

5/22/96  
 SATC  
 G

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION  
 FEDERAL RAILROAD ADMINISTRATION

REPORT FOR (month/year)

May 1996

FALSE PROCEED SIGNAL REPORT

DATE

May 17, 1996

All railroads subject to Regulations of the Federal Railroad Administration shall submit a false proceed signal report, original only, to the Federal Railroad Administration within five days after a false proceed occurs. If no false proceed occurs during any calendar month, a report showing "No Failures" must be filed within ten days after the end of the month.

REPORTING CARRIER (railroad & region or division)

Norfolk Southern Corporation  
 Division - Pocahontas

Copies of this form will be furnished upon request to the Department of Transportation, Federal Railroad Administration, Office of Safety, Washington, D.C. 20590

MAIL TO

Federal Railroad Admin.  
 Suite 440, North Tower  
 1720 Peachtree Rd., NW  
 Atlanta, GA. 30309

REPORT BY

OFFICER (signature/title)

Chief Engineer - Eastern Region  
 Communications & Signal Dept.

A failure should not be counted more than one time in items 1, 2, 3, and 4; the failure should be classified under the basic system or appliance of which it forms an essential part. E.g.: assume grounds cause a block signal to indicate a false proceed causing corresponding indications of a cab signal system on each train approaching this point, such failures should be included in item 1, Block Systems.

The following abbreviations may be used in the report.

- A - Automatic
- AB - Automatic block
- ACS - Automatic cab signal
- APB - Absolute permissive block
- ATC - Automatic train control
- ATS - Automatic train stop
- CL - Color light
- CPL - Color position light
- E - Electric
- EM - Electromechanical
- EP - Electropneumatic
- FP - False proceed
- MB - Manual block
- M - Mechanical
- P - Pneumatic
- PL - Position light
- SA - Semiautomatic
- TC - Traffic control

A false proceed failure is a failure of a system, device or appliance to indicate or function as intended which results in less restriction than intended.

| TYPE OF SYSTEM   | DATE    | LOCOMOTIVE NUMBER | DEVICE THAT FAILED | LOCATION (city and state) |
|--|---------|-------------------|--------------------|---------------------------|
| 1 BLOCK SYSTEMS<br><input type="checkbox"/> AB <input type="checkbox"/> APB <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> TC | 5/11/96 | 8951-8955         | human error        | Williamson, WV            |
| 2 INTERLOCKING<br><input type="checkbox"/> REMOTE <input type="checkbox"/> MANUAL                                  |         |                   |                    |                           |
| 3 AUTOMATIC SYSTEMS<br><input type="checkbox"/> ATS <input type="checkbox"/> ATC <input type="checkbox"/> ACS      |         |                   |                    |                           |
| 4 OTHER (specify)  |         |                   |                    |                           |

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION  
 FEDERAL RAILROAD ADMINISTRATION  
 RECEIVED

MAY 22 1996

ATLANTA, GEORGIA

NATURE AND CAUSE OF FAILURE / CORRECTIVE ACTION TAKEN

At approximately 7:10 PM, Train No. 195U110, Engineer \_\_\_\_\_, Conductor \_\_\_\_\_, had uncoupled from its train on the Old Passenger Main and pulled west of the 82L signal on Main 2. The Bluefield dispatcher lined a route for No. 195 to move east toward the SV Main, and Signal 82L indicated diverging approach diverging. Because the next signal in this route, 92L, was at stop, the 82L signal should have displayed diverging approach. Train 195 was safely stopped before passing the 92L signal, and signal personnel were notified.

Signal 82L is a color position type. Diverging approach is represented by red-horizontal over yellow-45°. Diverging approach diverging is represented by red-horizontal over flashing yellow-45°. The incident was duplicated by signal personnel. It was evident that any time 82L was setup to display diverging approach, the bottom head would flash making the signal incorrectly indicate diverging approach diverging. This was caused by the improper hookup of a flasher that had been replaced three days before. The flasher that was replaced was of a different manufacturer than the one that replaced it. Though either flasher was capable of flashing the aspect, the two had different terminal board arrangements and had to be hooked up differently. The hookup that was found caused the bottom head to flash improperly for the diverging approach aspect as well as for the diverging approach diverging aspect where it should have flashed. This condition was then corrected, the signals properly tested and returned to service.