

SECTION 305 NGEC

Executive Board Conference Call Meeting

MINUTES

MARCH 20, 2012

11:30 AM
EASTERN

CONFERENCE CALL

| | |
|--------------------|---|
| FACILITATOR | <i>Mario Bergeron, Vice-Chair, S305 NGEC Executive Board</i> |
| ATTENDEES | Executive Board Members: <i>Mario Bergeron, (Mario also had DJ Stadler's proxy for this meeting), Alan Ware, Paul Nissenbaum, Eric Curtit, (Eric Curtit also had the proxies of Bill Bronte and George Weber for this meeting) Ray Hessinger, John Sibold, Ron Adams, Joe Kyle, Kevin Lawson</i> Support Staff: <i>Steve Hewitt, Leo Penne, Shayne Gill, David Ewing, Larry Salci, Kevin Kesler, Nico Lindenau, Ryan Swick, Gordon Hutchinson, Ken Uznanski, Dale Engelhardt, Dave Warner, Andy House</i> |
| ABSENTEES | Board Members: <i>Tammy Nicholson, Pat Simmons, Bill Bronte, George Weber, DJ Stadler (Proxies provided for Bill Bronte, George Weber and DJ Stadler as noted above)</i> Support Staff: <i>Whitney Phend, Chad Edison, Jeff Gordon, Melissa Shurland, Drew Galloway, Nancy Greene, Robin McCarthy, Zach O'Connor, John Tunna, Tim Hoeffner,</i> |

WELCOME/ROLL CALL/MINUTES

Opening – Mario Bergeron, Vice-chair:

Mario Bergeron opened the conference call meeting, and asked Steve Hewitt to call the roll.

Roll Call – Steve Hewitt, Manager, S305 NGEC Support Services:

Steve Hewitt took a roll of Executive Board members, and it was determined that a quorum was present, with 12 of 14 Board members present or represented by proxy (as noted above).

Review this agenda – Mario Bergeron:

Mario Bergeron provided a brief overview of today's agenda.

Approval of the Minutes from the March 6, 2012 NGEC Annual Meeting – Mario Bergeron:

On a motion by Ron Adams, Wisconsin DOT, and a second by Eric Curtit, MODOT, the minutes of the March 6, 2012 conference call meeting of the Executive Board were approved without objection.

Agenda Items

Review and consider for approval: NGEC Scope and Budget for 4-1-12 thru 3-31-13 – Mario Bergeron/Ken Uznanski:

Ken Uznanski provided an overview of the final revised draft of the NGEC Scope and Budget for April 1, 2012 through March 31, 2013, as submitted to the Executive Board March 19, 2012.

Ken noted that the previous version had been distributed for review and comment from the Board members on March 12, 2012. All comments were due to Ken by COB March 14, 2012. Ken reported that he had received three comments – a clarification comment from Dave Warner, Amtrak, and a question/comment from Al Ware, Georgia DOT. The FRA provided comments which offered revisions primarily to the structure and flow of the proposal. The FRA also suggested some wording revisions in cases where it was felt that the original draft was "too wordy". All of the FRA comments have been incorporated in the revised draft under consideration on today's call.

Ken noted that the Board's intent, as directed on the last call, (March 6, 2012) was to "obligate the full \$2 million" provided by the FRA "to get it on the books to ensure that there was no opportunity for rescission." The difficulty in doing this was that some of the intended scope of work for specific projects or activities have not been fully vetted as of yet. As a result, the Board had determined that funds related to planned activities not yet fully scoped would be placed in the Executive Board contingency item, to be transferred to the appropriate subcommittee or task force once the Board had approved a scope related to the specific activity.

Ken pointed out that, after getting FRA's comments, and talking at length with Chad Edison, FRA, it was agreed that there would be two line items in the Executive Board's budget. One would be for funds to be allocated for professional consulting services (legal, technical, finance) and one item for general contingency for the entire 305 NGEC.

While this is a sound and good common sense approach, there are technical challenges yet to be clarified. It appears (in the view of Ken Uznanski and Beverly Thorpe, Amtrak) that every time funds are shifted by the Executive Board to the appropriate subcommittee or task force, once a scope has been fully vetted and approved, there will need to be a formal grant revision. Ken has reached out to Dharm Guruswany, FRA, to get his view on this, but he has been unavailable this week. Beverly Thorpe is reaching out to Amtrak and FRA legal to see if their assumption is correct and/or if there is a "reasonable work around" that can be implemented to resolve this procedural issue.

Ken noted that the procedural issue will not impact the scope or budget, per se, but may cause a revision to address the procedural issues.

Mario Bergeron proposed that a motion to approve the scope and budget as presented, notwithstanding the discussion with regard to the procedural issues, be offered now with the understanding that a decision will be forthcoming on how to transfer funds from the Board to the appropriate subcommittees or task forces. Further, Mario noted that he "leans towards approving the scope and budget now", and that he feels it is appropriate to do so.

Nico Lindenau, BAH, noted that, even if the requirement is to do a formal grant revision when transferring the funds, as described, it would not be overly burdensome as it is likely to be only 2 times that grant revisions may be needed. His suggestion would be to move forward today with approval and "deal with the grant revisions as they come along".

Ken pointed out that a revision would be required "anytime we move money" and that is likely to be more than two times. Ken added, "I would agree we should move forward, but understand there may be procedural changes."

Mario added, "we can revisit and adjust accordingly."

At this point, Eric Curtit, Missouri DOT, offered a motion to approve the NGEC Scope and Budget as submitted with the understanding that we may need a procedural modification. John Sibold, Washington State DOT, seconded the motion to approve.

Steve Hewitt polled the voting members of the Board:

Mario Bergeron, Amtrak – aye
Mario Bergeron as proxy for DJ Stadtler – aye
Al Ware, Georgia DOT, - aye
Paul Nissenbaum, FRA – aye with a comment that we have placeholder discussion in regards to the Finance subcommittee and potential modification in the form of consolidating subcommittees.
Eric Curtit, Missouri DOT – aye
Eric Curtit as proxy for Bill Bronte, Caltrans – aye
Eric Curtit as proxy for George Weber, Illinois DOT – aye
Kevin Lawson, Louisiana DOT – aye
Ray Hessinger, NYSDOT – aye
John Sibold, Washington State DOT – aye
Ron Adams, Wisconsin DOT – aye

Note: Joe Kyle, Oklahoma DOT, was not yet on the call for this vote. He did join the call shortly thereafter and participated in subsequent votes. Kevin Lawson, La. Was on the call for this and one other vote, but was called away to another meeting before the end of this call.

With a quorum present and all represented members voting in favor, the chair determined that consensus had been achieved, and the motion to approve the NGEC Scope and Budget had carried.

Mario asked that Steve Hewitt note in the minutes that further actions remain in relation to this item.

Ken Uznanski elaborated on the actions:

Ken works with the Amtrak grants people and submits the approved NGEC Scope and Budget to the FRA for grant approval.

Ken works with the FRA on finding a process and methodology for transferring funds from the Board to the appropriate subcommittees or task forces .

Steve asked if the scope and budget, as approved by the Board, can/should be posted to the website, or wait for final sign off/approval by the FRA grants office.

Paul Nissenbaum, FRA, suggested that it be posted, as approved by the NGEN Executive Board, "subject to grant approval."

Review and consider for approval: Structure and Finance Task Force proposed SOW-Section 6 – Eric Curtit:

In introducing this topic, Mario Bergeron asked all contractors on the call who may be interested in bidding on the SOW to please leave the call. He noted that it is difficult to enforce this on a call such as this, but asked for "good will and discussion."

Eric Curtit provided an overview of the SFTF's proposed SOW. He described the highlights as two areas to be addressed. One is "the development of a good product for meeting Section 6 grant requirements for the current procuring states, and to provide a model for other states."

The second item to be addressed is deployment for the Midwest states and, again, for other areas of the country.

Eric added that he has had discussions with Bill Bronte and they agree that operations is a "bigger issue" that will also need to be addressed – "how do we maintain a fleet and maintenance for life cycle costs...but this one is the first issue to address."

Paul Nissenbaum, FRA, agreed that Eric had described it well and asked if there were any questions.

Ron Adams, Wisconsin DOT, asked if the document should not also "say something about the likely operator being Amtrak, and note the 209 allocation methodology."

Eric saw these as "part of the discussion."

Paul Nissenbaum noted that on page five of the SOW there is a reference to 209 methodology.

Ron accepted that and said, "ok".

David Ewing noted that the "SOW is agnostic, not assuming any operator or group of operators. The reference to 209 goes to capital costs as well as operations."

Ron Adams, replied "there may well be a difference between operators."

David added, "it goes to the challenge of the ones doing the work – it's a good basis for a discussion. Your question (Ron's) goes to the heart of the 305 Committee and how it interlocks with 209 and that group should be made aware of it."

Ray Hessinger, NYSDOT, asked if anything should be said about what is in the proposed authorization bill which "mandates the states to provide equipment ownership to the 305 entity."

Eric responded, "we don't know what will be passed – but today, regardless of that, we have states' rights – a state can operate with a neighbor state – and I'm not so sure about turning ownership over to a national entity."

Paul Nissenbaum commented, "I believe there is latitude given in the proposed legislation to the Secretary to use his discretion... it is not an absolute."

Ray Hessinger agreed, "there is an opportunity for the Secretary to waive it."

With no further discussion, Al Ware, Georgia DOT, made a motion to approve the SOW as submitted by the SFTF. This motion was seconded by Ron Adams, Wisconsin DOT.

Steve Hewitt polled the voting members of the Board:

Mario Bergeron, Amtrak – aye
Mario Bergeron as proxy for DJ Stadler – aye
Al Ware, Georgia DOT, - aye
Paul Nissenbaum, FRA – aye
Eric Curtit, Missouri DOT - aye

Eric Curtit as proxy for Bill Bronte, Caltrans – aye
Eric Curtit as proxy for George Weber, Illinois DOT – aye
Kevin Lawson, Louisiana DOT – aye
Ray Hessinger, NYSDOT – aye
John Sibold, Washington State DOT – aye
Ron Adams, Wisconsin DOT – aye
Joe Kyle, Oklahoma DOT – aye

With a quorum present and all represented members voting in favor, the chair determined that consensus had been achieved and the motion was approved.

Mario Bergeron asked Eric Curtit what the next steps are to be.

Eric noted that the next step is to move it forward in parallel with AASHTO, to do the necessary steps with AASHTO as contract agent. He said it will take about a month between the time we “pull the trigger and put an RFP out on the street.”

At this point Leo Penne, AASHTO, reminded Board members that a second action was needed “to instruct AASHTO to carry out the contract.”

Steve Hewitt agreed, and reminded Board members that as part of the approval recommendation by the SFTF in submitting the SOW to the Board, the SFTF had requested that the Board ask AASHTO to serve as the contracting agent.

David Ewing suggested, and all agreed, that the motion include the word “competitive”.

Eric Curtit, Missouri DOT, offered a motion to “instruct AASHTO to serve as contract agent for the SOW for a competitive bid contract as proposed by the SFTF and approved by the Executive Board”. The motion was seconded by Ray Hessinger, NYSDOT.

Before going to a vote, Ron Adams asked if the funding was to come out of the Board’s contingency fund.

Ken Uznanski explained that there are two line items in the Executive Board budget. One is for professional services, and that is where this money will be allocated from.

Steve Hewitt polled the voting members of the Board:

Mario Bergeron, Amtrak – aye
Mario Bergeron as proxy for DJ Stadler – aye
Al Ware, Georgia DOT, - aye
Paul Nissenbaum, FRA – aye
Eric Curtit, Missouri DOT - aye
Eric Curtit as proxy for Bill Bronte, Caltrans – aye
Eric Curtit as proxy for George Weber, Illinois DOT – aye
Ray Hessinger, NYSDOT – aye
John Sibold, Washington State DOT – aye
Ron Adams, Wisconsin DOT – aye
Joe Kyle, Oklahoma DOT – aye

With a quorum present and all represented members voting in favor, the chair determined that consensus had been achieved and the motion was approved.

Review and consider for approval: The Administration Task Force proposal: Procedures for handling External Contacts with the Executive Board – Al Ware:

Al Ware provided an overview of the Administrative task force’s proposed “Procedures for Handling External Contacts with the Executive Board”.

The proposed procedures were approved by the Admn task force on March 16, 2012, and submitted to the Board that same day for its review and consideration.

The proposal outlines, in general terms, how someone, outside of the NGEC, would gain an audience with the Board, or provide information to the Board. It also makes it clear to those contacting the Board that their submissions become part of the public record.

The document has been revised a number of times over the past several months before being approved at the

task force level. It was once around 20 pages, and has been streamlined to the current 7 pages (2 of which are forms)

Eric Curtit asked if the procedures take into account Roberts Rules of Order. He asked if the Board wants to entertain an outside contact, would this preclude that from happening.

Al noted that he believed this would not preclude the Board's ability; and Steve Hewitt noted that on page 2 Roberts Rules of Order are noted as something that the Board follows or adheres to.

Mario Bergeron asked if the Board wants to take action now or should members be given an opportunity to review the procedures more thoroughly, and vote on it on the next call?

Al Ware noted that the Board does get "a fair number of letters and some requests to meet with the Board and, up to this point, there are no procedures in place". This proposal "gives us a good footing to move on."

Ultimately, it was agreed that the Board would wait to consider the procedures on its next call (April 3, 2012) to allow Board members more time to review the document. Steve Hewitt was asked to make sure this was an agenda item on the next Board call.

Consider for Acceptance/Approval: Standardization Independent Assessment Report – Mario Bergeron/Larry Salci:

Larry Salci provided a summary overview of the tasks and recommendations found in his assessment of the Standardization Working Group's pilot program. Much of Larry's summary mirrored his summary given on March 6, 2012 to the Board. Reprinted below is part of the summary provided on March 6th.

Task 1 – Review the SWG process, performance, and results and recommend changes to the SWG Work Plan and Work Plan Flow Chart.

The TWGs industry members' commercial bias does limit the ability of the TWG to propose systems and components as candidates for standardization, let alone perform the technical suitability or cost-benefit financial/economic analysis. The TWG efforts should be limited to technical specification development.

Recommendation:

- **Car Builder Standardization Plan** -The SWG request the NGENC to include a standardization process in the vehicle procurement phase (starting with the bi-level procurement) by requesting interested and qualified car builders to develop and submit a detailed (conceptual design) Standardization Plan for major system and components as candidates for standardization.
- **Standardization Plan Part of RFP Evaluation Process** - The car builder Standardization Plan should be part of the RFP submittal requirement and part of the evaluation of both technical and financial criteria. Evaluation criteria should be weighted in relation to the importance of standardization to the NGENC program
- **Utilize SWG to Assist in Evaluation Process and Design Phase** -The NGENC SWG should be considered as support as Subject Matter Experts (SME) in assisting in the RFP evaluation phase and the Program Management design phases.
- **Standardization Plan CDRL** - The owner should require the selected car builder Standardization Plan be included in the contract deliverable requirements (CDRL) in the form of inclusion in the Design Submittal Plan. The CDRL should reference and integrate the Standardization Plan for design review and approval as part of the Preliminary Engineering Phase (30%) and the Intermediate Design Phase (60%) including provisions for system (s) mock-ups.

Task 2A – How can perceived barriers to standards development be overcome, while maintaining involvement of the NGENC Technical Subcommittee in the standardization process?

There are both perceived and "real" barriers to standards development in the U.S. passenger railcar industry. Some of these barriers apply to the NGENC Standardization process. The barriers are the historical infrastructure limitations of legacy transit systems, customer demand for custom built railcars, federal, state and local funding issues, Federal, State and local procurement requirements,

low bid vs. negotiated procurements, and car builder market/bid strategies.

Recommendations:

- **Large Systems/High Usage Components** - Standardization should focus on both high dollar systems and high usage components over life of the vehicle
- **Modular Design** - Standardization of systems should be designed utilizing a "modular" approach or top down approach by the car builder through the design phase, and cross reference opportunities for vehicle platforms for all NGEN vehicles, bi-level, single level, trainsets, and DMUs
- **Key Interface Definition** - Define standardization as key interface, form, fit, function, and interchangeability, not design of an identical component
- **Two Step Procurements** – A procurement process that provides for two separate evaluation processes, technical and financial/price criteria utilizing weighted criteria method (Brooks Method) vs. low bid will enhance standardization objective. Low bid process runs counter to Total Cost of Ownership analysis (initial price plus life cycle cost analysis) and will negatively impact standardization efforts
- **Industry Funding** - Sufficient Federal/State funding creates order volume, will attract competition, provide for economies of scale, and create permanent jobs

Task 2B – How should the concept of standardization be defined? Should standardization include components comprised of several subcomponents? Should standardization be focused on systems or components or both?

Recommendations:

- **Modular Design** - Standardization should be defined as a modular approach, top down approach, starting with platform architecture, precisely define space envelope and weight limits, detail design interface requirements (form, fit, and function) and interchangeability. This approach will still protect suppliers intellectual property rights
- **Top Down Approach** - Standardization utilizing a top down approach should be defined starting at the highest system level and defined to the lowest component level possible
- **Both Systems and Components** - The vehicle platform should be used to guide the customer/owner and a listing of key systems/components should be defined jointly with all involved disciplines, including key system/component suppliers

Task 2C – How can the question of when to standardize be resolved? Will standardizing of components which exist now impede technological innovation? Is it more practical to base standards on the components chosen for incorporation in the first NGEN procurement order?

Recommendations:

- **RFP Starts Standardization Process** - Ideally, standardization should start with the design of a new vehicle, a new vehicle being defined as starting with a "clean sheet of paper" concept. If an existing design or technical specification already exists e.g., NGEN bi-level, single-level, trainset, or DMU specifications, then design RFP to contain requirement for car builders to develop a Standardization Plan to be submitted with their technical proposals for evaluation
- **Technological Innovation** – Utilizing both the modular approach and the key interface definition, standardization should enhance technological innovation as suppliers of components and systems will be able in theory, and practice, to allocate scarce engineering resources to R&D, manufacturing and assembly process improvements to improve product reliability, reduce costs, and improve their competitive position in the market. This will allow them to protect their intellectual property rights, key to their participation in standardization. The

modular design process avoids the perception that the car builder/suppliers who win the first order in effect become the standard for all future NGEC similar orders.

Task 2D – *How can/should the potential benefits of standardization be determined? In its current form, should the standardization process consider a cost/benefit like analysis? Would other metrics be more reflective of the potential gains achievable by standardizing components?*

- **Integrate into RFP Process** - *standardization benefits can only be determined by integrating Standardization into the RFP procurement process and using car builder Standardization Plans as a measure of benefit against a do nothing baseline. A best case evaluation will utilize both a technical suitability analysis and a financial/economic cost-benefit analysis that utilizes Total Cost of Ownership (initial cost plus life cycle costs) resulting in a "Best Value Approach"*
- **Best Value-Total Cost of Ownership Approach** - *TCO analysis requires technical and financial management resources beginning with the car builder evaluation phase, through the design approval phase. It also requires the verification of operational and maintenance cost over the life of the vehicle systems and components.*
- **Other Metrics**- *If TCO is not utilized; benefits can still be measure by the systems/component measurement against reliability metrics, Mean Distance Between Failure (MDBF) and maintenance metrics, Mean Time To Repair (MTTR) specification requirements. Other common metrics are warranty repair experience and cost of spare parts over time. However, these activities also require management analysis and verification of data.*

Task 2E – *If an item is rejected for standardization, what should the process for reviewing the reasons given and potentially re-evaluating the decision?*

Recommendation:

Car Builder Standardization Plan Requirement - *It is recommended that the responsibility to develop a Standardization Program be shifted from the SWG to the prospective car builders for bidding on NGEC procurements. This issue should be revisited and examined during the RFP evaluation phase and the car builder Standardization Plan should include a provision or process for re-evaluating candidate components previously rejected, and the rationale or criteria for re-evaluation (technical or economic) should be articulated."*

Following Larry's summary, Ron Adams asked "are you looking for the manufacturer to track life cycle costs?"

Kevin Kesler responded that this is not what is intended, explaining that in order to evaluate proposals for standards, carbuilders would submit an estimate of life cycle costs. This would provide an opportunity to compare the different proposals that come in. There is no requirement or penalty intended.

Larry Salci explained that the key is the methodology used. "Ask for the methodology they have used." The purpose here is to find a reasonable estimate around life cycle costs on standardized items. The evaluators will need to decide if what is provided is reasonable or not.

Larry did note that he found a typo on page 33of the report, and he will correct that and send it to Steve Hewitt after the call.

After some additional discussion, a motion was made by Paul Nissenbaum, FRA, to accept and approve the report as submitted by Larry Salci. Al Ware, Georgia DOT, seconded the motion.

Steve Hewitt polled the voting members of the Board:

Mario Bergeron, Amtrak – aye
Mario Bergeron as proxy for DJ Stadtler – aye
Al Ware, Georgia DOT, - aye

Paul Nissenbaum, FRA – aye
Eric Curtit, Missouri DOT - aye
Eric Curtit as proxy for Bill Bronte, Caltrans – aye
Eric Curtit as proxy for George Weber, Illinois DOT – aye
Ray Hessinger, NYSDOT – aye
John Sibold, Washington State DOT – aye
Ron Adams, Wisconsin DOT – aye
Joe Kyle, Oklahoma DOT – aye

With a quorum present and all represented members voting in favor, the chair determined that consensus had been achieved and the motion was approved.

Discussion: proposal for implementation of Standardization Recommendations – Kevin Kesler/Larry Salci:

Kevin Kesler, FRA, and Larry Salci, provided an overview of their memo to the Board in regards to “Standardization Language for the NGEN Bi-level Request for Proposals (RFP)”.

Kevin described the memo as “taking the essence of the report and, essentially, extracting specific recommendations for implementation in the procurement process to be used in the RFP as what is being sought in the Standardization Plan, and how it will be evaluated.”

He went on to add, that these were only recommendations and would still need to be approved by the JPTF core team. He noted that he is “asking the Board to recommend this language to the JPTF core team.”

Larry Salci explained. “guidance language is really all we are suggesting. It gives a benchmark on how individuals view standardization.”

Further, he stated “the language we are suggesting for the RFP is subject to modification by the JPTF core team and/or Caltrans and IDOT.”

Ron Adams asked if this language is in the technical specification.

The response is no – but the memo cross references the specification.

Kevin added that there is a specification side and a procurement document side – this would be for the procurement document side.

Mario Bregeron asked what would happen if a responder takes exception and does not offer a response on standardization.

Kevin Kesler answered, if a responder says, “no, I have nothing to offer as a standard, so I won’t do so and here is my justification.” In the review of the proposal this would be part of the overall consideration.

Kevin emphasized, “this is very important to the Department of Transportation and should be important to all on this call for maintaining and operating their fleet. It has been a difficult road to get to standardization, but this is a reasonable proposal as a first step to send to Caltrans and IDOT. This makes us look less like the Tower of Babel and more like the freight railroads.”

Ray Hessinger, NYSDOT, offered a motion “to move this memo forward to the JPTF core team to use as guidance in developing proposal instructions and evaluation criteria to achieve standardization.”

This motion was seconded by Paul Nissenbaum, FRA.

Steve Hewitt polled the voting members of the Board:

Mario Bergeron, Amtrak – aye
Mario Bergeron as proxy for DJ Stadler – aye
Al Ware, Georgia DOT, - aye
Paul Nissenbaum, FRA – aye
Eric Curtit, Missouri DOT - aye
Eric Curtit as proxy for Bill Bronte, Caltrans – aye
Eric Curtit as proxy for George Weber, Illinois DOT – aye
Ray Hessinger, NYSDOT – aye
John Sibold, Washington State DOT – aye
Ron Adams, Wisconsin DOT – aye

The next Executive Board Conference call is April 3, 2012 11:30 am Eastern

Decisions/Action Items

The NGEC Scope and Budget for the period from April 1, 2012 through March 31, 2013 was approved by the Executive Board, subject to grant approval. The document will be posted on the AASHTO website.

Ken Uznanski will work with the Amtrak grants people and submit the approved NGEC Scope and Budget to the FRA for grant approval.

Ken will work with the FRA on finding a process and methodology for transferring funds from the Board to the appropriate subcommittees or task forces.

The SFTF SOW for Section 6 and deployment was approved by the Executive Board. AASHTO was approved as the contracting agent for carrying out this competitive bid contract.

Eric noted that the next step is to move it forward in parallel with AASHTO, to do the necessary steps with AASHTO as the contract agent.

On March 16, 2012, the Administrative task force approved "Procedures for Handling External Contacts with the Executive Board. The Board received the approved proposal on March 16, 2012. On today's call, it was decided to table a vote on the proposal until the next Board conference call (April 3, 2012) to give members more time for review.

Steve Hewitt will ensure that this is an agenda item for April 3, 2012.

On today's call, the Executive Board formally accepted/approved the Standardization Assessment Report as submitted by Larry Salci.

Steve Hewitt will provide the final report (with a corrected typo) to AASHTO and ask that it be posted to the website in a PDF version.

On today's call, the Executive Board a motion to move the memo "Standardization Language for the NGEC Bi-level Request for Proposals (RFP)" forward to the JPTF core team to use as guidance in developing proposal instructions and evaluation criteria to achieve standardization."

Immediately following today's call, Steve Hewitt will send the memo and the Final (approved) Standardization Assessment Report to the JPTF core team in preparation for their conference call – March 21, 2012.

The Change management during Procurement report and recommendations was adopted by the Executive Board March 6, 2012. Jeff Gordon, FRA, will provide Steve Hewitt with a final – cleaned up – version for distribution and posting. (**carryover item**)

Melissa Shurland has checked with Gary Talbot to see what his intentions were when he made his recommendations in the report to Wisconsin DOT re: Talgo. Melissa reported to the Technical subcommittee on this issue on March 15, 2012. The issue remains unresolved. Kevin Kesler and Melissa are meeting with the Access Board and the OST on March 20, 2012 and, among other discussions will try to get clarification on this issue. They will then report back to the Technical subcommittee and subsequently to the Board. (**carryover item**)

Bi-level car Revision C is progressing – the Review Panel and the Technical subcommittee have the Rev C summary sheet and are reviewing it in parallel. The Technical subcommittee will vote for approval of Rev C on March 29, 2012; the Review Panel will consider Larry Salci’s REV C report and recommendations (likely on March 28, 2012) and the Executive Board should be ready to vote on approval of Rev C on April 3, 2012.

ATTACHMENTS



**S305 NGEC Executive Board Conference Call
March 20, 2012
11:30 AM – 1:00PM Eastern
Call in number: 866 299 7945 passcode: 1601544#
Agenda**

- | | |
|---|--------------------|
| 1. Open the Meeting | Mario Bergeron |
| 2. Roll Call | Steve Hewitt |
| 3. Review the Agenda: | Mario Bergeron |
| 4. Approval of Minutes from March 6, 2012 conference call | Mario Bergeron |
| 5. Review and consider for approval: NGEC combined Budget/Scope | Mario/Ken Uznanski |
| 6. Review and consider for approval: SFTF – SOW – Section 6 | Eric Curtit |
| 7. Review and consider for approval: Administration Task force proposal: Procedures for handling External Contacts with the Executive Board | Al Ware |
| 8. Consider for Acceptance/Approval: Standardization Assessment Report | Mario/Larry Salci |

- | | |
|---|----------------------------|
| 9. Discussion: Proposal for implementation of Standardization Recommendations | Kevin Kesler/Larry Salci |
| 10. Status: Bi-Level Revision C | Mario Bergeron/Dave Warner |
| 11. Other: | All |

ATTACHMENT

| Status Update: Action Items from 3-6-12 Executive Board Conference Call |
|--|
| <p>The SFTF will move forward with developing a SOW for outside consultant services for developing a work plan to be presented to the Board by September, 2012. The SOW was distributed to the SFTF members on February 24, 2012 and is under review. Comments are due by March 7, 2012 for discussion on the March 12, 2012 SFTF conference call. status update : The SFTF Sow was approved by the SFTF on March 12, 2012 and submitted to the Board on March 13, 2012 for its consideration on March 20, 2012.</p> |
| <p>By March 20, 2012, The Administrative task force will have a draft proposal for handling outside requests for meeting with the Executive Board and for handling responses to letters. status update: The Admn task force reviewed a revised proposal on March 16, 2012 and approved the proposal. It has been sent to the Board for its review and possible consideration.</p> |
| <p>The Administrative Task force will develop a proposal for contracting with AASHTO to produce the Railroad 101 webinar series. The proposal will follow NGEC sole source contract procedures. More discussion is needed and input from AASHTO – the task force hopes to further those discussions on its next call – March 16, 2012. Status update: A draft SOW was proposed as a proposed sole source contract with the AASHTO Rail Resource Center. Further discussions resulted in revising the proposal to incorporate the RR 101 scope and budget as a part of the AASHTO support services (with the additional budget) rather than as a separate contract.</p> |
| <p>The Executive Board has received the Standardization Report from Larry Salci and will review it and consider it during the March 20, 2012 conference call. Status update: This item is on the agenda for this call and is anticipated that the Board will consider approving/acceptance of the Report</p> |
| <p>By the end of next week (March 16, 2012) FRA and Larry Salci will put together a recommendation on how to implement the recommendations provided in the Standardization assessment report. Status update: This item is on the agenda for this call and it is anticipated that Kevin Kesler and Larry Salci will provide an overview/summary of their recommendations for implementation.</p> |
| <p>Ken Uznanski will develop a revised scope. He will work, as needed, with the chairs (and AASHTO) to fill in the gaps and with Chad Edison as the FRA point person. The scope will be sent to the Executive Board through Steve Hewitt by COB on Monday, March 12, 2012. The Scope will include all of the ongoing responsibilities and items that have been fleshed out, along with the dollars tied to those responsibilities. The remaining funding (since all of the funding is intended to be obligated) that is not yet specifically identified in the scope, will be put in an Executive Board contingency fund until its scope can be fleshed out more clearly. The Executive Board members are to provide any comments they have to Steve Hewitt and Ken Uznanski by COB on March 14, 2012. Steve will distribute the comments to all Board members and Ken will revise the scope accordingly. The revised scope will be distributed to the Board through Steve Hewitt by COB Friday, March 16, 2012. On March 20, 2012, the Executive Board will hold its regularly scheduled call and one agenda item will be consideration of the revised scope. Status Update: The above described steps have been taken – this item is now on this agenda for Board consideration for approval.</p> |
| <p>The Change management during Procurement report and recommendations was adopted by the Executive Board on this call. Jeff Gordon will provide Steve Hewitt with a final – cleaned up – version for distribution and posting. Status Update: Awaiting “clean” version for posting and distribution.</p> |
| <p>Melissa Shurland will check with Gary Talbot to see what his intentions were when he made his recommendations in the report to Wisconsin DOT. Melissa will report back to the Board on this issue on March 20, 2012. Status update: Melissa reported on her findings on the Technical subcommittee call on March 15, 2012. Since the FRA is meeting with the Access Board and the OST on March 20, 2012 and this will be a part of that discussion, and she will be following up with the AWG and the Technical subcommittee, the Board report will follow on a subsequent call.</p> |

