

MAGAZINE OF THE WESTERN PASSENGER TRAIN COALITION RAILPAC • ALL ABOARD ARIZONA • PASSENGER RAIL KANSAS • NEW MEXICO RA • MINNARP THE AURORA GROUP • NEVADA RAIL COALITION • PASSENGER RAIL OKLAHOMA

Los Angeles Union Station (LAUS) is Southern California's primary transportation hub, connecting multiple counties with a combined population exceeding 20 million people.

Since 1992 with the initiation of Metrolink service LACMTA (Metro) has had the responsibility to improve the efficiency of the station and reduce journey times as well as providing new connected services around the region.

LINK UNION STATION (LINK US)

RailPA

3rd QUARTER 2023

SW 3Q23 Contents

Editorials Welcome New Members – Link-US Delayed Again

President Commentary

Guest Commentary: James Tilley, The Aurora Group

Zero Emmissions Alternatives

Planning For Connections

Transit Fare Integration The Swiss Example

Coast Starlight Trip Report

Arizona News

Run-Through Tracks

From The Rear Platform – Remembering Bill Kerby

Electrification is the Solution for Rail Propulsion

RailPAC wants to know:

ed Modified Expanded Passenger Concours

- Where are the cranes?
- Why has construction not begun?
- What has happened to the money allocated to the project?
- Why are idling diesel trains still polluting the station area?
- Why do Metrolink trains not connect between routes?
- Why do Surfliner trains still have to reverse in the station and waste 20 minutes?

www.RailPAC.org



RAIL PASSENGER ASSOCIATION OF CALIFORNIA & NEVADA

Cleaner Air Better Train Performance More Haulage Power for Freight Quieter RailPAC

Zero Emission at Point of Use Proven Technology, World Standard Regenerative braking reduces power consumption Uses electricity from any source

www.railpac.org

In the Next Issue

Failed Governance, Reform Needed in Southern California Passenger Rail.

and more...

From the Editor's Desk



Green Shoots

I feel some cause for optimism in the last few weeks, fueled by a clutch of new members that joined us at the Los Angeles Union Station Train Fest early in September. We had some great conversations with some very enthusiastic and knowledgeable students from Santa Barbara, Irvine, and places in between. It gives me hope that it's not just

my generation that is interested in passenger rail as one of the solutions for our mobility problems.

After forty five years RailPAC is still relevant, indeed our voice is needed more than ever as passenger rail still does not receive the investment and the priority it deserves. But RailPAC will have to move with the times in order to be more effective, and indeed to speak the same language through the same media as the younger generations. Up to now we have relied largely on the print medium to propagate our message. Steel Wheels has been, and still is a useful tool to connect with our members. It is also successful at the Capitol in Sacramento and with many of the boards and governing councils because of its professional appearance. And because it is not electronic it doesn't get lost or deleted. Our guarterly distributions among state Senators and Assembly members, County Supervisors etc. are remembered by elected officials and their staff and so we plan to continue this method of communication. But as one of our new members pointed out at the Union Station event, a quarterly magazine cannot reach hundreds or thousands of people, and definitely not in a hurry. We MUST upgrade email lists and social media capability and have a more interesting website. These are priorities if we are to achieve our objectives in the years ahead.

Link-US

The ongoing saga of LAUS continues, with no good news in sight. A conversation with an informed source in early September revealed that there is yet another funding gap, that serious engineering will not start until **2026**, and construction completion tentatively set for **2033**. Another well placed individual told us that some of the concepts presented by the consultants included reducing the platform lengths and resulted in a grade from the platforms to the viaduct over the freeway that is too steep for mainline trains. It's hard to make this up, after 43 years of promoting this vital link.

Part of the problem is of course the ramp to the El Monte busway. Before it was built there was more clearance below the end of the station tracks. Caltrans has also raised its standard height for bridge clearance, although of course thousands of overbridges exist built to the old standard. What about substituting slimmer steel structural members instead of thick concrete slabs? One wonders if regrading the busway ramp has been considered, at least at the west end, which might alleviate the problem for two or four tracks.

A half a billion dollars of state money has been earmarked for the project and is supposedly "ring-fenced". It's hard for me to say this but given the uncertainty over both the practical difficulty of construction and the inability or reluctance of LACMTA (LA Metro) to find the rest of the funds, maybe the

By Paul Dyson - RailPAC Editor

State should spend the money on other vital rail projects. There is no shortage of worthwhile investments, both on the LOSSAN corridor and in other areas of the State.

Perhaps more important in both the immediate and long term is the complete ineptitude, and the indifference of LA Metro when it comes to main line rail infrastructure. When SCRRA (Metrolink) was formed in 1992 the routes north of Union Station to the Antelope Valley and to Ventura were predominantly single track. Apart from Los Angeles to Van Nuys and a couple of new sidings, they still are. South of Los Angeles the biggest bottleneck is the notorious Rosecrans – Marquardt at grade crossing. Talked about for years, this project finally got under way in 2018 thanks to a promise of High Speed rail money. It is slated for completion in 2025. But the key to it all, Union Station and the run through tracks, sits on a back burner. The plan to have it done by the 2028 Olympics has obviously been dropped.

The lesson that I draw from LA Metro's failure to deliver intercity and regional rail is that there is fundamental weakness and disconnect in the governance and management structure. We'll be examining that in depth in our 4th quarter issue, planned for the end of the year.

Pdyson@railpac.org

Notice is hereby given that Citizens For Rail California Inc., dba Rail Passenger Association of California and Nevada announces it's annual business meeting.





YOU can make a difference!

Rail Passenger Association of California and Nevada

A statewide membership organization working for the improvement and expansion of passenger rail service.

Organized in 1977 by a group of passenger rail supporters, RailPAC has been working for over 45 years to establish a network of rail services that will provide service to and throughout California and Nevada.

> We need your support to improve and expand passenger rail service in the west!



Representation and Advocacy

RailPAC presents a strong case to federal, state and local governments for reliable rail services from long-distance trains to commuter operations. Your organization gains strength with a growing membership base and members are invited to review and reflect on proposed changes in budgets, routes and service frequencies.

Cooperative Alliances

RailPAC works closely with other rail organizations and transit advocacy groups.

Volunteer Efforts

Members work with local rail passenger groups including Station Hosts at several Amtrak stations, attend and report on meetings of regional and transit boards and write letters to editors of newspapers. Members also submit personal reports of on-board service levels for distribution in Steel Wheels and the weekly e newsletter.

FOR MORE INFORMATION about RailPAC and how you can help expand and improve passenger rail, visit our website **RailPAC.org** or fill out and return the form on the back page of this newsletter.

RailPAC.org

Our website includes a complete listing of our current positions, as well as frequent articles and reports from around the state. Visit RailPAC.org to learn more about these and other regional passenger rail projects we support.

Social Media

To receive the latest rail news from around the state:

- Follow us on Twitter: www.twitter.com/RailPAC
- Become a fan on Facebook: www.facebook.com/RailPAC



RAILPAC'S WORK AT-A-GLANCE

RailPAC is working with Amtrak, Caltrans and all agencies involved in achieving the following goals for expanding and extending safe and reliable rail passenger service. We support adequate funding for these services and vigorously promote them.

High Speed Rail

Build the High Speed Rail system together with electrification Caltrain and Metrolink.

Coast Corridor

Reduce travel times. Continue to enhance onboard amenities. Restore connections to Long-Distance trains at Los Angeles Union Station. New stations at Gilroy, Watsonville, Soledad and King City.

Pacific Surfliner Corridor

Campaign for run through tracks at Los Angeles Union Station to improve punctuality and travel times for Amtrak and Metrolink. Extend service to the Coachella and Imperial valleys. Built bypass tunnels at San Clemente and Del Mar.

Sunset Corridor

Introduce daily service via Phoenix.

San Joaquin Corridor

Integrate service with High Speed segment, Extend service north of Sacramento. Add stations at Elk Grove, Marysville, Chico and Redding.

Capitol Corridor

Increase frequency to hourly service between Sacramento and Oakland. Increase frequency of service to San Jose. Extend service to Reno and San Luis Obispo.

Las Vegas

Reestablish service between Los Angeles and Las Vegas. Support the Brightline High Speed Rail Project linking Las Vegas with Southern California

Your Membership includes...

- STEEL WHEELS: Passenger Rail in California and the West
- Weekly newsletter and periodic email alerts
- Eligibility to attend our annual and regional meetings



RailPAC is a 501c3 Organization therefore all donations are tax deductible.



President's Commentary

By Steve Roberts – RailPAC President



The summer of 2023 has been an active one for RailPAC and key members of its Board. Driven by the situation in San Clemente and the Union Station Through Tracks Project (LinkUS), RailPAC has been very active in public and legislative outreach. Also of concern has been the end of the Division of

Rail at Caltrans which is something Paul Dyson, RailPAC VP Government Affairs, is monitoring.

Brian Yanity, RailPAC's VP South has been a whirlwind of activity regarding the San Clemente landslide issue. He has written articles for the Voice of Orange County, provided comments at Orange County Transportation Authority Board meetings (the lead agency), met with mayors, legislative staff, etc.

Paul Dyson, RailPAC VP of Government Affairs, has been at work trying to fathom what LA Metro is doing regarding the LinkUS situation. LinkUS just does not seem to be a priority.

The San Clemente landslide and the LOSSAN Corridor in general were a call to action for RailPAC's post-pandemic return to legislative meetings in Sacramento. State Senator Catherine Blakespear, whose district encompasses much of the south end of the LOSSAN Corridor, has taken a keen interest in the future of the Corridor and the San Clemente situation in particular. In August she chaired an informational hearing on the San Clemente landslide and recovery/planning actions and strategies. Brian, Paul and I had an hour meeting with the Senator the night before the hearing and she echoed many of our talking points the following day.

Brian and I attended and each of us made a public comment. Of interest was that the hearing was well attended by other Senators. Normally, since the goal of an informational hearing to create a public record for a committee, most senators don't attend (key staff members do) or if they do attend it is briefly to give a on the record statement. Senators stayed, listened and asked pointed questions of the presenters (Orange County Transportation Authority, North County Transit District, Caltrans, the local Orange County Supervisor for the San Clemente area, Supervisor Katrina Foley and a scientist from the Scrips Institute discussing climate change).

In addition to the hearing we had meetings with the Assembly Transportation Committee and Senate Transportation Committee staffs. These were followed by meetings with staff of several State Senators and Assembly members, Caltrans and the California High-Speed Rail Authority. In all these meetings, in addition to San Clemente issue, we also focused on the LA Metro's LinkUS governance failure as well as the restructuring at Caltrans.

One major takeaway from our August meetings in Sacramento is that there is no substitute for the quality of dialog one gets in a face-to-face meeting. Also there were several times where Brian and I were able to have impromptu discussions with Senators or their staff or senior agency managers in hallways/ floor lobbies while waiting for meetings to begin. procurement of new long-distance rolling stock. It is a deliberate and complex endeavor for several reasons. The first is the lack of a strong manufacturing base for long-distance equipment; little has been built in 40-years. Second, the new cars must meet new safety and accessibility requirements. Third, the CAF and Nippon Sharyo and now Venture car meltdowns do not breed confidence in either the manufacturers or the customer oversight process. Fourth, the market is not the same as it was historically, it is more bifurcated. On the one hand the coach market is more price sensitive while on the other there is more demand for premium accommodations and access to technology.

The current task underway as part of the car procurement process is Amtrak's proposed, accessible core alternative, a design strategy centered on having all disabled accommodations in specific cars (coach and sleeper) adjacent to the Diner and Lounge. All other coaches and sleeping cars would not have accessible accommodations and the designs shown are just placeholders. The current ADA requirements, requiring accessible accommodations in each car, create real design challenges for access to the diner or lounge.

Strictly from the ridership and ticket revenue perspective, the mobility impaired market represents a market worth accommodating. Over 21 million Americans, 7% or the total population, are ambulatory disabled. 15% of those between the ages of 65 and 74 are ambulatory disabled, while 31% of those aged 75 and older are ambulatory disabled. Many of those ambulatory disabled are veterans who have had to give up the easy mobility of youth and middle age because of their service to their country. They should be able to receive full access to services on their train journey.

It is important to remember two things; Amtrak's proposed concept is strictly focused on the approval or disapproval of an accessible core. Detailed non-accessible interior designs are still to be determined. If Amtrak's proposal is not accepted, the alternative for equal service could easily be at-seat food and beverage service from a commissary car (no diner or lounge).

Some have suggested an exemption, but that is not an option. Amtrak already had an exemption for the Superliners. The ADA has been in place for over thirty years, Amtrak has no option other than to design for accessible accommodations and on-board services. The option of just rebuilding the current fleet would leave no cars for expansion. It would also not be approved by the FRA since the key goal for the Infrastructure Act was to rebuild American manufacturing and its supply chain. Other concerns involve the semi-permanent couplings. As presented, Amtrak's design concepts, the accessible core, are the only cars semi-permanently coupled. The nonaccessible cars would be single cars. The propossed concept is not a permanently coupled trainset. In many ways Amtrak's accessible core concept is similar the Southern Pacific's 1930s articulated triple-unit diner/kitchen/coffee shop car configuration on the Coast Daylight.



One of most important initiatives underway is Amtrak's

Another issue noted is flexibility. The accessible core could be fielded as five or six car building blocks mixed and matched for seasonal variations or train legs. Finally, there is the issue of enroute car setouts. But how often does that occur and how many of those failures and set-outs are driven by the "fix it when it breaks" mentality? Talgo delivered near 100% dispatch reliability with no protect sets using predictive maintenance. This is the same process Amtrak is using with its new fleets.

Finally, as this Steel Wheels is being printed and distributed, major benchmarks for the Infrastructure Bill will have most likely been announced. The first is the Corridor ID Program a gateway process of planning requirements for a corridor to enter into the Infrastructure Bill funding pipeline. With its well established corridors and active JPA staff all of California's corridors and the two high-speed rail routes should make the cut. Approval in the Corridor ID program brings a modest amount of funding for more in-depth planning. The big funding program is the Federal-State Partnership category. Announcement of these grants will reveal whether California High Speed Rail and Brightline West can continue to aggressively move forward. Texas Central could also see a boost to its fortunes. Two Amtrak grant requests are of note. The first, in partnership with Illinois and the city of Chicago, is the Chicago Union Station Access Project. This project will dramatically improve access and reliability to Chicago Union Station for Midwest Corridor and long-distance routes south and east of Chicago. The second Amtrak grant request is to fund capital improvements to enable a daily Sunset Ltd. via Phoenix, daily Cardinal, a Fort Worth leg of the Crescent from Meridian, MS to Ft. Worth, TX and capacity improvements near Sandpoint, ID.

So stay tuned things are happening!

Guest Commentary by James Tilley

Co-Chair of THE AURORA GROUP and Distinguished Railroad Industry Veteran

As the end of FY23 rapidly approaches Amtrak has precious little time to firm up design specs and place an order for what appears to be a complete redesign of the long-distance passenger service. The IIJA provided five fiscal years of advance authorized funding for which Amtrak has, at most, three years left to obligate. Last week the railroad previewed an integrated train design focused upon accessibility but did not address other critical issues.

Since at least 2010 Amtrak's fleet plans have stressed the need to address replacing its increasingly aged railcar fleet. A 2018 statement of "fleet planning principles" included a guiding principle relating to the need to order "off the shelf designs". Upon passage of the IIJA it became increasingly apparent that not only had Amtrak failed to perform scheduled maintenance on its long-distance fleet but that no advance design work had been completed to expedite an order for replacement cars. Last week's presentation was notable in that, first, no rail car builder was there to elaborate upon its design ideas and, secondly, Amtrak did not attribute any of the concepts presented to supplier feedback solicited early this year. It is unclear, at best, if any car builder is prepared to execute the concept outlined.

Right now, two designs meet all FRA and ADA requirementsthe Siemen's Venture car and the Viewliner, an Amtrak design which has been adopted for dining cars, baggage cars and sleepers. Were Amtrak actually motivated to re-equip the LD service one might surmise that these designs would be central to an initial order. But that appears not to be the case.

Amtrak has the capability to modify existing equipment to immediately offer increased accessibility which would be available sooner than awaiting a ten-year delivery window which has characterized recent Amtrak car orders. Rocky Mountaineer recently gutted railcars built in the 1950's and remanufactured them at a reported cost that is 60% of that for a new car and extended the 60-year-old car's life by 10 years. These cars are presently in service between Denver and Moab, UT operating over the Union Pacific and yielding premium pricing for a premium travel experience.

Similarly, VIA Rail has similarly remanufactured railcars originally built in the 1950's which supports service between Toronto and Vancouver. However, there are no indications that this avenue is being pursued by Amtrak.

The focus upon integrated trainsets ignores the fact that Amtrak's operating plans encompass redeploying discrete segments of railcar capacity from one market to another to address seasonality of demand. Moreover, Amtrak operates shorter trainsets that combine or split with other trains for movement as a single entity to its terminating station. It is difficult to envision how such an operating plan would be supported if total reliance is placed upon trainsets.

Trainsets would be incompatible with existing equipment, further complicating the execution of an operating plan.

The Acela II trainsets were ordered more than seven years ago and have yet to enter service. Amtrak placed its order for 125 Viewliners in 2010 and, ten years later, cars were still entering service long after the initial target date. Due to an Amtrak design deficiency each of the new sleepers lacks a linen closet resulting in a sleeping car room being used for linen and supplies as opposed to being available for sale. The Amtrak OIG has already reported delays in deliver of the new Airo trainsets. Design oversights by Amtrak resulted in \$40 million in additional change-order related costs combined with a six-month delay in delivery. Amtrak participated in the design of the "Next Generation Bi-level Railcar" which Nippon Sharyo was to build. The contract was let in 2012 subsequent to design work that commenced with passage of PRIIA in 20008. The cars failed an FRA mandated buff strength test during the summer of 2015. An inability by Nippon Sharyo to rectify the flawed design resulted in the bi-level contract being cancelled in 2017 so as to enable awarding of the contract to Siemen's and utilize federal funding before the authorization expired.

Amtrak can ill-afford a repeat of this scenario.

Amtrak is to be commended for attempting to exceed ADA requirements for the LD fleet acquisition. But then again, perhaps not. Regulatory hurdles are daunting and can be a challenge to meet. Given supply bottlenecks and the aged nature of Amtrak's LD fleet adoption of existing designs with minimal modifications would seem to be the logical path forward in order to expedite delivery of a product that can be placed into service immediately. A product that is compatible with the existing fleet and one that offers the flexibility to be redeployed between markets as demand ebbs and flows."

Zero Emissions Rail Options: Overhead Wire, Battery, Hydrogen

by Brian Yanity, Vice President, South, RailPAC

Electric Rail/Overhead Wire

Electric trains are the most energy-efficient way of rapidly moving large numbers of people over land. A conventional electric train does not store its fuel supply onboard or carry its weight. Instead, the electrical energy is supplied from an external source as needed straight to the traction motors. With fewer moving parts, electric trains are much more dependable than diesel-powered trains. Electric energy can be supplied from a variety of sources, including regeneration during braking.

Electric, zero-emissions rail transportation is a proven technology over a century old, in widespread and growing use throughout the world. Electric trains are quieter, emission free, and have far greater overall energy efficiency. They



Aralvaimozhi is famous for the wind farms, which generate about 450 MW of electricity. Aralvaimozhi possesses the largest wind farms in the world. In the picture, Guruvayur - Chennai Egmore Express powered by ARAKKONAM WAP-4. Photo: Jay Railfotographia

also can accelerate faster than diesel-powered trains and have lower operating and maintenance costs. This enables increased frequency of trains and expanded capacity for a section of track. Passenger rail lines that rely exclusively on diesel-powered trains are by comparison limited in their speed, capacity, and capability.

The "sparks effect" is the phenomenon, documented around the world, of marked increase in passenger ridership following electrification due to: (1) increased train speed and frequency; (2) enhanced passenger comfort due to a quieter, smoother, smokeless ride; (3) fewer train breakdowns; and (4) lower costs, allowing for economies in ticket pricing or investment in more frequent service.

Electrification Here and Abroad

The US pioneered long-distance, heavy-duty electric railroading projects over a century ago. Regional electric rail systems helped develop California metropolitan areas in the first half of the twentieth century. Pacific Electric operated freight trains in Southern California until the 1950's; and the Sacramento Northern Railway ran electric freight locomotives to Oakland, Sacramento, and Chico until 1965¹.

Over a dozen countries have all their mainlines electrified, while others are spending tens of billions of dollars' each year on overhead wire rail electrification. A wide variety of rail operations in various nations, including South Africa, India, China, much of Europe, Japan, and Korea, have demonstrated that overhead catenary on main lines is less expensive overall than maintaining and operating an all-diesel fleet for an equivalent level of heavy service on main lines. An electric locomotive can have much greater power per unit than a diesel locomotive, so fewer locomotives are needed on a multilocomotive train to do the same job. The world's most powerful locomotives are all electrics. The 'fuel cost' is much less; and because electric locomotives have far fewer moving parts, they are less costly to maintain. Of course there are costs to maintain a catenary system, but conversely it is more costly to maintain diesel locomotives than electrics. Since electric trains require less maintenance, they spend less time in depots, resulting in higher equipment availability.

The total length of mainline railway electrified in the US is about 1,500 miles, or less than one percent of the system. The largest share, in the Northeast, is comprised of the Northeast Corridor, the Keystone Corridor, parts of the SEPTA system around Philadelphia, New Jersey Transit, Metro North and the Long Island Railroad. The only other metropolitan areas that have electrified routes are Chicago and Denver. By contrast, in 2022, more than 50% of combined passenger and freight rail was electrified in such countries as India (83%), Italy (79%), South Korea (78%), China (67%), Germany (55%), France (54%), and Russia (54%). The US lags virtually the entire developed world in railway electrification by an order of magnitude or more.

¹ http://www.wrm.org/about/railroad-history/sacramento-northern-railway

Costs

The main drawback to electrification is the initial capital cost of overhead wire and supporting electrical infrastructure. The recent Caltrain electrification project between San Francisco and San Jose cost about \$14 million/route mile, much higher than the world average and easily the most expensive per mile rail electrification project ever. However, many of the reasons for this arose from limited experience in the U.S. with electric mainline rail technology and construction. Also important is an industrial supply chain of experienced, competing contractors, manufacturers, and vendors. In Germany for example, labor pay scales, material costs, and environmental regulations are not much different from California, yet the cost of overhead wire catenary and supporting infrastructure is much less--as low as \$2 million/route mile.

The belief that overhead catenary wire is too expensive to install and maintain is not borne out by the evidence. The many countries that have electrified their rail networks did so primarily because it proved to be more economical than diesel power on heavily-used lines while improving performance.

Battery Power

Battery-powered maintenance trains have long been used by large urban rail transit agencies around the world. But starting in the late 1800s, electric trains powered by an external source took the lead.

Batteries of course have far more energy and power capability today and are steadily improving. For several years, Alstom battery-catenary hybrid switcher locomotives have been working in European freight yards. However, even if the current state of battery technology brought about doubling the current levels of energy density or onboard storage capacity, locomotives or multiple units powered by batteries alone would only have a small fraction of the range of those powered by diesel.

Operations and maintenance costs of a locomotive or multipleunit with a battery pack will always be higher than that of an equivalent 'straight-electric' unit without one, and overall energy efficiency will be somewhat less. Electrifying selected line segments, incremental electrification, combined with battery electric propulsion can potentially address many of the shortcomings of both technologies. However, commercial operating experience with battery combined with an external power source is very limited.



Hydrogen

It is unfortunate that, other than battery technology, unproven hydrogen seems to be the only "zero emissions" rail technology option even considered by Caltrans and CARB for California intercity and regional trains. The laws of physics mean that hydrogen-powered trains will always have inferior energy efficiency and be more complex compared to conventional electric trains. The primary problem with hydrogen is its low energy density compared to other fuels.

According to one estimate, hydrogen trains are about four times more expensive than a standard electric/catenary train. Other disadvantages stem from the inherent complexity of hydrogen supply chains, on-board storage systems, and drivetrains. More complex systems onboard mean more potential points of failure and higher costs. Future technological developments will not change these fundamental facts.

What California needs is a rail system with conventional electrification as its backbone (with catenary-battery hybrids for relatively short unelectrified sections). As concluded by a 2021 report by the UK Railway Industry Association: "Evidence does not support the view that electrification is unnecessary, thanks to hydrogen and battery systems improving rapidly: hydrogen trains are inherently less efficient than electric trains, due to the physical properties of the gas."

WANTED: Photographers for Steel Wheels If you have a collection of hi-res jpeg photos, especially of passenger trains in California, or enjoy taking them, contact the Editor,

pdyson@railpac.org.

Don't forget to check your subscription expiration date on the mailing label and renew your membership if it is due.

Thank you for your continued support for RailPAC and passenger rail.

Planning For Connections

by Alon Levy, pedestrianobservations.com

Swiss intercity rail planning follows the maxim "run as fast as necessary, not as fast as possible." This is usually uttered in opposition to high-speed rail in the sense of the French TGV network. But what does this slogan really mean? And how does it inform good planning?

The Issue of Timed Connections

The origin of the Swiss planning system is in the 1970s and 80s, as it was refining intercity rail, taking what West Germany was doing with its InterCity brand and going further. Two key elements were present from the start: timed connections, and regular clockface timetables (initially every two hours in West Germany). The clockface timetabling facilitated the timed connections, since it's easier to figure out how to schedule a timed transfer at (say) Frankfurt if the same train moves happen at the same intervals.

With these elements in place, Swiss Federal Railways (SBB) set up a schedule in which trains would be timed to arrive in Zurich all at the same time, currently just before the hour, and depart all at the same time, currently on or just after the hour.

The issue is what to do at stations other than Zurich. Optimizing for timed connections at Zurich means compromising on the question of what to do at other cities. If trains arrive and depart Zurich roughly on the hour, then the terminal at the other end may have ugly arrival and departure times - for example, a 1:40 trip time, with Zurich arrival :56 and departure :04, would mean that the other end has an arrival time of :44 and a departure time of :16. If it's an hourly train, it means it's not possible to time connections there - an arriving bus or regional train would have a transfer time of perhaps 20 minutes, which in a country the size of Switzerland is a large share of the overall trip.

And then there is the looming issue of intercity connections. Zurich is located fairly centrally in Switzerland, but there are some key connections that don't go anywhere near it, led by Bern-Basel via Olten. Bern's central location makes it a great node for timed connections as well. However, the Zurich-Bern trips took 1:09, making it impossible to have timed everywhereto-everywhere connections in both cities.

Speeding Up Trains to Make Connections

In the 1980s, the Zurich-Bern trips took 1:09, so connections could only be timed in Zurich, not Bern. At the time, there were plans for a French-style high-speed rail network connecting Zurich, Bern, and Geneva, but those plans were canceled due to high costs relative to Switzerland's size.

Instead of running as fast as possible, enough to connect Zurich and Geneva in perhaps 1:30, trains would run as fast as necessary, just enough to make connections. The centerpiece of this plan, dubbed Rail 2000, was to speed up Olten-Bern by just enough to shorten Zurich-Bern and Basel-Bern to 0:56 and 0:55 respectively. This way, trains could arrive in all three cities just before the hour and depart just after, facilitating more timed connections.

This system was a resounding success. Swiss rail ridership

has been sharply rising in the last 20 years, from an already fairly high level; by all metrics I am aware of, such as modal split, ridership per capita, and passenger-km per capita, it is Europe's strongest rail network. More speedups are planned, all aiming to add more points where trains can be timed to connect, called *knots*, till the network looks like this:



The Shape of Switzerland

The notion of running trains as fast as necessary is in one sense a global principle. But its surface manifestation of a system designed as an alternative to high-speed rail is a product of Swiss geography; in Japan, the current speed of the Shinkansen is also as fast as necessary. Switzerland's current knot diagram has to be understood in the context of the following geographical features:

Switzerland is small enough that the strongest trunk corridors, like Zurich-Bern, can support just a train every half hour.

Switzerland is also physically small enough that the Zurich-Bern-Basel triangle has legs of about 110 km, which an upgraded rail system can connect in an hour minus transfer time, and which it is very hard to speed up to 30 minutes minus transfer time.

Switzerland is two-dimensional: there is no central trunk through which all service must pass - the diagram above depicts Zurich-Olten as a key link, but Luzern, though not yet a knot, connects separately to both Zurich and Bern.

Swiss train stations have a surplus of tracks, while still functioning as central stations, without thee separation into different stations for different directions that Paris and London have.

Switzerland is not unique in having these features. The Netherlands is the same: it's a small two-dimensional country with demand for many connections to be timed. The Netherlands built a 300 km/h high-speed rail line between Amsterdam, Rotterdam, and the border with Belgium toward Antwerp, Brussels, and Paris, but this line is not important to its intercity rail planning, which instead lives on Swiss-style knots.



Rhaetian Bahn connection to Post bus at Untervaz-Trimmis, Switzerland Photo: Georg Trub

However, not even all small countries are like Switzerland and the Netherlands. Israel is one- rather than two-dimensional: all trains pass through Tel Aviv and the Ayalon Railway, and there is no real need for timed connections, as the most important city pair not involving Tel Aviv, Haifa-Jerusalem, passes through Tel Aviv, with through-service to begin as soon as electrification is completed. Taiwan is so linear that a single high-speed rail line connects all of its cities, with higher ridership per capita than in any other country I have data for except maybe Japan; even before high-speed rail, the shape of its mainline network was <u>a single line on the west coast</u> connecting the cities and another on the east coast connecting smaller settlements.

And then in large countries, running as fast as necessary requires choosing a speed. Germany is two-dimensional like Switzerland, but has a string of city pairs 90-100 km apart -Hanover-Bielefeld-Dortmund, or Mannheim-Stuttgart, or the Fulda-Frankfurt-Würzburg triangle, or Würzburg-Nuremberg - for which running a fast as necessary entails a choice between connections in 60, 45, or 30 minutes. Longer-distance city pairs, like Nuremberg-Munich, Berlin-Leipzig, and the Hamburg-Hanover-Bremen triangle, are even less constrained.

Capacity

The Swiss network is based on the idea that near major stations like Zurich, trains should arrive and depart on pulses every 30 minutes. This way, the Olten-Bern line runs eight intercity trains per hour, but they are not equally spaced: they are timetabled in two platoons over a period of even minutes each, with the off time used for regional trains not participating in the knot system.

Even in the Netherlands, this isn't quite tenable. Amsterdam-Eindhoven trains come at regular 10-minute interval, each third train requiring a connection at Utrecht and the other two trains in three running directly. In Israel, Tel Aviv-Haifa trains run at 30-minute intervals midday, but for two four-hour peak periods each day this is boosted to four trains per hour - and this is even before electrification has been completed.

The situation in Germany deserves especial mention. Germany is investing in it intercity rail network in a way that sometimes tries to be Switzerland except bigger (such as the Deutschlandtakt and other measures supported by technical advocates) and sometimes tries to build high-speed rail lines and through-stations like Stuttgart 21. The technical advocates dislike Stuttgart 21 and argue that it's un-Swiss to timetable intercity trains throughout the hour rather than in two pulses with inactivity between them. But Germany has large enough cities that it can't afford to keep intercity lines out for so much time. Already, with mediocre speeds, the Deutschlandtakt plan for 2030 prescribes 4.5 trains an hour between Frankfurt and Mannheim and between Frankfurt and Cologne. As more highspeed lines come online, demand will grow; Deutsche Bahn projects to double ridership between 2019 and the 2030s, which will force the busiest links to operate a train every five to 10 minutes.

Is Swiss Planning Useful Outside Switzerland and the Netherlands?

Unambiguously, yes. However, it would look different.

The best place to see how different it should be is, naturally, the Northeastern United States, my area of research. None of the features that made Rail 2000 work is present there: the region is large and has huge cities, is one- rather than two-dimensional, and has capacity-constrained stations forcing round-the-hour use of every approach track.

What this means is that there is little optimization from running slower than as fast as possible on the Northeast Corridor trunk line. However, running a fast as necessary remains a solid planning maxim on all the branches that connect to it, with their own timed connections to one another and to local buses in secondary cities like Worcester and Springfield. Most trains between Boston and Washington should run as express as practical based on station track speeds, and the local trains may plausibly only run every half hour, making them ideal for a system of timed half-hourly connections.

Train Bus and ferry all connect at Brienz, Switzerland. Photo: Martin Bennet



Notes from Switzerland: Transit Fare Integration is Key to Success



Seamless Bay Area's Ian Griffiths just completed an extensive study tour of Switzerland's intercity rail and urban transit systems. Streetsblog wanted to bring his thoughts to readers.

A key success factor in Switzerland's attractive, high-ridership system is the principle of "One journey, One ticket": the idea that when you pay a fare, it's for your entire journey, no matter how many times you transfer between modes or operators. The study delegation of Bay Area transit leaders to Switzerland learned the details of how this works from Helmut Eichhorn, Managing Director of Alliance SwissPass, a mandatory association of operators and fare associations created by the federal government, and from representatives from ZVV, the regional fare association for the Zurich region. The way this is done is more complex than I was expecting before I visited Switzerland, but the result for the end user is that you pay a 'fair' fare that is basically proportional to how far you go. And, there are major efforts underway to make it even simpler and fairer. For example, if you wanted to take a trip from the city to



the mountains, you might take a tram to a regional train to a ferry to a cable car, all of which would be included in the same ticket price. On the way back, if you chose to take a different combination of modes or routes, your journey would be the same price. Helmut Eichhorn of Alliance SwissPass presented to our study delegation the specific statutory requirements that make transit seamless across Switzerland – abiding by these are a condition of receiving public funding. The federal government defines in law some requirements for all ticket sales nationwide:

- Open access to transit (no fare gates) all transit is 'proof of payment' by law
- · No obligatory reservations
- All tickets must be flexible and have no restrictions on time of travel



How do we distribute the joint revenues?



How do the Swiss make this work? Switzerland has been described as a "system of systems" – there's both a nationwide fare structure for rail and bus, plus 18 regional fare associations, each with zone-based structures, where you pay for the number of zones you go through. (The Swiss zonebased fare structure was an inspiration for Seamless Bay Area's Fare Vision Map due to it's logical structure and how it lends itself to a polycentric region like the Bay Area.) Ticket machine sign showing Bern canton's fare structure is managed by regional tariff association Libero. Zones are small; the extra cost of going to the next zone is low. For trips between regions, Alliance SwissPass and SBB, the national rail agency, oversee



a distance-based fare structure, which is applied instead of the region-based structure. Fares are distributed back to operators based on some complex formulas – but the rider doesn't see the complexity.

Becoming a member of Alliance SwissPass, the national fare structure association, is a mandatory condition of receiving public funding. In other words, fare integration is not optional. In addition to the national structure, a variety of special passes are offered within the 18 regions in Switzerland; for example, offers in the Bern region, with a population of about 1 million, include a single ticket, a one-day travel pass, or multiple journey tickets (at a slight discount). The Zurich region uniquely offers a 24-hour ticket. Because of the lack of fare gates nationwide

automatically, the app charges the best possible fare. As shown in the screenshot, I tried out Fairtig, and it correctly mapped my journey, including the transfer, and charged me the right fare, and gave me a satisfying diagram of my journey – just like Uber or Lyft would send me after a ridehail. So, unlike the Bay Area, where the lack of any fare integration creates all sorts of inequities and disincentives to take transit, Switzerland has *a lot* of different levels of fare integration - between modes, and between regions. Fares are basically 'fair', even if all the fare zones are sometimes a bit complex. Riders may not be able to predict exactly what the fare will be, but they trust in the system and know they will get charged approximately proportional to how far they're going. The federal government is now trying to simplify fares even more with a pilot program that would reconcile regional differences and shift even more to 'post-trip pricing'. Finally, an important fare policy that drives ridership is the highly popular 'half-fare' travel card, which over 50 percent of the Swiss population chooses to purchase. The card, which costs CHF 165/year (US\$182), provides a 50 percent discount on all transit trips during the year. For many riders, the pass rapidly pays for itself, and acts as an incentive to ride transit throughout the year. Tourists are a significant market for transit and a variety of pass products are specifically marketed to them - but not the half-fare card, which is only for Swiss residents. (In fact a different 'half-fare card' product is available to visitors, but it is much more expensive than the product available to Swiss residents) In sum, my takeaways on Swiss fare policy are:

 Participation in integrated fare structures should be mandatory, not optional.

(mandated by law), many Swiss have embraced mobile ticketing: simply enter any origin & destination in the country on the SBB, VBB or other mobile app, purchase a ticket, and get a QR code. Here's the screenshot of when I used @ FAIRTIQ to travel from Bussnang to Zurich, with one transfer at Weinfelden (this was a long, 1hr 15 minute regional journey). It correctly mapped my trip and charged me the right fare. Most tickets are purchased as mobile tickets now instead of at machines. By law via Alliance SwissPass, all agencies must sell tickets for all other agencies in the nation - including on all apps. So any ticket is available from any point of sale. An even simpler way of paying is via Fairtiq, a popular Swiss mobile ticketing app. A rider can open the app and then 'swipe right' to begin their journey and transfer freely bewteen modes. Then, a rider swipes left when their journey ends (or, the app will guess where the trip ended if they forget); then

Thank you for travelling with FAIRTIQ!

| 5:23 PM | \mathbf{O} | |
|---------|--------------|------------|
| 5:23 PM | 9 | Bussnang |
| 5:31 PM | Ļ | Weinfelden |
| 5:38 PM | 9 | Weinfelden |
| 6:26 PM | ļ | Zürich HB |
| 6:26 PM | | |

Standard journey price

Charged price

CHF 27.80

• Having a common 'logic' to fare integration that seems fair matters appears more than having a super simple structure. 'One ticket, one journey' is key. (That said, at the UITP conference I attended after the study tour, many panelists stressed that fare simplification can be an important and effective strategy for attracting new markets of riders)

• Integrated fares provides opportunities for common fare passes, like half price fare cards & tourist passes, which can be powerful incentives to use transit a lot – and generate significant revenue.

• The more ways to pay for transit, the better. Ticket machines, mobile ticketing, and Fairtiq all work well for different types of users.

> This story appears courtesy of Seamless Bay Area Alliance

COAST STARLIGHT 2023: A SHAMEFULLY SHRUNK TRAIN

by Alek Friedman, RailPAC member, train & mass-transit advocate

In mid-June of this year, I finally was priveliged to travel on an Amtrak longdistance train. Having traveled regularly all over the U.S., this 5-year break was a long one... due to the pandemic, economic slowdown. closures & shutdowns. etc. Today, I certainly saw some big changes since the last trip back in 2018; and most changes weren't overly encouraging!



Unfortunately, this trip was not without some negative aspects and ongoing issues:

1. Train Consist / Lack Of Rolling Stock

Amtrak's ever diminishing fleet of 30 – 50 year-old "Steel Boxes on Wheels" (a.k.a. Superliner cars) is felt more than ever. This was the shortest Coast Starlight train I've ever

Initially, I booked a trip on the southbound Coast Starlight in October 2022, from San Jose to Los Angeles. However, a freight-train derailment occurred on the day of the trip, somewhere in southern Oregon. So, Amtrak employed its usual "Running after a fly with a bazooka" method – and canceled the entire (!) route, from Seattle all the way to L.A. How typical! The silver lining is, Amtrak not only issued me a full refund, but also granted me a travel certificate; so I went ahead and booked an inbound trip to L.A., to return after visit to my friends in San Jose.

First, Some Positive Observations:

On-Time Performance: The Coast Starlight's on-time performance was impressive. Considering numerous slow-downs and wait-times, – due to the single-tracking throughout the route, as well as traffic by freight trains and L.A. County commuter trains, – our train #11 has arrived into L.A. on time, even ahead of schedule!

Onboard Service: The sleeping car attendants were amazing! Both Lorna (car #1130) and especially Cindy (from the next car) were very professional and courteous. They made the trip truly special, and we engaged in numerous chats. We all agreed about Amtrak's major issues, including: lack of customeroriented service, severe lack of rolling stock, and a loss of the "Pacific Parlour" car, – a true Coast Starlight's gem.

Dining Menu: The upgraded dining menu, including lunch and dinner, was truly impressive. The Shrimp (appetizer) and the Steak (entrée) were amazing; so was the dessert (see picture). In fact, I haven't had such a delicious steak in years; the Amtrak chef has truly done an outstanding job.

Restroom Operation: All restrooms in our car (#1130) were operating normally, with minimal odor; although there was a sewage stench just outside our car.

seen. Our train consisted of just 7 cars total: a baggage car, 2 passenger coaches, observation car / lounge, dining car, 1 passenger sleeper, and finally - the 2nd sleeper shared with train staff. This is beyond shameful! I'm aware that these ridiculously short trains cost Amtrak significant loss of revenue, and for passengers - serious lack of travel options and soldout tickets well in advance. How many passengers were not able to travel! That's not even mentioning enormous waste of locomotive fuel, as the engines are built to pull trains with at least double (!) the consist. Lack of available train equipment is becoming more & more problematic, drawing astronomically high prices and causing severe shortage of train cars. Speaking of prices, the Amtrak Guest Rewards is almost becoming useless; the number of points has skyrocketed as well; and now it almost takes 100,000 points to travel on a sleeper across the country. The number of points has doubled or even tripled for the past 5 years.

The aging of Superliner cars also means frequent equipment malfunction, including the sewage system / toilets, airconditioning and climate control issues, and of course – cranky & shattered cars, which constantly produce squeaking & aching sounds. Considering that Amtrak has received significant funding (by the Biden administration), Amtrak's failure to order new cars, and repairing the existing ones, can only be attributed to Amtrak's gross mismanagement, if not callous indifference towards long-distance passenger service overall.

On a side note: I recently observed the Pacific Surfliner regional trains running with 5 - 6 cars, which is great and reasonably sufficient. So logically, the long-distance trains should run at least with double the # of cars, i.e. 10 - 14 cars per trainset. Sadly, in reality the term "Logic" is not in Amtrak's vocabulary. The long-distance trains are just as short as local / regional routes, if not shorter. In fact, as an example: the

Capitol Limited long-distance train was recently spotted with only 3 (!) passenger cars – instead of the usual 10+ cars.

Lastly, the loss of the "Pacific Parlour" car continues to be an issue for the Starlight. Amtrak's failing to repair and re-launch the "Parlour" – is inexcusable. The "Parlour" car has been unanimously supported by both the passengers and trains staff. Amtrak should most certainly repair and place the "Pacific Parlour" back onto the Starlight. Will it ever happen, though?..

2. Lack of Printed Schedules

Amtrak has gone too far with abolishing any & all printed schedules and timetables. The Amtrak management has yet to comprehend: printed schedules are a critical component of travel; it's a necessity. The fact that the timetables are no longer available – neither on trains, nor on any stations, – causes problems (not just an inconvenience) for travelers; this keeps passengers completely in the dark, with zero information about upcoming stations and layover times.

Amtrak should most certainly rollback its drastic decision, and print the schedules of every single route, as they had before. Timetables are the fundamental source of information and provide critically important arrival & departure information, as well as all upcoming cities & stations along the route. Besides, passengers should not be forced to go online all the time for schedule updates, especially since many regions, during travel, have no reception. All in all, Amtrak's savings from abolishing the printed schedules is minimal. Everywhere in the world printed train schedules are readily available, both on stations and aboard the trains. Amtrak should take a lesson from that.

3. Dining Car Service

Community Seating: Despite plenty of unoccupied tables in the dining car, the forced "Community Seating" is still in effect. Sadly, Amtrak continues to employ its outdated Communism rules, forcing passengers to join the strangers. Please don't get me wrong: personally, I love meeting new people and engaging in chats. However, it should always be up to the customer to decide whether to join another party, or not. This "Community Seating" clearly benefits Amtrak and its employees, while its effectiveness is questionable. Amtrak needs to abolish this outdated dictatorship rule.

Diner Operating Hours: Amtrak should also reconsider the diner operating hours. Ideally, the diner should be open all day, e.g. from 5 a.m. to 11:30 p.m., with rotating service shifts. An experiment was conducted years ago, with a diner open for 24 hours. The experiment was very successful! All-day dining service avoids overcrowding, forced "community seating", as well as overworked, fatigued staff. More importantly, all-day dining service is much more customer-oriented. It's time for Amtrak to not only take advantage of its successful experiment with all-day dining – but to also follow other countries' dining car rules (in many other countries dining cars are open all day) – and eliminate the policy of time restrictions, forced seating, and strict reservations!

4. Numbering Of Train Cars

Amtrak should (finally!) change its outdated and confusing system of indexing/numbering cars. Instead of assigning a meaningless 4-digit number (e.g. car 1130), a single- or

double-digit car number can be assigned, starting from the train front, in the ascending order. For instance, our Coast Starlight car #1130 can be just indexed as "car #5" (since it's the fifth passenger car – counting from the front). Likewise, if an Amtrak trainset consists of 11 cars, then the car numbers should simply go "Car #1" through "Car #11", in the ascending order. This is how it's done all over the world. And this Car Number should be clearly visible, with a large label, on the exterior. It's easier, simpler, and allows a passenger to locate his/her car immediately. For internal purposes, Amtrak could continue using the 4-digit indexing, but for passengers it makes no sense. Please change this outdated, cumbersome, and meaningless 4-digit numeration of train cars!

6. "Emergency Exit" Window Signage

Another issue where Amtrak has clearly gone too far, is its obsession (or paranoia?) with "Emergency Exit" signage. The new redundant bright label now appears on all windows - on the middle vertical mullion/frame. I've written to Amtrak about this issue previously, but to no avail. Unfortunately, this addition has completely ruined the aesthetics of not just the windows, - but the entire interior. There are already more than enough "Emergency Exit" labels & indicators (see image below); there was no reason to inundate the riders with yet another "Emergency" sign. Additionally, the concept of Aesthetics, not just usability, should be considered. This new label on the window's middle mullion is excessive and repetitive. Too many warnings & bright labels become obtrusive, making the whole ambience guite unpleasant. That is why, Amtrak should remove this useless vertical new "Emergency Exit" label from all train windows' middle frame.

7. Amtrak's Deceptive Advertising

Amtrak's deceptive advertising and unethical practices continue to flourish, particularly on social media. As such, they keep posting the outdated photos / videos of trains on Facebook; nowadays these trains look nothing like they did 10-20 years ago. Numerous photos were recently posted of 12-13 car Coast Starlight trains, with the "Pacific Parlour" car. Today, trains are just half the size (if not shorter), and the "Parlour" car – long-gone. What's even more disturbing, Amtrak's social media management cannot accept any criticism. I've made comments about their outdated and simply wrong photos, but they either ignore the negative comments, or remove the comments; last week they seem to have banned me completely. Oh well... If they continue "shooting themselves in the foot", let it be so. But their sneaky and unethical practices do not speak too highly of the whole Amtrak company, their gross mismanagement, and their deceptive, sneaky advertising.

To summarize: the train ride was itself was, as always, very relaxing, smooth, and much-much better than the outbound trip on FlixBux. However, Amtrak needs an overhaul, as far as its practices, management, goals, etc. If they continue on the current path, the long-distance train service may soon cease to exist. I do have hopes that the public, as well as the Congress, will continue to push on Amtrak and its bureaucrats, to become serious – and invest in new infrastructure, upgrading its existing infrastructure, and most importantly: order new long-distance equipment as soon as possible.

News from All Aboard Arizona

Todd Liebman – President – All Aboard Arizona

These are bright days for passenger rail in Arizona. Amtrak has applied for grants to bring the Sunset Limited back through Phoenix and run it daily. This will allow Arizona Amtrak passengers in the two largest cities to travel between each other and to the east and west in the state.

All Aboard Arizona has sent a letter to Amtrak requesting a stop for the Sunset Limited in Willcox. Willcox is a charming city with a quaint downtown and thriving viticulture and is the heart of the Arizona wine industry. It is home to orchards with apples and peaches. Willcox would be the gateway city to Douglas, Safford and Roper Lake State Park. With a daily Sunset through Phoenix, Phoenix passengers could catch the train and either make a day trip to Willcox and back or enjoy an overnight stay and have two full days to explore the area. The region would also benefit from a convenient travel option to Tucson and Phoenix for shopping, entertainment, or medical appointments. As for other stations in Arizona, we know that Benson and Yuma are slated for station improvements to make those stops ADA compliant funded by Amtrak.

Amtrak has filed a complaint with the Surface Transportation Board against Union Pacific's poor handling of the Sunset Limited. It is axiomatic that timekeeping is essential to building ridership and creating the economic synergies that Amtrak communities need. Amtrak is to be applauded for taking this vital step.

All Aboard Arizona lent its support to California and recently provided comments to the California State Rail Plan.

All this leads to you. Please come to our Passenger Rail Summit on November 4th in Phoenix. We will have dynamic speakers and you can get answers to the questions you have for passenger rail in Arizona.



From the Rear Platform



Bill Kerby and the Editor at the Siemens factory in South Sacramento, May 2013

William Kerby Obituary From the Sacramento Bee

William Charles Kerby

January 17, 1938 - August 13, 2023

Sacramento, California - Dr. William (Bill) Charles Kerby passed away peacefully on Sunday, August 13th at the age of 85 after a brief but valiant battle with lung cancer.

Sacramento native and lifelong resident, Bill was born to William John and Lorene Elizabeth Kerby on January 17th, 1938. He attended Sacred Heart and Sacramento High School, graduating at the age of 17 as class valedictorian. He was a commencement speaker and graduated summa cum laude with a BA in Business Administration from California State University Sacramento in 1959. He earned his Master's Degree in Economics at CSUS in 1961 before going on to the University of Oregon, obtaining a Ph.D. in Economics in 1971.

On a lucky day in 1964, Bill met Roseann Lavelle at his sister's Christmas party in Sacramento. The two immediately hit it off, fell in love, and were married at the Sacramento Cathedral on July 2, 1966. Inseparable since that day, Bill and Roseann built a home and raised three children in Greenhaven. Often seen with tools in his hand fixing anything and everything for anyone and everyone, Bill was a neighborhood fixture who may or may not have let his young children and grandchildren drive his Desoto "just around the block."

Dr. Kerby's career began teaching at CSUS. During his nearly 45 year tenure as a professor of Economics, he served as the Vice Dean of the University and as Chair of the Economics Department. He promoted Economic literacy through a foundation that generated hands-on curricula in area high schools. His most rewarding role was teaching students so they could leave the class with a real understanding of Economic principles, a favorite being that, "sunk costs are sunk." Bill carried his passions for trains, education, outdoor adventure, and civic activism throughout his career and into his retirement. His full life included many adventures that spanned the globe. He toured Guatemala and Mexico on a motorcycle in the early sixties. He enjoyed hikes in the mountains with his family that often became epic feats of endurance for all since "we are almost there." He loved to race his 1940 DeSoto

parallel to train tracks while chasing moving steam engines. He took his grandkids to beaches and Redwoods, State and National Parks, and to find the Loch Ness Monster by way of the Harry Potter train in Scotland. There was always a train ride to be had. Bill continued to advocate



RailPAC plaque presentation to Bill for his services as Treasurer, November 2015

for high-speed rail expansion well into his retirement, acting as the treasurer for the RailPAC.

Bill is survived by his wife of 57 years, Roseann Lavelle Kerby, their children Matthew Kerby, Katie Henderson, and Ann Sharma, and their spouses Michelle Kerby, Joshua Henderson and Saurabh Sharma. He also leaves behind ten grandchildren (Aidan, Liam, Megan, Rohan, Devin, Amanda, Charlotte, Ryan, Alex and Erin) and a multitude of nieces, nephews, grandnieces, and grandnephews - all of whom he spoiled with Vic's ice cream and his famous homemade cookies and pies. He was incredibly proud of his close-knit family and in turn, he was a beloved and dedicated husband, father, grandfather, brother, and uncle. William was preceded in death by his parents, his sister Brenda, and many beloved cats, dogs, rabbits, rats, turtles, and frogs, most of which showed up in his backyard knowing a kind soul when they found one and never left. William will be remembered for his kindness, intelligence, patience, gentle spirit, and enormous generosity. The mischievous Irish glint in his eyes and incredibly strong brew of his coffee will be profoundly missed.

I can only add , as past President of RailPAC and one who knew and collaborated closely with Bill over many years, we are all deeply saddened to hear of Bill's death. Bill was the ideal RailPAC member. Not only did he have a love and a passion for trains, he was also concerned about good public policy, the economic well being of the State and the Country and the role rail should be playing, as well as good value for money for the taxpayer. As Treasurer he took over at a critical time when his predecessor became ill. He inherited rather a mess, but without complaint he set to and soon had the records and accounts in order, and ensured that all the statutory filings were timely. At Board meetings we could always be sure of wise counsel from Bill.

I have fond memories of walking the halls of the Capitol offices with Bill, speaking to all who would listen, and enjoying thoughtful conversation in the Capitol Cafe over a well-earned refreshment. Bill and Roseann often extended hospitality at their home for these visits, for which I am forever grateful.

PDyson@railpac.org



A PUBLICATION OF THE **RAIL PASSENGER ASSOCIATION** OF CALIFORNIA & NEVADA

The RailPAC Mission: Passenger Rail advocacy, Publications...both print and electronic, Representation at regional meetings, and Rail education.

Join us! More memberships increase our strength in presenting the case for rail to policymakers at all levels!

©2021 Citizens for Rail California, Inc. dba Rail Passenger Association of California & Nevada. Permission is granted to quote items in other publications with credit. Signed articles represent author opinions, not necessarily the official views of RailPAC or the member associations. Articles and photos may be submitted for publication to info@railpac.org or mailed to the official address. RailPAC is a non-profit corporation organized under 501(C)(3). Donations are tax deductible.

2023 RAILPAC OFFICERS AND BOARD OF DIRECTORS

President: Steve Roberts, Concord Vice President, North: Doug Kerr, Healdsburg Vice President, South: Brian Yanity, Fullerton Vice President, Long Distance Trains: James Smith, Los Angeles Secretary/Treasurer: Marcus Jung, San Francisco

Directors Donald Bing, Moorpark George Chilson, San Diego Robert Frampton, Pasadena Robert Manning, Palm Springs Simon Oh, Campbell Dennis Story, Santa Barbara John Webb, Trinidad, CA

Presidents Emeritus: Noel Braymer, Paul Dyson Editor, Emeritus: Russ Jackson, Texas

Website: **Brian Yanity** Social Media: Simon Oh

Steel Wheels Editor: Paul Dvson

Steel Wheels Design & Layout: Dengate Design

Want to be notified of the latest RailPAC news between issues?

Visit Our Website regularly: www.RailPAC.org

Like us on Facebook: www.facebook.com/RailPAC

Follow us on Twitter: www.twitter.com/RailPAC

MAIL TO: RAILPAC c/o Marcus Jung

P.O. Box 22344, San Francisco, CA 94122

JOIN RAILPAC TODAY at RailPAC.org or mail to the address below!

RailPAC membership entitles you to:

- Steel Wheels Passenger Rail in California and the West newsletter
- Your chance to make a difference for all Californians
- Eligibility to attend our annual Steel Wheels conference and regional meetings

MEMBER INFORMATION

| DUES LEVEL |
|------------|
|------------|

| Name: | | | Regular (\$35-79) |
|----------|------------|----|---------------------------------------|
| Address: | | | Student/Senior/Fixed Income (\$25-34) |
| | | | Sponsor (\$80-199) |
| City: | State: Zij |): | Patron (\$200-499) |
| Phone: | Email: | | Organization (\$500 and above) |

Members: Please notify the RailPAC Office if and when there is a change of address. RailPAC is not responsible for re-delivery if mailed to an outdated address.