

SECTION 305 TECH SUB COMM

MINUTES

NOVEMBER 17,
2011

3:00PM

CONFERENCE CALL

FACILITATOR	<i>Mario Bergeron, 305 Technical Subcommittee Chair</i>
ATTENDEES	<i>Mario Bergeron, Dale Engelhardt, Ken Uznanski, Dave Warner, Michael Burshtin, Tammy Krause, Greg Gagarin, Andrew Wood, Kevin Kesler, Anand Prabhakaran, Curtis McDowell, Jack Madden, Jeff Schultz, Ron Adams, Steve Hewitt Lisa Bubienko, Camren Cordell, Stan Hunter, Rick Degman; Industry participants: Eric Wilde, Steven Morrison, George Mekosh, Mandy Bishop, Gavin Frazier, Bobby Doyle, Armin Kick, Richard Trail, Tak Ishigami, Jack Martinson, Jim Michel, Larry Salci, Arvind Kapoor, Richard Curtis, Rick DeBella, Graciella Trillanes, Terence Monaghan, Deep Satsangi</i>
ABSENTEES	<i>Mike Trosino, Devin Rouse, Chad Edison, Charles Bielitz, Allan Paul, Charlie Poltenson, George Weber, Art Peterson, Nico Lindenau, Kevin Lawson, John Oimoen, Michael Trezise, Don Damron, Shayne Gill, Leo Penne, Andy House, Melissa Shurland</i>

DISCUSSION/DECISIONS MADE

Chairman Bergeron opened the meeting and called for the roll of core team members.

Steve Hewitt took the roll and confirmed that there was a quorum present. Industry participants were asked to email a notification of their attendance to Steve at shewitt109@aol.

Chairman Bergeron reviewed today's agenda, and noted that as a part of today's discussions, he would like to talk about DCRs to make a distinction between the intent of the DCR process and commercial positions. He noted that recent events show that this needs some clarity.

Steve Hewitt reviewed the open action items and provided a brief update on those items that were not to be specifically covered on the agenda:

Review of Action Items:

Standardization:

Nothing new to report – the SOW for outside assessment has been approved by the Executive Board, as has the budget. The Executive Board has authorized AASHTO (Leo Penne) Amtrak (Ken Uznanski) and FRA (Kevin Kesler) to work out a plan to contract with Larry Salci. The team is to present a plan to the Executive Board on its next call - November 22, 2011.

Maintaining Industry Participation List:

Steve Hewitt reported that this remains an ongoing action item. The latest list can be found on the website in the monthly update of the NGEC background/activities report.

Dual Mode Locomotive Requirements Document:

No change as of yet. The Board can now take up approval of the Requirements document – adding the disclaimer proposed to the Board by FRA and accepted on November 8, 2011. I'm not sure when the Board will take the Requirements document up for consideration. I do not anticipate it will be added to next week's agenda, as it is a very busy agenda already.

The Locomotive Technology Task Force:

There is nothing new to report at this time.

Formation of a Cars Technology Task Force:

This action item remains as an open item for future consideration once the LTF has completed its work, and if it is determined that the subcommittee has the capacity to do it.

Improving website organization and navigability:

This effort is ongoing – some changes are in progress – AASHTO has brought back Zach O'Connor (previously an intern with AASHTO) and he will be primarily working on the 305 NGEC web site. AASHTO has also asked Andy House to help provide some back up for me, and to provide a quality assurance review of the web site on a regular basis.

Approval of the Minutes of November 3, 2011 Technical subcommittee call:

On a motion by, Andrew Wood, Amtrak, and a second by Kevin Kesler, FRA, the minutes of the November 3, 2011 conference call of the Technical subcommittee, were approved without objection.

DMU Specification Development: presentation of schedule, timeline, milestones, subgroups make up – for consideration:

Dave Warner provided a brief overview of the proposed schedule and structure for completing the development of the 305 DMU Specification. (The plan for developing the specification was distributed to all subcommittees in advance of the call)

Mario Bergeron commented that the plan follows the process that has been defined in developing previous 305 specifications.

The schedule calls for a face to face final review meeting around the end of May, 2012. The Chairman asked that Steve Hewitt put setting a meeting date, and securing a location as a future action item. It is expected that by the February 23, 2012 Annual Meeting, the subcommittee will have a good sense of how the schedule is holding up and, will be able to begin to make the face to face meeting arrangements around that time.

Steve Hewitt asked if the format for Technical subcommittee bi-weekly reports from the subgroup leaders will be used for this specification development. The Chair agreed, and Steve will put subgroup leader report outs as a standing subcommittee agenda item from this point forward.

With subcommittee members having read the schedule and structure plan for the DMU development in advance, and no questions forthcoming, Mario asked for a motion to accept the schedule and structure as proposed. Jack Madden, NYSDOT, made the motion, and it was seconded by Jeff Schultz, for CTDOT.

Steve Hewitt polled the voting members with the following results:

Mario Bergeron, Amtrak – in favor
Kevin Kesler, FRA – in favor
Stan Hunter, Caltrans – in favor
Curtis McDowell for NCDOT – in favor
Jack Madden, NYSDOT – in favor
Jeff Schultz for CTDOT – in favor
Ron Adams, Wisconsin DOT – in favor
Rick Degman, Washington State DOT – in favor

With no objections, Chairman Bergeron determined that consensus had been achieved and the motion had carried.

Mario will report on the DMU schedule and structure plan to the Board on November 22, 2011.

Status: FRA-CEM position paper – Kevin Kesler:

Kevin Kesler reported that the FRA letter/position paper on the issue of CEM had been sent to the Executive Board along with a disclaimer statement proposed to be used for all specifications. The disclaimer will address more than just the CEM issue – it was written to address all potential issues with safety. The intent is to make it clear that FRA, as a member of the NGEC, is not precluding its Safety Regulations with votes in support of PRIIA specifications.

Kevin reported that the Executive Board, on November 8, 2011, accepted the disclaimer language and agreed to include it in all previously adopted PRIIA specifications through the DCR process. It will also include the disclaimer in all future PRIIA specifications.

Steve Hewitt will distribute the FRA letter with the disclaimer statement to all subcommittee members following

this call and will ask AASHTO to post it to the web site.

Mario Bergeron commented that this was a "good move forward" as the FRA will now be able to vote in favor of specifications, rather than abstaining. With this disclaimer there is "no longer a technicality that will prevent a vote (by FRA) for approval."

Change Management during Procurement – revised report - Kevin Kesler:

Kevin Kesler reported that the group assigned to develop recommendations for Change Management during Procurement met (for the second time) this past week. The group has revised its earlier report to reflect comments received. At the request of California DOT, the group will not present its revised report next week to the Executive Board as originally planned. Caltrans has asked for time to take the report to its legal and procurement offices for review to, according to Stan Hunter, "ensure the integrity of the procurement."

Stan elaborated that he wants to be sure he gets Caltrans legal and procurement offices blessing so that Caltrans can be "ensured that we aren't doing anything that causes a problem." He promised that he will get a response as soon as possible, but could not provide a timeframe for the response.

Mario Bergeron noted that this is the first procurement, and "there is always a learning curve. We are working our way through it, and as we go along with future specs, things will move more quickly."

Kevin Kesler will provide a status update to the Board on November 22, 2011 – its next conference call.

Document Control Management – Consideration of the approval of Revision B – Dave Warner:

Dave Warner reported that the DCR Revision B summary of changes had been distributed a week ago to all subcommittee members, and there have been no comments received. He asked the Chair to entertain a motion to approve Revision B changes as presented.

Kevin Kesler, FRA, made a motion to approve, and Jack Madden, NYSDOT seconded it. The Chair asked Steve Hewitt to poll the voting members of the subcommittee.

Mario Bergeron, Amtrak – in favor
Kevin Kesler, FRA – in favor
Stan Hunter, Caltrans – in favor
Curtis McDowell for NCDOT – in favor
Jack Madden, NYSDOT – in favor
Jeff Schultz for CTDOT – in favor
Ron Adams, Wisconsin DOT – in favor
Rick Degman, Washington State DOT – in favor

With no objections, Chairman Bergeron determined that consensus had been achieved and the motion had carried.

The next step is to send the Revision B change summary to NGECC Chairman Bill Bronte, and ask that he assign the Review Panel to review the changes against the Bi-level car Requirements document. The Panel will have two weeks to provide a report with recommendations to the Executive Board. It is anticipated that the Board would be able to vote for adoption of Revision B at its December 6, 2011 conference call.

Steve Hewitt, on behalf of Chairman Bergeron, will transmit the DCR Revision B Change summary to Mr. Bronte following this call, and will ask that the Review Panel be re-formed on November 22, 2011 and, at that time begin their review.

Dave Warner reported that a number of DCRs came in after the deadline for submissions to Revision B. He noted that specific manufacturers had submitted some that they referred to as "urgent" and wanted included in Revision B even though the deadline had passed. Dave noted that "we need to figure this out now – how we can do this without holding up California's procurement schedule."

Stan Hunter, Caltrans, commented that his view was that "once the deadline passes it is part of the critical path for Caltrans". He stated that DCRs submitted after the Rev B deadline, "should not go into Rev B, but be held for a future Revision (C) – otherwise we will slow down the California process. Our procurement officers believe deadlines need to be held to. During the control procurement process, these things may go into the procurement – no promises." Stan summarized his view by emphasizing that his recommendation is to "hold it right where it is."

Kevin Kesler reminded members on the call that "we are engaged in discussions with Caltrans on change management during procurement."

Mario Bergeron noted that the RFI process may bring forth changes.

Stan responded, "we have been compiling responses to the RFI. We are just going through the hundreds of pages received from seven sources. Once we are in a position to know what comments are in – we'll have a better feel for whether or not changes can be made." He explained that he will go to the Caltrans procurement people with the comments submitted to the RFI, and get their input as to whether changes can be made based on comments to the RFI. "The key", Stan reiterated, "is to keep moving on schedule and very correctly."

Mario asked Dave to provide the subcommittee with a reminder of the intent of the urgent process.

Dave stated that the primary intent is to "follow a normal adjudication with a faster timeline – basically shorten the schedule for review."

Dave continued, "If DCRs come out of the RFI comment review, it would be up to California to issue urgent DCRs to be handled by the DCB. They must come from California"... "without naming who has submitted the comment."

Mario stated "to clarify, urgent DCRs versus commercial considerations -it is not part of our makeup and there is not a reason for moving on a fast track simply because there is a procurement" underway. "The specs have been available for many months" and there have been many opportunities for input with regard to changes.

Stan Hunter emphasized that there are actually two parts to this – a part A and part B. First, "Caltrans is in the beginning of a controlled process where the RFP is being prepared, then it will enter a tight control dictating the DCR process for urgent changes, and a timeframe where the schedule is tight for us. We may need urgent changes, or we may have the time (depending on how the schedule is moving) to do the DCR process as usual."

Mario reiterated that "we build specs from a template which includes latitude and flexibility in the process and includes an alternate component feature in the specs."

At this point, Dave Warner noted that there are "a few places where alternate components are allowed" and went on to read two sections in the specs where this is defined/clarified and where it is noted that the alternate must be approved by the customer and be interchangeable.

Steve Hewitt asked Dave to provide him with the two paragraphs for inclusion in the minutes, so all members can be very clear on this.

The two paragraphs can be found in section 1.3 of the Bi-level Specification near the top of page 1.4:

- *"Various components have been specified by manufacturer and part number in this Specification. The Contractor may propose alternate manufacturers components but the use of alternate components or manufacturers must be approved by the Customer. Proposed alternative components must be interchangeable in form, fit and function with components called out herein.*
- *For safety critical items, introduction of alternative components will only be considered if such components have an established record, in North America, and/or have undergone an appropriate qualification program that demonstrates an acceptable level of safety, service and reliability for intercity or commuter passenger cars. The data shall be submitted to the Customer for approval"*

One manufacturer asked if there was a timeline established yet for Revision C – and Dave responded that it has not yet been set.

Deep Satsangi from Bradken noted that changes that they had submitted during the Bi-level face to face meeting, and which had been agreed to, have not been included in the specification as posted on the AASHTO website. Dave asked that Deep send him the comments/changes and he will find out what happened and make appropriate corrections. Dale Engelhardt recommended that Dave check with Tammy Krause, Amtrak, as she had been tracking all approved changes at that time, and would have a record. Deep also agreed to send them to Dave.

Update: ADA Working Group progress report and discussion of milestones– Steve Hewitt:

Melissa Shurland was unavailable for this call, but she reported to Steve Hewitt that the ADA WG met on November 16, 2011 – and had nothing new to report at this point.

Other:

With no other business to come before the subcommittee today, the meeting adjourned at 4:00pm.

Next call: December 1, 2011 at 3:00pm Eastern

Action Items Update

Steve Hewitt will establish an action item for setting a date and location for the DMU face to face review meeting. It is expected to take place at the end of May, 2012.

It was agreed that subgroup leaders will report on the progress of their teams during each bi-weekly subcommittee conference call. Steve will make this a standing agenda item.

The DMU timeline, schedule and structure have been approved by the subcommittee. Mario Bergeron will report on the schedule to the Board on November 22, 2011 for their information.

Steve Hewitt will distribute the FRA – CEM letter to all subcommittee members after today’s call. He will also ask AASHTO to post it to the web site.

Kevin Kesler will report or arrange for an FRA person to report to the Board on the status of the Change Management during Procurement effort.

The Revision B change summary was approved by the subcommittee and will now be transmitted to Bill Bronte on behalf of Mario Bergeron and Bill will be asked to reconstitute the Bi-Level Review panel on November 22, 2011.

Bradken will provide Dave Warner with changes that were previously agreed to and are not incorporated in the Bi-level specification. Dave will also check with Tammy Krause.

Next conference call –December 1, 2011

ATTACHMENTS



PRIIA Section 305 Tech Sub Committee Meeting

November 17, 2011

The agenda for the meeting is below:

- | | |
|---|---------------------------------|
| 1. Roll Call | Steve Hewitt |
| 2. Review meeting agenda | Mario Bergeron |
| 3. Review Action Items | Steve Hewitt |
| 4. Approve Minutes of November 3, call | Mario Bergeron |
| 5. DMU Specification Development: presentation of schedule, timeline, milestones, subgroups make-up – for consideration | Dave Warner |
| 6. FRA-CEM paper/disclaimer – results of Exec Board discussion | Kevin Kesler |
| 7. Change Management during Procurement –revised report Jeff Gordon | |
| 8. Document Control Management
Consideration of the approval of Bi-level Revision B | Dave Warner |
| 9. Update: ADA WG | Melissa Shurland / Kevin Kesler |
| 10. Review this meeting:
a. Decisions
a) New Action Items | Steve Hewitt |

***Technical Sub Committee Conference Call Meeting:
Thursday November 17, 2011 3:00 EST: 1-866-209-1307 / passcode 6486648#***

Go to meeting invitation link: <https://www1.gotomeeting.com/join/608558625>

Please call in a few minutes early so all is in attendance for Roll Call. Thank you