Benchmarking Level Crossing Safety

Why do we do it?
 How do we do it?
 How to apply in Reality?

Steve Laffey, Railroad Safety Specialist Illinois Commerce Commission Springfield, ILL USA slaffey@icc.illinois.gov





Intro

Apply benchmarking to five examples and evaluate potential to use benchmarking to improve safety.

- 1. Three Classes of American Rail Operation: 2008-2012 Fatalities
- 2. U.S. Pedestrian and Trespasser Fatalities: 2006-2010
- 3. Fatality Rates for Selected Nations within the European Union
- Highway-Rail Crossing Collisions by State: 1990-2012
- 5. Highway-Rail Crossing Collisions by Railroad: 1990-2012



Benchmarking Defined

Process of comparing one's business processes and performance metrics to industry bests or best practices from other industries.

"In the process of best practice benchmarking, we learn how well the targets perform and, more importantly, *the business processes that explain why these firms are successful.*"



Analysis Objective

- Identify states and railways with superior rates of safety, as measured by the rate of collisions or fatalities per measure of risk
- Discern what is what makes the performance of the best, better than the worst
- Future / Ultimate Objective Is to apply the difference to reduce incidents





Process

- 1. Develop metrics to evaluate the relative safety of one state or railway against another, as well as classes of rail operation against one another (freight v. passenger).
- 2. Apply metric
- 3. Rank outcomes
- 4. Apply composite ranks



Method & Data

- Stepwise regression used to identify helpful dependent variables
- 2. Rankings ordering by best to worst
- 3. Composite ranking summing individual ranks into a composite
- 4. Composite scoring summing individual rates into a composite rate

<u>**Need:</u>** Safety data – number of incidents Exposure data – amount of activity</u>

<u>Major question</u> – use raw numbers, rates or some modification such as log transformations?



Intro Example: USA Railways by Type (Freight, Amtrak, Commuter)

				Train -
			Train -	Vehicle
		Fatalities	Vehicle	Collisions
	Fatalities:	Per	Collisions:	Per
Type of	2008 -	Million	2008 -	Million
Railroad	2012	Miles	2012	Miles
Class-1 RRs	2,389	0.84	7,361	2.60
Amtrak	617	3.04	499	2.46
Commuter RRs	336	1.43	273	1.16
Sub-Total	3,342	1.02	8,133	2.49
All Other RRs	104	0.90	172	1.49
Total	3,446	1.02	8,305	2.46



Range in Fatality and Collision Rates for American Railroads: 2008-2012

<u>Best</u>

0.84 Fatalities per million miles – Class 1 Railroads

1.16 Collisions per million miles – Commuter Railroads

<u>Worst</u>

3.04 Fatalities per million miles – Amtrak
2.60 Collisions per million miles – Class 1
Railroads



Example 2: Ped/Trespassers (Rank)

19 States: 2006 - 2010 with 50 or More Pedestrian & Trespass Fatalities	Pedestrians & Trespassers Killed	Rank - Per Million Population 2010 (Census)	Rank - Route Thousand Route Miles 2011 (AAR)	Rank - Per Thousand Carloads 2011 (AAR)	Rank - Composite
Missouri	52	8	1	1	10
Georgia	72	3	4	7	14
Michigan	50	2	2	11	15
Tennessee	54	5	8	4	17
Indiana	65	13	3	2	18
Texas	207	4	6	8	18
Ohio	108	11	7	5	23
New York	92	1	11	15	27
Arizona	66	15	14	3	32
Maryland	50	7	17	9	33
Louisiana	53	18	5	10	33
Pennsylvania	126	12	10	12	34
Illinois	192	19	12	6	37
Washington	70	16	9	13	38
Florida	161	6	15	18	39
New Jersey	82	10	19	14	43
North Carolina	96	14	13	17	44
Massachusetts	57	9	16	19	44
California	405	17	18	16	51
Total	2,058				

014 Global Level Crossing



Example 2: Ped/Trespassers (Rank by Composite Rank and Rank by Composite Rate)

Result when combining the RANK when sorted by best composite ranking and by the RANK when sorted by best composite RATE

19 States: 2006 - 2010 with 50 or More Pedestrian & Trespass Fatalities	Rank by Rank	Rank by Rate	Rank + Rate
Georgia	2	1	3
Vissouri	1	3	4
Vichigan	3	2	5
Tennessee	4	5	9
Texas	6	4	10
ndiana	5	6	11
Dhio	7	7	14
Arizona	9	10	19
ouisiana	11	9	20
Pennsylvania	12	8	20
New York	8	14	22
Maryland	10	12	22
llinois	13	13	26
North Carolina	17	11	28
lorida	15	15	30
Washington	14	17	31
New Jersey	16	18	34
California	19	16	35
Massachusetts	18	19	37



Example 2: Ped/Trespassers (Best & Worst by Composite Rate)

19 States: 2006 - 2010 with 50 or More Pedestrian & Trespass Fatalities	Pedestrians & Trespassers Killed	Rate - Per Million Population 2010 (Census)	Rate - Route Thousand Route Miles 2011 (AAR)	Rate - Per Thousand Carloads 2011 (AAR)	Rate - Composite
Low (Best)	50	4.75	13.14	0.007	18.9
High (Worst)	405	14.96	83.42	0.148	92.8
Difference	8.1	3.15	6.35	21.143	4.9
Low (Best)	MI & MD	NY	MO	MO	GA
High (Worst)	CA	ILL	NJ	MA	MA

Global Level Crossin



Example 3: EU Countries

2014 Global Level Cross





Example 3: EU Countries

Country		Rate		
United Kingdom	UK	0.01		
Norway	NO	0.02		
Spain	ES	0.03		
Germany	DE	0.04		
Sweden	SE	0.05		
France	FR	0.06	Min	0.013070
Austria	AT	0.09	Max	0.684053
Czech Republic	CZ	0.12	Range	52.339250
Belgium	BE	0.13		
Lithuania	LT	0.20		
Portugal	PT	0.21		
Hungary	HU	0.23		
Bulgaria	BG	0.25		
Poland	PL	0.27		
Estonia	EE	0.28		
Croatia	HR	0.31		
Romania	RO	0.38		
Slovakia	SK	0.45		
Greece	EL	0.68		





Example 4: Collisions Between Trains and Vehicles Between 1990 and 2012 by State

Forward stepwise regression identified three exposure variables that best explained the number of collisions - adjusted R-Square of 89.1

Once the independent variables that yield explanatory power were identified, a composite ranking was developed by:

- 1. Calculating the collision rate for only the <u>three "kept" variables</u> and only for the 32 states that experienced 500 or more collisions between 1990 and 2012. The 32 states accounted for 94.7 percent of the 70,728 collisions. The states were then ranked in order by the rate of collisions for each of the kept variables.
- 2. The three individual ranks were then summed to develop a "composite" rank.
- 3. Oregon was the "best" state and Texas the "worst" comparatively speaking.





Variables of Significance

Rate per crossing Rate per licensed driver Rate per million VMT

				Std. Error
Independent		R	Adjusted	of the
Variables	R	Square	R Square	Estimate
PubXings, VMT10,				
License09	0.947	0.897	0.891	13.856

				Std.	
Data Item	Description	Ν	Mean	Deviation	Result
	Number of Crashes 1990 thru				
Crash9012	2012	51	1,387	1,442	Dependent
			· · ·		
	Number of Licensed Drivers				
License09	in 2009	51	4,110	4,370	Kept
	Number of Public Highway-				
PubXings	Rail At-Grade Crossings	51	2,551	2,094	Kept
VMT10	Total Vehicle Miles Traveled	51	58,182	60,279	Kept
			· · ·		
AADT13	Annual Average Daily Traffic	51	5,929,611	6,891,329	Excluded
	% of Population w/ Bachelors				
Bach09	Degree in 2009	51	28	6	Excluded
	Number of Employed persons				
Employee10	in 2010	51	2,723	2,983	Excluded
Expose13	AADT * Daily Trains	51	74,965,254	124,900,000	Excluded
Female10	Female Population in 2010	51	3,078	3,458	Excluded
	Number of Public Highway-				
Gates	Rail Crossings with Gates	51	864	950	Excluded
	Number of Route Miles of All				
HwyMiles09	Types of Highways in 2009	51	79,426	54,533	Excluded
LandKm	Square Kilometers of Land	51	179,361	221,519	Excluded
	Number of Carloads Carried				
Loads11	in 2011 (AAR)	51	3,035,206	2,643,803	Excluded
Male10	Male Population in 2010	51	2,976	3,367	Excluded
Pop10	Total Population in 2010	51	6,053,834	6,823,984	Excluded
	Number of Public Highway-				
	Rail Crossings with 4-Quad				
Quads	Gates	51	7	17	Excluded
	Number of Registered				
Register09	Vehicles in 2009	51	4,829	5,710	Excluded
RtMiles	Railroad Route Miles	51	2,717	1,946	Excluded
	Total Square Kilometers of				
SqKm	Land & Water	51	192,775	250,936	Excluded
	Number of Rail Tons Carried				
Tons11	in 2011 (AAR)	51	161	144	Excluded
	Total Number of At-Grade				
Xings	Crossings	51	4,161	3,130	Excluded



Example 4: Collisions by State

States With 500					
or more	Collisions		Rate Per	Rate Per	
Collisions: 1990 -	(1990 -	Rate Per	Licensed	Million	Composite
2012	2012)	Crossing	Driver	VMT	Rank
Oregon	546	0.305	0.192	0.016	20
Colorado	736	0.431	0.199	0.016	28
New York	734	0.274	0.065	0.006	31
Idaho	570	0.444	0.540	0.036	31
Kansas	1,553	0.304	0.759	0.052	32
Washington	975	0.407	0.194	0.017	34
New Jersey	715	0.476	0.121	0.010	35
Nebraska	1,149	0.385	0.852	0.059	35
Virginia	904	0.475	0.169	0.011	36
Minnesota	1,918	0.436	0.591	0.034	39
Pennsylvania	1,466	0.418	0.169	0.015	41
Missouri	1,666	0.483	0.395	0.024	41
Oklahoma	1,800	0.483	0.776	0.038	44
Kentucky	1,406	0.595	0.478	0.029	48
lowa	2,076	0.478	0.968	0.066	49
Florida	2,008	0.529	0.143	0.010	50
North Carolina	2,035	0.508	0.313	0.020	50
Arizona	621	0.841	0.141	0.010	51
South Carolina	1,560	0.587	0.477	0.032	53
Michigan	2,464	0.528	0.348	0.025	54
Wisconsin	2,198	0.545	0.535	0.037	55
California	3,337	0.565	0.141	0.010	57
Georgia	2,866	0.550	0.454	0.026	57
Tennessee	1,813	0.659	0.405	0.026	58
Mississippi	2,248	1.014	1.164	0.056	62
Arkansas	2,089	0.770	1.012	0.062	62
Ohio	3,527	0.613	0.444	0.032	68
Alabama	2,683	0.963	0.709	0.042	69
Illinois	4,275	0.546	0.515	0.040	70
Indiana	4,242	0.733	0.764	0.056	74
Louisiana	3,530	1.203	1.144	0.078	74
Texas	7,255	0.799	0.472	0.031	76
32 States	66,965	0.577	0.364	0.026	
USA Total	70,728	0.544	0.337	0.024	

2014 Global Level Crossin



Example 5: Collisions Between Trains and Vehicles Between 1990 and 2012 by Railroad

Rate per crossing Rate per route mile

Independent		R	Adjusted	Std. Error of the
Variables	R	Square	R Square	Estimate
Xings, MilesPass,				
RtMile	0.997	0.994	0.993	10.150

Data Item	Description	Ν	Mean	Std. Deviation	Result
	Number of Crashes in				
Crash13	2013	24	77	123	Dependent
	Miles of Passenger				
MilesPass	Ops in 2013	24	3,106,898	8,221,297	Kept
RtMile	Railroad Route Miles	24	4,255	7,801	Kept
	Total Number of At-				
Xings	Grade Crossings	24	5,573	9,906	Kept
	Annual Average Daily				
AADT	Traffic	24	8,960,796	15,300,000	Excluded
Expose	AADT * Daily Trains	24	130,000,000	199,600,000	Excluded
	Employee Hours				
Hours	Worked in 2013	24	17,093,931	28,730,000	Excluded
	Miles of Freight Ops				
MilesFrt	in 2013	24	21,780,409	47,610,000	Excluded
	Total Miles of				
MilesTotal	Operation in 2013	24	28,246,930	53,440,000	Excluded
	Miles of Yard Ops in				
MilesYard	2013	24	3,183,186	6,047,349	Excluded
	Passenger Train				
PassMiles	Miles	24	601,000,000	1,549,000,000	Excluded
	Number of Public				
PubXings	Crossings	24	3,557	6,335	Excluded
	Number of Revenue				
RevenuePass	Passengers Carried	24	14,210,726	23,760,000	Excluded



Example 5: Collisions by Railroads

15 Reporting Railways with				
10 or More			Rate per	
Collisions in	Crashes	Rate per	Route	Composite
2013	2013 All	Crossing	Mile	Rank
СР	48	0.009	0.012	2
BNSF	315	0.012	0.014	5
UP	373	0.012	0.014	7
CN	96	0.010	0.016	6
CSX	328	0.013	0.019	10
KCS	54	0.016	0.020	13
CRSH	24	0.021	0.020	15
NS	340	0.014	0.022	14
NJTR	14	0.034	0.026	20
MBTA	10	0.030	0.026	20
LI	13	0.038	0.041	23
FEC	19	0.027	0.054	21
SCAX	22	0.074	0.057	27
NIRC	19	0.048	0.096	27
ATK	113	0.638	0.172	30
15 Railways	1,788	0.014	0.018	
USA Total	2,089	0.010	0.015	

014 Global Level Crossin



Findings

Example 1: United States summary by type of rail operation (freight v. Amtrak v. commuter rail) – Fatalities as low as 0.84 per million train-miles for Class 1 railways and as high as 3.04 per million train-miles for Amtrak; and for level crossing collisions as low as 1.16 per million train-miles for commuter railways and as high as 2.60 collisions per million train-miles for Class 1 railways

Example 2: Pedestrian and trespasser fatalities in the Chicago Metropolitan area – Fatalities as low as 4.75 per million population for Missouri and as high as 14.96 fatalities per million population for Illinois

Example 3: European Railway Level Crossing Fatalities – as low as 0.01 per million train-kilometers for the United Kingdom and as high as 0.68 fatalities per million train-kilometers for Greece

Example 4: United States level crossing collisions by State – as low as 0.274 collisions per crossing for New York state and as high as 1.203 collisions per crossing for Louisiana

Example 5: United States level crossing collisions by Railway – as low as 0.009 collisions per crossing for Canadian Pacific's American operations and as high as 0.638 collisions per crossing for Amtrak; or 0.048 for NIRC





Conclusion

Can we benchmark? Of course, it is actually pretty easy to do.

The truly hard part is finding what actually yields the difference between best and worst, and then,

<u>Implementing change</u> – challenging enough all by itself, but should be easier with good data and analysis to validate the reason behind the changes.

