



NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF RAILROAD PASSENGERS

Vol. 11, No. 9 September, 1977

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

Orren Beaty, President
Ross Capon, Executive Director
Thomas G. Crikelair, Assistant Director
Kim Tieger, Circulation Manager

Membership dues start at \$15/year (\$7.50 for those under 21 and over 65) and include a subscription to NEWS, published monthly except in November. Any material herein may be reproduced without permission. Credit to the source is requested.

(No. 8 was mailed September 27)

RETURN REQUESTED

ADAMS MEETS WITH NARP

U.S. Secretary of Transportation Brock Adams met for a full hour with ten members of the NARP Board and staff on September 21. The Secretary did much listening and note-taking, but there was no indication that his basic conviction about Amtrak funding was changed.

Adams believes that "we have not convinced the American public" or the Congress to support paying for Amtrak operating deficits of more than \$500 million per year. He said, "I think we're at the limit now," referring to \$500 million, which he also referred to as the level at which "new" programs (such as Amtrak) begin to interfere with other established programs and become more difficult to support.

NARP President Orren Beaty challenged Adams' reading of the sentiment in Congress, noting that there is considerable support for — and no organized opposition to — more funding for Amtrak. He pointed out that prospects for approval of such funding would be even better if the Secretary exercised leadership towards that end.

On the positive side, Adams was much more optimistic about prospects for future capital funding, saying that "you can always get new equipment" because the U.S. is oriented towards capital improvements and public works.

Woodruff M. Price, a special assistant to Adams who was

NARP members who wish to run for election to the NARP Board of Directors should indicate this to our Washington office as quickly as possible. The regional meetings at which elections are held will take place during early 1978. We expect to publish details in the next newsletter, along with the names of candidates we have received by then.

present during the meeting, repeated a suggestion he had made at the Amtrak Board meeting two days earlier: Amtrak should review its entire route structure at once rather than deal with one route at a time. He feels that, after six years of experience with the basic route structure, it is clear that some routes which are needed are not operating and other routes are operating which should be discontinued.

Also covered in the meeting was the need for improved rail passenger service on the Boston-New York "Inland Route"; the need for more rather than less service generally; labor utilization; energy considerations; and the problems which have delayed improvements to commuter rail service in the Washington area.

The NARP delegation included George Tyson of Baltimore, secretary; Joseph F. Horning, Jr., of the District of Columbia, treasurer; and Stanley H. Barriger, of Manchester, NH; Thomas C. Southerland, Jr., of Princeton, NJ; Samuel E. Stokes, Jr., of Alstead, NH; James M.S. Ullman, of Meriden, CT; and Rogers E.M. Whitaker of New York City.

EDITORIAL

The number one task of NARP members is to convince President Jimmy Carter and his Office of Management and Budget of the need for maintaining and expanding rail passenger service. **Keep letters and postcards urging support for an Amtrak FY 1978 supplemental appropriation of \$56.5 million coming to The President, The White House, Washington, D.C. 20500. Also, telephone the message to 202/456-1414.**

At the same time, continue to write to your legislators, at the following addresses:

The Honorable _____
U.S. Senate
Washington, D.C. 20510

The Honorable _____
U.S. House of Representatives
Washington, D.C. 20515

Some members of Congress are wavering in their support for Amtrak. To get the Democratically-controlled Congress to act against the wishes of a Democratic President requires extra work. Ask your legislators to contact the President on this issue as well.

Amtrak apparently will need a supplemental appropriation of \$38 million just to avoid making further service cutbacks beyond those already announced or implemented. Only the full \$56.5 million can turn around all of the cuts already announced.

NARP appreciates receiving copies of the replies which you
(continued on p. 4)

PEOPLE RIDE THESE TRAINS!

Most Amtrak users don't even know that their trains are in danger. This makes it all the more important that NARP members make their objections known. Are YOU prepared to sit back and watch as nearly all long-distance passenger trains are cut back to only three-days-per-week or less?

Questions have been raised about how it is that Amtrak management could have allowed a last-minute crisis of such dimensions to have arisen.

These questions need to be answered. But, meanwhile, what about the trains themselves? Are they being used? Are the people in the communities served by Amtrak ready to see this service cut back or eliminated?

One of the people disturbed by the magnitude of the cuts announced by Amtrak in early September was Silvio O. Conte (R-MA), ranking Republican on the House Appropriations Subcommittee on Transportation. In a statement issued Sept. 13, Conte said: "I want to determine whether the cuts were made on the basis of lack of ridership or whether they were made simply on the basis of lack of sufficient Congressional appropriations."

Rep. Conte emphasized that the Congress expected Amtrak to reduce only that service which could not be justified on the basis of ridership. "If the Appropriations provided will force Amtrak to cut further than that," Conte said, "Amtrak should so inform the Administration and the Congress, so that additional funds can be

(continued on p. 3)

FIGHT FOR SUPPLEMENTAL — II

On September 21 and 23, respectively, the House and Senate Appropriations Subcommittee on Transportation held briefings to hear from Amtrak and DOT regarding the Amtrak Board's September 19 vote to request a supplemental appropriation for FY 1978 of \$56.5 million (\$38 million of which is needed simply to prevent announcements of still more cutbacks).

Amtrak's presentation did not impress the legislators, and FRA Deputy Administrator Robert Gallamore disappointed them by his inability to give any Administration position beyond a statement of opposition to the Amtrak request. Gallamore's testimony was followed up with a September 27 letter to Rep. John McFall (D-CA), Chairman of the House subcommittee, from Secretary of Transportation Brock Adams.

The letter stated, in part: ". . .the Administration originally proposed an FY 1978 operating appropriation for Amtrak of \$500 million and subsequently appealed the House mark of \$488.5 million. The Conferees agreed to retain the House allowance and the Administration has accepted this Congressional decision in the context of funding constraints and overall Federal priorities. I think a consensus has been reached between the Congress and the Executive Branch that fiscal responsibility dictates that we hold the line for the present on Amtrak's budget.

We must ensure that Amtrak has achieved the optimum route structure and is operating efficiently before considering such large annual increases in operating funds that we have experienced in the past. We have supported raising the Amtrak appropriation back to the \$500 million requested but this option was not available when the Amtrak Board voted for the \$56.5 million request.

"In the Department's view, there have been no significant or uncontrollable changes in Amtrak's operating environment since President Reistrup testified last March that, '. . .based upon current estimates for FY 1978 the Corporation will be required to make further savings of \$29.6 million in order to operate within the \$500 million appropriation request. This is a feasible objective.'

"We are disappointed that the Corporation has only been able to partially implement the Congressionally approved Route and Service Criteria. The current frequency reductions have become necessary as a temporary measure partially because route restructurings have not been achieved on a timely basis. However, the Department, and I believe the Congress, expects that Amtrak should soon undertake a constructive systemwide application of the Route and Service Criteria, focusing not simply on reductions of expenditures but rather on reallocating in the most rational fashion the resources which are available for rail passenger service."

On September 28, the House Appropriations Committee approved a general supplemental bill with no money for Amtrak. Under House procedures, however, every bill must "get a rule" from the Rules Committee before it can go to the floor. Concerned about the absence of Amtrak funds in the bill, on Sept. 30 Reps. Christopher J. Dodd (D-CT), Shirley Chisholm (D-NY), Joe Moakley (D-MA), and B.F. Sisk (D-CA) were able to hold up Rules Committee clearance of the bill until they got a commitment that McFall's subcommittee would hold a formal hearing on the Amtrak request. This hearing was set for October 25.

Although the full House would likely begin consideration on October 11 of the general supplemental with no money for Amtrak, the scheduling of the October 25 committee hearing indicated that the House had made no decision — rather than a negative decision — regarding Amtrak. This increased the likelihood that the Senate Appropriations Committee, whose markup was expected soon after the full House acted, would include funds for Amtrak.

The possibility also existed that — if Congress could not

complete action on more funds for Amtrak before adjourning this year but prospects looked good for action early next year — a letter might be sent to Amtrak suggesting that it hold off on further cutbacks until the matter had been resolved.

The subcommittee briefings mentioned at the beginning of this article deserve further comment. Although Amtrak's Reistrup was supposedly there to defend the position his Board has taken, he did not do this. He made the same kind of presentations which he made to the Board, noting the effect on Amtrak service of the different funding alternatives. He said that his recommendation to the Board had been for \$45.6 million, but did not mention that he himself voted in the Board meeting in favor of the \$56.5 million (the only figure the Board actually voted on).

He stated that he had recommended the lower figure because it would put pressure on the Board to use the Route and Service Criteria. To his credit, he did note that pressure on the Board would remain even if the full request was approved.

Rep. Conte and Senators Clifford Case (R-NJ) and Lowell Weicker (R-CT), though generally supportive of Amtrak, raised some disturbing long-distance vs. corridor questions. Conte asked Reistrup if it was true that much of the Northeast Corridor service cutbacks could be restored by taking off only one long-distance train, and Reistrup replied in the affirmative. Rep. Robert Duncan (D-OR), on the other hand, looked favorably on the Northeast Corridor cuts and likened them to air service cuts made after the oil embargo which had led to higher passenger loads per airplane.

Reistrup strongly defended Amtrak's method of selecting the announced cutbacks against charges that they were designed to maximize pressure on Congress to provide more funds.

He said that the cuts were aimed at trains with high deficits per passenger mile and trains much of whose revenue could be retained on other trains on the same routes.

Reistrup also noted that any cuts beyond those already announced would "approach the point of being counterproductive." As an example, he explained that reduction of the Chicago-Oakland "San Francisco Zephyr" to tri-weekly, even just west of Denver, would cost Amtrak \$2.5 million in mail revenue (including connecting revenue on Eastern trains).

In response to questions from Rep. Max Baucus (D-MT), Reistrup said that he would not operate the "Empire Builder" daily during another winter unless new equipment was available.

PROGRESS AT UNION STATION

Although final plans are still incomplete, it appears that the Carter Administration has made some progress on straightening out the mess at the Washington, D.C., Union Station. In a letter to Sen. Warren Magnuson (D-WA), Chairman of the Senate Commerce Committee, Secretary of Transportation Brock Adams and Secretary of Interior Cecil D. Andrus outlined their agreement.

The National Visitor Center would continue to occupy 1/3 of the Union Station building (including the sunken theater in the front concourse), but the rest of the building would be devoted to ticketing, baggage handling, waiting rooms, and other railroad purposes. Most encouraging of all, serious consideration is still being given to bringing the tracks back to the old building (and thus removing the motel-style concourse in the new station). A consultant has found that this alternative — which would reduce the distance between the front of Union Station and the train platforms (now approximately 1/3 of a mile) — would cost about the same as most other alternatives under consideration.

PEOPLE RIDE THESE TRAINS! (cont'd. from p. 1)

provided through a Supplemental Appropriations bill."

NARP obtained check-point ridership data from Amtrak for the most recent period of time available — the first week of August. This data gives a good picture of just how many people Amtrak was able to serve during the middle of the summer season just past.

Let's look at two trains that Amtrak is considering cutting to three days a week if no supplemental funds are forthcoming—the Chicago-Oakland "San Francisco Zephyr" and the Chicago-Los Angeles "Southwest Limited."

The charts below show the highest check point passenger count for each day of the week, the capacities of the trains, and the percentages of spaces that were filled.

What the charts show is that these trains were running consistently either filled or very near to it. Given the fact of "no-shows," it is apparent that for most days they were completely sold out.

The numbers on these charts represent only those individuals who were able to obtain reserved space. How many potential passengers were turned away because no space was available?

Amtrak keeps a count of the number of requests for space which it turns down because a train has been fully booked. These figures are not a precise count of the actual number of persons turned away because, for example, the same person might call several times inquiring about one train. Even with this in mind, however, the numbers tell an interesting story about the public's demand for long-distance passenger trains.

We obtained figures for the second week in August. For the "San Francisco Zephyr", Aug. 8-14, the number of denied reservation requests for both east and westbound trains totaled: 1,312 coach seats, 357 first-class roomettes, and 566 bedrooms! For the "Southwest Limited", the totals were: 1,590 coach seats, 2,418 roomettes, 1,490 bedrooms, and 327 drawing rooms.

Our of curiosity, we asked about the New York-Florida trains for the same week, Aug. 8-14. Here is what we found —

number of denied requests for coach accommodations, Aug. 8-14

train	direction	number of denied requests
Silver Meteor	— southbound	8,353
	— northbound	8,943
Champion	— southbound	2,874
	— northbound	3,691
Silver Star	— southbound	3,775
	— northbound	3,025

The number of denied requests for travel between New York and Florida during this one week in August totaled 30,661!

A lot of people are going to be both perplexed and dismayed if the next time they call Amtrak they found that service has been cut back even further from its already inadequate levels. Amtrak, in conjunction with the Administration and the Congress, should be increasing the number of trains operating over established routes, not reducing them. In our view, it is the responsibility of those in Government to see to it that the public has available the kind of decent public transportation it wants and needs.

The NARP Executive Committee has approved the appointment of these people as new "At Large" members of the NARP Board of Directors: Stanley H. Barriger of Manchester, NH; F. Travers Burgess of St. Louis; George Falcon of Sepulveda, CA; and Oliver Jensen and Henry Luce III, both of New York City. The latter two formerly served as elected directors from Region II.

Those who continue as "At Large" directors are: J. Ford Bell of Minneapolis; Richard L. Day of Moscow, ID; Raymond E. Hannon of Dallas; Edwin C. Hutter of Princeton, NJ; Roy G. Poulsen of Kingston, RI; Robert W. Rynerson of Edmonton, Alberta; and Richard M. Scaife of Pittsburgh.

William J. Sunderman, of Charleston, IL, was appointed to the Region VII vacancy created by the resignation of William H. Bryan of Alton, IL.

The February and March newsletters list Board members who were elected at the regional meetings early this year.

Passenger counts at peak loading points on the westbound "San Francisco Zephyr."

August 1-7.

depar- ture	COACH			(check point)	FIRST CLASS			(check point)
	passengers	seats	%		passengers	beds	%	
Mon.	271	294	92.2	(Aurora)	62	64	96.9	(Denver)
Tues.		NO DATA				NO DATA		
Wed.	258	292	88.4	(Aurora)	83	88	94.3	(Denver)
Thurs.	289	290	99.7	(Denver)	55	66	83.33	(Denver/Cheyenne)
Fri.	225	294	76.5	(Denver)	57	64	89.1	(Chicago)
Sat.	283	294	96.3	(Denver)	63	66	95.5	(Denver)
Sun.	296	302	98.0	(Aurora/ Denver)	45	66	68.2	(Aurora/Denver)

Passenger counts at peak loading points on the westbound "Southwest Limited."

August 1-7.

depar- ture	COACH			(check point)	FIRST CLASS			(check point)
	passengers	seats	%		passengers	beds	%	
Mon.	337	352	95.7	(Dodge City)	97	100	97.0	(Albuquerque)
Tues.	243	352	69.0	(Dodge City)	60	66	90.9	(Dodge City)
Wed.	364	352	103.4	(Dodge City)	57	66	86.4	(Kansas City)
Thurs.	390	352	110.8	(Albuquerque)	65	66	98.5	(Albuquerque)
Fri.	364	352	103.4	(Dodge City)	73	88	83.0	(Barstow)
Sat.	286	352	81.3	(Fort Madison)	53	66	80.3	(Barstow)
Sun.	318	352	90.3	(Albuquerque)	70	88	79.5	(Barstow)

New England's Inland Route

When good intercity rail passenger service finally comes to Hartford, the entire Inland Route (Boston-New York via Worcester, Springfield, and Hartford), and the Amtrak system, NARP Director James M.S. Ullman, an attorney from Meriden, CT, will deserve more than an average share of the credit.

For ten years he has worked tirelessly on behalf of these causes, and two of his most spectacular accomplishments deserve special note. First, his column on the importance of the Inland Route was published in the *New York Times*' "Connecticut Weekly" section on July 31. The effectiveness of the column was increased by the inclusion of a big map showing all the population centers which Amtrak now serves poorly.

This column, and Ullman's other work, has inspired much other media coverage. The Middletown (CT) Press of August 16, for example, carried an editorial, "The Inland Rail Route", with that map and some quotations from Ullman, including this one: "There are four cities in New England with populations of roughly 160,000 (excluding Bridgeport), which would be served by trains on either route. Three of these cities, Hartford, Springfield, and Worcester are on the inland route. Only one of them is on the shoreline, Providence." The editorial also noted Ullman's view that "because of the large new population that would be served... a new inland route 'would not adversely affect the existing train service through Providence.'"

In response to the budget crisis, and the Amtrak service cuts which will hit the New Haven-Springfield line particularly hard, Ullman helped his Congressman, Rep. Ronald A. Sarasin (R-CT), organize a September 21 meeting on Capitol Hill between Amtrak officials and the Congresspeople whose districts are traversed by the Inland Route. The headline on Sarasin's news release was: "Sarasin, Ullman, Arrange Amtrak Cut Protest".

The meeting was chaired by Rep. Joe Moakley (D-MA). Other representatives in attendance included, besides Co-chairman Sarasin, Silvio O. Conte (R-MA), William R. Cotter (D-CT), Christopher J. Dodd (D-CT), Margaret M. Heckler (R-MA), Stewart B. McKinney (R-CT), and Anthony Toby Moffett (D-CT). In addition, other Congresspeople and Senators sent staff members.

From New England came public officials and others concerned about Inland Route service, including NARP Directors Ullman; Samuel E. Stokes, Jr., of Alstead, NH; and Stanley H. Barriger of Manchester, NH. They told the Amtrak and elected officials present that Amtrak's Inland Route service is programmed to fail. All but one of the Springfield/Hartford services require changes of trains in New Haven to reach New York City, and no through service is available to Worcester and the Boston area.

The key roles played subsequently by Reps. Dodd and Moakley (the two attendees who are on the House Rules Committee) in keeping alive hopes for a supplemental appropriation for Amtrak (See "Fight for Supplemental: II") may be due in part to the sense of urgency which the citizens conveyed at this meeting about the importance of obtaining better rail passenger service.

EDITORIAL (cont'd. from p. 1)

receive from your legislators and from the Administration, and thanks the many members who have already supplied such copies to us.

NARP believes that there is enough support in the Congress for rail passenger service to produce a supplemental appropriation, even without the leadership of Secretary Adams, but the dollar amount is uncertain.

Part of the problem with the Administration is the President's announced commitment to a balanced budget by FY 1981, which has a chilling effect on all spending increases. When the Office of Management and Budget is exceptionally tight-fisted, opportunities for changes in priorities are rare. The only way is to take funding away from some other projects — usually a politically difficult task.

Nevertheless, we urge the President to review the Amtrak situation very carefully, particularly in light of the energy crisis and of the opportunity to increase Amtrak's productivity (i.e., reduce its deficit per passenger mile) at higher frequency levels. (See the editorial in the July News.)

At least two comments made by the Secretary and his special assistant deserve note. First, Mr. Price reported that DOT had analyzed the cuts Amtrak has announced and found that Amtrak had generally made the right decisions — that is, ones which were based on economics rather than politics. At least this Administration is not playing the old game of "let's-divert-attention-from-the-need-for-more-money-by-claiming-Amtrak-made-cuts-in-the-wrong-places."

We think the accusations that Amtrak "played politics" in selecting the cuts simply illustrate the intense need for at least the pre-September 8 level of services. There are virtually no cuts which Amtrak could make without being accused of playing politics.

Second, the Secretary himself seemed optimistic about the future of Amtrak's capital budget. We would like to share that optimism. A healthy capital budget could, with good management (but also with higher operating subsidies than \$500 million), increase Amtrak's productivity and eventually bring about a decline in the operating deficits. Conversely, a continuation of the pattern to date of whittling back Amtrak's capital requests will lead to higher operating deficits than those shown in Amtrak's Five-Year Plan. (For FY 1978, the Plan called for \$316.8 million in capital grants and Amtrak will receive only \$108 million.)

As we have noted before, Amtrak has not helped matters. Relevant public officials and their staffs routinely complain about the quantity, quality, and timeliness of the information Amtrak makes available in support of its requests.

In the long run, the Administration must make the upgrading of Amtrak a prime goal.

But, in the short run, the people who depend on Amtrak service should not have to pay the ultimate penalty — loss of that service — because of shortcomings at L'Enfant Plaza.

U.S. POSTAL SERVICE STATEMENT OF OWNERSHIP, MANAGEMENT AND CIRCULATION (Required by 39 U.S.C. 3685)	
1. TITLE OF PUBLICATION News from Nat'l. Assoc. of Railroad Passengers	2. DATE OF FILING 9/77
3. FREQUENCY OF ISSUE Monthly except November	4. ANNUAL SUBSCRIPTION PRICE \$15.00-base rate
5. LOCATION OF KNOWN OFFICE OF PUBLICATION (Street, City, County, State and ZIP Code) (Not printers) 417 New Jersey Ave., SE, Washington, D.C. 20003	
6. NAMES AND COMPLETE ADDRESSES OF PUBLISHER, EDITOR, AND MANAGING EDITOR PUBLISHER (Name and Address) Orren Beatty, same address as #4 EDITOR (Name and Address) Ross Capon, same address as #4 MANAGING EDITOR (Name and Address)	
7. OWNER (If owned by a corporation, its name and address must be stated and also immediately thereunder the names and addresses of stockholders owning or holding 1 percent or more of total amount of stock. If not owned by a corporation, the names and addresses of the individual owners must be given. If owned by a partnership or other unincorporated firm, its name and address, as well as that of each individual must be given.)	
NAME National Association of Railroad Passengers	ADDRESS 417 New Jersey Ave., SE Washington, DC 20003
8. KNOWN BONDHOLDERS, MORTGAGEES, AND OTHER SECURITY HOLDERS OWNING OR HOLDING 1 PERCENT OR MORE OF TOTAL AMOUNT OF BONDS, MORTGAGES OR OTHER SECURITIES (If there are none, so state)	
NAME N.A.R.P. is an Illinois not-for-profit corporation and has no stockholders or other security holders. It is a membership organization.	
9. FOR COMPLETION BY NONPROFIT ORGANIZATIONS AUTHORIZED TO MAIL AT SPECIAL RATES (Section 132.122, PSN) The purpose, function, and nonprofit status of this organization and the exempt status for Federal income tax purposes (Check one)	

<input type="checkbox"/> HAVE NOT CHANGED DURING PRECEDING 12 MONTHS <input type="checkbox"/> HAVE CHANGED DURING PRECEDING 12 MONTHS (If changed, publisher must submit explanation of change with this statement.)		
10. EXTENT AND NATURE OF CIRCULATION	AVERAGE NO. COPIES EACH ISSUE DURING PRECEDING 12 MONTHS	ACTUAL NO. COPIES OF SINGLE ISSUE PUBLISHED NEAREST TO FILING DATE
A. TOTAL NO. COPIES PRINTED (Net Press Run)	7,691	8,600
B. PAID CIRCULATION 1. SALES THROUGH DEALERS AND CARRIERS, STREET VENDORS AND COUNTER SALES	None	None
2. MAIL SUBSCRIPTIONS	5,474	6,456
C. TOTAL PAID CIRCULATION (Sum of 10B1 and 10B2)	5,474	6,456
D. FREE DISTRIBUTION BY MAIL, CARRIER OR OTHER MEANS SAMPLES, COMPLIMENTARY, AND OTHER FREE COPIES	1,687	1,760
E. TOTAL DISTRIBUTION (Sum of C and D)	7,161	8,216
F. COPIES NOT DISTRIBUTED 1. OFFICE USE, LEFT OVER, UNACCOUNTED, SPOILED AFTER PRINTING	530	384
2. RETURNS FROM NEWS AGENTS	None	None
G. TOTAL (Sum of E, F1 and 2—should equal net press run shown in A)	7,691	8,600
11. I certify that the statements made by me above are correct and complete.		
SIGNATURE AND TITLE OF EDITOR, PUBLISHER, BUSINESS MANAGER, OR OWNER <i>Ross B. Capon</i> Executive Director		
12. FOR COMPLETION BY PUBLISHERS MAILING AT THE REGULAR RATES (Section 132.121, Postal Service Manual) 39 U.S.C. 3626 provides in pertinent part: "No person who would have been entitled to mail matter under former section 4359 of this title shall mail such matter at the rates provided under this subsection unless he files annually with the Postal Service a written request for permission to mail matter at such rates." In accordance with the provisions of this statute, I hereby request permission to mail the publication named in Item 1 at the phased postage rates presently authorized by 39 U.S.C. 3626.		
SIGNATURE AND TITLE OF EDITOR, PUBLISHER, BUSINESS MANAGER, OR OWNER <i>Ross B. Capon</i> Executive Director		