

Regulations.gov will undergo system upgrades and as a result the site will be unavailable Saturday, March 28, from 6:30am through 8am (ET).



Stephanie Bilenko - Comment

This is a Comment on the **Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration** (PHMSA) Proposed Rule: **Hazardous Materials; Amendments**

For related information, [Open Docket Folder](#) 

Comment Period Closed
Mar 24 2015, at 11:59 PM ET

ID: PHMSA-2013-0225-0042

Tracking Number: 1jz-8hvy-hdeo

Document Information

Date Posted:
Mar 25, 2015

RIN:
2137-AF04

[Show More Details](#) 

Submitter Information

Submitter Name:
Stephanie Bilenko

Comment

Dear PHMSA

I am deeply concerned that PHMSA does not have safe enough standards for transport of crude oil by rail.

Improving standards of railcars is not going to help the problem. Newer style DOT111 appear to be just as vulnerable. The accident in Lynchburg, VA had newer style tank cars and ruptured at a speed of only 23 mph. The recent crash in Galena, IL on March 5 also had the improved cars.

We need to seriously consider a ban on transport of oil by rail because it is too costly to people, wildlife, soil, and waterways if it derails. In 2014, PHMSA reported 117 oil spills and 535 hazardous spills and vapor releases from Dot111 tank cars in the U.S.

If we absolutely have to move oil by rail, then

- Mandate that crude oil be degasified to prepare it for safe transport.
- Railroads must have adequate insurance to cover any potential accident (around \$11 billion would be a good place to start).
- Make more safety inspections of the railroads.
- Avoid highly populated areas and areas with rivers and lakes nearby (within 1-2 miles)
- Intermingle non hazardous cars between the oil cars

We cannot continue to ignore the people, wildlife, and waterways that are going to be permanently affected by this dangerous transport.

Sincerely
Stephanie Bilenko