

SECTION 305 TECH SUB COMM

MINUTES

JAN. 20, 2011

3:00PM

CONFERENCE CALL

FACILITATOR	<i>Mario Bergeron, 305 Technical Subcommittee Chair</i>
ATTENDEES	<i>Mario Bergeron, Dale Engelhardt, Ken Uznanski, Rob Edgcumbe, Tammy Krause, Greg Gagarin, Jeff Gordon, Brian Marquis, Stan Hunter, Steve Fretwell, Curtis McDowell, Charlie Poltenson, Jack madden, Andrew wood, Leo Penne, Steve Hewitt, Industry Participants: Richard Curtis, George Mekosh, Rich Stegner, Jack Martinson, Richard Trail, Bob Highfill, Camren Cordell, Bob Sullivan, Kim Gilbert, Eric Wilde, Jon Hill, Michael Wiedman, Scott Braverman, Rick De Bella, Joe Smith</i>
ABSENTEES	<i>Dave Warner, Mike Burshtin, Mike Trosino, Kevin Kesler, John Tunna, Dharm Guruswamy, Anand Prabhakaran, Charles Bielitz, Karina Jacobsen, David Tyrell, Michael Coltman, Allan Paul, George Weber, Art Peterson, Tammy Nicholson, Kevin Lawson, John Oimoen, Michael Treazise, Don Damron, Shayne Gill</i>

DISCUSSION/DECISIONS MADE

Mario Bergeron, Technical Subcommittee Chair, opened the meeting and provided an overview of the agenda.

Steve Hewitt took the roll of the "Core Team" members present on this conference call meeting and asked that industry participants email a notification of their attendance to him at shewitt109@aol.com.

On a motion by Charlie Poltenson and a second by Rob Edgcumbe, the minutes of the January 6, 2011 conference call of the Technical Subcommittee were approved without objection.

Steve Hewitt reviewed the open action items – some were addressed as agenda items – some were not. On the items not covered by the agenda, the following describes the discussions/status of each item:

Review panels: In the absence of Review Panel consultant, Larry Salci, Steve Hewitt reported that he had spoken to Larry earlier in the week and that, as he understood it, Larry was making good progress. Steve noted that Larry had asked for some additional items to assist in his review and Steve had provided him with the items as requested.

Maintaining Industry Participation List: Steve Hewitt reported that this action item is ongoing, and that there continued to be new members of the industry joining the Subcommittee. This seems to be a good sign of continued interest among industry members.

Technical Subcommittee Presentation on where the subcommittee is on ADA and Platform Heights Requirements: Kevin Kesler was absent from the call, and there was nothing new to report. As of last conference call, Kevin had thought that he would provide a summary for distribution to Subcommittee members by January 7, 2011. Steve Hewitt reported that this had not occurred. We will hold this item as open for the next call.

Formal Notification to Chairman Bill Bronte of the posting of the Specifications (Single Level Standalone Cars and Diesel-Electric Locomotives) and commencement of Review Panels work: Steve Hewitt reported that he had notified Bill on behalf of the Subcommittee on January 7, 2011 – this task is now complete

Agenda Items:

Trainset Specification Development Updates – Subgroup Leaders Reports:

Structures Subgroup: In the absence of Team Leader, Anand Prabhakaran, Jeff Gordon reported on the activities of the subgroup. Anand had submitted a written summary and a list of questions developed by the Subgroup. Steve Hewitt had distributed them to all members. (attached)

Key items discussed:

- The Structures Subgroup has initiated its meetings for developing the trainset specification, the first

- meeting was held Friday, January 14, 2011. The Subgroup will continue to meet approximately weekly.
- Several questions about expectations from the trainset specifications have been raised by the subgroup. Those questions are attached to these minutes. A key concern has to do with volume/market for trainsets
 - The Subgroup is very concerned about the proposed time schedule for these Specifications. The consensus among subgroup members is that the schedule as proposed cannot be reasonably met given the significant effort needed on several aspects, including CEM definition. The Subgroup asked to hear from the Subcommittee about the need for such an accelerated schedule.
 - The Subgroup is looking for insight/resolution on the issues indicated above and is looking forward to making progress on the Trainset Specification.
 - A clear definition of what a Trainset is needed.
 - Jeff reported that the Subgroup recommended a two month extension of the proposed timeline/schedule.

After a great deal of discussion – it was agreed that Dale Engelhardt will respond to the outstanding questions, many of which are included in the requirements document – but, in some cases require clarity. Dale will also provide a clear definition of Trainsets and send it to Steve Hewitt after today's call – for distribution. Dale will also hold off line discussions in regards to the timeline concerns. Dale did reiterate that it was a draft timeline and schedule and he was looking for all subgroup input. It is his intent, however, to finalize the schedule on the next Technical Subcommittee call (February 3, 2011)

VTI Subgroup: Brian Marquis reported that the Subgroup will be holding its first meeting tomorrow (January 21, 2011), but that many members had sent emails expressing concerns about meeting the proposed timeline/schedule and raising a number of questions.

- Tilt- required or not?
- Is there a limit on cant deficiency?
- Single axle, two axles, open?

These and other issues are not clear in the requirements document in the view of the Subgroup members. It was suggested that, rather than try to provide the answers to the Subgroup members – it would be prudent to have the members of the Subgroup – the clear experts in the field – discuss them further and offer suggestions/answers/solutions.

Electrical Subgroup: Tammy Krause reported that her team believes it can meet the proposed timeline/schedule, however, the Subgroup will need to wait until the other Subgroups have completed their efforts on HVAC, Doors, and Food Service – thus there could be a delay awaiting their input. Otherwise, the most difficult challenge will be the issue of communications.

Mechanical Subgroup: Jeff Gordon reported that the Mechanical Subgroup had met on Tuesday, January 18, 2011, and were also of the opinion that the schedule was "a bit aggressive" and would be difficult to meet. The Subgroup had a series of questions, as well, many of which were similar to those of the Structures Subgroup.

1. What is the expected market for the trainset? What is the likely size of trainset procurement? How soon would the first order(s) likely be placed/
2. The Requirements Document provides extremely limited guidance as to the definition of a trainset. Clarification is requested on the expected/ desired consist size (total number of seats, total number of cars, whether the consist is semi-or permanently coupled etc.) Can more flexibility in terms of truck design and carbody materials be expected for trainset specification?
3. Based on the response to Question 1 (which may affect the level of competition generated) and if a particular manufacturer's trainset is not envisioned, should the Technical Subcommittee investigate options currently available from interested suppliers to determine the range of likely candidates before developing the trainset specification? This will help clarify (or better define) the desired characteristics of the trainset.
4. Based on Question 1, the schedule appears overly aggressive. Is there a reason why this is so?

It was agreed that the discussion of the schedule would be taken up off - line with Dale and team leaders and also with input from Chairman Bergeron. It was agreed that the schedule and timeline would be revised per the input of the Subgroups and would be redistributed in advance of the next conference call for further input with the intent being to finalize and approve the schedule on the next call. (February 3, 2011) It was, again, reiterated that Dale would clarify the definition of trainsets and provide it to Steve Hewitt for distribution.

Interiors Subgroup: Andrew Wood reported that his team was ok with the schedule as proposed. The team will be meeting weekly. His team also expressed interest in understanding what the trainset market is expected to be. While the general consensus is that the market demand is outside of the parameters of the Technical Subcommittee's responsibilities, it would be helpful to get a sense of the market from the Subcommittee state members.

A quick poll of states on the call was taken:

California: no current need for trainsets

North Carolina: interested in keeping options open

New York: not currently planning to acquire trainsets – New York has a great need for flexibility in adding and/or subtracting individual cars at certain times (holidays) to meet demands, and trainsets would not provide that flexibility.

Washington State: Current Grant calls for 2 trainsets and it is likely there will be a need for 2 more.

No other states were on the call, but it was noted that Oregon has 2 trainsets on order.

Andrew Wood agreed to reach out to the other member states to try to get a sense of potential volume. He will report his findings on the next conference call.

Schedule for trainset specification approval meeting: With there being varying opinions in regards to the schedule and timeline as presented, it was agreed that a revised timeline will be developed with a date for the approval meeting established in accordance with the new schedule. The Chairman requested that all Subgroups continue their work while awaiting a final resolution to the schedule.

Systems Engineering working group update: With Kevin Kesler absent from this call, Jeff Gordon gave an update on the Systems Engineering Working Group:

There are 31 members on the team.

There have been 3 meetings thus far and the next meeting is scheduled for February 2, 2011.

The team has identified candidate documents and has identified procurement aspects.

Requirements Documents and Specifications will need to be updated and kept current.

The group is looking to formalize the process for keeping things current.

On the February 2, 2011 call of the working group, the intent is to finalize a draft presentation for delivery to the Executive Board on February 8, 2011, in order to allow Board members adequate time to review it in advance of the Annual Meeting.

It was agreed that following the February 2, 2011 working group meeting, the "final" draft presentation would be sent to Steve Hewitt for distribution to all Subcommittee members prior to the February 3, 2011 conference call. A review and discussion of the presentation will be an agenda item on the February 3, 2011 Subcommittee call.

Standardization Working Group Update: Rob Edgcumbe gave a brief overview of the Standardization "draft" recommendations which had been distributed to all Subcommittee members.

It was agreed that Subcommittee members should provide comments on the report to Rob Edgcumbe for his response, by the end of next week. The next step is to present the working group report to the Executive Board on February 15, 2011. It will be sent in advance to Steve Hewitt, to include it in the handout packet for the Board meeting.

Work Plan beyond Trainset Specification: Rob Edgcumbe gave an overview of the "Next Steps" white paper he had prepared at the request of the Administrative Task Force. (A copy of the document was distributed to all Technical Subcommittee members in advance of today's call).

Rob noted that there does not appear to be a clear cut requirement for the development of additional specifications once the trainset spec is completed. He is looking for additional input on this from states and/or subcommittee members. One avenue that the subcommittee may wish to explore is advanced technology in areas not meant to interfere or duplicate the work of the FRA Research efforts already underway. He also noted that we do not want to lose the impetus established to date, and that could happen without a clear target for future specifications.

In response to Chairman Bergeron's request for input from members on the call, New York State (Jack Madden and Charlie Poltenson) made a strong request of the Subcommittee to consider developing a Dual Mode Variant of the Diesel-Electric Locomotives. There is a need to replace the aging P32s currently in use on the Empire Service into New York's Tunnels in Penn Station. Jack and Charlie explained that developing this spec would be reasonable as there is a "real world" market for the equipment. He noted that not only does NYSDOT have aging P32s, but Amtrak and MTA do as well. The discussion then revolved around the issue of commuter rail vs. passenger rail. The 305 NGEC develops specs for passenger rail. Is the need in New York for NYSDOT or for the MTA? Charlie and Jack clarified that it is NYSDOT looking to replace the aging P32s on the Empire Service and looking to spend federal dollars to do so. In order to use the federal funds it must order PRIIA specification equipment. The issue of MTA needing to order the Dual Mode Variants as well, would simply mean that the order would be larger – creating a greater market.

Dale Engelhardt raised the possibility of considering the development of bi-level cars for service in New York with the ability to enter the tunnels. These would actually be multi-level cars. Charlie and Jack noted that there would be potential interest by New York State to use such cars on the Empire Service from Albany to NYC since

those passengers are typically commuters and do not carry much luggage. (These cars have a shortage of baggage storage).

Ultimately, it was agreed that more input and further discussion was needed. It was suggested that this issue be raised with Board members on their January 28, 2011 conference call. Steve Hewitt will send a note to the Board members prior to the call. In the meantime, Subcommittee members are asked to send in their comments over the next two weeks, and the issue will be discussed further on the February 3, 2011 Technical Subcommittee call.

Next Conference Call: February 3, 2011 at 3:00pm Eastern

Action Items Update (New)

Dale Engelhardt will provide a clear definition of trainsets to Steve Hewitt for distribution, and he will provide answers to some of the questions posed on today's call.

The schedule and timeline for the trainset specification development will be discussed further with team members and the Chair, and a revised timeline will be distributed to subcommittee members prior to the February 3, 2011 conference call.

Andrew Wood will contact additional states in regards to their interest in procuring trainsets in order to better assess the volume of orders anticipated. Andrew will report on his findings on the February 3rd call.

Kevin Kesler or Jeff Gordon will provide Steve Hewitt with the final "draft" presentation by the Systems Engineering Working Group for distribution to the Technical subcommittee members on February 3rd. The presentation will be sent to Steve following the Working Group call on February 2nd.

All members of the subcommittee should provide comments on the Standardization report to Rob Edgcumbe by the end of next week. Rob will update the report based on comments received, and re-distribute for the February 3rd call.

Comments on the "Next Steps for Specification Development" document should be sent to Rob Edgcumbe prior to the February call – Steve Hewitt will send a note requesting input from Board Members on the January 28 Executive Board conference call.

ATTACHMENTS



PRIIA Section 305 Tech Sub Committee Meeting

January 20, 2011

The agenda for the meeting is below:

- | | |
|--|------------------|
| 1. Roll Call | Steve Hewitt |
| 2. Review meeting agenda | Mario Bergeron |
| 3. Approve Minutes
Review Action Items | Steve Hewitt |
| 4. Trainset specification development updates | Subgroup Leaders |
| 5. Schedule for trainset specification approval meeting | Dale Engelhardt |
| 6. Systems Engineering Group Update | Kevin Kesler |
| 7. Standardization working group update | Rob Edgcumbe |
| 8. Work plan beyond Trainset specifications | Mario Bergeron |
| 9. Review this meeting:
a) Decisions
b) New Action Items | Steve Hewitt |

***Technical Sub Committee Conference Call Meeting:
Thursday January 20th 3:00 EST: 1-866-209-1307 / passcode 6486648#***

Go to meeting invitation link: <https://www1.gotomeeting.com/join/608558625>

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

Questions on the PRIIA Trainset Specification from the Structures Group

1. Market

What is the expected short term and long term market for these trainsets?

The capacity and willingness of carbuilders to participate in the bid as well in the PRIIA spec writing process is dependant on the expected volume of orders. If the expected market for these is limited, participation from the carbuilders in the working groups may also be limited. Insight from the Technical Subcommittee is appreciated.

2. Trainset Capacity & Layout

What are the expectations for these trainsets, in terms of seating capacity, train length, train weight, etc.?

The requirements document does not outline any of the above parameters.

- How should train weights (would affect top speed), axle loads (should there be a limit on P2 forces), and train lengths (based on boarding platform lengths) be limited?
- What are the limits/expectations of weight/seat, horsepower/seat, etc?
- Should seating capacity be defined on a train length basis? X no. of seats per 100 ft of train length, for example.

3. Loading Platform(s)

What loading platform heights are we considering for this effort?

The requirements document highlights "8" ATOR", and also indicates low level boarding. Should high level boarding also be considered for potential future applications. Should the group assume that they should plan for both? Can the technical subcommittee please confirm their intent?

4. Articulation

Does the technical subcommittee have any preference with regard to articulation? Should the specification leave this option open, and allow for both articulated and non-articulated cars?

The group's preference is to develop the specification in a manner that allows for full and open competition of all the car builders. Can the Technical subcommittee confirm their intent.

5. Tilt

The requirements document indicates that trainsets may incorporate tilting capability as required to meet the desired trip times.

Should the car bodies be required to accommodate tilt equipment? This might provide for a standardized carbody, with tilt defined as a customer preference.