

LARRY KASECAMP
Legislative Director

DAVID PENDLETON SR
Assistant Director

TOM CAHILL
Secretary



MAIN OFFICE
11505 Caboose Road SW
Suite 1A
Frostburg, MD 21532-3712

ANNAPOLIS OFFICE
176 Conduit Street
Suite 206
Annapolis, MD 21401-2597

PH: 301-697-2695
utusldmd@gmail.com

March 7, 2024

The Honorable Chairman Marc Korman, Vice Chair Regina Boyce and
Members of the Environment & Transportation Committee

REPRESENTATIVES

CUMBERLAND
Local 600
LAWRENCE KASECAMP

BRUNSWICK
Local 631
TOM CAHILL

EDMONSTON
Local 1470
DAVID PENDLETON SR.

BALTIMORE
Local 610
JOHN WALKER

Local 1949
JACOB STROMAN

RE: SUPPORT HB1446 as Amended

I'm the Maryland Legislative Director for the Transportation Division of the International Association of Sheet Metal, Air, Rail and Transportation Worker's (SMART). We are the largest rail labor union in North America. Our members in Maryland are employees of CSX, Norfolk Southern Railway, Amtrak, Bombardier (MARC Service) and the Canton Railroad and work as conductors, engineers, switchmen, trainmen, utility persons and yardmasters. Our members operate freight and passenger trains that travel throughout the State. SMART represents over 216,000 members throughout the country.

My position as Legislative Director within our organization is first and foremost to seek to ensure our members have a safe work environment.


In that vein, I ask for your support for the rail safety legislation introduced in the House as **HB-1446 "Railroads – Safety Requirements (Maryland Railway Safety Act of 2024)" as amended**. This proactive rail safety legislation was intended to address several areas related to the safe operations of railroads in the State of Maryland. Specifically, there were four separate provisions in the original bill. As a result of the bill drafting process and some oversight there were issues with the language in a few of the provisions. The parties addressed the issues through the amendment offered by the sponsor leaving the 2-person minimum crew provision intact.

I hired on the B&O Railroad in 1977 and hold seniority as a freight Conductor with CSX Transportation for 47 years now. In 1977, each freight train had 4 to 5 crewmembers. Through advances in technologies, that number has been reduced. Today, the reality is over 99% of America's freight trains operate with two federally certified and licensed crewmembers: A Conductor and Engineer.

Several things happened that gave rise to the pursuit of this provision of the legislation. On July 6, 2013, a freight train derailed in Lac-Mégantic, Quebec that resulted in 47 lost lives and a town nearly destroyed. That accident happened because a Montreal, Maine & Atlantic Railway crewmember, working alone, had his 72-car crude oil train roll away and crash in the middle of a town causing horrific death and devastation.

There are many tasks that must be performed by the crewmembers on a freight train every day that one person just cannot accomplish alone, and this fact played a major role in the Lac- Mégantic tragedy. The train was left standing unattended on a steep grade several miles outside the town because that was the only stretch of track that could accommodate the entire train without blocking any highway grade crossings.

The train could have been secured and left unattended on flat terrain much closer to the town after having been separated, or “cut,” to keep the crossing open, but that task cannot be accomplished safely and in compliance with operating rules with a single crew member. Also, attempting to both secure the train with hand brakes and properly test the securement cannot be accomplished as safe operating standards dictate. The securement of the train failed, and the result was that the train traversed down the steep grade into the center of town where it eventually derailed resulting in explosions and fires killing 47 persons and causing millions of dollars in environmental damage.



Following this tragic accident, Canadian regulators banned this type of one-person operations throughout Canada.

On March 4, 1996, in Weyauwega, Wisconsin the town had to be evacuated due to a train derailment containing hazardous materials. 30 cars derailed containing liquid petroleum, and sodium hydroxide. The fire spread quickly, and the fire department’s chief concern was that the train would explode.



Within 45 minutes they determined that the town’s 2200 residents had to be evacuated. The residents had only 5 minutes notice to immediately vacate their homes and had to leave everything they had behind.

This wasn’t an orderly evacuation. Imagine being in your home with your family and having a firefighter in front of your house with a bull horn yelling evacuate now. People didn’t know where to go, didn’t know when they’d return, nor could they ask questions about what was going on. The fire burnt for over two weeks.

Following this tragic derailment, the state of Wisconsin passed a minimum 2-person crew requirement.

There have been several attempts to regulate crew size at the federal level through the Federal Railroad Administration rulemaking process. In 2008 the Obama administration initiated the rulemaking process. In 2016 the Trump administration cancelled the rulemaking process. In 2021 the Biden administration reinstated the rulemaking process to regulate crew size. No regulation has been issued to date.

This rail safety legislation has also been introduced in 34 states and has become law or regulation in Arizona, California, Colorado, Illinois, Kansas, Minnesota, New York, Nevada, Ohio, Washington, West Virginia, and Wisconsin.

Freight train crews work long hours, day and night, with few set shifts, and are on call 24 hours 7 days a week. With as little as 1 hour and 15 minutes notice, they are required to report to work for a 12-hour shift, often operating trains laden with hazardous materials. Fatigue in the freight railroad industry is our organizations number one safety concern and having a minimum of two crewmembers is the primary way we help combat fatigue. Having a minimum of two crewmembers also is the best way to assure compliance with the railroads complex operating rules.

Some of you will remember the 1996 head-on collision of a MARC commuter train and an Amtrak passenger train that occurred in Silver Spring, Maryland in which 11 persons were killed and 13 injured.



Following a lengthy investigation, the FRA found that a one-person crew in the locomotive contributed to signal violations associated with the collision and issued an Emergency Order and subsequent safety regulations requiring communications between the operating cab and the train crew stationed in the passenger cars. As a result, commuter passenger trains today routinely have a crew of three qualified people on the crew who must work as a team with constant communication between the crew members and qualifications for emergency response and first responder training.

The SMART-TD Maryland State Legislative Board contracted a reputable consulting firm to gage the level of support by the public for such minimum crew legislation. We wanted to see where the public stood in relation to the Governor, since the General Assembly was on opposite ends. The survey covered several demographic groupings with results separated based on gender, age, education, political self-identification, and geographic region. I'll just point out that the overall results of the survey are that the level of public support by Marylanders for this legislation is 88%. This survey is a part of the previous record on this legislation.

There is an increase in the transportation of hazardous and volatile materials on the railroads as well as significantly longer trains operating over the unique and widely varying geographical terrain existing in our state. This coupled with the possibility of decreasing train crew size, creates a significant localized safety hazard to the employees, the public, the communities, and the environment.

Adequate personnel are critical to insuring railroad operational safety, security, and in the event of a hazardous material incident, support of first responder activities. This legislation regulating minimum railroad crew staffing is a proactive effort to protect and promote worker health and safety, and the security and welfare of the residents of the state by reducing the risk exposure to local communities and protecting environmentally sensitive lands and waterways.

The recent freight train derailment that occurred in East Palestine, Ohio where a freight train carrying hazardous materials derailed, caught fire, and caused the evacuation of the community stands as a reminder of the current potential for disaster.



To allow these monstrous freight trains carrying many hazardous materials to operate through the State with one, or no crew members would be reckless.

Following this tragic accident, the state of Ohio passed a minimum 2-person crew requirement.

I am sure you have been approached by the railroads who are opposed to this legislation. I want to address some of their arguments against this legislation. Their first argument is that this legislation is preempted by federal law. We do not argue that there are many provisions in federal law covering a wide range of issues that are preempted from state regulation; however, crew member requirements on freight trains are not one of them.

Attached are three letters from the MD Attorney General's office wherein the first letter they reference this legislation and write "*appears to neither violate, nor is preempted by, federal law as it relates to crew member requirements for trains used in connection with the movement of freight in the State.*" In the follow up letter, which was requested by the railroads representatives the AG's office wrote "*if a sufficient legislative record is established to demonstrate that the minimum crew size requirements under the bill are primarily related to safety and will not interfere with rail transportation, a court is unlikely to find that the requirement is preempted under the ICCTA. On the other hand, without such evidence, a court may conclude that the minimum crew size requirement regulates rail transportation and operation*

in the State, which may be preempted under the ICCTA,” thereby leaving the door open for interpretation. The 3rd letter was just recently issued on February 13, 2023 wherein they Attorney General’s office again reiterated in their view *“For the foregoing reasons..... the holding in the Indiana R.R. II case does not alter the analysis and conclusion regarding the possibility of either 3RA preemption or FRSA authorization for state rail crew size as addressed in the Feldman Letter.”*

The AG’s first opinion is reinforced by the Seventh District Court’s decision rendered in *Burlington Northern and Santa Fe Railway Co. v. Doyle* which examined the Wisconsin law that required a minimum of two persons on freight trains. The court ruled that Wisconsin was “free to require two-person crews on over-the-road operations.” This finding by the 7th District Court rendered in 1999 has not been challenged by the railroads.

They also attempt to use Section 711 of the Regional Rail Reorganization Act of 1973 (3R Act) stating that “Congress expressly intended to preempt state minimum crew laws.” Again, we agree that in 1973 Congress did intend to preempt 17 states and the District of Columbia from regulating minimum crew laws. However, this decision was rendered at a time when there were 4 or 5 crew members on each freight train, and it was not for the purpose of denying States the ability to provide for the safety of their towns, communities, and citizens. Congress was attempting to protect the Midwest and Northeast regions from financial collapse related to a disappearance of rail service as seven Class I railroads were in bankruptcy. As a result, they created the federally government owed Consolidated Rail Corporation known as Conrail.

They did afford the provisions of the preemption to the other railroads operating in the 17 states and the District of Columbia due to the potential for unfair competition in the states they all served. Their main concern in creating this provision was their fiduciary responsibility to the taxpayers. In 1998, Conrail was absolved through the purchase of their assets by CSX and Norfolk Southern Railway and is no longer a potential liability to the taxpayers.

On the issue of preemption, the critical question in any preemption analysis is always whether Congress intended that a federal regulation supersedes state law. In the case of *Louisiana Public Service Commission v. FCC* the court wrote:

“Pre-emption occurs when Congress, in enacting a federal statute, expresses a clear intent to preempt state law, when there is outright or actual conflict between federal and state law, where compliance with both federal and state law is in effect physically impossible . . . or where the state law stands as an obstacle to the accomplishment and execution of the full objectives of Congress.

Moreover, the Supreme Court has also made it clear that “[p]re-emption may result not only from action taken by Congress itself; a federal agency acting within the scope of its congressionally delegated authority may preempt state regulation.”

So, the key to the argument that Section 711 of the 3R Act was intended to “expresses a clear intent to preempt state law” would be based on the record as to why Congress passed a federal statute and to what it applies. We take no exception to the fact that Congress had a clear intent to preempt state law within the 17 states that Conrail operated in. What we do take exception to is that that law is still applicable.

The record clearly shows that Congress was attempting to protect the Midwest and Northeast regions (17 States) from financial collapse related to a disappearance of rail service as seven Class I railroads were in bankruptcy. They were not passing a law to preempt crew size throughout the United States. They limited the laws reach to these 17 States to level the playing field against Conrail, the taxpayer owned railroad.

Congress placed Conrail back into the hands of the private sector through the sale of their assets. However, the obvious advantage the railroads operating in this limited 17 state area had over the rest of the railroads in the country, where the preemption did not apply, still existed. In response, Congress passed into law Section 408 of the Rail Safety Improvement Act that required the Department of Transportation (DOT) to complete a study regarding the impacts of repealing Section 711 of the 3R Act.

The DOT delegated this duty to the Federal Railroad Administration (FRA), the agency that Congress gave the jurisdiction over railroad safety to when they established it. The FRA completed the study and reported back to the Congress that ***“the goal of protecting the Midwest and Northeast regions from financial collapse related to a disappearance of rail service has been met. The rationale behind the preemption provision in the 3R Act of ensuring viable freight rail service no longer exists. Repealing Section 711 would restore the status quo that existed prior to its enactment and create a level playing field among rail carriers nationwide.”*** They concluded with ***“For the above stated reasons.....the purpose for which Section 711 was enacted was met a number of years ago and Section 711 should be repealed.”***

This report was issued by the FRA, the federal agency assigned by Congress with the responsibilities of overseeing safety in the rail industry. The effect of their report is that all railroads are on a level playing field nationwide.

The issue of preemption related to the states that were not within the 17-state limit has been settled. The U.S. Seventh District Court found in the *Burlington Northern and Santa Fe Railway Company v. Doyle* that the state of Wisconsin was ***“free to require two-person crews on over-the-road operations.”*** This settled law will govern the country until the FRA decides to affirmatively regulate such operations as minimum crew size, which they have not done.

The railroads claim that requiring a minimum of two persons on their freight trains will be a major inconvenience and break the bank. We find this argument hypocritical. On one hand they argue to maintain the outdated special treatment contained in Section 711, which gives them an unfair advantage over the 2/3 of the United States where the exemption didn't apply, and then argue they would be at a disadvantage if the same situation existed between Maryland and other states where they operate. In addition, the delay argument has no merit as crew changes already must occur over the routes and there is no additional cost for a second crew member if they board the freight train at the last regular crew change point before entering Maryland or at the border. So, no operational delay would be required.

We as an organization are cognizant of the fact the railroads are in business to make money for their owners and stockholders and we want them to secure more business and be as profitable as possible. After all, our member's jobs depend on their success. But when it comes down to the wellbeing, health, and safety of the members we represent and the safety of the public, we will always side with safety.

Another argument we have heard is that this is a collective bargaining issue and legislators should not be injected into the fray between labor and management. To the contrary, we believe this issue falls under the purview of employee and public safety, which places it under the jurisdiction of the legislative department within our organization. Our legislative department will not relinquish our responsibilities to provide for the safety and well-being of our members to collective bargaining. There is no amount of money or benefits worth any harm that may come to our members or the public if a tragic accident should occur because of insufficient manpower.

In 2008 Congress passed the Rail Safety Improvement Act, which we have been in support of, that required Positive Train Control's (PTC) implementation nationwide by 2015. The railroads had repeatedly requested delays in implementing this supplemental safety technology with full implementation just being completed in December 2020. The railroads now try to present this technology as their replacement for the second crew member.

On January 20, 2023, MARC had to cancel forty-one trains because of connectivity issues with PTC. While this was an inconvenience to thousands of Maryland commuters, fortunately no one was hurt because the trains were able to be canceled. Imagine this happening to a freight train loaded with hazardous material operating through Baltimore with one person.

Positive Train Control, or hot box detectors, or Deadman's pedal or the myriad of other supplemental safety apparatus will not prevent every accident in the railroad industry. Each merely complements the

other in making the industry safer, as does two persons on each crew. A single crewmember cannot perform all the tasks required of them and maintain the highest level of safety and respond to any emergency they may encounter.

15-year BNSF conductor Mike Rankin shared his harrowing story of how two freight rail crewmembers worked together to save someone's life — a feat that would have been impossible had just one person been operating their train the fateful night of December 23, 2004.

When the train Conductor Rankin and his colleague were operating hit a car that bypassed crossing gates, all three passengers in the vehicle were ejected. Two died instantly. The third, barely alive, needed immediate medical attention. An ambulance was on the way, but Rankin soon realized the ambulance was on the wrong side of the tracks. The only solution was to separate the train at the crossing, so the ambulance could drive through — a maneuver that requires two people to execute.

“There's no way a single crew member could have secured the train, briefed emergency personnel, uncoupled train cars and moved the front of the train forward all on his or her own,” Conductor Rankin said. *“I've seen enough to know that those who want one-crew train operations are not fully grasping the risks, emergencies, and close calls that my fellow conductors and engineers see on the rails regularly. Conductors and engineers don't just operate trains. In emergency situations, our presence and teamwork can mean the difference between life and death.”*

Another instance occurred when an engineer fell ill on their train in route to Cumberland, MD. They had to stop the train as the engineer was in severe pain and losing consciousness. The conductor summoned an ambulance via cell phone and was able to guide them to the rural location of the train since there was no physical address for GPS to work from. They transported the engineer to the nearest hospital where he underwent immediate surgery for acute appendicitis. The Doctor told the engineer he was close to having his appendix burst which may have resulted in his death had he not received the prompt attention to his condition. As you can imagine, he was extremely grateful for the conductor's presence and quick-thinking action.

The merits of the 2-person minimum crew provision of this legislation have been thoroughly debated over the last several years. Each time receiving a favorable report by the respective committees it went before. This provision has been passed by this committee 6 times and has passed the General Assembly 2 times, each time with overwhelming support. Unfortunately, it was vetoed each time by the previous Governor.

The arguments noted in the governor's veto letter were the same arguments offered in committees and on the House and Senate floor prior to passage. The public saw through those arguments as reflected in the survey; our members saw through those arguments as reflected in their ratification votes, and the General Assembly saw through those arguments and passed the legislation on multiple occasions with a bipartisan overwhelming vote.

WE THEREFORE URGE A FAVORABLE REPORT ON HB1446

Sincerely,



Lawrence E. Kasecamp
MD State Legislative Director
SMART Transportation Division