

**§ 240.411**

**49 CFR Ch. II (10-1-02 Edition)**

United States Courts and Magistrates as general guidelines for the introduction of evidence. Notwithstanding paragraph (m) of this section, all relevant and probative evidence shall be received unless the presiding officer determines the evidence to be unduly repetitive or so extensive and lacking in relevancy that its admission would impair the prompt, orderly, and fair resolution of the proceeding.

(o) The presiding officer may:

(1) Administer oaths and affirmations;

(2) Issue subpoenas as provided for in § 209.7 of part 209 in this chapter;

(3) Adopt any needed procedures for the submission of evidence in written form;

(4) Examine witnesses at the hearing;

(5) Convene, recess, adjourn or otherwise regulate the course of the hearing; and

(6) Take any other action authorized by or consistent with the provisions of this part and permitted by law that may expedite the hearing or aid in the disposition of the proceeding.

(p) The petitioner before the Locomotive Engineer Review Board, the railroad involved in taking the certification action, and FRA shall be parties at the hearing. All parties may participate in the hearing and may appear and be heard on their own behalf or through designated representatives. All parties may offer relevant evidence, including testimony, and may conduct such cross-examination of witnesses as may be required to make a record of the relevant facts.

(q) The party requesting the administrative hearing shall be the "hearing petitioner." The hearing petitioner shall have the burden of proving its case by a preponderance of the evidence. Hence, if the hearing petitioner is the railroad involved in taking the certification action, that railroad will have the burden of proving that its decision to deny certification, deny recertification, or revoke certification was correct. Conversely, if the petitioner before the Locomotive Engineer Review Board is the hearing petitioner, that person will have the burden of proving that the railroad's decision to deny certification, deny recertification, or revoke certification was in-

correct. Between the petitioner before the Locomotive Engineer Review Board and the railroad involved in taking the certification action, the party who is not the hearing petitioner will be a respondent.

(r) FRA will be a mandatory party to the administrative hearing. At the start of each proceeding, FRA will be a respondent.

(s) The record in the proceeding shall be closed at the conclusion of the evidentiary hearing unless the presiding officer allows additional time for the submission of additional evidence. In such instances the record shall be left open for such time as the presiding officer grants for that purpose.

(t) At the close of the record, the presiding officer shall prepare a written decision in the proceeding.

(u) The decision:

(1) Shall contain the findings of fact and conclusions of law, as well as the basis for each concerning all material issues of fact or law presented on the record;

(2) Shall be served on the hearing petitioner and all other parties to the proceeding;

(3) Shall not become final for 35 days after issuance;

(4) Constitutes final agency action unless an aggrieved party files an appeal within 35 days after issuance; and

(5) Is not precedential.

[60 FR 53137, Oct. 12, 1995]

**§ 240.411 Appeals.**

(a) Any party aggrieved by the presiding officer's decision may file an appeal. The appeal must be filed within 35 days of issuance of the decision with the Federal Railroad Administrator, 400 Seventh Street SW., Washington, DC 20590. A copy of the appeal shall be served on each party. The appeal shall set forth objections to the presiding officer's decision, supported by reference to applicable laws and regulations and with specific reference to the record. If no appeal is timely filed, the presiding officer's decision constitutes final agency action.

(b) A party may file a reply to the appeal within 25 days of service of the appeal. The reply shall be supported by reference to applicable laws and regulations and with specific reference to

the record, if the party relies on evidence contained in the record.

(c) The Administrator may extend the period for filing an appeal or a response for good cause shown, provided that the written request for extension is served before expiration of the applicable period provided in this section.

(d) The Administrator has sole discretion to permit oral argument on the appeal. On the Administrator's own initiative or written motion by any party, the Administrator may grant the parties an opportunity for oral argument.

(e) The Administrator may remand, vacate, affirm, reverse, alter or modify the decision of the presiding officer and the Administrator's decision con-

stitutes final agency action except where the terms of the Administrator's decision (for example, remanding a case to the presiding officer) show that the parties' administrative remedies have not been exhausted.

(f) Where a party files an appeal from a Locomotive Engineer Review Board decision pursuant to §240.403(e), the Administrator may affirm or vacate the Board's decision, and may remand the petition to the Board for further proceedings. An Administrator's decision to affirm the Board's decision constitutes final agency action.

[56 FR 28254, June 19, 1991, as amended at 60 FR 53138, Oct. 12, 1995; 64 FR 60995, Nov. 8, 1999]

APPENDIX A TO PART 240—SCHEDULE OF CIVIL PENALTIES<sup>1</sup>

Section	Violation	Willful violation
Subpart B—Component Elements		
240.101—Program Failures		
(a) Failure to have program .....	\$5,000	\$10,000
(b) Program that fails to address a subject .....	2,500	5,000
240.103—Failure to:		
(a) follow Appendix B .....	1,000	2,000
(d) to resubmit, when directed by FRA .....	1,000	2,000
240.104—Allowing uncertified person to operate non-traditional locomotives .....	5,000	10,000
240.105—Failure to have or execute adequate procedure for selection of supervisors .....	2,500	5,000
240.107—Classes of Service		
(a) Failure to designate classes of service .....	2,000	4,000
240.109—Limitations on considering prior conduct records		
(a) Failure to have procedure for determining eligibility .....	2,500	5,000
(e) Considering excluded data .....	2,000	4,000
(f,g) Failure to provide timely review opportunity .....	2,000	4,000
240.111—Furnishing Motor Vehicle Records:		
(a) Failure to action required to make information available .....	1,000	2,000
(b) Failure to request:		
(1) local record .....	1,000	2,000
(2) NDR record .....	1,000	2,000
(f) Failure to request additional record .....	1,000	2,000
(g) Failure to notify of absence of license .....	750	1,500
(h) Failure to submit request in timely manner .....	750	1,500
(i) Failure to report within 48 hours or railroad taking certification action for not reporting earlier than 48 hours .....	1,000	2,000
240.113—Furnishing prior employment information		
(a) Failure to take action required to make information available .....	1,000	2,000
(b) Failure to request record .....	1,000	2,000
240.115—Criteria for considering prior motor vehicle conduct		
(b) Considering excluded data .....	2,000	4,000
(c) Failure to		
(1) consider data .....	5,000	7,500
(3,4) properly act in response to data .....	2,500	5,000
240.117—Consideration of Operational Rules Compliance Records:		
(a) Failure to have program and procedures .....	5,000	10,000
(b-j) Failure to have adequate program or procedure .....	2,500	5,000
240.119—Consideration of substance abuse /rules compliance records		
(a) Failure to have program and procedures .....	5,000	10,000
(b-e) Failure to have adequate program or procedure .....	2,500	5,000
240.121—Failure to have adequate procedure for determining acuity .....	2,500	5,000
(f) Failure of engineer to notify .....	2,500	5,000
240.123—Failure to have:		
(b) Adequate procedures for continuing education .....	2,500	5,000
(c) adequate procedures for training new engineers .....	2,500	5,000
240.125—Failure to have		
(a) adequate procedures for testing knowledge .....	2,500	5,000

Section	Violation	Willful violation
(d) adequate procedures for documenting testing .....	2,500	5,000
240.127—Failure to have		
(a) adequate procedures for evaluating skill performance .....	2,500	5,000
(c) adequate procedures for documenting skills testing .....	2,500	5,000
240.129—Failure to have		
(a–b) adequate procedures for monitoring performance .....	2,500	5,000
Subpart C—Implementation of the Process		
240.201—Schedule for implementation		
(a) Failure to select supervisors by specified date .....	1,000	2,000
(b) Failure to identify grandfathered engineers .....	2,000	4,000
(c) Failure to issue certificate to engineer .....	1,000	2,000
(d) Allowing uncertified person to operate .....	5,000	10,000
(e–g) Certifying without complying with subpart C .....	2,500	5,000
(h–i) Failure to issue certificate to engineer .....	1,000	2,000
240.203 (a) Designating a person as a supervisor without determining that		
(1) person knows and understands this part .....	2,500	5,000
(2) person can test and evaluate engineers .....	5,000	7,500
(3) person has experience to prescribe remedies .....	2,500	5,000
(b) Certifying a person without determining that		
(1) person meets the eligibility criteria .....	5,000	7,500
(2) person meets the medical criteria .....	2,500	5,000
(3) person has demonstrated knowledge .....	2,500	5,000
(4) person has demonstrated skills .....	2,500	5,000
(c) Certifying a person without determining that		
(1) person has completed training program .....	2,500	5,000
(2) person meets the eligibility criteria .....	2,500	5,000
(3) time has elapsed .....	2,500	5,000
240.205—Procedures for determining eligibility based on prior safety conduct		
(a) Selecting person lacking eligibility .....	5,000	7,500
(d) Failure to have basis for taking action .....	2,500	5,000
240.207—Ineligibility based on medical condition		
(a) Selecting person lacking proper acuity .....	2,000	4,000
(b) Failure to have basis for finding of proper acuity .....	1,000	2,000
(c) Acuity examinations performed by unauthorized person .....	1,000	2,000
(d) Failure to note need for device to achieve acuity .....	1,000	2,000
(e) Failure to use device needed for proper acuity .....	1,000	2,000
240.209—Demonstrating knowledge		
(b) Failure to properly determine knowledge .....	2,500	5,000
(c) Improper test procedure .....	2,000	4,000
(d) Failure to document test results .....	1,000	2,000
(e) Allowing person to operate despite test failure .....	2,500	5,000
240.211—Demonstrating skills		
(b) Failure to properly determine knowledge .....	2,500	5,000
(c) Improper test procedure .....	2,000	4,000
(d) Failure to document test results .....	1,000	2,000
(e) Allowing person to operate despite test failure .....	2,500	5,000
240.213—Completion of approved training program		
(a) Failure to properly determine .....	2,500	5,000
(b) Failure to document successful program completion .....	2,000	4,000
240.215—Supporting information		
(a, f–h) Failure to have a record .....	1,000	2,000
(b) Failure to have complete record .....	500	1,000
(i) Falsification of record .....	(–)	10,000
240.217—Time limits for making determinations		
(a, c) Exceeding time limit .....	2,000	4,000
240.219—Denial of certification		
(a) Failure to notify or provide opportunity for comment .....	2,000	4,000
(c) Failure to notify, provide data, or untimely notification .....	2,000	4,000
240.221—Identification of persons		
(a–c) Failure to have a record .....	2,000	4,000
(d) Failure to update a record .....	2,000	4,000
(e–f) Failure to make a record available .....	1,000	2,000
240.223—Certificate criteria		
(a) Improper certificate .....	500	1,000
(b) Failure to designate those with signatory authority .....	500	1,000
(d) Falsification of certificate .....	(–)	10,000
240.225—Railroad Relying on Determination of Another:		
(a) Failure to address in program or failure to require newly hired engineer to take entire training program .....	5,000	7,500
(1) Reliance on expired certification .....	2,500	5,000
(2) Reliance on wrong class of service .....	2,500	5,000
(3) Failure to familiarize person with new operational territory .....	2,000	4,000
(4) Failure to determine knowledge .....	2,000	4,000

Section	Violation	Willful violation
(5) Failure to determine performance skills .....	2,000	4,000
240.227—Railroad Relying on Requirements of a Different Country		
(a) Joint operator reliance		
(1) on person not employed .....	1,000	2,000
(2) on person who fails to meet Canadian requirements .....	1,000	2,000
(b) Canadian railroad reliance		
(1) on person not employed .....	1,000	2,000
(2) on person who fails to meet Canadian requirements .....	1,000	2,000
240.229—Requirements for Joint Operations Territory:		
(a) Allowing uncertified person to operate .....	2,000	4,000
(b) Certifying without making determinations or relying on another railroad .....	2,500	5,000
(c) Failure of:		
(1) controlling railroad certifying without determining certification status, knowledge, skills, or familiarity with physical characteristics .....	4,000	8,000
(2) employing railroad to determine person's certified and qualified status for controlling railroad .....	4,000	8,000
(3) person to notify employing railroad of lack of qualifications .....	4,000	8,000
(d) Failure to provide qualified person .....	2,000	4,000
240.231—Persons Qualified on Physical Characteristics in Other Than Joint Operations:		
(a) Person unqualified, no exception applies or railroad does not adequately address in program	5,000	10,000
(b) Failure to have a pilot:		
(1) for engineer who has never been qualified .....	4,000	8,000
(2) for engineer previously qualified .....	2,500	5,000
Subpart D—Program Administration		
240.301—Failure to have system for certificate replacement	2,000	4,000
240.303—Monitoring operations		
(a) Failure to have program .....	5,000	10,000
(b) Failure to observe each person annually .....	1,000	2,000
(c) Failure to test each person annually .....	1,000	2,000
(d) Failure to test properly .....	1,000	2,000
240.305—Prohibited Conduct:		
(a) Unlawful:		
(1) passing of stop signal .....	2,500	5,000
(2) control of speed .....	2,500	5,000
(3) brake tests .....	2,500	5,000
(4) occupancy of main track .....	2,500	5,000
(5) tampering on operation with disabled safety device .....	2,500	5,000
(6) supervisor, pilot, or instructor fails to take appropriate action .....	2,500	5,000
(b) Failure of engineer to:		
(1) carry certificate .....	1,000	2,000
(2) display certificate when requested .....	1,000	2,000
(c) Failure of engineer to notify railroad of limitations or railroad requiring engineer to exceed limitations .....	4,000	8,000
(d) Failure of engineer to notify railroad of denial or revocation .....	4,000	8,000
240.307—Revocation of Certification:		
(a) Failure to withdraw person from service .....	2,500	5,000
(b) Failure to notify, provide hearing opportunity, or untimely procedures .....	2,500	5,000
(c-h) Failure of railroad to comply with hearing or waiver procedures .....	1,000	2,000
(i) Failure of railroad to make record .....	2,500	5,000
(k) Failure of railroad to conduct reasonable inquiry or make good faith determination .....	5,000	10,000
240.309—Oversight Responsibility Report:		
(a) Failure to report or to report on time .....	1,000	2,000
(b-h) Incomplete or inaccurate report .....	2,000	4,000

<sup>1</sup> A penalty may be assessed against an individual only for a willful violation. The Administrator reserves the right to assess a penalty of up to \$22,000 for any violation where circumstances warrant. See 49 CFR part 209, appendix A.

[56 FR 28254, June 19, 1991, as amended at 60 FR 53138, Oct. 12, 1995; 63 FR 11624, Mar. 10, 1998; 64 FR 60995, Nov. 8, 1999]

**APPENDIX B TO PART 240—PROCEDURES FOR SUBMISSION AND APPROVAL OF LOCOMOTIVE ENGINEER QUALIFICATION PROGRAMS**

This appendix establishes procedures for the submission and approval of a railroad's program concerning the training, testing, and evaluating of persons seeking certification or recertification as a locomotive en-

gineer in accordance with the requirements of this part (see §§ 240.101, 240.103, 240.105, 240.107, 240.123, 240.125, 240.127 and 240.129). It also contains guidance on how FRA will exercise its review and approval responsibilities.

*Submission by a Railroad*

As provided for in § 240.101, each railroad must have a program for determining the

qualifications of each person it permits or requires to operate a locomotive. In designing its program a railroad must take into account the trackage and terrain over which it operates, the system(s) for train control that are employed, the operational design characteristics of the track and equipment being operated including train length, train make-up, and train speeds. Each railroad must submit its individual program to FRA for approval as provided for in §240.103. Each program must be accompanied by a request for approval organized in accordance with this appendix. Requests for approval must contain appropriate references to the relevant portion of the program being discussed. Requests should be submitted in writing on standard sized paper (8-1/2 x 11) and can be in letter or narrative format. The railroad's submission shall be sent to the Associate Administrator for Safety, FRA. The mailing address for FRA is 400 Seventh Street, SW., Washington, DC 20590.

*Organization of the Submission*

Each request should be organized to present the required information in the following standardized manner. Each section must begin by giving the name, title, telephone number, and mailing address of the person to be contacted concerning the matters addressed by that section. If a person is identified in a prior section, it is sufficient to merely repeat the person's name in a subsequent section.

*Section 1 of the Submission: General Information and Elections*

The first section of the request must contain the name of the railroad, the person to be contacted concerning the request (including the person's name, title, telephone number, and mailing address) and a statement electing either to accept responsibility for educating previously untrained persons to be qualified locomotive engineers or recertify only engineers previously certified by other railroads (see §240.103(b)).

If a railroad elects not to conduct the training of persons not previously trained to be a locomotive engineer, the railroad is not obligated to submit information on how the previously untrained will be trained. A railroad that makes this election will be limited to recertifying persons initially certified by another railroad. A railroad that initially elects not to accept responsibility for training its own locomotive engineers can rescind its initial election by obtaining FRA approval of a modification of its program (see §240.103(e)).

If a railroad elects to accept responsibility for conducting the education of persons not previously trained to be locomotive engineers, the railroad is obligated to submit information on how such persons will be

trained but has no duty to actually conduct such training. A railroad that elects to accept the responsibility for the training of such persons may authorize another railroad or a non-railroad entity to perform the actual training effort. The electing railroad remains responsible for assuring that such other training providers adhere to the training program the railroad submits.

This section must also state which class or classes of service the railroad will employ. (See §240.107).

*Section 2 of the Submission: Selection of Supervisors of Locomotive Engineers*

The second section of the request must contain information concerning the railroad's procedure for selecting the person or persons it will rely on to evaluate the knowledge, skill, and ability of persons seeking certification or recertification. As provided for in §240.105 each railroad must have a procedure for selecting supervisors of locomotive engineers which assures that persons so designated can appropriately test and evaluate the knowledge, skill, and ability of individuals seeking certification or recertification.

Section 240.105 provides a railroad latitude to select the criteria and evaluation methodology it will rely on to determine which person or persons have the required capacity to perform as a supervisor of locomotive engineers. The railroad must describe in this section how it will use that latitude and evaluate those it designates as supervisors of locomotive engineers so as to comply with the performance standard set forth in §240.105(b). The railroad must identify, in sufficient detail to permit effective review by FRA, the criteria for evaluation it has selected. For example, if a railroad intends to rely on one or more of the following, a minimum level of prior experience as an engineer, successful completion of a course of study, or successful passage of a standardized testing program, the submission must state which criteria it will employ.

*Section 3 of the Submission: Training Persons Previously Certified*

The third section of the request must contain information concerning the railroad's program for training previously certified locomotive engineers. As provided for in §240.123(b) each railroad must have a program for the ongoing education of its locomotive engineers to assure that they maintain the necessary knowledge concerning personal safety, operating rules and practices, mechanical condition of equipment, methods of safe train handling (including familiarity with physical characteristics), and relevant Federal safety rules.

Section 240.123(b) provides a railroad latitude to select the specific subject matter to

be covered, duration of the training, method of presenting the information, and the frequency with which the training will be provided. The railroad must describe in this section how it will use that latitude to assure that its engineers remain knowledgeable concerning the safe discharge of their train operation responsibilities so as to comply with the performance standard set forth in §240.123(b). This section must contain sufficient detail to permit effective evaluation of the railroad's training program in terms of the subject matter covered, the frequency and duration of the training sessions, the training environment employed (for example, and use of classroom, use of computer based training, use of simulators, use of film or slide presentations, use of on-job-training) and which aspects of the program are voluntary or mandatory.

Safe train handling involves both abstract knowledge about the appropriate use of engine controls and the application of that knowledge to trains of differing composition traversing varying terrain. Time and circumstances have the capacity to diminish both abstract knowledge and the proper application of that knowledge to discrete events. Time and circumstances also have the capacity to alter the value of previously obtained knowledge and the application of that knowledge. In formulating how it will use the discretion being afforded, each railroad must design its program to address both loss of retention of knowledge and changed circumstances, and this section of the submission to FRA must address these matters.

For example, locomotive engineers need to have their fundamental knowledge of train operations refreshed periodically. Each railroad needs to advise FRA how that need is satisfied in terms of the interval between attendance at such training, the nature of the training being provided, and methods for conducting the training. A matter of particular concern to FRA is how each railroad acts to assure that engineers remain knowledgeable about safe train handling procedures if the territory over which a locomotive engineer is authorized to operate is territory from which the engineer has been absent. The railroad must have a plan for the familiarization training that addresses the question of how long a person can be absent before needing more education and, once that threshold is reached, how the person will acquire the needed education. Similarly, the program must address how the railroad responds to changes such as the introduction of new technology, new operating rule books, or significant changes in operations including alteration in the territory engineers are authorized to operate over.

*Section 4 of the Submission: Testing and Evaluating Persons Previously Certified*

The fourth section of the request must contain information concerning the railroad's program for testing and evaluating previously certified locomotive engineers. As provided for in §240.125 and §240.127, each railroad must have a program for the ongoing testing and evaluating of its locomotive engineers to assure that they have the necessary knowledge and skills concerning personal safety, operating rules and practices, mechanical condition of equipment, methods of safe train handling (including familiarity with physical characteristics), and relevant Federal safety rules. Similarly, each railroad must have a program for ongoing testing and evaluating to assure that its locomotive engineers have the necessary vision and hearing acuity as provided for in §240.121.

Sections 240.125 and 240.127 require that a railroad rely on written procedures for determining that each person can demonstrate his or her knowledge of the railroad's rules and practices and skill at applying those rules and practices for the safe operation of a locomotive or train. Section 240.125 directs that, when seeking a demonstration of the person's knowledge, a railroad must employ a written test that contains objective questions and answers and covers the following subject matters: (i) Personal safety practices; (ii) operating practices; (iii) equipment inspection practices; (iv) train handling practices (including familiarity with the physical characteristics of the territory); and (v) compliance with relevant Federal safety rules. The test must accurately measure the person's knowledge of all of these areas.

Section 240.125 provides a railroad latitude in selecting the design of its own testing policies (including the number of questions each test will contain, how each required subject matter will be covered, weighting (if any) to be given to particular subject matter responses, selection of passing scores, and the manner of presenting the test information). The railroad must describe in this section how it will use that latitude to assure that its engineers will demonstrate their knowledge concerning the safe discharge of their train operation responsibilities so as to comply with the performance standard set forth in §240.125.

Section 240.127 directs that, when seeking a demonstration of the person's skill, a railroad must employ a test and evaluation procedure conducted by a designated supervisor of locomotive engineers that contains an objective evaluation of the person's skills at applying the railroad's rules and practices for the safe operation of trains. The test and evaluation procedure must examine the person's skills in terms of all of the following subject matters: (i) Operating practices; (ii)

equipment inspection practices; (iii) train handling practices (including familiarity with the physical characteristics of the territory); and (iv) compliance with relevant Federal safety rules. The test must be sufficient to effectively examine the person's skills while operating a train in the most demanding type of service which the person is likely to encounter in the normal course of events once he or she is deemed qualified.

Section 240.127 provides a railroad latitude in selecting the design of its own testing and evaluation procedures (including the duration of the evaluation process, how each required subject matter will be covered, weighing (if any) to be given to particular subject matter response, selection of passing scores, and the manner of presenting the test information). The section should provide information concerning the procedures which the railroad will follow that achieve the objectives described in FRA's recommended practices (see appendix E) for conducting skill performance testing. The section also gives a railroad the latitude to employ either a Type 1 or a Type 2 simulator (properly programmed) to conduct the test and evaluation procedure. A railroad must describe in this section how it will use that latitude to assure that its engineers will demonstrate their skills concerning the safe discharge of their train operation responsibilities so as to comply with the performance standard set forth in §240.127.

Section 240.121 provides a railroad latitude to rely on the professional medical opinion of the railroad's medical examiner concerning the ability of a person with substandard acuity to safely operate a locomotive. The railroad must describe in this section how it will assure that its medical examiner has sufficient information concerning the railroad's operations to effectively form appropriate conclusions about the ability of a particular individual to safely operate a train.

*Section 5 of the Submission: Training, Testing, and Evaluating Persons Not Previously Certified*

Unless a railroad has made an election not to accept responsibility for conducting the initial training of persons to be locomotive engineers, the fifth section of the request must contain information concerning the railroad's program for educating, testing, and evaluating persons not previously trained as locomotive engineers. As provided for in §240.123(c), a railroad that is issuing an initial certification to a person to be a locomotive engineer must have a program for the training, testing, and evaluating of its locomotive engineers to assure that they acquire the necessary knowledge and skills concerning personal safety, operating rules and practices, mechanical condition of equip-

ment, methods of safe train handling (including familiarity with physical characteristics), and relevant Federal safety rules.

Section 240.123 establishes a performance standard and gives a railroad latitude in selecting how it will meet that standard. A railroad must describe in this section how it will use that latitude to assure that its engineers will acquire sufficient knowledge and skill and demonstrate their knowledge and skills concerning the safe discharge of their train operation responsibilities. This section must contain the same level of detail concerning initial training programs as that described for each of the components of the overall program contained in sections 2 through 4 of this appendix. A railroad that plans to accept responsibility for the initial training of locomotive engineers may authorize another railroad or a non-railroad entity to perform the actual training effort. The authorizing railroad may submit a training program developed by that authorized trainer but the authorizing railroad remains responsible for assuring that such other training providers adhere to the training program submitted. Railroads that elect to rely on other entities, to conduct training away from the railroad's own trackage, must indicate how the student will be provided with the required familiarization with the physical characteristics for its trackage.

*Section 6 of the Submission: Monitoring Operational Performance by Certified Engineers*

The final section of the request must contain information concerning the railroad's program for monitoring the operation of its certified locomotive engineers. As provided for in §240.129, each railroad must have a program for the ongoing monitoring of its locomotive engineers to assure that they operate their locomotives in conformity with the railroad's operating rules and practices including methods of safe train handling and relevant Federal safety rules.

Section 240.129 requires that a railroad annually observe each locomotive engineer demonstrating his or her knowledge of the railroad's rules and practices and skill at applying those rules and practices for the safe operation of a locomotive or train. Section 240.129 directs that the observation be conducted by a designated supervisor of locomotive engineers but provides a railroad latitude in selecting the design of its own observation procedures (including the duration of the observation process, reliance on tapes that record the specifics of train operation, and the specific aspects of the engineer's performance to be covered). The section also gives a railroad the latitude to employ either a Type 1 or a Type 2 simulator (properly programmed) to conduct monitoring observations. A railroad must describe in this section how it will use that latitude to assure

that the railroad is monitoring that its engineers demonstrate their skills concerning the safe discharge of their train operation responsibilities. A railroad that intends to employ train operation event recorder tapes to comply with this monitoring requirement shall indicate in this section how it anticipates determining what person was at the controls and what signal indications or other operational constraints, if any, were applicable to the train's movement.

*Section 7 of the Submission: Procedures for Routine Administration of the Engineer Certification Program*

The final section of the request must contain a summary of how the railroad's program and procedures will implement the various specific aspects of the regulatory provisions that relate to routine administration of its certification program for locomotive engineers. At a minimum this section needs to address the procedural aspects of the rule's provisions identified in the following paragraph.

Section 240.109 provides that each railroad must have procedures for review and comment on adverse prior safety conduct, but allows the railroad to devise its own system within generalized parameters. Sections 240.115, 240.117 and 240.119 require a railroad to have procedures for evaluating data concerning prior safety conduct as a motor vehicle operator and as railroad workers, yet leave selection of many details to the railroad. Sections 240.203, 240.217, and 240.219 place a duty on the railroad to make a series of determinations but allow the railroad to select what procedures it will employ to assure that all of the necessary determinations have been made in a timely fashion; who will be authorized to conclude that person is or is not qualified; and how it will communicate adverse decisions. Documentation of the factual basis the railroad relied on in making determinations under §§240.205, 240.207, 240.209, 240.211, and 240.213 is required, but these sections permit the railroad to select the procedures it will employ to accomplish compliance with these provisions. Sections 240.225 and 240.227 permit reliance on qualification determinations made by other entities and permit a railroad latitude in selecting the procedures it will employ to assure compliance with these provisions. Similarly, §240.229 permits use of railroad selected procedures to meet the requirements for certification of engineers performing service in joint operations territory. Sections 240.301 and 240.307 allow a railroad a certain degree of discretion in complying with the requirements for replacing lost certificates or the conduct of certification revocation proceedings.

This section of the request should outline in summary fashion the manner in which the

railroad will implement its program so as to comply with the specific aspects of each of the rule's provisions described in preceding paragraph.

*FRA Review*

The submissions made in conformity with this appendix will be deemed approved within 30 days after the required filing date or the actual filing date whichever is later. No formal approval document will be issued by FRA. The brief interval for review reflects FRA's judgment that railroads generally already have existing programs that will meet the requirements of this part. FRA has taken the responsibility for notifying a railroad when it detects problems with the railroad's program. FRA retains the right to disapprove a program that has obtained approval due to the passage of time as provided for in section §240.103.

FRA initially proposed specifying the details for most aspects of the programs being submitted under this appendix. The proposed rule contained a distillation of the essential elements of pre-existing training, testing, evaluating, and monitoring programs that appear to result in railroads having locomotive engineers who operate locomotives and trains safely. The proposal contained very specific details for each aspect of the program that appeared to contribute to that result. Those details included such things as the duration of classes intended to teach operating rules as well as the interval and methodology for acquiring familiarization with physical characteristics of an engineer's operational territory. Railroads commenting on the proposed rule did not question the validity of the FRA's views concerning the essential elements of an effective program but did convince FRA that they should be given more discretion to formulate the design of their individual programs.

Rather than establish rigid requirements for each element of the program as initially proposed, FRA has given railroads discretion to select the design of their individual programs within a specified context for each element. The proposed rule, however, provides a good guide to the considerations that should be addressed in designing a program that will meet the performance standards of this final rule. In reviewing program submissions, FRA will focus on the degree to which a particular program deviates from the norms identified in its proposed rule. To the degree that a particular program submission materially deviates from the norms set out in its proposed rule which was published in the FEDERAL REGISTER on December 11, 1989 (54 FR 50890), FRA's review and approval process will be focused on determining the validity of the reasoning relied on by a railroad for selecting its alternative approach



and the degree to which the alternative approach is likely to be effective in producing locomotive engineers who have the knowledge, skill, and ability to safely operate trains.

APPENDIX C TO PART 240—PROCEDURES FOR OBTAINING AND EVALUATING MOTOR VEHICLE DRIVING RECORD DATA

The purpose of this appendix is to outline the procedures available to individuals and railroads for complying with the requirements of section 4(a) of the Railroad Safety Improvement Act of 1988 and §§ 240.109, 240.111 and 240.205 of this part. Those provisions require that railroads consider the motor vehicle driving record of each person prior to issuing him or her certification or recertification as a qualified locomotive engineer.

To fulfill that obligation, a railroad must review a certification candidate's recent motor vehicle driving record. Generally, that will be a single record on file with the state agency that issued the candidate's current license. However, it can include multiple records if the candidate has been issued a motor vehicle driving license by more than one state agency. In addition, the railroad must determine whether the certification candidate is listed in the National Driver Register and, if so listed, to review the data that caused the candidate to be so listed.

*Access to State Motor Vehicle Driving Record Data*

The right of railroad workers, their employers, or prospective employers to have access to a state motor vehicle licensing agency's data concerning an individual's driving record is controlled by state law. Although many states have mechanisms through which employers and prospective employers such as railroads can obtain such data, there are some states in which privacy concerns make such access very difficult or impossible. Since individuals generally are entitled to obtain access to driving record data that will be relied on by a state motor vehicle licensing agency when that agency is taking action concerning their driving privileges, FRA places responsibility on individuals, who want to serve as locomotive engineers to request that their current state drivers licensing agency or agencies furnish such data directly to the railroad considering certifying them as a locomotive operator. Depending on the procedures adopted by a particular state agency, this will involve the candidate's either sending the state agency a brief letter requesting such action or executing a state agency form that accomplishes the same effect. It will normally involve payment of a nominal fee established by the state agency for such a

records check. In rare instances, when a certification candidate has been issued multiple licenses, it may require more than a single request.

*The National Driver Register*

In addition to seeking an individual state's data, each engineer candidate is required to request that a search and retrieval be performed of any relevant information concerning his or her driving record contained in the National Driver Register. The National Driver Register (NDR) is a system of information created by Congress in 1960. In essence it is a nationwide repository of information on problem drivers that was created in an effort to protect motorists. It is a voluntary State/Federal cooperative program that assists motor vehicle driver licensing agencies in gaining access to data about actions taken by other state agencies concerning an individual's motor vehicle driving record. The NDR is designed to address the problem that occurs when chronic traffic law violators, after losing their license in one State travel to and receive licenses in another State. Currently the NDR is maintained by the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration (NHTSA) of the Department of Transportation under the provisions of the National Driver Register Act (23 U.S.C. 401 note). Under that statute, state motor vehicle licensing authorities voluntarily notify NHTSA when they take action to deny, suspend, revoke or cancel a person's motor vehicle driver's license and, under the provisions of a 1982 change to the statute, states are also authorized to notify NHTSA concerning convictions for operation of a motor vehicle while under the influence of, or impaired by, alcohol or a controlled substance, and for traffic violations arising in connection with a fatal traffic accident, reckless driving or racing on the highway even if these convictions do not result in an immediate loss of driving privileges.

The information submitted to NHTSA contains, at a minimum, three specific pieces of data: the identification of the state authority providing the information, the name of the person whose license is being affected, and the date of birth of that person. It may be supplemented by data concerning the person's height, weight, color of eyes, and social security account number, if a State collects such data.

*Access to NDR Data*

Essentially only individuals and state licensing agencies can obtain access to the NDR data. Since railroads have no direct access to the NDR data, FRA requires that individuals seeking certification as a locomotive engineer request that an NDR search be performed and direct that the results be furnished to the railroad. FRA requires that

each person request the NDR information directly from NHTSA unless the prospective operator has a motor vehicle driver license issued by a state motor vehicle licensing agency that is "participating" under the provisions of the National Driver Register Act of 1982. Participating states can directly access the NDR data on behalf of the prospective engineer. The state agencies that currently are authorized to access NDR data in that manner are identified in appendix D of this regulation.

*Requesting NHTSA to Perform the NDR Check*

The procedures for requesting NHTSA performance of an NDR check are as follows:

1. Each person shall submit a written request to National Highway Traffic Safety Administration at the following address: Chief, National Driver Register, National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, 400 Seventh Street, SW., Washington, DC 20590.

2. The request must contain:

- (a) The full legal name;
- (b) Any other names used by the person (*e.g.*, nickname or professional name);
- (c) The date of birth;
- (d) Sex;
- (e) Height;
- (f) Weight;
- (g) Color of eyes;
- (h) Driver's license number (unless that is not available).

3. The request must authorize NHTSA to perform the NDR check and to furnish the results of the search directly to the railroad.

4. The request must identify the railroad to which the results are to be furnished, including the proper name of the railroad, and the proper mailing address of the railroad.

5. The person seeking to become a certified locomotive engineer shall sign the request, and that signature must be notarized.

FRA requires that the request be in writing and contain as much detail as is available to improve the reliability of the data search. Any person may supply additional information to that being mandated by FRA. Furnishing additional information, such as the person's Social Security account number, will help to more positively identify any records that may exist concerning the requester. Although no fee is charged for such NDR checks, a minimal cost may be incurred in having the request notarized. The requirement for notarization is designed to ensure that each person's right to privacy is being respected and that records are only being disclosed to legally authorized parties.

*Requesting a State Agency to Perform the NDR Check*

As discussed earlier in connection with obtaining data compiled by the state agency itself, a person can either write a letter to that agency asking for the NDR check or can

use the agency's forms for making such a request. If a request is made by letter the individual must follow the same procedures required when directly seeking the data from NHTSA. At present there are only a limited number of state licensing agencies that have the capacity to make a direct NDR inquiry of this nature. It is anticipated that the number of states with such capability will increase in the near future; therefore, FRA will continue to update the identification of such states by revising appendix D to this regulation to identify such state agencies. Since it would be more efficient for a prospective locomotive engineer to make a single request for both aspects of the information required under this rule, FRA anticipates that state agency inquiry will eventually become the predominant method for making these NDR checks. Requests to state agencies may involve payment of a nominal fee established by the state agency for such a records check.

State agencies normally will respond in approximately 30 days or less and advise whether there is or is not a listing for a person with that name and date of birth. If there is a potential match and the inquiry state was not responsible for causing that entry, the agency normally will indicate in writing the existence of a probable match and will identify the state licensing agency that suspended, revoked or canceled the relevant license or convicted the person of one of the violations referenced earlier in this appendix.

*Actions When a Probable NDR Match Occurs*

The response provided after performance of an NDR check is limited to either a notification that no potential record match was identified or a notification that a potential record match was identified. If the latter event occurs, the notification will include the identification of the state motor vehicle licensing authority which possesses the relevant record. If the NDR check results indicate a potential match and that the state with the relevant data is the same state which furnished detailed data (because it had issued the person a driving license), no further action is required to obtain additional data. If the NDR check results indicate a potential match and the state with the relevant data is different from the state which furnished detailed data, it then is necessary to contact the individual state motor vehicle licensing authority that furnished the NDR information to obtain the relevant record. FRA places responsibility on the railroad to notify the engineer candidate and on the candidate to contact the state with the relevant information. FRA requires the certification candidate to write to the state licensing agency and request that the agency inform the railroad concerning the person's

driving record. If required by the state agency, the person may have to pay a nominal fee for providing such data and may have to furnish written evidence that the prospective operator consents to the release of the data to the railroad. FRA does not require that a railroad or a certification candidate go beyond these efforts to obtain the information in the control of such a state agency, and a railroad may act upon the pending certification without the data if an individual state agency fails or refuses to supply the records.

If the non-issuing state licensing agency does provide the railroad with the available records, the railroad must verify that the record pertains to the person being considered for certification. It is necessary to perform this verification because in some instances only limited identification information is furnished for use in the NDR and this might result in data about a different person being supplied to the railroad. Among the available means for verifying that the additional state record pertains to the certification candidate are physical description, photographs and handwriting comparisons.

Once the railroad has obtained the motor vehicle driving record which, depending on the circumstance, may consist of more than two documents, the railroad must afford the prospective engineer an opportunity to review that record and respond in writing to its contents in accordance with the provisions of §240.219. The review opportunity must occur before the railroad evaluates that record. The railroad's required evaluation and subsequent decision making must be done in compliance with the provisions of this part.

#### APPENDIX D TO PART 240—IDENTIFICATION OF STATE AGENCIES THAT PERFORM NATIONAL DRIVER REGISTER CHECKS

Under the provisions of §240.111 of this part, each person seeking certification or recertification as a locomotive operator must request that a check of the National Driver Register (NDR) be conducted and that the resulting information be furnished to his or her employer or prospective employer. Under the provisions of paragraphs (d) and (e) of §240.111, each person seeking certification or recertification as a locomotive engineer must request that National Highway Traffic Safety Administration conduct the NDR check, unless he or she was issued a motor vehicle driver license by one of the state agencies identified in this appendix. If the certification candidate received a license from one of the designated state agencies, he or she must request the state agency to perform the NDR check. The state motor vehicle licensing agencies listed in this appendix participate in a program that authorizes

these state agencies, in accordance with the National Driver Register Act of 1982, to obtain information from the NDR on behalf of individuals seeking data about themselves. Since these state agencies can more efficiently supply the desired data and, in some instances, can provide a higher quality of information, FRA requires that certification candidates make use of this method in preference to directly contacting NHTSA.

Although the number of state agencies that participate in this manner is limited, FRA anticipates that an increasing number of states will do so in the future. This appendix will be revised periodically to reflect current participation in the program. As of December 31, 1989, the motor vehicle licensing agencies of the following states participate under the provisions of the 1982 changes to the NDR Act: North Dakota, Ohio, Virginia, and Washington.

#### APPENDIX E TO PART 240—RECOMMENDED PROCEDURES FOR CONDUCTING SKILL PERFORMANCE TESTS

FRA requires (see §240.127 and §240.211) that locomotive engineers be given a skill performance test prior to certification or recertification and establishes certain criteria for the conduct of that test. Railroads are given discretion concerning the manner in which to administer the required testing. FRA has afforded railroads this discretion to allow individual railroad companies latitude to tailor their testing procedures to the specific operational realities. This appendix contains FRA's recommendations for the administration of skill performance testing that occurs during operation of an actual train. It can be modified to serve in instances where a locomotive simulator is employed for testing purposes. These recommended practices, if followed, will ensure a more thorough and systematic assessment of locomotive engineer performance.

##### *The Need for a Systematic Approach*

There are numerous criteria that should be monitored when a designated supervisor of locomotive engineers is observing a person to determine whether that individual should be certified or recertified as a qualified locomotive engineer. The details of those criteria will vary for the different classes of service, types of railroads, and terrain over which trains are being operated. At a minimum, the attention of a designated supervisor of locomotive engineers should concentrate on several general areas during any appraisal. Compliance with the railroad's operating rules, including its safety directives and train handling rules, and compliance with Federal regulations should be carefully

monitored. But, in order to effectively evaluate employees, it is necessary to have something against which to compare their performance. In order to hold a locomotive engineer accountable for compliance, a railroad must have adequate operating, safety and train handling rules. Any railroad that fails to have adequate operating, safety, or train handling rules will experience difficulty in establishing a objective method of measuring an individual's skill level. Any railroad that requires the evaluation of an individual's performance relative to its train handling rules needs to have established preferred operating ranges for throttle use, brake application, and train speed. The absence of such criteria results in the lack of a meaningful yardstick for the designated supervisor of locomotive engineers to use in measuring the performance of locomotive engineers. It also is essential to have a definite standard so that the engineer and any reviewing body can know what the certification candidate is being measured against.

Evaluating the performance of certain train operation skills will tend to occur in all situations. For example, it would be rare for a designated supervisor of locomotive engineers to observe any operator for a reasonable period of time and not have some opportunity to review that engineer's compliance with some basic safety rules, compliance with basic operating rules, and performance of a brake test. As the complexity of the operation increases, so does the number of items that the operator must comply with. Higher speeds, mountainous terrain, and various signal systems place increased emphasis on the need for operator compliance with more safety, operating, and train handling rules. Accounting for such variables in any universal monitoring scheme immediately results in a fairly complex system.

FRA therefore recommends that designated supervisors of locomotive engineers employ a written aid to help record events and procedures that as a minimum should be observed for when conducting a skills performance test. FRA is providing the following information to assist railroads in developing such a written aid so as to ensure meaningful testing. When conducting a skills performance test, a designated supervisor of locomotive engineers should be alert to the following:

- Does the employee have the necessary books (Operating Rules, Safety Rules, Timetable, etc.)?
- Are predeparture inspections properly conducted (Radio, Air Brake Tests, Locomotive, etc.)?
- Does the employee comply with applicable safety rules?
- Does the employee read the bulletins, general orders, etc.?
- Enroute, does the employee:
- Comply with applicable Federal Rules?

- Monitor gauges?
- Properly use the horn, whistle, headlight?
- Couple to cars at a safe speed?
- Properly control in train slack and buff forces?
- Properly use the train braking systems?
- Comply with speed restrictions?
- Display familiarity with the physical characteristics?
- Comply with signal indications?
- Respond properly to unusual conditions?
- At the conclusion of the trip, does the employee:
- Apply a hand brake to the locomotives?
- Properly report locomotive defects?

Obviously, the less sophisticated the railroad's operations are, the fewer the number of identified practices that would be relevant. Hence, this list should be modified accordingly.

*The Need for Objectivity, Use of Observation Form*

It is essential that railroads conduct the performance skills testing in the most objective manner possible, whether this testing is the locomotive engineer's initial qualification testing or periodic retesting. There will always be some potential for the subjective views, held by the designated supervisor of locomotive engineers conducting the testing, to enter into evaluations concerning the competency of a particular individual to handle the position of locomotive engineer. Steps can be taken, and need to be taken, to minimize the risk that personality factors adversely influence the testing procedure.

One way to reduce the entry of subjective matters into the qualification procedures is through the use of a document that specifies those criteria that the designated supervisor of locomotive engineers is to place emphasis on. The use of an observation form will reduce but not eliminate subjectivity. Any skill performance test will contain some amount of subjectivity. While compliance with the operating rules or the safety rules is clear in most cases, with few opportunities for deviation, train handling offers many options with few absolute right answers. The fact that an engineer applies the train air brakes at one location rather than a few yards away does not necessarily indicate a failure but a question of judgment. The use of dynamic braking versus air brakes at a particular location may be a question of judgment unless the carrier has previously specified the use of a preferred braking method. In any case the engineer's judgment, to apply or not apply a braking system at a given location, is subject to the opinion of the designated supervisor of locomotive engineers.

A railroad should attempt to reduce or eliminate such subjectivity through use of

some type of observation or evaluation. For railroads developing any evaluation form, the areas of concern identified earlier will not be relevant in all instances. Railroads that do not have sophisticated operations would only need a short list of subjects. For example, most smaller railroads would not require line items pertaining to compliance with signal rule compliance or the use of dynamic brakes. Conversely, in all instances the observation forms should include the time and location that the observer started and ended the observation. FRA believes that there should be a minimum duration for all performance skills examinations. FRA allows railroads to select a duration appropriate for their individual circumstances, requiring only that the period be “of sufficient length to effectively evaluate the person.” In exercising its discretion FRA suggests that the minimums selected by a railroad be stated in terms of a distance since the examination has to be of a sufficient duration to adequately monitor the operator’s skills in a variety of situations. FRA also suggests that the format for the observation form include a space for recording the observer’s com-

ments. Provision for comments ideally would allow for the inclusion of “constructive criticism” without altering the import of the evaluation and would permit subjective comments where merited.

APPENDIX F TO PART 240—MEDICAL STANDARDS GUIDELINES

(1) The purpose of this appendix is to provide greater guidance on the procedures that should be employed in administering the vision and hearing requirements of §§240.121 and 240.207.

(2) In determining whether a person has the visual acuity that meets or exceeds the requirements of this part, the following testing protocols are deemed acceptable testing methods for determining whether a person has the ability to recognize and distinguish among the colors used as signals in the railroad industry. The acceptable test methods are shown in the left hand column and the criteria that should be employed to determine whether a person has failed the particular testing protocol are shown in the right hand column.

Accepted tests	Failure criteria
<b>PSEUDOISCHROMATIC PLATE TESTS</b>	
American Optical Company 1965 .....	5 or more errors on plates 1–15.
AOC—Hardy-Rand-Ritter plates—second edition .....	Any error on plates 1–6 (plates 1–4 are for demonstration—test plate 1 is actually plate 5 in book)
Dvorine—Second edition .....	3 or more errors on plates 1–15
Ishihara (14 plate) .....	2 or more errors on plates 1–11.
Ishihara (16 plate) .....	2 or more errors on plates 1–8.
Ishihara (24 plate) .....	3 or more errors on plates 1–15.
Ishihara (38 plate) .....	4 or more errors on plates 1–21.
Richmond Plates 1983 .....	5 or more errors on plates 1–15.
<b>MULTIFUNCTION VISION TESTER</b>	
Keystone Orthoscope .....	Any error.
OPTEC 2000 .....	Any error.
Titmus Vision Tester .....	Any error.
Titmus II Vision Tester .....	Any error.

(3) In administering any of these protocols, the person conducting the examination should be aware that railroad signals do not always occur in the same sequence and that “yellow signals” do not always appear to be the same. It is not acceptable to use “yarn” or other materials to conduct a simple test to determine whether the certification candidate has the requisite vision. No person shall be allowed to wear chromatic lenses during an initial test of the person’s color vision; the initial test is one conducted in accordance with one of the accepted tests in the chart and §240.121(c)(3).

(4) An examinee who fails to meet the criteria in the chart, may be further evaluated as determined by the railroad’s medical examiner. Ophthalmologic referral, field test-

ing, or other practical color testing may be utilized depending on the experience of the examinee. The railroad’s medical examiner will review all pertinent information and, under some circumstances, may restrict an examinee who does not meet the criteria from operating the train at night, during adverse weather conditions or under other circumstances. The intent of §240.121(e) is not to provide an examinee with the right to make an infinite number of requests for further evaluation, but to provide an examinee with at least one opportunity to prove that a hearing or vision test failure does not mean the examinee cannot safely operate a locomotive or train. Appropriate further medical evaluation could include providing another approved scientific screening test or

a field test. All railroads should retain the discretion to limit the number of retests that an examinee can request but any cap placed on the number of retests should not limit retesting when changed circumstances would make such retesting appropriate. Changed circumstances would most likely occur if the examinee's medical condition has improved in some way or if technology has advanced to the extent that it arguably could compensate for a hearing or vision deficiency.

(5) Engineers who wear contact lenses should have good tolerance to the lenses and should be instructed to have a pair of corrective glasses available when on duty.

[64 FR 60996, Nov. 8, 1999]

## PART 241—UNITED STATES LOCAL REQUIREMENT FOR DISPATCHING OF UNITED STATES RAIL OPERATIONS

Sec.

241.1 Purpose and scope.

241.3 Application and responsibility for compliance.

241.5 Definitions.

241.7 Waivers.

241.9 Prohibition against extraterritorial dispatching; exceptions.

241.11 Prohibition against conducting a railroad operation dispatched by an extraterritorial dispatcher; exceptions.

241.13 Prohibition against track owner's requiring or permitting use of its line for a railroad operation dispatched by an extraterritorial dispatcher; exceptions.

241.15 Geographical boundaries of FRA's regions and addresses of FRA's regional headquarters.

241.17 Penalties and other consequences for noncompliance.

241.19 Preemptive effect.

241.21 Information collection. [Reserved]

241.23 Termination of this part.

APPENDIX A TO PART 241—SCHEDULE OF CIVIL PENALTIES

APPENDIX B TO PART 241—GEOGRAPHICAL BOUNDARIES OF FRA'S REGIONS AND ADDRESSES OF FRA'S REGIONAL HEADQUARTERS

AUTHORITY: 49 U.S.C. 20103, 20107, 21301, 21304, 21311; 28 U.S.C. 2461, note; 49 CFR 1.49.

SOURCE: 66 FR 63959, Dec. 11, 2001, unless otherwise noted.

EFFECTIVE DATE NOTE: At 66 FR 63959, Dec. 11, 2001, part 241 was added, effective Jan. 10, 2002, through Jan. 10, 2003.

### § 241.1 Purpose and scope.

(a) The purpose of this part is to prevent railroad accidents and incidents,

and consequent injuries, deaths, and property damage, that would result from improper dispatching of railroad operations in the United States by individuals located outside of the United States.

(b) This part prohibits extraterritorial dispatching of railroad operations, conducting railroad operations that are extraterritorially dispatched, and allowing track to be used for such operations, subject to certain stated exceptions. This part does not restrict a railroad from adopting and enforcing additional or more stringent requirements not inconsistent with this part.

### § 241.3 Application and responsibility for compliance.

(a) Except as provided in paragraph (b) of this section, this part applies to all railroads.

(b) This part does not apply to—

(1) A railroad that operates only on track inside an installation that is not part of the general railroad system of transportation; or

(2) Rapid transit operations in an urban area that are not connected to the general railroad system of transportation.

(c) Although the duties imposed by this part are generally stated in terms of a duty of a railroad, each person, including a contractor for a railroad, who performs a function covered by this part, shall perform that function in accordance with this part.

### § 241.5 Definitions.

As used in this part:

*Administrator* means the Administrator of the Federal Railroad Administration or the Administrator's delegate.

*Dispatch* means:

(1) To perform a function that would be classified as a duty of a "dispatching service employee," as that term is defined by the hours of service laws at 49 U.S.C. 21101(2), if the function were to be performed in the United States. In particular, *dispatch* means to use a telegraph, telephone, radio, or any other electrical or mechanical device, or hand delivery—

(i) To control the movement of a train or other on-track equipment by