

SECTION 305 TECH SUB COMM

MINUTES

JUNE 22, 2011

3:00PM

CONFERENCE CALL

FACILITATOR	<i>Mario Bergeron, 305 Technical Subcommittee Chair</i>
ATTENDEES	<i>Mario Bergeron, Dale Engelhardt, Michael Burshtin, Tammy Krause, Bill Bronte, Stan Hunter, Greg Gagarin, Rob Edgcumbe, Kevin Kesler, Dave Warner, Andrew Wood, Anand Prabhakaran, Allan Paul, Jeff Gordon, Brian Marquis, Andrea Ryan, Leo Penne, Charlie Poltenson, Jack Madden, Art Peterson (IDOT), Ron Adams, Ron Adams proxy for Iowa, Jeff Schultz, Scott Witt, Dharm Guruswany, Kevin Lawson, David Ewing, Whitney Phend, Chad Edison, Nancy Greene, Ken Uznanski Industry Participants: George Mekosh, Tom Hunt, Tsutomu Shirai, Richard Curtis, Eloy Martinez, Tony Jones, Bill Willamer, Jim Costin, Michael Weinman, Ted Schaeffer, Jolene Molitoris, Barry Fromm, Scott Braverman, Bob Highfill, Larry Salci, Tak Ishigami, Shinishiro Ohta, Deep Satsangi, Wolfgang Maerth, Dave Ward, Richard Trail, Michael Latour, James Michel, Graciella Trillanes, Rick Brilz, Sergio Alvarez, Paul Jamieson, Joe Gagliardino, Roger Patton, Tony Sanchez, Gene Germaine, Jan Radtke, Kevin Bahnline, Bobby Doyle, Kevin Dow,</i>
ABSENTEES	<i>Mike Trosino, Devin Rouse, Charles Bielitz, Michael Coltman, Curtis McDowell, Steve Fretwell, George Weber, Tammy Nicholson, John Oimoen, Michael Treazise, Don Damron, Shayne Gill</i>

DISCUSSION/DECISIONS MADE

Chairman Bergeron opened the meeting – and a safety briefing was provided by Gus from the Holiday Inn staff.

Mario Bergeron asked for self introductions by all meeting attendees. Kevin Kesler, FRA introduced Dharm Guruswany and Whitney Phend, FRA.

BillBronte, S305 NGEN Executive Board Chair provided some introductory comments in regards to the role of the NGEN, his role, the need for the development of the industry, the impact of climate change and the ongoing need for development of passenger rail.

It was noted that Steve Hewitt, S305 NGEN Support Services Manager was en route after encountering flight delays. It was agreed to hold off on the official roll call and approval of previous minutes until Steve arrived.

A phone conference line was arranged - Jack Madden, Charlie Poltenson, NYSDOT and Ken Uznanski, Amtrak were on the line. (Later, George Mekosh, Bombardier, also joined the call)

Chairman Bergeron reviewed the meeting packet contents.

He then provided an introductory presentation: (full presentation will be distributed – and will be posted on line)

His presentation had some focus on the reasons why this specification development process was different, and the demand for Trainsets was of concern to the industry. He particularly emphasized that the technical subcommittee does what comes from demand from the states. When people ask him to develop a different specification, that isn't the way that it happens. If the states want something, then "we" will be tasked to do it.

The task today is to get the specification through. There are some follow up items that will be covered if we have completed the primary task.

Dale Engelhardt provided an overview of the Trainset Specification Development and Approval process.

What will happen today?

- We have one goal before the meeting is concluded:
 - Finalize the specification for the single-level trainset
- How has that specification been produced?
- How are we going to review that work today?
- Who is going to take us through the process?

Dale also reviewed the various inputs received in developing the trainset specs including:

DOT input; FRA input; Lessons learned; standardization; Amtrak input; Bi-Level framework; Single level specification; supplier input; and Environmental requirements.

Mr. Engelhardt noted "what is different about this specification?"

- Several Chapters on project management, testing, materials, references, etc. (Chapters 2-3 and 16-23) have used the common wording found in bi-level and single level car specifications
- It was decided that changes to these "Common" chapters should be made using the PRIIA Document Change Request (DCR) form, so that any changes are kept in "sync" with all other issued car specifications

He then explained today's process and what is expected to occur:

- Everyone has had the opportunity to review the draft specification, and propose changes
- The subgroups have reviewed and decided upon each of the change requests, and a summary matrix of findings is posted on the AASHTO website
- Decision on some requests has been deferred to today
- We will review all deferred urgent and as many less urgent change requests as time allows

And described how the review will take place:

- The same as last time for those that were there!
- Each question is allocated 15 minutes maximum
 - 5 minutes for the proposer to explain why they believe a change is necessary
 - 5 minutes for the rolling stock team and subgroup leader to respond
 - 5 minutes for discussion and conclusion
- The decision will be made by the rolling stock team and the subgroup leader based on the discussion held
- When all points are reviewed and decisions made, a vote will be taken by the voting members on the acceptability or otherwise of the specification for submission to the Executive Board

At this point Steve Hewitt took the roll of the "Core Team" members present to determine and confirm the presence of a quorum. It was agreed that a quorum was present.

Steve Hewitt introduced the minutes from the June 16, 2011 Technical subcommittee conference call and on a motion by Washington State DOT, and a second by Wisconsin DOT, the minutes were approved, without objection or exception.

Michael Burshtin, Amtrak, described the Specification and provided a summary of the change requests received and their status:

- Chapters and change request forms were posted on the ASHTO website. Comment period was June 1 to June 16
- Each submitted change request form was reviewed and final decision made by Subgroup, who revised Chapter wording as necessary
- All Change Request forms and their disposition are shown on the Change Request Summary Matrix on the AASHTO website
- The Change Request details are as follows:

– Accepted	168
– Amended	38
– Rejected	64
– Deferred	11
– Open	0
– TOTAL	281

As noted in Michael's presentation, there were 11 items that were deferred and would be taken up at this meeting.

A review team comprised of Michael Burshtin, Greg Gagarin and the relevant team leader would consider the proposed change after hearing from the individual who had requested the change; and after input from meeting attendees.

All 11 deferred items were reviewed in this matter, with a number of lengthy discussions. Additionally, there were

three wording changes requested during the meeting. A summary of the results of the review of these items is as follows:

TS Change 01-13 – Withdrawn
TS Change 04-06 – Accepted as amended
TS Change 04-16 – Withdrawn
TS Change 04-17 – Accepted
TS Change 04-18 – Accepted as amended
TS Change 04-31 – Rejected – referred to the Executive Board for future action/consideration
TS Change 09-48 – Accepted
TS Change 09-49 – Accepted as amended
TS Change 09-50 – Withdrawn
TS Change 15-03 – Withdrawn
TS Change 15-06 – Withdrawn

The additional word changes proposed as the meeting as accepted:

1.4.3.1 – add axle weight for cab car of 42,000 lbs
5.1 – add axle weight for Cab car of 42,000 lbs
5.4.5 – delete numerical values for height adjustment

(A full description of all of the above change requests and a reflection of the decisions associated with each have been prepared by Michael Burshtin and sent to all subcommittee members by Steve Hewitt – June 27, 2011)

One specific change request (TS Change 04-31) resulted in a long discussion and merits a substantial review in these minutes.

The request was submitted by Kevin Kesler on behalf of the FRA:

“The FRA desires that, where present in the trainset specification, the requirement for crash energy management (CEM) feature be denoted as optional.

“For simplicity, a single change is recommended in Chapter 4 as proposed here which is intended to have specification-wide effect.”

The proposed sentence requested to be inserted:

“The design of the trainset must be compliant with FRA’s regulations or consistent with Engineering Task Force Guidance, and may, as an option, incorporate Crash Energy Management (CEM) features.”

This request prompted a great deal of discussion.

- As CEM language is in all of the previously developed PRIIA specifications and the requirements documents for each specification, the change may well impact all of the PRIIA specifications –the FRA’s desire is to have all specifications be consistent – so an impact is likely.
- There could be liability impacts “Tort lawyer field day” if an accident occurs and there is no CEM incorporated – the potential of a non CEM design because of the language allowing for the “option” could create a risk.
- NGEN Chairman Bill Bronte, asked, “Do we want to, as a group, step back from the requirements that are already in 2 of the PRIIA car specifications already?” Further, he noted that “due to the seriousness of this subject, a 15 minute review is not an appropriate amount of time to discuss this and come to a decision” Bill suggested that the issue needs to be talked about in depth so that a “more reasoned decision can be made.”
- Jack Madden, NYSDOT, commented that this change would also impact the Diesel-electric locomotive specification already approved, and will impact the Dual Mode Locomotive Requirements document under development currently.
- Some state and industry members commented that if CEM is optional, it is very likely that, due to costs, states could very well decide not to go with CEM – and this could put car builders in a libelous position.
- It was also noted that liability could come back to the S305 NGEN as well.

After a long discussion had ensued, Mario Bergeron, Chair of the Technical subcommittee reminded those in attendance that the subcommittee adheres to the Requirements documents approved by the Executive Board for each specification. The proposed change to CEM would “go against the Trainset Specification Requirements

document previously finalized and adopted by the Executive Board. What is in the requirements document is "what we (the tech subcommittee) are asked to do." Mr. Bergeron when on to reiterate that all of the previous requirements documents included CEM. Mario recommended that with the discussion we've had – given the implication – we should request the Board (as soon as tomorrow) put this issue on its agenda for clarification and direction from the Board.

At this point, it was agreed that the trainset specification should proceed with the current language which aligns with previous specifications especially in light of the fact that this specification is based on the requirements put forward in the Requirements document by the Executive Board. Making a change that differs from that document is beyond the scope of this subcommittee – only the Board can change its requirements.

It was agreed to move forward with consideration of a motion to accept the trainset specification as presented with the addition of the resulting changes reviewed and decided upon today.

It was also noted by Board Chairman Bronte and Technical subcommittee Chair Mario Bergeron that if FRA did, indeed dissent due to its desire to the CEM change request rejection, the subcommittee Chair would ask (in accordance with the voting procedures of the Technical subcommittee) request that the FRA prepare a "white paper" or position paper which clearly defines the requested change and the reasons for it. The paper should address both technical and legal aspects of making this change.

Bill Bronte agreed to put the item on the June 23rd Board meeting agenda for discussion purposes to make all Board members aware of it. Both Mario and Bill agreed that this issue cannot be seen as slowing down the procurement process.

Kevin Kesler agreed that FRA would develop a position paper, and emphasized that the FRA also does not wish to slow down the procurement process in any way and would not want this issue to be seen as an impediment to advancing procurements.

Further, Kevin stated that "the FRA fully supports the work of the 305 Committee. The work that has been done is well recognized within USDOT – right up to the Secretary of Transportation. Do not interpret the CEM issue as meaning that we are disparaging the work of the Committee in any way."

Mario Bergeron noted that this is another example of the Committee carrying out our work in a collaborative way – and that while there is not always 100% agreement – it is clear – the process works.

Steve Hewitt was asked to poll the voting members to ensure the continued presence of a quorum. By a poll, it was determined the quorum was still present.

Allan Paul, NCDOT made a motion, seconded by Jack Madden, NYSDOT to approve the trainset specification as presented today with the inclusion of the additional changes agreed to today.

On a poll of the voting members by Steve Hewitt the results were as follows:

Mario Bergeron for Amtrak – Aye
Stan Hunter for Caltrans – Aye
Allan Paul for NCDOT – Aye
Jack Madden for NYSDOT – Aye
Art Peterson for IDOT – Aye
Ron Adams for Wisconsin DOT – Aye
Ron Adams as proxy for Iowa DOT – Aye
Jeff Schultz for Washington State DOT – Aye
Kevin Lawson for Louisiana DOT – Aye
Kevin Kesler for FREA – disapprove

At this point, as allowed for in the voting procedures, the Chair determined that due to the dissent of the FRA, consensus had not been achieved. Referring to the voting procedures, he called for a block vote to determine whether or not the motion is approved.

The block vote would include 8 state votes (as there are 8 states represented) and thus Amtrak would cast 8 votes and FRA would also cast 8 votes.

A poll of the states, once again resulted in 8 votes for approval. Mario Bergeron cast Amtrak's 8 votes for approval, and Kevin Kesler cast FRA's 8 votes for disapproval.

As a result, the motion carried by a count of 16 for approval and 8 for disapproval. Motion carries.

Chairman Bergeron summarized the next steps in the process:

- The specification is updated to include all approved changes
- It is transmitted to the Executive Board's Review panel
- The Panel is comprised of:
 - Bill Bronte, Caltrans
 - Scott Witt, Washington State DOT
 - Ron Adams, Wisconsin DOT
 - Allan Paul, North Carolina DOT
 - John Tunna, FRA
 - Larry Salci, Consultant
- The Review Panel provides a report with recommendations to Executive Board members two weeks before the August 2, 2011 Executive Board conference call.
- August 2, 2011 – the Executive Board meets via conference call to consider adoption of the PRIIA Trainset Specification

The Chairman also summarized the subcommittee's next steps:

- Standardization Working Group continues its efforts to implement standardization
- The Document Control Pilot program continues to develop a document control process
- The Locomotive Technology Task Force is continuing its work
- Finalizing the Dual Mode Locomotive Requirements document and submitting it to the Board for its consideration
- The subcommittee will provide support for the acquisition program

It is all about procuring equipment and the subcommittee will be involved, as appropriate. Additional tasks will be forthcoming from the Executive Board.

At this point, the trainset review and approval meeting adjourned and the Chair convened a meeting to discuss other agenda items that had been included as "time permitting".

1. Document Control - Dave Warner:

Overview:

- Manage NGEC-Approved Documents
 - Specifications
 - Support Documents
 - Process Documents
 - Drawings/Engineering Documents
- Consistency w/NGEC Guiding Principles
- Ensure Appropriate Review
- Configuration Control

Key Players:

- Revision Control Coordinator (RCC)
- Document Control Coordinator (DCC)
 - One for each document
 - Led original document development
- Document Control Board (DCB)
 - Technical Subcommittee heads
 - Can be different for different documents
- Technical Subcommittee (TS)
- Executive Board (EB)
- Review Panel (RP)
- Administrative Support (Camren Cordell)

Document Change Requests:

- **Minor Change Request**
 - Generally administrative in nature that do not affect the technical content of document
 - Typographical errors
 - Updated specifications

- Formatting
- DCC has authority to approve
- DCC returns approved DCR to RCC

Major Change Request

- Everything else
 - Affects final vehicle design/performance
 - Administration of procurement processes
 - Interoperability of vehicles with other rail equipment
 - Document Control Board must adjudicate
 - Handled by "head" of technical working group
 - 10 working days to review
 - DCB provides decision to DCC
 - Approved
 - Approved as Amended
 - Rejected
 - DCC returns DCR to RCC
- RCC files accepted changes in "suspense file"
 - RCC prepares summary of changes for TS vote
 - TS votes on changes
 - Review Panel approves changes
 - Executive Board approves changes
 - RCC and Administrative Support
 - Changes placed in document
 - New revision issued
 - Web site postings made

Urgent Change

- Time-sensitive Major Change
- Occur at critical time during vehicle procurement
 - Material Orders
 - Engineering Drawing Changes
 - Production Impacts
- Time frame of Major Change unacceptable
- Days instead of weeks

Proposal vetted by members of Technical Subcommittee, Executive Board and Review Panel

Proposed Urgent Change Procedure:

- RCC received DCR
 - Forwards it to DCC
 - Informs RP and EB of Urgent Change
 - DCC forwards DCR to DCB with 2 day deadline
 - TS and RP concurrently review DCR with 3 day deadline
 - EB votes (E-mail) with 2 deadline
 - RCC informs DCR author of approval
 - Updating of document follows
- **Highlights**
 - Days Instead of weeks
 - Takes advantage of communications technology
 - Maintains the process by which original documents were created
 - DCB same as for each specific document
 - TS and EB-same as present
 - Permanent Review Panel

Stan Hunter commented that the document control process has been a great collaborative body and the DCR process continues as a contract is let – constant fine tuning will occur to help the procuring entity make the changes to the specification as it realizes the need for improvements/clarifications etc. Any changes we make will go through the Document Control process as described.

Concerns were expressed by attendees in regards to making spec changes once a contract has been awarded. – A change would impact the contract.

It was explained that the DC process will not get into the design function – it will be a function of change management for the spec – not design review.

Kevin Kesler noted that in every procurement “we are trying to create some kind of uniformity. There will be some communication beyond sending out an ‘as built’ drawing to accomplish the goal of uniformity.”

Larry Salci noted that the Finance subcommittee has established a working group to look at structure, management process and financing.

Some industry members stated that “once the RFQ is out we can’t have the Technical subcommittee involved.”

Mario noted that the Board will provide clarity on what our (technical subcommittee) role is, and while it needs to be resolved – it is our intention to continue to move forward.

2. ADA Requirements presentation – Kevin Kesler:

Outline

- Objective
- Approach for Developing/Refining NGEC Accessibility Requirements and Specification
- Background
 - Summary of ADA Intercity Rail Cars and System Requirements
 - Summary of Transit Industry /VIA Rail Practices or Equivalent Compliance
- Key issues of needs of customers with disabilities
- Gaps in ADA

Objective

Develop/refine requirements and specifications to meet current and projected needs of passenger rail customers with disabilities

Review Lessons learned from VIA Rail and Transit

Identify gaps between present ADA and future requirements

- demographics,
- oversized mobility aids,
- obese travelers,
- passengers with service animals, and
- those with sensory disabilities
- Number of accessibility locations per trainset

Review and evaluate international accessibility standards and systems for intercity trains

- Collaborative approach that is mindful of operational, technical and economic constraints
 - Impact on space
 - Impact on safety and security
 - Consultation with key stakeholders and PRIIA 305 Committee
 - Seek consensus on revised requirements
 - Consult with key stakeholders for technical, operational and manufacturing possibilities and limitations
 - Work with NGEC Technical Working Groups to develop proposed specifications
 - Support NGEC Committee approval processes
- Demographics: increase in passengers using large mobility aids
- Scooter dimensions and weight not defined
- Obese traveler requirements
- Access from non-level platforms for mobility aids
- Accessible onboard pathways and washrooms
- Accommodation of travelers with service animals
- Onboard information for sensory impaired travelers
- Next Steps

- Seek approval of assignment to Technical Working Group within Technical Subcommittee
- Work with TWG to develop/refine work plan and schedule

Kevin commented that the FRA had contracted with Oregon State University for guidance for ADA Requirements and to inform his body of what the forecast is. He is looking to have a Technical Working Group (described above) work with the Oregon State consultant. Kevin stated that Melissa Shurland, FRA, "will own this effort".

3. Buy America – Kevin Kesler:

Kevin gave a brief overview of Buy America issues. He noted that "we recognize the challenge given by Congress in regards to 100% US content. The FRA understands this is a challenge and is trying to come up with answers that will help us move forward. He announced that Georgia Tech University is helping on this as an independent assessor. Kevin has contacted many carbuilders and is asking for any others that he has not contacted to provide him with contact information via email. He advised that the "carbuilders should stick together-speak with a single voice – to find a way to come together on what is possible."

Kevin is working with Georgia Tech on developing a list of questions to assist in gathering facts. He noted that FRA representatives: Dharm Gurutswany, Whitney Phend, and Chad Edison are working together on this issue and that Chad will be the point person for implementation.

4. Standardization – Kevin Kesler

Kevin Kesler gave a brief overview of the standardization effort that has been ongoing. He stated that "it may not have been hit as hard as we want it to be. It is a priority of the Administration to develop a supply chain in this country." He is "glad that 305 has a process identified to put standards in place". He also emphasized that it will really happen "as a part of a procurement evaluation process." DOT will support the standardization effort and will invest in it.

The June 22, 2011 meeting of the Technical subcommittee adjourned at approximately 4:30PM Central time.

Next Conference Call: July 14, 2011

Action Items Update (New)

A summary of the trainset specification changes discussed and addressed today will be provided to Steve Hewitt by Michael Burshtin for distribution.

A final summary of changes and revised trainset specification individual chapters will be provided to the Review Panel and will be posted to the website.

Kevin Kesler (FRA) will provide the subcommittee Chair with a position paper on its request to change the trainset specification to state: "The design of the trainset must be compliant with FRA's regulations or consistent with Engineering Task Force Guidance, and may, as an option, incorporate Crash Energy Management (CEM) features." The position paper should address both the technical and legal implications of this language change. Upon receipt of the position Paper, Chairman Bergeron will transmit it to the Executive Board for its review/consideration.

In regards to ADA- Kevin Kesler will follow up with the subcommittee to establish a Technical working group.

In regards to Buy America – Kevin Kesler will work with Georgia Tech to develop a list of questions to assist in gathering facts, and will continue to reach out to carbuilders.

