

President
ROBERT G. ABBOUD

Trustees
FRITZ H. GOHL, JR., Pro-Tem
WALTER E. SMITHE
JULIE McKEVITT
STEVEN E. KNOOP
GEORGE L. SCHUEPPERT
BETH MALLEN

ELAINE M. RAMESH, Clerk
DOLORES G. TRANDEL, Deputy Clerk



112 ALGONQUIN ROAD
BARRINGTON HILLS, ILLINOIS 60010-5199
www.barringtonhills-il.gov

TELEPHONE
(847) 551-3000

FACSIMILE
(847) 551-3050

February 15, 2008

Surface Transportation Board
395 E Street, SW
Washington, DC 20423

Attention: Phillis Johnson-Ball
Environmental Filing,
STB Finance Docket No. 35087

Re: Comments on the Draft Scope of the EIS
Village of Barrington Hills, Illinois

Surface Transportation Board
CN-EJ&E EIS - FD-35087

Log and Distribution

Date Recd: _____

HDR File No: _____

Scanned (Initial): _____

STABCT #: _____

Cc: Original - Job File

HDR

Dear Ms. Johnson-Ball:

The Village of Barrington Hills has reviewed the draft scope of study for the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) to be prepared by the Section of Environmental Analysis of the Surface Transportation Board (STB) in regards to the proposed acquisition of the EJ&E West Company (EJ&E) by the Canadian National Railway Corporation (CN). The proposed acquisition would have a significant impact on the Village of Barrington Hills, and as such the Village offers the following comments in regards to the draft scope of study:

- Category #1 (Safety)-** The draft scope of study indicates that accident probability and safety factors will be considered for grade crossings with Average Daily Traffic (ADT) levels of 2,500 trips or more. The Village of Barrington Hills recommends that this threshold be lowered to consider grade crossings with 2030 projected ADT levels of 1,000 trips or more. There are a limited number of roadways crossing the tracks within the Village, and generally they are spaced two or more miles apart. Lowering the threshold will allow the STB to consider county highway crossings that serve as vital points of access for police, fire, and rescue vehicles, as well as school bus routes. In addition, consideration of 2030 projected ADT levels will allow the study factor in the substantial growth in population, employment, and travel activity projected for the area.

The Village also recommends that as part of the safety review consideration be given to the structural integrity of the existing infrastructure, including embankments, culvert crossings, and bridges. Our understanding is that the proposed acquisition will result in an increase in both the number of trains each day as well as the class of cargo being transported. Consideration should be given to ensure that the existing infrastructure can support the increased frequency and magnitude of the proposed train traffic.

2. **Category #2 (Transportation Systems)-** The draft scope of section E indicates that the EIS will include estimates of typical delays at grade crossings that have 2030 projected vehicular traffic levels of 2,500 ADT or more and exceed certain levels of train traffic increases. The Village of Barrington Hills recommends that the threshold be lowered to consider delays at grade crossings with ADT levels of 1,000 trips or more to include delays at county highway crossings that serve vital roles in protecting the public health and safety of the Village. The existing roadway network will also determine the ability of emergency services to reach a train in case of derailment.
3. **Category #3 (Land Use and Socioeconomics)-** As the draft scope of study seeks to identify potential adverse impacts to social and economic resources, the Village of Barrington Hills recommends that the study utilize local zoning or land use plans to ensure appropriate land uses are assigned adjacent to the railroad.

The Village also recommends that the study identify the location of responding entities for emergency services (police stations, fire stations, hospitals, etc.), as well as other points of interests including both public and private schools in order to adequately identify key travel routes.

4. **Category #6 (Noise and Vibration)-** As part of the review of impacts to noise the Village recommends that the draft scope of study identify both established quiet zones along the EJ&E railway line as well as quiet zone studies currently in effect to determine the impact that increased train traffic would have on the ability of local communities to establish quiet zones in accordance with Federal Railroad Administration (FRA) criteria. In addition, the study should identify any measures that may be required in order to maintain current or proposed quiet zones that would be impacted by increased train traffic.

The draft scope of study indicates potential vibration effects will be studied based on the vibration methodology of the Federal Transit Administration. The Village requests confirmation that the study will include the impacts of the increased occurrence of unit trains and the resulting impacts on vibrations that would accompany the proposed increase in rail traffic.

5. **Category #8 (Water Resources)-** The draft scope of study indicates that potential impacts to water resources will be considered in those areas of proposed construction of improved rail connections, siding extensions, and installation of a second track. The Village of Barrington Hills recommends that the EIS also consider potential impacts to water resources throughout the length of affected tracks. As a community whose residents are dependent upon shallow sand and gravel aquifers for drinking water supply, the Village is concerned that vital groundwater recharge areas along the length of the track may be susceptible to contamination due to increased potential for pollution, spills of hazardous chemicals, or potential derailments caused by the

increased train traffic. The tracks cross the headwaters of both Spring Creek and Flint Creek, creating the potential for transmittal of contaminants throughout the Village via surface water and transmittal to groundwater via infiltration and recharge.

There are also a number of significant drainage structures crossing under the tracks within the Village limits. The structural integrity of these drainage structures, and in turn the drainage characteristics of areas upstream and downstream of these drainage structures, should be considered in areas of projected increases in rail traffic. The Village recommends that as part of the EIS the Canadian National Railway Company inventory, assess, and acknowledge ownership and maintenance responsibility for all drainage structures that would fall under their jurisdiction under the proposed acquisition.

We appreciate the opportunity to provide comments concerning the draft scope of study of the Environmental Impact Statement. If you should have any questions regarding the above, please do not hesitate to contact our office.

Sincerely,
Village of Barrington Hills



Robert Kosin
Village Administrator

cc: Village President & Board of Trustees

**RESOLUTION OBJECTING TO THE PROPOSED ACQUISITION
OF THE EJ&E WEST COMPANY BY THE
CANADIAN NATIONAL RAILWAY CORPORATION
(SURFACE TRANSPORTATION BOARD - FINANCE DOCKET NO. 35087)**

WHEREAS, the Village of Barrington Hills (the "Village") located in the Counties of Cook, Kane, Lake and McHenry in the State of Illinois, is a home rule municipality; and

WHEREAS, on October 30, 2007 the Canadian National Railway Corporation, along with its U.S. subsidiary, Grand Trunk Corporation (collectively, "CN"), filed an application with the federal Surface Transportation Board ("STB") seeking approval to acquire the EJ&E West Company, a wholly owned subsidiary of the Elgin, Joliet and Eastern Railway Company (collectively, "EJ&E"); and

WHEREAS, the proposed acquisition by CN would involve shifting a significant amount of train traffic that currently moves over CN's rail lines in the City of Chicago to sections of the EJ&E rail line west and south of the City of Chicago, including a segment that runs through the Village; and

WHEREAS, the increase in freight train traffic resulting from the proposed acquisition by CN will create an adverse impact on the communities along the EJ&E rail line, including, but not limited to, the Village, such as increased noise and diminution of property values; and

WHEREAS, CN estimates that if the proposed transaction takes place, the average number of daily trains that run along the segment of the EJ&E rail line that runs through the Village will increase from approximately 5.5 trains per day to approximately 23.5 trains per day and the gross tons of freight per day that run over that segment of rail line will increase from approximately 23,285 tons to approximately 173,965 tons; and

WHEREAS, the increased amount of train traffic will interfere with the motoring public passing through as well as within the Village, including emergency vehicles, as one CN freight train could simultaneously close up to five grade crossings within the Village and neighboring municipalities; and

WHEREAS, freight traffic has rights over passenger traffic and the proposed acquisition will have significant secondary and cumulative effects on the Village and northwest suburban region in that the planned Metra Suburban Transit Access Route (the "Star Line") that proposes to utilize the EJ&E railroad corridor to provide north-south commuter rail service to connect the northwest suburbs to other existing Metra commuter lines and will likely jeopardize the future opportunity to provide a new dynamic transportation option for residents, workers and visitors in the northwest suburban region; and

WHEREAS, the Village is the premier equestrian community in the northwest suburban region and one of the Village's public riding trails runs along a portion of the EJ&E rail line near Old Dundee Road north of Illinois Route 62; and

WHEREAS, at the January 8, 2008 Special Meeting of the Village Board, the Board authorized the expenditure of up to \$15,000 to permit the President of the Village to engage advisors necessary to advise the Village on the analysis and actions required by the Village in order to convey its concerns to the STB about the impact of the proposed acquisition.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the President and Board of Trustees of the Village of Barrington Hills, located in the Counties of Cook, Kane, Lake and McHenry in the State of Illinois, a home rule municipality as follows:

Section 1: The foregoing recitals are hereby incorporated into this Resolution as findings of the President and Board of Trustees.

Section 2: The Village asks that the Section of Environmental Analysis (the "SEA") of the STB include and incorporate the issues, concerns and comments of the Village set forth in this Resolution in the scope of study for the draft Environmental Impact Study and final Environmental Impact Study (collectively, the "EIS") and that said comments and concerns be considered and addressed in the EIS, by the STB.

Section 3: The Village does hereby formally object to the proposed acquisition of the EJ&E by CN, and urges the STB to disapprove of the proposed transaction based on the negative impact it will have on the Village, its residents and the region.

Section 4: The various provisions of this Resolution are to be considered as severable and if any part or portion of this Resolution shall be held invalid by any Court of competent jurisdiction, such decision shall not affect the validity of the remaining provisions of this Resolution.

Section 5: This Resolution shall be in full force and effect from and after its approval and publication according to law.


APPROVED THIS 08 day of January, 2008

AYES: 5 NAYS: ABSENT: 2

ATTEST:

Elaine Ramesh

Village Clerk


Village President



**Village of Barrington Hills
112 Algonquin Road
Barrington Hills, Illinois 60010-5199**

Date: Thursday, February 14, 2008

To: Phillis Johnson-Ball
Environmental Filing
STB Finance Docket No. 35087
Surface Transportation Board
395 E. Street, SW
Washington, DC 20423
(e-mail and certified mail)

Subject: STB Comments From The Village of Barrington Hills Opposing the CN Rail Purchase of the EJ&E Railway Line

Reference: STB Document, "SURFACE TRANSPORTATION BOARD'S SECTION OF ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS EXTENDS PUBLIC SCOPING PERIOD ON PROPOSED CANADIAN NATIONAL RAILWAY ACQUISITION OF ELGIN, JOLIET & EASTERN RAILWAY", FD 35087, 2008.

Ms. Johnson-Ball,

I am writing to you to express the Village of Barrington Hills' strongest concern regarding the Canadian National acquisition of the EJ&E Rail Line. We ask that you consider the issues shown in attachment A of this letter in your evaluation of the acquisition.

In short, we believe that CN, a foreign corporation, has demonstrated little or no value to the region as a result of their acquisition. Our community, and others along the subject railway line, such as the Village of Barrington, will suffer extensive direct costs and immediate damage to our respective economies and property values.

Additionally, we found the CN representatives at the Makray Memorial Golf Club STB presentation to be arrogant and disdainful of the community and the STB process. Two of the representatives indicated to me and select members of our Board of Trustees that the 'deal is done' and that CN's involvement in the STB process is purely perfunctory. This causes me to question the efficacy of federal regulation in this process.

After consulting a variety of federal, rail community, and private agencies regarding impacts and possible mitigation strategies, it is clear there are no realistic methods to relieve these risks and direct insults to our communities. Since we do not see any mitigation pathways, we urge you to deny the applicant's request for acquisition of the EJ&E railway.

I appreciate that you may have additional questions. In that case, please feel free to contact me or our staff directly at the numbers below. I and my staff would be happy to meet with you to discuss these issues at your convenience. I hope that through this request for further analysis, you can allay our concerns about this transfer of American assets to a foreign corporation.

Best Regards,

Robert G. Abboud
President, Village of Barrington Hills
Office: 847-551-3000
Cell: 847-921-1932
Bob@RGALabs.com

Cc: EJ&E Communities



**Village of Barrington Hills
112 Algonquin Road
Barrington Hills, Illinois 60010-5199**

Attachment A

The following provides issues of concern to the Village of Barrington Hills and neighboring communities. Attachment B provides a map showing the EJ&E rail as it passes through Barrington Hills, and surrounding communities. This line passes roughly 6.1 miles of residential property in the Village. Many of these homes are close to the existing rail line.

1. The CN acquisition deprives the economic development of the entire Chicago region in exchange for the profit of a foreign corporation

Each community along the EJ&E route, including Barrington Hills and adjacent communities will be deprived of economic development through this acquisition. In the case of Barrington Hills, we will be deprived economic development due to a variety of altered rail and transportation services including:

- The loss of the future STAR line passenger rail service which is well documented in the regions comprehensive plans
- Increased shipping costs to neighboring business who use rail service including automobiles and lumber
- Loss of access to communities and their retail services to our north, east, and south
- Loss of property value
- Deleterious impacts to traffic and congestion

Barrington Hills and the communities along the EJ&E have no obligation to improve the profit position of a foreign corporation at the expense of our own constituents.

2. CN should bear all mitigation costs, not the tax payers of Barrington Hills, Illinois, or the United States for the profit of a foreign corporation

There are approximately 134 grade-level crossings on the EJ&E line from Waukegan to Gary, IN. The chairman of CN has been quoted as saying that the US federal government and the affected communities should help with hundreds of millions of dollars in mitigations costs in order to support this acquisition. This amounts to simple corporate welfare to a foreign corporation paid for by the tax payers of Illinois and the United States.

Barrington Hills and the communities along the EJ&E have made no demand for this acquisition. Therefore, they should not be taxed for an infrastructural change that is not demanded, and is deleterious to their economic growth.

3. The CN acquisition will not produce new jobs in the region

The proposed new rail traffic is some 25-35 *unit* freight trains per day, depending upon which CN document one references. Unit freight trains are typically composed of cars carrying a single type of commodity that are all bound for the same destination. By hauling only one kind of freight for one destination, a unit train does not need to switch cars at various intermediate junctions and so can make nonstop runs between two terminals. Therefore, the Chicago region is just used as a pass through.

CN claims there will be new jobs generated in the region by the acquisition. No new jobs will be created in the EJ&E communities from rail yard or intermodal operations since these trains will not be stopping.

Rather, jobs will be lost as intermodal operations currently in operation will be displaced by dedicated unit rail traffic passing through. This appears to be the experience of central and northern Wisconsin after CN rail purchase.



**Village of Barrington Hills
112 Algonquin Road
Barrington Hills, Illinois 60010-5199**

We ask that the STB provide environmental and economic impact studies from other areas in Wisconsin and Illinois where unit freight traffic has replaced local freight traffic.

4. The CN acquisition will increase costs to local customers

The CN acquisition will crowd out local freight traffic currently supplying a variety of businesses. These businesses will have to move to road going shippers, increasing costs and increasing truck traffic in local communities, including Barrington Hills.

We ask that the STB provide environmental and economic impact studies from other areas in Wisconsin and Illinois where unit freight traffic has replaced local freight traffic.

5. The CN acquisition will threaten ground and surface waters in Barrington Hills and surrounding water sheds.

Attachment C provides a Federal Railroad Administration list of rail accidents from 2003 through October of 2007. Many of these accidents result in release of hazardous materials, fire, and fatalities.

The residents of Barrington Hills and surrounding communities rely exclusively on ground water from shallow aquifers. In addition, Barrington Hills has three extensive and productive water sheds providing surface water bodies, streams, wetlands, and recharge for aquifers. These aquifers have high connection efficiencies with our surface waters. The surface water complex in Barrington Hills is also highly connected to the Fox River system. Clean surface and ground water form one of the foundational bases for property value and animal habitat in Barrington Hills.

The accident histories in Attachments C demonstrate that the risk to our water supplies of increased rail traffic is excessive given the consequence to the Village of Barrington Hills and surrounding areas.

An accident of the magnitude such as those documented in Attachment C would destroy property values in an unrecoverable fashion. The market value of property in Barrington Hills is approximately \$2B. Actual damage to our water supply or the *perception* of damage to our water supply and surface inventory will irrevocably destroy our property values.

6. The CN acquisition will threaten general health and safety through increased rail accidents

Attachment C provides a Federal Railroad Administration list of rail accidents from 2003 through October of 2007. Many of these accidents result in release of hazardous materials, fire, and fatalities.

The increased traffic proposed for the EJ&E will increase the probability of an accident on the rail line within our community in a non-linear fashion. That is, an increase of 75 times the per mile rail car traffic proposed by CN will result in more than 300 times increase in risk of accident from the present condition.

In addition to the increase in traffic, CN proposes speeds in the range of 40-45 mph through the Barrington Hills / Barrington area. Presently rail traffic moves at approximately 10-15 mph. This increase in speed will substantially increase the accident rate.

7. The CN acquisition will delay the delivery of emergency services

Emergency services in Barrington Hills and the Barrington area are highly interconnected and interdependent across jurisdictional boundaries. The Village of Barrington Hills has 5 separate fire districts alone. Police, fire, hospital systems, and dispatch all work together.

These emergency services are highly response time dependant. Operation of these services requires operable grade crossings across the EJ&E for this interconnection to work effectively. It should be noted that due to the unusual rural nature of Barrington Hills, we do not have fire hydrants, and the distances to



**Village of Barrington Hills
112 Algonquin Road
Barrington Hills, Illinois 60010-5199**

be traveled to reach homes and emergency centers are unusually long. Therefore, any delay in the travel time of emergency vehicles directly impacts health and safety.

The proposed CN traffic will close the Barrington Hills and Barrington grade crossings for more than 230 minutes per day based on 30 trains per day moving at the current speed of 15 mph. Additionally, because these trains will be more than 9,000 feet long, multiple crossings will be blocked at the same time. This is an unacceptable increase in risk for our community. Attachment D provides the FRA's view on the impact of blocked crossings relative to emergency response.

Construction of additional emergency response facilities is not possible due to lack of available land, land use restrictions, and the ultimate cost to the community.

8. The CN acquisition will increase traffic congestion and travel times

The roadway system in the Chicago land area is highly interconnected. Business and residential property value traffic depends upon efficient roadway travel. The relationship of employment and housing has long depended upon working roadway networks in our area. The Barrington school system (District 220) also makes hundreds of crossings of the EJ&E tracks daily.

Our roadway system is already stressed due to high flow volumes. The proposed CN traffic will close the Barrington Hills and Barrington grade crossings for more than 230 minutes per day based on 30 trains per day moving at the current speed of 15 mph. Additionally, because these trains will be more than 9,000 feet long, multiple crossings will be blocked at the same time. This will create virtual auto traffic gridlock within Barrington Hills and our surrounding communities.

9. The CN acquisition will destroy property values in Barrington Hills

The character and brand of the Village of Barrington Hills will be immediately damaged by the increase in freight rail traffic proposed by CN. The brand of the Village is defined by a quiet rural character and access to services in surround communities. Attachment E, Crains Chicago, July 31, 2006, provides evidence of how the market views property values and character within our Village. 230 minutes per day of freight trains rumbling through our Village will no doubt substantively damage our character. Most importantly, it will damage the market perception of our Village and thus impact our +\$2B property value inventory.

Additionally, the CN rail traffic will effectively block our residents' access to services north, south, and east of our Village. This will also negatively affect property values.

10. The CN has reckless about its impacts on our community

During the course of recent events regarding the CN acquisition of the EJ&E, I have found the CN to show no interest in its impacts to the affected communities. While Barrington Hills has some 6.1 miles of EJ&E track way, Barrington Hills has yet to be contacted by a member of senior management of the CN, even after we have made numerous attempts to speak with them.

At the Makray Memorial Golf Club STB presentation, we found the CN representatives to be arrogant and disdainful of the community and the STB process. Two of the representatives indicated that the 'deal is done' and that their involvement in the STB process is purely perfunctory. This causes us to question the value of the data provided by CN and the efficacy of federal regulation in this process.

Experience has shown that companies with this level of disdain for communities have a higher level of serious accidents and impacts on health and safety. We believe this is a relevant factor in STB's evaluation. In particular, we caution the STB about relying on CN supplied data.



**Village of Barrington Hills
112 Algonquin Road
Barrington Hills, Illinois 60010-5199**

11. Rail traffic will not be reduced in other communities

CN claims that the new rail traffic configuration after the acquisition will reduce train traffic in other communities. We believe this to be false. CN is proposing to bring 30 **new** unit trains per day along the EJ&E. Assuming that existing traffic and intermodal operations must be served, we do not see any drop in other community traffic other than possibly an initial temporary drop in local traffic. We request an independent market study be performed on this issue. In addition, we request a review of Midwestern areas where CN has made similar claims as part of an acquisition.




**Village of Barrington Hills
112 Algonquin Road
Barrington Hills, Illinois 60010-5199**

Attachment B provides a map showing the EJ&E rail as it passes through Barrington Hills, and surrounding communities.

Attachment C provides a list of FRA rail accident reports from 1/2003 through 10/2007.

Attachment D provides an FRA report on emergency response issues due to blocked rail crossings

Attachment E provides a Chicago Crain's Business article from July 31, 2006, highlighting Barrington Hills as one of the best places to live in the Chicago area and a demonstration of our brand. "Estates in Leafy Seclusion"



Sources: CMAP


- GRADE SEPARATED CROSSING
- AT GRADE CROSSING
- EJ&E RAILWAY
- UNION PACIFIC RAILWAY

Barrington Area Railway Exhibit

0 7000
1 inch equals 7,000 feet



GEWALT HAMILTON
ASSOCIATES, INC.



Federal Railroad Administration
Office of Safety - Headquarters
Accident/Incident Investigation Assignments
January - December, 2003

1. January 02, 2003- CSX Transportation (CSX), Union City, Georgia
A road switcher collided with standing cars while backing on an industrial track.
2. January 02, 2003- Union Pacific Railroad (UP), Towers, Nebraska
A coal train, operating at 49 mph, derailed 43 cars.
3. January 06, 2003- Southern California Regional Rail Authority (SCAX), Buena Vista, CA
A highway vehicle was struck by a commuter train at a highway-rail grade crossing.
4. January 14, 2003- Iowa Chicago & Eastern Railroad (ICE), Lawler, Iowa
A grain train, operating at 27 mph, derailed 21 cars.
5. January 22, 2003- CSX Transportation (CSX), Brownsville, Tennessee
A freight train, operating at 42 mph, entered a siding at a misaligned hand operated switch and collided with two unattended locomotives.
6. January 25, 2003- CSX Transportation (CSX), Philadelphia, Pennsylvania
Rear-end collision.
7. February 5, 2003- Burlington Northern Santa Fe (BNSF), Silsbee, Texas
A runaway cut of cars collided with the locomotives that were in pursuit of those cars.
8. February 9, 2003- Canadian National Illinois Central (CNIC), Tamaroa, Illinois
A mixed freight train, operating at 41 mph, derailed 22 cars. An evacuation was ordered.
9. February 10, 2003- Amtrak/Canadian National Illinois Central (CNIC), Pinckneyville, IL
An Amtrak train, operating at 60 mph, derailed the ninth head car of the train.
10. February 10, 2003- Norfolk Southern (NS), Montevallo, Alabama
A freight train, operating at 26 mph, derailed 34 cars.
11. February 11, 2003- Union Pacific (UP) North Dupo, Illinois
A switch engine collided head-on with a freight train.
12. February 11, 2003- Norfolk Southern (NS), Radford, Virginia
A coal train, operating at 30 mph, derailed three locomotives and 17 cars.
13. February 13, 2003- Burlington Northern Santa Fe (BNSF), Scotts Bluff, Nebraska
Side collision.
14. February 14, 2003- Norfolk Southern (NS), Farmington, Delaware
A freight train, operating at 25 mph, derailed six cars. Five cars contained hazardous materials. An evacuation was ordered.
15. February 20, 2003- Canadian National Illinois Central (CNIC), Hobart, Indiana
A freight train, operating at 60 mph, derailed 35 cars.
16. February 25, 2003- Norfolk Southern (NS), Johnstown, Pennsylvania
A freight train, operating at 34 mph, derailed 21 cars.

17. February 28, 2003- Norfolk Southern (NS), Blacksburg, Virginia
A coal train, operating at 26 mph, derailed 33 cars.
18. March 02, 2003- Burlington Northern Santa Fe (BNSF), Brush, Colorado
Rear end collision.
19. March 04, 2003- CSX Transportation (CSX), New Orleans, Louisiana
A train departing the yard derailed six cars into a standing train.
20. March 06, 2003- Union Pacific (UP) Akron, Illinois
A coal train, operating at 46 mph, derailed 48 cars.
21. March 10, 2003- Burlington Northern Santa Fe (BNSF), Seattle, Washington
A freight train, operating at 18 mph, struck the side of an opposing train.
22. March 11, 2003- Norfolk Southern (NS), Ashtabula, Ohio
A freight train, operating at 7 mph, collided head-on with a standing train.
23. March 13, 2003- CSX Transportation (CSX), Holten, Tennessee
A freight train, operating at 22 mph, collided head-on with a hi-rail vehicle.
24. March 13, 2003- Kansas City Southern (KCS), Baton Rouge, Louisiana
A yard train employee was injured during a remote control switching operation.
25. March 18, 2003- Burlington Northern Santa Fe (BNSF), Clarendon, Texas
A freight train, operating at 49 mph, derailed two locomotives and 28 cars.
26. March 21, 2003- Burlington Northern Santa Fe (BNSF), New Castle, Wyoming
A unit coal train, operating at 50 mph, derailed 35 cars.
27. March 22, 2003- Kansas City Southern (KCS), Kansas City, Missouri
Side collision.
28. March 28, 2003- Union Pacific (UP) Gering, Nebraska
A unit coal train, operating at 50 mph, derailed 24 cars.
29. March 29, 2003- Burlington Northern Santa Fe (BNSF), Ogles, Texas
A freight train, operating at 48 mph, derailed 28 cars.
30. March 30, 2003- Canadian National (CN), Bellevue, Michigan
A unit coal train, operating at 38 mph, derailed 25 cars.
31. April 01, 2003- Norfolk Southern (NS), Surrency, Georgia
A freight train, operating at 49 mph, derailed 25 cars.
32. April 05, 2003- Canadian Pacific (CP), Red Wing, Minnesota
A freight train, operating at 40 mph, derailed 29 cars.
33. April 05, 2003- Norfolk Southern (NS), Sheffield, Ohio
A Sperry Rail detector car, operating at 28 mph, collided with the side of a freight train.
34. April 11, 2003- Burlington Northern Santa Fe (BNSF), Olathe, Kansas
A unit coal train, operating at 47 mph, derailed 27 cars.

35. April 11, 2003- Burlington Northern Santa Fe (BNSF), Slaton, Texas
A freight train, operating at 4 mph, derailed 6 cars resulting in a release of hazardous material and subsequent evacuation.
36. April 15, 2003- Canadian National Illinois Central (CNIC), Jackson, Mississippi
A freight train, operating at 50 mph, derailed 25 cars.
37. April 15, 2003- Union Pacific (UP) Marlin, Texas
A freight train, operating at 45 mph, derailed 26 cars.
38. April 15, 2003- Union Pacific (UP) Roseville, California
A remote control yard switcher made a back-up move through a misaligned switch and derailed one car onto its side. The car struck the lead locomotive on another yard job.
39. May 01, 2003- Burlington Northern Santa Fe (BNSF), Lapine, Oregon
A freight train collided head-on with a hi-rail vehicle.
40. May 02, 2003- Burlington Northern Santa Fe (BNSF), Seattle, Washington
A freight train, operating at 5 mph, struck the rear-end of another train.
41. May 04, 2003- CSX Transportation (CSX), Flomaton, Alabama
A freight train, operating at 20 mph, struck the rear-end of another train.
42. May 05, 2003- CSX Transportation (CSX), Tarrant, Alabama
A remote controlled yard switcher collided with the side of another yard switcher.
43. May 06, 2003- Burlington Northern Santa Fe (BNSF), Dant, Texas
A freight train, operating at 19 mph, collided with a hi-rail vehicle.
44. May 05, 2003- Burlington Northern Santa Fe (BNSF), Hazard, Nebraska
A work train collided with the rear end of another train. The resulting derailment struck a third train standing on the adjacent main track.
45. May 06, 2003- Amtrak (ATK)/CSX Transportation (CSX), McIntosh, Georgia
An Amtrak passenger train, operating at 79 mph, struck a tractor trailer loaded with plywood at a highway/rail grade crossing.
46. May 06, 2003- Union Pacific (UP) Carroll, Iowa
An westbound auto train, operating at 61 mph, derailed into an eastbound freight train operating at 50 mph on the adjacent main track.
47. May 17, 2003- Burlington Northern Santa Fe (BNSF), Matfield Green, Kansas
An eastbound freight train, struck the side of a westbound freight train.
48. May 28, 2003- Amtrak (ATK)/Union Pacific (UP), Dotsero, Colorado
An Amtrak passenger train, operating at 38 mph, derailed 2 cars.
49. June 02, 2003- CSX Transportation (CSX), Atherton, Indiana
An Intermodal train, operating at 50 mph, derailed eight cars resulting in an explosion and fire.
50. June 17, 2003- Norfolk Southern (NS), Richwood, Kentucky
A freight train, operating at 58 mph, struck a vehicle at a highway-rail grade crossing.
51. June 19, 2003- CSX Transportation (CSX), Cumberland, Maryland
A westbound container train, operating at 28 mph, collided head-on with a freight train operating at 11 mph.

52. June 20, 2003- Burlington Northern Santa Fe (BNSF), Minneapolis, Minnesota
A remote control yard switcher, operating at 9 mph, derailed 42 cars.
53. June 20, 2003- Union Pacific (UP), City of Commerce, California
Runaway cars rolled out of a siding onto the main track and subsequently derailed.
54. June 21, 2003- CSX Transportation (CSX), Blasdel, New York
A freight train, operating at 49 mph, derailed 29 cars.
55. July 14, 2003- New Jersey Transit (NJT)/Amtrak (ATK) Secaucus, New Jersey
A NJT passenger train, operating at 60 mph, derailed three cars.
56. July 28, 2003- Burlington Northern Santa Fe (BNSF)/ Union Pacific (UP), Bisbee, Texas
A freight train, operating at 20 mph, collided head-on with a standing train.
57. July 30, 2003- CSX Transportation (CSX), Holland, Michigan
Four Maintenance-of-Way employees were struck by a ballast regulator while performing track work.
58. July 31, 2003- Union Pacific (UP), Dunsmuir, California
A freight train, operating at 20 mph, derailed 15 cars.
59. August 14, 2003- Union Pacific (UP), Wallace, Louisiana
A freight train, operating at 39 mph, derailed 47 cars.
60. September 7, 2003- Union Pacific (UP), Beaumont, California
A freight train, operating in double track territory, derailed 18 cars which were subsequently struck by a passing train resulting in the passing train derailling 3 locomotives and eight cars.
61. September 8, 2003- Union Pacific (UP), Riner, Wyoming
A freight train, operating at 41 mph, derailed 27 cars.
62. September 17, 2003- Burlington Northern Santa Fe (BNSF), Chriesman, Texas
A freight train, operating at 13 mph, struck the rear-end of another train.
63. September 18, 2003- Patapsco & Black Rivers (PBR)/Norfolk Southern (NS), Baltimore MD
A PBR freight train, operating at 7 mph, collided head-on with a standing NS train.
64. October 1, 2003- Burlington Northern Santa Fe (BNSF), Udall, Kansas
A BNSF freight train struck a Hi-Rail vehicle that was sitting on the main track working near an interlocking.
65. October 7, 2003- CSX Transportation (CSX), Leland, North Carolina
A remote control activated locomotive was working in a yard when it struck another switching movement.
66. October 12, 2003- Metra Commuter Service (Metra), Chicago, Illinois
Commuter train No. 519 derailed both locomotives and all five cars as it was entering a crossover switch at 49th Street.
67. October 18, 2003- Burlington Northern Santa Fe (BNSF), Hale Center, Texas
A freight train, operating at 49 mph, struck a vehicle at a highway crossing at grade. As a result of the collision, three people were killed and three others were injured.
68. November 15, 2003- Union Pacific (UP)/Burlington Northern Santa Fe (BNSF), Longview, Washington
A UP Intermodal train, operating at 50 mph, struck the side of a BNSF Intermodal train.

69. November 19, 2003- CSX Transportation (CSX), Opelika, Alabama

A CSX Hi-Rail vehicle that was operating behind a CSX coal train struck the rear of the train stopped on the main line ahead of them.

70. November 22, 2003- Norfolk Southern (NS), Cordova, Alabama

A freight train, operating at 18 mph, derailed 23 cars.

71. November 23, 2003- Union Pacific (UP), Dunlap, Illinois

A freight train, operating at 45 mph, derailed 30 cars. A railroad bridge was destroyed.

72. December 8, 2003- Union Pacific (UP), Los Angeles, California

An Aurant Yard UP switcher, struck the side of an arriving UP Intermodal train.

73. December 16, 2003- Union Pacific (UP), Sunset Whitney, California

A freight train, operating at 48 mph, derailed 26 cars.

74. December 18, 2003- CSX Transportation (CSX), Alexandria, Virginia

A freight train, operating North through Alexandria Interlocking, derailed 20 cars. Passenger train service was disrupted.

75. December 23, 2003- Union Pacific (UP), Bridgeport, Colorado

A freight train, operating at 33 mph, derailed 32 cars.

76. December 29, 2003- Burlington Northern Santa Fe (BNSF), Pauls Valley, Oklahoma

A Westbound train, traveling at 4 mph, struck the side of an Eastbound train traveling at 14 mph.

Federal Railroad Administration
Office of Safety - Headquarters
Accident/Incident Investigation Assignments
January - November, 2004

1. January 10, 2004- Union Pacific Railroad (UP), Umatilla, Oregon
A mixed freight train derailed 17 cars, 3 of which derailed into the Columbia River..
2. January 11, 2004- Burlington Northern Santa Fe (BNSF), Hoyte, Texas
A mixed freight train, operating at 47 mph, derailed 36 cars.
3. January 13, 2004- Burlington Northern Santa Fe (BNSF), Decatur, Texas
A coal train, operating at 42 mph, derailed 30 cars.
4. January 20, 2004- Kansas City Southern (KCS), Vicksburg, Mississippi
A road switcher, struck a tractor trailer truck, when the locomotive engineer became incapacitated and the ground crew was not in a position to stop the run away locomotive consist.
5. January 22, 2004- Amtrak (ATK)/Union Pacific (UP), Sacramento, California
A passenger train, backing up to position itself to clear the main line, struck the rear of a stopped UP freight train.
6. January 22, 2004- CSX Transportation (CSX), Charleston, South Carolina
A Yard Switcher collided with the side of a road train carrying military equipment and supplies.
7. January 26, 2004- Union Pacific (UP), Lisco, Nebraska
A coal train, operating at 50 mph, derailed 48 cars.
8. January 30, 2004- Union Pacific (UP), Fort Worth, Texas
A mixed freight train, operating at 5 mph while crossing from one main track to another, derailed 20 cars and blocked a major highway.
9. February 1, 2004- Burlington Northern Santa Fe (BNSF), Ashland, Nebraska
A loaded coal train, operating at 38 mph, derailed 36 cars.
10. February 3, 2004- CSX Transportation (CSX), Henrietta, New York
A freight train, operating at an estimated 50 mph, passed over an out-of-service crossing, striking an automobile and killing it's two occupants.
11. February 7, 2004- CSX Transportation (CSX), North East, Maryland
A freight train, operating at 44 mph, derailed 35 cars, including 11 hazardous material tank cars.

12. February 10, 2004- Norfolk Southern (NS), Columbus, Ohio
While a humping operation was in progress, a hazardous material tank car was struck and lost its load requiring an evacuation of the area.
13. February 21, 2004- Union Pacific (UP), Carrizozo, New Mexico
A freight train, operating at 36 mph, struck the side of a loaded grain train as the grain train was entering the siding to clear the main track. Both crew members of the striking train were killed.
14. February 21, 2004- CSX Transportation (CSX), Lagrange, Georgia
A freight train, operating at 30 mph, derailed 33 cars.
15. February 23, 2004- Norfolk Southern (NS), Pine Knot, Kentucky
A freight train, operating at 50 mph, struck an automobile at a highway grade crossing killing all three occupants.
16. February 29, 2004- Union Pacific (UP), Lewellen, Nebraska
A coal train, operating at 47 mph, derailed 30 cars.
17. March 5, 2004- Burlington Northern Santa Fe (BNSF), Ansley, Nebraska
A coal train, operating at 50 mph, derailed 32 cars.
18. March 9, 2004- Burlington Northern Santa Fe (BNSF), White Earth, North Dakota
A freight train, operating at 60 mph, derailed 31 cars.
19. March 18, 2004- Nebraska Central Railroad (NCRC), Norfork, Nebraska
A Remote Control Locomotive, thought to be coupled to cars but was not, struck a cut of cars standing on another track when the Remote Control Operator continued to move the locomotive not realizing that it was not coupled to the cars he was observing.
20. March 28, 2004- Union Pacific (UP), Silver Lake, Kansas
A coal train, operating at 60 mph, derailed 38 cars.
21. April 6, 2004- Amtrak (ATK)/Canadian National/Illinois Central (CNIC), Flora, Miss.
An Amtrak train, operating at 79 mph, derailed its locomotive and all 9 of its cars. One passenger was killed.
22. April 19, 2004- Long Island Railroad (LIRR)/Amtrak (ATK), Manhattan, New York
Amtrak equipment, destined to make train number 183, struck the rear of LIRR commuter train number 2099 while it waited to enter Penn Station.
23. April 20, 2004- Burlington Northern Santa Fe (BNSF), Essex, Montana
A unit grain train, operating at 25 mph, derailed 30 cars.

24. April 28, 2004- Burlington Northern Santa Fe (BNSF)/Union Pacific (UP), Hesperia, Calif.
A BNSF freight train, operating at 18 mph, struck the side of a UP freight train operating at 8 mph, resulting in derailed cars and closed highways.
25. May 3, 2004- Union Pacific (UP), San Antonio, Texas
A westbound freight train, operating at 40 mph, struck the side of the last car of an eastbound freight train as the eastbound train was crossing over from one main track to another.
26. May 7, 2004- Union Pacific (UP), North Dexter, Missouri
A northward freight train, operating at an estimated 16 mph, struck the rear of a standing northward inter-modal train.
27. May 8, 2004- Union Pacific (UP), Williamsville, Missouri
A freight train, operating at 40 mph, derailed 36 cars.
28. May 14, 2004- Norfolk Southern (NS), Surgoinsville, Tennessee
An eastward loaded coal train, operating at an estimated 40 mph, struck the rear of a standing eastward freight train.
29. May 17, 2004- CSX Transportation (CSX), Suttersville, Pennsylvania
A freight train, operating at 25 mph, derailed 26 cars.
30. May 19, 2004- Burlington Northern Santa Fe (BNSF), Gunter, Texas
A southward freight train, operating at an estimated 40 mph, collided, head-on, with a northward freight train. One employee was killed and four were injured.
31. May 24, 2004- Union Pacific (UP), Gurdon, Arkansas
A northward freight train, operating at an estimated 30 mph, struck the rear of a standing northward inter-modal train.
32. May 27, 2004- Norfolk Southern (NS), Front Royal, Virginia
A westward inter-modal train, operating at an estimated 19 mph, struck the rear of a standing westward freight train.
33. June 7, 2004- Kansas City Southern (KCS), Morton, Mississippi
A westward freight train, operating at an estimated 24 mph, failed to stop and struck the side of an eastward freight train.
34. June 8, 2004- Burlington Northern Santa Fe (BNSF), Adamana, Arizona
A northward freight train, operating at an estimated 5 mph, struck its own train while setting out a cut of cars at a siding. The conductor was seriously injured.

35. June 19, 2004- Union Pacific (UP), Bloom, Utah

An eastward freight train, operating at an estimated 7 mph, struck the side of a westward freight train as it was entering the siding.

36. June 20, 2004- Missouri and Northern Arkansas Railroad (MNA), Adrian, Missouri

A northward MNA freight train, operating at an estimated 38 mph, was struck by a cut of four cars that had rolled out of an industry track and onto the main track.

37. June 20, 2004- Montana Rail Link (MRL), Laurel, Montana

A remote control locomotive was involved in a switching operation that involved shoving a cut of cars. The movement, operating at an estimated speed of 5 mph, struck the side of a standing train that was waiting at the opposite end of the yard.

38. June 21, 2004- Union Pacific (UP), Warm Springs, California

A remote control locomotive was involved in a switching operation that involved shoving a cut of cars. The movement, operating at an estimated speed of 11 mph, involved some cars with air and some without. An emergency application of the air brake system took place, the cars separated, and the free rolling block struck the side of a standing train.

39. June 24, 2004- Union Pacific (UP), Grand Junction, Colorado

A loaded coal train, operating at 29 mph, derailed 27 cars.

40. June 25, 2004- Norfolk Southern (NS), Chalmette, Louisiana

A southward freight train, operating at an estimated 23 mph, struck a gasoline tank truck at a highway-rail grade crossing. The truck exploded and burned killing two crew-members and the truck driver.

41. June 27, 2004- CSX Transportation (CSX), Saugerties, New York

A northward freight train, operating into a siding at an estimated 11 mph, struck the rear of a standing northward freight train that was waiting for an opposing train to arrive.

42. June 28, 2004- Union Pacific (UP)/Burlington Northern Santa Fe (BNSF), MacDona, Texas

A westward UP freight train, operating at an estimated 45 mph, failed to stop and struck the side of an eastward BNSF freight train while it was entering the siding. A chlorine leak ensued, an evacuation was ordered, the UP conductor and two citizens were found dead at the scene.

43. June 30, 2004- Burlington Northern Santa Fe (BNSF), Overbrook, Oklahoma

A freight train, operating at 52 mph, derailed 27 cars. A load of steel beams shifted and one fell to the ground puncturing a tank car. The subsequent explosion and fire necessitated an evacuation.

44. June 30, 2004- Canadian Pacific (CP), Lowry, Minnesota

A freight train, operating at 30 mph, derailed 25 cars. The derailment necessitated an evacuation.

45. July 9, 2004- Canadian National Illinois Central (CNIC), Benton, Illinois
A loaded coal train, operating at 22 mph, derailed 13 cars as it traversed a railroad viaduct spanning interstate route 57. Several railroad cars landed on the highway closing it and causing highway delays.
46. July 9, 2004- Union Pacific (UP), Pine Bluff, Arkansas
A northward remote control locomotive was pulling cars out of a track at 5 mph. The two person crew was not in a position to see the leading end of the move and it subsequently passed a stop signal, entered the main track, and struck the side of a passing train.
47. July 17, 2004- Burlington Northern Santa Fe (BNSF), Wichita, Kansas
A loaded grain train, operating at 25 mph, derailed 20 cars.
48. July 22, 2004- CSX Transportation (CSX), Lincoln, North Carolina
A southward freight train, operating at an estimated 37 mph, struck a Hi-Rail vehicle head-on.
49. July 24, 2004- Florida East Coast (FEC), Stuart, Florida
A freight train, operating at 25 mph, derailed 30 cars.
50. July 29, 2004- CSX Transportation (CSX), Laurens, South Carolina
A southward freight train, operating at 35 mph, entered a hand operated switch that had been lined from the main track to the engine track, and struck a "helper" engine that was standing in the track awaiting additional locomotives. Three crew members were injured.
51. August 2, 2004- Norfolk Southern (NS), Payne, Ohio
A freight train, operating at 42 mph, derailed 29 cars. There was a short, precautionary evacuation ordered.
52. August 5, 2004- Union Pacific (UP), Carleton, Nebraska
An eastward loaded coal train operating at 60 mph, derailed 45 cars. The cars derailed into the side of a passing coal train derailing three locomotives and 17 cars of that train.
53. August 14, 2004- Union Pacific (UP), North Lake, Illinois
A remote control locomotive (RCL) was shoving 56 cars in a yard, when the operator went to stop the movement. The locomotive stopped but the cars didn't. The free rolling cars struck the side of another RCL job derailing 5 of its cars. Some of the five derailed cars struck the side of a standing Canadian National train.
54. August 18, 2004- CSX Transportation (CSX), Davenport, Florida
A freight train, operating at an estimated 30 mph, passed over a highway rail crossing, equipped with flashers and lights that did not operate, striking a truck with seven occupants. None of the occupants suffered life threatening injuries.

55. August 19, 2004- CSX Transportation (CSX), Mobile, Alabama

A coal train, operating at 23 mph, derailed 30 cars. The derailment occurred as the train was crossing a ballast deck bridge and some of the cars fell into the Sera Water Bayou.

56. August 30, 2004- CSX Transportation (CSX), Climax, Georgia

A freight train, operating at an estimated 40 mph, struck a tractor trailer truck being used by a driver training school. Passive warning devices were in effect at the crossing and all four occupants of the truck were killed. The two person train crew was taken to the hospital.

57. September 4, 2004- CSX Transportation (CSX), Ilion, New York

A freight train, operating at 50 mph, derailed 37 cars.

58. September 5, 2004- Kansas City Southern (KCS), Bolton, Mississippi

A freight train, operating at 35 mph, derailed 21 cars.

59. September 7, 2004- CSX Transportation (CSX), Aberdeen, North Carolina

At an opened switch, a freight train, operating at 29 mph, derailed 5 locomotives and 17 cars.

60. September 17, 2004- Union Pacific (UP), Calipatria, California

At an opened switch, an eastward freight train, operating at an estimated 35 mph, struck the rear of a standing eastward freight train. As a result, there was a short, precautionary evacuation ordered.

61. September 21, 2004- Alton and Southern Railroad (ALS), East St. Louis, Illinois

A hump switching job had 2 hazard material tank cars stall part way over the hump. The locomotive and remaining cars attempted to reach over and couple to them; however, the effort failed and while operating at 20 mph, the locomotive and remaining cars struck, derailed, and damaged both cars, resulting in an evacuation.

62. September 23, 2004- Canadian National (CN)/Union Pacific (UP), Chicago, Illinois

An eastward CN freight train, operating at 30 mph, struck the side of the lead locomotive of a standing UP freight train. The UP train was in the process of putting its train away and the lead locomotive pulled to a point that fouled the main track at the switch providing access to the yard.

63. September 24, 2004- Norfolk Southern (NS), Pacolet, North Carolina

A freight train, operating at 40 mph, derailed 3 locomotives and 20 cars.

64. September 27, 2004- Burlington Northern Santa Fe (BNSF), Naysmith, Nebraska

A loaded grain train, operating at 25 mph, derailed 42 cars.

65. September 29, 2004- Union Pacific (UP)/Texas Mexican Rwy (TexMex), Thompson, Texas
A southward UP train operating at 21 mph, struck the leading end of a standing, unattended TexMex train that had been left on the siding. The hand throw switch providing access to the siding was lined for the siding at the time of the collision.
66. October 8, 2004- Burlington Northern Santa Fe (BNSF), Lincoln, Nebraska
A BNSF Remote Control Locomotive Yard Switcher, making an eastward move, and operating at 7 mph, struck the side of a standing BNSF empty coal train. The ensuing derailment of the empty coal cars struck a passing loaded coal train.
67. October 10, 2004- CSX Transportation (CSX), Baltimore, Maryland
An eastward CSX freight train, operating at 18 mph, struck the side of another CSX freight train that was crossing over from one main track to another.
68. October 16, 2004- Union Pacific (UP), Pico Rivera, California
An eastward UP freight train operating at 57 mph, derailed 11 cars. A precautionary evacuation was ordered since three of the containers indicated that they contained some hazardous materials.
69. October 16, 2004- CSX Transportation (CSX), Sanderson, Florida
A northward CSX freight train, operating at 49 mph, derailed 25 cars.
70. October 17, 2004- Union Pacific (UP), Boyd, Texas
A southward UP freight train operating at 24 mph, derailed 11 cars. The derailed cars damaged a railroad bridge over the Trinity River.
71. October 18, 2004- Burlington Northern Santa Fe (BNSF), Collins, Montana
A northward BNSF loaded grain train, operating at 57 mph, derailed 25 cars.
72. October 25, 2004- Canadian National Illinois Central (CNIC), Detroit, Michigan
A northward CN freight train, operating at 2 mph, derailed 9 cars. Among the nine cars were four containing hazardous materials, one of which was leaking, therefore, an evacuation was ordered within a one mile radius.
73. October 29, 2004- Amtrak (ATK), New Haven, Connecticut
A westward Acela express passenger train, operating at restricted speed, derailed one power car and one coach while it was moving within the limits of the interlocking.
74. October 30, 2004- Burlington Northern Santa Fe (BNSF), Brenham, Texas
A southward BNSF freight train, operating at 45 mph, derailed 2 locomotives and 23 cars. A precautionary evacuation was ordered.

75. October 30, 2004- CSX Transportation (CSX), Little Falls, New York
A eastward freight train, while passing a westward freight train on the adjacent main track, derailed 16 cars into the westward train, causing an additional 18 cars being derailed on the westward train.
76. November 2, 2004- Burlington Northern Santa Fe (BNSF), Zita, Texas
A BNSF freight train, operating at 6 mph, struck the rear of a standing BNSF inter-modal train.
77. November 10, 2004- Norfolk Southern (NS), Graniteville, South Carolina
A northward geometry train, operating at an estimated 45 mph, struck a passenger vehicle at a highway-rail grade crossing. The crossing was equipped with automatic highway warning devices. All five occupants in the vehicle were killed.
78. November 10, 2004- Union Pacific (UP), San Antonio, Texas
A conventional switching crew, while switching at an industry, shoved a cut of cars into other standing cars, through wheel stops that had been installed at the end of a track, and through a building wall. As a result of the incident, one citizen was killed.
79. November 14, 2004- Union Pacific (UP), Ames, Nebraska
An westward freight train operating at 25 mph, derailed 20 cars. The cars derailed into the side of an eastward standing train derailing 12 cars on that train.
80. November 15, 2004- Union Pacific (UP), Pine Bluff, Arkansas
A southward freight train, operating at 17 mph, struck the side of a northward work train as it was crossing over from main track No.1 to main track No. 2.
81. November 15, 2004- Canadian National (CN)/Canadian Pacific (CP), Franklin Park, Illinois
A westward CN freight train, operating at 10 mph, struck the side of an eastward CP inter-modal train as it was crossing over at a control point. The collision occurred on Indiana Harbor Belt Railroad trackage.
82. November 22, 2004- Norfolk Southern (NS), Elko, Georgia
A auto-rack freight train, operating at 38 mph, derailed 27 cars. The derailment damaged a ballast deck bridge.
83. November 23, 2004- Union Pacific (UP), Notus, Idaho
A westward UP freight train operating at 62 mph, derailed 25 cars.
84. November 25, 2004- CSX Transportation (CSX), Milan, Tennessee
A northward CSX freight train, operating at 48 mph, derailed 3 locomotives and 13 cars. As a result of the derailment, a precautionary evacuation was ordered.

85. November 25, 2004- Burlington Northern Santa Fe (BNSF), Conkelly, Montana

An eastward freight train, operating at 10 mph, collided head on with a westward freight train operating at 20 mph. As a result, a total of 7 locomotives were derailed and one employee hurt.

86. November 28, 2004- Burlington Northern Santa Fe (BNSF), Ottumwa, Iowa

A loaded coal train, operating at 50 mph, derailed 42 cars.

87. November 29, 2004- CSX Transportation (CSX), Vitis, Florida

A southward freight train collided head on with a northward freight train. As a result, two employees were hurt and one was killed..

Federal Railroad Administration
Office of Safety - Headquarters
Accident/Incident Investigation Assignments
January - December, 2005

1. January 5, 2005- CSX Transportation (CSX), Glenco, Kentucky
A mixed freight train collided with debris on the tracks that occurred as the result of a partial collapse of a tunnel wall. As a result of the collision, both locomotives and the head eight cars derailed. Minor injuries to both crew members.
2. January 6, 2005- Norfolk Southern (NS), Graniteville, South Carolina
A mixed freight train, operating at 45 mph, traversed a mis-aligned hand operated switch located in non-signal territory, and collided with standing equipment left on an industrial lead. As a result of the collision, a number of cars derailed including a chlorine car which ruptured. The resultant discharge killed a number of citizens, one railroad employee and forced a 1 mile evacuation of the area.
3. January 8, 2005- Burlington Northern Santa Fe (BNSF), Bieber, California
A mixed freight train, operating at 39 mph, traversed a mis-aligned hand operated switch located in non-signal territory, and collided with standing equipment left in a storage yard. As a result of the collision, 7 locomotives and 14 cars derailed and both crew members were hurt.
4. January 8, 2005- Burlington Northern Santa Fe (BNSF), Temple, Texas
An eastward freight train, operating at an estimated 8 mph, struck the rear of a standing eastward freight train.
5. January 8, 2005- Union Pacific (UP), Bayport, Texas
A southward freight train was performing switching operations when one locomotive and three Hydrogen-Peroxide cars derailed. As a result of the derailment, two of the three cars caught fire, and a precautionary evacuation was ordered.
6. January 11, 2005- CSX Transportation (CSX), Banks, Alabama
A mixed freight train, operating at 4 mph at the point of collision, traversed a mis-aligned hand operated switch located in non-signal territory, and collided with a standing train which had been tied down on the siding.
7. January 15, 2005- Union Pacific (UP), Waller, Texas
A mixed freight train, operating at 40 mph, derailed 25 cars.
8. January 26, 2005- Southern California Regional Rail Authority (SCRX) Glendale, California
A westward Metrolink commuter train struck a highway vehicle that had been abandoned on the tracks. As a result of the collision, the train derailed, hit another passing MetroLink train and knocked over a UP locomotive. 11 people died including the conductor of the passing train. Many passengers were injured including the conductor and engineer of the striking train.

9. January 31, 2005- Norfolk Southern (NS), Tarentum, Pennsylvania
An eastward mixed freight train, operating at 29 mph, derailed 14 cars, which included four hazardous materials cars. As a result of the derailment, a car of flouride hydrogen anhydrous landed in the river and leaked product. A precautionary evacuation of the area was called and lasted more than 24 hours.
10. February 1, 2005- CSX Transportation (CSX), Bellefontaine, Ohio
An eastward mixed freight train operating at an unknown speed-required to be operating at "restricted speed with a cap of 20 mph- struck the rear of a standing eastward freight train.
11. February 3, 2005- Burlington Northern Santa Fe (BNSF), Wellsville, Kansas
A westward intermodal freight train operating at an unknown speed, struck the rear of a standing westward intermodal train. As a result of the collision, derailed cars fouled the adjacent track and a passing eastward train was able to stop before hitting the pile.
12. February 11, 2005- CSX Transportation (CSX), Fonda, New York
A westward freight train, operating at an unknown speed, struck a vehicle at Broadway crossing killing the driver. The actions of a second crew, that had tied down within the crossing circuitry, and had "cut-out" the gates for their train are the focus of the investigation.
13. February 13, 2005- Amtrak(ATK)/Canadian National(CN), Roseland, Louisiana
A northward ATK train operating at an unknown speed, struck a vehicle that had turned directly in front of the leading locomotive. All four passengers in the vehicle were killed.
14. February 14, 2005- Amtrak(ATK)/Union Pacific(UP), Oxnard, California
A northward ATK train, operating at an estimated speed of 79 mph, struck a tractor trailer truck at 5th street and Rose.
15. February 13, 2005- Montana Rail Link (MRL), Trident, Montana
A westward freight train operating at 18 mph, struck the rear of a standing westward train.
16. February 19, 2005- Union Pacific (UP), Fulton, Arkansas
An eastward mixed freight train, operating at an unknown speed, struck an ambulance killing the driver and both attendants. The patient survived.
17. February 21, 2005- Union Pacific (UP), Salem, Illinois
A southward mixed freight train, operating at 5 mph, derailed 21 cars as the train began to pull from a siding and onto the main track.
18. March 2, 2005- Amtrak(ATK)/CSX Transportation(CSX), Pomoano Beach, Florida
A northward ATK train, operating at an estimated speed of 65 mph, struck a flat bed truck and then a van at Hammonsville Road killing the van driver and injuring two ATK employees. The crossing was equipped with active highway rail warning devices.

19. March 5, 2005- Union Pacific (UP), Meachum, Oregon

An eastward mixed freight train, operating at an estimated speed of 49 mph, derailed 30 cars as the train passed through a series of curves. The curves had permanent speed restrictions in effect that restricted the speed of trains through the area to less than half the estimated speed of 49 mph.

20. March 4, 2005- Kansas City Southern (KCS), Oil City Louisiana

A northward empty coal train, operating at a speed of 55 mph, struck a vehicle at a highway rail crossing at grade equipped with passive warning devices. As a result of the collision, three people in the vehicle were killed and another seriously injured.

21. March 6, 2005- BNSF Railway (BNSF)/Fort Worth & Western (FWW), Dublin, Texas

A BNSF westward freight train operating over FWW trackage at 32 mph, derailed 17 cars located toward the middle of the train and while passing over a five span bridge. As a result of the derailment, the bridge was destroyed. A culvert pipe and fill structure was built to replace the bridge.

22. March 11, 2005- Union Pacific (UP), Humble, Texas

A freight train, operating at a speed of 40 mph, struck a vehicle at a highway rail grade crossing equipped with passive warning devices. As a result of the collision, three people died.

23. March 19, 2005- Iowa Chicago & Eastern (ICE)/BNSF Railway, Cottage Grove, Minnesota

An ICE mixed freight train, operating on BNSF trackage, derailed 21 cars. As a result of the derailment, six of the cars landed in the Mississippi River and two of the derailed cars were HM tanks.

24. March 31, 2005- Indiana Railroad Company (INRD), Newton, Illinois

A southward mixed freight train, operating at 13 mph, derailed 25 cars as the train began to pull from a Stop they had made to comply with an operating rule. As the result of the derailment, several "bents" of a single track bridge were heavily damaged.

25. April 2, 2005- Union Pacific (UP), Wellington, Missouri

An eastward mixed freight train, derailed 18 cars. As a result of the derailment, one car landed on a bridge and could have toppled into a small tributary.

26. April 3, 2005- Amtrak (ATK), Home Valley, Washington

A westward ATK passenger train, operating at 60 mph, derailed its locomotive and all 4 of its cars. As a result of the derailment, two passengers were seriously injured and a number of others were transported to a local hospital, treated and released.

27. April 3, 2005- Amtrak (ATK), Lyons, New York

A westward ATK passenger train, derailed the last three coaches of the train. As a result of the derailment, no passengers were injured and all were transported to their destinations.

28. April 5, 2005- Union Pacific (UP), Rialto, California
A northward mixed freight train, operating at an estimated speed of 25 mph, derailed 13 cars, among them, were several hazardous material tanks. As a result of the derailment, a precautionary evacuation was ordered.
29. April 5, 2005- Union Pacific (UP), Dixon, Illinois
A westward mixed freight train operating at 3 mph, struck the rear of a standing westward mixed freight train. As a result of the collision, both crew members suffered non-life threatening injuries when they jumped from the leading locomotive.
30. April 6, 2005- BNSF Railway (BNSF/Canadian Pacific (CP), St. Paul, Minnesota
An eastward BNSF mixed freight train, derailed 6 cars, which struck the side of a passing westward CP train, derailling an additional 12 cars from the passing CP train.
31. April 9, 2005- BNSF Railway (BNSF), Pueblo, Colorado
An eastward mixed freight train, operating at 12 mph, derailed 28 cars.
32. April 10, 2005- Canadian Pacific (CP), Columbus, Wisconsin
A freight train, operating at an unknown speed, struck a vehicle at a highway rail grade crossing equipped with passive warning devices. As a result of the collision, four people died.
33. April 13, 2005- Union Pacific (UP), Blairstown, Iowa
An eastward mixed freight train operating at 28 mph, struck the rear of a standing eastward loaded coal train. As a result of the collision, all three crew members suffered non-life threatening injuries.
34. April 14, 2005- Union Pacific (UP), Solon Springs, Wisconsin
A southward mixed freight train, operating at a speed of 45 mph, derailed 12 cars. As a result of the derailment, a fire ensued and a precautionary evacuation was ordered.
35. April 21, 2005- CSX Transportation (CSX), Waycross, Georgia
A yard switcher, operating at 6 mph and in an easterly direction, struck the side of a westward mixed freight train operating at 10 mph, while in the process of pulling into the yard. As a result of the collision, 13 cars of the road train and 2 locomotives on the yard switcher were derailed.
36. April 21, 2005- Union Pacific (UP), Tyrone, Oklahoma
An eastward mixed freight train, operating at a speed of 70 mph, derailed 35 cars. As a result of the derailment, automobile traffic was detoured away from a nearby highway.
37. April 28, 2005- Montana Rail Link (MRL), Helena, Montana
An eastward mixed freight train, operating at a speed of 22 mph, derailed 30 cars.

38. May 2, 2005- Union Pacific (UP), North Bend, Nebraska

An eastward coal train operating at 16 mph, struck the rear of a standing eastward coal train. As a result of the collision, 6 cars and two locomotives derailed and both crewmembers of the striking train were transported to the hospital.

39. May 3, 2005- Union Pacific (UP), Galt, Illinois

An eastward mixed freight train operating at 44 mph, derailed 31 cars. As a result of the derailment, a double track railroad bridge spanning Elcorn Creek was destroyed.

40. May 5, 2005- BNSF Railway (BNSF), Casselton, North Dakota

A westward mixed freight train, operating at 40 mph, derailed 25 cars. As a result of the derailment, a contractor, operating a weed sprayer on the adjacent track was hurt when the derailed cars crushed his equipment.

41. May 10, 2005- Heber Valley Railroad (HVRX), Heber, Utah

A westward (scenic) passenger train stalled while enroute from Heber Yard and while stopped, was struck in the rear by an empty, free rolling passenger car. As a result of the collision, the rear car of the passenger train derailed, four passengers were hurt and an on-board service crewmember was injured. The free rolling passenger car had been set out of the train at Heber yard and began its 4.3 mile roll shortly after the passenger train had departed.

42. May 12, 2005- BNSF Railway (BNSF), Hannibal, Missouri

A freight train, operating at an unknown speed (maximum speed is 25 mph), struck a bus at a highway rail grade crossing equipped with active warning devices. As a result of the collision, a number of children and adults were hurt.

43. May 15, 2005- Union Pacific (UP), Bill, Wyoming

A coal train, operating at 18 mph, derailed 28 cars. As a result of the derailment, a double track railroad bridge spanning Elcorn Creek was destroyed.

44. May 20, 2005- Union Pacific (UP), Owyhee, Idaho

A intermodal freight train, operating at 64 mph, derailed 36 cars.

45. May 30, 2005- Canadian National(CN), Mikoma, Mississippi

A freight train, operating at 50 mph, struck a van at a highway rail grade crossing equipped with active warning devices. As a result of the collision, three state inmates and the guard who was transporting them to a work site died.

46. May 30, 2005- CSX Transportation (CSX), Cumberland, Maryland

An RCL yard switcher, operating at 4 mph and in an easterly direction, lost the transmission signal, went into emergency and broke a coupler knuckle. As a result, the trailing 62 cars rolled free until they struck a train being made up for departure. The collision resulted in a total of 17 cars being derailed.

47. June 3, 2005- BNSF Railway (BNSF), Memphis, Tennessee

A southward RCL yard switcher, operating at 5 mph, became uncoupled and the cars struck the side of another RCL yard switcher. As a result of the collision, 8 cars were derailed.

48. June 20, 2005- Norfolk Southern (NS), Galilee, Pennsylvania

An eastward mixed freight train, operating at an unknown speed, struck the rear of another eastward standing freight train. As the result of the derailment, the leading locomotive derailed and a diesel spill ensued.

49. June 24, 2005- BNSF Railway (BNSF), Hoxie, Arkansas

A northward mixed freight train, operating at 54 mph, derailed 25 cars and 3 locomotives. As a result of the derailment, 2 local highways were closed by emergency responders.

50. June 25, 2005- BNSF Railway (BNSF), Gypsum, Colorado

An eastward loaded coal train, while pulling away from a siding, after meeting and Amtrak train and operating at 23 mph, derailed 18 cars. As a result of the derailment, spilled coal landed on the driveway of a nearby ranch but did not reach the river.

51. June 26, 2005- CSX Transportation (CSX), Emison, Indiana

A southward mixed freight train, operating at an unknown speed, derailed 19 cars.

52. June 28, 2005- Kansas City Southern (KCS), Dixon, Mississippi

A westward train, operating at an unknown speed, struck the head end of an eastward train operating at an unknown speed and on the same track as the opposing train. As a result of the collision, 5 railroad employees were injured, a small fire ensued and a total of 27 cars were derailed.

53. July 2, 2005- BNSF Railway (BNSF), Verona, Missouri

An eastward mixed freight train, operating at 20 mph, derailed 23 cars.

54. July 10, 2005- Canadian National(CN), Anding, Mississippi

A northward mixed freight train, operating at an unknown speed, collided with the head end of a southward mixed freight train. As a result of the collision, equipment derailed, a fire ensued, and all four crewmembers were killed.

55. July 14, 2005- Union Pacific (UP), Ogallah, Kansas

A M of W Tamper machine operating over a highway rail grade crossing that was equipped with an active warning system, struck or was struck by an automobile. As a result of the collision, one person died and one was critically injured.

56. July 30, 2005- BNSF Railway (BNSF), Kingman, Arizona
An eastward mixed freight train, operating at an unknown speed, collided with the rear car of a standing eastward mixed freight train. As a result of the collision, equipment derailed but none of the crewmembers were seriously injured.
57. July 31, 2005- Dakota, Minnesota & Eastern (DM&E), Pierre, South Dakota
An eastward mixed freight train, operating at 20 mph, derailed 23 cars.
58. August 1, 2005- Norfolk Southern (NS), Danville, Pennsylvania
An eastward mixed freight train, operating at an estimated speed of 40 mph, derailed 26 cars.
59. August 2, 2005- Union Pacific (UP), Thrall, Texas
An intermodal freight train, operating at 44 mph, derailed 29 cars.
60. August 2, 2005- Amtrak(ATK)/Norfolk Southern (NS), Raliegh, North Carolina
An eastward ATK train, operating at 48 mph, struck a dump truck and, as a result, derailed the locomotive and all six cars. The two people in the truck died and a few passengers and crew members reported minor injuries.
61. August 4, 2005- BNSF Railway (BNSF), Belton, Montana
A westward freight train operating at an estimated 3 mph, struck the side of an eastward freight train operating at an estimated speed of 20 mph.
62. August 5, 2005- Amtrak(ATK)/Union Pacific (UP), Somis, California
A southward ATK train, operating at 60 mph, struck a dump truck and, as a result, derailed the lead truck of the cab car. The two people in the truck and a few passengers and crew members were transported to a local medical center.
63. August 6, 2005- Napa Valley Railroad (NVRr), St. Helena, California
A southward excursion passenger train, operating at 11 mph, became uncoupled and, as a result, the two sections collided with each other. A number of railroad employees and passengers were taken to a local hospital.
64. August 8, 2005- Union Pacific (UP), Pocatello, Idaho
An eastward RCL yard switcher, operating at 5 mph, derailed 9 cars. As a result of the derailment, another train movement, operating on an adjacent track derailed 2 cars when it was struck by derailed equipment from the original derailment.
65. August 17, 2005- BNSF Railway (BNSF), Oriva, Wyoming
An eastward unit coal train, operating at 24 mph, struck the rear of a standing eastward coal train.

66. August 18, 2005- CSX Transportation (CSX), Falkville, Alabama

A southward freight train, operating at an estimated 47 mph, struck an ambulance at Piney Grove road. As a result of the collision, the driver and passenger of the ambulance were killed.

67. August 19, 2005- Kansas & Oklahoma Railroad (KO), Nickerson, Kansas

An eastward freight train, operating at an estimated 25 mph, struck a standing cut of cars located on a siding in TWC dark territory.

68. August 20, 2005- Union Pacific (UP), Heber, California

An eastward freight train, operating at an estimated 25 mph, struck a standing cut of cars located in a small yard after diverging through a hand operated switch in TWC dark territory.

69. August 26, 2005- BNSF Railway (BNSF), Blacktail, Montana

A westward grain train, operating at an estimated 24 mph, derailed the last 21 cars in their train.

70. August 27, 2005- BNSF Railway (BNSF), Bear, Nebraska

An eastward unit coal train, operating at 48 mph, derailed 39 cars.

71. August 28, 2005- Norfolk Southern (NS), Shannon, West Virginia

An eastward coal train, operating at an estimated 24 mph, derailed 3 locomotives and 19 cars.

72. August 28, 2005- Indiana & Ohio Railway (IORY), Cincinnati, Ohio

A rail car, loaded with Styrene Monomer heated up to a point where an evacuation was ordered, schools and roads were closed and emergency responders took 24 hours to stabilize the car.

73. August 30, 2005- Union Pacific (UP), Clyman, Wisconsin

An engineering department railroad worker was making a delivery of material to a highway rail grade crossing improvement job site when his truck was hit by a train. The employee was killed.

74. September 6, 2005- BNSF Railway (BNSF), Esperanza, California

An eastward train, making a set off, collided with standing cars. As a result, commuter operations were disrupted.

75. September 7, 2005- BNSF Railway (BNSF), Mesler, Missouri

While proceeding through a siding, a southward BNSF train, operating at 27 mph, struck the side of a passing Union Pacific train.

76. September 10, 2005- Union Pacific (UP), Hanna, Wyoming

A westward coal train, operating at 50 mph, derailed 40 cars.

77. September 13, 2005- Union Pacific (UP), Gibbon, Nebraska

An eastward coal train, operating at 50 mph, derailed 25 cars.

78. September 15, 2005- Union Pacific (UP), Shepherd, Texas
A southward freight train, operating at 37 mph, collided head on with a standing northward freight train located on the siding. As a result of the collision a total of 4 locomotives and 17 cars derailed, a precautionary evacuation was ordered and one employee was fatally injured.
79. September 17, 2005- Northeastern Illinois Regional Commuter Rail(NIRC), Chicago, Ill.
A northward METRA train, operating at 69 mph, derailed its entire train. As a result of the derailment, there were a number of injuries and one passenger died.
80. September 22, 2005- CSX Transportation (CSX), Boykins, Virginia
A southward rock train and another rock train coming North, collided head on. As a result of the collision a total of 2 locomotives and 4 cars derailed and six employees were injured.
81. September 22, 2005- CSX Transportation (CSX), Buffalo, New York
An RCL, shoving cars West into a yard track, raked the side of another movement operating at the West end of the yard. As a result of the collision, 3 cars derailed. One of the derailed cars contained a cask designed to carry radioactive waste.
82. September 25, 2005- Union Pacific (UP), Sibyl, Arizona
A westward freight train, struck the rear of a standing westward freight train. As a result of the collision, 4 articulated cars on the standing train derailed.
83. September 28, 2005- Amtrak(ATK), New London, Connecticut
A southward ATK Acela train, operating at 60 mph, struck an automobile at a highway rail crossing at grade. As a result, the driver was killed and the passenger was transported to a local medical center.
84. October 1, 2005- CSX Transportation (CSX), Rocky Mount, North Carolina
An RCL, shoving cars into a yard track, struck the side of another RCL movement operating on another track within the yard.
85. October 1, 2005- Union Pacific (UP), Kit Carson, Colorado
An eastward coal train, operating at 38 mph, derailed 20 cars.
86. October 3, 2005- CSX Transportation (CSX), Evansville, Indiana
A southward coal train, operating in 40 mph territory, struck the utility bucket on a contractor's vehicle. As a result of the collision, the contractor in the bucket was killed, another contractor was injured and the locomotive engineer was injured.
87. October 3, 2005- BNSF Railway (BNSF), Erie Junction, North Dakota
An eastward grain train, operating at an estimated 45 mph, derailed 32 cars.

88. October 5, 2005- Union Pacific (UP), Broadwater, Nebraska
An eastward coal train, operating at 48 mph, derailed 20 cars.
89. October 13, 2005- Norfolk Southern (NS), Davisboro, Georgia
An eastward freight train, operating at 49 mph territory, derailed 24 cars.
90. October 15, 2005- Union Pacific (UP), Texarkana, Arkansas
A westward freight train, struck the rear of a standing westward freight train. As a result of the collision, tank cars derailed and a fire ensued.
91. October 18, 2005- CSX Transportation (CSX), Hamlet, North Carolina
A northward freight train, operating at 23 mph, struck the side of a southward train that was crossing over in front of the northward train.
92. October 21, 2005- Norfolk Southern (NS), Millbury, Ohio
A westward train, operating in 19 mph territory, collided head on with a stopped eastward train. As a result, a total of 2 locomotives and 4 cars derailed and one employee was injured.
93. October 22, 2005- BNSF Railway (BNSF), Worden, Montana
A westward grain train, operating at an estimated 49 mph, derailed 43 cars.
94. October 24, 2005- Union Pacific (UP), Lorraine, Wyoming
A westward freight train, struck the rear of a standing westward freight train. As a result of the collision, derailed cars struck a standing train on an adjacent track.
95. October 26, 2005- Wheeling & Lake Erie (WE), Navarre, Ohio
A northward freight train, operating at an estimated 15 mph, derailed 8 cars. As a result of the derailment, a hazardous material car leaked some product.
96. October 27, 2005- Canadian National (CN), Cherokee, Iowa
An eastward freight train, operating at an estimated 30 mph, derailed 20 cars.
97. October 31, 2005- CSX Transportation (CSX), Mauk, Georgia
A northward freight train struck the rear of a standing freight train. As a result of the collision, 2 locomotives and 8 cars were derailed and 2 crewmen were injured.
98. November 1, 2005- CSX Transportation (CSX), Oneida, New York
An eastward freight train struck the rear of a high-rail geometry test truck as it was clearing the main track.
99. November 4, 2005- Union Pacific (UP), Riga, Kansas
An eastward coal train, operating at 50 mph, derailed 43 cars.

100. November 5, 2005- BNSF Railway (BNSF), Ft. Morgan, Colorado
A westward coal train, operating at 40 mph, derailed 23 cars.
101. November 10, 2005- BNSF Railway (BNSF), Ft. Madison, Iowa
An eastward train, operating on the siding at 10 mph, struck the side of a westward train passing on the main track and operating at 25 mph. As a result, 2 locomotives and 2 intermodal cars were derailed and 3 employees were injured.
102. November 13, 2005- Tri-County Commuter Rail Authority(TCCX)/CSX Transportation(CSX) Pompano Beach, Florida
A southward TCCX commuter train, operating at 77 mph, struck a SUV at a highway rail grade crossing equipped with an active warning system. As a result, the truck driver and both his passengers were killed.
103. November 20, 2005- Norfolk Southern (NS), Bluestone, West Virginia
An eastward freight train, operating at 20 mph, derailed 20 cars.
104. November 19, 2005- CSX Transportation (CSX), Central Square, New York
A southward freight train, operating at 38 mph, derailed 29 cars and 1 locomotive. As a result of the derailment, one school canceled classes and State Route 11 was closed.
105. November 23, 2005- Northeastern Ill. Reg. Commuter Rail(NIRC), Elmwood Park, Ill.
A westward METRA train, operating at 68 mph, struck several automobiles that were fouling the main track at a highway rail grade crossing. As a result, several vehicle drivers were injured.
106. November 24, 2005-Union Pacific (UP)/Norfolk Southern (NS), Momence, Illinois
A UP freight train and a NS freight train collided at an interlocking. As a result, a total of 39 cars and 5 locomotives were derailed and 3 employees were injured.
107. December 6, 2005- Norfolk Southern (NS), Canton, Ohio
A westward freight train, operating in 50 mph territory, struck an automobile at a highway rail crossing at grade. As a result, the driver and the passenger were transported to a local medical center.
108. December 14, 2005- Amtrak(ATK)/Union Pacific (UP), Cisco, Utah
An eastward ATK train, operating in 70 mph territory, struck a tractor-trailer truck at a highway rail crossing at grade. As a result, the lead locomotive derailed, the truck driver was killed and two ATK passengers were injured.
109. December 22, 2005- Norfolk Southern (NS), Reynolds, Georgia
A northward freight train, operating at 34 mph, derailed 25 cars.

110. December 22, 2005- Union Pacific (UP), Lane, Kansas

A southward coal train, operating at 12 mph, struck the side of a northward coal train that was operating at 14 mph.

Federal Railroad Administration
Office of Safety - Headquarters
Accident/Incident Investigation Assignments
January - December, 2006

1. January 5, 2006- Virginia Railway Express (VRE)/CSX Transportation, Quantico, Virginia
A northward commuter train, operating at 45 mph, derailed the rear 3 cars and the pushing locomotive. As a result of the derailment, a few passengers and one crewmember sustained injuries.
2. January 16, 2006- Norfolk Southern (NS), York, Alabama
A northward mixed freight train, operating in 50 mph territory, derailed 28 cars. As a result of the derailment, a number of ATK trains were cancelled.
3. January 17, 2006- CSX Transportation (CSX), New Castle, Pennsylvania
One mixed freight train, shoving East, in New Castle yard, collided into the side of another train operating on the West end of the yard. As a result of the collision, 5 cars derailed, 2 of which contained sulfuric acid. A precautionary evacuation was ordered.
4. January 18, 2006- Norfolk Southern (NS), Lincoln, Alabama
An eastward train, struck the rear of another eastward train as it was clearing into the siding. As the result of the collision, 3 employees on the striking train were injured, 3 locomotives and 10 rail cars were derailed and a precautionary evacuation was ordered.
5. January 25, 2006- BNSF Railway (BNSF), Jasper, Alabama
A mixed freight train, operating at an estimated 20 mph, derailed 31 cars.
6. January 26, 2006- Amtrak(ATK)/CSX Transportation, Garrison, Kentucky
A westward passenger train, operating at an estimated 5 mph, derailed one car.
7. January 26, 2006- Norfolk Southern (NS), Salamanca, New York
A northward coal train, operating on the Western New York & Pennsylvania Railroad, derailed 28 cars.
8. January 28, 2006- Amtrak(ATK)/BNSF Railway (BNSF), Sprague, Washington
An eastward passenger train, operating at 40 mph, derailed one locomotive and 4 cars. As a result of the derailment, a few passengers and two crewmembers were injured.
9. January 31, 2006- Union Pacific (UP), Timpson, Texas
A southward mixed freight train, operating at 25 mph, derailed 37 cars.
10. February 10, 2006- Norfolk Southern (NS), Montgomery, Virginia
An eastward mixed freight train, operating at 30 mph, derailed 20 cars.

11. February 16, 2006- Union Pacific (UP), Ranger, Texas
An eastward mixed freight train, operating at 55 mph, struck a vehicle at a highway rail grade crossing. As a result of the collision, all four passengers in the vehicle were killed.
12. February 22, 2006- Amtrak (ATK)/CSX Transportation (CSX), Boca Raton, Florida
A northward passenger train, operating at 60 mph, struck a vehicle at a highway rail grade crossing equipped with active warning devices. As a result of the collision, the two passengers in the vehicle were injured and the warning devices are the focus of the investigation.
13. March 7, 2006- Union Pacific (UP), Yukon, Oklahoma
An eastward mixed freight train, operating at 47 mph, struck a dump truck at a highway rail grade crossing. As a result of the collision, the truck driver was killed, 3 crewmembers were injured and 25 cars were derailed.
14. March 17, 2006- CSX Transportation (CSX), Laurens, South Carolina
A locomotive, operating South at 20 mph, struck a hi-rail vehicle authorized by the train dispatcher to occupy the main track. As a result of the collision, the hi-rail truck was shoved into another piece of on-track equipment destroying it as well.
15. March 19, 2006- BNSF Railway (BNSF), Rozet, Wyoming
An unattended four locomotive consist, moving at 18 mph, struck the head end of a standing train. As a result of the collision, one of the locomotives derailed and two crewmen on the standing train were injured.
16. March 19, 2006- BNSF Railway (BNSF), Ismay, Montana
A coal train, operating at 35 mph, derailed 29 cars.
17. March 20, 2006- Union Pacific (UP), Longview, Texas
A northward RCL yard switcher, operating at 10 mph, struck the side of another yard switcher operating South at 4 mph and at the opposite end of the Yard. As a result of the collision, 5 cars and one locomotive derailed.
18. March 24, 2006- Norfolk Southern (NS), Keytesville, Missouri
A westward mixed freight train, operating at an estimated 45 mph, struck a "low boy" trailer that had become hung up at a highway rail grade crossing equipped with active warning devices. As a result of the collision, both crewmen were injured, both locomotives and 14 loaded auto rack cars were derailed.
19. April 5, 2006- Union Pacific (UP), Higginson, Arkansas
A northward intermodal train, operating in 70 mph territory, struck a tractor trailer at a highway rail grade crossing equipped with active warning devices. As a result of the collision, both crewmen were injured, 6 cars were derailed and they in turn, derailed 6 more and a locomotive on another train standing on an adjacent track.

20. April 6, 2006- Long Island Railroad (LIRR), Jamaica Station, Queens, New York
Two eastward passenger trains were operating at an estimated 7 mph and pulling off two adjacent station tracks when they collided with each other. As a result of the collision, 1 car was derailed and a passenger was taken to the hospital.
21. April 8, 2006- BNSF Railway (BNSF), Berea, Nebraska
An eastward loaded coal train, operating at 50 mph, derailed 38 cars which were located toward the middle of the train.
22. April 13, 2006- BNSF Railway (BNSF), Granada, Colorado
A westward freight train, operating at an estimated 49 mph, struck a van at a highway rail grade crossing equipped with passive warning devices. As a result of the collision, six (6) of the seven (7) occupants of the van were killed.
23. April 22, 2006- CSX Transportation (CSX), Chillicothe, Ohio
A northward freight train, preparing to stop, discovered 2 cars derailed toward the rear of the train. Additionally, the cars were burning, an evacuation was ordered and state route 23 was closed.
24. April 22, 2006- CSX Transportation (CSX), Richmond, Virginia
A southward loaded coal train, operating at 4 mph, derailed 11 cars while passing over the James River bridge. As a result of the derailment, a portion of the bridge collapsed near the city's flood wall at the sewer diversion plant.
25. April 27, 2006- Union Pacific (UP), Elm Creek, Nebraska
An eastward loaded coal train, operating at 38 mph, derailed 2 locomotives and 29 cars.
26. April 28, 2006- Alabama Gulf Coast (AGR), Linden, Alabama
A southward freight train, operating at 16 mph, struck a cut of cars standing on the siding. As a result of the collision, 2 cars derailed.
27. May 3, 2006- Norfolk Southern (NS), Radebaugh, Pennsylvania
A westward freight train, operating at an unknown speed, derailed 30 cars.
28. May 11, 2006- Union Pacific (UP), Dalton, Illinois
A northward RCL yard switcher, shoving 32 cars at an estimated 4 mph, collided with a standing freight train. As a result of the collision, the crew of the standing freight train were treated and released and the leading car of the shove move derailed.
29. May 14, 2006- Union Pacific (UP), Claremore, Oklahoma
An northward mixed freight train, operating at 52 mph, struck a vehicle at a highway rail grade crossing. As a result of the collision, three of the five occupants in the vehicle were killed.

30. May 17, 2006- BNSF Railway (BNSF), Lakeside, Nebraska
An eastward loaded coal train, operating at 23 mph, struck the rear of a standing loaded coal train. As a result of the collision, two crewmen on the striking train were injured.
31. May 19, 2006- BNSF Railway (BNSF), Preston, Oklahoma
A southward mixed freight train, operating at 23 mph, derailed 29 cars.
32. May 20, 2006- Union Pacific (UP), Montpelier, Idaho
A westward container train, operating at 49 mph, derailed 41 cars. As a result of the derailment, four containers (two cars) derailed into the Bear River.
33. May 22, 2006- Union Pacific (UP), Queen Creek, Arizona
A southward mixed freight train, operating at 46 mph, struck a pick-up truck at a highway rail grade crossing equipped with active warning devices. As a result of the collision, the three occupants of the truck were killed.
34. May 22, 2006- Norfolk Southern (NS), Loudon, Tennessee
A westward grain train, operating on a yard track at an estimated 6 mph, collided head on with a yard local, operating in the opposite direction on the same yard track at an estimated 12 mph. As a result of the collision, 2 locomotives and 2 cars were derailed.
35. May 25, 2006- Amtrak (ATK)/Allegheny Valley Railroad (AVR), Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania
An eastward passenger train, stopped to receive and discharge passengers at the station, was struck in the rear by an AVR freight train operating at 5 mph. As a result of the collision, there were a few passenger injuries.
36. May 25, 2006- CSX Transportation (CSX), Osark, Alabama
A southward mixed freight train, operating at an unknown speed, struck the side of another southward mixed freight train that had not cleared the fouling point at the north switch at Dillard siding. As a result of the collision, the rear two cars of the standing train derailed and the crewmembers on the leading locomotive of the striking train were injured.
37. May 27, 2006- BNSF Railway (BNSF), Cassoday, Kansas
A westward mixed freight train, operating at 65 mph, struck a pick-up truck at a highway rail grade crossing equipped with passive warning devices. As a result of the collision, all three of the occupants in the vehicle were killed.
38. May 27, 2006- Union Pacific (UP), San Antonio, Texas
An eastward mixed freight train, operating at 16 mph, struck a westward mixed freight train, operating at 9 mph, while moving in opposite directions on the same track. As a result of the collision, there were injuries to some crew members and 5 cars derailed.
39. May 28, 2006- Union Pacific (UP), Mojave, California
A northward mixed freight train, operating at 42 mph, derailed 11 cars.

40. May 30, 2006- Amtrak(ATK)/Norfolk Southern (NS), Jackson, Michigan
An eastward passenger train, operating at an unknown speed, struck a dump truck at a private highway rail grade crossing equipped with passive warning devices. As a result of the collision, the driver was killed, a fire ensued, and a few train passengers were treated at the scene for smoke inhalation.
41. May 30, 2006- CSX Transportation (CSX), Fonda, New York
A westward mixed freight train, operating at an unknown speed, derailed 26 cars. As a result of the derailment, both main tracks were blocked and ATK passenger service through this area was suspended for more than 24 hours.
42. June 1, 2006- Norfolk Southern (NS), LeMoyne, Alabama
A southward mixed freight train, operating at an estimated 15 mph, struck a tractor trailer hauling sulfuric acid that had pulled in front of the train at a highway rail grade crossing. As a result of the collision, all 3 crewmen and the truck driver were injured, one locomotive and 12 cars were derailed and a fire ensued.
43. June 6, 2006- Union Pacific (UP), Montpelier, Idaho
A westward mixed freight train, operating at 39 mph, derailed 21 cars. As a result of the derailment, four cars came to rest in a pond.
44. June 8, 2006- BNSF Railway (BNSF), Lockwood, Missouri
A southward mixed freight train, operating at 46 mph, derailed 42 cars.
45. June 9, 2006- BNSF Railway (BNSF), Grants, New Mexico
An eastward mixed freight train, operating at 56 mph, derailed 7 container cars carrying 53 container units. As a result of the derailment, both main tracks were blocked and ATK passengers were bused around the scene.
46. June 10, 2006- Union Pacific (UP), Morrison, Missouri
An eastward mixed freight train, operating at an estimated 22 mph, derailed 21 cars. As a result of the derailment, both main tracks were blocked and ATK passengers were bused around the scene.
47. June 9, 2006- Norfolk Southern (NS), Moscow, Tennessee
A westward mixed freight train, operating at 34 mph, struck a vehicle at a highway rail grade crossing equipped with passive warning devices. As a result of the collision, 3 of the 4 occupants of the vehicle were killed and the other was seriously injured.

48. June 14, 2006- BNSF Railway (BNSF), Kismet, California

An eastward mixed freight train, operating at 22 mph, struck the head-end of an opposing westward unit train operating at an estimated speed of 30 mph. As a result of the collision, all crew members of both trains were taken to a local hospital with injuries, a total of 7 locomotives and 17 cars, including 1 hazardous material and 1 tank car derailed. ATK passengers were bussed around the scene.

49. June 14, 2006- Amtrak (ATK), Bayview, Maryland

A northward train, operating at 35 mph, struck an ATK engineering department under-cutter machine. As a result of the collision, the locomotive and both cars derailed upright and in line. The 3 person crew of the northward train were treated and released.

50. June 14, 2006- Amtrak (ATK)/BNSF Railway(BNSF), Boutte, Louisiana

A westward passenger train, operating at 69 mph, struck a tractor trailer at a highway rail grade crossing equipped with passive warning devices. As a result of the collision, 3 passengers sustained injuries and the lead locomotive was damaged.

51. June 17, 2006- Norfolk Southern (NS)/CSX Transportation(CSX), Chicago, Illinois

A westward NS mixed freight train, operating at 8 mph, struck the side of an eastward UP mixed freight train operating at 11 mph which was operating on the CSX main line No. 2. As a result of the collision, the striking locomotive derailed as did 4 cars on the struck train.

52. June 20, 2006- Norfolk Southern (NS), Sweetwater, Tennessee

An eastward freight train, operating at 42 mph, derailed 21 cars. As a result of the derailment, 4 hazardous material tank cars were involved in the derailment and a precautionary evacuation of one-half mile was ordered.

53. June 21, 2006- Northern Illinois Regional Commuter/Canadian National(CN) Lemont, IL

A passenger train, operating at 79 mph, struck a tractor trailer at a highway rail grade crossing equipped with passive warning devices. As a result of the collision, the lead METRA locomotive was derailed, METRA service was delayed 6 hours and the passengers were bussed to their final destination.

54. June 25, 2006- CSX Transportation (CSX), Baltimore, Maryland

A westward mixed freight train, operating at 16 mph, struck the rear of a standing mixed freight train. As a result of the collision, one locomotive on the striking train and 3 cars on the standing train were derailed.

55. June 26, 2006- Amtrak (ATK)/Canadian National(CN) Arcola, Louisiana

A northward passenger train, operating at 60 mph, encountered a thermal mis-alignment (sun-kink). The train was brought to a safe stop avoiding derailment. However, because of the rough ride through the area, a number of passengers received injuries and some of them were treated at a local hospital.

56. June 27, 2006- BNSF Railway (BNSF)/Union Pacific (UP), Houston, Texas

An eastward BNSF mixed freight train, operating at 26 mph, derailed 12 cars. As a result of the derailment, 3 hazardous material tank cars were involved in the derailment, and one of which was found to be leaking.

57. June 27, 2006- CSX Transportation (CSX), Saint Jacobs, Illinois

An eastward mixed freight train, operating at an unknown speed, derailed 20 cars. As a result of the derailment, an evacuation was ordered.

58. June 30, 2006- Norfolk Southern (NS), Keating, Pennsylvania

A southward mixed freight train, operating at 73 mph, derailed 31 cars. As a result of the derailment, sodium hydroxide leaked from some of the derailed tank cars requiring an evacuation. Additionally, some of the product escaped into Portage Creek.

59. June 30, 2006- Canadian Pacific (CP), Elbow Lake, Minnesota

A westward mixed freight train, operating at an estimated 40 mph, derailed 27 cars.

60. July 1, 2006- BNSF Railway (BNSF), Marshall, Texas

A northward mixed freight train, operating at 27 mph, struck the rear of a standing mixed freight train. As the result of the collision one locomotive and 3 cars on the rear of the struck train were derailed.

61. July 1, 2006- Southeastern Pa. Transportation Authority (SEPTA), Willow Grove, Pa.

A southward commuter train, operating at 39 mph, struck the head end of a stopped northward commuter train at 11 mph. As a result of the collision, 4 commuter cars derailed and a number of passengers and crewmen were taken to the hospital.

62. July 3, 2006- Amtrak (ATK)/BNSF Railway(BNSF), Castle Rock, Washington

A southward passenger train, operating at 74 mph, struck an automobile at a private highway rail grade crossing equipped with passive warning devices. As a result of the collision, 4 occupants of the vehicle were killed.

63. July 14, 2006- Union Pacific (UP), Klamath Falls, Oregon

A local switcher, shoving cars south out of the BNSF yard, passed through a mis-aligned crossover switch and struck the side of a southward UP train moving on the main track. As a result of the collision, 2 cars derailed.

64. July 16, 2006- BNSF Railway (BNSF), McKenzie, North Dakota

A westward grain train, operating at an unknown speed, derailed 19 cars.

65. July 17, 2006- Union Pacific (UP), St. Marys Kansas

An eastward loaded coal train, operating at 40 mph, derailed 29 cars. As a result of the derailment, a 15 foot ballast deck bridge was destroyed.

66. July 17, 2006- CSX Transportation (CSX), Valdosta, Georgia

A northward mixed freight train, operating at 21 mph, struck a loaded log truck at a highway rail grade crossing equipped with an active warning system. As the result of the collision, two occupants of the log truck were injured.

67. July 27, 2006- Union Pacific (UP), Champlin, Utah

An eastward mixed freight train, operating at 27 mph, struck the side of a westward mixed freight train that had yet to clear the main track at the switch providing access to the siding. As a result of the collision, 2 locomotives and 3 cars were derailed.

68. July 27, 2006- Central Oregon & Pacific Rail Corp (CORP), Roseburg, Oregon

A southward mixed freight train, operating at 8 mph, derailed 25 cars.

69. July 27, 2006- Union Pacific (UP), Chiloquin, Oregon

A southward mixed freight train, operating at 30 mph, derailed 37 cars.

70. August 4, 2006- CSX Transportation (CSX), Grovetown, Georgia

A northward mixed freight train, operating at 4 mph, struck the head end of a standing southward train holding the main track between the switches of the siding. As the result of the collision, two locomotives and 3 rail cars on the striking train were derailed.

71. August 10, 2006- Paducah & Louisville (PAL), Calvert City, Kentucky

A southward mixed freight train, operating at 21 mph, struck the rear of a standing mixed freight train. As the result of the collision three locomotive and 2 cars were derailed and 2 employees were hurt.

72. August 12, 2006- Union Pacific (UP), Bradford, Iowa

A southward mixed freight train, operating at 16 mph, struck the rear of a standing mixed freight train. As the result of the collision two locomotive and 5 cars were derailed.

73. August 16, 2006- CSX Transportation (CSX), Rome, New York

A westward mixed freight train, operating at 46 mph, struck an automobile at a highway rail crossing at grade equipped with passive warning devices. As the result of the collision, one occupant died at the scene and the other four were taken to a local hospital.

74. August 22, 2006- Florida East Coast (FEC), Fort Lauderdale, Florida

A northward mixed freight train, operating at 37 mph, derailed 30 cars. As a result of the derailment, a number of derailed cars struck a stopped train standing on the adjacent track.

75. August 26, 2006- Union Pacific (UP), Redlands, California

A westward 9 locomotive consist, operating at 81 mph, derailed 7 of the 9 locomotives. As a result of the derailment, one of the locomotives caught fire and both crew members were hurt.

76. September 8, 2006- Amtrak (ATK), Wayne, Michigan
A westward passenger train, operating at an estimated 57 mph, struck an automobile at a private highway rail grade crossing equipped with passive warning devices. As a result of the collision, the lone occupant of the car, an Norfolk Southern conductor, was severely injured.
77. September 19, 2006- BNSF Railway (BNSF), Crawford, Texas
A northward mixed freight train, operating at 52 mph, derailed 25 cars. As a result of the derailment, a tank car began leaking product and an evacuation ensued.
78. October 3, 2006- BNSF Railway (BNSF), Sherman, Mississippi
A southward loaded coal train, operating at 42 mph, derailed 43 cars.
79. October 9, 2006- BNSF Railway (BNSF), Cactus, Texas
A southward loaded coal train, operating at 36 mph, entered a siding in non-signal territory and struck cars that were sitting there. As a result of the collision, 26 cars and two locomotives were derailed, both crewmen were injured and damages are estimated to exceed \$1,000,000.
80. October 18, 2006- BNSF Railway (BNSF), Abbott, Nebraska
An eastward coal train, operating at 48 mph, derailed 31 cars. As the result of the derailment, a ballast deck bridge sustained damage to its walkways and ballast retainers.
81. October 20, 2006- Norfolk Southern (NS), New Brighton, Pennsylvania
An eastward loaded unit ethanol train, operating at 23 mph, derailed 31 cars. As the result of the derailment, a ballast deck bridge sustained damage, five cars settled in the Beaver River, some of the rail cars burned for more than 12 hours and approximately 100 people were evacuated.
82. October 21, 2006- BNSF Railway (BNSF), St. Genevieve, Missouri
A northward mixed freight train, operating at 40 mph, derailed one locomotive and 21 cars. Damages are estimated to exceed \$1,000,000.
83. October 23, 2006- Mass. Bay Commuter Rail (MBCR), Franklin, Massachusetts
An eastward passenger train, operating at 25 mph, struck a "lowboy" trailer at a highway rail crossing at grade equipped with active warning devices. As the result of the collision, an excavator, being carried by the "lowboy" severely damaged the leading car, two cars derailed and several passengers and railroad employees were injured.
84. October 24, 2006- CSX Transportation (CSX), Catlettsburg, Kentucky
A westward lite engine consist, operating at 5 mph, and an eastward lite engine consist operating at 4 mph collided head-on. As the result of the collision, one locomotive derailed and three crewmen were injured.
85. October 27, 2006- BNSF Railway (BNSF), Salem, Nebraska
An eastward mixed freight train, operating at 49 mph, derailed 21 cars.

86. October 27, 2006- BNSF Railway (BNSF), Miltonvale, Kansas
An eastward loaded grain train, operating at 35 mph, derailed 30 cars.
87. November 8, 2006- Union Pacific (UP), Kismet, Kansas
A westward lite engine consist, operating at 68 mph, struck an automobile at a highway rail grade crossing equipped with passive warning devices. As a result of the collision, the three occupants of the vehicle were killed.
88. November 9, 2006- Union Pacific (UP), Midas, California
A westward M of W rail grinder equipment consist was unable to stop its movement, got up to 50 mph on a 2.6% grade, and derailed the lead unit and 9 cars. As a result of the derailment, 2 on-board contract employees were killed.
89. November 13, 2006- Montana Rail Link (MRL), Trout Creek, Montana
A westward loaded unit coal train, operating at an estimated 45 mph, derailed 21 cars while passing over bridge No. 57 which spans the Clark Fork River. As a result of the derailment one car landed in the river.
90. November 20, 2006- Canadian National (CN), Marris, Illinois
A northward empty coal train, operating at 57 mph, struck an automobile (SUV) at a highway rail grade crossing equipped with active warning devices. As a result of the collision, three occupants of the vehicle were killed.
91. November 22, 2006- Union Pacific (UP)/BNSF/Norfolk Southern (NS), Memphis, TN.
An eastward UP freight train, operating at an estimated 16 mph, and a westward BNSF freight train that was stopped, collided head-on while operating under the direction of NS personnel. As a result of the collision, 5 cars were derailed and two UP crewmen were injured.
92. November 29, 2006- BNSF Railway (BNSF), Sadler, Missouri
An eastward loaded coal train, operating at 50 mph, derailed 40 cars.
93. November 30, 2006- CSX Transportation (CSX), North Baltimore, Ohio
A westward mixed freight train, operating at 47 mph, derailed 13 cars into a passing eastward unit coal train operating at 10 mph, derailling 5 coal cars. As a result of the derailment, 3 nearby automobiles were damaged and 3 citizens were injured.
94. December 2, 2006- Saginaw Bay Southern (SBS), Saginaw, Michigan
A northward freight train derailed two cars, stopped on a highway rail grade crossing equipped with an active warning system and was struck by a highway vehicle. As a result of the collision, the driver of the highway vehicle was taken to the hospital.
95. December 4, 2006- Union Pacific (UP), Zeigler, Illinois
A northward mixed freight train, operating at approximately 35 mph, derailed 2 locomotives and 21 cars. As a result of the derailment, an evacuation was ordered.

96. December 5, 2006- Union Pacific (UP), Hodge, Missouri
An eastward unit coal train, operating at 41 mph, derailed 40 cars.
97. December 7, 2006- Norfolk Southern (NS), Bloomsburg, Pennsylvania
A southward freight train, operating at 40 mph, derailed 21 cars.
98. December 8, 2006- BNSF Railway (BNSF), Casey, Oklahoma
An eastward intermodal train, operating at 35 mph, derailed 1 locomotive and 7 cars.
99. December 15, 2006- CSX Transportation (CSX), Woodstock, Maryland
An eastward mixed freight train, operating at 23 mph, derailed 22 cars including 4 HM tank cars.
100. December 15, 2006- Union Pacific (UP), Marlin, Texas
A northward unit powered cement train, operating at an estimated 50 mph, derailed 31 cars.
101. December 16, 2006- Norfolk Southern (NS), Chattanooga, Tennessee
An eastward mixed freight train, operating at an unknown speed, derailed 33 cars.
102. December 22, 2006- Union Pacific (UP), Peck, Kansas
A northward train, operating at 20 mph, collided into the side of a stopped southward rock train that had not, as yet, cleared into the siding. As a result of the collision, 2 locomotives and one car were derailed and there were injuries to the striking train's crew.

Federal Railroad Administration
Office of Safety - Headquarters
Accident/Incident Investigation Assignments
January - October, 2007

1. January 9, 2007- Mass. Bay Transit Authority (MBTA), Woburn, Massachusetts
A southward commuter train, operating at an estimated 60 mph, entered an out-of-service area on signal indication. As a result, 2 track employees were struck and killed.
2. January 15, 2007- CSX Transportation (CSX), Calla, Kentucky
A cut-of-cars rolled out of a yard, traveled approximately 27 miles and struck the locomotive consist of a southward train that had positioned its locomotives at a location in which the run-a-way cars could be stopped.
3. January 16, 2007- CSX Transportation (CSX), Brooks, Kentucky
A northward mixed freight train, operating in 60 mph territory, derailed a number of cars including at least 3 tank cars. As a result of the derailment, a fire ensued, an evacuation was ordered and I-65 was closed.
4. January 17, 2007- Union Pacific (UP), Wagoner, Oklahoma
A loaded coal train operating at an unknown speed, derailed 14 cars. As a result of the derailment, a trestle bridge collapsed and at least 6 coal cars spilled into the Arkansas River.
5. January 30, 2007- BNSF Railway (BNSF), Columbus, Kansas
A mixed freight train, operating at 2 mph during a switching operation, derailed 24 cars.
6. February 8, 2007- CSX Transportation (CSX), Thorsby, Alabama
A northward mixed freight train, operating at an estimated 45 mph, struck a van at a highway rail grade crossing equipped with passive warning devices. As a result of the collision, 4 of the 8 passengers in the van were killed.
7. February 14, 2007- Norfolk Southern (NS)/CR Shared Assets (CRSH), Plainfield, NJ
A group of track workers were cleaning switches on the Port Reading Branch which is non-signaled territory. They finished, put their track equipment away on a spur track and gave up their authority to be on the main track. Later, an NS eastward unit ethanol train, operating at 26 mph, noticed the open switch, initiated an emergency application of the train brakes and entered the spur track. As a result, the locomotives and one car derailed, the track equipment was destroyed and a customer's building was damaged.
8. February 18, 2007- Norfolk Southern (NS), Walnut Hill, Illinois
A westward mixed freight train, operating at 48 mph, struck an automobile at a highway rail grade crossing equipped with active warning devices. As a result of the collision, all 3 occupants of the vehicle were killed.

9. February 21, 2007- Norfolk Southern (NS), Goshen, Indiana
An eastward mixed freight train, operating at 37 mph, passed a signal and collided with the side of a westward train that was crossing over from one main track to another. As a result of the collision, 12 cars were derailed from the middle of the westward train and both locomotives and 6 cars from the eastward train were also derailed.
10. March 4, 2007- Union Pacific (UP), Chandler, Texas
A westward mixed freight train, operating at 48 mph, derailed 28 cars. As a result of the derailment, a fire ensued and damages are estimated to exceed \$1.32 million.
11. March 7, 2007- Canadian National (CN)/Metra, Chicago, Illinois
CN locomotives rolled away from the crew using them and collided with the leading end of a Metra commuter train that was operating on ATK's main track No. 4. As a result of the collision, one locomotive and one passenger car derailed, the engineer of the Metra train was injured and a number of passengers aboard the Metra train were taken to area hospitals for treatment.
12. March 8, 2007- Kansas City Southern (KCS), Hattiesburg, Mississippi
A southward mixed freight train, operating at 11 mph, derailed 11 cars. As a result of the derailment, two tank cars released product, a few people were treated and released and an evacuation was ordered.
13. March 12, 2007- CSX Transportation (CSX), Oneida, New York
An eastward mixed freight train, operating at an estimated 50 mph, derailed 28 cars including 22 tank cars. As a result of the derailment, a fire ensued, an evacuation was ordered, ATK trains were re-routed and the NY Throughway was closed.
14. April 6, 2007- Missouri & Northern Arkansas (MNA), Bergman, Arkansas
A northward empty coal train, operating at an estimated 10 mph, struck the side of a southward mixed freight train that had begun to enter a siding and stopped. As a result of the collision, two locomotives from the striking train and 5 cars from the struck train were derailed.
15. April 7, 2007- BNSF Railway (BNSF), Columbus, Kansas
A southward loaded coal train, operating at 39 mph, derailed 34 cars. As a result of the derailment, damages to track and equipment will exceed \$2.6 million.
16. April 7, 2007- Union Pacific (UP), Independence, Missouri
A westward loaded intermodal train, operating at 20 mph, struck the rear of a stopped westward empty coal train. As a result of the collision, a number of cars were derailed.
17. April 8, 2007- BNSF Railway (BNSF), Degraw, Nebraska
An eastward loaded coal train, operating at an estimated 20 mph, derailed 20 cars. As a result of the derailment, there was damage to a railroad bridge.

18. April 8, 2007- Iowa Chicago & Eastern (ICE), Excelsior Springs, Missouri
A southward mixed freight train, operating at 37 mph, struck an automobile at a highway rail grade crossing equipped with active warning devices. As a result of the collision, all 3 occupants of the vehicle were killed.
19. April 8, 2007- Union Pacific (UP), Broadwater, Nebraska
An eastward loaded coal train, operating at an unknown speed, derailed 29 cars.
20. April 14, 2007- BNSF Railway (BNSF), Henry, Nebraska
An eastward loaded coal train, operating at 48 mph, derailed 27 cars.
21. April 23, 2007- Amtrak (ATK)/Canadian National (CN) Sledge, Mississippi
A southward ATK passenger train, operating at an unknown speed (79 max), struck a tractor trailer truck loaded with diesel fuel at a private highway rail grade crossing equipped with passive warning devices.
22. April 24, 2007- BNSF Railway (BNSF), Ashby, Nebraska
An eastward loaded coal train, operating at 46 mph, derailed 43 cars. As a result of the derailment, damages to track and equipment will exceed \$2.9 million.
23. April 25, 2007- BNSF Railway (BNSF), Orin, Wyoming
An eastward loaded coal train, operating at an estimated 45 mph, derailed 23 cars.
24. May 2, 2007- M&B Railroad (MNBR), Myrtlewood, Alabama
An eastward military train, operating at an estimated 5 mph, was traversing an open deck bridge when several spans failed. As a result, a portion of the bridge collapsed, both locomotives and three cars derailed and 5 people were hurt.
25. May 2, 2007- Amtrak (ATK)/Union Pacific Railroad (UP) Ontario, California
An eastward ATK passenger train, operating at 10 mph, derailed one locomotive and six cars while operating on Guasti siding.
26. May 8, 2007- Amtrak (ATK) Riverbank, California
A westward ATK passenger train, operating at 79 mph, struck a vehicle at a highway rail grade crossing equipped with an active warning system. As a result of the collision, 6 occupants of the vehicle were killed.
27. May 12, 2007- BNSF Railway (BNSF), Red Oak, Iowa
An eastward loaded coal train, operating at 52 mph, derailed 61 cars.
28. May 14, 2007- Southeastern Penn. Transit Authority (SEPTA) Philadelphia, Pennsylvania
A northward passenger train, operating at 3 mph, struck the rear of a stopped northward passenger train. As a result of the collision, a number of passengers were injured.

29. May 16, 2007- Union Pacific (UP)/BNSF, Du Pont, Washington
A southward freight train, operating at 38 mph, struck the side of a northward freight train as it was crossing over from one BNSF main track to another. As a result of the collision, a number of cars and three locomotives were derailed.
30. May 23, 2007- BNSF Railway (BNSF), Denver, Colorado
The crew of an RCL yard switcher cut away from 34 cars which subsequently rolled out of the track and into the head end of a standing train. The impact caused 4 cars to derail and destroyed two locomotives.
31. May 24, 2007- CSX Transportation (CSX), Perryville, Pennsylvania
A westward loaded intermodal train, operating at 17 mph, struck the rear of a stopped westward mixed freight train. As a result of the collision, a number of cars were derailed.
32. May 24, 2007- CSX Transportation (CSX), Castleberry, Alabama
A northward mixed freight train, operating at 50 mph, derailed 26 cars. As a result of the derailment, tank cars were damaged and an evacuation was ordered.
33. June 4, 2007- BNSF Railway (BNSF), Casco, Minnesota
An eastward loaded taconite train, operating at 45 mph, derailed 72 cars.
34. June 6, 2007- BNSF Railway (BNSF), Tower City, North Dakota
An eastward loaded coal train, operating at 50 mph, derailed 30 cars.
35. June 10, 2007- Union Pacific Railroad (UP), Groesbeck, Texas
A southward mixed freight train, operating at 40 mph, derailed 32 cars.
36. June 10, 2007- CSX Transportation (CSX), Campbellsburg, Kentucky
A southward loaded coil steel train, operating at 25 mph, derailed 31 cars.
37. June 14, 2007- Union Pacific Railroad (UP), Baytown, Texas
An eastward mixed freight train was struck by a highway vehicle at Archer Road grade crossing which is equipped with passive warning devices. As a result of the collision, 4 occupants of the vehicle were killed, 2 others were hurt, and a loaded LPG tank car was damaged.
38. June 21, 2007- CSX Transportation (CSX), Buchanan, Virginia
An eastward loaded coal train, operating at 26 mph, derailed 25 cars.
39. June 21, 2007- Metro North Commuter Railroad (MNCW), Milford, Connecticut
Passenger Train No. 1926 derailed its locomotive and all three of its passenger cars when it was unexpectedly diverted through a mis-aligned hand operated switch and toward a siding. As a result of the improperly lined switch and subsequent derailment, a number of passengers were hurt.

40. June 26, 2007- Union Pacific Railroad (UP), Tama, Iowa

An eastward loaded coal train, operating at 26 mph, derailed 43 cars in double track territory. As a result of the derailment, an intermodal train, operating west on the adjacent track, struck the pile of derailed coal cars at 25 mph.

41. July 6, 2007- Kansas City Southern (KCS), Hartford, Illinois

A northward FRA Track Geometry Car (TGC) operating at an estimated 55 mph was struck by a UP Boom Truck at Canal Road grade crossing which is equipped with passive warning devices. As a result of the collision, the TGC derailed, 2 occupants of the TGC and the driver of the Boom Truck vehicle were injured.

42. July 16, 2007- Amtrak (ATK), Lakeland, Florida

A northward passenger train, operating at an estimated speed of 79 mph, struck a highway vehicle at Walbash Street grade crossing which is equipped with active warning devices. As a result of the collision, 4 occupants of the vehicle were killed.

43. July 17, 2007- Amtrak (ATK), Plant City, Florida

A northward passenger train, operating at an estimated speed of 79 mph, struck a tractor trailer truck at a private highway rail grade crossing equipped with passive warning devices. As a result of the collision, the truck driver was killed, a few passenger train riders were injured and most of the train (both locomotives & 9 cars) derailed.

44. July 19, 2007- BNSF Railway (BNSF), Sikeston, Missouri

A northward mixed freight train, operating at 25 mph, derailed 2 engines and eleven cars. As a result of the derailment, tank cars were damaged and a precautionary evacuation was ordered.

45. July 19, 2007- Amtrak (ATK) Shafter, California

A northward ATK passenger train, operating at 79 mph, struck a vehicle at a highway rail grade crossing equipped with an active warning system. As a result of the collision, the ATK locomotive and two passenger cars derailed and the engineer was shaken up.

46. July 23, 2007- CSX Transportation (CSX), Watertown, New York

A maintenance-of-way (MOW) work equipment train was struck by a cut of cars that had run away from U.S. Army personnel charged with loading the flat cars at Fort Drum. As a result of the collision, a MOW crane caught fire, route 81 was closed and a precautionary evacuation was ordered.

47. July 23, 2007- Norfolk Southern (NS), Thomasville, Alabama

A northward maintenance-of-way tamping machine, struck a loaded log truck at a private grade crossing equipped with active warning devices. As a result of the collision, the driver of the truck and the tamper operator sustained non-life threatening injuries.

48. July 26, 2007- CSX Transportation (CSX), Lumberton, North Carolina

A westward mixed freight train, operating at an unknown speed, struck a vehicle at a highway rail grade crossing equipped with passive warning devices. As a result of the collision, one occupant of the vehicle was killed and four were seriously injured.

49. August 9, 2007- Kansas City Southern (KCS), Agua Dulce, Texas

A westward mixed freight train, operating at 46 mph struck a Ford F250 Crew Cab truck at a highway-rail grade crossing equipped with active warning devices. As a result of the collision, 3 occupants of the vehicle were killed and 2 others were seriously injured.

50. August 22, 2007- Amtrak (ATK) Houston, Texas

A westward ATK passenger train, operating at an estimated speed of 49 mph, struck a vehicle at a highway rail grade crossing equipped with an active warning system. As a result of the collision, three occupants of the vehicle were killed.

51. September 19, 2007- New Mexico Railrunner Corp (NMRX) Los Charvez, New Mexico

A westward NMRX passenger train, operating at an estimated speed of 79 mph, struck a vehicle at a private highway rail grade crossing equipped with a passive warning system. As a result of the collision, the driver of the vehicle was killed.

52. September 25, 2007- Union Pacific (UP)/Utah Railway (UTAH), Helper, Utah

A westward UP coal train, operating at an unknown speed, derailed ten cars. As a result of the derailment, the cars struck a passing eastward UTAH empty coal train and derailed 17 additional cars.

53. September 26, 2007- Iowa Chicago & Eastern (ICE), Monona, Iowa

An eastward mixed freight train, operating at an estimated 25 mph, derailed 27 cars. As a result of the derailment, one small trestle bridge was destroyed and another was heavily damaged.

54. September 26, 2007- Norfolk Southern (NS), Columbus, Ohio

A northward RCL yard switcher struck the side of a cut of cars being pulled into another track. As a result of the collision, a total of 1 locomotive and 4 cars were derailed.

55. October 1, 2007- Amtrak (ATK)/Union Pacific (UP) Martinez, California

An eastward ATK passenger train, operating at an estimated speed of 40 mph, derailed the trailing locomotive. As a result of the derailment, the lead locomotive of a standing UP freight train was struck by the ATK locomotive and it, in turn, derailed.

56. October 1, 2007- Norfolk Southern (NS)/Alabama Gulf Coast (AGR), Boligee, Alabama

A northward NS mixed freight train, operating at 38 mph, struck the side of a standing AGR mixed freight train. As a result of the collision, 5 cars were derailed and no injuries reported.

57. October 10, 2007- CSX Transportation (CSX), Painesville, Ohio

An eastward mixed freight train, operating at an estimated speed of 47 mph, derailed 31 cars. As a result of the derailment, a fire ensued, an evacuation was ordered and several roads were closed

58. October 12, 2007- BNSF Railway (BNSF), Motley, Minnesota

A westward unit coal train, operating at 38 mph, passed through a switch in the reversed position, entered the siding and derailed 2 locomotives and 9 cars. As a result of the derailment, 8 additional cars standing on another track were struck by the derailing cars and also derailed.

59. October 13, 2007- Northern Indiana Commuter Trans. Dist.(NICD) Michigan City, Michigan

A westward commuter train operating at an estimated 20 mph, struck the side of an empty passenger rail car fouling the main line. As a result of the collision, one car in the standing cut of cars derailed and damages were expected to exceed \$1M.

60. October 18, 2007- BNSF Railway (BNSF), Kansas City, Kansas

A westward four unit lite locomotive movement, operating at an estimated speed of 8 mph, diverged through a switch and struck the side of a moving cut of cars. As a result of the collision, the leading locomotive on the striking equipment and 5 of the struck cars derailed.

61. October 18, 2007- Port Terminal Assoc.(PTRA)/BNSF Railway (BNSF), Houston, Texas

A southward two unit PTRA lite locomotive movement, operating at an estimated speed of 7 mph, struck the side of a standing BNSF train. As a result of the collision, the leading locomotive on the striking equipment derailed.

62. October 18, 2007- DeQueen & Eastern (DQE)/Union Pacific Railroad (UP) Wright City, OK

A westward DQE mixed freight train, operating on UP trackage and at an unknown speed, was struck by a loaded log truck at a highway rail grade crossing equipped with active warning devices. As a result of the collision, the driver of the vehicle was killed, all three crewmembers were taken to the hospital and 3 locomotives along with the head car of the train were derailed.

63. October 20, 2007- BNSF Railway (BNSF), Imboden, Arkansas

A southward loaded unit coal train, operating at an estimated 40 mph, derailed the rear (DPU) locomotive in the train. The derailed, but upright locomotive, traveled over 5 miles. As the derailed locomotive passed over a switch providing access to a siding, it struck and derailed 2 locomotives and 6 cars on a standing empty northward train that was awaiting a re-crew.

64. October 20, 2007- CSX Transportation (CSX), Grand Ridge, Florida

A southward mixed freight train, operating at an estimated speed of 50 mph, derailed all 5 locomotives and 28 cars. As a result of the derailment, a precautionary evacuation was ordered.

65. October 29, 2007- BNSF Railway (BNSF), Clara City, Minnesota

A southward mixed freight train had entered a siding and while on the siding, had derailed a number of cars on the rear of the train. Subsequently, a northward passing train, operating at an estimated 35 mph, struck the derailed cars that fouled the main track. As a result, a total of 82 cars and 2 locomotives were derailed and an evacuation was ordered.

66. October 29, 2007- BNSF Railway (BNSF), Ellinor, Kansas

An eastward mixed freight train, operating at 43 mph, derailed 25 cars.



THE SECRETARY OF TRANSPORTATION
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20590

September 26, 2006

The Honorable Ted Stevens
Chairman
Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation
United States Senate
Washington, DC 20510

Dear Chairman ~~Stevens~~: CHAIRMAN,

I am pleased to submit a report by the Federal Railroad Administration (FRA) on the *Impact of Blocked Highway/Rail Grade Crossings on Emergency Response Services*, in response to Section 9004 of Public Law 109-59. The report examines the causes, solutions, and examples of projects that reduce the impact of blocked crossings.

The study was conducted in consultation with State and local government officials, including transportation planners and emergency responders. These groups and others provided significant input into the report, particularly with respect to real-world approaches to resolving blocked crossing problems.

Identical letters have been sent to the Co-Chairman of the Senate Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation, and the Chairman and Ranking Member of the House Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

Sincerely yours,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Maria Cino", is written over the typed name.

Maria Cino
Acting Secretary

Enclosure



THE SECRETARY OF TRANSPORTATION
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20590

September 26, 2006

The Honorable Daniel K. Inouye
Co-Chairman
Committee on Commerce,
Science, and Transportation
United States Senate
Washington, DC 20510

Dear Senator Inouye: ~~SENATOR,~~

I am pleased to submit a report by the Federal Railroad Administration (FRA) on the *Impact of Blocked Highway/Rail Grade Crossings on Emergency Response Services*, in response to Section 9004 of Public Law 109-59. The report examines the causes, solutions, and examples of projects that reduce the impact of blocked crossings.

The study was conducted in consultation with State and local government officials, including transportation planners and emergency responders. These groups and others provided significant input into the report, particularly with respect to real-world approaches to resolving blocked crossing problems.

Identical letters have been sent to the Chairman of the Senate Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation, and the Chairman and Ranking Member of the House Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

Sincerely yours,

A handwritten signature in cursive script, reading "Maria Cino", is written over the typed name.

Maria Cino
Acting Secretary

Enclosure



THE SECRETARY OF TRANSPORTATION
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20590

September 26, 2006

The Honorable Don Young
Chairman
Committee on Transportation and
Infrastructure
U.S. House of Representatives
Washington, DC 20515

Dear Chairman Young: ~~CHAIRMAN,~~

I am pleased to submit a report by the Federal Railroad Administration (FRA) on the *Impact of Blocked Highway/Rail Grade Crossings on Emergency Response Services*, in response to Section 9004 of Public Law 109-59. The report examines the causes, solutions and examples of projects that reduce the impact of blocked crossings.

The study was conducted in consultation with State and local government officials, including transportation planners and emergency responders. These groups and others provided significant input into the report, particularly with respect to real-world approaches to resolving blocked crossing problems.

An identical letter has been sent to the Ranking Member of the House Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, and Chairman and Co-Chairman of the Senate Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

Sincerely yours,

A handwritten signature in cursive script, reading 'Maria Cino', is written over the typed name.

Maria Cino
Acting Secretary

Enclosure



THE SECRETARY OF TRANSPORTATION
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20590

September 26, 2006

The Honorable James L. Oberstar
Ranking Member
Committee on Transportation and
Infrastructure
U.S. House of Representatives
Washington, DC 20515

Dear Congressman Oberstar: ~~CONGRESSMAN,~~

I am pleased to submit a report by the Federal Railroad Administration (FRA) on the *Impact of Blocked Highway/Rail Grade Crossings on Emergency Response Services*, in response to Section 9004 of Public Law 109-59. The report examines the causes, solutions and examples of projects that reduce the impact of blocked crossings.

The study was conducted in consultation with State and local government officials, including transportation planners and emergency responders. These groups and others provided significant input into the report, particularly with respect to real-world approaches to resolving blocked crossing problems.

Identical letters have been sent to the Chairman of the House Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, and the Chairman and Co-Chairman of the Senate Committee on Commerce, Science and Transportation.

Sincerely yours,

A handwritten signature in black ink, reading 'Maria Cino', is written over the typed name.

Maria Cino
Acting Secretary

Enclosure

**Impact of Blocked Highway/Rail Grade Crossings
On Emergency Response Services**

Federal Railroad Administration

August 2006

Report on the Impact of Blocked Highway-Railroad Grade Crossings on Emergency Response Services

Table of Contents

	Page
I. Executive Summary	3
II. Introduction	3
III. Methodology	4
IV. Scope of the Problem	5
A. Community Growth	6
B. Growth in Highway Traffic	6
C. Growth in Rail Traffic	7
V. Causes of Blocked Crossings	8
A. Moving Trains	8
B. Stopped Trains	10
C. Trains held in sidings	10
D. Yard and Switching Activities	13
E. Operational Problems	13
F. Summary	14
VI. Impacts on Emergency Response	15
VII. Possible Remediation Activities	15
A. Community Responses	15
B. Communication	17
C. Training	18
D. Railroad Operational Changes	18
F. Public Investments	19
1. Grade Separations	19
2. Rail Relocations	20
G. Private Investments	21
H. Technology	22
Conclusion	23
 Appendix I - Case Studies	 1
A. Comprehensive Solutions:	1
1. Reno, Nevada	1
2. Alameda Corridor	1
3. Alameda Corridor East	3
B. Grade Separations	3
1. Belen, New Mexico	3
2. Laredo, Texas	5
3. Chattanooga, Tennessee	8
C. Public/Private Investments	9
1. Greenville, North Carolina	9
2. Fayetteville, North Carolina	17

D.	Communications and Monitoring	19
1.	Houston, Texas	19
2.	Albany, Oregon	20
E.	Rail Relocation	22
1	Hidalgo County, Texas	22
2	Spokane, Washington	25
F.	Grade Separation, Line and Yard Relocation	26
	El Paso, Texas	26
	Zaragoza Road	26
	Doniphan Road	28
G.	Private Investments in Railroad Infrastructure	32
1	Hammond, Indiana	32
2	Eloy, Arizona	32
Appendix II - FRA Regional Grade Crossing Managers		34

I. Executive Summary

As directed by Congress in the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act; a Legacy for Users of 2005 (SAFETEA-LU), the Federal Railroad Administration (FRA) has prepared a report regarding the impacts of blocked highway-railroad grade crossings on emergency response providers.¹ In this report, FRA has identified the principal causes of blocked grade crossings.

While every minute can be precious in an emergency, crossings blocked for extended periods of time are a much greater problem than simply having to wait while a train passes through a crossing. A variety of railroad operational issues, described in this report, can lead to trains stopping in a position that blocks a crossing. Given the growth in both rail and highway traffic, it is likely that the problem of blocked crossings will increase in the future.

Railroads and communities around the country, working together, have crafted a number of solutions to the problem. These remedies range from grade separations, which solve the problem completely, to cooperative agreements with the railroads to notify emergency response personnel when a crossing is or may be blocked. Grade separations are expensive and generally are undertaken to address traffic problems caused by blocked crossings, although the advantages for emergency response are a factor in justifying such investments. Monitoring railroad operations, either with radars and cameras at crossings or through contact with the railroad, is much cheaper. When dispatchers are aware that a crossing is or will be blocked by a train, they can route emergency responders to alternative routes. Additionally, railroads have altered their operations in ways that reduce blockages, although often these changes increase railroad costs.

Communities are the best judges of the severity of the problem of blocked crossings. Working with the railroads, they can identify the most cost-effective solution. The existence of relatively inexpensive remedies should allow most communities to take the necessary steps to mitigate the problem.

Railroads must play a key role. They should actively work with communities to identify problems and propose possible remedies. Although railroads have only limited staffs available to work on community issues, this report found numerous examples of active railroad and community cooperation that resulted in projects or procedures to reduce the impact of blocked crossings.

II. Introduction

Section 9004 of SAFETEA-LU, "Report Regarding Impact on Public Safety of Train Travel in Communities without Grade Separation," requires the Secretary of the U.S.

¹ For the purpose of this report, highway-railroad grade crossing refers to any vehicular crossing of railroad tracks, including state and federal highways, county roads and city streets as well as private grade crossings.

Department of Transportation (DOT) to conduct a study of the impacts of blocked highway-railroad grade crossings on emergency response providers - ambulance, fire, and police services. The Federal Railroad Administration (FRA) has conducted this study for the Secretary, gathering information from State and local government officials, emergency responders, and the railroads.

This report describes the sources of the blocked highway-railroad grade crossing problem and reports on possible solutions. The report presents a number of case studies of communities that have experienced blocked grade crossings and solutions that have either been implemented or are in the process of being developed.

In the preparation of this report, FRA has received assistance from a number of entities, including our DOT partners, the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration (NHTSA) and the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA): a variety of state and local governments and several railroads. We thank them all for their assistance.

III. Methodology

There is no uniform national data collected on blocked crossings or on emergency responder delays. While some individual communities collect information on these subjects, there is no way to extrapolate these experiences into a national picture of delays. Therefore, the approach chosen was to contact those who had knowledge or experience in the area and build on that to create a report that explored the issue on the basis of those who actually dealt with it.

First, FRA sought to better understand the problem as seen by the emergency response community. Working with NHTSA, FRA sent a joint letter to state emergency response directors, soliciting input on their perception of the problem. This led to additional contacts in the emergency medical services (EMS) community, including mention of the study on various EMS-related websites. As a result, FRA received a large number of responses from police, fire, and rescue personnel throughout the country. Their experiences and concerns led to a better appreciation of what they faced and where those problems were most severe.

Additionally, the FRA's regional grade crossing managers, who deal daily with grade crossing safety concerns, were asked to provide any experiences and contacts they might have with regard to emergency response issues.² They provided valuable information on specific crossing concerns in a number of areas as well as identifying locations we might use for case studies.

State DOTs were contacted both to learn of problems and solutions as well as to get their views. They provided valuable contacts and information on the issue, including how state rail programs were working to eliminate or avoid such problems.

² FRA has regional grade crossing managers in each of its 8 regions. See Appendix II for their names and contact information.

Finally, FRA contacted the Class I railroads to learn of their view of the issue, and, in particular, how they were addressing blocked crossings. They provided much valuable information on their operations and on solutions they had identified.

Using the contacts developed, FRA followed up to learn more about what was the cause of blocked crossings and what solutions might be appropriate. The results of these efforts are summarized in the case studies in Appendix I.

The FRA then identified solutions proposed or implemented in various communities. Each community is best situated to evaluate how severely it views the situation and what efforts it is prepared to make, in cooperation with the railroads, to mitigate the problem. This report gives an idea of the wide range of solutions to be considered.

IV. Scope of the Problem

There are over 241,000 highway-railroad grade crossings in the U.S., 146,000 public and the rest private.³ Highway-railroad crossings are blocked when trains travel over or stop on track crossed by a highway. Trains may block crossings for only a limited time for a short passenger train traveling at a fairly high speed, or for hours after a grade crossing accident or a mechanical problem with a train. Blocked crossings are a problem for all highway users, but they can be a particularly serious problem for emergency responders. Emergency responders (emergency medical services, fire and police) need to reach their destinations as quickly as possible. An ambulance racing to a heart attack victim or an automobile accident may be delayed only a few minutes by a passing train, but even a few minutes is a very long time in an emergency. A fire engine forced to take another route because of a stopped train may arrive at a fire too late to prevent significant damage or even deaths or injuries. Delayed police response can lessen the chance to apprehend a criminal or prevent a more serious crime.

The problem is not simply trains moving through a grade crossing. Many areas reported problems with trains that stopped while blocking a crossing, sometimes for hours. There are a number of reasons for trains to block crossings and these factors also determine the length of time the crossing is blocked.

While there are no aggregate statistics on delays at crossings, blocked crossings have become a more contentious issue in recent years. This may be partly due to the expectation that emergency response will be quicker and therefore delays are less acceptable. But there are several national trends that may be leading to greater problems with blocked crossings.

³ These numbers are approximate, based on reports by state DOTs to FRA and other sources. In some cases, a railroad line may be abandoned, but the crossing is still counted. In other cases, a highway crossing may be closed, but still counted. New crossings, both public and private, are added all the time, making it difficult to have an exact number.

A. Community Growth


In many parts of the country, communities grew up around the railroad, which means the railroad often runs right through the middle of town. Grade separations in these towns are often resisted because of the density of development and the need to build ramps to any road bridge over the tracks. If these towns have emergency facilities only on one side of the railroad, the potential for blocked crossings will grow as the community grows, particularly if rail traffic is also growing.

As these towns spread out into suburbs, development leads to new roads and demands for additional grade crossings if there is no nearby grade-separated highway. This can result in new residential areas without direct grade separated access to emergency facilities.

B. Growth in Highway Traffic

Highway traffic has grown steadily. As Chart 1 indicates, the number of lane miles has grown much more slowly. This has led to increased traffic density on many of our roads and highways. With more highway traffic, blocked crossings inevitably lead to more delays for motorists. The ensuing congestion can further hamper emergency responders who are delayed by a train in a crossing. They must then make their way through the traffic resulting from blocked crossing.

Chart 1




Source: Federal Highway Administration, Highway Statistics, 2004

C. Growth in Rail Traffic

Like highway traffic, rail traffic has continued to grow. In 1980, railroads in the United States originated 1.492 billion tons of freight traffic. By 2004, that figure grew to 1.844 billion tons.⁴ The growth in rail traffic reflects changes in rail regulation and the growth of demand for rail transportation. After years of decline, the rail industry was partially deregulated by the Staggers Act in 1980. The railroad industry then entered a period of consolidation and restructuring that led to a decrease in track miles, increased railroad merger activity, and significant productivity improvements

Between 1980 and 2004, despite traffic growth, railroad track miles decreased considerably (see Chart 2). The result is that density – cars or trains per day for each mile of highway or track - has steadily grown. Grade separations have alleviated conflicts in some areas, but more trains and more vehicles at most crossings inevitably lead to highway delays – delays that can also delay emergency response times.

Chart 2




Source: Association of American Railroads, Railroad Facts, 2005 Edition, page 27, 45

The demand for rail services has meant more trains on those remaining miles. The increase in the number of trains on a line inevitably means more delays for highway users and emergency responders. Rail traffic growth has come primarily from two sources: intermodal freight and coal. The growth in intermodal freight traffic, particularly in

⁴ Association of American Railroads, Railroad Facts, 2005 Edition, page 28.

trains to and from the Ports of Los Angeles and Long Beach, has been phenomenal (see Chart 3). Coal traffic, the historic mainstay of the rail industry, has also been increasing rapidly. The relatively low price of coal for generating electricity, compared to natural gas and oil, has led many utilities to increase the use of coal where possible. Responding to legislation to reduce emissions, many utilities have switched to low-sulfur coal from the Powder River Basin in northeastern Wyoming and nearby areas. This coal is now being hauled to utilities in the south and east. These long hauls have increased traffic on a number of Midwestern rail lines.

Chart 3



Source: Association of American Railroads, Railroad Facts, 2005 Edition, page 26


V. Causes of Blocked Crossings

A. Moving Trains

Many freight trains today are over one mile long. At twenty miles an hour, such a train would take 3 minutes to clear a crossing. If the crossing has gates, those gates would go down before the train arrived and would not rise until the train had passed, perhaps adding another minute or two. With growing rail traffic handled over fewer rail lines, blockages due to passing trains are becoming more frequent in certain areas. There are a number of rail corridors with over 100 trains a day, and some with over 150. If, as a rough estimate, a given crossing has four trains an hour, it is inevitable that at some point the gates lowered for a passing train will remain down as another train approaches from the opposite direction, so crossings of busy lines might see delays of 10 or more minutes per occurrence, depending on train speed.

Rail freight traffic density is shown in Map 1. Forecasts by the U.S. DOT and DRI-WEFA (see AASHTO Bottom Line Report, Table 6, Page 56) indicate that freight traffic overall is likely to increase 57% between 2000 and 2020 while rail traffic is forecast to grow by 44% in the same period, leading to even greater density.

Map 1



As of July, 2006, oil had reached a price of \$78 a barrel, an increase of about 300% from the \$25 a barrel it sold for in 2000. If oil prices remain at current (or higher) levels, coal traffic from the Powder River Basin and other areas will grow rapidly. Additionally, continued economic growth will likely generate rapid growth in intermodal traffic from the ports.

Increases in train traffic coupled with increases in highway traffic will lead to more congestion related to highway-railroad grade crossings. It may also lead to problems in providing emergency services unless steps are taken to mitigate these problems.

B. Stopped Trains


The problem of blocked crossings due to passing trains, and sometimes multiple trains, is a serious problem in some limited areas. In many communities, however, the problem is due to stopped, rather than moving trains. Stopped trains might block a crossing for 15 minutes to several hours. The impact of a stopped train on emergency response can, of course, be very serious in cases of true emergency, particularly if no grade separated alternative is available nearby. The number of instances of blocked crossings due to stopped trains is probably increasing due to growth in rail traffic. There are a number of reasons, discussed below, that the growth in rail traffic and related congestion on the railroads may be causing more crossings to be blocked for extended periods.

1. Trains Held in Sidings

Railroad main lines are generally either double or single track. On single-track rail lines, passing sidings are used to allow two trains proceeding in opposite directions to pass (known as a “meet”) or to allow a faster train to overtake a slower train. On a single-track rail line, one train must always pull into a siding and then wait to allow an oncoming train to proceed or to allow a faster train to pass. Trains operating over a double-track rail line generally do not have to stop to allow oncoming trains to pass. Depending on the capability of the signaling system and the availability of crossover tracks between the two rail lines, on a double track rail line, faster trains can even overtake slower trains going in the same direction, if there is no oncoming train in the area.

As the Map 2 shows, most railroad mainlines in the U.S. are single track. As traffic grows, a single-track railroad can quickly become congested, resulting in trains stopped in sidings for sometimes hours.

Map 2



Source: Trains Magazine

Colored lines indicate double (or more) tracked rail lines

Consider a fairly common situation: a single track main line and passing sidings every few miles. In such cases, one train must pull into the passing siding and await an oncoming train. Depending on the spacing of sidings, the speed of the trains, and whether or not they are on schedule, the train pulling into the siding (typically a lower priority train) may have to wait for a considerable time before it is free to continue its journey. Trains, and consequently sidings, have been getting longer. Sidings are now almost always a mile or more in length. In many parts of the country, it is difficult to locate a siding more than a mile long in a place where it will not cross a road. Trying to locate a series of such sidings along a rail corridor without blocking a crossing is nearly impossible. At least one railroad interviewed for this study has stated that it has had difficulty locating sidings where they are needed in terms of railroad operations due to community opposition to extending a siding across a highway. Any vehicle using a grade crossing that crosses a rail line at a siding is probably going to face serious delays occasionally.

For example, on CSX's busy corridor between Chicago and Florida, sidings are being lengthened to 10,000 feet. The distance between sidings is being reduced from 30 to 15 miles. Entrance and exits speeds are being doubled to 30 mph. Improved signaling will allow meets and passes to take place more efficiently.⁵ These improvements, in addition to benefiting CSX's productivity, should have a positive impact on blocked crossings in the corridor, by reducing the time a train is stopped in a siding blocking a crossing.

To illustrate how long trains must sometimes remain in sidings in the course of normal operations, consider the situation just described, before improvements: sidings spaced 30 miles apart. A train arrives at the siding where a meet is to take place and pulls in. If the oncoming train is late, but has just passed the last siding between the trains, the stopped train would have to wait while the oncoming train covered the 30 miles between the sidings. That could easily mean the stopped train would stay on the siding for an hour or more, depending on the speed of the oncoming train. If that siding had a crossing, it would mean substantial delays for routine highway users but potentially critical delays for emergency response vehicles.

It also takes a considerable time for a stopped train to clear the siding and resume its journey after the oncoming train has passed. Among the factors that can determine the delays are powered or manual turnouts (switches) and the type of turnouts (higher or lower speed limits apply to different types of turnouts);⁶ the railroad signaling system; the grade, if any, that the train must ascend; and visibility. If a grade crossing has been located beyond the end of the crossing to avoid parked trains blocking the crossing, there could still be a blockage of 15 to 20 minutes while the train pulls out of the siding. If the turnouts are manual, the train crewmember must throw the switch to allow the parked train to pull out of the siding onto the mainline, wait while the train pulls through the turnout (manual switches typically have a 15 mph or less speed limit), then throw the switch to the through position. The train, after it clears the turnout must stop and wait while the crewmember walks the length of the train (maybe a mile or more) to climb into the locomotive. At this point, the train can resume its journey.

The problem is even worse in cases where a lower priority train pulls into a siding to allow an overtaking train going in the same direction to pass. In this case, depending on the signaling system, the train must wait until the overtaking train has proceeded through the next signal block so that the passed train has a clear signal to proceed.⁷

⁵ Railway Age, September 2005, page 16

⁶ These speed limits are determined by the angle that the turnout deviates from the tangent rail line. The sharper the angle, or the more quickly a train would be put in a new direction, the slower the speed limit

⁷ Signaled railroad lines are divided into blocks. Each block has a signal at the beginning of the block that tells the engineer to stop, proceed slowly such as to be able to stop at the next signal, or to proceed normally. Two trains are generally not permitted to occupy the same block, since there would be no signal to warn an overtaking train that there is another train in the block. Two trains may occupy the same block under certain conditions if there is no risk of collision. For example, a train may be allowed to proceed at a very low speed until it approaches a stopped train in the same block when congestion delays several trains at the same time. Block spacing depends on railroad policies, but in general a block cannot be smaller than the distance that would be required for a train to stop.

Visibility can also be an issue, requiring the train to enter a siding at a slow enough speed to stop if there is a problem. This is a factor if the signaling system is not able to indicate whether the siding (as opposed to the mainline) is clear.

2. Yard and Switching Activities

Railroads yards are used to sort cars from arriving trains into departing trains bound for the car's ultimate destination. Yards function in a manner somewhat similar to airline terminal "hubs." Yards also form "local" trains that pickup and deliver cars to area customers. These switching activities -- pulling a block of cars from one track, then pushing the cars onto another track -- can lead to blocked crossings. Increases in rail traffic and the growing length of individual trains have strained the capacity of rail yards to assemble and disassemble trains. Few rail yards have highway crossings, but since many yards are a mile or more long, they often have highway crossings just beyond the "throat" of the yard. (The throat is the beginning of the yard, where turnouts begin to provide access to the many sorting and storage tracks.) As trains are assembled from blocks of cars on individual tracks, the switching locomotives must pull strings of cars out of the yard to clear a turnout, then push the string onto a different track to connect with the next block of cars scheduled to be part of the train. Highway crossings just beyond the throats of rail yards can be blocked by the assembling of trains and the associated pulling into and out of the yard.

Arriving trains are usually routed into a "receiving yard." The road locomotives are uncoupled and switching locomotives disassemble the blocks of cars in the train and put them on tracks where they will await their next move, either directly to a customer in a local train or assembly into new trains. If more trains arrive in a given period than there is room in the receiving yard, the arriving trains may wait in sidings along the mainline before the yard or on the mainline itself. These waiting trains may block crossings if they must wait on segments of track with crossings. Often, delays resulting from yard congestion have caused trains to block these crossings for far more time than would result from a passing train.

Railroad switching -- where a train stops, backs up and drops off or picks up cars and pulls forward again -- can produce longer blockages than a passing train would cause. Usually, these moves are involved in serving customers directly, picking up or delivering cars. Such switching can also result if the track configuration requires partial disassembling of a train to accommodate limited track structure. (See Case Study C. i., Greenville, NC.)

3. Operational Problems

Highway-railroad grade crossings may be blocked by trains forced to stop for operational reasons. These include trains stopping for mechanical reasons, trains stopped because the crew has reached the hours of service limits and trains involved in grade crossing

accidents with highway vehicles⁸. In many of these cases, it may be several hours before the train can resume its journey.

Congestion on a railroad line often means delays for individual trains, as they wait in sidings for other trains to pass or are stopped on the mainline until room is found for them in a receiving yard. These delays can cause the train crew to reach its service limit under the hours of service rules. Railroad procedures generally call for the dispatcher to direct such crews to a siding where they can halt the train and await a relief crew. Dispatchers often attempt to place trains where they will not unduly impede highway traffic, but the key consideration is that they not block the railroad's mainline and that they are placed in a location where a relief crew, coming by van, can easily reach them by road. Local officials interviewed in this study noted at least some cases where crews have stopped trains blocking important crossings when they reached their hours of service limit, resulting in extended crossing blockages.

Trains, like highway vehicles, can experience mechanical problems that require the train to halt. For example, there are "hot box" detectors along many lines that sense when a rail car's wheel bearings have become too hot. Rather than continue on and experience a potentially catastrophic accident, it becomes necessary to stop the train and "set out" the car with an overheated bearing. This requires the train to stop at a point where there is a siding or other track, and leave the car there. Because of the need to find a satisfactory point to drop off the car, the train may stop and switch at a point where it blocks a crossing for a considerably longer time than would be the case if the train were just passing through.

Finally, train accidents, including grade crossing accidents, can lead to unplanned delays that can be extensive, if the train involved in the accident blocks crossings.

Railroads are aware that an emergency train stop can block crossings. Some railroads have a standing policy of notifying local police and emergency responders when a train blocks crossings in certain communities. Others have a policy of "breaking" a train when it would otherwise block a crossing for an extended period. "Breaking" a train refers to uncoupling a train and pulling the front part of the train forward until an interval is opened at the grade crossing between the front and back parts of the train.

C. Summary

It was impossible to quantify the various delays and types of problems nationally. Therefore, FRA identified communities that have reported problems and examined their experiences. Based on these discussions and discussions with the railroads, FRA found that crossings are blocked for a number of reasons. Trains passing through a grade crossing do cause delays and interfere with emergency response. Trains that stop while blocking a crossing are a more significant problem. FRA identified a number of causes

⁸ Federal Hours of Service rules govern the time train crews can remain on duty. If a train is delayed and the crew reaches its hours of service limits, the crew is required to halt the train.

for trains to stop in crossings, sometimes causing lengthy delays. Stopped trains appear to cause more concern to the emergency response community than passing trains. While crossings blocked by passing trains cause stressful delays, they are neither as dangerous nor as frustrating as being totally unable to reach the scene of an emergency due to a stopped train.

VI. Impacts on Emergency Response

Delays in emergency situations can have tragic consequences. Emergency responders can be delayed by many things: availability of units, highway traffic, dispatching delays or errors and weather. Delays due to highway-railroad crossings are no different in effect than delays due to other causes. In evaluating the impact of delays, we must consider the cost in terms of deterioration in expected outcome for ambulance patients, worsening of fire damage from delayed fire truck response, and reduced likelihood for apprehension of suspects from delayed police response. Additionally, delays prove very stressful to emergency responders and victims, which also is a cost to be considered. Unfortunately, it is very difficult to convert a delay in response into a quantifiable impact.

The FRA has reviewed anecdotal reports of problems resulting from delays in emergency response due to blocked highway-railroad crossings. However, it is not possible to estimate the costs or impacts of such delays nationally or locally without much more detailed information from communities than is available. The impacts on communities from delayed response due to blocked crossings, while sometimes severe, are less than the impacts of traffic delays and congestion caused by blocked crossings. Another way to look at it would be to say that in places where blocked crossings are seen as a problem – to traffic, to safety and to emergency response – emergency response delays may help to justify a grade separation or other major expenditure, but such delays are unlikely, by themselves, to justify major remediation measures except in special cases.

VII. Possible Remediation Activities

Finding solutions to blocked crossings requires first identifying the reasons for blockage. As described in this section, there are a large number of actions which might be taken to eliminate or ameliorate problems from blocked crossings. A community concerned with blocked crossings may want to consider several of these possible solutions. In addressing a blocked crossing issue, a community should always strive to work closely with the railroad, since in many cases a solution based on changes by the railroad may be the most cost-effective.

A. Community Responses

Although there are no Federal regulations regarding blocked crossings in general, FRA safety regulations do address standing (idling) trains that unnecessarily activate grade-crossing warning systems. These rules prohibit standing trains, locomotives, or other rail equipment from activating the warning systems at grade crossings unless the operations are part of normal train or switching movements. Some states and communities have

attempted to address blocked crossings through legal action. The issue of a State's authority to legislate or regulate blocked crossings is highly contentious and still being defined in the courts.

The railroads have on occasion mounted "preemption" defenses, citing FRA regulations and other Federal requirements (e.g., the former Federal Railroad Safety Act of 1970 (49 U.S.C. 20106) and the Interstate Commerce Commission Termination Act) that they feel take precedence over State laws. For example, to clear a crossing in compliance with a State provision, a railroad might have to adjust either the speed or the length of its train, both of which are governed by Federal regulations. Likewise, a railroad might not be able to complete required air-brake testing at certain locations where doing so would block a crossing in violation of a State provision. Where there is a conflict between the State law and Federal safety requirements, the courts will find the State law to be preempted and, thus, unenforceable.

A better approach, both for the community and freight transportation, is to establish a cooperative relationship between the parties. If the railroad and emergency responders (or the community) establish a good relationship, some relatively simple operational changes in railroad activities can do much to resolve blocked crossing problems. If both sides understand the position of the other, it is likely that a solution that at least partially resolves the problem can be reached. If the only answer is a major, long-term project (such as the Alameda Corridor East, see case studies), railroad-community cooperation is also essential. Working together, understanding each other's position and constraints, is the mechanism by which a solution that is mutually acceptable can best be achieved.

While many blocked crossings are the result of "legacy" infrastructure and development, some problems are the result of poor planning. State and local governments should consider the possible impact on emergency services from new highway-railroad crossings and new housing or commercial developments. For example, a major yard on the NS north-south line between Atlanta and Washington, DC/Harrisburg, PA is located in Linwood, NC. As traffic has grown, arriving trains often must wait on the mainline before there is room to proceed into the receiving yard. There is a road that crosses just beyond the beginning of the yard that provides access to a peninsula on a lake. The peninsula is undeveloped and is currently lightly used for recreational purposes (mostly hunting and fishing). The access road is frequently blocked for extended periods of time by stopped trains. There is no other access to the peninsula. A developer is proposing to build several hundred houses on the lakefront of the peninsula. North Carolina Department of Transportation (NCDOT) raised the issue of access to the county authorities, pointing out the safety issues. The developer and the governments have attempted to work out a solution to improve access but at this point it appears the issue of what, if any, access improvements will be built and who will pay for them will be settled in court. The ultimate outcome is unclear at this point, but thanks to the cooperation of the highway planning and rail sections of NCDOT, this issue was raised and will be resolved before the houses are constructed and hundreds of families are put at risk from being cut off from emergency services.

If grade crossing blockages cannot be reduced or ameliorated by any of the approaches that follow, communities can take steps to reduce impacts on their own. For example, communities may construct additional emergency response facilities or station emergency units on opposite sides of a railroad line, so the line need not block responders. In many larger cities, numerous response facilities greatly reduce the problem of blocked crossings because of the wide range of responder locations that can be accessed. However, in smaller communities, with few facilities, the cost of opening another fire or police station may be prohibitive. The locations that indicated to us that they had emergency response problems we found them to be mostly smaller towns and rural areas.

B. Communication

Improving communication between railroads and emergency responders can be an effective and relatively inexpensive solution. Communication systems, some of which do not require railroad participation, can alert EMS personnel to possible crossing closures from approaching trains and allow them to choose alternative routes, if necessary. This approach can be particularly effective if dispatchers are able to route emergency vehicles to open crossings or grade separated crossings before the vehicles have committed to a route that is blocked by a train.

Communication can include connecting the emergency response dispatchers by phone or radio to railroad dispatchers, as has been done in some cases. One approach that has been used is to have the railroad dispatcher inform the local EMS dispatcher or personnel when they will be blocking a crossing.

If the blockage may be lengthy or opening the crossing is critical because of some emergency, arrangements can be made to have the railroad establish a protocol to “break” a train so that it will not block a crossing. Federal Railroad Administration regulations require an air brake test before the train can be moved after it is recoupled, which means that the conductor must walk around the train to check the connections. With trains often more than a mile long, this can take significant time during which the crossing must be blocked. Breaking a train adds to railroad costs by delaying the train and must result in the crossing being blocked for up to an hour while the train is reassembled, but in certain areas it is an approach to be considered. At least one major railroad interviewed for this study has a policy of breaking trains when a blockage of more than 45 minutes is expected over most of the territory in which it operates.

A more sophisticated approach is the use of sensors near the highway-railroad grade crossing that detect an approaching train. The information on speed and location is then used by a central computer to estimate train speed and predict when a train will block a crossing. Different types of sensors are in use, including Doppler radar and magnetometers. Some systems also notify motorists of expected blockages through active signs. Examples of systems that predict train blockages of crossings include

Pomona, CA and Sugarland, TX. See Appendix I for more details. Pomona is described in A. 2 Alameda Corridor East and Sugarland is covered in D. 1. Houston.

C. Training

An important part of establishing cooperation and communication is an understanding of the requirements of both railroad and emergency response operations. One way to facilitate this understanding is through training courses such as those presented by Operation Lifesaver.⁹ These courses help acquaint emergency response personnel with railroad operations and clarify procedures for contacting railroad personnel in case of emergencies.

Most public grade crossings with flashing lights or gates have a number posted that emergency responders can use to contact the railroad in case there are problems with the crossing. While the primary function of these numbers is to alert railroad personnel of malfunctions in the crossing protective device or to warn of stalled vehicles on the crossing, contact with the railroad can allow the emergency responders to request that a stopped train be “broken” to allow passage of the emergency vehicles. Although it usually takes some time to “break” the train, this may be the best alternative in cases where there are no alternative access routes to the site of the emergency.

D. Railroad Operational Changes

Routine railroad operations may leave crossings blocked and create problems for emergency responders. Generally, railroads establish their operations so as to minimize their costs and provide service to their customers. Nonetheless, railroads and their dispatchers are often aware of crossings that are routinely blocked in the course of railroad operations. In some cases, railroads can alter their operations to minimize these impacts.

In some cases, long trains can regularly block crossings during the change of rail crews. Crew change points are places on the railroad where a crew that has completed its work assignment turns the train over to a replacement crew. This process takes some time during which the train remains stopped. In some cases, there is little alternative in terms of selecting points for crew change where there is less likelihood of blocking a crossing. However, if crew change points are a problem for emergency response and general traffic, communities should consult with the railroad about possible options. At least one railroad interviewed for this study indicated that it had moved crew change points to avoid blocking crossings.

⁹ Operation Lifesaver (OLI) is a non-profit public education program established to end collisions, deaths and injuries at places where roadways cross train tracks, and on railroad rights-of-way. Sponsored cooperatively by federal, state, and local government agencies, highway safety organizations, and the nation’s railroads, OLI provides free safety presentations to increase public safety around railroad tracks. State Coordinators can be found at http://www.oli.org/contact/contact_state.

Serving rail customers requires a number of rail moves to pick up and deliver cars at the customer's siding. This process can lead to regularly blocked crossings. If this is a problem, it is possible the process can be altered to minimize the length of blockages. For example, the railroad can avoid placing cars on a crossing, perhaps leaving them further up the track. Several railroads have reported that they have altered switching patterns at customer locations in an effort to reduce the time a crossing is blocked.

Longer trains may block crossings that were established when trains were generally shorter. Railroads have been increasing train length because longer trains have a lower operating cost per car than shorter trains. However, in cases where these longer trains regularly block crossings when stopped in sidings, it may be possible to negotiate with the railroad on limiting train length. At least one railroad has reduced train length in one area to minimize blocked crossings, although it raises the railroad's cost. On the other hand, shorter trains also mean more frequent trains, which can also cause community problems.

E. Public Investments

1. Grade Separations

The "gold standard" for eliminating possible delays in emergency response due to blocked crossings is grade separation. Building a highway overpass or underpass eliminates any delays from blocked crossings. Unfortunately, grade separations are expensive, typically costing several million dollars. Moreover, in many cases they are inappropriate, since the ramps can block homes and businesses located adjacent to the tracks. In some cases, the geography of the crossing can also make construction very difficult.

In many cases a proposal to provide a grade separation also involves closing some nearby crossings. The FRA advocates a "corridor approach" to grade crossing issues, looking at the risks of an entire corridor and often resulting in recommendations to provide a grade separation or two, closing some crossings and improving crossing protection at others. A corridor approach is also required for the implementation of a "quiet zone" within which train horns do not sound at crossings.¹⁰ Closing crossings is often contentious and may

¹⁰ "Quiet Zones" are permitted under FRA's Final Train Horn Rule, which became effective on June 24, 2005. The rule implemented a 1994 law mandating the use of the locomotive horn (or "whistle") at all public highway-rail grade crossings with certain exceptions. The rule pre-empted applicable state laws and related railroad operating rules requiring locomotive horns be sounded, and it also superseded the previously issued Interim Final Rule. Under the rule, communities have the choice to consider silencing train horns at highway-rail grade crossings based on meeting safety needs. The Final Rule provides for six types of quiet zones, ensures the involvement of state agencies and railroads in the quiet zone development process, gives communities credit for pre-existing safety warning devices at grade crossings and addresses other issues including pedestrian crossings within a quiet zone.

The Final Rule on the Use of Locomotive Horns at Highway-Rail Grade Crossings is available at the U.S. Department of Transportation Docket Management System web site at <http://dms.dot.gov/>

engender political opposition to a proposal that involves a grade separation and the closing of crossings many residents may see as more convenient.

Grade separations are generally funded by the States' DOT and local communities. Railroads are generally not legally required to contribute. Railroads maintain the crossings and so enjoy a reduction in costs when crossings are eliminated. They also perceive a reduction in liability and risk from crossing accidents. However, these gains are minor in terms of the cost of a grade separation, so railroads are usually only a limited partner in separation projects.

SAFETEA-LU reauthorized the Federal highway program in 2005. While it made several changes, it did continue to provide funding for highway-railway crossing safety. This program, section 1401 of SAFETEA-LU (also known as "the section 130 program") provides \$220 million a year for crossing safety. These funds are divided among the States to address problems at thousands of crossings. Because there so many projects competing for limited funding, States have difficulty supporting multi-million dollar grade separations.

Federal Highway Trust funds can generally be used to provide partial funding of grade separations. Depending on the status of the road or highway, grade separations can be funded from accounts such as the National Highway System and the Surface Transportation Program, although the demand for these funds for "regular" highway construction tends to leave little available for grade separations.

2. Rail Relocations

Where grade crossing issues affect an entire corridor rather than a single crossing, relocating the rail line is often proposed as a solution. Railroad lines may be relocated either vertically or horizontally - that is to say a rail line may be moved up or down to separate it vertically from surface streets, or the line may be moved horizontally to a new right-of-way. Relocation is usually extremely expensive. However, it can produce significant benefits in terms of reducing negative community impacts and improving safety. There have been very few rail relocation projects in recent years. Among the projects that have been completed are the Lafayette Railroad Relocation project in Lafayette, IN, which eliminated 41 grade crossings by relocating the rail line out of downtown and the Union Pacific's construction of a 5.4 mile double-track bypass around Hastings, NE in 1994. Brownsville, TX recently completed a project begun in 1973 to relocate in-city rail yards and deactivate 79 of the city's 93 grade crossings. The project, which cost \$52 million, provided smoother rail operations and took the majority of traffic from the Port of Brownsville out of the downtown business district. Another recent rail relocation project is the "vertical relocation" (the construction of a railroad trench) of the Union Pacific Railroad in Reno, NV. (See Appendix I, A. 1..)

Rail relocations generally require the construction of new rail lines, which must be approved by Surface Transportation Board (STB). Approval by STB also involves completing the necessary environmental review, which can mean a full Environmental Impact Analysis if the relocation will entail extensive new construction. Usually, the right-of-way for the new line must be acquired by eminent domain from existing landowners, which can be a contentious and expensive process. If the rail line is to be removed from a downtown area, for example, the line might have to be relocated far enough from town to be in an undeveloped area, requiring the acquisition and construction of many miles of new railroad.

Another approach to rail relocations involves the agreement of two railroads that operate parallel lines to improve and use one line while abandoning the other (or limiting it to local traffic) have the advantage of reducing the amount of new right-of-way that must be acquired and constructed. The original Alameda Corridor project (Appendix I, A. 2) is an example as is the proposed “Bridging the Valley Project” in the Spokane, WA area. (See Appendix I, E. 2.)

F. Private Investments

Railroad infrastructure investments to enhance capacity may have the additional benefit of resolving crossing problems. For example, if a crossing is frequently blocked by trains parked on a siding, converting the line to double track may greatly reduce the problem. As BNSF and UP continue to convert their major transcontinental routes between Los Angeles and the Midwest from single to double track, delays due to trains awaiting oncoming trains should decline, benefiting communities such as Eloy, AZ (see Appendix). The case study on Hammond, IN (Appendix) describes how a railroad’s investment in remote controlled turnouts ameliorated a serious crossing blockage problem.

Communities may be interested in working with railroads to expedite infrastructure improvements that provide public benefits as well as benefits to the railroads. The Kansas City Flyovers are an example of such a public investment in railroad infrastructure. “Flyovers” refer to separating two railroad lines by over- or under- passes, instead of having the lines cross each other at grade. The Sheffield Flyover, a 3-mile \$74 million project opened in 2000, and the Argentine Connection, a 2-mile \$60 million flyover opened in 2004 improve the flow of rail traffic through the city and provide significant public benefits. The Sheffield Project helped reduce delays of as many as 250 trains a day by eliminating at-grade intersections of several railroads. Similarly, the Argentine Project reduced delays for 80 trains through the Kansas City Terminal area. Each project was financed through special bonding authority, to be paid off through railroad user fees. The railroads supported these projects because they made major improvements in rail flows, while the public benefited from the elimination of significant congestion on area roads and highways that resulted when trains backed up at the rail-rail crossings.

Another successful public-private project to provide improved rail infrastructure is the Norfolk Southern Corporation's Shellpot Bridge rebuilding in Wilmington, DE. The bridge's poor condition caused the previous owner, Conrail, to take the bridge, and consequently the line serving the east side of Wilmington, out of service. Freight then had to move on other lines through the city and rail service to industries on Wilmington's east side was degraded. The parties realized that rebuilding the bridge and reopening the line would improve efficiency and capacity for north/south freight traffic, lessening freight on a passenger route, and providing economic benefits to Wilmington and Delaware. Norfolk Southern had limited capital to finance the \$13 million project; however, the state used a combination of grants and loans to rehabilitate the bridge, with the loans to be repaid through a per-car user fee.

G. Technology

The railroad industry is currently exploring a number of technological advances that may serve to mitigate blocked crossing problems. Two examples are some form of positive train control and electronically controlled pneumatic brakes.

Railroads are developing positive train control (PTC) systems that can improve the safety of train operations while also providing timely information concerning the position, velocity and direction of movement of trains. The Global Positioning System and radio data link systems will help the railroads plan train movements and potentially avoid undesirable situations such as blocked crossings. Over time, information from these systems may be available for use in Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITS) applications that provide warning of potential blockages and assist in traffic control on the roads. Each of the four largest freight railroads is developing such systems, and major pilot projects are underway or planned. The Burlington Northern Santa Fe Railway (BNSF) has submitted an initial Product Safety Plan for review by FRA and states that it is committed to deploying this technology across its system over the coming years.

Electronically controlled pneumatic brakes (ECP) may potentially reduce the time it takes to break a train and then recouple and resume operations. If this technology safely permits a train to proceed after recoupling without the currently required power break test, the time a train blocks a crossing after being rejoined would be substantially reduced, making breaking a train at a crossing much more feasible. In 2005, FRA, in cooperation with railroads, rail labor, shippers, and car owners undertook an assessment of the benefits of ECP brakes. That study will soon be released. The ECP brakes will reduce stopping distance and derailments, while permitting longer trains. Improved railroad operations would be expected to reduce the time a crossing is blocked.¹¹

¹¹ FRA may consider waivers or changes in the current Power Brake rule if experience with ECP brakes satisfactorily demonstrates the safety of such an approach.

Conclusion

It is impossible to quantify the delays emergency responders experience at blocked grade crossings. The extent of the problem can be gauged from contacts with emergency responders, states, railroads and FRA safety personnel who work in the grade crossing area. This study has identified the many different situations that can lead to blocked crossings and outlined a number of possible solutions.

All these approaches have advantages and disadvantages and no one solution works in all cases. Communities must consider the alternatives and work with the railroad to determine the most effective solution and to minimize cost. If possible, the best solutions involve addressing all the crossing issues in a corridor at the same time. That way issues such as noise, traffic congestion, economic development and safety can be considered together. While a comprehensive approach must entail more effort and probably more expense than a more piecemeal approach, the opportunities to address the sum of the problems offers the potential to build consensus on a worthwhile solution to all railroad related problems.

In almost all cases, the key to solving the problem is to establish a close working arrangement between the community and the railroad. If both sides understand each other's concerns and limitations, a reasonable solution most likely can be found.

Appendix I. Case Studies

The following cases illustrate some of the problems and/or solutions that have been discussed above. They do not represent a complete list of the communities with blocked highway-railroad crossing problems nor a list of all communities that have developed solutions.

A. Comprehensive Solutions: These cases studies represent efforts to resolve highway-railroad crossing problems (including, but not limited to, emergency response crossings) by initiating comprehensive, corridor wide programs that provide multiple grade separations and/or use a number of the solutions described above.

1. Reno, NV

When the Union Pacific Railroad (UP) acquired the Southern Pacific in 1996, one of the conditions ordered by the Surface Transportation Board was that the UP cooperate with Reno in addressing the grade crossing issues on the rail line that passed through downtown Reno. The rail corridor passing through Reno is a critical freight route from the Port of Oakland to inland destinations. The number of trains traveling through Reno was expected to increase from approximately 15 per day to as many as 34 per day as a result of the merger.

The cost of building a new line around the city was prohibitive, so a “rail trench” was built, completely separating the railroad from streets in downtown Reno. The completed project eliminated 10 highway-railroad crossings along a 2.1-mile route by taking train traffic 33 feet below ground. Without the project, vehicle delays were projected to more than double from 188 hours to 473 hours per day.

The project was partially funded by UP with the City of Reno contributing \$50 million provided by a loan through the U.S. Department of Transportation's Transportation Infrastructure Finance and Innovation Act (TIFIA) credit assistance program. The TIFIA helps state and local governments construct transportation projects using flexible and innovative financing approaches. The program allowed the City of Reno to pledge different revenue streams to repay the loan and refinance the project through regular financial markets.

2. Alameda Corridor, CA

Perhaps the best example of a comprehensive solution to grade crossing blockage problems is the Alameda Corridor. Growing container traffic through the Ports of Los Angeles and Long Beach was causing major congestion in the area between the ports and rail yards near downtown Los Angeles. At the time (1981), three railroads: the Union Pacific, the Atchison, Topeka and Santa Fe (now Burlington Northern Santa Fe (BNSF)), and the Southern Pacific, served the port with three different rail lines. Trains from the ports blocked numerous grade crossings, often for long periods, because the trains moved

very slowly. Trucks carrying containers from the ports to rail yards and other customers also added to the congestion.

The solution was the development of a 20-mile long grade-separated rail corridor. Linking the ports of Long Beach and Los Angeles to the transcontinental rail network near downtown Los Angeles, the Alameda Corridor is a series of bridges, underpasses, overpasses and street improvements that separate freight trains from street traffic and passenger trains, facilitating a more efficient transportation network. The project's centerpiece is the Mid-Corridor Trench, which carries freight trains from both railroads (now UP and BNSF) that serve the ports in an open trench that is 10 miles long, 33 feet deep and 50 feet wide between State Route 91 in Carson and 25th Street in Los Angeles. The project consolidated four separate low-speed rail lines to the ports, eliminating conflicts at more than 200 at-grade crossings, providing a high-speed freight expressway, and minimizing the impact on communities.

The project produced a wide range of benefits, including:

- More efficient freight rail movements
- Reduced traffic congestion by eliminating at-grade crossings
- Multiple community beautification projects
- Decreased train emissions
- Slashed delays at highway-railroad crossings
- Cut noise pollution from trains
- Reduced emissions from idling automobiles and trucks

The \$2.4 billion Alameda Corridor was funded through a unique blend of public and private sources. Revenues from user fees paid by the railroads will be used to retire debts. Railroads initially paid \$15.00 for each loaded 20-foot equivalent unit (TEU) container; \$4.00 for each empty container, and \$8 for other types of loaded rail cars such as tankers and coal carriers. Over a 30-year period, fees will increase between 1.5 percent and 3 percent per year, depending on inflation. Effective January 1, 2006, fees are \$16.75, \$4.47 and \$8.93 respectively.

Planning began in 1981, construction in 1997 and operations in 2002. The project extends through or borders the cities of Vernon, Huntington Park, South Gate, Lynwood, Compton, Carson, Los Angeles, and the County of Los Angeles.

For additional details on the project see the Alameda Corridor Transportation Authority website.¹²

The Alameda corridor used rail relocation, new rail infrastructure and grade separations to solve quite a few crossing problems.

¹²The Alameda Corridor Transportation Authority website is at http://www.acta.org/projects_completed_alameda.htm

3. Alameda Corridor East, CA

The growth of imports through the Ports of Los Angeles and Long Beach that led to the Alameda Corridor project (above), as well as increased commuter rail service, have led to sharp increases in train traffic in many areas of the Los Angeles Basin beyond the Alameda Corridor area. In particular, after trains pass through the Alameda Corridor and continue to the east, grade crossing problems occurred to the east of downtown Los Angeles. One result of the increased train traffic was the creation of the Alameda Corridor-East Construction Authority by the San Gabriel Valley Council of Governments – a consortium of the 31 cities of the San Gabriel Valley. Train traffic along the corridor is expected to increase from 69 trains a day in 2003 to 161 in 2025. Meanwhile, vehicular traffic is expected to grow 40% and vehicular delay at crossings will grow by 300%.

The goal of the \$950 million ACE project is to mitigate the effects of the increased train traffic along a 35-mile freight rail corridor through the San Gabriel Valley from East Los Angeles to Pomona. It includes transportation safety improvement projects at 39 grade crossings located throughout the San Gabriel Valley. The ACE project includes grade separations at 20 of the most congested crossings, safety improvements at another 42 crossings and the Intelligent Roadway/Rail Interface System (IR/RIS), a communication system to alert motorists and emergency responders to blocked crossings. The project, when completed, is estimated to eliminate 150 accidents a year. Other benefits include reduced congestion, improvements in air quality and enhanced attractiveness to industry.

The grade separations will also improve emergency response, as will the IR/RIS system, which will allow emergency responders to select the best route to an incident. As part of this study, the FRA staff met with officials from the City of San Gabriel to determine how blocked crossings had affected emergency response. In San Gabriel, fire and police stations are located south of the railroad line, which splits the town. Stopped trains have caused serious delays in emergency response in the past, forcing neighboring emergency services to respond to calls in San Gabriel, with unacceptable delays, according to local officials interviewed for this report. The ACE Project, by providing a grade separation in San Gabriel, should reduce the emergency response problem.

B. Grade Separation

1. Belen, NM

Belen, NM is located on the west bank of the Rio Grande in Valencia County. The very busy BNSF east-west lines between Chicago, IL and Los Angeles, CA run through the heart of the city. The Belen rail yard is a stopping point for inspections, repairs, refueling, and crew changes. New Mexico Highway 314 also runs through the middle of Belen parallel to the BNSF rail line and is the city's Main Street. Highway 47 and Interstate 25 cross the east and west sides of the city.

In response to a surge in the demand for freight transportation, the BNSF plans to complete its second mainline track from Los Angeles to Chicago, through Belen. Currently, an average of 110 trains pass through Belen every day (1 train every 15 minutes). When the new mainline track is completed, this will increase train traffic to 160 trains per day. At a public hearing, the FRA Grade Crossing Manager for the region stated that as a result of the additional train traffic, affected grade crossings could be closed for 70 percent of the time.¹³

The New Mexico Department of Transportation (NM DOT) is building a train station in Belen for its new RailRunner Express, a commuter rail service between Belen and Bernalillo, New Mexico. The train station will draw added highway vehicle traffic to the area surrounding the rail line, resulting in an increase highway vehicle-train accident risk and the amount of time it takes for highway traffic to clear the grade crossing after each closure. The RailRunner will run on dedicated track parallel to the BNSF double track. Both projects will add to the number of times per day grade crossings are closed. Belen's emergency response providers would be affected by these projects.


The BNSF and NM DOT have worked together to improve safety and reduce highway delay along this rail line. Initially, NM DOT notified BNSF it would have to upgrade the signal equipment at the affected grade crossings. But BNSF offered to contribute \$2 million towards a grade separation at one location in exchange for an agreement with the city to close four adjacent grade crossings. NM DOT agreed and added \$3 million in Federal Section 130 (Rail Safety) and Section 152 (Hazardous Elimination) funds, bringing the total grade separation funds available to \$5 million. Then, the Belen Planning and Zoning Commission gained public support for the grade crossing separation and closures by hosting a series of public hearings where NM DOT, BNSF, FRA, and the general public presented their views.

Some project details still need to be addressed. If successfully resolved, the city of Belen will have a total of three grade-separated crossings evenly spaced throughout the city and a Quiet Zone by default since no at grade crossings will remain. This will allow all vehicles, including emergency response vehicles, access to all points in the city within a reasonable amount of time. The BNSF will have fewer grade crossing signal systems to maintain, as railroads are required by Federal law to maintain all grade-crossing signaling equipment.

¹³ Ms. Carolyn Cook, Federal Railroad Administration Grade Crossing Manager at the Belen Planning and Zoning Commission Meeting, December 12, 2005.

This project is an excellent example of the state, community and railroad working together to address a potentially critical problem as railroad traffic grows to very high levels.

Map 1A



Source: FRA Office of Policy and Program Development


2. Laredo, TX

The city of Laredo, located in the south of Texas, is considered to be the main gateway of trade between the United States and Mexico. It is the busiest highway-railroad crossing on the U.S./Mexico border. Freight reaches Laredo from the south through the Kansas City Southern's (KCS) Transportacion Ferroviaria Mexicana (TFM) railroad subsidiary in Mexico, from the north via the Union Pacific Railroad (UP) and east by the Texas-Mexican Railroad, also owned by KCS. Highway transportation is provided mainly by

I-35, which travels north to San Antonio and handles a large amount of truck traffic. Increased freight movement has led to significant impacts on local transportation infrastructure.

All US/Mexico traffic at Laredo uses the single-track international railroad bridge in downtown Laredo, which connects TFM with Texas-Mexican/KCS and UP. The bridge is owned by KCS but UP operates over the bridge via a usage agreement. The Texas-Mexican Railroad has an east-west direction and travels to Corpus Christi then to Houston and the Midwest. The UP connects north to its mainline in San Antonio. The railroads in downtown Laredo run parallel to the Rio Grande, the border with Mexico, resulting in a long and thin strip of urban land between the railroads and the border. Each company owns a rail yard where it sorts and assembles rail cars. The UP rail yard is located about a half mile north of the international bridge and is used primarily for import and export operations. The Texas-Mexican rail yard is located to the east in central Laredo, and is used to assemble trains going out to east Texas and the Midwest or Mexico. The two railroads combined have 81 grade crossings in Laredo, plus five grade separations. Map 2A (pg. 7) shows the location of the railroads and Laredo street system.

Map 2A



Source: Wilbur Smith Associates, 2005

The city of Laredo has a number of major activity centers, those that attract or generate large numbers of vehicle trips, within the land strip between the border and the railroads (the area in the map to the left of the railroads). The only way to access these centers are at-grade highway-railroad crossings. This presents a problem because the large number of people going into and out of the area between the border and the railroads means a higher likelihood of emergency response calls. There are two hospitals in the downtown area, located north and east of the railroads, on the other side of the strip between the railroads and the border. In case of an emergency, the ambulance must cross the tracks to reach a hospital after a call in the strip. Due to crossing blockage, emergency response may be delayed. Fire stations are well distributed throughout the city and there are stations on every side of the rail lines. However, the police department has its main offices south of the railroads in central Laredo. This means that a police car must detour

to use one of the three overpasses available if trains block highway-railroad grade crossings.

The proposed solution to this problem is the construction of 16 overpasses that would provide access to all areas at any time. This tactic is expensive and complex and will take a long time to complete. For this reason, an alternative, short-term approach is being considered that makes use of technology developed at the Texas Transportation Institute (TTI). Doppler radars, video cameras and wireless technology will be used to inform first responders about blocked crossings and the best alternative routes (see Houston in the Communications section of the Appendix).

3. Chattanooga, TN

Chattanooga (population 156,000) is located in southeastern Tennessee in Hamilton County. It is on a bend in the Tennessee River between Lookout and Signal Mountains and at the junction of Interstates 75, 24 and 59. Four railroads move traffic through Chattanooga. The Norfolk Southern Railroad (NS) runs two lines through the city; from north to south and from east to west, the CSX railroad enters the city from the west and departs to the south, with a branch to the east. The Chattanooga Belt Railroad runs from east to west through the city, while the Chattanooga and Chickamauga Railroad runs south out of the city.


The Hamill Road Crossing is near the northern edge of Chattanooga on NS track. Between 36 and 44 trains and over 19,000 highway vehicles pass over the highway-railroad crossing each day. Auto traffic at this crossing will most likely increase due to considerable commercial and real estate development in the area.

The Hamill Road crossing is on a double tracked rail line. One mile north, the double tracks converge to single track at the Hixon Interlocking. Northbound trains sometimes have to slow down at the Hamill Road crossing to allow oncoming southbound trains to pass through the interlocking. Some southbound trains have to slow down at the crossing to drop off crews or for switching activity at Norfolk Southern DeButts Rail Yard, which is 1.4 miles to the south and just over the Tennessee River Bridge. Slow north- and south-bound trains can occupy the crossing one right after another. As a result, the Hamill Road crossing is frequently blocked from 30-55 minutes at a time. This can cause auto traffic to back up until it blocks Highway 153, one-quarter mile away, which is a designated evacuation route for a Tennessee Valley Authority nuclear plant and serves as a major traffic artery for school buses, fire trucks, and ambulances. When Highway 153 is blocked by traffic, the alternative route to cross the Tennessee River to the south can take an additional 10-15 minutes in travel time.

The city police and fire departments report the Hamill Road crossing has caused serious delays for emergency vehicles. The hospital and fire station are on the west side of the railroad tracks and about 5,000 people live to the east. The entrance to the North Park Hospital, an acute care facility, is on Hamill Road, one-quarter of a mile southwest of the crossing. Emergency vehicles and patients are delayed when the crossing is blocked.

Approaching from the east, emergency vehicles can detour about a mile to the north where there is a grade separated crossing, but that results in a delay of several minutes and then contending with the backup on the other side crossing to reach the Hospital. City officials and the Norfolk Southern Railroad have received numerous complaints from the public concerning this crossing and are working together to develop a solution. Right now, the city of Chattanooga is widening Hamill Road from two to four lanes up to the crossing so that traffic does not back up onto Highway 153. The Hamilton County Rail Authority plans to conduct a feasibility study to evaluate a highway rail grade separation.

Map 3A



Source: FRA Office of Policy and Program Development


C. Public/Private Investments

1. Greenville, NC

The city of Greenville is located in eastern North Carolina; the city and surrounding metropolitan area have a total population of around 142,500. Greenville is intersected by the railroad lines of Norfolk Southern (NS) running east-west and CSX Corporation going north-south (see Map 4A, pg. 15). Railroad operations block local roads, causing delays in the vehicle flow between southeast residential neighborhoods and destinations in the northwest of the city. Local streets are blocked during the movement of freight

trains coming southbound on the CSX line onto the NS eastern route. The problem arises because there is no track directly connecting the southbound track to the eastbound track at the intersection. Trains must proceed beyond the intersection into the nearby switching yard (see Map 5A, pg. 16). At the yard, the locomotives must “run around” the train so they will be at the other end of the train, which will be the front as the train now heads east. The train will now be pulled northbound onto the eastbound NS line, since there is a direct track connection in that direction as seen on Map 5A. In order to “turn” the train, that is, prepare it to be operated in the opposite direction, it must be broken into shorter segments at the yard, because the yard is not long enough to hold the entire train and thus allow the locomotives to “run around” the train on one of the yard tracks. After the locomotives are on the north side of the train segments, they recouple the segments and proceed north and east to the customer. This switching back and forth blocks the roads at either end of the yard for substantial periods of time. The North Carolina Department of Transportation (NCDOT) reports that blockages can last up to 3 hours two times a day, often at peak travel times on roads with volumes ranging from 16,000 to 30,000 vehicles per day. This means commuters, school busses, and emergency vehicles cannot pass through the rail corridors.


Figure 1. - CSX-NS railroad intersection



Source: *Federal Railroad Administration, Office of Policy*

In Figure 1, the CSX track runs from the bottom left (south) and the NS line runs across the figure horizontally. Currently, CSX trains proceed past this crossing to a yard, where the locomotives are moved to the opposite end of the train, the new front of the train, and the train then uses the connecting track shown in Figure 4 to proceed eastward (left in this picture). A direct connecting track running to the left in Figure 1 between the CSX line and the NS line would eliminate blocked crossings caused by the need to move locomotives to the opposite end of the train.


Figure 2. – CSX rail yard and Howell Street



Source: Federal Railroad Administration, Office of Policy

Figure 2 illustrates the proximity of Howell Street to the north end of the CSX rail yard and how trains will likely block the crossing.


Figure 3.- At Grade Crossing of Arlington Boulevard & CSX railroad



Source: *Federal Railroad Administration, Office of Policy*

Figure 3 above shows the at-grade crossing of Arlington Boulevard and the CSX Transportation rail line. Arlington Boulevard is at the southern limit of the yard. This artery serves as access road for a high school, located next to the yard. To the left of the picture is a residential area and people travel to the right to get to school, work and, if needed, medical services.

Figure 4. - Northeast connecting track branching to the left



Source: Federal Railroad Administration, Office of Policy

Figure 4 faces north and shows the CSX line and the track heading off to the right that connects directly with the NS line to the east. The intersection of the two lines can be seen in the center of the picture. (Figure 1 was taken on the other side of the crossing in the center, looking south.)

A 2006 study prepared for NCDOT by Ralph Whitehead Associates concludes that these negative railroad impacts can be mitigated by two projects. One is the construction of a south-to-east connecting track at the intersection of NS-CSX lines and the other is relocating CSX rail yard from downtown Greenville to a site north of US 264. The construction of the southeast connecting track would prevent trains from blocking Arlington Blvd and Howell St as direct south to east travel would now be possible. Relocation of the switching yard would move rail car sorting operations out of the city and limit the remaining impact on the CSX line to a smooth movement of freight through the urban area. Table 1 shows the costs and benefits of the two projects. Total construction costs for the two projects amount to \$2.9 million. These projects also result in fuel and labor savings for the railroad companies estimated to total \$467,298 per year.

Table 1. - Costs and Benefits Estimates

Total Construction Costs	Rail yard	\$2,144,340
	South to East connector	\$822,090
Benefits Per Year	Labor Savings	\$467,298
	Fuel Savings	\$158,080

Source: *Ralph Whitehead Associates, Inc.*

This project is still in its preliminary stage and stakeholders will need to coordinate and agree on many details. Some of the matters to be resolved include agreements between the railroads on granting each other operating rights on their tracks and whose trains should proceed first over jointly used tracks. The City of Greenville also needs to consider the plans that Eastern Carolina University has for a number of properties surrounding the study area that could potentially be affected by the project. ¹⁴

¹⁴ References:


Dehler, B.D. (2006). *Greenville Traffic Separation Study -Phase I (DRAFT)*. Ralph Whitehead Associates, Inc.

Greenville-Pitt County Convention & Visitors Bureau. April 28th, 2006.
<http://www.visitgreenvillenc.com/>

United States Census Bureau. **American Factfinder**. April 28th, 2006.
<http://factfinder.census.gov/home/saff/main.html>

Map 4A


Transportation System of Greenville, NC



Source: Federal Railroad Administration, Office of Policy

Map 5A

Downtown Railroads in Greenville, NC



Source: Federal Railroad Administration, Office of Policy

2. Fayetteville, NC

Fayetteville is the sixth largest city in North Carolina and the county seat of Cumberland County. Located along the Cape Fear River, this city of 60 square miles has a population over 120,000.¹⁵ Three railroads - CSX, the Norfolk Southern (NS), and the Aberdeen and Rockfish - traverse the city, resulting in 183 private and public at-grade highway-railroad grade crossings. Train volumes at each crossing vary from 3 to 39 trains per day.¹⁶

The CSX and NS rail lines enter the city from the northwest, north, and northeast corners of the city, crisscross each other along one of Fayetteville's central thoroughfares, where they also traverse the Aberdeen and Rockfish Railroad, which runs east to west. The CSX and NS rail lines continue out of the city towards the southwest, south, and southwest.

The dense web of Fayetteville's roads and railroads increases the probability of grade crossing accidents and auto traffic delay, especially in the central city, where all three rail lines intersect and conduct switching activity, often stopping at the grade crossing for more than 30 minutes at a time. When a grade crossing is blocked for such a long interval, it has a significant effect on auto traffic delay and, potentially, emergency response, especially during the morning and evening rush hours. This delay can affect the public services provided by hospitals, schools, fire and rescue stations.

The NCDOT has completed a Traffic Separation Plan for Fayetteville designed to improve highway-railroad grade crossing safety and to mitigate grade crossing traffic delay. The plan evaluated 52 grade crossings for potential closures, roadway improvements, signal upgrades and grade crossing separations. In North Carolina, the railroads and the state pay all the costs of closing grade crossings and any associated mitigation projects, although the state pays for grade separations.

The state, the city CSX and NS are planning two rail realignment projects, financed in part by Federal funds. The first realignment involves constructing a connection track between two CSX lines entering Fayetteville from the north. One track is the heavily used CSX "A" line and the other serves the Fort Bragg military base and is essential to the movement of military equipment. The second realignment will connect the NS main track to the Milan Yard. As a result, some railroad track and several grade crossings will be removed. These two new track improvements will allow all three of the city's railroads to reroute traffic from downtown Fayetteville to the Milan rail yard on the city's outskirts and hence eliminate the current midtown pushing and pulling of trains as they conduct switching activities.

These cooperative efforts among the state, city, and the two Class 1 railroads will result in less traffic delay for all vehicles including emergency responders, less chance of rail-


¹⁵ US Department of Census, American Fact Finder, 2006.

¹⁶ Federal Railroad Administration, National Grade Crossing Inventory Database, 2006. This includes 117 public and 64 private at-grade crossings.

highway vehicle accidents, and improved movement of freight in and around the city of Fayetteville.

These projects demonstrate a comprehensive approach to crossing issues in Fayetteville. By adding rail connections, relocating rail lines, closing grade crossings and providing safety upgrades at remaining crossings, Fayetteville should see reduced traffic delays and improved safety. These projects also illustrate a cooperative effort involving several railroads, the state and the city. Funding also will come from a wide variety of sources, ranging from the railroads to the federal government.

Map 6A



Source: FRA Office of Policy and Program Development

D. Communications and Monitoring

1. Houston, TX

The Houston area may have more grade crossings than any other city of comparable size in the United States, because of its role as a major railroad and industrial center, and its location in a flat, low lying area. Railroads in many cities follow river bottoms, often in valleys well below the surrounding land, which has led to grade separations when highway bridges are built connecting hills on either side of the river. In Houston, highway bridges across non-navigable waterways do not need to be elevated above the adjacent railroad tracks because the terrain is so flat. Moreover, underpasses, for either highways or railroads, are subject to flooding. As a result, Houston has had serious grade crossing issues.

Faced with delays at grade crossings, two rail monitoring systems have been implemented in the Houston area. Within the City of Houston, a series of 18 cameras were placed at critical grade crossings in 2005. This is part of TransLink, the intelligent transportation system (ITS) research program of the Texas Transportation Institute (TTI). The web site <http://traffic.houstontranstar.org/cctv/railroad/> provides video from these cameras. Emergency responders as well as citizens can use these videos to see if a grade crossing is blocked. The usefulness of the system depends on the emergency responder or the dispatcher taking the time to check the cameras. If they have access to the internet, that can be done quickly. If the crossings on the route to the scene of an incident are rarely blocked, responders often do not take the time to check.

In nearby Sugar Land, Texas, a more elaborate system was installed in 2002. In cooperation with Texas DOT, TTI developed the Sugar Land rail monitoring implementation project. Funding for the program also came from the U.S. DOT ITS Priority Corridor Program. The system monitors all the crossings on a 6.4 mile rail corridor. TTI developed a train detection/projection system for the corridor and a graphic display (available on line at <http://traffic.houstontranstar.org/rail/>). The system indicates real time train status and arrival time projections at the various crossings. Kiosks displaying this information are provided at two fire stations and at the police/fire communications center. The train detection is based on a Doppler radar system at each crossing connected by cellular wireless communications equipment to the central system.

The Sugar Land system, unlike the monitoring system in Houston, was designed particularly for the need of the emergency response community. It has prevented at least one very serious incident when a truck carrying sodium hydroxide, an extremely hazardous chemical, stalled on a crossing. Police dispatchers spotted the stalled truck and saw that a train was approaching at 44 miles per hour. The dispatcher immediately alerted the railroad and police units to the situation. Dispatchers continued to monitor the train's location and speed as it drew closer to the disabled truck. Alerted to the problem, the train crew was able to safely stop the train before a collision occurred. A collision that resulted in a spill would have required a full evacuation of the area.

TTI, a part of Texas A&M University, has also installed a similar system in College Station, TX. The College Station community is split by a rail line carrying 20-24 trains a day. Train speeds vary from 10 to 45 miles per hour and the gates at crossings may be down from 1 to 10 minutes. Using a system of sensors mounted on poles located off the railroad right of way, this system uses solar power to operate the radar and wireless communication system. College Station does have fire stations on both sides of the track, providing some flexibility in dispatching. The system includes a display kiosk that is located in the fire house on the route used by emergency personnel to reach the fire stations bays where the emergency vehicles are positioned. Responders can check crossing status as they go to their vehicles. A system with both cameras and radars was preferred, since the Doppler radars do not detect stopped trains that may be blocking a crossing. Emergency responders have been rerouted about 15-18 times a year.

With the research completed, a system such as that at Sugar Land can be relatively inexpensive, depending on the length of the corridor, the number of radars and or cameras used and local conditions. The components are “off the shelf.” While experience indicates the system is reliable, it is essential to determine who is responsible for maintenance.

2. Albany, OR

Albany, Oregon, is located in Linn County in the central Willamette Valley in Oregon, bordering Interstate Five. Albany has a population of approximately 43,000. Queen Avenue is a centrally located main East-West route through Albany. One main line track and three yard tracks cross over Queen Avenue at this location. One block away, the west side of the crossing connects at an intersection to the main highway (Hwy. 99). The crossing is equipped with gates and cantilever flashing lights.

The Queen Avenue crossing is on the Union Pacific Railroad (UP) north-south mainline between California and the Pacific Northwest. It is at the south entrance to the UP yard, currently leased to the Willamette & Pacific Railroad. The yard, once used by a single freight railroad, currently serves one Class I railroad (UP), two short line railroads (the Willamette & Pacific Railroad and the Albany & Eastern Railroad) and Amtrak. There are six Amtrak trains, approximately 25 through-freight train movements and 125 switching movements over the crossing each day. The average daily auto traffic count is just over 16,000.


In 1980, the Public Utility Commission of Oregon (PUC) granted the Southern Pacific Railroad (the UP's predecessor) a variance to the blockage rules the Commission had established stipulating the amount of time a railroad could block a crossing. The PUC variance extends the amount of time the railroad can block the crossing from 10 to 20 minutes at a time. This increase in blockage time can only be applied to road trains, not switching movements, and cannot be used during designated rush hours (between 6:00am to 9:00am and 4:00pm to 6:00pm). The railroad must use outlying sidings for set outs and pick-ups. Because a 20 minute grade crossing blockage will cause significant delay for all highway vehicles, including emergency vehicles, the railroad is required to give at

least 1-hour advanced notice to the city of Albany before blocking the Queen Avenue crossing. Oregon also requires the railroads to coordinate road closures and re-openings with the public authority during blockages.

The Oregon State Department of Transportation Rail Division receives at least one blockage complaint per day on this crossing, but often more, due to railroad operations at this crossing. Traffic queues grow quickly. When the railroad completes its move and clears the crossing for a minute or two, traffic will have typically backed up onto the highway and to the east approximately one-quarter of a mile. When the railroad resumes switching over the crossing, traffic that was previously queued may once again be stopped. Railroad operations affect traffic flow and create mobility issues from the east to west side of Albany. Upon approaching Queen Avenue from either direction, should the crossing be occupied, there is some opportunity for motorists to choose an alternate route, which makes this crossing an excellent candidate for intelligent signaling. However, Queen Avenue is only one part of a larger congestion problem in Albany, so that frequent blockages at this crossing during rush hour can cause significant delays throughout the area.

Currently, ODOT, the railroads, and local governments are reviewing a number of options to alleviate the motor vehicle congestion issues in the Albany region. Unfortunately, there is no room for any type of yard expansion. While any complete solution will take time and likely be expensive, a warning/communication system such as used in Sugar Land might provide an interim step to reducing the problem.

Map 7A



Source: FRA Office of Policy and Program Development

E. Rail Relocation

1. Hidalgo County, TX

Hidalgo County, TX (population 658,248) is a fast growing rural area located on Rio Grande River at the southern most part of Texas near Brownsville. Its population grew 19.1 percent from 2000 to 2005, compared to 9.6 percent for the state of Texas, and 5.3 percent for the entire US for the same time period.¹⁷ Most of the county residents live and work near the railroad-highway configuration described in this section.

Hidalgo County's rail lines and highway network provide intermodal freight transportation between the United States, Texas and Mexico. While intermodal transportation is key to the area's current economic prosperity, long traffic delays at

¹⁷ US Census Bureau, Population Finder, www.census.gov.

highway-rail grade crossings have become a costly and dangerous problem for all transportation users, including emergency vehicles.

This is especially so along a stretch of rail track owned by Rio Valley Switching Company (RVSR) short line railroad that extends 65 miles from the Union Pacific Railroad's (UP) Harlingen Rail Yard westward through Hidalgo County, into the small interchange yard in the City of Mission, before connecting with the Border Pacific Railroad (BOP). RVSR track runs parallel to US Business 83. Warehouses and transloading facilities along US Business 83 use team tracks (rail sidings that are accessible to trucks) to transfer freight from truck to railcars on the RVSR track.

The RVSR traffic includes agricultural products, paper, and other manufactured goods that have been trucked across the Mexican border over three international bridges. All RVSR traffic is interchanged with UP at the Harlingen Rail Yard, but RVSR does not have access to the Harlingen Yard to switch or sort cars. Instead, RVSR brings entire trains of unsorted cars to Mission Yard, where cars are blocked in groups for local customers. The Mission Yard has no yard lead track and very little storage capacity. Hence, rail operations at this yard often block adjacent grade crossings on major thoroughfares, including US 83, for over 30 minutes at a time. The condition of the rail track in this area is so poor that the maximum train speed is limited to 10 miles per hour.¹⁸ Since many of the trains handled by the RVSR are 100 cars long, through trains can block a crossing for 5 minutes at a time.

Local government entities approached RVSR to discuss relocating its rail line away from Business 83 when they first began operations in 1993, after purchasing the line from UP. But RVSR and their customers argued that the combined costs of relocating the rail line and the warehouse facilities in the immediate area made this proposition financially impractical.

Train traffic volumes on the RVSR line have grown from 2,700 carloads in 1993 to 11,000 carloads in 2003. Growth is attributed to the railroad's ability to provide specialized customer service. Because Hidalgo County is so far from any major urban area, there is little direct competition from the trucking industry.¹⁹

While the railroad acknowledges serious operating constraints, RVSR hopes to nearly double its 2003 traffic volume to 20,000 carloads by 2010. To accomplish this, RVSR would like to build an intermodal terminal. Local business development groups support this type of investment to encourage growth. Toyota recently decided against development in Hidalgo County for lack of intermodal access.

Hidalgo County Metropolitan Planning Organization (HC MPO) has commissioned the Hidalgo County Rail Study to evaluate a series of at-grade roadway enhancements, adjustments to railway sidings, grade separations, and railroad track improvements as

¹⁸ Hidalgo County Rail Study, Hidalgo County Metropolitan Planning Association, February 28, 2005, p. 12.

¹⁹ *Id.* at 12.

short and mid-term solutions. The roadway enhancements would improve safety and traffic flow. The adjustments to railway sidings would facilitate switching and sorting operations in the Mission Yard. Grade crossing separations would eliminate all highway-rail problems at the separated crossing and could alleviate traffic congestion at adjacent crossings if traffic is successfully redirected. The railroad track improvements would allow trains to travel at higher speeds to reduce the amount of time crossings are blocked for each through train.

In the long term, the Rail Study recommends relocating railroad track and building an intermodal yard. The HC MPO Rail Study proposes using multiple sources to fund these projects. The study states that the track siding improvements and track upgrades may qualify for the Short Line and Regional Railroad Rehabilitation Tax Credit Program.²⁰ But since the total value for this tax credit program is capped, it is likely that the funding for the siding improvements would have to come from a combination of funds from RVSR, online shippers at affected sidings, and local municipalities. Shared funding would be justified by the shared benefits of the improved sidings including improved rail service and reduced grade crossing delay.

The grade separations may be eligible for funding under the Federal Highway Administration's Surface Transportation Program (STP) apportionment for Texas, although the projects must compete with many other eligible highway projects in Texas. Funds from this program may be used to provide up to 80 percent of the funding, with the remaining 20 percent provided by state or local entities. Within the State of Texas, the Unified Transportation Program (UTP) provides the 20 percent matching funds for their Grade Separation Program.²¹


The rail relocation and intermodal facility are costly investments and require further study. HC MPO Rail Study identifies these projects as good candidates for a Railroad Rehabilitation and Improvement Financing (RRIF) loan from FRA.²²

²⁰ The Short Line and Regional Railroad Rehabilitation Tax Credit (26 USC 45G) provides a tax credit of 50 cents on the dollar for every dollar invested in track rehabilitation or maintenance, not to exceed \$3,500 per mile. The credit is available every year but expires at the end of 2007.

²¹ Hidalgo County Rail Study, Hidalgo County Metropolitan Planning Association, February 28, 2005, 1p. 39.

²² The Railroad Rehabilitation & Improvement Financing (RRIF) Program, administered by FRA, provides direct loans and loan guarantees up to railroad-related projects. For more information, see the FRA website: <http://www.fra.dot.gov/us/content/177>

Map 8A



Source: FRA Office of Policy and Program Development

2. Spokane, WA

The “Bridging the Valley” program is a community-initiated project to explore creation of one common railroad corridor over which BNSF and UP would operate between Spokane, WA and Athol, ID. This 42 mile two-railroad corridor presently has 72 grade crossings with over 70 trains a day. The UP and BNSF lines are roughly parallel, a mile or two apart. Growth in train traffic is forecast to increase annually by 3.4 percent over the next 20 years.

The project would move UP’s operations onto a triple track railroad along the BNSF corridor, although local rail service to customers on the UP would be retained. The project would eliminate approximately 51 at-grade crossings through closure and the relocation of the UP line. The remaining 21 crossings either are or would be grade separated. The total cost was estimated at \$252 million in 2001 dollars.

While not primarily a response to emergency response issues, reduced traffic congestion and crossing delays should benefit emergency response in the areas while also improving crossing safety and reducing emissions in a serious non-attainment areas. Although total funding for the project has not been secured, work has begun on some parts of the project.

F. Grade Separation, Line and Yard Relocation

El Paso, TX

The city of El Paso is located in far west Texas at the tip that meets New Mexico and Mexico. In 2005, the area had a total population of 721,598. The El Paso region is at a strategic location in the midpoint of the Southern California-East Texas route and at the border with Mexico (Map 9A, pg. 31). The community has a high level of passenger and freight movement. The region is served by two railroad companies: Union Pacific (UP) and Burlington Northern Santa Fe (BNSF). UP has two routes serving the region, the Sunset Route which travels from southern California to East Texas and Louisiana and the Tucumcari line which connect El Paso with Kansas City and the Midwest. BNSF has one line traveling north to its main route in Albuquerque, New Mexico. UP and BNSF lines are connected with Ferromex (FXE) in Mexico by two bridges over the Rio Grande river. The El Paso metropolitan area has 141 at-grade crossings. The high number of highway-railroad crossings creates safety and congestion problems.

Zaragoza Road

One problem crossing is the Zaragoza Rd crossing, an important arterial highway. Zaragoza Road is in the east side of the city and travels north-south, serving residential, commercial and industrial areas along its corridor. This road is crossed at-grade by the double track of the UP Sunset Route. Map 10A (pg. 32) shows the location of this road in the study area and the direction it follows from the north limit near IH-10 to the south at the Ysleta International port of entry. Congestion in this arterial is forecast to increase in the mid-term as adjacent vacant land is developed. New residential neighborhoods and retail facilities are being developed to the north of I-10. Also, railroad traffic on the Sunset line has increased due to intermodal freight moving from the Ports of Long Beach and Los Angeles (see previous discussion of Alameda Corridor and Alameda Corridor East) to Texas and the Midwest. In 2003, Moffat and Nichols Engineers reported that there were 40 trains traveling over the Sunset line but the freight traffic has probably grown since then. Of those 40 trains, 25 percent divert to the Tucumcari line to the Midwest, the rest continue to travel east on the Sunset Route to Dallas, Houston and the south

Figure 1F. - Sunset Route and Zaragoza Rd. in El Paso, Texas



Source: El Paso Metropolitan Planning Organization, 2006

The picture above shows the Sunset Route Zaragoza Road at-grade crossing. The El Paso MPO considers that this crossing presents a problem for effective emergency response. The railroad is between a major entertainment center and the regional command center of that area. An officer from the El Paso Police Department reported an incident when he was struggling to contain a brawl at the Speaking Rock Casino and, as the incident involved multiple individuals, he requested support from the police central command. At the moment when the other police cars were on their way to the nightclub to help their colleague, a train blocked the Zaragoza Road crossing which prevented the needed support to reach the scene immediately. Once at the blocked crossing, it would take longer to do a U-turn and go through the nearest separated grade crossing, thus, police cars decided to wait. The blockade lasted only for a few minutes and reinforcements eventually arrived at the incident location without serious consequences to the first officer on the scene. However, these types of incidents have the possibility of tragic results because they require immediate response. Medical services face the same type of problems in this area as most hospitals and providers are adjacent to I-10. Residents near Zaragoza Road must travel north to arrive to the closest hospital and face the same problem as the police department did in the example.

The El Paso Metropolitan Planning Organization's long-term transportation plan projects an overpass construction in this location by 2015 but no funds have been allocated. This project seems to be the best solution because the source of the problem is the amount of both railroad and automobile traffic passing through this crossing. The crossing is a six-lane divided road and a double track railroad. The total cost for this project is \$9,312,360 and no cost-benefit analysis has been carried out. Unquantified benefits include reductions in emissions, delay and accidents, as well as the intangible benefit of improved emergency response.

Doniphan Road

The Burlington Northern-Santa Fe line connecting El Paso to the BNSF main east-west line in central New Mexico passes through the west side of El Paso from the yard in downtown El Paso. This line handles about four through trains a day and two local switching trains. The rail yard is also connected to Ferromex (FXE) through two international bridges in downtown El Paso. Currently two trains are exchanged daily.

Figure 2F. – BNSF railway in El Paso, Texas



Source: El Paso Metropolitan Planning Organization, 2006.


Doniphan Road runs parallel to the BNSF rail line. Local streets intersecting Doniphan also intersect the railroad. This causes problems as cross traffic may be stopped by traffic lights at Doniphan Road and then again at the grade crossing. Emergency responders are delayed when trains are in the crossings, especially those trains conducting switching operations. Blocked crossings are an issue because the zone to the west of the railroad is

mainly residential and rural and first responder facilities are located more toward the center of town to the east. Figure 2F shows the BNSF railroad and the intersection of Doniphan Rd and Sunland Park Dr. The railroad separates emergency responders located to the left in this picture from residential areas to the right. Map 10A shows the layout of the zone and location of the police department. As can be seen, responders may be forced to take alternative longer routes that increase the time of response substantially.

Moffatt & Nichols Engineers carried out a study in 2003 on the overall railroad infrastructure in El Paso and recommended the construction of a new port of entry, rail yard and a fly-over crossing. The new port and rail yard is suggested to be located west of El Paso in Santa Teresa, New Mexico and would include a fly-over at the railroad-railroad crossing between BNSF and UP railroads. The railroad-to-railroad separated crossing is necessary so easy and fast operations are possible for both BNSF and UP. The project is at a very early stage and needs coordination between all the stakeholders, including the federal government, three railroads, two states, local authorities, and the Mexican government.

Map 9A


Surface Transportation System in El Paso, Texas.



Source: Federal Railroad Administration

Map 10A

Zaragoza Road and Sunset Route Crossing in El Paso Texas



G. Private Investments in Railroad Infrastructure

In these cases, private investments by the railroad have or will ameliorate delays due to blocked crossings.

1. Hammond, IN

One contributor to crossing delays is the need to throw manual turnouts (switches). A crew member (usually the conductor) must get off the train, move the switch to the desired direction, and wait as the train pulls through. After the train has cleared the turnout, the crew member must walk back to the locomotive before the train can proceed. These delays can be avoided if remote controlled turnouts are installed. These powered turnouts, remotely controlled by dispatchers or tower operators, can be changed before the train arrives and, if needed, returned to the original position after the train passes without requiring the train to stop. While the railroad obviously gains a benefit from speeding its operation, such improvements can be expensive, costing perhaps as much as \$500,000 each and requiring more maintenance than manual turnouts. However, in some cases, powered turnouts can provide substantial benefits in terms of reducing the length of time that crossings are blocked.

Hammond, IN experienced serious delays at crossings due to trains stopping while switches were thrown. By automating the Osborn Interlocking in 2000, Norfolk Southern and the Indiana Harbor Belt Railroad were able to dramatically improve NS train operations through Hammond. Completion of the Hohman Interlocking in 2001 continued the marked improvement in movement of NS trains through Hammond. These trains also are now able to travel at higher speeds, further reducing delays. NS continues to work with Hammond and nearby cities, the "Four Cities Consortium," to address any blocked crossing issues that occur, although now these are generally concerned with a specific train, rather than the day-to-day problems that formerly existed in the area.

2. Eloy Fire District, AZ

The Union Pacific Sunset Route runs through the middle of Eloy, where there are three at-grade crossings, all of which may be blocked at the same time. The Eloy Fire District also includes Toltec, which has a single crossing. This crossing may be blocked for up to 20 minutes by stopped trains.

The Sunset Route is a single line railroad with sidings. Currently, due to growth in intermodal traffic originating at the ports of Los Angeles and Long Beach, the line is very congested. While UP is in the process of double tracking the line, it may be several years before this portion of the line is double tracked. The delays at Eloy may be due to trains stopped at sidings waiting for oncoming trains to pass. Double tracking should reduce the delay times, although a grade separation would be preferred solution. In New Mexico, through which the Sunset Route also passes, most of the railroad route has been double tracked. As a result, discussions with the railroad indicate few problems on the

double tracked section in New Mexico. As the Union Pacific continues to upgrade its infrastructure, especially that of the former Southern Pacific, the length of time crossings are blocked on the Sunset Route are likely to decline, despite increased traffic on the line.

Appendix 2

FEDERAL RAILROAD ADMINISTRATION Regional Managers for Highway-Rail Crossing Safety and Trespass Prevention Programs (Updated—August 22, 2006)

Region I	Mr. Randall L. Dickinson	(O) (518) 899-5372
CT NJ	Federal Railroad Administration	(F) (518) 899-5372
ME NY	P.O. Box 2144	
MA RI	Ballston Spa, New York 12020	
NH VT		
Region II	Mr. Donald P. Thomas	(O) (610) 521-8212
DE PA	Federal Railroad Administration	(F) (610) 521-8225
MD VA	Baldwin Tower, Suite 660	
OH WV	1510 Chester Pike	
	Crum Lynne, Pennsylvania 19020	
Region III	Mr. Thomas Drake	(O) (404) 562-3824
AL MS	Federal Railroad Administration	(F) (404) 562-3830
FL NC	61 Forsythe Street, SW, Suite 16T20	
GA SC	Atlanta, Georgia 30303-3104	
KY TN		
Region IV	Ms. Tammy Wagner	(O) (312) 353-6203
IL MN	Federal Railroad Administration	ext 49
IN WI	200 West Adams, Suite 310	
MI	Chicago, Illinois 60606	(F) (312) 886-9634
Region V	Ms. Carolyn Cook	(O) (512) 282-8412
AR OK	Federal Railroad Administration	(F) (512) 282-8412
LA TX	P.O. Box 1522168	
NM	Austin, Texas 78715-2168	
Region VI	Mr. Bennie D. Howe	(O) (816) 407-9651
CO MO	Federal Railroad Administration	(F) (816) 792-2881
IA NE	P.O. Box 758	
KS	Liberty, Missouri 64069-0758	
Region VII	Mr. Charles M. Hagood	(O) (559) 641-7649
AZ NV	Federal Railroad Administration	(F) (559) 641-7649
CA UT	P.O. Box 453	
	Oakhurst, California 93644	
Region VIII	Ms. Chris Adams	(O) (360) 694-1797
AK OR	Federal Railroad Administration	(F) (360) 694-1797
ID SD	500 East Broadway, Suite 240	
MT WA	Vancouver, Washington 98660	
ND WY		

CHICAGO BUSINESS
— POWERED BY CRAIN'S —

[My Account](#)

[My Clippings \(0\)](#)

Welcome!
Home > This Week's Crain's > Estates in leafy seclusion

BROWSE

ChicagoBusiness Home
Daily Headlines
This Week's Crain's
My Industry News
Crain's Lists
People/Profiles
Article Archives
RSS Feeds

Search Crain's

Advanced Search

News By Industry
- Please Select -

View All Industries

Issue
July 31, 2006

CRAIN'S
CHICAGO BUSINESS

Subscribe to
Crain's Chicago Busi...

By H. Lee Murphy

Subscribe to an RSS feed on this topic

Estates in leafy seclusion

At end of gravel roads, sprawling land, mansions

Some residents of Barrington Hills grouse about home construction and rising traffic posing threats to the privileged privacy they've protected with restrictive zoning for much of the past century. But the complaints ring a bit hollow in such a vastly roomy village.

Many captains of suburban industry, both active and retired, live here, at the end of gravel roads on sprawling estates hidden by the leafy rolling landscape. They include Robert Galvin, former CEO of Motorola Inc., who has a house, pool and tennis court on more than 300 acres; A. Robert Abboud, onetime CEO of First National Bank of Chicago, who lives more modestly on 18 acres; Richard L. Duchossois, chairman of Duchossois Industries Inc. in Elmhurst, who maintains a 600-acre horse-breeding farm, and Jasper B. Sanfilippo, chairman and CEO of John B. Sanfilippo & Son Inc. in Elgin, who lives in a 60,000-square-foot house that ranks as one of the largest private residences in the Midwest.

Talk about seclusion. Barrington Hills, which reaches into four counties, doesn't have any stores or even sidewalks. Virtually all its land is zoned for residences on five acres or more. Some 50 miles of local trails are open for horseback riding.

"People who come to live in Barrington Hills like to own land," says Thomas Wamberg, chairman and CEO of Clark Inc., an executive compensation specialist based since 1992 in North Barrington, a short commute from Mr. Wamberg's house on 70 acres. "There may be no other place around Chicago that you can find such big estates unless you're willing to move really far out."

Lots to mow: Software executive Robert G. Abboud, above, is village president; dad A. Robert Abboud, former CEO of First National Bank of Chicago, is also a resident.
Photo: John R. Boehm

Local Information

Events Calendar

M	T	W	T	F	S	S
24	25	26	27	28	29	

Register for Crain's Events
Add your Event
Today's Stocks
Traffic Report
Weather

Special Features


Dining Reviews
Entertain a Client
Join an Organization
Commute/Travel

Business Tools

Look up Phone/Zip
Public Records
Study Demographics
Career Resources

Research a Company
Services
Classifieds
Download Top Lists
Blue Dates
Meeting Planners Guide
Golf Guide
Advertise with Us
Contact Us
About Us
Subscription Center

Mr. Wamberg, 53, built an eight-bedroom residence for his large family four years ago. It's reputed to be 20,000 square feet; he's not sure himself. "It's a large home but feels small and even quaint," he says.



Related Article Topics | Related Industry News

10 acres up for sale, with an asking price of \$2 million. Mr. Paris is 72 and has tired of maintaining the pool and tennis court.

Such upscale rural living typically requires crews of landscapers and isn't for everyone. Alexander Paris, president of Barrington Research Associates Inc. who moved to town in 1979, has his 7,000-square-foot residence on

"I moved here originally for the clean air and open spaces," he says. "But the roads have become crowded with traffic, and the town has changed somewhat over the years."

Bigger changes loom. Earlier this year a development partnership headed by the Fritz Duda Co. of Dallas won a five-year battle that raged to the Illinois Supreme Court to take a 368-acre parcel on the northwest corner of the village and build 371 homes on lots as small as one-fourth of an acre.

Village officials vow to block the Duda project. "Barrington Hills will ultimately prevail, period," declares Robert G. Abboud, 49, village president and president and CEO of Barrington-based RGA Labs Inc., a developer of software for utilities. His father is A. Robert Abboud.

Last year 79 houses sold in Barrington Hills, priced between \$400,000 and \$3.6 million, with the average at \$1.07 million. In the first six months of this year 41 properties sold, with the average sale price up 12% to \$1.2 million.

Less than two years ago, Mary Williams, owner/broker of Barrington Realty Co., sold her parents' 3,000-square-foot home in Barrington Hills for \$825,000. A developer tore it down and put a speculative 15,000-square-foot house in its place, still on the market at an asking price of \$5 million.

"If there wasn't so much empty land in Barrington Hills, some of these big new mansions would seem excessive," she says.

BEST PLACES TO LIVE

Barrington Hills

Population: 4,258
Area: 27.9 square miles
Median household income: \$145,330
Commute: 46 minutes by Metra

Population figure estimates as of July 2005; household income as of 2000. U.S. Census and land area data are from City-Data.com. Commute times are to Chicago's Loop during morning rush hour and are calculated by Metra schedule.

Some residents worry that the biggest parcels of open space will eventually be redeveloped as five-acre tracts, boosting a population that has been stable for decades. Mr. Duchossois, who is 84, has owned his Hill 'n' Dale Farm on 600 acres since the 1960s. Once he's gone, he says, his family "has no plans to do anything with this farm. But nothing is forever."

©2006 by Crain Communications Inc.

Additional Resources

Related Article Topics

Related Industry News

- › Fashion, Style, Trends
- › Real Estate - Residential

Today's Other Headlines

- › Accident claims plummet, baffling insurers
- › Kraft rebuilds its Tang dynasty — overseas
- › LATE NEWS: Ill. health firms in the pink; Boeing seeks OK for new freighter; local thrift boosts safeguards; more...

- › [Real Estate - Residential](#)
- › [Suburban Matters](#)

Related Resources

- › [Chicago's Largest Advertising Agencies](#)
- › [Public Relations Firms](#)
- › [Who's Who in Chicago Advertising and Public Relations](#)

- › [Mesirow executive loses SEC fraud case](#)
- › [Tribune sells \\$46 million in Time-Warner stock](#)
- › [Ryan lawyers again ask judge to throw out verdict](#)
- › [Stroger, Peralca spar over big-box wage issue](#)
- › [Candidates for state treasurer face off in first debate](#)
- › [ComEd seeks \\$346 million rate hike, gets \\$8 million](#)
- › [U.S. Cellular parent reports 4Q profit](#)
- › [Citing suppliers, analyst sees slower growth at Sears](#)
- › [Wm. Blair fund leaders leave to start new firm](#)
- › [Cardinal George has second surgery](#)
- › [Bally shares rise as hedge fund ups stake](#)
- › [Gino's East steps into grocery stores](#)
- › [View All of Today's Headlines](#)

Top Stories in This Week's Crain's



Claims plummet, baffling insurers



Business doubts Daley



Where sponsors are king



I've made it! Just check my address

◀ [Previous Article](#) - [Next Article](#) ▶



[Privacy Policy](#) | [Site Map](#) | [About Us](#) | [Contact Us](#) | [Back to Top](#)
 Copyright © 2006 Crain Communications, Inc.
 Programming, Technology & Hosting Services, ePublishing, Inc.