

# Could It Be?

Robert "R. B." Frank  
Leg. Rep. - BLET Div. 839

August 1, 2004

Could it be, that the highest and best use for Belly-Pack is not the "pissing" contest over safety as compared with Conventional? Could it be, also, that the highest and best use for Belly-Pack is not the "pissing" contest over productivity as compared with Conventional, either? Could it be, then, that the highest and best use for Belly-Pack is to manipulate, orchestrate and gerrymander R.R. congestion for the purpose of seeking the highest amount of corporate welfare money possible in the form of pending HR 3550, TEA-LU Legislation. (Transportation Equity Act - Legacy for Users)

This question is analogous to the welfare mom who seeks the highest welfare check possible, based on the greatest number of sickly children she might have. Comparably, our carriers, by staging lack of transport capacity, by means of Belly-Pack caused congestion, could be seeking welfare as well, of the corporate kind, to fund and/or finance such things as completely unmanned freight trains, courtesy of tax payers like you and me. If this is the case, this demonstrates why our R.R chiefs earn the big money. Their R.R. robber baron forefathers would be proud indeed, as would, the generations of R.R. executives in between.

Why else, for example, would our carriers, particularly Union Pacific, want to blanket Southern California with Belly-Pack use, when this region already suffers from logistical strokes and heart attacks? When these ailments are made far worse by Belly-Pack, the case to be made for Uncle Sam billions will be far easier, obviously. I would caution, however, the political timing in this yet another, alternate form of Belly-Pack manipulation. After all, Congress may not appreciate the Belly-Pack manipulation of congestion during this present day era of Enrons or for that matter war, based on weapons of mass "deception", or was that "destruction"?

At any rate, and in conclusion, we must show credit and respect, where credit and respect are due. BNSF, for example, has used good judgment by avoiding BellyPack cram down. In fact, BNSF has abolished Belly-Pack use at locations where it has proven to be cost and/or logistically ineffective. A meaner spirited U.P., on the other hand, has erred on the side of "who wears the pants syndrome." U.P., not only suffers from too much Belly-Pack cram down, but has kept it at all locations, even where its use makes no economic or logistical sense, except for possible corporate welfare reasons as already discussed. Consequently, BNSF, having kept their operations fluid, is now able to handle the new traffic, as well as the old traffic, which U.P. can't! Could it be that BNSF, this year or next, will fulfill Rob Kreb's 1999 vision of overtaking U.P. in gross revenue, even if it is five or six years later? Who else, besides your BLET Calif. State Legislative Board, anticipated this very outcome over two years ago, based on an understanding of carrier temperament plus common sense? Who else, that is, except for maybe BNSF headquarters!

Thanks again.

