

PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

Rail Safety and Carriers Division
Rail Engineering Safety Branch
Rail Transit Safety Section

RESOLUTION ST-20
Date December 20, 1996

R E S O L U T I O N

RESOLUTION ST-20. GRANTING APPROVAL OF LOS ANGELES
COUNTY METROPOLITAN TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY'S SYSTEM
SAFETY PROGRAM PLAN

SUMMARY

This resolution grants the Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority's (LACMTA) request for approval of its system safety program plan except for the security portion which is deferred until January 1, 1998.

BACKGROUND

The Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act of 1991 required the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) to issue a rule requiring the States to oversee the safety of rail fixed guideway systems not regulated by the Federal Railroad Administration. That rule, 49 CFR Part 659 (FTA rule), became effective on January 26, 1996. The FTA rule requires, in part, that each rail transit agency prepare a system safety program plan in accordance with requirements established by a designated State oversight agency. The FTA rule further requires the designated State oversight agency to approve in writing, before January 1, 1997, each rail transit agency's system safety program plan, except for the security portion of each plan which must be approved in writing before January 1, 1998. The FTA is allowing the designated State oversight agencies an extra year to define the security requirements which have never before been considered as an integral part of system safety for rail transit.

Governor Wilson designated the Public Utilities Commission (Commission) as the State oversight agency for California by letter dated October 13, 1992. The Commission then responded to the FTA rule by adopting General Order No. 164, Rules and Regulations Governing State Safety Oversight of Rail Fixed Guideway Systems. General Order No. 164, which became effective on September 20, 1996, contains requirements which must be met by each rail transit agency for preparing and obtaining Commission approval of a system safety program plan.

DISCUSSION

By letter dated November 25, 1996, LACMTA submitted its System Safety Program Plan-Operations, Revision No. 1 (Issue Date: November 25, 1996) for review by staff of the Rail Transit Safety Section (staff) and approval by the Commission. The LACMTA submittal has been reviewed by staff in accordance with a 23 point checklist that is included in the Rail Transit Safety Section's procedure RTSS-2, Procedure for Reviewing, Approving and Filing Transit Agency Prepared System Safety Program Plans.

The completed checklist showing that staff reviewed the LACMTA system safety program plan and found it to be acceptable, except for the security portion of the plan which was not reviewed, is attached as Appendix A. Based upon the results of this review, staff recommends that the Commission grant approval of LACMTA's system safety program plan as being in compliance with the requirements in General Order No. 164 and the FTA rule requirement for approval prior to January 1, 1997. Staff further recommends that approval of the security portion of LACMTA's system safety program plan be deferred until January 1, 1998.

PROTESTS

No protests or objections have been received.


FINDINGS

1. LACMTA has requested by letter dated November 25, 1996 approval of its system safety program plan.
2. Staff has reviewed LACMTA's system safety program plan (except for the security portion) and determined that the plan meets the requirements contained in General Order No. 164 and the FTA rule requirement for approval prior to January 1, 1997.
3. Staff has not reviewed the security portion of LACMTA's system safety program plan which in accordance with the FTA rule does not require Commission approval until January 1, 1998.
4. Staff recommends that with the exception of the security portion, LACMTA's request for approval of its system safety program plan be granted by the Commission.

IT IS ORDERED that:

LACMTA's request for approval of its System Safety Program Plan-Operations, Revision No. 1 (Issue Date: November 25, 1996) is granted except for the security portion of the plan which shall be submitted to the staff of the Rail Transit Safety Section for review, and approval by the Commission prior to January 1, 1998.

I hereby certify that this Resolution was adopted by the Public Utilities Commission at its regular meeting on December 20, 1996. The following Commissioners approved it:



WESLEY M. FRANKLIN
Executive Director

P. GREGORY CONLON
President
DANIEL Wm. FESSLER
JESSEIE J. KNIGHT, Jr.
HENRY M. DUQUE
JOSIAH L. NEEPER
Commissioners

APPENDIX A

SUMMARY CHECKLIST
 FOR
 REVIEWING SYSTEM SAFETY PROGRAM PLANS

TRANSIT AGENCY: <u>Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority (LACMTA)</u>		A C C E P T A B L E	U N A C C E P T A B L E			A C C E P T A B L E	U N A C C E P T A B L E
PLAN TITLE: <u>System Safety Program Plan Operations</u>							
REV NO: <u>1</u> DATE: <u>November 25, 1996</u>							
ITEM				ITEM			
1	Policy Statement and Authority for System Safety Program Plan	Yes		13	Training and Certification Review / Audit	Yes	
2	Description of Purpose for System Safety Program Plan	Yes		14	Emergency Response Planning, Coordinating, Training	Yes	
3	Clearly Stated Goals for System Safety Program Plan	Yes		15	System Modification Review / Approval Process	Yes	
4	Identifiable and Attainable Objectives	Yes		16	Safety Data Acquisition / Analysis	Yes	
5	System Description / Organizational Structure	Yes		17	Interdepartmental / Interagency Coordination	Yes	
6	System Safety Program Plan Control and Update Procedure	Yes		18	Configuration Management	Yes	
7	Hazard Identification / Resolution Process	Yes		19	Employee Safety Program	Yes	
8	Accident / Incident Reporting & Investigation	Yes		20	Hazardous Materials Program	Yes	
9	Internal Safety Audit Process	Yes		21	Drug and Alcohol Abuse Programs	Yes	
10	Facility Inspections (Includes Systems Equipment & Rolling Stock)	Yes		22	Contractor Safety Coordination	Yes	
11	Maintenance Audits / Inspections (All Systems & Facilities)	Yes		23	Procurement	Yes	
12	Rules / Procedures Review	Yes					

The System Safety Plan is:

Acceptable
 Unacceptable, Revise and Resubmit

Reviewed by: Audrey Ong

Date: November 25, 1996

Approved by: Donald R. Johnson

Date: November 26, 1996

CHECKLIST FOR REVIEWING OF SYSTEM SAFETY PROGRAM PLANS

Transit Agency: **LOS ANGELES COUNTY METROPOLITAN TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY**

Reviewer: **Audrey Ong**

Date: **November 25, 1996**

No.	CHECKLIST ITEM	SSPP REQUIREMENTS Does the plan contain or provide for:	INCLUDED		PAGE REF	COMMENTS
			Y	N		
1	Policy Statement and Authority for System Safety Program Plan	a. Approval of the SSPP by the CEO or Board of Directors?	Yes		1, ii	
		b. Preparation and maintenance of the SSPP by a specific department or person?	Yes		1-4	Section 1.7
2	Description of Purpose for System Safety Program Plan	a. An explanation of the purpose of the plan?	Yes		1-2	Section 1.2
		b. Definition of the term "System Safety" and other related terms?	Yes		1-1	Section 1.0
		c. A description of the shared responsibilities for safety by the operations, maintenance, and engineering departments?	Yes		1-2	Section 1.3
		d. Assignment of authority for plan implementation by operations, maintenance, and engineering departments?	Yes		1-1 1-2	Section 1.1 Section 1.3
3	Clearly Stated Goals for System Safety Program Plan	a. A listing of system-specific safety and security* goals that are long term, meaningful, and realizable?	Yes		1-2	Section 1.4
4	Identifiable and Attainable Objectives	a. A statement of objectives that are quantifiable and achievable through the implementation of policies and procedures?	Yes		1-3	Section 1.5
		b. A statement that safety policies are established by top management?	Yes		ii	
		c. A statement that addresses the personal security* of passengers and employees?	Yes		1-2 1-3 4-21	See note down below.

* NOTE: The security portion of the SSPP was not reviewed by staff at this time. Approval of the security portion has been deferred until January 1, 1998 as permitted by the FTA CFR Part 69.

Transit Agency: **LOS ANGELES COUNTY METROPOLITAN TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY**

No.	CHECKLIST ITEM	SSPP REQUIREMENTS Does the plan contain or provide for:	INCLUDED		PAGE REF	COMMENTS
			Y	N		
5	System Description / Organizational Structure	a. A system description?	Yes		2-1	Section 2.0
		b. Organization charts showing the lines of authority and responsibility for operations, maintenance, and engineering as they relate to system safety; including security*?	Yes			See Appendices B&C
		c. A written description or diagram showing the lines of communication between the transit agency and the Commission staff for safety related matters affecting operations, maintenance, engineering, and construction?	Yes		2-17, 2-18 3-6, 3-12 3-24, 3-25 3-26, 3-27	
6	System Safety Program Plan Control and Update Procedure	a. A maximum time interval between documented plan reviews to determine whether or not the plan needs to be revised to meet changed conditions and requirements?	Yes		1-4	
		b. A description of the method for updating, correcting, and modifying the plan?	Yes		1-4	
		c. Identification of the persons responsible for initiating, developing, and approving changes to the plan?	Yes		1-4	
		d. A statement that the Commission staff will be notified of plan changes?	Yes		1-4	
7	Hazard Identification / Resolution Process	a. A description of the mechanism by which hazards are identified and documented for operations, maintenance, and engineering?	Yes		3-6	
		b. A description of the process by which identified hazards are categorized, analyzed, and resolved for operations, maintenance, and engineering. (includes hazard severity, hazard probability and use of the APTA Hazard Resolution Matrix)?	Yes		3-9 3-10 3-11	

* NOTE: See note on previous page (Page 1).

Transit Agency: **LOS ANGELES COUNTY METROPOLITAN TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY**

8	Accident / Incident Reporting & Investigation	a. Criteria for determining what accident / incidents require investigation, and who is responsible to conduct specific investigations?	Yes		3-24 3-25	Section 3.2.16
		b. A description of the procedures for performing investigations; including the reporting of findings, conclusions reached, corrective action recommendations, and follow up to verify corrective action implementation?	Yes		3-25	
		c. CPUC accident and unacceptable hazardous conditions reporting and investigation requirements as specifically contained in the Commission General Order:	Yes		3-25	
		* Notification to CPUC staff of unacceptable hazardous conditions and reportable accidents.	Yes		3-25	
		* Prior notice to allow CPUC staff participation in post accident / incident inspections, examinations, and testing.	Yes		3-25	
		* Submittal of written accident / incidents investigation reports to CPUC staff for review and approval. Reports to contain the most probable cause, other contributing causes, corrective action plans, and schedule for implementing corrective action.	Yes		3-25 3-26	
9	Internal Safety Audit Process	a. Planned and scheduled internal safety audits to be performed by the transit agency to evaluate compliance and measure the effectiveness of its SSPP?	Yes		5-2 5-3	Section 5.3.2 Section 5.3.4
		b. The use of written checklists?	Yes		5-3	Section 5.3.3
		c. Auditors that are independent from the first line of supervision responsible for the activity being audited?	Yes		5-2	Section 5.3.1
		d. Documenting the audit findings in written reports that include an evaluation of the adequacy and effectiveness of the SSPP?	Yes		5-3	Section 5.3.4
		e. An annual audit report issued prior to February 15, summarizing the results of the individual audits performed during the previous year, including a summary of required corrective action, if any, and provisions for follow-up to ensure timely implementation? This report submitted to CPUC staff for review?	Yes		5-3	Section 5.3.4

Transit Agency: **LOS ANGELES COUNTY METROPOLITAN TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY**

No.	CHECKLIST ITEM	SSPP REQUIREMENTS	INCLUDED		PAGE REF	COMMENTS
			Y	N		
10	Facility Inspections (Includes Systems Equipment & Rolling Stock)	a. Preparation of a list of the safety related facilities and equipment subject to regular inspection and testing?	Yes		3-17	
		b. A description of how safety related equipment and facilities are included in a regular maintenance inspection and testing program?	Yes		3-17	
		c. A description of how identified hazards are entered into the hazard resolution process?	Yes		2-19 3-6 3-18	
11	Maintenance Audits / Inspections (All Systems & Facilities)	a. A description of the maintenance process including controls over equipment manuals, shop/site specific procedures, maintenance records, and tracking and resolving of problems identified during inspections; including the lack of required maintenance?	Yes		2-16 2-17 2-18 2-19 3-15	
12	Rules / Procedures Review	a. Developing, maintaining, and effective use of operating rules and procedures?	Yes		3-15 3-16	Section 3.2.4
13	Training and Certification Review / Audit	a. Categories of safety related work requiring training and certification?	Yes		3-19	
		b. A description (including frequency) of the training and certification program for employees in safety related positions?	Yes		3-19	
		c. Maintaining a permanent file of personnel training records?	Yes		3-19	
14	Emergency Response Planning, Coordination, Training	a. The preparation and use of emergency response procedures?	Yes		3-20	
		b. Meetings with outside emergency response agencies and holding of regularly scheduled, emergency drills?	Yes		3-20	

Transit Agency: **LOS ANGELES COUNTY METROPOLITAN TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY**

No.	CHECKLIST ITEM	SSPP REQUIREMENTS	INCLUDED		PAGE REF	COMMENTS
			Y	N		
15	System Modification Review / Approval Process	a. Identification of the unit in the organization with responsibility for ensuring that hazards associated with system expansions or modifications are included in the Hazard Resolution Process?	Yes		3-13	
		b. Inclusion of operating and safety department personnel in the design review process for new equipment and system expansions?	Yes		3-13	
		c. A sign-off and certification process for verification of operational readiness of new equipment and system expansions prior to entering revenue service?	Yes		3-27	
		d. Assignment of responsibility and authority for approval of modification exceptions to established design criteria for new equipment and system expansions?	Yes		3-14	
16	Safety Data Acquisition / Analysis	a. The collection, maintenance, and distribution of safety data relative to system operation?	Yes		3-21	
17	Interdepartmental / Interagency Coordination	a. A description of interdepartmental coordination for the exchange of safety related information?	Yes		3-1 3-24	Section 3.2.14
		b. Coordination of communications with the CPUC staff to keep them informed of significant safety issues on a timely basis?	Yes		3-6 3-25 4-17	
18	Configuration Management	a. A description of the configuration management control process; including the authority to make configuration changes, and assurances necessary for all involved departments to be formally notified?	Yes		3-14	
19	Employee Safety Program	a. An Employee Safety Program incorporating the applicable state and federal OSHA requirements?	Yes		3-22 3-23 4-17	

Transit Agency: **LOS ANGELES COUNTY METROPOLITAN TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY**

No.	CHECKLIST ITEM	SSPP REQUIREMENTS Does the plan contain or provide for:	INCLUDED		PAGE REF	COMMENTS
			Y	N		
20	Hazardous Materials Programs	a. A Hazardous Materials Program incorporating the applicable local, state, and federal OSHA requirements?	Yes		3-23	
21	Drug and Alcohol Abuse Programs	a. A Drug and Alcohol Abuse Program incorporating the federal DOT requirements?	Yes		6-2	
22	Contractor Safety Coordination	a. Safety requirements that contractor personnel must follow when working on, or in close proximity of, the Transit Agency's property?	Yes		4-10	Section 4.2.21
23	Procurement	a. Safety measures / controls for procurement of hazardous materials?	Yes		3-16 4-20	Section 3.2.6 Section 4.3.11
		b. Receiving inspection of procured materials and equipment to prevent the inadvertent installation of defective items?	Yes		3-16 4-20	Section 3.2.6 Section 4.3.11