On activities for all cases. Given this analysis, the IR for the Hialeah Yard aligns with the fixed facility IR acceptability criteria stated in NFPA 59A (see Table 1) for all train configurations C-1 to C-4.

The comparison of FN curves for the facility shows that the risk profile drops similar to that presented in Figure 59 for the mainline; however, the decrease in risk from C-1 to C-4 is only slight since the lifting activities dominate. The results indicate that the SR for the Hialeah Yard falls within the "ALARP" or tolerable region of acceptability according to the fixed facility SR criteria in NFPA 59A (see Figure 1), regardless of train configuration.

8.3.2.2 Port of Miami Intermodal Facility

Based on the results for Hialeah, train configurations C-1 and C-4 are reported for the movement and handling of LNG ISOs in the Port of Miami intermodal facility. ⁶⁹ A summary of the risk metrics for the LNG ISO car Port of Miami lifting and movement cases is provided in Table 51. The risk reduction presents the percent reduction in the SR Integral based on the C-1 (baseline) train configuration case. Based on comparison of the SR Integral for the two configurations, a risk reduction of 4.14% may be realized by using C-4 instead of C-1 for the Port of Miami intermodal operations. The maximum IR observed and the FN curve are virtually unchanged for C-4, as the risk is driven by the Lift Off activities which are not influenced by the train configuration. The risk results for C-1 are discussed above in Section 8.1.3. Given this analysis, the IR and the SR for the Port of Miami intermodal facility align with the fixed facility IR and SR acceptability criteria stated in NFPA 59A (see Table 1 and Figure 1) for both train configurations C-1 and C-4. Since train configuration C-1 represents the most significant risk of all configurations considered, it is anticipated that the other train configurations will have similar or less risk.

Table 51. Port of Miami - summary of the risk metrics for LNG ISO car movement and lifting for multiple train configurations.

Risk Metric	Port of Miami	
	C-1	C-4
SR Integral (total risk)	1.69×10⁻⁴	1.62×10 ⁻⁴
Maximum IR	4.45×10 ⁻⁵	4.41×10 ⁻⁵
Risk Reduction		4.14%

1308194.001 - 5691 117

The IR contours are overlaid on an aerial image of the facility for these four train configurations in Appendix F, and the FN curves for the four train configurations can be found in Appendix G.