

SECTION 305 NGENC Executive Board Second Annual Meeting

MINUTES

FEBRUARY 23,
2012

8:30 AM EASTERN

CONFERENCE CALL

FACILITATOR	<i>Bill Bronte, Chair, S305 NGENC Executive Board</i>
ATTENDEES	Committee Voting Members: <i>Bill Bronte, Mario Bergeron, Gordon Hutchinson for DJ Stadler, Alan Ware, Chad Edison for Paul Nissenbaum, Eric Curtit, Bill Bronte for Kevin Lawson, George Weber, Ray Hessinger, Pat Simmons, John Sibold, Ron Adams, Tammy Nicholson, Ron Adams, Tim Hoeffner, Tammy Nicholson for Joe Kyle, Support Staff and guests: Steve Hewitt, Leo Penne, Shayne Gill, Zach O'Connor, David Ewing, Larry Salci, Kevin Kesler, Jeff Gordon, Melissa Shurland, Dale Engelhardt, Nico Lindenau, Ashok Sundararajan, Ken Uznanski, Dave Warner, Jeff Schultz, Richard Devylder, Nancy Greene, Dave Warner, Mathew Kelly, David Stieren, Beth Kinser Industry Participants: see attached registration list, and sign in sheets</i>
ABSENTEES	Board Members: <i>All members were represented in person or via proxy or designated representative as noted above. Support Staff/Observers: Whitney Phend, Drew Galloway, Robin McCarthy, Andy House, John Tunna,</i>

INTRODUCTORY AND WELCOME

Welcome – Bill Bronte, Chair:

Bill welcomed all attendees to the "Second Annual Meeting of the Next Generation Corridor Equipment Pool Committee" and called for self-introductions. Following the self-introductions, Bill asked that Steve Hewitt formally call the roll of Voting Members of the Committee. (For Committee business, the Executive Board and any other states represented are voting members – for Board business, only Executive Board members may vote)

Roll Call – Steve Hewitt, Manager, S305 NGENC Support Services:

Steve Hewitt took a roll of Executive Board members, and State Committee members present. After calling the roll, it was determined that a quorum of Executive Board members was present, either in-person, or via designated representative or proxy (as noted above).

Agenda Items

Chairman's Report – Bill Bronte:

Chairman Bronte called the meeting to order and welcomed all those in attendance to what he called "a celebration" of the accomplishments of the Committee over its 25 month existence. Bill referred to the 71 page background/activities document, prepared by Support Services Manager Steve Hewitt, as a thorough history of the work of the Committee, and a snapshot of the complex organization, as well as an indication of the progress made in this short time.

Bill thanked the members of the industry for the tremendous contributions they have made to the successes of the Committee, as a whole, and to the Technical subcommittee, specifically. He also thanked Amtrak and FRA for their commitment and staff support for the work of the NGENC.

The Chair also noted that the Committee, in 25 months, has developed and adopted specifications for PRIIA Next Generation Equipment for: Bi-level cars; Diesel –Electric Locomotives; Single Level Standalone cars; and Single Level Trainsets. He added that the Technical subcommittee is currently working on the development of the PRIIA DMU specification and, upon its completion, will begin work on a PRIIA Dual Mode Locomotive specification.

He continued, reporting that there was now a joint procurement (with California and the mid-west states) in process for the bi-level cars, and that a joint procurement for locomotives will immediately follow.

For the bi-level cars, an RFI had been released, soon to be followed by an RFP. California and Illinois DOT and the mid-west states have executed an agreement to jointly procure approximately 150 cars and, along with

Washington State, 40 locomotives.

Bill expressed amazement "that we got it done in such a short amount of time. What this group has done in 25 months is incredible. It may not be as quick as it will be once a framework is established as a way moving forward", and added that "this first procurement will result in the development of a skeleton for a joint procurement that others will be able to use."

He went on to describe the establishment of a Document Control Process developed by the Technical subcommittee, and approved by the Board, as another accomplishment that was critical to the success of the NGEC.

Chairman Bronte added, "I am proud of this Board and of all of you (industry members and state, Amtrak and FRA support staff) for what we've accomplished".

He specifically stressed how incredible it was that "we have put competing companies together in a collaborative and transparent process" and have worked through any issues that have come up because of the amazing cooperation of all parties.

"Overall, it has been an enjoyable process, and we all need to be proud of ourselves."

Looking forward, Chairman Bronte noted the importance of the work of the newly established Structure and Finance Task Force (SFTF) which will go a long ways towards mapping out the future course of the NGEC. The SFTF will tackle such issues as finance, management, structure, maintenance etc.

Bill closed his remarks by, once again, expressing his thanks to the many individuals and organizations that have contributed to the successes to date; and noting the tremendous amount of work that lies ahead as the Committee moves forward.

Approval of the Minutes of the February 14, 2012 Executive Board conference call – Bill Bronte:

On a motion by Pat Simmons, NCDOT, and a second by Ray Hessinger, NYSDOT, the Minutes of the February 14, 2012 Executive Board conference call were approved without objection or exception.

Report from the FRA – Chad Edison:

Chad Edison, FRA, spoke on behalf of FRA Administrator Joe Szabo and Deputy Administrator Karen Hedlund, noting that they both would have liked to have been here for today's meeting.

Chad continued by adding that the FRA commends the NGEC for its hard work and accomplishments and for the collaborative process. They are proud of the NGEC and feel that it has exceeded their expectations. The NGEC has adopted specifications in a timely manner. These "unprecedented efforts have coincided with renewed interest across the nation in passenger rail."

He stressed the fact that "passenger rail equipment is badly needed" by the states and Amtrak.

Chad described the USDOT and FRA's "three pronged approach" as:

- Equipment
- Standardization
- Reinvigoration of a manufacturing supply chain (commenting on the recent NIST/MEP forums held in Sacramento and Chicago in February and noted the "challenges" of getting to 100% US content))

He added that the USDOT, FRA, and the Administration "is committed to the High Speed Intercity Passenger Rail (HSIPR) program" and is exploring alternate sources of funding "like RRIF".

Chad continued, "The NGEC has its hands full...the procurements (underway and those in the future) have national significance." He noted that the next generation equipment being manufactured and procured will have intended use over several decades.

He stressed that the FRA stands behind the NGEC and will continue to offer needed support to it.

He noted the importance of creating management plans for the equipment program and recommended that states work with the NGEC.

He added that the FRA is pleased that standardization is being addressed and the effort has been elevated, but there is concern that there still needs to be "real measurable results".

Chad closed his remarks by noting that all here today have contributed greatly to the effort which will result in next generation equipment that will be "going for 30-40 years".

"This is a national effort and we thank you."

Kevin Kesler, FRA, added "I have been surprised at the Committee coming together so well to get specifications developed." He continued, "the resources provided by the industry have been phenomenal. This has been an amazing effort between Amtrak, the FRA, the states and the industry." He added "Amtrak's involvement has truly been amazing" and emphasized "this is only the beginning of a long and successful endeavor."

Treasurer's Report – Gordon Hutchinson, Amtrak – on behalf of DJ Stadtler NGEC Treasurer:

Mr. Hutchinson provided an overview of the status of the current (revised) grant and the estimated expenses for the current period year to date. (full presentation has been distributed and will be posted on the NGEC website) He also provided information related to the development of an NGEC budget for the period from April 1, 2012 through March 31, 2013, and noted that in addition to the funding to be carried over, the NGEC has received an additional \$2 million in funding from the FRA.

Some of the highlights of the report included:

NGEC has met budget requirements:

- NGEC expenditures are at or below budget
- Thousands of hours of time and effort have been donated by the FRA, States, Amtrak and the Industry—limiting direct expenses
- Unspent Funding will be carried over and reprogrammed in future budget(s)

Budget Development 2012-2013:

- Implementation of Joint Procurement Task Force and Structure and Finance Task Force will provide major new work components
- Scope of Work and Budgets currently under deliberation
- FRA provided an additional \$2 million of funding

NGEC Reimbursable Expenses Reminder:

- Federal Travel Guidelines must be followed for travel expenses to be eligible for reimbursement
- All requests for reimbursement must be documented with receipts

Bill Bronte commented that the Executive Board is working hard on the next budget and work plan, and hopes to bring it to conclusion soon. He noted, too, that there will be challenges to stay within budget in light of the fact that the Board will likely need to go to "outside (consultants) for additional support" .

Report of the Technical Subcommittee – Mario Bergeron:

Mr. Bergeron provided an overview of the activities and accomplishments of the Technical subcommittee over the past year. He noted that "bringing the work together and looking at a specification is a challenge, and he briefly described the process that has been developed to complete the assigned tasks. He explained the subcommittee is "effective in the way we do it, We try to do it right the first time."

Highlights of the presentation include:

Presentation Summary:

Highlights Since Last Meeting: Feb. 15, 2011:

- Technical Subcommittee Overview
- Document Approval Process
- Vehicle Requirements Documents
- Vehicle Specifications
- Disclaimers
- Systems Engineering Task Force
 - Document Management System
- Locomotive Technology Task Force
- Standardization Task Force

- Accessibility Working Group
- Membership
 - Core Team Members
 - Industry Members
- Structure
 - Technical Working Groups
 - Task Forces
- Meetings
 - Technical Subcommittee
 - Technical Working Groups
 - Task Forces

Document Approval Process:

- General document flow evolving
- Essentially the same for each document
- Requirements Document
- Specification
- Document Changes
- Special reports

Vehicle Requirements Documents:

- Diesel Electric Locomotive (Relook)
 - Issue: 125 or 110 mph top speed
 - LTFF tasked to provide answers/recommendations
 - LTFF recommended “No Change” to Diesel Requirements Document 9/8/11
 - 2-3 Months of effort
 - End result: Still 125 mph
- Dual Mode Locomotive
 - Requirements Document approved by Tech. Sub: July 2011
 - Executive Board approved: December 2011
- Diesel Multiple Unit (DMU)
 - Executive Board approved Requirements Doc.: October 2011
- Generally require 6 – 9 months to develop
- Previously approved specifications
 - Bi-Level (August 2010)
 - Single Level (February 2011)
- Diesel Electric Locomotive approved (March 2011)
- Trainset approved (August 2011)
 - FRA Objected to inclusion of Crash Energy Management
 - FRA Issued Position Paper and Disclaimer Statement in November
- Diesel Multiple Unit (DMU) In Process
 - Requirements Document approved (October 2011)
 - Milestones Approved (November 2011)
 - Anticipated Completion in Summer, 2012

Disclaimers:

- Specifications:
 - General Use Disclaimer
 - Adopted by Executive Board on March 16, 2011
 - “Use at Own Risk”
 - FRA Disclaimer Statement
 - FRA concerned about “approving” features exceeding scope of existing regulations and supplier product endorsement
 - Exec. Board consensus to implement (Nov. 2011)
- Administrative (for Special Reports)
 - Request by Locomotive Technology Task Force
 - Adopted by Exec. Board on Jan. 3, 2012

Systems Engineering Task Force:

- Ensures Documentation:

- Meets needs of NGEN members
- Is kept current
- Benefits
 - Common approach to equipment acquisition
 - Adoption of industry lessons-learned
 - Improved ability to promote vehicle standardization
- Activities
 - Document Management System
 - Support FRA Buy America guidance
 - Standardization language incorporated into Bi-Level RFI

Document Management System:

Type Of Changes:

- Minor
- Major
- Urgent

- Manage NGEN-Approved Documents
- Bi-Level Specification
 - Rev. A Approved. (Pilot Project) (50 Changes)
 - Rev. B Approved (63 Changes)
 - Rev. C In Progress (to support RFP) (85 Changes)
- Locomotive
 - Rev A In Progress (to support RFI) (>50 Changes)
- Single Level
 - Rev A In Progress (100 Changes)

How Does a Procurement Impact the Process?

Locomotive Technology Task Force:

- Diesel Locomotive Reports Issued
 - Locomotive-Vehicle Technology Report (Dual Mode loco.)
 - Potential Other Locations for Dual Mode loco.
 - Top Speed Variation Impact Study
- Exceptional open disclosure from several suppliers during report creation
- "Questions" Answered: Fuel consumption simulation
- Is the "GO TO" group for locomotive-related questions

Standardization Working Group:

- Pilot Program Established in May 2011
 - Seven standardization candidates identified
 - Trainset specification delayed work
 - No effective agreement on Pilot candidates
- Challenges
 - Little Technical SubGroup member interest
 - No current baseline vehicle for interface standards
- Renewed Focus with current effort from Independent Review of the process, issues, and recommendations.

* Topic of a separate agenda item

Accessibility Working Group:

- All vehicle specifications meet current ADA requirements
- Committee formed to analyze future accessibility needs/make recommendations to Technical Subcommittee
- Multiple organizations developed recommendations that exceed current federal requirements
- Some new features related to lift capacity and dimensions to be included in Bi-Level passenger car under Rev. "C".

* Topic of a separate agenda item

Thank You!

- Technical Subcommittee Core Team Members
- Specification Leaders

- Technical Working Group Leaders & Volunteers
 - Technical Support & Consultants
 - Industry Members
 - Presentation Creative Team
- Thank You!

In summary, Mario emphasized, "The process works". He cited, as an example, the Diesel Locomotive specification – "we found things that needed to be changed, and we were able to go back and get it done". The process showed, in a positive way, "that there is scrutiny – we are not just issuing a specification" for the sake of issuing it. We "get it right".

Report from Amtrak – Matthew Kelly Senior Director, Government Affairs, Amtrak:

Matt Kelly, Amtrak, provided a summary report on Amtrak. He noted that the "work of the NGEC should be on the top of the list. Equipment is paramount". He also commented that Intercity Passenger Rail needs to be involved in the tax policy debate." In his remarks, Mr. Kelly emphasized the "need for a national rail plan" and he also noted that Congress is in a "transition period."

Presentation Highlights included:

Amtrak has a good story to tell policymakers in 2012:

- Expect to finish FY12 with lowest Federal operating support need (\$345m) since 1975
- Requesting less operating funds for FY13 than what was appropriated last year
- Increased ridership in 8 of last 9 years
- Revenues up 42% in same time period
- DC-NY air/rail share approaching 80%; NY-BOS above 50%
- American workers building equipment in NY, CA, GA, OH

Tangible improvements to the product help our image on the Hill:

- 75% of passengers have access to on-board Wi-Fi
- Launched iPhone app
- 110-mph service in Michigan
- National roll-out of e-Ticketing
- Modern on-board food sales system

FY13 Amtrak Grant Request:

Total Received (in millions) 2012: 1.418.0

Total Request (in millions) 2013: 2.157.2

The FY 2013 request is for less than is authorized in PRIIA (2.33.0) and includes a request for less operating support in 2013 than was received in 2012. (466.0 vs. 450.0). Debt service in FY 2013 is also less than FY 2012 (212.4 vs. 271.0). The major increase in the request for FY 2013 vs. the amount received in FY 2012 is for Capital Programs. 681.0 in 2012 vs. 1504.8 in 2013 requests.

FY2013 Appropriations Outlook:

Operating and debt service requests are lower than FY12-enacted levels by a combined \$75 million

- Capital request of \$1.5 billion properly states the need but represents >\$800 million increase over FY12-enacted level
- The good news:
 - Congress likes capital more than operating
 - Amtrak's FY12 capital appropriation increased after House-Senate conference
- The bad news:
 - Discretionary spending caps are tight; so too will be THUD allocation
 - FY12 bill used rescissions in housing accounts to beef up transportation
 - Specter of sequestration looms

Amtrak's Surface Transportation Bill Priorities:

- Provide dedicated, multiyear funding for intercity passenger rail, for both the development of new services and existing assets.
- Establish a national rail investment strategy through a National Rail Plan.
- Create a clear role for Amtrak within the Plan.

- Conduct coordinated corridor planning and project execution in other areas of the country similar to the Northeast.
- Close gaps in liability and insurance requirements.

Key issues for appropriators:

- Fleet
 - *"...these plans shall include a comprehensive fleet plan which shall establish year-specific goals and milestones and discuss potential, current and preferred financing options..."* (FY12 Conference Report)
- ADA
 - *"...the conferees direct Amtrak to the best of its ability to maintain this plan for complying with the requirements of ADA..."* (FY12 Conference Report)
- Provide dedicated, multiyear funding for intercity passenger rail, for both the development of new services and existing assets.
- Establish a national rail investment strategy through a National Rail Plan.
- Create a clear role for Amtrak within the Plan.
- Conduct coordinated corridor planning and project execution in other areas of the country similar to the Northeast.
- Close gaps in liability and insurance requirements.

Amtrak & the 112th Congress:

Senate

- Of the 41 Senate cosponsors of PRIIA in 2007, 17 are no longer in office or are retiring in 2012 (includes 6 Republicans)
- 23 of 74 PRIIA "Yea" Votes no longer in office or retiring in 2012
- There is a path to 60 votes, but it's not proven

House

- 96 new House members sworn in 2011
- Vote on Sessions amendment to FY11 CR demonstrates support for Amtrak
 - All 190 Democrats and 60 Republicans voted against draconian cuts to FY11 capital/debt appropriation

Looking ahead to November:

Senate

- Democrats currently have 53-47 majority; Republicans projected to gain anywhere from 2-5 seats; 50-50 tie conceivable

House

- Republicans currently have 242-192 majority (one vacant seat); Democrats need 25 seats but are projected to gain only 5-12

Governors

- 11 seats are up in 2012; 6 in states with a service that is state-supported or will become state-supported under PRIIA § 209

Report of the Finance Subcommittee – Gordon Hutchinson (on behalf of DJ Stadler):

Gordon Hutchinson provided an overview of the activities of the NGEF Finance subcommittee over the past 12 months. The highlights of this report included:

Key Topics:

Scope of Work for 2012 was a carry-over from 2011 with some additions

- Railroad 101 Education webinar(s)
- Structure and Funding Working Group
 - Coordinated Effort with Administrative Task Force
 - Draft Report
 - Next Steps
- Coordination with Joint Procurement efforts
- Scope of Work and Budget Development FY12-13
- Other Work

Rolling Stock 101:

- Railroad/Rolling Stock 101
 - Survey of states indicated lack of expertise/knowledge in many areas, including procurement, equipment types, fleet management, financing methods, etc.
 - Subcommittee developed scope of work
 - Education using a proposed series of webinars for subject matter experts (primarily peers) to share information
 - Coordinate through/with AASHTO
 - Funding shifted to Administrative Task Force Budget
 - Proposed implementation in 2012-2013

Structure and Finance Working Group:

- Identified need to develop Options Paper on funding and Structure
 - Identify tools for states to use for financing procurements
 - Developed work plan, scope and budget
- Further Discussion led to Executive Board desire to develop a “business plan” for NGECE
- Procurement Questions:
 - Structure?
 - Do we create a separate entity or not?
 - How do we fund?
- Finance Subcommittee developed Structure and Funding Working Group
 - Structure Nancy Greene - Lead
 - Funding Ruben Vabner - Lead
 - Management Process Larry Salci – Lead
- Draft Report circulated for comments in fall 2011
 - FRA comments incorporated
 - Finance Subcommittee interviews senior Amtrak, FRA and State officials for further direction and vision
 - Based on these interviews the Structure and Finance Task Force (SFTF) was established

Support Joint Procurement Efforts:

- Joint Procurement Task Force established by Executive Board to help develop “template” and common methodologies for S305 procurements
 - California/Midwest States first to utilize S305 developed specification (Bi-Level) for joint procurement
 - Finance subcommittee to provide financial expertise as necessary to develop templates for future procurements.

Scope of Work/Budget Development for 2012-2013:

- Subcommittee has provided its suggested budget for 2012-2013
 - Financial Consulting will assist with the Structure and Finance Task Force
 - Independent audit of NGECE Activities
- Future direction of Subcommittee will evolve as NGECE moves towards implementation of procurements

Other Items:

- As the appropriators were preparing the FY12 appropriation the Finance Subcommittee prepared information outlining NGECE accomplishments and funding needs that was sent by letter to the Appropriators
- Responded to other ad-hoc information requests

Report from the Administrative Task Force – Al Ware:

Administrative Task Force Chair Al Ware, Georgia DOT, provided a summary overview of the activities of the Administrative Task force over the past 12 months. The highlights of this report included:

Accomplishments 2011-12 :

- Development of a Disclaimer Statement for those providing opinions as part of the NGECE Technical report and specifications
- Establishment of AASHTO as the Contracting

Agency for NGEC

- Developing a Process and Guidelines for Contracting with Consultants for NGEC Work
- Develop a Pool of State Lawyers that are Involved with State Passenger Rail Programs
- Work to elevate the Structure and Finance Working Group to Task Force

To Be Completed 2012-13:

- Developing Instructions for the use of NGEC Developed Equipment Specifications
- Developing a Committee Policy dealing With process and Procedure for Requests to address the Committee or Other Communications with the Committee
- Continue to Develop Railroad 101
- Recruiting New State Members for the Administrative Task Force

Report from the Structure and Finance Task Force – Eric Curtit:

Eric Curtit, Missouri DOT is the Chair of the newly established Structure and Finance Task Force (SFTF). The task force has held one organizational conference call meeting to date.

Eric recently met with Chad Edison and others at FRA to get a sense of direction for the task force.

The task force, in its first conference call, appointed co-vice chairs: Tim Hoeffner, Michigan DOT and Ron Pate, Washington State DOT.

The task force is developing/finalizing its member list and hoping to recruit additional states.

The task force will meet every other Monday at 3:30pm Eastern.

The task force's goal is to put a plan in place that can be used "once the equipment is out". The plan will address such issues as: ownership, maintenance, lifecycle costs, deployment and operations, etc.

The task force is in the process of procuring outside consultant services to assist in developing the work plan. A Statement of Work (SOW) is in the process of being developed. The task force will use the recently adopted NGEC contract procedures for procuring the outside support. It is intended that a draft work plan be completed by September 2012.

Chad Edison, FRA, noted that "this is an FRA priority". The FRA sees the development of a plan to address ownership as critical over the entire useful life of the equipment. Developing a plan is a requirement of the grants for states acquiring equipment.

Bill Bronte noted the importance of the work of the task force commenting that "the work plan needs to be put in place if the NGEC is to continue with procurements, and look at issues such as how do you address maintenance and operations."

He noted that the Executive Board recognized the importance of developing the structure and finance aspects of the NGEC, and therefore elevated the former Structure and Finance Working Group to that of a task force reporting directly to the Executive Board.

He added that previously the priority for the NGEC was developing specifications, but now "we need to address the infrastructure of the NGEC – and look ahead to the future – and additional procurements."

Report from the Joint Procurement Task Force – Bill Bronte:

Bill Bronte briefly summarized the work of the Joint Procurement Task force (JPTF), noting that much of the information was confidential due to the RFI (for the bi-level cars) already having been released, and the RFP to follow shortly.

The primary focus of the JPTF is "to get the first set of procurement documents and process right."

He described the JPTF as having a full membership including states involved in the procurement and states interested in future procurements, as well as Amtrak, FRA and others (all of whom have signed Conflict of Interest Forms) and a core team which includes FRA and the states involved in the initial procurements. The core team meets weekly, via conference call, and the full JPTF will meet once a month.

The core team will "do the grunt work of putting the RFP together." The core team is anticipating holding a face to face meeting in Chicago around March 13-14, 2012 and will likely meet every 6 weeks or so face to face in addition to the weekly calls.

Bill made it clear that this is "an iterative process which will continue to develop and improve."

Report on Standardization – Larry Salci:

The Executive Board retained consultant Larry Salci to do an outside (or independent) assessment of the Standardization Working Group's Pilot Program. The Board has just received the full report from Mr. Salci and has not yet reviewed or commented on it. At a future meeting of the Board, it will consider the report and provide its feedback to Mr. Salci.

Highlights of Mr. Salci's presentation include:

Standardization Mandate:

- The 2008 PRIIA Act, Section 305 states, Amtrak shall establish a Next Generation Equipment Pool Committee
- The purpose of the Committee shall be to design and develop specifications for, and procure **Standardized** next Generation corridor equipment
- Amtrak and the States participating in the Committee may enter into agreements for the funding, procurement, remanufacture, ownership, and management of corridor equipment,

NGEC Technical Subcommittee:

- The NGEC created several standing subcommittees, including a Technical Subcommittee comprised of Amtrak, FRA, States, and industry members representing railcar manufactures and system and component suppliers
- The Technical Subcommittee has successfully completed 3 vehicle and 1 locomotive technical specifications
- The bi-level coach technical specification is the first to enter the procurement phase which is in process, time is critical to meet RFP and NTP schedule

Standardization Working Group:

- The NGEC created a Standardization Working Group (SWG) in January 2011 to address the standardization process
- The SWG was comprised of members from Amtrak, States, FRA, and a consultant facilitator
- SWG developed a detailed work plan that identified Objectives, Approach, Process, Staff, and developed a Pilot Program to verify the process

SWG Work Plan Objectives:

- Embrace long-range effort to achieve commonality of systems or components
- Encourage vitality of US domestic railcar supply industry
- Identify potential candidates for standardization
- Develop a common process for evaluation technical and economic benefits
- Emphasize use of open and industry standards
- Determine process for revisions
- Establish schedule for periodic re-validation

SWG Identified Benefits of Standardization:

- Reduction in life-cycle costs
- Reduction in parts inventory
- Reduction in worker training
- Reduction in tools and equipment for maintenance and manufacturing
- Consistency in design, manufacture, operation
- Improved sustainability of US railcar supply industry
- Reduces car builders risks, technical, delivery schedule

SWG Identified 3 levels of Standardization:

- Standardization of technical specification layout
- Standardization of key interfaces so that components are interchangeable with common performance requirements
- Standardization of the design of a particular component or system resulting in identical components or systems

Implementation of Pilot Program:

- SWG Pilot Program selected 7 candidates for standardization consideration:
 - Wheel sets –still in process
 - Brake Discs – Standard developed
 - Brake Shoes – Standard developed
 - Brake Valves – Rejected
 - Seats – Rejected
 - Windows – Still in process
 - HVAC – Rejected due to no interface baseline

Issues Found During Pilot Program:

- Process took longer than expected, resulting in lengthy delays in developing Pilot Program Standards
- Lack of Subgroup member interest, only 25% participation
- For members who did participate, lack of urgency
- SWG determined it needed to understand lack of industry member participation
- NGENC Board believed potential bias may be introduced by having industry members make determination of system/component standardization

Independent Review of NGENC Standardization Process:

- NGENC requested independent third party to perform independent review of Standardization Process
- Work Scope Tasks for Independent Assessor
 - Task 1-Review SWG process, performance, recommend changes or revisions on funding, independence, and productivity
 - Task 2 –Address Standards Development in context of current NGENC activities by considering the following questions:

Task 2 Scope of Work:

- Task 2A-How can perceived barriers to standards development be overcome while maintaining involvement of industry representatives
- Task 2B-How should the concept of a standardized component be defined? Should standardization be focused on components or major systems or both?
- Task 2C-How can the question of when to standardize be resolved?
- Task 2D-How can/should the potential benefits of standardization be determined?
- Task 2E-What should be the process for re-evaluating decision to reject candidate

Historical Impediments to Standardization:

- Older systems, NY, Chicago, Boston, have infrastructure that require custom vehicles
- Historical U.S. market is limited and erratic, tends to be for custom cars
- Market is infrequent, railcars have 25-40 year life
- Even newer systems favor designs of their own equipment, fleets were not designed with modularity or design re-use criteria
- Federal, State and local funding is scarce, competing interest for capital needs, orders are unpredictable

Public Agency Procurement Impacts on Standardization:

- Procurement bid process, low bid vs. negotiated (two steps)
- Negotiated procurement may allow for Total Cost of Ownership evaluation (initial cost + life cycle cost) or best value approach- but may increase bid protests
- Low bid doesn't allow for TCO evaluation-recent trends to low bid, attractive prices to public agencies
- State and Local procurements often have full disclosure requirements, impacts supplier proprietary information, may limit number of proposals

Railcar Manufacturers Participating in US Market:

- Market dominated by multinational railcar companies, US owned companies exited industry 1970-1990, no barriers to entry
- US market witnessed large turnover, but 10 multinational companies compete today, but not in all market segments
- Worldwide, more car builder manufacturing capacity than demand, same in U.S., exerts downward pressure on margins
- Multinational companies have different US strategies, some have permanent US facilities, other use temporary assembly facilities for local contracts
- Bid price levels are erratic, low bid process generates price differentials of 25% from low bid, commercially not sustainable without government support

US Industry Generally Supports Standardization:

- Industry supports key interfaces with common performance requirements
- Defined as design to form, fit, and function that allows for inter-changeability of components/systems
- Car builders support "Modular" or top down approach
- Suppliers not prone to give up intellectual property rights, key interface definition meets this commercial issue, provides customer with standardization
- Car builders that support standardization prefer negotiated procurements, low bid procurement preferences do not support standardization

Task 1 Independent Analysis:

- Task 1-Review the SWG process, performance
- Recommended Changes:
 - NGEN request bi-level procurement RFP to request prospective car builders to develop Standardization Plan as part of technical proposal evaluation
 - Car builders use "Modular" or top down approach, integration with suppliers and vehicle design critical
 - NGEN identify major candidate systems for inclusion, Doors, HVAC, Seats, Couplers, etc.
- Task 1 Recommended Changes:
 - Decision required whether to include TCO (initial cost + life-cycle cost) as part of evaluation process-requires financial/economic resources
 - SWG can provide procurement assistance, evaluations as Subject Matter Experts to procurement process
 - Owner/successful car builder will require close working relationship through design phase, final decisions made at Preliminary Design Phase (30%)

Task 2A Independent Analysis:

- Task 2A-How to overcome perceived barriers to standardization
- Recommendations:
 - Utilize negotiated (two steps) procurement process
 - Standardization should focus on two major cost drivers, high dollar systems and high usage components over useful life of component
 - Assumes use of TCO for evaluation
 - Car builder utilizes "modular" approach to standardization, form, fit, function, with key interfaces electrical, mechanical, pneumatic defined

Task 2B Independent Analysis:

- Task 2B-How should concept of standardization be defined, components or systems or both?
- Recommendation:
 - Use key interface standardization definition
 - Car builder uses "modular" approach, defines space, weight limits, key interfaces for elect., mech., pneumatic

- Identify high dollar systems and high usage components as candidates
- Define components to lowest level possible

Task 2C Independent Analysis:

- Task 2C-Question of when to standardize? Will standardization impede technological innovation?
- Recommendation:
 - Ideal time to standardize is concurrent with development of technical spec
 - Start with "clean sheet of paper" a platform from which all vehicle architecture is developed
 - Apply the modular design concept, top down integration
 - Standardization implementation should enhance technological innovation, suppliers can orient their engineering resources to product development, both product design and manufacturing process improvements

Task 2D Independent Analysis:

- Task 2D-How should potential benefits of standardization be determined?
- Recommendation:
 - Integration of standardization process into the procurement process
 - Require prospective car builders to propose Standardization Plan
 - Utilize technical suitability (form, fit, function) and TCO (initial cost + life cycle cost) to calculate total cost benefit analysis
 - TCO will require management resources and continuity for both bid evaluation and for monitoring data from warranty claims, operations, maintenance, and overhaul

Task 2E Independent Analysis:

- Task 2E Process for reviewing rejected candidates
- Recommendation:
 - If Standardization Process responsibility shifts from SWG to car builder Standardization Plan, car builder should suggest process
 - SWG Flow Chart documents sound process for evaluation, and should be modified to interface with car builder Standardization Plan, especially the procurement evaluation process and the Preliminary Design Review Phase (30% level)

Conclusions:

- Shift Standardization Process to car builder, only way meaningful standardization can happen
- Negotiated (NGEC) procurements offers opportunity for integration of standardization into process, low bid process will be major inhibitor.
- SWG can provide meaningful evaluation and ongoing monitoring resources to standardization process
- Standardization process can only become meaningful if funding for continued orders (volume) materialize

At the conclusion of Mr. Salci's report, there were a number of questions and comments. Some of the discussion is captured below:

Kevin Kesler, FRA, thanked Larry for his work saying "it helps us focus on the issues. Standardization is most important to the FRA and DOT". He also noted that there have been two models for the standardization of a fleet – the freight model and the transit model. For passenger rail "we are hopeful; that in the procurement process folks are encouraged to help, when bidding, to answer the question of what items can be standardized". He added, that to "advance this program, getting one or two wins in the first procurement, it is my hope, will begin to create standards."

In responding to questions of interface – Larry Salsi pointed towards "the installed vs. the modular approach – do that and you'll get there."

In answer to a question about the current procurement process– Bill Bronte noted that they (California and the mid-west) "are using a best value process – not low bid."

In response to the availability of international standards, Dale Engelhardt, Amtrak, responded " Amtrak and FRA are looking at adopting standards in place in Europe that can be used in the US".

Kevin Kesler stated that "someday we want to export out of the US and grow our manufacturing in that way – as part of a long term objective."

One attendee asked, "How do we pollinate the other car builders from the one that gets the first contract, and, essentially sets the standards?"

Larry Salci responded, "it should be a benefit, not an inhibitor. The second bid will have a standardized spec that goes out with designed standards. This will attract multiple bidders for a design already done."

Kevin Kesler responded, "If the first builder ends up setting the standard – if that does not become non-proprietary, it puts others at a disadvantage." However, "if you do the first build and, once it is in the public domain, then everyone can do it."

Kevin added, "Standardization should build competitiveness in the long run. Your recommendations should include suppliers as well as car builders".

Mr. Salci responded that it's the owner's determination in the design phase working with vendors who use total cost approach – suppliers are a key part of it "they do the life-cycle cost analysis".

Kevin Kesler added, "in many cases it is the supplier that defines the interface so a car builders and suppliers partnership will design the interfaces." He added, "car builders will ask suppliers to provide the interface and ask what way would you release intellectual property."

In response to question asking "will there be a systematic way to feed innovating deviations back", Larry Salci answered, "the specs allow for approved or equal components – make your case."

Report from the Accessibility Working Group – Kevin Kesler and Melissa Shurland:

Melissa Shurland and Kevin Kesler reported on the Accessibility Working Group's efforts.

Background and Objective:

The Accessibility Working Group was established in the Technical subcommittee on July 14, 2011

- Objective - review the current and future needs of passengers with disabilities, and making recommendations to the Technical subcommittee on how best to address those needs in the most cost-effective and reasonable manner.

Accomplishments:

Successful implementation of recommendation for accessibility in the bi-level specification requirements document

- 800 lbs. design load for carborne mobility aid lift
- 30 inches y 54 inches clear surface for carborne mobility aid lift
- 44 inches width in vestibule
- 32 inches by 59 inches accessible seating location space

Path Forward:

Continue work on recommendations for single-level and trainset accessibility

- Dual mode communication
- Automatic controls in accessible restrooms
- Emergency evacuation equipment

John Sibold asked – for next generation equipment if we are renovating a car, would these requirements be needed?"

Kevin Kesler responded "this is undetermined, but it is not in the jurisdiction of this Committee."

Tim Hoeffner asked "will the Access Board change the requirements for ADA?"

Kevin responded, "I can only give my opinion – other modes are advancing – our community needs to also. It is up to us, as a community, to come up with a path forward."

Richard Devylder, OST, responded "it is on their (the Access Board's) list to update the requirements".

Report on the NIST/MEP Forums – Kevin Kesler/David Stieren/Beth Kinser:

Kevin Kesler, David Stieren, and Beth Kinser provided an overview of the recently held forums for developing car builder and supplier interaction.

Kevin provided a background: On day one the direction of Congress was for 100% Buy American – no waiver. “Since then we’ve looked at where the hard spots are and what is possible and what is not.”

Today 100% is not likely achievable – but more than the transit results of 60% is achievable.

David Stieren, NIST/MEP and Beth Kinser, DPAC, can help us find suppliers we’ve never heard of who are interested in getting involved in the passenger rail supply business.

The DPAC can help produce items for dual use – beyond only defense purposes.

David Stieren gave the following presentation:

About MEP:

- Federal-state-private partnership that works with U.S. manufacturers to help them create and retain jobs, increase profits, and save time and money.
- Nationwide network of manufacturing specialists assisting manufacturers to develop new customers, expand into new markets, and create new products.
- MEP operates in all 50 U.S. states and Puerto Rico
 - 60 MEP Centers with >370 field service locations
 - System wide, >1,300 Non-Federal staff
 - Managed at federal level by NIST
 - Contracting with over 2,300 third party service providers
- *Performance Emphasis* – MEP measured on impact of center services on manufacturing firms.

What MEP Does:

- **MEP Center areas of strength across the network**
 - Technical Manufacturing Services for products/processes
 - Growth Services – new and expanded market opportunities
 - Market Diversification
 - Environmental Sustainability
 - Workforce Development
 - Lean Manufacturing & Quality Systems
- Reach nearly 34,000 manufacturing firms and complete over 10,000 projects per year*

DOT – MEP Partnership

The Opportunity

- Next Generation Rail Procurements have domestic content targets that will require development of more robust U.S. supply base for rail equipment production
- Market diversification – specifically in production of next generation rail equipment – represents real, significant growth opportunity for U.S. manufacturers
- **MEP Supplier Scouting** processes are proven and successful in leveraging MEP’s nationwide network of manufacturing specialists to identify and work with U.S. manufacturers to meet sourcing needs of federal agencies and OEMs
 - ✓ MEP has significant Supplier Scouting experience over past several years serving the *DOD, DOE, NIST, alternative energy OEMs, power utilities*

DOT – MEP Partnership

Working Together

- DOT-DOC Memorandum of Agreement, DOT FRA-NIST MEP Interagency Agreement
- Connecting (small-medium) U.S. manufacturers with large OEMs, Tier 1 Suppliers
- Using proven **MEP Supplier Scouting** and partnering processes to identify *capable and interested* manufacturers
- Bringing rail supply/production opportunities to more U.S. manufacturers – those with traditional rail industry experience, as well as new industry partners
- Supporting manufacturers once connections are made

DOT – MEP Partnership

Supply Chain Connectivity

- 2 Forums held in February 2012:

- ✓ Sacramento, CA – Feb 8; Chicago, IL – Feb 14
- ✓ Participation from ~400 representatives of U.S. manufacturing entities interested in supply chain opportunities
 - Manufacturers participated on a nationwide basis from 24 U.S. states
- ✓ 12 OEMs and Tier One Suppliers participated in over 300 one-on-one meetings with prospective suppliers
- National Webcast in December 2011 w/participation from 8 OEMs, >100 representatives of the MEP System & client manufacturing companies from across nation.
 - ✓ Introduced MEP Center supplier scouting points of contact and interested manufacturing clients to Next Generation Rail Equipment supply opportunities with OEMs.
 - ✓ MEP Centers are working with manufacturers to help facilitate supply connections and assist as appropriate during supply operations and processes

DOT – MEP Partnership
Supply Chain Connectivity

- NIST MEP website operating as central, easy-to-use location for relevant info on Next Generation Rail Supply Chain Connectivity
 - ✓ 2012 procurement info
 - ✓ Presentation material from Connectivity Forums, webcasts
 - ✓ OEM contact info
 - ✓ Section 305 Committee specs and standards, other info
 - ✓ Relevant rail links
 - ✓ www.nist.gov/mep
- Anticipate significant opportunities to exercise FRA-MEP partnership in conjunction with 2012 rail car and locomotive procurements
- Potential additional Supply Chain Connectivity Forums and/or webcasts being considered for first six months of 2012.

Beth Kinzer presented the following:

The Defense Production Act
(50 U.S.C. App. § 2061 *et seq.*)

Enacted in 1950

Provides broad authorities to Federal agencies to ensure the ability of the domestic industrial base to supply materials and services to meet national needs. DPA authorities delegated to Federal agencies via E.O. 12919

Title I – Priorities & Allocations

Provides the authority to order priority performance (delivery) on Government contracts and allocate materials to meet national requirements (DO/DX ratings)

Title III – Expansion of Productive Capacity and Supply

Authorizes use of unique economic incentives to create, expand or preserve domestic industrial manufacturing capabilities for industrial resources, technologies, and materials needed to meet Government requirements (includes homeland security)

Title VII – General Provisions

- Committee on Foreign Investment in U.S. (CFIUS)
- Defense Production Act Committee (DPAC)
 - Established in 2009 DPA reauthorization
 - Advises President on effective use of DPA authorities to mitigate industrial base risks

Title III of the Defense Production Act

- Government-wide authority. Allows Federal Departments and agencies to pool resources into the “DPA Fund” to mitigate industrial base shortfalls/risks and expand U.S. production capabilities that impact national requirements.
- Title III oversees capital expenditure (CAPEX) investments (retrofits, new machinery, or whole-sale construction).
- Authorities focused on initiatives for military and energy production/construction, stockpiling, space, critical infrastructure protection/restoration, homeland security, emergency preparedness, and critical infrastructure assistance to foreign nations.
- Title III actions stimulate private investment in production resources by reducing the risks associated with the capitalization and investments required to establish the needed production capacity. Projects range from process improvement to production plant construction.

- Objectives:
 - Creating/expanding/sustaining production capacity
 - Ensuring U.S. Government access to technology/resources
 - Ensuring long-term commercial viability
- DoD effectively functions as the Executive Agent for the Government

Title III Economic Incentives

Purchases/Purchase Commitments (*Sec. 303a*)

- Purchases provide direct subsidy to company to assist in establishing production capacity
 - Purchase and installation of production equipment
 - Engineering support to improve quality and yield of production facility
 - Sample quantities for process validation and customer qualification testing
 - Costs to develop business and marketing plans
- Purchase Commitments
 - Guaranteed market to incentivize companies to establish, expand or maintain production capability
 - Company may use internal funding or obtain external funding i.e., loan
 - Government is buyer of last resort. Some or all of funds may not be expended
- Installation of Production Equipment in Government or Privately Owned Facilities (*Sec. 303e*)
- Development of Substitutes (*Sec. 303g*)
- Loans/Loan Guarantees (*Sec. 301; Sec. 302*)
- Focus of Title III investments is to establish commercially viable industrial capabilities that will continue to prosper after Government assistance expires

Title III Statutory Requirements for Project Execution

1. Obtain "Presidential Determination"
 - Industrial resource or technology item is essential for national defense
 - Industry cannot/will not provide needed capacity in a reasonable time without Title III assistance
2. Notify Congress in writing
3. Wait 30 days to allow for Congressional comment

Title III Funds

- Title III appropriations are credited to the Defense Production Act Fund
 - Special repository in Treasury to support Title III activities (non-DoD Fund)
 - Title III appropriations are no-year procurement funds and are valid until expended
 - By law, funds may be used only for Title III purposes
 - SECDEF designated as Fund Manager for Federal Government by E.O. 12919
- Funding for Title III initiatives may also be provided by other Federal Agencies as funding offsets for specific Title III efforts.
- Revolving fund permits reuse of unexpended and recovered moneys by Title III Program
- DPA contains its own authorization of appropriations
 - Funds appropriated for Title III are automatically authorized. Title III initiatives are not normally included in authorization bills for this reason.

Why Use Title III

- Title III is a Government-wide authority that focuses on industrial base issues that are beyond the capabilities of individual agencies or programs to rectify. Capable of engaging multi-agency partners.
- Single tool to directly address industrial production shortfall issues.
 - Title III investments injected directly into industrial base – no intermediaries
- Provides a transition bridge from R&D arena to affordable, volume production; supports development of engineering specifications to qualify new materials in defense applications.
- Enhances Affordability
 - Reduced costs through efficient, lean processes
 - Improved quality driven by modern production technologies
- Enables trusted sources for uncompromised components for critical government applications.
- Accelerates availability of emerging technologies years ahead of "normal" availability
- Maintains secure domestic sources vice potentially unreliable foreign sources
- Strengthens the economic & technological competitiveness of the U.S. industrial base

Creates U.S. based jobs

Defense Production Act**Title III Contacts**

web site: <http://www.acq.osd.mil/ott/dpatitle3/>

OSD Program Director
Mr. Mark Buffler
DASD(MIBP)
(703) 607-5314
mark.buffler@osd.mil

Air Force Executive Agent
Mr. Jeff Smith
AFRL/RXM
(937) 904-4591
Jeffrey.smith@wpafb.af.mil

At the conclusion, Beth commented that "we want to understand where your weak points are. Where do you find you can't get domestic content or can't buy domestically."

Kevin noted "the FRA is to remain intimately involved and engaged to ensure you all get the help you need".

There may be additional forums, Kevin, David and Beth will keep us informed. There is a link to the NIST/MEP efforts on the NGEC website, and the partnership will continue.

Website Improvements – Leo Penne/Zach O'Connor/Dave Warner:

Leo Penne, AASHTO walked the attendees through the section of the AASHTO High Speed-Rail website dedicated to the Section 305 Next Generation Corridor Equipment Pool Committee (NGEC). Leo explained that it is actually easy to find the site – "go to Google and put in 305 Committee or NGEC Committee and you will end up on the home page of the site". He explained how the website has recently undergone major consolidation for easier access and navigability.

As more and more documents are placed on the site – changes to it will be inevitable – but the major premise is to make it easy "to get around" and find what you are looking for. The site contains information on the organization of the NGEC; all memberships; all minutes of the Board meetings; the subcommittees and task force(s) meetings, and has a section dedicated to all of the Specifications and Requirements documents produced/developed by the NGEC.

Dave Warner, as the Document Control Manager, Steve Hewitt, Support Services Manager, Leo Penne and Zach O'Connor of AASHTO met recently with AASHTO's web master to make the revisions that are now mostly in place. We will continue to make improvements and maintain the site to make it as useful and functional as possible.

Election of the S305 NGEC Executive Board and the Election of the Executive Board Officers- Bill Bronte/Steve Hewitt:

Steve Hewitt reviewed the process for electing the members of the Executive Board. The current Board members all have completed their two year terms and a Board must be elected at the Annual meeting. The members of the Board from Amtrak are automatic – the CMO and the CFO are members of the Board. The FRA appoints its member. The state members of the NGEC elect its state representatives to the Board. The by-laws call for 9 or 11 states to be members of the Board.

Chairman Bronte appointed a nomination committee comprised of Al Ware, Georgia; Tammy Nicholson, Iowa; Ron Adams, Wisconsin; and Eric Curtit, Missouri. The Nominating Committee develops a list of 9 or 11 state representatives to serve as the Executive Board for the next two years. This list is presented to the Chair as a recommendation for consideration by all state committee members.

On a motion by Al Ware, Georgia DOT, and co seconds by Tim Hoeffner, Michigan DOT, and Ron Adams, Wisconsin DOT, the following state representatives were put forward for election to the state Board positions:

Bill Bronte, Caltrans
Al Ware, Georgia DOT
Pat Simmons, NCDOT
Eric Curtit, Missouri DOT
Tammy Nicholson, Iowa DOT
Joe Kyle, Oklahoma DOT
Ron Adams, Wisconsin DOT

George Weber, Illinois DOT
Ray Hessinger, NYSDOT
Kevin Lawson, Louisiana DOT
John Sibold, Washington State DOT

Bill Bronte asked for additional nominations, none came forward, and no objections were expressed. Chairman Bronte then determined that consensus had been achieved and the current nominated states representatives were all elected to new two year terms.

The next step was to elect Executive Board officers for new two year terms. The officer positions are: Chair; Vice Chair; Treasurer; Secretary.

On a motion by Al Ware, Georgia DOT, and a second by Ray Hessinger, NYSDOT, the current slate of officers was put forward for re-election to their current posts.

Bill Bronte, Caltrans for Chair
Mario Bergeron, Amtrak for Vice Chair
DJ Stadtler, Amtrak for Treasurer
Al Ware, Georgia DOT for Secretary

With no additional names brought forward and no objections, Chairman Bronte determined that consensus had been achieved and the slate of officers, as presented, were re-elected to new two year terms.

Wrap up - Bill Bronte:

Bill Bronte thanked the Board for their willingness to serve another two years, and to the officers for their willingness to stay on and continue the work of the NGEC. He, again, noted the many accomplishments made to date, and reminded all attendees of the tremendous challenges that lie ahead.

Special thanks were expressed by the Chair and many Board members to Support Services Manager Steve Hewitt for keeping the Committee together and moving forward. Attendees were reminded that Steve is the point of contact for any questions they may have or any information they are looking for. Steve can be reached at shewitt109@aol.com or 845 616 3076.

It was agreed that the next face to face meeting of the Executive Board would take place on September 20, 2012 in Portland, Maine in conjunction with the AASHTO SCORT meeting and the S4PRC meeting.

Executive Board conference calls will continue to be held bi-weekly on Tuesday mornings at 11:30am Eastern. The next call will take place on March 6, 2012.

Adjourn

On a motion by Al Ware, Georgia DOT, and a second by Eric Curtit, Missouri DOT, the 2nd Annual Meeting of the S305 NGEC was adjourned at approximately 3:00pm Eastern.

The next Executive Board Conference call is March 6, 2012 11:30 am Eastern

8:40 – 8:45 am	Roll call of NGEC members present for Annual Meeting (Executive Board & non-Board member states) – Steve Hewitt, Manager, NGEC Support Services
8:45 – 8:50 am	Approval of the Minutes of the February 14, 2012 Executive Board conference call
8:50 – 9:10 am	NGEC Chairman’s Report – Bill Bronte
9:10 – 9:30 am	Report from the FRA – Kevin Kesler and Chad Edison
9:30 – 9:50 am	Report from Amtrak – Patrick Edmond and Matthew Kelly
9:50 – 10:20 am	NGEC Treasurers Report – Gordon Hutchinson, Acting CFO, Amtrak
10:20 – 10:30 am	Break
10:30 – 11:30 am	Report from the Technical Subcommittee – Mario Bergeron Chair, Technical Subcommittee
11:30 – 11:50 am	Report from the Finance subcommittee – Gordon Hutchinson, Amtrak
11:50– 12:10 pm	Report from the Administrative Task Force – Al Ware, Chair of the Task Force
12:10 – 1:10 pm	Lunch Break
1:10 – 1:25 pm	Report from the Structure and Finance Task Force - Eric Curtit, Chair of the Task Force
1:25 – 1:45 pm	Report from the Joint Procurement Task Force – Bill Bronte Chair of the Task Force
1:45 – 2:15 pm	Report on Standardization – Larry Salci, Consultant
2:15 – 2:45 pm	Report from the Accessibility Working Group – Kevin Kesler/Melissa Shurland
2:45 – 3:30 pm	Report on the NIST/MEP Forums – Kevin Kesler/David Stieren/Beth Kinzer
3:30 – 3:45 pm	Break
3:45 – 4:00 pm	Website improvements – Leo Penne, AASHTO/ Steve Hewitt NGEC Support Services Mgr
4:00 – 4:15 pm	Election of NGEC Executive Board Officers – Bill Bronte, Chair
4:15 – 5:15 pm	Comments/discussion - All Attendees
5:15 – 5:30 pm	Wrap up and Closing Remarks – Chairman
5:30 pm	Adjourn



Feb 23rd NGEC Annual Meeting Registrants: as of February 22, 2012

Executive Board Voting Members or designated representatives:

Bill Bronte, Caltrans
Mario Bergeron, Amtrak
Gordon Hutchinson, Amtrak (for DJ Stadtler)
Chad Edison, FRA (for Paul Nissenbaum)
Ron Adams, Wisconsin DOT
Eric Curtit, Missouri DOT
Al Ware, Georgia DOT
Pat Simmons, NCDOT
Joe Kyle, (via proxy to Tammy Nicholson)
Ray Hessinger, NYSDOT
Tammy Nicholson, Iowa DOT
John Sibold, Washington State DOT
George Weber, Illinois DOT
Kevin Lawson (via proxy to Bill Bronte)

Support Staff:

Dale Engelhardt, Amtrak
Ken Uznanski, Amtrak
Dave Warner, Amtrak
Michael Burshtin, Amtrak
Andrew Wood, Amtrak
Matthew Kelly, Amtrak
Patrick Edmund, Amtrak
Nancy Greene, Amtrak
Kevin Kesler, FRA
Jeff Gordon, FRA
Devin Rouse, FRA
Melissa Shurland, FRA
Nico Lindenau, Booz Allen Hamilton
Ashok Sundararajan, Booz Allen Hamilton
Steve Hewitt, Support Services Manager
Leo Penne, AASHTO
Shayne Gill, AASHTO
Andrea Ryan, AASHTO
Andy House, AASHTO
David Ewing, Consultant to AASHTO

Additional State representatives:

Tim Hoeffner, Michigan DOT
Jeff Schultz, (PB) on behalf of Connecticut DOT

Industry:

George Mekosh, Bombardier
Gavin Frazier, CH2MHill
Kevin Dow, APTA
Bill Slater, Wabtec
Steve Morrison, Siemens
Al Bieber, STV, Inc.
Chuck Wochele, Alstom
Jack Martinson, Bombardier
Rodney MCGhee, TIMKEN
Joe Quigley, Alstom
Mandy Bishop, US Railcar
Roger Patton, McConway and Torley, LLC
Joe Gagliardino, McConway and Torley, LLC

Gagan Sood, GE Transportation
Stephen Bonina, Stadler US, Inc.
Norman Forde, STV, Inc.
Jim Coston, Corridor Capital LLC
Bill Saddler, Wabtec
Mark Dobson, Southco
Cesar Vergara, Vergara Studio
Armin Kick, Siemens
Mike Weinman, PTI Transport
Kevin Bahnline, EMD, Inc.
Bobby Doyle, EMD, Inc
Don Itzkhoff, GE Transportation
Mark Kaidy, Knorr Brake Corp.
Joel McNeil, Brookville Equipment Corporation
Bill Smith, Smith Systems, Inc.
Joe Moore, Smith Systems, Inc.
John Hanrahan, Sepsa North America
Tom Hunt, Nippon Sharyo USA
Ken Takeda, Kawasaki Rail
Jack Straub, RTR Technologies, Inc.
Hats Kageyama, Sojitz
Shu Onodera, Sojitz
Dai Iwama, Sojitz
Kevin Simms, Voith Turbo
Deep Satsangi, Bradken
Virginia Verdeja, CAF USA
Jitendra Tomar, CAF USA
Igan Erostarbe, CAF USA
Ted Krohn, DB International USA, Inc.
James Michel, Marsh Global Rail
Josh Coran, Talgo
Rick Brilz, Motive Power, Inc.
Ken Pierson, Motive Power, Inc.
Scott Braverman, Corridor Capital, LLC
Jim Coston, Corridor Capital, LLC
Gene Germaine, Kustom Seating Unlimited, Inc.
Joe Quigley, Alstom
June Garland, Avalon Rail
Wolf Reimann, BRADKEN
Thomas Volpe, Dayton T Brown
Timothy Zimmer, Interfleet, Inc.
Larry Salci, Salci Consult
George Barr, SKF
Richard Curtis, Curtis Engineering Consulting Services
Raul Bravo, Raul V Bravo Associates, Inc.
Phil Strong, P S Consulting
Tony Jones, Voith Turbo
David Stieren, NIST
Beth Kinzer, Northrup Grumman
Randy Mitzelfelt, Voith Turbo, inc.
Josh Coran, Talgo
Ray Chambers, Transportation Policy Advisor
Ted Schaefer, US Railcar