

SECTION 305 TECH SUB COMM

MINUTES

SEPTEMBER 8,
2011

3:00PM

CONFERENCE CALL

FACILITATOR	<i>Mario Bergeron, 305 Technical Subcommittee Vice Chair</i>
ATTENDEES	<i>Mario Bergeron, Dale Engelhardt, Greg Gagarin, Tammy Krause, Dave Warner, Michael Burshtin, Andrew Wood, Kevin Kesler, Melissa Shurland, Nico Lindenau, Anand Prabhakaran, Jeff Gordon, Brian Marquis, Steve Fretwell, Jack Madden, Jeff Schultz, Art Peterson, Phillip Meraz, Steve Hewitt, Leo Penne</i> Industry Participants: <i>Richard Curtis, Eloy Martinez, Don Itzkoff, Jack Martinson, Rick DeBella, Philip Strong, George Mekosh, Tak Ishigami, Terry Monaghan, Joe Moore, Peter Mazzeo, Graciela Trillanes, Bobby Doyle, Dave Ward, Jolene Molitoris, Mandy Bishop, Scott Braverman, Gavin Fraser, Eric Wilde, James Michel, Rick Brilz, Tim Buchanan</i>
ABSENTEES	<i>Ken Uznanski, Mile Trosino, Devin Rouse, Chad Edison, Whitney Phend, Charles Bielitz, Allan Paul, Curtis McDowell, Charlie Poltenson, Michael Coltman, Stan Hunter, George Weber, Ron Adams, John Oimoen, Michael Treazise, Don Damron, Kevin Lawson, Shayne Gill,</i>

DISCUSSION/DECISIONS MADE

Chairman Bergeron opened the meeting and reviewed the agenda.

Steve Hewitt took the roll of the "Core Team" members and confirmed that there was a quorum present. Industry participants were asked to email a notification of their attendance to Steve at shewitt109@aol.com.

On a motion by, Andrew Wood, Amtrak, seconded by Jack Madden, NYSDOT, the minutes of the August 25, 2011 conference call of the Technical subcommittee, were approved without objection.

Steve Hewitt reviewed the open action items and provided a brief update on those items that were not on the agenda

Maintaining Industry Participation List:

Steve Hewitt reported that since the last update the subcommittee has added three new industry participants. The list has been updated, and now includes **186** members! The list is posted on line at the AASHTO website at www.highspeed-rail.org in the subcommittee link, and is included in the monthly S305 NGEC activities report.

Dual Mode Locomotive Requirements Document:

As previously reported, the Dual Mode Locomotive Requirements Document has been submitted from the subcommittee to the Board. The Board has been asked not to consider the document until the issue of CEM has been resolved. The next Board meeting is September 15th in Charlotte, NC and it is unknown if the CEM position paper will come before the Board that day – but it will be an agenda item.

Formation of a Cars Technology Task Force:

This action item remains as an open item for future consideration once the LTF has completed its work and if it is determined that the subcommittee has the capacity to do it.

DMU specification states survey of interest:

This action item task has been completed – the survey resulted in 11 states expressing interest in having a 305 DMU specification developed.

DMU specification – assessing the need/interest re: industry participation:

This task is also complete with 9 members of the industry expressing interest in assisting with the development of a 305 DMU specification.

DMU Requirements Document development:

The development of this document is underway, with Dale Engelhardt in the lead. It is anticipated to come before the subcommittee on its next call (September 22, 2011).

Agenda Items:

Review of the August 30th Executive Board Call –

a. DMU – Mario Bergeron:

Mario Bergeron reported that with the feedback that has been received (11 states and 10 members of the industry interested), the Executive Board voted, on its August 30, 2011 conference call, to direct the Technical subcommittee to begin the process of developing the specification. The first step in that process is the development of a requirements document. The Executive Board anticipates considering the requirements document on its September 27, 2011 conference call. The subcommittee will utilize the US Railcar draft requirements document, previously received, as well as additional input provided by industry members, and the Mechanical subgroup. Dale Engelhardt is to lead the effort to develop the document. The document will be formatted in a manner consistent with previous PRIIA 305 requirements documents, as will the specification itself. A previous Amtrak DMU specification will also be used as a reference in developing the 305 DMU specification.

Eloy Martinez asked if states had provided information concerning their anticipated order volume of DMU cars. Steve Hewitt and Mario Bergeron responded that, although the question was asked, the states did not provide a number. Uncertainty in federal funding availability made the states unsure of what they would be able to do and when, but they were clear that they want a 305 DMU specification available as an option.

b. Diesel-Loco Requirement Docs – Dave Warner:

Dave Warner reported, that "*this has been a topic of phone calls at levels both higher and lower than this group. This morning, during the LTF call, representatives from five manufacturers were asked if the Diesel Locomotive Requirements Document should be modified as presently being considered; or should be left alone, i.e., that is, 125 mph top speed, 600KW HEP and 1800 gallon fuel capacity. The emissions requirements, which are only overtly mentioned in the specification, should be clarified to "Comply with current US EPA emission standards for Line-Haul locomotives 40CFR1033," which, given the practical timeline for the first diesel locomotive delivery means, "keep Tier IV". Three of the manufacturers said the requirements document should be kept as is, one felt an interim phasing option to permit an intermediate 110 mph top speed should be included, and one manufacturer said the requirements document should be changed.*

Further, the manufacturers were asked if an "upgradable" clause, as suggested last week during the Executive Board call was a good idea or bad idea. The response was a unanimous "bad idea".

A long discussion ensued in regards to the issue of changing the requirements document, as requested by the Executive Board, or not. The FRA had provided a marked up version of the original change proposal, and that is part of what the LTF was reviewing and reacting to.

Some industry members on the call weighed in with their thoughts. One mentioned that the suggestion by FRA for an "upgradable" clause was a problem. He felt that "you should either go for 110 or 125 – not in between." The point was made that "uncertainty is a concern for manufacturers. We have done lots of behind the scene design work for 125 mph."

Chairman Bergeron asked Kevin Kesler, FRA, if he had any comments on the LTF perspective. Kevin stated that he thought Mr. Warner had given a good summary of the LTF discussion. "It is achievable and manufacturers would like it to stay as it is".

Mr. Bergeron noted that "we'll bring the feedback we've received to the Executive Board next week at the September 15th in-person meeting." He also reiterated that the proposed changes are "doable – we stand ready to go however the Board wants us to go."

Industry members began to weigh in some more, and the discussion continued. Some comments offered were:

- HEP or fuel isn't the issue – it is the 110 or 125 mph that is the issue. If you separate those two, you will likely get a different answer. Many manufacturers do not support the change to 110.
- Since there is no immediate requirement for 125, the phased approach could offer a life cycle

advantage. A suggestion is that states in the first locomotive procurement should have the option for the most economic solution, but, as we go forward, 125 is the way to go. To foreclose on the opportunity at this point is not in the best interest of all concerned. High Speed Rail is an incremental step by step approach.

- The point was made by one manufacturer that, in terms of timing, "we have about 36 months before Tier IV – so it is possible since it will take between 28-32 months to deliver, some of the first locomotives will fall into Tier IV".
- Another manufacturer differed on this point, stating that they have a product and can deliver in shorter time – there is the capability to do the 110.
- Others weighed in as well, stating that they could deliver a locomotive in 18 months. Those who want a Tier III 110 mph locomotive in 18-20 months from the time of the order will not run into 2015 (Tier IV).
- Another member of the industry commented that unless the Board believes that Tier III is necessary, "we should stop going around and around on this. First it was the cost, now its Tier III vs. IV this is not what the PRIIA process is about. We keep going around finding reasons why they want to go 110."
- Another stated, "We are listening to the customer – we can deliver sooner at Tier III if that is what the states want."

Dale Engelhardt commented that "keeping it at 125 allows the states to operate at 110 if they so choose. It is much easier than having two specs – 110 and 125. Leave it as is, and if a customer wants to operate at 110 it's their decision."

Mario Bergeron noted that "this would be consistent with the work the subcommittee has done on the car side."

After continued discussion, Mario summed it up in this manner. "We have done our homework on this, and we have received feedback on the technology side of it. It is not about the advantage of one manufacturer over another. From a technical standpoint, we are ready to deliver if an order is placed in the next few months. The question assigned to us – we have answered." He went on to say, "we will deliver the key discussion points to the Executive Board next week, and Mr. Hewitt, will capture them in the minutes so they will be well noted."

c. Status: FRA – CEM position paper – Kevin Kesler:

Kevin Kesler reported that the CEM position paper is still working its way through the FRA process. It has been delayed due to year end fiscal issues which are taking up much of the time of senior management. "Still, we hope to have it available before the Board meets next week, but I wouldn't necessarily count on it."

Mario Bergeron asked if the disclaimer statement was going to be a part of the position paper as agreed to at a recent Board meeting. Kevin commented that he believed it was part of it. Steve Hewitt noted that Mark Yachmetz told the Board on August 30th that it was a part of what they were preparing.

Kevin and Steve explained the issue of the disclaimer statement for those who may not have been aware of it. Steve emphasized that the bottom line is that the disclaimer statement would clarify that the NGEC is not intending to modify safety regulations through its process.

Kevin added that the FRA position is that CEM is part of the RSAC process, and the process should be allowed to run its course without having the NGEC expand or operate outside of or in parallel with RSAC.

Update: Standardization Pilot Program Review – Michael Burshtin:

Michael Burshtin reported that the Standardization Pilot process continues to move forward. One candidate proposed has been set aside as "not worth considering."

He is working with consultant Larry Salci on issues of a commercial nature.

There are about 4 or 5 other candidates that are making their way through the process.

Once standards have been created, the administrative handling will be based on the Document Control process. He is working with Dave Warner to come up with forms and process.

Update: Document Control Pilot process status – Dave Warner:

Dave Warner reported: "The Document Change Summary for Bi-Level Specification Revision A was not voted on at the last meeting; the vote was tabled until this meeting.

Assuming approval of the changes today, the Document Change Summary will next go to the Review Panel for its assessment of the changes vis-à-vis the requirement document. I would recommend that the Review Panel that reviewed the Bi-Level Specification be re-assembled for this effort. Ideally this will not take more than two weeks, and then the Executive Board will vote on the Changes, hopefully on September 27.

Progress is being made on preparing the Amtrak specifications and drawings referenced in vehicle specifications to industry. Clones have been created of existing Amtrak specifications, and assigning them PRIIA numbers. Disclaimers are being placed on both the Amtrak and PRIIA versions that mention their "parentage," and requesting Amtrak/PRIIA contact each other if a change to one is made. For drawings, a disclaimer is being placed on the PRIIA Clone to not change the drawing without first getting Amtrak's approval. References dealing with intercar cables and connectors are being changed to APTA references. I will coordinate the submission of appropriate Document Change Requests.

I had hoped to get this done by last Friday, but a few of the specifications/drawings required some digging to find, and it turns out some of the referenced specs don't yet exist. If they turn out not to be used in the vehicle specifications, they will be deleted from the list".

Update: ADA working group progress – Melissa Shurland:

Melissa Shurland reported that the ADA WG had last met August 31, 2011 – and expected to take consider input received on the issue of the wheel chair lift going from 600 to 800 pounds soon.

Also under consideration are wheel chairs that are 35-48 inches and the more modern wheel chair sizes of 48-56 inches. There are a few outstanding issues being worked on.

After some discussion about changing to a monthly report, (every other meeting of the subcommittee) it was decided to keep this as a standing agenda item for all calls.

Update: Buy America Survey work – Kevin Kesler:

Kevin Kesler reported that the Buy America effort is progressing well. There have been meetings with the Secretary and Deputy Secretary, and "we are getting a great deal of support in developing guidance". The FRA is "embracing FTA guidelines and expect to adopt their definition of components as best as possible."

As for the survey of the industry members, Kevin said they are compiling the responses and have done follow up phone calls with the respondents. He expects that they will survey some suppliers as well. He anticipates the presentation to the Secretary and the Administrator to take place in late September, and will follow up with a briefing, at some point, to the 305 Committee. (Board and subcommittee)

Approval of the Document Change Summary – Mario Bergeron:

After some additional discussion, it was the decision of the subcommittee to vote on approval of the Document Change Summary Revision A for the bi-level specification and, if approved, send it on to the Board, asking that they re-form the Bi-level Review Panel to review the summary and make a recommendation to the Board.

On a motion offered by Jack Madden, NYSDOT, and seconded by Art Peterson for IDOT, Chairman Bergeron asked Steve Hewitt to poll the voting members of the subcommittee. The vote results were:

Mario Bergeron, Amtrak – in favor
Kevin Kesler, FRA - in favor
Steve Fretwell, Caltrans – in favor
Jack Madden, NYSDOT – in favor
Jeff Schultz for Connecticut DOT – in favor
Art Peterson for IDOT – in favor
Philip Meraz, Iowa DOT – in favor

With all votes cast in favor, the Chairman determined that consensus had been achieved and the change

summary will be submitted to the Board and addressed by Chairman Bergeron at its meeting next week. At that time, he will ask the Board to re-form the Bi-Level Review Panel to consider the change summary, and make a recommendation to the Board.

Action Items Update

The Standardization working group continues to progress – it has 4-5 candidates working through the process. The Standardization Group has decided to use the Document Control process for handling the administration side of items assembled and approved for Standardization. Dave Warner and Michael Burshtin will work to develop forms and the process based on the Document Control process.

Feedback received from the industry on the locomotive requirements document's proposed changes will be provided to the Executive Board at its meeting on September 15, 2011. The Board will ultimately make the decision on whether or not the requirements will stay the same or change.

The PRIIA Bi-Level Car Change Summary - Revision A has been approved by the subcommittee and will be submitted to the Executive Board. The Board will be asked to re-form the Bi-level Review Panel and ask them to consider the change summary and provide the Board with a recommendation.

Clones have been created of existing Amtrak specifications, and assigning them PRIIA numbers. Disclaimers are being placed on both the Amtrak and PRIIA versions that mention their "parentage," and requesting Amtrak/PRIIA contact each other if a change to one is made. For drawings, a disclaimer is being placed on the PRIIA Clone to not change the drawing without first getting Amtrak's approval. Dave Warner will continue this effort and have cover sheets ready in the near future.

The FRA position paper on CEM is still in process and will remain an agenda item until resolved.

Next conference call – September 22, 2011

ATTACHMENTS



PRIIA Section 305 Tech Sub Committee Meeting

September 8, 2011

Agenda

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 August 25th meeting | Mario Bergeron |
| 5. Review of the Aug 30 th Executive Board Call | |
| a) DMU | Mario Bergeron |
| b) Diesel Loco Requirement Docs | Dave Warner |
| c) Status: FRA – CEM position paper | Kevin Kesler |
| 6. Update: Standardization pilot program | Michael Burshtin |
| 7. Update: Document control pilot process status | Dave Warner |
| 8. Update: ADA working group progress | Melissa Shurland |
| 9. Update: Buy America survey work | Kevin Kesler |
| 10. Review this meeting: | Steve Hewitt |
| a. Decisions | |
| a) New Action Items | |

***Technical Sub Committee Conference Call Meeting:
Thursday September 8, 2011 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***