

Section 305 Next Generation Equipment Committee 1/13– 1/14/2010 Meeting Summary

The “kickoff” meeting of the Section 305 Next Generation Equipment Committee was convened by Stephen Gardner, Amtrak, on the afternoon of January 13, 2010 at the Hall of the States, in Washington, DC and concluded early in the evening of January 14, 2010.

Participants included; representatives of Amtrak, the Federal Railroad Administration (FRA), 10 State Departments of Transportation (DOTs), and rail program staff of the American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials (AASHTO), as well as the AASHTO Rail Resource Center (ARRC) and 305 Committee consultants. (Complete list of meeting attendees for each day is attached)

January 13, 2010

Opening Remarks:

The meeting began just after noon. In his opening remarks, **Stephen Gardner** stressed the importance of the provisions of the Passenger Rail Investment and Improvement Act (PRIIA) in ushering in a new era for intercity passenger rail (ICPR) in this country and noted that the funding for ICPR (\$8 billion) provided by the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA) has “hastened it along”. He went on to emphasize the importance of the implementation of the provisions of PRIIA’s Section 305 Next Generation Corridor Train Equipment Pool, describing it as the most critical element of ICPR in the US and noting that equipment is the key element in successfully implementing PRIIA.

In convening the “kickoff” meeting of the 305 Equipment Committee, Stephen stressed that the long range economics of ICPR largely depends on the work of the committee and cited it as critical to long term growth. Long term growth will depend on gaining efficiencies and economies of scale, strengthening the US supply base and the size and reliability of the market place. This is a great opportunity to provide incentives for the American economy.

He described Amtrak as an “absolute and engaged” partner with the states and FRA in the efforts of the 305 committee, and thanked the group for coming together to kick off the process. Collectively, the committee will achieve, in short order, what has been difficult to achieve in the past due to a lack of funding.

Paul Nissenbaum, FRA, stressed safety as a priority for the Administration and emphasized the importance placed on the work of the committee within the ranks of the FRA at the “highest levels”. He also emphasized the importance of making investments that will rebuild the US Rail equipment economy and create jobs, and noted that standardization and interoperability are key components. The 305 committee has, in the FRA’s opinion, broad authority and the Administration is interested in the flexibility of the committee to look at the broader aspects. He also noted that the Administration is looking for the committee to achieve consensus.

Another point of emphasis Paul noted is that time is of the essence – “the more time the committee takes the less relevant it may be”. As grants are announced - there will be strong ties to the need for pooled or standardized equipment as a key part of the start of the process. He advised the committee to “set deadlines and meet them”.

Bill Bronte, California DOT (CALTRANS) gave the States' perspective/overview. The \$8 billion in ARRA funding provided for HS/ICPR created expectations and the need for rolling stock is fundamental to the states being able to meet those expectations. Bill stressed that the 305 committee has a unique opportunity and great challenges ahead. Bill labeled standardization as the easiest of those challenges and procurement and financing as the most difficult. He suggested that we need to develop a finance and procurement infrastructure to grow and sustain the program and pointed out that it is crucial that we get the manufacturers "up and running". He also emphasized the need for "quick successes" and stated that the states are anxious to move forward.

Leo Penne, AASHTO, gave a brief overview from AASHTO's perspective, citing its role as that of providing logistical and secretariat support to the committee, and stated that AASHTO staff will do "whatever the 305 committee wants us to do." The work of the committee is an extremely important enterprise to the states and is a great opportunity to bring to fruition work that has been undertaken for a number of years by David Ewing (consultant) and others who have long understood the importance of creating an equipment pool. Leo also introduced Shayne Gill, AASHTO, as its lead for the 305 committee activities and David Ewing and Steve Hewitt as AASHTO's consultants on the effort.

Goals and Expectations:

Stephen Gardner described the Goals/expectations that he anticipated having achieved by the conclusion of this initial "kickoff" meeting. He defined these goals as more "organizational than substance".

1. Get a sense of the state of current plans – what is the universe of where the States and Amtrak are?
2. Agree to and adopt By-Laws for the 305 Committee and elect officers. (Chair, Vice Chair, Treasurer and Secretary)
3. Establish sub-committees – a.) Technical sub-committee and b.) Finance sub-committee and assign Chairs for each sub-committee
4. Agree on 1st year goals and a work plan
5. Adopt a schedule for the coming months
6. Funding and staffing issues

Discussion of PRIIA Section 305:

Stephen led a discussion of PRIIA and its' Section 305, providing a legislative history. He described PRIIA as creating a new program and development initiative for ICPR and as a 3 part partnership – FRA, Amtrak and the States. He saw PRIIA Section 305 as an opportunity to introduce equipment into the US market place and the 305 committee as helping to facilitate that collective work.

He noted, also, that there was both opportunity and ambiguity in the statute for moving forward. The statute has no implementation or resolution dates for the committee and no specific rules are defined. Amtrak is called on to establish the committee, but once established, Amtrak becomes a part of the committee.

The committee should bring together all of the elements – from structure to procurement to management. It is vital to bring parties together who can: develop equipment specifications;

procure equipment; finance the equipment acquisition; manage the equipment pool and balance equipment needs and manageability.

Further group discussions concerned the role or involvement of manufacturers, host railroads and other passenger railroad operators. The general sense of the meeting participants was that these stakeholders will be brought into the discussion through the technical sub-committee rather than the Executive Committee where potential conflicts of interest could occur.

While it was suggested that it may be a good idea to work into the By-Laws a discussion of very high speed rail equipment, and it was noted that there are no limitations on equipment type in the law; FRA advised of the need to minimize the span of equipment. It was suggested that the committee prioritize types of equipment, as a group, and define what the focus should be.

In regards to questions concerning participation of States that are not on the committee, AASHTO made it clear that all States will be kept informed of the committee's activities. It was also pointed out that the process for selecting which States would be members of the committee was inclusive and the states in the room were the ones who ultimately expressed interest in actively participating and becoming committee members.

A question concerning the committee's ability to spend the money that has been appropriated was raised. Does any of the appropriation need to be set aside – or can we spend it all? It was determined that the Secretary of Transportation has the final decision on funding activities. The committee is challenged to prioritize and set the goals, objectives and structure.

Status of Current Amtrak Efforts:

At this point, discussions focused on the Status of Amtrak efforts to date. Stephen reported that Amtrak's Comprehensive Fleet Strategy has not had final Board approval – but anticipates Board action soon and the release of the Comprehensive Fleet Strategy around the 1st of February, 2010.

Amtrak representatives described the Fleet Strategy Plan Overview and methodology to the group and the general discussion, including questions posed to Amtrak reps, brought out the following points:

- There was a lack of sufficient funding in recent years
- Amtrak is looking at a 30 year timeframe and what it would do for a domestic manufacturing base
- There is a need to get away from boom and bust periods – sustainability and the development of a supply base is critical to success
- There is a need to build a flexible and a sustainable core base to be scaled to what the future may bring
- Currently Amtrak has 1500 cars – some of which are 30-40 years old; and 400 locomotives
- There is a need for an order of 100 cars a year (all types) and a smaller # of locomotives, in order to keep up with the scale that is anticipated
- Unprecedented acquisition, by US standards, will require Amtrak synergy with the States' needs.
- The strategy for corridor growth is to work closely with the Section 305 Executive Committee.
- Amtrak's overall goal is to get a Fleet that truly meets the needs of the market place

- Amtrak discussed and described the status of cars to be ordered – specs are complete – and quotes are being reviewed.
- Amtrak also provided a brief review of the status/size of the current fleet – long distance single level Fleet and Electric Units.
- Amtrak also emphasized that the Fleet Plan/Strategy does not talk about implementation or deployment, as the market could change – market condition and technical consideration will dictate.
- Ultimately, the whole Fleet needs to be recapitalized

Amtrak's Dale Englehardt gave an overview of Amtrak's New Equipment Acquisition Process Design. (Single level – Long distance; Single level-Short distance (Amfleet); Bi-Level Short Distance (California shared) Bi-level Long Distance – replace superliner; and Acela Train Set - specs under review) and reviewed the New Equipment Procurement Program and Timelines.

Status of Current State Efforts/Needs:

Several of the states' representatives gave an overview of their equipment needs - current and future:

New York:

Existing 110 MPH capabilities on portions of the Empire Corridor.

Dual Diesel/Electric with 3rd rail into NYC

Interoperability issues with New York's MTA on the Empire Corridor and the need for dual equipment – running diesel on over 90% of New York's existing corridor and then switching over to 3rd rail supplied power into New York City tunnels leading into Penn Station.

California:

Bi-Level spec effort – 3 years - \$150 million for rolling stock.

California has worked with Amtrak on the specs – 90% complete and at consultant review process.

Needs: 60 additional cars and 10 locomotives – equipment is designed for 125 MPH and tested at 110MPH.

Other states are interested in the possibility of tying into California's specs – this could lead to an additional 90 cars.

Existing Fleet: 88 cars, 17 locomotives, 7 long term lease Superliners

Iowa:

Iowa is new to ICPR – has only long distance currently.

Part of the Midwest Regional Rail Initiative – working closely with Illinois and Wisconsin

and

looking at working jointly with the other Midwest States and the Mid-West equipment pool.

Working with Illinois on the "Greenline Vision" Chicago to Iowa City – using biofuels/renewable materials - no equipment specs yet for this route. A key issue to be resolved is turning the cars around once they reach their destination.

North Carolina:

The general approach has been to acquire Heritage equipment and refurbish it.

The State has experimented with adapting/modifying cars – i.e. combination cars – lounge and baggage.

6 locomotives – 4 were rebuilds and 2 were new, but are now in mid-life rebuild. (In NY) The State is working with partners (NC State University, AG, EPA, DOT) to research bio-fuels technology.

Overall strategy: survive and grow – add new service while progressing the rebuild strategy and look to add new equipment (8 trainsets as new equipment).

Re-use plan: If ARRA applications are successful and the money is available for the new equipment – NC will also be able to expand service to the East and West in NC.

Established a statewide website: bytrain.org

Maryland:

Maryland does not own and operate ICPR equipment – but does own and operate MARC train equipment (commuter rail) – and believes MARC is really intercity and would like to see it qualify for funding.

Amtrak operates 1 line and CSX operates 2 diesel lines.

Height constraints in Baltimore Tunnel – BMP – built in the 1800's - is a critical issue.

MDOT has had discussions with Amtrak about future expansion to Ocean City and the Delaware Beaches. Success would lead to the need for more trains.

Currently – no money = no equipment purchases coming up.

Washington State:

Looking at options – ARRA money will impact decisions on expanding the fleet and refurbishing cars.

Working with the 305 committee will greatly benefit Washington State's decision making, and will have an impact on what options there are.

Looking for delivery by 12/31/2012

Other States:

Amtrak's Drew Galloway gave a brief overview of some of the other states (Maine to Virginia) - describing potential for expansion with growth estimates at 60-75%.

Historical Background – Discussion of Previous Equipment Pool Effort:

A discussion of past efforts to develop standards and establish an equipment pool followed the States' needs discussion. David Ewing and Drew Galloway, Amtrak, described the history of what was, in essence, a precursor to the 305 committee. The states, working through the S4PRC and with Amtrak, looked at specs, needs, and issues such as how to pay for, and how to acquire equipment in the period between 2004-2005. The effort was able to proceed quite well, with several conference calls and informal meetings, culminating in a meeting with manufacturers in Chicago -- in early 2005. The manufacturers coalesced around each other and began to form informal alliances to look at new configurations. Eventually, the effort stalled due to 3 major problems: the ability to find the resources to go to the next steps; the need to get outside expertise (design work, legal advice re state laws etc); and ultimately, the fact that neither Amtrak nor the States had available funding to proceed to or accomplish next steps. This informal – volunteer group - had taken the effort as far as they could with limited resources.

In the end, it can be said that the ensuing Section 305 Committee has been born out of the efforts of this earlier equipment pool effort. The volunteer effort clearly demonstrates that what is proposed in Section 305 is doable. Ken Uznanski of Amtrak (formerly with Washington State DOT) was a State member of the initial volunteer effort and reminded the 305 group that there is a wealth of information to be drawn from, as a result of that effort. It is important that the 305 Committee be aware of the existence of huge amounts of historical files and that it be willing to

tap into those files. Ken also stressed the importance of collectively understanding the size of the universe today and suggested that the Committee may be well served to update some of the surveys and information gathered previously.

Discussion at the end of the day for setting the Schedule for the next day's priorities on January 14, 2010, (Day 2):

Stephen Gardner led a discussion regarding Day 2 priorities. He stressed the importance of reviewing and adopting the draft By-Laws with amendments as appropriate and, in general, organizing the Committee and electing officers.

A long discussion regarding the draft By-Laws ensued. Bill Bronte made it clear that the States had only just received the draft of the By-Laws and would need the opportunity to review them before adopting them, but agreed it was a priority for Day 2 to get it done.

The discussion then revolved around potential amendments that would be necessary such as; stating in the By-Laws that this group that has assembled now can name officers and an Executive Board at the meeting tomorrow and does not have to wait until a later date. It was suggested that the By-Laws should reflect that this group can set up or establish the committee.

FRA pointed out that, although the intent is to have consensus, the inherent difficulty of getting consensus with such a large group has led the FRA Administrator to suggest the RSAC model be used in establishing voting procedures. The RSAC model utilizes voting Blocks. FRA would recommend establishing voting Blocks consisting of; Amtrak, the States, and the FRA each as a Block, with one vote, rather than each committee member having a singular vote.

A long discussion of the merits of consensus and/or Block voting took place. It was pointed out that RSAC moves slowly and this group does not have time on its side. Time is of the essence and this committee must be able to achieve consensus and make decisions quickly. FRA suggested that AREMA may be a better model as it is a less deliberative process. Leo Penne, AASHTO, stated that the States are not a Block and that State members see this as a consensus process. The By-Laws should reflect a consensus process with a "fail-safe" alternative to ensure that the committee's work progresses. It was generally agreed that RSAC is not the right vehicle on which to model the committee's voting structure, but that there needs to be a remedy for when consensus is not reached.

Further discussion revolved around establishing the Executive Board and the technical sub-committees and what their relationship is in regards to voting and membership structure. The general view was that the Executive Board is the decision making body and the technical sub-committees take up technical issues and make technical decisions.

Stephen pointed out that the committee is defined by Congress in the Law. This group needs to create the Board and make decisions regarding voting Blocks etc.

It was decided that the States would caucus and bring forward nominations for officers for the Executive Board and Amtrak's lawyers and interested states would revise the current draft By-Laws to reflect the day's discussions and re-submit for consideration on Day 2 (January 14, 2010).

January 14, 2010

Brief Recap and Update of activities from Day 1:

Stephen Gardner, Amtrak, opened the meeting and briefly recapped the January 13th discussions. He also gave an update on the state of the draft By-Laws. Amtrak lawyers had revised the By-Laws overnight in accordance with the discussions that had taken place, and would review the changes today with two State designees (Iowa and Missouri) who would then report back to the States and make recommendations on acceptance, as revised, and/or suggest additional revisions if deemed necessary.

Review and Refinement of Draft Work Plan:

Stephen Gardner led a group discussion of the draft Work Plan that was incorporated in the meeting agenda. A review of the draft work plan resulted in additions and/or changes being made as noted below. (Changes and/or additions and comments are in **bold**)

- A. Committee Work will be a multi-year process - (**agreed as is**)
- B. Goals/Deliverables:
 - 1. Develop Single Level Specifications
 - 2. Finalize Bi-Level Coach Specifications
 - 3. **Develop Diesel Locomotive specifications – specs to accommodate 125 MPH**
 - 4. **Develop Ownership and Organizational Structures**
 - 5. Develop Procurement Strategies
 - 6. Develop Fleet management (pool) Strategies
 - 7. Prepare Initial Procurement (**There was much discussion about the practicality of achieving this goal – but it was determined that with a 2012 deadline to obligate and money to be spent by 2017 – it was important to strive to prepare an initial procurement. It was suggested that it was possibly feasible for Amtrak, working with California on Bi-level specs, to prepare the initial procurement.**)
- C. Elements
 - 1. Overall Committee
 - a.) Determine Strategy on Equipment Specification Development – **agreed to with discussion of types of specs – technical specs (hard – experience of certain existing systems) vs. performance specs (speed, acceleration rates, etc) vs. hybrid specs – (hard specs for proven components, but give manufacturers ability to hit the performance goals). The specs prepared by Amtrak to date are “hybrid”. It was also noted that interoperability is a key factor.**
 - b.) Assess State Needs (amount, timing, type) (**After a long discussion, it was determined that AASHTO would work with Amtrak to develop a survey of the states to truly assess/update current needs including; types of cars and timeframe with a 5, 10, 15 year outlook. It was pointed out that the S4PRC had done similar surveys and it would be of benefit to look at those results, but that the information would need to be refreshed due to the amount of time that has elapsed. AASHTO will be responsible for distributing the survey and will work with Amtrak to help define the questions.**)

- c.) Develop/refine State corridor specific Operating Plan, Facilities, Fleet Needs – **It was agreed that these issues would also be included in the survey of the states.**
- d.) Answering key Questions:
 - i. Does one size fit all? **This question has really already been answered (one size does not fit all) but it was agreed to pose the question anyway.**
 - ii. What types of Equipment are appropriate?
 - a.) Single level Tilt/Non-Tilt – **after a long discussion regarding tilt/non-tilt it was determined that this should also be added to the survey.**
 - b.) Bi-Level
 - c.) DMU/EMU – **agreed that this be taken out of consideration and replaced with a new item c.) Tier II high speed equipment**
 - d.) Geographical/driven needs – **agreed that this should be accounted for**
 - iii. Car based procurements or trainsets? – **agreed that this remains in the Work Plan, but would also be included as a survey question.**
 - iv. Next Generation Non Electric Locomotives – **agreed to strike this from the Elements section as it is now a first year Goal/Deliverable**
 - v. Provide common vision and direction to manufacturing community – **agreed**
 - vi. Safety Standards, ADA and Buy American – **agreed with addition of Buy American**
- e. Reporting to Congress/others as appropriate
 - i. Vital for funding and implementation – **agreed – important for both visibility and to provide information**

2) Finance Sub-Committee – DJ Stadtler, Amtrak, (proposed chair)

- a. Identify Joint Procurement Opportunities with Amtrak Fleet Plan-**agreed**
 - b. Evaluate Funding/procurement Strategies for Fleet Acquisition- **agreed**
 - c. Prepare Initial Fleet Procurement – **first year goal/deliverable**
 - d. Identify institutional opportunities/structures for successful implementation of procurement strategies
- The Finance Sub-Committee will also serve as liaison to financial institutions, and manufacturers looking for finance opportunities. The issue of establishing a corporation is one which the finance Sub-Committee should take up and can propose it to the Executive Board, but it is ultimately the Board's decision.**

3) Technical Sub-Committee – Mario Bergeron, Amtrak (proposed chair)

- a. Salient Features – **agreed - core features of the Sub-Committee are of a technical nature**
- b. Determine appropriate level of involvement from industry – **agreed – how do we handle larger manufacturing group? The Technical Sub-Committee should make the agenda and seek involvement of the larger community. Kevin Kesler, FRA – commented that he is looking to move issues for the Technical Sub-Committee immediately and welcomes committee input.**
- c. Establish Interoperability and Safety Standards – **agreed**
- d. Adapt Current Bi-Level Spec for generic Use – **agreed**
- e. Develop Single Level Specification(s) for State Use – **agreed**
- f. Develop Additional Specification(s) for State Use – **agreed**

A direct result of the Sub-Committee discussions was the realization of the need for an Administrative arm of the overall committee to be established. It was agreed that the committee should establish an Administrative task Force to handle budget issues and

manage the operation of the committee. The Administrative task force would be able to determine protocols for various issues that may come up such as; site tours, definition of what the committee can present to Congress – ensuring that the Board is not engaging in lobbying activities but is getting information out and maintaining visibility and, in general, establish administrative policy for the committee. The task force would also determine where and how the administrative support is housed and provided to the committee. Currently, at least for this meeting, AASHTO is serving as the support team and plays the role of Secretariat to the committee. AASHTO also provides the needed interaction with all of the States and will provide information support and record management through the establishment of the AASHTO Rail Resource Center (ARRC) web site. (this web site is expected to be up and running in a week or so)

Presentation to the 305 Committee and Discussion with FRA Administrator Joseph Szabo:

Federal Railroad Administrator Joseph Szabo addressed the committee in the early afternoon and made the following key points:

- The States are an important part of carrying out the President's Vision – this is a partnership – ultimately the states make the Vision happen with guidance from the FRA
- The work of the 305 Committee is a high priority and great opportunity – its focus reaches all the way to the White House - this is, however, “good news-bad news”, as such interest at the highest levels elevates timelines and underlines the need to be expeditious in achieving consensus.
- “Buy American” is the floor – not the ceiling – production of equipment in the US will create significant job development
- This is beyond just “U.S. owned” it is about U.S. factories
- The White House sees this as a great opportunity to re-invigorate domestic manufacturers and create jobs
- The Administration is looking at a Rail Program build - out for several decades – and jobs will grow nationwide – States should not get sidetracked with where or what State a manufacturer will be in – it is more important to be concerned with the 305 committee developing a good set of single standards that can be built by multiple manufacturers – develop of economies of scale – (what is envisioned is something similar to the “737” model in aviation, whereby one particular piece of equipment can be easily replicated)
- Karen Rae, FRA Deputy Administrator, commented on the fact that the committee should not duplicate the Transit model – where redesigning occurs every time equipment is ordered.
- Szabo also emphasized the need for technical capacity development “of people” and the fact that Rail will become a bigger part of State DOT'S – currently there is a wide gap among states with some having rail staffs of 1 and others having Rail staffs numbering 100.
- FRA is planning to do “substantial” hiring to implement its various new and continuing responsibilities

FRA: Roles, Responsibilities and Expectations:

FRA's Mark Yachmetz described the FRA's role, responsibilities and expectations: is interested in the product – and the advancement of this effort – this will reinvigorate the manufacturing element of the economy and create a new form of transportation in this

country – using a model similar to that which created the highway program – sustainability is a key. FRA will be participants – (not officers) of the Executive Board. Initially the technical side will be FRA's main area of involvement. This will include areas such as Research and Development – Safety in passenger equipment- crash energy management.

The FRA is also interested in the financing end as the “funders” of the 305 Committee, but does not want to be drivers – just participants.

Timelines and Action Items:

After considerable discussion, the committee agreed to the following Action items and Timelines:

1. The States' Survey will be circulated to the states by AASHTO staff with assistance from Amtrak in formulating the questions to be asked in the survey. This action is to be completed by the March 9-10, 2010, meeting of the AASHTO Standing Committee on Rail Transportation (SCORT)
2. The next in-person meeting of the 305 Committee Executive Board will take place in Washington, DC in conjunction with the SCORT meeting. Tentatively, the Executive Board meeting is scheduled for the afternoon of March 10th and the morning of March 11th.
3. The Sub-Committees (Technical and Finance) will be created and the Chairs will be elected by January 21st. Names to be submitted to Executive Board Chair Bill Bronte.
4. The Board has agreed that an Administrative Task Force needs to be established and its functions, responsibilities need to be defined. In an effort to create the Task Force as soon as possible, it was determined that the names of volunteers willing to serve on the Task Force are to be submitted to the Executive Board Chair by January 21st.
5. Amtrak will provide a briefing on its Fleet Plan once it has been adopted by the Amtrak Board. The Board is expected to act by early February (February 17th is the deadline) Upon receiving final approval, Amtrak will brief the states via Conference Call/Webinar. (Goal is to hold the call in Mid-February)
6. Funding issues – Amtrak will work with the FRA to resolve as soon as possible, issues concerning funding the 305 effort and how/when the funds will flow from FRA to Amtrak and the States.
7. Sub-Committees will constitute themselves and develop work plans and schedule including proposals for how and when meetings will be conducted by Mid-February.
8. FRA has proposed a meeting with AASHTO, APTA, S4PRC and equipment manufacturers. The meeting was originally planned for the end of January. It is likely to be held around the SCORT meeting timeframe. The 305 Committee will plan to do a presentation to the manufacturers at that meeting.
9. The By-Laws that will be adopted at this meeting will be distributed by AASHTO after being finalized by Amtrak, by the end of the week ending January 22, 2010, and will be posted on the ARRC website as soon as possible.

Adoption of By-Laws:

After a review of the changes discussed previously and with the inclusion of additional modifications (changing State membership on the Executive Board to 9 or 11 States rather than 7 or 9 – sections 5.1 and 5.8) – the 305 Committee By-Laws were moved for approval by Stephen Gardner, Amtrak and seconded by Kevin Kesler, FRA. The motion to adopt the By-laws, as revised, passed unanimously.

Organization of the Committee:

After the States caucused to determine a slate of officers, the group reconvened and there was unanimous agreement on the following:

On a motion made by Stephen Gardner, Amtrak, and seconded by Caitlin Hughes Rayman, Maryland DOT; it was unanimously agreed that the States making up the Executive Board are to be: California, Missouri, Wisconsin, Iowa, (in tandem with Illinois if Illinois is unable to serve – because of travel restrictions) North Carolina, New York, Georgia, Louisiana, Washington State, Oklahoma and Maryland.

The committee unanimously voted on a motion nominating a slate of officers for the Executive Board. The motion was offered by Don Hannon, NYSDOT, and seconded by DJ Stadtler, Amtrak. The elected officers are:

Chairman: Bill Bronte, California DOT

Vice Chair: Mario Bergeron, Amtrak

Treasurer: DJ Stadtler, Amtrak

Secretary: Rod Massman, Missouri DOT

Pat Simmons, NCDOT, recommended, and the Board agreed that there be a joint press release (AASHTO, Amtrak and FRA) on the formation of the Committee and for the purpose of soliciting members for the Technical Sub-Committee.

The “kickoff” meeting of the Section 305 Next Generation Equipment Committee was then adjourned at approximately 4 pm.