

11-80-8

HE
2771
.18
C738c
Phase III
1980

**LEUW
CATER**

Phase III

De Leuw, Cather & Company
Engineers and Planners • Chicago

**Report to
Linn County Regional Planning Commission
Rail Study Advisory Committee**

**Comprehensive Railroad Study
for
Linn County, Iowa**

October 1980

IOWA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
LIBRARY
800 LINCOLN WAY
AMES, IOWA 50010

De Leuw, Cather & Company
Engineers and Planners • Chicago

**Report to
Linn County Regional Planning Commission
Rail Study Advisory Committee**

The recommendations are very general. They could have come out of any other study - what will make it happen - implementation wise?

This Study proposes to be done by Railroads + industries. Are the RR + industries committed?

**Comprehensive Railroad Study
for
Linn County, Iowa.**

Phase III as proposed in Contract

- Two Part Implementation*
- (1) Expeditious Projects*
 - (2) Longer term projects.*

Methodology -

- (1) Staging of the plan*
- (2) Capital Expenditures.*
- (3) Responsibilities Delineated*
- (4) Progress monitoring System established*

October 1980

Chapter VIII

ACTION PLAN

In Chapter VI, the 26 improvement alternatives selected to become part of the final program were identified. In this chapter, the requirements for implementation of each will be discussed.

There are four elements in the implementation program:

- . Determination of action required to achieve proposed physical improvements and operational or organizational changes.
- . Delineation of responsibilities of all involved participants.
- . Recommendations for equitable capital and operating cost participation by the various railroads, industries, and governmental agencies.
- . Establishment of a control system to monitor progress and results.

OK. These all agree with Scope of Services

seems weak.

The requirements for successful implementation of each specific improvement alternative considering the above elements follows.

PROBLEM I: INSUFFICIENT SUPPLY OF SERVICEABLE RAIL CARS

I-1 INDUSTRIES BUY OR LEASE CARS

Implementation Action

- . Industries determine the number and type of rail cars needed to handle their traffic.
- . Industries make an economic analysis to establish the feasibility of buying or leasing cars.
- . Industries enter into purchase or lease agreements for the required cars.

Should consultant be doing this?

Participants and Responsibilities

- . Each individual industry would examine its own needs to determine the need for cars and the economic benefits of acquisition.

Cost Participation

- . Each industry would absorb costs of cars.

Control and Monitoring Procedures

- . None needed except that industries might, at their discretion, advise interested parties of their actions.
- . Industries acquiring cars should maintain running records to assure that anticipated utilization is achieved.

I-2 RAILROADS ACQUIRE CARS

Implementation Action

- . Each railroad determines the number and type of cars needed to handle present and anticipated traffic of local industries. *forecasting was to be done by consultant.*
- . Railroads make an economic analysis to establish justification for acquisition of additional cars.
- . Each railroad purchase or lease the necessary cars.

Participants and Responsibilities

- . Local industries would furnish the railroads with traffic forecasts based on availability of additional cars.
- . Each railroad would examine the estimated costs and benefits of an increased car fleet to determine potential profitability.

Cost Participation

- . Each railroad would be expected to finance the cost of additional cars either internally or possibly through 4R Act funding.

In the scope of services, the consultant was to make 10-yr forecasts.

Control and Monitoring Procedures

- . None is required except that railroads would probably advise industries and other interested parties of proposed and actual increases in their car fleets.
- . Railroads should monitor utilization of cars (if they do not already do so) to verify estimated revenue gains and profitability.

I-3 RAILROADS REPAIR OR UPGRADE BAD-ORDER CARS

Implementation Action

- . Each railroad determines the availability of cars currently in bad order status that are types normally in short supply.
- . Railroads make an economic evaluation based on repair costs and potential revenue if cars are returned to service.
- . Railroads determine if and where shop capacity exists for a repair program.
- . Railroads examine sources of funding, either internal or possibly through 4R Act provisions.
- . Where economic feasibility is indicated, railroads arrange funding and institute a repair program.

Participants and Responsibilities

- . Local industries would furnish railroads with traffic forecasts so that the carriers could estimate the revenue potential of additional cars. *for what time period.*
- . Each railroad, individually, would then carry out the implementation actions outlined above.

Cost Participation

- . Each railroad would be responsible for the costs of repairing and upgrading equipment, but cash outlay and long-term costs could be kept relatively low if 4R Act financing provisions were utilized.

Control and Monitoring Procedures

- . None is required except that railroads would probably advise industries and other interested parties of proposed and actual increases in their car fleets.
- . Railroads should monitor utilization of cars (if they do not already do so) to verify estimated revenue gains and profitability.

I-4 INDUSTRIES FINANCE RAILROAD REHABILITATION OF CARS AND ARE REPAID ON A REBATE BASIS

Lower Rates?

Implementation Action

- . Each industry determines the type and number of additional cars needed to adequately handle its traffic.
- . Serving railroads determine the availability of bad-order cars of the required types and the estimated rehabilitation costs.
- . Railroads and industries negotiate agreements covering repair costs and payback arrangements that are mutually beneficial.
- . Following negotiation of necessary agreements, the railroads would proceed with the repair program and would assign the cars to the participating industry's service.

Participants and Responsibilities

- . Either a railroad or industry could take the lead in identifying the need for additional cars.
- . A railroad would have to establish availability of cars that would be suitable candidates for rehabilitation and the costs involved.
- . Railroads and industries interested in such a program would have to work jointly to negotiate financial terms and scheduling of repair work.

Cost Participation

- . Each involved industry would fund the initial rehabilitation program.

. The participating railroad would pay back the initial costs financed by an industry on either a periodic rental or per-car-shipped basis. In effect, the railroad would get a no- or low-interest loan to return cars to revenue service, and an industry would be guaranteed a captive car fleet.

Control and Monitoring Procedures

- . Procedures would be set up to maintain a check on costs of initial rehabilitation work and to provide the basis for agreed-to payback arrangements.
- . Participating railroads and industries should establish a method to continually control car usage and also verify that originally anticipated utilization is achieved.

1-5 IMPLEMENT A CAR CLEANING AND UPGRADING PROGRAM

Implementation Action

- . Each railroad makes an economic analysis to determine costs and savings from the operation of a car cleaning and upgrading facility, and whether the work should be contracted or done with railroad forces.
- . Railroads negotiate an agreement, if a joint cleaning and upgrading facility is planned, to cover the operation and cost divisions.
- . Railroads determine a location for the facility, easily accessible for railroads and close to major car users.
- . Railroads construct new facilities or upgrade an existing facility, depending on which location is chosen.
- . Railroads negotiate an agreement with a contractor to perform work and establish procedures for doing the work.

Participants and Responsibilities

- . Each railroad should determine the number and type of cars rejected due to need for cleaning or upgrading.
- . Each railroad would examine the estimated costs and benefits of a joint car cleaning and upgrading facility to determine the potential profitability.

- . Contractor will be responsible for performing the necessary work as specified by the railroads.

Cost Participation

- . Each participating railroad would pay a share of the initial cost of setting up the cleaning and upgrading facility.
- . Railroads would share operating expenses on a per-car basis.

Control and Monitoring Procedure

- . Each railroad should check rejection rate of cars by industries to determine if cars are properly cleaned and upgraded.
- . Each railroad should monitor the cost of operating the facility to determine if the anticipated savings are realized.
- . Railroads should check with industry officials to see if the cleaning and upgrading facility is improving the car supply problem.

I-7 REVIEW AND MODIFY TARIFFS

Implementation Action

- . Each railroad should review rates to see if they are compensatory, and each industry should review the rates to see if they are competitive with other modes of transportation.
- . Railroad and industry officials should negotiate rates that are profitable to the railroads and competitive with other modes.
- . Railroads file for rate revisions through normal regulatory channels.
- . Rate negotiations and adjustments would have to be carefully handled because of regulatory and rate-making legislation now being enacted.

Participants and Responsibilities

- . Both industries and railroads would participate in rate reviews.
- . Railroads would apply for rate revisions in the normal manner.

Cost Participants

- . Railroads and industries would absorb costs of personnel involved in the project.

Control and Monitoring Procedures

- . None is required.

PROBLEM II: INADEQUATE OR INSUFFICIENT YARDS AND CONNECTING TRACKAGE

II-5 INDUSTRIES FINANCE STORAGE TRACKS FOR THEIR CARS

Implementation Actions

- . Each industry and the serving railroad should determine the amount of storage needed for industry-owned or leased cars.
- . Each industry, in conjunction with the serving railroad, should determine the best location for a storage track(s).
- . Each industry should enter into an agreement with the serving railroad for construction and maintenance of the storage track.

Participants and Responsibilities

- . Each industry would determine the amount of trackage needed for storing its own rail cars.
- . Serving railroads would assist in determination of capacity required, location, and design.
- . Each industry would be responsible for the construction of its track.

Cost Participation

- . Each industry would be expected to finance the cost of construction and maintenance of their storage tracks.

Control and Monitoring Procedures

- . None required.

II-6 STORE HEAVY BAD ORDERS AT LOCATIONS OUTSIDE OF CEDAR RAPIDS

Implementation Action

- . Each railroad finds an adequate location outside of Cedar Rapids to store bad-order cars.

Participants and Responsibilities

- . Each railroad would be responsible for keeping heavy bad-order cars out of active yards in Cedar Rapids.

Cost Participation

- . None required.

Control and Monitoring Procedures

- . None required.

II-7 INDUSTRIES ASSIST RAILROADS IN EFFORTS TO STORE
LEASED OR ASSIGNED CARS OUTSIDE CEDAR RAPIDS

Implementation Action

- . Railroad determines convenient locations outside Cedar Rapids to store industry-leased or assigned cars.
- . Communications are established between railroads and industries so that surplus cars can be stored enroute.

Participants and Responsibilities

- . Each railroad would identify enroute storage locations.
- . Each industry provide serving railroad with a forecast of cars needed so surplus cars can be held at storage points outside of Cedar Rapids.

Cost Participation

- . None required.

Control and Monitoring Procedures

- . None required.

II-8 USE OF MILW MAIN LINE BETWEEN BEVERLY TOWER AND VERA
FOR CAR STORAGE

Implementation Action

- . CRANDIC and CNW agree to work scope and division of ownership of MILW trackage involved.

- . Negotiate purchase agreement with the MILW Trustee.
- . Construct necessary connections and retire unneeded trackage.

Participants and Responsibilities

- . CRANDIC and CNW would be jointly responsible for developing a mutually acceptable final plan, division of ownership, and sharing of costs.
- . CRANDIC and CNW would be responsible for negotiating a purchase agreement with the MILW for the property each would acquire.

Cost Participation

- . The division of costs should be related to operating benefits and savings that would accrue to each carrier and would be dependent, to some extent, on which road gets use of the storage capacity. At present, CNW pays 80 percent of the Beverly Interlocking maintenance and operating expense, with the MILW share being 20 percent. It is suggested that, as a starting point in negotiating a final agreement, the CNW share of track revision costs be 80 percent and the CRANDIC 20 percent.

Control and Monitoring Procedures

- . None required.

II-9 CNW USE MILW ROUTE FROM VERA TO 9TH AVENUE AND RI
YARD

Implementation Action

- . CRANDIC purchases MILW trackage between Vera and 9th Avenue Tower.
- . CNW negotiates a trackage rights agreement with the CRANDIC to permit operation between Vera and 9th Avenue Tower.
- . Connection is improved between the CNW and MILW at Vera.
- . The MILW route is upgraded from Vera to 9th Avenue to handle increased traffic.

Participants and Responsibilities

- . CRANDIC would be responsible for negotiating a purchase of the property involved from the MILW.
- . CNW and CRANDIC would be jointly responsible for negotiating the necessary trackage rights agreement.
- . CNW would handle improvement of the connection at Vera.
- . CRANDIC would upgrade trackage between Vera and 9th Avenue Tower.

Cost Participation

- . CNW would pay for the improved connection at Vera.
- . CRANDIC and CNW would share the cost of track upgrading between Vera and 9th Avenue Tower. The proportion paid by each could be based on estimated usage or some other equitable basis, but, in any event, would have to be negotiated.

Control and Monitoring Procedures

- . None required other than standard railroad accounting to determine costs of upgrading and operating expense and the share to be borne by each carrier.

PROBLEM III: POOR CONDITION OF YARDS AND CONNECTING TRAFFIC

III-1 RETIRE UNNECESSARY TRACKAGE

Implementation Action

- . Each railroad surveys property and determines what trackage is no longer needed.
- . Railroads determine removal cost, salvage credit, and annual maintenance savings.
- . Each railroad prepares a work program and perform work when labor force becomes available.

Participants and Responsibilities

- . Individual railroads would be responsible for developing retirement programs and progressing the work.

Cost Participation

- . Because of salvage credits and release of property for sale, most retirements are profitable and no funding should be required.

Control and Monitoring Procedures

- . None required.

III-2 RAILROADS REHABILITATE TERMINAL TRACKAGE

Implementation Action

- . Survey all essential yards and lines to determine what rehabilitation is required.
- . Determine cost to rehabilitate trackage and submit authority for expenditure for approval.
- . Develop a work program and schedule that is realistic, considering the availability of funds and manpower.

Participants and Responsibilities

- . Each railroad would be responsible for developing and progressing a rehabilitation program for essential yards and running tracks on its own property.

Cost Participation

- . Each railroad would be responsible for funding rehabilitation projects, but could utilize 4R Act provisions for low-cost financing. Also, retirement credits could offset rehabilitation costs.
- . Depending on the location and nature of work, outside financing may be available, including state and federal grade crossing funds, state assistance programs, or city participation in specific projects.

Control and Monitoring Procedures

- . None required other than normal accounting procedures to verify expenditures.

III-3 INDUSTRIES REHABILITATE AND MAINTAIN THEIR OWN IN-PLANT TRACKAGE

Implementation Action

- . Each industry determines if rail service is important enough to assume ownership and maintenance of trackage in plant.
- . Railroads and industries enter into an agreement whereby industries assume ownership and maintenance of in-plant trackage.
- . Each industry determines rehabilitation needed and arranges for work to be done.
- . Each industry arranges for periodic maintenance.

Participants and Responsibilities

- . Industries must make a determination that ownership and maintenance of trackage is economically justifiable.
- . Industries would thereafter be responsible for maintenance of in-plant trackage.

Cost Participation

- . Each participating industry would be responsible for the initial rehabilitation cost and the subsequent maintenance expense.

Control and Monitoring Procedures

. None needed.

PROBLEM IV: DELAYS ASSOCIATED WITH INTERCHANGE IMPROVEMENTS

IV-4 BETTER COORDINATION OF INTERCHANGE MOVEMENTS
BETWEEN RAILROADS

Implementation Action

- . Develop regular schedules for interchange of traffic between railroads. These interchange movements would be tailored to inbound and outbound road train schedules, as well as spot and pull times at industries.
- . Publish and circulate schedules to all railroads and shippers.

*Should
consultant
make
this
facilitate*

Participants and Responsibilities

- . CRANDIC, CNW, ICG would jointly develop the interchange schedules.

Cost Participation

- . These schedules could be developed at minimal cost to the carriers.

Control and Monitoring Procedures

- . A representative of one railroad should be designated to coordinate schedule development and ensure that the project is accomplished.
- . Following establishment of schedules, sample car movements should be checked on a regular periodic basis to verify conformance. Railroads and industries should both do this so that action can be taken to correct deviations.
- . Typical current movement times for interchange cars were tabulated during this study, and these can be used as a baseline to measure results.

PROBLEM V: LACK OF DISCIPLINED PROGRAM FOR SWITCHING, INTER-
CHANGE, AND ROAD MOVEMENTS

V-1 RAILROADS PROVIDE SCHEDULES FOR MOVEMENTS OF
TRAFFIC

Implementation Action

- . Develop schedules for outbound traffic from major shippers. These schedules should provide that, based on a certain cut-off time for shipments or receipt of interchange from other carriers, cars would depart Cedar Rapids on specified trains.
- . Establish schedules that guarantee availability of inbound cars to industries within a specified time following arrival in road trains or after being interchanged from another carrier.
- . Circulate schedules to industries and railroad operating personnel.

Participants and Responsibilities

- . Each railroad should designate personnel to work up schedules for movements solely under its control.
- . Key representatives from all railroads would work jointly to formulate schedules involving interchange movements and final preparation and circulation of schedules.

Control and Monitoring Procedures

- . A representative of one railroad should be designated to coordinate schedule development and ensure that the project is accomplished.
- . Following establishment of schedules, sample car movements should be checked on a regular periodic basis to verify conformance. Railroads and industries should both do this so that correct action can be taken to correct deviations.
- . Current transit times for movement of cars in and out of Cedar Rapids were compiled during the study. These can be used to determine improvements resulting from implementation of this alternative.

V-2 IMPROVE BLOCKING OF TRAFFIC AND THROUGH TRAIN
OPERATION

Implementation Action

- . Railroads examine traffic flow to determine volumes, routing, and any inadequacies in present train scheduling and blocking.
- . Railroads change or add service as required to move traffic on the scheduled basis.
- . Railroads commit adequate power to trains serving Cedar Rapids to ensure outbound cars are not delayed because of tonnage restrictions.
- . Operations should be examined periodically to identify changes necessary to accommodate any changes in traffic.

Participation and Responsibilities

- . Road haul carriers (CNW and ICG) would be responsible for analyzing traffic movement and developing improved blocking and movement of traffic.
- . Local industries should provide input so that the railroads are aware of the transit time that is required to retain or attract more traffic.

Cost Participation

- . The minor cost involved should be absorbed by the railroads.

Control and Monitoring Procedures

- . Both railroads and industries should make periodic checks to ensure that traffic moves as scheduled.
- . Data developed during this study can be used to determine improvements in transit time resulting from this alternative.

ESTABLISH A TERMINAL STEERING COMMITTEE

Implementation Action

- . Designate representatives of the steering committee. Present railroad members of the Rail Advisory Committee would be likely candidates.
- . Develop purpose and specific goals.
- . Agree on meeting frequency, format, and procedures.

Participation and Responsibilities

- . Each railroad should designate a representative with authority to make commitments on the part of his company.

Cost Participation

- . Minimal, if any.

Control and Monitoring Procedures

- . None required.

PROBLEM VII: TRACKAGE AT INDUSTRIES INADEQUATE OR IN POOR
CONDITION

VII-1 EXPAND OR REVISE INDUSTRY TRACKAGE TO PERMIT
MORE EFFICIENT OPERATIONS

Implementation Action

- . Each industry examine in-plant trackage to determine adequacy of layout.
- . Develop plans for upgrading, revising, or adding trackage as necessary and determine cost of work. The industry would then make an economic analysis to determine if project is economically justifiable.
- . Establish a final program and schedule and proceed with work.

Participants and Responsibilities

- . Railroads would assist industries in determining improvements to the physical layout needed.
- . Each industry must make the decision (after economic analysis) whether or not revisions in the physical layout are worthwhile.
- . Each industry would be responsible for funding and progressing the necessary work.

Cost Participation

- . Each industry would finance the physical revisions of its trackage.

Control and Monitoring Procedures

None required.

VII-2 REVISE LOADING AND UNLOADING FACILITIES TO ACCOMMODATE MODERN CARS

Implementation Action

- . Industries determine if use of presently restricted cars is economically desirable.

- . Industries survey loading and unloading facilities to determine compatability with desired car sizes.
- . Each industry modifies loading and unloading facilities to accommodate modern cars.

Participants and Responsibilities

- . Each industry would survey loading facilities and make the necessary alterations to accommodate modern cars.

Cost Participation

- . Industries would finance revisions within their own facilities.

Control and Monitoring Procedures

- . None required.

PROBLEM VIII: CAR DELAYS CAUSED BY INDUSTRY OPERATING PRACTICES

VIII-1 INDUSTRIES UNLOAD CARS PROMPTLY AND BILL OUTBOUND CARS WHEN LOADED OR ORDERED OUT OF PLANT

Implementation Action

- . Each industry examines its operations to determine the cause of car detention.
- . Each industry makes modifications in their operating procedures to avoid excessive delay of cars.

Participants and Responsibilities

- . Each industry would be responsible for making modifications in their operating procedure to alleviate car delays.
- . Serving railroads should assist industries in identifying reasons for car delay and developing improved operating procedures.

Cost Participation

- . The only cost involved is the time required for industry personnel to examine operational procedures, which should be absorbed by the industries.

Control and Monitoring Procedures

- . Each industry periodically examines their operating procedure to ensure they are not unduly delaying cars.
- . Industries should monitor their demurrage charges to measure car delay.

VIII-2 INDUSTRIES FURNISH RAILROADS WITH ACCURATE ADVANCE FORECASTS OF EQUIPMENT REQUIREMENTS

Implementation Action

- . Each industry establish internal procedures for forecasting rail car needs.
- . Industries and serving railroads jointly establish lines of communication for the transmission of car requirement forecasts.

Participants and Responsibilities

- . Each industry would be responsible for establishing an accurate forecasting system.
- . Serving railroads must make every effort to effectively utilize the advance requests for cars and furnish as required.

Cost Participation

- . Minimal expense, if any, would be involved.

Control and Monitoring Procedures

- . Industries should compare the percentage of requested cars supplied before and after implementation of an advance forecast system to determine effectiveness.
- . Industries compare advance forecasts with actual car loadings to determine accuracy.

VIII-3 MINIMIZE GRAIN INSPECTION AT CEDAR RAPIDS

Implementation Action

- . Make a concerted effort to establish an acceptable system of origin-point inspection.
- . Railroads take action to ensure that clean, noninfested cars are furnished for the movement of grain.
- . Examine the possibility of grain inspection being performed at the consignees' plants (as is done with trucks) so that cars can move directly to these locations, thus reducing switching.
- . Explore more widespread use of automatic samplers.
- . Study the possibility of an earlier grain bulletin time.
- . Examine the feasibility of grain being bulletined and inspection conducted regularly on a seven-days-a-week basis to avoid weekend delays.

Participants and Responsibilities

- . Development of an acceptable system of origin point inspection would require a cooperative study with the participation of elevator operators, brokers, processors, railroads and the U.S. Department of Agriculture.
- . The other possibilities mentioned above could be accomplished on a local basis. The railroads, processors, and the Cedar Rapids Grain Inspection Service should work jointly to make improvements in local procedures.

Cost Participation

- . Origin-point inspection would have a nationwide impact and, possibly, the USDA could be the funding agency for a study if widespread support of such a program were evident.
- . The cost of studying local procedural improvements would not be great and should be borne by all participants.

Control and Monitoring Procedures

- . If it is decided to pursue this alternative, a committee of local industrial and railroad representatives should be set up to actively address the problem.

PROBLEM IX: RAIL/HIGHWAY CONFLICTS IN THE 4TH STREET CORRIDOR

IX-1 IMPROVE THE RAILROAD PHYSICAL PLANT IN THE 4TH STREET CORRIDOR TO EXPEDITE MOVEMENTS

Implementation Action

- . Disposition of RI trackage in the 4th Street Corridor would be resolved.
- . Eventual owner of corridor trackage (which at this time would most likely be the CNW) agrees on the program of improvements suggested or a modified version thereof.
- . Prepare final cost estimates.
- . Determine sharing of costs among the railroad, the City of Cedar Rapids, and state and federal agencies.
- . Execute required contracts.
- . Establish a schedule and proceed with the work.

defined where? phase II.

Participants and Responsibilities

- . The CNW (assuming it acquires ownership of RI property in the corridor) should assume the lead in developing plans for improvements and negotiating funding participation with city and state agencies.
- . Cedar Rapids and Linn County Regional Planning Commission personnel should explore benefits that can be derived from the proposed corridor improvements and actively assist the CNW in obtaining funding from city, state, and federal sources.
- . Iowa State DOT should assist in planning and funding of improvements.

Cost Participation

1. The total estimated costs of corridor improvements described in the report are \$1,069,900. On a preliminary basis, recommended cost divisions would be as follows:

. Federal programs	\$ 157,200	<i>FHWA RRP Funds.</i>
. State programs	151,400	
. City of Cedar Rapids	104,000	
. CNW	<u>657,300</u>	

Total \$1,069,900

Table VIII-1 shows the proposed cost-sharing for specific elements of the work.

2. The CNW will realize savings of \$134,000 annually because of closing 9th Avenue Tower and reduction of maintenance expense, which can be applied toward amortization of the initial costs.
3. An attempt should be made to get partial funding from the newly created Iowa Railway Finance Authority Act. Possibly, money could be advanced to the CNW to perform the required work and be repaid on the basis of annual savings.

Control and Monitoring Procedures

- . The Linn County Planning Commission is the most logical agency to coordinate the progress of this improvement alternative.

This is not 4th St. Corridor.

IX-2 COMPLETE CONNECTION BETWEEN ICG AND MILW YARDS

Implementation Action

- . A necessary prerequisite to implementation of this alternative is ICG purchase of the MILW yard. This purchase is now close to a final agreement.
- . ICG negotiate with FHWA to assume MILW portion of contract to build the connection between MILW and ICG yards.
- . ICG obtain material, finish construction, and put track in service.

Negotiations should be made between ICG and Railroads

Participants and Responsibilities

- . The FHWA and ICG should jointly arrange ICG assumption of the MILW contract.
- . The ICG would be responsible for the construction of the trackage.

Table VIII-1

BREAKDOWN OF 4TH STREET CORRIDOR IMPROVEMENT COSTS AND
PROPOSED FUNDING PARTICIPATION

	<u>Total Cost</u>	<u>CNW</u>	<u>Cost Participation Federal Programs</u>	<u>State Programs</u>	<u>City of Cedar Rapids</u>
1. Upgrade running track between A Avenue and 10th Avenue	\$ 252,300	\$252,300			
2. Track retirements	5,500	5,500			
3. Install power turnouts and remote control signal equipment	280,600	280,600			
4. Modernize crossing warning circuits	174,700		\$157,200		\$ 17,500
5. Rebuild 1st avenue crossing	97,300	32,400		\$ 64,900	
6. Rebuild 2nd through 10th Avenue	<u>259,500</u>	<u>86,500</u>	<u> </u>	<u>86,500</u>	<u>86,500</u>
	\$1,069,900	\$657,300	\$157,200	\$151,400	\$104,000

VIII-26

FIWA
RRP Funds?

state initiates

Cost Participants

- . The cost of the project would be funded by the FHWA; the funds have already been authorized.

Control and Monitoring Procedures

- . None required.

IX-3 MINIMIZE RAIL MOVEMENTS DURING PEAK VEHICULAR TRAFFIC PERIODS

Implementation Action

- . Make updated hourly traffic counts at all crossings to determine peak times.
- . City and railroad officials agree on guidelines to minimize crossing blockages during peak traffic periods.
- . Railroads determine what modifications can be made in operations to minimize rail movements during peak traffic periods.
- . Railroads enforce compliance by all employees to agreed guidelines.

Participants and Responsibilities

- . Railroads will make a concerted effort to curtail rail movements during peak vehicular traffic times.
- . Industries can assist railroads by minimizing switching requirements during peak traffic periods.

Cost Participation

- . None required.

Control and Monitoring Procedures

- . City should compare traffic delays before and after initiation of this alternative.
- . Monitor train movements periodically during peak periods to ensure compliance.
- . Periodically review guidelines to accommodate any changes in vehicle or rail movements.

The following supplementary program should be progressed because of MILW and RI abandonment of service in Linn County:

- IX-2
what
difference
between
this and
IX-2?
1. ICG acquires and operates MILW facilities between Louisa and Marion and between Indian Creek and Menard Lumber Co.

Implementation Action

- . ICG purchases this property from the MILW.
- . ICG designs and constructs a connection between the MILW and ICG at Louisa.

Participants and Responsibilities

- . ICG would negotiate with the Trustee of the MILW to acquire the facilities noted.
- . ICG and FHWA would negotiate any agreement covering costs of the connection at Louisa.

Cost Participation

- . ICG would fund the purchase of MILW property either internally or from outside sources, possibly by means of 4R Act financing.
- . FHWA should fund the proposed connection at Louisa because it will eliminate the need for a grade separation at about one tenth the cost.

Control and Monitoring Procedures

- . None required.

Comments

- . ICG and the MILW have agreed to the sale of most of the property involved, subject to court approval, and it is likely that this element of the program will become final in the near future.
2. CRANDIC acquires and operates MILW facilities from Amana through Cedar Rapids to Iowa Manufacturing.

Implementation Action

- . CRANDIC purchases this property from the MILW.

state +
initiative
Kend
Cedar Rapids

Participants and Responsibilities

- . CRANDIC would negotiate with the Trustee of the MILW to acquire the facilities noted.

Cost Participation

- . CRANDIC would fund the purchase of this property.

Control and Monitoring Procedures

- . None required.

Comments

- . CRANDIC is actively negotiating for the purchase of this property from Amana to 9th Avenue Tower. The ICG will probably acquire the MILW yard and trackage to Iowa Manufacturing. Since the ICG and CRANDIC have agreed to CRANDIC access to the 6th Street power plant and direct interchange arrangements, the operating benefits proposed will be made.
- . Providing an agreement can be reached between the CRANDIC and CNW, the benefits noted in improvement alternative II-8 can still be realized.
- 3. ICG acquires operating rights in the MILW Cedar Rapids Yard.

Comments

- . Because ICG is in the process of buying the MILW Yard, the benefits contemplated in this proposal, including additional ICG yard space and direct ICG-CRANDIC interchange, are now taking place and should become permanent.
- 4. CNW acquires MILW trackage between Beverly Tower and Vera.

Comments

- . The purpose of this proposal was to provide car storage space for the CNW and is basically the same as improvement alternative II-8. Since the CRANDIC is negotiating for the purchase of this trackage from the MILW and, as noted in the discussion of II-8, it makes little difference whether the CRANDIC or CNW has ownership and use, the benefits should be achieved.

5. CNW acquires operating rights between Vera and 9th Avenue Tower.

Comments

- . This is exactly what is proposed in improvement alternative II-9, and implementation is discussed under that item.
- 6. CNW acquires all RI facilities and operations from the north end of the Cedar River Bridge to the north limits of Cedar Rapids Yard.

Implementation Action

- . CNW negotiates with the RI Trustee for purchase of trackage and facilities.
- . Negotiate trackage rights agreement with ICG and CRANDIC for their use of tracks in the 4th St. Corridor.
- . CNW upgrades main track through 4th St. Corridor to accommodate road train operation into and out of RI Yard.

Participants and Responsibilities

- . The CNW would be responsible for negotiating the purchase.
- . ICG, CRANDIC, and CNW would jointly negotiate trackage rights agreement for ICG and CRANDIC use of trackage in the 4th Corridor.

Cost Participation

- . CNW would fund the purchase of RI property either internally or from outside sources, possibly by means of 4R Act financing.

Control and Monitoring Procedures

- . None required.

Comments

- . The CNW has been operating the RI facilities identified in this proposal on a temporary basis and is negotiating a purchase agreement with the Trustee of the RI. If these negotiations are successful, this particular proposal will be accomplished.

7. CRANDIC acquires RI facilities from the north end of North Yard to Palo, and has operating rights from Transfer Yard to North Yard limits.

Implementation Action

- . CRANDIC negotiates with the RI Trustee for purchase of the trackage from the north end of North Yard to Palo.
- . Negotiate trackage rights with owner of trackage (CNW or RI) from Transfer Yard to North Yard limits.

Participants and Responsibilities

- . CRANDIC would be responsible for negotiating purchase of this trackage.
- . CRANDIC and CNW (or other eventual owner of 4th Street Corridor trackage and RI North Yard) would be jointly responsible for the negotiation of the required trackage rights agreement.

Cost Participation

- . CRANDIC would fund the proposed purchase internally.

Control and Monitoring Procedures

- . None required.

Comments

- . This proposal is necessary only to maintain rail access to the power plant at Palo in the event the RI main line north of Cedar Rapids is abandoned. CRANDIC has indicated its willingness to purchase and operate this line.
8. CRANDIC acquires switching from RI at the Penick & Ford plant.

Implementation Action

- . A prerequisite to this alternative would be the CRANDIC acquiring the MILW facilities from Amana through downtown Cedar Rapids to 9th Avenue Tower.
- . Penick & Ford and CRANDIC agree on plant switching arrangements.

- . Penick & Ford construct a connection between RI and MILW trackage within the plant.

Participants and Responsibilities

- . Penick & Ford would be responsible for construction of the in-plant connection.

Cost Participants

- . Penick & Ford would fund the construction and subsequent maintenance of the in-plant connections.

Control and Monitoring Procedures

- . None required.

Comments

- . This alternative has already been accomplished.
9. RI downtown trackage north of 9th Avenue and west of 4th Street be phased out and facilities relocated.

Comments

- . Possible track retirements in this particular area were included in improvement alternative III-1.

Chapter IX

SUMMARY

The objectives of this study were:

- . To evaluate the adequacy of the existing Linn County rail system to meet present and anticipated service demands.
- . To identify rail system problems and deficiencies.
- . To develop a plan consisting of specific alternatives to correct present deficiencies and provide for an overall improvement in the rail network in terms of faster transit time, increased availability of cars, and dependability of service.

Two part implementation program

During the initial phase of the study, field inspections were made of all railroad facilities and interviews were conducted with railroad, industry, and community representatives. This investigation identified nine major problem areas:

1. Insufficient supply of serviceable rail cars.
2. Inadequate or insufficient yards and connecting trackage.
3. Poor conditions of yards and connecting trackage.
4. Delays associated with interchange movements.
5. Lack of a disciplined program for switching, interchange and road movements.
7. Trackage at industries inadequate or in poor condition.
8. Car delays caused by industry operating practices.
9. Rail/highway conflicts in the 4th street corridor.

During the second phase of the study, over 40 improvement alternatives were developed to correct these problems and enhance rail service. In conjunction with the Rail Advisory Committee, the list of alternatives was narrowed down to 26 that were economically and operationally feasible. These 26 are included in the final program.

Early in 1980, it became apparent that two of the four trunk line railroads serving Cedar Rapids, the Rock Island and the Milwaukee, might terminate operations in this area. Because of this possibility, contingency plans were developed to preserve adequate rail service in this event. The Milwaukee did, in fact, cease operations on March 1, 1980, followed by the Rock Island on April 1, 1980. The Chicago and North Western, Cedar Rapids and Iowa City, and the Illinois Central Gulf took over temporary operation of segments of the Milwaukee and Rock Island shortly thereafter.

The cessation of service in Linn County by the Milwaukee and Rock Island caused major changes in the course of the study, but it also offered new possibilities for consolidation of facilities and operations. Improvement alternatives under consideration were modified to conform to the drastically altered situation.

At this time, the surviving railroads are negotiating with the Trustees of the Milwaukee and Rock Island to purchase various line segments. Until these acquisitions are made, some improvement alternatives cannot be progressed. However, it does appear that the acquisitions proposed by the various railroads and the temporary operations now being conducted (which would be made permanent) fit quite well with the recommendations made in the contingency plan.

Because of the importance of the disposition of Milwaukee and Rock Island property and the resulting rail operations, an additional section was added to the action plan. This supplementary section includes recommended changes to preserve the best possible Linn County rail system even though the service of two carriers has been lost.

The last phase of the study was the formulation of the final rail improvement program. This program included the 26 improvement alternatives jointly selected by the Rail Advisory Committee and De Leuw, Cather, and additional recommendations resulting from discontinuance of service by the Milwaukee and Rock Island.

These are four elements in the program:

- . Actions required to achieve the proposed physical improvements and operational or organizational changes.
- . Delineation of responsibilities of involved participants.

- . Recommendations for equitable sharing of capital and operating costs.
- . Establishment of a control system to monitor progress and results.

Before completion of the study, four of the original improvement alternatives were put into operation. These were:

- . Use of the Milwaukee Yard by other railroads. This is now being done by the CRANDIC and ICG.
- . CNW use of the RI yard. This has taken place on a temporary basis and will become permanent if the CNW acquires ownership.
- . Establishment of direct interchange between the CRANDIC and ICG. This has been accomplished.
- . Joint use of track scale at the MILW yard by the ICG and/or CNW. The ICG is now using this scale.

Because they are already accomplished, these four alternatives were removed from the final plan.

Implementation of the various improvement alternatives will result in some or all of the following benefits:

- . Provide additional rail cars and improve utilization.
- . Expedite the movement of rail traffic.
- . Effectively provide more yard space.
- . Eliminate excess trackage.
- . Reduce railroad operating expense.
- . Minimize railroad-community conflicts.
- . Permit urban development in areas now occupied by railroad facilities.

This report documents a many-faceted program for improving rail service in the Linn County area and, additionally offers a number of community benefits. For successful implementation of the plan there must be the continued cooperative and coordinated effort on the part of the railroads, industries and governmental agencies that was conspicuous during the study period.

STATE LIBRARY OF IOWA



3 1723 02117 7118