

DEVELOPMENT OF A HAZARD-BASED METHOD FOR EVALUATING THE FIRE SAFETY OF PASSENGER TRAINS

by

**Richard W. Bukowski, Richard D. Peacock,
Paul A. Reneke and Jason D. Averill
Building and Fire Research Laboratory
National Institute of Standards and Technology
Gaithersburg, MD 20899 USA**

**and
Stephanie H. Markos
Volpe National Transportation Systems Center
U.S. Department of Transportation
Cambridge, MA 02142 USA**

**Reprinted from the Fire Research Development and Application in the 21st Century.
FORUM 2000 Symposium. Organized by Architectural and Building Research Institute
(ABRI), MOI, and FORUM for International Cooperation in Fire Research. Proceedings.
October 23-24, 2000, Taipei, Taiwan, 1-24 pp, 2000.**

**NOTE: This paper is a contribution of the National Institute of Standards and
Technology and is not subject to copyright.**



NIST

**National Institute of Standards and Technology
Technology Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce**

Development of a Hazard-Based Method for Evaluating the Fire Safety of Passenger Trains

Richard W. Bukowski*, Richard D. Peacock, Paul A. Reneke, and Jason D. Averill

NIST Building and Fire Research Laboratory

Gaithersburg, MD 20899 USA

Stephanie H. Markos

Volpe National Transportation Systems Center

U.S. Department of Transportation

Cambridge, MA 02142 USA

* Corresponding author, Richard W. Bukowski, Senior Research Engineer, Group Leader, Fire Safety Systems, Building and Fire Research Laboratory, 100 Bureau Drive, Gaithersburg, MD 20899 USA, (301) 975-6853, fax: (301) 975-4052, e-mail: richard.bukowski@nist.gov

Development of Fire Hazard Analysis for Passenger Trains

ABSTRACT

The fire safety of U.S. passenger trains currently is addressed through small-scale flammability and smoke emission tests and performance criteria promulgated by the Federal Railroad Administration (FRA). The FRA approach relies heavily on test methods applied to the primary combustible materials of rail car components. As fire safety regulations for buildings move toward performance codes, there has been interest in the application of fire hazard assessment to passenger rail cars using modeling techniques. Accordingly, the FRA has funded the Volpe National Transportation Systems Center (Volpe Center) and the National Institute of Standards and Technology (NIST) to develop such an alternative approach. This effort included a systematic study of the fire performance characteristics of current rail car materials. First, the heat release and smoke production of actual materials in use were characterized in the Cone Calorimeter. Next, full-scale assembly tests of components such as seats and interior panels constructed of these same materials were conducted in a furniture calorimeter. Finally, full-scale tests of passenger rail cars incorporating the tested components were conducted. The predictive accuracy of fire hazard modeling techniques was assessed against the full-scale test results. The model's utility in evaluating alternative fire safety improvements, such as automatic suppression or smoke exhaust was demonstrated. The paper provides an overview of work to date. It is expected that this work could lead to the recognition of fire hazard-based methods as an alternative to the current prescriptive requirements for passenger rail and transit vehicles.

Key words: Fire safety; fire models; fire test methods; hazard analysis; heat release rate; passenger trains; railroads; transportation

Development of Fire Hazard Analysis for Passenger Trains

CURRENT FRA REQUIREMENTS

As part of the passenger rail equipment rulemaking process required by Congress, the Federal Railroad Administration (FRA) has published requirements that passenger train materials meet certain flammability and smoke emission test methods and performance criteria¹. These requirements are based on guidelines for intercity and commuter rail cars which FRA first issued in 1984 and revised in 1989^{2,3}. The 1984 FRA guidelines were identical to Urban Mass Transportation Administration (UMTA), now Federal Transit Administration (FTA) recommended practices for rail transit vehicles, also issued in 1984⁴. The FRA issued revised guidelines in 1989 that used terms and categories to more closely reflect passenger train design and furnishings; smoke emission performance criteria for floor coverings and elastomers were also included.

Based primarily on small-scale test methods which demonstrate fire characteristics of individual materials, the FRA requirements form a prescriptive set of design specifications which historically have been used to evaluate rail car material fire performance. This approach provides a screening device to allow interested parties to identify particularly hazardous materials and to select preferred combinations of individual components; material suppliers can independently evaluate the fire safety performance of their own materials.

TYPICAL RAIL CAR MATERIALS

Passenger rail cars are constructed primarily of stainless steel; some newer designs incorporate aluminum components. Due to the typically longer distances traveled, the furnishing of conventional passenger rail cars is more complex than the furnishing provided in a rail transit

Development of Fire Hazard Analysis for Passenger Trains

vehicle (e.g., subway, light rail). Most intercity and many commuter rail cars are equipped with upholstered seats. Multilevel cars have stairways which allow passengers to move from one level to another. Intercity passenger trains may consist of coach cars, café/lounge cars, dining cars, and sleeping cars. In addition, cooking equipment, heat and air conditioning systems, AC and DC power equipment, and lavatories are included in various passenger rail car designs.

Intercity passenger rail cars typically have interior walls, ceilings, and floors partially covered with carpeting or fabric glued to a perforated sheet metal base material. The underside of the overhead luggage storage rack is covered either with the same carpeting or rigid PVC/acrylic. In some configurations, the carpeting on walls has been replaced with fiberglass-reinforced polymer (FRP) material. Polycarbonate windows are usually used. Fabric drapes are used at windows in many cars. Elastomeric materials are used for gasketing at door edges, around windows and between cars. Polymeric materials are also used in hidden spaces (nonpassenger-accessible space), such as cable and wiring, pipe wrap, ventilation and air ducting. The majority of rail car floors are constructed of plywood/metal (plymetal panels). Fiberglass insulation is used in the floors, sidewall, end wall, and air ducts in the cars. The floor covering consists of carpet and resilient matting.

Coach cars contain rows of upholstered seats, windows and overhead luggage storage space. Coach seats consist of fabric-covered foam cushions installed on steel seat frames with plastic seat shrouds, back shells, and food trays. Seat support diaphragms provide flexible support for the seat bottom. Certain coaches used for longer distances are equipped with padded arm and leg rests, and foot rests, as well as curtains which cover the windows. The seats in first class sections

Development of Fire Hazard Analysis for Passenger Trains

are similar to coach seats described above but plush fabric upholstery installed over thicker foam cushions provides a higher level of comfort. For trains using a single level car configuration, café/lounge car interior furnishings are similar to the coach cars. The café/lounge cars have a minimal food service area and reduced seat density and may be equipped with tables. Dining cars contain an extensive separate food preparation area, laminated tables and walls, and vinyl upholstered seats. Dining tables are phenolic laminate over plymetal. Seat assemblies are constructed similar to the coach cars.

Sleeping cars contain a series of individual rooms arranged along a corridor plus luggage storage space. Seat configuration in the individual rooms is somewhat different than coach seat configuration, but comparable materials are used in the seat assemblies. The seats convert to beds with fabric-covered foam mattresses; pillows, cotton sheets, and wool blankets provided. Fabric curtains line the doors to provide privacy. Partitions between sleeping compartments and hallways are constructed of plymetal panels.

Materials selected for evaluation were provided by Amtrak which provides U. S. intercity rail passenger service. The Amtrak fleet consists of several generations of passenger rail cars. These include cars which provide coach or first class seating, food service, or overnight sleeping accommodations. Selected materials reflecting a broad cross section of interior materials (representing the bulk of the fire load found in most passenger rail cars) were tested in the Cone Calorimeter. Table 1 lists the materials selected and tested.

Development of Fire Hazard Analysis for Passenger Trains

Table 1. Selected Passenger Train Materials Evaluated in the Study

Category	Sample No.*	Material Description (Components)
Seat and Bed Assemblies	1a, 1b, 1c, 1d	Seat cushion, (foam, interliner, fabric/PVC cover)
	2a, 2b, 2c	Seat cushion, (foam, interliner, fabric cover)
	3	Graphite-filled foam
	4	Seat support diaphragm, chloroprene elastomer
	5	Seat support diaphragm, FR cotton muslin
	6	Seat shroud, PVC/acrylic
	7	Armrest pad, coach seat (foam on metal support)
	8	Seat footrest cover, chloroprene elastomer
	9	Seat track cover, chloroprene elastomer
	10a, 10b, 10c	Mattress (foam, interliner, ticking)
	11a, 11b, 11c	Bed pad (foam, interliner, ticking)
Wall and Window Surfaces	12	Wall finishing, wool carpet
	13	Wall finishing, wool fabric
	14	Space divider, polycarbonate
	15	Wall material, FRP/PVC
	16	Wall panel, FRP
	17	Window glazing, polycarbonate
	18	Window mask, FRP
Curtains, Drapes, And Fabrics	19	Privacy door curtain and window drape, wool/nylon
	20	Window drape, polyester
	21	Blanket, wool fabric
	22	Blanket, modacrylic fabric
	23a, 23b	Pillow, cotton fabric/polyester filler
Floor Coverings	24	Carpet, nylon
	25	Rubber mat, styrene butadiene
Misc	26	Cafe/lounge/diner table, phenolic/wood laminate
	27	Air duct, neoprene
	28	Pipe wrap insulation foam
	29	Window gasketing, chloroprene elastomer
	30	Door gasketing, chloroprene elastomer

* Letters indicate individual component materials in an assembly.

Individual component materials are listed in order in parentheses following the material description

Note: All foam except Sample 3 is the identical type

COMPARISON OF CONE CALORIMETER TEST DATA WITH EXISTING FRA TEST DATA

Heat release rate (HRR) and fire hazard analysis are the primary focus of this current study of passenger train fire safety. HRR is the key indicator of fire performance of a material or

Development of Fire Hazard Analysis for Passenger Trains

construction, including ignition, flammability⁵, and smoke emission⁶ properties. Accordingly, HRR data are necessary to conduct fire hazard analyses and can also be used to predict real-scale fire behavior. Passenger rail car materials have historically been tested according to other test methods and performance criteria not directly related to HRR. In this section, the Cone Calorimeter test data are compared to test data obtained from Amtrak for FRA-cited test methods. This comparison is intended to provide a better understanding of the relationships and limitations of Cone Calorimeter test data relative to FRA-cited test method data. A detailed report is available⁷.

FRA-Cited Test Method

Several FRA-cited test methods include American Society for Testing and Materials (ASTM) and Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) measures of material flammability in terms of flame spread (ASTM E 162, D 3675, and E 648) or ignition/burn resistance (FAA FAR 25.853 (a) and ASTM C 542). ASTM E 162 and D 3675 measure downward flame spread on a near vertically mounted specimen (the specimen is tilted 30° from the vertical with the bottom of the specimen further away from the radiant panel than the top of the specimen). FAA FAR 25.853 (a) and ASTM C 542 are small burner tests which measure a material's resistance to ignition and burning for a small sample of material. ASTM E 648 measures lateral flame spread on a horizontally-mounted specimen. Since ASTM E 648 was designed to measure fire performance of flooring materials, it is the only test method that attempts to replicate end-use conditions. Material flammability and smoke emission test data were obtained for thirty materials from manufacturers and/or suppliers. Review of additional data from related studies^{8, 9, 10} show performance similar to the current tests.

Development of Fire Hazard Analysis for Passenger Trains

Of the materials currently in use, only the polycarbonate space divider does not meet the FRA flammability performance criterion of 35; used as a window glazing, the same material meets the FRA performance criterion of 100. ASTM E 648 was used to evaluate two floor covering materials: nylon carpet and resilient rubber floor mat. The test data indicated that both met the FRA performance criteria. The FAA FAR 25.853 (a) burn length test data available for 4 of the 10 materials indicated they met the FRA performance criteria. Flame time was available for only 3 of the 10 materials which also passed the criterion.

Available ASTM E 662 test data showed that the majority of samples met FRA smoke emission criteria. Exceptions such as seat support diaphragm, armrest pad, footrest pad, seat track cover, window and door gasketing represent a small portion of the fire load in a typical vehicle interior. Amtrak is considering replacement materials with better fire performance.

Cone Calorimeter Test Method

The individual material data obtained from the Cone Calorimeter tests are shown in Table 2. All Cone Calorimeter tests in this study were conducted at a heat flux exposure of 50 kW/m². This level represents a severe fire exposure consistent with actual train fire tests. With the high performance typical of currently used materials, flux exposures higher than 50 kW/m² are unlikely. A spark ignitor was used to ignite the pyrolysis gases. All specimens were wrapped in aluminum foil on all sides except for the exposed surface. A metal frame was used and where necessary a wire grid was added to prevent expanding samples from entering into the cone heater. Included in Table 2 are ignition time, peak HRR, and average specific extinction area smoke data (SEA, σ) for the first 180 s of each test. More extensive data are available ⁷.

Development of Fire Hazard Analysis for Passenger Trains

Table 2. Cone Calorimeter Test Data for Selected Passenger Rail Car Materials

Sample Number*	Time to Ignition(s)	Peak HRR(kW/m ²)	SEA 180s Average(m ² /kg)
1a, 1b, 1c, 1d	14, 5, 11, 7	80, 30, 420, 360	30, 300, 225, 770
2a, 2b, 2c	14, 5, 8	80, 30, 265	30, 300, 400
3	7	65	40
4	31	295	1400
5	7	190	490
6	28	110	490
7	54	610	780
8	45	400	960
9	26	190	1100
10a, 10b, 10c11a, 11b, 11c	9, 5, 7	80, 25, 150	40, 70, 70
12	30	655	510
13	21	745	260
14	105	270	1000
15	23	120	1000
16	18	270	530
17	115	330	1000
18	53	210	n.a.
19	13	310	380
20	20	175	810
21	11	170	560
22	17	18	n.a.
23	24	340	570
24	10	245	350
25	35	300	1400
26	44	250	80
27	30	140	810
28	7	95	700
29	33	210	1100
30	38	200	1200

n.a. = data not available* letters indicate individual component materials in an assembly. Note: All foam except sample 3 is the same type

Times to ignition varied from 5 s for the cotton interliner used in the seat assemblies to 115 s for the window glazing. In general, seat and bedding materials and curtain and fabric materials

Development of Fire Hazard Analysis for Passenger Trains

exhibited the shortest times to ignition, typical of thin materials. Wall and window surfaces, as well as window and door gaskets, had the longest times to ignition, typical of thicker materials.

Peak HRR varied over an order of magnitude from 65 kW/m² for the graphite foam to 745 kW/m² for the wall fabric. The majority of the 34 individual sample materials tested had peak HRR between 100 kW/m² and 600 kW/m²:

- 6 materials had peak HRR below 100 kW/m² – including all the seat and mattress foams;
- 25 materials had peak HRR between 100 kW/m² and 600 kW/m²; and,
- 3 materials had peak HRR over 600 kW/m² – usually thin materials.

Since the seat foam is one of the largest single combustible materials in a rail car, the low HRR results are particularly important.

Smoke SEA data showed a larger distribution for the 180 s average, σ (m²/kg), as compared to the peak HRR. Peak σ varied from 30 m²/kg for a seating foam to 1400 m²/kg for a seat support diaphragm and a rubber floor covering material.

Several materials showed elevated HRR and smoke values over an extended period of time.

Although the peak HRR of these materials fall into an intermediate range, the extended duration of the HRR curve makes these materials important for study in future fire hazard analysis efforts.

Development of Fire Hazard Analysis for Passenger Trains

For component assemblies of materials, the time to ignition was controlled by the exposed layer of material. The peak HRR for assemblies was generally between the highest and lowest peak HRR for individual component materials making up the assembly. Smoke data was greatly reduced compared to individual component materials with 180 s average σ varying from 30 m²/kg for a mattress assembly to 560 m²/kg for a pillow.

Cone Calorimeter data from the 1984 FRA/Amtrak study ⁸, 1990 National Highway Traffic Safety Administration (NHTSA) school bus study ⁹, and 1996 Maryland Area Rail Commuter (MARC) system rail car study ¹¹ shows material performance similar to the materials tested for this study. In addition, the NHTSA and MARC data includes tests conducted at a range of incident fluxes which showed an expected increase in peak HRR as incident heat flux increased.

Implication of Small-Scale Test Results on Current Passenger Rail Car Design

For the majority of materials, the relative ranking from "best" to "worst" was similar in both test methods. While the materials tested represent a range of those currently used in passenger rail cars, many other material combinations are possible in actual use. Moreover, new materials and designs are better judged through a systems approach which considers the impact of material and design choices on the overall fire safety of the system. The use of HRR data in a hazard analysis applied to passenger trains could provide such an overall system evaluation.

ASSEMBLY TESTING

The outstanding passenger train fire safety record shows that current requirements have been successful in preventing small ignition sources from causing major fires. To provide data

Development of Fire Hazard Analysis for Passenger Trains

for fire hazard analysis, selected real-scale assemblies from Amtrak trains were tested in the furniture calorimeter. All of the assemblies tested were extremely resistant to ignition. The assemblies tested require an initial fire source ranging from 25 kW to 200 kW to ignite. Some of the materials do not contribute to the fire even with these ignition sources.

These assembly tests represent a range of materials used in intercity passenger rail cars and are consistent with those tested in the Cone Calorimeter. The tests were arranged in six groups:

- Ten trash bag tests, with six taken from an actual Amtrak overnight train and four filled with newspaper to match the HRR of the trash-filled bags with a more repeatable filling. Newspaper-filled trash bags were used as an ignition source for the seating and bedding tests described below.
- Four coach seat assembly tests to study the burning behavior of entire seating assemblies to varying ignition sources. The assemblies were placed next to a noncombustible wall representative of an Amtrak coach car wall and overhead luggage rack.
- Three bedding assembly tests in a compartment sized to be representative of an economy room on an overnight train. Although the construction materials for the bedding assemblies are similar to the seating assemblies, the geometry of the compartments is significantly different from that in a coach car.
- Four wall and ceiling carpet tests. In some configurations, wall and ceiling carpet comprise a significant fraction of the surface area in a car. The extent to which the carpeting supports the spread of fire is a controlling factor in fire spread from a seat assembly to the upper walls and luggage rack.
- Six window drape and door privacy curtain tests. Like the carpet, drapes and curtains can be a path for fire spread to the upper walls and luggage rack.
- Two window assembly tests, including window glazing and window masks from Amtrak coach cars. The window assemblies comprise a significant fraction of the wall surface area in a car.

Development of Fire Hazard Analysis for Passenger Trains

Assembly Test Results

Peak HRR values were measured during each of the 29 tests conducted. For the assemblies tested, the peak HRR ranged from 27 kW for a coach seat assembly (including the TB 133 burner) to 918 kW for a sleeping compartment assembly (including both lower and upper berths, bedding, window drapes, and a trash bag ignition source). Table 3 summarizes the data from the assembly tests.

Table 3. Peak HRR Measured During Furniture Calorimeter Assembly Tests

Test Assembly	Ignition Source (Kw)	Range of Peak HRR* (Kw)	Net Peak HRR (Kw)
Trash bags ranging in weight from 4 lb to 21 lb. (1.8 kg to 9.5 kg)	25	50 – 280	25 – 260
Coach seat assemblies	17 – 200	30 – 490	10 – 290
Lower bed with bedding and pillow	200	760 – 840	550-- 640
Upper and lower beds with bedding and pillow	200	920	720
Wall carpet on a wall or a wall and ceiling	50	340 – 850	330 – 800
Window drape or privacy curtain assemblies	25	70 – 200	40 – 170
Window assemblies	50 – 200	130 – 450	80 – 250

* – Includes the contribution of the ignition source.

All the assemblies tested were extremely resistant to ignition. The assemblies tested require an initial fire source ranging from 25 kW to 200 kW to ignite. Materials and products that comply with the current FRA-cited fire tests and performance are difficult to ignite, requiring ignition source strengths of 2 to 10 times those used for similar materials and products found outside of the rail car operating environment. Some of the materials do not contribute to the fire even with these ignition sources. Like the 1983 tests conducted on real-scale mockups of Amtrak coach

Development of Fire Hazard Analysis for Passenger Trains

cars, wall carpet and window assemblies are seen as the most important materials for fire growth⁸. These assemblies are typical of intercity passenger rail cars. While commuter rail cars or rail transit vehicles may have different levels of furnishings, results for some of the assemblies (such as the seat assemblies) may be appropriate for these applications as well. Since the focus of this report is primarily passenger rail car interior design, all of these results apply to interior ignition scenarios. Exterior ignition sources, which may be important in some environments, particularly in the design of tunnel ventilation systems, were not considered. Such scenarios have been considered elsewhere¹².

Implications of Assembly Test Results on Current Passenger Rail Car Design

Clearly, it takes a significant ignition source for any of the items tested to become involved in a fire. All of the assemblies tested were exposed to an initial ignition source ranging from 17 kW to 200 kW. Some of the materials do not contribute to the fire even with these ignition sources. For example, the seat cushions do not produce a significant HRR even with the severity of the near 200 kW newspaper-filled trash bag ignition source. For the seat assemblies, the HRR results largely from burning of carpeting attached to the rear of the assemblies.

Conversely, if a severe ignition source exists, some of the materials can contribute to further fire growth. The wall carpeting and window glazing, though difficult to ignite, produce high HRR values once ignited. This is consistent with earlier National Bureau of Standards (NBS, predecessor to NIST) real-scale mockup assembly tests conducted on Amtrak coach interior materials⁸. In these earlier tests, the wall covering (carpeting or window mask) adjacent to the seating were seen as important to the growth of fire in the tests. Like the earlier NBS tests, the

Development of Fire Hazard Analysis for Passenger Trains

effect of geometry can be significant. In the bed tests, the small enclosed geometry of the sleeping compartment allowed a much larger HRR for the bed assembly tests than for the seat assembly tests, even though the materials are similar.

Following the 1983 Amtrak fire tests, the use of carpeting on the underside of the luggage racks was discontinued. Similarly, current tests involving trash bags as an ignition source capable of producing a significant fire has led Amtrak to replace these bags with a fire resistant container. Other observations have resulted in a new awareness of ignition source strengths and the benefits of enclosed luggage bins as opposed to open racks. The results from these tests are clearly having an influence on both design and operating practices.

FIRE HAZARD ANALYSIS

Traditionally, techniques for fire hazard analysis¹³ typically involve a process for the evaluation of hazard of a product or products in a specific scenario. For the analysis of passenger trains, this process limits the evaluation to the contribution of specific products without providing an overall assessment of the performance of the entire system.

Therefore, the procedure was revised for this project to better reflect the minimum appropriate performance of the overall rail car system while maintaining an evaluation of a specific design as compared to that required minimum performance level. For this systems-based analysis, the process is also conducted in four steps:

Development of Fire Hazard Analysis for Passenger Trains

- Define the rail car design and performance criteria,
- Calculate the rail car fire performance,
- Evaluate specific rail car fire scenarios, and
- Evaluate the suitability of the proposed rail car design.

Steps 1 and 4 are largely subjective and depend on the expertise of the user. Step 2, the heart of fire hazard analysis, involves extensive use of computer software, and requires considerable expertise in fire safety practice. Step 2 is a sequence of procedures implemented in computer software to calculate the development of hazardous conditions over time, calculate the time needed by occupants to escape under those conditions, and estimate the resulting effects on the occupants, based on tenability criteria. In addition to evaluating the hazard resulting from specific products used in the design, the new procedure proposed in this report determines the worst case fire which allows the overall passenger rail car system to meet chosen design criteria. Step 3 evaluates the specific fires that are likely to occur in the application. Step 4 compares the results of steps 2 and 3 and evaluates the appropriateness of the calculations performed, as well as determining whether or not the proposed design meets the design goals established in Step 1.

Three different passenger car designs were considered: a single level coach car, a bi-level dining car, and a bi-level sleeping car. For each of these designs, a range of design fires were used which are represented by a power law relation, expressed as:

$$\dot{q} = \alpha t^n$$

where \dot{q} is the heat release rate (kW), α is the fire intensity coefficient (kW/sⁿ), t is time (s), and n is a power chosen to best represent experimental data. For most flaming fires, $n=2$, the so-called

Development of Fire Hazard Analysis for Passenger Trains

t-squared growth rate is an excellent representation. A set of specific t-squared fires labeled slow, medium, fast, and ultra-fast, with fire intensity coefficients (α) such that the fires reached 1055 kW (1000 BTU/s) in 600 s, 300 s, 150 s, and 75 s, respectively are typically used. In addition to the t-squared design fires, data from

the small-scale and assembly-scale tests of actual rail car materials were used as input to the computer fire model CFAST, to predict the conditions within the train that result from a specified fire and place the design fires in context. Figure 1

illustrates the results of the coach car analysis.




Figure 1 Calculated Fire Performance Graph for Baseline Fire Hazard Analysis of Coach Car Configuration

Key Observations from the Fire Hazard Analysis

Fire hazard analysis can quantify the consequences of specific, interior rail car fire scenarios on the safety of passengers and crew in typical intercity coach, sleeping, and dining cars. Such an analysis can provide information on:

- The worst-case fire that still provides sufficient time to ensure that passengers and crew are safe from unreasonable risk of death or injury from interior fires. For example, materials or products exhibiting fire growth rates at or below a medium t-squared level would provide sufficient time for egress for the design fires considered in Figure 1.
- By comparing the largest design fire to specific fire scenarios involving materials used in the construction of passenger rail cars, the acceptability of the materials can be judged. For example, materials and products that comply with the current FRA requirements for

Development of Fire Hazard Analysis for Passenger Trains

fire performance exhibit fire growth rates below the medium t-squared level, and thus would be acceptable under the design criteria presented in Figure 1.

The quantity, arrangement, and fire performance characteristics (ignitability and fire growth characteristics) of items brought aboard by passengers as baggage, and materials brought aboard as supplies such as packaging materials associated with food or cleaning supplies, could affect the analysis. The impact of items such as baggage could be quantified in a more detailed analysis. However, for all but the most severe ignition sources, conditions in all three rail car designs studied remain tenable sufficiently long to allow safe passenger egress, e.g., in some cases more than 10 min.

The effects of severe fire scenarios may be potentially mitigated by precluding any fire having a fire growth rate of faster than medium t-squared, or modifying the egress system. For example, the severe scenario where all components are ignited by a large trash bag has been addressed by Amtrak through a redesign of trash containers and modification of operational procedures to ensure accumulations of trash are not present in the cars.

EVALUATION OF MODEL PREDICTIONS WITH FULL-SCALE TESTS

From the fire hazard analysis, the obvious question that arises is how good are the model predictions. The only widely-accepted method of verifying the model predictions is to test them against actual controlled experiments. Full-scale experiments were conducted to examine the model predictions.

Development of Fire Hazard Analysis for Passenger Trains

Two different types of tests were conducted to evaluate the accuracy of the results of fire hazard analyses conducted: 1) a series of gas burner tests to evaluate the accuracy of the fire performance curves for an actual rail car geometry and 2) a series of other interior tests to evaluate fire spread and growth for actual train car furnishings exposed to a range of initial fire sources. In a fire hazard analysis, the fire performance curves show the predicted response of the chosen car geometry to a range of typical fire growth rates and determine the available safe egress time from a car exposed to an arbitrary fire. These calculations are then compared to the time necessary to evacuate passengers from the car to determine the largest fire growth rate and size that is allowable for a chosen car geometry. To evaluate the accuracy of the model calculations of the fire performance curves, a series of gas burner fires covering a range of fire size and growth rate were used to experimentally determine a fire performance curve for an actual rail car. The experimental fire performance curve determined from temperature and gas concentration measurements made during the tests can then be compared against the predicted fire performance curve to determine any differences and their significance. Figure 2 shows one of the gas burner tests. Table 4 shows some of the test results from the tests.




Figure 2. Typical T-squared Gas Burner Fire Growth

Table 4. Selected Results from Real-Scale Tests of an Amfleet I Coach Car

	Gas Temperature (°F / °C)				Heat Flux (kW/m ²)		Gas Concentration (volume %)					
	Upper Layer		Lower Layer				O ₂		CO ₂		CO	
	Peak	At Time	Peak	At Time	Peak	At Time	Min	At Time	Peak	At Time	Peak	At Time
Slow t ² gas burner	748 / 398	600	223 / 106	600	19	625	16	630	3.0	620	0.02	– a
Medium t ² gas burner	628 / 331	320	178 / 81	315	16	317	17	330	2.4	325	0.01	–
Fast t ² gas burner	709 / 376	155	172 / 79	155	15	155	16	170	2.8	190	0.01	–
Ultra-fast t ² gas burner	702 / 372	80	163 / 73	80	14	80	17	95	2.3	95	0.03	–
Window Drape with 25 kW burner	127 / 53	510	90 / 32	600	0.31	540	20	600	0.31	–	0.01	–
Wall carpet with Trash Bag	361 / 183	300	142 / 61	320	9	270	17	290	3.7	300	0.2	280
TB 133 ignition on seat	117 / 47	600	90 / 32	365	0.24	560	21	–	0.23	–	0	–
25 kW burner ignition on seat	127 / 53	565	88 / 31	255	0.46	505	21	–	0.32	–	0	–
Trash bag on seat	685 / 363	270	268 / 131	260	27	90	12	285	6.6	290	1.4	285

a – measured condition is at an ambient or near-ambient value and roughly constant throughout the test.

Development of Fire Hazard Analysis for Passenger Trains

Figure 3 shows a fire performance graph

determined from experimental measurements in the gas burner tests along with fire model predicted curves calculated for the test rail car. For a medium growth rate t-squared fire, the time to incapacitation determined from the replicate gas burner tests was

(126 ± 7) s. For other growth rate fires,

the time to incapacitation ranged from

(40 ± 4) s for the ultra-fast growth rate

fire to (230 ± 12) s for the slow growth rate fire. On average, the uncertainty of the

experimentally determined times to these untenable conditions was less than 7 % (based on one standard deviation).




Figure 3. Comparison of Experimental and Predicted Fire Performance Curves for Incapacitation and Lethality in a Coach Car.

Key Observations from Full-Scale Tests

The gas burner tests served three primary purposes: verification of the fire modeling results from the Phase II hazard analysis report, calibration of the heat release rate measurements taken through the stack at the end of the rail car, and estimation of the uncertainty of the measurements.

The replicate measurements from the gas burner tests proved to be very repeatable. As an example, the average uncertainty of the upper layer temperature measurements for the slow,

Development of Fire Hazard Analysis for Passenger Trains

medium, fast and ultra-fast t-squared fires ranged from 3.1 percent to 10.8 percent. The uncertainty of the HRR measurements ranged from ± 5 kW to ± 21 kW.

The flame spread and growth tests clearly supported the conclusion from the full scale tests in Phase II that a significant ignition source was necessary to sustain significant flame spread. The three tests which used small ignition sources (25 kW burner on seat, TB 133 burner on seat, and 25 kW burner on curtains), each yielded temperature and species levels near or slightly above ambient. The tests which used the trash bag as an ignition source (trash bag in corner and trash bag on the seat) exhibited sustained flame spread and extension, producing temperatures and species concentrations sufficient to render the main compartment untenable.

Visually, the comparison between the experimentally determined fire performance curves and the curves calculated with the CFAST computer fire model is quite good. The relative difference between experimental and calculated times averages 13 % for all fire growth rates and both tenability criteria. Comparisons of model predictions with fire test experimental measurements more typically show agreement within 20 % to 25 %. Thus, the average agreement of 13 % for these calculations should be considered excellent.

SUMMARY

This paper presented an overview of an ongoing research project intended to demonstrate the use of heat release rate measurements and hazard analysis techniques when applied to passenger train fire safety. The results of this project are intended to: (1) provide additional information useful in refining existing fire safety provisions, and (2) allow car builders and

Development of Fire Hazard Analysis for Passenger Trains

passenger train system operators design flexibility to employ a broader array of materials and designs in future passenger rail cars. The successful application of this approach to complement material screening tests could provide a more cost-effective way to evaluate the actual fire performance of passenger rail car materials.

Development of Fire Hazard Analysis for Passenger Trains

REFERENCES

1. Federal Railroad Administration (FRA). 49 CFR, Transportation, Parts 216, 223, 229, 231, 232, and 238: "Passenger Equipment Safety Standards, Final Rule." *Federal Register*, Vol. 64, No.91, May 12, 1999. USDOT. National Archives and Records Administration, Washington, DC.
2. FRA. "Rail Passenger Equipment; Guidelines for Selecting Materials to Improve Their Fire Safety Characteristics." *Federal Register*, Vol. 49, No. 162, August 20, 1984. Notices. 33076-33078. Reissued in *Federal Register*, Vol. 49, No. 217, November 7, 1984. 44082-44584. U.S. Department of Transportation (USDOT). National Archives and Records Administration, Washington, DC.
3. FRA. "Rail Passenger Equipment: Reissuance of Guidelines for Selecting Materials to Improve Their Fire Safety Characteristics." *Federal Register*, Vol. 54, No. 10, January 17, 1989. Notices. 1837-1840. USDOT. National Archives and Records Administration, Washington, DC.
4. Urban Mass Transportation Administration (UMTA). "Recommended Fire Safety Practices for Rail Transit Materials Selection." *Federal Register*, Vol. 49, No. 158, August 14, 1984. Notices. 32482-32486. USDOT. National Archives and Records Administration, Washington, DC.
5. Babrauskas, V. and R. D. Peacock. "Heat Release Rate: The Single Most Important Variable in Fire Hazard." *Fire Safety Journal* 18 (3): 255-272 (1992).
6. Hirschler, M.M. "How to Measure Smoke Obscuration in a Manner Relevant to Fire Hazard Assessment: Use of Heat Release Calorimetry Test Equipment," *Journal of Fire Science* 9: 183-222 (1993).
7. Peacock, R. D., and Braun, E. "Fire Safety of Passenger Trains: Phase I: Material Evaluation (Cone Calorimeter).U.S. Department of Transportation, Federal Railroad Administration, DOT/FRA/ORD-99/01, Natl. Inst. Stand. Technol., NISTIR 6132 (1999).
8. Peacock, R. D. and Braun, E. "Fire Tests of Amtrak Passenger Rail Vehicle Interiors," National Bureau of Standards (U.S.), Technical Note 1193, 1984.
9. Braun, E., et al. "Assessment of the Fire Performance of School Bus Interior Components." Natl. Inst. Stand. Technol. NISTR 4347, 1990.
10. Gandhi, S., R.T. Long, and J.G. Quintiere. "Fire Tests of Passenger Rail Car Interior Materials". Prepared by the Department of Fire Protection Engineering, University of Maryland for the NTSB. Final Report. Contract No. NTSB12-96-SP-034, 1996.
11. National Transportation Safety Board (NTSB). *Railroad Accident Report: Derailment and Collision of Maryland Rail Commuter MARC Train 286 with National Railroad Passenger Corporation Amtrak Train 29, near Silver Spring, Maryland, on February 16, 1996*. Adopted: July 3, 1997. Washington, DC. Report No. NTSB/RAR-97/02.
12. Kennedy, W. D., R. E. Richard, and J. W. Guinan. "A Short History of Train Fire Heat Release Calculations," *1998 Annual American Society of Heating, Refrigeration, and Air-Conditioning Engineers Conference, Toronto, Canada, June 20 - 24, 1998*.
13. Bukowski, R. W., et al. *Fire Hazard Assessment Method*, National Institute of Standards and Technology Handbook 146, (1989).