

SECTION 305 TECH SUB COMM

MINUTES

DEC. 16, 2010

8:30AM

MEETING – ARLINGTON,
VA

FACILITATOR	<i>Mario Bergeron, 305 Technical Subcommittee Chair</i>
ATTENDEES	Core Team members: Mario Bergeron, Dale Engelhardt, Rob Edgcumbe, Tammy Krause, Greg Gagarin, Kevin Kesler, Allan Paul, Curtis McDowell, Kevin Lawson, Jack Madden, Stan Hunter, Steve Fretwell, Andrew Wood, Steve Hewitt, Bill Bronte, Scott Witt, David Warner, Mike Trosino, Mike Burshtin, Anand Prabhakaran, Michael Coltman, Leo Penne, Andrew House, Tammy Nicholson, Charles Bielitz, Industry Participants: (sign in sheets for both days included in the minutes distribution) Total attendees signing in : 54 –additional member not on the sign in sheet: James Michel
ABSENTEES	<i>John Tunna, George Weber, Art Peterson, Don Damron, Leonard Evans, Dharm Guruswamy, Karina Jacobsen, David Tyrell, Ken Uznanski, Brian Marquis, Charlie Poltenson, Shayne Gill, Jeff Gordon</i>

DISCUSSION/DECISIONS MADE

Technical Subcommittee Chair, Mario Bergeron welcomed everyone to the meeting and, once again, thanked them for being here and being so involved. It was agreed that while many attendees were present at the meeting yesterday, as well, there were a number who had come only for today – for the locomotive specification discussion - thus self introductions would, again, be beneficial.

Steve Hewitt, Support Services Manager for the S305 NGEC, reviewed the handout packets and reminded all attendees that all NGEC related documents can be viewed on the AASHTO website at www.highspeed-rail.org.

Steve was then asked to ensure that a quorum was present for the day's meeting. A roll call of voting members resulted in the determination that a quorum was, indeed, present. (Ohio DOT, once again, being the only voting member not represented in –person or by proxy).

Roll Call results:

Mario Bergeron, for Amtrak - present
Kevin Kesler, for FRA-present
Stan Hunter, for Caltrans - present
Jack Madden, for NYSDOT - present
Jack Madden, proxy for Illinois DOT - present
Allan Paul, for NCDOT - present
Tammy Nicholson, for Iowa DOT - present
Tammy Nicholson, proxy for Wisconsin DOT - present
Kevin Lawson, for Louisiana DOT (Kevin informed the group that he would be leaving early and gave his voting proxy to Tammy Nicholson – Iowa DOT) - present
Andrew Wood, for Washington State DOT - present

Chairman Bergeron, as he had done the day before, briefly reviewed the:

Purpose of the Meeting:

- The excellent work from the bi-level specifications has continued on.
- The Draft Specification has been created for both the high speed diesel passenger locomotive and the standalone single-level passenger cars
- Everyone has worked very hard – thank you all!
- Yesterday we finalized the single level standalone specification.
- Today it is the turn of the locomotive
- By the end of this meeting, we hope to have both agreed and accepted!

The history of the formation of the technical subcommittee:

- Participation Solicited from states, FRA and Amtrak
- Core group of participants formed
- Conference Call schedule established
- Break down of work requirements agreed
- Industry workshop set up and run
- Bi-Level specification created, approved and accepted by the Executive Board

PRIIA Section 305 legislation:

- Next Generation Corridor Equipment Pool Committee established
- Comprised of representatives of Amtrak, the Federal Railroad Administration, host freight railroad companies, passenger railroad equipment manufacturers, interested States, and, as appropriate, other passenger railroad operators.
- Purpose -- to design, develop specifications for, and procure standardized next-generation corridor equipment

The structure of the subcommittee:

industry participation:

- Workshop for industry held in Chicago on April 22nd
- Attendance of over 150 people
- Briefed all participants on the process
- Interested industry participants were allocated to sub-groups
- Bi-Level specification:
- Requirements document completed
- Completed ahead of scheduled 31st July 2010 deadline
- The Executive Board appointed a Review Panel
- Based on Review Panel findings, the Executive Board approved the specification
- Locomotive group has been working since the beginning – as you know!
- Single level standalone and train set commenced after bi-level

Sub-Groups:

- The locomotive sub-group was created from Day One.
- Steve Fretwell provided the leadership for the sub-group
- Industry participants were, where possible, allocated based on preference
- Preliminary work was undertaken during the Chicago workshop
- Groups created work plans for ongoing review
- Work has continued from there with some specialist teams within the sub-group

Technical Sub-Groups and Team Leaders:

- Locomotive Sub-Group – Steve Fretwell
- Mechanical Sub-Group – Jeff Gordon
- Structural Sub-Group – Eloy Martinez/Anand Prabhakaran
- VTI Sub-Group – John Tunna/Brian Marquis
- Interior Sub-Group – Andrew Wood
- Electric Sub-Group – Tammy Krause

Next Steps:

- The Executive Board will need to accept the recommended specification of the technical subcommittee
- A requirements document has been accepted by the Executive Board
- A review panel has been established
- The review panel will assess the specification against those requirements and recommend acceptance or further work
- The Executive Board will then vote on acceptance of the specification (Board meeting – February 15, 2011)

Other Specification work still ahead:

- The single level trainset is currently the outstanding specification of the original tasks
- Additional work is under review by the Executive Board
- The goal is to continue the work while we have the teams established.

- Specifications will be generated based on the need of the states and Amtrak for new equipment

....and Mr. Bergeron thanked everyone for their hard work in such a short period of time and gave a view of what is still ahead:

- A great deal has been achieved in a short space of time
- Everyone's commitment has been appreciated
- Other work assignments will be identified shortly by the Executive Board
- We mustn't lose sight of what will come after these requirements
- The procurement processes will follow closely and they are what this is all about.

Dale Engelhardt, Vice Chair of the Technical Subcommittee was then asked to provide an overview of the expectations for this meeting:

- We have one goal before the meeting is concluded
- Finalize the specification for the diesel passenger
- How has that specification been produced?
- How are we going to review that work today?

Who is going to take us through the process?

He described the Process to date:

- The subgroup was created at the original Chicago meeting and has focused on this task since then
- Tech Subcommittee conference calls were held approximately every two weeks
- The draft specification was posted on the AASHTO website on November 23rd 2010
- Updated drafts were placed on the website as they became available

Locomotive Specification inputs:

- FRA input
- State DOTs input
- Amtrak Input
- Supplier input
- Standardization
- Bi-Level framework
- Environmental Requirements
- Lessons learned

Vehicle Differentiation vs. Standardization:

- The standardization working group is active on this topic
- A recommendation will be delivered to the Executive Board for their February 15, 2011 meeting
- Standardization can be achieved without losing supplier identity

What happens today?

- Everyone has had the opportunity to review the draft specifications
- The subgroups and the rolling stock team at Amtrak have agreed to the drafts
- Those who were on different subgroups have had a chance to review areas of interest outside their subgroup
- We will review all urgent and as many less urgent changes as time allows

How will the Review 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
- ***Please Be Concise!***

Greg Gagarin and Dave Warner of Amtrak's Engineering team provided a summary of the work done in the development of the specification and provided a summary of the change requests they had received by the December 7th deadline:

- 137 proposals were received
- These have been reviewed and fed back to the proposers
- Some proposals were duplicates
- The details are as follows:
- Accepted 76
- Amended 25
- Rejected 36
-
- TOTAL 137

At this point sponsors of changes that had been rejected were given an opportunity to make the case for their proposals and a review team (Greg Gagarin, Dave Warner and Locomotive Sub-Group leader, Steve Fretwell), after opening the floor for comments, would discuss and then make a decision for acceptance, modification or rejection of the proposals brought forward. Additionally, and similarly, an opportunity was provided for discussing comments received after the December 7th deadline.

As the discussions began, it was pointed out that it was important to remember that locomotives must be interchangeable – do not compromise interchangeability - was a message that was emphasized.

Kevin Kesler, FRA, advised the subcommittee to “work at things that are best practices to bring forward.”

There was a great deal of discussion revolving around issues such as; load/stress limit; issues with items in the summary table as currently written; P2 Forces (82,000 vs. 86,000). In the end, it was agreed that the summary table would “come out” and the Locomotive Subgroup should fashion an appropriate table to address the many issues that were raised. In regards to P2 Forces, it was agreed it would remain at 82,000 and a number of inconsistencies were corrected.

Participants were reminded that the specifications (bi-level, single level and locomotive) are all “living documents” and as technology changes or even as typos or errors are discovered, the documents can be modified/corrected.

A key point agreed to was to revise the name of the locomotive specification from **Diesel Locomotive** to **Diesel-Electric Locomotive**

After all new and previously rejected change requests were reviewed and thoroughly discussed – changes agreed to were changed in the document in Real-time – and each point was reviewed at the conclusion of the discussions through the drafting of a comparative document – prepared on site by Rob Edgcumbe.

After the conclusion of the summary, and review of the comparative document with all changes highlighted; it was agreed that the Chair should entertain a motion to approve the PRIIA Diesel- Electric Locomotive Specification. On a motion to approve the proposed specification, offered by Allan Paul, NCDOT, and seconded by Stan Hunter, Caltrans; the voting members and/or their proxies were polled for the record.

Vote Results:

FRA – Kevin Kesler - approve
Amtrak – Mario Bergeron – approve
North Carolina DOT – Allan Paul – approve
NYSDOT – Jack Madden - approve
Illinois DOT – Jack Madden – NYSDOT as the proxy – approve
California DOT – Stan Hunter – approve
Washington State DOT – Andrew Wood – approve
Iowa DOT – Tammy Nicholson – approve
Wisconsin Dot – Tammy Nicholson as proxy – approve
Louisiana DOT – Tammy Nicholson as proxy - approve

The PRIIA Diesel-Electric Locomotive Specification was approved unanimously by all voting members present and/or accounted for, and Chairman Bergeron declared that consensus had been achieved.

