# *Port of Vancouver*
# *Schedule 1*
# *Rail Engineering, Operations, and Safety Review*
# *Final Report*

**Prepared for:**

# *HDR*

**Prepared by:**

## TÜV Rheinland Mobility
## Rail Sciences Division

**March 25, 2014**

TÜVRheinland®
RSI Rail Sciences

# *Who We are*

- TUV Rheinland was founded 1872, ~18.000 Employees in 65 countries
- RSI was founded 1987, ~30 Employees
- Offices in Atlanta, Rochester, Detroit and Omaha
- Specialize in rail safety assessments and simulation technology
- TOS, VAMPIRE®, TOES™ ,NUCARS™
- Conducted investigations in 5000+ Derailments/Accidents
- Specialize in Railroad component failures
- Wheel/Rail Interaction Studies
- Testing and Instrumentation
- General Engineering and design
- Vehicle and Train Dynamics
- Network Capacity Modeling
- Technical Training
- Testing/Inspection/Certification Services for Rail & Transit
- International Approvals
- Vital system assurance

# Project Introduction

- POV through their partners at HDR requested that TÜV Rheinland Mobility Rail Sciences Division (TÜV Rail Sciences) evaluate the derailment risk of a proposed route exiting BNSF Fallbridge Subdivision at MP 10.69 into the Port of Vancouver.
- POV provided TUV RSI with track profile information, typical train configurations and operational criteria such as speed with expected train consists, track data and operating speed limits.
  - Grain, 110 covered hopper cars, 2 locomotives at head end and 1 at rear end
  - Oil, 120 tank cars, 3 locomotives at head end and 2 at the rear end
  - Potash, 170 covered hopper cars, 2 locomotives at head end and 2 at the rear end.
- HDR also requested that TUV RSI compute the lateral and vertical forces using VAMPIRE as well as the resulting L/V ratios for the proposed track alignment between the BNSF main line track and Lafarge.
- The AAR's Train Operations Simulator (TOS) was used to determine the longitudinal in-train forces

**HDR Vancouver Connection Track**
**Track Profile**




TUV Rail Sciences Inc.

TÜVRheinland®
RSI Rail Sciences

# *Analysis – Longitudinal In-Train Forces*

- TUV-RSI is licensed user of TOS ™
  - Train make up and marshalling
    - » Safe trailing tonnage behind empty, long/short car
    - » Route locomotive tonnage ratings
    - » Operating rules and restrictions; timetable instructions
    - » Locomotive placement for helper and locotrol
  - Train Slack action
  - Derailments
  - Fuel conservation studies
  - Locomotive utilization and performance
  - Over the road running time analysis




TÜVRheinland®
RSI Rail Sciences

# In-Train Force Analysis




TÜVRheinland®
RSI Rail Sciences

# In-Train Force Analysis

- Next, a series of train stopping simulations were performed using loaded trains with nominal train handling approaching the track location where braking was initiated during:
  - Full service braking stops
  - Emergency braking stops
- Utilizing nominal train handling prior to the onset of braking normalized the train slack in a representative state to determine if train slack is a significant factor relevant to predicted in-train forces.
- Braking from 10 mph was initiated (at 0.2 mile intervals) encompassing the 3 miles of proposed connection track. Track was assumed to be level on each end of the provided track data.
- Two train braking scenarios were simulated:
  1. Full Service
     - Nominal train handling was employed up to the train braking location at which point full service braking was initiated, the throttle was immediately moved to IDLE from its current position, and the engine brakes were bailed off.
  2. Head-End Emergency
     - Nominal train handling was employed up to the train braking location at which point emergency braking was initiated form the lead locomotive, the throttle was immediately moved to IDLE from its current position, and the engine brakes were bailed off.

# In-Train Force Analysis




TÜVRheinland®
RSI Rail Sciences

# In-Train Force Analysis




TÜVRheinland®
RSI Rail Sciences

# In-Train Force Analysis

- The following table quantifies the maximum in-train longitudinal forces observed in all nominal and braking simulation scenarios

**Table 1.0 Maximum Longitudinal Forces**

| Scenario | | | Maximum In-Train Longitudinal Forces (Kips)* | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Train | Consist | | Nominal 10 MPH | | Full Service Braking | | | | Emergency Braking | | | |
| Type | Locomotives | Cars | Connection Track | | Connection Track | | Level Track | | Connection Track | | Level Track | |
| | | | Draft | Buff | Draft | Buff | Draft | Buff | Draft | Buff | Draft | Buff |
| Grain | C44-9 2x0x1 | 110 Covered Hoppers | 115 | -110 | 225 | -185 | 225 | -125 | 165 | -140 | 150 | -90 |
| Fuel | C44-9 3x0x2 | 120 Tank Cars | 75 | -125 | 225 | -225 | 235 | -130 | 235 | -215 | 185 | -145 |
| Potash | AC4400 2x0x2 | 170 Covered Hoppers | 110 | -140 | 320 | -210 | 135 | -120 | 265 | -235 | 170 | -150 |

* Note: Forces rounded to nearest multiple of 5.

- The maximum simulated Draft and Buff forces are well within industry and AAR recommended limits

TÜVRheinland®
RSI Rail Sciences

# Analysis – Lateral/Vertical

- Computed L/V ratios and lateral bolster forces for both the empty and loaded car configurations. The L/V ratios for the empty cars are wheel climb (single wheel) ratios. The L/V ratios for the loaded cars are rail rollover ratios. The AAR L/V established industry accepted design limits

**Figure VI-1**
**Lateral to Vertical Force Relationsip Between Rail and Wheel**




The lateral to vertical ratio (L/V) is the lateral force pushing outward against the rail compared to the vertical force pushing downward on the top of the rail. The tendency for the rail to tip and/or move laterally, or for the wheel to climb the rail increases as the L/V ratio increases.

L/V = 1.29 wheel may climb new rail
L/V = .82 wheel lift impending
L/V = .75 wheel may climb worn rail
L/V = .64 rail overturn force starts
(unrestrained rail may overturn)

**Lateral Forces**

Lateral forces are influenced by the following factors:

- Centrifugal force
- Coupler forces
- Wheel creep forces
- Track geometry input.

1. Centrifugal force is only associated with negotiating curves and is a direct result of speed and curvature. This force is normally nullified by the amount of superelevation for a given "balance" speed around the curve. However, it will produce a significant lateral force at the wheels if the train is moving much faster than the balance speed. The force will occur at the outside rail and will

TÜVRheinland®
RSI Rail Sciences

# *VAMPIRE Analysis*

- **VAMPIRE®*** is a vehicle – track interaction computer simulation software.
- It simulates rail vehicles with their suspension characteristics, and their performance travelling over track features.
- It is a tool to predict the following:
  - Derailment Risk (L/V Ratio)
  - Forces into track
  - Ride Quality




TÜVRheinland®
RSI Rail Sciences

# Vehicle Dynamics Results – Loaded Vehicles

| Maximum Individual Wheel L/V Ratio | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Vehicle | In-Train Force | As Designed Track | Class 1 Cross Level Dip | Class 2 Cross Level Dip |
| Grain Car Loaded | 300 Kips Buff | 0.44 | 0.58 | 0.56 |
| | 300 Kips Draft | 0.34 | 0.50 | 0.48 |
| | None | 0.39 | 0.56 | 0.54 |
| Potash Car Loaded | 300 Kips Buff | 0.43 | 0.59 | 0.57 |
| | 300 Kips Draft | 0.34 | 0.52 | 0.50 |
| | None | 0.39 | 0.56 | 0.54 |
| Tanker Car Loaded | 300 Kips Buff | 0.43 | 0.57 | 0.55 |
| | 300 Kips Draft | 0.34 | 0.50 | 0.48 |
| | None | 0.39 | 0.54 | 0.53 |

- *Indicator of Wheel Climb Potential:*
  - Industry Recommended Maximum Allowable L/V Ratio = 0.82
  - AAR Chapter XI Standard Maximum Allowable L/V Ratio = 1.00

# Vehicle Dynamics Results – Loaded Vehicles

| Minimum % Wheel Unloading | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Vehicle | In-Train Force | As Designed Track | Class 1 Cross Level Dip | Class 2 Cross Level Dip |
| Grain Car Loaded | 300 Kips Buff | 82.58 | 55.75 | 58.35 |
| | 300 Kips Draft | 90.30 | 66.23 | 69.22 |
| | None | 90.78 | 60.95 | 63.31 |
| Potash Car Loaded | 300 Kips Buff | 86.29 | 58.83 | 61.01 |
| | 300 Kips Draft | 91.89 | 67.13 | 69.83 |
| | None | 91.05 | 62.36 | 65.32 |
| Tanker Car Loaded | 300 Kips Buff | 83.86 | 56.96 | 59.42 |
| | 300 Kips Draft | 90.60 | 68.37 | 70.75 |
| | None | 90.87 | 62.09 | 64.75 |

- *Indicator of Wheel Lift Potential:*
  - AAR Chapter XI Standard Minimum Allowable Percent Wheel Unloading = 10.0%

# Vehicle Dynamics Results – Loaded Vehicles

| Maximum Axle Sum L/V Ratio | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Vehicle | In-Train Force | As Designed Track | Class 1 Cross Level Dip | Class 2 Cross Level Dip |
| Grain Car Loaded | 300 Kips Buff | 0.77 | 0.92 | 0.90 |
| | 300 Kips Draft | 0.65 | 0.84 | 0.82 |
| | None | 0.73 | 0.89 | 0.87 |
| Potash Car Loaded | 300 Kips Buff | 0.76 | 0.93 | 0.91 |
| | 300 Kips Draft | 0.66 | 0.86 | 0.84 |
| | None | 0.72 | 0.90 | 0.88 |
| Tanker Car Loaded | 300 Kips Buff | 0.76 | 0.91 | 0.89 |
| | 300 Kips Draft | 0.67 | 0.84 | 0.82 |
| | None | 0.73 | 0.88 | 0.86 |

- *Indicator of Wheel Climb Potential:*
  - AAR Chapter XI Standard Maximum Allowable Axle Sum L/V Ratio = 1.50

TÜVRheinland®
RSI Rail Sciences

# Vehicle Dynamics Results – Loaded Vehicles

| Maximum Truck Side L/V Ratio | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Vehicle | In-Train Force | As Designed Track | Class 1 Cross Level Dip | Class 2 Cross Level Dip |
| Grain Car Loaded | 300 Kips Buff | 0.31 | 0.37 | 0.36 |
| | 300 Kips Draft | 0.30 | 0.28 | 0.27 |
| | None | 0.28 | 0.33 | 0.32 |
| Potash Car Loaded | 300 Kips Buff | 0.31 | 0.37 | 0.37 |
| | 300 Kips Draft | 0.31 | 0.31 | 0.30 |
| | None | 0.29 | 0.35 | 0.34 |
| Tanker Car Loaded | 300 Kips Buff | 0.32 | 0.39 | 0.38 |
| | 300 Kips Draft | 0.33 | 0.32 | 0.31 |
| | None | 0.30 | 0.36 | 0.35 |

- *Indicator of Potential to Shift the Rail Laterally or Roll the Rail:*
  - AAR Chapter XI Standard Maximum Allowable Truck Side L/V Ratio = 0.60

TÜVRheinland®
RSI Rail Sciences

# Conclusions and Recommendations

- TÜV-RSI concluded, based on in-train force and vehicle dynamics analyses that the proposed operation and track configuration is well within industry safety standards, a low risk of derailment

- To further improve safety POV requested TUV RSI to propose further enhancements:
  - Maintain track to a *minimum* Class 2 standard to reduce levels of allowable track deviation and the associated risks of local track perturbations over time.
  - Install a high guard rail frog on #15 turnout and double guard rail on the connection track between #15 turnout and the BNSF overhead bridge and through the "Trench", to further lessen the potential for damage.

TÜVRheinland®
RSI Rail Sciences

# Conclusions and Recommendations cont.

- Construct the track structure with new concrete or wooden ties, premium fasteners, and continuously welded 141 pound rail to maintain a robust and less dynamically varying track structure.

- Perform rail neutral temperature measurements during track construction to properly set track neutral temperature.

- Periodically measure track geometry to ensure safety against derailment as the track changes over time.

- Based on these recommendations, POV will further improve the safety performance characteristics, which will result in a very low likelihood of derailment.

# *TÜV Rheinland Mobility Rail Sciences Division*

TÜVRheinland®
RSI Rail Sciences