

SECTION 305 TECH SUB COMM

MINUTES

DECEMBER 6, 2012 3:00PM EASTERN

CONFERENCE CALL

| | |
|--------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| FACILITATOR | <i>Mario Bergeron, Chairman, S305 Technical subcommittee</i> |
| ATTENDEES | Core Team Members: Mario Bergeron, Dale Engelhardt, Darrell Smith, Tammy Krause, Dave Warner, Vincent Brotski, Michael Burshtin, Kevin Kesler, Melissa Shurland, Nico Lindenau, Stan Hunter, Curtis McDowell, Jack Madden, Jeff Schultz, Art Peterson, Phil Meraz, Ron Adams, Melissa Wilbers, Steve Hewitt, Larry Salci Industry Participants: Fran Nelson, James Michel, George Mekosh, Bill Saddler, Eric Wilde, Tom Hunt, Lew Hoens, Tim Buchanan |
| ABSENTEES | <i>Greg Gagarin, Andrew Wood, Devin Rouse, Anand Prabhakaran, Charles Bielitz, Ryan Swick, Michael Coltman, Brian Marquis, Camren Cordell, Allan Paul, Charles Poltenson, Kevin Lawson, Larry Salci, Shayne Gill</i> |

DISCUSSION/DECISIONS MADE

Chairman Mario Bergeron called today's meeting to order and asked Steve Hewitt to take the roll.

Steve called the roll and it was established that a quorum was present.

As always, industry participants are asked to email a notification of their attendance to Steve Hewitt at Shewitt109@aol.com

Review of Action Items:

Steve Hewitt reviewed the open action items, providing a brief update on those items that were not to be specifically covered on the agenda:

Maintaining Industry Participation List: Status: Steve reported that this remains an ongoing action item. There are currently **206** registered industry participants.

APTA Standards update: Status: Kevin Kesler provided a brief update. He and Martin Schroeder are working on defining the charge and establishing a review group. He is hopeful he will have more to report on for the next subcommittee call.

Updating ECP Standards: Status: Paul Jamieson has provided the following report for inclusion in today's minutes:

"Teleconference is planned for December 11, 2012 for a status review. Anyone interested in participating who is not on our mailing list should contact either Paul Jamieson or Jeff Gordon".

Executive Board Member Vision Statements: At an appropriate time after the Board has reviewed and discussed its members' vision statements for the future of the NGEC, Chairman Bergeron will have an agenda item on a subcommittee call to provide Board feedback on the vision statements to subcommittee members. **Status:** The Executive Board met on Tuesday, November 27, 2012. They are now in the process of reviewing a "strawman" vision statement proposal developed by NGEC Chairman Bill Bronte. It is expected that the Board will discuss and possibly come to consensus on an NGEC Vision on the December 11, 2012 call.

Diesel-electric locomotives procurement update: Kevin Kesler will keep the subcommittee updated as to the progress of the locomotive procurement **Status:** FRA reported to the Executive Board during its' call of November 27, 2012, that a lead state has not been determined as of yet. Kevin reported that this is still the status today, but he did point out that a lot of work is going on and progress is being made. There still is more work to be done. He will continue to keep the subcommittee apprised.

Approval of the Minutes of the November 15, 2012 Technical subcommittee call – Mario Bergeron:

After a motion by Jack Madden, NYSDOT, and a second by Ron Adams, Wisconsin DOT, the Minutes of the November 15, 2012, conference call meeting of the Technical subcommittee, were approved without objection.

Report from the Accessibility Working Group (AWG) -Melissa Shurland:

a. AWG "volunteer SOW"

Melissa Shurland, FRA, reported that Steve Hewitt had distributed to all subcommittee members the Statement of Need for technical support for assessment of accessibility recommendations, especially in interior design and layout. She noted that on the last Technical subcommittee call the AWG came to the subcommittee requesting assistance, and it was agreed that the subcommittee would ask for volunteers to support and assist in this effort. Thus, the statement of need was sent out to all members asking for help. Volunteers are asked to contact Melissa Shurland at [melissa.shurland@ dot.gov](mailto:melissa.shurland@dot.gov).

Mario Bergeron asked if any volunteers had come forward to this point. Melissa responded that no one had as of yet. Mario emphasized that "I encourage you all to look at the statement of need and see if you may know someone who could assist us." He added, "it would be very very helpful to us, and would provide us with better drawings to assist us in our decision making."

b. Status: Building code regulations acceptability

Mario Bergeron noted that the General Counsel's (OST) guidance document has just been released. Steve Hewitt distributed it to all subcommittee members just prior to this call. Mario explained that his intent for today is "to get a sense of what is in the interpretation". He added that "we may not have all the answers today" and "I ask you to formulate any questions you have and submit them in writing to Melissa Shurland to be handled and progressed." He added that "it may take some time, but I think it will be helpful to proceed this way."

Mario asked Kevin Kesler if he wanted to add anything further.

Kevin agreed with the chair's recommended action plan and offered to "highlight" some of the key bullets in the document.

At this point Kevin read the first four or five bullets contained in the document, and stressed that the guidance "does not affect existing equipment." He added that it provides guidelines, as applicable, for when 49 CFR part 38 does not cover it.

Ron Adams, Wisconsin DOT, stated "we will not be submitting questions." He added "I want to thank Melissa for hanging in there and getting the answers."

Mario Bergeron again emphasized that "we should all look at the document and send questions in writing to Melissa." Also "I propose, with the leadership of the AWG, that we take a proactive role to identify the known gaps and frame them and review what that means - do it in a proactive way."

Kevin Kesler agreed with this suggestion and Melissa Shurland agreed that "this is an area where we (AWG) can help. We will work with the Chief Counsel's office to guide us as to what is applicable and what is not. We will then provide a spreadsheet to the subcommittee."

Mario Bergeron commented, "It's more about what is not in 49 CFR part 38 than what is." He went on to say, "the AWG can help frame the effort and a timeline." He asked that they provide an update on the next call. Steve Hewitt will keep it as an open action item.

Ron Adams noted that "one issue is Café car counter top heights".

Ultimately, the actions were identified as:

- Define the gaps in 49CFR part 38 – defining when the architectural standards apply to supplement 49 CFR part 38
- First step – define the effort to get there
- Second step – define the help "we'll" need
- Third step – provide a skeleton of the framework

Update: Document Control – Dave Warner:

a. General Update

Dave Warner

Dave Warner submitted the following update for inclusion in today's minutes:

"Most importantly, the purchase request to establish a contract between Amtrak and Jacobs to support Camren Cordell's continued efforts were approved today to go to Purchasing, so Amtrak and Jacobs should begin discussions within a few days for actual contact discussions/writings.

As far as documents go, Bi-level Revision C.1, the bid-award version, is posted on the AASHTO website.

During the next few months we'll progress the approval of the "base specification," Rev. D. My intention is to create one DCR covering all of the changes that were in C.1. It doesn't make sense to create a separate DCR for each and every item since they've already been approved. There is presently one accessibility-related DCR in the "to approve" queue, it deals with installation of assisted listening loops.

Single Level Revision A was approved by the Executive Board in November. Absent an urgent need to get this posted, work on integrating the changes into the specification are on hold until the technical services contract is finalized.

Similarly, the completion of the DMU initial release specification is awaiting the technical service contract. If someone knows why the document needs to be posted now, please contact me."

b. Accessibility "Twin Loop" DCR Discussion

Mario Bergeron/Dave Warner

Dave Warner submitted the following update for inclusion in today's minutes:

"You all received a copy of DCR 100-004 many weeks ago. At the last Technical Subcommittee meeting a decision was made to delay further discussion until this meeting to provide subcommittee members more time to review it.

The purpose of this DCR is to modify the handling of DCRs relating to accessibility matters. This also changes the nature of the Accessibility Working Group's duties and establishes a new Accessibility Policy Group.

To summarize the concern, currently the Accessibility Working Group has to handle both policy and technical matters associated with proposals. The Accessibility Working Group, which reports to this body, isn't really the right place in which policy decisions to be made. This dual-role has caused discussions within the Accessibility Working Group to bog down from time to time. Consequently, the Executive Board, at its meeting in September, directed that the policy and technical decisions be separated.

The proposed resulting process has been named "Twin Loop" because there are two separate paths for a DCR to follow. The first deals solely with policy, i.e., in broad terms, is the proposal something that PRIIA wishes to entertain. This is represented on the first flowchart of the DCR. If the decision is yes, then a separate path goes through the technical aspects, e.g., specification language writing, of the process. In terms of execution, these two separate process flows are much simpler than the combined flow that was approved last summer.

Shortly before this meeting, Steve Hewitt emailed everyone a file that contains some suggested modifications to the process that I received since the last call. The changes from what is presently in DCR-100-004 are highlighted in red.

On the policy loop, the decision point of the Executive Board Vote has had the three options renamed to be "Proceed, Review and Do Not Proceed." Proceed is the same as the previous "Approve" off to the left of the diamond. Review is a different term for what had been "Reject APG's Recommendation," and better reflects the desire for consideration of the DCR to continue. The option off the bottom of the diamond had been a possibly grammatically-confusing "approve...recommendation to reject." This option is now labeled "Reject" and the words modified, as well as the addition of an option for the Executive Committee to disagree with the APG's implementation recommendation. In both these cases, work on the DCR will end, and the DCC will be instructed to inform the originator of the rejection per the established procedures. The rejection will be noted in the next DCR summary sheet submitted to the Technical Subcommittee.

On the technical loop, the original loop did not contain a "rejection option." That was somewhat done on purpose, to stimulate discussion. It worked. Now there are three options for the Technical Subcommittee's choice, and they're structured the same as the Executive Board's. The "Reject" option has been added to the bottom point of the diamond. Note this option can only be used if the item/feature under discussion is not required by regulations. As before, this

rejection will be noted in the next DCR summary sheet submitted to the Technical Subcommittee.

I have not provided the revised text to Appendix D of the Document Management Process procedure to which these flowcharts belong since I felt it was much easier to understand the suggested changes by looking at the flowcharts.

One final note, the DCR did/does make a suggestion as to who should be on the Accessibility Policy Group, but ultimately the membership is a decision to be made by the Executive Board."

Discussion:

Mario Bergeron commented that the Twin Loop DCR, as modified was issued just earlier today, so we will not vote for approval today. We will give the subcommittee members time to review the modified proposal.

Kevin Kesler asked if there is text that accompanies the flow chart distributed today. Dave Warner commented that there is a companion document.

Kevin asked if "in the three decision points the criteria by which we decide are made are reported for people to understand?"

Dave replied – "that is not in there because every DCR is different..."

Mario reminded the group that once something has been reviewed by the subcommittee it goes to the Board. The Board could have questions or comments or different thoughts that come back to the subcommittee, and then, again back to the Board.

Kevin Kesler added two "quick comments"

1. What got us (FRA) concerned was the Technical subcommittee considering costs and possibly rejecting something based on that.
2. If the Technical subcommittee rejects something would the Executive Board have a chance to consider why and decide that there is reason to reject (or not).

To the last comment Dave explained it is reflected in the proposal and he described the chain of events that brings it from the Board to the Tech sc to the DCC, back to the Tech sc and back to the Board.

Mario Bergeron emphasized that "the task from the Board will be precise to the Technical subcommittee." The subcommittee could offer alternatives and, as a result, a rejection could end up as an opportunity for another approach.

Ultimately it was agreed that subcommittee members should review the flow chart and send comments to Dave Warner by COB on Monday December 10, 2012. Dave will then get a revised flow chart and revised text out to subcommittee members by COB on Tuesday, December 11, 2012. This will allow subcommittee members a full week to review and be prepared to vote on December 20th during the next subcommittee call.

Registering for the NGECC 3rd Annual Meeting – Steve Hewitt:

Steve Hewitt reminded participants that the NGECC will hold its third Annual Meeting on February 21, 2013 at the 20th F Street Conference Center, Washington, DC. This is a change in venue, but is right around the corner from the original site (Washington Court Hotel) and a block or so from the Hyatt Regency Hotel where a block of rooms has been reserved for attendees. Information on the block of rooms was sent out earlier this week. The cutoff date for reserving a room at the block rate is January 11, 2013. Also, for purposes of having a head count, it is important that you register your intentions to attend the meeting by emailing Steve Hewitt. Thus far only 6 industry members are registered.

Technical subcommittee state members and support staff who plan to attend, should also register with Steve, and there is a block of rooms at the Hyatt for this group as well with a cutoff date of January 11, 2013.

Other:

In regards to the previously discussed accessibility guidance document issued by the USDOT Chief Counsel, Mario Bergeron asked Kevin Kesler "what will be the intention of the questions to Melissa on the guidance document?"

Kevin replied "our intention is that Melissa will receive and organize the questions and they will go to the Chief Counsel for response." (in a format with Q & A)

The discussion concluded with the decision being that once Melissa and the AWG get all of the submitted questions compiled, and organized, they will be distributed to the full subcommittee to see if they generate additional questions. After a week for review by the subcommittee, they will be sent to the Chief Counsel.

In regard to the call for volunteers to assist in the statement of need effort described earlier in the call, Dave Warner urged subcommittee members to spread the word on the need for assistance. He noted that in the past the subcommittee has done great work with volunteer assistance in writing specs etc. He emphasized that this is central to how PRIIA runs and why it has been successful.

Jack Madden, NYSDOT, asked what type of individual member would be the right one to help.

Kevin Kesler responded "anyone with CAD capabilities." He added, "we have the information, they would put it together in drawings."

Dave Warner stressed "this is as important as writing a spec chapter."

Ron Adams, Wisconsin DOT asked "does Amtrak have this already?"

Dave Warner responded "not to these dimensions."

Ron Adams noted that even if it is not to these dimensions it could possibly be used as a basis to comment on.

Mario Bergeron replied, "we will assist any way we can – we need the help first."

Kevin Kesler added that it may be helpful even if it is not to the dimensions needed.

Dave Warner replied "Amtrak can provide a starting point."

Adjourn:

With no further business to come before the subcommittee, today's conference call meeting was adjourned at approximately 4:00 pm Eastern.

Next conference call – December 20, 2012 – 3:00pm Eastern

Decisions and Action Items

Volunteers are being requested for technical support for assessment of accessibility recommendations, especially in interior design and layout. Volunteers should reply to Melissa Shurland, based on the statement of need that has been circulated.

The Twin Loop DCR proposal: The revised version has been sent to all subcommittee members. Comments are due to Dave Warner by COB on Monday, December 10, 2012. Once all comments are received, Dave Warner will

The agenda for the meeting is below:

- | | |
|------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------|
| 1. Roll Call | Steve Hewitt |
| 2. Review meeting agenda | Mario Bergeron |
| 3. Review Action Items | Steve Hewitt |
| 4. Approve Minutes of November 15, 2012 | Mario Bergeron |
| 5. Report from the Accessibility Working Group | Melissa Shurland |
| a. AWG "volunteer" SOW | Melissa Shurland |
| b. Status: Building code regulations acceptability | Melissa Shurland |
| 6. Document Control | Dave Warner |
| c. General Update | Dave Warner |
| d. Accessibility "Twin Loop" DCR Discussion/Approval | Mario Bergeron/Dave Warner |
| 7. Registering for the NGEN Annual meeting | Steve Hewitt |
| 8. Review this meeting: | Steve Hewitt |
| a) Decisions | |
| b) New Action Items | |

***Technical Sub Committee Conference Call Meeting:
Thursday December 6, 2012 3:00 EST: 1-866-209-1307 / passcode 6486648#***

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

Next Call: December 20 2012 – 3:00pm Eastern