

ORIGINAL

Decision No. 59090

BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

In the matter of the investigation into the rates, rules and regulations, charges, allowances and practices of all common carriers, highway carriers and city carriers relating to the transportation of any and all commodities between and within all points and places in the State of California (including, but not limited to, transportation for which rates are provided in Minimum Rate Tariff No. 2).

Case No. 5432

Petitions for Modification Nos. 149 and 153

Appearances are listed in Appendix A

O P I N I O N

By Petition for Modification No. 149, California Trucking Associations, Inc. seeks upward adjustments in the minimum class rates and charges prescribed in Minimum Rate Tariff No. 2. The increases sought are greater for the small shipments and the longer lengths of haul. No increases are sought for the commodity rates or for the rates for Classes 5, A, B, C, D and E.

By Petition for Modification No. 153, the major railroads seek authority to increase class rates and charges prescribed in Pacific Southcoast Freight Bureau Tariffs Nos. 255 and 294 by the same amount and to the same extent as the Commission may prescribe for highway carriers.

Public hearing was held in the petitions before Examiner J. E. Thompson at Los Angeles on June 9, 10 and 11, 1959, and at San Francisco June 23 and 24, 1959.

The rates and charges contained in Minimum Rate Tariff No. 2 were revised and adjusted generally by Decision No. 55704, dated October 15, 1957, following extensive proceedings in Petition No. 62 in Case No. 5432. Said rates were increased by various

amounts, not exceeding ten percent and averaging about five percent, by Decision No. 57545 dated November 3, 1958 in Petition No. 124 in Case No. 5432. The increases in rates gave effect to changes in the cost of operations of highway carriers subsequent to the prior decision with respect to increased wages, fuel costs and Federal Social Security taxes, and a reduction in the California transportation tax.

Since proceedings were held in Petition No. 124, highway carriers have experienced increases in operating costs. Cost studies introduced by the California Trucking Associations, Inc., hereinafter referred to as C.T.A., and by the Commission's Transportation Division indicate increases in the cost of operation as of May 1, 1959 on the order of about two percent.

C.T.A. proposes adjustments of certain portions of the minimum rate structure in areas where assertedly the present minimum rates are deficient and in others where petitioner believes that the traffic can better sustain the burden of increases in rates.

Class Rates

Petitioner proposed a schedule of class rates which was developed by applying certain percentage increases to the present rates and rounding off the result. In some instances adjustments were made in the results so as to provide a more uniform progression of rates. The pattern of the proposed class rate adjustments is shown in Table I.

TABLE I  
PATTERN OF PROPOSED CLASS RATE  
ADJUSTMENTS SHOWING AVERAGE  
PERCENTAGE INCREASES

Distance (Constructive Miles)	<u>Minimum Weight Brackets</u>					Class 5 Thru E
	AQ	2,000	4,000	10,000	20,000	
Under 100	2%	2%	2%	1%	1%	0%
100 - 350	3%	2%	2%	1%	1%	0%
Over 350	5%	-	3%	1%	1%	0%

C.T.A.'s Director of Research testified that diversion of traffic to proprietary operations is more apt to occur in connection with movements of 100 miles or less. This was one of the reasons why petitioner's proposed schedule of rates reflect greater increases for the longer distances than the shorter distances. He also testified that the present minimum rates for the longer distances have not been sufficient. One reason given is that the rate structure, except on the very short hauls, reflects cost data which is based upon the movement of less-than-truckload shipments across two carrier terminals, whereas practically all of the traffic moving under rates for distances of 350 miles or more actually has one or more additional handlings through terminals at intermediate points.<sup>1/</sup>

The increases proposed by petitioner assertedly to offset the cost of additional terminal handling were opposed by a number of parties. The Traffic Manager of the State of California urged the Commission to consider the establishment of proportional rates which, if adopted, would result in reductions in rates for some of the hauls of longer distances.

There is an abundance of cost data of record as well as reports of financial statements of 103 carriers engaged in transportation subject to the rates in Minimum Rate Tariff No. 2. There is also testimony showing the manner in which traffic moves over various routes in California.

The transportation of less-than-truckload shipments in California follows a recognizable pattern. It normally is a series of relatively short hauls between what may be called terminal points

---

<sup>1/</sup> The point-to-point class rates applicable between Los Angeles Territory on the one hand and San Francisco Territory and Sacramento on the other are the equivalent of the class rates for distances over 325 miles but not over 350 miles.

or junction points from origin to destination. The number of terminal points or junction points through which the traffic moves varies; normally, however, the number increases with the distance from the point of origin to the point of destination. There are a few points, such as Los Angeles, San Francisco and Sacramento, where less than truckload shipments seldom move through without a terminal handling. Trucks moving between the terminal points usually enjoy relatively high load factors resulting not only because of traffic having origin and destination at the terminal points, but also because of the traffic moving through the points. Load factor is an important element of the cost per 100 pounds of transporting shipments. On these facts the parties have different views regarding suitable and reasonable minimum rates. An illustration will best describe their respective contentions.

A 600 pound shipment from Los Angeles to Galt and one from Los Angeles to Roseville would probably be handled in the same manner, i.e., line-hauled from Los Angeles to Sacramento and thence peddle-tripped to destination. It is probable that the actual cost of transporting the shipment to Galt would be as high or higher than the cost of the shipment to Roseville, yet, because Galt is intermediate between Sacramento and Los Angeles on an authorized route, the rate may not exceed the rate from Los Angeles to Sacramento. The first-class rates per 100 pounds of such shipments are \$1.81 in the case of the shipment to Galt, and \$2.75 in the case of Roseville. It is petitioner's view that the point-to-point rates must be sufficiently high to offset higher costs of serving intermediate points and that the rates to beyond points should be increased in order to offset the costs of handling such shipments over a third terminal. The

Traffic Manager of the State contends that the rates to beyond points, such as Roseville in this instance, do not reflect the high load factors involved on over 96 percent of the route traversed. He urges that proportional rates be established to be used in combination with the point-to-point rates for shipments beyond Sacramento, San Francisco and Los Angeles. Some of the shippers, particularly those from Southern California, contend that the Los Angeles to Sacramento and San Francisco rates are too high considering the load factors of equipment operating between those points.

All of these contentions assume that there is or should be a constant relationship between the rates and the actual cost of providing transportation between the various points in this state. This is not a valid assumption. Such a rate structure would tend to create discriminations and would be highly preferential to the larger cities to the prejudice of the smaller communities surrounding such cities. There are many economic forces and factors which must be considered in minimum rate making. Additionally, rates based solely upon distance do not, and can not, reflect differences in the flow of traffic, volume of movement, methods of transportation and other economic considerations as between various pairs of termini. The basic minimum rate structure is composed of distance rates with certain exceptions, such as the point-to-point rates between Los Angeles and San Francisco, made necessary by reason of extremely favorable conditions. The cost data of record were developed to conform to the rate structure generally<sup>2/</sup> and do not reflect the differences in conditions between various pairs of termini throughout the

---

<sup>2/</sup> An example of this is in the development of costs for less than truckload shipments for distances of 500 miles, a "load factor" is necessary to develop the cost per 100 pounds. There are few, if any, instances of vehicular trips of 500 miles or more so that the "load factor" was developed by extrapolation of data for trips of shorter distances. (See Chart No. 3, Ex 62-104 in Case 5432.)

State. The various contentions illustrated above involve economic considerations which vary as they pertain to transportation for equal distances between different points in California. The differences are greatest in connection with traffic moving through San Francisco, Los Angeles and Sacramento, where additional handling is performed on the shorter hauls as well as on the longer hauls between points in northern and southern California. Where additional terminal handling is performed, the cost of performing transportation will be higher than the estimated costs which were considered in the establishment of minimum rates and, if possible, some effect should be given to this circumstance. Other than in its proposed "Any Quantity" rates, petitioner gave little effect to this factor. In the proposed "Any Quantity" rate scale petitioner starts giving effect to additional handling costs in the rates for 150 miles. This is not warranted by the facts of record. While the evidence shows that shipments moving 500 miles or over regularly receive an additional terminal handling, it does not show that such is the case for shorter distances.

Other than the proposed "Any Quantity" rates, the class rates, in general, proposed by petitioner reflect the increases in costs shown by the evidence of record. Some minor adjustments will be made to remove a few instances where there is an uneven progression of rates. With respect to the "Any Quantity" scale of minimum class rates, the evidence of record shows that in addition to increases necessary to offset recent cost increases, an upward adjustment in the rates for the longer distances is warranted and is necessary. The amount of the increases sought by petitioner, however, have not been justified. The adjustments which will be made in said rates will, in general, follow those suggested by the staff

for distances of less than 500 miles and will be somewhat higher than those suggested by the staff for the longer distances.

Minimum Charges

In addition to increases in the present structure of minimum charges, petitioner seeks two major modifications in the provisions respecting this item. It is proposed that a new and higher schedule of charges be established for distances exceeding 350 miles, other than shipments subject to the point-to-point rates between San Francisco and Los Angeles. Petitioner contends that a higher scale of charges is warranted by the higher costs involved and that the present scale of charges is insufficient to return the cost of transportation. It is recognized that the cost per shipment of transporting property ordinarily increases with the distance; however, if this were the primary consideration, separate schedules of minimum charges should be established for all of the mileage brackets for which class rates are prescribed.

In the establishment of minimum rates, we have recognized that there are many common carriers which are regularly tendered small shipments whose services are necessary to the public. Under present circumstances and conditions, the economic stability of those carriers would be impaired if the minimum charges were established at a level substantially below full cost. From the evidence of record, however, we are not persuaded that the additional schedule of charges proposed by petitioner for distances exceeding 350 miles is necessary to preserve such services.

Petitioner also proposes for distances exceeding 150 miles that the minimum charge for shipments weighing less than 100 pounds be for 100 pounds at the applicable class rate. At present, the tariff provides that for shipments classified higher than first-class the minimum charge shall be for 100 pounds at the first-class rate.

Petitioner contends that the transportation characteristics of articles should be given effect in the minimum charges. The present minimum charge rule does give some effect to classification; e.g., while the minimum charge is applicable on articles rated first-class weighing up to 100 pounds, it is applicable only on those articles rated double first-class weighing less than 50 pounds. Extremely low density is probably the most distinguishing characteristic of articles rated higher than first-class. Whatever the difference may be in the cost of transporting a shipment of articles rated double first-class weighing 40 pounds and a shipment of articles rated first-class weighing 90 pounds is not as substantial as would be the difference in charges as proposed by petitioner. The effect of density, as a transportation characteristic, upon the cost of performing the service is diminished where the quantity being shipped is small. This proposal has not been shown to be justified.

The Northern California Shippers' League proposed modifications to provide for lower minimum charges for each shipment when five or more shipments are picked up at one time. No specific schedule of charges was proposed. The spokesman for the League stated that its proposal was offered as a starting point towards the establishment of rates and charges on small shipments which would pass on to the shipper the savings in cost to the carrier resulting when large numbers of small shipments are tendered by the shipper to the carrier at one time. He said that while the League's proposal suggests five as the minimum number of shipments governing the application of the lower charges, it, too, is offered only as an initial step in the consideration of a schedule of charges which would reflect the reduced costs and other advantages to the carrier associated with multiple lot pickup and prepayment of charges.



The California Manufacturers Association advocated that the Commission not act upon the League's proposal at this time. It suggested that the Commission direct its staff to develop and prepare data which may be presented in any future proceeding involving this subject so that the Commission will have evidence upon which it can make a determination in the matter.

Petitioner urged the Commission not to act upon the League's proposal at this time in that there was some question of whether a system of charges as proposed would result in unfair and unjust advantages to some carriers and shippers to the prejudice and disadvantages of others.

There is little in this record which will permit a determination of a fair and reasonable structure of minimum charges along the general lines proposed by the League.

Apparently a number of carriers and shippers support the establishment of minimum charges for multiple shipments picked up at one time and shipped prepaid. An appropriate petition should be filed by the advocates thereof, setting forth the proposal for adjustment of the rate structure. The shippers are in a position and should be prepared to present factual data respecting the tender and movement of their shipments and other basic data affecting the proposal. The carriers are also in a position to present data regarding their experience in the pickup of multiple shipments and they would be expected to present whatever data they could assemble along those lines.

A number of shippers protested any increase in the minimum charges. There was evidence showing that wholesalers and jobbers dealing in merchandise having a manufacturer's fixed retail price will be forced to curtail their areas of distribution if the minimum charges are increased. The evidence conclusively shows that a

portion of the small shipment traffic will be diverted to other means of transportation and distribution. We have considered all of such circumstances.

It is generally recognized that over the past several years there has been a rapid spiraling of costs of operations of transportation companies. The record shows that, because of the amount of labor involved, the rate of increase in costs incurred in terminal services has exceeded the rate of increase of expenses assigned to line-haul operation. This, in turn, has necessitated greater increases in the rates and charges for small shipments than for larger shipments. In the past years there has been a trend in marketing and merchandising of retailers and other outlets to maintain lower inventories. This trend has been due to many factors, one of which is an increase in the practice of retailers and other outlets to maintain greater types and varieties of the same general item. This has resulted in reductions in the average weight per shipment tendered to the common carriers.

These circumstances, among other economic forces, have resulted in the carriers receiving a greater proportion of "high cost" traffic which in turn has necessitated substantial increases in rates. X The circumstances have had an untoward effect upon ✓ the manufacturer and the retailer. While the above is an oversimplification of the so-called small shipment problem, it illustrates the conditions with which the carriers and the shippers are

confronted. Not to increase present rates and charges as advocated by some shippers is not a solution. The cost of performing transportation service has increased. Unless the carriers are permitted to recover the additional costs through an increase in rates, their ability to maintain facilities to provide adequate and dependable transportation service to the public will be impaired. It may be that revisions in the rate structure, along the lines proposed by the League or otherwise, may improve the situation; however, the record herein does not provide facts which would permit such determination.

The minimum charges suggested by the staff in Exhibit No. 149-8 provide for increases of five cents in the charges other than for shipments weighing over 250 pounds and shipments weighing over 25 but not over 50 pounds for distances not exceeding 150 miles. In the former instance the increase is ten cents, and in the latter, the increase is fifteen cents. There was objection to the latter by several parties. The present minimum charge is the same for all shipments weighing not over 50 pounds; the schedule proposed by the staff provides separate charges for shipments weighing 25 pounds or less and shipments weighing over 25 pounds. The following table shows the suggested charges for shipments weighing not over 100 pounds with the estimated costs of record.

TABLE II

COMPARISON OF MINIMUM CHARGES FOR DISTANCES NOT EXCEEDING 150 CONSTRUCTIVE MILES PROPOSED BY COMMISSION'S STAFF WITH ESTIMATED COSTS OF RECORD (30 MILE LENGTH OF HAUL)

<u>Weight in Lbs.</u>		<u>Present Charge</u>	<u>Suggested Charge</u>	<u>Full Cost at 100% Operating Ratio</u>	
<u>Over</u>	<u>But Not Over</u>			<u>Staff</u>	<u>Petitioner</u>
0	25	\$1.60	\$1.65	\$1.682	\$2.50
25	50	1.60	1.75	1.950	2.770
50	75	1.85	1.90	2.206	3.049
75	100	2.15	2.20	2.461	3.290

Upon consideration of all of the evidence we find that the minimum charges proposed by the staff are reasonable and that the increases in charges resulting therefrom are necessary and are justified.

#### Other Charges

Increases are proposed in charges for split pickup, split delivery, and accessorial services of between two and five percent generally. There was substantial objection by a number of shippers of the form and the amount of increases in the charges for split pickup and split delivery. Split pickup and split delivery have been extensively used by shippers in connection with distribution of small shipments. It has been shown that recent substantial increases in such charges, in effect, has eliminated this avenue of economically distributing large volumes of small shipments. In this respect, the matter is closely related to our discussion regarding the proposal of the Northern California Shippers' League with respect to minimum charges for pickup of multiple shipments. The evidence shows that the cost of performing the service has increased. ✓ Upon consideration of all of the facts and circumstances we find that the increased charges suggested by the staff are justified. ✓

Petitioner proposes cancellation of minimum rates for receiving and transmitting purchase orders. It was testified that such services are no longer performed by carriers. In the circumstances the proposal will be adopted.

#### The Petition of the Railroads

The railroads are subject to the minimum rates for the transportation of less-than-carload shipments moving under class rates. Evidence offered by the rail lines shows that such traffic

moves at an out-of-pocket loss and that the truck lines are the rate-making carriers for the transportation of less-than-carload traffic. The rail lines additionally seek authority to increase certain rates in Pacific Southcoast Freight Bureau Tariff No. 294 (Trailer on Flat Car Service). Some of the rates and charges, such as for split pick-up, split delivery and accessorial services are directly related to the operation of trucks and the wage cost of truck drivers and helpers. The railroad lines are subject to the same costs as are the truck lines for such services. The record shows that the rates and charges for such services should be increased. The railroads maintain class rates for shipments of minimum weights of 20,000 pounds in trailer on flatcar service. The railroads characterize such rates as carload rates. The carriers engage truck drivers to operate the truck equipment used in this operation. Such employees are covered by the same labor agreement as drivers employed by highway carriers. There is no doubt that the labor expenses of the carriers engaged in performing trailer or flatcar services have increased.

A number of shippers protested the increases sought. They contended that the railroads offered no evidence concerning the cost of performing trailer on flatcar service or the revenue needs of the carriers in connection with that service.

If the increases sought are not granted, under Section 3663 of the Public Utilities Code, the existing rates would be the minimum rates for all highway carriers including common carriers, furnishing service in competition with the railroads between the same points. It is necessary for the preservation of adequate transportation service that the class rates maintained by the railroads for shipments subject to minimum weights of 20,000 pounds on trailer on flatcar service be maintained at competitive levels.

Upon consideration of all of the facts and circumstances, we find that the increases sought have been justified.

Conclusion

Some of the arguments made by shippers in opposition to increases in the minimum rates, and the facts adduced in support of their arguments deserve further comment.

We recognize that numerous wholesalers and jobbers are highly dependent upon the less-than-truckload services of common carriers in distributing their goods and that the successive increases in the minimum charges, split delivery charges and rates for small shipments are decreasing the areas in which they can market their goods. We further recognize that, because of differences in the rate structures, in some instances the charges applicable on small shipments from out-of-state to California points are lower than the intrastate rates for equivalent distances. This latter circumstance could be changed by the adoption of a rate structure similar to that maintained by interstate carriers in lieu of the "grasshopper scale" type of structure presently established. This structure, however, would not recognize the cost differential between the transportation of the small shipment and the transportation of the volume shipment which is less than truckload. Shippers using the less-than-truckload volume rates would be required to pay more for the transportation services performed for them.

Some parties have contended in these proceedings that if the rate increases are not granted the weaker carriers will fall by the wayside and the stronger ones, in prevailing, will have additional traffic which will improve load factors, which in turn will lower the cost of performing service. Assuming for the moment that the sharing of all available traffic by fewer carriers would provide for lower rates, it is uncertain whether this would redound to the

interest of the shipping public. In proceedings before the Commission shippers have asserted that economic circumstances and conditions in California require the flexibility that results from a large number of carriers. Indeed, in Application No. 39276 of the Draymen's Association of San Francisco, numerous shippers participated and testified and not one stated a contrary view. Of the shipping public who have participated and who have been represented in proceedings before the Commission, by far the larger segment has stated that a large number of carriers available to transport their goods is essential to their well being.

The Public Utilities Code appears to reflect those views. If the Legislature was of the opinion that a smaller number of carriers would be in the public interest, it could have enacted legislation to that purpose. The fact that entry into the field of highway carriage has not been barred and that the door is open to all indicates that the Legislature has held a contrary view.

The Commission is charged with the duty of establishing minimum rates so as to maintain transportation services which are essential to the public. The cost of the maintenance of an adequate and dependable transportation system must be borne by the shipping public.

Upon consideration of all the facts and circumstances of record, we are of the opinion and find that the rates and charges which will be established in the order which follows are just, reasonable and non-discriminatory rates and charges for the

transportation of property and that the increases in rates and charges which will be herein authorized and required have been shown to be justified and are necessary to preserve to the public adequate and dependable transportation service.

O R D E R

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

IT IS ORDERED:

1. That Minimum Rate Tariff No. 2 (Appendix "D" to Decision No. 31606, as amended) be and it is further amended by incorporating therein, to become effective November 13, 1959, the supplement and revised pages attached hereto and listed in Appendix "B", also attached hereto, which supplement, pages and appendix by this reference are made a part hereof.

2. That common carriers subject to the Public Utilities Act, to the extent that they are subject also to said Decision No. 31606, as amended, be and they are directed to establish in their tariffs the increases necessary to conform with the further adjustments herein of that decision.

3. That any provisions currently maintained in common carrier tariffs which are more restrictive than, or which produce charges greater than, those contained in Minimum Rate Tariff No. 2, are authorized to be maintained in connection with the increased rates and charges directed to be established by Ordering Paragraph 2 hereof.

4. That the increased class rates and increased minimum charges and accessorial service charges directed to be established



by Ordering Paragraph 2 hereof be and they are authorized to be made applicable also for the transportation of traffic:

- (a) For which minimum commodity rates have been established.
- (b) For which minimum rates have not been established.

5. That common carriers, subject to the Public Utilities Act and subject also in some degree to Decision No. 31606, as amended, and to Ordering Paragraph 2 hereof, other than common carriers by railroad, which maintain in their tariffs minimum charges on levels higher than the minimum charges contained in Minimum Rate Tariff No. 2, be and they are authorized to increase their minimum charges in amounts not to exceed the following:

<u>Weight of Shipment</u> <u>(in pounds)</u>		<u>Amount of Increase</u> <u>(in cents)</u>
<u>Over</u>	<u>But Not Over</u>	
0	25	5
25	50	15
50	250	5
250	-	5

6. That highway common carriers and express corporations, subject to Decision No. 31606, as amended, which maintain in their tariffs rates for the transportation of commodities under refrigeration differentially higher than the minimum rates for such transportation, be and they are hereby authorized to establish the increases required to maintain the differential in rates.

7. That common carriers by railroad, in addition to the increases hereinbefore directed or authorized, be and they are authorized to increase the rates, charges and provisions in the tariffs or portions thereof identified below to the levels of the comparable rates, charges and provisions of Minimum Rate Tariff No. 2 as established pursuant to Ordering Paragraph 1 hereof:

(1) Pacific Southcoast Freight Bureau Tariff  
No. 294-B, M. A. Nelson, Tariff Publish-  
ing Officer:

- (a) Item No. 305 - Accessorial Charges
- (b) Item No. 400 - Split Pickup
- (c) Item No. 425 - Split Delivery
- (d) Section 1 - Class Rates  
(minimum weight 20,000 pounds)

(2) Pacific Southcoast Freight Bureau Tariff  
No. 255-G, M. A. Nelson, Tariff Publish-  
ing Officer:

- (a) Item No. 360 - Accessorial Charges
- (b) Item No. 840 - Minimum Charges
- (c) Item No. 1100 - Split Delivery
- (d) Item No. 1130 - Split Pickup
- (e) Section 2 - Class Rates

8. That common carriers, in establishing and maintaining the rates and charges authorized or directed hereinabove, be and they are authorized to depart from the provisions of Article XII, Section 21, of the Constitution of the State of California, and Section 460 of the Public Utilities Code, to the extent necessary to adjust long-and-short-haul departures now maintained under outstanding authorizations; that such outstanding authorizations be and they are modified only to the extent necessary to comply with this order; and that common carriers in publishing rates under the authority conferred in this ordering paragraph shall make reference in their schedules to the prior orders authorizing the long-and-short-haul departures and to this order.

9. That tariff publications required or authorized to be made by common carriers as a result of the order herein may be made effective not earlier than the effective date hereof or not less than ten days' notice to the Commission and to the public, and that such tariff publications as are required shall be made effective not later than November 13, 1959, and that as to tariff publications

which are authorized but not required, the authority herein granted shall expire unless exercised within sixty days after the effective date hereof.

10. That in all other respects Petition No. 149 of the California Trucking Associations, Inc., and Petition No. 153 of the Southern Pacific Company, et al., are denied.

The effective date of this order shall be twenty days after the date hereof.

Dated at San Francisco, California, this 29th day of September, 1959.

*Ernest R. DeLoach*  
 President

*W. J. Mohr*

*W. J. Mohr*

*E. J. Lynn*

Commissioners

Commissioner Theodore H. Jenner, being necessarily absent, did not participate in the disposition of this proceeding.

APPENDIX A  
Page 1 of 2

LIST OF APPEARANCES

Petitioners: Arlo D. Poe, J. C. Kaspar, and J. X. Quintrall, for California Trucking Association, Inc.; Charles W. Burkett, Jr., for Southern Pacific Co., The Atchison, Topeka and Santa Fe Railway Co., Western Pacific Railroad Co., Union Pacific Railroad Co., Pacific Electric Railway Co., and Northwestern Pacific Railroad Co.

Protestants: A. E. Norrbom, for Los Angeles Wholesale Institute, California Shippers Associates, and Toy Manufacturers of the U. S. A.; William Cheatham, for Dohrman Commercial Company and/or Northern California Shippers League; G. R. Arvedson, for The Plas-Tex Corporation; Burt W. Miller, for California Retailers Association.

Respondents: Gus M. Somlyo, for Victorville-Barstow Truck Line; A. C. Des Jardin, for Higgins Trucks, Inc.; Joe Araiza, for Santa Fe Transportation Company; William J. Pope and V. W. Pope, for Aetna Freight Lines; F. S. Kohles, for Valley Express Company and Valley Motor Lines, Inc.; Bill Crawford, for Mercury Freight Lines; Otto C. Broyles, for Anaheim Truck & Transfer Company; Fred G. Love, for Inland Transportation Corporation; Anthony J. Konicki, for Pacific Motor Trucking Company; E. J. McSweeney, for Pacific Motor Trucking Company; Jack J. Connelly, for Marine Transport Company; Thomas R. Dwyer and Roy Grob, for Delta Lines, Inc.; C. V. Stadler, for S & M Freight Lines; James H. Carr, for Carr Bros.; H. H. Halverson, for Halverson Transport Company; Herbert J. Griley, for Griley Security Freight Lines; Robert C. Ellis, for California Motor Transport Co., Ltd., Circle Freight Lines, California Motor Express, Ltd., and Stockton Motor Express; Cecil C. Clark, for Inter City Truck & Delivery; Armand Karp, for Callison Truck Lines, Inc.; Marion L. Frost, Jr., for Southern California Freight Lines, Southern California Freight Forwarders, Oregon-Nevada-California Fast Freight, Inc., Coast Line Truck Service, Inc.; Norman R. Moon, for Highway Transport, Inc., and Highway Transport Express.

Interested Parties: C. S. Connolly, A. P. Davis, Jr., and Joseph Q. Joynt, for Carnation Company; J. A. Sullivan, for California Hardware Company; Cromwell Warner, for Traffic Managers Conference of Southern California; A. L. Russell and Robert Dempster, for Sears, Roebuck and Company; W. M. Stigers, for Union Hardware & Metal Company; C. R. Dick Hart, for Imperial Truck Lines, Inc.; Donald L. Cole, for General Petroleum Corporation; O. H. Scott, for J. A. Clark Draying Company, Ltd.; Warren L. Carroll, for Ducommun Metals & Supply Company; B. F. Bolling, for The Flintkote Company; Emil Metkovich, for Harper & Reynolds; Gerald C. Turner, for Owens-Illinois Glass; Eugene A. Read, for California Manufacturers Association; Earl S. Williams, for State of California Department of Finance;

APPENDIX A  
Page 2 of 2

LIST OF APPEARANCES

E. J. Lanchofer, for San Diego Chamber of Commerce; John P. Hellmann, for Johnson & Johnson and/or National Small Shipments League; W. Y. Bell, for Richfield Oil Corporation; R. C. Fels, for Furniture Manufacturers Association of California; Allen K. Penttila, for Sherwin Williams Company; H. J. Bischoff, for Fair Transportation Standards, Inc.; Gus Amson, for the May Company; W. F. McCann, for Container Corporation of America and Sefton Fibre Can Company; Edward J. Schilz, for Young's Market Company and Beverage Wholesalers of Southern California; V. A. Bordelon, for Los Angeles Chamber of Commerce; W. J. Knoell, for Western Motor Tariff Bureau, Inc.; Jack Clodfelter, for McCormick & Company, Schilling Division; D. C. Turrentine, for Wine Institute; Robert M. Ivie, for United Vintners, Inc.; C. H. Costello, for Continental Can Company, Inc.; Roy J. Varni, for Wm. Volker & Company, T. B. Kircher, for Spreckels Sugar Co.

Commission Staff: John F. Specht, R. J. Staunton and G. L. Malquist.

APPENDIX "B" TO DECISION NO. 59090

Revised Pages to Minimum Rate Tariff No. 2  
Authorized by Said Decision

Eighth Revised Page 19-B  
Eighteenth Revised Page 20  
Twelfth Revised Page 20-A  
Eighteenth Revised Page 21  
Fifteenth Revised Page 41  
Fifteenth Revised Page 42  
Twelfth Revised Page 43  
Tenth Revised Page 43-A  
Sixteenth Revised Page 44  
Seventh Revised Page 44-A  
Sixth Revised Page 44-B

End of Appendix "B"

Item No.	SECTION NO. 1 - RULES AND REGULATIONS OF GENERAL APPLICATION (Continued)								
<p>143-D Cancel 143-C</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">DELAYS TO EQUIPMENT ON WHOLE GRAIN (See Note)</p> <p>1. Definitions                      (a) Actual placement. By actual placement is meant the placing of carriers' equipment at place designated by consignee or consignor for loading or unloading.                      (b) Constructive placement. By constructive placement is meant the holding of a unit of carriers' equipment at a point other than the designated loading or unloading place, due to the inability of consignee or consignor to accept for actual placement the unit of carriers' equipment after its tender for actual placement by the carrier. Constructive placement of equipment for purpose of loading or unloading shall not commence prior to the time specified in consignee's or consignor's oral or written equipment order, or at any time other than normal business days between the hours of 8:00 A.M. and 3:00 P.M. (the lunch hour between 12:00 noon and 1:00 P.M. excepted) Monday through Friday.                      (c) Unit of Equipment. By unit of equipment is meant a motor truck, trailer, or semi-trailer, exclusive of motor tractor.</p> <p>2. Free Time                      (a) A period of four (4) hours will be allowed on each unit of equipment between constructive placement and time equipment has actually completed loading or unloading.                      (b) The provisions of this item shall not apply in connection with the actual placement of units of equipment under agreement with the consignor or consignee for loading by the consignor or unloading by the consignee, when such agreement is recorded on the shipping document.</p> <p>3. Demurrage on Equipment Held After Free Time Has Elapsed                      A charge of <del>2</del> per 100 pounds will be made by the carrier on all shipments on all equipment unloaded or loaded after the free time has elapsed.</p> <p>4. Provisions of Item No. 145 of this tariff will not apply.</p> <p>NOTE:-Applies only on shipments of Whole Grain in bulk or in bags, subject to minimum weights of 10,000 pounds or more.</p>								
<p>*145-G Cancel 145-F</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">CHARGES FOR ACCESSORIAL SERVICES OR DELAYS</p> <p>For accessorial services or delays under conditions specified in Items Nos. 140 and 142, charges based upon the actual elapsed time shall be assessed for each period or fraction thereof, as follows:</p> <table style="margin-left: auto; margin-right: auto;"> <thead> <tr> <th colspan="2" style="text-align: center;">Charges in Cents</th> </tr> <tr> <th style="text-align: center;">For First 30 Minutes or Fraction</th> <th style="text-align: center;">For Each Additional 15 Minutes or Fraction</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">(a) For driver, helper or other carrier employee, per man....</td> <td style="text-align: center;">♦210      ♦105</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">(b) For unit of equipment (each motor truck, trailer or semi-trailer, exclusive of motor tractors) .....</td> <td style="text-align: center;">65              33</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Charges in Cents		For First 30 Minutes or Fraction	For Each Additional 15 Minutes or Fraction	(a) For driver, helper or other carrier employee, per man....	♦210      ♦105	(b) For unit of equipment (each motor truck, trailer or semi-trailer, exclusive of motor tractors) .....	65              33
Charges in Cents									
For First 30 Minutes or Fraction	For Each Additional 15 Minutes or Fraction								
(a) For driver, helper or other carrier employee, per man....	♦210      ♦105								
(b) For unit of equipment (each motor truck, trailer or semi-trailer, exclusive of motor tractors) .....	65              33								

ADVERTISING ON EQUIPMENT

147- C  
Cancels  
147- B

For placing or carrying any sign, or signs, or advertising, of alcoholic liquors on carrier's equipment engaged in transporting alcoholic liquors, N.O.I.B.N., as described under that heading in the Western Classification, moving between San Francisco Territory and Los Angeles Territory, an additional charge of \$6.60 per unit per shipment shall be assessed by the carrier.

\* Change }  
◇ Increase } Decision No. 59099

EFFECTIVE NOVEMBER 13, 1959

Issued by the Public Utilities Commission of the State of California,  
San Francisco, California.  
Correction No. 957



Item No.	SECTION NO. 1 - RULES AND REGULATIONS OF GENERAL APPLICATION (Continued)		
	MINIMUM CHARGE		
	The minimum charge per shipment shall be as follows:		
	(a) For distances not exceeding 150 constructive miles (See Exceptions 1 and 2):		
	Weight of Shipment (In Pounds)		o Minimum Charge
	<u>Over</u>	<u>But Not Over</u>	<u>(In Cents)</u>
	0	*25	165
	# 25	50	175
	50	75	190
	75	100	220
	100	150	275
	150	200	325
	200	250	380
	250	-	440
	(b) For distances exceeding 150 constructive miles, the minimum charge per shipment shall be (See Exceptions 1 and 2):		
	1. If classified first class or lower, for 100 pounds at the class or commodity rate applicable thereto; or		
*150-P Cancels 150-0	2. If classified higher than first class, for 100 pounds at the first class rate; or		
	3. If shipment contains different articles and no article is rated higher than first class, for 100 pounds at the class or commodity rate applicable to the article taking the highest rate; or if any article is rated higher than first class, for 100 pounds at the first class rate; but		
	4. In no event shall the minimum charge be less than:		
	Weight of Shipment (In Pounds)		o Minimum Charge
	<u>Over</u>	<u>But Not Over</u>	<u>(In Cents)</u>
	0	100	220
	100	150	275
	150	200	325
	200	250	380
	250	-	440
	<u>EXCEPTION 1:</u> For shipments (a) having point of origin or point of destination on steamship wharves or docks, or (b) trans- ported beyond public highways to or from oil or gas well sites, the minimum charges shall in no event be less than those set forth in Paragraph (b) 4 plus an additional o31 cents per shipment.		

(1) EXCEPTION 2: For shipments transported between points in the Redwood Empire Territory, as described in Item No. 271-3, on the one hand, and points within the areas described in Paragraphs (b) and (c) of Item No. 512, on the other hand, the minimum charge shall be the applicable charge set forth in this item plus 10 percent per shipment. Fractions of less than one-half cent shall be dropped and fractions of one-half cent or greater shall be increased to one cent.

(1) Expires with May 1, 1960

\* Change            )  
o Increase         )  
# Addition         )

Decision No. 5909~~8~~

EFFECTIVE NOVEMBER 13, 1959

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

Correction No. 958

Item No.	SECTION NO. 1 - RULES AND REGULATIONS OF GENERAL APPLICATION (Continued)
	<p style="text-align: center;">SPLIT PICKUP</p> <p>The rate for the transportation of a split pickup shipment shall be determined and applied as follows, subject to Note 1:</p> <p>(a) Subject to the alternative provided in paragraph (g) of this item, 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.</p> <p>(b) Subject to the alternative provided in paragraph (g) of this item, point-to-point rates shall be applied only when point of destination and all points of origin are within the territories or are within the pickup and delivery limits of the named points between which the point-to-point rates apply, or are located between said territories or named points on a single authorized route.</p> <p>(c) Subject to the alternative provided in paragraph (g) of this item, 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.</p> <p>(d) The carrier shall not transport a split pickup shipment unless prior to or at the time of the initial pickup, written information has been received from the consignor showing the name of the consignor, the points of origin and the kind and quantity of property in each component part of such shipment.</p> <p>(e) At the time of or prior to the initial pickup, the carrier shall issue to the consignor a single split pickup document. It shall show the name of the consignor, points of origin, date of pickup, name of the consignee, point of destination and the kind and quantity of property of the entire shipment. In addition, a shipping document (see Item No. 255) shall be issued by the carrier to the consignor for each component part of the split pickup shipment (including the initial pickup) which shall give reference to the single split pickup document covering the entire shipment, by showing its date and number (if assigned a number), the name of the consignor, and such other information as may be necessary to clearly identify the single split pickup document.</p> <p>(f) If split delivery is performed on a split pickup shipment or a component part thereof, or if written information does not conform with the requirements of Paragraph (d) hereof, or if all of the component parts are not received by the carrier during one calendar day, each component part of the split pickup shipment shall be rated as a separate shipment under other provisions of this tariff, except that those component parts which do conform with the requirements of this item shall constitute a separate split pickup shipment or shipments.</p>

\*160-p  
Cancels  
160-C

(g) In determining the charge for a split pickup shipment, component parts may be rated as separate shipments from point or points of origin of such component parts to any point on the split pickup route (as provided in paragraph (a), (b) or (c) hereof); provided that the written instructions furnished to the carrier under paragraph (d) hereof show (1) the component parts to be treated as separate shipments and (2) the points between which the separate shipment rates are to be applied. The additional charges provided in Note 1 shall apply to all component parts of the split pickup shipment rated in accordance with the provisions of this paragraph, provided, however, where two or more component parts are rated under rates provided in this tariff as separate shipments to the same point on the split pickup route, the aforesaid two or more components shall be considered as one split pickup and the charge therefor shall be at the combined weight of the aforesaid component parts.

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:

Weight of Component Part (Pounds)			Split Pickup Charge for Each Component Part in Cents	Weight of Component Part (Pounds)			Split Pickup Charge for Each Component Part in Cents
Over	But Not Over	Over		But Not Over			
0	100	-----	145	2,000	4,000	-----	330
100	*250	-----	165	4,000	10,000	-----	390
#250	500	-----	175	10,000		-----	445
500	1,000	-----	195				
1,000	2,000	-----	250				

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	Weight of Component Part (Pounds)			Split Pickup Charge for Each Component Part in Cents
Over	But Not Over	Over		But Not Over			
0	100	-----	165	2,000	4,000	-----	550
100	*250	-----	205	4,000	10,000	-----	665
#250	500	-----	215	10,000		-----	775
500	1,000	-----	305				
1,000	2,000	-----	440				

\* Change  
 o Increase  
 # Addition

Decision No. 59090

EFFECTIVE NOVEMBER 13, 1959

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

Correction No. 959

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) Subject to the alternative provided in paragraph (g) of this item, 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) Subject to the alternative provided in paragraph (g) of this item, point-to-point rates shall be applied only when point of origin and all points of destination are within the territories or are within the delivery and pickup limits of the named points between which the point-to-point rates apply, or are located between said territories or named points on a single authorized route.
- (c) Subject to the alternative provided in paragraph (g) of this item, 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) The carrier shall not transport a split delivery shipment unless at the time of or prior to the pickup of the shipment, written information has been received from the consignor showing the name of each consignee, point or points of destination, and the kind and quantity of property in each component part of such shipment.
- (e) At the time of or prior to the pickup of the shipment, the carrier shall issue to the consignor a single split delivery bill of lading or comparable shipping order for the entire shipment. It shall show the name of the consignor, point of origin, date of pickup, name of each consignee, point or points of destination, and the kind and quantity of property in each component part of such shipment, or, the single split delivery bill of lading or comparable shipping order shall refer to specifically designated documents attached thereto and forming a part thereof which show the component part delivery information.
- (f) If split pickup is performed on a split delivery shipment or if written information does not conform with the requirements of Paragraph (d) hereof, or if all of the shipment is not received at the carrier's established depot or picked up by carrier during one calendar day (see exception in multiple lot shipment), each component part of the split delivery shipment shall be rated as a separate shipment under other provisions of this tariff.

\*170-P  
Cancels  
170-0

(g) In determining the charge for a split delivery shipment, component parts may be rated as separate shipments from any point or points on the split delivery route (as provided in paragraph (a), (b) or (c) hereof) to point or points of destination of such component parts; provided that the written instructions furnished to the carrier under paragraph (d) hereof show (1) the component parts to be treated as separate shipments and (2) the points between which the separate shipment rates are to be applied. The additional charges provided in Note 1 shall apply to all component parts of the split delivery shipment rated in accordance with the provisions of this paragraph, provided, however, where two or more component parts are rated under rates provided in this tariff as separate shipments from the same point on the split delivery route, the aforesaid two or more component parts shall be considered as one split delivery and the charge therefor shall be at the combined weight of the aforesaid component parts.

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:

Weight of Component Part (Pounds)		◊ Split Delivery Charge for Each Component Part in Cents	Weight of Component Part (Pounds)		◊ Split Delivery Charge for Each Component Part in Cents
But Not Over	Over		But Not Over	Over	
0	100	145	2,000	4,000	330
100	*250	165	4,000	10,000	390
#250	.500	175	10,000		445
500	1,000	195			
1,000	2,000	250			

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	Weight of Component Part (Pounds)		◊ Split Delivery Charge for Each Component Part in Cents
But Not Over	Over		But Not Over	Over	
0	100	165	2,000	4,000	550
100	*250	205	4,000	10,000	665
#250	.500	215	10,000		775
500	1,000	305			
1,000	2,000	440			

6172-F  
Cancel  
172-E

ITEM CANCELED

STRINGING PIPE

175-B  
Cancels  
175-A

When the service of stringing (distribution in transit along a line) is performed in connection with the transportation of pipe and culvert, fencing, posts and poles, 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 shall be assessed for the time consumed in performing the stringing service, less ten minutes per ton.

\* Change )  
◊ Increase )  
⊖ Reduction )  
// Addition )

Decision No. 59099

EFFECTIVE NOVEMBER 13, 1959

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

Correction No. 960

Item No.	SECTION NO. 2												
	CLASS RATES												
	In Cents Per 100 Pounds												
	Any Quantity (See Note)				Minimum Weight 2,000 Pounds (See Note)				Minimum Weight 4,000 Pounds (See Note)				
	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4	
But Not Over	Over												
0	3	171	154	137	120	99	89	79	69	73	66	58	51
3	5	173	156	138	121	100	90	80	70	74	67	59	52
5	10	175	157	140	123	103	93	82	72	75	68	60	53
10	15	177	158	141	124	105	95	84	74	76	69	61	54
15	20	179	161	143	125	108	97	86	76	79	71	63	55
20	25	181	162	144	126	110	99	88	77	81	73	65	57
25	30	183	165	146	128	114	103	91	80	84	76	67	59
30	35	185	167	148	130	116	104	93	81	86	77	69	60
35	40	187	168	149	131	120	108	96	84	89	80	71	62
40	45	189	170	151	132	123	111	98	86	91	82	73	64
45	50	191	172	153	134	125	113	100	88	94	85	75	66
50	60	194	175	155	136	130	117	104	91	98	88	78	69
60	70	197	176	157	137	135	122	108	95	100	90	80	70
70	80	200	180	160	140	140	126	112	98	104	94	83	73
80	90	203	184	163	143	145	131	116	102	106	95	85	74
90	100	206	187	166	146	150	135	120	105	110	99	88	77
100	110	209	189	168	147	155	140	124	109	113	102	90	79
110	120	212	192	170	149	161	145	129	113	115	104	92	81
120	130	215	194	172	151	166	149	133	116	118	106	94	83
130	140	218	197	175	153	171	154	137	120	120	108	96	84
140	150	220	199	177	155	176	158	141	123	123	111	98	86
150	160	222	202	179	157	181	163	145	127	125	113	100	88
160	170	224	205	182	160	186	167	149	130	128	115	102	90
170	180	226	207	184	161	191	172	153	134	130	117	104	91
180	190	228	210	186	163	198	178	158	139	133	120	106	93
190	200	230	212	188	165	204	184	163	143	135	122	108	95
200	220	234	215	191	167	213	192	170	149	139	125	111	97
220	240	238	219	194	170	221	199	177	155	141	127	113	99
240	260	242	221	197	172	230	207	184	161	145	131	116	102
260	280	246	225	200	175	239	215	191	167	149	134	119	104
280	300	250	230	204	179	248	223	198	174	153	138	122	107
300	325	255	234	208	182	-	-	-	-	158	142	126	111
325	350	260	239	212	186	-	-	-	-	164	148	131	115
350	375	265	243	216	189	-	-	-	-	169	152	135	118
375	400	270	248	221	193	-	-	-	-	174	157	139	122
400	425	275	253	225	197	-	-	-	-	179	161	143	125
425	450	280	257	229	200	-	-	-	-	183	165	146	128
450	475	285	262	233	204	-	-	-	-	188	169	150	132
475	500	290	266	237	207	-	-	-	-	193	174	154	135
500	525	295	271	241	211	-	-	-	-	198	178	158	139

\*500-0  
 Cancels  
 500-N



525	550	300	275	245	214	-	-	-	-	203	183	162	142
550	575	305	280	249	218	-	-	-	-	206	185	165	144
575	600	310	284	253	221	-	-	-	-	211	190	169	148
600	625	315	289	257	225	-	-	-	-	215	194	172	151
625	650	320	293	261	228	-	-	-	-	220	198	176	154
650	675	325	298	265	232	-	-	-	-	224	202	179	157
675	700	330	302	269	235	-	-	-	-	229	206	183	160
700	725	335	307	273	239	-	-	-	-	234	211	187	164
725	750	340	313	278	244	-	-	-	-	240	216	192	168
750	775	345	318	282	247	-	-	-	-	245	221	196	172
775	800	350	322	286	251	-	-	-	-	250	225	200	175
800	850	358	329	292	256	-	-	-	-	255	230	204	179
850	900	367	336	298	261	-	-	-	-	261	235	209	183
900	950	376	342	304	266	-	-	-	-	269	242	215	188
950	1000	384	349	310	272	-	-	-	-	275	248	220	193
1000	1050	392	356	316	277	-	-	-	-	283	255	226	198
1050	1100	400	363	322	282	-	-	-	-	290	261	232	203
1100	1150	408	369	328	287	-	-	-	-	296	266	237	207
1150	1200	416	376	334	293	-	-	-	-	304	274	243	213

NOTE. - For shipments originating at or destined to points within the Redwood Empire Territory these rates are subject to the provisions of Item No. 512.

\* Change )  
 ♦ Increase ) Decision No. **59090**

EFFECTIVE NOVEMBER 13, 1959

Issued by the Public Utilities Commission of the State of California,  
 San Francisco, California.  
 Correction No. 961

Item No.	SECTION NO. 2										CLASS RATES				
											In Cents Per 100 Pounds				
Rates shown below will not apply to transportation for which rates are provided in Item No. 520															
MILES	Minimum Weight 10,000 Pounds except as provided in Note 1 (See Note 3)				Minimum Weight 20,000 Pounds except as provided in Note 2				Minimum Weight as provided in Western Classification, Exception Sheet or this Tariff, subject to Item No. 290						
	But Not Over	0 1	0 2	0 3	0 4	0 1	0 2	0 3	0 4	5	A	B	C	D	E
0	3	41	37	33	29	20	18	16	14	11 $\frac{1}{2}$	12 $\frac{1}{2}$	10 $\frac{1}{2}$	9 $\frac{1}{2}$	8 $\frac{1}{2}$	7 $\frac{1}{2}$
3	5	43	39	34	30	23	21	18	16	12 $\frac{1}{2}$	13 $\frac{1}{2}$	11 $\frac{1}{2}$	10 $\frac{1}{2}$	9 $\frac{1}{2}$	7 $\frac{1}{2}$
5	10	44	40	35	31	24	22	19	17	13 $\frac{1}{2}$	14 $\frac{1}{2}$	12 $\frac{1}{2}$	11 $\frac{1}{2}$	10 $\frac{1}{2}$	8 $\frac{1}{2}$
10	15	45	41	36	32	25	23	20	18	14 $\frac{1}{2}$	15 $\frac{1}{2}$	13 $\frac{1}{2}$	12 $\frac{1}{2}$	11 $\frac{1}{2}$	9 $\frac{1}{2}$
15	20	46	42	37	33	28	25	22	19	15 $\frac{1}{2}$	16 $\frac{1}{2}$	14 $\frac{1}{2}$	13 $\frac{1}{2}$	12 $\frac{1}{2}$	10 $\frac{1}{2}$
20	25	48	43	38	34	29	26	23	20	16 $\frac{1}{2}$	17 $\frac{1}{2}$	15 $\frac{1}{2}$	14 $\frac{1}{2}$	13 $\frac{1}{2}$	11 $\frac{1}{2}$
25	30	49	44	39	35	30	27	24	21	17 $\frac{1}{2}$	18 $\frac{1}{2}$	16 $\frac{1}{2}$	15 $\frac{1}{2}$	14 $\frac{1}{2}$	12 $\frac{1}{2}$
30	35	50	45	40	36	33	30	26	23	18 $\frac{1}{2}$	19 $\frac{1}{2}$	17 $\frac{1}{2}$	16 $\frac{1}{2}$	15 $\frac{1}{2}$	13 $\frac{1}{2}$
35	40	51	46	41	37	35	32	28	24	19 $\frac{1}{2}$	20 $\frac{1}{2}$	18 $\frac{1}{2}$	17 $\frac{1}{2}$	16 $\frac{1}{2}$	14 $\frac{1}{2}$
40	45	54	49	43	38	36	33	29	25	20 $\frac{1}{2}$	22	19 $\frac{1}{2}$	18 $\frac{1}{2}$	17 $\frac{1}{2}$	15 $\frac{1}{2}$
45	50	55	50	44	39	39	35	31	27	22	24	20 $\frac{1}{2}$	19 $\frac{1}{2}$	18 $\frac{1}{2}$	16 $\frac{1}{2}$
50	60	59	53	47	41	41	37	33	29	24	26	22	20 $\frac{1}{2}$	19 $\frac{1}{2}$	17 $\frac{1}{2}$
60	70	61	55	49	43	45	41	36	32	26	28	23	22	20 $\frac{1}{2}$	18 $\frac{1}{2}$
70	80	64	58	51	45	48	43	38	34	28	30	24	23	22	19 $\frac{1}{2}$
80	90	66	59	53	46	51	46	41	36	30	32	25	24	23	20 $\frac{1}{2}$
90	100	69	62	55	48	55	50	44	39	32	34	26	25	24	22
100	110	71	64	57	50	58	52	46	41	33	36	28	26	25	23
110	120	74	67	59	52	60	54	48	42	35	38	30	27	26	24
120	130	76	68	61	53	63	57	50	44	37	40	32	28	27	25
130	140	79	71	63	55	66	59	53	46	39	42	34	29	28	26
140	150	81	73	65	57	70	63	56	49	41	44	36	30	29	27
150	160	84	76	67	59	73	66	58	51	42	46	38	31	30	28
160	170	86	77	69	60	75	68	60	53	44	48	40	33	31	29
170	180	89	80	71	62	78	70	62	55	46	50	42	35	32	30
180	190	91	82	73	63	80	72	64	56	48	52	44	37	33	31
190	200	94	85	75	66	83	75	66	58	49	53	45	39	34	32
200	220	98	88	78	69	85	77	68	60	50	55	46	41	36	33
220	240	101	91	81	71	89	80	71	62	52	57	48	43	38	34
240	260	105	95	84	74	91	82	73	64	54	59	50	45	40	35
260	280	110	99	88	77	95	86	76	67	56	61	52	47	42	37

\* 505-Cancel 505-

NOTE 1.-When applied in connection with carload ratings, minimum weight will be as provided in the Western Classification, Exception Sheet or in this tariff, subject to Item No. 290.

NOTE 2.-When applied in connection with carload ratings, minimum weight will be as provided in the Western Classification, Exception Sheet or in this tariff (subject to Item No. 290) but in no event less than 20,000 pounds.

NOTE 3.-For shipments originating at or destined to points within the Redwood Empire Territory these rates are subject to the provisions of Item No. 512.

\* Change )  
◊ Increase ) Decision No. 59090

EFFECTIVE NOVEMBER 13, 1959

Issued by the Public Utilities Commission of the State of California,  
San Francisco, California.  
Correction No. 962

Item No.	SECTION NO. 2				CLASS RATES (Continued) In Cents Per 100 Pounds											
	MILES	Minimum Weight 10,000 Pounds except as provided in Note 1 (See Note 3)				Minimum Weight 20,000 Pounds except as provided in Note 2				Minimum Weight as provided in Western Classification, Exception Sheet or this Tariff, subject to Item No. 290						
		But Not Over	01	02	03	04	01	02	03	04	5	A	B	C	D	E
	280	300	115	104	92	81	99	89	79	69	58	64	54	49	44	39
	300	325	120	108	96	84	105	95	84	74	61	67	56	52	46	41
	325	350	125	113	100	88	109	99	87	76	64	70	59	54	48	43
	350	375	130	117	104	91	114	103	91	80	67	73	62	57	51	45
	375	400	135	122	108	95	119	107	95	83	70	76	64	59	53	47
	400	425	140	126	112	98	124	112	99	87	73	80	67	62	55	49
	425	450	145	131	116	102	129	116	103	090	76	83	70	64	57	51
	450	475	150	135	120	105	134	120	107	94	79	86	73	66	59	53
	475	500	155	140	124	109	139	125	111	097	82	89	76	69	62	55
	500	525	160	144	128	112	144	130	115	101	85	92	79	71	64	57
	525	550	165	149	132	116	149	134	119	104	89	96	82	74	66	59
	550	575	170	153	136	119	154	139	123	108	92	99	85	76	69	61
	575	600	175	158	140	123	159	143	127	111	95	102	87	79	71	63
	600	625	180	162	144	126	164	148	131	115	98	105	89	81	73	65
	625	650	185	167	148	130	169	152	135	118	101	109	92	84	75	67
	650	675	191	172	153	134	175	158	140	123	104	113	95	87	78	69
	675	700	196	176	157	137	180	162	144	126	107	116	98	89	80	71
	700	725	201	181	161	141	185	167	148	130	110	119	101	92	82	73
	725	750	206	185	165	144	191	172	153	134	113	122	104	94	84	75
	750	775	211	190	169	148	196	176	157	137	116	126	107	97	87	77
	775	800	216	194	173	151	203	183	162	142	120	130	110	100	90	80
	800	850	223	201	178	156	209	188	167	146	124	135	114	103	93	83
	850	900	230	207	184	161	216	194	173	151	128	139	118	107	96	85
	900	950	238	214	190	167	223	201	178	156	132	144	121	110	99	88
	950	1000	246	221	197	172	230	207	184	161	136	148	125	114	102	91
	1000	1050	255	230	204	179	238	214	190	167	140	153	129	117	105	94
	1050	1100	263	237	210	184	244	220	195	171	145	157	133	121	108	97
	1100	1150	270	243	216	189	251	226	201	176	149	162	137	124	112	100
	1150	1200	279	251	223	195	259	233	207	181	154	166	141	128	115	103

\*507-X  
Cancels  
507-J

NOTE 1.—When applied in connection with carload ratings, minimum weight will be as provided in the Western Classification, Exception Sheet or this tariff, subject to Item No. 290.

NOTE 2.—When applied in connection with carload ratings, minimum weight will be as provided in the Western Classification, Exception Sheet or in this tariff (subject to Item No. 290) but in no event less than 20,000 pounds.

NOTE 3.—For shipments originating at or destined to points within the Redwood Empire Territory, these rates are subject to the provisions of Item No. 512.

\* Change  
 o Increase, Except as noted  
 o No change  
 Decision No. **59090**

EFFECTIVE . NOVEMBER 13, 1959

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

Correction No. 963

Item No.	SECTION NO. 2				CLASS RATES (Continued) In Cents per 100 Pounds										
	BETWEEN	AND	Any Quantity				Minimum Weight 2,000 Pounds				Minimum Weight 4,000 Pounds				
*509-G Cancels 509-F	Class Rates shown below are intermediate in application subject to Note 1.														
	San Jose (See Item No. 260-7.5)	San Francisco (See Item No. 260-7)	01	02	03	04	01	02	03	04	01	02	03	04	
		Oakland (See Item No. 260-5.5)	191	172	153	134	125	113	100	88	94	85	75	66	
	Santa Clara Campbell														
			Minimum Weight 10,000 Pounds except as provided in Note 2				Minimum Weight 20,000 Pounds except as provided in Note 3				Minimum Weight as provided in Western Classification, Exception Sheet or this tariff, sub- ject to Item No. 290				
	San Francisco (See Item No. 260-7)	01	02	03	04	01	02	03	04	5	A	B	C	D	E
	Oakland (See Item No. 260-5.5)	55	50	44	39	39	35	31	27	20½	24	20½	19½	18½	16½
		54	49	43	38	36	33	29	25	20½	22	19½	18½	17½	15½

NOTE 1.-If charges accruing under the Class Rates in this item, applied on shipments from, to or between points intermediate between origin and destination points via Routes 8, 9 and 10 shown in Item No. 900 are lower than charges accruing under the Distance Class Rates in Items Nos. 500 and 505 on the same shipment via the same route such lower charges will apply.

NOTE 2.-When applied in connection with carload ratings, minimum weight will be as provided in the Western Classification, Exception Sheet or in this tariff, subject to Item No. 290.

NOTE 3.-When applied in connection with carload ratings, minimum weight will be as provided in the Western Classification, Exception Sheet or in this tariff (subject to Item No. 290) but in no event less than 20,000 pounds.

\* Change )  
 ◊ Increase ) Decision No. **59099**

EFFECTIVE NOVEMBER 13, 1959

Issued by the Public Utilities Commission of the State of California,  
 San Francisco, California.  
 Correction No. 964

Item No.	SECTION NO. 2		CLASS RATES (Continued) In Cents per 100 Pounds													
Class Rates shown below are intermediate in application subject to Note 1.																
-- BETWEEN		AND	MINIMUM WEIGHT													
			Any Quantity				4,000 Pounds				10,000 Pounds except as provided in Note 2					
510-N Cancels 510-M  SAN FRAN- CISCO TERRITORY as de- scribed in Item No. 270-3  SACRA- MENTO (See Item No. 260-7)		LOS ANGELES TERRITORY as de- scribed in Item No. 270-3	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4		
			0260	0239	0212	0186	0164	0148	0131	0115	0125	0113	0100	0088		
			Minimum Weight 20,000 Pounds except as provided in Note 3				Minimum Weight as provided in Western Classification, Excep- tion Sheet or this tariff, subject to Item No. 290									
			1	2	3	4	5	A	B	C	D	E				
0109	0099	0087	0076	64	70	59	54	48	43							
<p>NOTE 1.- If charges accruing under the Class Rates in this item, applied on shipments from, to or between points intermediate between origin and destination territories shown in this item via routes shown in Item No. 900 are lower than charges accruing under the Distance Class Rates in Items Nos. 500, 505 or 507 on the same shipment via the same route, such lower charges will apply.</p> <p>NOTE 2.- When applied in connection with carload ratings, minimum weight will be as provided in the Western Classification, Exception Sheet or this tariff, subject to Item No. 290.</p> <p>NOTE 3.- When applied in connection with carload ratings, minimum weight will be as provided in the Western Classification, Exception Sheet or in this tariff (subject to Item No. 290) but in no event less than 20,000 pounds.</p>																

RATES TO AND FROM POINTS IN THE REDWOOD EMPIRE TERRITORY  
AS DESCRIBED IN ITEM NO. 271-3

- (a) The provisions of this item apply only to shipments, including split pickup and split delivery shipments, subject to minimum weights of 10,000 pounds and less.
- (b) On shipments, including split pickup and split delivery shipments, transported between points in the Redwood Empire Territory, on the one hand, and points in the San Francisco Territory, as described in Item No. 270-3, and points in the Counties of Marin, Mendocino, Napa and Sonoma, on the other hand, determine the class rates in accordance with the rates provided in this section and increase the rates so determined by 10 percent.
- (c) On shipments, including split pickup and split delivery shipments, not embraced within Paragraph (b) above, transported between the Redwood Empire Territory, on the one hand, and points in California southerly of the Counties of Napa, Nevada, San Francisco, Sutter Yolo and Yuba, on the other hand, determine the class rates in accordance with the rates provided in this section and increase the rates so determined by adding the following arbitraries:

(1)  
512-A  
Cancel:  
512

(Arbitrarities in Cents per 100 Pounds)

Any Quantity				Minimum Weight 4,000 Pounds				Minimum Weight 10,000 Pounds			
1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4
26	24	21	18	16½	15	13	11½	13	11½	10½	9

- (d) Fractions of less than one-half cent shall be dropped and fractions of one-half cent or greater shall be increased to one cent.
- (e) When the charges on all or any portion of a shipment are subject to the increase provided for in this item, the provisions of Item No. 80 shall apply only after the increase has been added in accordance with this item.

(1) Expires with May 1, 1960.

\* Change }  
o Increase } Decision No. 59099

EFFECTIVE : NOVEMBER 13, 1959

Issued by the Public Utilities Commission of the State of California.  
San Francisco, California.  
Correction No. 965

Item No.	SECTION NO. 2				CLASS RATES (Continued) In Cents per 100 Pounds																																		
Class Rates shown below are intermediate in application subject to Note 1.																																							
BETWEEN		AND		Any Quantity				Minimum Weight 2,000 Pounds				Minimum Weight 4,000 Pounds																											
LOS ANGELES ZONE 1 AS DESCRIBED IN THE DISTANCE TABLE		SANTA ANA		<table border="1"> <tr><td>1</td><td>2</td><td>3</td><td>4</td></tr> <tr><td>185</td><td>167</td><td>148</td><td>130</td></tr> </table>				1	2	3	4	185	167	148	130	<table border="1"> <tr><td>1</td><td>2</td><td>3</td><td>4</td></tr> <tr><td>116</td><td>104</td><td>93</td><td>82</td></tr> </table>				1	2	3	4	116	104	93	82	<table border="1"> <tr><td>1</td><td>2</td><td>3</td><td>4</td></tr> <tr><td>86</td><td>77</td><td>69</td><td>60</td></tr> </table>				1	2	3	4	86	77	69	60
				1	2	3	4																																
				185	167	148	130																																
				1	2	3	4																																
116	104	93	82																																				
1	2	3	4																																				
86	77	69	60																																				
Minimum Weight 10,000 Pounds except as pro- vided in Note 2				Minimum Weight 20,000 Pounds except as pro- vided in Note 3				Minimum Weight as provided in Western Classification, Exception Sheet or this tariff, sub- ject to Item No. 290																															
<table border="1"> <tr><td>1</td><td>2</td><td>3</td><td>4</td></tr> <tr><td>50</td><td>45</td><td>40</td><td>36</td></tr> </table>				1	2	3	4	50	45	40	36	<table border="1"> <tr><td>1</td><td>2</td><td>3</td><td>4</td></tr> <tr><td>33</td><td>30</td><td>26</td><td>23</td></tr> </table>				1	2	3	4	33	30	26	23	<table border="1"> <tr><td>5</td><td>A</td><td>B</td><td>C</td><td>D</td><td>E</td></tr> <tr><td>18½</td><td>19½</td><td>17½</td><td>16½</td><td>15½</td><td>13½</td></tr> </table>				5	A	B	C	D	E	18½	19½	17½	16½	15½	13½
1	2	3	4																																				
50	45	40	36																																				
1	2	3	4																																				
33	30	26	23																																				
5	A	B	C	D	E																																		
18½	19½	17½	16½	15½	13½																																		
<table border="1"> <tr><td>1</td><td>2</td><td>3</td><td>4</td></tr> <tr><td>50</td><td>45</td><td>40</td><td>36</td></tr> </table>				1	2	3	4	50	45	40	36	<table border="1"> <tr><td>1</td><td>2</td><td>3</td><td>4</td></tr> <tr><td>33</td><td>30</td><td>26</td><td>23</td></tr> </table>				1	2	3	4	33	30	26	23	<table border="1"> <tr><td>5</td><td>A</td><td>B</td><td>C</td><td>D</td><td>E</td></tr> <tr><td>18½</td><td>19½</td><td>17½</td><td>16½</td><td>15½</td><td>13½</td></tr> </table>				5	A	B	C	D	E	18½	19½	17½	16½	15½	13½
1	2	3	4																																				
50	45	40	36																																				
1	2	3	4																																				
33	30	26	23																																				
5	A	B	C	D	E																																		
18½	19½	17½	16½	15½	13½																																		

\*515-G  
Cancels  
515-F

NOTE 1.—If charges accruing under the Class Rates in this item, applied on shipments from, to or between points intermediate between origin and destination points via Route 11 shown in Item No. 900 are lower than charges accruing under the Distance Class Rates in Items Nos. 500 and 505 on the same shipment via the same route such lower charges will apply.

NOTE 2.—When applied in connection with carload ratings, minimum weight will be as provided in the Western Classification, Exception Sheet or in this tariff, subject to Item No. 290.

NOTE 3.—When applied in connection with carload ratings, minimum weight will be as provided in the Western Classification, Exception Sheet or in this tariff (subject to Item No. 290) but in no event less than 20,000 pounds.

\* Change )  
o Increase ) Decision No. **59099**

EFFECTIVE NOVEMBER 13, 1959

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

Correction No. 966



Cancels

Item No.	SECTION NO. 2		CLASS RATES (Continued) In Cents per 100 Pounds							
*520-F Cancels 520-E	<p>Rates in this item apply only to shipments having point of origin in San Francisco or South San Francisco and point of destination in Alameda, Albany, Berkeley, El Cerrito, Emeryville, Oakland, Piedmont, Richmond, San Leandro, San Pablo or Stege and to shipments having point of origin in Alameda, Albany, Berkeley, El Cerrito, Emeryville, Oakland, Piedmont, Richmond, San Leandro, San Pablo or Stege and point of destination in San Francisco or South San Francisco. (Subject to Note 2.)</p>									
	Minimum Weight 20,000 Pounds Except as Provided in Note 1					Minimum Weight as Provided in Western Classification, Exception Sheet or this Tariff, Subject to Item No. 290				
	1	2	3	4	5	A	B	C	D	E
	035	032	026	024	19½	20½	18½	17½	16½	14½
<p>NOTE 1.-When applied in connection with carload ratings, minimum weight will be as provided in the Western Classification, Exception Sheet or in this tariff (subject to Item No. 290) but in no event less than 20,000 pounds.</p> <p>NOTE 2.-When applied in connection with Item No. 160 (split pickup) or Item No. 170 (split delivery), San Francisco and South San Francisco will be considered as one territory and Alameda, Albany, Berkeley, El Cerrito, Emeryville, Oakland, Piedmont, Richmond, San Leandro, San Pablo or Stege will be considered as one territory in connection with the application of paragraphs (b) and (c) of Items Nos. 160 and 170, respectively.</p>										
<p>* Change ) o Increase) Decision No. 50090</p>										
<p>EFFECTIVE NOVEMBER 13, 1959</p>										
<p>Issued by the Public Utilities Commission of the State of California, San Francisco, California.</p> <p>Correction No. 967</p>										