# $2 A$ <br> PACKAGING OPPORTUNITIES IN ATLANTA $/ 2^{5}$ 

Prepared for<br>FORWARD ATLANTA<br>The Atlanta Chamber of Commerce

by
Wade McKoy

Industrial Development Division
Engineering Experiment Station GEORGIA INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY September 1962

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page
Foreword ..... i
Summary ..... iii
INTRODUCTION ..... 1
THE NATIONAL MARKET ..... 3
Toiletries ..... 3
Packaged Medications ..... 5
Packaged Household Supplies ..... 6
Volume Products ..... 7
PRODUCTION CENTERS AND REGIONAL MARKETS ..... 11
Toiletries Production ..... 11
Packaged Medications Production ..... 11
Packaged Household Supplies Production ..... 11
Regional Markets ..... 11
ATLANTA AND THE SOUTHERN MARKET ..... 13
Freight Advantage Area Market ..... 13
( Freight Advantage Area Sales Forecast ..... 15
Population Concentration ..... 15
The Wholesale Market ..... 15
Relationships with Suppliers and Customers ..... 18
ATLANTA AS A PACKAGING CENTER ..... 19
Products Best Suited for Packaging in Atlanta ..... 19
Availability of Containers.in Atlanta ..... 19
Atlanta's Freight Advantage ..... 21
A Hypothetical Case Study ..... 24
Conclusion ..... 25
Appendices ..... 27
Market Forecast Calculations ..... 29
U. S. Retail Sales of 84 Packaged Products ..... 37
Information and Calculations for the Hypothetical Case Study ..... 51
Maps:

1. Production Concentration of Packaged Products ..... v
2. Regional Markets for Packaged Products ..... v
3. Atlanta Freight Advantage Area ..... 14
4. Wholesale Sales of Drugs, Drug Proprietaries,Druggists' Sundries and Toiletries in the 11-StateArea and in Larger Municipalities16
Page
Tables:
5. U. S. Retail Sales of Toilet Goods (1951-1961) ..... 3
6. U. S. Retail Sales of Packaged Medications (1949-1961) ..... 5
7. U. S. Retail Sales of Household Supplies (1951-1961) ..... 6
8. Packaged Formulations for the Consumer Market ..... 8
9. Sales Performance of Products with High Sales Volume and Good Growth Record in 1961 ..... 10
10. Wholesale Sales of Drugs, Drug Proprietaries, Druggists' Sundries, and Toiletries (1958) ..... 17
11. Packaged Formulations Analysis Data ..... 20
12. Freight Rates on Drugs, Medicines and Toilet Preparations from New York and from Atlanta to Southern Cities ..... 21
13. Selected Commodity Rates on Toilet Preparations, Medicines and Drugs ..... 23
Figures:
14. Correlation Between Personal Expenditures for Services and Toilet Goods Sales ..... 4
15. Truckload Motor Freight Rates Compared to Distance Shipped ..... 22
Appendix Tables:
1-A. Calculations for Coefficient of Correlation between Personal Expenditures for Services and Toilet Goods Sales and for the Correlation Line Fitted by Least Squares ..... 31
1-B. Per Capita Sales of Packaged Medications and Packaged Household Supplies ..... 35
2-A. U. S. Retail Sales of 84 Packaged Products ..... 37
3-A. Tabulation of Product Mix Information ..... 52
3-B. Tabulation of Atlanta Freight Advantage Area ..... 53
3-C. Tabulation of Shipping Costs and Freight Savings for the Hypothetical Case Study ..... 54
3-D. Freight Costs for National Distribution from New York-Northeastern New Jersey Area ..... 55
Appendix Figures:
1-A. Trend and Forecast of Personal Expenditures for Services ..... 33
1-B. Per Capita Sa1es of Packaged Medications and of Packaged Household Supplies ..... 34

## Foreword

This is the ninth and final report in the series of special product analyses growing out of the first 12 months of research which the Industrial Development Division has carried out for the "Forward Atlanta" program of the Atlanta Chamber of Commerce. Like the others in the series, it focuses on a particular manufacturing potential found to exist in the Atlanta Metropolitan Area.

Two other special reports complete the published series: one on the outstanding complex of educational and training facilities found in Metropolitan Atlanta, and the other on the strengths and weaknesses of the Atlanta area's metalworking facilities.

The 11 technical reports published to date represent only part of the data furnished the Atlanta Chamber of Commerce for use in the "Forward Atlanta" program. In some cases reports have been prepared for special limited distribution, and in other cases the information has been supplied to give background only. In many instances the material has not yet been published in any form. Maps and special tabulations on Atlanta's extensive transportation resources, background data analyzing past economic growth and present industrial structure, and special "briefs" prepared as bases for advertisements or for professional developers are among these materials. This information is available to firms interested in Atlanta, either through the Atlanta Chamber of Commerce or Georgia Tech.

As noted in the first report in this series, the intensive research effort which produced these reports and other analytical materials was made possible by a special allocation of $\$ 100,000$ from Governor S. Ernest Vandiver.

Kenneth C. Wagner, Chief Industrial Development Division GEORGIA INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY

## Summary

Three major categories of packaged products with rapidly expanding sales are toiletries, packaged medications and packaged household supplies. Retail sales for 1967 are forecast to increase over 1961 sales by $65 \%$ for toiletries, by $32 \%$ for packaged medications, and by $35 \%$ for packaged household supplies.

Whereas the markets for packaged products are spread widely though unevenly over the United States, $78 \%$ of the production is concentrated in the northeastern part of the country. (See Maps 1 and 2.) Because of this large variation between production centers and regional markets, an Atlanta branch plant could serve the southern United States more economically than most of the existing plants.

The area to which it is cheaper to ship from Atlanta than from New York or Chicago is represented by 11 states ${ }^{1 /}$ which include $23 \%$ of the U.S. population and account for $20 \%$ of the national market for packaged products. It is estimated that within five years there will be a $\$ 1.7$ bil1ion retail market for toilet goods, packaged medications and packaged household products in the Atlanta freight advantage area.

In the wholesaling of drugs, drug proprietaries, druggists' sundries, and toiletries, Atlanta not only stands fourth in the nation behind New York, Chicago and Los Angeles, but it is far ahead of any other city in the South. Twenty-five per cent of all the wholesale sales of these products in the eight South Atlantic states, the District of Columbia, and the five East South Central states combined are made in Atlanta.

Freight savings for an Atlanta plant would make a major contribution to increased profits. A hypothetical case study illustrates a $\$ 263,000$ savings in freight on annual sales of $\$ 20$ million for an Atlanta plant over a plant in the New York area. This would increase the profit on sales by more than $10 \%$.

1/ Alabama, Arkansas, Florida, Georgia, Kentucky, Louisiana, Mississippi, North Carolina, South Carolina, Tennessee and Texas.

MAP 1
PRODUCTION CONCENTRATION OF PACKAGED PRODUCTS
(Shown by Value of Shipments for Toilet Preparations,
Pharmaceutical Preparations and Household Supplies)


MAP 2

## REGIONAL MARKETS FOR PACKAGED PRODUCTS

(Shown by 1960 Retail Drug Store Sales)


## INTRODUCTION

The term "packaged products" covers an almost endless number and variety of items which reach the consumer in packaged form. Many of these items are logically packaged at the point of manufacture. Others, however, may be manufactured or processed centrally and then shipped for packaging at locations which are more convenient to regional markets. To focus this study on those items which are best suited for regional packaging, three major groups of products were chosen for analysis: toiletries, packaged medications, and packaged household supplies.

These packaged products have certain common characteristics. Typically, the raw materials are procured from basic chemical processors and mixed according to special formulas. The resulting formulations are finished in forms such as solutions, ointments, suspensions, powders, tablets, capsules or ampoules. These are packaged in containers which, in many instances, constitute a major portion of the total weight of the finished products.

By formulating and packaging these products in close proximity to large consumer markets, it is possible to effect considerable freight savings in distributing the finished packaged products. The primary savings result from reducing the distances that containers must be shipped. Ingredients can be shipped from a central source to a regional market area more cheaply in bulk form than in packaged form or, in many cases, can be procured on a delivered price basis. Additional shipping cost savings result when the formulations contain a large amount of water, which can be added at the point of packaging.

This study is concerned with the feasibility of establishing formulating and packaging operations in the Atlanta area to serve the large southern market. The present and future national market for toiletries, packaged medications and packaged household supplies is considered, and the concentrated production centers and the dispersed regional markets are contrasted. Atlanta's strategic position in the southern market is analyzed, and Atlanta's advantages as a packaging center are documented.

In pointing out the advantages of having a formulating and packaging operation in Atlanta, this report concentrates on the freight advantages the Atlanta plant would have. Atlanta's many other attractions as a location
have been reported in other publications in the "Forward Atlanta" series. $1 /$ These include relatively low property taxes, electric rates, natural gas rates, construction costs, and production wage rates, as well as many concomitant services which are not available to the same extent in any other southeastern city.

1/ Household Waxes and Polishes: A Manufacturing Opportunity in Atlanta, Wade McKoy, May, 1962; Antibiotics: A Manufacturing Opportunity in Atlanta, George W. Morris, Jr., June, 1962.

## Toiletries

Retail sales of toilet goods in 1961 totaled almost $\$ 2$ billion and have been growing at an average annual rate of $7.8 \%$ since 1951 . (See Table 1.) This is a substantially higher rate than population growth, indicating a rapidly rising per capita consumption.

Table 1

## U. S. RETAIL SALES OF TOILET GOODS

(1951 - 1961)

|  |  | Per Cent |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| $\frac{\text { Year }}{1961}$ | Sales | Increase Over <br> Previous Year |
| 1960 | $\$ 1,933,500,000$ | 8.4 |
| 1959 | $1,784,000,000$ | 10.0 |
| 1958 | $1,622,000,000$ | 6.5 |
| 1957 | $1,523,000,000$ | 6.5 |
| 1956 | $1,430,000,000$ | 8.3 |
| 1955 | $1,321,000,000$ | 10.8 |
| 1954 | $1,192,000,000$ | 9.8 |
| 1953 | $1,086,000,000$ | 6.5 |
| 1952 | $1,020,000,000$ | 1.6 |
| 1951 | $1,004,000,000$ | 10.1 |
| Source: | "Toilet Goods Association 27th Annual Meeting," |  |

Sales of toiletries include perfumes, cosmetics and other toilet preparations, but do not include toilet soap.

Retail sales of toilet goods are expected to reach $\$ 3.2$ billion in 1967, a $65 \%$ increase over 1961 sales. This forecast is based on the extremely close correlation (0.997) between sales of toilet goods and the U. S. Department of Commerce figures on "Personal Expenditures for Services" (PES) for the years 1951 through 1961. Using the U. S. Department of Commerce statistics, the McGraw-Hill Department of Economics has made

FIGURE 1
CORRELATION BETWEEN PERSONAL EXPENDITURES FOR SERVICES AND TOILET GOODS SALES

forecasts of PES. The PES forecast provided the base for forecasting toilet goods sales. (See Figure 1 and Appendix 1 for details.)

## Packaged Medications

Retail sales of packaged medications reached more than $\$ 1.7$ bi11ion in 1961. Sales of these products have been growing by approximately $\$ 70$ mil1ion a year for a number of years, although the growth from 1960 to 1961 was only $\$ 43$ million. (See Table 2.)

Table 2
U. S. RETAIL SALES OF PACKAGED MEDICATIONS (1949 - 1961)

Year
1961
1960
1959
1958
1957
1956
1955
1954
1953
1952
1951
1950
1949

Sa1es
\$1,746, 840,000
1,703,000,000
$1,635,660,000$
$1,550,060,000$
$1,487,730,000$
$1,348,620,000$
$1,254,510,000$
$1,154,100,000$
$1,109,710,000$
1,077,390,000
$1,046,000,000$
$1,008,680,000$ 958, 800, 000

Source: "Annual Summary of Sales of Drug Store Products," Drug Topics, Ju1y, 1950 - July, 1962. The years prior to 1955 were adjusted to basis started in 1955.

Packaged medications include vitamin concentrates, cough and cold items, laxatives and other elimination aids, internal analgesics, tonics and other alteratives, external analgesics, antacids, etc.

Retail sales of packaged medications in the U. S. should reach $\$ 2.3$ billion in 1967, an increase of $32 \%$ over 1961 sales. This estimate was arrived at by combining estimated future population and estimated future per capita sales. (See Appendix 1.)

## Packaged Household Supplies

Retail sales of packaged household supplies in 1961 were slightly more than $\$ 2.2$ bil1ion and have been growing at an average annual rate of $5.1 \%$ since 1951. Annual sales and percentage increases are indicated in Table 3.


Sales in this category of packaged products include soaps and detergents, laundry supplies, waxes and polishes, dry cleaners, other cleaners and cleansers, household pesticides and other packaged household supplies.

Retail sales of packaged household supplies should increase $35 \%$ from 1961 to reach $\$ 3$ billion in 1967. The method of forecasting was the same as that used in forecasting sales of packaged medications. (See Appendix 1.)

Eighty-four items -- ranging in annual sales from almost $\$ 600$ million for dry synthetic detergents to less than $\$ 12$ million for poison ivy remedies -- account for the major volume of packaged products sold. These leading packaged formulations for the consumer market are listed in descending order of 1961 retail sales in Table 4. Historical sales records of these products are shown in Appendix 2.

A number of these high-volume packaged products have outstanding growth records. Those showing the largest dollar increases in 1961 sales over the previous year are listed in Table 5.

In addition to the 84 items with the largest sales volumes, three products deserve mention because of their growth records and prospects for continued growth. These products are:

|  | Per Cent Increase |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 1961 Over 1960 | 1961 Sales |
| Cream Make-up |  |  |
| Base | 39.6 | \$ 9,450,000 |
| Eye Shadow | 26.6 | 3,690,000 |
| Mascara | 16.3 | 10,390,000 |

Table 4

## PACKAGED FORMULATIONS FOR THE CONSUMER MARKET

(1961 Retail Sales in Descending Order)

| Product | Sales |
| :---: | :---: |
| Dry Synthetic Household Detergents | \$588,390,000 |
| Vitamin Concentrates | 311,020,000 |
| Metered Calorie Products | 270,040,000 |
| Toilet Soaps | 266,740,000 |
| Liquid Synthetic Detergents | 258, 340,000 |
| Tooth Paste | 243, 730,000 |
| Aspirin-salicylate Compounds | 236,950,000 |
| Shampoos | 172,740,000 |
| Liquid Bleaches | 145,600,000 |
| Face Creams | 127,600,000 |
| Lipsticks | 121,680,000 |
| Household C1eansers | 100,790,000 |
| Self-Polishing Floor Wax | 97,710,000 |
| Spray Hair Fixatives | 91,490,000 |
| Cough Sirups, Elixirs, Expectorants | 88,120,000 |
| Mouth Washes and Gargles | 87,570,000 |
| Shoe Polish (white and others) | 83, 190,000 |
| Aspirin | 80,700,000 |
| Liquid Tonics and Alteratives | 77,840,000 |
| Hair Coloring Preparations | 74,440,000 |
| Men's Hair Tonics | 74,360,000 |
| Face Cleansing Creams | 71,190,000 |
| Home Permanent Kits and Refills | 70,210,000 |
| Aerosol Household Pesticides | 67,420,000 |
| Aerosol Cologne | 65,420,000 |
| Cold Tablets, Capsules, Vaccines | 59,480,000 |
| Soap Flakes, Chips, Powders | 56,020,000 |
| Auto Polish | 55,040,000 |
| Aerosol Shaving Cream | 54,790,000 |
| Aerosol Household Deodorizers | 54,680,000 |
| After-Shave Lotion | 49,440,000 |
| Household Disinfectants | 49,290,000 |
| Reducing Preparations | 44,630,000 |
| External Analgesics, Salves, Ointments and Balms | 44,340,000 |
| Pressed Cake Face Powder | 41,790,000 |
| Laxative Tablets, Pills, Gums, Lozenges | 41,550,000 |
| Nail Polish and Enamel | 38,370,000 |
| Roll-On Deodorants | 38,070,000 |
| Hand Lotions | 37,860,000 |
| Perfumes | 37,440,000 |

Table 4 (Cont'd)
Product
Sales

Wall and Floor Cleaners
Antihistamines
Cream Deodorants
Colognes, Toilet Waters (other)
Talcum and Body Powders
Feminine Hygiene Medicaments
Cough Drops
Liquid Household Pesticides
Laundry Bar Soap
Arthritic and Rheumatic Pain Relievers
Liquid Facial Cleaners
Moth Control Agents (Pesticides)
Antacid Tablets, Pills, Gums, Lozenges
Salves and Ointments (Cough and Cold Items)
Milk of Magnesia Liquids
Women's Hair Dressings and Conditioners
Ache Aid Products
Rubbing Alcohol
Loose Face Powder
Face Lotions and Astringents
Nasal Sprays
Make-up Lotion
Synthetic Sweetners
Nose Drops
Baby Powder
Liquid Starch
Laxative Saline Preparations (includes Epsom Salts)
Liniments and other Liquids as External Analgesics Cough Lozenges, Troches
False Teeth Adhesives
Bulk Type Laxatives
Salves and Ointments for Feet
Liquid Antacids
Face Lubricating Creams
Household Tints and Dyes
Liquid External Antiseptics
Baby Oils and Lotions
Toilet Bow1 Cleaners
Window Cleaning Liquids
Squeeze Container Sprays (External Personal Deodorants)

Burn Remedies
Suntan Lotions and Oils
Anti-Coagulant Rodenticides (Pesticides)
Poison Ivy Remedies

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \$ 36,000,000 \\
& 35,480,000 \\
& 35,380,000 \\
& 35,310,000 \\
& 34,450,000 \\
& 34,040,000 \\
& 33,240,000 \\
& 31,960,000 \\
& 30,880,000 \\
& 30,350,000 \\
& 29,640,000 \\
& 29,150,000 \\
& 27,650,000 \\
& 26,500,000 \\
& 25,900,000 \\
& 25,770,000 \\
& 25,130,000 \\
& 24,700,000 \\
& 24,680,000 \\
& 24,630,000 \\
& 23,830,000 \\
& 23,790,000 \\
& 22,340,000 \\
& 22,150,000 \\
& 21,990,000 \\
& 21,790,000 \\
& 21,670,000 \\
& 21,510,000 \\
& 21,020,000 \\
& 20,540,000 \\
& 20,370,000 \\
& 19,770,000 \\
& 19,630,000 \\
& 19,580,000 \\
& 19,080,000 \\
& 17,660,000 \\
& 16,890,000 \\
& 15,710,000 \\
& 15,630,000 \\
& 15,020,000 \\
& 14,250,000 \\
& 13,990,000 \\
& 13,670,000 \\
& 11,870,000
\end{aligned}
$$

Table 5
SALES PERFORMANCE OF PRODUCTS WITH HIGH SALES VOLUME AND GOOD GROWTH RECORD IN 1961

| Product | Dollar Volume $\qquad$ 1961 | Dollar <br> Increase <br> 1961 over $\qquad$ | Percent <br> Increase <br> 1961 over $\qquad$ | Average <br> Annual <br> Percent <br> Increase | Number of Years Covered |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Metered Calorie Products | \$270,040,000 | \$154,640,000 | 134.0 | 722.0 | 2 |
| Liquid Synthetic Detergents | 258,340,000 | 22,840,000 | 9.7 | 30.0 | 4 |
| Lipsticks | 121,680,000 | 21,290,000 | 21.2 | 10.3 | 12 |
| Aerosol Cologne | 65,420,000 | 12,280,000 | 23.1 | 21.0 | 4 |
| Aspirin-salicylate Compounds | 236,950,000 | 12,220,000 | 5.4 | 10.0 | 12 |
| Mouth Washes and Gargles | 87,570,000 | 11,750,000 | 15.5 | 11.1 | 12 |
| Spray Hair Fixatives | 91,490,000 | 10,240,000 | 12.6 | 17.3 | 7 |
| Tooth Paste | 243,730,000 | 8,920,000 | 3.8 | 8.3 | 12 |
| Toilet Soaps | 266,740,000 | 8,890,000 | 3.4 | 5.3 | 12 |
| Hair Coloring Preparations | 74,440,000 | 6,830,000 | 10.1 | 16.2 | 12 |
| Liquid Tonics and Alteratives | 77,840,000 | 6,490,000 | 9.1 | 0.5 | 11 |
| Shampoos | 172,740,000 | 6,160,000 | 3.7 | 7.4 | 12 |
| Shoe Polish (whites and others) | 83,190,000 | 6,150,000 | 8.0 | 7.5 | 12 |
| Rol1-On Deodorants | 38,070,000 | 6,100,000 | 19.1 | 40.0 | 5 |
| Pressed Cake Face Powder | 41,790,000 | 5,950,000 | 16.6 | 10.0 | 6 |
| Home Permanent Kits and Refills | 70,210,000 | 5,560,000 | 8.6 | -4.0 | 5 |
| Face Creams | 127,600,000 | 5,430,000 | 4.4 | 3.3 | 12 |
| Nail Polish and Enamel | 38,370,000 | 5,380,000 | 16.3 | 8.0 | 12 |
| Aspirin | 80,700,000 | 4,980,000 | 6.6 | 5.9 | 12 |
| Aerosol Household Deodorizers | 54,680,000 | 4,650,000 | 9.3 | 15.2 | 5 |
| Men's Hair Tonics | 74,360,000 | 4,440,000 | 6.4 | 6.4 | 12 |
| Arthritic and Rheumatic Pain Relievers | 30,350,000 | 4,180,000 | 16.0 | 8.3 | 6 |
| Aerosol Shaving Cream | 54,790,000 | 3,680,000 | 7.2 | 12.3 | 6 |
| Household Disinfectants | 49,290,000 | 3,180,000 | 6.9 | 4.2 | 12 |
| Make-Up Lotion | 23,790,000 | 3,140,000 | 15.2 | 10.1 | 6 |
| Cough Sirups, Elixirs, Expectorants | 88,120,000 | 2,810,000 | 3.3 | 6.1 | 12 |
| External Analgesics, Salves, Ointments and Balms | 44,340,000 | 2,670,000 | 6.4 | 5.4 | 12 |
| Aerosol Household Pesticides | 67,420,000 | 2,460,000 | 3.8 | 10.8 | 12 |
| Cream Deodorants | 35,380,000 | 2,340,000 | 7.1 | 3.8 | 9 |
| Cough Lozenges, Troches | 21,020,000 | 2,270,000 | 12.1 |  |  |
| Nasal Sprays | 23,830,000 | 2,200,000 | 10.2 | 11.4 | 6 |
| Colognes, Toilet Water (other) | 35,310,000 | 2,190,000 | 6.6 |  |  |
| After-Shave Lotion | 49,440,000 | 2,170,000 | 4.6 | 6.9 | 12 |
| Face Cleansing Creams | 71,190,000 | 2,140,000 | 3.1 | 2.6 | 12 |
| Acne Aid Products | 25,130,000 | 2,000,000 | 8.6 | 12.1 | 6 |

[^0]Whereas the markets for packaged products are spread widely though unevenly over the United States, $78 \%$ of the production is concentrated in the northern manufacturing belt (six New England states, three Middle Atlantic states, and five East North Central states). This large variation between production centers and regional markets is shown on Maps 1 and 2 .

## Toiletries Production

The northern manufacturing belt accounts for $83 \%$ of the $U$. S. production of toiletries. Forty-nine per cent is concentrated in New Jersey and New York, with New Jersey ranking first and New York second. Production in these two states totals $\$ 520$ million.

## Packaged Medications Production

Although the available data do not show the production of packaged medications separately, the information on pharmaceutical preparations provides a close approach to it. These data show that New Jersey and New York together produce $41 \%$ of the preparations in the U. S. The East North Central states produce $32 \%$ of the total. Altogether, $87 \%$ of the $U$. S. production is concentrated in the northern manufacturing belt.

## Packaged Household Supp1ies Production

The production of detergents and specialty cleaning, polishing and sanitation preparations (SIC 2841 and 2842) is also concentrated in the northern manufacturing belt. Approximately $65 \%$ of the total $U$. S. production is located in the Northeast and the East North Central states.

## Regional Markets

In contrast to the highly concentrated production centers, the markets for packaged products are spread over the entire country. Drug store sales provide a reliable indication of the market for packaged products. Toiletries and medications represent a substantial part of the total sales of drug stores, while packaged household supplies represent a smaller but growing segment of the drug store business.

Regional markets, based on 1960 retail drug store sales, are shown below and on Map 2.

## Per Cent of

| Approximate Region | U. S. Retail Sales |
| :--- | ---: |
| Upper Atlantic (11 states) | 27.2 |
| East North Centra1 (5 states) | 22.6 |
| Southern (12 states) | 18.6 |
| Southwestern (3 states) | 7.9 |
| West North Centra1 (7 states) | 8.5 |
| North Western Mountain (5 states) | 2.6 |
| Pacific Area (5 states) | 12.3 |

This consideration of production centers and regional markets indicates that the South consumes four times as much as it produces. It is feasible, therefore, to consider Atlanta as a production center for the southern market.

## ATLANTA AND THE SOUTHERN MARKET

## Freight Advantage Area Market

Map 3 shows the area to which it is cheaper to ship from Atlanta than from New York or Chicago. The 1961 retail sales volumes in the area are estimated to be:

| Toilet Goods | $\$ 386,700,000$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| Packaged Medications | $\$ 349,368,000$ |
| Packaged Household Products | $\$ 440,996,000$ |

The freight advantage area contained 41.68 million people in 1960 , or $23 \%$ of the U. S. population.

This area is estimated to have $20.0 \%$ of the national market for packaged products. Several sources of data are available with which to measure the area's share of the market. Since information is given by state, 11 states ${ }^{1 /}$ were chosen as representative of the freight advantage area, and adjustments were made based on population.

In 1958 the 11 states accounted for $19.6 \%$ of the $U$. S. wholesale sales of drugs, drug proprietaries, druggists' sundries and toiletries (SIC 5022). $2 /$ In retail drug store sales (SIC 591), the 11 states accounted for $20.4 \%$ of the U. S. sales. Retail grocery store sales (SIC 541) for the 11 states amounted to $21 \%$ of the U. S. sales. Topics Publishing Company reports that 1960 retail sales of non-prescription items in drug stores for the 11 states accounted for $20.2 \%$ of the $U$. S. sales.

In summary:

|  | 11-State Percentage <br> of U. S. Sales |
| :--- | :---: |
| 1958 Wholesale drug sales | 19.6 |
| 1958 Retail drug store sales | 20.4 |
| 1958 Retail grocery store sales | 21.0 |
| 1960 Retail drug store sales of | $\underline{20.2}$ |
| non-prescription items | 20.3 |

The average for the freight advantage area (20.0\%) was obtained by adjusting the 11-state average according to population.

1/ Alabama, Arkansas, Florida, Georgia, Kentucky, Louisiana, Mississippi, North Carolina, South Carolina, Tennessee and Texas.

2/ United States Census of Business: 1958, U. S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census.

MAP 3
ATLANTA FREIGHT ADVANTAGE AREA


## Freight Advantage Area Sales Forecast

It is estimated that retail sales in Atlanta's freight advantage area will reach the following levels by 1967:

1967 Sales Increase over 1961
Toilet Goods
Packaged Medications
\$640,000,000 65\%

Packaged Household Products
$\$ 460,000,000$ $32 \%$
$\$ 600,000,000$ $35 \%$

Methods used in the forecast are given in Appendix 1. Sales in the freight advantage area are expected to be $20.0 \%$ of national sales in 1967 , the same as in 1960.

The above figures indicate that in five years there will be a \$1.7 billion retail market for toilet goods, packaged medications and packaged household products within an area economically served from Atlanta.

## Population Concentration

Within the freight advantage area, Atlanta has a higher concentration of population within a 200 -mile radius (straight line) than other possible locations such as Dallas and Memphis. The following is given for comparison:

$$
1960 \text { Population Within }
$$

City 200 Mile Radius

Atlanta
9 million
Da11as
5.7 million

Memphis
5.5 million

Atlanta is strategically located with well developed facilities for serving the large retail markets in Miami, Houston, Dallas-Fort Worth and New Orleans. In addition, the relatively large market in North Carolina is economically served.

## The Wholesale Market

Atlanta's total annual wholesaling volume of about $\$ 4$ billion places it $\$ 1.5$ billion ahead of its nearest competitor in the Southeast (Memphis).

Statistics on wholesale sales of packaged items as a group are not available, but they are available on drugs, toiletries and related items -a significant segment of the packaged products group. These data show that wholesale sales in the study area amount to $19.6 \%$ of the $U$. S. total.

MAP 4
WHOLESALE SALES OF DRUGS, DRUG PROPRIETARIES, DRUGGISTS' SUNDRIES AND TOILETRIES IN THE 11 STATE AREA AND IN THE LARGER MUNICIPALITIES


In the wholesaling of drugs, drug proprietaries, druggists' sundries, and toiletries, Atlanta not only stands forth in the nation behind New York, Chicago and Los Angeles, but it is far ahead of the city that ranks fifth.

A total of $\$ 233$ million worth of drugs, drug proprietaries, druggists' sundries and toiletries was wholesaled in Atlanta in 1958. The entire New England area in the same year wholesaled only $\$ 246,900,000$, while sales in the states of Florida, North Carolina and South Carolina combined were only $\$ 235,884,000$. Twenty-five per cent of all the wholesale sales of these products in the eight South Atlantic states, the District of Columbia, and the four East South Central states combined are made in Atlanta.

Wholesale sales of drugs, drug proprietaries, druggists' sundries, and toiletries in the 11 states of the study area are indicated in Table 6 and on Map 4. Sales in the major wholesaling centers of the country are shown on Map 4.

Table 6
WHOLESALE SALES OF DRUGS, DRUG PROPRIETARIES, DRUGGISTS' SUNDRIES, AND TOILETRIES
(1958)

| Alabama | \$ | 45,152,000 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Florida |  | 128,477,000 |
| Georgia |  | 263,606,000 |
| Mississippi |  | 9,644,000 |
| North Carolina |  | 76,766,000 |
| South Carolina |  | 30,641,000 |
| Tennessee |  | 108,032,000 |
| Kentucky |  | 35,268,000 |
| Arkansas |  | 35,422,000 |
| Louisiana |  | 94,419,000 |
| Texas |  | 340,742,000 |
| TOTAL |  | 168,169,000 |
| United States |  | 955,366,000 |

## Relationships with Suppliers and Customers

Atlanta is not only the retail, wholesale and population center of the southern market, but also the regional center for decentralized national operations. Some 3,500 national concerns are represented by warehouses, branch plants or sales offices in the Atlanta area. An Atlanta manufacturer of packaged products, therefore, could conveniently establish and maintain effective relationships with suppliers and customers.

## Products Best Suited for Packaging in Atlanta

While most packaged products could be produced advantageously in Atlanta, those products with a high volume of sales, a favorable raw material position, and a low price to weight ratio are best suited for Atlanta packaging operations. A few of the many packaged items that meet these criteria are synthetic detergents, shampoos, household cleansers, spray hair fixatives, and men's hair tonics.

The 84 packaged products with the highest volumes of sales have been discussed previously and are listed in Table 4. Selected high-volume products with outstanding growth records are shown in Table 5. Appendix 2 gives additional sales information on those products which meet the criterion of high volume of sales.

Raw materials or ingredients that constitute a major part of the net weight of most packaged products are either available in the Atlanta area or are sold on a delivered price basis. For many products water is an ingredient that forms a major part of the net weight of the product. In general, the availability of supplies and materials are as satisfactory in Atlanta as in present manufacturing locations.

Selected packaged products with low price to weight ratios are shown in Table 7.

## Availability of Containers in Atlanta

A primary location factor for a regional packaging plant is that all types of containers must be available locally. Containers and packaging material are a major part of the shipping weight of some items, such as shampoo, in which these items account for 50 to $70 \%$ of the shipping weight. (See Table 7.)

Six plants in the Atlanta area manufacture metal, plastic and glass containers. Five are in an area within a two-mile radius on the edge of the city. Both the radial expressway and the circumferential expressway (under construction) pass through the area. In addition, Atlanta has numerous manufacturers of folding, corrugated and set-up boxes. The

Table 7

## PACKAGED FORMULATIONS ANALYSIS DATA

| Item | ```Wholesale Price to Weight Ratio (Dollars Per Pound)``` | Weight of <br> Packaging <br> Material <br> to Total <br> Shipping Weight <br> (Per Cent) | $\begin{gathered} \text { Markup } \\ (\text { Per Cent) } \end{gathered}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Aerosol Household Deodorant | $0.70-$ | 45 - |  |
| Aerosol Shaving Cream | 0.55-0.80 | 30-70 | 65-70 |
| After Shave Lotion | 0.50 |  | 70-75 |
| Cream Deodorant | 0.90 | - 85 | 75-80 |
| Dishwashing Detergents | 0.26 |  |  |
| Hair Shampoo | $0.40-0.70$ | 50-70 | 65-70 |
| Hair Spray Fixatives | 0.45 - | $35-$ | 65-70 |
| Liquid Synthetic Detergents | 0.16-0.32 | 39-46 |  |
| Men's Hair Tonic (Glass Containers) | 0.55-0.80 |  |  |
| Powdered Detergents | 0.18-0.21 |  |  |
| Toilet Soap | 0.33-0.40 |  |  |
| Tooth Paste | 0.65-1.60 | 15-60 | $50-60$ |

manufacturers of containers in the Atlanta area are:
PlantAmerican Can Company
Crown Cork \& Seal Company
Knox Glass Company
Owen-Illinois Glass Company,
Owen-I11inois Glass Company,Plastic Products Division
Polyco, Inc.Glass Container Division Glass containers

## Products

Carbonated beverage cans, oblong cans, beer cans, paper tubes with metal ends, lithographing facilities
General, open top cans, aerosol cans, aluminum cans, beer cans, bottle caps, oblong cans, lithographing facilities
Glass containers

Glass containers

High density polyethylene bottles
High density and low density polyethylene bottles

## Atlanta's Freight Advantage

A hypothetical case study for a New York area company with annual U. S. sales of $\$ 100$ million demonstrates that an Atlanta regional plant would save the company $\$ 263,000$ annually in freight costs. (See section following.)

Examples of freight savings to Memphis, Jacksonville and Dallas for an Atlanta plant over a New York plant are shown in Table 8.

Table 8

## FREIGHT RATES ON DRUGS, MEDICINES AND TOILET PREPARATIONS FROM NEW YORK AND FROM ATLANTA TO SOUTHERN CITIES

(Truckload Shipment of 30,000 Pounds)

| To: | From <br> New York City Area (\$/cwt.) | From Atlanta <br> (Estimated New Rates) ${ }^{1 /}$ (\$/cwt.) | ```Savings Atlanta vs. New York City Area ($/cwt.)``` |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Memphis | 1.75 | . 73 | 1.02 |
| Jacksonville | 1.59 | . 66 | . 93 |
| Dallas | 2.64 | 1.24 | 1.40 |

1/ The estimated new rates are $27 \%$ of the Class 100 rates applicable to truckload shipments. They are on the same relative basis as the present rate of $\$ 1.20$ on 30,000 pounds from New York to Atlanta. Present rates from Atlanta are: $\$ 1.08$ on 22,000 pounds to Memphis; $\$ .98$ on 22,000 pounds to Jacksonville; and $\$ 1.61$ on 30,000 pounds to Dallas.

Commodity rates for drugs, medicines and toilet preparations show a definite, although not precise, relationship with distance shipped. The rates are plotted in Figure 2. The Class 100 rates, also plotted in Figure 2, illustrate the increased cost of shipping from one freight territory to another. Commodity rates generally are established as a percentage of the Class 100 rates. The point-to-point commodity rates shown in Figure 2 are identified in Table 9.

FIGURE 2
TRUCKLOAD MOTOR FREIGHT RATES COMPARED TO DISTANCE SHIPPED (in cents per 100 pounds)


Table 9
SELECTED COMMODITY RATES ON TOILET PREPARATIONS, MEDICINES AND DRUGS

| $\text { Point }^{1 /}$ | Origin | Destination | $\text { Rate }^{2 /}$ | Minimum <br> Shipment $\qquad$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1. | Baltimore, Md. | Atlanta, Ga. | 120 | 30M |
| 2. | Bridgeport, Conn. Fairfield, Conn. | Atlanta, Ga. | 156 | 27M |
| 3. | Ft. Washington, Pa. West Point, Pa. | Atlanta, Ga. | 120 | 30M |
| 4. | Fairlawn, N. J. Hillside, N. J. New York, N. Y. | Atlanta, Ga. | 120 | $\begin{aligned} & 32 \mathrm{M} \\ & 30 \mathrm{M} \end{aligned}$ |
| 5. | Suffern, N. Y. <br> Pearl River, N. Y. | Atlanta, Ga. | 120 | $\begin{aligned} & 30 \mathrm{M} \\ & 32 \mathrm{M} \end{aligned}$ |
| 6. | Boston, Mass. | Atlanta, Ga. | 156 | 27M |
| 7. | Renselaer, N. Y. | Atlanta, Ga. | 132 | 30 M |
| 8. | Malvern, Pa . Myerstown, Pa. | Atianta, Ga. | 120 | 30M |
| 9. | Bound Brook, N. J. | Atlanta, Ga. | 120 | 32 M |
| 10. | Rouses Point, N. Y. | Atlanta, Ga. | 164 | 27M |
| 11. | Baltimore, Md. | Charlotte, N. C. | 91 | 27M |
| 12. | Morristown, N. J. New York, N. Y. | Charlotte, N. C. | 95 | 27M |
| 13. | Pearl River, N. Y. | Charlotte, N. C. | 120 | 32 M |
| 14. | Boston, Mass. | Charlotte, N. C. | 140 | 27M |
| 15. | Hillside, N. J. | Memphis, Tenn. | 140 | 34M |
| 16. | New York, N. Y. | Memphis, Tenn. | 175 | 30 M |
| 17. | Clifton, N. J. | Memphis, Tenn. | 134 | 35M |
| 18. | Bridgeport, Conn. <br> Fairfield, Conn. | Charlotte, N. C. | 140 | 27M |
| 19. | Clinton, Conn. | Jacksonville, Fla. | 162 | 30 M |
| 20. | New York, N. Y. and New Jersey Area | Jacksonville, Fla. | 159 | 30M |
| 21. | Bridgeport, Conn. Fairfield, Conn. | New Orleans, La. | 212 | 27M |
| 22. | Philadelphia, Pa. | New Orleans, La. | 190 | 30 M |
| 23. | West Point, Pa. | New Orleans, La. | 190 | 30 M |
| 24. | Pearl River, N. Y. | New Orleans, La. | 266 | 30 M |
| 25. | Baltimore, Md. | Dallas, Texas | 253 | 30 M |
| 26. | New York, N. Y. | Dallas, Texas | 282 | 23M |
| 27. | Philadelphia, Pa. | Dallas, Texas | 265 | 30 M |
| 28. | Yonkers, N. Y. | Dallas, Texas | 264 | 30 M |
| 29. | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Bristol, } \mathrm{Pa} \text {. } \\ & \text { Penndel, } \mathrm{Pa} \text {. } \end{aligned}$ | Dallas, Texas | 268 | 30M |
| 30. | Trenton, N. J. | Dallas, Texas | 268 | 30M |
| 31. | Atlanta, Ga. | Memphis, Tenn. | 73* | 30M |
| 32. | Atlanta, Ga. | Charlotte, N. C. | 60* | 30M |
| 33. | Atlanta, Ga. | Jacksonville, Fla. | 66* | 30 M |
| 34. | Atlanta, Ga. | New Orleans, La. | 80* | 30M |
| 35. | Atlanta, Ga. | Dallas, Texas | 124\% | 30M |

* Estimated revised rates.

[^1]
## A Hypothetical Case Study

This hypothetical case study shows that a company packaging in Atlanta for sales in the southern region would increase profits on sales (before taxes) by more than $10 \%$. The increase is due to a freight savings of $\$ 263,000$ annually.

The case study company is assumed to be located in the New Yorknortheastern New Jersey area and to distribute products nationally from this location. Other pertinent facts concerning the company are the following:

Annual sales
Earnings before taxes $1 /$
Annual freight bil1²/
Product mix:
Toothpaste 34.4\%
Shampoo 22.5\%

Hair Spray 10.4\%
Men's Hair Tonic 9.5\%
Aeroso1 Household Deodorizers 6.8\%
Aerosol Shaving Cream 6.5\%
After Shave Lotion 6.0\%
Cream Deodorant 4.0\%
It is assumed that $20 \%$-- or $\$ 20$ million -- of the company's output is sold in the Atlanta freight advantage area. If a packager were serving this regional market from Atlanta, the following freight savings would result:

Freight cost from New York-northeastern New Jersey plant

Freight cost from proposed Atlanta plant \$462,941

Estimated annual freight savings 199,832
\$263,109

Freight costs were calculated using truckload commodity rates. Experience in the industry indicates that many shipments are less than truckload and move at higher rates than those used in this study. In actual practice, therefore, it can be assumed that the freight savings from packaging in Atlanta would be greater than are indicated above. The calculations for this study are shown in Appendix 3.

[^2]In serving the southern regional market, greater earnings are possible when the products are packaged (along with simple formulating) in Atlanta rather than being shipped in from outside the area. While increased earnings of more than $10 \%$ can be shown for a hypothetical company, the actual increase in earnings that a specific company would realize can only be determined from a case study for that company. Individual studies can be made for interested companies.

APPENDICES

## Appendix 1

## MARKET FORECAST CALCULATIONS

The toilet goods sales forecast was made by relating toilet goods sales to personal expenditures for services (PES) ${ }^{1 /}$ and then using an authoritative forecast for PES. Toilet goods sales versus personal expenditures for services for the years 1951 through 1961 are shown in graphic form in Figure 1 of the text.

The coefficient of correlation for the data is 0.997 , and the calculations are shown in Appendix Table 1-A.

Personal expenditures for services are graphed in Appendix Figure 1-A on semilogarithmic paper with expenditures on the log scale. McGraw-Hill's Department of Economics figures and forecasts for personal expenditures for services are:

| Year | PES in 1960 Do11ars |
| :--- | :---: |
| 1950 | 85.4 |
| 1960 | 131.8 |
| 1965 | 168 |
| 1970 | 209 |
| 1975 | 260 |

Interpolating for 1967 and changing from 1960 to 1967 dollars puts the PES estimate at $\$ 227$ billion for 1967. Toilet goods sales for 1967 are calculated to be $\$ 3.18$ billion by correlating to PES, using the least squares equation.

Packaged medication and packaged household supplies sales forecasts were made by extrapolating per capita sales to 1967 and using an authoritative estimate of the population. Per capita sales are listed in Appendix Table 1-B and are extrapolated to 1967 in Appendix Figure 1-B.

From the extrapolation in Appendix Figure 1-B, per capita sales in 1967 are estimated to be:

1/ Survey of Current Business, July issue, U. S. Department of Commerce.

Packaged Medications (average annual increase of 3.3\%)

- \$11.50

Packaged Household Supplies (average annual increase of 3.3\%) - \$14.92
The 1967 population estimate is based on the following forecast from the March 27, 1961, issue of U. S. News and World Report:

| Year | U. S. Population | 11-State Population ${ }^{1 /}$ | 11-State \% of U. S. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1960 | 179, 323,175 | 42,570,522 | 23.74 |
| 1970 | 209,358,000 | 49,551,000 | 23.65 |

The average annual rate of increase from 1960 to 1970 for the U. S. and the 11 -state area is $1.5 \%$. By using this rate, the 1967 population is estimated to be:

United States - 199,766,000
11-State Area - 47,423,600
Based on these population and per capita sales forecasts, the 1967 sales of packaged medications and household supplies are estimated to be the following:

1967
Per Capita
Sales
$\$ 11.50$
14.92

1967 Retail Sales
(Per capita sales times 1967 U. S. population)
\$2,297,309,000
\$2,980,509,000

National forecasts are rounded off to the nearest $\$ 100$ million in the text. Using national sales estimates and a regional market share of $20.0 \%$, t following regional sales forecasts for 1967 were derived:

|  | 1967 U. S. Sales | Atlanta Regional Market ( $20.0 \%$ of U. S. Sales) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Toilet Goods | \$3,180,000,000 | \$636,000,000 |
| Packaged Medications | \$2, 297,309,000 | \$459,461, 800 |
| Packaged Household |  |  |
| Supplies | \$2,980,509,000 | \$596,101,800 |

Regional forecasts are rounded off to the nearest $\$ 10$ million in the text.

1/ Alabama, Arkansas, Florida, Georgia, Kentucky, Louisiana, Mississippi, North Carolina, South Carolina, Tennessee and Texas.

Appendix Table 1-A
CALCULATIONS FOR COEFFICIENT OF CORRELATION BETWEEN PERSONAL EXPENDITURES FOR SERVICES (X) AND TOILET GOODS SALES (Y) AND FOR THE CORRELATION LINE FITTED BY LEAST SQUARES

|  | Toilet Goods <br> Sales <br> (Billions of <br> Dollars) | Services <br> (Billions <br> of Dollars) | Functions Used in the Calculations |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |

$G_{y}=\sqrt{\frac{\mathrm{Sy}^{2}}{\mathrm{~N}}}=\sqrt{\frac{1.154}{11}}=.32389$
$G_{x}=\sqrt{\frac{S x^{2}}{N}}=\sqrt{\frac{5,337.3}{11}}=22.0273$

Coefficient: $r=\frac{\text { Sxy }}{N G{ }_{y}{ }_{x}}=\frac{78.268}{(11)(.32389)(22.0273)}=0.9973$

## Appendix Table 1-A (Cont'd)

The correlation line fitted by least squares: General Equation Yc $=a+b x$

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \mathrm{b}=\frac{S x y}{S x}=\frac{78.268}{5,337.3}=0.01466 \\
& a=\bar{Y}-b \bar{X}=1.348-(.01466)(102)=-0.147
\end{aligned}
$$

Formula for Correlation Line: Yc $=0.01466 \mathrm{X}$ - 0.147

## Points on the Correlation Line

| Yc | X |
| ---: | :--- |
| 1 | 78.2 |
| 2 | 146.4 |
| 3 | 214.7 |
| 3.18 | 227 |

Percent increase from 1961 to 1967: $\frac{3.18}{1.93}=1.65$ or $65 \%$

## APPENDIX FIGURE 1-A

TREND AND FORECAST OF PERSONAL EXPENDITURES FOR SERVICES


## APPENDIX FIGURE 1-B <br> PER CAPITA SALES OF PACKAGED MEDICATIONS AND PACKAGED HOUSEHOLD SUPPLIES



## Appendix Table 1-B <br> PER CAPITA SALES OF PACKAGED MEDICATIONS AND PACKAGED HOUSEHOLD SUPPLIES

Year
1961
1960
1959
1958
1957
1956
1955
1954
1953
1952
1951
1950
1949

Packaged Packaged Household
Medications
$\$ 9.51$
9.43
9.23
8.91
8.69
8.02
7.59
9.65
7.11
9.41
6.95
9.16
6.86
8.87
6.78
8.89

### 6.65

6.43

Appendix 2
Appendix Table 2-A
U. S. RETAIL SALES OF 84 PACKAGED PRODUCTS

|  |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { Dry } \\ \text { Househol } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | nthetic Detergents | Vita Concen | $\begin{aligned} & \text { min } \\ & \text { trates } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | Toilet | Soaps | Liquid $\qquad$ | ynthetic <br> gents | Tooth | Paste | Asp Sali Com | rinylate ounds |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Year | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Minlions } \\ & \text { of } \\ & \text { Dollars } \end{aligned}$ | \% Change | $\begin{gathered} \text { Millions } \\ \text { of } \\ \text { Dollars } \end{gathered}$ | \% Change | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Millions } \\ & \text { of } \\ & \text { Dollars } \end{aligned}$ | \% Change | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Millions } \\ & \text { of } \\ & \text { Dollars } \end{aligned}$ | \% Change | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Millions } \\ & \text { of } \\ & \text { Dollars } \end{aligned}$ | \% Change | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Millions } \\ & \text { of } \\ & \text { Dollars } \end{aligned}$ | \% Change |
|  | 1961 | 588.39 | -1.7 | 311.02 | -7.0 | 266.74 | 3.4 | 258.34 | 9.7 | 243.73 | 3.8 | 236.95 | 5.4 |
| 1 | 1960 | 598.57 | 4.3 | 334.45 | -2.0 | 257.85 | 4.4 | 235.5 | 12.8 | 234.81 | 3.1 | 224.73 | 5.2 |
| $\stackrel{\text { v }}{ }$ | 1959 | 573.89 | 4.1 | 341.22 | 0.3 | 246.95 | 5.8 | 208.78 | 21.7 | 227.65 | 2.3 | 213.58 | 6.0 |
|  | 1958 | 551.34 | 5.7 | 340.35 | 0.6 | 233.39 | 6.6 | 171.54 | 34.4 | 222.59 | 10.0 | 201.42 | 7.8 |
|  | 1957 | 521.66 | 4.7 | 338.36 | 4.7 | 218.96 | 15.5 | 127.65 | 53.1 | 202.34 | 13.5 | 186.93 | 19.3 |
|  | 1956 | 498.10 | 6.2 | 323.2 | 6.7 | 189.58 | 6.6 | 83.36 | 78.7 | 178.27 | 13.4 | 156.67 | 8.4 |
|  | 1955 | 468.93 | 11.0 | 303.05 | 6.7 | 177.82 | 6.1 | 46.66 | 41.7 | 157.25 | 4.4 | 144.52 | 27.6 |
|  | 1954 | 422.37 | 10.7 | 284.03 | 3.8 | 167.58 | 7.1 | 32.92 | 54.2 | 150.62 | 0.6 | 113.24 | 8.0 |
|  | 1953 | 381.39 |  | 273.65 | 2.9 | 156.51 | 3.3 | 21.34 |  | 149.72 | 6.7 | 104.82 | 8.2 |
|  | 1952 |  |  | 265.94 | 3.4 | 151.57 | -1.2 |  |  | 140.32 | 24.8 | 96.83 | 8.4 |
|  | 1951 |  |  | 257.2 | 2.9 | 153.5 | 8.0 |  |  | 112.44 | 9.5 | 89.33 | 11.2 |
|  | 1950 |  |  | 249.95 | 2.1 | 142.09 | -0.7 |  |  | 102.68 | 9.6 | 80.36 | 6.9 |
|  | 1949 |  |  | 244.81 |  | 143.12 |  |  |  | 93.69 |  | 75.21 |  |



|  |  | Hous Cle | ehold <br> nsers |  | Sirups, irs, rants | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Spra } \\ & \text { Fixa } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { y Hair } \\ & \text { tives } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | Shoe | Polish | $\begin{array}{r} \text { Mouth W } \\ \text { Gar: } \\ \hline \end{array}$ | shes and <br> les | Asp | irin |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Year | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Millions } \\ & \text { of } \\ & \text { Dollars } \end{aligned}$ | \% Change | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Millions } \\ & \text { of } \\ & \text { Dollars } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | \% Change | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Millions } \\ & \text { of } \\ & \text { Dollars } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | \% Change | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Millions } \\ & \text { of } \\ & \text { Dollars } \end{aligned}$ | \% Change | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Millions } \\ & \text { of } \\ & \text { Dollars } \end{aligned}$ | \% Change | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Millions } \\ & \text { of } \\ & \text { Dollars } \end{aligned}$ | \% Change |
|  | 1961 | 100.79 | 6.8 | 88.12 | 3.3 | 91.49 | 12.6 | 83.19 | 7.98 | 87.57 | 15.5 | 80.70 | 6.6 |
|  | 1960 | 94.37 | 6.3 | 85.31 | 12.1 | 81.25 | 6.7 | 77.04 | 9.75 | 75.82 | 9.8 | 75.72 | 9.9 |
|  | 1959 | 88.78 | 5.4 | 76.10 | 9.1 | 76.15 | -6.6 | 70.19 | 5.60 | 69.05 | 8.0 | 68.88 | 4.6 |
|  | 1958 | 84.20 | 12.9 | 69.79 | -3.8 | 81.50 | -1.3 | 66.47 | 4.00 | 63.94 | 17.0 | 65.86 | 8.2 |
| $\stackrel{\omega}{6}^{\sim}$ | 1957 | 74.56 | 11.5 | 72.53 | 19.3 | 82.54 | 10.0 | 63.91 | 6.20 | 54.65 | 39.0 | 60.88 | 10.6 |
| 1 | 1956 | 66.89 | -1.3 | 60.79 | 9.9 | 75.05 | 51.6 | 60.18 | 5.82 | 39.32 | 14.0 | 55.06 | 4.7 |
|  | 1955 | 67.76 | 1.4 | 55.34 | 6.8 | 49.49 | 65.4 | 56.87 | 2.62 | 34.49 | 4.5 | 52.59 | 3.8 |
|  | 1954 | 66.82 | 5.0 | 51.84 | -1.4 | 29.92 | 41.8 | 55.42 | 14.34 | 33.00 | 4.4 | 50.65 | 2.6 |
|  | 1953 | 63.63 | 3.6 | 52.56 | 4.2 | 21.10 | 201.3 | 48.47 | 24.60 | 31.62 | 11.5 | 49.37 | 1.9 |
|  | 1952 | 61.40 | 3.1 | 50.46 | 4.3 | 7.0 | 170.0 | 38.90 | 4.03 | 28.36 | 4.6 | 48.44 | 4.4 |
|  | 1951 | 59.59 | 5.7 | 48.38 | 3.9 | 2.6 |  | 37.39 | 1.71 | 27.10 | 5.0 | 46.42 | 7.5 |
|  | 1950 | 56.37 | -0.3 | 46.58 | 7.1 |  |  | 36.76 | 5.19 | 25.82 | 4.2 | 43.16 | 6.6 |
|  | 1949 | 56.52 |  | 43.49 |  |  |  | 34.95 |  | 24.78 |  | 40.50 |  |


|  |  | Liquid <br> Alter | onics and atives | Men's Ha | ir Tonics | Face Cr | leansing <br> eams | Hair <br> Prepa | oloring ations | Aerosol $\qquad$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Household } \\ & \text { cides } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Home } \mathrm{P} \\ & \text { Kits a } \end{aligned}$ | rmanent <br> d Refils |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Year | Millions <br> of <br> Dollars | \% Change | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Millions } \\ & \text { of } \\ & \text { Dollars } \end{aligned}$ | \% Change | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Millions } \\ & \text { of } \\ & \text { Dollars } \end{aligned}$ | \% Change | Millions <br> of <br> Dollars | \% Change | Millions of Dollars | \% Change | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Millions } \\ & \text { of } \\ & \text { Dollars } \end{aligned}$ | \% Change |
|  | 1961 | 77.84 | 9.1 | 74.36 | 6.4 | 71.19 | 3.1 | 74.44 | 10.1 | 67.42 | 3.8 | 70.21 | 8.6 |
|  | 1960 | 71.35 | -1.1 | 69.92 | 0.1 | 69.05 | 3.1 | 67.61 | 46.9 | 64.96 | 0.6 | 64.65 | -4.8 |
|  | 1959 | 72.14 | 2.9 | 69.85 | 5.0 | 66.98 | 3.7 | 46.01 | 23.4 | 64.60 | 23.9 | 67.91 | -8.6 |
|  | 1958 | 70.11 | -1.6 | 66.52 | 2.7 | 64.62 | 3.9 | 37.30 | 15.2 | 52.13 | 18.6 | 74.27 | -6.7 |
| + | 1957 | 71.22 | -0.7 | 64.74 | 7.9 | 62.18 | 2.5 | 32.37 | 14.9 | 43.95 | 6.2 | 79.64 | -7.9 |
|  | 1956 | 71.73 | -1.4 | 60.00 | 11.6 | 60.65 | 2.6 | 28.17 | 15.0 | 41.40 | -5.2 | 85.51 | 7.8 |
|  | 1955 | 72.78 | 4.2 | 53.75 | 9.6 | 59.12 | -0.6 | 24.50 | 9.7 | 43.67 | 16.5 | 80.29 | 9.1 |
|  | 1954 | 69.86 | 6.9 | 49.06 | 3.8 | 59.49 | 0.8 | 22.33 | 6.7 | 37.48 | -6.1 | 73.61 | 6.3 |
|  | 1953 | 65.36 | -0.04 | 47.27 | 10.6 | 59.00 | 2.7 | 20.93 | 10.1 | 39.92 | 25.9 | 69.23 | 6.3 |
|  | 1952 | 65.38 | -11.7 | 42.74 | 4.5 | 57.45 | 0.8 | 19.01 | 7.5 | 31.71 | 17.9 | 65.12 | 17.7 |
|  | 1951 | 74.03 | 0.6 | 40.91 | 13.6 | 57.01 | 3.3 | 17.68 | 17.5 | 26.89 | 14.8 | 55.32 | 4.3 |
|  | 1950 | 73.59 | 67.4 | 36.02 | 1.6 | 55.18 | 5.0 | 15.05 | 23.2 | 23.43 | 18.7 | 53.06 | 7.6 |
|  | 1949 | 43.98 |  | 35.46 |  | 52.57 |  | 12.22 |  | 19.74 |  | 49.32 |  |


|  |  | Cold T Capsules | ab lets, <br> , Vaccines | $\begin{gathered} \text { Soap } \\ \text { Chips, } \end{gathered}$ | Flakes, Powders | Auto | olish | Aerosol | Cologne | Aerosol $\qquad$ | Shaving <br> am | $\begin{gathered} \text { Aerosol } \\ \text { Deodd } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Household } \\ & \text { rizers } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Year | Millions <br> of <br> Dollars | \% Change | Millions <br> of <br> Dollars | \% Change | Millions <br> of <br> Dollars | \% Change | Millions of Dollars | \% Change | Millions <br> of <br> Dollars | \% Change | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Millions } \\ & \text { of } \\ & \text { Dollars } \end{aligned}$ | \% Change |
|  | 1961 | 59.48 | -5.5 | 56.02 | -9.3 | 55.04 | 1.9 | 65.42 | 23.1 | 54.79 | 7.2 | 54.68 | 9.3 |
|  | 1960 | 62.94 | -3.3 | 61.77 | -4.8 | 54.02 | 9.6 | 53.14 | 15.4 | 51.11 | 14.8 | 50.03 | 10.1 |
|  | 1959 | 65.09 | 25.5 | 64.88 | -10.6 | 49.29 | 2.5 | 46.05 | 22.4 | 44.52 | 12.6 | 45.44 | 15.2 |
|  | 1958 | 51.86 | 29.0 | 72.56 | -7.4 | 48.08 | 4.4 | 37.62 | 22.9 | 39.54 | 9.8 | 39.46 | 25.3 |
| $\pm$ | 1957 | 40.19 | 25.3 | 78.34 | -10.3 | 46.04 | 18.0 | 30.62 | 24.3 | 36.00 | 16.9 | 31.48 | 17.5 |
| 1 | 1956 | 32.08 | 9.2 | 87.35 | -13.6 | 39.01 | 7.4 | 24.63 | 41.3 | 30.80 | 12.6 | 26.79 | 15.7 |
|  | 1955 | 29.39 | 14.8 | 101.09 | -14.3 | 36.32 | -13.3 | 17.43 |  | 27.35 | 31.7 | 23.16 | 43.8 |
|  | 1954 | 25.60 | -6.0 | 117.89 | -11.8 | 41.90 | -6.9 |  |  | 20.76 | 39.3 | 16.11 | 12.2 |
|  | 1953 | 27.23 | -1.0 | 133.65 | -22.2 | 45.00 | 8.7 |  |  | 14.90 | 245.2 | 14.35 |  |
|  | 1952 | 27.50 | 9.8 | 171.72 | -22.7 | 41.40 | -10.7 |  |  | 4.32 | 332.0 |  |  |
|  | 1951 | 25.04 | 1.7 | 222.12 | -0.5 | 46.36 | 32.5 |  |  | 1.00 |  |  |  |
|  | 1950 | 24.63 | -3.1 | 22.3 .23 | -15.4 | 34.99 | 161.9 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 1949 | 25.41 |  | 263.79 |  | 13.36 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |


| $\underset{1}{ \pm}$ | Year | After-Shave Lotion |  | Household Disinfectants |  | External Analgesics, Salves, Ointments, Balms |  | Reducing Preparations |  | Laxative Tablets, Pills, Gums, Lozenges |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { Colognes, Toilet } \\ \text { Waters (other) } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Millions } \\ & \text { of } \\ & \text { Dollars } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | \% Change | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Millions } \\ & \text { of } \\ & \text { Dollars } \end{aligned}$ | \% Change | $\begin{gathered} \text { Millions } \\ \text { of } \\ \text { Dollars } \end{gathered}$ | \% Change | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Millions } \\ & \text { of } \\ & \text { Dollars } \end{aligned}$ | \% Change | Millions of Dollars | \% Change | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Millions } \\ & \text { of } \\ & \text { Dollars } \end{aligned}$ | \% Change |
|  | 1961 | 49.44 | 4.6 | 49.29 | 6.9 | 44.34 | 6.4 | 44.63 | 2.7 | 41.55 | 4.3 | 35.31 | 6.6 |
|  | 1960 | 47.27 | 5.8 | 46.11 | 1.1 | 41.67 | 5.1 | 43.46 |  | 39.84 | 2.3 | 33.12 | 8.0 |
|  | 1959 | 44.68 | 7.2 | 45.61 | 7.3 | 39.65 | 7.2 |  |  | 38.94 | 6.8 | 30.67 | 6.4 |
|  | 1958 | 41.68 | 7.3 | 42.51 | -4.7 | 36.98 | 4.2 |  |  | 36.45 | 2.3 | 28.82 | 6.9 |
|  | 1957 | 38.84 | 11.0 | 44.58 | 6.0 | 35.47 | 14.1 |  |  | 35.63 | 4.2 | 26.96 | 4.0 |
|  | 1956 | 35.00 | 7.6 | 42.08 | 2.1 | 31.10 | 7.6 |  |  | 34.18 | 6.8 | 25.92 | -6.7 |
|  | 1955 | 32.52 | 7.2 | 41.22 | 2.6 | 28.91 | 4.3 |  |  | 32.00 | 1.9 | 27.78 |  |
|  | 1954 | 30.32 | 5.9 | 40.17 | 4.4 | 27.71 | 0.5 |  |  | 31.39 | 1.2 |  |  |
|  | 1953 | 28.64 | 4.3 | 38.46 | 4.9 | 27.59 | 1.8 |  |  | 31.01 | 2.1 |  |  |
|  | 1952 | 27.47 | 4.6 | 36.68 | 8.5 | 27.10 | 3.6 |  |  | 30.37 | 1.0 |  |  |
|  | 1951 | 26.26 | 8.4 | 33.80 | 7.8 | 26.16 | 2.5 |  |  | 30.08 | 10.4 |  |  |
|  | 1950 | 24.22 | 9.2 | 31.34 | 4.6 | 25.52 | 8.0 |  |  | 27.25 | 0.1 |  |  |
|  | 1949 | 22.18 |  | 29.98 |  | 23.64 |  |  |  | 27.21 |  |  |  |


|  |  | Per | umes | Hand | Lotions | Press | d Cake <br> der | Wall a Cle | d Floor ners | Antihis | tamines | Laund | y Bar |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Year | Millions <br> of <br> Dollars | \% Change | Millions <br> of <br> Dollars | \% Change | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Millions } \\ & \text { of } \\ & \text { Dollars } \end{aligned}$ | \% Change | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Mi11ions } \\ & \text { of } \\ & \text { Dollars } \end{aligned}$ | \% Change | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Millions } \\ & \text { of } \\ & \text { Dollars } \end{aligned}$ | \% Change | Millions <br> of <br> Dollars | \% Change |
|  | 1961 | 37.44 | 1.4 | 37.86 | 4.6 | 41.79 | 16.6 | 36.00 | 1.1 | 35.48 | 3.1 | 30.88 | -10.7 |
|  | 1960 | 36.92 | 4.1 | 36.20 | 3.8 | 35.84 | 6.1 | 35.61 | -1.6 | 34.41 | 6.2 | 34.59 | -9.6 |
|  | 1959 | 35.47 | 7.2 | 34.87 | 3.7 | 33.78 | 10.3 | 36.19 | -13.3 | 32.4 | 7.2 | 38.26 | 1.8 |
|  | 1958 | 33.07 | 5.6 | 33.63 | 3.3 | 30.63 | 11.8 | 41.74 | 0.4 | 30.22 | 7.9 | 37.57 | 2.3 |
| $\pm$ | 1957 | 31.33 | 5.6 | 32.54 | 4.8 | 27.41 | 7.4 | 41.57 | 6.7 | 28.02 | 10.5 | 36.73 | -7.1 |
| 1 | 1956 | 29.68 | 6.6 | 31.04 | 5.3 | 25.53 | 13.2 | 38.96 | 6.8 | 25.35 | 6.9 | 39.53 | 1.1 |
|  | 1955 | 27.85 | 6.0 | 29.48 | 6.3 | 22.56 |  | 36.48 | 7.0 | 23.71 | 2.0 | 39.10 | -10.5 |
|  | 1954 | 26.26 | 3.4 | 27.74 | 2.0 |  |  | 34.11 | 5.9 | 23.23 | 2.8 | 43.69 | -1.9 |
|  | 1953 | 25.40 | 1.2 | 27.19 | 4.2 |  |  | 32.21 |  | 22.60 | 0.6 | 44.52 | -17.3 |
|  | 1952 | 25.10 | 1.7 | 26.10 | 5.3 |  |  |  |  | 22.48 | 2.8 | 53.80 | -13.5 |
|  | 1951 | 24.69 | 3.3 | 24.79 | 5.3 |  |  |  |  | 21.87 | -20.3 | 62.20 | -8.0 |
|  | 1950 | 23.89 | -3.0 | 23.55 | 15.4 |  |  |  |  | 27.44 | -23.0 | 67.61 | -20.9 |
|  | 1949 | 24.62 |  | 20.40 |  |  |  |  |  | 35.65 |  | 85.48 |  |


|  |  | Talcum | $\begin{aligned} & \text { ind Body } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \text { Liquid } \\ \text { Pest } \\ \hline \end{array}$ | ous ehold <br> cides | Cream D | eodorants | $\begin{gathered} \text { Nail } \mathrm{P} \\ \mathrm{En} \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | lish and <br> me1 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Feminine } \\ & \quad \text { Medice } \end{aligned}$ | Hygiene aments | Roll-On | eodorants |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Year | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Millions } \\ & \text { of } \\ & \text { Dollars } \end{aligned}$ | \% Change |  | \% Change |  | \% Change | Millions of Do1lars | \% Change | Millions <br> of <br> Dollars | \% Change | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Millions } \\ & \text { of } \\ & \text { Dollars } \end{aligned}$ | \% Change |
|  | 1961 | 34.45 | 2.8 | 31.96 | -3.5 | 35.38 | 7.1 | 38.37 | 16.3 | 34.04 | 4.4 | 38.07 | 19.1 |
|  | 1960 | 33.51 | 0.9 | 33.12 | -5.7 | 33.04 | 8.2 | 32.99 | 6.0 | 32.61 | 8.6 | 31.97 | 22.1 |
|  | 1959 | 33.21 | 3.5 | 35.12 | 8.2 | 30.53 | -0.7 | 31.12 | 9.7 | 30.02 | 7.4 | 26.18 | 28.2 |
| 1 | 1958 | 32.09 | 5.7 | 32.46 | 1.2 | 30.75 | -3.6 | 28.36 | -2.7 | 27.96 | 0.2 | 20.42 | 48.8 |
| + | 1957 | 30.38 | 3.8 | 32.08 | 2.3 | 31.91 | 1.6 | 29.16 | 11.4 | 27.90 | 9.0 | 13.73 | 93.4 |
|  | 1956 | 29.26 | 9.3 | 31.36 | -3.6 | 31.39 | 9.5 | 26.17 | 6.1 | 25.59 | 10.9 | 7.10 |  |
|  | 1955 | 26.76 | 6.8 | 32.52 |  | 28.67 | 5.6 | 24.66 | 8.7 | 23.08 | 9.9 |  |  |
|  | 1954 | 25.07 | 6.0 |  |  | 27.14 | 1.2 | 22.69 | 11.6 | 21.00 | 14.6 |  |  |
|  | 1953 | 23.64 | 3.3 |  |  | 26.81 | 6.3 | 20.32 | 7.4 | 18.32 | 1.2 |  |  |
|  | 1952 | 22.89 | 2.8 |  |  | 25.22 |  | 18.92 | 8.5 | 18.10 | 2.9 |  |  |
|  | 1951 | 22.28 | 2.6 |  |  |  |  | 17.44 | 6.3 | 17.59 | 2.1 |  |  |
|  | 1950 | 21.72 | 5.2 |  |  |  |  | 16.41 | 3.7 | 17.23 | 5.8 |  |  |
|  | 1949 | 20.64 |  |  |  |  |  | 15.82 |  | 16.29 |  |  |  |



1/ Pastes and Solid Control Agents

|  |  | $\begin{array}{r} \text { Milk of } \\ \quad \text { Lig } \end{array}$ | Magnesia | Loose Fa | e Powder |  | s Hair ngs and ioners | $\begin{array}{r} \text { Face Lot } \\ \text { Astrin } \end{array}$ | ions and gents | Acne Aid | Products | Synt Swee | tic ners |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Year | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Mil1ions } \\ & \text { of } \\ & \text { Dollars } \end{aligned}$ | \% Change | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Millions } \\ & \text { of } \\ & \text { Dollars } \end{aligned}$ | \% Change | Millions of Dollars | \% Change | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Millions } \\ & \text { of } \\ & \text { Dollars } \end{aligned}$ | \% Change | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Millions } \\ & \text { of } \\ & \text { Dollars } \end{aligned}$ | \% Change | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Millions } \\ & \text { of } \\ & \text { Dollars } \end{aligned}$ | \% Change |
|  | 1961 | 25.90 | 3.3 | 24.68 | -1.1 | 25.77 | 4.5 | 24.63 | 0.9 | 25.13 | 8.6 | 22.34 | 2.8 |
|  | 1960 | 25.07 | 5.8 | 24.96 | -2.1 | 24.66 | 14.4 | 24.41 | 4.1 | 23.14 | 9.2 | 21.74 | 8.3 |
|  | 1959 | 23.69 | 8.2 | 25.49 | 1.8 | 21.56 | 2.4 | 23.45 | 5.1 | 21.19 | 11.0 | 20.07 | 5.5 |
|  | 1958 | 16.17 | 3.3 | 25.03 | -0.4 | 21.06 | 9.3 | 22.31 | 4.8 | 19.09 | 14.5 | 19.03 | 2.2 |
| か | 1957 | 15.65 | 11.0 | 25.13 | -0.7 | 19.27 | 13.3 | 21.3 | 4.0 | 16.67 | 11.1 | 18.61 | 10.8 |
| 1 | 1956 | 14.10 | 9.0 | 25.31 | 1.8 | 17.01 | 7.5 | 20.49 | 4.8 | 15.00 | 18.5 | 16.80 | 13.8 |
|  | 1955 | 12.94 | 4.3 | 24.86 | 1.9 | 15.82 | 8.5 | 19.56 | 2.0 | 12.66 |  | 14.76 |  |
|  | 1954 | 12.41 | 3.8 | 24.39 | -1.7 | 14.59 | 12.4 | 19.17 | 2.9 |  |  |  |  |
|  | 1953 | 11.95 | 1.4 | 24.82 | -1.0 | 12.98 |  | 18.62 | 3.4 |  |  |  |  |
|  | 1952 | 11.79 | 0.1 | 25.06 | -0.5 |  |  | 18.02 | 2.5 |  |  |  |  |
|  | 1951 | 11.78 | -0.4 | 25.19 | 0.7 |  |  | 17.58 | 4.8 |  |  |  |  |
|  | 1950 | 11.82 | 0.6 | 25.03 | 0.5 |  |  | 16.78 | 5.3 |  |  |  |  |
|  | 1949 | 11.75 |  | 24.90 |  |  |  | 15.93 |  |  |  |  |  |


|  |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { Laxative } \\ \text { Prepare } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Saline } \\ & \text { tions } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | Nasal | Sprays | $\begin{array}{r} \text { External } \\ \quad \text { Lin } \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Analgesics } \\ & \text { ments } \end{aligned}$ | Baby | owder | Make-Up | Lotion | Nose | Drops |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Year | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Milliopars } \\ & \text { of } \\ & \text { Dollars } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | \% Change | $\begin{gathered} \text { Millions } \\ \text { of } \\ \text { Dollars } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | \% Change | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Millions } \\ & \text { of } \\ & \text { Dollars } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | \% Change | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Millions } \\ & \text { of } \\ & \text { Dollars } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | \% Change | $\begin{gathered} \text { Millions } \\ \text { of } \\ \text { Dollars } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | \% Change | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Millions } \\ & \text { of } \\ & \text { Dollars } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | \% Change |
|  | 1961 | 21.67 | 0.9 | 23.83 | 10.2 | 21.51 | 1.0 | 21.99 | 4.1 | 23.79 | 15.2 | 22.15 | 8.1 |
|  | 1960 | 21.65 | 0.8 | 21.63 | 8.2 | 21.29 | 0.4 | 21.12 | 1.8 | 20.65 | 9.7 | 20.49 | 1.1 |
|  | 1959 | 21.48 | 2.2 | 20.00 | 12.9 | 21.21 | 5.0 | 20.75 | 1.1 | 18.82 | 5.4 | 20.26 | 1.0 |
|  | 1958 | 21.02 | -0.7 | 17.71 | 9.2 | 20.20 | -1.3 | 20.52 | 1.1 | 17.87 | 13.4 | 20.06 | 0.5 |
| $\pm$ | 1957 | 21.17 | 2.2 | 16.21 | 16.6 | 20.47 | 1.8 | 20.30 | 10.4 | 15.75 | 5.6 | 19.95 | 18.6 |
| 1 | 1956 | 20.71 | 2.0 | 13.90 | 11.7 | 20.12 | 9.1 | 18.39 | 3.4 | 14.91 | 11.9 | 16.82 | 1.6 |
|  | 1955 | 20.30 | 1.8 | 12.45 |  | 18.44 | 5.4 | 17.79 | 11.4 | 13.33 |  | 16.56 |  |
|  | 1954 | 19.94 | 0.5 |  |  | 17.51 | 0.3 | 15.97 | 0.9 |  |  |  |  |
|  | 1953 | 19.84 | 2.8 |  |  | 17.46 | 2.2 | 15.83 | 9.6 |  |  |  |  |
|  | 1952 | 19.30 | 0.6 |  |  | 17.08 | 10.6 | 14.45 | 17.5 |  |  |  |  |
|  | 1951 | 19.19 | 3.9 |  |  | 15.45 | 0.8 | 12.30 | 8.1 |  |  |  |  |
|  | 1950 | 18.48 | -0.8 |  |  | 15.33 | 0.6 | 11.38 | 15.8 |  |  |  |  |
|  | 1949 | 18.62 |  |  |  | 15.24 |  | 9.83 |  |  |  |  |  |


|  |  | Bu1k Laxa | Type | Liquid | Starch | False <br> Adhe | Teeth ives | $\begin{gathered} \text { Face } \\ \\ \mathrm{Cr} \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | ricating <br> ams | Liquid | tacids | $\begin{array}{r} \text { Salve } \\ \text { Ointment } \end{array}$ | and <br> for Feet |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Year | Millions <br> of <br> Dollars | \% Change | Millions of Dollars | \% Change | Millions of Dollars | \% Change | Millions <br> of <br> Dollars | \% Change | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Millions } \\ & \text { of } \\ & \text { Dollars } \end{aligned}$ | \% Change | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Millions } \\ & \text { of } \\ & \text { Dollars } \end{aligned}$ | \% Change |
|  | 1961 | 20.37 | 3.5 | 21.79 | 12.5 | 20.54 | 8.9 | 19.58 | 3.9 | 19.63 | 5.1 | 19.77 | 7.2 |
|  | 1960 | 19.68 | 7.4 | 19.37 | 13.9 | 18.86 | 6.1 | 18.85 | 4.4 | 18.67 | 6.7 | 18.45 | 10.5 |
|  | 1959 | 18.33 | 7.4 | 17.00 | -8.0 | 17.78 | 10.0 | 18.05 | 6.3 | 17.50 | 8.2 | 16.69 | 9.1 |
|  | 1958 | 17.06 | -0.1 | 18.48 | -3.6 | 16.16 | 10.0 | 16.98 | 4.9 | 16.17 | 3.3 | 15.30 | 4.0 |
| $\underset{\infty}{+}$ | 1957 | 17.08 | -7.6 | 19.18 | 7.8 | 14.69 | 8.3 | 16.19 | 1.5 | 15.65 | 6.5 | 14.72 | 5.7 |
|  | 1956 | 18.47 | 3.8 | 17.80 | 5.8 | 13.56 | 10.1 | 15.95 | 6.5 | 14.70 | 8.9 | 13.92 | -0.1 |
|  | 1955 | 17.80 | 1.6 | 16.83 | 11.9 | 12.32 | 11.5 | 14.97 | 4.0 | 13.50 | 11.0 | 13.94 | 4.8 |
|  | 1954 | 17.53 | -0.3 | 15.04 | 15.2 | 11.05 | 2.5 | 14.40 | 1.4 | 12.17 | 3.9 | 13.30 | 1.6 |
|  | 1953 | 17.57 | 4.5 | 13.05 | 10.7 | 10.78 | 4.9 | 14.20 | 3.4 | 11.71 | 9.0 | 13.09 |  |
|  | 1952 | 16.81 | 7.8 | 11.79 |  | 10.28 | 6.1 | 13.74 | -2.1 | 10.74 | 12.1 |  |  |
|  | 1951 | 15.60 | 9.0 |  |  | 9.69 | 2.9 | 14.04 | 0.1 | 9.58 | 12.5 |  |  |
|  | 1950 | 14.32 | 10.2 |  |  | 9.42 | 9.4 | 14.02 | 7.5 | 8.52 | 0.3 |  |  |
|  | 1949 | 13.00 |  |  |  | 8.61 |  | 13.05 |  | 8.50 |  |  |  |


|  |  | Household Tints and Dyes |  | Liquid External Antiseptics |  | Baby Oils and Lotions |  | Window Cleaning Liquids |  | Toilet Bowl Cleaners |  | Squeeze Container Spray Deodorant |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { Millions } \\ \text { of } \\ \text { Dollars } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | \% Change | Millions of Dollars | \% Change | Millions of Dollars | \% Change | Millions of Do1lars | \% Change | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { Mil1ions } \\ \text { of } \\ \text { Dollars } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | \% Change | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Millions } \\ & \text { of } \\ & \text { Dollars } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | \% Change |
|  | 1961 | 19.08 | 6.5 | 17.66 | 4.8 | 16.89 | 4.8 | 15.63 | 1.8 | 15.71 | 5.8 | 15.02 | 3.7 |
|  | 1960 | 17.92 | 0.7 | 16.85 | 3.0 | 16.12 | 3.5 | 15.35 | 1.0 | 14.85 | 7.1 | 14.48 | -2.5 |
|  | 1959 | 17.79 | 7.5 | 16.36 | 6.8 | 15.57 | 1.8 | 15.20 | 7.1 | 13.86 | 7.3 | 14.85 | -3.5 |
| 1 | 1958 | 16.55 | 5.6 | 15.31 | 3.3 | 15.29 | 3.1 | 14.19 | 5.1 | 12.92 | 1.9 | 15.39 | -7.8 |
| $\stackrel{f}{6}$ | 1957 | 15.68 | 6.5 | 14.82 | -0.3 | 14.83 | 8.3 | 13.50 | 16.9 | 12.68 | 7.5 | 16.70 | 0.3 |
| 1 | 1956 | 14.72 | 4.4 | 14.86 | -0.7 | 13.70 | 10.4 | 11.55 | 4.5 | 11.79 | 3.2 | 16.65 | 9.3 |
|  | 1955 | 14.11 | 3.2 | 14.97 | 2.6 | 12.40 | 5.6 | 11.05 | 3.1 | 11.43 | 3.1 | 15.24 | 4.4 |
|  | 1954 | 13.67 | 6.3 | 14.58 | 0.7 | 11.74 | -1.2 | 10.72 | 3.4 | 11.08 | 5.0 | 14.59 | 0.2 |
|  | 1953 | 12.86 | 1.7 | 14.48 | 0.7 | 11.89 | 8.9 | 10.38 | 3.5 | 10.55 | 13.9 | 14.56 | 22.5 |
|  | 1952 | 12.64 | 6.2 | 14.39 | 4.1 | 10.91 | 12.5 | 10.02 | -5.1 | 9.26 | 3.5 | 11.89 |  |
|  | 1951 | 11.91 | 25.1 | 13.82 | 3.3 | 9.70 | 3.2 | 10.56 |  | 8.94 |  |  |  |
|  | 1950 | 9.52 | 10.2 | 13.38 | 0.8 | 9.40 | 8.4 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 1949 | 8.64 |  | 13.28 |  | 8.67 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |


|  |  | $\begin{array}{r} \text { Anti-C } \\ \text { Roden } \\ \text { (Pest } \\ \hline \end{array}$ | agulant icides cides) | $\begin{array}{r} \text { Suntan } \\ \text { and } \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Lotions } \\ & \text { Oils } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | Burn Re | medies | $\begin{gathered} \text { Cough } \\ \quad \text { Tro } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | zenges, hes | $\begin{array}{r} \text { Pois } \\ \text { Rem } \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { n Ivy } \\ & \text { dies } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | Rubbing | Alcohol |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Year | Millions of Dollars | \% Change | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Millions } \\ & \text { of } \\ & \text { Dollars } \end{aligned}$ | \% Change | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Millions } \\ & \text { of } \\ & \text { Dollars } \end{aligned}$ | \% Change | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Millions } \\ & \text { of } \\ & \text { Dollars } \end{aligned}$ | \% Change | $\begin{gathered} \text { Millions } \\ \text { of } \\ \text { Dollars } \end{gathered}$ | \% Change | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Millions } \\ & \text { of } \\ & \text { Dollars } \end{aligned}$ | \% Change |
|  | 1961 | 13.67 | -2.6 | 13.99 | 5.1 | 14.25 | 12.1 | 21.02 | 12.1 | 11.87 | 3.5 | 24.70 | 0.8 |
|  | 1960 | 14.04 | 4.2 | 13.31 | 8.6 | 12.71 | 12.6 | 18.75 | 2.2 | 11.47 | 5.0 | 24.51 | 5.1 |
|  | 1959 | 13.47 | 7.7 | 12.26 | 16.3 | 11.29 | 8.6 | 18.35 | 7.8 | 10.92 | 8.8 | 23.32 | 5.3 |
|  | 1958 | 12.51 | 4.6 | 10.54 | 4.1 | 10.40 | 9.6 | 17.02 | 1.7 | 10.04 | 0.7 | 22.14 | 4.6 |
| $\cdots$ | 1957 | 11.96 | -9.4 | 10.12 | 8.7 | 9.49 | 12.0 | 16.73 | 27.4 | 9.97 | 3.9 | 21.17 | 5.9 |
| 1 | 1956 | 13.20 | 10.9 | 9.31 | 12.2 | 8.47 | 13.8 | 13.13 |  | 9.60 | 16.8 | 19.99 | -2.1 |
|  | 1955 | 11.90 |  | 8.3 | 14.2 | 7.45 | 5.8 |  |  | 8.22 | 3.0 | 20.42 | 1.4 |
|  | 1954 |  |  | 7.27 | 8.7 | 7.04 | -0.4 |  |  | 7.98 | 11.0 | 20.13 | 1.9 |
|  | 1953 |  |  | 6.69 | 13.3 | 7.07 | 0.2 |  |  | 7.19 |  | 19.76 | -0.9 |
|  | 1952 |  |  | 5.90 | 24.3 | 7.05 | 2.2 |  |  |  |  | 19.94 | 3.1 |
|  | 1951 |  |  | 4.75 | 5.8 | 6.9 | 1.8 |  |  |  |  | 19.34 | 0.1 |
|  | 1950 |  |  | 4.49 | -4.0 | 6.78 | 4.1 |  |  |  |  | 19.31 | 6.5 |
|  | 1949 |  |  | 4.68 |  | 6.51 |  |  |  |  |  | 18.13 |  |

## Appendix 3

## INFORMATION AND CALCULATIONS FOR THE HYPOTHETICAL CASE STUDY

The annual sales of $\$ 100$ million for the hypothetical company are related to the total U. S. retail sales for the selected items. Product mix information is shown in Appendix Table 3-A. Company sales are in the same percentage as the total U. S. wholesale sales are for the group of products. The average shipping weight of 1.37 pounds per dollar of wholesale sales derived from this tabulation is used in calculating the freight costs.

The freight advantage area served from Atlanta has $20.0 \%$ of the U. S. sales. Company sales in this area are assumed to be the same percentage, or $\$ 20$ million.

Appendix Table 3-B gives the tabulation of the Atlanta freight advantage area. Appendix Table 3-C shows a representative destination for the purpose of computing shipping costs and freight savings. Sales are converted to shipping costs by multiplying by the conversion factor of 1.37 listed in Appendix Table 3-A.

In computing the annual freight bill for the hypothetical company in the New York-northeastern New Jersey area, the 48 states were divided into areas, and a representative destination was chosen for each area as shown in Appendix Table 3-D. A state's share of the national market was assumed to be its percentage of the $U$. S. wholesale sales for drugs, drug proprietaries, and druggists' sundries (SIC 5022). The factor of 1.37 was used to convert sales to shipping weight. Freight rates were applied to determine the freight cost.

## Appendix Table 3-A

TABULATION OF PRODUCT MIX INFORMATION

|  |  | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) | (5) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Item | ```1960 U. S. Retail Sales (Thousands of Do1lars)``` | Mark-up <br> Factor <br> Wholesale <br> to Retail | Wholesale <br> Sales <br> (Thousands <br> of Dollars) | Shipping Weight per Dollar of Wholesale Sales (Pounds per Dollar) | Shipping Weight (Thousands of Pounds) |
|  | Tooth Paste | 234,810 | 1.5 | 158, 700 | 0.7 | 111,300 |
|  | Shampoo | 166,580 | 1.6 | 104,000 | 1.75 | 182,000 |
|  | Hair Spray | 81,250 | 1.7 | 47,800 | 2.1 | 100,500 |
|  | Men's Hair Tonic | 69,920 | 1.6 | 43,700 | 1.5 | 65,500 |
| ' | Aerosol Shaving Cream | 51,110 | 1.7 | 30,100 | 1.7 | 51,100 |
| N | Aerosol Household Deodorizers | 50,030 | 1.6 | 31,300 | 1.5 | 46,900 |
|  | After Shave Lotion | 47,270 | 1.7 | 27,800 | 2.0 | 55,700 |
|  | Cream Deodorant | 33,040 | 1.8 | 18,340 | 1.0 | 18,300 |
|  | TOTAL | 734,010 | 1.59 | 461,740 | 1.37 | 631,300 |

Average wholesale sales per pound of shipping weight: \$0.73

```
Sources: Column 1-- From Topics Publishing Company
Column 2 -- Derived from Manufacturers' Price Lists
Column 3 -- Wholesale Sales = Retail Sales (1) \(\div\) Mark-up Factor (2)
Column 4 -- From information supplied by manufacturers
Column 5-- Column 3 x Column 4
```


## Appendix Table 3-B

TABULATION OF ATLANTA FREIGHT ADVANTAGE AREA

|  | 1960 Non-Prescription Retail Drug Sales (Thousands of Dollars) | State Percent of U. S. | Prorating ${ }^{1 /}$ $\qquad$ Factor | Atlanta <br> Market <br> Area, <br> Percent <br> of U.S. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Alabama | 65,596 | 1.25 | 1.00 | 1.25 |
| Arkansas | 45,130 | . 86 | . 93 | . 80 |
| Florida | 168,325 | 3.22 | 1.00 | 3.22 |
| Georgia | 84,107 | 1.61 | 1.00 | 1.61 |
| Kentucky | 71,339 | 1.36 | . 74 | 1.00 |
| Louisiana | 82,725 | 1.58 | 1.00 | 1.58 |
| Mississippi | 39,848 | . 76 | 1.00 | . 76 |
| North Carolina | 84,978 | 1.62 | . 93 | 1.51 |
| South Carolina | 46,289 | . 89 | 1.00 | . 89 |
| Tennessee | 81,926 | 1.55 | 1.00 | 1.55 |
| Texas | 283,381 | 5.42 | . 90 | 4.88 |
| Virginia | 101,388 | 1.94 | . 23 | . 45 |
| West Virginia | 38,468 | . 74 | . 68 | . 50 |
| Area Total | 1,193,509 | 22.82 |  | 20.00 |
| U. S. | 5,229,860 |  |  |  |

[^3]Appendix Table 3-C
TABULATION OF SHIPPING COSTS AND FREIGHT SAVINGS
FOR THE HYPOTHETICAL CASE STUDY


1/ Estimated new rates. For discussion, see footnote to Table 8 in the text.

| Destination | Appendix Table 3-D |  |  |  | $\begin{array}{l}\text { Freight } \\ \text { Cost }\end{array}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | FREIGHT COSTS FOR NATIONAL DISTRIBUTION FROM NEW YORK-NORTHEASTERN NEW JERSEY AREA |  |  |  |  |
|  | ```Wholesale Sales by State (Per Cent)``` | Wholesale <br> Sales by Area (Per Cent) | Shipping Weight of Sales ${ }^{1 /}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Freight } \\ \text { Rate } \\ \text { (\$/cwt.) } \end{gathered}$ |  |
| Boston Area |  | 3.13 | 4.28 | . $54 \%$ | \$23,100 |
| Maine | . 22 |  |  |  |  |
| New Hampshire | . 06 |  |  |  |  |
| Vermont and |  |  |  |  |  |
| Rhode Is land | . 31 |  |  |  |  |
| Massachusetts | 2.54 |  |  |  |  |
| New York Area |  | 36.63 | 50.2 | .63* | \$316,500 |
| New York | 16.2 |  |  |  |  |
| Connecticut | 1.0 |  |  |  |  |
| Pennsylvania | 4.81 |  |  |  |  |
| New Jersey | 3.96 |  |  |  |  |
| Ohio | 6.1 |  |  |  |  |
| Delaware and |  |  |  |  |  |
| West Virginia | 1.13 |  |  |  |  |
| Maryland | 2.2 |  |  |  |  |
| Virginia | 1.23 |  |  |  |  |
| Chicago Area |  | 23.90 | 32. 75 | 1. $30 \%$ | \$426,000 |
| Michigan | 3.1 |  |  |  |  |
| Indiana | 1.64 |  |  |  |  |
| Kentucky | . 59 |  |  |  |  |
| Illinois | 2. 83 |  |  |  |  |
| Wisconsin | . 88 |  |  |  |  |
| Minnesota | 2.1 |  |  |  |  |
| Iowa | . 68 |  |  |  |  |
| Missouri | 4.8 |  |  |  |  |
| Kansas and |  |  |  |  |  |
| North Dakota | . 53 |  |  |  |  |
| Nebraska | . 63 |  |  |  |  |
| South Dakota | . 12 |  |  |  |  |
| Atlanta Area |  | 11.12 | 15.23 | 1.20 | \$182, 700 |
| Tennessee | 1.81 |  |  |  |  |
| North Carolina | 1.29 |  |  |  |  |
| South Carolina | . 51 |  |  |  |  |
| Georgia | 4.43 |  |  |  |  |
| Florida | 2.16 |  |  |  |  |
| Alabama | . 76 |  |  |  |  |
| Mississippi | . 16 |  |  |  |  |
| Dallas Area |  | 8.69 | 11.9 | 2.68 | \$319,000 |
| Arkansas | . 59 |  |  |  |  |
| Louisiana | 1.59 |  |  |  |  |
| Texas | 5.72 |  |  |  |  |
| Oklahoma | . 64 |  |  |  |  |
| New Mexico | . 15 |  |  |  |  |
| Denver Area |  | 1.83 | 2.51 | 3. $20 \%$ | \$80, 300 |
| Montana | . 21 |  |  |  |  |
| Idaho, Wyoming, |  |  |  |  |  |
| Nevada | . 06 |  |  |  |  |
| Colorado | 1.26 |  |  |  |  |
| Utah | . 30 |  |  |  |  |
| San Francisco Area |  | 14.78 | 20.23 | 4.78 | \$967,000 |
| Washington | 1.5 |  |  |  |  |
| Oregon | . 82 |  |  |  |  |
| California | 12.2 |  |  |  |  |
| Arizona | . 26 |  | - |  |  |
| TOTAL |  |  | 137.100 | 1.687 | \$2,314,600 |
| * Estimated from Figure 2 in the text, using tariff mileage. |  |  |  |  |  |

[^4]
[^0]:    Source: Topics Publishing Company, New York, New York

[^1]:    1/ Point identification on Figure 2.
    2/ In cents per 100 pounds on the largest truckload commodity rate existing.

    3/ Minimum truckioad quantity in thousands of pounds.

[^2]:    1/ Average earnings before taxes for the Chemicals and Allied Products industry averaged $12 \%$ of sales in 1961, according to Quarterly Financial Report for Manufacturing Corporations, Federal Trade Commission.

    2/ A New York plant was used for all of the national sales. The method used to determine the annual freight bill is discussed in Appendix 3.

[^3]:    1/ Prorated according to population in the Atlanta market area for the part of the state that would be served from Atlanta.

[^4]:    hypothetical company with annual sales of $\$ 100,000,000$.

