

SECTION 305 TECH SUB COMM

MINUTES

JUNE 17, 2010

3:00PM

CONFERENCE CALL

FACILITATOR	<i>Mario Bergeron, 305 Technical Subcommittee Chair</i>
ATTENDEES	<i>Mario Bergeron, Dale Engelhardt, Tammy Krause, Jeff Gordon, Steve Fretwell, Curtis McDowell, Andrew Wood, Tammy Nicholson, John Tunna, GregGagarin, Nancy Greene, Steve Hewitt</i>
ABSENTEES	<i>Ken Uznanski, Rob Edgcumbe, Kevin Kesler, Eloy Martinez, Dharm Guruswamy, Gary Fairbanks, Charles Bielitz, Michael Coltman, Brian Marquis, Gil Wilson, Stan Hunter, Bob Haslam, Allan Paul, Charles Poltenson, John Madden, Gerorge Weber, Kevin Lawson, John Oimen, Don Damroin, Leonard Evans, Shayne Gill</i>

DECISIONS MADE

This conference call of the of the S305 Technical Subcommittee, Core Team Members only, convened for the primary purpose of receiving a report on where we are as the July 16th deadline for subgroup submissions has arrived. Greg Gagarin, Amtrak, reported that all subgroup submissions anticipated: VTI, Mechanical, Electrical, Interiors and Structural have been received and Amtrak staff was beginning to go through the recommended changes/comments received. 4 of the 5 subgroups had been working with the 3 question format for submission and the Structural Group had been using the second format of Chapter review/revision. At the conclusion of the Bi-Level Specification process, the subcommittee will determine which format/process works best as we move to the next sets of specs – single level and locomotives. Greg reported that they had received a total of 241 comments from the 4 subgroups and that the Structural subgroup submission included the revision of Chapters 5 and 6 (Amtrak staff had not yet completed its review of those revisions).

In response to comments raised by VTI Team Leader John Tunna, it was agreed that the current process that Tammy, Greg and staff are going through will serve to provide the necessary overall review of the combined submissions.

In response to suggestions by Mechanical subgroup Team Leader, Jeff Gordon, that there be a new Amtrak spec developed for qualification of friction materials – a concern of Brake industry members - it was noted that it may help to streamline the process by pre-qualifying friction materials. The result could be more manufacturers/multiple suppliers. Greg agreed that anything that can be done to streamline the process will be done. He will get back to Jeff Gordon in regards to his suggestion.

Each subgroup Team Leader present briefly reported on the activities of their teams and the resulting comments/changes submitted. Chairman Bergeron thanked all subgroups leaders and their teams for their tremendous efforts in doing such a thorough job of reviewing and commenting on the C-21 specs and in adhering to a very aggressive schedule in meeting the July 16 deadline.

It was agreed that the current team/subgroup format had worked well and would continue as we move to the next sets of specification development. The details on how to proceed with single level and locomotive specs have not yet been completely worked out by Dale Engelhardt – as they are – he will provide them to Steve Hewitt for distribution to the subgroup leaders.

As a next step in the Bi-Level process, it was agreed that all of the subgroup submissions received would be sent to Cars subgroup Team Leader, Ken Uznanski, for their review and input as the oversight/validate/ overview subgroup.

In regards to the issue of establishing voting procedures, Mario had distributed a proposed procedure document based largely on the Executive Board approved By-Laws. Since there was not a quorum present on this call, (only 4 states present and no representative from FRA) it was agreed that the subcommittee core team would meet again on July 1 at 3:00pm on a conference call to vote for approval of the proposed procedures. Steve Hewitt was asked to follow up with core team members to ensure that there will be a quorum on July 1. Steve will keep Mario apprised of how those efforts are going.

Steve reported that the July 29-30 meeting attendance currently consisted of very few states. (2) (all members – core team and industry had been invited and asked to submit their attendance intentions to Steve by July 17) Steve was asked to contact members of the core team to try to ensure that there would be a quorum in Chicago, either in person or via proxy, so that final approval of the bi-level specs could take place for submission to the Review Board and ultimately on to the Executive Board.

At Steve Hewitt's request, Steve Fretwell clarified the P2 Force numbers for inclusion in the minutes of the previous (June 10th) full subcommittee conference call meeting. The correction will be made to the minutes which initially stated that the current Amtrak P2 Standard is 46,000 and may well be increased in the subgroup to 48,000 – **the correction will state that the numbers are: 65,000 going to 68,000.**

The conference call meeting concluded at approximately 4:00pm. The next Core Team only Call is scheduled for July 1 at 3:00pm Eastern

Action Items Update (New and Current)

Tammy Krause and Greg Gagarin and the Amtrak team will continue review of subgroup submissions, compiling them into the bi-level specification document and give a status report to the Core Team members on July 1. They will also send all submissions that have been received to the Cars subgroup Team Leader Ken Uznanski for that team's review.

Greg will address the friction material issue raised by the Mechanical Subgroup.

Dale Engelhardt will develop and provide guidance in regards to moving forward with the next sets of specs. Dale's guidance will be distributed to the subgroup team leaders by Steve Hewitt

All Core Team members are asked to review the voting procedures that they have received and provide any comments to Mario Bergeron and Nancy Greene prior to the July 1 Conference call of the Core Team members.

Steve Hewitt to contact core team members in regards to attendance at the July 1 conference call and the July 29-30 final bi-level specs meeting in Chicago. Steve's efforts are to be focused on ensuring that there is a quorum present at both meetings.

ATTACHEMENTS



Voting Procedures Document – for Review

PART C. – TECHNICAL SUBCOMMITTEE

1. Membership of Technical Subcommittee

The Technical Subcommittee will be open to all Committee members

2. Officers of the Technical Subcommittee

The Technical Subcommittee will have a Chair and two Vice Chairs who shall be voting members appointed by a vote of the Executive Board and serve for two year terms. One of these three positions will always be occupied by an Amtrak representative. Other officers may be created as deemed necessary by the Subcommittee. The Chair of the Executive Board may designate a representative of the Executive Board to serve as liaison between the Executive Board and the Technical Subcommittee.

The duties of the Officers of the Technical Subcommittee will be as follows:

Chair:

The Chair will schedule and preside at all meetings of the Technical Subcommittee. He/she will serve as the official representative of the Technical Subcommittee to the Committee and Executive Board. He/she will ensure there is a balanced representation on the Technical Subcommittee in order to be able to carry out the mission of the Committee. He/she will be responsible ensuring the Technical Subcommittee takes the supportive action necessary to assist the Committee in achieving its objectives and will perform all such other duties as usually pertain to such office.

Vice Chairs:

The First Vice Chair will preside at meetings in the absence of the Chair. He/she will assist the Chair in the development and conduct of Technical Subcommittee activities.

The Second Vice Chair will preside at meetings in the absence of both the Chair and First Vice Chair. The Second Vice Chair will also be responsible for coordinating tasks with Amtrak as required to fulfill the mission of the Committee.

3. Purpose and Responsibilities of Technical Subcommittee

The purpose of the Technical Subcommittee is to: (1) develop and/or evaluate alternative passenger rail car and propulsion technologies and designs, (2) evaluate proposed vehicle subsystems, (3) establish performance and safety criteria standards, develop specifications, (4) respond to requests made by the Committee or Executive Board to assist in carrying out their duties; and (5) any such other tasks and duties as may be assigned by the Executive Board.

The Technical Subcommittee will maintain an updated catalog of one or more approved passenger vehicle specifications that are determined to be eligible for use in the Next Generation Passenger Rail Equipment Pool. As appropriate, it will develop its on-going efforts into recommendations for the Executive Board to act upon. The complete specifications or portions thereof may, as determined by the Executive Board, be subject to use limitations.

4. Subjects to be addressed by the Technical Subcommittee

Subjects to be addressed by the Technical Subcommittee may include but are not limited to:

- Safety criteria
- Regulatory compliance requirements and procedures
- Interoperability of car/locomotive/infrastructure requirements
- Performance criteria
- Passenger car interior configurations, including design enhancements to facilitate travel by the disabled and elderly communities
- Passenger amenities
- Motive power
- Operational issues
- Efficiency of operations
- Economies of scale benefits from common fleets
- Servicing/inspection requirements
- Maintenance and overhaul criteria
- Procurement guidelines
- Inventory criteria for both spare parts as well as vehicle spare margins
- Maintenance facility requirements

5. Initial Meeting of Technical Subcommittee

At its initial meeting, the Technical Subcommittee will establish procedures regarding its orderly functions, etc. It may form task forces to focus upon specific issues. It will determine what, if any, financial support may be needed to carry out its mission and recommend to the Finance Subcommittee what such requirements may be. It is recommended that the Officers of the Technical Subcommittee initially include representation from states that fund Amtrak train service or that are funding corridors in development, or representative of professional organizations that represent states (e.g., AASHTO) and/or represent Amtrak.

6. Quorum and Voting

There shall be two classes of members in the Technical Subcommittee: Voting and Non-Voting Members. FRA, Amtrak, and one representative of each member State shall be voting members. All others shall be non-voting members.

Voting members may vote in person or by proxy. The Chair of the meeting shall determine the validity of all proxies. Generally speaking, a proxy should be provided to the Chair in writing in advance of the meeting and kept [with](#) the minutes of the meeting. A state which does not have a representative physically present at the meeting but which has authorized another individual by proxy to represent it at the meeting will be considered present and participating at the meeting for purposes of voting and determining a quorum.

A formal Technical Subcommittee vote may be taken only when a quorum is present.

A quorum shall consist of a majority of the State members of the Technical Subcommittee, with each State counting as one member, plus at least one representative from Amtrak and one representative from FRA.

Decisions of the Technical Subcommittee shall be made by consensus whenever possible. Where there is lack of consensus, i.e., if there is opposition to a substantial issue by any state, FRA or Amtrak, a decision will be made by a majority of the following votes calculated as follows:

* a total of votes cast individually by each representative State on the Subcommittee participating in the

meeting;

- * the same total votes cast en bloc by Amtrak; and
- * the same total votes cast en bloc by the FRA Administrator or designee.

Note that the number of votes cast at any particular time will depend on the actual number of state representatives present and voting at the Subcommittee meeting (or voting by proxy and thus considered present and participating) at the time a vote is taken. The votes should be recorded and kept with the minutes of the meeting.

A dissenting member may provide for the record a written explanation of the dissenting position. The Chair may also request a dissenting member to prepare such an explanation (a "position paper" on the dissenting member's position). If the Chair determines it would be helpful for the Executive Board to review the dissenting member's position paper when considering a Technical Subcommittee recommendation, the Chair may provide the position paper to the Chair of the Executive Board.

Voting members may vote in person or by proxy. The Chair of the meeting shall determine the validity of all proxies. Generally speaking, a proxy should be provided to the Chair in writing in advance of the meeting and kept [with](#) the minutes of the meeting. A state which does not have a representative physically present at the meeting but which has authorized another individual by proxy to represent it at the meeting will be considered present and participating at the meeting for purposes of voting and determining a quorum.

A formal Technical Subcommittee vote may be taken only when a quorum is present.

A quorum shall consist of a majority of the State members of the Technical Subcommittee, with each State counting as one member, plus at least one representative from Amtrak and one representative from FRA.

Decisions of the Technical Subcommittee shall be made by consensus whenever possible. Where there is lack of consensus, i.e., if there is opposition to a substantial issue by any state, FRA or Amtrak, a decision will be made by a majority of the following votes calculated as follows:

- * a total of votes cast individually by each representative State on the Subcommittee participating in the meeting;
- * the same total votes cast en bloc by Amtrak; and
- * the same total votes cast en bloc by the FRA Administrator or designee.

Note that the number of votes cast at any particular time will depend on the actual number of state representatives present and voting at the Subcommittee meeting (or voting by proxy and thus considered present and participating) at the time a vote is taken. The votes should be recorded and kept with the minutes of the meeting.

A dissenting member may provide for the record a written explanation of the dissenting position. The Chair may also request a dissenting member to prepare such an explanation (a "position paper" on the dissenting member's position). If the Chair determines it would be helpful for the Executive Board to review the dissenting member's position paper when considering a Technical Subcommittee recommendation, the Chair may provide the position paper to the Chair of the Executive Board.