



NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF RAILROAD PASSENGERS

Vol. 14, No. 2 February, 1980

417 New Jersey Avenue, S.E., Washington, D.C. 20003
202-546-1550

OFFICERS: John R. Martin, *President*; George Tyson, *Secretary*
Joseph F. Horning, Jr., *Treasurer*

STAFF: Ross Capon, *Executive Director*; Barry Williams,
Assistant Director; Kay Stortz, *Circulation Manager*

Membership dues start at \$15/year (\$7.50 for those under 21 and over 65) of which \$4.00 is for the subscription to NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF RAILROAD PASSENGERS NEWS, published monthly except in November.

(No. 1 was mailed Mar. 6)

RETURN REQUESTED

PHOENIX COMMUTER RAIL!

Amtrak began providing commuter rail service on Southern Pacific's 16-mile Phoenix-Tempe-Mesa, AZ, line Feb. 25 after Salt River flooding forced closure of 8 out of 10 Phoenix highway bridges. The service is financed by the Arizona Department of Transportation.

Six Amcoaches with 504 seats and a locomotive at each end for quick turn-around are making five weekday round-trips Phoenix-Mesa plus a sixth Phoenix-Tempe (8 miles one-way). The train operates from 5:30 AM to 10 PM with 15-minute layovers at the end-points except for two longer midday layovers, 55 minutes and 120 minutes. A record of efficient utilization most railroaders would envy!

"Amtrak is one place where we have urged Congress to reassess spending. . . It's a question whether the public should subsidize rail passenger service when that may not be the most efficient system."

—DOT Asst. Secy. William B. Johnston, at Feb. 28 TAA panel discussion, quoted in Mar. 10 Traffic World

The service is to end when enough bridges reopen, probably in late March, but it is so popular that some—including Phoenix Vice Mayor Joy Carter and the chairman of the Arizona House Ways and Means Committee, Peter Dunn (R-Phoenix)—would like it made permanent. Ridership jumped from 3,940 on Day One to

5,348 on Day Three when the sixth coach was added, and some individual trips have carried 800 passengers.

Arizona Gov. Bruce Babbitt said, "I had forgotten how much fun it was to ride on a train." His last trip was about 20 years ago. But he said permanent service "is not in the cards for the immediate future. The population densities are too low to support, on a continuing basis, a commuter train." (*The Arizona Republic*, Feb. 24).

But the Phoenix SMSA population is 1.3 million, about the same as Portland, OR, and larger than Buffalo. Both of those cities are building light-rail systems with exclusive-use rights-of-way, so it would not seem out of line for Phoenix to have a less ambitious commuter rail service sharing tracks with freight.

Environmentalists nationwide will observe the 10th anniversary of Earth Day—a chance for you to promote passenger trains. Earth Day '80 (1638 R St., NW, Washington, D.C. 20009, 202/293-2550) has a list of planned activities.

Senators from MO, IL, IN, OH, and PA (except Danforth, Lugar, Schweiker) have written to their governors urging restoration of the "National Ltd." via Sec. 403b (20% state funding). NARP members in those states may wish to write similar letters.

79 MPH CORRIDORS LOOK GOOD!

Yet another study supports NARP's longstanding claim that the U.S. has many corridors where 79 mph passenger trains are economically feasible. But this one is by the Federal Railroad Administration and Amtrak and has an above-average chance of leading to action.

"Rail Passenger Corridors: Analysis of Potential Improvements" was released Feb. 22 and covers 13 of 19 corridors which FRA and Amtrak have promised to study (see table). It is available from Amtrak Government Affairs, 400 N. Capitol St., NW, Washington, D.C. 20001.

The report estimates that all 13 corridors would better the maximum 9¢ avoidable-cost-per-passenger-mile and minimum 80 passenger-miles-per-trainmile criteria in the 1979 Amtrak authorization, and all but one would make positive contributions towards the Congressionally mandated goal that Amtrak's revenues cover 50% of "operating expenses, excluding depreciation . . . by the end of fiscal year 1985."

For each corridor, 12 scenarios were examined: 3, 6, and 12 daily round-trips at 79 and 110 mph top speeds with 1985 gasoline costs of \$1.40 and \$2.50/gallon in today's dollars. In addition, the report examined a 10% gasoline supply shortfall with gasoline at \$1.40, 79 mph, and 6 RT's. The report states: "Generally speaking,

even modest increases in frequency may be more effective in increasing ridership than increasing maximum speed from 79 mph to 110 mph."

The numbers in our table may be conservative for three reasons: no gasoline supply shortfall was assumed though the report says a 10% shortfall at \$1.40/gallon would bring more passengers to the rails than would \$2.50/gallon with no shortfall; a uniform frequency was assumed throughout any given corridor but economics might be improved with variations (i.e. more trains between Chicago-Indianapolis than Indianapolis-Cincinnati);

(continued on page 4)

TRAVELERS' ADVISORY

By Apr. 15, Amtrak hopes to have all-electric heating/AC on the NY/Washington-Chicago "Broadway Ltd." The first of three newly-renovated trainsets was to be introduced Mar. 17. From Apr. 27, the NY and Washington sections will be switched in Philadelphia instead of Harrisburg.

Because of further delays of Superliner deliveries, Amtrak is not predicting when the second long-distance train will get the new cars, but the Chicago-Seattle "Empire Builder" will run daily from June 15, including sleeping cars.

Carter on Public Transport

On Sept. 25, 1979, President Carter became the first U.S. president to address the American Public Transit Association, the trade organization for mass transit operators and manufacturers. NARP members may wish to write or phone (202/456-2852) the President to remind him of what he said, particularly in light of the following:

- On Jan. 28, President Carter submitted to Congress an FY 1981 budget with \$650 million for Amtrak operations (Amtrak needs the authorized \$674.9 million), \$23 million for state-supported trains (\$29 million was authorized), and \$250 million for capital investment and labor protection (\$256 million was authorized).

- On Feb. 28, William B. Johnston, Assistant DOT Secretary for Policy and International Affairs (who was, until recently, on the White House domestic policy staff, in charge of transportation policy analysis) participated in a panel discussion sponsored by the Transportation Association of America. He was quoted in the Mar. 3 Journal of Commerce: "There is a question whether or not the public is going to continue to subsidize rail passenger service when it is not the most efficient way of moving people around. We are overinvesting in rapid rail transit systems. I think rail investments deserve critical analysis," he said, noting that capital expenditures are often not accompanied by any serious effort to move travelers out of autos and into the new rapid transit system. "In terms of our country's health, the freight system is at the heart of it," he said. "We should give our earliest attention to the highway system. We cannot continue to over-invest in rapid transit or we will reach a stage where our highway system is equally as 'fine' as our rail system," he said.

(NARP is not happy with the costly goldplating of new rail transit systems as in San Francisco and Washington, but the answer is to use more economical approaches, including light rail and commuter rail. This way, more route miles could be put in service at less cost—and sooner. The answer is not to divert funding from rail to road projects, since the superiority of rail over bus transit in attracting riders stands without serious challenge.)

- On Sun., Mar. 2, The Washington Post reported: "President Carter has asked his aides to come up with at least \$20 billion worth of spending cuts this week that would allow him, if he chooses, to balance the 1981 federal budget. . . . As part of a broad economic policy review begun a week ago, all federal agencies were asked on Friday to report by tomorrow morning where they would prefer to make cuts in their programs."

- On Tues., Mar. 4, the Post said that, in response to that request, Federal agencies had submitted cuts totalling "about \$10 billion for (FY) 1981" including "about \$90 million from the Department of Transportation, from highway, airport and rail construction projects." The Post also referred to an effort to find "about \$4 billion worth of cuts this fiscal year," which would mean cuts of \$8 billion at an annual rate, since FY '80 will be half over on Mar. 31.

Here is the full text of the President's speech—less dated references to the Windfall Profits Tax fight—delivered at the APTA annual convention in New York City:

I am glad to be here in New York—this great city that is, among so many other superlatives, the mass transit capital of the world. And I am glad to be in the same room with so many people who agree with me that public transit is one of the keys to the future of the United States.

We can no longer afford to think of public transportation as something we might get around to one day once all the superhighways and cloverleaves are built.

This Nation is in the throes of an energy crisis—a crisis of dangerous overdependence on foreign oil—a crisis that affects every American.

In a few blunt words, that is why strong public mass transit is important to all citizens of this country, no matter where they may live. In cities and small towns, among suburbanites and rural dwellers; subway riders and pickup truck drivers—we all have an interest in public transit because we all have an interest in solving the problem of energy. And we will solve that problem. The subways, buses, and trolleys of America will help to carry America to a future of energy security.

In my first energy speech as President, I told the American people bluntly that the era of cheap, abundant energy and wasteful consumption was over. I was warned that it would not be good politics. Nobody likes bad news. But I was determined then, as I am now, to level with the American people. I called the energy crisis the moral equivalent of war. It was not easy to get the message across. But today, two and a half years after that speech, millions of Americans know from their own hard experience that I was not exaggerating.

Not too long ago the U.S. was a net oil-exporting nation. By 1973, when the OPEC oil embargo hit, we were importing a third of the oil we used. But we failed to come to grips with the underlying problem that OPEC began to exploit. Instead, through a complicated system of price controls, we tried to insulate ourselves from the realities of a global economy.

It didn't work. In fact it encouraged our illusions about cheap energy and actually made our dependence worse—so that this year we are importing almost half the oil we use.

And because OPEC has continued to take advantage of the industrial world's thirst for oil to jack up prices, the dollars have flowed out even faster than the oil has flowed in. In 1973 we were paying out \$7 billion for foreign oil. This year we could pay out \$70 billion—ten times as much.

When those billions of dollars flow out of our country, American jobs flow right out after them. And when those millions of barrels of foreign oil flow in, so does inflation. Without the astronomical rise in energy costs, in fact, the inflation rate would be more than a third lower than it is right now.

Our economic well-being is at stake, and so is our political freedom of action. We are vulnerable to interruptions in oil supply that could strike at any time. And the competition for oil supplies is a strain on our alliances.

Dependence on foreign oil threatens our economy. It threatens our security. It threatens our very future. Therefore we must stop and then reverse its growth. Public transit can help us do that.

Thirty-five years ago, at the close of the Second World War, this country could claim some of the finest transit systems in the world. Those transit systems were more than just a way to get from one place to another—they helped structure a compact, efficient pattern of land development—and this contributed to a sense of community, a feeling that brought neighbors together in a common sense of place. Our transit systems were a vital connecting link that helped to form our way of life.

But in the years after World War II, we let that connecting link erode. Because we did not recognize its worth, we valued it too little. Because we did not measure its contribution, we ignored it too much. And because we could not imagine its absence, we hardly noticed its decline.

As we turned our attention to the construction of a vast network of superhighways, we began to operate on a set of unspoken, unacknowledged assumptions.

We assumed that the United States was floating on an endless sea of 20-cent-a-gallon gasoline. We assumed that bigger always

meant better—and that nothing could be better than a long, chrome-plated convertible with a gas-guzzling V-8 under the hood. We assumed that the only respectable way to get a 160-pound human being from point A to point B was wrap him in two tons of metal with an engine powerful enough to drive a tank.

So we began to lose our public transportation systems. One by one, city by city, the systems fell prey to decay and neglect.

Now we know that was a mistake. Now we recognize the value of mass transit. And now—as the battle for American energy security is joined—we stand committed to the rediscovery and revitalization of America's transit systems.

We embarked on that rediscovery. We began that revitalization. Federal support for public transportation now stands at the highest point ever.

I proposed, and the Congress passed, the most far-reaching surface transit bill in our history—giving it a higher priority than ever before.

Under our comprehensive urban policy—the Nation's first—cities and towns are now working with private enterprise and the Federal government to make transit an integral part of urban redevelopment.

There is a good example just a few blocks from here, at Grand Central Terminal—where a \$10 million Federal grant will help tie in several forms of public transit with a new mall, a new hotel, and the surrounding area of shops and offices.

During the fuel shortage this summer we kept the trains and buses fueled and rolling. We will keep them rolling. America's public transit systems will continue to have the fuel they need.

When I was looking for a new Secretary of Transportation, I looked all over America for a person who would come to Washington as a strong advocate of public transit. I found that person in Neil Goldschmidt—who worked as a leader on our nation's transportation problems and whose commitment to mass transit produced extraordinary results in Portland during his term as Mayor.

We have made a strong start, but I am here today to tell you that we have got to do more—much more.

Our Nation's investment in public transit during the 1970s came to \$15 billion. We must now take a quantum jump. With the energy proposals I have presented to the Congress, this Nation will invest \$50 billion in public transportation during the decade of the 1980s.

Our goal is to add 15 million passengers per day to the buses, streetcars and subways of our cities and communities. We will double the production of buses—the only form of mass transit in 97 per cent of America's cities.

We will step up the modernization and refurbishment of existing rapid transit. For example, New York's subway system is the senior citizen of underground rail travel—the IRT is 75 years old this year. But when Ed Koch and Harold Fisher and I get through with it—with the tools we are fighting to get the Congress to give us—it won't look a day over sweet sixteen.

We will speed up construction of new rail lines already approved or under way in other American cities.

We will build subways, elevated trains, trolleys, people movers and commuter trains. We will repair track beds, modernize stations, improve signalling and control systems, replace aging rail cars, expand the size of fleets, extend lines into new areas, and encourage new technologies.

In short, we will reclaim America's transit systems.

Over the long term, the energy savings will be massive. Those savings will result not only from getting folks out of cars and onto buses and trains, but also from the patterns of development that public transit will encourage. Public transit means good living for people in downtown areas and more efficient housing development—which in turn means less waste of fuel for heating and cooling. And better mass transit will give us an insurance policy against lack of mobility in the future gasoline crunches that will surely come.

Better mass transit will help us attack a whole range of critical, interrelated problems—not just energy, but also inflation, unemployment, the health of our environment and the vitality of our cities.

Public transit means cleaner air. It means less noise. It means stronger, more livable cities. It means more mobility and more opportunity for everybody, especially those who need it the most—the young, the old, the handicapped, minorities and the poor.

And public transit means jobs. The energy mass transit initiative I have proposed will put Americans to work. I am not talking about a few hundred jobs for bureaucrats and administrators, but an average of 40,000 jobs a year, at all levels of skill, throughout the 1980s.

Clearly, public transportation is a critical part of the overall assault that I have directed against this nation's energy dilemma. Just as clearly, our transit investments cannot do the job alone.

Those investments must be part of a comprehensive program. And that is exactly what I have proposed:

A program that makes conservation a part of everyday life. A program that develops alternative forms of energy, especially those plentiful sources that are ours to control, such as coal—and the most plentiful source of all, the sun. A program that gets vital energy projects built without endless red tape and processing delays—and also without compromising our commitment to a clean environment. A program that offers some help for the poor among us, on whom the most cruel blows of skyrocketing energy costs will fall.

This program, together with our transit initiative, can take us to our national goal of energy security.

But for this program to succeed, the Congress absolutely must approve one major element—the Windfall Profits Tax. . . .

Cutting our reliance on foreign oil will curb inflation, strengthen our dollar and stimulate new jobs. Public transportation is part of this chain of support—saving energy, adding jobs, and improving the overall quality of life in our nation's cities.

We are about to enter a new decade, carrying with us the lessons of the past and the hopes and aspirations of all Americans. The choices ahead are difficult, and we cannot avoid making them. I believe in the decency and courage of the American people. I believe that we have the material, moral and spiritual strength to meet any challenge.

Together, in the years ahead, we can seize control of our own destiny, and make sure that America will remain what America is today—the greatest nation on earth.

Transport 2000 Canada

(continued from last issue)

T2000 was also accorded official recognition by Canada's rail regulators when the Railway Transport Committee of the Canadian Transport Commission included these provisions in its Nov. 8, 1979, decision denying Canadian National Railways' application to discontinue Regina-Saskatoon-Prince Albert passenger services: "(e) In order to determine a future role for the service, VIA Rail then should set up a group to include provincial government agencies and enterprises, Transport 2000 Saskatchewan, railway unions, municipalities and other interested parties, to examine the issues of intermodal coordination, infrastructure, energy, financing, etc.; (f) VIA should. . . (keep) the Committee

informed of the deliberations of the above-mentioned group; (g) At the end of the one-year experimental period, the service should continue in operation until the Committee has evaluated the results of the experiment and the findings of the above-mentioned group and has determined whether the service should continue."

Michael Jackson, President of Transport 2000 Saskatchewan, had this reaction in a letter in the group's January newsletter: "We have been listened to and given a chance; now we must act. After some initial foot-dragging, the provincial government appears to be ready to participate in the advisory group, but S.T.C. (the bus company) still needs to be persuaded to share in the experiment and stop viewing rail as a threat. VIA Rail has welcomed the idea of the advisory group and will provide the necessary resources. The

City of Prince Albert, now a Transport 2000 member, is an enthusiastic supporter of the plan for improved rail service. Transport 2000's role will be the vital one of a catalyst and stimulus to the other parties, pressing for a sensible, intermodal public transport system. . . ."

T2000 has joined with Transit Ottawa, another consumer group, to produce a mammoth quarterly newsletter, Trans-Action (Sept. was 52 pages!), with funding from the Samuel and Saidye Bronfman Family Foundation of Montreal. It is well worth the modest cost to NARP members: \$5 if you include the figures on the key (top) line of the mailing label on your NARP News, to Transport 2000, PO Box 300, Station A, Ottawa, Ontario, Canada.

Transport 2000 Canada and NARP are affiliated with Transport 2000 International; other affiliates are in France, UK, Norway, and Switzerland, usually named T2000 followed by the name of the country.

79 MPH Corridors *(continued from page 1)*

and "it was assumed that doubling of frequency would probably generate 70% more traffic, from 3 to 6 daily round trips, and 40% more traffic, from 6 to 12 daily round trips" although this is "conservative in view of Amtrak's experience where frequency has been increased (such as Los Angeles-San Diego, New York-Buffalo, and others) and on observed ridership changes in the Northeast Corridor."

Two factors not detailed in the report can have dramatic impacts on ridership: the quality of big-city station locations, and the extent to which the corridor connects with other short- and long-distance services.

The importance of good downtown stations is reflected in a June 17, 1977, letter from VIA Rail Canada President J. Frank Roberts to Michael Jackson, chairman of the Saskatchewan Rail Committee (now Transport 2000 Saskatchewan): "In Saskatoon, the Canadian National passenger terminal was relocated five miles from the downtown core in 1965 and this resulted in a decline of 75% in Regina-Saskatoon rail patronage within 1½ years. . . .In Ottawa, the joint CN-CP passenger terminal was relocated from its downtown site to Alta Vista in the eastern outskirts in 1967. In 1968, Ottawa-Montreal rail passenger traffic fell by 45%. In 1976, Palais Station in Quebec City was closed, replaced by a CN station in Ste-Foy on the outskirts of Quebec and a CP

Most Favorable FRA/Amtrak Estimate For Each Route: Assumes Gasoline at \$2.50/gallon (FY '80 dollars), Top Speed 79 mph, and Frequency 6 Daily Round-Trips Except as Noted.

Route*	Ratio of Revenue to Long Term Avoidable Cost	Short Term Avoidable Profit or (Loss)/Passenger-Mile
Los Angeles-San Diego (12 RT's)	90%**	1¢
Los Angeles-Las Vegas (3 RT's)	90%	1¢
New York-Buffalo	88%	1¢
Washington-Richmond (3 RT's)	79%	(5¢)***
Texas Triangle	77%	(1¢)
Chicago-Detroit	74%	(1¢)
Chicago-St. Louis (3 or 6 RT's)	67%**	(3¢)
Miami-Jacksonville	66%	(3¢)
Chicago-Twin Cities (3 or 6 RT's)	62%	(4¢)
Chicago-Cleveland	62%	(4¢)
Seattle-Portland (3 RT's)	57%**	(5¢)
Chicago-Cincinnati	57%**	(5¢)
Sacramento-Oakland-San Jose	49%	(8¢)

*By early April, FRA and Amtrak are expected to release estimates for Atlanta-Nashville, Atlanta-Savannah, Cleveland-Cincinnati, and Philadelphia-Atlantic City. FRA will also release the work of its consultants on Boston-Springfield-New Haven and Philadelphia-Harrisburg.

**These routes looked better at 110 mph (6 RT's): LA-San Diego 92%; Chicago-St. Louis 73%; Seattle-Portland 62%; Chicago-Cincinnati 58%.

***With 6 RT's, the Washington-Richmond loss was only 1¢/PM and the ratio was 75%.

station in St-Sacremet. Indications are to date that Montreal-Quebec carryings have decreased by 15%."

From Sept. 1978 to Sept. 1979, Amtrak's Schenectady ridership jumped 63.6%. Since the New York-Buffalo line overall was up only 21.6% at the same time, it seems clear that relocation of passenger facilities from suburban Colonie to downtown Schenectady was the major factor in the ridership gain there.

Historically, intercity passenger trains (and all public transport!) were heavily used by people making connections. A large portion of riders leaving Cincinnati on Chicago-bound New York Central trains would change at Indianapolis for the St. Louis train. Amtrak recently discovered the continuing importance of the "network" effect when it estimated that extending a Chicago-Detroit run to Toledo to connect with the "Lake Shore" for the East would add more revenues than costs! With the connection at Toledo, the train would be more evenly filled throughout its run instead of getting steadily emptier as it moved further away from what is now its only rail transfer point—Chicago.

The network concept also affects costs. Sacramento-San Jose is at the bottom of the table not for lack of demand but because it is short (129 miles), doesn't have existing Amtrak terminals at either end, and fixed facility costs are consequently high per route mile.

Four crucial factors are converging to encourage early action on corridor service improvements: the technical finding that moderate-speed/moderate-cost trains are justified; the fact that the economics are better for "networks" of services than isolated lines; the need to serve many geographical areas in order to forge a viable political coalition in Congress; and the strong and growing interest among members of the general public, state governments, legislators, and Amtrak management.

The House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Subcommittee on Transportation and Commerce has held four hearings on the concept: in San Diego, Sacramento, Atlantic City, and Washington. At the Washington hearing on Feb. 28, Amtrak President Alan S. Boyd said it is time to proceed with detailed engineering surveys that would lead to trackwork. He said that if more time had been available in which to do the report, which was released just over 4 months after it had been requested, it would have been thicker and more expensive and would have said essentially the same thing.

Federal Railroad Administrator John Sullivan, in contrast, wanted more detailed marketing studies and no track engineering studies at this time. This, of course, would permit further postponement of trackwork and service improvements.

NARP is pushing for legislation that will include trackwork in FY 1981, making use of revenues from the Windfall Profits Tax, but may encounter resistance from both House and Senate authorizing committees. House members who are supporting fast action include Commerce Chairman Harley O. Staggers (D-WV), John D. Dingell (D-MI) of Detroit who is expected to succeed Staggers as chairman next year, Lionel Van Deerlin (D-CA) of San Diego, Robert T. Matsui (D-CA) of Sacramento, and Harold T. Johnson (D-CA) of Roseville.

And 33 out of 43 California representatives, including erstwhile Amtrak opponent Barry Goldwater, Jr., signed a letter to House Subcommittee Chairman James J. Florio (D-NJ) and Ranking Minority Member Edward R. Madigan (R-IL) supporting eventual development of the entire Sacramento-San Diego corridor. The letter said, "We realize, however, that there are other worthy projects around the nation, and that you are laboring under severe budget constraints. A good start on a California rail corridor can be made by providing construction funds to improve and increase service on the San Diego-Oxnard and San Francisco-Sacramento routes. . . .The time for study is past and the time to start building an alternative means of transportation is here. While we do not begrudge the Northeast the \$2.5 billion federal expenditure for rail service improvement, we emphasize that other parts of the country need good rail service, too. . . .Let's get the work underway."

Please forgive your Quaker editor for misidentifying Judge John Garrett Penn as Judge William Penn in explaining the C.T. Babers quotation (Jan. News, p. 2).