

# SECTION 305 NGEC

## Executive Board Conference Call Meeting

MINUTES

MARCH 6, 2012

11:30 AM  
EASTERN

CONFERENCE CALL

<b>FACILITATOR</b>	<i>Bill Bronte, Chair, S305 NGEC Executive Board</i>
<b>ATTENDEES</b>	<b>Executive Board Members:</b> <i>Bill Bronte, Mario Bergeron, DJ Stadtler, Alan Ware, Paul Nissenbaum, Eric Curtit, George Weber, Ray Hessinger, Pat Simmons, John Sibold, Ron Adams, Ron Adams proxy for Joe Kyle</i> <b>Support Staff:</b> <i>Steve Hewitt, Leo Penne, Shayne Gill, David Ewing, Larry Salci, Chad Edison, Kevin Kesler, Jeff Gordon, Melissa Shurland, Nico Lindenau, Ryan Swick, Gordon Hutchinson, Ken Uznanski, Dale Engelhardt, Dave Warner,</i>
<b>ABSENTEES</b>	<b>Board Members:</b> <i>Tammy Nicholson, Kevin Lawson, Joe Kyle (Joe was represented by Ron Adams as his proxy)</i> <b>Support Staff:</b> <i>Whitney Phend, Drew Galloway, Robin McCarthy, Andy House, Zach O'Connor, John Tunna, Tim Hoeffner,</i>

### WELCOME/ROLL CALL/MINUTES

**Opening – Bill Bronte, Chair:**

Bill Bronte 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).

**Welcome/opening remarks- Bill Bronte:**

Chairman Bronte welcomed all members to the call and noted that it was "good to see you all at the Annual meeting two weeks ago, and I would like to thank all of those who re-elected the Board."

**Approval of the Minutes from the February 23, 2012 NGEC Annual Meeting – Bill Bronte:**

On a motion by Al Ware, Georgia DOT, and a second by Ron Adams, Wisconsin DOT, the minutes of the NGEC Annual Meeting of February 23, 2012 were approved without objection or exception.

### Agenda Items

**2012-2013 NGEC Budget/Scope discussions/status/timeline – Bill, Paul, Ken:**

Chairman Bronte introduced the agenda item regarding the 2012-2013 NGEC Budget and Scope, calling it a "thorny issue" and asked, "how do we do it? How do we get it to a proposal?" Bill called the process of getting this scope and budget approved as difficult in the sense that the NGEC is going through a "maturation process." He noted that he understood that Ken Uznanski, Chad Edison and Nico Lindenau had had several conversations in recent weeks, and asked Ken to "give us a reprise as to where we are."

Ken Uznanski reported that during the last call (February 14, 2012) Paul Nissenbaum, FRA, had indicated that FRA "had questions in regards to the underpinnings of the budget- how pieces fit together, and how to address the continued evolving of the Committee and its structure."

Ken also noted that he believes that Chairman Bronte and Paul Nissenbaum had spoken, but didn't know if DJ Stadtler and Paul had connected yet. (DJ responded that – yes they had talked) Ken added that he and Bill had some discussions as well.

As a result of some of the discussions, Ken has modified parts of the scope to address the concerns expressed by FRA, but "I need more direction from Bill, Paul, and DJ as to where you want to go. Is this the time to modify the structure? What do I put in the scope?"

Bill Bronte responded that "I am uncomfortable having a drastic change to the structure until the Structure and Finance Task Force (SFTF) work is complete enough to have Executive Board approval of that work product". Bill reiterated, "we need to revise the budget – but I don't want too significantly change it until the SFTF concludes its work."

DJ Stadler stated that he was "Ok with this approach", and added that the Finance subcommittee has "funds in the budget for an audit...the rest overlaps with other groups" such as the SFTF and the Administrative task force. "I'll strip all of the funds (in the Finance subcommittee budget) to get a clearer direction for the SFTF." He went on to say, he wants to "keep it as lean as possible." He also noted that the Board "could put funds in holding to get them obligated " and added "that would be appropriate."

Paul Nissenbaum commented that he is "comfortable with what Bill and DJ are saying. Ideally, what the SFTF needs to do is get specific about what it will do in an RFP. I am comfortable with holding the budget in reserve for the Executive Board to determine what to do with it."

Leo Penne, AASHTO, asked "What does it mean to hold the budget? AASHTO will have expenses beyond the end of March, 2012" which is as far as the current agreement goes.

Paul responded, "I want to know what the core items are that must continue in order to administer here. I see no break in that...the responsibilities of AASHTO and Amtrak are ongoing."

Chad Edison, FRA, suggested, "you could amend the existing agreement with Amtrak to obligate partial funds to cover those ongoing responsibilities."

Bill Bronte added, "FRA has said it needs to know what everybody is doing, including David Ewing, Steve Hewitt, and Ken Uznanski" and that is "an important aspect of this."

Ken Uznanski noted that "I have been modifying those elements, but wasn't ready to present them today – I will continue to work through that."

Ken then asked if it was decided that the direction is to modify the grant agreement to "partially obligate " the funds for the ongoing responsibilities and leave the rest on hold?

Paul Nissenbaum stated, "No, we should obligate all of the money, but not do a full budget until we have clear priorities and activities" identified.

Ken went on to describe the scope and budget information he has so far:

- The Technical subcommittee has items in its scope that are ongoing, such as completing the DMU specification development, a dual-mode specification forthcoming, etc. "I will submit this scope with the dollars tied to it."
- The Administrative task force has its functions submitted
- The finance subcommittee – DJ has said he will strip out everything but the costs of the audit.
- The SFTF draft SOW is out for comment this week

Paul Nissenbaum interjected, "the bottom line is to have the technical subcommittee's ongoing tasks keep going and the support functions – conference calls, notes, minutes and so on must continue. Clarification of what the support functions are would be helpful, but they need to continue." He went on to add, "my issues are with the Finance subcommittee, the Administrative task force and the SFTF – within those committees, sort of what I would call the softer side of the house, we need to figure the priorities out."

Leo Penne reminded the members that AASHTO's support service also included managing and maintaining the website for the Committee.

Bill Bronte asked Ken Uznanski "when can you have something for us to review?"

Ken said he thought he could get something out by Thursday, and would expect the subcommittee and task force chairs to comment and "turnaround quickly."

Bill Bronte said he thought getting it to the Board by next Monday, March 12, 2012, would be more reasonable.

After additional discussion around getting a proposal for review and a timeline for the action, Steve Hewitt asked for clarification to be sure he was capturing the intended actions correctly. He then repeated what he believed were the actions and timelines:

- Monday, March 12, 2012, the proposal for the scope goes to the Executive Board members through Steve Hewitt.

- By COB on Wednesday, March 14, 2012, Executive Board member comments are due to Steve Hewitt and Ken Uznanski. Steve will share them with all Board members, and Ken will revise the draft to reflect the comments received.
- Ken will provide a revised draft scope by COB on Friday, March 16, 2012.
- The intent or, at least the goal, will be to take Board action on the proposal on the March 20, 2012 Executive Board call.

Consensus was that this was the correct action items list and timelines.

Steve then asked for clarification in regards to the amount of the funding to be obligated. He stated that he had heard suggestions for partial obligation, and for obligating all of the funds and holding part of the budget not yet clarified in a contingency fund.

Chad Edison stated, "the goal is to obligate it all, and not hold up the funding."

Ken Uznanski suggested that we put whatever we have not fully developed in the scope in an Executive Board contingency fund. Paul Nissenbaum agreed that this was a good approach, and added that it is what "was done last year."

Ken then asked if there was a lead person for FRA that he could talk to.

Paul Nissenbaum responded, "Chad Edison is the point person for Ken."

David Ewing raised the issue of the SFTF having other costs associated to it "beyond the SOW". He identified those as "support functions that the FRA had funded directly in the past."

Kevin Kesler added that it was FRA's intent to have some of the SFTF support, such as Larry Salci and Sharma Associates, funded in an NGECC contract through AASHTO rather than as a direct cost to FRA.

It was suggested that Ken work with the subcommittee and task force chairs. It was clarified that these "support functions" being described by David and Kevin, were apart from "keeping the lights on". These would fall under consulting in the SFTF, but are in support of the SFTF scope.

David Ewing identified the role of the Administrative task force as providing the "housekeeping: for the NGECC. He added that the Finance subcommittee, which was now looking at the audit as its primary function, had originally been also tasked with "looking at financing measures going forward" and, now much of that is in the SFTF SOW – including "financing techniques".

DJ Stadler suggested that "when there is a need to pursue other sources of funding, we may want to consider establishing a one - time subgroup or task force to look at that".

David Ewing urged DJ to take a close look at the SFTF SOW that is currently out for review and, suggested, in the end "we may want to enhance the F in the SFTF".

DJ emphasized that the "core issue" is that "we may not need a Finance subcommittee."

Bill Bronte noted, "I am having an underlying issue...what is our mission?" In the first two years getting products out (meaning the PRIIA Specs) was the focus, but now that has shifted.

Paul Nissenbaum agreed, "it is worth taking a look at the mission of 305" it "has been up and running for two years" and it is good to look at it again – but "not by the next meeting."

Bill Bronte then asked Paul Nissenbaum, "Where are we on the development of a National Rail Plan – and would a vision for 305 mesh with it?"

Paul responded, "this is a topic for another day, but it is likely that there will be a multiple of products in the National Rail Plan, including equipment strategy."

Ultimately it was agreed that these items would be discussed at a future date.

Bill Bronte then asked Steve Hewitt to go back to clarify, once more, what the action items and timelines were.

Steve commented that he would try, although he felt like we had drifted into some of the "soft side of the house discussions today", and that Ken would likely need to have discussions with the chairs as he developed the revised draft scope.

Steve then identified what he believed were the actions and timelines:

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 it's 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**.

Steve asked if this seemed to be an accurate description of the actions, and hearing no comments, objections or corrections, Bill Bronte closed the discussion, and agreed that the Board will proceed along the lines Steve Hewitt had just described.

#### **Consideration Change management during procurement – procedures – Bill, Jeff Gordon:**

Jeff Gordon gave a brief overview of the report on the Change Management during Procurement process with recommendations that were being proposed for Board consideration. Jeff reported that the report was sent to the Board on February 7, 2012, and was the 4<sup>th</sup> version of the report. This version reflects the Board's earlier feedback.

Jeff added that he believes the process described is consistent with the Board's intent.

Larry Salci commented that "I believe the major issues have been addressed."

(At this point, Paul Nissenbaum needed to leave the call, but designated Kevin Kesler to vote for FRA)

After additional discussion and review of the process recommendations, Bill Bronte wondered if the intent was to vote on this today or "should it be put off till the next meeting?"

Ron Adams, Wisconsin, stressed the point that "we have had this for a month, I would move that we adopt it."

Eric Curtit, Missouri, seconded the motion to adopt.

Steve Hewitt polled the Board:

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

Not present or represented for the vote:

Pat Simmons, NCDOT  
Tammy Nicholson, Iowa DOT  
Kevin Lawson, Louisiana DOT

With all present or represented by proxy voting Aye, the Chairman determined that consensus had been achieved and the report and recommendations contained therein was adopted.

Steve Hewitt asked Jeff Gordon to provide him with a clean final version of the report for distribution and posting to the website. Jeff agreed to do so.

Jeff also added that, like all of the various processes we develop, this one, too, can be changed if there are areas that are bumpy and need to be smoothed out. "It can be changed at any time."

**Consideration/discussion Standardization Independent Assessment – revised report – Bill Bronte/Larry Salci:**

Larry Salci provided an overview of the Standardization report which he had revised based on feedback from the Board, and feedback received during the Annual Meeting. "Yesterday (March 5, 2012) the final report was distributed. I changed the format and edited some language for clarity, but did not change substance." He added that he had "re-looked at areas to be sure the wording did not create issues for the NGECC or public relations."

He referred the members to Page 23 of the report and walked them through the basic premises and resulting recommendations described therein:

*"Examples of successful standardization in other transportation industries include automotive, aerospace, and rail freight. There are several common factors in these industries that encourage standardization. They are all profitable (generally) private sector industries, in which product designs to serve customers are driven by economics of improving their cost structures and competitive position. All utilize the architectural platform approach to developing vehicle or aircraft designs. In autos, there are small car, mid-size car and large car platforms that use common and interchangeable engine/transmission components, electrical components, seat components, HVAC systems, wheels, etc. In the aerospace industry, Boeing by example has platforms for 737, 747, 757, 767, and 777 models, that all utilize common components for avionics, toilet systems, interior lighting, seat designs, jet engines, brake systems, and interior doors and panels. The Class I freight railroads utilize (through stock ownership) Trailer Train (TTX) for platform designs for high volume freight cars, e.g. low-level double stack flat cars, box cars, and high cube hopper cars. They all have common components, couplers, brakes, wheels, and axles. All these industries designs are driven by private sector customer demand; the manufactures control the product design process, have the advantage of predictable financing from capital markets, generate large volume orders on an annual basis, and compete in global markets.*

*In contrast, the passenger railcar market is characterized by public ownership, unpredictable public finance of capital order needs, the design process is historically controlled by owner technical specifications due to historical infrastructure or owner preferences, and U.S. vehicle safety design standards differ from Europe and Asia standards limiting global design applications to U.S. markets.*

*Therefore, the ability to achieve elements or levels of standardization in the U.S. public sector railcar industry is more challenging as compared to the other private sector transportation industries. However, like the industries above, only the manufacturer can achieve the objectives of standardization and the process recommended to the NGECC is to achieve standardization through the RFP process of requiring car builders to develop Standardization Plans.*

*Standardization efforts should be focused on the major high dollar systems and high usage components. The two high dollar systems above, seats and HVAC were both rejected as Pilot Program Candidates due to no baseline design. The SWG was absolutely correct in selecting these items. However, the standardization of candidate major systems can only be accomplished by the selected car builder.*

*By example, standardization of the HVAC system, a high dollar system, should be a high priority item. Car builders all support what can be defined as a "modular" or top down design approach. Car builders would have preferred starting with a "clean sheet of paper" design approach based on vehicle architecture, but meaningful standardization can still be accomplished within existing NGECC designs. From this vehicle platform the car builder would define the space/weight requirements for the HVAC system, define the electrical, mechanical, pneumatic interface requirements and communicate these design parameters to all HVAC suppliers who can then design their respective HVAC systems to meet the space/location envelope, weight limits, and all interface requirements. The same comment applies to seats, doors, and other high dollar systems that can be standardized via the modular approach.*

*The two primary functions of the car builder in the design of a passenger rail car is to perform or create the design of the carshell structure (including CEM) and integrate all systems and components within the vehicle dimensions. Design all space requirements, weight requirements, which accomplishes form, fit and function or integration into the vehicle and with all other systems and components. The end product or design must meet all design, manufacture, test, and acceptance performance requirements.*

*To date, the success of the SWG (Standardization Working Group) has been limited to stand alone components, like brake discs or brake shoes. Components that meet industry standards can be*

defined for performance and dimensional requirements (fit and function) and procured as a commodity. They do not require detailed design integration with the vehicle carbody by the car builder like seat systems or HVAC systems.

Therefore, the SWG Standardization Process is handicapped because the TWGs rely on industry participants to both identify candidate systems and components and perform evaluation of both the technical suitability and financial/economic benefits of major systems for standardization.

Mr. Salci went on to describe in detail the tasks assigned to him and reviewed most of the Executive Summary beginning on page 8 and describing the tasks and recommendations:

**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 NGECE 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 NGECE program
- **Utilize SWG to Assist in Evaluation Process and Design Phase** -The NGECE 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 NGECE 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 NGECE 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 NGECE 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 NGEC equipment 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., NGEC 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.”

Kevin Kesler commented, that Mr. Salci’s report was “well summarized” He added, “Standardization takes place during procurement and design and the focus is on the interfaces and form, fit, function. He elaborated, “what goes inside the box is up to the vendor.”

Kevin went on to say that “the concept is well defined”...the question for the Committee (NGEC) is “how do we move forward...someone needs to be engaged with the selected carbuilder”

He then proposed establishing a task force to come back to the Board to say how this happens. His recommendation was that the task force would include: Caltrans, Illinois DOT, Amtrak, FRA and Larry Salci. The task force would “recommend how the Committee interacts with procurement and the design process to address standardization.”

Bill Bronte raised the issue of timing – “the question is how we get this into this RFP – due the end of March, 2012?”

Kevin answered that “something has to be to Caltrans no later than 2 weeks – even sooner.” He then suggested, “by the end of next week we have a draft to the Board of who would constitute the NGEC representatives to interact and how they would interact with Caltrans during procurement and design.”

More concerns were raised about the timing, and Steve Hewitt asked who the “we” is that Kevin noted would come back with the recommendations.

Ultimately it was clarified that “By the end of next week (March 16, 2012) FRA and Larry Salci will put together a recommendation on how you would implement his (Larry’s) recommendations.”

Ron Adams asked “how does this fit in the scope of the contract Larry has with AASHTO (as the contracting agent for the NGEC)? The answer was “it doesn’t”. Larry, however noted that he is in contract with FRA through Booz Alan Hamilton for work related to the SFTF and this really fits into that.

Kevin concurred, and it was the general consensus that they should proceed.

After additional discussion, it was agreed that the Board would not vote to accept the Standardization report and recommendations presented today (received last night – March 5, 2012), to give members a chance to further review it. The Board will plan to vote for acceptance on the



next call – March 20, 2012.

**Status: Bi-level Revision C – Mario Bergeron/Dave Warner:**

Dave Warner provided the following status report for inclusion in the minutes:

*"There were 88 DCRs issued to handle the RFI/Rev. C comments. We received a revised Chapter 12, Communications, chapter last week, so we really believe there will be no more DCRs for us to consider. Over 60 of the DCRs have been adjudicated, including the seven dealing with ADA issues. Our goal is to have the remaining DCRs completed by March 15. If we are able to do this, that would hopefully enable a vote to be taken by the Technical Subcommittee on March 29, followed your approval vote on April 3.*

*Recall that because we're attempting to handle these DCRs under the "Urgent" procedures, the Review Panel will also be given the Summary Sheet on the 15<sup>th</sup>, thus providing a bit more than two weeks to review it before the Executive Board call. I've already given the Review Panel one summary sheet with about 28 adjudicated DCRs on it, and I will provide an updated Summary Sheet to the Review Panel later today."*

Bill Bronte commented that this timeline "pushes the RFP back by a week."

Dave was asked how quickly he could turnaround the final document, once the Board had approved it on April 3, 2012. He responded that, as he has in the past, he is already working with Camren Cordell and expects that, by getting a head start they can turnaround the final document and get it posted within 24 hours of approval by the Board. He said he would not "guarantee" it, but felt strongly that it would be doable.

Bill Bronte responded, "As quick as you can, that's all we can ask for."

Dave also noted that his described schedule was based on the Board meeting schedule.

**Accessibility Working Group – next steps – Kevin Kesler/Melissa Shurland:**

Kevin Kesler and Melissa Shurland reported that on March 20, 2012 they were meeting with the DOT Chief Counsel, Civil Rights Office, and the Access Board to look at future Accessibility recommendations not to impact the bi-level specification, but for future specifications. Within a week of the March 20<sup>th</sup> meeting the AWG would be prepared to make a presentation on the recommendations to the Technical subcommittee.

During the ensuing discussion, Ron Adams asked Kevin Kessler how Gary Talbot's comments concerning the height of the café counter on the TALGO trainsets would apply to the bi-level procurement. Kevin responded that he wasn't aware of the issue but would include it in the March 20<sup>th</sup> meeting. Ron promised to send him the report Gary prepared following his visit to the Talgo equipment. Melissa Shurland stated that Gary's comments on this were a suggestion.

**Other:**

With no other business to come before the Board today, on a motion by Ron Adams, Wisconsin, and a second by Eric Curtit, Missouri, the March 6, 2012 Executive Board conference call was adjourned at approximately 1:10pm Eastern.



<b>ATTACHMENTS</b>



**S305 NGEC Executive Board "Special" Conference Call  
 March 6, 2012  
 11:30 AM – 1:00PM Eastern  
 Call in number: 866 299 7945 passcode: 1601544#  
 DRAFT Agenda**

- |  |                            |
|--|----------------------------|
| 1. Open the Meeting  | Bill Bronte                |
| 2. Roll Call   | Steve Hewitt               |
| 3. Approval of Minutes from February 23, 2012 Annual Meeting             | Bill Bronte                |
| 4. 2012-13 NGEC Budget/Scope discussion/status/timeline                  | Bill/Ken/Paul              |
| 5. Consideration: Change management during procurement - procedures      | Jeff Gordon                |
| 6. Consideration: Standardization Independent Assessment –revised report | Larry Salci                |
| 7. Status: Bi-Level Revision C   | Mario Bergeron/Dave Warner |
| 8. Accessibility Working Group – next steps                              | Kevin/Melissa              |
| 9. Other:  | All                        |

**Next Call: March 20, 2012 11:30AM – 1:00PM Eastern**