

Docket TP-151079

Karen Hengerer, August 10, 2015

Why is the 'UTC Rulemaking to Consider Adoption of Rules Relating to Rail Safety' an opt-in program?

With the proliferation of oil terminal and refinery requests along the entire Washington State coastline, and the exponential increase in oil-train traffic along the entire Columbia from Spokane, through Washougal, Camas, Vancouver, Longview and all cities north to Seattle, it would seem that any program with only an 'opt-in' feature for cities and high population density areas is a program in name only for the following reasons:

1. Involvement in the rulemaking process and/or the participation in workshops is fully dependent on all cities and municipal organizations to be following this process carefully.
2. Rail Safety, especially with the known issues of oil-car quality, enforcement of speed regulations, lack of regular (advanced) reporting of impending trains through municipalities should require automatic participation.
3. The cities along the BNSF lines from North Dakota through the entire state of Washington are not prepared for a 'reasonable worst case scenario' oil spill, and certainly are not indemnified at the rate of \$400/gallon for such a spill.

Safe rail crossings with miles of oil trains seems a minimum requirement for a safety program, and should be a requirement for all cities currently experiencing oil-by-rail traffic, and expecting significant increase in that traffic.

I will leave to others the more detailed analysis of the contents of this Docket item, but it certainly seems irresponsible for the State of Washington not to require these minimum standards at this time, for ALL cities and high density areas with oil-by-rail traffic.

Karen Hengerer  
Falk Road, #J48  
Vancouver WA, 98661