

# SECTION 305 NGEN

## Executive Board Meeting – Portland, ME

MINUTES

SEPTEMBER 20,  
2012

8:30AM EASTERN

<b>FACILITATOR</b>	<i>Bill Bronte, Chair, S305 NGEN Executive Board</i>
<b>ATTENDEES</b>	<b>Executive Board Members:</b> <i>Bill Bronte, Mario Bergeron (phone) Al Ware (phone), Darrell Smith as proxy for Gordon Hutchinson, Chad Edison as proxy for Paul Nissenbaum, Eric Curtit, Kevin Lawson, Tammy Nicholson, Ray Hessinger (phone) Paul Morris, Johnson Bridgwater, Ron Pate as proxy for John Sibold, Ron Adams, <b>Support Staff:</b> Anthony Fuller, Steve Hewitt, David Ewing, Larry Salci, Kevin Kesler (phone), Whitney Phend (phone), Jeff Gordon, Nico Lindenau, Dale Engelhardt, Vincent Brotski, Leo Penne, <b>Industry members:</b> Steve Morrison, Jack Martinson, Chuck Wochele,(phone), Brian Beeler II, Daniel McNair</i>
<b>ABSENTEES</b>	<b>Board Members:</b> <i>John Oimoen <b>Support Staff:</b> Tim Hoeffner, Jason Biggs, Robin McCarthy, Dave Warner, Melissa Shurland, John Tunna,</i>

### WELCOME/ROLL CALL/MINUTES

**Opening – Self introductions Bill Bronte:**

Bill Bronte opened the conference call meeting, and asked Steve Hewitt to call the roll.

**Roll Call – establishing a quorum - Steve Hewitt:**

Steve Hewitt took a roll of Executive Board members, and the presence of a quorum was confirmed with 13 of 14 Board members present or represented by proxy. Illinois DOT absent.

#### Agenda Items

**Welcome and Opening Remarks – Bill Bronte:**

Chairman Bill Bronte welcomed all participants – in person- and on the phone – to today’s NGEN Executive Board meeting. He noted that “we should be proud of the work we have done –and the many accomplishments we have had since the 2010 inception of the 305 NGEN.”

He noted that in that short period of time, the NGEN had adopted five PRIIA specifications and is now in the process of two procurements. He reported that the cost opening for the Bi-level cars is planned for next week.

“You should pat yourselves on the back for all the work you’ve done while juggling your own jobs.”

He also expressed thanks to AASHTO for making all of the arrangements for this meeting and, especially thanked Andrea Ryan for her hard work in making all of the logistical arrangements for us.

**Approval of the Minutes from the September 4, 2012 Executive Board conference call – Bill Bronte:**

On a motion by Paul Morris, NCDOT, and a second by Eric Curtit, Missouri DOT, the minutes of the September 4, 2012 conference call meeting of the Executive Board were approved without objection.

**Review of Action Items – Steve Hewitt:**

Bill Bronte will continue to keep the Board “generally” apprised of the progress of the bi-level railcar procurement and of the progress of the locomotive procurement. **Status: This item is on today’s agenda as a JPTF**

**update.**

Jeff Gordon will continue to provide the AASHTO, Amtrak and FRA public affairs officers with email notifications of NGEN activities. This week, he will, specifically inform them of the adoption of the DMU specification (the fifth PRIIA specification to date). Bill Bronte will send the contact info for Caltrans public affairs to Jeff to add to his email list. **Status: This is ongoing. Jeff Gordon, FRA provides email updates to the four public affairs offices, and they determine what "Press is worthy". The adoption of the DMU specification was captured in an article in the September 7, 2012 edition of the AASHTO Journal. Steve Hewitt forwarded the Journal article to all Board members and all Technical subcommittee members and industry participants.**

**Bill Bronte mentioned to Jeff Gordon that it was his understanding that there have been discussion in regards to press for the announcement of the cost opening on September 25<sup>th</sup>.**

Steve Hewitt will send Ron Adams the Conflict of Interest (COI) form for his signature prior to the convening of the Bi-level Review panel for Rev C.1. **Status: Task complete – COI signed by Ron Adams.**

Bill Bronte will set up the Review panel call for some time next week (week of September 10, 2012). **Status: This task is complete. The Review Panel met on September 13, 2012, and approved the report with recommendations prepared by consultant Larry Salci. The report has been sent to all Board members and is on today's agenda. Larry Salci will provide a summary presentation, and the Board is expected to consider the Bi-Level Car Revision C.1 for approval today.**

Steve Hewitt will send the approved DMU Review Panel Report to AASHTO for posting to the website. **Status: The DMU Review Panel Report and Recommendation, as approved by the Executive Board on September 4, 2012, has been posted to the AASHTO website. Task Complete**

Darrell Smith and/or Leo Penne will notify Steve Hewitt when the AASHTO/Amtrak Agreement is executed. AASHTO will execute the PB and Salci contracts immediately after the Amtrak/AASHTO agreement is executed. **Status: The Amtrak/AASHTO Support Services agreement has been fully executed. This has freed up AASHTO to finalize the pending contracts with PB and Larry Salci. Eric Curtit and Leo Penne reported today that the PB contract has been executed. The Salci contract is close to being finalized.**

Steve Hewitt and Leo Penne will discuss the need for a webinar for the September 20, 2012 meeting in Portland, ME. **Status: Task complete. The meeting is being conducted as a webinar and conference call.**

The RR101 work plan was approved and the ATF and AASHTO can proceed to implement the webinar series. **Status: Al Ware will provide an update on RR101 in the ATF report today.**

All members are asked to provide any agenda changes they may have to Steve Hewitt and Bill Bronte by COB on September 6, 2012. **Status: Task complete.**

All presentations (power point or handouts) are to be sent to Steve Hewitt by COB September 6, 2012. **Status: Task complete for today's meeting, and following the meeting the presentations will be sent out to all Board members and posted on the website.**

Gordon Hutchinson will let Steve Hewitt know who will handle the Amtrak Update on September 20, 2012. **Status: Task complete – Darrell Smith will provide the Amtrak Update today.**

#### **Treasurer's Report – Darrell Smith:**

Darrell Smith, on behalf of Gordon Hutchinson, provided the following Treasurer's report:

(See separate power point presentation for full report –posted on website)

#### **NGEC Budget:**

- Has accumulated in three periods:
- Jan 1, 2010 – March 31, 2011
- April 1, 2011 – March 31, 2012
- April 1, 2012 – March 31, 2014
- Totals to \$4 million
- Unspent Funding is carried over and reprogrammed in future budget(s)

Budget: 1/1/2010 – 3/31/2011:	4/1/2011 – 3/31/12:	4/1/13 – 3/31/14	Total Budget 1/1/10-3/31/14	
Executive Board -	\$0	\$293,216.	\$835,380.	\$1,128,596.
Technical subcommittee -	\$150,000.	\$500,000.	\$150,000.	\$ 800,000.
Finance subcommittee -	\$0	\$100,000.	\$50,000.	\$ 150,000.
Admn task force -	\$4,500.	\$114,000.	\$65,000.	\$ 183,500.
JPTF -	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
SFTF -	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
AASHTO Support Svces	\$470,000.	\$367,784.	\$899,620.	\$1,737,904.
<b>Total -</b>	<b>\$625,000.</b>	<b>\$ 1,375,000.</b>	<b>\$2,000,000.</b>	<b>\$4,000,000.</b>

**Total Expenditures: 1/1/2010 – 3/31/2012**

Executive Board -	\$0.
Technical Subcommittee -	\$480,138.
Finance subcommittee -	\$0
Admn task force -	\$56,070.
JPTF -	\$0
SFTF -	\$0
AASHTO Support Svces	\$697,780.
<b>Total -</b>	<b>\$1,233.988.</b>

(Includes estimated amounts not yet submitted to FRA)

Estimated Total Remaining Funds as 3/31/2012:	Total Remaining from 1 <sup>st</sup> Grant:	
Executive Board -	\$1,128,596.	\$ 293,216.

Technical Subcommittee-	\$ 319,862.	\$ 169,862
Finance subcommittee -	\$ 150,000.	\$ 100,000.
Admn task force -	\$ 127,430.	\$ 62,430.00
JPTF -	\$0	\$0
SFTF -	\$0	\$0
AASHTO Support Svces	\$1,040,124.	\$140,504.
<b>Total -</b>	<b>\$2,766,012.</b>	<b>\$ 766,012</b>

(Includes estimated amounts not yet submitted to FRA)

**NGEC Has Met Budget Requirements**

- Grant period through 3/31/2012 leaves as estimated \$766,000 to re-program
- New grant period has \$539,938 in contingency

**Budget Adjustments for Discussion and Action:**

4/1/2012 -3/31/2014 Funds:

Recommend Adjustments to:

Executive Board –

Administrative Task Force

AASHTO Support Services

Technical Subcommittee

**Budget Adjustments for Discussion and Action:**

- **\$30,000 funds to AASHTO/Professional Services for support of Technical Committee:**
  - Single Level Revision A (document cleanup)
  - Bi-Level Revision D (public review of the C.1 errata/changes)
  - Trainset Revision A (document cleanup)
  - Locomotive RFP A.1 (section 1.5.12, limited access review from "cone of silence" period)
  - Locomotive Revision B (public review of the A.1 errata/changes  
*Dual Mode Locomotive Initial Release (probably May 2013)*)
  - *DMU Revision A (document cleanup, probably after March 2013)*

**Budget Adjustments for Discussion and Action:**

- **\$40,000 funds to Technical Committee/Professional Services**
  - Further development of technical specifications (continues efforts of Cameron Cordell)
- **\$55,000 funds to Administrative Task Force for Labor for Amtrak Project Manager:**

- **Fills gap from first period grant budget (through 3/31/2012)**

**Adjusts for change in Amtrak project manager approach**

**Budget Adjustments for Approval:**

<b>Category/Line</b>	<b>Previous Amount</b>	<b>Change Amount</b>	<b>Revised Amount</b>
<b>AASHTO Support Services</b>	<b>\$607,958.</b>	<b>\$30,000.</b>	<b>\$637,958.</b>
<b>Administrative Task Force</b>	<b>\$51,000.</b>	<b>\$55,000.</b>	<b>\$106,000.</b>
<b>Technical SC Professional Svcs</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$40,000.</b>	<b>\$40,000.</b>
<b>Executive Board</b>	<b>\$296,042.</b>	<b>(\$125,000)</b>	<b>\$171,042</b>

**Budget Adjustments for Later Discussion:**

- **Have an estimated \$766,000 to re-program from 3/31/2012 grant period**
- **Would still retain contingency of \$539,938 for unforeseen needs**

After completing the Treasurer’s report and recommending that adjustments were needed to the current budget in order to address areas in need of funding for immediate action. The adjustments are simply that, adjustments, which are intended to move money the Executive Board Professional Services line to the appropriate category where the funding is needed and identified (above).

In closing his report, Darrel requested that the proposed adjustments be made.

Chad Edison, FRA, asked “Is there a reason why we take it from the Professional Services line instead of contingency?”

Darrell responded, that “it does make sense because most of it is professional services going to AASHTO”

At this point Bill Bronte asked if there was a motion to approve the recommended adjustments.

A motion to approve was made by Eric Curtit, Missouri DOT, and seconded by Tammy Nicholson, Iowa DOT

Steve Hewitt polled the voting members present:

- Bill Bronte, Caltrans - aye
- Mario Bergeron, Amtrak - aye
- Al Ware, Georgia DOT – aye
- Darrell Smith as proxy for Gordon Hutchinson, Amtrak – aye
- Chad Edison as proxy for Paul Nissenbaum, FRA - aye
- Eric Curtit, Missouri DOT -aye
- Kevin Lawson, Louisiana DOT - aye
- Tammy Nicholson, Iowa DOT - aye
- Ray Hessinger, NYSDOT - aye
- Paul Morris, NCDOT - aye
- Johnson Bridgwater, Oklahoma DOT - aye
- Ron Pate as proxy for John Sibold, Washington State DOT - aye
- Ron Adams, Wisconsin DOT – aye

With a quorum present and all members voting in the affirmative, Chairman Bronte determined that consensus has been achieved and the motion carried.

Chad Edison noted that there is still a need to reprogram the remaining unspent money from the first grant. Members agreed this is a priority.

At this point a discussion ensued in regards to the new travel expense reimbursement form that Darrell has developed, and AASHTO is utilizing as of this meeting. The new form was sent to eligible members and support staff by Steve Hewitt in advance (electronically) and a hard copy was provided this morning.

Darrell reminded all members to "follow all federal travel guidelines, and use the revised form". Darrell elaborated, and Leo Penne, AASHTO, concurred, that if an individual does not follow the guidelines and use the form "AASHTO will bounce it."

He noted that documented receipts for meals are optional but all should use the GSA per diem rate. This rate is better, in most cases, than state per diem rates. Darrell also noted that "meals are at 75% for the initial and last day of travel."

Chad Edison added that "after midnight, it's a new day".

Ron Adams, Wisconsin DOT, referring back to the un-programmed money, asked if it could be transferred to the Executive Board contingency.

Chad Edison responded "this is possible with a stated purpose."

#### **Report From the Finance Subcommittee: Darrell Smith:**

Darrell Smith provided a brief update on the activities of the Finance subcommittee.

The subcommittee meets on a regular basis (every 4 weeks) and has been involved in three primary activities:

- Getting the Amtrak/AASHTO agreement executed and the PB contract finalized and signed.
- NGEA Audit – The subcommittee has agreed that Amtrak should conduct an audit of the NGEA. Dave Warren, Amtrak assistant OIG, is currently developing a scope for the Audit.
- Developing a fact sheet to go over funding and financing options that may be available for the NGEA in going forward. (examples: RRIF, TIFIA, future grants)

The subcommittee will continue to keep the Board apprised as its work progresses.

#### **Report from the Administrative task force – Al Ware:**

Al Ware (on the phone) provided a summary report of the activities of the Administrative task force and highlighted the RR101 program which is overseen by the Administrative task force:

Currently the Administrative task force meets every four weeks on Fridays at 11:00 AM, but more often when the need arises.

Meetings are scheduled for one hour.

ATF meetings have been kept to the minimum required time while still allowing for members input and discussions.

#### **Accomplishments 02/2011 – 9/2012**

- External Contact request procedures for Addressing or other communications with the NGEA Board.  
Lead by Jeff Gordon, FRA (Cambridge SYS), Nancy Greene, Amtrak Legal (formerly)
- Railroading 101 Development of curriculum Schedule and implementation.  
Lead By Tammy Nicholson, Mary Jo Key
- NGEA Specification Utilization form.  
Lead by Jeff Gordon, FRA ( Cambridge SYS), Nancy Greene Amtrak (formerly)
- Member Recruitment Activities for NGEA and ATF.  
Lead by Alan Ware ATF Chairman/ NGEA Secretary and Steve Hewitt.

Al also noted that the task force has undergone a number of changes in members over the past year. The task force has lost members to retirements and/or job changes. Previous members no longer involved are: Joe Kyle,

Oklahoma DOT, Rod Massman, Missouri DOT, and Pat Simmons, NCDOT, as well as Nancy Greene, Amtrak Legal support, and Ken Uznanski, Amtrak NGEC Project Manager (and ATF vice chair).

New members have stepped in and fortified the task force. The newer members include: Tammy Nicholson, Iowa DOT, Mary Jo Keys, Iowa DOT, Johnson Bridgewater, Oklahoma DOT, Darrell Smith, Amtrak, who is the new Amtrak NGEC Project Manager and is also serving as ATF vice chair, and Vincent Brotski, Amtrak Legal.

Al then provided a summary overview of the RR101 webinar series that is a joint effort with the ATF and AASHTO (through its Rail Resource Center).

**What is RR 101?**

- Series of webinars and workshops
- Monthly
- 1 hour in duration
- Passenger Rail and Freight Rail
- Target audience is State DOT rail staff and new generation of rail professionals

**Who is leading RR 101?**

- NGEC and Administrative Task Force
- AASHTO Rail Resource Center providing support
- NGEC budget \$21,500
- Coordinate with FRA Corridor Performance Management Series

**RR 101 Topics (Draft)**

- September 2012: Kickoff at SCORT in Maine
- October 2012: Intro and staffing a DOT Rail office
- November 2012: Rail Planning
- December 2012: Funding
- February 2013: Equipment
- April 2013: Access
- May 2013: Revenue Modeling
- June 2013: Operations and Maintenance
- July 2013: Summing Up/RR 201
- September 2013: Kickoff RR 201 at SCORT in Ohio

**Format of Webinars**

- "Expert" presentation
- State DOT, FRA, Amtrak and industry involved in presentations
- Materials and resources provided in advance
- Follow-up Q&A
- Archive on-line at Rail Resource Center

**Future activities**

- Archive webinars for long-term use
- Identify needs and topics for RR 201

Al closed his presentation with a special thanks to Tammy Nicholson, Shayne Gill, Leo Penne and David Ewing for their hard work in putting together the RR101 series.

Bill Bronte added his thanks to Al and the entire ATF for their hard work and many accomplishments. He also noted how invaluable the RR101 and future RR201 series will be in educating the states and others who participate.

**Update from FRA – Chad Edison:**

Chad Edison provided an FRA update.

He noted that the FRA recognizes the great progress that has been made by the NGEC since its creation in January of 2010. He characterized it as "a lot of progress". The fact that there have been five specifications adopted and two procurements are under way, "is a testimony to the support from the states, Amtrak and the industry." The FRA is very pleased with the great support given by all involved in this effort.

Chad noted "in context with 209 and the increasing implication for that in future procurements", it is important to recognize this "as a business case – if thought through – for purchasing new equipment – there are opportunities

for options on the existing procurements.”

The FRA is hoping to work closely with the states to provide funding opportunities moving forward. The FRA is interested in what the NGECC becomes “when it grows up”. He added, “this next year is an opportunity to work together on this with the SFTF as the vehicle.”

The opportunity for 305 or whatever entity comes out of it to “support states in procurements, including states that do not have adequate staffing resources.”

There are many opportunities over the next 6-12 months and the SFTF will provide ongoing – regular briefings of the Executive Board as a standing agenda item.

#### **Update from Amtrak – Darrell Smith:**

On behalf of Joe McHugh, Amtrak Government Affairs, Darrell Smith provided an update from Amtrak:

- Overview of Amtrak
- State-supported services
- Long Distance trains
- 8 annual ridership records in the last 9 years
- 44% more riders last year than in 2000
- Cut our debt in half since 2002
- 79% farebox recovery – best for a passenger railroad in the U.S.
- More than half our trains reach or exceed 100mph

Growth is occurring at every level – corporate, business line, and individual services:

There have been tremendous increases in ridership across the Amtrak system with a 53% growth since 1998 and 30.2 million riders in 2012.

In short distance corridors ridership has nearly doubled with 14.7 million riders in 2012.

On Time Performance (OTP) across the system has improved greatly as well with increases in OTP in both long distance and short distance corridors.

#### **Equipment:**

##### **Electric Locomotive Order:**

- Contract Award announced October 29, 2010
- First delivery scheduled, 2013
- Revenue service entry scheduled, 2014
- Final delivery expected, 2016 (based on delivery rate of 2/mo.)

##### **Long Distance Single Level Cars:**

Car types and quantities:

Bag/Dorm – base order: 25 additional Option order: 15  
Sleeper - base order: 25 additional option order: 10  
Diner - base order: 25 additional option order: 15  
Baggage - base order: 55 additional option order: 30  
Total - base order: 130 additional option order: 70

Production Car Shipping Goals

- 1st Diner, 2013
- 1st Baggage, 2013
- 1<sup>st</sup> Baggage Dorm, 2014
- 1st Sleeper, 2014
- Final delivery, 2015

#### **Strong share in major markets:**



Amtrak has developed a strong share of riders versus air travel in the major markets:

New York – Washington DC	Air: 23% Rail:77%
New York – Boston	Air: 46% Rail:54%
LA-San Diego	Air: 4% Rail: 96%
Chicago-Milwaukee	Air: 11% Rail: 89%
Seattle – Portland	Air: 31% Rail: 69%
Chicago- St. Louis	Air: 71% Rail: 29%
Chicago – Detroit	Air: 88% Rail: 12%

**All data as of  
1Q FY 2012**

**What drives demand?**

- Changing conditions
  - Traffic
  - Environmental concerns
  - Attitudes
    - In 1983, 69% of 17 year olds could drive
    - In 2010, less than half have a license
- Rail's niche is the sub-500 mile intercity market – and it's a big market
  - More than 79% of 'long distance' trips (50+ miles) fall into this category
  - Number of Americans living in urban areas expected to double (150M to 300M) by 2050
- Together, these indicators point to major coming changes in the way we travel

(\$100.9 billion is about 72 years of Federal Amtrak funding)

**Opportunities in the Midwest:**

Projects Under Way

- 110mph test trains for Chicago-St. Louis coming this year
- 110mph service began on Michigan Line this year
- Michigan Line purchase pending
- New equipment is coming

**The 209 process:**

Events to Date

- June 2011, Amtrak prepared and distributed draft policy
- Fall 2011, Draft policy approved by Amtrak Board and 18 of 19 states
- March 2012, STB issued decision formally adopting methodology
- June 1, 2012, preliminary operating numbers sent out to states
- June 15, 2012, Equipment capital numbers sent out to states
- Summer-Fall 2012, face-to-face meetings to review costs and methodology are ongoing

Next Steps

- Develop details of capital investments for states' share of Amtrak fixed assets, consistent with Section 209 and the Approved Policy
- Update individual State agreements to be compliant with Agreed Methodology – individual state contract cycles, July 2012-2013

**Long Distance services:**

- About 40% of America's rural population enjoys Amtrak access
- Number of Americans served only by Amtrak (i.e., no bus or air service) has tripled since 2005
- Amtrak's long distance services are vital
  - Only Amtrak service on half our system
  - Carry 42% of the passengers with disabilities who use our services
  -

**Funding and the legislative situation:**

- Multiple challenges await us
  - Funded by continuing resolution through March
  - Amtrak requested \$2.1B for FY13
    - House version includes \$1.8B for Amtrak, \$500M of the requires match
    - Senate version includes \$1.45B
  - Sequestration is still a great unknown

- Recent surface reauthorization has some small opportunities
  - No rail title, but:
  - TIFIA loan program expanded
  - CMAQ funding use for rail corridors reauthorized
  - Transportation Alternatives (formerly Transportation Enhancement) funds usable for ADA compliance work

**Improving partner engagement:**

- Ongoing outreach program
  - Key routes
  - Mayors and civic leaders
  - Amtrak suppliers
- Replicating partner survey
  - Expect to hear from us
  - Previous surveys provided valuable data
  - Inform the whole process of strategy development and corporate cultural change

Amtrak is beginning a customer satisfaction survey which will begin with a pre-survey contact with state partners and commuter agencies on September 24, 2012 and conclude with a final report issuance around January 31, 2013.

**Our vision for future partnerships:**

- Our efforts directed toward closer and more collaborative partnership
- 209 process has improved matters
  - Better transparency
  - Clearer understanding
  - Removed perceptions of unequal treatment
- Want to build collaboration while retaining the advantages of a unified national passenger rail system

**Challenging times – but good times, too:**

- We've turned in several great years
  - OTP improvements
  - Ridership records
  - Financial efficiencies
- There are going to be challenges ahead – but the issues are fundamentally different
- Not "will passenger rail survive", but:
  - How will it be organized?
  - How will government be involved?
  - Which investments will we make?

**Report from the Technical subcommittee – Dale Engelhardt:**

On behalf of Chairman Mario Bergeron, the Technical subcommittee vice chair, Dale Engelhardt, provided a summary presentation of the subcommittee activities:

**Overview:**

- Status of Vehicle Specifications
- Document Management System
- Accessibility Working Group
- Standardization Working Group
- Systems Engineering

**Vehicle Specifications – 1:**

- Bi-Level
  - Revision B issued – Jan. 24, 2012
  - Revision C issued Request for Information (RFI) – Apr. 3, 2012
  - RFP Milestones
    - Issued – Apr. 20, 2012
    - Intent to Bid Deadline – May 11, 2012
    - Draft Proposals Due – June 6, 2012

- Final RFP Documents Released – Aug. 15, 2012
- Final Proposals Due – Aug. 24, 2012
- Intent to Award and Notice to Proceed – Mid October

#### **Vehicle Specifications – 2:**

- Locomotive
  - Revision A issued – July 10, 2012
  - RFI
    - Issued by Joint Procurement Task Force – July 6, 2012
    - Responses Due – July 20, 2012
    - Response Review Team Meeting – Aug. 9, 2012
  - Request for Proposal
    - Under Review-TBD
    - Issue Date-TBD
    - Award in 2013

#### **Vehicle Specifications – 3:**

- Diesel Multiple Unit
  - Initial Draft Posted – April 19, 2012
  - Comment Period Ended – May 11, 2012
  - Tech. Subcommittee Approval – June 14, 2012
  - Executive Board Approval – Sept. 4, 2012
- Dual Mode Locomotive
  - Tentative Specification 3Q 2013
  - Most Work to Follow Locomotive RFP

#### **Vehicle Specifications – 4:**

- Single Level Car
  - Worked on 144 DCRs based on Bi-Level Revs. A, B and C.
  - Summary Sheet Approved – Sept. 13, 2012
  - Presently at Review Panel
  - Anticipate Executive Board (EB) Approval – Late Fall
- Trainset
  - Nothing to Report
  - Next in Line for “Clean Up DCR Effort”

#### **Document Management:**

- Change Management Process
  - Rev. A Approved by EB on June 26, 2012
    - Change Management During Limited Participation
    - Developed ADA-Related Change Process
  - ADA Change Process
    - Involves Accessibility Working Group to evaluate DCRs:
      - Exceed Existing Regulatory Requirements, or
      - Not covered by a Requirements Document
    - Formalizes Important, but Difficult, Task

#### **Accessibility Working Group:**

- Led by FRA
  - Develop Recommendations for future accommodation of passengers with wide variety of disabilities.
  - Wide Variety of Membership
- Current Efforts
  - Dual Mode Communications
  - Assistive Loop System Installation

#### **Systems and Standardization:**

- Systems Engineering Task Force
  - Nothing to Report Beyond Document Mgmt. Efforts

- Standardization Task Force
  - “Way Forward” Report Presented in Feb.
  - Efforts Should Resume Once Specific Components Are Identified for Bi-Level Car.

Discussion:

Kevin Kesler, FRA, reported that the Accessibility Working Group (AWG) met yesterday (September 19, 2012) via conference call. He noted that there is concern being expressed about the process moving forward – especially in regards to signage and communications. If all recommendations from this activity call for cost benefits there is a negative impact on the disabled community. Kevin added that the AWG has not come to a conclusion on this issue yet, but will.

Mario Bergeron asked Kevin if he has a recommendation for a way forward.

Kevin responded that, it is only his opinion, but the “approach should be to look to standardization on interface and the rest should be based on a performance level.” He added that Gary Talbot, Amtrak, is drafting proposed language to go into the requirements. These would first be reviewed by the AWG, and, if approved there, be brought forward to the Technical subcommittee.

Mario Bergeron stated that the Technical subcommittee has talked about a best way forward to integrate these kinds of changes, but “we are now meeting the regulations, and these features would enhance the regulations.” It ultimately “becomes a policy decision which is beyond the Technical aspect as to whether to include in the specifications or not.” He asked, “is it the Technical subcommittee or is it at the policy level which is the responsibility of the Executive Board?” Mario continued, “in the end it is a closed loop, but at the start it may not be a technical issue.” He elaborated that he believes “it is a complex issue and placing technical experts in a position to address policy decisions causes a lot of tension.”

Kevin Kesler responded “that is precisely the challenge. The Technical subcommittee should evaluate technologies, and, the AWG and the Technical subcommittee can examine costs, but it is not right for it to make judgment calls on policy. Policy issues should go to the Board.”

Ron Adams asked if the issue of counter top heights has been resolved. Are we to go to commercial standards when there is no standard in the regs? How do we resolve it?

Kevin responded that he believes calling for “architectural standards is the answer -it is expected practice when there are no standards”, but that he is not certain of what the status is in regards to the question that has been raised. He will check with Melissa Shurland and try to get back to the Board on this today.

Bill Bronte noted “I think that Linda Martin (FRA) maintains that architectural standards do not apply. I got the impression from Linda relative to architectural standards – that they should not be imposed.”

Kevin responded “well Linda is our expert” on this. “I will get verification and come back to the Board.”

Chad Edison asked Whitney Phend, FRA (who was on the phone) to work with Kevin and Linda on this.

Mario Bergeron interjected “if there is a change we will ask that legal deciders provide us with the decision before it goes public so we have a general understanding.”

Paul Morris, NCDOT noted “this is a real time issue and it needs to be resolved quickly.” We need “clarity on the policy and we need the Board to make a judgment based on technical input.”

Dale Engelhardt emphasized how this could really have a major impact on the car and needs to be resolved.

Mario Bergeron commented, “to circle back with the Technical subcommittee...to review the process that provides the Technical subcommittee to make policy decisions and go back to the Board with a recommendation as it affects policy. We can propose a different policy than we have today for approaching DCRs and take it to the Board.”

It was ultimately agreed that the Technical subcommittee would take the action of looking at its current DCR process as it pertains to Accessibility changes. Even if the process is deemed to need no change from its current policy, the Technical subcommittee will still bring it to the Board to “reconfirm”.

**Re-convening the Single Level Car Review Panel – Bill Bronte:**

Following up on the Technical subcommittee’s September 13, 2012 approval of the Single level car Revision A Summary sheet Bill Bronte called for a reconvening of the Single level Review Panel.

Steve Hewitt provided an explanation of the process. Once the subcommittee has approved a specification or revisions to a specification, it submits it to the Executive Board Chair (Bill Bronte). The Chair then convenes a Review Panel which is charged with comparing the specification (or the revision) to the Requirements document for that particular specification and ensure compliance. A consultant to the Review Panel (Larry Salci has been that consultant) prepares a report with recommendations based on his review of the revisions and their compliance with the Requirements document. The Review Panel then meets to go over the report and recommendations. Once it has approved the report, it is sent to the Executive Board. The Board then considers the report and recommendations for approval. Once the Board has approved it, the Revision (or specification) is adopted.

In the case of the Single Level Car Revision A, the original Review Panel should be reconvened. The panel did include Scott Witt, Washington State DOT, but Scott is no longer with the state, so the recommendation would be for Bill Bronte to reconvene those who are currently acting as the Review Panel for the Bi-level cars and the DMU, etc.

Bill agreed, and the action taken was to ask that the Review Panel members agree to convene to review the Single Level Revision A. In the end, each member agreed to serve in this capacity.

The Review Panel as established today is:

Bill Bronte, Caltrans – Chair  
Ron Adams, Wisconsin DOT  
Tammy Nicholson, Iowa DOT  
Eric Curtit, Missouri DOT  
John Tunna, FRA

Bill Bronte then asked the Board to, once again, approve of AASHTO entering into a contract with Larry Salci to serve as consultant to the Review Panel. The Board agreed. Darrell Smith confirmed that this was the intent in moving \$30,000 to the AASHTO Support Services Budget for this task and for additional review efforts that were highlighted in the Treasurer's report.

#### **Update: Joint Procurement Task Force – Bill Bronte:**

Bill Bronte provided a brief summary of the current activities of the JPTF to the extent that he could without violating any confidentiality issues pertaining to an active procurement.

#### **Bi-Level car status update:**

Bill reported that the final proposals on the Bi-Level rail cars were received on August 24, 2012. Five proposals were submitted. 1 proposer dropped out. Originally there were 7 responses to the RFI; and then 6 responding with a notice of intent to bid, but in the end only 5 actually submitted a final proposal. Caltrans and IDOT are in the midst of reviewing the proposals now. The schedule is that the Cost opening will be September 25, 2012; with a Notice of Intent to Award on September 26 or 27, 2012; followed by an FRA/Buy America pre-award audit; with a formal Notice of Award on October 26, 2012.

#### **Diesel-electric locomotive:**

On the Locomotive procurement, Bill gave an overview of the RFI results previously reviewed by the JPTF and accepted by the Board. Bill summarized by saying that the industry respondents basically said "we can meet the terms of the Requirements Document and produce within the ARRA time frame for expending the funds". The JPTF recommended no changes to the specification or Requirements document and the Board accepted the recommendation. (see August 21, 2012 Executive Board Minutes)

Bill also reported that the JPTF has established a core group to work on the locomotive procurement similar to the way it was done for the Bi-level. The core team is comprised of Caltrans, IDOT, Washington State DOT, and Missouri as well as FRA. This group will determine how to move this procurement expeditiously acknowledging the scarce staff resources available. The group will "think outside the box to move this procurement forward."

Bill also emphasized that the key decision as to who is in the lead on this procurement has not been made yet. "Staffs are stretched thin – we have base documents we can lean on such as a JRSPA (from the bi-level) but issuing the document and responding to the Qs and As is a lot of work." He added, "we may need resources from Caltrans, FRA, and others to help pull the document together. We still want to get this out as early as possible –

but there is much to be done, just to start doing a lot of work.”

Bill asked Chad Edison if he had anything to add and he replied that he agreed with Bill’s assessment. “Putting out a procurement is labor intensive...we need to get the resources and develop a work plan that we can implement.”

**Bi-Level Car Review Panel Report and Recommendations – Rev C.1 – Larry Salci:**

Larry Salci, consultant, gave a summary presentation of the Bi-Level Car Revision C.1 Review Panel Report and recommendation.

He noted “the work on bi-level C.1 was needed to comply with the Document Control process put in place a year ago.”

All members of the Board had received the final report approved by the Review Panel (distributed to them by Steve Hewitt) on September 13, 2012.

The report states that the 84 changes listed are in compliance with the Requirements document and that it is the recommendation of the Review Panel that all should be included in the specification.

**Consideration of Approval: Bi-Level Revision C.1 – Bill Bronte:**

Bill Bronte, as Chair of the Review Panel, stated, “I recommend that the Board adopt Revision C.1 for the Bi-Level specification.”

A motion to adopt was offered by Ron Adams, Wisconsin DOT, and seconded by Kevin Lawson, Louisiana DOT.

Steve Hewitt polled the voting members present:

Bill Bronte, Caltrans - aye  
Mario Bergeron, Amtrak - aye  
Al Ware, Georgia DOT – aye  
Darrell Smith as proxy for Gordon Hutchinson, Amtrak – aye  
Chad Edison as proxy for Paul Nissenbaum, FRA - aye  
Eric Curtit, Missouri DOT -aye  
Kevin Lawson, Louisiana DOT - aye  
Tammy Nicholson, Iowa DOT - aye  
Ray Hessinger, NYSDOT - aye  
Paul Morris, NCDOT - aye  
Johnson Bridgwater, Oklahoma DOT - aye  
Ron Pate as proxy for John Sibold, Washington State DOT - aye  
Ron Adams, Wisconsin DOT – aye

With a quorum present and all members voting in the affirmative, Chairman Bronte determined that consensus has been achieved and the motion carried. He added, “this specification document is the baseline moving forward”. Bill thanked the Technical subcommittee, and the Review Panel, and he gave special recognition to the industry for “all of their ‘pro-bono’ support”.

**Report from the Structure and Finance Task Force (SFTF) – Eric Curtit:**

Eric Curtit, Missouri DOT, gave a summary presentation on the activities of the SFTF.

**SFTF tasks:**

- Context Document
- ‘Section 6’ best-practice identification on equipment management and ownership models, and implementation plan
- Incorporation of ‘context document’ into ‘Section 6’ plan

- Actionable Memorandum

**Context Document:**

- Define context of new equipment
- Reference previous work
- Supply industry market (U.S. manufacturers and component suppliers)
- Market demand estimate
- Economic relationships of rail industry
- Explore international experiences
- Implications of PRIIA 209 and 305

**'Section 6':**

- Fleet deployment plan development (best practices for management, maintenance, cost sharing, ownership models)
- Apply best-practice model to Midwest states
- Blue print for other regions
- Addresses the 'how's' states will soon face

**Real context paper:**

- Begin to combine Section 6 work & context
- "Global context"
- Not just fleet deployment
- Operations, maintenance, ownership

**Recommendation to Exec Board:**

- Recommendation from findings
- Outlining possible approaches
- Recommend states actions
- Presentation of possible equipment pool entity models and options

Discussion:

Dale Engelhardt commented that operations, maintenance, ownership are items of tremendous significance. Including all of this "is now some entity!" He cautioned "you could end up with 3 separate entities and result in major changes."

Ron Adams concurred and added that there would be "big cost implications".

Chad Edison commented on the Section 6 work as having 2 parts to it:

1. Develop Grant Agreement Plans to be in place by next summer.
2. Developing a set of agreements that flow from these plans...ready agreements based on an adopted plan- is the key before the first step is taken as to what the NGEC is to be in the future.

Eric Curtit answered a question in regard to the length of the PB contract for Section 6/deployment. "The contract is for 6 months, and there will be a report (from Eric) every 2 weeks to the Executive Board." (On its bi-weekly calls) He also noted that there will be regular interaction scheduled with the consultants throughout the process. He added that there will be a draft of the work presented to the Board by next spring at the Board's face to face meeting.

Steve Hewitt reminded everyone that the next face to face meeting of the Board is the Annual Meeting. It was agreed that there may well need to be a separate briefing of the Board prior to the Annual Meeting – possibly the day before.

**Discussion: Strategy for Moving the NGEC forward – Bill Bronte:**

Bill Bronte opened the discussion in regards to developing a strategy for moving the NGEC forward. He noted that the timing is right to start getting serious about "what we (NGEC) want to be when we grow up". Factors

leading to the sense of urgency:

PRIIA reauthorization (2013)

2014 is the end of the current grant agreement which accounts for all of the current funding for the NGEC (see Treasurer's report)

Bill explained "we need to establish –why should the NGEC continue? Why should the NGEC be funded in the future?"

He described the "brainstorming" session that was held among the states and FRA yesterday (9-19-12) on "what is the NGEC; what are the functions – short and long term; and how do we justify the NGEC?"

He described the "function" discussion as looking at what are the things the NGEC does? He expressed the view that the "short and medium functions are covered in the PB effort". The higher level look – "what is the policy direction for the NGEC begins with the mundane and moves to financing, ownership...etc."

"We need to really sit back and look at moving forward. Do we begin to look at a 'son of Section 6' report and begin to look at bringing someone (consultant) in to look at that?" Bill continued, "we need to define functions and how to carry them on within the organization. There are key issues such as liability – and how does it fit in on the federal side...we need help to figure out how to move forward."

Alan Ware, Georgia DOT, weighed in to say "early in the NGEC timeline Rod (Massman) and I did grass roots framing and thought, at one point, that we need a Board retreat on this subject and we need to bring in an expert."

David Ewing, consultant, noted that "in the third stage of the Executive Board's charge to the SFTF there is an actionable memo that is to be prepared to form the basis for the retreat." He asked Bill Bronte, "are you describing the actionable memo?"

Bill responded "in part – but I want to get to the end zone – I don't like all the steps needed to get there in a DC framework."

Tammy Nicholson, Iowa DOT, added "the NGEC sets the framework of the group – a growing group of active states who are not yet involved with us. This group builds the framework that allows for anyone to join and/or become engaged."

Chad Edison, FRA, added "there are varying approaches that are needed. We need the ability to address a variety of need – different states need different things."

Eric Curtit, Missouri DOT, expressed the view "the SFTF should take the initial charge of the Board and see if they are still applicable, or do they need enhancement. The SFTF should bring a recommendation back to the Board." Eric noted that he will take this back to the SFTF as a charge from the Board and will then come back to the Board with the recommendation.

Bill Bronte noted that "I have re-read the context document...does it make sense still, based on what we know now, that the timeline should be that at the end of the PB work we bring someone in to help us do this? We are running out of time and we can't do this ourselves."

Johnson Bridgwater, Oklahoma DOT stated "we need a sense of ultimate goals – simple agreements take 9 months it seems – and there are a tremendous amount of hurdles and legal challenges facing us."

Bill Bronte noted "AASHTO could be a model. Is there (to Leo Penne) a contractual relationship between AASHTO and the states?"

Leo responded "in particular facets such as AASHTO software (AASHTOWARE)."

Leo then went on to say "I would be inclined to look at it historically. I would suggest that Hewitt (Steve) can assemble materials related to this discussion and put them all in one place. I would look at the Phoenix Park Hotel meeting (of the Board), there is documentation of early discussions." Leo went on to note that "the monthly activities report that Hewitt put together and updates every month, has a substantial and very detailed record of how the NGEC has operated and how decisions are made. The document is quite valuable as an historic piece." Leo also noted that "in the recent past an org chart was produced which is also very useful" as a snapshot of what the NGEC is and how complex it is. "It is startling...this is a big and complicated organization in itself. At a glance the org chart gives a sense of what the NGEC is and what it is responsible for."

Leo continued "I suggest that Hewitt and AASHTO assemble what is useful for the Board Members", especially



since there are many new members who were not here in the beginning, "it would be helpful for them to see the very constitution of the By-laws."

Paul Morris, NCDOT agreed "we need a history of why this instrument was created and did it do what we thought it should – it is probably more expansive than initially assumed."

It was agreed that Hewitt would assemble a history of what has been discussed on this topic as suggested by Leo.

Leo Penne then suggested "Hewitt, Ewing (David), and AASHTO should develop a 10 page summary of the NGEC from start to finish to approach Congress, the USDOT, etc."

Paul Morris added "going forward – yesterday was enlightening...we talked about what, not how? In Reauthorization (of PRIIA) Congress will wonder – does the NGEC need to continue at all? We need to make the case that it serves its original purpose and more, but the work is not yet done in accordance with Section 305." Paul also noted that he felt a 10 page summary was "too long" for Congress. "It should be a 2-5 pager" and should include "bullets in logical sequence of thought that should go to Congress" and it should not be written in a way that it can be viewed as "self-perpetuating".

Leo Penne added "if you look at the wall charts from yesterday you can see that people are beginning to understand the work of the NGEC is not done when the specs are."

At that point Bill Bronte asked who had the "wall charts" from yesterday. Nico Lindenau, FRA consultant, said he had taken pictures of them. Bill asked to get a copy – it was agreed that Nico would send them to Steve Hewitt for distribution to all of the Board members.

It was discussed that Section 6 will be done (PB) in six months, but states need to figure out how do they use it when their equipment is delivered. Those who are getting equipment need to start now to look at maintenance.

Dale Engelhardt, Amtrak, made a few comments/suggestions:

"You all need to define what each of you (the Board Members) think is the end zone. Do a reconciliation of the vision to get one goal." He then added, "it is amazing how much you all now understand about the railroad business from where you all were in the beginning. As your education increases your goals keep changing. Everyone here has come a long way, but we need a uniform objective when we talk to Congress." He then noted that the "scope has gone from specifications to being the owner and leasing to states...it's time to make a decision. The NGEC is in a position where rail is growing more than it ever has, and we are in a position now to make sure that this country does it right."

Chad Edison made the point that "there is an opportunity to attach legislative language between now and November-December (2012) to describe what we mean in regards to equipment. This is actually a pretty short timeline. At the federal level understanding needs and expectations is important for making funding requests. What are you recommending here? What is the exact nature of the request?"

The discussion circled back to the vision statement and to a position paper for Congress. It was agreed that a 2-5 page position paper should be developed as a performance report to Congress (and others) and that it is a "bridge with the need."

It was also agreed that all members of the Executive Board will put together a one paragraph "vision" statement of what they see as the NGEC going forward. These statements are to go to Bill Bronte and Steve Hewitt by October 4, 2012 (two weeks) and will not be attributable to any one or any organization as a position.

Kevin Kesler added, "I have many requests for an NGEC summary power point – a companion document for all to see."

Al Ware, suggested that developing the position paper should fall within the purview of the Administrative Task Force. It was agreed that the Task Force would develop the paper over the next 8-9 weeks and, once approved by its members, it would be brought forward to the Executive Board for its consideration.

Darrell Smith "on the vision – this parallels work I have done before – like job access and reverse commute." There are models in the transit industry that parallel some of what we are looking at."

Paul Morris agreed "there are some good models to be found in transit."

Leo Penne noted that there are "also samples to be found in the freight container world."

Leo then re-iterated, "you will need to hire someone down the road. You cannot get to the end zone without



**The next Executive Board Conference call is October 2, 2012 11:30am Eastern**

**Decisions/Action Items**

Bill Bronte will continue to keep the Board “generally” apprised of the progress of the bi-level railcar procurement and of the progress of the locomotive procurement. **(Ongoing)**

Jeff Gordon will continue to provide the AASHTO, Amtrak and FRA public affairs officers with email notifications of NGEC activities. **(ongoing)**

It was agreed that there will be a transfer of funds from the Executive Board professional services item to:

- AASHTO Support Services: \$30,000 for continued specification review efforts over the next 6 months.
- The Technical subcommittee: \$40,000 for professional services for Camren Cordell as described in the Treasurer’s report.
- The Administrative Task Force: \$55,000 for labor for the Amtrak project manager item.

The budget will be adjusted accordingly.

All power point presentations will be sent to all Board members by Steve Hewitt, and will be posted on the website on the executive Board page.

Kevin Kesler will continue to follow the Accessibility issue in regard to using architectural standards as discussed today. He will inform the Board and the technical subcommittee once a final decision has been made. Kevin will also bring Gary Talbot’s recommended language forward to the AWG and, once approved there, on to the subcommittee.

The Technical subcommittee will review the to review the process that provides the Technical subcommittee with the ability to make policy decisions, and go back to the Board with a recommendation as it affects policy. The subcommittee can propose a different policy than it has today for approaching DCRs and take it to the Board or, if no change is recommended – bring that to the Board as well, for its affirmation. The AWG will take a look initially and report to the Technical subcommittee, which will in turn report to the Executive Board.

The decision was made to re-convene the Single level review panel to produce a report and recommendation to the Board on Revision A. The Board agreed to bring Larry Salci back as the consultant to the panel. Leo Penne and Darrell Smith will get together to get this done in accordance with the budget adjustments approved today.

Bi-level car Revision C.1 was adopted by the Executive Board and will serve as the baseline document for the procurement. Steve Hewitt will send the final Review Panel Report to AASHTO for posting on the website on the documents/specification page.

Steve Hewitt (with assistance from AASHTO) will assemble all documents pertaining to earlier discussions about the future of the NGEC and get them all in one place.

Through the ATF, AASHTO and David Ewing and Steve Hewitt will first develop an outline and then a 2-5 page position paper on the NGEC activities to be used as a marketing exercise for Congress and others. The timeline for this (originally thought to be 6 weeks) will be 8-9 weeks for approval out of the ATF and consideration by the Board. The outline should be ready for ATF in 6 weeks and will be on its agenda on September 28<sup>th</sup>.

Each Executive Board member is to prepare a one paragraph “vision” statement for what the NGEC should be and send it to Bill Bronte, cc to Steve Hewitt, within two weeks from today (October 4, 2012). Bill Bronte will then compile the input received (not attributable) and bring it back to the Executive Board.

Nico Lindenau will provide Steve Hewitt with the pictures of the wall charts from yesterday’s (September 19<sup>th</sup>) SFTF workshop/brainstorming session. Steve will send it to all Board members and support staff.

The SFTF will begin immediately to develop a scope for a consultant for after the PB work on Section 6/deployment. This is the so-called “Son of Section 6” effort.

The SFTF will take the initial charge of the Board and see if it is still applicable, or is enhancement needed. The SFTF will bring a recommendation back to the Board.

It was agreed that the 3<sup>rd</sup> NGEC Annual Meeting will be held on February 21, 2013 in Washington, DC at the Washington Court Hotel. Additional information will follow. There will also be meeting rooms available at the Hyatt (as well as sleeping rooms there) if the NGEC Board wishes to conduct additional meetings such as a review of the PB draft report in advance of the Annual Meeting.

ATTACHMENTS



**S305 NGEC Executive Board Meeting**  
**Portland Regency Hotel – Atlantic Room**  
**Portland, Maine**  
**September 20, 2012**  
**8:30 AM – 4:00 PM Eastern**  
**Webinar/conference - call information:**  
**By Phone: 866 299 7945 passcode: 1175624#**  
**By computer: Go to [www.startvisuals.com](http://www.startvisuals.com) passcode/ID: 1175624**

**AGENDA**

8:00 - 8:30	Registration	
8:30 - 8:40	Open the Meeting - self introductions	Bill Bronte
8:40 – 8:45	Roll Call - establishing a quorum	Steve Hewitt
8:45 – 9:00	Welcome and Opening Remarks	Bill Bronte
9:00 - 9:05	Approval of Minutes from September 4, 2012 conference call	Bill Bronte
9:05 – 9:15	Review of Action Items	Steve Hewitt
9:15 – 9:30	Treasurer’s Report	Darrell Smith
9:30 - 9:45	Report from the Finance Subcommittee	Darrell Smith
9:45 – 10:05	Report from the Administrative Task Force	Al Ware
10:05 – 10:15	Break	
10:15- 10:35	Update from FRA	Chad Edison
10:35 – 10:45	Update from Amtrak	Darrell Smith
10:45 – 11:15	Report from the Technical subcommittee	Dale Engelhardt
11:15- 11:20	Re-convening the Single Level Review Panel	Bill Bronte
11:20 – 11:35	Update: Joint Procurement Task Force Activities - Bi-Level car status update - Diesel-electric Locomotive status	Bill Bronte
11:35 – 12:05	Bi-Level Car Review Panel Report and Recommendations Rev C.1	Larry Salci
12:05 – 12:15	Consideration of Approval: Bi-Level Revision C.1	Bill Bronte

12:15 – 1:15	Lunch	
1:15 – 2:00	Report from the Structure and Finance task force	Eric Curtit
2:00 – 2:15	Break	
2:15 – 3:30	Discussion: Strategy for Moving the NGEC Forward	Bill Bronte
3:30 - 4:00	Next Steps/Action Items	Bill Bronte
4:00	Adjourn	