

8. What is the grade structure and how many super grades—quota and non-quota—are involved?

The railroad does not have any supergrades.

9. What capital equipment, such as ADP, if any, do you rely upon to fulfill this program?

Capital equipment employed by the railroad in its operations consists of land, buildings, structures and facilities (roadbed and track), and equipment (rolling stock, machine shop, office equipment including one IBM 1440 computer).

10. Do you expect the expenditures or the benefits of the program to grow appreciably in the future?

The increase in expenditures related to this program would relate to any increase in our depreciation or retirement rates.

11. At what level are the personnel responsible for the various parts of the program coordinated to determine if the program as a whole is being efficiently carried out?

Any postponement of this program would put the railroad in the position of having an excessive amount of deferred maintenance which, of course, could result in the lowering of safety standards or types of services offered.

12. Is there a continual program review within the agency, other than the annual budgetary review, to determine more effective and efficient ways to achieve these program objectives?

There is a continuing program review of revenue and expense by management.

13. To your knowledge, does this program duplicate or parallel work being done by any other agency.

This program does not duplicate or parallel work being done by any other agency.

14. Is your organizational structure such that the program is being carried out most efficiently and effectively?

We think so, to the best of our ability. The organizational structure would be changed if potential improvements became apparent.

15. Are there any outstanding GAO reports on this program? If so, what is the status of the GAO recommendations the report contains?

The work of the GAO team currently conducting a management survey is not completed. A letter report from the Seattle region, dated April 23, 1968, is currently being replied to.

16. What significant problems, if any, are you facing in accomplishing the program objectives?

The same problems of any commercial common carrier; the challenge to produce revenues in excess of costs and still perform the developmental functions of the railroad.

17. Do you administer any grants, loans, or other disbursed funds related to this program? If so, is the size of your administrative staff commensurate with the magnitude of the outlays?

Not applicable.

18. If your appropriations were reduced, how would you absorb the cut—by an overall reduction, or by cutting or curtailing certain activities?

We have not asked for O. & M. appropriations since 1939, nor capital improvements since 1956, with the exception of the costs of repairing earthquake damage in 1964.

19. If additional funds were available, what would you do with the new money?

If the additional funds were sufficient, we would bring a location survey and an economic feasibility study of an extension of the railroad from Dunbar to Bornite, and north from the proposed railroad through the Anaktuvuk Pass to the oil and gas fields on the northern slopes of the Brooks Range.

PROGRAM CATEGORY 5—ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION

1. What is the nature of and authority for this program?

The act approved May 13, 1954, authorized the St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation to construct that part of the St. Lawrence Seaway in the U.S. territory between Lake Ontario and St. Regis, N.Y., to consummate necessary arrangements with the St. Lawrence Seaway Authority of Canada relative to construction and operation of the seaway, to cooperate with Canada in the control and operation of the St. Lawrence Seaway and to negotiate with Canada for an agreement on tolls. The act approved July 17, 1957, authorized the Corporation to participate with the St. Lawrence Seaway Authority of Canada in the