MOTOR TRUCK FREIGHT TRANSPORTATION

U. S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE BUREAU OF FOREIGN AND DOMESTIC COMMERCE



CONTENTS

-

-

Foreword
Introduction
Equipment
Truck capacity
Truck weights and loads
Six-wheeled equipment
Trailers
Tire equipment
Operations
Length of haul
Factors affecting rates
Type of haul
Fixed routes
Irregular hauls
Commodities.
Transportation costs
Variations by size of organization
Variations in accounting methods
Mileage and tonnage records
Essentials of proper cost accounting
Unit-cost accounting
Fleet-cost accounting
Operating costs in detail
Unit costs
Fleet costs

 \mathbf{m}

FOREWORD

This bulletin reports the results of a survey of intercity motortruck freight transportation for hire, conducted in 1931 jointly by the Bureau of Public Roads of the United States Department of Agriculture and the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce of the United States Department of Commerce. The principal objects of the investigation were to secure available data on (1) motor equipment in use, particularly as to types and weights of vehicles, (2) radius of haul, and (3) costs of operation.

The survey was made under the general supervision of E. W. James, chief, division of highway transport, Bureau of Public Roads, and A. Lane Cricher, chief, division of transportation and communication, Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce. William G. Eliot, 3d, Robert A. Montgomery, and Frank B. Curran, of the Bureau of Public Roads, and Wellington McNichols, of the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce, conducted the field investigation and compiled this report.

> FREDERICK M. FEIKER, Director, Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce.

AUGUST, 1932.

IV

MOTOR TRUCK FREIGHT TRANSPORTATION

INTRODUCTION

The information contained in this report was secured, through personal interviews, from 217 motor-trucking concerns in 41 States and the District of Columbia. Data as to truck and trailer equipment and hauling radius were generally available, especially from operators making regular trips over fixed routes. Comprehensive figures on operating costs, however, were scarce, only 122 firms supplying cost data in sufficient detail to permit statistical analysis. The inadequacy of accounts and records for the industry as a whole may be attributed to numerous circumstances, but its rapid growth, the large proportion of small-scale operations, and unstable competitive conditions are probably the most important. Motor trucking as an industry is still new and unorganized. Equipment and methods have been changing rapidly. There is little accumulated experience for guidance, and each operator must work out almost alone the solution for his own particular problems.

Although there is apparent some tendency toward consolidation and large-scale operation in the motor-freight field, the industry is still predominatingly one of small fleets and individual management. Scientific accounting is the exception rather than the rule, direct personal familiarity with the business taking the place, however inadequately, of elaborate records.

Under such circumstances it is natural that the available statistical data should be limited in scope. Statistical conclusions, therefore, must be accepted only as indicative of general tendencies, not as final evidence on the subject.

While a reasonable effort was made to show a true cross section of commercial truck operations, the final selection of cases was unquestionably influenced by the nature of the data sought. It was usually the better-known operators who were interviewed and reports were made only on those who were able to supply some details as to costs of operation. The reports show a preponderance of common carriers in States where certificates of convenience and necessity are required. This is due at least in part to the fact that the names and addresses of certificated carriers are on public file, and they are usually required to maintain records in a prescribed form and to make periodic reports. In certain other States, however, the data show a disproportionate number of contract carriers. This is usually the case where there is no common-carrier legislation and truck operators are not compelled to assume the legal status of common carriers, even though they cater to the general public.

In proportion to their numbers, the small operators, especially in rural communities, constitute the group least adequately represented. Typically, they employ one or two trucks, which may be engaged principally in local transfer work or private business. Accounting, if any, is likely to be inextricably mingled with personal transactions, while certain overhead or administrative costs are frequently ignored.

Very few of the truck operators interviewed were able to give as complete reports as were desired for the purposes of this survey. There was a wide variety of accounting and statistical systems in use, and even where full records were kept it was impossible to extract all the details of the operation in a reasonable length of time. It was very difficult to secure comparable records, especially regarding costs of operation. This will explain the fact that almost none of the statistical analyses shows a complete summary of data from all the concerns interviewed. In each case the analysis covers only the trucks or trucking for which the details were reported.

Of the 217 operators included in the survey, 103 reported a commoncarrier business only, 41 contract hauling only, while 73 reported both common-carrier and contract hauling. The disproportionate representation of the larger operators is brought out in Tables 1 and 2, showing gross revenues for 1930, and size of fleets, respectively.

TABLE 1	GROSS	REVENUES,	1930, OF	TRUCKING	CONCERNS
---------	-------	-----------	----------	----------	----------

Gross revenue	Number of con- cerns	Per cent of con- cerns	Gross revenue	Number of con- cerns	Per cent of con- cerns
Under \$5,000 \$5,000 to \$9,999	\$ 14	2 8 7	\$100,000 and over No revenue data given	60 48	28
\$10,000 to \$19,999 \$20,000 to \$49,999 \$50,000 to \$99,999	40 34	19 16	Total	217	100

TABLE 2.-SIZE OF FLEETS OF TRUCKING CONCERNS

	Power	units	All ı	inits
Size of fleet	Number	Per cent	Number	Per cent
	of con-	of con-	of con-	of con-
	cerns	cerns	cerns	cerns
1 or 2 vehicles	16	7.4	15	6.9
	31	14.3	222	10.1
	69	31.8	58	26.7
	30	13.8	35	16.1
	21	9.6	27	12.4
	39	18.0	36	16.6
	7	8.2	14	6.5
	8	1.4	4	1.9
	1	.5	6	2.8
Total	217	100. 0	217	100. 0

Figure 1 shows on a map of the United States the "regular" routes of the truck operators from whom reports were secured in this survey. It does not include irregular or "anywhere for hire" hauling, since such trucking is practically without limit. The map clearly indicates the wide geographical field of the survey.



.

EQUIPMENT

The variety of equipment apparent in a comparison of different operations and different sections of the country is indicative of a marked specialization of motor-truck chassis and body design for particular types of hauling service.

The most obvious differences are those arising directly from the nature of the commodity hauled. Tank trucks and trailers, for example, are designed for the purpose of hauling gasoline, oil, or other liquids in an efficient manner. For the transportation of perishables in hot climates, refrigerator bodies are becoming increasingly common. Household goods are moved in closed, weatherproof vans, frequently equipped with sleeping accommodations for the driver or drivers on long trips. Dump bodies of special types are required in the handling of coal, coke, and certain building materials. Armored vans have been specially designed for the transportation of silk and other commodities of high value in concentrated bulk.



Figure 2.-A 6-wheeled tractor truck, a 4-wheeled semitrailer, and a 6-wheeled full trailer

For loading, unloading, or hoisting safes, machinery, and other heavy freight, trucks are not infrequently equipped with power winches or cranes. Exceptional loads, usually moved over the highways only under special permit, are carried on low, flat trailers, on multiple wheels, with capacities as high as 25 tons and more.

All these special types of equipment were among those listed by the trucking companies interviewed. By far the greater number of trucks and trailers, however, may be described as being in the "general purpose" class; that is, they are all reasonably well adapted to miscellaneous hauling of whatever freight is offered. Their suitability to any given job depends primarily on how well their capacity, speed, and economy of maintenance are adapted to the particular demands made upon them. Even for general hauling there is a wide range of sizes from which to choose, and a considerable variety in body and chassis design. They range from the light express truck, of ½-ton capacity, to outfits like that illustrated in Figure 2, a tractor-truck, semitrailer, and trailer combination capable of carrying 90,000 pounds gross load, on 30 balloon tires. This heavy combination, it should be stated, is no longer in use, not because of excess wheel or axle loads, or because of illegal dimensions, but because the State in which it is registered now sets a maximum gross load of 68,000 pounds for any combination of vehicles, and this load can be more efficiently handled by an ordinary 6-wheeled truck in combination with a 6-wheeled trailer.

TRUCK CAPACITY

The choice of truck capacity depends primarily on the loads which are to be moved. Since most of the firms contributing statistics in this inquiry were engaged principally in intercity hauling, the proportion of large-capacity trucks is far greater than if all trucking were included. In the questionnaire circulated to the trucking industry by the General Motors Truck Co. in 1929, the percentages of light, medium, and heavy duty trucks were 58 per cent, 32 per cent, and 10 per cent, respectively. The corresponding percentages for the survey here reported were 11 per cent for the light trucks, 60 per cent for medium duty trucks, and 29 per cent for the heavy trucks.

Even these figures may not be fairly representative of the trucks used in highway hauling, inasmuch as the lightest trucks reported were commonly described as "pick-up" trucks, used principally in local pick-up and delivery work in connection with a line haul by heavy trucks. Others of the light trucks were engaged in a local transfer business more or less independent of the intercity work. On the other hand, it is possible that the inclusion of a larger proportion of small trucking concerns in the survey might have reduced somewhat the proportion of heavy trucks reported.

Table 3 shows, by geographic divisions, the rated capacities of vehicles reported. Table 4 shows the per cent of power units (trucks and tractor trucks) in each capacity group.

		Light vehicles, ½ to 1¼ tons			Medium capacity vehicles, 1½ to 3 tons			Heavy vehicles, 3½ tons and over			No capacity data					
Geographic division ¹ .	Trucks	Tractor trucks	Semitrailers	Trailers	Trucks	Tractor trucks	Semitrailers	Trailers	Trucks	Tractor trucks	Semitrailers	Trailers	Trucks	Tractor trucks	Semitrailers	Trailers .
New England Middle Atlantio East North Cantral South Atlantic South Atlantic East South Central West South Central Mountain Pacific	31 14 38 39 13 19 16 24 128	1	2	3 1 5	134 190 265 260 199 58 86 109 384	85 22 9 9 28 5 2	27 9 10 3 22 4 8	8 18 44 11 1 18 11 69	103 255 75 32 35 26 7 38 248	4 86 58 31 1 7 31	11 100 151 80 5 11 38 1 21	1 54 96 13 1 7 20 3 137	23 3 1 1 41 13	8 32 4 11 4 15 1 2	1 12 5 1 16 3 6	3 5 74
United_States	322	1	3	9	1, 685	160	83	180	819	234	418	332	83	77	44	82

TABLE 3.—RATED CAPACITY OF VEHICLES REPORTED, BY GEOGRAPHIC DIVISIONS

¹ According to U.S. Bureau of the Census.

4 49.3 6 34.8 5 67.0 2 73.4 1 80.9 0 56.3 5 67.9 6 64.9 5 49.6	39.3 02.6 25.5 16.4 14.0 27.7 22.6 21.6 33.9	100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100
	4 49.3 6 34.8 5 67.0 2 73.4 1 80.9 0 56.3 5 67.9 6 64.8 5 49.6 0 57.3	4 49.3 39.3 6 34.8 62.6 5 67.0 25.5 2 73.4 10.4 1 80.9 14.0 0 56.3 27.7 5 67.9 22.6 6 64.8 21.6 5 49.6 33.9 0 57.3 32.7

TABLE 4.—PER CENT OF TRUCKS AND TRACTOR TRUCKS, BY CAPACITY GROUPS

¹ According to U. S. Bureau of the Census.

Few marked differences appear in the average or predominating rated capacity of trucks in the several sections of the country as above grouped. The factors determining the choice of truck are so many that they tend to cancel out in a large sample. There is some evidence, however, that the larger vehicles are more usual in those sections where the principal cities and towns have been linked with paved highways. This is brought out by regrouping the States according to the progress they have made in paving their State highway systems, as shown in Table 5.

TABLE 5.—RATED CAPACITY OF TRUCKS, ACCORDING TO PROGRESS OF STATE Highway Systems

Road mileage improved with high-type surfaces	States	Number of trucks	A verage rated capacity
50 to 100 per cent	7 13 5 23	739 1, 110 415 531	Tons 3, 23 3, 10 2, 55 2, 21
Total	48	2, 795	2, 88

Six of the seven States from which no reports were secured fall in the last group above, having a relatively small amount of paved highway, which, in itself, may be regarded as significant.

The gross weight allowable under the law also appears to have an effect on the sizes of trucks used, although the limits have so many qualifications and exceptions (for example, giving higher limits to 6-wheeled vehicles or providing for special limits on certain highways) that statistical evidence is not easily presented.

That license or registration fees assessed against trucks influence the choice of capacity seems to be demonstrated by the fact that in the 30 States in which the license fees (for either common or contract carriers) are based on rated or actual capacity, the average capacity reported is 2.3 tons, where for all other States the average is 3.1 tons.

The 2½-ton truck is the most favored size for intercity commercial hauling, according to the reports in this survey. In a total of 2,826 trucks for which capacity information was supplied, 510 were in this

class, slightly over 18 per cent. Actually, these 2½-ton trucks handle large overloads, as shown elsewhere in this report.

Figure 3 pictures a typical 2¹/₂-ton truck.

TRUCK WEIGHTS AND LOADS

One of the more important aims of the survey was to to secure data relative to weights of trucks and loads carried. So far as it was obtainable, information was recorded covering the tare weights of the trucks used, the "usual loads" carried, and the gross weights of the loaded trucks. The "usual load" was taken to mean not an average load, but that load which the operator regarded as a normal or capacity load for a given vehicle, assuming sufficient freight was available. The usual load was not the maximum load, since many operators stated that they hauled loads considerably in excess of normal capacity under emergency conditions. Nor was usual load equivalent to rated capacity, as it is commonly agreed that practical



Figure 3.-Typical 21/2-ton freight truck

working capacity is in excess of listed rating. Gross weight was computed as the sum of tare weight and usual load as defined above. Table 6 shows the average tare weight, usual load, and gross weight for trucks in the light, medium, and heavy capacity groups.

TABLE 6	6TARE	WEIGHT,	USUAL	LOAD,	AND	GROSS	WEIGHT	OF	TRUCKS,	BY
			RATED	CAPACI	ту Сі	ROUPS				

	Tare	weight	Usua	l load	Gross weight		
Rated capacity	Number of trucks	Average	Number of trucks	Average	Number of trucks	Average	
1/4 to 11/4 tons (light)	143 997 585	Pounds 4, 043 7, 979 13, 366	121 1, 037 592	Pounds 3, 129 8, 132 13, 690	99 869 566	Pounds 7, 220 16, 021 27, 363	
Total 1	1, 760	9, 408	1, 784	9, 585	1, 568	19, 457	

¹ Includes trucks for which rated capacity was not reported.

It is of interest to compare the average usual load of 9,585 pounds with an actual average load of 7,820 pounds as computed from reports of 27 common-carrier freight lines to the State of Washington in 1930.¹ This latter figure is derived by dividing freight ton-mileage by truck mileage, and so takes into account both loaded and empty mileage run. It also includes freight hauled by trailer, however, which to an unknown extent increases the load hauled by, as distinct from the load carried upon, the average truck.

The range and distribution of gross weights of trucks is shown in Table 7. The evident tendency toward concentration between 15,000 and 25,000 pounds does not necessarily indicate that trucks within this range are the most efficient for the work they are doing, since that tendency is probably controlled to a considerable degree by the prevailing legal load limits for 4-wheeled trucks.

Gross weight	Trucks	Gross weight	Trucks
Under 5,000 pounds	32 190 281 338 323 230	30,000 to 34,999 pounds 35,000 to 39,999 pounds 40,000 pounds and over Total	151 9 14 1, 568

TABLE 7.-GROSS WEIGHT OF TRUCKS

Loading in excess of manufacturer's rated capacity was found to be very general, especially on the medium capacity trucks. The largest trucks were apparently loaded somewhat below capacity, probably due in part to legal limitations on gross weight. Operation of trucks with greater capacity than utilized was in some instances explained by the fact that these trucks pulled trailers, and that it was necessary to use the larger vehicles to provide sufficient motive power, regardless of whether they carried a full load on their own wheels.

Table 8 shows the average proportion of loading beyond rated capacity for some of the more common sizes of trucks.

TABLE 8.-USUAL LOADS OF TRUCKS IN EXCESS OF RATED CAPACITY

Manufacturer's rated capacity	Number of trucks reported	Average excess load	Manufacturer's rated capacity	Number of trucks reported	Average excess load
1 ton 1½ tons 2 tons 2½ tons 2½ tons 3 tons	92 241 277 328 187	Per cent 62. 2 71. 8 87. 7 93. 9 08. 8	31/2 tons	226 25 228 111	Per cent 70.4 68.2 42.9 1-7.6

1 Average load 7.6 per cent below rated capacity, rather than any excess.

It will be noted that the largest trucks, grouped as 5½ tons and over, show an average load 7.6 per cent below their rated capacities.

Usual loads were reported, in very rare instances, as high as three times the manufacturers' ratings. Normally, however, the excess was less than 125 per cent. Approximately one-fourth of all trucks

^{1 1930} Statistics of Auto Transportation Companies, State of Washington, department of public works.

and more than one-third of the medium capacity trucks were reported as carrying 100 to 125 per cent above capacity—roughly, double their rated capacity. Nearly two-thirds of the heavy trucks carried



Figure 4.-Typical 4-wheeled tractor and semitrailer unit

less than 50 per cent above capacity. The percentage of trucks in each range of overloading is indicated in Table 9.

		Per cent of trucks								
Rated capacity	Number of trucks	Less than 25 per cent over- load 1	25 to 49 per cent overload	50 to 74 per cent overload	75 to 99 per cent overload	100 to 124 per cent overload	Over 124 per cent overload	Total		
Under 1½ tons 1½ to 3 tons 3½ tons and over	121 1,037 592	29. 7 14. 1 26. 9	9. 9 8. 2 38. 7	21. 5 20. 7 16. 9	2.5 9.2 8.1	24. 0 36. 8 3. 5	$12.4 \\ 11.0 \\ 5.9$	100. 0 100. 0 100. 0		
All trucks	1,750	19.5	18.6	19.5	8.3	24.7	9.4	100. 0		

TABLE 9.—TRUCK LOADING IN EXCESS OF MANUFACTURERS' RATED CAPACITIES

¹Includes loads below capacity.

It should be clearly understood that these excess loads are not necessarily or as a rule illegal overloads. Light or medium capacity trucks with adequate tire equipment can carry far above their rated capacity without exceeding the legal limit for either gross weight, axle weight, or load per inch of tire width. The damage, if any, from overloading under such conditions is limited to the vehicle itself.

SIX-WHEELED EQUIPMENT

The liberalizing of gross-weight restrictions in favor of 6-wheeled vehicles (that is, those having three axles) has been a recent development in a number of States. It is the wheel load rather than the gross load which determines stress in the pavement. Larger loads are possible, therefore, with the 6-wheeled trucks and are legalized in an increasing group of the States. Furthermore, for light trucks well within existing gross-weight limitations a third axle may greatly increase the safe and economical carrying capacity. That this is generally recognized by truck operators is indicated by the fact that 8.7 per cent of the trucks were on six wheels. The number of 6-wheeled tractor trucks was negligible, inasmuch as a tractor truck and semitrailer combination is, in effect, a 6-wheeled unit. Only two 6-wheeled tractor trucks were reported, these being used for heavy hauling with large capacity semitrailers. One heavy semitrailer on two axles was reported. Of the trailers listed (excluding semitrailers) 14.3 per cent were on six wheels.

TRAILERS

Trailer equipment was reported by many operators, and in a variety of types and capacities. The first broad classification to be made is that between the trailer which carries its load independently, upon its own wheels, and the semitrailer, of which the forward end rests upon a tractor truck (sometimes briefly referred to as a tractor, but not to be confused with the industrial or agricultural tractor). Part of the load of the semtrailer is, therefore, carried by the tractor truck.



Figure 5.-Platform truck with auxiliary axle

The first class of trailer referred to may be likened to an ordinary wagon with a single tongue or drawbar. The semitrailer, when uncoupled from its tractor truck, must have some temporary supporting legs under its forward end.

There is apparently no single word or phrase in accepted usage to describe trailers exclusive of semitrailers. It might be desirable to refer to them as 4-wheeled trailers, except that some of them are on six wheels, and some semitrailers have two axles. Figure 2, page 4, shows a 6-wheeled tractor truck, a 4-wheeled semitrailer, and a 6-wheeled full trailer. The term "full trailer" will here be used when semitrailers are not referred to.

The full trailer is used especially by the regular freight lines. It permits economical handling of varying volumes of freight, because the cost of stand-by equipment is relatively low as compared with equivalent freight capacity in trucks. Almost any truck has sufficient reserve power to draw one or more trailers where grades are not excessive, and many operators use truck and trailer combinations regularly. The mechanical expense of operating the truck which draws the trailer is apparently not increased anywhere near in proportion to the increased load handled, though available cost data are insufficient to show this in detail. The driver cost is only slightly greater, if at all, and the capital cost of a trailer is small as compared with that of a truck. The trailer is simply hitched behind the truck, and may quickly be detached when not needed, or while it is being loaded or unloaded.



Figure 6.-Furniture-moving van

As stated above, the full trailer, like the motor truck, is sometimes built with six wheels to increase carrying capacity. Dual pneumatic tire equipment is possible on even the front axle of a trailer, since it is steered through the drawbar.

The use of a special type of 2-wheeled trailer seems to be confined almost wholly to the Pacific Northwest States. This differs from the



Figure 7.-Closed freight body for long-distance hauling

semitrailer in that it is coupled to a regular freight-body truck instead of to a tractor. The load is carried almost entirely on the single axle, as in the case of the familiar "camp trailer" used with passenger cars. Coupling is made through the same pintle hook or other hitch as is used for full trailers. These 2-wheeled trailers are of relatively low capacity, and it is believed that they are already obsolescent.

The semitrailer is valuable where it can be "spotted" for loading and unloading, while the much more expensive power unit is efficiently used elsewhere. A single tractor truck may provide motive power for an entire group of semitrailers, keeping constantly at work and moving each in turn. An idle power plant is far more expensive than a standing semitrailer.

A second use for the semitrailer is to increase the hauling capacity of a single power unit. This is probably the more important reason for its adoption by intercity haulers. Frequent instances were recorded where the fleet included only one semitrailer to each tractor truck, the two vehicles rarely being uncoupled. The combination becomes, in effect, an articulated 6-wheeled truck, and beside the possible large increase in size of body the carrying capacity of the power unit is practically doubled.

A few cases were reported where semitrailers were equipped with 2-wheeled dollies in front, the result being a unit essentially equivalent to a full trailer.

Because of the absence of power plant, and resultant low chassis weight, the capacity loads of trailers run much higher than for trucks operating under the same legal gross weight restrictions. This will be seen in Table 10, showing rated capacities of trailers and semitrailers reported.

		Trailers					
Rated capacity	trailers (2 wheels	4 wheels	6 wheels	Total trailers ¹		
½ to 1 ton	3 83 98 281 39 44 548	5 6 3 	4 143 160 66 	44 11 18 73	9 180 167 154 11 82 003		

TABLE 10.—TRAILERS AND SEMITRAILERS BY RATED CAPACITIES

Includes one 8½-ton semitrailer on two axles. Includes trailers with number of wheels not reported.

One instance was reported in which semitrailer units were exchanged between two freight-line operators on joint hauls. The fifth-wheel coupling mechanism on the respective tractor trucks was identical, and considerable saving was effected through the avoidance of unloading and reloading.

A mover of household goods reported that on shipments to a neighboring city, he was in the habit of coupling one of his full trailers to a freight truck of another concern which was scheduled to make the trip nightly. His power equipment was thus saved for local transfer work.

These two illustrations suggest the possible desirability of standardized equipment, at least with regard to coupling mechanism, to permit a freer exchange of equipment in a manner similar to that of the railroads.

Data covering weights and loads of trailers and semitrailers are shown in Tables 11 and 12. It should be understood that weights and loads shown for semitrailers are not the weights carried on the single-trailer axle, but include that part of the load supported by the tractor truck.

TABLE 11.—TARE WEIGHT, USUAL LOAD, AND GROSS WEIGHT OF TRAILERS, BY RATED CAPACITY

	Tare	weight	Usua	l load	Gross weight		
Rated capacity	Number of units	Average	Number of units	Average	Number of units	Average	
Under 1½ tons	6 70 116 130 11	Pounds 4, 217 4, 758 7, 261 9, 133 12, 691	6 77 83 92 10	Pounds 5, 333 7, 817 15, 648 16, 433 20, 450	6 52 74 90 10	Pounds 9, 550 13, 235 23, 356 25, 402 33, 450	

TABLE 12.---TARE WEIGHT, USUAL LOAD, AND GROSS WEIGHT OF SEMITRAILERS, BY RATED CAPACITY

	Tare	weight	Usua	l load	Gross weight		
Rated capacity	Number of units	Average	Number of units	Average	Number of units	Average	
Under 1½ tons	1 35 39 93 32	Pounds 2, 300 4, 364 5, 434 7, 688 9, 947	1 42 73 117 12	Pounds 4,000 11,262 14,838 18,067 22,495	1 24 34 61 8	Pounds 6, 300 17, 565 24, 094 26, 413 29, 225	

TIRE EQUIPMENT

Pneumatic tires are rapidly displacing solid tires on motor trucks. The National Automobile Chamber of Commerce reports that only 3.6 per cent of the total output of motor trucks in 1930 were equipped with solid tires.² However, there are still many older trucks on the roads that have not been converted to pneumatic equipment. Analysis revealed that 24 per cent of the trucks and tractor trucks and 32 per cent of the trailers reported were on solid (or "cushion") tires on one or more axles. This is shown in Table 13, together with the use of dual pneumatic tires.

TABLE 13.—TIRE EQUIPMENT OF COMMERCIAL TRUCKS, TRACTOR TRUCKS, AND TRAILERS

Tire equipment	Trucks a truc	ad tractor ks	Trailers		
	Number	Per cent	Number	Per cent	
Pneumatic tires: Single Dual	522 1, 556	19. 1 57. 0	120 465	13. 9 54. 0	
Total Solid tres	2, 078 652	76. 1 23. 9	585 276	67. 9 32. 1	
Total	2, 730	100. 0	861	100.0	

² Facts and Figures of the Automobile Industry, 1931 edition, National Automobile Chamber of Commerce, p. 38.

123554°-32-2

This proportion of solid-tired vehicles was unexpectedly high, but an examination of the original data reveals that of the 652 solid-tired trucks and tractor trucks, 167 were operated by a single firm, principally in a metropolitan area. If this firm is excluded from the tabulation, the percentage of solid tires drops to 19. It is likely, too, that some of the solid-tired equipment was so obsolescent as to be used relatively infrequently as compared with the more modern vehicles.

Of the trucks and tractor trucks dating from 1925 or older 53.2 per cent were on solid tires, whereas the 1926 and later models were only 9.0 per cent on solids, and of the 1929 and later models only 2.5 per cent were on solids. This would indicate that the intercity commercial truckers are now buying proportionately fewer solid-tired vehicles than other truck users; which seems reasonable in view of the need for greater speed in the long-haul work.

The prevalence of solid-tire usage was also checked against statewide figures for Maryland, confirming the belief that the proportion



Figure 8.-Stake body for general hauling

shown in the survey was unduly high. Data supplied from the office of the commissioner of motor vehicles in that State show among the common carriers a proportion of 8.6 per cent of solid-tired trucks in 1931. The decline in solid tires for all trucks in Maryland during several recent years is shown in Table 14, and it is probable that the use of solid tires by common carriers and contract haulers has been decreasing at least in the same proportion.

TABLE 14.—Solid Tires on Motor Trucks Registered in Maryland, 1929 to 1931

Vee	Total truck regis- tration Nu	Solid-tired vehicles 1		
i car		Number	Per cent	
1929 1930 1931	38, 839 37, 832 36, 080	8, 703 6, 554 4, 534	22. 4 17. 3 12. 6	

1 Includes a negligible number of vehicles other than trucks,

Dual pneumatic tire equipment was found on a large proportion of the trucks, tractor trucks, and trailers, especially in the larger sizes. In all but four States, tire width is a governing factor in limiting loads. Dual pneumatic tire equipment, as shown in Table 13, includes all vehicles having two or more wheels equipped with dual pneumatic tires. Trucks whose capacity has been increased by a supplementary third axle are often fitted with dual tires on the driving axle only. Trailers are frequently equipped with dual tires on the front wheels.

Figure 10 shows graphically the tire equipment of trucks and tractor trucks according to capacity. It is apparent that the use of solid tires is principally confined to the heavier vehicles, and that single pneumatic tire equipment is rare on the larger units.

OPERATIONS

LENGTH OF HAUL

The distances over which trucks are being operated, as reported in this investigation, gave no clear evidence as to the profitable radius of



Figure 9.-Rack body for transporting livestock

motor hauling. General statements are apt to be misleading, since there are many factors involved in determining the economic length of haul in any given case. (The rates which the traffic will bear, the type of haul (that is, whether between points on fixed routes as in the usual common-carrier operation or to points not on fixed routes), the commodity hauled, the availability and cost of other means of transportation, whether return loads can be obtained, topography and road conditions, all share in setting the limit to motor-truck haul.)

Regularly scheduled runs were reported in excess of 500 miles between terminals. Occasional hauls, not on regular schedules, were reported up to 2,500 miles. Indirect information from other sources indicates that a very considerable amount of long-distance hauling is being done. Tires, for example, are being shipped by truck from Ohio factories as far as Omaha, St. Paul, and New York. Fully assembled automobiles are transported on special semitrailers for distances as great as 1,000 miles from the factory. Fish have been trucked from Seattle to San Francisco. Fruits and vegetables move from the Eastern Shore of Maryland to New England. Livestock is hauled 100 miles or more to stockyards in the Middle West. Some of these long hauls have proved unprofitable, others apparently are continuing successfully, but it is clear that no definite limit can be set for motor hauling.

A clear distinction should be made between the expressions "length of haul" and "length of route." Where a trucking concern operates



Figure 10.-Tire equipment of trucks and tractor trucks, by capacity

between two large centers of population, the bulk of its freight will move the whole distance, especially if the trucks make an overnight run while business houses are closed. Commodities, however, are not always carried from one terminal of a route to another, but are frequently picked up or delivered en route.

The average haul of certificated motor-freight operators in the State of Washington can be approximated from reports of tonnage and ton-

mileage data made to the department of public works. In 1930 this figure for 11 of the 25 common carriers interviewed in that State³ was 55 miles, as compared with 71 miles for the average route of these same operators. This comparison is only a rough one, since it does not take into consideration the probable greater number of trucks or more frequent service on the shorter routes, the average route shown being a simple unweighted average of the routes covered by each operator.

FACTORS AFFECTING RATES

In the final analysis, it is the rate that an operator can obtain for hauling that determines the distance to which he will go. Rates, however, depend on many circumstances. For superior service by truck a shipper will pay only as much in excess of competing transportation rates as any added advantages of truck transportation may be worth. Between points served by rail or water transportation the profitable haul by truck ends where the railroad or navigation company can offer a lower rate after due allowance is made for cartage costs at shipping point and at destination and for other possible advantages of truck service such as less rigid packing requirements.

No study of rates and rate making for truck hauling was attempted during this survey. In general, it may be said that truck rates are frequently based on rail tariffs where a competitive condition exists, the truck rates being either slightly higher, to cover pick-up and delivery costs, or approximately the same. However, there are many exceptions to this generalization, as, for example, where the rates are further reduced through competition between rival truck lines or where special commodity rates are made.

TYPE OF HAUL

The effect of the type of haul on the distance commodities are to be carried is easily evident. By legal restrictions or by choice, the common carrier will usually limit his haul and adhere to a definite schedule. He will haul practically any freight offered, but only between points on his regular routes. In certain States he is restricted to fixed routes by regulation and is not permitted to haul beyond the limits imposed by his franchise or certificate. On the other hand, the contract carrier will haul "anywhere for hire," though he may undertake to handle only certain classes of commodities. Regulation does not restrict the distance nor confine his operations to fixed routes. The contractcarrier reports show exceptionally long hauls. One of the questions asked of the anywhere-for-hire operators was: "What was your longest single trip during the past year?" This brought records of trips 1,200, 2,000, and even 2,500 miles, practically all of these extremely long trips being with loads of household goods.

FIXED ROUTES

The number of operators who reported regular hauling over fixed routes was 182, or 84 per cent of the number interviewed during the survey. These were located in 39 States and the District of Columbia, including all the States except Iowa and South Carolina, where only operators between points not on fixed routes were reported, and

^{*}The remaining 14 carriers did not report ton-mileage.

the seven States 4 from which no reports were received. Table 15

shows data for length of fixed routes, by geographical areas. Figure 11 shows the percentage of fixed routes of various lengths. Although routes over 250 miles in length and extending as far as 530 miles were reported, their number was so small that they have been shown only as routes longer than 250 miles. It will be noted that



about 95 per cent of the routes reported were less than 250 miles long. 92 per cent were less than 200 miles, 80 per cent were less than 120 miles, and 75 per cent less than 110 miles in length. Over half the routes were shorter than 70 miles. The largest group, those ranging from 31 to 40 miles in length, contained 10.5 per cent of the whole.

⁴ Delaware, Maine, Mississippi, Nevada, New Hampshire, Vermont, Wyoming.

Geographic divisions and States	Number of com- panies reportng	Number of routes reported	Total route mileage	Average length of route	Median length of route	Longest route reported	Shortest route reported
Grand total, United States	182	562	49, 160	88	70	530	5
New England	12	57	3, 866	68	50	240	10
Massachusetts	8	41	2,650	65	50	210	10
Connecticut.	3	10	667	67 67	32	165	20
Middle Atlantic	11	30	2, 354	78	73	192	20
New York	3	6	270	45 72	31	70	20
Pennsylvania	5	. 16	1, 512	95	92	192-	30
East North Central	29	102	7, 595	75	60	500	11
Ohio Indiana	4	19 12	1, 200 1, 026	63 86	60 55	150 311	15
Illinois.	3	19	761	40	40	75	11
Michigan Wisconsin	4	18	2,586	144	113	500	15
West North Central		01	7 953	87		256	
was North Central			1,000				
Minnesota	8	37	2,784	75	59 60	250	5
North Dakota	4	7	745	106	92	247	46
South Dakota	1	16	1, 266	79	81	134	34
NeDraska	4	11	1 177	118	65	150	34
11111000							
South Atlantic	21	80	4, 928	62	50	150	5
Maryland	6	36	1, 262	35	27	120	5
Virginia	4	6 01	689	69	100	150	20 18
West Virginia	ž	Ť	477	68	5 0	134	40
North Carolina	1	6	434	72	74	120	23
Georgia	1	4	313	78	83	114	34
			1, 1/0	100	102		
East South Central		27	3,058	113	90	350	33
Kentucky	25	9	1 907	90 133	90	200 (33
Alabama	ĭ	3	253	84	88	105	60
West South Central	13	45	6, 178	137	112	317	34
Arkansas	1	5	334	67	55	117	42
Louisiana		17	1,752	103	106	165	54
Oklahoma	2	6	1,095	183	205	265	70
10185		- 17	4,991		170		
Mountain	16	36	3,902	108	70	530	
Montana	4	5	247	49	50	75	27
Colorado	2	13	887	68	65	120	39 11
New Mexico	ī	2	230	115	115	165	65
Arizona	3	10	1,976	198	135	530	24
0 tan	¥						
Pacific	49	94	9, 328	99	70	412	6
Washington	26	44	4, 167	95	.65	877	6
Callfornia	17	40	3, 442	86	60	412	14
·		-			1		

TABLE 15.-LENGTH OF FIXED ROUTES REPORTED BY MOTOR-TRUCK OPERATORS

NOTE.-No reports received from Delaware, Maine, Mississippi, Nevada, New Hampshire, Vermont, and Wyoming; no fixed routes reported in Iowa and South Carolina.

`

The total number of routes reported was 562, with an aggregate length of 49,160 miles. The average length of route was 88 miles, ranging from an average of 35 miles in Maryland for six companies operating 36 routes to an average of 198 miles in Arizona for three companies with 10 routes. An ordinary arithmetical average may be greatly and disproportionately affected by a few long routes, especially where the number of operations is relatively small. A truer picture of the typical truck route probably results from the median figure. When the routes are listed in order of length, the median is the middle item in the series. In other words, the median route is exceeded in length by just as many routes as are inferior to it in length. The median length of route for Maryland is 27 miles, as compared with the arithmetical average of 35 miles quoted above, while that for Arizona is 135 miles as compared with 198 miles. In the latter instance the effect of two routes approximating 500 miles each is pronounced. In



Figure 12.-Average and median length of fixed routes, by geographic divisions

certain other States, as will be seen from the table, medians and averages are nearly identical.

The median length of route is, therefore, shown in Table 15 as well as the arithmetical average, and is to be preferred to the ordinary average.

Figure 12 shows the average length of fixed routes reported in different sections of the country. It will be noted that the average for the West North Central section is practically the same as for the United States as a whole, while those of the East South Central, West South Central, Mountain, and Pacific States exceed the average for the country.

The map shown as Figure 1 on page 3 outlines the extent of the territory reached by the fixed routes reported. No attempt was made to separate the routes, and thus one line on the map may indicate several routes following the same course, and may also be made up of several routes end to end. It is perhaps not necessary to point out that the map is not intended to show all the commoncarrier motor-freight routes now in existence. Doubtless a complete map of such routes would show, except in certain sections, that practically all the cities of importance in the United States are connected by the network of truck lines now in operation.

Of the total of 562 fixed routes reported, 154 were interstate.

The small number of reports from some of the States prevents the drawing of too definite conclusions, but certain general tendencies may be pointed out. For 101 operators in States west of the Mississippi River the median length of 266 routes, covering 27,361 miles, is 80 miles, while for 81 firms east of the Mississippi, with 296 routes totaling 21,799 miles, the median is 60 miles. In 10 States in the southwestern part of the country 40 concerns, operating over a total of 13,006 miles on 112 routes, have a median route length of 95 miles.

IRREGULAR HAULS

Hauling to points not on fixed routes, commonly referred to as "anywhere for hire," was carried on not only by operators who had no fixed routes but also by many carriers in addition to their scheduled Specific data regarding length of haul were naturally difficult trips. to secure for these irregular movements. The operator himself frequently has no detailed record of where his truck or trucks have been working, except perhaps on the exceptionally long trips. Each of the "anywhere for hire" operators was asked his normal or usual hauling radius. For 70 operators, reporting irregular hauls other than "local," the average normal radius was approximately 119 miles, with a median of 100. The latter figure (100 miles) was also the most commonly reported, being named by 17 out of the 70 irregular operators. It is clearly apparent that estimates were made in wellrounded figures. Three operators reported 500 miles; 19, on the other hand, reported 50 miles or less, some of these hardly exceeding local limits. In addition to the 70 irregular haulers mentioned, there were five who reported only a normal "local" range for their work, this usually being a city transfer business. Eleven operators who occasionally made long irregular hauls furnished no information as to the normal range.

COMMODITIES

The distance a commodity can profitably be hauled by truck is, in actual practice, limited by the nature of that commodity. Such freight as wheat, coal, and building and road materials, whose weight or bulk are relatively high compared to their value, require special loading equipment and carriers of large capacity, such as freight cars or barges, if they are to be hauled long distances at economically sound rates. Other products, like household goods, poultry and livestock, perishables which suffer from excessive handling, silk, and similar commodities of relatively low weight or bulk and high value, can be hauled comparatively long distances at higher cost. Over the longer hauls trucks tend to specialize in the less-than-carload business, often equivalent to express service, although this is by no means universally true, as evidenced by bulk hauling of gasoline in tanks from Los Angeles 400 or 500 miles over the mountains to Arizona points.

By far the greater number of operators reported only "miscellaneous" or "general freight" hauling. Some of these also named the particular commodities which made up an important proportion of their business. Other firms specialized in particular commodities, like milk, automobile parts, household goods, oil and gasoline, etc. These special commodities were not listed often enough to permit of significant statistical tabulation, however, and no attempt is here made to compare the length of haul of different classes of freight.

TRANSPORTATION COSTS

A major object of this survey was the compilation of data relative to the cost of operating motor trucks, either as common carrier or contract carrier vehicles, in interurban freight service. While it was recognized that the wide variety of conditions under which motorfreight services are performed, as well as the numerous factors affecting individual operations, would modify any generalization on the subject of operating costs, it was felt that a presentation of actual cost figures contributed by motor-trucking concerns, noting the accounting practices in use, would be of value to the industry. An endeavor was made to obtain truck operating cost figures for the calendar year 1930, and this was successful in so far as fleet operating, costs were concerned. Data on the cost of operating individual verhicles for a yearly period were scarce, and the figures in the unit cost table cover varying shorter periods of time.

Figures on operating costs, vehicle mileage, tonnage hauled, and other pertinent data were obtained directly from the books and records of the concerns interviewed. In some instances, these data were supplemented by extracts from the companies' reports to the State regulatory commissions. Cost information was generally scarce, but much more material was available in those States requiring periodic reports from motor-freight carriers. The necessity of filing a statement of operations with the regulatory body not only compels the truck operator to keep reasonably accurate records of his business, but effects in many respects a more uniform method of accounting in that particular State.

The actual cost of commercial transportation over the highways is difficult to obtain and only comparatively meager knowledge is available from present records. This is perhaps the principal conclusion to be drawn from the cost study here reported, although such figures as were obtained are, it is believed, significant and valuable. Some cost data were received from every concern reported upon, but much of the material collected was not susceptible of the detailed analysis necessary for a study of transportation costs.

The inadequacy of existing information on motor-trucking costs, on the volume of business, as measured by, tonnage transported, and the distance it is moved, is due to a number of circumstances. The most important of these are the large proportion of small-scale operations, the lack or insufficiency of accounting methods and records, and the failure of many operators to accord proper recognition to the importance of an accurate knowledge of costs.

VARIATIONS BY SIZE OF ORGANIZATION

Small-scale organizations.—Thousands of small motor lines form a predominant part of the motor-freight hauling business. The very nature of these small organizations, individualistic in character and operating with a minimum of capital and personnel, makes difficult

the compiling of detailed figures and statistics. The owner-operators of these small firms exercise immediate personal supervision over their business and decide, justifiably or not, that a system of simple accounts is sufficient for their requirements. Even if the need were felt for more records and greater detail, the necessity of keeping overhead expenses to a minimum would be a factor of paramount importance.

The administrative personnel of these small concerns generally consists of the owner, sometimes assisted by an additional office employee. With the innumerable duties incident to the supervision and management of a motor-freight line performed by one or two employees, the importance of comprehensive cost records is likely to be minimized in comparison with other features of the business.

Despite these disadvantages, if the lack of facilities for elaborate record keeping may be termed such, a few of the small trucking companies had excellent figures on their operations. In general, though, these small concerns, constituting a numerical majority of the industry, lacked detailed data, with the result that the burden of furnishing the more comprehensive information fell to the larger truck lines, who were the important contributors of a majority of the material herein.

Large-scale organizations.—The larger trucking companies, especially those doing a common-carrier business, require more elaborate organization. Many of them are splendid examples of efficiently conducted enterprises, utilizing the most modern of business methods. The activities of these large concerns are sometimes divided into separate departments, such as traffic, auditing, and maintenance, each under experienced supervision. In such organizations adequate accounting records are highly essential to the administrative officials.

Medium-size organizations.—In between these two extremes of large and small scale motor-freight operations comes the medium or averagesize trucking organization. It operates from 6 or 10 to 20 or 30 trucks. While the varied accounting practices and the adequacy of cost data may not be defined and measured according to the extent of the loperations, it may be said that generally this class of operator maintains an ordinary accounting system. Segregation of expense items in more or less detail is made, and comparative figures for revenue and expenditures can be determined. These, however, are not sufficient for a scientific analysis of costs.

VARIATIONS IN ACCOUNTING METHODS

Other factors responsible for the deficiency in cost information are the incompleteness and lack of detail in existing cost systems. It was not unusual to find a combination of one or more standard items of operating or administrative expenses, such as gasoline, oil, and tires; maintenance and repair and tires; drivers' and other wages; taxes and insurance, etc. It is to be presumed that when the account has such a limited segregation of expenses, the owner is not interested in the various itemized costs, but is concerned only with the total expense of his operation and the determination of net revenue. It was practically impossible for the investigator to distribute these combined expenses into their component items, and in the unit-cost table (Table 16) where a per mile cost for individual items of expense is computed, it was necessary to omit these multiple costs. Some concerns, particularly the smaller ones, fail to include in their accounts items of legitimate expense, with the result that a false or excessive profit may be shown on the operation. This neglect is generally confined to the omission of overhead or administrative costs. The shortcomings appearing most frequently were failure to charge to the business a salary for its owner; not including compensation paid to member of family employed in the business; no allowance for rent, light, telephone, etc., when home and garage are used for office and storage purposes; no charge for maintenance and repair labor performed by owner; and the overlooking of miscellaneous petty-cash expenditures.

Contrary to an impression that has gained wide credence in some quarters, depreciation expense was not a neglected item of trucking cost. Very few of the concerns that furnished unit or fleet costs stated that no depreciation allowance was charged on their books

MILEAGE AND TONNAGE RECORDS

Bases for cost comparisons.—The value of cost data available was sometimes nullified by the absence of an accurate measure as a basis for studying and comparing costs. The cost of hauling, if it is to have significant meaning, can be expressed only in relation to service performed. Statistics as to truck-miles operated, tons of freight transported, and ton-miles hauled are essential—and extremely scarce.

Truck-mileage records.--Many concerns do not keep an accurate record of truck mileage. This was often explained by the statement that odometers could not be kept in proper order under the severe operating conditions imposed by motor-truck service, and the difficulty and expense of maintaining them in working order. In other instances it was apparent that the concern did not consider mileage records essential. In the case of scheduled freight hauls mileage was often estimated on the basis of the number of trips over the known distance between terminal points during a certain period. Where irregular anywhere-for-hire hauling was done, it was often impossible to reach any satisfactory estimate. In determining the cost per mile figures as published in the unit cost table, actual odometer mileage was used when available, but reasonably accurate approximations were accepted in its absence.

Ton-mileage records.—The true measure of the cost of transporting goods over the highway is the cost of hauling a certain tonnage of goods a certain number of miles. The unit of measurement, the tonmile, represents a load of 1 ton moved a distance of 1 mile. With few exceptions ton-mile figures were not available, despite the fact that the basis for determining such figures is to be had from the bills of lading or daily manifest sheets. The failure of concerns to summarize these bills of lading or manifest sheets prevented the development of these important data. Where the service rendered is a through haul between the point of origin and a limited number of destinations, the summarization of ton-miles is not difficult, but where service is performed over a number of routes, serving a number of points on each route, the computation of ton-miles involves a great deal of detailed tabulation.

Ton-mile cost varies more widely than truck-mile cost. While there are fairly definite physical limitations to the per mile operating costs for trucks in normal use, the ton-mile cost depends almost wholly upon the average load carried. The ton-mile cost of a given haul will be reduced by almost half if the truck can return loaded instead of empty. In other words, ton-mile cost, which is a most accurate measure of hauling costs, is dependent upon the efficiency of the loading practice. Paradoxically, the less a truck carries, which is equivalent to saying the less efficiently it is used, the more cheaply it will operate, as measured by per mile cost, while under the same condition of partial loadings the per ton-mile cost will be high.

The cost per ton of transporting goods is not usually significant unless consideration is given to the length of haul, when it resolves itself into a ton-mile basis of calculation. For any particular concern or group of concerns, however, it may be helpful in comparing business done during successive periods of operation.

ESSENTIALS OF PROPER COST ACCOUNTING

An accurate conception of costs is essential to the survival of any business enterprise and this applies no less to motor-freight hauling than to any other.

Substantiating evidence for this statement is to be found in a survey made by the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce, Causes of Business Failures and Bankruptcies of Individuals in New Jersey in 1929-1930. While various reasons were advanced by those who failed regarding the causes of failure, it is significant that of the 487 cases of bankruptcy and other failures of business establishments studied, 23.5 per cent kept no books and 29.4 per cent kept inadequate records, or a total of 52.9 per cent who had no accurate knowledge of their costs.

It is not the purpose of this report to propose or suggest the manner in which costs should be kept nor the accounting methods to be used. However, a statement as to the principal objectives of a cost system for motor freight line operations may be found helpful. To this end, the following items are enumerated as essential to a proper knowledge of costs:

1. Absolute reckoning of every expenditure made on behalf of the business.

2. A proper record of every such expenditure made.

3. Sufficient detail in accounts to permit a scientific analysis of the operating costs, so that it may be determined which vehicles are being operated most economically or efficiently, and which portions of the services are or are not profitable.

The above three points are elementary, but if these primary purposes are kept in mind, they should result in improved services, more efficient utilization of equipment and personnel, elimination of unprofitable practices and services, and increased profit to the operator.

A generalization of the accounting methods of motor-freight companies is not possible but, stated simply, they may be classified as the unit-cost system and the fleet-cost system, with the latter in much more general use.

UNIT-COST ACCOUNTING

Under a unit-cost system, each expenditure is charged to the vehicle for which it is incurred. The majority of concerns using this method of accounting confine the allocation of costs against the individual vehicle to what are considered as direct operating or running expenses. The expense items embraced in this classification are gasoline, oil and grease, tires and tubes, maintenance and repair, drivers' wages, and depreciation. When the probable life of a vehicle is estimated on a time basis, as for a fixed number of years, depreciation expense is more properly a fixed rather than a variable operating cost. However, while the majority of firms interviewed computed depreciation on a time basis, they considered the account as an operating expense, and it has been so carried in the unit-cost table herein.

A tax accruing only from actual operation of the vehicle, such as a gasoline tax, a mileage, a ton-mileage, or even a gross revenue tax, may be considered as an operating expense and charged to the individual vehicle. The gasoline tax is almost invariably included in the cost of gasoline, and not as a separate operating expense. Theoretically, certain forms of insurance which cover contingencies generally possible only from operation of the vehicle on the highway should also be charged to operating expense. In a few instances the unit-cost system was extended to include taxes and insurance, but no separation was made as between those incurred as operating costs and those more properly chargeable to administrative expense.

The restriction of unit-cost allocation to direct operating or running costs is principally due to the simplicity of tracing expenses, such as gasoline, oil, tires, etc., for an individual unit, while the affixing of its proper share of fixed or overhead expense presents some difficulties. Too, there is less need for assessing a proportionate share of overhead expense to individual vehicles, where the primary purpose of the unit-cost system is to determine the relative efficiency of various makes or types of equipment, either for purchase or for a particular service. In only rare instances was there any attempt by operators to apportion general overhead or administrative expenses on a proportionate basis.

FLEET-COST ACCOUNTING

The fleet-cost system has the advantage of simplicity, which undoubtedly accounts for its more extensive use. Properly set up, it permits the operator to know the most important fact pertaining to his business, namely, whether or not he is making a profit. It permits him to classify and budget his expenditures and to segregate his fixed and his variable charges. It does not reveal, however, which vehicles are operating most economically or efficiently, nor which portion of the business is profitable. Costs per truck-mile are apt to be misleading if averaged over a fleet which includes trucks of widely differing capacities and ages.

Segregation of expense items is usually confined to the principal costs occurring consistently in the firm's operation, and will vary with different concerns. Direct operating expenses and many of the fixed or overhead costs are general to all motor-truck operations, but the number and type of various miscellaneous costs are governed by the ramifications of the firm's service as well as by the accounting practice. The method of computing the different expense items and the extent of segregation of such items will vary with the need or desires of the truck owner.

OPERATING COSTS IN DETAIL

Nearly all of the concerns reporting in this survey furnished some sort of information regarding operating costs, but in only 122 cases was it sufficiently complete for analysis. Unit operating cost figures were obtained for 146 vehicles or combinations of vehicles, operated by 39 firms.

These vehicles were selected in the field after consultation with the operators as typical units engaged in intercity hauling.

Fleet operating costs were supplied by 91 concerns operating a total of 2,380 vehicles of various capacities and types, including trailers. A few of the vehicles for which unit costs are given are also included in the tabulation of fleet costs.

The figures in Table 16 cover 146 typical vehicles from fleets totaling 680 vehicles, of which 579 were trucks and tractor trucks. It is apparent that cost figures for a few of the units show unusual divergence, due to some extreme condition not disclosed in the investigation. Figures for expense items were furnished in a sum total, and abnormal costs which might have been questioned and perhaps accounted for did not become apparent until this total figure was broken down into a per mile or other relative basis.

The varying periods of time affect the comparability of individual unit-cost figures for different trucks. The unit-cost averages, however, are probably equalized over a large number of vehicles; this is evidenced by the consistency of the average figures for the various size ranges. Where unit costs are shown for less than a year, it is either because the unit-cost system had been recently installed or because some firms kept unit costs for only short periods of time for their own experimental purposes.

Utmost consideration should be given to the numerous factors affecting operations of individual concerns and individual vehicles in comparing the costs for vehicles of similar capacity in the table. Operating conditions vary greatly and have a corresponding effect on costs. Some of the physical factors of the vehicle and the road have been set forth in the cost table, but the human elements of control and management, equally or more responsible for variations in operating cost, are not possible of evaluation. Vehicles of similar size and character, engaged in identical services on the same route, may show a wide variation in operating costs, the favorable figure resting with the unit having the most efficient supervision, better maintenance methods, and superior driver ability.

UNIT COSTS

The 146 vehicles for which unit-cost figures are given include 126 trucks, 9 tractor truck-trailer units, 2 truck-trailer units, and 9 trailers.

Trucks have been divided into three ranges, according to rated capacity. The medium-duty range includes trucks of $1\frac{1}{2}$ to 3 tons capacity; the heavy-duty range, $3\frac{1}{2}$ to 5 tons capacity; and the extraheavy-duty range, over 5 tons. This division is not based on any particular standard, but to permit an equitable comparison within a range, between vehicles not too dissimilar in character. The smaller trucks, from $\frac{1}{2}$ to $\frac{1}{4}$ tons capacity, are not included, as they are seldom used for road-haul purposes, usually being restricted to city pick-up and delivery service. Costs for tractor-and-trailer and truckand-trailer combinations and for trailer units are shown in a separate section of the table.

Because various items of operating expense for some units were not available, complete operating costs are shown for but slightly more than half of the vehicles in the table. Total operating cost per mile is given for 65 trucks, 4 tractor-trailer units, and 9 trailers. Per mile cost is also shown for each individual item of operating expense, where a cost and mileage figure were obtained. The omission of figures for some items does not necessarily indicate that these expenses were not carried in the operator's account; rather, it indicates inability to separate a combination of various expenses of which this omitted item was a part.

As heretofore mentioned, the table on unit costs includes only those expenses commonly considered as variable operating or running costs, overhead or fixed costs necessarily being omitted because so few firms attempted to apportion such costs to the individual vehicles of their fleet. These direct operating expenses have been reduced to a per mile cost for each item of expense, and a total per mile and per ton-mile cost for all items, where a basis for such tabulation was possible. The value of per mile figures as a measure for the cost of operating motor trucks is often questionable, but it is believed that the accompanying descriptive data for each unit, relative to age, tire equipment, maximum loads, average loads, and type of road, sufficiently reflect approximate operating conditions to permit a fair comparison.

Ton-mile figures in some instances were taken direct from stationto-station tonnage data. More often they were derived from an estimated average load (including empty as well as loaded mileage) multiplied by the miles operated. They are an approximation; obtained, however, from the operators themselves.

Cost data for combination units, or for trailers or semitrailers as individual units, were rare, and the few examples shown in the table are given merely as illustrative of what it cost a few firms to operate such vehicles. No comparisons can be made within the several groupings.

A number of trucks shown in the unit-cost table in addition to those listed among the combination units were at times operated with trailers. In some instances this is indicated by footnote. Facts were not available to show any consistent operation of a specified trailer with a particular truck or tractor truck. In many instances it was evident that little attention was devoted to the operating costs of trailers or semitrailers as individual units, or to the relative efficiency and operating costs for combination units as compared with trucks.

The letters following the truck numbers designate the firms operating the trucks. Truck 1-A, for example, was operated by the same firm as Truck 26-A.

TABLE 16.-UNIT OPERATING COSTS

MEDIUM-CAPACITY TRUCKS, 1% TO 3 TONS

DESCRIPTIVE DATA' 11/2 11	- 1½. - 4. - PN. - Closed. - New. - 12. - Paved. - Crackers.
23 Rated capacity, tons. 114	- 11/2. - 4. - PN. - Closed. - New. - 12. - Paved. - Crackers.
Tire equipment: PN PN </td <td>PN. PN. Closed. New. 12. Paved. Crackers.</td>	PN. PN. Closed. New. 12. Paved. Crackers.
Bear	PN. Closed. New. 12. Paved. Crackers.
Age at start of period, months. Open top Open top Stare Cused Stare Stare <td>New. 12. Paved. Crackers.</td>	New. 12. Paved. Crackers.
Pariod covered, months	- 12. - Paved. - Crackers.
Principal commodity handled	_ Crackers.
Average load, pounds	
Truck-miles operated	3,000.
DIBECT OPERATING COSTS \$256.60 \$275.05 \$1,002.97 \$11.02 \$54.50 \$35.33 \$87.8 Per mile 0.0491 0.0133 0.0188 0.0020 0.0045 0.0114 0.0491 Gasoline. including fax 170.33 532.10 1.203.27 114.04 2225.11 4.34 44.34	42,241.
Tires and tubes	
Gasolina, including tay 170 32 532 10 1 263 7 114 04 292 81 4 34 34 444 2	
	754. 20
Per mue 0. 0325 0. 0258 0. 0237 0. 0207 0. 0182 0. 0143 0. 0 Oll and grease	/ 0.0178 49.30
Per mile	1 0.001 261.20
Per mile) 0.0063 1.560.00
Per mile	; 0.036
Per mile	
TOTAL DIBECT OPERATING COSTS	.
Total direct operating cost	
Per ton-mile	

¹ Truck used for local drayage half of the day.

TABLE 16.- UNIT OPERATING COSTS-Continued

MEDIUM-CAPACITY TRUCKS, 11/2 TO 3 TONS-Continued

	Truck 9-A	Truck 10-A	Truck 11-A	Truck 12-A	Truck 13-A	Truck 14-G	Truck 15-O	Truck 16-H
DESCRIPTIVE DATA								
Rated capacity, tons	2 PN D-PN. Open top 12 Paved & dirt	2 PN D-PN Open top 12 Paved & dirt	2 4 D-PN Open top 12 Paved & dirt	2 4 D-PN. Open top 12. Paved & dirt.	2 4 D-PN. Open top 12. Paved & dirt	24 4	2 PN D-PN yan 9 6 Paved	2. 4. D-PN. Flat. 144. 5. Paved.
Direct Operation Costs	3,528 737 48,700	3,187 602 36,620	3,467 678 43,814	3,248 1,007 61,930	3,619 290 18,770	M1se. & milk. 8,000 6,000 28,548	Horses 6,500 6,000	M 150. 10,000. 4,470. 290. 14,401.
Tires and tubes Per mile Gasoline, including tar Per mile Per mile Per mile Drivers' wages Per mile Depreciation Per mile	\$880. 84 0.0180 1, 595. 14 0.0327 204. 89 0.0042 2, 258. 11 0.0463 1, 649. 50 0.0338 1, 461. 00 0.0300	\$683. 73 0.0187 1, 291. 80 0.0353 135. 25 0.0037 987. 35 0.0270 1, 345. 00 0.0368 1, 095. 60 0.0300	\$419.68 0.0095 1,135.11 0.0259 272.07 0.0062 1,992.38 0.0464 1,574.85 0.0359 1,314.42 0.0300	\$617.05 0.0099 1,708.03 0.0275 224.14 0.0036 1,343.81 0.216 2,477.50 0.0400 1,857.90 0.0300	\$439, 95 0, 0234 546, 58 0, 0291 105, 12 0, 0056 570, 16 0, 0303 642, 50 0, 0342 563, 10 0, 0300	\$360.00 0.0126 520.00 0.0182 65.00 183.00 0.0022 183.00 0.0064 366.00 0.0128 400.00 0.0128	\$155.00 0.0077 581.76 0.0220 57.53 0.0028 100.00 0.0050 366.00 0.0183 1,000.00 0.0500	\$371. 14 0. 0257 348. 81 0. 0242 148. 19 0. 0102 382. 10 0. 0265 552. 50 0. 0265 552. 50 0. 0318
TOTAL DIRECT OPERATING COSTS Total direct operating cost Per truck-mile Per ton-mile	8, 049. 48 • 0, 1652 0, 0936	5, 538. 73 0. 1516 0. 0950	6, 709. 29 0. 1531 0. 0682	8, 228. 43 0. 1328 0. 0818	2, 867, 41 0. 1527 0. 0844	1, 894. 00 0. 0663 0. 0221	2, 260, 29 0, 1130 0, 0376	2, 261. 59 3 0, 1570 0, 0702

30

MOTOR TRUCK FREIGHT TRANSPORTATION

Item	Truck 17-J	Truck 18-K	Truck 19-L	Truck 20-M	Truck 21-N	Truck 22-P	Truck 23-P	Truck 24-E
DESCRIPTIVE DATA							•	
Rated capacity, tons	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2.
Tire equipment:			·					
Front	<u>PN</u>	PN	PN	PN	PN	8	PN	PN.
_ Rear	. D-PN	D-PN	D-PN	D-PN	D-PN	8	D-PN	D-PN.
Type of body	. Closed	Stake	Van	Stake	Van	Open top	Upen top	Closed.
Age at start of period, months	- 18	10	0	18	18	10	ð 10	40.
Terior coverer, months	- Doved & max	Dowod	Doved	Daved	(Jeoval	Dowod	Poved	Powed & grav.
Principal commodity handled	.) raved of grav.	Miso	Miso	Miso	Mise	Furn & Miso	Furn & Mise	Mise.
Usual maximum load, pounds	8.000	8.000	8.000	6.000	6.000	6.000	6.000	9.000.
Average load, pounds	. 6.000	5.240	8.000	4.700	1.632	-,		2,580.
Tons hauled								179.
Truck-miles operated	. 1,139	14,706	52,000	23,300	17,893	15,473	22,800	7,257.
DIRECT OPERATING COSTS	1				1			
Tires and tubes				\$456.68	\$103.50	\$154.73	\$228.00	\$14. 25
Per mile				0.0196	0.0057	0.0100	0.0100	0.0019
Gasoline, including tax) \$26,40	\$360.61	\$1, 114.00	618.31		628,40	616.30	183.76
Per mue	. 0.0231	0.0245	0.0214	0.0265		0.0404	0.0270	0.0253
Dar mila	- 3,00	22.20		***		35. 19	30.43	37.75
Maintenance and renair		0.0015	800.00		1 192 25	373.27	147.90	102 44
Per mile	0.030	0.0020	0.0115		0.0071	0 0001	0.0064	0.0265
Drivers' wages	39.29	1.531.80	1,440,00	1, 175, 00	1.200.00	1.300.00	1,430,00	202.25
Per mile	0.0344	40.1041	0.0276	0. 0504	0.0670	0.0840	0.0627	0,0278
Depreciation	51.25	400.00	805.00	786.33	420.00			
Per mile	0.0119	0.0271	0.0154	0.0337	0.0234			
TOTAL DIRECT OPERATING COSTS			ł – –	Į	Į	ļ	l	
Total direct operating cost.	1]						
Per truck-mile								
For top mile								

.

••**r**

Pulling 3}4-ton trailer part time.
Not including labor.
Contract service, short-trip haul.

TABLE 16 .- UNIT OPERATING COSTS-Continued

MEDIUM-CAPACITY TRUCKS, 11/4 TO 3 TONS-Continued

	Truck 25-E	Truck 26-A	Truck 27-A	Truck 28-A	Truck 29-Q	Truck 80-R	Truck 31–11	Truck 32-H
DESCRIPTIVE DATA								
Rated capacity, tons Number of wheels Tire equipment: Front Rear Type of body Age at start of period, months Pariod covered, months Type of road	2 PN D-PN Stake 12 Paved & grav.	214 PN D-PN Open top 12 Paved & dirt	214 4 D-PN Open top 12 Paved & dirt.	214 4 PN D-PN Open top 12 Paved & dirt.	214 4 PN. D-PN. Flat. 48. 12. Paved.	214 4 D-PN Stake 24 3 Payed	21/2 4 D-PN Closed 48	214 4. D-PN. Closed. 48. 6. Payed.
Principal commodity handled Usual maximum load, pounds Average load, pounds Tons hauled Truck miles operated DIRECT OPERATING COSTS	Mise 9,000 529 8,071	4.636 723 30,790	3,502 949 39,240	5,910 952 31,830	Mise 10,000 18,000	Mise 5,000 4,000 2,550	N1150 10,000 3,676 334 19,086	Misc. 10,000. 3,078. 283. 19,591.
Tires and tubes Per mile Gasoline, including tax Per mile	\$205.38 0.0254 48.42 0.0059 202.70 0.0251 201.34 0.0249	\$590. 49 0. 0191 1, 153. 41 0. 0374 195. 29 0. 0063 2, 151. 57 0. 063 1, 329. 75 0. 0431 923. 70 0. 0300	\$560. 61 0.0142 1, 128. 01 0.0312 97. 43 0.0024 1, 154. 06 0.0294 1, 953. 00 0.0500 1, 177. 20 0.0300	\$618.45 0.0194 1,215.66 0.0381 134.43 0.0042 954.45 0.0299 1,310.50 0.0411 954.90 0.0300	\$594.00 0.0330 910.00 0.0505 75.00 0.0041 500.00 0.0277 2.500.00 0.1388 864.00 0.0300	\$63.00 0.0241 83.95 0.0329 8.96 0.0024 8.96 0.0329 8.96 0.0024 87.50 0.0343 390.00 4 0.1429 108.00 0.0423	\$269. 29 0.0141 419. 55 0.0219 186. 12 0.0097 416. 63 0.0218 773. 50 0.0405 713. 20 0.0373	\$213. 94 0. 0109 414. 81 0. 0211 186. 12 0. 0095 400. 39 0. 0204 782. 00 0. 0399 713. 20 0. 0364
Total direct operating cost Per truck-mile. Per ton-mile.		6, 344. 21 0. 2060 0. 0888	6, 180. 31 0. 1575 0. 0898	5, 188, 39 0, 1630 0, 0550	5, 41 3. 00 0. 3023	739. 41 9 0. 2899 0. 1449	2, 778, 29 * 0, 1455 0, 0791	2, 710, 46 2 0, 1383 0, 0898

Item	Truck 33-S	Truck 34–T	Truck 35-A	Truck 36-U	Truck 37-V	Truck 38-J	Truck 39-J	Truck 40-W
DESCRIPTIVE DATA							•	
Rated capacity, tons	214 4 CU 84 Paved Misc 10,000 5,439 1,670 18,420	214 4 D-PN Van New Paved & grav. H o useh old goods. 9,000 6,000 22,000	21/4 6 PN-PN Open top Paved & dirt 5,277 818 30.270	214 4 D-PN Stake New Paved Milk & mise 12.000 8,907 526 9,346	214 4 PN D-PN Stake 48 Paved Misc 4,800 744 12,400	21/2 4 D-PN Closed 36 Paved Mise, & milk 13,500 10,000 3.721	21/2 4 PN D-PN Open top 36 Paved & grav. Misc 12,000 2,561	235. 4. PN. D-PN. Van. 30. 6. Paved. Misc. 10,000.
DIRECT OPERATING COSTS						-,		
Tires and tubes Per mile Oil and grease Per mile Maintenance and repair Per mile Drivers' wages Per mile Per mile Per mile Per mile	\$156.00 0.0084 570.00 20.0300 20.0300 20.0300 72.75 0.0039 1,226.00 0.0719 500.00 0.0271	\$318. 12 0. 0144 652. 06 0. 0310 131. 04 0. 0059 3 390. 00 0. 0177 1, 800. 00 0. 0818 770. 00 0. 0350	\$1, 163, 41 0, 0384 986, 21 0, 0325 138, 99 0, 0045 1, 676, 48 0, 0553 1, 240, 65 0, 0409 908, 10 0, 0300	316. 14 0. 0391 13. 35 0. 0014 191. 57 0. 0205 412. 60 0. 0441 765. 00 0. 0818	454, 55 0, 0360 41, 07 0, 0033 143, 23 0, 0115 620, 00 0, 0500 251, 19 0, 0202	89, 32 0, 0240 6, 56 0, 0017 21, 24 0, 0057 274, 38 0, 0737 93, 54 0, 0251	45.76 0.0178 3.92 0.0015 24.39 0.0095 150.36 0.0587 78.48 0.0310	643.00 0.0411 31.00 0.0021
TOTAL DIRECT OPERATING COSTS Total direct operating cost Per truck mile Per ton-mile	2, 654. 50 0. 1441 0. 0529	4,091.22 0.1859 0.0619	6, 113. 84 0, 2019 0, 0764					

.

٠

Pulling 3½-ton trailer, part time.
Not including labor.
70 per cent local hauling.

TABLE 16.-UNIT OPERATING COSTS-Continued

MEDIUM-CAPACITY TRUCKS, 11/2 TO 3 TONS-Continued

Item	Truck 41-W	Truck 42-L	Truck 43–X	Truck 44-X	Truck 45-Y	Truck 46-Z	Truck 47–U	Truck 48-F
DESCRIPTIVE DATA								
Rated capacity, tons Number of wheels Tire equipment:	214	21⁄2 4	2½ 4	23.4	21/2	21⁄2 4	2½ 4	21/2. 4.
Front Rear	PN D-PN	D-PN	PN. D-PN	PN D-PN	PN D-PN	PN D-PN	PN. D-PN	D-PN.
Type of body Age at start of period, months Period covered, months	Van 30	Van New 12	Van 40 12	403	Closed	Stake 7 3	Stake New6	Stake. 36. 12.
Type of road Principal commodity handled	Paved	Paved Mise	Paved Misc	Paved	Paved & grav. Cream & misc.	Paved & grav Mise	Paved Milk & mise	Paved. Misc.
Average load, pounds			5,800. 163.	5,420 62	3,134		7,827	6,000.
Truck miles operated	26,898	41,600	4,200	1,730	21,500	6,110	26,890	24,480.
Tires and tubes		\$936.00	\$90.60	\$39, 79	\$265, 36	\$32, 12	\$27, 79	
Per mile Gasoline, including tax	\$812.42	0.0225	0. 0230	0. 0230	0.0123	0. 0525	0.0010	\$603.90
Per mile Oil and grease	0.0302 45.00	0. 0288					0.0217 33.00	0.0216 63.00
Per mile	0.0016	1,400.00	162. 61	27.55	600. 23 0. 0270	387.60	0.0012 1.35	0.0025 239.40 0.0097
Drivers' wages	779. 22 0. 0289	1, 440, 00 0, 0346	349, 45 0, 0832	143.00 0.0826	1, 563.00 0, 0726	177.50 0.0290	886.20 0.0329	1, 560, 00 0, 0637
Depreciation Per mile	506. 94 0. 0300	1, 038. 00 0. 0249	475, 00 0, 1130	43. 25 0. 0250	919.00 0.0427		444, 10 0, 0165	
TOTAL DIRECT OPERATING COSTS								
Total direct operating cost Per truck mile Per ton-mile				·				
<u> </u>		I	/]				

Item	Truck 49–AA	Truck 50-M	Truck 51–B	Truck 52–U	Truck 53-U	Truck 54-AB	Truck 55-AB	Truck 56-AC
DESCRIPTIVE DATA						•	1	
Rated capacity, tons	214 4	214 P.N. D-PN. Stake New 12 Paved Misc 8,000 3,040 25,000	3 PN D-PN Van New 3 10,000 3,371	3 4 PN D-PN Stake 36 11 Paved Milk & mise 12,000 7,730 819 18,920	3 4 D-PN Stake 24 12 Paved Milk & misc 12.000 7,579 1,288 27,120	3 PN D-PN Stake 12 Paved Milk & misc. 12.000 8,420 8,734	3 4 D-PN. Stake. 12 Paved. Milk & misc. 11,000. 7,720. 00. 2,550.	3. 4. D-PN. Refrigerator. New. 10. Paved. Milk. 9,600. 33,020.
DIRECT OPERATING COSTS Per mile. Gasoline, including tax. Per mile. Oil and grease. Per mile. Maintenance and repair. Par mile. Drivers' wages. Per mile. Depreciation. Per mile.	\$1,041.76 0.0254 292.62 0.0071 1,088.06 0.0205 1,535.40 0.0375	\$550.00 0.0220 798.84 0.0319 	\$18.00 0.0053 74.57 0.0221 7.70 0.0022 15.32 0.0045 387.50 0.1149 160.00 0.0474	\$170. 39 0.0090 505. 93 0.0267 45. 45 0.0024 * 9. 10 0.0005 1, 225. 50 0.0653 881. 25 0.0405	\$105. 52 0.0038 556. 14 0.0205 30. 75 0.0013 \$182. 47 0.00613 \$182. 47 0.0067 980.00 0.0361 753. 30 0.0277	\$74. 68 0. 0200 78. 12 0. 95 0. 0026 13. 68 0. 0036 245. 05 0. 0656 94. 00 0. 0251	\$44. 98 0. 0176 56. 80 0. 0222 10. 40 38. 08 0. 0149 160. 00 0. 0627 55. 20 0. 0216	\$742. 95 0. 0225 785. 90 0. 0239 83. 00 0. 00025 275. 00 0. 0083 1, 000. 00 0. 0302 1, 000. 00 0. 0302
TOTAL DIRECT OPERATING COSTS Total direct operating cost Per truck mile Per ton-mile		 	. 663. 09 0. 1967	2, 847. 62 0, 1505 0, 0389	2, 614, 18 0, 0963 0, 0254	515. 48 0. 1380 0. 0327	365.46 0.1433 0.0371	8, 886. 85 0. 1177

.

* Not including labor.

TABLE 16.-UNIT OPERATING COSTS-Continued

MEDIUM-CAPACITY TRUCKS, 11/2 TO 3 TONS-Continued

Item	Truck 57-B	Truck 58-V	Truck 59-G	Truck 60-K	Truck 61-J	Truck 62-X	Truck 63-X	Truck 64-Z
DESCRIPTIVE DATA					·			
Rated capacity, tons Number of wheels Tire equipment:	. 3 4	4	4	3	3 4	3	3	3. 6.
Front. Rear. Type of body.	D-PN Stake	D-PN Stake	D-PN Closed	D-PN Stake	D-PN. Open top	D-PN Stake	D-PN. Stake	D-PN. Stake.
Period covered, months Type of road Princinal commodity handled	4 Paved	4 Paved	Baved	12. Paved.	1. Paved.	12. Paved	12. Paved	0. 4. Paved & grav. Misc.
Usual maximum load, pounds Average load, pounds Tons hauled	10,000	6,000	9,000 9,000	12,000	12,000	14,000 4,320 485	16,000 6,540 1,066	17,000.
Truck miles operated DIRECT OPERATING COSTS	8,314	. 17,680	22,500	14,748	1,616	16,807	24,479	21,070.
Tires and tubes. Per mile Gasoline, including tax	\$3.50 0.0004 220.96	\$214.09	\$877.50	\$301, 40	\$55, 44	\$386.58 0.0230	\$563, 01 0, 0229	\$104. 17 0. 0049
Per mile Oil and grease Per mile	0. 0265 23. 00 0. 0027	0. 0121 30. 48 0. 0017	0. 0390 168. 75 0. 0075	0, 0204 15, 75 0, 0010	0. 0343 3. 47 0. 0021			
Maintenance and repair Per mile Drivers' wages	79.42 0.0095 483.75	62, 53 0, 0035 416, 00	150.00 0.0066 366.00	72. 37 0. 0049 1, 460. 05 0. 0050	19.00 0.0117 126.00	103. 28 0. 0061 1, 010. 73	1, 637, 60 0, 0668 2, 010, 73	155, 63 0, 0073 561, 00 0, 0266
Depreciation Per mile	120.00 0.0144	0. 0235 342, 45 0. 0193	500.00 0.0222	1, 008, 40 0, 0683	76.57 0.0473	719.26 0.0427	869, 29 0, 0355	
TOTAL DIRECT OPERATING COSTS Total direct operating cost	930. 63							
Per truck mile	0. 1119				(

Item	Truck 65–E	Truck 66-AD	Truck 67-AE	Truck 68-A F	Truck 69–AF	A verage for medium-ca- pacity trucks
DESCRIPTIVE DATA						
Rated capacity, tons	3	3	3	37	37	
Tire equipment:	2	3	3	7	*	
Front	PN	PN	PN	PN	PN	
Rear	D-PN	D-PN	D-PN	D-PN	D-PN	
Age at start of period, months	24	2	27	24	36	
Period covered, months	12	1	12	12	12	
Type of road-	Paved & grav.	Mise	Misc.	Mise	Mise	
Usual maximum load, pounds	7,500	6,000	7,000			
A verage load, pounds		*******	************			
Truck miles operated	14, 712	2,016	12,000	50, 574	31, 503	
	· ·			-		
DIRECT OPERATING COSTS	\$77 m	An1 18	#007 00	#000 00	£170 (D	
Per mile	aro. 23 0. 0051	1 521.1 /	0.0222	0.0165	0.0150	\$0.0149
Gasoline, including tax	377.58	41.75	283.50	1, 244. 53	772.87	
Per mile	0.0256	0.0207	0.0236	0.0246	0.0245	0.0273
Per mile	0.0035	0.0055	0.0039	0.0037	0. 0020	0.0036
Maintenance and repair	278.83			1, 184. 02	929. 27	
Drivers' wages	376.75	137.85		0.0234	Ų. U294	0,0230
Per milė.	0.0256	0.0683				0. 0450
Depreciation		1 17.85	0.0511	1,285.80	1,352.90	0.0308
			••••••			
TOTAL DIBLCT OPERATING COSTS	· ·					1
Total direct operating cost					 	
Per truck mile				-		0.1513
E @F WIL*44110			·[0.0000

• On both rear axles. • Pulling 3-8 ton capacity trailer.

TABLE 16.—UNIT OPERATING COSTS—Continued

HEAVY-DUTY TRUCKS, 31/2 TO 5 TONS CAPACITY

Item	Truck 70-A	Truck 71-A	Truck 72-A	Truck 73-A	Truck 74-A	Truck 75-A	Truck 76-A	Truck 77-R
DESCRIPTIVE DATA							/	
Rated capacity, tons	514 PN S Open top 12 Paved & dirt Misc 5,516	314 4 S Open top	314 PN D-PN Open top 12 Paved & dirt Misc 6,429	3½ PN S Open top 12. Paved & dirt. Misc 9,104	31/2	314 PN D-PN Open top 12 Paved & dirt Misc 5,030	314 PN D-PN Open top 12 Pavod & dirt Misc 5,033	314. 4. PN. D-PN. Stake. 30. 3. Paved. Misc. 7,000. 7,000.
Tons hauled Truck miles operated	264 8,910	707. 22,310	801 25,330	410 8, 970	788	1,464 71,260	046 44,320	2,800.
Tires and tubes Per mile Casoline, including tax Per mile Oil and grease Per mile Maintenance and repair Per mile Drivers' wages Per mile Per mile Per mile Per mile Per mile Per mile	\$406. 88 0. 0456 370. 14 0. 0415 41. 20 0. 0046 752. 93 0. 0845 484. 00 0. 0543 267. 30 0. 0300	\$161.64 0.0206 926.21 0.0115 100.33 0.0044 1,201.39 0.0336 669.30 0.0300	\$553.17 0.0218 1,060.70 0.0418 116.14 0.0045 2,037.41 0.0507 759.90 .0.0300	\$195. 14 0. 0217 414. 37 0. 0461 53. 30 0. 0059 824. 24 0. 0918 499. 50 0. 0556 269. 10 0. 0300	\$897. 31 0.0272 1,074. 86 0.0326 268. 11 0.0081 1,723. 06 0.0523 1,379. 00 0.0418 988. 20 0.0300	$\begin{array}{c} \$1, 324. 25\\ 0.0185\\ 2, 108. 70\\ 0.0205\\ 200. 41\\ 0.0028\\ 1, 520. 61\\ 0.0213\\ 2, 002. 50\\ 0.0417\\ 2, 137. 60\\ 0.0300\\ \end{array}$	\$1, 372, 64 0, 0309 1, 435, 14 0, 0323 217, 52 0, 0019 1, 670, 85 0, 0376 1, 802, 60 0, 0406 1, 329, 60 0, 0300	\$112.00 0.0400 98.20 9.68 0.0034 141.00 0.0503 390.00 4 0.1392 196.00 0.0700
TOTAL DIRECT OPERATING COSTS Total direct operating cost Per truck mile Per ton-mile	2, 322, 45 0, 2606 0, 0944	4. 109. 00 0. 1841 0. 0578	5, 811, 57 0, 2294 0, 0712	2, 255, 65 0, 2515 0, 0552	6, 330, 54 0, 1921 0, 0722	10, 200. 27 0. 1431 0. 0508	7, 828, 35 0, 1766 0, 0700	946. 88 * 0. 3381 0. 0966

MOTOR TRUCK FREIGHT TRANSPORTATION

Item	Truck 78-H	Truck 79–H	Truck 80–II	Truck 81-H	Truck 82-D	Truck 83-K	Truck 84-H	Truck 85-AA
DESCRIPTIVE DATA Rated capacity, tons Number of wheels Tire equipment: Front Rear	3¼ 4 PN D-PN	3¼ 4 PN D-PN	314 4 PN D-PN	3½ 4 D-PN	334 4 PN D-PN	3½ 4 PN D-PN	334 4 PN D-PN	314. 4. PN. D-PN.
Type of bodyAge at start of period, months Period covered, months Type of road Principal commodity handled Usual maximum load, pounds Average load, pounds Truck miles operated	Closed 5	Closed	Closed	Closed24 24 ————————————————————————————————	Stake New	Stake 12 Paved Misc 14,320 8,280 14,761	Closed New 5 Paved Misc 10,000 5,323 138 5,427	Van. 24. 12. Misc. 8,670. 6,000. 44,072.
Tires and tubes. Per mile Gasoline, including tar Per mile Oil and greass. Per mile Maintenance and repair Per mile Drivers' wages. Per mile Depreciation. Par mile	\$619.70 0.0247 903.54 0.0360 186.12 0.0074 576.57 0.0229 1,047.00 0.041.70 674.90 0.0269	\$175.36 0.0070 1,060.05 0.0428 186.12 0.0075 857.75 0.0346 1,089.50 0.0439 901.05 0.0363	\$540.68 0.0232 941.89 0.0405 186.12 0.0080 752.96 0.0324 1,038.50 0.0445	\$406. 88 0.0161 926.05 0.0367 186.12 0.0073 429.76 0.0170 1.089.50 0.0432 749.20 0.0297	\$1, 042. 28 0. 0447 722. 34 0. 0310 118. 89 0. 0051 120. 15 0. 0051 1, 335. 69 0. 0573 1, 741. 00 0. 0747	\$386.07 0.0261 22.20 0.0015 46.90 0.0317 1,573.70 0.1066 540.00 0.0365	\$225. 11 0. 0414 59. 97 0. 0110 174. 76 0. 0322 221. 00 0. 0407 132. 32 0. 0243	\$1,390.56 0.0315 307.25 0.0059 1,482.24 0.0336 1,656.00 0.0375
TOTAL DIRECT OPERATING COSTS Total direct operating cost Per truck mile Per ton-mile	4,007.83 20.1597 0.0582	4, 269, 83 ³ 0, 1724 0, 0614	4,494.10 3 0.1934 0.0684	3,787.51 * 0.1503 0.0540	5,080.33 0.2182 0.1038	 		

¹ Pulling trailer, 3½-ton capacity, part-time. ¹ 70 per cent local hauling.

.

TABLE 16.-UNIT OPERATING COSTS-Continued

٠

HEAVY-DUTY TRUCKS, 3½ TO 5 TONS CAPACITY-Continued

Item	Truck 86-A G	Truck 87-AH	Truck 88-M	Truck 89-AF	Truck 90-A F	Truck 91–AF	Truck 92-Q	Truck 93-AJ
DESCRIPTIVE DATA								
Rated capacity, tons Number of wheels Tire equipment: Front Rear Type of body Age at start of period, months Period covered Type of road Principal commodity handled Usual maximum load, pounds Average load, pounds	314 3.4 S Stake 9 Paved Misc 7,000 3,900	314 PN	314 PN PN Stake 2 Paved Misc 11,000	4 PN. D-PN. Stake 12. Paved Misc. 22,000 ⁷ .	4 PN. D-PN. Stake. 12. Paved. Misc. 22,000 ³ .	4 PN. D-PN 4 Stake 12 Paved Misc 34,000 7	5 4 S Stake 108 Paved Misc 15,500	5. 4. S. Flat. 48. 8. Lumber. 14,000.
Truck miles operated	7,475	28,680	24,000	56,102	28,090	48,727	18,000	11,606.
DIRECT OPERATING COSTS Tires and tubes Per mile Gasoline, including tax Per mile Oil and grease Per mile Maintenace and repair Per mile Drivers' wages Per mile Depreciation Per mile	\$97, 17 0, 0129 334, 03 0, 0446 30, 7600 0, 0041 679, 33 0, 0908 1, 025, 00 0, 1371	\$453. 14 0. 0157 2, 271. 46 0. 0792 1, 915. 82 0. 0667 500. 00 0. 0174	\$542.40 0.0226 821.82 0.0342 	\$879, 83 0, 0156 1, 055, 88 0, 0188 83, 41 0, 0014 268, 28 0, 0047 1, 575, 85 0, 0230	\$456. 16 0. 0162 692. 86 0. 0246 100. 26 0. 0035 909, 85 0. 0323 	\$890. 24 0. 0182 1, 340. 82 0. 0275 161. 90 0. 0033 536, 97 0. 0110 	\$900.00 0.0500 1,090.00 0.0605 75.00 0.0041 500.00 0.0277 2,500.00 0.1388 900.00 0.0500	\$269.07 0.0231 361.42 0.0311 68.21 0.0053 409.70 0.0353 1,252.45 0.1079 617.76 0.0532
TOTAL DIRECT OPERATING COSTS Total direct operating cost Per truck mile Per ton-mile				· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·			5, 965. 00 1 0. 3313	2, 978. 61 0, 2566

MOTOR TRUCK FREIGHT TRANSPORTATION

Item	Truck 94-AJ	Truck 95-A K	Truck 96-AG	Truck 97-D	Truck 98-V	Truck 99–V	Truck 100-K	Truck 101-K
DESCRIPTIVE DATA Rated capacity, tons Number of wheels Tire equipment: Front Rear Twne of body	5 4 S S Open top	5 4 PN D-PN	5 4 8 Van	5 4 PN Stake	5 6 PN D-PN 4 Van	5 6 PN D-PN 4 Van	5 4 9 D-S Stake	5. 4. PN. D-PN. Stake
Age at start of period, months. Period covered, months. Type of road. Principal commodity handled. Usual maximum load, pounds. Average load, pounds. Tons hauled. Truck-miles operated.	Coke 11,000	84 Paved Misc 15,000	24 9	12 Paved Misc 11,000 6,654	Van New Paved Misc 7,640 1,240 16,200	Val. New	42 Paved Misc 14,000 7,820 8,057	48. 12. Paved. Misc. 16,000. 8,600. 14,052.
DIRECT OPEBATING COSTS Tires and tubes Per mile	\$281. 21 0. 0237 441. 15 0. 0372 74. 72 0. 0063 955. 49 0. 0607 1, 318. 30 0. 1113 1, 640. 64 0. 0878	\$185.00 0.0123 328.46 0.0217 70.22 0.0046 83.54 0.0046 83.54 0.0055 1,171.50 0.0781 100.00 0.0066	\$864. 80 0. 0400 1, 586. 74 0. 0733 128. 04 0. 0059 843. 89 0. 0390 1, 710. 00 0. 0. 0790 1, 725. 00 0. 0797	\$124. 70 0. 0.187 224. 24 0. 0.337 39. 75 0. 0059 175. 52 0. 0263 860. 67 0. 1293 151. 68 0. 0227	\$660. 14 / 0. 0407 78. 75 0. 0047 83. 49 0. 0051 775. 00 0. 0478 542. 03 0. 0334	\$437.06 0.0326 59.53 0.0044 56.49 0.0042 640.00 0.0478 442.41 0.0330	\$276. 94 0. 0343 16. 95 0. 0021 21. 00 0. 0026 712. 75 0. 0884 1, 143. 00 0. 1418	\$530. 98 0. 0377 19. 65 0. 0013 188. 44 0. 0134 1, 641. 25 0. 1167 1, 200. 00 0. 0863
TOTAL DIRECT OPERATING COSTS Total direct operating cost Per truck-mile Per ton-mile	4, 111. 51 0. 3472	1, 936. 72 0. 1291	6, 858. 47 0, 3172 0, 1554	1, 576. 56 0. 2369 0. 0789				

⁶ On both rear axles.
⁷ Pulling 3-8 ton capacity trailer.
⁸ Hauling in congested metropolitan area.
⁹ 60 per cent local hauling.

TABLE 16.-UNIT OPERATING COSTS-Continued

HEAVY-DUTY TRUCKS, 31/2 TO 5 TONS CAPACITY-Continued

Item	Truck 102-K	Truck 103-D	Truck 104-AK	Truck 105–A L	Truck 106-X	A verage for heavy-duty trucks
DESCRIPTIVE DATA Rated capacity, tons Number of wheels The equipment: Front Rear Type of body Age at start of period, months Period covered, months Type of road Type of road Frincipal commodity handled. Usual maximum load, pounds Average load, pounds Tons hauled. Truck miles operated.	5 4 PN D-PN Stake 82 Paved Misc 16,500 8,880 11,844	5 6 PN-PN Stake 10 Paved Misc 20,000 14,940 135 2,600	5 4 PN D-PN 22 6 Pared Misc 15,000	5 4 PN D-PN 38 6 Paved Misc 12,000	5 6 D-PN 4 Stake New Paved Misc 24,000 7,060 1,089 23,146	
DIRECT OPERATING COSTS Tires and tubes Per mile Gasoline, including tax Per mile Ofil and grease Per mile Maintenance and repair Per mile Drivers' wages Per mile Depreciation Per mile TOTAL DIRECT OPERATING COSTS	\$320, 98 0, 0271 48, 75 0, 0041 118, 95 0, 0100 1, 542, 50 0, 1302 970, 00 0, 0818	\$96, 48 0, 0371 11, 40 0, 0043 28, 03 0, 0107 160, 00 0, 0615 145, 83 0, 0560	\$387. 36 0. 0258 41. 30 0. 0027 71. 04 0. 0047 	\$148.00 0.0123 265.34 0.0221 39.24 0.0032 158.42 0.0132 260.00 0.0216	\$925. 32 0. 0309 925. 32 0. 0390 1. 637. 60 0. 0707 1. 387. 76 0. 0599	\$0. 0232 0. 0339 0. 0047 0. 0305 0. 0608 0. 0388
Total direct operating cost Per truck-mile Per ton-mile						0. 2005 0. 0704

IOTOR TRU	
CKE	
REIGHT	
TRANSPORTATION	

EXTRA-HEAVY-DUTY TRUCKS, OVER 5 TONS CAPACITY

Item	Truck 107-AM	Truck 108-AM	Truck 109-AM	Truck 110–AM	Truck 111-AN	Truck 112-AN	Truck 113-AN	Truck 114-AN
DESCRIPTIVE DATA					_			
Rated capacity, tons	7 6	8 4	8 4	8 4	10 6	10 6	10 6	10. 6.
Tire equipment: Front Rear	PN.	S	8 D_9	8 D_8	PN	PN.	8 8	8. 89
Type of body Age at start of period, months	Stake 30	Stake36	Stake	Stake 42	Van48	Van	Van	Van. 36.
Period covered, months. Type of road.	12. Paved	12. Paved	12 Paved	12. Paved	6. Paved	6. Paved	6. Paved	6. Paved.
Usual maximum load, pounds	14,000 10,250	14,000 10,500	15,000 9,000	15,000	16,520	15,720	16,470	16,320.
Tons hauled Truck-miles operated	25,065	24,200	1,548	1,782 19,806	25,937	28,904	13,256	16,315.
DIRECT OPERATING COSTS		ļ						
Tires and tubes. Per mile	\$408.00 0.0162	\$373.50 0.0154	\$333.00	\$386, 50 0, 0195	\$516.66 0.0199	\$568. 29 0. 0196	\$268. 47 0. 0202	\$331.20 0.0203
Gasoline, including tax Per mile	. 816.48 0.0325	908.34 0.0375	723.35 0.0420	784.96 0.0396	1, 164. 51 0. 0448	1, 238, 50 0, 0428	819, 80 0, 0618	905.45 0.0554
Par mile. Maintenance and repair.	0.0044	0.0043	0.0059 510.60	97.03 0.0049 499.75	114.0/ 0.0044 1.882.86	118.23 0.0040 1.242.42	0.0061 573.96	0.0055 985.70
Per mile Drivers' wages	. 0.0209 1,820.00	0.0170	0.0256	0. 0252 1, 820. 00	0.0725 1,687.71	0.0429 1, 878.76	0.0432 861.64	0.0604
Depreciation Per mile	1,000.00 0.0398	1,000.00 0.0413	1, 200. 00 0. 0697	0.0918 1,200.00 0.0605	0.0650 674.64 0.0260	603, 42 0, 0208	589.06 0.0444	171.22 0.0104
TOTAL DIBECT OPERATING COSTS	· ·							
Total direct operating cost Per truck-mile Per ton-mile	4, 682. 47 0. 1868 0. 0364	4, 618, 47 0, 1908 0, 0363	4, 689. 70 0. 2726 0. 0605	4, 788, 86 0, 2417 0, 0537	6, 041. 05 0, 2329	5, 649. 62 0, 1954	3, 194, 12 0. 2409	3, 544. 85 0. 2172

• On both rear axles.

٤

TABLE 16.—UNIT OPERATING COSTS—Continued

EXTRA-HEAVY-DUTY TRUCKS, OVER 5 TONS CAPACITY-Continued

Item	Truck 115-AN	Truck 116-AN	Truck 117-AN	Truck 118-AN	Truck 119-AN	Truck 120-AN	Truck 121-AN	Truck 122-AN
DESCRIPTIVE DATA								
Rated capacity, tons Number of wheels Tire_equipment:	- 10 6	10 6	10 6	10	6	10 6	10 6	. 10. . 6.
Front Rear Type of body Age at start of period, months	D-PN	D-PN	S S-S Van	D-PN 4	D-PN • Van	D-PN • Van	D-PN	D-PN . Stake.
Period covered, months Type of road Principal commodity handled	6 Paved Misc. & meats_	6. Paved. Misc. & meats.	6. Paved Misc. & meats	3. Paved. Misc. & meats.	6. Paved Misc. & meats	3. Paved. Misc. & ments.	6. Paved Misc. & meats	12. Paved. Misc.
Usiai maximum load, pounds Average load, pounds Tons hauled Truck-miles operated	8,331	10,466	10,242	6,540.	29,328	15,384	28,299	43,156.
DIRECT OPERATING COSTS								
Thres and tubes Per mile Gasoline, including tax Per mile Oll and grease Per mile Maintenance and repair Per mile Drivers' wages Per mile Depreciation Per mile Depreciation Per mile	\$171. 20 0.0205 302.19 0.0362 56.69 0.0068 670.66 0.0805 541.52 0.0650 340.86 0.0409	\$204, 14 0, 0105 371, 92 0, 0355 62, 13 0, 0059 434, 70 0, 0415 686, 28 0, 0650 340, 88 0, 0325	\$238, 49 0, 0232 649, 69 0, 0634 71, 25 0, 0069 1, 144, 79 0, 1117 665, 73 0, 0650 280, 20 0, 0273	\$150, 60 0, 0236 257, 76 0, 0394 10, 76 0, 0016 252, 56 0, 0335 425, 10 0, 0050 217, 14 0, 0332	\$576. 20 0.0196 1, 285. 01 0.0438 128. 71 0.0043 1, 874. 77 0.0639 1, 906. 32 0.0650 608. 88 0.0207	\$388. 80 0. 0252 825. 62 0. 0536 54. 01 0. 0035 691. 28 0. 0449 999. 96 0. 0650 301. 44 0. 0197	\$573.76 0.0202 1,188.56 0.0420 138.97 0.0048 1,212.91 0.0428 1,839.44 0.0650 609.88 0.0215	\$824. 27 0.0191 1, 658. 88 0.0301 272. 11 0.0063 1, 141. 00 0.0264 0.0650 1, 740. 08 0.0403
Total direct operating cost. Per truck mile. Per ton-mile	2, 083. 12 0. 2500	2, 094. 04 0. 2000	3, 050, 15 0, 2978	1, 313, 92 0, 2009	6, 379, 89 0. 2175	3, 264, 11 0, 2121	5, 560. 52 Q. 1964	

.

Item	Truck 123-A F	Truck 124-A F	Truck 125–A F	Truck 126-AA	Average extra heavy-duty trucks
DESCRIPTIVE DATA \		·		•	
lated capacity, tons.	10	10	10	10	
lumber of wheels	6	6	6	6	
Yre equipment:	1				
Front	PN	PN	PN	PN	
Rear	D-PN	D-PN	D-PN	D-PN	
'\$pe of body	. Stake	Stake	Stake) Van	
ige at start of period, months	12	12	12	<u> 1</u> 2	
eriod covered, months	- 12	12	12	7	
Type of road	Paved	Paved	Paved	I Pavod	
Tingpal commodity handled	- MISC	N11SC	N11SC	AllSC	
Jong Indian Dad, pounds	- 19,190 **	19,180 **	19,190	22,000	
Verage logi, pollus				1 10,000	
Frick miles operated	42 724	44 810	43 418	35 891	
DIJECT OPERATING COSTS				ļ	
Fires and tubes.	\$816.81	\$857.27	\$831.82]	
Per mile	0.0191	0.0191	0. 0191		\$0.019
	1,634.83	1,675.16	1, 683.40	\$1,430.88	
		049 22	0.0387	0.0398	0.041
Part mile	201.73	248.02	228.10	210.00	0.005
A of mine-	1 1 060 74	094 55	9/6 42	1 672 00	0.000
Per mile	1 1,000,14	0.0219	0.0200	1, 6, 6, 6, 6, 6, 7, 1, 6, 7, 7, 7, 7, 7, 7, 7, 7, 7, 7, 7, 7, 7,	0.038
Drivers' wages				1.092.15	
Per mile				0.0304	0.066
Depreciation	1,738.43	1,940.45	1,897.85]	
Per mile	0. 0406	0.0433	0.0137		. 0. 036
TOTAL DIRECT OPERATING COSTS					
Total direct operating cost					
Per truck mile					. 0.218
Per ton-mile			-F	1	1

-

.

⁴ On both rear axles. ¹⁹ Puiling 10-ton trailer.

MOTOR TRUCK FREIGHT TRANSPORTATION

45

.

COMBINATION AND NONMOTIVE UNITS

	Unit	1-AP	Uni	t 2-D	Unit	3-AP	Unit	4-AB	Unit	5-AG	Unit	6-AJ	Unit	7-AJ
Item	Tractor	Semi- trailer	Tractor	Semi- trailer	Tractor	Semi- trailer	Tractor	Semi- trailer	Tractor	Semi- trailer	Tractor	Semi- trailer	Tractor	Semi- trailer
DESCRIPTIVE DATA											[
Rated capacity, tons Number of wheels Tire equipment:	11/2 4	3 2	2 4	7	3 4	3 2	3 4	5 2	31/2 4	8 2	734 4	15 2	71/2 4	15. 2,
Rear	D-PN	D-PN	D-PN	D-PN	D-PN	D-PN	D-PN	D-PN_	D-PN	D-PN.	s	8	S	s.
Type of body		Closed	}	Stake		(Closed	}	Stake		Van		Flat	}	fflat. Flat.u
Age at start of period, months		(OMARD	New		9		24		New		21		18	(1 100
Period covered, months	. 5 Pavad &	ma val	10		5		Payed		Paved		8		8.	
Principal commodity handled	Mise	Misc. 15 400			Mise		Mise		Silk hose.		Lumber.		Lumber.	
Usual maximum load, pounds	8,000	15,400			12,000		20,000		13,000	•••••				
Tons hauled	3,820	10,000					119		0,001					
Vehicle miles operated	6,380		20,664		9,650		3,040		31,341		8,275		15,010.	
DIRECT OPERATING COSTS							1							
Tires and tubes Per mile		\$93.40	\$	721, 74 0, 0349	1	248.60		\$91.20	\$1,	567.20 0.0500	;	\$337.83 0.0108		\$607.17
Gasoline, including tax		99.53		526.80		193. 47		58.92	1,	447.75		378.06		700.66
Oil and grease		19.80		35.58		42.30		11.40		60.94		60.85		93, 90
Per mile	'	0.0031		0.0017		0.0013		0.0037		0.0019		0.0073		0.0062
Per mile		0.0130		105.84		167.45		66.92		865.51		647.35		890.40
Drivers' wages		164.00	1,	166. 83		625.00		171. 70	1,	800.00		783. 42	1	1.378.78
Per mile		0.0257		0.0564		0.0647		0. 0564		0.0574	-	0.0946		0.0918
Per mile	····			0.0361					I,	483.14	1,	476.80	1	1,572.56
TOTAL DIRECT OPERATING COSTS	-]		ſ								v		4 1011
Total direct operating cost Per vehicle-mile Per ton-mile			3,	303.53 0.1598 0.0319					7,	224. 54 0. 2305 0. 0761	3,	684. 31 0. 4452	l	5, 243. 47 0. 3493
		· '		·								1		

MOTOR TRUCK FREIGHT TRANSPORTATION

/													
•	Unit 8-W				Unit 9-W		Unit l	10-AQ	Unit	11-AQ	Timit 10 Tr.	Unit	U nit
Item	Tractor	Semi- trailer	Trailer	Tractor	Semi- trailer	Trailer	Truck	Trailer	Truck	Trailer	trailer	13–H; trailer	14–H; trailer
DESCRIPTIVE DATA													
Rated capacity, tons Number of wheels Tire equipment:	23/2	3 to 5 2	2 to 4	3½ 4	5 to 10 2	2 to 4 4	31 <u>4</u>	5 4	5 4	5 4	31/2	3½ 4	31 <u>6</u> . 4
Front	PN	D_PN	PN	PN	T-PN	PN	8 D_9	PN	8 D9	PN	PN	PN	PN. D-PN
Type of hady		Stake	Stake	<i>D</i> -1 M-1	/Van	lvan	Flat	Flat	Flat	Flat	Closed	Closed	Closed
Age at start of period, months	6	Stake ¹¹ _ 30	18	6	Van ¹¹ 18	18	60		120			18	7.
Type of road Principal commodity handled	Paved. Misc			Paved. Misc			Paved Bldg, ma	terials	Paved Bldg. ma	terials	Paved	Paved Misc	Paved. Misc.
Usual maximum load, pounds	21,500			31,500	*********						10,000	10,000	10,000, 5,073.
Vehicle miles operated	32,458			29,842			7,946		4,766		21,669	22,010	23,647.
DIRECT OPERATING COSTS													•
Tires and tubes Per mile								\$40.00 0.0050	1	\$131.40 0.0275	\$385.98 0.0178	\$3.00	\$248.20 0.0104
Gasoline, including tax	-	\$	1,014.65 0.0312		\$	1,027.90		297, 22		176.06			
Oil and grease	-		75.00	ł		57.50	ł	18.48	{	6.17	110.67	110.68	110.68
Maintenance and repair			v. w23					297. 41		139.95	119, 44	166. 91	118.22
Per mile			1,039.10			1, 039, 10	il 👘	0, 0374 720, 99	Į	0. 0293 59. 75	0.0055	0.0075	0.0049
Per mile	-)		0. 0320			0.0348		0, 0907		0.0125	0.0081	0.0080	0.0077
Per mile	-		0. 0272			0.0300					412.80	245.10	275.15 0.0116
TOTAL DIRECT OPERATING COSTS	{						1		1				
Total direct operating cost	.			- -							1, 205, 89	703.69	935, 25
Per ton mile	- -				••••••		-				0, 0558	0. 0319 0. 0136	0. 0395 0. 0155
	<u> </u>			-		· · · ·	·		<u> </u>		<u> </u>	<u> </u>	·

~

.

¹¹ Two different semitrailers interchanged with same tractor. ¹² Drivers paid \$1.50 per day extra when trailer attached to truck.

MOTOR TRUCK FREIGHT TRANSPORTATION

TABLE 16 .--- UNIT OPERATING COSTS--- Continued

COMBINATION AND NONMOTIVE UNITS-Continued

Item	Unit 15-17; trailer	Unit 16-AN; trailer	Unit 17–AN; trailer	Unit 18-AN; trailer	Unit 19–AN; traller	Unit 20-AN; truiler
DESCRIPTIVE DATA			1			}
Rated capacity, tons	314	5 4 D-PN D-PN Van 72 6 Paved Misc. & meats 15,306	5 4 D-PN D-PN Van 60. 3 Paved Mis. & meats 11,578	5 4 S Van 84 Misc. & meats Misc. & meats 8,137	10SSSSSSS	10. 6. 9-9. Van. 72. 6. Paved. Misc. & meats. 34,000.
DIBECT OPERATING COSTS Tires and tubes Per mile. Gasoline, including tax	\$271.87 0.0121	\$329, 73 0. 0215	\$311.96 0.0269	\$158.62 0.0194	\$201. 65 0. 0205	\$305, 30 .0, 0208
Per mile Oil and grease Per mile Maintenance and repair Per mile Drivers' wages Per mile Depreciation	110. 70 0. 0049 64. 91 0. 0029 19 175. 50 0. 0078 246. 30	5. 74 0. 0003 345. 27 0. 0025 193. 74	5. 74 0. 0004 161. 05 0. 0139	5.74 0.0007 182.15 0.0223 8.82 8.82	5,74 0,0004 424,72 0,0333	5, 74 0, 0003 (39, 69 0, 0419 10, 86
TOTAL DIRECT OPERATING COST Total direct operating cost Per vehicle mile Per ton mile	6,0110 869,28 0,0339 0,0154	0, 0126 874, 48 0, 0571	0. 0052 573. 79 0. 0495	0.0010 355.33 0.0436	0. 0007 701. 29 0. 0550	0. 0007 961, 59 0. 0631

¹² Driver paid \$1.50 per day extra when trailer attached to truck.

TIRES AND TUBES

Very few concerns endeavored to set up an estimated tire life in miles and compute tire costs accordingly. The majority simply took the total amount expended, for both new tire purchases and repairs, and divided this sum by the mileage traveled to obtain a per mile cost for a particular period of operation. This latter method may produce an abnormal per mile tire cost unless it covers an extended period of time, sufficient to take into consideration the irregular exhaustion and replacement of tires and tubes for the vehicle.

Tire cost during a brief period of operation depends to a large degree upon the expenditures for new tire equipment. If no replacements are made during such period, assuming normal mileage traveled, the per mile cost will cover only the negligible amount spent for tire and tube repairs. Inversely, if it is necessary to equip the vehicle with all new rubber during the period, a high per mile tire cost results, and the succeeding period of operation will reap the benefit of the tire life still remaining. The length of period analyzed, therefore, becomes of particular importance in comparing per mile tire cost for the different units tabulated.

Other conditions affecting tire cost are road surfaces and grades, loads carried, maintenance (tire repair, inflation, wheel alignment, brake adjustment, etc.), driver ability, traffic conditions, and frequency of stops. Many of these factors affect other operating expenses.

The majority of the vehicles for which tire costs are given are equipped with pneumatic tires, with dual pneumatics on the rear wheels. The extremely small number of typical vehicles otherwise equipped does not allow a comparison of tire costs as between various types of tire equipment. Only a few of the vehicles listed are equipped with solid tires, but it may be significant that the other operating expenses per mile for these trucks tend to be high.

GASOLINE

Gasoline costs tabulated include the gasoline tax. Few operators made any attempt to keep the tax as a separate item of expense, since it was not considered essential to their accounting records. Nevertheless, the gasoline tax is often one of the largest single items The average gasoline tax in 50 representative cities in of tax cost. the United States in June, 1930, was 23 per cent of the average service-station gasoline price, not including tax, according to figures compiled by the American Petroleum Institute.⁵ In many localities the tax will be a much larger proportion of the gasoline cost, especially if the operator purchases at wholesale prices. In comparing fuel costs, the differences in gasoline price (including tax) in different parts of the country must be taken into consideration. The number of gallons consumed was rarely reported, however; hence the price per gallon can not be computed from the total cost of the gasoline as set forth in the table.

' LUBRICANTS

While the cost of oil and grease is relatively small as compared with other items of expense, it is by no means insignificant. Vehicles vary in their lubrication needs according to age and design and

Petroleum Facts and Figures, third edition (1930), American Petroleum Institute, p. 49.

according to the conditions under which they are operated. The policy followed by a truck operator with respect to lubrication will not only affect this one item of cost, but may have a much more important effect upon maintenance and repair expense.

MAINTENANCE AND REPAIR

Maintenance and repair costs as tabulated show extreme variations. Efforts were made in compiling these figures to combine repair labor with repair materials and other expenditures for maintenance. In many instances it was difficult to reach an accurate total for all of these items, or to determine whether the figure given included all three classes of expense. The situation is complicated by the fact that in some of the smaller organizations the owners or the drivers do a considerable share of maintenance and repair work and the repair labor is not charged to that account. During a short period consideration must be given to variation in the per mile cost due to possible inclusion (or exclusion) of periodic overhauls, or of possible expensive repairs following an accident or mechanical failure.

DRIVERS' WAGES

As indicated by the per mile cost figures, few of the concerns interviewed paid drivers' wages on a mileage basis. A conspicuous exception appears in the group of 10-ton trucks, where 11 vehicles belonging to a single operator show a uniform rate of 6½ cents per mile. Only where route schedules can be so arranged that the drivers are assured of adequate compensation with but slight fluctuation in earnings does the mileage method of payment prove equitable to both employer and employee. When wages are paid on a time basis, a wide variation per mile naturally results from differences in daily mileage. In each group, those units showing a high cost per mile show also a low average daily mileage. Such low mileage may be due to a large proportion of time-consuming pick-up and delivery service as compared with line haul, to a predominantly urban route with many traffic delays, or to a short daily round trip and much actual idle time.

Whether the vehicle makes delivery to consignees or performs only the road haul has an important effect upon the per mile driver cost. Where a division of facilities exists, with the larger vehicles restricted to line-haul work and pick-ups and deliveries made by light trucks used solely for that purpose, the per mile driver cost for road trucks will generally be low. Wages for drivers of local trucks are often carried as part of the terminal expense rather than as a wage expense. A number of truck lines operate through truck terminals at destination points, and the pick-up and delivery expense is absorbed in the terminal charge. Other firms confine their operations and equipment strictly to line-haul service, contracting with local drayage concerns for pick-ups and deliveries. The restriction of the driver's duties to line-haul operation reduces his nondriving time to a minimum and results in a proportionately lower per mile driver cost.

DEPRECIATION

Depreciation is calculated by most motor truck operators on the basis of an estimated life in years—usually three to six for trucks, though four years is so common as to be almost the standard figure. The fact that the United States Bureau of Internal Revenue has accepted four years as prima facie reasonable for income-tax purposes is probably responsible for the general adoption of the 25 per cent per annum rate. Trailers and semitrailers are generally estimated at a life of 50 to 100 per cent longer than that of trucks and tractor trucks. Some concerns also depreciate the truck chassis and body separately, on the assumption that the latter will have a longer life. In most instances the truck operator merely divides the actual cost of the vehicle when acquired by the estimated life in years, making no allowance for salvage value or for additions to capital account through subsequent replacements of major parts or installation of special equipment. A few firms depreciate their vehicles on a per mile basis.

Many truck owners apparently write off the value of their equipment faster than the vehicles actually depreciate, owing either to a natural inclination to provide a safe margin for replacement before the vehicle is worn out or obsolete or to an incorrect method of estimating its probable life. On the other hand, it will be noted that a depreciation figure is shown for some units which even under extraordinary circumstances should have been written off before they reached their present age. If an owner has recently purchased a truck secondhand he is, of course, entitled to allow for depreciation regardless of the age of the vehicle, but hardly in an amount as high as that shown for some units. The omission of a depreciation figure for some units in Table 16 is due either to this rapid depreciation or to the inability of the firm to furnish an accurate figure for this account.

In nearly every capacity class the table shows a maximum per mile depreciation cost for vehicles with a low annual mileage, and vice versa. This is only to be expected in computing any fixed cost on a per mile basis. It is of interest to note, however, that the units with maximum depreciation figures in the $1\frac{1}{2}$ -ton and 2-ton groups are depreciated at an arbitrary rate per mile. It would seem that this excessively high rate would be justified only if the vehicles were engaged in a particularly severe type of service.

AVERAGE COSTS

The most conspicuous characteristic of the per mile cost data for the various items is the tendency toward a wide and irregular distribution rather than a symmetrical concentration around an average figure, even within like capacity groups. This may be attributed principally to the limited number of data available. The only marked uniformity that appears anywhere is in the depreciation for both medium-capacity and heavy-duty trucks, where the frequency of the 3-cent rate is easily explained by the fact that these trucks were depreciated on an arbitrary 3 cents per mile basis, 12 of them in the medium-capacity class and 7 in the heavy-duty class belonging to a single operator.

With such irregularities an average cost lacks the significance it would have if there were a clearly typical figure in each group. An ordinary arithmetical average of per mile costs for the different units would be seriously affected by the abnormally extreme variations. There is no clear evidence, moreover, as to which items should properly be rejected before calculating an average on the remaining, presumably sound, items. The average for each class (medium-capacity, heavy-duty, and extra-heavy duty trucks) shown in Table 16, therefore, includes all the trucks in that class, but is weighted according to the mileage run by each truck. This minimizes the effect of those costs which are erratic owing to short periods of operation.

While there are several capacities of truck in each class, the groups are reasonably homogeneous, and the very small number of trucks of some sizes does not permit an analysis by single capacity classes.

The generally higher costs for the heavier trucks indicate that the figures for unit costs are at least consistent within themselves. As an additional check on these costs, however, they were compared with estimated costs per mile for direct operating costs as supplied by two leading truck manufacturers. These are shown in Table 17.

Rated capacity	Tires and tubes	Gasoline (includ- ing tax)	Oil and grease	Mainte- nance and repair	Drivers' wages	Deprecia- tion
Tield survey average:						
11/2 to 3 tons	\$0.0149	\$0.0273	\$0.0036	\$0.0235	\$0.0450	\$0.0308
31/2 to 5 tons	. 0232	. 0339	.0047	. 0305	. 0606	. 0386
Estimated by manufacturer A:			ļ .			
3 tons	. 0264	. 0208	.0024	. 6185	. 0400	. 0195
5 tons	. 0530	. 0300	. 0039	. 0273	0400	. 0241
Estimated by manufacturer B:						
116 tons	. 0081	.0167		. 0200		0126
2 tons	. 0100	. 0200		. 0225		0161
214 tons	. 0100	.0222		0250		.0158
3 tons	0112	0250		0250		0191
ald tons	0173	0286		0275	[·····	0222
A tons	.0224	0286		0275		0230
	0281	0000		0200		0070

TABLE 17.—TRUCK OPERATING COSTS PER MILE AS SHOWN BY SURVEY, COM-PARED WITH MANUFACTURERS' ESTIMATES

GROSS UNIT COSTS

No attempt is made in the unit-cost table to reach total costs of transportation, including overhead or administrative costs in addition to the direct operating costs tabulated. As previously stated, the principal object of keeping records of unit costs is to show the relative costs of different pieces of equipment, and for this purpose the overhead costs are of secondary importance. As a basis for rate making, however, it is desirable to know the total cost of a certain haul, and this requires some apportionment of overhead expenses.

The choosing of a satisfactory basis for such apportionment of overhead is not easy. Where all the vehicles in the fleet are alike and engaged in similar service, it makes little, if any, difference whether the allocation is made merely according to the number of vehicles in the fleet or whether it is made according to earnings, mileage, tonnage, capacity, direct operating costs, or other individual characteristic of each vehicle. Each unit will get an equal share, exactly or approximately. Where there are important differences between the vehicles, in either potential or actual performance, inconsistencies may arise to upset almost any system.

None of the bases mentioned above can exactly measure the proportionate overhead cost of any one unit. License, taxes, and garage storage will depend primarily upon size of vehicle; clerical overhead will probably bear a close relation to tonnage handled or, in less degree, to earnings or mileage run; fleet insurance is frequently based on gross revenue, and so on. It would seem to be impossible to set forth any one general rule for the apportionment of overhead cost among the different units of a fleet under different forms of company organization.

An approximation of gross expenses per mile for the several truckcapacity groups may be reached by adding to each figure for total direct operating costs a proportionate addition to cover the overhead costs. This, of course, is equivalent to allocating the overhead costs in proportion to direct operating costs. The analysis of fleet costs in the following section of this report shows that direct operating cost averaged 57 per cent and overhead cost 43 per cent of the total. On this basis Table 18 gives an approximate gross expense per truckmile for medium, heavy, and extra heavy trucks.

TABLE 18.—GROSS EXPENSE PER TRUCK-MILE, BY RATED CAPACITY GROUPS

Rated capacity	Direct oper-	Overhead	Gross ex-
	ating costs	costs (43	pense (100
	(57 per cent)	per cent)	per cent)
11/2 to 3 tons. 31/2 to 5 tons. Over 5 tons.	\$0. 1513 	\$0. 1141 . 1513 . 1647	\$0. 2654 . 3518 . 3830

FLEET COSTS

Gross operating expenses for 91 motor truck fleets in the year 1930 were selected for clarity and completeness and are presented in Table 19. The firms listed show gross expenses ranging from approximately \$15,000 to slightly over \$800,000. They have been grouped according to size to facilitate a comparison between large and small operations as to the relationship of separate items of expense to gross expenses.

Because emphasis in the survey was given to unit costs rather than fleet costs, the latter were not obtained in every case where they were available. The number of firms represented in the table, therefore, is not an accurate indication of the percentage of firms interviewed that were able to furnish such data.

Although a more detailed classification of expenses than that given in the table is desirable, it was generally difficult to obtain from the operators details as to some expenses, and the subdivisions in the table were found to be the most adaptable to the majority of reports.

Records of mileage and tonnage and ton-mileage figures for fleet operations were meager. This deficiency is not of serious importance, however, as an attempt to measure fleet costs on one of these bases would mean very little. Per mile or other measure of costs averaged over a fleet is of value only when the fleet is composed of vehicles similar in every respect, and operating in identical service; even then only an approximation would be possible. The analysis of fleet cost figures, therefore, has been confined to showing the relation of each of the standard items of trucking cost bears to the gross expense for fleets in the different groups.

Where an expense column contains a figure for more than one expense or the expense item is not complete, the combined figure or the incomplete item is not included in the computation of the ratio of that particular cost item to gross expenses. This elimination of combination and incomplete expenses tends slightly to unbalance the percentages for a group, so that they do not total exactly 100 per cent, but the error is very small.

TABLE 19 .- FLEET OPERATING COSTS

GROSS EXPENSES OF \$10,000 to \$24,999

			Direct	operating	expenses		<u> </u>			Overhea	d expenses			
Firm number	Tires and tubes	Gasoline (including tax)	Oil and grease	Mainte- nance and repair	Deprecia- tion	Drivers' Wages	Total	Taxes and licenses (not in- cluding gasoline)	Insurance	Rent	Wages and salaries	Miscella- neous	Total	Total gross expenses
1 2 3 4 5 6	\$1, 427, 12 306, 25 542, 94 1, 055, 98 1, 473, 57 1, 114, 43	¹ \$1, 876, 20 1, 493, 32 1, 481, 59 2, 732, 04 4, 365, 63 ¹ 3, 738, 06	() (?) \$161. 12 303. 55 388. 65 (?)	\$897. 17 ⁴ 1, 064, 54 1, 656, 54 2, 599, 82 1, 437. 70 2, 372, 54	\$2, 482, 25 1, 200, 00 \$ 2, 373, 53 \$ 3, 975, 60 3, 007, 84 3, 866, 19	(³) (³) \$3, 951, 80 3, 875, 50 4, 343, 20 6, 166, 82	¹ \$6, 682, 74 ¹ 4, 064, 11 ¹ 10, 167, 52 ¹ 14, 542, 49 15, 016, 59 17, 258, 04	\$908. 73 4 890. 04 567. 18 1, 324. 75 2, 125. 65 792. 33	\$924, 67 704, 82 563, 00 857, 38 771, 68 897, 42	\$420.00 1, 349.78 457.92 645.00 442.50 1, 980.00	¹ \$5, 297, 30 ¹ 8, 150, 07 2, 376, 35 4, 485, 00 1, 971, 57 2, 041, 00	\$583. 11 320. 43 1, 461. 06 1, 011. 63 2, 098. 23 1, 867. 79	¹ \$8, 133. 81 ¹ 11, 415. 14 ³ 5, 425. 51 ¹ 8, 323. 76 7, 409. 63 7, 578. 54	\$14, 816, 55 15, 479, 25 15, 593, 03 22, 866, 25 22, 428, 22 24, 838, 58
7 8 9 10 11	2, 011. 30 (1) (2) (1) (2) (1) (1) (1) (1) (2) (1) (1) (1) (1) (1) (1) (1) (1) (1) (1	¹ 2, 317, 21 ¹ 2, 498, 33 ¹ 3, 566, 75 ¹ 1, 376, 23 3, 055, 01	00 209. 34	2, 856, 36 12, 383, 95 1, 628, 16 621, 06 1, 526, 00	3, 494, 56 2, 024, 25 906, 46 2, 786, 96 2, 373, 14	5, 149, 51 4, 944, 57 2, 068, 00 5, 825, 85 4, 579, 30	15, 828, 94 11, 851, 10 8, 169, 37 10, 610, 10 12, 900, 59	414.08 164.17 341.10 1,191.93 581.92	904. 85 943. 12 671. 41 1, 283. 15 237. 01	1, 384. 00 570. 00 347. 28 900. 00 3, 098. 45	3, 631, 92 1, 980, 00 5, 539, 39 6, 000, 00 3, 885, 32	2, 758, 64 1, 780, 13 1, 920, 49 1, 168, 16 859, 80	9, 093, 49 5, 437, 42 8, 819, 67 10, 541, 24 8, 662, 50	24, 922, 43 17, 288, 52 16, 989, 04 21, 151, 34 21, 563, 09
12 13 14 15 16	530, 55 779, 94 375, 55 926, 68 888, 37	1, 167, 36 2, 200, 38 2, 283, 03 2, 061, 44 2, 464, 82	66, 15 135, 08 366, 58 226, 45 384, 63	658, 69 1, 762, 07 1, 323, 61 1, 324, 97 1, 738, 85	656. 41 2, 449. 37 3, 527. 35 1, 871. 61 2, 069. 22	5, 037, 30 3, 551, 27 6, 195, 65 5, 349, 81 8, 447, 25	8, 116, 46 10, 878, 11 14, 071, 77 11, 760, 96 15, 993, 14	680, 54 709, 47 1, 547, 05 589, 49 847, 51	823, 18 635, 81 1, 508, 57 889, 07 374, 90	2, 297, 58 1, 419, 24 3, 403, 82 2, 276, 38 1, 320, 50	1, 785, 00 2, 700, 30 2, 318, 92 720, 00 1, 976, 90	546. 92 895. 92 2, 127. 07 702. 49 898. 78	6, 133, 22 6, 360, 44 10, 905, 43 5, 177, 43 5, 418, 59	14, 249, 68 17, 238, 55 24, 977, 20 16, 938, 39 21, 411, 73
Per cent of total expenses	4. 89	12. 30	1. 26	8.00	11. 93	24. 60	62.48	4. 30	4. 15	7, 13	14.66	6. 71	87. 52	100. 00
- <u> </u>					GROSS 1	EXPENSE	S OF \$25,00	0 TO \$49,	.999					

17 18 19 20 21	\$2,071.63 2,002.02 1,004.77 817.39 (7)	\$3, 435, 88 4, 067, 42 3, 229, 67 4, 633, 12 6, 882, 00	\$464, 52 267, 94 219, 88 659, 22 472, 00	\$4, 389, 34 5, 554, 45 5, 064, 62 4, 893, 63 7, 163, 00	\$3, 349, 39 6, 456, 40 • 3, 207, 90 • 4, 251, 75	\$8, 369, 68 10, 522, 32 10, 237, 44 \$18, 703, 20 11, 700, 00	\$22, 080, 44 28, 870, 55 19, 756, 38 1 32, 914, 46 30, 468, 75	\$1, 701, 58 2, 729, 65 2, 778, 84 1, 449, 30 607, 38	\$1, 590, 51 1, 955, 91 5, 343, 37 2, 256, 42 1, 749, 00	\$1, 130, 70 1, 200, 00 2, 269, 04 3, 267, 60 900, 00	\$6, 511, 50 9, 932, 36 7, 227, 40 5, 215, 11 10, 945, 00	\$664, 50 1, 667, 93 400, 97 1, 892, 48 3, 444, 00	\$11, 598, 79 17, 485, 85 18, 019, 62 ¹ 14, 080, 91 17, 645, 38	\$33, 679, 23 46, 356, 40 37, 776, 00 46, 995, 37 48, 114, 13
22	1, 781, 76	3, 619, 76	352, 44	3, 905, 91	3, 650, 04	8, 782, 71	22, 092, 62	681.02	851. CO	866, 74	4, 552, 40	1, 174, 15	8, 125, 91	30, 218, 53
23	(⁷)	4, 807, 41	350, 00	¹ 3, 084, 90	2, 600, 00	(³)	¹ 10, 842, 31	297.00	1, 917. 45	1, 200, 00	1 9, 932, 67	1, 062, 00	¹ 14, 409, 12	25, 251, 43
24	1, 723, 55	4, 730, 00	660, 00	4, 664, 49	6, 250, 00	9, 630, 00	27, 658, 04	191.90	1, 206. 67	336, 00	3, 750, 00	196, 00	5, 680, 57	33, 338, 61

25 26	1, 346, 65 1, 637, 29	2, 716, 98 4, 416, 62	468, 24 642, 25	2, 308, 98 2, 198, 23	3, 821. 60 1, 806, 92	8, 194, 24 8, 665, 47	.18, 856, 69 19, 366, 78	1, 053, 22 950, 56	1, 856, 28 926, 92	893.62 1,994.50	5, 234, 11 5, 480, 00	3, 578, 79 1, 611, 33	12, 616, 02 10, 963, 31	31, 472, 71 30, 330, 09
27 28 29 30	1, 269, 00 1, 491, 59 1, 512, 39 842, 06	8,000.00 4,017.72 7,276.51 3,528.79	(†) 451. 85 660, 07 286. 83	1, 735, 86 1, 291, 05 5, 896, 00 2, 555, 41	 5, 435, 00 3, 991, 50 6, 475, 94 3, 483, 66 	6, 600, 00 4, 013, 00 12, 068, 15 5, 431, 46	¹ 23, 039, 86 15, 256, 71 33, 889, 06 16, 127, 21	548, 80 480, 00 1, 689, 87 892, 06	1, 645, 00 1, 811, 78 716, 63 539, 52	7, 461. 67 1, 620, 00 3, 615. 82 2, 699. 36	7, 762, 00 5, 040, 00 4, 200, 00 2, 915, 00	3, 047. 00 1, 452. 80 3, 489. 71 7, 175. 30	¹ 20, 464, 47 10, 404, 58 13, 712, 03 14, 221, 24	43, 504, 33 25, 661, 29 47, 601, 09 30, 348, 45
Per cent of total expenses	3, 99	12. 24	1, 27	10. 14	10. 95	23. 70	64. 43	3, 13	4.76	5. 75	16. 18	6. 03	35, 57	100.00
					GROSS H	XPENSE	CS OF \$50,00	ю то \$99,	.999					
81 32 33 34 35	\$5, 775. 35 511. 44 (7) 4, 633. 23 1, 683. 34	\$9, 048. 48 3, 864. 80 ¹ 8, 433. 63 10, 992. 88 4, 793. 69	\$868. 46 304. 44 (¹) 700. 00 1, 026. 46	\$4, 162, 40 4, 342, 21 1 8,974, 53 5, 853, 31 881, 84	\$12, 705, 11 5, 866, 32 10, 314, 90 8, 408, 72	\$20, 649. 95 16, 133, 63 14, 486, 73 18, 739, 18 25, 967, 83	\$53, 209. 75 31, 022. 84 42, 209. 79 49, 327. 32 34, 353. 16	\$3, 378, 45 3, 051, 77 2, 320, 69 1, 637, 65 2, 723, 30	\$846. 91 3, 118. 93 3, 867. 85 3, 972. 78 748. 15	\$2, 418, 33 864, 50 3, 979, 77 1, 861, 40	\$9, 034, 63 14, 345, 30 20, 244, 93 10, 242, 84 9, 575, 27	\$7, 996. 23 2, 836. 13 12, 267. 86 7, 565. 38 6, 136. 38	\$23, 674. 55 24, 216. 63 42, 681. 10 25, 280. 05 19, 183. 10	\$76, 884, 30 55, 239, 47 84, 890, 89 74, 607, 37 53, 536, 26
36 37 38 39 40	3, 652, 96 1, 030, 08 3, 496, 58 2, 366, 66 1, 198, 07	1 5, 522, 63 3, 391, 65 6, 825, 06 11 5, 380, 41 5, 677, 04	(1) 675.00 644.41 174.81 748.80	4, 166, 22 9, 581, 55 8, 747, 47 8, 242, 11 2, 562, 71	8, 370. 96 2, 877. 32 5, 109. 44 6, 102. 71	11, 810, 14 5, 384, 48 33, 236, 15 26, 345, 33 16, 172, 25	33, 522, 91 322, 940, 08 55, 059, 11 3 1 42, 509, 32 5 32, 461, 07	190, 21 629, 74 1, 496, 11 2, 255, 87 2, 034, 99	2, 692, 66 5, 213, 84 7, 741, 17 4, 547, 87 2, 304, 34	1, 397, 50 4, 669, 50 2, 340, 00 5, 461, 10	7, 220, 00 15, 690, 00 14, 249, 80 7, 140, 00 7, 332, 11	8, 496, 09 19 43, 091, 56 5, 301, 05 5, 210, 73 4, 135, 88	18, 598, 96 66, 022, 64 33, 457, 63 ¹ 21, 494, 47 21, 268, 42	52, 121, 87 88, 962, 72 91, 516, 74 64, 003, 79 53, 729, 49
41 42 43 44 45	9, 593, 58 (7) 1, 059, 81 (7) (7)	¹ 14,236, 93 7, 870, 40 7, 305, 18 7, 207, 25 1 8, 932, 71	(1) (1) 1, 886. 69 200. 37 (1)	8, 263, 21 17,532, 2 3, 621, 2 19,349, 9 111,376,5	8, 010. 22 6, 410. 04 8, 210. 82 • 6, 631. 47	12, 950, 57 (³) 9, 478, 2 23, 141, 19 20, 957, 3	7 53, 054, 51 1 15, 402, 67 9 29, 761, 21 9 48, 109, 54 6 1 47, 898, 13	3, 303. 8 631. 2 2, 199. 4 3, 637. 5 3, 603. 8	3, 356, 10 3, 101, 48 5 780, 37 1, 677, 73 5 2, 973, 29	7, 373. 12 352. 80 8, 134. 20 4, 086. 68 2, 722. 08	10, 518. 03 28, 737. 71 13, 842. 35 9, 004. 60 13, 702. 40	5, 262, 12 4, 611, 04 9, 361, 43 4, 102, 06 4, 738, 78	29, 811, 20 ¹ 37, 434, 31 34, 317, 80 22, 508, 59 ¹ 27, 740, 40	82, 865, 71 52, 836, 98 64, 079, 01 70, 618, 13 75, 638, 53
48 47 48 49 δ0 δ1	2, 844, 45 3, 871, 43 3, 616, 06 2, 506, 92 1, 601, 87 1, 145, 39	9, 352, 14 1 8, 531, 34 8, 586, 88 8, 650, 95 5, 212, 22 3, 772, 78	600, 00 (*) 1, 316, 86 961, 10 577, 86 315, 30	5, 073, 7 4, 728, 1 8, 010, 1 8, 405, 4 8, 040, 2 5, 031, 6	6,031.35 9,675.46 6 8,291.96 9 8,162.66 1 5,698.35 0 5,027.00	10, 342, 4 9, 756, 3 7, 691, 6 16, 684, 0 17, 484, 6 15, 121, 4	5 34, 244. 1' 11 36, 562. 6' 11 37, 513. 4' 19 45, 371. 2 31 38, 615. 0 61 30, 413. 6'	1, 398. 8 1, 067. 2 2, 521. 6 1, 062. 4 2, 799. 8 2, 119. 9	1,946.71 2,330.32 5 5 2,330.32 5 5 5 1,257.63 3 1,373.32 3 1,301.86	1, 244. 57 515. 25 5, 254. 44 738. 75 2, 874. 56 3, 578. 00	5, 080, 00 7, 739, 18 15, 840, 00 4, 264, 98 8, 344, 55 8, 286, 17	6, 710, 28 13 7, 794, 11 2, 237, 46 5, 273, 55 6, 360, 64 13 7, 416, 06	16, 380, 41 19, 446, 09 26, 506, 36 12, 597, 36 21, 752, 90 22, 702, 04	50, 624, 58 56, 008, 76 64, 019, 83 57, 968, 57 60, 367, 98 53, 115, 65
Per cent of total ex- penses	- 4.60) 10, 34	1. 1:	2 9.0	7 11.01	L 24.9	9 59.6	7 3.1	s 4. CC	4. 33	15. 91	12.00	40, 33	100.00

¹ Combination expenses and incomplete items not included in percentage computation. ² Included in gasoline cost. ³ Included in wages and salaries. ⁴ Repair labor included in wages and salaries. ⁴ Incomplete.

• Includes depreciation on other property, • Included in maintenance and repair.

Includes drayage charges.
Includes \$4,663.48 for pick-up and delivery charges.
Includes \$32,242,67 for truck hire.
Includes \$2,242.67 and power expense.
Includes \$2,920.21 for pick-up and delivery charges.
Includes \$2,832.18 for truck hire.

MOTOR TRUCK FREIGHT TRANSPORTATION

TABLE 19.-FLEET OPERATING COSTS-Continued

GROSS EXPENSES OF \$100,000 TO \$249,999

			Diroct	operating	expenses					Overhe	ad expense	9		
Firm number	Tires and tubes	Gasoline (including tax)	Oil and grease	Mainte- nance and repair	Deprecia- tion	Drivers' wages	Total	Taxes and licenses (not in- cluding gasoline)	Insurance	Rent	Wages and salaries	Miscella- neous	Total	Total gross expenses
52 53 54 55 56 57	\$7, 335, 57 1, 993, 64 2, 058, 59 10, 139, 00 2, 873, 45 12, 842, 80	¹ \$14,994,44 21,093,44 11,172,75 23,624,32 15,272,05 18,987,26	(*) \$2, 195, 73 1, 539, 23 1, 500, 00 1, 417, 00 2, 123, 67	\$8, 484. 00 24, 666. 25 9, 422. 76 7, 472. 00 10, 105. 77 28, 339. 17	\$20, 744. 35 18, 290, 83 9, 896. 47 8, 400, 00 8, 695, 84 15, 835, 09	\$39, 337. 44 66, 354. 04 39, 475. 12 27, 039. 00 36, 424. 49 22, 937. 48	\$90, 895, 80 134, 593, 93 73, 564, 92 78, 174, 32 74, 788, 60 101, 065, 47	\$7, 961, 08 9, 132, 43 9, 404, 12 8, 512, 00 4, 545, 21 5, 066, 03	\$7, 005. 98 8, 773. 20 6, 424. 27 7, 900. 00 2, 854. 40 3, 442. 84	\$10,395.90 5,725.00 9,405.34 20,759.00 7,062.75 7,007.32	\$35, 140, 93 50, 774, 13 35, 052, 62 52, 298, 00 9, 252, 34 47, 247, 27	\$16, 936, 52 10, 125, 45 12, 179, 23 22, 596, 00 8, 459, 30 48, 464, 14	\$77, 440, 39 84, 530, 21 72, 465, 58 111, 885, 00 32, 174, 00 111, 227, 60	\$168, 336, 19 219, 124214 146, 030, 50 190, 239, 32 106, 962, 60 212, 293, 07
58 59 60 61 62	(7) 14, 584, 55 7, 206, 38 (7) 9, 626, 43	17, 552, 07 1 32, 133, 69 1 23, 558, 11 1 26, 220, 74 1 32, 008, 20	4, 400. 00 (?) (?) (?) (?) (?)	¹ 21, 238, 50 21, 709, 76 14 9, 557, 93 1 18, 292, 79 13, 162, 72	9, 600. 00 31, 578. 24 21, 509. 35 29, 063. 52	19, 188, 71 39, 750, 84 (¹⁾ 101, 760, 32 31, 243 , 20	71, 979, 28 139, 757, 08 1 61, 831, 77 175, 337, 37 86, 040, 55	2, 647, 97 4, 334, 67 4, 075, 26 9, 740, 19 2, 003, 36	2, 510, 00 18, 076, 13 11, 367, 42 10, 133, 17 8, 794, 89	2, 037. 00 2, 442. 40 3, 893. 00 4, 523. 00 4, 577. 70	30, 715, 82 57, 054, 28 1 101, 069, 55 14, 774, 19 48, 762, 80	9, 294, 77 24, 504, 47 26, 623, 07 4, 894, 23 14 30, 662, 62	47, 205, 56 106, 411, 95 1 147,028, 30 44, 064, 78 94, 801, 37	119, 184, 84 246, 169, 03 208, 860, 07 219, 402, 15 180, 841, 92
63 64 65 66 67	7, 301, 34 4, 046, 20 6, 000, 00 4, 971, 90 7, 275, 98	¹ 23, 690, 67 ¹ 15, 237, 97 13, 800, 00 13, 730, 89 11, 023, 41	(1) 900.00 1, 160.51 1, 482.76	7, 650, 85 5, 750, 61 8, 500, 00 13, 860, 51 6, 130, 20	17, 945, 43 11, 389, 19 7, 530, 50 13, 422, 42	54, 587, 58 23, 403, 00 30, 000, 00 37, 514, 62 52, 364, 65	111, 175, 87 59, 826, 97 59, 200, 00 78, 768, 93 91, 699, 42	9, 322, 65 1, 977, 80 3, 810, C0 3, 719, 54 4, 646, 31	6, 128, 78 2, 419, 41 4, 200, 00 5, 168, 15 1, 968, 33	2, 389, 97 7, 480, 68 4, 800, 00 4, 931, 50 4, 835, 07	17, 367, 65 34, 849, 55 20, 000, 00 31, 347, 00 15, 249, 74	14, 678, 63 8, 947, 56 20, 600, 00 10, 813, 01 14 27, 592, 29	50, 887, 68 55, 675, 00 53, 410, 00 55, 979, 20 54, 291, 74	162, 063, 55 115, 501, 97 112, 610, 00 134, 748, 13 145, 991, 16
68 69 70	10, 027, 45 8, 193, 07 9, 828, 27 5, 455, 95 8, 920, 68	¹ 21, 766, 46 15, 053, 17 14, 114, 44 ¹ 20, 992, 35 12, 304, 20	(*) 1, 816, 02 960, 00 (*) 3, 850, 83	13, 594, 55 10, 487, 40 4, 488, 67 5, 538, 43 17, 658, 36	9, 073, 02 10, 894, 34 10, 222, 49 23, 927, 56 8, 420, 04	22, 673, 39 15, 845, 81 10, 364, 86 26, 192, 68 14, 913, 48	¹ 77, 134, 87 62, 289, 81 49, 978, 73 82, 106, 59 66, 067, 97	3, 539, 48 3, 685, 69 3, 249, 53 1, 495, 14 783, 83	1, 645. 37 1, 573. 70 5, 511. 57 5, 248. 11 2, 179. 51	4, 433, 53 8, 807, 73 2, 601, 75 4, 071, 97 487, 95	10, 800, 00 25, 644, 13 39, 932, 21 16, 169, 75 7, 549, 14	5, 484, 19 5, 293, 92 7, 132, 46 25, 370, 78 1 ³ 39, 746, 28	¹ 15, 210, 57 45, 005, 17 58, 427, 52 52, 355, 75 50, 746, 71	103, 037. 44 107, 294. 08 108, 406. 25 134, 462. 72 116, 814. 30
73 74 75 76 78 78	11, 002, 96 17, 322, 49 2, 225, 58 4, 826, 89 13, 980, 72 2, 231, 55	21, 639, 65 30, 003, 50 14, 654, 05 14, 707, 30 16, 686, 96 5, 201, 06	2, 795, 49 4, 936, 49 1, 817, 86 1, 841, 17 3, 133, 55 446, 25	11, 234. 98 24, 253. 20 17, 916. 81 10, 450. 86 12, 937. 57 6, 726. 16	24, 641, 69 22, 661, 36 23, 599, 28 17, 851, 63 31, 694, 31 3, 964, 70	31, 305. 60 51, 117. 73 62, 284. 57 32, 693. 66 21, 567. 83 23, 206. 38	102, 620, 37 150, 294, 77 122, 498, 15 82, 371, 51 99, 970, 94 41, 776, 10	8, 365. 76 11, 934. 36 4, 265. 79 6, 235. 70 5, 312. 74	7, 140. 26 5, 213. 72 8, 819. 23 4, 476. 85 2, 492. 76 920. 75	4, 002. 50 12, 815. 21 10, 844. 06 5, 591. 89 880. 00 8, 023. 38	72, 279, 31 28, 975, 05 53, 466, 93 32, 176, 66 15, 120, 00 28, 157, 46	22, 150, 84 8, 254, 31 20, 575, 90 6, 528, 59 7, 460, 91 11 23, 608, 74	113, 938, 67 55, 258, 29 105, 640, 48 53, 039, 78 32, 195, 37 66, 023, 07	216, 559, 04 205, 553, 96 228, 138, 63 135, 411, 29 132, 166, 31 107, 799, 17
Per cent of total ex- penses	4.87	10. 59	1. 39	8. 04	10. 33	22, 91	57. 58	3. 48	3. 56	8. 87	20. 37	10. 95	42. 42	100.00

GROSS EXPENSES OF \$250,000 AND OVER

50	ere 701 17	Pa1 041 12	es 070 02	e70 021 20	A	9105 AAA 01	1 6214 010 00	820 049 40	en 502 12	\$12 152 80	897 794 79	90 999 578 11	1\$211 088 22	\$528 800 12
80	4, 388, 43	20, 954, 46	30, 070. 00 (2)	11, 007, 06	25, 922, 95	18, 328, 36	80, 601, 26	15, 409. 38	6, 375, 68	14, 062, 56	96, 459, 05	20 54, 086. 61	186, 393, 28	266, 994. 54
81	19, 403, 70	31, 630. 75	3, 742. 11	37, 852, 10	4 36, 156.08	66, 052. 65	1 194, 837.39	11, 543. 66	10, 333, 99	7, 594. 50	31, 214, 95	61, 092. 17	1 121, 779. 27	316, 616, 66
82	0,015.11	24,868.75	(¹)	11, 294, 27	87,854.66	39, 092, 67,	169, 125, 46	2, 353, 70	8, 150, 85	4,200.00	66, 677, 59	11, 304, 86	82,747.00	251,872,46
00	7, 350. 00	37, 330.00	3, 350, 00	30, 073. 00	10, 500, 00	73, 000. 00	114, 313. 00	a, 11 0.00	10, 000. 00	0,100.00	03,000.00	00,200.00	104, 120, 00	021,000.00
84	18, 073. 66	1 46, 209, 01	(1)	24, 029, 59	28, 302. 46	(4)	1 116, 614. 72	3, 289. 45	17, 127, 68	11, 522, 14	227, 168, 49	56, 369. 35	1 315, 477. 11	432, 091, 83
85	20, 755. 37	42,010.83	6, 273. 72	46, 220, 36	26, 602. 85	61, 344. 76	203, 207. 89	12, 817, 89	19, 369. 63	21, 513. 48	42, 309, 80	28, 716, 54	124, 727. 34	327, 935. 23
87	0 673 74	30, 337, 54	3 404 83	21, 561, 17	20, 702, 48	20, 905, 77	114, 737.03	8 007 47	14 410 00	13 117 53	59, 219, 42 50 376 87	30 227 43	100, 143, 73	265, 880, 70
88	58, 425, 41	90, 536, 65	10, 982, 92	64, 889, 12	0 71, 514, 51	118, 591. 96	1 414, 940, 57	60, 945, 02	26, 026. 34	12, 417, 26	157, 096, 16	138, 295, 76	1 394, 780, 54	809, 721. 11
~						-								
89	31, 939, 33	90, 881, 62	9,382.75	39, 312, 24	* 69, 029, 32 36, 604, 00	{4} 126 544 00	1 240, 545, 26 200, 402, 00	33,046.18	21 152 00	13, 424. 36	· 314, 095, 50 /12)	78, 321, 52	105 800 00	306 302 00
91	16, 942, 87	35, 388, 47	4, 586, 78	33, 096, 65	40, 355, 90	28, 214, 63	158, 583, 30	9, 462, 44	15, 666, 07	<u>}</u>	1 53, 200, 53	117, 436, 84	195, 765, 88	354, 349, 18
D													ŕ	
rer cent of total er-	4 58	11 25	1 30	R 90	10.60	17 18	54 80	2 02	4 41	2.40	17 66	0 A R I A	45 31	100.00
	1				10.00	11.10	04.04	0.82	7.01) 2.00]	10.45	10.01	100, 00

RECAPITULATION

(Per cent of total gross expenses)

Expense group	Tires and tubes	Gasoline (including tax)	Oil and grease	Mninte- nance and repair	Deprecia- tion	Drivers' wages	Total oper- ating ex- pense	Taxes and li- censes (not in- cluding gas)	Insur- ance	Rent	Wages and salaries	Miscella- neous	Total over- head ex- pense	Total gross expenses
\$10,000-\$25,000	4, 89	12, 30	1. 26	8.00	11, 93	24, 60	62. 48	4. 30	4. 15	7. 13	14, 66	6. 71	37. 52	100
\$25,000 - \$50,000	3, 99	12, 24	1. 27	10.14	10, 95	23, 70	64. 43	3. 13	4. 76	5. 75	16, 18	6. 03	35. 57	100
\$50,000 - \$100,000	4, 60	10, 34	1. 12	9.07	11, 01	24, 99	59. 67	3. 18	4. 03	4. 33	15, 91	12. 06	40. 33	100
\$100,000 - \$250,000	4, 87	10, 59	1. 39	8.04	10, 33	22, 91	57. 58	3. 43	3. 56	3. 87	20, 37	10. 05	42. 42	100
\$250,000 and over	4, 58	11, 25	1. 30	8.80	10, 80	17, 16	54. 69	3. 92	4. 61	2. 69	17, 66	16. 49	45. 31	100
Average	3, 96	11, 01	1. 31	8.60	10, 71	20, 89	57. 47	8. 64	4. 16	3. 64	18, 38	13. 26	42. 53	100

¹ Combination expenses and incomplete items not included in percentage computation.
² Included in gasoline cost.
³ Includes depreciation on other property.
⁴ Included in maintenance and repairs.
¹⁴ Not including repair labor cost.
¹⁴ Including \$20,196.07 charged as local drayage.

¹⁶ Includes \$11,105.75 for repairs to buildings and plant.
¹⁷ Includes \$24.745.80 for pick-up and dellvory charges.
¹⁸ Includes \$38,796.88 for truck hire and \$5,474.77 for warehouse expense.
¹⁹ Includes \$18,328.36 for truck hire.
²⁰ Includes \$37,754.31 for truck hire.
²⁰ Includes \$37,754.31 for truck hire.
²¹ Includes \$34,792.20 rpick-up and delivery charges and \$17,823.96 for truck hire.
²² Included in miscellaneous expenses.

MOTOR TRUCK FREIGHT TRANSPORTATION

The percentage relationship of the individual items of direct operating or running costs to gross expenses shows no great variation among the different groups except for the wide spread in drivers' wages. In the \$50,000 to \$100,000 group, the ratio of drivers' wages to gross expenses is approximately 25 per cent, the highest of all groups, while the \$250,000 and over group shows a ratio of 17 per cent, the minimum. The average for all groups is 21 per cent. The low figure for the \$250,000 and over group is not necessarily indicative of a less proportionate expense per driver or a lower wage scale for this group, but rather to the tendency toward a higher percentage ratio of other expenses.

The percentage figure for total operating costs shows an almost consistent decrease in successive groups of higher gross expenses, this being offset by the increase in the ratio of fixed or overhead expenses to gross expenses for these groups.

Wages and salaries assume a proportionately larger part of the gross expenses for firms in the higher groups, owing to the greater number of persons other than drivers and mechanics employed by firms engaged in extensive operations. The ratio of this expense to gross expense fluctuates and shows no consistent trend among the various groups. A coincidence occurs in the \$250,000 and over group in that the ratio of wages and salaries to gross expenses is approximately the same as that of drivers' wages to gross expenses. The matching of each dollar paid for drivers' wages by a dollar outlay for administrative salaries in this group appears indicative of the supervision and clerical detail necessary to the proper functioning of a large motor-freight operation.

As mechanics' wages are included in maintenance and repair expense, an exact ratio of total labor cost to gross expenses is not determinable. Drivers' wages and all other wages and salaries except mechanics', however, constitute 41 per cent of gross expenses for all groups.

It should be clearly understood that the item "Taxes and licenses" does not represent the total amount paid in taxes, since it excludes, the important sum paid as gasoline tax as well as Federal and State, income taxes. The gasoline tax information was not reported separately but included with expenditures for gasoline. The determination of the different types and the amounts of taxes paid by common and contract carriers was not feasible in this survey because the majority of operators made no segregation as between the various kinds of taxes paid, nor was it possible to ascertain the amount of taxes levied on the concern for the operation of motor vehicles as distinct from those assessed against the business in general.

Greater ownership of facilities by firms engaged in large-scale operations is evidenced by the decreasing ratio of rental expense to gross expenses in successive groups. The maximum ratio figure for this expense, 7 per cent, occurs in the lowest classification of \$10,000 to \$25,000, and the minimum of 2.7 per cent in the highest classification of \$250,000 and over, with a consistent decrease for the intervening groups.

Miscellaneous expenses comprise a multitude of unclassified costs. Many of them constitute quite a large proportion of the total gross

MOTOR TRUCK FREIGHT TRANSPORTATION 59 penses for some concerns, but vary greatly both and the second second