State of the Industry Outlook and Trends

HARRAL · WINNER · THOMPSON · SHARP · LAWRENCE, INC.

AASHTO Discussion

July 2001

The modern rail era began in 1980

35 Year US Rail Freight Trends



Rail traffic recovery started in 1985

US Rail Traffic



After a long decline ...

Transport Market Shares



Rail market presence increased

Intercity Ton-miles



HARRAL · WINNER · THOMPSON · SHARP · LAWRENCE, INC.

High growth in container traffic

Rail Traffic Growth Index



Average rail rates declined



Even on current price basis



Major changes in the last 20 years

- Formation of short lines and shedding of passenger responsibilities reduced capital requirements.
- Increasingly sophisticated marketing and differential pricing helped maximize revenues in competitive environment.
- Resulting in improved plant, equipment, productivity, and much improved financial health

Consolidation an important driver
The economics of consolidation has been a big part of rail industry history

• Staggers made it easier to eliminate excess lines.



- Total companies increased after 1980
- While number of Class I's continued to shrink

Network businesses need density

- Cost of network is high--railroads are a capital intensive business--and higher density improves profitability.
- Consolidation has permitted concentration of traffic, driving up density
 - Excess capacity in rail system has been eliminated over the last 20 years of consolidation and line abandonment
 - Class Is continue to trim lines that don't justify continuing investment.

Recent consolidations caused havoc

- While consolidation has helped railroads cut costs
 - The NS/CSX acquisition of Conrail was expensive and has increased financial pressures on the two carriers.
 - Recent mergers have also resulted in service breakdowns, causing significant financial harm.
- Railroads have had difficulty earning sufficient returns in a capital intensive industry.
 - Shares have low multiples on stock market, making cost of equity capital very high and value of equity low.
 - But, industry debt:equity ratios are already high

Recently, market shares have declined

Ton-Mile Share



Investments have slowed markedly

120,000 2,000 1,800 100,000 1,600 Locomotives 1,400 80,000 **Freight Cars** 1,200 60,000 1,000 800 40,000 600 400 20,000 200 0 1970 1975 1980 1985 1990 1995 2000

Freight Car & Locomotive Sales

Financial health driven by cost cutting

- Cost cutting was most important element of industry financial recovery
 - Eliminating excess lines, shops, stations, other assets
 - Improving utilization of equipment, eliminating excess
- Consolidation increased the ability to reduce costs
- But excess employees and assets now largely eliminated
 - Only one or two more consolidations possible
 - Other cost reductions cannot be duplicated

Employment can't go further

Transport Employment



Outlook uncertain

- Merger problems raised political stakes
- Many shipper groups gunning for majors (CURE, ARC, CMA, NITL)
- STB actions delays decisions
- Poor financial performance and limited cost reduction potential
- Fierce competition for freight
- Many competing uses for assets

Earnings improvement needed

- More cost cutting
- New technologies
- Advanced management techniques
 - New organization structures
 - New pricing and service strategies
- Service quality again a focus for higher revenue
- Pressure to increase asset utilization further
- More industry alliances for cost reduction, increased asset utilization and traffic growth

Consolidation likely to continue

- Market reach
- Cost control
 - Density, increase economies of scale
 - Equipment utilization, reduce equipment assets
 - Network utilization, reduce network assets
- Control of service delivery processes
 - Ability to create/realize economic value
 - Ability to multiply network value

Every major railroad is involved

- UP recovering from SP merger
- CSX & NS recovering from CR
- CN/IC/WC merger up next
- KCS looking isolated but valuable with Mexico
- CP now in play, CN interested
- But, BNSF/CN still a possibility
- Will it end with 3 transcontinentals?

The US network might look like this



Policy Issues

- Consolidation and increasing network density to improve economics of the industry have resulted in congestion and bottlenecks.
 - Especially during peak periods and disruptions
 - Will require some time to correct
- Should public money be used on private networks to create capacity for freight?
 - Access issues, public money may require public access
 - Differential benefits (private/public) affects who pays
 - Railroads may not want to participate

Policy Issues

- Industry has history of public/private investment
 - Highway crossings, crossing elimination
 - Real estate developments
 - Operation of commuter and passenger systems
- What future public/private investments and cooperation might make sense?
 - Grade separations
 - Joint high-capacity corridors
 - Line capacity investments to support commuter/traffic

Policy Issues

- Short lines have absorbed many light density lines and provide economic rail services to rural areas
 - Usually, thinly capitalized
 - Low margin operations
- How can state investments support short line and would such investments be worth while?
 - Bridges & structure replacements
 - Increased capacity of network for heavy axle-loads
 - Connections to increase competitiveness

Network finance and access an issue

- Inadequate ROI and capital shortages have led industry to finance many assets, limited to rolling stock so far. Infrastructure financing is the next logical step.
- Public finance of infrastructure may result in demands for public access.
- Pressure on Congress to increase competition could fundamentally change the structure of the industry.

US rail network already shares access



(Red lines show rail network with multiple users, includes Amtrak)

HARRAL · WINNER · THOMPSON · SHARP · LAWRENCE, INC.