

SECTION 305 TECH SUB COMM

MINUTES

APRIL 26, 2012

3:00PM EDT

CONFERENCE CALL

FACILITATOR	<i>Mario Bergeron, Chairman, S305 Technical subcommittee</i>
ATTENDEES	Core Team Members: <i>Mario Bergeron, Greg Gagarin, Dave Warner, Michael Burshtin, Ken Uznanski, Kevin Kesler, Melissa Shurland, Anand Prabhakaran, Nico Lindenau, Ryan Swick, Jeff Gordon, Stan Hunter, Camren Cordell, Allan Paul, Jack Madden, Charlie Poltenson, Jeff Schultz, Art Peterson, Ron Adams, Steve Hewitt, Industry Participants: Paul Jamieson, Richard Curtis, Tak Ishigami, Stanton Saucier, Steve Morrison, James Michel, Jack Martinson, Rick DeBella, Ted Schaefer, Mike Pracht, Bill Saddler, Andy Hyer</i>
ABSENTEES	<i>Dale Engelhardt, Tammy Krause, Mike Trosino, Andrew Wood, Charles Bielitz, Brian Marquis, George Weber, Phil Meraz, Kevin Lawson, Eric Curtit, Shayne Gill, Leo Penne, Larry Salci, Andy House</i>

DISCUSSION/DECISIONS MADE

Mario Bergeron called today's meeting to order and asked Steve Hewitt to take the roll.

Steve Hewitt took the roll and the presence of a quorum was confirmed. Industry participants are asked, as always, to email a notification of their attendance to Steve at shewitt109@aol.com.

Review of Action Items:

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:

Maintaining Industry Participation List:

Steve Hewitt reported that this remains an ongoing action item. There are currently **202** registered industry participants. We had a few changes in participants – with some companies assigning new representatives – so we added some new and lost a few who have left the company they were previously with.

Formation of a Cars Technology Task Force:

This action item remains as an open item for future consideration based on need and subcommittee capacity to do it.

Improving website organization and navigability:

This effort is ongoing. Consolidation continues – updates are being addressed. The individual chapters for Rev C have been removed from the site pending a recommendation from Dave Warner and Stan Hunter – an action item from the last call

NIST/MEP Forums:

An action item from the last call was that Jeff Gordon would provide details on the May 3, 2012 (Kansas City) and May 8, 2012 (Orlando) rail forums. This task was completed –details were distributed to all members of the subcommittee including the industry participants.

Approval of DCRs 100-101 and 100-102:

On the last call of the subcommittee it was agreed that an electronic vote would be taken to consider approval of DCRs 100-101 and 100-102. The vote took place and by unanimous consent the DCRs were approved. Subsequently, on April 17, 2012, the Executive Board adopted the DCRs as presented.

Update: See Dave Warner's Document Control management report – below.

Posting Individual Chapters of Rev C or not:

On the last call, Dave Warner, Camren Cordell and Stan Hunter agreed to meet (via phone call) to determine a solution to the issue of whether or not the individual Rev C Chapters should be posted with an identifier or not at all. They are currently off the site pending a recommendation.

Update: Dave Warner and Stan Hunter agreed that the individual chapters of Rev C should remain off of the site.

Determining how best to engage /outreach to Journalists:

This remains an open action item. The last report from Kevin was that the FRA Public Affairs office was working with AASHTO Public Affairs, and will come up with a strategy. Kevin was to look into how they are progressing.

Accessibility Working Group (AWG):

Nothing new to report specific to the AWG until they have met again. There is to be a discussion on today's agenda with regard to ADA Requirements and Railcar standards.

Update: Melissa Shurland, FRA, reported that the AWG met yesterday (April 25, 2012) and is beginning to look at recommendations for the single level cars.

Approval of the Minutes of the April 12, 2012 Technical subcommittee call:

On a motion by Jack Madden, NYSDOT, and a second by Allan Paul, NCDOT, the Minutes of the April 12, 2012 conference call of the Technical subcommittee, were approved without objection.

Status: DMU Specification – Dave Warner:

Dave Warner provided the following report for inclusion in today's minutes:

"The first draft version of the specification was posted slightly ahead of schedule on the AASHTO web site last Thursday. Along with the 25 chapters are two additional documents:

- 1. A Change Request Form*
- 2. A sheet of instructions for submitting a change.*

The comment period runs through 11:59 pm on Friday, May 11, 2012."

Mario Bergeron asked Dave if there have been many comments coming back so far, or is it too soon? Dave said it was too soon to know and only one comment has been received thus far.

Mario then reviewed the procedure explaining that this is an opportunity for those who have been involved with specific segments of the spec to review the entire spec and provide input. It is also a chance for those who have not had input to review the entire document and give comments based on their review.

Update: Document Control Management – Dave Warner:

Dave Warner provided the following report for inclusion in today's minutes:

"At our last call two Document Change Requests were presented to make changes to the Document Management Procedure. As Steve Hewitt mentioned earlier, the actual vote took place by e-mail following the meeting, and the changes were approved. The Executive Board approved those changes on April 17, and the two DCRs have been sent to Camren Cordell for incorporating into the document and getting signed by Mr. Bronte.

With the pressure of the changes related to the Bi-Level RFP now behind us, there is a bit of time to do some needed internal housekeeping on our existing specifications, dependent, of course, on the volume of change requests received

for the DMU specification.

Last fall, Michael Burshtin and I started processing DCR revisions to the Single Level car specification that were based upon Revisions A and B to the Bi-Level car specification. However, to keep the Technical groups free to focus on the DMU and Bi-Level Revision C higher priority work; we halted work on Single Level DCRs around New Year's Day. Together with some DCRs Mr. Burshtin identified as a result of his review of the specification, there had been 105 DCRs created. At the time we paused efforts there were just over 40 DCRs still outstanding.

This week I went through the approximately 85 Bi-Level Rev. C DCRs, and found 38 that applied to the Single Level car. So, doing the math, that makes now a total of 78 DCRs still outstanding for Rev. A of the Single Level car, with a grand total of 143 DCRs eventually to be incorporated into the specification. "

Following Dave's report a discussion ensued in regards to anticipation of the procurement of the Diesel Locomotives. Dave was asked by Nico Lindenau, BAH, if there were a lot of locomotive related DCRs that have been received, and whether or not he would be able to adjudicate them in time for a Revision A to be used for the RFI for the Locomotives. Dave said that he was unaware of the timeline at this point, but that there are currently not a lot of DCRs submitted on the locomotives and, as soon as he is given notice of the procurement moving forward and a date "we can change our focus accordingly" and address those DCRs and a Revision A.

Mario Bergeron noted that, "fundamentally, from a priority standpoint" the locomotive procurement will come before a single level procurement since grant money has been awarded for locomotives. He added that it's important to "prioritize our efforts to be sure we have a locomotive spec as close to ready as possible". He asked if any DCRs for locomotives "are coming at you" (Dave)?

Dave responded –"No" there have not been many coming at him and, for now, "we are taking advantage of a relative calm time to do cleanup housekeeping work." (as described in Dave's report)

Dave reiterated that once a date is provided, "we can turn it around quickly."

Jack Madden, NYSDOT raised the point that the next PRIIA specification to be developed is the Dual Mode Locomotive, and when that effort begins he would want to start with an updated Rev A of the Diesel locomotive.

When asked about New York's timeline for purchasing Dual Mode Locomotives, Jack responded that the 2015-16 timeline expressed previously, is accurate as far as when the need will occur, and "we'll have to do something", but he reiterated that New York does not currently have money in place for a procurement of the Dual Modes.

Mario interjected that it is likely that Jack will be working with a Rev A, B or even C before doing the Dual Modes.

Jack agreed, and added that he expected that sometime in 2012 some entity will be going for a procurement for the Diesel locomotives and NYSDOT would say "let's develop the Dual Mode specification based on Rev A or B or whatever is in place at the time."

At this point the discussion changed to the status of the Casey amendment.

Allan Paul, NCDOT, asked "where does the Casey amendment stand". Steve Morrison, Siemens, responded that "it is in the Senate Bill, but not in the 90 day extension, and not in law."

Allan noted that "NCDOT is sending a letter in support of **not** lowering the speed" from 125-110. (Opposing the Casey amendment).

Mario appreciated the information and commented that we (the 305 Technical subcommittee) are not a lobbying organization, and will not weigh in on this as a group.

ADA Requirements and Railcar Standards – Mario Bergeron:

Mario Bergeron provided an overview of the legal interpretation he had received from Amtrak's General Counsel in

regard to using building codes in the absence of Railcar standards. He noted that the interpretation was distributed, by Steve Hewitt, to all Technical subcommittee members and industry participants on April 17, 2012. In general, the interpretation is that building codes do not apply in the absence of Railcar ADA regulations.

Mario noted that he wanted to not only clarify what the interpretation meant, but also what it doesn't mean. "It doesn't mean that we will not implement greater Accessibility requirements" as we develop next generation equipment specifications.

He added, "how we work in 305 – greater requirements would come from the Executive Board" which would "mandate to the Technical subcommittee through a requirements document." He continued, "we want the Executive Board to determine if there are to be better standards and to put them in a requirements document which is what the Technical subcommittee uses in developing specifications."

Mario then outlined the process that is to be used. "The ADA DCRs should come from the AWG". The DCRs from the AWG would be approved through the Technical subcommittee process, and submitted to the Executive Board. The Board would then send them back (if approved) as requirements to the Technical subcommittee. "This is what we have in place" as a process. This, he added, is a process, as opposed to a legal requirement. "I trust our counsel has the legal interpretation correct."

Kevin Kesler, FRA, said that he thought Mario had described the process "pretty much right – what matters is what the Executive Board believes are appropriate requirements for a next generation fleet." Kevin added that "we have had lots of input from the Access Board, OST and more" and "a summary report from Oregon State University is being done and is looking at "expected needs and types of solutions" including new technologies being used in other countries, etc. As soon as this report is completed it will be made available to the Executive Board "to incorporate into our requirements".

Kevin also noted that Melissa Shurland has re-engaged the AWG and when the Oregon report is available it will be reviewed by the AWG.

Melissa Shurland acknowledged that the AWG has been re-engaged and they are looking at single level car accessibility recommendations. They met yesterday (April 25, 2012) and will soon be coming back to the Technical subcommittee with recommendations from the AWG.

A fairly extensive discussion then took place in regards to the DCR process as it pertains to accessibility and the AWG, and a question of what to do with two recent DCRs received by Michael Burshtin for accessibility requirements having to do with dual communications.

First, a clarification was needed as to what these recent DCRs would mean to the bi-level car Rev C. Dave Warner reminded everyone that "there is a procurement on the street" so there is a procedural problem.

Kevin Kesler emphasized "Rev C is it for the bi-level – any additional changes will come when they come through the procurement."

Further discussion took place regarding the fact that there are really two different processes – one for changes to the Requirements Document which is dealt with by the Executive Board, and one for changes to the specifications which is a responsibility of the Technical subcommittee.

Michael Burshtin and Dave Warner asked for specific direction as to what they should be doing with the two DCRs they have received that are not in the Requirements document of the bi-level specification.

Mario Bergeron clarified, "anything that is related to ADA should be provided to the AWG", and the AWG then makes a recommendation to the Technical subcommittee." The AWG should review and make recommendations and "if it is determined that the change would be a greater requirement than we have now, we get on the agenda of the Executive Board for their action."

Ron Adams of Wisconsin DOT asked "does USDOT concur with the legal opinion we got from Amtrak?"

Kevin Kesler responded that "we sent the interpretation to the Access Board and the Civil Rights office of USDOT

and expect an answer soon.”

Allan Paul, NCDOT, referencing the issue of using building code standards in the absence of Railcar standards, noted that, “we remain concerned about the impacts on operations...especially without further analysis.”

Kevin recommended that such concerns should be expressed to the AWG. Allan commented that he was a member of the AWG and fully engaged with it, but that he believes the Executive Board will ultimately have to make the decision.

Stan Hunter, Caltrans stated that “Caltrans would second what Allan has said...we have concerns that recommendations are going way beyond the cursory changes that were put into the bi-level.” He added, “there is a lot of research by the AWG, but I’m not sure that its getting back to all of the AWG members...this is an issue – not understanding priority level or impact of proposed solutions.”

Kevin Kesler reiterated that the Oregon State report is being finalized and, “it forecasts needs and looks at emerging technologies. It does not make a specific recommendation. The report will be given to the Technical subcommittee and will give the basis for why the AWG recommendations are to be considered.”

As discussion concluded, Mario Bergeron asked that Dave Warner and Michael Burshtin review the process for ADA related DCRs – they should review the discussion and come back with a recommendation for how we should handle those DCRs.

Update: DMU final Review meeting –Steve Hewitt:

Steve Hewitt reported that the AASHTO meeting planners have made arrangements for the June 14th DMU final review meeting to be held at the Boston Park Plaza Hotel. A block of 25 rooms has been reserved for the core members of the subcommittee and what is called a shadow block has been reserved for industry members. AASHTO will be providing me with the room costs and reservation codes in a day or two and I will send that information out. The meeting room will be in the same hotel. We have a room reserved that will hold up to 80 and currently we have approximately 50 attendees registered with me to attend. About 30 of those are industry members. There is still time to confirm your attendance, via email to me at shewitt109@aol.com. Please do so asap.

Andrea Ryan, AASHTO, has provided me with a list of hotels nearby which I will provide – but core team members should use the Boston Park Plaza Hotel room block to get the negotiated rate. We will also be providing a list of restaurants nearby.

We have not yet set a start time for the meeting, or developed an agenda. I have been notified that members of the Interior working group would like to see the meeting start later than it has in the past – their request is for a 10:00 am start. So that they may be able to make this a day trip without an overnight stay being involved.

While Mario believed that a 10:00 am start time may be a bit late, he agreed that, “for now” we will plan to start at 9:30am to hopefully accommodate those who wish to come in that same day. Mario also reminded everyone that the goal is to have an approved specification by the end of the day, so no matter when we start; we stay until our job is done.

Other – All:

Kevin Kesler expressed thanks to Dave Warner, Michael Burshtin and everyone engaged in processing DCRs – “they have done a truly professional job and it is greatly appreciated by FRA.”

Mario Bergeron concurred, and said if that had been a motion he would second it.

Next call: May 10, 2012 at 3:00pm Eastern

Decisions and Action Items

- | | |
|--|----------------|
| 4. Approve Minutes of April 12, 2012 | Mario Bergeron |
| 5. Status: DMU Specification | Dave Warner |
| 6. Update: Document Control management | Dave Warner |
| 7. ADA Requirements and Railcar Standards | Mario Bergeron |
| 8. DMU Review meeting update | Steve Hewitt |
| 9. Review this meeting:
a) Decisions
b) New Action Items | Steve Hewitt |

***Technical Sub Committee Conference Call Meeting:
Thursday April 26, 2012 3:00 EST: 1-866-209-1307 / passcode 6486648#***

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