Campbell & Kautz

## A determination of the comparative values of cross-ties of different materials

### Railway Civil Engineering

Civil Engineering

B. S.



#### UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS LIBRARY

Class 1310

Book G15

Volume

Mr10-20M

4 + + Ze + \* -\* + \* \* × F + st. to + \* + age + 4 + ÷ + + + \* + \* +-7. + \* + \* 4 + + + te + + te + t \* \* + -the -7-+ + of -+ \* + fe. \* \* \* t fri-+ + + + \* +of -\* the T \* ×. \* 7-\* \* × \* \* + \* 4. -+-\* + \* the te -4 -\* \* \* -te \* -r + \* \* 4 \* + + \* \* \* A \* 4 + + + \* + + + + + \* ----\* \* the \* \* 1/2 5 + \* + 4 + the 4 \* 2 + + + the \* + t ¥. \* \*= \* × + \* T + \* + the. \* + + sk. -+ \* + 7. y +

# Digitized by the Internet Archive in 2013

http://archive.org/details/determinationofc00camp

#### A DETERMINATION OF THE COMPARA-TIVE VALUES OF CROSS-TIES OF \$75 DIFFERENT MATERIALS

ВҮ

NEIL NELSON CAMPBELL PAUL KAUTZ

#### THESIS

FOR THE

#### DEGREE OF BACHELOR OF SCIENCE

IN

#### RAILWAY CIVIL ENGINEERING, NEIL NELSON CAMPBELL

 $\mathbf{I}\,\mathbf{N}$ 

CIVIL ENGINEERING, PAUL KAUTZ

COLLEGE OF ENGINEERING

UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS

PRESENTED JUNE, 1910

#### UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS

May 26, 1900

#### THIS IS TO CERTIFY THAT THE THESIS PREPARED UNDER MY SUPERVISION BY

Neil Nelson Campbell

ENTITLED A DETERMINATION OF THE COMPARATIVE VALUES OF CROSS-

TIFS OF DIFFERENT MATERIALS

7.15

1.1

8

IS APPROVED BY ME AS FULFILLING THIS PART OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE

DEGREE OF Bachelor of Science

Railway Civil Engineering

Shelby S. Roberto Instructor in Charge

APPROVED: Edward & Schmust

HEAD OF DEPARTMENT OF Railway Engineering



#### UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS

May 26, 1910

THIS IS TO CERTIFY THAT THE THESIS PREPARED UNDER MY SUPERVISION BY

Paul Kautz

ENTITLED A DETERMINATION OF THE COMPARATIVE VALUES OF CROSS-

TIES OF DIFFERENT MATERIALS

IS APPROVED BY ME AS FULFILLING THIS PART OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE

DEGREE OF Bachelor of Science

Sheeby S. Roberts Instructor in Charge

HEAD OF DEPARTMENT OF Civil Engineering

#### Contents.

Article Page					
		Introduction	1		
	1.	The Structure of Timber	3		
	2.	Factors which cause decay and how they work	6		
	3.	Methods of preserving Timber	9		
	4.	Cutting and Seasoning Ties	-14		
	5.	Tie Plates	-22		
	6.	Rail Fastenings	-24		
	7.	Steel and Concrete Ties	-27		
	8.	An Economic Comparison of Cross Ties of different materials	-30		
	9.	Conclusions and Recommendations	-46		

~

#### Introduction.

In order to supply the increasing demand for timber, an enormous amount of it has to be cut.Most of this is used for building material,cross ties,fence posts,telegraph poles,etc. In 1906,the railroads of the United States alone purchased 102,834,042 ties,at a total cost of \$48,819,124-an average of 47 cents per tie.In 1905,the number of ties purchased amounted to about 15,000,000 less than in 1906,but this does not necessarily mean that the demand for ties is increasing at the rate of 15,000,000 per year.From these figures we see that the amount of timber cut from our forests each year is enormous,and at the rate at which railroads are now being built and new industries introduced,the demand for timber is bound to increase even faster than it has in past years.

Most of the timber in the past came chiefly from sources along the lines of railroads already built, and as this became exhausted the forests farther back were tapped. In the early period of railroad construction, the principal source of supply of white oak ties was Pennsylvania, Ohio, Indiana, and Wisconsin, but at present these states furnish very little, the supply now coming from Missouri, Arkansas, Kentucky and Tennessee.

Fifteen years ago, the railroads purchased, for the most part, the very best white oak ties, of which nearly all were obtained from forests adjacent to their lines. Now the Eastern roads draw the larger part of their tie supply from the

-1-

pine forests of the South and from points in Canada, those of the North and Central West from the Pacific Coast, while those of the Central States are drawing from the forests in the lower Mississippi valley. Although the points of supply change slowly.

it is evident that unless something is done to protect our forests the timber proposition will be a serious one in the near future.

Both the Department of Agriculture of the Unites States, and the tie and timber departments of the various railroads, are paying a great deal of attention to the preservation of our forests and the planting of treeless areas for future use. Much attention is also being paid to the methods of preserving the timber used, thus not only making it cheaper on account of its greater life, but also by decreasing the cuantity used. In the past, the high grade timbers have always been cut and used first while the inferior woods were left standing. One of the great problems that confronts the railroads of today is to devise means whereby the inferior woods, such as swamp-oak, tanarack, lodgepole pines, loblolly pine, gum, etc., can be treated so as to make them valuable for ties, leaving the white oak and other superior woods for higher grade structural purposes.

In the following pages some attention will be given to the causes of decay in timber, together with a brief outline of the present methods of preservation used in this and other countries. The cutting and seasoning will also be considered, together with the value and necessity of the plates and better methods of fastening the rail to the ties. In conclusion, we will make an economic comparison of cross ties of different materials

-2-

from data received from represented railroads all over the United States, and show the relative value of the fifferent timbers used for cross ties; also the effect which treatment has on their total capitalization and annual cost.

The subject will be considered under the following heads;

1.	The structure of timber.
2.	Factors which cause decay and how they work.
3.	Methods of preserving timber.
4.	Cutting and seasoning ties.
5.	Tie plates.
6.	Rail fastenings.
7.	Steel and concrete ties.
8.	An economic of cross ties of different materials.

9. Conclusions and recommendations.

#### The Structure of Timber.

In order to fully comprehend the problems which have to be solved in impregnating timber, it is necessary to have a general understanding of the structure and composition of the wood itself.

Wood is composed of a series of closed tubes extending parallel with the trunk of the tree and fitting into one another endwise so as to form a splice. These tubes vary in size, those formed in the spring when growth is most active being of larger diameter and lighter in color than those formed in the

.

summer.A group of spring tubes, together with the corresponding summer tubes, form what is know as an annual ring and represents one year's growth.

The young cells are filled with a semi-liquid mass called protoplasm, but as they grow older they lose their protoplasm and become filled with air and various substances, such as gums and resins. In most woods, a series of tubes extend radially outward from the center of the tree; these are known as pith, or medullary rays. They are especially noticeable in oak wood and on this account the quarter-sawed oak is in great demand as a finishing lumber. The medullary rays are composed of short, thin-walled cells and serve to conduct water and food supplies to the inner portions of the tree.

The outermost rings of the tree constitute the living elements. In them the circulation of water takes place, especially the transfer of the same from the roots to the upper branches. The wood cells are filled with various food substances such as starches, sugar, and oils; but as one goes toward the center of the trunk he finds that the cells gradually lose these contents and are partly filled with air. They are then mature, their walls having reached their maximum thickness and strength become reservoirs for the deposit of gums and restins which remain in the tree but take no active part in its life. The depth to which the living elements in a tree go depends on the kind of tree. In the maple and beech, for example, the living elements extend through as many as thirty rings, while in the locust and red cedar not more than

-4-

• •

fourteen. This is probaly the cause of the early decay in the maple and beech and of the long life in the locust and red cedar.

From the above we see that the outer or living part (commonly known as sapwood) differs materially from the inner or dead part(known as heartwood) in the presence of large quantities of food materials and in the readiness to transmit water. In general, the purpose of the sapwood is to allow the free passage of water and food supplies from the roots through the trunk to the upper branches, while the heartwood to support the crown and living parts. In most trees the heartwood is easily distinguished from the sapwood being of a darker color due to the presence of certain coloring substances. The change from sapwood to heartwood is apparantly sudden and does not always take place in one full ring each year. It has been noticed that on one side of a tree more rings are heartwood than on the other.What ever the cause of the change from sapwood to heartwood may be for practical purposes the difference is sufficiently well marked. The heartwood lasts longer than the sapwood and is stronger. In some trees, such as the giants of our Western forests the heartwood resists decay for hundreds of years while others, such as the willow and maple, apparently offer no resistance.

-5-

#### Factors which cause decay and how they work.

The principal causes of the decay of timber are insects, bacteria, and fungi. The insects, such as white ants and termites, which are so destructive to timber in warmer climates, bore holes in the wood and often riddle it completely. In structural timber, however, decay is more generally caused by fungi or bacteria."Fungi are low plants consisting of colorless threads called hyphae many hyphae making up the mycelium." The fungi may grow on either the dead or the living parts of the tree, from which they extract certain food materials and finally destroy the tissues. The fungi obtain access to the tree through wounds in the bark, or where large branches are broken off the latter being the principal source of evil. The spores of the fungi, which are floating around in the air, lodge in the cavaties of the dead branch and there germinate. They finally make their way down the branch until they reach the trunk of the tree, when with deadly effect they work both up and down.

Many trees have numerous natural resources for protecting themselves against these invading parasites, such as thick bark and the exudation of gums and resins which close up the wounds made on the tree.During the early life of the tree, these means are more effective than later. The living portion is quickly covered with gum or resin and finally heals entirely, while on the other hand the dead part, has no means in itself of excluding the spores of the fungi.

-6-

Its sole protection lies in the living layer which surrounds it on all sides. The wood of some trees, however, such as the cypress, red cedar, and red wood contains a peculiar chemical compound which protects it against the attacks of the fungi. food After sufficient, has been absorbed, the hyphae

form fruiting bodies on the outside of the tree.These fruiting bodies are commonly known as punks, conchs, toad stools, frog stools, etc., and when ripe they discharge their spores in clouds which float off through the air to find lodgment in other trees.The cells of the trees thus infected are first destroyed and finally the tree itself.

For the development and rapid growth of the bacteria and fungi there must be an abundant supply of food and a certain amount of heat and moisture.Some require a large supply of oxygen,others grow best without it;some require startches and sugars,while others do not;but <u>all</u> require moisture. Even the socalled "dry rot" fungi require a certain amount of moisture for its growth.If this simple principle were adhered to more closely,"That without water there can be no rot,"much of the decay of timber could be prevented.We find that the ties in a well drained ballast will last longer than their neighbors in a poor ballast. This is also one of the principal reasons why sap wood decays more rapidly than heartwood.The cells of the sapwood afford free passage of water and contain starches, sugar,oils, stc., thus forming an ideal place for the

-7-

invading fungi to Germany. On the other hand, the heartwood does not admit of a ready circulation of water, and contains certain gums and resins which protect it against the fungi.

It has been found that dry wood will resist the attacks of fungi for an indefinite period of time. The timbers of old buildings have been found perfectly sound after being in service for hundreds of years, Wood completely immersed in water will also resist decay, as the supply of oxygen necessary for the growth of the fungi is cut off. Piles are a good example of this, the portion completely and continuously submerged in water remaining sound indefinitely.

The opinion is common among many railraod men that a hewn tie will last longer than a sawn tie, and for this reason many railr**oads** specify that their ties shall be hewn from young trees. It is claimed by some that in the sawing, a straight line is cut and that more of the cells are opened, thus allowing a freer passage of water into the tie. Also the surface of the sawn tie is rougher and holds moisture more readily, while in the hewn tie the chips are split off along the lines of the grain of the tree and thus a smoother cut is made. Thatever the real or imaginary advantages of the hewn tie over the sawn tie may be, it is a matter of small importance when the ties are treated; but on the other hand, hewing is an extremely wasteful process. It is slow and uneconomical and requires the use of young timber, while older and more mature timber is left standing.

-8-

-

We have seen from the foregoing that the older and more mature trees have less power within themselves to resist the attacks of fungi and bacteria and that much of the timber is affected by these parasites after it reaches a certain age, differing with different trees.It therefore should become the practice of all roads to cut the older and more mature timber and reserve the young trees for future needs, thus saving the timber which is likely to be destroyed by fungi and allowing the young trees to continue to grow.

The qualities of timber which determine its resistance to the attacks of fungi are as yet undefined. The physical qualities, such as hardness, density, and tensile strongth seem to have no influence. We find that the hard, strong white oak will decay more rapidly than the cypress. The tamarack and hemlock decay more rapidly than the cedar and the locust. Some of the trees which resist decay more than others are the red cedar, cypress, red wood, locust, catalpa, and arbor vitae, the reason for this increased resistance to decay is probaly due to the presence to some chemical compand which protects them against the invading fungi and bacteria.

#### Methods of preserving timber.

To get the greatest value out of ties of different kinds, especially those most susceptible to decay it is necessary

-9-

·

to use some preservative which will prevent the work of the destructive fungi and bactoria. The principal materials used in impregnating timber at present are; zinc chloride. zinc sulphate, mercuric chloride, tannic acid, and the products of coal tar distilation. These salts when injected into the timber act as poisons, killing the fungi and bacteria which destroy the wood. According to some authorities the amount necessary to Hill these parasites is very small, but the general practice in treating ties is too inject as much of the salts as the tie will hold, because the salts, being soluble in water, leak out when the tie comes in contact with water, and of course, the more salt injected the longer it will take to leak out. It is important here to note that "It is the presence of the injected salts which prevent decay". and that it is impossible for the destructive fungi to work and destroy the wood tissues so long as there is sufficuent of these poisonious salts in the tie.

In order to perfectly protect a tie against the attacks of destructive organisms, it is necessary that the preservative used fulfill the following requirements;

	It must be poisonous to all destroying agents.
2.	It must be capable of comparatively, injection.
3.	It must remain in the wood after being injected.
4.	It must protect all parts of the wood.
5.	It must be so cheap that its cost will not
	prevent its use.

-10-

At present, the principal methods of treatment used in this and other countries are (1)Creosoting, (2) Rucping process, (3) Lowry process, (4) Card process, (5) Wellhouse or zinc tannin process, (6) Burnett izing or zinc chloride process.

The full cell creasote process is considered the best and most lasting of all the processes in use today. It consists of impregnating the wood cells and fibres of the tie with from 6 to 12 pounds of creosote oil per cubic foot. The wood is first seasoned, preferably in the open, or if not in the open, in steaming retorts-often both. After the steaming, a vacuum is produced and maintained until the oil is introduced. The wood is completely submerged in oil, after which it is put under a pressure of from 100 to 125 pounds per square inch until the desired impregnation is secured. The creosole oil is then drained off, and a vacuum is produced to assist in draining off the surplus oil from the exterior of the tie. The complete process requires in the noighborhood of 6 or 7 hours.

Creosoting is used on all English and most French lines, also extensively in Belgium. In these countries, especially in Franch, marked results have been obtained, due to the unlimited amount of high grade creosote oil injected. In England it was found that the Stotch pine tie, which untreated will decay in five or six years, lasts twenty five years or more when treated with creosote. In France, it is claimed that they get thirty years life out of a beech tie treated with croosote, while untreated it will last only from

-11-

three to four years.

The Rueping process, often referred to as a partial cell treatment, is used principally with creosote oil. It consists of forcing conpressed air into the cells of the wood and at a higher pressure creosote oil without relieving the air pressure; then, upon relieving the combined pressure, the air expands and forces out the surplus oil, leaving only the wood fibres impregnated.

The Lowry process, also referred to as a partial cell treatment, is very similar to the Rueping process in that it is used in connection with creosote oil, and the results obtained are the same. It consists in forcing creosote oil into the tie and then drawing out, by means of a vacuum, the surplus oil, leaving only the wood fibres impregnated.

The **C**ard process consists of impregnating the wood cells with a mixture of zinc chloride and creosote oil, about one half pound of dry zinc and from one and a half to four pounds of creosote oil per cubic foot being injected.

In this process, it is necessary to keep the mixture agitated so as to prevent a separation of the zinc and the creosote.

The Well house ,or zinc tannin process, as it is commonly called, consists of impregnating the tie with a hot solution containing about one half pound of dry zinc chloride and one half percent of glue per cubic foot of wood; also a second solution containing one half percent of tannic acid. The purpose of the tannic acid is to solidify the first

-12-
injection and prevent its leaking out.

Burnettizing or zinc chloride process, is very similar to the zinc tannin process, except that the glue and the injection of tannic acid are omitted. The process consists of impregnating the tie with a solution containing one half pound of dry zinc chloride per cubic foot of tie.

The average costs of the treatments per tie, 7" x 9" x 8'0", are about as follows;

1.	Full cell creosote process	\$0.46
2.	Rueping process	<b>\$0.31</b>
3.	Lowry process	\$0.31
4.	Card process	\$0.26
5.	Zinc tannin process	\$0.22
6.	Zinc chloride process	\$0.15

The success attending any and all of these different treatments depends upon the thoroughness with which it is done, the length of time the tie is allowed to season before and after being treated, the kind of timber treated, etc. In Austria, it was found that pine ties having an average life of about six years, untreated, would last about twenty years when treated with zine chloride, while an oak tie lasting fifteen years, untreated, would decay in seventeen years after being treated with zine chloride. Again, a beech tie untreated which last three and a half years in the track will give twelve years service when treated with zine chloride, and seventeen years when treated with creosote. A fir tie lasting four and a half years untreated will last about nine years

-13-

treated with zinc chloride and thirteen years treated with creosote.

These examples illustrate the great variation in the increased life of different ties when treated with the same treatments. The life of the oak tie is increased only two yearsby treating it with zinc chloride, while the life of the pine tie is increased fourteen years. The reason for this is not quite certain but probaly is due to the cell structure of the different woods.

We find that ties impregnated with salts soluble in water soon leak out if placed in the track immediately after treatment, where they come in contact with water at frequent intervals; but, on the other hand, if the tie is thoroughly seasoned after treatment the water from without the tie must first force an entrance into the dry wood before it can dissolve the salts which are in the wood fibre and cause them to leak out. Most of the cells are filled with air also and for this reason the entrance of water from without is a very slow process, thus delaying the time when there is not sufficient of the poisonous salts in the wood to destroy the invading fungi.

# Cutting and Seasoning of Ties.

With the greater demand for ties and the increase in price comes the question of the more economic use of our

-14-



forests trees. The present method of hewing ties is extremely wasteful and must be improved if we would reserve our forests for future generations. In Europe, we find that all ties are sawn, and that specifications have been adopted which allow the greatest utilization of the material from one tree. Belgium leads in this respect, using ties which are left half round, thus getting two ties out of a tree which otherwise would produce only one. In each case they make use of all the sapwood, and impregnate it so that it will last as long as the heartwood. In hewing ties, a tree ten inches in diameter breast high is large enough to get 6" x 8" tie.

6

13

12

//

9"

6

PB

Diameter 14

E

To

G

Π

Π

Fig. 1

-15-

but we find from the records of the forestry department that about sixty percent of the hewn ties are cut from trees thirteen and fourteen inches in diameter. This waste of timber is wholly unnecessary and with proper methods of sawing we obtain the greatest possible number of ties from each tree and have a considerable amount of lumber left as a by-product.

Fig l.shows the possibility of cutting A a tie 6" x 8", B board 6" wide,C and C' boards  $5\frac{1}{2}$  " wide,D and D' boards 4" wide,E board 13" wide,F board 12" wide,G board 11" wide,H board 9" wide,and I board 6" wide from a log 14" in diameter.Although it is not always possible to get this amount of lumber out of a 14" log yet it shows the possibility of getting considerable.

By consulting Table 1 we see the gain in lumber resulting when ties are Lawn instead of being hewn.Furthermore by a comparison of Figures 2 and 3 we see the advantage of the method of cutting ties used in England over and above

Table 1.

Diameter of Log at small end inside of bark in inches.	Yield of a l In hewn ties 6" x 8" bd,ft.	6 ft.log. In sawn ties & Lumber. Ties 6"x8" Lumbor		Percentage of Volume of hewn tie
		Bd,Ft.	Bd.ft.	gained by
				sawing.
10	64	64	14.8	23
11	64	64	27.0	42
12	64	64	52.4	82
13	64	64	70.8	112
14	64	64	101.3	158
15	64	128	57.6	191

Cain in lumber brought about by sawing instead of hewing ties.

·

.



that used in America, whereby they obtain two ties from a tree which in this country would yield only one heartwood tie. The Belgium practice is illustrated by Fig.4, whereby they utilize the entire tree, thus getting two ties from a tree which with present methods of cutting used in America only one is obtained.Fig.5 shows a proposed method of cutting two ties from a tree fourteen inches in diameter, thus utilizing considerable of the sapwood.

Assuming three cuts to a tree certain diameter trees will make ties as follows;-

16	inches	Diameter	4	ties	6" x	811
18	11	11	6	11	11 1	T IT
20	п	t1	10	17	11	ŦŦ
22	11	11	12	п	п	п
24	Ħ	11	20	11	п	11
30	11	TŤ	28	11	П	11
33	п	18	34	П	11	11

The importance of seasoning ties before placing in the track does not seem to have impressed itself upon our American lumberman; at least, they do not practice it systematically, except in comparatively few cases. In European countries, where timber is scarce and therefore very expensive, all ties are seasoned before being used. The Russian railroad authorities found that a well seasoned oak tie will last practically as long as one treated with zine chloride, and for that reason they do not treat their oak ties. In all cases treated ties are thoroughly seasoned before and after treatment.

-18-

 1	9	-

#### Table 2.

Kind of timber.	Untrcated		Treated. Zinc Chloride	
	seasoned, percent.	Not seasoned, percent	Seasoned, percent	Not scasoned, percent.
Oak	4.9	9.0		2.4
Pine	81.8	109.9	9.0	19.8
Spruce	162.8	203.3	51.2	64.4
Beech	205.7	279.3	18.1	43.8

Percentage of ties removed after twelve years.

The oak ties are allowed from 6 to 20 months to season, the time of seasoning depending upon the demand for ties, from four to six months being allowed for beech. An experiment conducted in Germany brings out very clearly the advantage of seasoning ties. In 1888, a number of ties of different materials were laid in the track, some treated, others untreated. In each case one hundred and twenty one ties were laid.

By consulting Table 2, which shows the percentage of ties removed after twleve years, we see that seasoning ties before they are laid materially increases their life in the track.Of the untreated oak nine percent of the seasoned ties were removed against four and nine tenths percent of the seasoned, representing a little over half as many. In the case of the unseasoned pine tie treated with zine chloride, nineteen and eight tenths percent were removed in twelve years while only nine percent of the seasoned ties had to be taken out-considerably less than half the former number. The beech









ties treated with zinc chloride show still greater results, forty three and eight tenths percents of the unseasoned ties being removed and only eighteen and one tenth of the seasoned.

In seasoning ties, special attention must be paid to the method of stacking, so as to allow the greatest amount of surface exposed to the sun and wind.Fig.6 shows the method of piling ties used by the Eastern railroad of France, a method which is the outgrowth of long years of experience, and represents about the best that can be used.In Figures 7,8,&9 we see some of the methods of stacking ties used in Amorica, which have proven very satisfactory.The pile should always rest upon poles or blocking so as to prevent the lower row from being attacked by fungi, and should have the top row piled close together and inclined so as to shed water.

### Tie Plates.

On account of the increasing scarcity of hard wood timbers it has been found necessary to use some means of preserving the softer treated timbers against mechanical wear until they fail by decay.Most of the principal railroads in the United States have found by the use of steel plates on curves and portions of the track where the traffic is very heavy that they have been able to prevent, to a great extent, the cutting of ties by rails and spikes, so that from seventy five to ninety five per cent of the ties fail by decay.

-22-

Some use tie plates altogether, with the result that practically all the ties fail be decay.

In Europe, and also in this country, it has become almost the universal practice to use a flat plate with a shoulder on the outer side to prevent the rails from spreading. This type of plate has almost entirely replaced the rail brace, because it was found to be more efficient in keeping the track in line on curves. Several years ago the Pennsylvania railroad adopted a flat tie plade exclusively, with no ridges of any kind on the bottom, as they claimed that these ridges cut into the tie so badly that a large part of its usefulness was lost. Since that time, however, they have made a series of experiments with heavy engines at high speed on curves, and found that this tie plate is not as efficient in holding the track to line as a tie plate with a cutting edge on the cuter side.

On straight track, where the primary object of the tie plate is to prevent the rail from cutting into the tie, wooden tie plates have been found to be economical in a few cases. The Eastern railroad of France imploys a popular tie olate one eight of an inch thick impregnated with creosote. The principal objection to these plates is that they have to be renewed at frequent intervals, but this is not a great expense, as the tie plates cost only three dollars per thousand. The Frisco lines also use a wooden tie plate of red gum or creosoted black gum, but it is their purpose to replace these with steel tie plates as soon as the finances of the road will permit. Each plate is fastened to the tie with four 4-penny wire nails,

-23-





Showing method of applying wooden tie plates used by the St.Louis and San Francisco R.R.Co.

and is so located as to be exactly covered by the base of the rail, as is illustrated in Fig.10.

## Rail Fastenings.

The dertermination of a proper fastening between the rail and the tie has become a matter of considerable importance.During the period when the supply of suitable hard wood timber was sufficient, the ordinary spike satisfactorily fulfilled the requirements; but with the heavier weights of cars and locomotives and also with the use of softer woods for ties the common spike has proved deficient.Variations in the

form of the ordinary spikes have been developed and new forms devised, in an effort to overcome the loss of efficiency attendant upon the use of inferior timbers. In Europe, screw spikes have been used extensibly, a hole being bored in the tie for the spike, before treatment, at the treating plant. But in this country on account of the different sections of rail used it would not be practical to drill these holes at the treating plant.

Table 3 containing the results of tests made at the University of Illinois, shows the pulling strengths of common and screw spikes in different kinds of wood.All the values, except those for white oak, have been taken from treated ties. Treated ties offer a greater resistance to pulling than

Kind of wood	Ordinary spike	'Screw spike	Remarks
White Oak	7870 lbs.	12630 lbs.	Untreated
Red Oak	7730 "	13560 "	Treated
Ash	7730 "	12760 "	12
Beech	884 <b>0</b> "	16230 "	TT
Elm	7500 "	13690 "	11
Poplar	5670 "	7490 "	17
Chestnut	5200 "	8700 "	12
Cum	5300 "	8280 "	17
Lobloly Pine	4300 "	10620 "	U

Table 3

Showing the pulling strengths of common and screw spikes.

Based upon a penetration of five inches.

\* Bulletin No. 6. Engineering Experiment Station, University of Illinois.

-25-

.

untreated ties. This probaly due to two causes. (1) The presence of the preservative in the cells, thus reducing the space into which the fibres can crowd as the spike is withdrawn. (2) The hardening of the fibres by steaming preparatory to treatment, which renders them less pliable.

Tests have also been made to dertermine the effect of a side blow such as comes on the spike from the rail in service. A five hundred pound weight was dropped three inches on the head of a rail turned sidewise. For the ordinary spike two blows of the hammer pulled the inside spike fag enough to allow the rail to drop out. For the screw spike seven blows did not start the inside spike perceptibly, but the head of the outside spike was gradually bent over until the rail fell out .

On account of the comparative ease with which the ordinary spike is withdrawn, rails require frequent respiking. The original hole that is made by the spike is soon onlarged to such an extont that the spike will no longer hold and therefore must be driven in a new place. These holes not only weaken the tie, but they form an entrance through which water can get into the heart of the tie and cause decay. This is the principal way treated ties fails. If no protection against this spike-cutting is made by the use of tie plates or screw spikes the soft wood ties that have been treated to last fifteen years will not last more than fife or sim. It has been found in Europe, where screw spikes are used in connection ... ith tie plates, that this evil has been over-Bullelin No 50 Forestry Division of Depariment of Agriculture

-26-

· ·

come all together. Tests have shown that the screw spike is not perceptibly loosened by the pressure on the inside of the rail and so does not need to be redriven.

In driving the screw spike, it is necessary to bore a hole in the tie, in order to get the spike in place and thus the wood fibre around the spike is not injured to any appreciable extent, while in the case of the common spike the fibres, especially in soft wood ties, are broken to such an extent that they do not withstand the lateral pressure of the rail.

There are two principal objections to the screw spike.(1) Its first cost is greater than the ordinary spike, (2) It takes longer and costs more to put it in the track; but these objections are more than ofset by the added life thus given to the tie.

#### Steel and Concrete Ties.

It has been pointed in numerable times that some must be found substitute, for the wooden ties, and many are working in the hope of evolving the ideal equivalent. It must be borne in mind that such a substitute must not be the equivalent only, but, the superior, of the wood tie, affording by form, dimension, material, and mass, a better and more permanent bearing surface and greater stapility in the road bed. A 7" x 8" x 8' wooden tie has been found to give insufficient bearing surface for the modern high speed track and a larger tie has been recomended,

-27-

but wood has become so scarce that the size of the tie is governed largely by the supply and it is evident that these conditions will not improve with time.

Steel ties have been used in Europe for the last forty years and have given very good service, but when the engineers of this country began experimenting with the steel tie they realized the difference in conditions between the two countries and made little attempts to follow the design that had proved most efficient in Europe. The designs used most successfully there was practically a half circular shell made of steel or wrought iron, while the earlier designers in this country tried to make use of the standard shapes of channels and "T" bars. The design used in Europe was followed in Mexico with very good results but the conditions are much the same in the two countries. In Mexico, however, they have demonstrated that the steel tie can be protected from rust by dipping in hot tar before it is laid.

The only tie in this country that followed the European design very closely is known as the "Snyder steel tie" which consists of a half circular shell filled with asphalt and broken stone .These ties failed by being bent out of shape by heavy traffic, and thus could not be used where speed was one of the principal objects in view.The asphalt and stone did not add materially to the strength, so these ties were not a success, except on unimportant lines where high speed was not attained, and where the traffic was not heavy.

In the design of a substitute for wood ties three

-28-

. • • .

elements must be considered: (1) an efficient method of fastening the rail to the tie; (2) the requirement of a considerable measure of elasticity; (3) a satisfactory method of insulation. There is always a tendency for the ballast to become unstable and for the track to become center bound. This condition has been largely met by the wood tie because of its elasticity, but in the case of the steel and the concrete tie, which are not as elastic, greater care will be required in track surfacing and maintenance. The question of insulating the steel tie is a serious objection to its adoption in view of the rapid increase in the insulation of block signals. It has been found necessary to use fibre as an insulating material, and this wears so rapidly that it will be a source of considerable trouble and expense to maintain insulating pieces on each tie.Concrete is almost an insulating material and it will probaly be practical to design a concrete tie that will overcome this difficulty. On the other hand, the construction of such a tie will require a great deal of care to prevent contact through the metal reinforcement.

In addition to these three difficulties in design, there is another which, although it foes not affect the efficiency of the tie, nevertheless will prevent its general acceptince for some time at least. This is its first cost. A steel tic costing two dollars and a half might show greater economy than a white oak tie costing sixty-eight cents, but most roads would not have sufficient capital to invest in steel ties.

Of the concrete ties placed upon the market none

-29-

.

have proven satisfactory, their life ranging from two weeks to two years. In most cases they failed by crushing under a heavy traffic, but there are several designs which might be found enonomical in places where the speed is slow and conditions are especially adverse to the life of wood or metal.

Of the steel ties, one seems to be very promising. This is the improved Carnegie tie with a metal plate over the insulating fibre and with the wedge clip rail fastenings. The fibre used for insulating has a life of about two years and gives very good results. This tie has an "I" beam section and has several advantages over the wood tie. The Bessemer and Lake Erie railroad, which has a very heavy traffic, principally of ore and coal, amounting to 1,000,000 tons a month, these ties have undergone a severe test and have been found to give better alignment on curves than wooden ties. They were first put in the track in 1904 and apparantly are in as good shape as when laid.

An Economic Comparison of Cross Ties of Different Materials.

The principal elements that must always be considered in de**ter**mining the relative merits of different materials used as cross ties are;(1) the first cost,which should include the cost in forest, the freightage, handling and distributing, and the cost of placing the tie in the track; (2) the life, that is, the time elapsing from the date when the

-30-
tie is laid to the time when it becomes necessary to renew it; (3) Cost of renewals;(4) rate of interest on money;(5) maintenance,or cost of repairs;(6) salvage,or the scrap value of the tic at the close of its life of usefulness.Since the cost of maintenance on ties is practically the same for all kinds, it will be omitted in this consideration.The item of salvage is also extremely small and in most cases is zero or negative;therefore this also will be omitted, leaving only four elements to be considered.(1) The first cost,(2) life,(3) cost of renewals, (4) rate of interest.

For example, let us consider two ties-a white oak tie which costs sixty-eight cents in the track and lasts nine years, and a pine tie which costs sixty-one and a half cents in the track and lasts six years.

In the basis of capitalization, that tie is considered cheapest which under present conditions will require the least amount to install and to be set aside at compound interest to reproduce it forever, the capitalization is made up of;

(a) The first cost = C

(b) The amount at compound interest necessary to in interest during the life of a tig its first cost.=C'= $\frac{C}{(1+R)^{N}-1}$ 

Total capitalization equals.  $C + C' = \frac{C(1+R)^{N}}{(1+R)^{N}-1}$  -----(1)

in which N equals the years of life of the tie, and R equals the rate of interest on money, taken in this consideration as 4%.

-31-

•

Total capitilization of white oak tie,

$$\frac{0.68(1+.04)^9}{(1+.04)^9-1} = \$2.286$$

-

Total capitilazation of pine tie.

$$= \frac{0.615(1+.04)^6}{(1+04)^6} = \$2.933$$

On the basis of annual cost that tie is considered cheapest which under present conditions shows the least annual cost.The annual cost being made up of;

(a) The interest on first cost = I = CR.

(b) The amount that must be set aside annually at compound interest to provide for renewal at the expiration of the life of the tie.  $= A = \frac{CR}{T1+R}N$ 

Annual cost of white oak tie  

$$= \frac{0.68 \times .04(1+.04)^9}{(1+.04)^9} = \$0.091$$
Annual cost of the pine tie  

$$= \frac{0.615 \times .04(1+.04)^6}{(1+.04)^6} = \$0.117.$$

On the basis of equivalent cost one tie is considered to cost the same as another when the capitalization or annual cost of the one is equal to the capitalization or annual cost of the other or

$$\mathbf{C'} = \frac{C(1+R)N}{(1+R)N} \times \frac{(1+R)N'-1}{(1+R)N'}$$
 (3)

where C is the cost of a tie of N years life and C' is the cost of a tie of N' years life.

-32-

· · ·

Assuming a white oak tie that costs sixty-eight cents in the track and last nine years to find what can be paid for a pine tie lasting six years to show the same morit.

$$C' = \frac{0.68(1+.04)^9}{(1+.04)^9 - 1} \times \frac{(1+.04)^6 - 1}{(1+.04)^6} = \$0.479.$$

From the above consideration, we see that on the basis of capitalization the white oak tie is the more economical, requiring only \$2.286 total capitalization while the pine tie requires \$2.933, showing an advantage in favor of the white oak tie of \$0.647.0n the basis of annual cost the same is true. The annual cost of the white oak tie being \$0.091 while that of the pine tie is \$0.117, showing an advantage in favor of the white oak tie of \$0.026. Again, on the basis of equivalent cost we soe that we can pay only \$0.479 for a pine tie lasting six years to show the same merit as a white oak tie lasting nine years and costing \$0.68, while we actually pay \$0.615.

Table 4 shows the average life and cost in track of the ties used on representative railroads all over the United States having a total milage of 62,309 miles.We regret that we were unable to get data representing a larger milage, but we present in tabular form the data as received showing the kind of ties used, their average life, their average cost in track together with the comparative value of each on the basis of capitalization, annual cost, and equivalent cost using as a basis for comparison a live white oak tie costing \$0.68 in the track and lasting nine years. Ties which show an average life of a fraction of a year in the computations were considered to

-33-

	ross-ties	Equivalent	<b>₩</b> 0.680	0.479	0.8 0 1	1.017	0.479	1.017	0.616	0.742	1.112	1.017	0.680	0.407	1.017	1.112	1.017	1.112	0.858	1.112	1.243	1.017	1.112
	rent C	Annual Cost	16004	0.119	0.083	0.074	0.117	0.067	0.106	0.066	0.078	670.0	0.088	0.124	0.073	0.070	0.073	0078	0.075	0.071	0.074	0.073	0.078
4	e of Diff	Capitali- zation	<b>₽</b> 2.286	2.981	2.0 8.3	1.060	2.933	1.687	2.636	1.664	1.952	1.822	2.202	3.089	1.822	1.757	1.822	1.952	1.865	1.767	1.840	1.822	1.9.52
TABLE	ative Valu	Cost in Track	4 0.680	0.62.3	0.7.30	0.827	0.615	0.7.50	0.710	0.540	0.9.50	0, 8, 0	0.655	0.5.5.0	0.810	0835	0.810	0.950	0700	0.860	1.000	0.810	0350
	e Compara	Average Life In vrs.	0.6	6.0	0.11	1 5.0	6.0	1 5.0	<u>ð.</u> 0	1 0.0	1 7.5	1.5.0	9.0	5.0	1.5.0	5.71	15.0	1 7.5	12.0	1 7.0	2 0.0	15.0	17.5
	Showing the	Treatment	None	None	Zinc Chloride	Creosote	None	Creosote	Zinc Chloride	None	Creosote	Ruepina	None	None	Ruepina	Creosoté	Ruepina	Creosoté	None	Rueping	Creosoté	Rueping	Creosote
	Table	Kind of Material	White Oak	Other Oaks	11 11	и 11	Pine	H.	н	CVDYESS	1	11	Chestnut	Gum	16	14	Hemlock	11	Locust	-	-	Hickory	н

TABLE 4 (Continued)

Equivalent	\$ 0330	1.017	1.112	1.017	0.5.5.0	1.017	0.330	1.017	1.243	0.742	1.017	0.549	1.017
Annual Cost	1 0 1 2 1	0.076	0.078	0.073	0.151	0.073	0.1.51	0.073	0.044	<u> <u></u><u></u><u></u><u></u><u></u><u></u><u></u><u></u><u></u><u></u><u></u><u></u><u></u><u></u><u></u><u></u><u></u><u></u><u></u></u>	0.073	0.104	0.075
Capitali- zation	\$ 3.787	688.1	1.932	1822	3.787	1.8.2.2	3.787	1.822	1.104	2.620	1.822	2582	1.867
Cost in Track	<b>∯</b> 0.5.5.0	0.840	0.50.0	0.810	0.5.5.0	0.810	0.5.5.0	0.810	0.600	0.8.5.0	0.810	0.620	0.830
Average Life. In vrs	4.0	0.01	17.5	15.0	4.0	1 5.0	4.0	1 5.0	2 0.0	0.0	1.3.0	7.0	1 5.0
Treatment if any	None	Rueping	Creosoté	Rueping	None	Rueping	None'	Rueping	None	None	Rueping	None	Zinc Chloride
Kind of Material	Beech	и	11	Tamarack	Maple	- 11	Birch	-	Catalpa	Redwood	Elm	Fir	-

TABLE 4a.														
Tab	Table Showing Data of Table 4 Arranged in Order of Merit.													
N₽	Kind of Material	Treatment	Average	Cost in Track	Capitali- zation	Annual Cost								
1	Catalpa	None	20.0	\$0.600	\$1.104	\$0.044								
2	Cypress	None	10.0	0.540	1.664	0.066								
3	Pine	Creosote	15.0	. 0.7 5 0	1.687	0.067								
_4	Gum	Creosote	17.5	0.855	1.757	0.070								
5	Locust	Rueping	17.0	0.860	1.767	0.071								
6	Cypress	Rueping	15.0	0.810	1.822	0.073								
_7	Gum	Rueping	15.0	0.8 1 0	1.822	0.073								
8	Hemlock	Rueping	15.0	0.810	1.822	0.073								
9	Hickory	Rueping	15.0	0.810	1.822	0.073								
10	Tamarack	Rueping	15.0	0.8 1 0	1.822	0.073								
11	Maple	Rueping	15.0	0.810	1.822	0.073								
12	Birch	Rueping	15.0	0.810	1.822	0.073								
13	Elm	Rueping	15.0	0.810	1822	0.073								
14	Locust	Creosoté	2 0.0	1.0.0 0	1.840	0.074								
15	Other Oaks	Creosote	5.0	0.827	1.860	0.074								
16	Locust	None	12.0	0.700	1.865	0.075								
17	Fir	Zinc Chloride	15.0	0.830	1.867	0.075								
18	Beech	Rueping	15.0	0.840	1.889	0.076								
19	Cypress	Creosote	17.5	0.950	1.952	0.078								
20	Hemlock	Creosote	17.5	0950	1.952	0.078								
21	Beech	Creosote	17.5	0.950	1.952	0.078								
22	Hickory	Creosote	17.5	0.950	1.952	0.078								
23	Other Oaks	Zinc Chloride	11.0	0.730	2.083	0.083								
24	Chestnut	None	9.0	0.655	2.202	0.088								
25	White Oak	None	9.0	0.680	2.286	0091								
26	Fir	None	7.0	0.620	2.582	0.104								
27	Redwood	None	10.0	0.850	2.620	0.105								
28	Pine	Zinc Chloride	8.0	0.710	2.636	0.106								
29	Pine	None	6.0	0.615	2.933	0.117								
30	Other Oaks	None	6.0	0.625	2.981	0.119								
31	Gum	None	5.0	0.550	3.089	0.124								
32	Beech	None	4.0	0.550	3.787	0.151								
33	Maple	None	4.0	0.550	3.787	0.151								
34	Birch	None	10	0550	3787	0151								





have a life represented by the nearest whole number of years. Table 4a shows the same data as is contained in Table 4 excepting the column equivalent cost is omitted. In this table, the ties have been arranged in the order of merit as shown by their capitalization and annual cost regardless of the kind of timber used or whether they were treated or untreated.

Figure 11 represents graphically what we can afford to pay for cross ties of different life to show the same merit as a white oak tie costing \$0.68 in the track and lasting nine years.

In Table 4 we have not taken into account the necessity of using tic plates on any of the ties, but with the increase in traffic and heavier rolling stock it becomes necessary to use tic plates on all soft wood tics on curves whether treated or untreated and on hard wood ties which are treated.Best practice also recommends that tie plates should be used on all soft wood treated ties on tangent. If this is not done it is impossible to obtain the full life of the tie. They fail through mechanical wear before they lose their usefulness through decay. Assuming that a live white oak tie will resist mechanical wear as long as it can resist decay, let us compare it with a pine tie on which we have to use a tie plate, the white oak tie with life of nine years to cost \$0.68, and the pine tie with life of six years to cost \$0.615, tie plates to cost fourteen cents each and last for twenty years. Total capitalization of white oak tie,

formula-----(1)

-38-

$$= \frac{C(1+R)^{N}}{(1+R)^{N}-1} = \frac{0.68(1+.04)^{9}}{(1+.04)^{9}-1} = \$2.286$$

Total capitalization of pine tie equals.

(a) First cost in track = C =

Cost of pine tie to be renewed every 6 years = \$0.615 Cost of 2 tie plates to be renewed every 20 years =\$0.280 Total-----\$0.895

(b) The amount at compound interest necessary to produce in interest during the life of the tie its first cost =  $C_1$ =  $\frac{C - T}{(1 + R)^N - 1}$ 

(c) The amount at compound interest necessary to produce in interest during the life of the tie plates their first cost.

 $= C_{2} = \frac{T}{(1+R)^{N'} - 1}$ Total capitalization = C+ C<sub>1</sub> + C<sub>2</sub>  $= \frac{C(1+R)^{N}}{(1+R)^{N} - 1} - \frac{T}{(1+R)^{N} - 1} + \frac{T}{(1+R)^{N'} - 1}$ Where T = cost of tie plates which last N' years. N = life of tie. R = rate of interest on money. Then total capitalization of pine tie.  $= \frac{0.895(1+.04)^{6}}{(1+.04)^{6} - 1} - \frac{28}{(1+.04)^{6} - 1} + \frac{28}{(1+.04)^{20} - 1} = \frac{1}{2}3.448.$ The annual cost of the live oak tie;formula-----(2)  $= \frac{CR(1+R)^{N}}{(1+R)^{N} - 1} - \frac{0.68 \times .04(1+.04)^{9}}{(1+.04)^{9} - 1} = \frac{0.091}{1}$ The annual cost of the pine tie equals

(a) The interest on first cost = CR.

-39-

•

(b) The amount that must be set aside annually at compound interest to provide for the renewal of the tie at the expiration of its life =  $A = \frac{R(C-T)}{(1+R)^N} - 1$ 

(c) The amount that must be set aside annually at compound interest to provide for the renewal of the tie plates at the expiration of their life =  $A_1 = \frac{RT}{(1+R)^{N'}-1}$ 

Then total annual cost =  $I + A + A_1$ .

 $= \frac{CR(1+R)^{N}}{(1+R)^{N}-1} - \frac{TR}{(1+R)^{N}-1} + \frac{TR}{(1+R)^{N}-1}$ =  $\frac{0.895 \times .04(1+.04)^{6}}{(1+.04)^{6}-1} - \frac{0.28 \times .04}{(1+.04)^{6}-1} + \frac{0.28 \times .04}{(1+.04)^{20}-1} = \$0.138.$ 

From these examples we see that the white oak tie shows considerable advantage over the pine tie, requiring only \$2.286 capitalization, while the pine tie with a tie plate requires \$3.448.A similar advantage is shown when the two are considered on the basis of annual cost. The annual cost of the white oak tie being \$0.091 against \$0.138 for the pine tie.

Table **\$** shows the same data as is contained in Table 4.excepting that the comparison of the ties on the basis of capitalization and annual cost it was considered necessary to use tie plates on all tios excepting the white oak,other oaks,chestnut,gum,beech,birch,and maple,which are untreated. In the case of these ties it was considered that they would resist mechanical wear as long as they can resist decay.

Table 5acontains the same data as Table 5 excepting that the column headed "Equivalent Cost" has been omitted.

. . • 

5	)
L	
Z	
5	L

-

S	1								+	+			+					r				
g Tie. Plate	Equivalent Cost	<sup>#</sup> 0.680	0.479	0.801	1.017	0.47.9	0.616	1.017	0.742	1.112	1.017	0.680	0.407	1.017	1.112	1.017	1.112	0.858	1.112	1.243	1.017	
s-ties Usin	Annual Cost	160.0 #	0.119	0.104	0.095	0.138	0.126	0.088	0.0 8 7	0.099	0.093	0.088	0.124	0.093	0.091	0.093	0.099	0.095	0.091	0.094	0.093	each.
rent Cross	Capitali- zation	\$ 2.286	186.2	2.598	2.375	3.448	3.151	2.202	2.179	2.467	2,337	2.2.02	3089	2.3.3.7	2.272	2.337	2.467	2.370	2.2.82	2.355	2.337	t 14 cents
alue of Diffe	Cost in Track Including Two Tie-plates	<sup>⋬</sup> 0.680*	0.625*	1.010	1.107	0.89.5	066.0	1.030	0.820	1.230	0601	0.655*	0.5.50*	060.1	1.135	0601	1.230	0.980	1.040	1.200	0601	med to cos
parative V	Average Life	9.0	6.0	1 1.0	15.0	6.0	8.0	1 5.0	1 0.0	17.5	1.5.0	9.0	5.0	15.0	17.5	15.0	17.5	12.0	17.0	2 0.0	1 5.0	lates assu
ing the Com	Treatment if any	None	None	Zinc Chloride	Creosote	None	Zinc Chloride	Creosote	None	Creosote	Rueping	None	None	Rueping	Creosoté	Rueping	Creosote	None	Rueping	Creosoté	Rueping	Note: Ti'é pl
Table Show	Kind of Material	White Oak	Other Oaks	a 1	=	Pine	Н	Н	Cvbress	1 1	N	Chestnut	Gum	1	Ξ	Hemlock	-	Locust	2	-	Tamarack	



	Equivalent Cost	₿ 0.3.3.0	1.017	1.112	1.017	1.112	0.7.3.0	1.017	0.3.3.0	1.017	1.243	0.742	1.017	0.549	1.017	
d )	Annual Cost	\$ 0.151	0.096	0.099	0.093	0.099	0.151	0.093	1010	5.0.0	0.065	0.125	0.093	0.124	0.095	
(Continue	Capitali- zation	₿ 3.787	2.404	2467	2.3.37	2.467	3787	2.337	3.787	2.337	1.619	3.135	2.337	3097	2382	v
TABLE 5	Cost in Track Including Two Tie Plates	₿0.550 <sup>+</sup>	1.120	1.2.3.0	0601	1.230	0.550*	0.00.1	0.550	0 60.1	0.880	1.130	060.1	0.900	1.110	in these tio
	Average Life	4.0	1 5.0	17.5	1 5.0	17.5	4.0	15.0	4.0	150	200	1 0.0	15.0	7.0	1 5.0	not used o
	Treatment if any	None	Rueping	Creosofe	Rueping	Creosote	None	Rueping	None	Rueping	None	None	Rueping	None	ZincChloride	* Tip nintes
	Kind of Material	Beech	2	Ŧ	Hickory	н	Maple	- 11	Birch	-	Catalpa	Redwood	Elm	Fir	н	

ווב אושבש ווט טשבט ווורשב וובש.

-42-



Toble         Solution           Nº         Kind of Material         Treatment it any Life         Average Iotal In Track         Cost Zation         Annual Cost Cost Zation           I         Catalpa         None         200         %0.880         %1.619         %0.655           Z         Cypress         None         100         0.820         Z1.79         0.087           3         Chestnut         None         90         0.655*         Z2.02         0.088           4         Pine         Creosote         1.50         1.030         Z2.02         0.088           5         Gum         Creosote         1.75         1.135         Z2.72         0.091           6         Locust         Rueping         1.70         1.040         Z2.82         0.091           7         White 0ak         None         90         0.6860*         Z2.86         0.091           8         Cypress         Rueping         1.50         1.090         Z337         0.093           9         Gum         Zueping         1.50         1.090         Z.337         0.093           11         Hickory         Rueping         1.50         1.090         Z.337         0.09	TARIF 50												
N°         Kind of Material         Treatment is any Life         Average Total in Track         Cost zation         Annual Cost           i         Catalpa         None         200         *0880         *1.619         *0.065           2         Cypress         None         100         0820         2.179         0.088           3         Chestnut         None         90         0655*         2.202         0.088           4         Pine         Creosote         1.50         1.030         2.202         0.088           5         Gum         Creosote         1.50         1.040         2.282         0.091           6         Locust         Rueping         1.70         1.040         2.282         0.091           7         White 0ak         None         90         0.680*         2.286         0.091           8         Cypress         Rueping         1.50         1.090         2.337         0.093           9         Gum         Rueping         1.50         1.090         2.337         0.093           11         Hickory         Rueping         1.50         1.090         2.337         0.093           12         Tamarack <t< td=""><td colspan="13">Table Showing Data of Table 5 Arranged in Order of Merit.</td></t<>	Table Showing Data of Table 5 Arranged in Order of Merit.												
Material       If any       Iffe       In Irack       zditon       Cost         1       Catalpa       None       200       \$0.880       \$1.619       \$0.065         2       Cypress       None       100       0.820       2.179       0.087         3       Chestnut       None       90       0.655*       2.202       0.088         4       Pine       Creosote       1.50       1.030       2.202       0.088         5       Gum       Creosote       1.75       1.135       2.272       0.091         6       Locust       Rueping       1.70       1.040       2.282       0.091         7       White Oak       None       90       0.660*       2.286       0.091         8       Cypress       Rueping       1.50       1.090       2.337       0.093         10       Hemlock Rueping       1.50       1.090       2.337       0.093         11       Hickory       Rueping       1.50       1.090       2.337       0.093         12       Tamarack       Rueping       1.50       1.090       2.337       0.093         13       Maple       Rueping       1.50	Nº	Kind of	Treatment	Average	Total Cost	Copitali-	Annual						
1       Uatalpa       Nane       200       *0880       *1619       *0.065         2       Cypress       None       100       0820       2.179       0.087         3       Chestnut       None       90       0655*       2.202       0.088         4       Pine       Creosote       150       1.030       2.202       0.088         5       Gum       Creosote       175       1.135       2.272       0.091         6       Locusi       Rueping       170       1.040       2.282       0.091         7       White Oak       None       90       0.680*       2.286       0.091         8       Cypress       Rueping       150       1.090       2.337       0.093         9       Gum       Rueping       150       1.090       2.337       0.093         11       Hickory       Rueping       150       1.090       2.337       0.093         12       Tamarack       Rueping       150       1.090       2.337       0.093         13       Maple       Rueping       150       1.090       2.337       0.093         14       Birch       Rueping       150		Material	<u>it any</u>	Lite	In Irack	zátion	Cost						
2       Cypress       None       100       0820       2.179       0087         3       Chestnut       None       .90       0655*       2.202       0088         4       Pine       Creosote       150       1.030       2.202       0.088         5       Gum       Creosote       17.5       1.135       2.272       0.091         6       Locust       Rueping       170       1.040       2.282       0.091         7       White Oak       None       .90       0680*       2.237       0.093         9       Gum       Rueping       150       1.090       2.337       0.093         10       Hemlock       Rueping       150       1.090       2.337       0.093         11       Hickory       Rueping       150       1.090       2.337       0.093         12       Tamarack       Rueping       150       1.090       2.337       0.093         13       Maple       Rueping       150       1.090       2.337       0.093         14       Birch       Rueping       150       1.090       2.337       0.093         15       Elm       Rueping       150		Catalpa	None	2 0.0	₿0.880	#1.619	₹0.065						
3       Chestnul None       90       0655       2202       0.088         4       Pine       Creosote       150       1030       2202       0.088         5       Gum       Creosote       175       1135       2272       0.091         6       Locusi       Rueping       170       1.040       2282       0.091         7       White 0ak       None       90       0680*       2286       0.091         8       Cypress       Rueping       150       1.090       2.337       0.093         9       Gum       Rueping       150       1.090       2.337       0.093         10       Hemlock       Rueping       150       1.090       2.337       0.093         12       Tamarack       Rueping       150       1.090       2.337       0.093         13       Maple       Rueping       150       1.090       2.337       0.093         14       Birch       Rueping       150       1.090       2.337       0.093         15       Flm       Rueping       150       1.090       2.337       0.093         15       Flm       Rueping       150       1.090 <td>2</td> <td>Cypress</td> <td>None</td> <td>10.0</td> <td>0.820</td> <td>2.179</td> <td>0.0.87</td>	2	Cypress	None	10.0	0.820	2.179	0.0.87						
4       Vine       Creosole       150       1.030       2.202       0.088         5       Gum       Creosole       17.5       1.135       2.272       0.091         6       Locust       Rueping       170       1.040       2.282       0.091         7       White Oak       None       9.0       0.680*       2.286       0.091         8       Cypress       Rueping       150       1.090       2.337       0.093         9       Gum       Rueping       150       1.090       2.337       0.093         10       Hemlock       Rueping       150       1.090       2.337       0.093         11       Hickory       Rueping       150       1.090       2.337       0.093         12       Tamarack       Rueping       150       1.090       2.337       0.093         13       Maple       Rueping       150       1.090       2.337       0.093         14       Birch       Rueping       150       1.090       2.337       0.093         15       Fim       Rueping       150       1.090       2.337       0.093         15       Im       Rueping <t< td=""><td>3</td><td>Chestnut</td><td>None</td><td>90</td><td>0.655</td><td>2.202</td><td>0.088</td></t<>	3	Chestnut	None	90	0.655	2.202	0.088						
5       Gum       Creosole       17.5       1.135       2272       0.091         6       Locust       Rueping       17.0       1.040       2282       0.091         7       White Oak       None       9.0       0.680*       2286       0.091         8       Cypress       Rueping       15.0       1.090       2.337       0.093         9       Gum       Rueping       15.0       1.090       2.337       0.093         10       Hemlock       Rueping       15.0       1.090       2.337       0.093         11       Hickory       Rueping       15.0       1.090       2.337       0.093         12       Tamarack       Rueping       15.0       1.090       2.337       0.093         13       Maple       Rueping       15.0       1.090       2.337       0.093         14       Birch       Rueping       15.0       1.090       2.337       0.093         15       Flm       Rueping       15.0       1.090       2.337       0.093         16       Locust       Rueping       15.0       1.090       2.337       0.093         16       Locust       None <td>4</td> <td>Pine</td> <td>Creosote</td> <td>1 5.0</td> <td>1.030</td> <td>2.202</td> <td>0.088</td>	4	Pine	Creosote	1 5.0	1.030	2.202	0.088						
6       Locust       Kueping       170       1.040       2282       0.091         7       White Oak       None       90       0.680*       2286       0.091         8       Cypress       Rueping       150       1.090       2.337       0.093         9       Gum       Rueping       150       1.090       2.337       0.093         10       Hemlock       Rueping       150       1.090       2.337       0.093         11       Hickory       Rueping       150       1.090       2.337       0.093         12       Tamarack       Rueping       150       1.090       2.337       0.093         13       Maple       Rueping       150       1.090       2.337       0.093         14       Birch       Rueping       150       1.090       2.337       0.093         15       Fim       Rueping       150       1.090       2.337       0.093         15       Fim       Rueping       150       1.090       2.337       0.093         16       Locust       Kreosole       200       1280       7.355       0.094         17       Locust       None <td< td=""><td></td><td>Gum</td><td><u>Creosote</u></td><td>17.5</td><td>1.135</td><td>2272</td><td>0.091</td></td<>		Gum	<u>Creosote</u>	17.5	1.135	2272	0.091						
7       White Oak       None       90       0.680*       2.286       0.091         8       Cypress       Rueping       150       1.090       2.337       0.093         9       Gum       Rueping       150       1.090       2.337       0.093         10       Hemlock       Rueping       150       1.090       2.337       0.093         11       Hickory       Rueping       150       1.090       2.337       0.093         12       Tamarack       Rueping       150       1.090       2.337       0.093         13       Maple       Rueping       150       1.090       2.337       0.093         14       Birch       Rueping       150       1.090       2.337       0.093         15       Im       Rueping       150       1.090       2.337       0.093         15       Im       Rueping       150       1.090       2.337       0.093         16       Locust       Rueping       150       1.090       2.337       0.093         16       Locust       Creosole       200       1280       2.355       0.094         17       Locust       None <t< td=""><td>6</td><td>Locust</td><td>Kueping</td><td>1 7.0</td><td>1.040</td><td>2.2.82</td><td>0.091</td></t<>	6	Locust	Kueping	1 7.0	1.040	2.2.82	0.091						
8         Cypress         Rueping         150         1090         2.337         0.093           9         Gum         Rueping         150         1.090         2.337         0.093           10         Hemlock         Rueping         150         1.090         2.337         0.093           11         Hickory         Rueping         150         1.090         2.337         0.093           12         Tamarack         Rueping         150         1.090         2.337         0.093           12         Tamarack         Rueping         150         1.090         2.337         0.093           13         Maple         Rueping         150         1.090         2.337         0.093           14         Birch         Rueping         150         1.090         2.337         0.093           15         Elm         Rueping         150         1.090         2.337         0.093           16         Locust         Creosole         200         1.280         2.337         0.093           17         Locust         None         120         0.980         2.370         0.095           18         Other Oaks         Creosote         <	7	White Oak	None	9.0	0.680*	2.2.86	0.091						
9       Gum       Kueping       15.0       1.090       2.337       0.093         10       Hemlock       Rueping       15.0       1.090       2.337       0.093         11       Hickory       Rueping       15.0       1.090       2.337       0.093         12       Tamarack       Rueping       15.0       1.090       2.337       0.093         13       Maple       Rueping       15.0       1.090       2.337       0.093         14       Birch       Rueping       15.0       1.090       2.337       0.093         14       Birch       Rueping       15.0       1.090       2.337       0.093         15       Elm       Rueping       15.0       1.090       2.337       0.093         15       Elm       Rueping       15.0       1.090       2.337       0.093         16       Locust       Creosote       200       2.337       0.093         17       Locust       None       120       2.337       0.093         16       Locust       Creosote       15.0       1.107       2.375       0.095         18       Other Oaks       Creosote       17.5       1	8	Cypress	Rueping	15.0	1.090	2.337	0.093						
10       Hemlock       Kueping       15.0       1.090       2.337       0.093         11       Hickory       Rueping       15.0       1.090       2.337       0.093         12       Tamarack       Rueping       150       1.090       2.337       0.093         13       Maple       Rueping       150       1.090       2.337       0.093         14       Birch       Rueping       150       1.090       2.337       0.093         15       Elm       Rueping       150       1.090       2.337       0.093         15       Elm       Rueping       150       1.090       2.337       0.093         16       Locust       Rueping       150       1.090       2.337       0.093         16       Locust       None       120       0.900       2.337       0.093         17       Locust       None       120       2.407       0.093         18       Other Oaks       Creosote       150       1.107       2.375       0.095         20       Beech       Rueping       150       1.120       2.404       0.096         21       Cypress       Creosote       17.5 <td>9</td> <td>Gum</td> <td>Rueping</td> <td>1.5.0</td> <td>1.090</td> <td>2.337</td> <td>0.093</td>	9	Gum	Rueping	1.5.0	1.090	2.337	0.093						
11       Hickory       Rueping       150       1.090       2.337       0.093         12       Tamarack       Rueping       150       1.090       2.337       0.093         13       Maple       Rueping       150       1.090       2.337       0.093         14       Birch       Rueping       150       1.090       2.337       0.093         15       Elm       Rueping       150       1.090       2.337       0.093         15       Elm       Rueping       150       1.090       2.337       0.093         16       Locust       Creosole       200       1.280       2.355       0.094         17       Locust       None       120       0.980       2.370       0.095         18       Other Oaks       Creosote       150       1.107       2.375       0.095         20       Beech       Rueping       150       1.110       2.382       0.095         20       Beech       Rueping       150       1.120       2.404       0.096         21       Cypress       Creosote       17.5       1.230       2.467       0.099         23       Beech       Creosote<	10	Hemlock	Rueping	1.5.0	1.090	2.337	0.093						
12       Tamaraćk       Rueping       150       1.090       2.337       0.093         13       Maple       Rueping       150       1.090       2.337       0.093         14       Birch       Rueping       150       1.090       2.337       0.093         15       Elm       Rueping       150       1.090       2.337       0.093         15       Elm       Rueping       150       1.090       2.337       0.093         16       Locust       Creosole       200       1.280       7.355       0.094         17       Locust       None       120       0.980       2.370       0.095         18       Other Oaks       Creosole       1.50       1.107       2.375       0.095         19       Fir       Zinc Chloride       150       1.107       2.375       0.095         20       Beech       Rueping       150       1.120       2.404       0.096         21       Cypress       Creosole       17.5       1.230       2.467       0.099         23       Beech       Creosole       17.5       1.230       2.467       0.099         24       Hickory       Cr	1.1	Hickory	Rueping	1 5.0	1.090	2.337	0.093						
13       Maple       Rueping       150       1.090       2.337       0.093         14       Birch       Rueping       150       1.090       2.337       0.093         15       Elm       Rueping       150       1.090       2.337       0.093         15       Elm       Rueping       150       1.090       2.337       0.093         16       Locust       Creosole       200       1280       2.355       0.094         17       Locust       None       120       0.980       2.370       0.095         18       Other Oaks       Creosole       1.50       1.107       2.375       0.095         19       Fir       Zinc Chloride       150       1.107       2.375       0.095         20       Beech       Rueping       150       1.110       2.382       0.095         20       Beech       Rueping       150       1.120       2.404       0.096         21       Cypress       Creosole       17.5       1.230       2.467       0.099         23       Beech       Creosole       17.5       1.230       2.467       0.099         24       Hickory       Creoso	12	Tamaraćk	Rueping	1 5.0	1.090	2.337	0.093						
14       Birch       Rueping       150       1.090       2.337       0.093         15       Elm       Rueping       150       1.090       2.337       0.093         16       Locust       Creosole       200       1.280       2.355       0.094         17       Locust       None       120       0.980       2.370       0.095         18       Other Oaks       Creosole       1.50       1.107       2.375       0.095         19       Fir       Zinc Chloride       1.50       1.107       2.375       0.095         20       Beech       Rueping       1.50       1.110       2.382       0.095         20       Beech       Rueping       1.50       1.120       2.404       0.096         21       Cypress       Creosole       1.7.5       1.230       2.467       0.099         22       Hemlock       Greosole       1.7.5       1.230       2.467       0.099         23       Beech       Creosole       1.7.5       1.230       2.467       0.099         24       Hickory       Creosole       1.7.5       1.230       2.467       0.099         25       Other Oaks<	13	Maple	Rueping	1 5.0	1.0.90	2.337	0.093						
15       Elm       Rueping       150       1.090       2.337       0.093         16       Locust       Creosole       200       1.280       2.355       0.094         17       Locust       None       120       0.980       2.370       0.095         18       Other Oaks       Creosole       150       1.107       2.375       0.095         19       Fir       Zinc Chloride       150       1.107       2.382       0.095         20       Beech       Rueping       150       1.110       2.382       0.095         20       Beech       Rueping       150       1.120       2.404       0.096         21       Cypress       Creosole       17.5       1.230       2.467       0.099         23       Beech       Creosole       17.5       1.230       2.467       0.099         23       Beech       Creosole       17.5       1.230       2.467       0.099         24       Hickory       Creosole       17.5       1.230       2.467       0.099         24       Hickory       Creosole       17.5       1.230       2.467       0.099         25       Other Oaks Zinc C	14	Birch	Rueping	150	1.090	2.337	0.093						
16       Locust       Creosole       200       1280       2355       0.094         17       Locust       None       120       0.980       2370       0.095         18       Other Oaks       Creosole       150       1.107       2.375       0.095         19       Fir       Zinc Chloride       150       1.107       2.375       0.095         20       Beech       Rueping       150       1.110       2.382       0.095         20       Beech       Rueping       150       1.120       2.404       0.096         21       Cypress       Creosole       17.5       1.230       2.467       0.099         22       Hemlock       Greosole       17.5       1.230       2.467       0.099         23       Beech       Creosole       17.5       1.230       2.467       0.099         24       Hickory       Creosole       17.5       1.230       2.467       0.099         24       Hickory       Creosole       17.5       1.230       2.467       0.099         25       Other Oaks Zinc Chloride       110       1.010       2.598       0.104         26       Other Oaks	15	Elm.	Rueping	1 5.0	1.090	2.337	0.093						
17       Locust       None       120       0.980       2370       0.095         18       Other Oaks       Creosote       150       1.107       2.375       0.095         19       Fir       Zinc Chloride       150       1.110       2.382       0.095         20       Beech       Rueping       150       1.120       2.404       0.096         21       Cypress       Creosote       17.5       1.230       2.467       0.099         22       Hemlock       Creosote       17.5       1.230       2.467       0.099         23       Beech       Creosote       17.5       1.230       2.467       0.099         23       Beech       Creosote       17.5       1.230       2.467       0.099         24       Hickory       Creosote       17.5       1.230       2.467       0.099         24       Hickory       Creosote       17.5       1.230       2.467       0.099         25       Other OaksZinc Chloride       110       1.010       2.598       0.104         26       Other Oaks None       6.0       0.625*       2.981       0.119         27       Gum       None	16	Locust	Creosote	20.0	1.280	2.355	0.094						
18       Other Oaks       Creosote       150       1.107       2.375       0.095         19       Fir       Zinc Chloride       150       1.110       2.382       0.095         20       Beech       Rueping       150       1.120       2.404       0.096         21       Cypress       Creosote       17.5       1.230       2.467       0.099         22       Hemlock       Creosote       17.5       1.230       2.467       0.099         23       Beech       Creosote       17.5       1.230       2.467       0.099         23       Beech       Creosote       17.5       1.230       2.467       0.099         24       Hickory       Creosote       17.5       1.230       2.467       0.099         24       Hickory       Creosote       17.5       1.230       2.467       0.099         25       Other Oaks Zinc Chloride       110       1.010       2.598       0.104         26       Other Oaks       None       6.0       0.625*       2.981       0.119         27       Gum       None       7.0       0.900       3.097       0.124         29       Redwood	17	Locust	None	12.0	0.980	2370	0.095						
19       Fir       Zinc Chloride       150       1.110       2.382       0.095         20       Beech       Rueping       150       1.120       2.404       0.096         21       Cypress       Creosole       17.5       1.230       2.467       0.099         22       Hemlock       Creosole       17.5       1.230       2.467       0.099         23       Beech       Creosole       17.5       1.230       2.467       0.099         24       Hickory       Creosole       17.5       1.230       2.467       0.099         24       Hickory       Creosole       17.5       1.230       2.467       0.099         25       Other OaksZinc Chloride       10       1.010       2.598       0.104         26       Other Oaks None       6.0       0.625*       2.981       0.119         27       Gum       None       7.0       0.900       3.097       0.124         28       Fir       None       7.0       0.900       3.13.5       0.125         30       Pine       Zinc Chloride       8.0       0.990       3.151       0.126         31       Pine       None       6	18	Other Oaks	Creosote	1 5.0	1.107	2.375	0.095						
20       Beech       Rueping       15.0       1.120       2.404       0.096         21       Cypress       Creosote       17.5       1.230       2.467       0.099         22       Hemlock       Creosote       17.5       1.230       2.467       0.099         23       Beech       Creosote       17.5       1.230       2.467       0.099         24       Hickory       Creosote       17.5       1.230       2.467       0.099         24       Hickory       Creosote       17.5       1.230       2.467       0.099         25       Other OaksZinc Chloride       110       1.010       2.598       0.104         26       Other Oaks None       6.0       0.625*       2.981       0.119         27       Gum       None       5.0       0.550*       3.089       0.124         28       Fir       None       7.0       0.900       3.097       0.124         29       Redwood       None       10.0       1.130       3.135       0.125         30       Pine       ZincChloride       8.0       0.990       3.151       0.126         31       Pine       None       6.0<	19	Fir	Zinc Chloride	1 5.0	1.110	2.382	0.095						
21CypressCreosote17.51.2302.4670.09922HemlockCreosote17.51.2302.4670.09923BeechCreosote17.51.2302.4670.09924HickoryCreosote17.51.2302.4670.09925Other OaksZinc Chloride1101.0102.5980.10426Other OaksNone6.00.625*2.9810.11927GumNone5.00.550*3.0890.12428FirNone7.00.9003.0970.12429RedwoodNone10.01.1303.1350.12530PineZinc Chloride8.00.9903.1510.12631PineNone6.00.8953.4480.13832BeechNone4.00.550*3.7870.151	20	Beech	Rueping	15.0	1.120	2.404	0.096						
22HemlockCreosote17.51.2302.4670.09923BeechCreosote17.51.2302.4670.09924HickoryCreosote17.51.2302.4670.09925Other Oaks Zinc Chloride1101.0102.5980.10426Other OaksNone6.00.625*2.9810.11927GumNone5.00.550*3.0890.12428FirNone7.00.9003.0970.12429RedwoodNone10.01.1303.1350.12530PineZinc Chloride8.00.9903.1510.12631PineNone6.00.8953.4480.13832BeechNone4.00.550*3.7870.151	21	Cypress	Creòsote	17.5	1.230	2.467	0.099						
2.3BeechCreosote17.51.2302.4670.0992.4HickoryCreosote17.51.2302.4670.0992.5Other Oaks Zinc Chloride1.01.0102.5980.1042.6Other OaksNone6.00.625*2.9810.1192.7GumNone5.00.550*3.0890.1242.8FirNone7.00.9003.0970.1242.9RedwoodNone10.01.1303.1350.1253.0PineZinc Chloride8.00.9903.1510.1263.1PineNone6.00.8953.4480.1383.2BeechNone4.00.550*3.7870.151	22	Hémlock	Creosote	17.5	1.230	2.467	0.099						
24HickoryCreosote17.51.2302.4670.09925Other Oaks Zinc Chloride1.01.0102.5980.10426Other OaksNone6.00.625*2.9810.11927GumNone5.00.550*3.0890.12428FirNone7.00.9003.0970.12429RedwoodNone10.01.1303.1350.12530PineZinc Chloride8.00.9903.1510.12631PineNone6.00.8953.4480.13832BeechNone4.00.550*3.7870.151	23	Beech	Creosote	17.5	1.230	2.4.67	0.099						
25Other Oaks Zinc Chloride1101.0102.5980.10426Other OaksNone6.00.625*2.9810.11927GumNone5.00.550*3.0890.12428FirNone7.00.9003.0970.12429RedwoodNone10.01.1303.1350.12530PineZinc Chloride8.00.9903.1510.12631PineNone6.00.8953.4480.13832BeechNone4.00.550*3.7870.151	24	Hickory	Creosote	17.5	1.230	2.467	0.099						
26Other OaksNone6.00.625*2.9810.11927GumNone5.00.550*3.0890.12428FirNone7.00.9003.0970.12429RedwoodNone10.01.1303.1350.12530PineZinc Chloride8.00.9903.1510.12631PineNone6.00.8953.4480.13832BeechNone4.00.550*3.7870.151	25	Other Oaks	Zinc Chloride	11.0	1.010	2.598	0.104						
27GumNone5.00.550*3.0890.12428FirNone7.00.9003.0970.12429RedwoodNone10.01.1303.1350.12530PineZincChloride8.00.9903.1510.12631PineNone6.00.8953.4480.13832BeechNone4.00.550*3.7870.151	26	Other Oaks	None	6,0	0.625*	2.981	0.119						
28FirNone7.00.9003.0970.12429RedwoodNone10.01.1303.1350.12530PineZincChloride8.00.9903.1510.12631PineNone6.00.8953.4480.13832BeechNone4.00.550*3.7870.151	27	Gum	None	5.0	0.550*	3.089	0.124						
29RedwoodNone10.01.1303.1350.12530PineZincChloride8.00.9903.1510.12631PineNone6.00.8953.4480.13832BeechNone4.00.550*3.7870.151	28	Fir	None	7.0	0.900	3.097	0.124						
30PineZincChloride8.00.9903.1510.12631PineNone6.00.8953.4480.13832BeechNone4.00.550*3.7870.151	29	Redwood	None	1 0.0	1.130	3.135	0.125						
31PineNone6.00.8953.4480.13832BeechNone4.00.550*3.7870.151	30	Pine	Zinc Chloride	8.0	0.9.90	3.151	0.126						
32 Beech None 4.0 0.550° 3.787 0.151	31	Pine	None	6.0	0.895	3.448	0.138						
	32	Beech	None	4.0	0.550*	3.787	0.151						
33 Maple None 4.0 0.550 3.787 0.151	33	Maple	None	4.0	0.550	3.787	0.151						
34 Birch None 4.0 0.550* 3.787 0.151	34	Birch	None	4.0	0.550*	3.787	0.151						

"No the plates used on these ties.





·

In this table the ties have been arranged in order of merit, as shown by their capitalization and annual cost.By comparing this table with Table  $4_{a}$ , we see the effect upon the capitalization and annual cost of the tie, caused by the use of tie plates. In Table  $4_{a}$ , the white oak tie comes number 25 in order of merit, while in Table  $5_{a}$ , it jumps to number 7.Again, the untreated pine tie drops from number 29 in Table  $4_{a}$ to number 31 in Table  $5_{a}$ , while the chestnut jumps from number 24 to number 3.These tables also show the relative merit of ties of the same kind which are treated with different treatments.For example, in Table  $4_{a}$  the creosoted pine tie holds 3rd place, the pine tie treated with zine Chloride the 28th, and the untreated pine tie the 29th. In case of the creosoted gum tie we find it occupies 4th place, the some fic treated with running process drops to the 7th place, while the untreated gum falls to the Sist.

Fig.12 represents graphically what we can afford to pay for ties of different life to show the same merit as a tie costing \$1.00 in the track and lasting 9 years.For example, suppose we have a chestnut tie lasting 9 years in the track and costing \$0.655 to find what we can afford to pay for a tie which lasts 12 years.From the curve we find that the cost of a tie with life of 12 years is \$1.262,multipy this by the cost of the tie of 9 years' life,\$0.655 and we have \$0.827,or the price we can pay for a tie with life of 12 years to show the same merit as the chestnut tie.

-45-

# Conclusions and Recommendations.

In considering which is the most economical cross tie so many variable factors must be considered that it is extremely difficult to arrive at any certain result. A few questions, however, have been proven beyond a doubt, and in conclusion we present these, together with a few recommendations.

### Methods of Preserving Timber.

Preservatives of different kinds have been used for a century or more and it is certain that they materially increase the life of the ties. There are, however, several questions which need further investigation such as the amount of preservative necessary to kill the bacteria and fungi, and the most economical treatment to use with ties cut from different kinds of wood.Experiment has shown that no tie should be treated until it has been thoroughly air fried; and in no case ties freshly treated with preservatives soluable in water should be exposed to weathering influences until they have been carefully seasoned to allow the water in the tie to evaporate. Attention should also be paid to such inferior timbers as the tamarack.swamp oak.loblolly pine,lodge pole pine,hemlock,etc., to see if some method cannot be devised whereby they can be made valuable as timbers for ties, so that the white oak and other superior timbers may be reserved for higher grade of

-46-

structural purposes.

## Cutting and Seasoning Ties.

Creen ties should be placed in open piles as soon as cut, and allowed to remain there until thoroughly seasoned, as this materially increases their life in the track. The questions as to how long a tie should be allowed to season and which are the best methods of stacking are as yet uncertain, and to answer these questions a series of tests on a large scale are recommended. It is also recommended that the practice of sawing all ties should be adopted, as this allows of the most economical use of the timber in one tree.

# Tie Plates.

The use of tie plates is recommended on all soft wood treated ties and such other ties as cannot resist mechanical wear as long as they can resist decay. The tie plates not only protect the tie against rail-cutting but also afford a better method of holding the track to line.

## Rail Fastenings.

Experiment has shown the superiority of the screw

-47 -



spike over the common spike in holding power and in resistance to lateral pressure.Furthermore, it does not injure the wood fibre to such an extent in being put in place and seldom has to be redriven.We therefore recommend the use of some form of the screw spike on all soft wood ties and such other ties as are treated.

### Steel and Concrete Ties.

It is recommended that further investigation and experiment be made with different designs of steel and concrete ties in order to devise some suitable substitute for the wooden tie as present designs do not fulfill the requirements.

zh + -y-4 20 \* té 3 + + the \* \* · An the y +-- nga \* \* -+-\* + + \* to \* \* te -\* \* ×




