## Background to Research

- 'Higher' speed passenger trains (up to 110 mph ) are being increasingly discussed
- Amtrak's experience shows that there is not a safe (when empty) freight car truck for speeds over 70 mph
- FRA is funding research for freight car trucks that are deemed safe up to 125 mph
- Sharma and Associates, Inc. awarded contract to design and develop a higher speed truck, which they did, and they subsequently hired David Burns to jointly develop a business case for justification for funding further testing and development


# Is there a Business Case for Higher Speed Freight? 

- In the 1930s there were very profitable mail and express trains that were operated at passenger train speeds
- This traffic shifted to air, road and intermodal
- Today railroad intermodal operates at only 50 to $60 \%$ of today's passenger train speeds
- Many shippers, especially for longer distances, need faster services so they make use of team driven trucks and even air
- Only a limited volume of freight can justify the extra cost of higher speed delivery, on inventory cost alone


## U.S. Rail and Truck tons by length of haul



Source: 2007 Commodity Flow Survey

## Rail and Truck Ton Miles



## Example of Comparative Speeds



## How Fast is Trucking



## Long Distances Speed Comparison



## Consumption of Food and Beverages with Rail Share of Transportation (2004)

|  | Domestic Usage | Exports | Railroad Tonnage | Boxcar | Railroad Share by Car Type |  |  |  | Total RR Percent |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Tank |  |
| Food Group | tons million |  |  |  | Covered Hopper | Refrig. Boxcar | TOFC/ COCF |  |  |
| Red Meat | 16.35 | 2.86 | 1.29 |  |  | 3.0\% | 0.8\% | 2.9\% | 6.7\% |
| Poultry | 9.90 | 2.75 | 0.80 |  |  | 5.6\% | 0.5\% | 0.2\% | 6.3\% |
| Fish | 2.15 |  | 0.13 |  |  | 3.9\% | 2.1\% |  | 6.0\% |
| Dairy Products | 85.89 |  | 0.94 | 0.3\% |  | 0.6\% | 0.2\% |  | 1.1\% |
| Fats and Oils - | 13.28 | 2.9 | 11.04 |  | 0.3\% | 0.1\% | 0.6\% | 67.3\% | 68.2\% |
| Fruit, Fresh | 18.40 |  | 0.62 | 0.5\% | 0.1\% | 2.3\% | 0.5\% |  | 3.4\% |
| Fruit, Processed | 20.85 |  | 0.78 | 0.5\% |  | 2.0\% | 1.2\% |  | 3.8\% |
| Veg., Fresh | 28.19 |  | 1.95 | 1.1\% | 1.1\% | 1.4\% | 3.3\% |  | 6.9\% |
| Veg., Processed | 32.35 |  | 0.26 | 0.0\% | 0.2\% | 0.4\% | 0.2\% | 0.0\% | 0.8\% |
| Flour and Cereal | 28.01 |  | 10.84 | 5.3\% | 29.4\% | 1.7\% | 2.3\% | 0.0\% | 38.7\% |
| Caloric Sweeteners | 20.54 | 0.5 | 15.73 | 1.2\% | 17.6\% | 1.3\% | 0.5\% | 54.0\% | 74.8\% |
| Sub Total | 275.91 |  | 44.37 |  |  |  |  |  | 16.1\% |
| Beverages |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Beer | 25.30 |  | 7.28 | 10.3\% |  | 14.6\% | 1.8\% | 2.1\% | 28.8\% |
| Wine | 2.40 | 0.3 | 1.79 | 2.4\% |  | 31.1\% | 32.8\% |  | 66.3\% |
| Liquor | 1.41 | 0.2 | 0.71 |  |  |  | 33.0\% | 11.2\% | 44.2\% |
| Soda | 69.22 |  | 0.44 |  |  |  | 0.6\% |  | 0.6\% |
| Sub Total | 98.33 |  | 10.22 |  |  |  |  |  | 10.4\% |

$\sim 6$ million tons in reefers or COFC/TOFC

Today ~ 10 million tons about 10\%

Source: U.S. Dept. of Agriculture 2004 and STB Carload Waybill Sample

## Cold Chain is a Necessity!

| Common Name | Storage | Relative Humidity \% | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Highest Freezing } \\ & \text { \% Temp. F } \end{aligned}$ | g $\begin{aligned} & \text { Ethylene } \\ & \text { production }\end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{\|l\|l} \hline \text { Ethylene } \\ \text { Sensitivity } \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Approx. } \\ & \text { storage-life } \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Aensientive | 30.32 | 90.95 | 29.3 | vH | H | 3.6 months |
| Apple-chill sensitive | 40 | 90.95 | 29.3 | vH |  | 1.2 months |
| Apricot | ${ }^{31-32}$ | 90.95 | 30 | m | M | 1.3 weeks |
| Arugula | 32 | 95-100 |  | vL | H | 7.10 days |
| Asparagus | 36 | 95-100 | 31 | vL | M | 2.3 weeks |
| Avocadofuerte, Hass | 3745 | 85.90 | 29.1 | H | H | ${ }^{2.3}$ weeks |
| Avocado-Fuchs, | 55 | 85.90 | 30.4 | + | H | 2 week |
| Avocado-Lula, Booth | 40 | 90.95 | 30.4 | H | H | 4.8 weeks |
| $\checkmark$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Mix and match produce is a necessity

## Estimate of Annual Tonnage of Fruits and Vegetables Consumed by Location

| Basically 3 major corridors |  | Percent | Originating Annual Tonnage |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Destination Locations | Population | West \& SW | Florida |
|  | Northeast | 23.0 | 5,092,706 | 552,161 |
|  | Midwest | 17.5 | 3,874,885 | 420,123 |
|  | Southeast | 21.4 | 4,738,431 |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Total Daily 'Truck' loads Consumed |  |  |  |
|  | Northeast |  | 728 | 79 |
|  | Midwest |  | 554 | 60 |
|  | Southeast |  | 677 |  |

## Typical New York Prices

| Produce | Cost per lb | Market price <br> per ton |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Orange Juice | $\$ 3(4 \mathrm{lb}-$ half gal. $)$ | $\$ 1,500$ |
| Strawberries | $\$ 2.50$ | $\$ 5,000$ |
| Processed Lettuce | $\$ 4.00$ | $\$ 8,000$ |
| Herbs and Raspberries | $\$ 15.00$ | $\$ 30,000$ |
| Avocados | $\$ 3.30$ | $\$ 6,600$ |
| Potatoes | $\$ 0.80$ | $\$ 1,600$ |

Some produce can pay for high transport costs

Note: FOB prices are approximately $\mathbf{3 0 \%}$ of retail prices.

## How can Railway Compete with Team Driven Trucks?

Comparison of field-to-distribution center for shipping from California to Northeast by rail and road

|  | Rail Current times hrs |  |  | Passenger <br> Train ~ 54 <br> mph | Priority <br> Freight <br> Train ~ <br> 59 mph | Single <br> Driver | Team Drivers |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Low | High | Average |  |  |  |  |
| Field to packing shed | 0.5 | 3 | 1.5 | 1.5 | 1.5 | 1.5 | 1.5 |
| Packing Shed | 3 | 2160 | 8 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 |
| Transport to Consd. Facility | 1 | 36 | 8 | 8 | 4 |  |  |
| Consolidation Facility | 5 | 36 | 24 | 12 | 5 |  |  |
| Rail or Road Transit | 100 | 124 | 112 | 60 | 55 | 129 | 69 |
| Rail Transload Facility | 5 | 36 | 24 | 12 | 5 |  |  |
| Transit to Distribution Center | 0.25 | 48 | 8 | 8 | 8 |  |  |
| Wholesale Distribution Center | 4 | 24 | 8 | 8 | 4 |  | 4 |
| Total Hours (after packing shed) | 115.25 | 304 | 184 | 108 | 81 | 134.5 | 78.5 |
| Total Days (after packing shed) | 4.8 | 12.7 | 7.7 | 4.5 | 3.4 | 5.6 | 3.3 |

## Revenue per Freight Car Based on Cost of Trucking

|  | Average <br> shelf life | \% by <br> weight | Truck <br> charge \$ | Handling <br> discount | Truck <br> loads/car | Rev./ 55 car <br> train |
| :--- | :--- | ---: | :--- | :--- | :--- | ---: |
| Category 1 (Berries, lettuce, etc) | 8 days | $15 \%$ | 10000 | $20 \%$ | 2.5 | 165000 |
| Category 2 (Leaf veg, oranges, etc) | 14 days | $45 \%$ | 7500 | $20 \%$ | 3.5 | 519750 |
| Category 3 (Root veg., apples, etc) | 28 days | $40 \%$ | 6000 | $20 \%$ | 4.0 | 422400 |
| Potential avg. revenue per Car \$ |  |  |  |  |  | 20130 |
| Revenue per 55 car train \$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Value of additional freshness

|  | Cars per train | Truck loads <br> per train | Potential <br> additional \$ | Potential Rev./Train |
| :--- | ---: | :--- | :--- | ---: |
| Category 1 (Berries, package lettuce) | 8.25 | 20.6 |  | 0 |
| Category 2 (Leaf veg, oranges, etc) | 24.75 | 86.6 | 1500 | 129938 |
| Category 3 (Root veg., apples, etc) | 22 | 88.0 | 1000 | 88000 |
| Additional Revenue/55 car train \$ |  |  |  | $\$ 217,938$ |

# Rail Potential Revenue from Produce ~ $\$ 330 /$ train mile 



## Produce Summary

- Rail transit time must compete with team driven trucks
- Operating as second section to passenger train minimizes train path interference
- Must be able to consolidate and mix produce
- Higher speed freight takes advantage of competitive speed and car weight capacity
- 300+\% increase in freight car utilization
- Only about $10 \%$ of produce currently shipped by rail
- Annual revenue potential could be as high as $\mathbf{\$ 3 . 7}$ billion


## Package and Courier Service



## Package and Courier Service

|  | Tons per Day |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  | Next day | Deferred | Ground |
| Less than 50 miles | 1366 | 1062 | 12746 |
| $50-99$ miles | 719 | 559 | 6712 |
| $100-249$ miles | 1551 | 1206 | 14473 |
| $250-499$ miles | 1712 | 1331 | 15974 |
| $500-749$ miles | 1322 | 1028 | 12340 |
| $750-999$ miles | 971 | 755 | 9058 |
| $1,000-1,499$ miles | 1082 | 842 | 10102 |
| $1,500-2,000$ miles | 723 | 562 | $67 \%$ |
| More than 2,000 miles | 725 | 564 | 6770 |
|  | 6535 | 5082 | 60990 |

> Team driven truck tonnage is small in weight but larger in volume

Source: UPS

| Corridors | \% Population <br> On Corridor | Traffic <br> Percentage | Distance <br> miles | National <br> Tons/day | Trucks/ Day <br> UPS only | Comments |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| NE-SE | 44.4 | $23 \%$ | 750 to 999 | 764 | 55 | Tunnels will restrict to single stack <br> and will not go through Atlanta |
| MW-SE | 38.9 | $20 \%$ | $1000-1499$ | 852 | 61 |  |
| SW-SE | 34.8 | $18 \%$ | $1500-2000$ | 569 | 41 | Will not go through Dallas |
| SW-MW-NE | 53.9 | $27 \%$ | $<2000$ | 571 | 41 | Must go through Chicago |
| Other | 24.7 | $13 \%$ |  |  |  | Probably does not warrant train. |


|  | Low | Average | High | Passe nger Train | Priority <br> Train 65 mph | Single <br> Driver | Team Drivers |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Drayage | 0.25 | 0.5 | 2.5 | 0.5 | 0.25 |  |  |
| Wait | 0.1 | 0.5 | 3 | 0.5 | 0.1 |  |  |
| Load | 0.1 | 0.25 | 0.5 | 0.25 | 0.1 |  |  |
| Transit |  |  |  | 60 | 55 | 129 | 61 |
| Unload Average | 0.1 | 0.5 | 0.5 | 0.5 | 0.1 |  |  |
| Drayage | 0.25 | 0.5 | 2.5 | 0.5 | 0.25 |  |  |
| Total Time hrs |  |  |  | 62.25 | 55.8 | 129 | 61 |

## Package and Courier Service

COFC /TOFC speed based on single driver

For package and courier service there appear to be four major long distance traffic lanes:

- Los Angeles to New York via Chicago
- New York to Florida, via Atlanta (Based on passenger train routes this currently is not yet available by rail)
- Los Angeles to Dallas (There is currently no direct passenger train route)
- Atlanta to Dallas (Currently not a passenger train route).

| Train Distance <br> miles | 3250 |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Revenue/Container |  |  |  |
| Deferred \$ | 9000 |  |  |
| Ground \$ | 6000 |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| Train Length (cars) | 25 | 50 | 75 |
| Total Containers | 50 | 100 | 150 |
| Deferred | 20 | 20 | 20 |
| Ground | 30 | 80 | 130 |
| Deferred Revenue | 180000 | 180000 | 180000 |
| Ground Revenue | 180000 | 480000 | 780000 |
| Train Revenue | 360000 | 660000 | 960000 |
| \$ per train mile | 110.77 | 203.08 | 295.38 |

Would probably require minimum 50 car trains

## Package and Courier Service-Summary

- 'Ground’ service business required to fill the train
- What would be the value of faster 'ground' service?
- Service demand varies by day of week
- Lends itself to double stack
- Hub and spoke could be a problem
- Identified annual revenue ~ \$ 54 million

Interested in rail but how?


## Opportunity and Problems of Short Distances



Up to 500 miles trucks are faster even for rail at 100 mph

Under 500 miles rail must be integral part of logistics chain, such as overnight and higher speeds makes additional city pairs possible

## Short Distance Summary

- 6 pairs of U.S. cities have a potential
- San Francisco - Los Angeles
- Atlanta - Central Florida
- Atlanta - Richmond/Washington
- Chicago - Minneapolis
- Chicago - Kansas City
- Chicago - Pittsburgh

- Washington - Boston (likely not feasible because of the limitations of the North and East River Tunnels at Penn. Station New York).
- Potential annual revenue $\$ 150$ to $\$ 250$ million


## Higher Speed Intermodal

- Intermodal trains today operate at single driver speeds or slower
- Manifest freight generally cannot justify higher train speeds
- Less Truck Load (LTL) range from 150 lbs to 5 tons, average 1200 lbs, about 250 million tons/year
- About $15 \%$ demand for premium service, with $20 \%$ higher price
- Majority will be containerized
- SW - NW LTL demand is for 2.5 trains/day
- A single train a day with a $40 \%$ premium, filling rest with economy, 6 trains per week each way is may be financially viable
- Annual revenue on higher speed trains $\$ 318$ million, of which at least $\$ 140$ million will be additional revenue
- May require double stacks, higher speed may be difficult


## Cost of Going Faster

## (Average of 60 mph compared to $\mathbf{3 0 \mathrm { mph }}$ )



Source: University of Illinois

At higher speeds cars are more cost effective per ton of capacity than containers

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  | Class 1 | Increase in Cost |  | Higher Speed Cost |  |
| Catigories of Expense | Average | Cars | COFC | Cars | COF |
| Transportation w/o fuel | $25 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ | 25 | 25 |
| Fuel | $20 \%$ | $90 \%$ | $118 \%$ | 38 | 43.6 |
| Equipment | $25 \%$ | $49 \%$ | $98 \%$ | 37.3 | 49.4 |
| Track | $18 \%$ | $20 \%$ | $25 \%$ | 21.6 | 22.5 |
| General and Admin | $12 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ | 12 | 12 |
|  | $100 \%$ |  |  | 133.9 | 152.5 |
| Estimate \% increase in cost |  |  |  | 33.9 | 52.5 |

Source: average cost percentage AAR and University of Illinois

## Line Capacity Considerations

- Faster trains haul higher-rated freight and are more profitable, allowing the sacrifice of some slow-freight capacity without financial penalty
- 70 mph passenger train requires $\sim$ three (3) 50 mph train paths
- Second section to passenger train only requires 0.5 to 1 additional train paths
- Computerized dispatching will reduce capacity problem and increase overall speed
- Lapped sidings would be an advantage


## Line Capacity Costs

## Revenue and expense per 'Average’ train mile

| Freight Revenue/Freight-train-mile: | $\$ 118.32$ |
| :--- | :---: |
| Freight Service Expense/Freight-train-mile: | $\$ 89.37$ |
| Freight Operating Income/Freight-train-mile: | $\$ 28.95$ |
| Freight Service Expense/Freight Revenue Ratio: | $\mathbf{7 5 . 5 \%}$ |

If only one average freight displaced, operating income could be ~ \$200/train-mile

Source : AAR
Revenue per train mile to offset lost train paths
Produce train revenue
$\$ 280$ to $\$ 330$ / train mile

Courier and Package revenue $\sim \$ 200+$ /train mile

LTL Intermodal revenue ~ \$165/ mile

| "Average" freights displaced | Higher Speed Freight Cost Differential |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 0\% | 20\% | 40\% | 60\% | 80\% | 100\% |
| 0.5 | \$104 | \$122 | \$140 | \$157 | \$175 | \$193 |
| 1 | \$118 | \$136 | \$154 | \$172 | \$190 | \$208 |
| 2 | \$147 | \$165 | \$183 | \$201 | \$219 | \$237 |
| 3 | \$176 | \$194 | \$212 | \$230 | \$248 | \$266 |
| 4 | \$205 | \$223 | \$241 | \$259 | \$277 | \$295 |
| 5 | \$234 | \$252 | \$270 | \$288 | \$306 | \$323 |
| 6 | \$263 | \$281 | \$299 | \$317 | \$335 | \$352 |
| 7 | \$292 | \$310 | \$328 | \$346 | \$364 | \$381 |

## The Freight Car Truck Question

- Railroads do not offer freight service at passenger train speeds or higher because there is no proven, safe and low maintenance freight truck that can be operated above 70 mph and $100+$ tons
- For priority freight maximum speeds of 90 or 100 mph are needed
- Heavier axle loads and higher speeds dictate a track friendly truck that will probably require a primary suspension
- Higher speed freight car utilization will be 5 to 10 times a conventional fright car, so capital cost not significant
- North American freight car truck suppliers have limited interest in developing a higher speed, heavy axle load truck because the railroads are currently showing little, if any, interest


## Potential of the Higher Speed Freight Car

- Could increase rail revenue by at least $\$ 4.5$ billion/year
- Produce $\$ 3.1$ to $\$ 3.7$ billion
- Package and Courier at least $\$ 54$ million
- Higher Speed Intermodal $\sim \$ 318$ million
- Short Distance intermodal $\$ 150$ to $\$ 250$ million
- Long distance trucking, unidentified additional revenue, may be $\$ 5$ to $\$ 10$ billion a year
- Could increase annual operating income by about $\$ 2$ billion
- Improvements in conventional freight car trucks
- Freight railroads could benefit from infrastructure required for 'higher' speed passenger train
- Will result in significant reduction of long distance truck traffic

