

SECTION 305 FINANCE and ADMINISTRATIVE SUB COMMITTEE

MINUTES

JUNE 10, 2015

3:00PM EASTERN

CONFERENCE
CALL/WEBINAR

FACILITATOR	<i>Darrell Smith, Chair of the S305 Finance and Administrative Subcommittee (FASC)</i>
ATTENDEES	<i>Darrell Smith, Brent Thompson, Ray Hessinger, Eric Curtit, Arun Rao, Arun Rao also as proxy for Tammy Nicholson, Tim Hoeffner, Jeff Gordon as proxy for Michael Lestingi, Brian Beeler II, Beth Nachreiner, Shayne Gill, Steve Hewitt</i>
ABSENTEES	<i>Tammy Nicholson, Michael Lestingi, Larry Salci, Jason Biggs, Vincent Brotski, Sal DeAngelo, Nico Lindenau, Bryan Hong, Strat Cavros</i>

DECISIONS MADE

1. Welcome and Open Meeting – Darrell Smith:

Subcommittee Chair Darrell Smith, Amtrak, opened the conference call meeting and asked Steve Hewitt to call the roll.

2. Roll Call – Steve Hewitt:

Steve Hewitt called the roll, and, confirmed the presence of a quorum.

3. Action Items Review – Steve Hewitt:

Executing the Amended Grant Agreement for a no cost extension through 9-30-17: On the June 9th call of the NGEN Executive Board, Chairman Curtit reported that Grant Agreement Amendment #5 through federal fiscal year 2017 (9-30-17) was signed by FRA, and thus, formally executed on June 8, 2015.

Under agenda item 5, Darrell Smith will describe the steps required to also formally approve the extension of the existing/grandfathered-in contracts through the life of the amended grant agreement. (As was done, after the last grant agreement extension)

Looking into the availability of FRA R&D funds for the NGEN: Jeff Gordon will look into the possible availability of R&D funds for the NGEN.

The answer to this question is “generally no”.

In order for FRA Research and Development to dispense grant funds the following is necessary: The applicant must demonstrate a clear link to safety. As the NGEN does not directly provide safety benefits it is not likely that it would qualify for an R&D grant.

The FRA R&D program goes through a ranking process with an elaborate decision model. The applicant would need to receive a rank equal to or higher than a project within the same area. This would be somewhat possible for the NGEN – but not probable.

Funding Options Task Force activities: The task force has met twice, set a conference call schedule (bi-weekly) and timeline – completion by June 10, 2015; and has begun work on the assigned tasks.

Status: The Task Force will provide a report with recommendations under agenda item 6.

Developing educational documents for getting the message out: Steve Hewitt will prepare an outline for the next version of the Backgrounder – to be a look ahead – Foregrounder.

Steve will also begin developing a potential progress report to Congress to go from the NGEN Chair.

Status: Both of these items are under development – drafts will be forthcoming in advance of the July 1, 2015 call – discussion under agenda item 9.

Obtaining data in regard to potential/future acquisition needs: Michael Lestingi and Beth Nachreiner will look to see what data the FRA has with regard to data on equipment acquisition/needs, and will report back on the next FASC call.

Agenda item 8

Review of and comment on the NGEC Future Concept document: Members of the Subcommittee are asked to review the NGEC Future Concept Document and supporting material and provide comments with regard to obstacles or alternatives to the recommendations therein. Members should also look at the NGEC functions suggested in the document and comment on those as well. **All comments are due to Steve Hewitt with a CC to Darrell Smith by May 20, 2015.**

Status: No comments have been received as of 6-9-15 – topic for agenda item 10

4.

Approval of Minutes from the May 6, 2015 FASC conference call – Darrell Smith:

On a motion by Brent Thompson, WSDOT, and a second by Eric Curtit, MODOT, the minutes from the May 6, 2015 FASC call were approved without exception.

5.

Status: Amended GA with Extension through 9-30-17 – Consideration of the extension of existing contracts - Darrell Smith:

With the FRA having signed the Grant Agreement Amendment #5, thus executing the amended agreement through 9-30-17, the NGEC can move forward in accordance with the SOW and budget approved previously. In compliance with the SOW and Budget, and in compliance with the OIG Audit, it is necessary for the FASC and the Executive Board (upon recommendation from the FASC) to approve a motion to extend the existing contracts including AASHTO's, Hewitt Consulting and SalciConsult.

Following the action taken after the last grant agreement amendment, Darrell Smith called for a motion to approve the following:

The Finance and Administrative Subcommittee recommends that the NGEC Executive Board approve the following: *"As was intended in past NGEC budget approvals and to ensure compliance with the Audit of Grant Agreement of March 27, 2013, and the NGEC's updated Procedure of Establishing Contract Support adopted August 6, 2013, the NGEC authorizes Amtrak to contract with AASHTO for administrative support services as well as subsequent sub-contracts per the statement of work for entities such as; with Hewitt Consulting for Manager of Support Services, and with SalciConsult for Specification Consultant services. In addition, the Federal Railroad Administration's June 8th, 2015, approval of the NGEC's Supplemental Statement of Work and related budget extension through September 30, 2017, Amtrak is authorized to extend its agreement with AASHTO and AASHTO's sub-consultants in accordance with the Statement of Work."*

A motion to approve was offered by Eric Curtit, Missouri DOT, and seconded by, Tim Hoeffner, Michigan DOT.

With no further discussion, Darrell Smith asked Steve Hewitt to call for the vote:

Darrell Smith, Amtrak – aye
Brent Thompson, WSDOT – aye
Eric Curtit, Missouri DOT – aye
Tim Hoeffner, Michigan DOT - aye
Arun Rao, Wisconsin DOT – aye
Arun Rao, as proxy for Iowa DOT – aye
Brian Beeler for Maine DOT – aye
Jeff Gordon, for FRA – aye

With a quorum having been established and all voting members present voting in the affirmative, Chairman Smith determined that consensus has been achieved and the motion is approved. Darrell asked that Steve

Hewitt forward the motion and recommendation for approval to the Executive Board and ask for an electronic vote so as to expedite the process for executing extensions to the existing contract.

Eric Curtit, NGEN Executive Board Chairman, a member of this subcommittee as well, concurred and asked Steve to send out an electronic ballot with votes due by COB on Monday June 15, 2015.

6.

Report/Recommendations– Funding Options Task Force - Brent Thompson:

- a. Summary report with recommendations - overview from the task force Chair:

Brent Thompson provided an overview of the Funding Options Task Force Summary report (below) and its recommendations.

NGEC Finance and Administrative Subcommittee (FASC)

Funding Options Task Force (approved 6-10-15)

Summary/Recommendations

Task Force Charge:

1. Determine whether or not a fee can be charged and the viability
 - What is the mechanism to charge and collect the fee?
 - What is the amount that should be charged?
 - Is this a viable funding source?
 - Identify and research existing models
2. Receipt of Costs
 - Can the NGEN accept receipt of costs?
 - What are the mechanics?
3. Tracking/monitoring changes/modifications to specifications by users
 - Developing an agreement that any modifications to the specs are brought back to the NGEN.

The task force addressed the above charge by addressing the following questions. Currently NGEN is funded by FRA grant funding through Amtrak. An amended grant agreement to extend the grant at no cost - utilizing the remaining available funds through September 2017 was executed on June 8, 2015.

In Summary

What is needed for NGEN to collect fees?

Possible funding could be generated by fees imposed for use of the NGEN specifications when they are used in procuring new equipment. It has been determined that NGEN cannot collect fees as it is currently structured. Per FRA's legal office NGEN is currently an extension of a government body and cannot raise its own funds. NGEN would have to establish itself as a not for profit 501 C3 corporation, or something similar. The down side for NGEN becoming a not for profit is that it would not be able to receive additional federal grants under the program from which the current grant was obtained.

If the NGEN were to incorporate would it be eligible for grant funds?

It would depend on grant eligibility as defined in the grant program. In the original statute, the eligible grantees are Amtrak and states only. See question "Can NGEN Receive grant funding and fees at the same time and how would that work?" below.

How much fee would need to be collected?

Current estimate to operate the NGEN is \$500K annually. This amount will be higher if NGEN needs to change its structure to a not for profit, or something similar. The additional cost would be needed to cover ancillary cost associated with the structure of the organization. The actual fee still needs to be determined. From the current conversation it would be anticipated to start around \$12K per unit plus contingency and ancillary costs. Another thought was expressed that there could be an assessment of a small fee for "piggybacking" on an existing order.

What is the market for charging fees?

Currently this is unknown and is under investigation. FRA looked at the State Rail Plans to see if they could be used to determine the sense of demand for new equipment. At this time there doesn't appear to be enough information without additional data from Amtrak. At this time Amtrak is updating its equipment plan which will help in assessing the demand. Also, monitoring and tracking the requests for information and the equipment

specs, from the website, will assist in determining the market.

Other models?

AAR charges for the use of its standards – items such as wheel profiles, couplers, etc., not specifications.

APTA does not charge a fee – its standards are available on their website. It develops its standards through a process similar to that by which the NGEC specifications are developed and it receives a grant for standards development from the FTA.

Can NGEC Receive grant funding and fees at the same time?

If the NGEC expects to receive federal funds and raise revenues, it will need to change its status and be a subsidiary of Amtrak. In which case the federal grant would be issued to NGEC through Amtrak.

Tracking and monitoring the use of the NGEC specs.

While discussing tracking and monitoring specification usage, the task force addressed how to better and more consistently track and/or monitor modifications made to NGEC specifications by the user – if outside the NGEC. It determined that any modifications that are made to an NGEC specification must be brought back to the NGEC so that it can, potentially, make revisions to its specs to address those changes as deemed appropriate. It was agreed that such requirements would be written into the specification utilization form. A revised specification utilization form was developed and approved by the task force and had been submitted to the subcommittee for its consideration.

Other items or outstanding Issues

Does the NGEC need to be a subsidiary of Amtrak if it were to seek additional grant funds?

This has been brought up earlier to Amtrak Board and the States and was met with mixed reactions from both parties. No final resolution was reached at that time, but it is generally acknowledged that additional work would need to be done to resolve the concerns raised previously before it could be proposed. FRA and Amtrak concur that if the NGEC is an Amtrak subsidiary it can receive fed grant funds passed thru the Amtrak parent. If the NGEC becomes an independent entity, Congress would need to appropriate grant funds to it directly. In either case, the grants would be subject to a new appropriation of Congress. The NGEC, as currently constituted, could also receive an additional grant through Amtrak. (Note: Of the original NGEC Authorization of \$5 million - \$1 million remains unappropriated)

Are there R&D funds available for the NGEC?

The answer to this question is “generally no”. In order for FRA Research and Development to dispense grant funds the following is necessary: The applicant must demonstrate a clear link to safety. As the NGEC does not directly provide safety benefits it is not likely that it would qualify for an R&D grant.

The FRA R&D program goes through a ranking process with an elaborate decision model. The applicant would need to receive a rank equal to or higher than a project within the same area. This would be somewhat possible for the NGEC – but not probable.

Recommendations

1. The Task Force recommends that the Finance and Administrative Subcommittee accept the changes it has made to the NGEC Specification Utilization form which will improve its tracking and monitoring capabilities and will provide a requirement that changes made to our specs by outside parties using them will be submitted to the NGEC. Further the task force recommends that the subcommittee submit the revised form to the Executive Board for its consideration for adoption.
2. It is the recommendation of this Task Force that the Finance and Administrative Subcommittee continue to consider, as an option, the seeking of federal funds for the operation of the NGEC and its ongoing activities.
3. It is also the recommendation of the Task Force that the Finance and Administrative Subcommittee should begin preparations for charging specification use fees, in addition to federal funds (as identified in recommendation 2) and that it consider any appropriate structure changes associated with the charging of such fees.

Darrell Smith weighed in on what needs to be done moving forward. He noted that the task force identified the fact that there is more work yet to be done.

Brent acknowledged that this “starts the preliminary part of it.”

Darrell Smith reviewed the recommendations, and it was agreed that the next immediate step was for the FASC to vote in consideration of accepting the report and recommendations.

Steve Hewitt pointed out that one recommendation - #1 – requests further action by the Executive Board, but recommendations #2 and #3 call for the FASC to do additional work in preparation for making formal recommendations to the Executive Board by October, 2015.

The one action item for the Executive Board (#1) is to adopt the specification utilization report form as revised by the Funding Options Task Force. The revisions to the form were made to address the task force charge to track and monitor specification use and document changes/modifications made to the specs by outside users.

As for next steps, Darrell Smith recommended that, with it becoming clear that federal grants are expected to be a primary source of funding, it would be advisable that a working group be established to consider and review potential efforts to educate the Hill. Darrell suggested that this working group be comprised of Governmental or Legislative affairs "types" from the states and from Amtrak and FRA.

It was also suggested that FRA and Amtrak staff familiar with the federal budget process be asked to participate.

7.

Consideration/Acceptance of FASC Recommendations - Darrell Smith:

Darrell Smith called for a motion to accept the Summary Report and Recommendations as put forth by the Funding Options Task Force.

A motion to accept was offered by Arun Rao, Wisconsin DOT, and was seconded by Brian Beeler II, for Maine DOT.

With no further discussion, Darrell Smith asked Steve Hewitt to call for the vote:

Darrell Smith, Amtrak – aye
Brent Thompson, WSDOT – aye
Eric Curtit, Missouri DOT – aye
Tim Hoeffner, Michigan DOT - aye
Arun Rao, Wisconsin DOT – aye
Arun Rao, as proxy for Iowa DOT – aye
Brian Beeler for Maine DOT – aye
Ray Hessinger, NYSDOT - aye
Jeff Gordon, for FRA – aye

With a quorum having been established and all voting members present voting in the affirmative, Chairman Smith determined that consensus has been achieved and the motion is approved.

8.

Obtaining data in regard to potential/future acquisition needs – Beth Nachreiner:

Beth Nachreiner reported that they (FRA) had looked at the state rail plans and there was "not much" in them regarding acquisition needs. She said that utilizing other sources and with the help of Nico Lindenau they had prepared "a back of the envelope" look at "the best sense of what the needs might be". She emphasized that it was "not a well vetted body of work", but may help with providing some sense of it.

Beth agreed to provide the information to Steve Hewitt for distribution to the FASC members.

9.

Status: Developing educational documents for getting the message out - Steve Hewitt:

The FASC has asked Steve Hewitt to draft a revised Backgrounder/Foregrounder educational document to include accomplishments and a look ahead. Steve has begun to do this. He has reached out to Nippon Sharyo and Siemens for jobs numbers, and to Caltrans as well. Momoko Tamaoki has provided numbers from the jobs report, Tom Hunt, Nippon Sharyo is contacting Sumitomo; and Steve Morrison, Siemens, is looking into their numbers for the D/E electric locomotive jobs numbers.

Steve and Eric will be developing a draft of a quarterly update for Congress as a part of the educational outreach effort.

Darrell returned to his suggestion that outreach be done to establish a working group of Governmental and legislative affairs staff and those (from FRA and Amtrak) familiar with the federal budget process.

Members on the call agreed that this was a good suggestion and it was agreed that states should submit names and contact information for potential working group participation from their agency, and that FRA and Amtrak should also submit names of potential participants with knowledge of the federal budget process.

Shayne Gill, AASHTO, agreed to provide to Darrell Smith a list of state representatives from the policy/governmental affairs side that he is familiar with.

Ultimately, it was agreed that names and contact information should be provided to Darrell Smith, with a cc to Steve Hewitt, by COB on June 25, 2015; and the subcommittee would endeavor to establish a working group on the July 1, 2015 FASC call.

10.

Review of and comment on the NGEC Future Concept document - Darrell Smith:

Darrell Smith raised the fact that this issue has been going around in circles for a long time without evidence of making further progress. He asked if there were any comments or input on the proposal as put forth in 2013, and tabled by the Board for further review.

Eric Curtit commented that he is beginning to develop a "white paper/memorandum to the Board" that will highlight the proposal to establish the NGEC as a subsidiary of Amtrak raised in the concept paper, and call for the members to take a closer look. Eric will note the synergy that such an entity could create while allowing Amtrak to retain the autonomy it desires. Eric equated the concept entity as similar to TTX. He also emphasized that he would be talking about the new entity with regard to equipment fleets not Amtrak operations or anything like that. His memo will attempt to "define the what, where and how we would do it".

He added that the first time the concept was raised there had not been enough time devoted to venting it properly. Amtrak was "interested"; FRA was "interested" and the states were "interested"; and not all in a positive way – but interested none the less.

With the Grant Agreement extension having been executed, the NGEC now has the time to vent the concept more fully and refine it, but implementation would not be easy or quick and time is still of the essence.

Tim Hoeffner commented that the Mid-West is dealing with this concept now on a regional level – and will need to do it before the 2017 timeframe of the NGEC. The Mid-West is looking at governance and at getting out RFPs for a Fleet Manager and a Fleet Maintainer. It has not been an easy task, but progress is being made.

Eric recognized the challenges and noted that, ultimately, the Mid-West may serve as a model for all fleets.

Tim Hoeffner commented "we will start regionally and then we could possibly look at it on a larger basis to see how we would integrate our work with a larger entity."

Eric agreed to develop a draft of his "white paper/memo" in advance of the FASC call scheduled for July 1, 2015.

Darrell Smith suggested that the FASC also begin to look at preparing a scope of work for bringing in outside expertise to help to understand what we need organizationally and to help us with the mechanics of accepting fees, etc. Darrell believes that the members of the subcommittee are about at the limit of their knowledge in this area and will need professional support to make progress.

11.

Next Steps - Darrell Smith:

A review of the next steps

12.

Other Issues/questions – All:

With no further business forthcoming, Darrell Smith adjourned today's conference call meeting at approximately 3:50PM Eastern.

Next Finance and Administrative subcommittee conference call July 1, 2015

866 209 1307 access code: 9786620#

Decisions and Action Items

Executing the Amended Grant Agreement for a no cost extension through 9-30-17: On the June 9th call of the NGEC Executive Board, Chairman Curtit reported that Grant Agreement Amendment #5 through federal fiscal year 2017 (9-30-17) was signed by FRA, and thus, formally executed on June 8, 2015.

Extending existing contracts: With the FRA having signed the Grant Agreement Amendment #5, thus executing the amended agreement through 9-30-17, the NGEC can move forward in accordance with the SOW and budget approved previously. In compliance with the SOW and Budget, and in compliance with the OIG Audit, it is necessary for the FASC and the Executive Board (upon recommendation from the FASC) to approve a motion to extend the existing contracts including AASHTO's, Hewitt Consulting and SalciConsult.

Following the action taken after the last grant agreement amendment, Darrell Smith called for a motion to approve the following:

The Finance and Administrative Subcommittee recommends that the NGEC Executive Board approve the following: *"As was intended in past NGEC budget approvals and to ensure compliance with the Audit of Grant Agreement of March 27, 2013, and the NGEC's updated Procedure of Establishing Contract Support adopted August 6, 2013, the NGEC authorizes Amtrak to contract with AASHTO for administrative support services as well as subsequent sub-contracts per the statement of work for entities such as; with Hewitt Consulting for Manager of Support Services, and with SalciConsult for Specification Consultant services. In addition, the Federal Railroad Administration's June 8th, 2015, approval of the NGEC's Supplemental Statement of Work and related budget extension through September 30, 2017, Amtrak is authorized to extend its agreement with AASHTO and AASHTO's sub-consultants in accordance with the Statement of Work."*

The motion was approved with all members present voting in favor. It was subsequently submitted to the Executive Board with a request that it take up the motion electronically with a deadline for voting set for COB on Monday, June 15, 2015.

Looking into the availability of FRA R&D funds for the NGEC: Jeff Gordon will look into the possible availability of R&D funds for the NGEC.

The answer to this question is "generally no".

In order for FRA Research and Development to dispense grant funds the following is necessary: The applicant must demonstrate a clear link to safety. As the NGEC does not directly provide safety benefits it is not likely that it would qualify for an R&D grant.

The FRA R&D program goes through a ranking process with an elaborate decision model. The applicant would need to receive a rank equal to or higher than a project within the same area. This would be somewhat possible for the NGEC – but not probable.

Funding Options Task Force activities: The task force completed its work and provided a report with recommendations to the full subcommittee.

On today's call, the FASC accepted the report and recommendations with all members present voting in the affirmative.

One item called for a request that the Executive Board adopt the revised specification utilization report form as developed by the task force. Steve Hewitt will send the revised form to the executive Board for consideration on its next call – 6-23-15.

Developing educational documents for getting the message out: Steve Hewitt will prepare an outline for the next version of the Backgrounder – to be a look ahead – Foregrounder.

Steve will also begin developing a potential progress report to Congress to go from the NGEC Chair.

It was agreed that a working group be established to consider and review potential efforts to educate the Hill. The group will be comprised of Governmental or Legislative affairs "types" from the states and from Amtrak and FRA, and it was agreed that FRA and Amtrak staff familiar with the federal budget process be asked to participate.

Members on the call agreed to submit names and contact information for potential working group participation from their agency, and FRA and Amtrak should also submit names of potential participants with knowledge of the federal budget process.

Shayne Gill, AASHTO, agreed to provide to Darrell Smith a list of state representatives from the policy/governmental affairs side that he is familiar with.

Ultimately, it was agreed that names and contact information should be provided to Darrell Smith, with a cc to Steve Hewitt, by COB on June 25, 2015; and the subcommittee would endeavor to establish a working group on the July 1, 2015 FASC call.

Obtaining data in regard to potential/future acquisition needs: FRA has prepared "a back of the envelope" look at "the best sense of what the needs might be". It was emphasized that this is not a well vetted body of work.

Beth Nachreiner agreed to provide the information to Steve Hewitt for distribution to the FASC members.

Review of and comment on the NGEC Future Concept document:

Eric Curtit will prepare a draft "white paper/memo" for FASC review in regard to taking a closer look at the concept proposal for establishing the NGEC as a subsidiary of Amtrak for matters related to Fleets. Eric will have a draft memo ready for distribution to FASC members in advance of the next call – 7-1-15.

On the next call, the FASC will begin developing a potential scope for seeking outside professional expertise to help the FASC to understand what is needed organizationally and to help with the mechanics of accepting fees, etc.

ATTACHMENTS

Next Generation
Equipment Committee



The NGEC will provide national leadership in standardization, acquisition, financing and management of passenger rail equipment.

SECTION 305 Finance and Administrative Subcommittee (FASC)

**Conference call
June 10, 2015**

3:00pm. Eastern

866 209 1307 pass code 9786620#

MEETING AGENDA

- | | |
|--|---------------|
| 1. Welcome/Open | Darrell Smith |
| 2. Roll Call | Steve Hewitt |
| 3. Action Item Review | Steve Hewitt |
| 4. Approval of the Minutes from 5-6-15 | Darrell Smith |

- | | |
|---|--------------------------------|
| 5. Status: Amended GA with Extension through 9-30-17 | Darrell Smith/Michael Lestingi |
| 6. Report/Recommendations– Funding Options Task Force | Brent Thompson |
| a. Summary report from the task force Chair | |
| b. Discussion: proposed revisions to the specification Utilization Form | |
| 7. Consideration of FASC Recommendations | Darrell Smith |
| 8. Obtaining data in regard to potential/future acquisition needs | Michael Lestingi |
| 9. Status: Developing educational documents for getting the message out | Steve Hewitt |
| 10. Review of and comment on the NGEC Future Concept document: | Darrell Smith |
| 11. Next Steps: | Darrell Smith |
| 12. Other Issues/questions | All |

Next Call July 1, 2015

Call in # 866 209 1307 passcode 9786620#

DRAFT

**SUBMIT
FORM**

**PRIIA Section 305
Next Generation Equipment Committee
Specification Utilization Report**

**Form Number:
(YEAR-STATE-SPEC/REV-
nn)**

The Section 305 Next Generation Equipment Committee (NGEC) established pursuant to Section 305 of the Passenger Rail Investment and Improvement Act of 2008 (PRIIA) is maintaining a record of all uses of the equipment specifications developed by the Committee. This record will show by whom and when each specification is used and the type of equipment that is procured. The NGEC intends to review uses and modifications of the specifications in order to continuously improve the specifications as new developments are conceived. To achieve this, the NGEC requests that users of the specifications provide a copy of the as-built specification to the NGEC so that it may consider adoption of those revisions or improvements in subsequent releases.

Toward that end, please complete this form each time you utilize a Section 305 specification to order equipment. The information you provide will be maintained in the records of the Committee.

The information below is intended to be submitted in two parts. Complete Section I when the order is initially placed (manufacturer receives Notice to Proceed). Submit the form using the button in the upper left corner of this page. Complete Section II after delivery of all units. Resubmit the form using the button in the upper left corner of this page.

SECTION I: TO BE COMPLETED WHEN ORDER IS PLACED (Manufacturer receives Notice to Proceed)	
Name of purchaser of equipment:	
Contact name:	
Phone number:	
Email address:	
Route (and type of service) on which equipment will be used:	
Vendor:	
Purpose (New, Rehabilitation, Upgrade, Retrofit):	
Specification number and revision level (RFP):	
Type and number of equipment units ordered BASE BID:	
Type and number of equipment units ordered OPTIONS:	
Anticipated date equipment will be placed in service:	
In this space, please provide comments describing your experience using the Specification, including any suggestions you may have for its improvement. Please describe any special or unusual circumstances related to the procurement: e.g., purchase of spare parts, rehabilitation of existing equipment.	

SECTION II: TO BE COMPLETED AFTER DELIVERY OF ALL UNITS	
Type and number of equipment units delivered BASE BID:	
Type and number of equipment units delivered OPTION ORDER:	

As-built specification* (including Specification Change Sheet denoting any revisions made to the source specification) number(s) and revision date(s):		
Period during which equipment was placed in service:		

* Copy of as-built specification to be provided to the NGEC.

DRAFT