



News from the

# National Association of Railroad Passengers

Vol. 27, No. 10  Oct.-Nov. 1993

RETURN REQUESTED

John R. Martin, Pres.; Eugene Skoropowski, Vice Pres.; Robert Glover, Sec.; Joseph Horning, Jr., Treas.; Ross Capon, Exec. Dir.; Scott Leonard, Asst. Dir.; Jane Colgrove, Membership Dir.; Harriet Parcels, Transp. Assoc.

News from the National Association of Railroad Passengers (ISSN 0739-3490), is published monthly except November by NARP, 900 Second Street, N.E., Suite 308, Washington, DC 20002, (202) 408-8362. ©1993 National Association of Railroad Passengers. All rights reserved. Membership dues are \$24/year (\$12.00 under 21 or over 65) of which \$5 is for a subscription to NARP NEWS. For the latest rail passenger news, call the NARP Hotline: 1-900-988-RAIL (\$1.20 per minute, most messages last 4 minutes; service available 24 hours a day; callers under 18 must have parental permission to use this service; updated at least every Friday PM).

**Postmaster:** send address changes to National Association of Railroad Passengers, 900 Second Street, NE, Suite 308, Washington, DC 20002.

(This has news through Oct. 15. Vol. 27 No. 9 was mailed 1st class Oct. 8.)

Second Class Postage Paid  
At Washington, D.C.

## Funding Bills in Conference

### TRAVELERS' ADVISORY

As soon as House-Senate appropriations conferees reached agreement, Amtrak was expected to give two weeks' notice for:

- Reducing the "Pioneer" to tri-weekly west of Denver. Trips would originate in Seattle M/W/Sa, in Chicago Su/Tu/F.

- Making the "Texas Eagle" tri-weekly below St. Louis. Trips would start in Houston and San Antonio Su/Tu/Th and start in Chicago Su/Tu/F. This coincides with existing "Sunset Ltd." connection days but, as NARP told Amtrak, means Amtrak's first-ever abandonment of the popular Friday afternoon departure from Texas north. ("Sunset" days of operation were changed when "Eagle" went daily and are not being readjusted now.)

- Replacing the "River Cities" with a St. Louis-Centralia (IL) bus.

If Amtrak gets less than \$351 mill. for FY '94 operations, the "hit list" will lengthen.

Amtrak also is seeking public comments (due Oct. 30 at Amtrak Harrisburg Service, PO Box 2709, Washington, DC 20013-2709) on its plan to eliminate three "Section 403(d)" Philadelphia-Harrisburg trains—5:35a and 6:35a from Harrisburg and 5:35p from Philadelphia—and to restructure the rest of the service Nov. 1. Pennsylvania—now that its 403(b) trains are in the "basic system"—may pay Amtrak to keep the 403(d)'s running.

NARP asked Amtrak to post *informative* notices so the public could comment intelligently. NARP calculated that, overall, Amtrak proposed to reduce the number of Philadelphia-Harrisburg round-trips by only one a week, while *increasing* New York-Harrisburg by 11 a week. NARP expressed the hope that Pennsylvania's "renewed interest" portended aggressive state actions to recover short-distance traffic that has left this line in the past 12 years.

### Senate Approves Higher Amtrak Funding

The full Senate approved HR 2750, the 1994 transportation appropriations bill, with the numbers included in NARP Pres. John Martin's Sept. 29 letter to NARP members—overall, 15% more intercity rail passenger funding than was enacted for 1993 (18% more counting \$28 million for maglev). The Senate approved the bill Oct. 6 on a 90-9 vote. (Federal Fiscal Year 1994 began Oct. 1, when the Dept. of Transportation and many other agencies began operating on a continuing resolution good through Oct. 21.)

The Senate Appropriations Subcommittee on Transportation, chaired by Frank R. Lautenberg (D-NJ), and the full committee, chaired by Robert B. Byrd (D-WV), approved HR 2750 on Sept. 29.

Earlier, on Sept. 23, the House passed its version of HR 2750 by a vote of 312-89 without changing committee-approved figures reported here before. House intercity rail passenger funding was 22% *below* the 1993 level.

A conference committee, consisting mainly of members of the House and Senate transportation appropriations subcommittees, was expected to agree on a single bill by mid-Oct.

**LATE FLASH! Conferees Oct. 15 approved \$351.7 mill. for operations (\$.7 mill. for NC's new "Piedmont"), \$195 mill. for capital, \$225 mill. for NECIP, \$20 mill. for maglev and \$3.5 mill. for high speed rail.**

The Senate increases were in capital investment—a much higher Amtrak capital figure, inclusion of Northeast Corridor Improvement Project (NECIP) funding for high-speed train sets and safety-related Manhattan tunnel work, and funding for the Clinton Administration's high-speed corridor improvement program.

The Senate held Amtrak operations at \$351 million, the 1993 level. Assuming House-Senate conferees agreed on

continued on page 3



NEW YORK

1. Hochbrueckner (D)	••
2. Lazio (R)	••
3. King (R)	••
4. Levy (R)	••
5. Ackerman (D)	••
6. Flake (D)	••
7. Manton (D)	••
8. Nadler (D)	••
9. Schumer (D)	••
10. Towns (D)	••
11. Owens (D)	••
12. Velazquez (D)	# #
13. Molinari (R)	
14. Maloney (D)	••
15. Rangel (D)	••
16. Serrano (D)	# #
17. Engel (D)	••
18. Lowey (D)	••
19. Fish (R)	••
20. Gilman (R)	••
21. McNulty (D)	••
22. Solomon (R)	•
23. Boehler (R)	••
24. McHugh (R)	•
25. Walsh (R)	•
26. Hinchey (D)	••
27. Paxon (R)	
28. Slaughter (D)	••
29. LaFalce (D)	# #
30. Quinn (R)	••
31. Houghton (R)	••

NORTH CAROLINA

1. Clayton (D)	• #
2. Valentine (D)	• #
3. Lancaster (D)	
4. Price (D)	••
5. Neal (D)	•
6. Coble (R)	
7. Rose (D)	••
8. Hefner (D)	••
9. McMillan (R)	••
10. Ballenger (R)	
11. Taylor (R)	•
12. Watt (D)	••

NORTH DAKOTA

AL Pomeroy (D)	••
----------------	----

OHIO

1. Mann (D)	••
2. Portman (R)	
3. Hall (D)	••
4. Oxley (R)	•
5. Gillmor (R)	
6. Strickland (D)	••
7. Hobson (R)	•
8. Boehner (R)	

9. Kaptur (D)	# #
10. Hoke (R)	•
11. Stokes (D)	••
12. Kasich (R)	
13. Brown (D)	••
14. Sawyer (D)	# •
15. Pryce (R)	•
16. Regula (R)	••
17. Traficant (D)	••
18. Applegate (D)	••
19. Fingerhut (D)	••

OKLAHOMA

1. Inhofe (R)	
2. Synar (D)	• #
3. Brewster (D)	
4. McCurdy (D)	•
5. Istook (R)	
6. English (D)	•

OREGON

1. Furse (D)	••
2. Smith (R)	
3. Wyden (D)	••
4. DeFazio (D)	••
5. Kopetski (D)	••

PENNSYLVANIA

1. Foglietta (D)	••
2. Blackwell (D)	••
3. Borski (D)	••
4. Klink (D)	••
5. Clinger (R)	••
6. Holden (D)	••
7. Weldon (R)	•
8. Greenwood (R)	••
9. Shuster (R)	•
10. McDade (R)	
11. Kanjorski (D)	•
12. Murtha (D)	••
13. Margolies-Mezvinsky (D)	••
14. Coyne (D)	••
15. McHale (D)	••
16. Walker (R)	
17. Gekas (R)	••
18. Santorum (R)	••
19. Goodling (R)	
20. Murphy (D)	••
21. Ridge (R)	••

RHODE ISLAND

1. Machtley (R)	••
2. Reed (D)	••

SOUTH CAROLINA

1. Ravenel (R)	
2. Spence (R)	•
3. Derrick (D)	••

4. Inglis (R)	
5. Spratt (D)	••
6. Clyburn (D)	••

SOUTH DAKOTA

AL Johnson (D)	••
----------------	----

TENNESSEE

1. Quillen (R)	••
2. Duncan (R)	•
3. Lloyd (D)	••
4. Cooper (D)	•
5. Clement (D)	••
6. Gordon (D)	•
7. Sundquist (R)	
8. Tanner (D)	•
9. Ford (D)	••

TEXAS

1. Chapman (D)	••
2. Wilson (D)	••
3. Johnson (R)	
4. Hall (D)	•
5. Bryant (D)	••
6. Barton (R)	
7. Archer (R)	#
8. Fields (R)	
9. Brooks (D)	••
10. Pickle (D)	•
11. Edwards (D)	•
12. Geren (D)	••
13. Sarpalius (D)	••
14. Laughlin (D)	• #
15. de la Garza (D)	••
16. Coleman (D)	••
17. Stenholm (D)	••
18. Washington (D)	• #
19. Combest (R)	
20. Gonzalez (D)	••
21. Smith (R)	
22. DeLay (R)	
23. Bonilla (R)	
24. Frost (D)	••
25. Andrews (D)	
26. Armey (R)	
27. Ortiz (D)	••
28. Tejeda (D)	••
29. Green (D)	••
30. Johnson (D)	••

UTAH

1. Hansen (R)	
2. Shepherd (D)	••
3. Orton (D)	•

VERMONT

AL Sanders (I)	••
----------------	----

VIRGINIA

1. Bateman (R)	••
2. Pickett (D)	••
3. Scott (D)	••
4. Siskiy (D)	••
5. Payne (D)	••
6. Goodlatte (R)	••
7. Bliley (R)	••
8. Moran (D)	••
9. Boucher (D)	••
10. Wolf (R)	••
11. Byrne (D)	••

WASHINGTON

1. Cantwell (D)	•
2. Swift (D)	••
3. Unsoeld (D)	••
4. Insee (D)	••
5. Foley (D)	# #
6. Dicks (D)	••
7. McDermott (D)	••
8. Dunn (R)	
9. Kreidler (D)	••

WEST VIRGINIA

1. Mollohan (D)	••
2. Wise (D)	••
3. Rahall (D)	••

WISCONSIN

1. Barca (D)	••
2. Klug (R)	•
3. Gunderson (R)	
4. Kleczka (D)	••
5. Barrett (D)	••
6. Petri (R)	#
7. Obey (D)	••
8. Roth (R)	•
9. Sensenbrenner (R)	

WYOMING

AL Thomas (R)	
---------------	--

PUERTO RICO

RC Romero-Barcelo (D)	# #
-----------------------	-----

AMERICAN SAMOA

DEL Faleomavaega (D)	# #
----------------------	-----

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

DEL Norton (D)	••
----------------	----

GUAM

DEL Underwood (D)	••
-------------------	----

VIRGIN ISLANDS

DEL de Lugo (D)	••
-----------------	----

Funding Bill (continued from page 1)

\$351 mill., Amtrak expected to make up a \$30 mill. budget shortfall with \$11 mill. in service cuts (see Travelers' Advisory) and \$19 mill. in "cost-cutting measures" including "closing lightly used stations in various parts of the country" and unwelcome further reductions in non-safety maintenance.

NARP asked Amtrak to consider keeping St. Louis-Dallas daily, protecting mail revenue, but Amtrak hopes to save the mail by trucking it to the train at Memphis on days "Eagle" skips.

The House voted on two anti-Amtrak amendments (see chart). Reps. Carr (D-MI), Wolf (R-VA), Traficant (D-OH), Castle (R-DE), and Lowey (D-NY) spoke for Amtrak; only two spoke for deeper Amtrak cuts, claiming they would help "privatize" Amtrak: Hefley (R-CO) and Cox (R-CA).

The full Senate approved a Trent Lott (R-MS) amendment clarifying that Amtrak must begin a new 403(b) train in 1994 wherever a state or other party covers all of the operating loss including depreciation on rolling stock, and where rolling stock is available (as it is between New Orleans and Mobile, which would be served either by extending part of the "City of New Orleans" or the "Gulf Breeze").

NEW GROUP FOR NEBRASKA

A charter meeting for the Nebraska Assn. of Railroad Passengers was held at Lincoln on Sept. 11 (there had been one for a period of time several years ago). By mid-September the group had about 45 members and planned to incorporate. Its goals include Omaha-Kansas City train service, renaming the state Dept. of Roads (Nebraska is one of the few remaining states without a "DOT") and raising the visibility of passenger trains in the state government and legislature. Interested parties may contact Mr. Dan Lutz, 3915 Apple St., Lincoln, NE 68503-2133.

QUOTE OF THE MONTH

"I suppose I ought to drive from now on. I could park at [Baltimore's] Inner Harbor and take a cab the rest of the way to Johns Hopkins."

—Overheard Sept. 10 on Amtrak's northbound "Merchants Ltd.," after the locomotive failed and passengers were stuck for two hours without lights or air-conditioning somewhere east of Baltimore. The speaker was a 75-year-old grandmother from Wilmington, DE who travels to Baltimore regularly for medical tests—just the sort of passenger who depends on a reliable alternative to driving.

# Clinton, Rail Labor, and Amtrak's Future

"One of my first nights here, I was working trash and Herb showed up and started working too. I figured it must be a pretty good place if the top guy was out throwing trash."

—Mike Fand, Southwest Airlines' manager of ramp and operations at Love Field, Dallas, referring to Southwest Chairman Herbert D. Kelleher

"This is one of the things we've got to look at to be competitive. All airlines have to deal with it."

—John F. Peterpaul, General VP—Transportation of the International Assn. of Machinists and Aerospace Workers, a major United Airlines— and Amtrak—union, on union efforts to develop a low-cost structure for shorter flights as part of union efforts to buy a controlling interest in United (both quotes *The Washington Post*, Sept. 12, 1993)

Amtrak's economic improvement from FY '81 to FY '91 is due as much to rail labor's cooperation in negotiating forward-looking contracts as to capital investment. Every Amtrak explanation of its progress should credit labor in the same breath with capital investment.

When train and engine crew takeovers were completed in 1987, for example, Amtrak estimated annual cost savings at \$50 million. Allowing for inflation, this means agreements with just two of Amtrak's 14 unions—United Transportation Union and Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers—lowered FY '91 costs by over \$70 mill. This really meant more service and jobs, since the federal grant likely would not have been that much bigger absent those agreements.

Amtrak should praise labor more often partly because Amtrak needs still more from labor—as anyone knows who rides the trains and watches the state of the economy, the widening impact of Southwest Airlines and the federal budget process in general.

Once it seemed Amtrak's revenues suffered from the competitive impact of "airlines killing each other" with low fares. Southwest, however, has low fares and is profitable—only partly because of federal aviation subsidies discussed here before (including our Dec. '85 lead story) and the extra federal subsidies enjoyed by low-fare airlines.

---

## LOWER AIR FARES = HIGHER AIR SUBSIDIES

**Because federal airline taxes are collected as a percentage of ticket price, low-fare airlines in effect pay less for the same services than do airlines with higher fares. This would not be true if airlines paid on the basis of passenger-miles or boardings or a combination of the two.**

---

Southwest pays good wages (especially counting profit-sharing) and is 84% unionized, "perhaps the highest degree of unionization of any U.S. airline" (*The Washington Post*, Sept. 12). What sets Southwest apart are the absence of work-rules that unnecessarily hurt productivity, and Chairman Kelleher's ability to promote company loyalty among his employees (Amtrak presidential search committee, take note!).

Progress in work rule reform in the past year has been limited—and some earlier progress came slowly—because management, labor, many on Capitol Hill and the Administration have not had a shared vision of Amtrak's needs.

Some employees, legislators and reporters misinterpreted Amtrak's talk about its improving economics to mean Amtrak had become profitable. Work rule reform also is hampered by the number of rail unions—Amtrak has contracts with 14.

Management's style has hurt too. Pres. W. Graham Claytor Jr. sent "messages" to workers on Sept. 30 and Nov. 30,

1992. To the first, he attached a summary of an employee relations study the firm Towers Perrin did for Amtrak which included this: "The leadership style at Amtrak is most often described by managers and non-managers as autocratic, militaristic, intimidating and focused on micro-management and crisis management." The second letter was Claytor's explanation of actions taken in response to the report.

Some legislators appeared to encourage employees to think work rule changes unnecessary. Legislators understandably focused on the fact that employees had gone without raises since 1988, although this resulted largely from the combined impact of the Railway Labor Act (which neither labor nor management seems eager to change), the reluctance of some unions to settle with Amtrak before settling with freight railroads (unions feared an Amtrak settlement would lead to otherwise avoidable concessions to freight railroads) and, later, the resistance of other unions to work rule reform.

A 1991 Congressional hearing held just after some freight railroad agreements were reached (and thus when Amtrak work rule progress might have been expected) probably set back the cause of work rule reform. Last year, during nationwide rail talks where Amtrak had much at stake, 81 members of Congress wrote letters to Amtrak widely perceived as urging management to cave. Reps. John D. Dingell (D-MI) and Al Swift (D-WA) then wrote a letter urging members of Congress to stay out of the bargaining process.

Finally, Presidential Emergency Board #222 last year issued an Amtrak decision that failed to distinguish between the needs of Amtrak and profitable freight railroads. Amtrak workers got the raises Amtrak offered but there was, by Amtrak's estimate, only \$5 mill. worth of savings from work rule revisions—\$15 mill. less than Amtrak had assumed in drawing up its FY '93 budget.

Sounds almost as bad as 1960s labor negotiations at New York Central—and probably a few other railroads. The railroad got freight work-rule progress in return for backward passenger moves. The latter helped lay the groundwork for killing more passenger trains as big money-losers.

Prospects for quick changes are uncertain. Amtrak can serve "Section 6" (change-of-agreement) notices on the United Transportation Union (conductors and trainmen) for crew sizes, but most other agreements are good through January 1, 1995. So, with "business-as-usual," it would be at least FY '96 before the benefits of new work rules (other than UTU crew size) could be realized, and this could hurt efforts to avoid more significant service cuts in the meantime.

Hopefully, the Clinton Administration will commit the creative energy needed to push ahead—a task that may initially involve taking flak from some in rail labor, but a task which many labor people support because it would help Amtrak survive and grow, even in today's tough competitive environment.

Let's be clear on one thing. We're talking about improving Amtrak's productivity with an eye towards more service and more jobs. We're *not* talking about repealing "labor protection," an action which would make it easier to eliminate Amtrak services.

The Administration should:

- pick a new Amtrak president with good team-building skills;
  - send whenever necessary the same message Dingell and Swift sent last year; and
  - make clear to everyone—including federal mediators if it comes to that—that passenger-specific work-rule issues are important.
-