



US Army Corps of Engineers  
Construction Engineering Research Laboratory

USACERL TECHNICAL REPORT M-90/23  
September 1990  
Facilities Engineering Applications Program

AD-A227 359

# Maintenance Management of U.S. Army Railroad Networks— The RAILER System: Demonstration of System Setup at Hunter AAF, GA

by

R.W. Harris  
D.R. Uzarski

The RAILER system of railroad maintenance management is a decision support tool for Army installation Directorates of Engineering and Housing. It can be used to analyze and evaluate track segments, determine and prioritize work needs, develop annual and long-range work plans, estimate maintenance and repair costs, and develop budgets.

As part of the Facilities Engineering Applications Program, RAILER version 2.0 was demonstrated at Fort Stewart, GA, and its neighboring installation, Hunter Army Airfield (AAF). This report documents the Hunter AAF demonstration.

The data collection process was demonstrated, including segment inventory and track inspection. New track inspection procedures were tested and verified to be better than those previously used. In all, the Hunter AAF demonstration complemented the Fort Stewart test and showed that RAILER version 2.0 is ready to release for general implementation on domestic Army installations.

DTIC  
ELECTE  
OCT 03 1990  
S  
E  
D  
Co

Best Available Copy

Approved for public release; distribution is unlimited.

2004 0305 054

88-10

088

The contents of this report are not to be used for advertising, publication, or promotional purposes. Citation of trade names does not constitute an official indorsement or approval of the use of such commercial products. The findings of this report are not to be construed as an official Department of the Army position, unless so designated by other authorized documents.

*DESTROY THIS REPORT WHEN IT IS NO LONGER NEEDED*

*DO NOT RETURN IT TO THE ORIGINATOR*

# REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE

Form Approved  
OMB No. 0704-0188

Public reporting burden for this collection of information is estimated to average 1 hour per response, including the time for reviewing instructions, searching existing data sources, gathering and maintaining the data needed, and completing and reviewing the collection of information. Send comments regarding this burden estimate or any other aspect of this collection of information, including suggestions for reducing this burden, to Washington Headquarters Service, Directorate for Information Operations and Reports, 1215 Jefferson Davis Highway, Suite 1204, Arlington, VA 22202-4302, and to the Office of Management and Budget, Paperwork Reduction Project (0704-0188), Washington, DC 20503.

1. AGENCY USE ONLY (Leave Blank)	2. REPORT DATE <p style="text-align: center;">August 1990</p>	3. REPORT TYPE AND DATES COVERED <p style="text-align: center;">Final</p>	
4. TITLE AND SUBTITLE Maintenance Management of U.S. Army Railroad Networks—The RAILER System: Demonstration of System Setup at Hunter AAF, GA		5. FUNDING NUMBERS <p style="text-align: center;">FEAP F58</p>	
6. AUTHOR(S) <p style="text-align: center;">Richard W. Harris and Donald R. Uzarski</p>		8. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION REPORT NUMBER <p style="text-align: center;">TR M-90/23</p>	
7. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES) U.S. Army Construction Engineering Research Laboratory (USACERL) 2902 Newmark Drive, PO Box 4005 Champaign, IL 61824-4005			
9. SPONSORING/MONITORING AGENCY NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES) US Army Engineering Housing & Support Center ATTN: CEHSC-FB-P Ft. Belvoir, VA 22060		10. SPONSORING/MONITORING AGENCY REPORT NUMBER	
11. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES Copies are available from the National Technical Information Service, 5285 Port Royal Road, Springfield, VA 22161			
12a. DISTRIBUTION/AVAILABILITY STATEMENT <p style="text-align: center;">Approved for public release; distribution is unlimited.</p>		12b. DISTRIBUTION CODE	
13. ABSTRACT (Maximum 200 words)  The RAILER system of railroad maintenance management is a decision support tool for Army installation Directorates of Engineering and Housing. It can be used to analyze and evaluate track segments, determine and prioritize work needs, develop annual and long-range work plans, estimate maintenance and repair costs, and develop budgets.  As part of the Facilities Engineering Applications Program, RAILER version 2.0 was demonstrated at Fort Stewart, GA, and its neighboring installation, Hunter Army Airfield (AAF). This report documents the Hunter AAF demonstration.  The data collection process was demonstrated, including segment inventory and track inspection. New track inspection procedures were tested and verified to be better than those previously used. In all, the Hunter AAF demonstration complemented the Fort Stewart test and showed that RAILER version 2.0 is ready to release for general implementation on domestic Army installations.			
14. SUBJECT TERMS RAILER Hunter Army Airfield, GA Railroads		15. NUMBER OF PAGES <p style="text-align: center;">38</p>	16. PRICE CODE
17. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF REPORT <p style="text-align: center;">Unclassified</p>	18. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE <p style="text-align: center;">Unclassified</p>	19. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF ABSTRACT <p style="text-align: center;">Unclassified</p>	20. LIMITATION OF ABSTRACT <p style="text-align: center;">SAR</p>

## **FOREWORD**

This report documents a demonstration conducted for the U.S. Army Engineering and Housing Support Center (USAEHSC) under Facilities Engineering Applications Program (FEAP), Project F58 "Railroad Track Maintenance Management System (RAILER)." The work was conducted by the U.S. Army Construction Engineering Research Laboratory (USACERL), Engineering and Materials Division (EM). The USAEHSC Technical Monitor was Robert Williams, CEHSC-FB-P. His support is greatly appreciated.

The support and cooperation of the personnel at Hunter AAF were crucial to the success of this demonstration: the Facility Engineer (FE), Jerry Bridges, and members of the FE staff including Grady Collet, Albert Myles, and Debbie Sharpe. Assistance in the field and office was provided by J. Borse, D. Brown, F. Calabrese, J. Crowder, and S. Wagers. The USACERL technical editor was D.P. Mann, Information Management Office.

Dr. Paul A. Howdyshell is Acting Chief of USACERL-EM. COL Everett R. Thomas is Commander and Director of USACERL, and Dr. L.R. Shaffer is Technical Director.

## CONTENTS

	SF 298	1
	FOREWORD	2
	LIST OF TABLES AND FIGURES	4
1	INTRODUCTION .....	5
	Background	
	Objective	
	Approach	
	Scope	
	Mode of Technology Transfer	
2	FIELD WORK .....	7
	Office Preparation	
	Site Vists	
3	DATA LOADING AND PROCESSING .....	24
	Data Entry	
	Data Verification and Processing	
4	SYSTEM TURNOVER TO INSTALLATION PERSONNEL .....	26
5	CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS .....	27
	REFERENCES	27
	APPENDIX A: Final Segmented Maps	28
	APPENDIX B: RAILER Reports	31

### DISTRIBUTION

Accession For	
NTIS GRA&I	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
DTIC TAB	<input type="checkbox"/>
Unannounced	<input type="checkbox"/>
Justification	
By _____	
Distribution/	
Availability Codes	
Dist	Avail and/or Special
A-1	



## TABLES

Number		Page
1	Office Preparation Activities and Time Required	8
2	Hunter AAF Segmentation	9
3	Field Activities and Times	10
4	Data Entry and Verification Times	24

## FIGURES

Number		Page
1	Stationing Using Hand Measuring Wheel	11
2	Completed Inventory Form	12
3	Tie Inspection Form Used During Second Trip (#1 of 7)	14
4	Vegetation Inspection Form Used During Second Trip (#2 of 7)	15
5	Rail Inspection Form Used During Second Trip (#3 of 7)	16
6	Tie Plates, Rail Fastenings and Joints Inspection Form Used During Second Trip (#4 of 7)	17
7	Roadway and Ballast Inspection Form Used During Second Trip (#5 of 7)	18
8	Road and Rail Crossings Inspection Form Used During Second Trip (#6 of 7)	19
9	Drainage Structures Inspection Form Used During Second Trip (#7 of 7)	20
10	Turnouts Inspection Form (same for second and third trips)	21
11	Project Level Track Inspection Form Used During Third Trip (#1 of 2)	22
12	Project Level Track Inspection Form Used During Third Trip (#2 of 2)	23
A1	Hunter Army Airfield South (Ordnance Area) Trackage Segmenting	28
A2	Hunter Army Airfield SPUR 5807 Trackage Segmenting	29
A3	Hunter Army Airfield SPUR 5794 Trackage Segmenting	30

# MAINTENANCE MANAGEMENT OF U.S. ARMY RAILROAD NETWORKS—THE RAILER SYSTEM: DEMONSTRATION OF SYSTEM AT HUNTER AAF, GA

## 1 INTRODUCTION

### Background

The RAILER system of railroad maintenance management is one of a family of Engineered Management Systems (EMS) being developed by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers to support Army installation Directorates of Engineering and Housing (DEHs) in managing maintenance and repair (M&R) of their facilities. The RAILER system is a decision support tool that can be used, in part, to analyze and evaluate track segments, determine and prioritize work needs, develop annual and long-range work plans, estimate maintenance and repair costs, and develop budgets. The system can help the DEH make maintenance decisions and schedule M&R as needed to meet mission requirements at the least possible cost.

Developed at the U.S. Army Construction Engineering Research Laboratory (USACERL), RAILER includes field procedures for collecting data and a computer program for storing, retrieving, and processing the information to aid maintenance management decisions. While an interim version of RAILER<sup>1</sup> (1.0) had been successfully tested at several sites, the current version (2.0) included several modifications and additional capabilities that had not been demonstrated within a DEH organization. For example, the track inspection procedures<sup>2</sup> had been enhanced to capture all of the track defects specified in the new Army Track Maintenance Standards.<sup>3</sup> The inventory procedures had also been revised as a result of further research and feedback.<sup>4</sup> Another enhancement to RAILER version 2.0 was the development of customized maintenance policies. To support these changes and enhancements, and to provide a more user-friendly interface, the RAILER software had also been greatly revised for version 2.0.

To test the applicability and usability of these new procedures and software, Fort Stewart, GA, was chosen as a demonstration site for RAILER version 2.0.<sup>5</sup> The proximity of Hunter Army Airfield (AAF) and the interaction between the DEH staffs at the two installations made it desirable to include Hunter AAF in the demonstration. This implementation was conducted as part of the FY87 Facilities Engineering Applications Program (FEAP).

---

<sup>1</sup> D. R. Uzarski, D. E. Plotkin, and D. G. Brown, *The RAILER System for Maintenance Management of U.S. Army Railroad Networks: RAILER I Description and Use*, Technical Report M-88/18/ADA199859 (U.S. Army Construction Engineering Research Laboratory (USACERL), September 1988).

<sup>2</sup> D.R. Uzarski, D.G. Brown, R.W. Harris, and D.E. Plotkin, *Maintenance Management of U.S. Army Railroad Networks--The RAILER System: Detailed Track Inspection Manual*, Draft Technical Report (USACERL, 1988).

<sup>3</sup> Technical Manual (TM) 5-628, *Railroad Track Standards* (Headquarters, Department of the Army (HQDA), October 1988).

<sup>4</sup> D.R. Uzarski, D.E. Plotkin, and D.G. Brown, *Maintenance Management of the U.S. Army Railroad Networks--The RAILER System: Component Identification and Inventory Procedures*, Technical Report M-88/13/ADA200276 (USACERL, August 1988).

<sup>5</sup> D. G. Brown and D. R. Uzarski, *Maintenance Management of U.S. Army Railroad Networks--The RAILER System: Demonstration of System Setup at Fort Stewart, GA*, Technical Report M-90/22 (USACERL, September 1990).

## Objective

The threefold objective of this FEAP demonstration was to:

1. Implement RAILER's data collection procedures and computer program, including recent improvements suggested by experience with the FEAP site at Fort Stewart, GA.<sup>6</sup>
2. Test the ability of the computer software and management procedures to work together in providing maintenance management decision support. In the field, these activities include inventory, inspection, and maintenance policy establishment. On the computer, they include data entry, analysis, and report generation.
3. Establish a working implementation of RAILER version 2.0 to permit an effective, practical evaluation of RAILER by both the prospective users and system developers.

## Approach

USACERL personnel fully implemented RAILER version 2.0 at Hunter AAF with assistance of the installation DEH. The Hunter AAF network is fairly small (about 4 track miles total), and so was useful for testing the applicability of RAILER procedures to this size installation. The demonstration followed an approach similar to what a private contractor would probably use for other installations with relatively small track networks. This approach aided USACERL and USAEHSC in developing guidelines for future contract implementations of RAILER at other sites.

During this FEAP, USACERL collected data on RAILER's performance and users' reactions. This feedback was used to improve the system, both during the ongoing implementation and after the FEAP was complete.

## Scope

This report describes the implementation and system turnover of RAILER version 2.0 at Hunter AAF. It does not include a history of use by base personnel or support by USACERL.

## Mode of Technology Transfer

Interest in RAILER appears to be growing, and several more implementations are currently planned. These efforts will be performed by private contractors or base personnel under the guidance of USAEHSC. In either case, the installation personnel will receive training in RAILER use. USACERL and USAEHSC are jointly developing a standard course. A RAILER support center is also planned for follow-on assistance to installations and maintenance of the RAILER software. The most likely candidate for providing support services would be the extension service of a qualified public university.

---

<sup>6</sup> Brown and Uzarski.

## 2 FIELD WORK

The field work associated with implementing RAILER includes stationing and segmenting the installation railroad network, and collecting data which is later entered into the computer. Stationing establishes a location referencing system for each track in the network. The track segment is the maintenance management unit within RAILER; segmentation is concerned with dividing each track into one or more track segments. Most of the data collection effort is devoted to inventory and inspection data; traffic, installation, work history, and maintenance policy data are also collected. The stationing and segmenting was done on one trip (June 10, 1987). The inventory, installation and traffic information, and part of the inspection data were collected on a second trip (July 13-17, 1987). The inspection was completed and maintenance policy gathered during a third visit (July 25-29, 1988). Work history information was not gathered for this implementation. The system was turned over to installation personnel on a fourth trip (January 19, 1989). The number of trips is due to coordination of this FEAP with the one at Fort Stewart. It is expected that a contractor would make fewer trips, and that each one would be a larger effort. This would keep total hours of effort about the same, but would reduce travel costs.

Procedures for stationing, segmenting, and collecting inventory data are documented elsewhere.<sup>7</sup> as are the detailed inspection procedures implemented.<sup>8</sup> Procedures for collecting other data elements are documented for an earlier version of RAILER.<sup>9</sup> The effective and efficient use of all these procedures requires some office preparation before going to the field.

### Office Preparation

Office preparation includes becoming familiar with the track network layout (including identifying all tracks and estimating their lengths), establishing a preliminary track segmentation (and component identification), acquiring and organizing supplies, and developing a work plan to be followed in the field. Table 1 lists the specific tasks and times required for them. While all these functions were performed by engineers, some, such as supply preparation, could be done by technical assistants. All of these activities require information about the installation network. In the case of Hunter AAF, this information was not readily available to USACERL. Information obtained from a Military Traffic Management Command Traffic Engineering Agency (MTMC-TEA) Installation Transportation System Capability Study<sup>10</sup> only provided information for a portion of the track network at Hunter AAF (i.e., the part that would be used in event of mobilization). It was suspected that more track was on base. A trip to Fort Stewart, which is located only about 40 miles from Hunter AAF, was planned. A 1-day information trip was made to Hunter AAF on June 10, 1987 to collect installation maps and verbal information from the Hunter AAF personnel.

---

<sup>7</sup> Uzarski, Plotkin, and Brown (August 1988).

<sup>8</sup> Uzarski, Brown, Harris, and Plotkin.

<sup>9</sup> Uzarski, Plotkin, and Brown (September 1988).

<sup>10</sup> *Installation Outloading Capability Study: Fort Stewart, Georgia and Camp Blanding, Florida*, MTMC Report TE 81-3a-42 (Military Traffic Management Command Transportation Engineering Agency [MTMC-TEA], July 1982).

**Table 1**  
**Office Preparation Activities and Time Required**

Activity	Manhours
<b>Track Segmentation:</b>	
Reviewing Maps	5
Reviewing Segmentation, Curve ID, and Turnout ID assignments	2
Drawing Segmented Track Diagrams	8
<b>Supply Preparation:</b>	
Organizing Station Plates	5
Acquiring and Packing Supplies	3
Reproducing and Packing Data Forms	1
<b>Work Plan Preparation:</b>	
Formulating Plan	4
Communicating with Staff at Meeting (two people)	2
<b>Total</b>	<u>30</u>

*Track Segmentation*

USACERL personnel segmented the trackage during the June 10, 1987 site visit using the maps provided (Table 2). This information was taken back to USACERL for a continuation of the office preparation before the bulk of the field work was accomplished.

In addition to track segments, two other track components--turnouts and curves--are given identification (ID) numbers within RAILER. These numbers were also assigned during the segmentation process according to established RAILER procedures.<sup>11</sup>

After the network was segmented, track diagrams that included segment, turnout, and curve numbers were made up for use in the field (see Appendix A).

---

<sup>11</sup> Uzarski, Plotkin, and Brown (August 1988).

**Table 2**  
**Hunter AAF Segmentation**

Track Number	Number of Segments
1	3
2	3
3	1
4	4
5	2
6	1
7	7
9	2
10	1
5794	5
5807	5

*Supplies*

The supplies taken to Hunter AAF were based on expected work, network size, and crew size. The equipment required for track inspection is documented elsewhere.<sup>12</sup> Additional equipment included stationing materials (hammer, measuring wheel, nails, and station plates), and equipment for comfort of field personnel (insect repellent, sun screen, gloves, and coolers for food and drinks). A number of RAILER forms are required for data collection; these were taken to Hunter AAF, along with pencils and note paper, with some allowance for wastage. In general, about twice as many forms as needed were taken.

Installing station plates at 200 ft\* intervals along the track is an important part of RAILER implementation. To make this job easier in the field, the plates were organized by track number in the office before going to the field; each track's station plates were strung in order on a separate wire. Experience at Fort Stewart indicated that this approach saved much time and effort in the field.<sup>13</sup>

---

<sup>12</sup> Uzarski, Brown, Harris, and Plotkin.

\* 1 ft = 0.3048 m.

<sup>13</sup> Brown and Uzarski.

### *Work Plan*

The implementation at Hunter AAF was a small-scale field effort. Most of the field work was done by a crew of two, with some followup by a single person. The planning and scheduling of work was very flexible and informal, as is appropriate for this size project. The actual work is discussed below.

### *Site Visits*

As discussed previously, the field work entailed four site visits to Hunter AAF. Table 3 summarizes the various activities during the visits and the time required for each task.

**Table 3**  
**Field Activities and Times**

<b>Activity</b>	<b>Manhours</b>
Stationing	16
Track Segment Inventory	24
Track Segment Inspection	40
Traffic	1
Installation Information	1
Maintenance Policy	4
Total	<u>86</u>

As stated earlier, the first visit to Hunter AAF was a 1-day trip, made during a visit to the nearby Fort Stewart, for reconnaissance and segmenting the network. Most of the field data were gathered on the second and third trips. On the third trip, only part of the time was spent gathering field data; the rest was spent at Fort Stewart gathering maintenance policy data that was used for both installations. The fourth visit was a 1-day detour from Fort Stewart to turn the system over to installation personnel.

Most workdays began at 0700 hours and ended at 1730 hours, though some were longer. On the first and second trips, there were two workers. On the third trip there was a single worker. The fourth trip was again made by two workers.

### *Stationing*

The stationing was performed by using a hand-held measuring wheel (Figure 1). A crew of two performed the stationing on the first visit. Station locations were marked at 200 ft intervals on the rail web with paint. The station plates were not available during the first trip, so they were placed during the inventory phase of the second trip. During the stationing process, it is often desirable to note the location

of inventory items, both in a field notebook and by writing locations on the rail web with paint. This was not done at Hunter AAF, and inventory was slowed greatly. During the inventory process, it was necessary to measure the stations of various inventory items, such as culverts and switch points of turnouts. This separate effort during the inventory process takes much longer than stopping to record these locations during stationing. It is recommended strongly that future implementations follow the procedure of noting inventory locations, both on paper and on the rail web, during the segmenting process.

### *Segmenting*

The track segments, identified in the maps provided by Hunter AAF personnel during the first visit, were field validated during the stationing process. No changes were required in the segments or in the turnout and curve identification. The time required to accomplish this field validation is included in the stationing time.

### *Inventory*

Figure 2 is an example of a completed inventory field data form used at Hunter AAF. The inventory data were collected by a two-person crew. The inventory process consists of collecting and recording physical characteristics of the track and related structures that are relatively permanent. These include beginning and end locations, rail weight, tie size and spacing, and many others. Crew members collected this data by walking the track and observing and recording the information. A single pass by a crew of two was sufficient to gather this information, and it was validated by reviewing the inventory notes during breaks and at the day's end.



Figure 1. Stationing using hand measuring wheel.

SEGMENT IDENTIFICATION													
Begin Location (station)	End Location (station)	Track Category	Track Use	Track Rank	Construction code	Preceding Track Segment Number (s)	Comments:						
0+00	17+99	A(B)C	Acc/Aux L So St		(P)STL	CSXLEAD							
TRACK STRUCTURE													
Begin Location (station)	RAIL		TIE PLATE				RAIL ANCHORS	GUAGE RODS	TIES		BALLAST		
	Weight (lbs/yd)	Section	Length (inches)	Shoulder		SS DS NS NO	(N)Y	(N)Y	Cross Section (in x in)	Quantity (#/Length)	Material Type	Support Depth (inches)	Type
0+00	85		9	SS	DS	NS	NO	(N)Y	(N)Y	6 X 8	127 X 200	WOOD	STONE
				SS	DS	NS	NO	N Y	N Y				
				SS	DS	NS	NO	N Y	N Y				
				SS	DS	NS	NO	N Y	N Y				
Comments: TIE PLATES ON ABOUT 1/2 OF SEGMENT													
TURNOUTS													
Turnout ID Number	Switch Point Location (station)	Direction	Point Length (LF)	Rail Weight Change	Frog Type	Frog Size	Guard Rail Length (LF)	Reversing Tangent <50 Ft Past Frog	Comments:				
		LH EQ RH		N Y	B SQ RBW SP			N Y					
		LH EQ RH		N Y	B SQ RBW SP			N Y					
CURVES													
Curve ID Number	Curvature (Degrees)								Super-Elevation (inches)	Max Desired Speed (mph)	Comments:		
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	Avg.				
151									4.5				
CROSSINGS													
Road Name/ Crossing Identity or Crossing Segment Number	GRADE CROSSINGS						RAIL CROSSING						
	Centerline Location (Station)	Road Crossing ID Number	Crossing Length (feet)	Crossing Type	Protection	Bolted Joints	Rail Weight (lbs/yd)	Frog Type	Crossing Angle (degree)				
					Q F S N	N Y		B M SM					
					Q F S N	N Y		B M SM					
					Q F S N	N Y		B M SM					
					Q F S N	N Y		B M SM					
Comments:													
CLEARANCE RESTRICTIONS AND RELATED FACILITIES													
Circle One or Both	Begin Location (Station)	End Location (Station)	Obstruction and/or Facility Type	Restriction Measurement (ft)		Facility Number	# of Box Car Positions (Docks), or Tangent Track Length (Ramps)	Comments:					
				Horiz.	Vert.								
CR RF	0+08		D R GATE	7.6									
CR RF			D R										
CR RF			D R										
DRAINAGE STRUCTURES					BRIDGES								
Centerline Location (Station)	Type	Size (in x in)	Material	Facility Number	Begin Location (Station)	End Location (Station)	Balasted	Construction Type					
							N Y						
							N Y						
Comments:													

Figure 2. Completed inventory form.

## *Inspection*

The inspection was done mainly during the second visit, with some final work on the third. After the second visit, the inspection forms were revised for more efficient inspection. These changes were due to experience gained at Fort Stewart<sup>14</sup> and the previous trip to Hunter AAF. Inspection went much faster during the third visit, due to the improved inspection forms. The number of passes to inspect a segment fully was reduced from four or five for a single inspector to two passes for a single inspector, which reduced overall inspection effort by about 50 percent. The speed of passes stayed roughly the same at about 1000 ft/hour (0.2 mph), but still depended on track condition. Only a relatively small part of the Hunter AAF network was inspected using the new procedures, so more verification is needed, but the improvement is clear.

Figures 3 through 12 are completed examples of the inspection forms used at Hunter AAF. Figures 3 through 10 were used during the first part of the inspection effort (second visit); Figures 11 and 12 are the improved forms used during the second inspection effort (third visit).

## *Traffic Information*

Traffic information was obtained from the Installation Transportation Office (ITO) during the third visit to Hunter AAF. The information was gathered through an interview with the ITO director. This information has several potential uses within RAILER, such as prioritizing track segments, structural evaluation, and predicting track deterioration. Only a few car types are used at Hunter AAF, and traffic is quite infrequent. The tracks for the bulk fuel storage yard are occasionally (once every several years) subjected to a trainload of tanker cars (about 150 cars). The other yards tracks see two or three movements a year with lightly loaded cars, rarely with heavy cars. The track to the ordnance area is used only every several years, and handles a load of 20 to 50 box cars when used. Individual car weights were not available. The traffic pattern was made using the data available. The car weights were assumed, somewhat conservatively, to be maximum Gross Vehicle Weight (GVW).

## *Installation Information*

Installation information was obtained from installation personnel and drawings. The nearest commercial yard was the CSX yard in Savannah, GA.

## *Maintenance Policy Data*

A maintenance policy specifies required work actions (if any), and associated costs for those actions, for each defect type/track category combination. Since the DEH at Hunter AAF is subordinate to the Fort Stewart DEH, the policy for Fort Stewart was adopted for Hunter AAF with the approval of Hunter AAF maintenance personnel. The creation of the Fort Stewart policy is documented in the Fort Stewart FEAP report.<sup>15</sup>

---

<sup>14</sup> Brown and Uzarski.

<sup>15</sup> Brown and Uzarski.

RAILER II INSPECTION  
TIES

DATE: 7/15/87  
INSPECTOR: BA

TRACK SEGMENT #	DEFECTIVE TIE CONDITIONS								
	CONSECUTIVE DEFECTIVE TIES				ALL JOINT TIES OR MORE DEFECTIVE	AVERAGE SPACING PER RAIL LENGTH >22 in.	ROTATED OR SKEWED TIES	MISSING/ BUNCHED/BADLY SKEWED TIES (tie spacing along either Rail > 48in)	TOTAL DEFECTIVE TIES
	2	3	4	5 OR MORE					
101	 						 		
Check if no defects <input type="checkbox"/>									
TOTAL	19	5	3	1	0	0	12	0	183
COMMENTS									
102									
Check if no defects <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>									
TOTAL									
COMMENTS									
103	 						 		
Check if no defects <input type="checkbox"/>									
TOTAL	18	1	2	0	0	7	0		163
COMMENTS									

Figure 3. Tie inspection form used during second trip (#1 of 7).

RAILER II INSPECTION  
VEGETATION

DATE: 7/15/87  
INSPECTOR: JB

TRACK SEGMENT	DEFECTS	LOCATION •					
		Left		Center		Right	
		Occurences	Total	Occurences	Total	Occurences	Total
101	No Defects Insufficient, where needed Growing in Ballast Prevents Track Inspection Interferes with Walking Interferes with Visibility of Signs Brushes Sides of Rolling Stock Interferes with Trains or Track Vehicles Presents a Fire Hazard	/	1	HHH	5	/	1
		HHH III	8	IIII	4	HHH III	8
COMMENTS							
102	No Defects Insufficient, where needed Growing in Ballast Prevents Track Inspection Interferes with Walking Interferes with Visibility of Signs Brushes Sides of Rolling Stock Interferes with Trains or Track Vehicles Presents a Fire Hazard	/	1	/	1	/	1
COMMENTS							
103	No Defects Insufficient, where needed Growing in Ballast Prevents Track Inspection Interferes with Walking Interferes with Visibility of Signs Brushes Sides of Rolling Stock Interferes with Trains or Track Vehicles Presents a Fire Hazard	HHH	5	HHH 1	6	HHH	5
		IIII	4	IIII	4	IIII	4
		/	1			/	1
COMMENTS							

Figure 4. Vegetation inspection form used during second trip (#2 of 7).



RAILER II INSPECTION  
TIE PLATE, RAIL FASTENERS AND JOINTS      DATE: 7/15/87  
INSPECTOR: RL

TRACK SEGMENT #	COMPONENTS	IMPROPER SIZE/TYPE		FLAMECUT/ALTERED		MISSING/INSUFFICIENT NUMBER/CRACKED/BROKEN		IMPROPERLY INSTALLED OR LOOSE	
		Occurences	Total	Occurences	Total	Occurences	Total	Occurences	Total
101	Tie Plates 1								
<input type="checkbox"/> Check if no defects	Spikes • 1					11	2		450 *
	Joint Bars					1	1		
	Joint Bolts					1	1		
	Compressive Bars								
	Rail Anchors • 1								
	Gage Rods								
All Joint Bolts Missing or Broken for a Rail End				Occurences	Total	COMMENTS * IMPROPER SPIKE PATTERN IN SCATTERED GROUPS			
Rail End Mismatch Exceeds 3/16"									
Rail End Gap Exceeds 1" but not 2"									
Rail End Gap Exceeds 2"									
102	Tie Plates 1								
<input type="checkbox"/> Check if no defects	Spikes • 1								120 *
	Joint Bars								
	Joint Bolts								
	Compressive Bars								
	Rail Anchors • 1								
	Gage Rods								
All Joint Bolts Missing or Broken for a Rail End				Occurences	Total	COMMENTS * IMPROPER SPIKE PATTERN IN SCATTERED GROUPS			
Rail End Mismatch Exceeds 3/16"									
Rail End Gap Exceeds 1" but not 2"									
Rail End Gap Exceeds 2"									
103	Tie Plates 1								
<input type="checkbox"/> Check if no defects	Spikes • 1								970 *
	Joint Bars								
	Joint Bolts								
	Compressive Bars								
	Rail Anchors • 1								
	Gage Rods								
All Joint Bolts Missing or Broken for a Rail End				Occurences	Total	COMMENTS * IMPROPER SPIKE PATTERN IN SCATTERED GROUPS			
Rail End Mismatch Exceeds 3/16"									
Rail End Gap Exceeds 1" but not 2"									
Rail End Gap Exceeds 2"									

• See reverse for Spiking and Rail Anchor Patterns.  
 ! If defect exists continuously over significant track length, place "X" under "Occurences" and in "COMMENTS" enter the beginning and ending station locations, along with defect type.

Figure 6. Tie plates, rail fastenings and joints inspection form used during second trip (#4 of 7).

RAILER II INSPECTION  
ROADWAY AND BALLAST

DATE: 7/15/87  
INSPECTOR: ad

TRACK SEGMENT #	ITEM	Hazardous to Train Movement		Not Hazardous	
		Occurrences	Total	Occurrences	Total
101	Ballast/Subgrade Pumping				
<input type="checkbox"/> Check if no defects	Insufficient Ballast			11	2
	Erosion of Embankment and Cut Slopes				
	Embankment Sliding or Slippage				
	Potential Slope Stability Problems				
	Settlement at Approaches to Bridges				
	Washouts Under the Track				
Percent of Dirty or Poorly Draining Ballast to Nearest 10%: <u>30</u>					
COMMENTS:					
	Ballast/Subgrade Pumping				
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Check if no defects	Insufficient Ballast				
	Erosion of Embankment and Cut Slopes				
	Embankment Sliding or Slippage				
	Potential Slope Stability Problems				
	Settlement at Approaches to Bridges				
	Washouts Under the Track				
Percent of Dirty or Poorly Draining Ballast to Nearest 10%:					
COMMENTS: <u>BRIDGE</u>					
103	Ballast/Subgrade Pumping				
<input type="checkbox"/> Check if no defects	Insufficient Ballast				
	Erosion of Embankment and Cut Slopes				
	Embankment Sliding or Slippage				
	Potential Slope Stability Problems				
	Settlement at Approaches to Bridges				
	Washouts Under the Track				
Percent of Dirty or Poorly Draining Ballast to Nearest 10%: <u>10</u>					
COMMENTS:					

Figure 7. Roadway and ballast inspection form used during second trip (#5 of 7).





TRACK SEGMENT # \_\_\_\_\_  
 TURNOUT ID # 173

RAILER II INSPECTION  
 TURNOUTS

DATE: 7/16/97  
 INSPECTOR: RH

GENERAL		TIES			
Roll Weight changes within Turnout limits	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Y	# of Defective Ties in a row (worst case)	2		
Reversing Tangent Past Frog Less than 50 Feet	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Y	# of Occurrences where Joint Ties are Defective	0		
Switch Difficult to Operate	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Y	# of Occurrences where Tie Spacing >22 in.	0		
Flangeways Dirty or Fouled	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Y	# of Skewed Ties	0		
Crib Areas Dirty or Fouled	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N	# of Missing/Bunched/Badly Skewed Ties (Tie spacing along either rail >48 in.)	0		
Line & Surface		TOTAL # of Defective Ties	2		
COMPONENTS	NO DEFECTS	IMPROPER SIZE/ TYPE/POSITION/ DESIGN (Y or #)	LOOSE (Y or #)	CHIPPED/WORN/BENT/ CRACKED/BROKEN/ CORRODED/ALTERED (Y or #)	MISSING (Y or #)
S W I T C H & S T A N D	Switch Stand	X	Y	Y	Y
	Point Lock/Lever Latch	X	Y	Y	Y
	Connecting Rod	X	Y	Y	Y
	Switch Point - Left	X	Y	Y	Y
	Switch Point - Right	X	Y	Y	Y
	Switch Rods				1
	Rod & Clip Bolts		1		
	Cotter Keys				15
	Slide Plates		1		
	Braces			4	
F R O G	Heel Filler & Bolts	X			
	Joint Bars/Shoulder Bars	X			
G U A R L S	Point & Top Surface	X			
	Bolts	X			
G U A R L S	Guard Rails	X			
	Filler & Bolts	X			
MEASUREMENTS (Inches)		STRAIGHT SIDE	TURNOUT SIDE	COMMENTS	
F R O G	Gage at Point	56.2	56.8		
	Guard Check Gage	54.2	65.0		
	Guard Face Gage	52.5	52.9		
	Flangeway Width	1.6	2.0		
	Flangeway Depth	1.75	1.75		
G U A R L S	Flangeway Width	2.0	1.8		
O T H E R	Gage at Switch Points	56.9			
	Gage at Joints in Curved Closure Rails	56.6			

• See reverse for illustrations of wear and improper position  
 + See reverse for illustrations of measurements  
 See reverse for fraction/decimal conversion table

Figure 10. Turnouts inspection form (same for second and third trips).

TRACK SEGMENT #: 702		SEGMENT BEGINNING LOCATION: 8+19			INSPECTOR: RH		DATE: 7/27/78			
TIME DEFECTS	CHECK IF NO DEFECTS <input type="checkbox"/>	INSPECTION IMPAIRED BY VEGETATION OR OTHER MATERIAL LENGTH(TF):  TOT (TF):	NUMBER OF DEFECTIVE OR MISSING TIES III //	CONSECUTIVE DEFECTIVE OR MISSING TIES 2   3   4   5 or more			ALL JOINT TIES DEFECTIVE OR MISSING	AVERAGE SPACING PER RAIL LENGTH: >22 in	IMPROPERLY POSITIONED (skewed, rotated, bunched)	TIE CENTER-TO-CENTER DISTANCE ALONG EITHER RAIL > 48"
	TOTAL %: 40 #: 42		#4: 2 #: #:		#: #:		#: 4 #:		#:	
	COMMENTS: • 22 inches per tie is equivalent to 21.3 ties per 39 ft. rail and 18 ties per 33 ft. rail									
	CHECK IF NO DEFECTS <input type="checkbox"/>									
VEGETATION	GROWING IN BALLAST, INTERFERES WITH WALKING, BRUSHES SIDES OF ROLLING STOCK	PREVENTS TRACK INSPECTION, FIRE HAZARD, INTERFERES WITH TRAIN MOVEMENT OR SIGN VISIBILITY		MAKES MOVEMENT VERY HAZARDOUS OR IMPOSSIBLE		COMMENTS:				
	LENGTH(TF): 3+100	LENGTH(TF):		LENGTH(TF):						
	TOTAL (TF): 103	TOTAL (TF):		TOTAL (TF):						
	%:	%:		%:						
RAIL AND JOINT DEFECTS	DEFECT CODE(s)	RAIL (L/R, both)	SIDE (Field, gage, MA)	LOCATION (station)	# OF JOINTS	COMMENTS	RAIL DEFECT CODES BHC = BOLT HOLE CRACK BRK = BREAK - COMPLETE BRB = BROKEN BASE CDH = CHIP / DENT IN HEAD CRB = CORRODED BASE COR = CORROSION CRH = CRUSHED HEAD EDB = END BATTER > 1/4" ESB = ENGINE BURN FLK = FLAKES FOT = FRACTURE - DETAIL FFB = FRACTURE - ENGINE BURN HWS = HEAD / WEB SEPARATION OVF = OVERFLOW L13 = RAIL LENGTH < 13' SPL = SPLITTING SHH = SPLIT HEAD-HORIZONTAL SHV = SPLIT HEAD-VERTICAL SWB = SPLIT WEB TCE = TORCH CUT END TCH = TORCH CUT HOLE WRS = WEAR - SIDE WRV = WEAR - VERTICAL WDD = WELD DEFECT			
		LRB	FOMA							
		LRB	FOMA							
		LRB	FOMA							
		LRB	FOMA							
		LRB	FOMA							
		LRB	FOMA							
		LRB	FOMA							
		LRB	FOMA							
		LRB	FOMA							
	LRB	FOMA								
CHECK IF NO DEFECTS	1/4"	INSPECTION IMPAIRED BY VEGETATION OR OTHER MATERIAL (LF)	LINE TOTAL (LF)	ALL TOTAL (LF)	SUM of CL (LF):	JOINT DEFECT CODES ASB = ALL BOLTS ON A RAIL END MISSING OR BROKEN BJB = BROKEN JOINT BAR (not through center) CBB = CENTER BROKEN BAR CCB = CENTER CRACKED BAR CJB = CRACKED/BENT JOINT BAR (not through center) EP = IMPROPER BOLT PATTERN ISB = IMPROPER SIZE/TYPER BAR LJB = LOOSE JOINT BAR(s) LJB = LOOSE JOINT BOLT(s) MJB = MISSING JOINT BAR MJB = MISSING/BENT CRACKED or BROKEN BOLT RG1 = RAIL END GAP > 1" BUT < 2" RG2 = RAIL END GAP > 2" RDM = RAIL END MISMATCH > 3/16"				
	1									
	2									
	3									
	4									

Figure 11. Project Level Track inspection form used during third trip (#1 of 2).



### 3 DATA LOADING AND PROCESSING

The data loading and processing required several steps. First, all data collected at Hunter AAF was entered into the computer. Then RAILER information reports were run to check against the original field forms for missing/erroneous data. After the information was verified and errors corrected, the reports were run again. Some of these reports are presented in Appendix B. The computer work was done on an IBM-PC AT with a 20 M hard disk. The data was entered and verified by an engineer, but it could have been done by a trained technical assistant or data entry specialist.

#### Data Entry

The database for Hunter AAF was created using an option in the RAILER program. The data was then transferred from the paper forms to the computer using the RAILER data entry procedures. Because the program continued to evolve throughout the time data was collected, the data entry screens did not always match the original data collection forms. In particular, because of changes made to the inspection procedures between the second and third site visits the data collected during the first visit was in a much different format from the program screens. To help make the information easier to enter, the data on the old forms was translated onto the new forms before entry into the computer. This extra step greatly eased the burden of the data entry person. Since future implementations will not require this task, the time required for inspection data entry should drop by 20 to 50 percent. The data entry speed for Hunter AAF was similar to that of Fort Stewart. Table 4 contains the data entry time for Hunter AAF.

**Table 4**  
**Data Entry and Verification Times**

**Note: Approximately 50% of time was for data entry, 50% for verification**

<b>Information Area</b>	<b>Workhours</b>
Installation Information	1
Track Segment Inventory	14
Track Segment Inspection	16
Maintenance Policy (used Fort Stewart's)	1
Traffic	1
Total	<u>33</u>

## Data Verification and Processing

After the data was loaded, the following RAILER information reports were run:

- Installation Network Information
- Track Segment Inventory Information
- Track Segment Inspection Information
- Traffic Information Report
- Policy Report.

These reports were compared with the data collection form to check for errors in the data entry. Some mistakes made in the field were detected in this phase as well, usually, minor oversights such as a tie count of 212 ties per 200 ft, instead of 112 ties per 200 ft. After the corrections were made, the reports were run again and verified. Estimating the time for this procedure is difficult because, in this effort, the data correction phase was combined with the system development task of checking and verifying RAILER algorithms. The Fort Stewart FEAP test reported a time of 3 hours.<sup>16</sup> A reasonable estimate for the time required for checking and verifying the Hunter AAF database would probably be 1 to 3 hours.

When the database was correct, key reports were generated (Appendix B). The installation information and segment inventory information reports describe the relatively permanent features of the track network. The inspection condition comparison compares the current inspection to the U.S. Army track standards,<sup>17</sup> providing a fairly objective assessment of track condition and operational status of each track segment. The condition comparison report has three different levels of detail. The comparison in Appendix B is at the middle level of detail (comparison by inspection type).

---

<sup>16</sup> Brown and Uzerski.

<sup>17</sup> Technical Manual (TM) 5-628, *Railroad Track Standards* (Headquarters, Department of the Army [HQDA], October 1988).

#### 4 SYSTEM TURNOVER TO INSTALLATION PERSONNEL

There are three main objectives to system turnover: (1) to install a working copy of RAILER and the installation database onto the computer that will be used for running RAILER, (2) to show installation personnel what has been done in the implementation process and how it will benefit them, and (3) to train the personnel who will be using the system.

The system turnover at Hunter AAF was somewhat challenging in that extensive personnel reorganization took place at Hunter AAF during the course of the FEAP. Personnel left and arrived, and many changed job functions. When the USACERL team arrived to turn over the database, personnel at Hunter AAF were still in a period of adjustment and it was unclear who would be responsible for RAILER's use at the installation. The most likely users had not yet been informed about RAILER or the work that USACERL personnel had done.

However, when the responsible individuals were identified, the installation personnel were very cooperative and the turnover was successful. Meetings were held with the facility engineer, Jerry Bridges; the track foreman, Grady Collet; and the computer programmer, Debbie Sharpe. RAILER was installed on a computer in the office, and personnel were briefed on the RAILER program and its usefulness. Informal instruction was provided on system use; formal training for installation personnel is being planned, probably through the extension services of a qualified public university. Overall, the people who were briefed and instructed were interested in RAILER and showed a desire to make it function well and provide long-term benefits.

While it is not within the scope of this report to document the long-term use of RAILER at Hunter AAF, it is expected that the long-term success of the project will require support for the installation personnel. This support is being planned through a support center and/or a RAILER users' group.

## 5 CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

RAILER version 2.0 was implemented successfully at Hunter AAF as part of the FY88 FEAP. Installation personnel were interested in the system and wished to make the project a long-term success as well.

The data collection process was demonstrated, including segment inventory and track inspection. New track inspection procedures were verified to be improvements over those used at Fort Stewart and in the early phases of collection at Hunter AAF. The structured inspection procedures eased the burden on the inspectors' memory, leaving them more time to concentrate on spotting defects. The procedures are quite good for project-level type inspection, but are still too labor-intensive for network-level management. The network-level procedures being developed at USACERL are aimed at reducing the effort needed to evaluate the track. Less detail and the addition of sampling techniques should reduce the required time without sacrificing safety. The project-level inspections would then be performed only on those segments scheduled for maintenance in the near future.

A crew size of one or two was sufficient to perform the procedures. A third member increases efficiency in some procedures, but is probably not justified for an installation of this size. The stationing and inventory can both be accomplished in a single pass by two crew members. The inspection can be completed in a single pass by two crew members as well, though they may choose to use more than one pass in some situations, such as when the track is in very poor condition and inspection effort per foot of track rises. The other tasks, such as gathering installation network, traffic, and policy information, can be gathered by a single person working with installation personnel and/or installation records. If two crew members are on site, the best allocation of resources is probably to divide the tasks and have each crew member gather information separately.

The implementation at Hunter AAF complemented the implementation at Fort Stewart and showed that RAILER is workable. As a result of these experiences, it is recommended that RAILER version 2.0 be released for general implementation on domestic Army installations. It is also recommended that the applicability of RAILER version 2.0 to other potential users be investigated.

## REFERENCES

- Brown, D. G. and D. R. Uzarski, *Maintenance Management of U.S. Army Railroad Networks--The RAILER System: Demonstration of System Setup at Fort Stewart, GA*, Technical Report M-90/22 (USACERL, 1990).
- Installation Outloading Capability Study: Fort Stewart, Georgia and Camp Blanding, Florida*, MTMC Report TE 81-3a-42 (Military Traffic Management Command Transportation Engineering Agency [MTMC-TEA], July 1982).
- Uzarski, D. R., D. E. Plotkin, and D. G. Brown. *The RAILER System for Maintenance Management of U.S. Army Railroad Networks: RAILER I Description and Use*, Technical Report M-88/18/ADA199859 (USACERL, September 1988).
- Uzarski, D. R., D. G. Brown, R. W. Harris, and D. E. Plotkin, *Maintenance Management of U.S. Army Railroad Networks--The RAILER System: Detailed Track Inspection Manual*, Draft Technical Report (USACERL, 1988).
- Technical Manual (TM) 5-628, *Railroad Track Standards* (Headquarters, Department of the Army [HQDA], October 1988).
- Uzarski, D. R., D. E. Plotkin, and D. G. Brown. *Maintenance Management of U.S. Army Railroad Networks--The RAILER System: Component Identification and Inventory Procedures*, Technical Report M-88/13/ADA200276 (USACERL, August 1988).

APPENDIX A:  
Final Segmented Maps

HUNTER ARMY AIRFIELD  
SOUTH (ORDNANCE AREA) TRACKAGE  
SEGMENTING  
Pg 1 of 3

NOT TO SCALE

SEGMENT #'s IN ( )




Figure A1. Hunter Army Airfield South (Ordnance Area) Trackage Segmenting.

HUNTER ARMY AIRFIELD  
SPUR 5807 TRACKAGE  
SEGMENTING

Pg 2 of 3

NOT TO SCALE

SEGMENT #'s IN ( )




Figure A2. Hunter Army Airfield SPUR 5807 Trackage Segmenting.

HUNTER ARMY AIRFIELD  
SPUR 5794 TRACKAGE  
SEGMENTING  
Pg 3 of 3

NOT TO SCALE

SEGMENT #'s IN ( )




Figure A3. Hunter Army Airfield SPUR 5794 Trackage Segmenting.

**APPENDIX B: RAILER Reports**

HUNTER, GA

RAILER  
05/17/1989

Page: 1

**TRACK SEGMENT INVENTORY INFORMATION REPORT**

INSTALLATION #: 00000

PRIMARY INSTALLATION NUMBER:

SEGMENT IDENTIFICATION

<u>Track Segment #</u>	<u>Begin/End Location (station)</u>	<u>Track length (feet)</u>	<u>Track Category</u>	<u>Track Use</u>	<u>Track Rank</u>	<u>Construction Code/ Preceding Track Segment #(s)</u>
901	0+88 11+26	1038	B	LOADING		P 580701

Comments:

TRACK STRUCTURE

RAIL

<u>Track Segment #</u>	<u>Begin Location (station)</u>	<u>End Location (station)</u>	<u>length (feet)</u>	<u>Weight (lbs/yd)</u>	<u>Section</u>
901	0+88	1+26	2076	85	

FASTENINGS

TIES

BALLAST

<u>Tie Plate Length (in)</u>	<u>Shoulder</u>	<u>Rail Anchors</u>	<u>Gauge Rods</u>	<u>Cross Section (in x in)</u>	<u>Spacing (in)</u>	<u>Material</u>	<u>Support Depth (in)</u>	<u>Type</u>
9.00	SS	Y	Y	6X8	20.51	WOOD		CRUSHED STONE

Comments:

CURVES

<u>Track Segment #</u>	<u>Curve ID #</u>	<u>Curvature (degrees)</u>	<u>Required Superelevation (inches)</u>	<u>Speed (mph)</u>
901	1C9	16.10	0.00	

Comments:

**GRADE CROSSINGS**

<u>Track Segment #/ Road Name or Crossing Identity</u>	<u>Centerline Location (station)</u>	<u>Road Crossing ID #</u>	<u>Crossing Length (feet)</u>	<u>Crossing Type</u>	<u>Protection</u>	<u>Bolted Joints</u>
901	4+51	30.0	AC	SIGNS	Y	

**DOUGLAS**

Comments:

901	6+56	20.0	AC	NONE	Y	
-----	------	------	----	------	---	--

**LOADING LANE**

Comments:

**CLEARANCE RESTRICTIONS AND RELATED FACILITIES**

<u>Track Segment #/ Type</u>	<u>Begin/End Location (station)</u>	<u>Obstruction and/or Facility Type</u>	<u>Restriction Measurement (feet)</u>		<u>Facility Number</u>	<u># of Box Car Positions For Docks or Tangent Track Lengths For Ramps</u>
			<u>Horiz (Center)</u>	<u>Vert</u>		
901	5+80	DOCK	7.30			
BOTH	10+46					

Comments: Measurement from inside of near rail head

**DRAINAGE STRUCTURES**

<u>Track Segment #</u>	<u>Centerline Location</u>	<u>Type</u>	<u>Size (inches)</u>	<u>Material</u>
901	4+51	PIPE	24	CONCRETE

Comments:

901	6+87	PIPE	12	METAL
-----	------	------	----	-------

Comments:

901	8+86	PIPE	12	METAL
-----	------	------	----	-------

Comments:

00000  
HUNTER, GA

RAILER  
Condition Comparison  
by Inspection Type Report

Page: 1  
Date: 05/17/89

Report Criteria:

Condition Comparison by Inspection Type Report for  
Track Segment(s): 901, 902.

<u>TRACK</u> <u>SEGMENT #</u>	<u>NO</u> <u>OPERATION</u>	<u>5 MP</u> <u>SPEED LIMIT</u>	<u>10 MPH</u> <u>SPEED LIMIT</u>	<u>FULL</u> <u>COMPLIANCE</u>	<u>DEFECT</u> <u>FREE</u>
901		TIES		FLANGWAY MEA TRACK COMP VEGETATION	RAIL & JOINTS
902				FLANGWAY MEA TIES TRACK COMP TURNOUT GEOM TURNOUTS	RAIL & JOINTS VEGETATION

## USACERL DISTRIBUTION

### Chief of Engineers

ATTN: CEHEC-IM-LH (2)  
ATTN: CEHEC-IM-LP (2)  
ATTN: CECC-P  
ATTN: CECW  
ATTN: CECW-O  
ATTN: CECW-P  
ATTN: CECW-RR  
ATTN: CEMP  
ATTN: CEMP-C  
ATTN: CEMP-E  
ATTN: CERD  
ATTN: CERD-L  
ATTN: CERD-C  
ATTN: CERD-M  
ATTN: CERM  
ATTN: DAEN-ZCE  
ATTN: DAEN-ZCI  
ATTN: DAEN-ZCM  
ATTN: DAEN-ZCC

### CEHSC

ATTN: CEHSC-ZC 22060  
ATTN: DET III 79906  
ATTN: CEHSC-FB-P 22060

### US Army Europe

ODCS/Engineer 09403  
ATTN: AEAEN-FE  
ATTN: AEAEN-ODCS  
V Corps  
ATTN: DEH (11)  
VII Corps  
ATTN: DEH (16)

### AMC - Dir., Inst., & Svcs.

ARRAF.COM 07801  
Aberdeen proving Ground 21005  
Jefferson Proving Ground 47250  
Fort Monmouth 07703  
Letterkenny Army Depot 17201  
Pueblo Army Depot 81008  
Red River Army Depot 75507  
Redstone Arsenal 35809  
Rock Island Arsenal 61299  
Savannah Army Depot 61074  
Sharpe Army Depot 95331  
Seneca Army Depot 14541  
Tobyhanna Army Depot 18466  
Tooele Army Depot 84074  
Watervliet Arsenal 12189

DLA ATTN: DLA-WI 22304

DNA ATTN: NADS 20305

### Fort Belvoir, VA

ATTN: Australian Liaison Officer 22060  
ATTN: Water Resource Center 22060  
ATTN: Engr Studies Center 22060  
ATTN: Engr Topographic Lab 22060  
ATTN: ATZA-TE-SW 22060  
ATTN: CECC R 22060

CECRL ATTN: Library 03755

CEWES ATTN: Library 39180

Chanute AFB, IL 61868  
3345 CES/DE, Stop 27

### Tyndall AFB, FL 32403

AFESC/Engineering & Service Lab

### FORSKOM

FORSKOM Engineer, ATTN: Spt Det. 15071  
ATTN: Facilities Engineer  
Fort Bragg 28307  
Fort Campbell 42223  
Fort Carson 80913  
Fort Devens 01433  
Fort Drum 13601  
Fort Giam 30050  
Fort Hood 76544  
Fort Sam Houston 78234  
Fort Lewis 98433  
Fort McCoy 54656  
Fort George G. Meade 20755  
Fort Ord 93941  
Fort Pickett 23824  
Fort Polk 71459  
Fort Richardson 99505  
Fort Riley 66442  
Fort Sheridan 60037  
Fort Stewart 31314  
Fort Wainwright 99703

### Military Dist of Washington

ATTN: DEH  
Cameron Station (3) 22314  
Fort Lesley J. McNair 20319  
Fort Myer 22211

### Military Traffic Mgmt Command

Falls Church 20315  
Oakland Army Base 94626  
Bayside 07002  
Sunny Point MOT 28461

### TRADOC (19)

HQ, TRADOC, ATTN: ATEN-DEH 23651  
ATTN: DEH  
Fort Belvoir 22060  
Fort Benning 31905  
Fort Bliss 79916  
Fort Chaffee 72905  
Fort Eustis 23604  
Fort Gordon 30905  
Fort Benjamin Harrison 46216  
Fort Jackson 29207  
Fort Knox 40121  
Fort Leavenworth 66027  
Fort Lee 23801  
Fort McClellan 36205  
Fort Rucker 36362  
Fort Sill 73503

### NAVFAC

ATTN: Division Offices (11)  
ATTN: Facilities Engr Cmd (9)  
ATTN: Naval Public Works Center (9)  
ATTN: Naval Civil Engr Lab (3)  
ATTN: Naval Constr Battalion Ctr 93043

US Government Printing Office 20401  
Receiving/Depository Section (2)

Defense Technical Info. Center 22304  
ATTN: DTIC-FAB (2)

157  
8/90

## EMC Team Distribution

Chief of Engineers 20314  
 ATTN: CBMP-ZA  
 ATTN: CBMP-ZM (2)  
 ATTN: DAEN-ZCP

CBHSC  
 ATTN: CBHSC-PB

US Army Engineer District  
 New York 10278  
 ATTN: Chief, Design Br  
 Pittsburgh 15223  
 ATTN: Chief, ORPCD  
 ATTN: Chief, Engr Div  
 Philadelphia 19106  
 ATTN: Chief, NAPEN-D  
 Baltimore 21203  
 ATTN: Chief, Engr Div  
 Norfolk 23510  
 ATTN: Chief, NAOEN-M  
 ATTN: Chief, NAOEN-D  
 Huntington 25701  
 ATTN: Chief, ORHED-G  
 Wilmington 28401  
 ATTN: Chief, SAWEN-D  
 Charleston 29402  
 ATTN: Chief, Engr Div  
 Savannah 31402  
 ATTN: Chief, SASAS-L  
 Jacksonville 32232  
 ATTN: Coast Branch  
 Mobile 36652  
 ATTN: Chief, SAMEN-D  
 ATTN: Chief, SAMEN-F  
 ATTN: Chief, SAMEN-C  
 Nashville 37202  
 ATTN: Chief, ORNED-P  
 Memphis 38103  
 ATTN: Chief, Com'r Div  
 ATTN: Chief, LM1ED-D  
 Vicksburg 39180  
 ATTN: Chief, Engr Div  
 Louisville 40201  
 ATTN: Chief, Engr Div  
 Detroit 48231  
 ATTN: Chief, NCEED-T  
 St. Paul 55101  
 ATTN: Chief, ED-D  
 ATTN: Chief, NCSER-GH  
 Rock Island 61204  
 ATTN: Chief, NCRED-G  
 St. Louis 63101  
 ATTN: Chief, ED-D  
 Kansas City 64106  
 ATTN: Chief, Engr Div  
 Omaha 68102  
 ATTN: Chief, Engr Div  
 New Orleans 70160  
 ATTN: Chief, LMNED-DO  
 Little Rock 72203  
 ATTN: Chief, Engr Div  
 Tulsa 74121  
 ATTN: Chief, Engr Div  
 Ft. Worth 76102  
 ATTN: Chief, SWFED-D  
 Galveston  
 ATTN: Chief, SWGAS-L 77553  
 ATTN: Chief, SWGCO-C 77553  
 ATTN: Chief, SWGED-DC 77550  
 Albuquerque 87103  
 ATTN: Chief, Engr Div  
 Los Angeles 90053  
 ATTN: Chief, SPLED-F

San Francisco 94105  
 ATTN: Chief, Engr Div  
 Sacramento 95814  
 ATTN: Chief, SPKED-D  
 ATTN: Chief, SPKCO-C  
 Ft. East 96301  
 ATTN: POPED-L  
 Portland 97208  
 ATTN: Geotech Engr Br  
 ATTN: Chief, PM-1  
 ATTN: Chief, EN-DB-ST  
 Seattle 98124  
 ATTN: Chief, NPSCO  
 ATTN: Chief, NPSBEN-PM  
 ATTN: Chief, EN-DB-PT  
 Walla Walla 99362  
 ATTN: Chief, Engr Div  
 Alaska 99506  
 ATTN: NPAEN-G-M

US Army Engineer Division  
 New England 02154  
 ATTN: Chief, NEDED-T  
 ATTN: Laboratory  
 ATTN: NEDECD  
 North Atlantic 10007  
 ATTN: Chief, NADEN-T  
 Middle East (Rear) 22601  
 ATTN: Chief, MEDED-T  
 South Atlantic  
 ATTN: Laboratory 30060  
 ATTN: Chief, SADEN-TC 30303  
 ATTN: Chief, SADEN-TS 30303  
 Huntsville 35807  
 ATTN: Chief, HNDED-CS  
 ATTN: Chief, HNDED-M  
 ATTN: Chief, HNDED-SR  
 Lower Mississippi 39180  
 ATTN: Chief, LMVED-G  
 Ohio River  
 ATTN: Laboratory 45227  
 ATTN: Chief, Engr Div 45201  
 Missouri River  
 ATTN: Chief, MRDED-G 68101  
 ATTN: Laboratory 68102  
 Southwestern 75202  
 ATTN: Laboratory  
 ATTN: Chief, SWDED-MA  
 ATTN: Chief, SWDED-TO  
 South Pacific 94966  
 ATTN: Laboratory  
 Pacific Ocean 96858  
 ATTN: Chief, Engr Div  
 ATTN: PM&S Branch  
 ATTN: PODED-D  
 North Pacific  
 ATTN: Materials Lab 97060  
 ATTN: Chief, Engr Div 97208

7th US Army 09407  
 ATTN: AETM-DT f-MQ-EH

HQ, Combined Field Army (ROK/US)  
 ATTN: CPAR-EN 96358

US Army Foreign Sci. & Tech Ctr  
 ATTN: Charlottesville, VA 22901  
 ATTN: Ft. East Off 96328

USA ARRADCOM 07801  
 ATTN: DRDAR-LCA-OK

HQ, USAMRDC 21701  
 ATTN: SORD-PLC

West Point, NY 10996  
 ATTN: Dept of Mechanics  
 ATTN: Library

Pt. Belvoir, VA 22060  
 ATTN: Learning Resources Center

Pt. Benning, GA 31905  
 ATTN: ATZB-DEH-BO  
 ATTN: ATZB-EH-E

Pt. Leavenworth, KS 66027  
 ATTN: ATZLCA-SA

Pt. Lee, VA 23801  
 ATTN: AMXMC-D (2)

Pt. McPherson, GA 30330  
 ATTN: APEN-CD

Pt. Monroe, VA 23651  
 ATTN: ATEN-AD  
 ATTN: ATEN-FE-ME  
 ATTN: ATEN-FN (2)

Pt. Richardson, AK 99505  
 ATTN: AFVR-DB-E

Rocky Mountain Arsenal 80022  
 ATTN: SARRM-CO-FEP

USAWES 39180  
 ATTN: C/Structures  
 ATTN: Soils & Pavements Lab

Naval Facilities Engr Command 22332  
 ATTN: Code 2003

COMMANDER (CODE 2636) 93555  
 Naval Weapons Center

Little Rock AFB 72099  
 ATTN: 314/DEEB

Building Research Board 20418

Dept of Transportation Library 20590

Transportation Research Board 20418

107  
 +1  
 08/90