goldstein,
James L. Roney, J. A. Sullivan, H. R. Van Maren,
John E. Costello, August R. Allen, A. T. Eche,
W. P. Gunn, Frank J. Krantz, Thomas H. Losee,
A. L. Russell, Robert Hopping, Laurence E. Binsacca,
C. F. Breidenstein, E. R. Chapman, Morton S. Colgrove,
Gerald W. Collins, W. R. Donovan, Richard J. Fletcher,
L. L. Foley, Mrs. Ruth Church Gupta, William G. Jackson,
R. J. Jones, W. F. McCann, Jos. R. McNicoll, Frank L.
Merwin, J. E. Myers, H. C. Nay, L. E. Osborne,
Maurice A. Owens, Allen K. Penttila, Patrick W. Pollock,
G. V. Pomares, Walter A. Rohde, P. J. Ryan, W. L. Ryan,
Jack P. Sanders, Harry J. Scherer, A. F. Schumacher,

P. N. Kujachich, John C. Sutherland, C. J. Van Duker, Harold A. Lincoln, Milton A. Walker, Ralph S. Schmitt, F. F. Miller, John F. Kirkman and Carl J. Riedy, for various shippers, shipper organizations and chambers of commerce, interested parties.
Frank B. Austin, Grant L. Malquist, R. A. Lubich, John A. McCunniff and M. J. Gagnon of the staff of the Public Utilities Commission of the State of California.

O P I N I O N

By Petition for Modification No. 17, filed in this proceeding on October 16, 1953, the Truck Owners Association of California and The Motor Truck Association of Southern California seek the revision of rules and charges contained in Highway Carriers' Tariff No. 2 applicable to split pickup shipments and split delivery shipments.

Public hearings were held before Examiner Bryant at Los Angeles and San Francisco on various dates as shown in the margin below.¹ The matter was submitted on June 3, 1954, and is ready for decision.

The petitioners allege that the reasonableness and sufficiency of the charges and the governing rules have not been considered by the Commission for many years. Assertedly the existing provisions are unjust, unreasonable, and discriminatory. In an opening statement counsel for the petitioners declared that the assailed rules and charges have been criticized by highway carriers throughout the years, and have been the subject of special study by the petitioners for more than a year. Clearly, he said, the subject matter

¹ November 19, 1953, April 7 and 8, May 6 and 7, June 1, 2 and 3, 1954.

of split pickup and delivery is very complex, and there is no simple solution for whatever difficulties are involved. He explained that petitioners' objective in this proceeding is the development of a basis of charges that will produce fair and reasonable compensation for the services rendered in providing split pickup and split delivery services under ordinary conditions and circumstances.

At the initial hearing the director of research for the petitioners introduced exhibits consisting of a freight bill analysis of the traffic, a study of the added cost of transporting split pickup and split delivery shipments, and proposed tariff items containing charges developed from the cost study. Upon the conclusion of his direct testimony a number of shipper representatives asked that the Commission staff make an independent study of the problem of split pickup and split delivery rules and charges for presentation at an adjourned hearing.

At later hearings members of the Commission staff introduced a traffic flow study based upon analysis of split pickup and split delivery shipments, a report on the cost of transporting such shipments by motor vehicle equipment, a rate analysis, and a proposal for amendments to the applicable rules provided in Highway Carriers' Tariff No. 2. An amended tariff proposal was submitted by the petitioners also, and other carrier witnesses testified. Many shippers and shipper representatives offered oral and documentary evidence, including a substantial number of exhibits analyzing their own

shipments in detail and showing, among other things, the effects which the proposals made by the petitioners and by the Commission staff would have upon their traffic.

Early in the proceeding (April 2, 1954) The Los Angeles Traffic Managers Conference, Inc. filed a motion to dismiss the petition herein under consideration, alleging errors on the part of the petitioners and failure to support the need for added revenues. The motion will be denied.

The evidence was directed to three subjects which may be stated as questions. First, what restrictions should apply to split shipments? Second, how should the line-haul transportation rate for the composite shipment be determined? Third, what additional charges should be made for each of the component parts?

As defined in Highway Carriers' Tariff No. 2, a split pickup shipment is a shipment consisting of several component parts transported from more than one point of origin or from more than one consignor; a split delivery shipment is a shipment consisting of several component parts transported to more than one consignee or to more than one point of destination.² The present rules require in general that the composite

² The complete definitions are provided in Item No. 11 series of Highway Carriers' Tariff No. 2 as follows:

SPLIT PICKUP SHIPMENT means a shipment consisting of several component parts, tendered at one time and received during one day and transported under one shipping document from (a) one consignor at more than one point of origin, or (b) more than one consignor at one or more points of origin, the composite shipment weighing (or transportation charges computed upon a weight of) not less than 4,000 pounds, said shipment being consigned and delivered to one consignee at one point of destination and charges thereon being paid by the consignee when there is more than one consignor. (Continued on page 5)

shipment shall weigh (or transportation charges shall be computed upon a weight of) not less than 4,000 pounds, that all of the charges shall be paid by the shipper of a split delivery shipment and by the receiver of a split pickup shipment, that no shipment shall be accorded both split pickup and split delivery, and that the carrier must be furnished in advance with written instructions showing the origin and destination and the kind of property in each component part.

None of the parties proposed any substantive change in these requirements. However, the petitioners asked as a new limitation that no shipment moving at commodity rates or at rail alternative rates be accorded split pickup or split delivery service unless (a) every component is rated at 10,000 pounds or more, or (b) the composite shipment weighs at least 30,000 pounds and has not more than four components. Shipments not meeting these specifications would not be split unless the higher class rates were assessed.

Another change proposed both by the petitioners and the Commission staff is the elimination of a provision which permits rating any of the component parts as separate shipments when lower aggregate charges would result.

The existing charges for transportation of split shipments are a combination of the line haul rates plus additional

2 (Continued)

SPLIT DELIVERY SHIPMENT means a shipment consisting of several component parts delivered to (a) one consignee at more than one point of destination, or (b) more than one consignee at one or more points of destination, the composite shipment weighing (or transportation charges computed upon a weight of) not less than 4,000 pounds, said shipment being shipped by one consignor at one point of origin and charges thereon being paid by the consignor when there is more than one consignee.

charges varying with the weight of the component parts. The line haul rate may be a distance rate, a point-to-point rate, or a combination of the two. Under distance rates the mileage used is one-half of the round-trip distance from a point of origin to and through all of the other points of origin or destination. The petitioners urged elimination of the use of one-half of the round-trip mileage. The proposal is that the rate be based upon the full one-way mileage. The association witness testified that the existing provision results in revenue deficiencies as measured by his study and cost analysis.

The Commission staff did not support this proposal. It was the staff position that the use of one-half of the round-trip mileage is necessary in order to keep the charges on a reasonable minimum basis under certain circumstances.

Under the existing rules the additional charges to be made for each component part range from 52 cents for lots weighing not over 100 pounds to \$4.03 for lots weighing over 20,000 pounds. The petitioners and also the Commission staff recommended increases in these charges, based primarily upon the respective studies of the cost of performing the service. In lieu of the single scale of additional charges now applying, the petitioners suggested two scales of charges, according to whether or not the aggregate mileage for the composite shipment exceeds 75 miles. The Commission staff likewise proposed two scales, placing the critical distance at 100 miles. The petitioners would provide as a new feature that the total charge for any component would in no case be less than the minimum

charge applicable if the component moved as a separate shipment. The Commission staff did not subscribe to this suggestion. In other respects the charges recommended by the Commission staff are generally higher than those proposed by the petitioners, and the charges under both proposals are higher than those contained in the existing rules.³ The proposed charges were predicated upon the additional cost of making split pickups and split deliveries as measured by the respective cost analyses submitted by the petitioners and by the staff.

The shipper representatives in general opposed any change in the existing tariff provisions. Some testified that they would have no objection to a moderate increase in the charges, but that the recommended charges would be excessive.

A number of shippers submitted extensive exhibits showing representative examples of their own shipments as rated under the existing rules, under the proposed rules, and as separate shipments. Based upon these analyses some of the witnesses contended that the proposed rules and charges would virtually eliminate all practical use of split pickup or split delivery service. Such elimination, they asserted, would tend to spread the traffic among more carriers and the pickups over longer periods, thus decreasing efficiency and increasing the cost to the carriers and to the shippers. They testified that such effects would tend to induce or compel an increase in proprietary

³ No charge would be made under the Commission staff proposal for component parts weighing over 10,000 pounds within the 100-mile limit, or weighing over 20,000 pounds for the longer distances.

trucking. Some of the shippers, seeking fallacies or errors in the cost studies, undertook to analyze and recombine the cost figures submitted by the petitioners and by the Commission staff, and to relate the results to their own traffic.

Virtually all of the shipper representatives expressed opposition to the proposals to cancel the provision which permits rating one or more components as a separate shipment if a lower aggregate charge would be obtained thereby. They contended that the carrier should bear the obligation of determining and applying the lowest charge by whatever method obtained. Some of them indicated by examples that it would be difficult and impracticable for shippers to determine in advance of movement whether lower charges might be obtained by considering any one or more of the component parts as a separate shipment. In this connection they explained that shipments necessarily are often tendered by persons unskilled in tariff matters, that the larger industries must establish shipping procedures to be followed day after day, and that it would be economically unsound for traffic managers to analyze intended split shipments to determine whether lower charges might result from tendering any of the components as separate shipments.

The president of one highway carrier operating principally between the San Francisco Bay area and points north thereof testified that his company considers the present rules and charges to be adequate. He opposed the suggested increases in charges, particularly those recommended by the Commission staff. This witness expressed fear that any

substantial increase in the charges would divert traffic to proprietary vehicles. He feared particularly the loss of small multiple-lot shipments moving over short distances, which he stated are particularly susceptible to proprietary handling, and are needed by the common carriers to maintain volume.

Discussion and Conclusions

In the eight days of public hearing devoted to this matter more than 80 appearances were entered, some 20 witnesses testified, and 26 exhibits were received in evidence. The intensive participation of carriers and industrial traffic managers in this proceeding suggests the importance which they attach to split pickup and split delivery in the movement of goods and commodities between points within this state.

The evidence shows that split pickup and split delivery shipments are diverse in character as to commodities, as to points of origin and destination, as to types of carriers performing the service, and as to the manner in which the traffic is handled by the carriers. This diversity makes more difficult the selecting of typical shipments for the purpose of cost determination and rule development. There are so many possible circumstances and conditions to be provided for that great care must be taken lest unreasonable charges or unwarranted restrictions be established which would interfere with the free flow of commerce.

From the cost evidence submitted by the petitioners no sound basis is readily discernable for the proposal that shipments of less than 30,000 pounds or having components of

less than 10,000 pounds be denied split pickup or split delivery service if rated under commodity rates or rail alternative rates. Whether the applicable line-haul rate is a class rate or a commodity rate should not normally be controlling in determining whether such service will be performed. It is concluded that split pickup or split delivery service should be permitted without reference to the question whether class rates or commodity rates are to be applied.

On the other hand, petitioners' proposal that the application of distance rates be related to the one-way mileage rather than to one-half of the round-trip mileage appears to be based upon practical considerations. The effect of the existing provision is to require carriers and shippers to compute a round-trip mileage and divide it by two. The resulting figure is less than the one-way mileage whenever a pickup or delivery is made at a point not on the shortest direct route between the most distant points. Aside from the inconvenience of the method, the evidence is convincing that its application produces rates lower than justified by cost and distance considerations. It is concluded that petitioners' recommendation relative to the distance rates should be adopted substantially as proposed.

The establishment of two scales of added charges according to the length of haul, as proposed by the petitioners and the Commission staff, is necessary in order to place the charges in necessary relationship to the different services performed. This difference essentially is that for movements

within a range of approximately 75 to 100 miles it is commonly most efficient to load the shipment upon a vehicle from which the component parts will be distributed without rehandling. For longer distances it is often more efficient to transfer the tonnage at the carrier's terminal to different line haul vehicles. The most efficient methods will be given recognition in the fixation of minimum rates and charges.

As to the level of the charges, it is clear that some increase in the existing basis is required. The cost studies underlying the recommended increased charges are exceptionally comprehensive, and are supported by quantities of data gathered in the field and through freight bill sampling. While no important defect was disclosed in either study, there are important differences in the conclusions reached by the two cost witnesses. When either cost basis is converted into charges the results are difficult to reconcile with other rate-making considerations. It appears from the exhibits that some attempt may have been made to compensate in the costs for excessive mileage required under certain conditions.⁴ However, such a method of compensation would not be proper in a

⁴ Point-to-point rates are provided in Highway Carriers' Tariff No. 2 for transportation between certain extensive territories as described in the tariff. These rates apply from and to all places within each territory. Thus, a point-to-point rate may be applied for multiple pickups or deliveries within the territories without the addition of any distance rate for the extra mileage involved. Where the points served within the territory are not on any reasonably direct route a service may be performed for which full compensation is not provided in the tariff. This problem was recognized by some of the witnesses but none of them proposed specifically any method by which it might be corrected.

minimum rate structure. Minimum rates should be related closely to the particular services for which they are designed, and should not be made high in one instance to offset a non-compensatory service in another. The added charges hereinafter established are not based wholly upon either of the cost studies as translated into the rate exhibits. Modifications have been made in light of the full record.

The provision in the existing rules which permits treating one or more of the component parts as a separate shipment for the purpose of determining a lower aggregate charge requires particular comment. The evidence shows that in practice the strict application of this provision would require that the carrier determine as to each split pickup or split delivery shipment whether separate shipments should have been made instead. Under it the shipper could with logic tender as a split delivery shipment all lots of property ready to be shipped at a single time, regardless of the scattering of the destinations, and the carrier would be expected to assess charges as though the freight had been reasonably tendered according to the different routes as split delivery shipments or separate shipments. The evidence indicates that neither the shippers nor the carriers are assuming literally the full burden of determining in what manner and to what extent lower aggregate charges may result from treating one or more component parts as separate shipments. It was testified that to do so in all cases would be wasteful of skilled man-hours disproportionate to the differences in transportation charges which might result.

Nevertheless, the existence of the present provision in the Commission tariff compels the carriers either to analyze each split shipment according to the numerous possible combinations, or to disregard the provision and thereby assess charges possibly higher than those provided in the tariff.

Such a choice is not a reasonable one to impose. Removal of the provision would not affect the minimum rates or charges, but would require that the shipper exercise care in tendering shipments as single shipments or split shipments. If he deems the possible savings to be insufficient to warrant such care, it is not reasonable that the carrier be required to assume the burden. Unnecessary burdens which tend to increase costs are likely to be reflected in carrier rates. It is concluded that the provision in question should be cancelled.

Upon careful consideration of all of the evidence it is concluded that the existing minimum rates, rules, regulations, and charges for the transportation of split pickup shipments and split delivery shipments should be revised to the extent provided in the order which follows.

O R D E R

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

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED:

(1) That Highway Carriers' Tariff No. 2 (Appendix "D" of Decision No. 31606, as amended) be and it is hereby further

amended by incorporating therein to become effective September 10, 1954, the revised pages attached hereto and listed in Appendix "A" also attached hereto, which pages and appendix by this reference are made a part hereof.

(2) That tariff publications required or authorized to be made by common carriers as a result of the amendments herein of the aforesaid tariff shall be made effective on or before September 10, 1954, on not less than five days' notice to the Commission and to the public.

(3) That in all other respects the aforesaid Decision No. 31606, as amended, shall remain in full force and effect.

(4) That the motion to dismiss Petition for Modification No. 17, which motion was filed in this proceeding on April 2, 1954, by The Los Angeles Traffic Managers

Conference, Inc., be and it is hereby denied.

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

Dated at San Francisco, California, this 20th of July, 1954.

Walter E. Mitchell
President
Justin J. Caswell
Kenneth J. Pottel
James Ferguson

Commissioners

APPENDIX "A" TO DECISION NO. 50297

Revised Pages to Highway Carriers' Tariff No. 2 Authorized
by Said Decision

Thirteenth Revised Page 13 cancels Twelfth Revised Page 13

Fifth Revised Page 20-A cancels Fourth Revised Page 20-A

Eleventh Revised Page 21 cancels Tenth Revised Page 21

Sixth Revised Page 65 cancels Fifth Revised Page 65

(End of Appendix)

Item No.	SECTION NO. 1 - RULES AND REGULATIONS OF GENERAL APPLICATION (Continued)
<p>20-C Cancels 20-B</p>	<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 and the Household Goods Carriers Act and apply for transportation of property by radial highway common carriers, highway contract carriers and household goods carriers as defined in said Acts.</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> <p>Radial highway common carriers, highway contract carriers and household goods carriers may deviate from the minimum rates named in this tariff in connection with the transportation of property for the armed forces of the United States.</p> <p>Rates, rules and regulations named in this tariff shall not apply to transportation by independent-contractor subhaulers when such transportation is performed for other carriers. This exception shall not be construed to exempt from the tariff provisions carriers for whom the independent contractors are performing transportation service.</p>
<p>*30-K Cancels 30-J</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">APPLICATION OF TARIFF - TERRITORIAL</p> <p>*Subject to the note below the 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 except as provided in Items Nos. 176, 177, 178 and 179 series;</p> <p>(c) Shipments having both point of origin and point of destination within the San Diego Drayage Area as described in City Carriers' Tariff No. 7 - Highway Carriers' Tariff No. 9, amendments thereto or reissues thereof;</p> <p>(d) Shipments having both point of origin and point of destination within the Los Angeles Drayage Area, as described in City Carriers' Tariff No. 4 - Highway Carriers' Tariff No. 5, amendments thereto or reissues thereof;</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 & Son, Sacramento Wool Company, Sacramento Feed Company, Essex Lumber Company, Campbell Soup Company, McKesson & Robbins, Inc., and Howard Terminal Warehouse, on the other hand; (4) between said cities and plants on the one hand and the Sacramento Air Depot, the Sacramento Municipal Airport and the Sacramento Signal Depot on the other hand; and (5) between the Sacramento Air Depot, the Sacramento Municipal Airport and the Sacramento Signal Depot;</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;

(g) Shipments between the Sonora freight depot of the Sierra Railroad Company and Sonora.

//Note: The exceptions provided in this item do not apply in connection with the transportation of split pickup or split delivery shipments having one or more points of origin or destination outside of the cities or areas designated in this item.

*Change }
//Addition } Decision No. 50297

EFFECTIVE SEPTEMBER 10, 1954

Issued by the Public Utilities Commission of the State of California,
San Francisco, California.

Correction No. 622

Item No.

SECTION NO. 1 - RULES AND REGULATIONS OF GENERAL APPLICATION (Continued)

◇ SPLIT PICKUP

The rate for the transportation of a split pickup shipment shall be determined and applied as follows, subject to Note 1:

- (a) Distance rates shall be determined by the distance to point of destination from that point of origin which produces the shortest distance via the other point or points of origin.
- (b) Point-to-point rates shall be applied only when point of destination and all points of origin are within the territories between which the point-to-point rates apply, or are located between said territories on a single authorized route.
- (c) Point-to-point rates determined under paragraph (b) may be combined with distance rates provided in paragraph (a) where lower charges result. The applicable distance rate factor shall be determined by use of one-half the shortest distance from the territory or authorized route and return thereto via the off-route point or points of origin and destination.
- (d) For each split pickup shipment a single bill of lading or other shipping document shall be issued; and at the time of or prior to the initial pickup the carrier shall be furnished with written instructions showing the name of the consignor, the point or points of origin and the description and weight of property in each component part of such shipment.
- (e) If split delivery is performed on a split pickup shipment or a component part thereof, or if shipping instructions do not conform with the requirements of paragraph (d) hereof, each component part of the split pickup shipment shall be rated as a separate shipment under other provisions of this tariff.

*160-I
Cancels
160-H

NOTE 1: In addition to the rate for transportation, the following additional charges shall be assessed for split pickup service:

- 1. For split pickup shipments transported under distance rates, when the distance computed in accordance with paragraph (a) hereof does not exceed 100 constructive miles, and shipments transported under point-to-point rates named in Items Nos. 509, 515 and 520 series:

Weight of Component Part (Pounds)		Split Pickup Charge for Each Component Part in Cents
Over	But Not Over	
0	100	100
100	500	100
500	1,000	130
1,000	2,000	180
2,000	4,000	250
4,000	10,000	295
10,000		345

2. For split pickup shipments, except as provided in paragraph 1:

Weight of Component Part (Pounds)		Split Pickup Charge for Each Component Part in Cents
Over	But Not Over	
0	100	100
100	500	130
500	1,000	200
1,000	2,000	300
2,000	4,000	400
4,000	10,000	500
10,000		600

* Change)
 ◊ Increase) Decision No. 50297

EFFECTIVE SEPTEMBER 10, 1954

Issued by the Public Utilities Commission of the State of California,
 San Francisco, California.

Correction No. 623

Item No.	SECTION NO. 1 - RULES AND REGULATIONS OF GENERAL APPLICATION (Continued)																											
	◇ SPLIT DELIVERY																											
	The rate for the transportation of a split delivery shipment shall be determined and applied as follows, subject to Note 1:																											
	(a) Distance rates shall be determined by the distance from point of origin to that point of destination which produces the shortest distance via the other point or points of destination.																											
	(b) Point-to-point rates shall be applied only when point of origin and all points of destination are within the territories between which the point-to-point rates apply, or are located between said territories on a single authorized route.																											
	(c) Point-to-point rates determined under paragraph (b) may be combined with distance rates provided in paragraph (a) where lower charges result. The applicable distance rate factor shall be determined by use of one-half the shortest distance from the territory or authorized route and return thereto via the off-route point or points of origin and destination.																											
*170-I Cancel 170-H	(d) For each split delivery shipment a single bill of lading or other shipping document shall be issued; and at the time of or prior to the tender of the shipment the carrier shall be furnished with written instructions showing the name of each consignee, the point or points of destination and the description and weight of property in each component part of such shipment.																											
	(e) If split pickup is performed on a split delivery shipment or a component part thereof, or if shipping instructions do not conform with the requirements of paragraph (d) hereof, each component part of the split delivery shipment shall be rated as a separate shipment under other provisions of this tariff.																											
	NOTE 1: In addition to the rate for transportation, the following additional charges shall be assessed for split delivery service:																											
	1. For split delivery shipments transported under distance rates, when the distance computed in accordance with paragraph (a) hereof does not exceed 100 constructive miles, and shipments transported under point-to-point rates named in Items Nos. 509, 515 and 520 series:																											
	<table style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <thead> <tr> <th colspan="2" style="text-align: center;">Weight of Component Part (Pounds)</th> <th style="text-align: center;">Split Delivery Charge for Each Component Part in Cents</th> </tr> <tr> <th style="text-align: center;"><u>Over</u></th> <th style="text-align: center;"><u>But Not Over</u></th> <th></th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">0</td> <td style="text-align: center;">100</td> <td style="text-align: center;">100</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">100</td> <td style="text-align: center;">500</td> <td style="text-align: center;">100</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">500</td> <td style="text-align: center;">1,000</td> <td style="text-align: center;">130</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">1,000</td> <td style="text-align: center;">2,000</td> <td style="text-align: center;">180</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">2,000</td> <td style="text-align: center;">4,000</td> <td style="text-align: center;">250</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">4,000</td> <td style="text-align: center;">10,000</td> <td style="text-align: center;">295</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">10,000</td> <td></td> <td style="text-align: center;">345</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Weight of Component Part (Pounds)		Split Delivery Charge for Each Component Part in Cents	<u>Over</u>	<u>But Not Over</u>		0	100	100	100	500	100	500	1,000	130	1,000	2,000	180	2,000	4,000	250	4,000	10,000	295	10,000		345
Weight of Component Part (Pounds)		Split Delivery Charge for Each Component Part in Cents																										
<u>Over</u>	<u>But Not Over</u>																											
0	100	100																										
100	500	100																										
500	1,000	130																										
1,000	2,000	180																										
2,000	4,000	250																										
4,000	10,000	295																										
10,000		345																										

2. For split delivery shipments, except as provided in paragraph 1:

Weight of Component Part (Pounds)		Split Delivery Charge for Each Component Part in Cents
Over	But Not Over	
0	100	100
100	500	130
500	1,000	200
1,000	2,000	300
2,000	4,000	400
4,000	10,000	500
10,000		600

RECEIVING AND TRANSMITTING PURCHASE ORDERS

172-B
Cancels
172-a

When the service of receiving and transmitting purchase orders is performed in connection with the transportation to which the rates provided in this tariff are applicable the charge for handling said purchase orders shall be 2-3/4 cents per order.

STRINGING PIPE

175

When the service of stringing (distribution in transit along a line) is performed in connection with the transportation of iron or steel pipe for which the class rates provided in this tariff are applicable, the class rates shall be applied to the point at which the stringing service is commenced. In addition thereto hourly rates provided in Item No. 720 series shall be assessed for the time consumed in performing the stringing service, less ten minutes per ton.

* Change }
◇ Increase } Decision No. 50297

EFFECTIVE SEPTEMBER 10, 1954

Issued by the Public Utilities Commission of the State of California,
San Francisco, California.
Correction No. 624

Item No.	SECTION NO. 3		COMMODITY RATES (Continued) In Cents per 100 Pounds	
	COMMODITY	FROM	TO	RATE
*740-F Cancels 740-E	Sugar, minimum weight 30,000 pounds	SAN FRAN- CISCO (See Item No. 260 series) CROCKETT	LOS ANGELES BASIN TERRITORY as described in Item No. 270 series	(1) (2) (3) 42
	<p>(1) Subject to Item No. 900 series.</p> <p>(2) When accessorial services are rendered by carrier in connection with shipments moving under rate in this item the following charges shall be in addition to rate shown:</p> <p>(a) For loading or unloading other than tailgate loading or tailgate unloading 3½ cents per 100 pounds.</p> <p>(b) For other accessorial charges see Items Nos. 140 and 180 series.</p> <p>(3) Item No. 170 series: Split delivery service will apply only when the weight of each component part is 10,000 pounds or more, or transportation charges are based on a weight of not less than 10,000 pounds for each component part.</p>			
<p>* Change & Reduction } Decision No. 50297</p>				
EFFECTIVE SEPTEMBER 10, 1954				
<p>Issued by the Public Utilities Commission of the State of California, San Francisco, California.</p> <p>Correction No. 625</p>				