SECTION 305 TECH SUB COMM

MINUTES JUNE 14, 2012 3:00PM EDT DMU FINAL REVIEW MEETING

FACILITATOR	*Mario Bergeron, Chairman, S305 Technical subcommittee*
ATTENDEES	***Core Team Members:*** *Mario Bergeron, Dale Engelhardt, Tammy Krause, Dave Warner, Michael Burshtin, Andrew Wood, Jack Madden, Charlie Poltenson, Jeff Schultz, Stan Hunter, (Stan also was proxy for Eric Curtit, Ron Adams and Allan Paul) Phil Meraz (Phil was also proxy for Kevin Lawson) Kevin Kesler, Jeff Gordon, Devin Rouse, Brian Marquis, Larry Salci, Steve Hewitt, Leo Penne, Andrea Ryan* ***Industry Participants:*** *Paul Jamieson, James Michel, Ted Schaefer, Mark Kaidy, Al Beiber, Wolf Reimann, Deep Satsangi, Rodney McGhee, Phil Strong, Dan Sneller, Robert Doyle, Joe Gagliardino, Roger Patton, Wei Lu, Cesar Vergara, George Long, Daniel Gornstein, Randall Mitzefelt, Richard Curtis, Terry Soesbee, Tony Jones*
ABSENTEES	*Voting members: Ron Adams, (proxy to Stan Hunter), Eric Curtit (proxy to Stan Hunter), Allan Paul (proxy to Stan Hunter) Kevin Lawson (Proxy to Phil Meraz) George Weber*

DISCUSSION/DECISIONS MADE

Chairman Mario Bergeron called the Technical subcommittee DMU specification Review Meeting meeting to order and asked all attendees to do self-introductions.

Following the self-introductions, Steve Hewitt took the roll of the subcommittee voting members. The presence of a quorum was confirmed with 10 of 11 voting members present or represented.

Review of Meeting Packets – Steve Hewitt:

Steve Hewitt reviewed the information provided in the meeting packets.

Approval of the Minutes of the June 7, 2012 Technical subcommittee call – Mario Bergeron:

On a motion by Charlie Poltenson, NYSDOT, and a second by Stan Hunter, Caltrans, the Minutes of the June 7, 2012 conference call meeting of the Technical subcommittee, were approved without objection.

Welcoming Comments, Agenda and Objectives for today's Meeting – Mario Bergeron:

Subcommittee Chair, Mario Bergeron, welcomed all meeting attendees, and expressed appreciation for all the work that has gone into the development of the DMU Specification, noting that "DMU enthusiasm is difficult, so it meant that it pulled fewer into the development of the specification. I appreciate those who have put so much time and effort into this".

Mario described the goal of today's meeting as getting the DMU specification approved. He also noted that long term, the goal is "about turning paper into steel", adding "we are not just producing paper to put on a shelf".

Mario continued, "we are here to get increased use of rail…and to gain additional capacity." He noted that Amtrak ridership continues to grow and break records. Last year was a record year for ridership, and this year is on track to break last year's record. He called for additional capacity and cited the fact that many people, even at this meeting, flew when, with more capacity, "rail could be a viable option."

Mario went on to present a power point overview:

Purpose of the Meeting

- The Draft Specification has been created for DMU
- This specification has involved more Technical Working Groups than before

- Lessons learned from previous specification writing efforts have been incorporated
- By the end of this meeting, we expect to vote to approve the specification

The PRIIA Specification Family

- Bi-Level (Initial Approval)—August 2010
  - Rev A: September 2011
  - Rev B: January 2012 (in support of RFI)
  - Rev C: April 2012 (in support of RFP)
- Single Level—February 2011
- Diesel Electric Locomotive—March 2011
- Trainset—August 2011
- DMU—*planned August 2012*
- Dual-Mode Locomotive—anticipated late 2013

Specification Development

- Requirements Document
  - Approved by Executive Board
  - Provides Basis for Specification Details
- Specification First Draft Open Comment Period
- Technical Subcommittee Approval
- Review Panel Review and recommendation
- Executive Board Approval
- Subsequent Changes/Configuration Mgmt.

Industry Role for DMU

- At the outset of the DMU specification process there was much discussion over the demand for equipment
  - Many previous participants in specification development were less able to justify investing the time to support the DMU process
- A core group of people undertook to produce the necessary inputs to allow the specification to be completed
- The smaller group of contributors has several effects
  - The time for generation of the document was extended
  - Greater participation during the specification development period was strongly encouraged to minimize change proposals.
  - This contributed to only receiving **13** change proposals
- Today is the culmination of the review process and we shall see whether we can approve the specification as was the case for the previous specifications

PRIIA 305 Technical Subcommittee Organizational Structure

- The same subgroup structure has been used as was the case for the previous specifications
- Specification Director – Dave Warner
- Technical Sub Groups
  - Electrical – Tammy Krause
  - Interior – Andrew Wood
  - Mechanical – Jeff Gordon
  - Propulsion – Jack Madden
  - Structures – Anand Prabhakaran
  - VTI – Brian Marquis
- Many thanks to the subgroup leaders and those members of their groups that have worked on this specification

What makes the DMU Specification Different?

- Previous specifications have been more definitive about the product that is required.
- Based on the single-level car specification, but includes propulsion.

- Wide variety of propulsion modes and configurations need to be accommodated.
- The goal is to have a specification that:
  - does not unduly favor any manufacturer over any other
  - does not favor any technological approach over any other
  - provides compatibility with PRIIA single-level equipment

What Happens Next to the Specification?

- The Executive Board will need to review for acceptance the recommended specification of the technical subcommittee
  - A requirements document was approved by the Executive Board
  - A Review Panel has been established to assess the specification against those requirements and recommend acceptance or further work
  - The Executive Board will then vote on acceptance of the specification on/about August 7th, 2012

Steve Hewitt was asked to provide the names of the Review Panel members involved previously:

Bill Bronte, Caltrans, chair of the panel; Ron Adams, Wisconsin DOT; Tammy Nicholson, Iowa DOT; Eric Curtit, Missouri DOT; and John Tunna, FRA. Larry Salci serves as the consultant to the Review Panel.

Other Technical Subcommittee Activities

- This is the first of the non-core specifications to be completed.
- Future specification work will include dual mode locomotive – likely completion date 3rd quarter 2013
- Current ongoing work includes
  - Standardization working group activities on implementing the standardization policy adopted by the Executive Board
  - Procurement support of Bi-Level specification
  - Pre-RFI revision of Diesel-***Electric*** Locomotive specification
  - Revisions to other specifications
  - Accessibility Working Group developing recommendations

At this point, Jack Madden, NYSDOT, asked for clarification in regards to the date for completing the Dual Mode Locomotive Specification. Mario explained that the first and most immediate priority is to assist Caltrans and the mid-west states with the current procurements (bi-Level and Diesel-electric Locomotive) where and when needed. As Revisions are required, the Technical subgroups assist in the review of proposed changes as part of the Document Control process.

He went on to review the steps that are standard for developing a PRIIA specification, and noted that assuming the same basic timeline we have used for the other specs, the Dual Mode Locomotive will come to a final Technical review around a year from now.

Ted Schaefer, US Railcar, expressed his appreciation and thanks to all for the hard work, and complimented the subcommittee for having a "great process" in place. He then re-iterated Mario Bergeron's view that the work of the subcommittee, and the NGEC overall, will "translate the specification into steel".

Specification Development and Approval Process – Dale Engelhardt:

Dale Engelhardt, Vice Chair of the Technical subcommittee, provided the following presentation to walk through the process developing the specification and bringing it to approval.

What Will Happen Today?

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

- Who is going to take us through the process?

DMU Specification Inputs

- USDOT
- FRA
- Supplier
- Environmental Requirements
- Lessons Learned
- Standardization
- Amtrak
- Locomotive Specification
- Single level Specification

All these inputs contribute to the development of the DMU specification

What makes the DMU Specification Different?

- Several chapters on project management, testing, materials, references, etc. (Chapters 2, 3, 18 and 19) have used the common wording found in previous specifications
- The vehicle contains propulsion and passenger car attributes.
  - Other chapters were matched as closely as possible to existing chapter numbers.
  - Total of 25 chapters makes it the "largest" specification to date.

What Happens Today?

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

How will the Review Take Place?

- The same as we've done before
- 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 specification director and the Technical Working Group 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!

At this point, Dale entertained a question from Mark Kaidy, Knorr, in regards to changes proposed previously, not yet included, that he thought would be given an opportunity to get in at a later date – not simply in the 5 minutes allotted for today.

Jeff Gordon, FRA, and leader of the mechanical subgroup, clarified that he had explained to the mechanical subgroup members that he will convene a meeting of the subgroup soon to begin preparing Revision A DCRs.

Dale provided clarification of the process, explaining that the subcommittee will approve the document today with the changes that have been made through the comment period, as well as any requests that come forward today, and are accepted by the judging panel of the subcommittee (Dave Warner, Jack Madden and the subgroup leader whose jurisdiction includes a particular change request).

Mario Bergeron then explained that once the specification has been approved by the subcommittee, it goes to the

Board Chairman who sends it to the Review panel. The Review panel compares it against the Requirements document, prepares a report with recommendations, and submits it to the Board for its consideration.

The document is then a living document and additional opportunities go through the DCR process for Revision A, B or however many it takes to get a specification ready for procurement. In the bi-level specification, for example, there has been a Rev A, B and C thus far.

Michael Burshtin, Amtrak, added that right now they are reviewing the single level specification to ensure consistency with the bi-level, and there are already over 100 DCRs.

In essence, this does not end the process; it begins the process of moving forward towards procurement.

Summary of Status of Changes Proposed for the DMU

- Initial draft of all DMU Chapters, and Change Request form posted on AASHTO website. Comment period was April 20 to May 11.
- Each submitted Change Request form was reviewed and final decision made by Sub Group, who revised Chapter wording as necessary
- All Change Request forms and their disposition are shown on the Change Request Summary Matrix on the AASHTO website
- The Change Request details are as follows
  - **Accepted 3**
  - **Amended 8**
  - **Rejected 1**
  - **Deferred 1**
  - **Open 0**

  TOTAL 13

At this point, Dale explained that moving forward there will be an evolution of the subcommittee's work, but it will remain a very busy subcommittee with a lot ahead of it.

Upcoming Activities for the NGEC Technical Subcommittee

- Standardization Working Group
  - Process currently undergoing pilot
  - Implementation through acquisition programs to come
- Document Control Process
  - Processed three Revisions to Bi-Level Specification
  - Working on Rev. A to Diesel Locomotive Specification for planned end—of-June RFI
  - Working on Rev. A to Single Level Specification
  - Developing procedures to handle Accessibility Changes
- Support to Acquisition Programs
  - RFP in progress for approx. 130 Bi-Level cars
  - RFI for diesel-electric locomotive this summer
  - Technical support throughout the program will be required

Dale closed his presentation by thanking all of those here today, and all who have been involved, including the 200+ members of the industry, for all the hard work so far. He also encouraged continued and renewed involvement in the subgroups and in the bi-weekly full subcommittee calls.

Kevin Kesler, FRA, expressed appreciation, on behalf of Secretary LaHood and FRA Administrator Szabo, who "are aware of the hard work and very appreciative of all that has been done." He added that "it is about re-establishing and revitalizing the rail manufacture and supply industry in this country." Kevin then emphasized that the work of this subcommittee is appreciated, and "its importance is recognized at the highest levels".

Specification Review – Individual Proposals for Change Requests :

Dave Warner reported that, at this point, there was one additional change that he was aware of, to be considered today. It has been brought to Dave's attention that the specification, as currently presented, does not have an air compressor in it, and this must be corrected.

Paul Jamieson, Wabtec, an industry participant and member of the mechanical subgroup, provided suggested language to rectify this error. The "judging team" reviewed the language and accepted the change as provided to "correct this faux pas of not having originally included it into the spec."

Dave Warner added "we thank those who recognized the 'oops' that occurred".

Dale Engelhardt also thanked "those who discovered the error". The change was approved and the document will be revised as agreed.

In total, including the change to add the air compressor, there were five changes offered and accepted during the meeting. The changes are:

1.4.4. Carbody

- All DMUs shall have two side doors on **each** ~~either~~ side.

5.4.3.3 Dynamic Response on FRA Class 6 Track
Performance of the DMU at high-speed and high cant deficiency shall be verified through analysis requirements defined in 49CFR Section 213.345. ~~Minimally Compliant Analytical track (MCAT) simulations shall be performed based on the revenue speed limit and maximum cant deficiency defined in Chapter 4 of this Specification. Limit values are to be based on the VTI safety limits table in 49CFR Section 213.333.~~ As a supplement to the requirements of 49CFR Section 213.345, the analyses are to verify vehicle stability for a wheel/rail combination with a minimum conicity of 0.3 (per the calculation method of APTA Standard SS-M-017-06). ~~Dynamic tests with instrumented wheel sets are required.~~

7.5.1 Air Compressor
The air compressor shall be electrically driven or approved equal with the following functions:
• On and off capabilities upon demand.
• Main reservoir pressure shall be maintained at 140 psi (130 psi to 150 psi operating range) with minimum flow rate (CFM) to be determined based on DMU configuration.
• The air compressor shall be equipped with an after cooler, capable of reducing the discharge air temperature to within 15°F of ambient temperature.
• The after cooler shall be equipped with a separate automatic drain dump valve and shall be designed to avoid condensate traps and dump valve shall be heated as required to avoid freezing.

7.5.2 Air Dryer
System shall be equipped with regeneration type air dryer system compliant with APTA SS-M-011-99, Standard for Compressed Air Quality for Passenger Locomotive and Car Equipment.
(Existing Sections 7.5.1 through 7.5.8 renumbered to 7.5.3 through 7.5.10)

7.5.6.8 (revised number) Control Manifold and Valves
The minimum brake cylinder pressure shall be established to provide adequate adjustment from minimum service to full service for proper train operation. The brake cylinder pressure (full service and emergency) shall be approved as part of the design review process.

~~Full service brake cylinder pressure shall be nominally 60 – 65 psi. Emergency brake cylinder pressure shall be nominally 75 – 78 psi.~~

Vote for Acceptance of DMU Specification – Mario Bergeron:

After all recommended additional changes had been proposed and the language of the changes agreed to, Chairman Bergeron asked for a motion to approve the PRIIA DMU specification, as revised.

A motion for approval was offered by Jack Madden, NYSDOT, and seconded by Phil Meraz, Iowa DOT.

Chairman Bergeron asked Steve Hewitt to call the roll of voting members:

Mario Bergeron, Amtrak – in favor
Kevin Kesler, FRA – in favor

Jack Madden, NYSDOT – in favor
Jeff Schultz, for Connecticut DOT – in favor
Stan Hunter, Caltrans – in favor
Stan Hunter as proxy for Allan Paul, NCDOT – in favor
Stan Hunter as proxy for Eric Curtit, Missouri DOT – in favor
Stan Hunter as proxy for Ron Adams, Wisconsin DOT – in favor
Phil Meraz, Iowa DOT – in favor
Phil Meraz as proxy for Kevin Lawson, Louisiana DOT – in favor

With a quorum confirmed and all votes cast in favor, Chairman Bergeron determined that consensus had been achieved and the motion carried. The Technical subcommittee, therefore, has approved the PRIIA DMU specification as revised.

Steve Hewitt will transmit a note to Bill Bronte on behalf of Mario Bergeron informing him of the approval and asking that he re-convene the DMU Review panel.

Mario Bergeron thanked everyone again and commented that the level of reviews for each specification has improved tremendously. He called this a "Testimony to the fact that the process works". He added that refinement continues and "this is not the end, but the beginning."

Acquisition Update – Stan Hunter:

Stan Hunter, Caltrans, provided a brief update on the bi-level procurement and status of the upcoming locomotive procurement.

Bi-Level Procurement:

- April 20, 2012 – the Bi-level RFP was released
- All funding is in place
- May 11, 2012 – was the deadline for Notices of Intent to Bid to be submitted. There were 7 notices received – This is a very good sign that there is a high degree of interest and a competitive environment. The industry is well represented in the responses received.
- Over 400 questions have been received so far- Caltrans is working its way through and working with the Change Control Board. Stan also noted that "the industry is really doing a great job of going through this spec."
- June 20, 2012 – Draft proposals are due.
- August 17, 2012 – Final proposals due.
- The goal is to have a Notice of Intent to Award go out sometime in October, 2012
- Stan also noted that there were many lessons learned throughout this process and recommendations for some fine tuning and streamlining of the process will be coming forward to the Technical subcommittee.

Locomotive Procurement:

- The lead agency has not yet been finalized yet – Caltrans staffing issues are impacting that decision. There are ongoing discussions among the FRA, Caltrans and the mid-west states.
- There is no set timeline, but the FRA has made it clear that it wants an aggressive schedule.
- The RFP is expected to be released later in this calendar year.

Kevin Kesler, FRA, elaborated – the goal is for an RFI in early July, 2012 and RFP before the end of the calendar year.

A member of the industry commented that in order to have sufficient quantities (there are about 35 locomotives included in the states procurement) for the industry to be interested they would need Amtrak to be a part of it. He asked Mario if Amtrak would be a part of the procurement.

Mario responded that "money and priorities is the constraint." He added that in the most recent Amtrak Fleet Plan 2016 is indicated as the date for locomotive replacement.

Mario added that Amtrak does not have "bad intent, but funding is the issue."

Technical Subcommittee Subgroup Leaders Elections – Dale Engelhardt:

Dale Engelhardt presented a power point that was intended to "recognize the great work of the subgroup leaders" Dale emphasized that being a subgroup leader was not easy and felt it was only fair to give the current leaders

recognition after they have been in their positions since the very beginning of the NGEC effort. He also wanted the leaders to have an opportunity to determine whether they wanted to continue on in their current roles – and if not- he wanted to stress the requirements a replacement would need to have to become a subgroup leader.

Technical Subcommittee Organizational Structure

- Chairman - Mario Bergeron
- Vice Chairman - Dale Engelhardt
- Document Control Management - Dave Warner
- Accessibility Working Group - Melissa Shurland
- Locomotive Technology Task Force - Dave Warner
- Standardization Working Group – Michael Burshtin
- Systems Engineering Task Force - Kevin Kesler
- Technical Sub-Groups

Technical Sub-Groups (except locomotives)

- Interiors - Andrew Wood
- Electrical - Tammy Krause
- Mechanical - Jeff Gordon
- Structure - Anand Prabhakaran
- VTI - Brian Marquis
- Propulsion - Jack Madden

Technical Sub-Groups – Locomotives

- Lead/General - Jack Madden
- VTI - Brian Marquis
- Mechanical - Al Bieber
- Cab & Customer Amenities - Jack Madden
- Environmental - Bruce Wolff

Technical Sub-Group

- Sub-Group Leaders are Volunteer Positions
- Existing Sub Group Leaders Have Served Since the Beginning of PRIIA 305 (2+ Years)
- Senior Leadership terms are 2 years long

Sub-Group Leaders Job Requirements

- Objective and Neutral
  - In Development of Specification Requirements
- Leader
  - Coordinator of Volunteer Members
- Project Management Skills
  - Coordination of Team Members
  - Meet Schedule Requirements
- Strong Communicator

Current Sub-Group Leaders

- Excellent Performance
  - Objective in Specification Development
  - Strong Communication skills
    - Listening
    - Speaking
  - Organized
    - Sub-Committee Meeting Scheduling
    - On-Time Delivery of Specifications
  - Flexible

Sub-Group leaders

- Each Sub-Group to Discuss with Their Leaders if He/She Wants to Continue in Their Role
- For Those Requesting Replacement, Identify a Successor Meeting Job Requirements

- Propose Replacements to Technical Sub-Committee

Remember The Sub-Group Leaders are Volunteer Positions Requiring Additional Effort and Time

Mario Bergeron added "this is a presentation in recognition of all that has been done by the leaders" and is descriptive of how much they do and how much is required of them in taking on this voluntary responsibility.

Andrew Wood, Amtrak, and Interiors Sub-Group leader commented "the leaders are successful because of the members of our sub-groups" he emphasized that it is "amazing" how much interest has been generated and noted that there are 32 participants on his Interiors sub-group alone!

Evolution of the Technical Subcommittee – Mario Bergeron:

Mario Bergeron presented a power point describing the Evolution of the Technical subcommittee as it moves from developing specifications into procurement and document control/systems engineering.

Quick Timeline

What have we done?
- Created several specifications
- Established document management procedures
- Performed industry reviews
- Supported first procurement RFI

What will we be doing?
- One more specification to write
- Supporting two procurements
- Managing existing specifications
- Developing accessibility changes/recommendations
- Maintenance/Operations support?

Who Does This? Volunteers

Specification Development
Four approved
One in approval process
One more to be written
- Dual Mode Locomotive
- Begin after Diesel Electric Locomotive award has been made
- Anticipate beginning in late 2012/early 2013
- Approval expected by Q3 2013

Document Management
Specification Changes
- "Cleaning up" language inconsistencies, etc.
- Procurement-related activities
  RFI
  RFP
  Changes during construction
  As-built

Requires Standing Technical Working Groups
- "on Call"
- Long-term commitment
- Variable time requirements

Document Change During RFP
Confidentiality concerns preclude full involvement
Agency/States must still submit DCRs for changes
DCRs go to a Review Panel
- Membership outline to Document Management Process procedure
- Compliance with Requirements Document Mandatory

Upon contract award
- Decision made to incorporate changes
  Into new "BASE" specification for future procurements
  Unique for this procurement, PRIIA compliant version
- Changes Incorporated using "Urgent" DCR flow

Other Future Activities
Vehicle Maintenance Support
Other, as yet unknown, taskings
We are in this for the long haul

In giving his presentation, Mario urged members to get involved as volunteers – he emphasized that doing so is a good opportunity to meet other members of the industry, and to be integral to the successes of the NGEC.

Mario also noted the efforts of the Structure and Finance Task Force (SFTF) in releasing an RFP for consultant services for Section 6 and deployment, as required by the HSIPR grant agreements between states and FRA. He asked Stan Hunter to provide an overview of Section 6.

Stan explained that it is a provision in the grant agreement that calls for vehicle maintenance, life cycle, operation and deployment plans. "It is a very complex provision".

Kevin Kesler, FRA, explained the SFTF is in the process of procuring services now to help to standardize the process going forward rather than having a variety of documents submitted by states as they procure equipment. A standardized Section 6 response is the intent of the procurement. The goal is to build a guidance document for future procurements and still comp0ly with Section 6.

The SFTF has issued the RFP and has received proposals. The SFTF selection committee will make a recommendation to the full SFTF which will, it is assumed, approve the recommendation and submit it to the Executive Board for its consideration. AASHTO will, once again, serve as contracting agent.

One of the key points that Mario made, and Kevin Kesler emphasized as well, is that this is a long term effort. "We are in this for the long haul", Mario stated, "and we will need more volunteers".

Mario added that as questions come up, or new designs are developed, the technical subcommittee will be turned to.

Stan Hunter agreed and noted "that's why there is an urgent DCR process."

Kevin Kesler added – "we are not done yet stay tuned throughout the procurements – we'll all be called upon" as it moves forward.

Some question arose in regards to the Section 6 effort.

Bobby Doyle asked "how will it work? How do you provide ideas to the chosen consultant?"

Kevin Kesler responded with a suggestion that once it is awarded "contact them directly and provide feedback."

Mario added that "within the milestones of the RFP there is a requirement to meet with stakeholders" and that should provide an opportunity to give input.

Kevin stressed "it is an NGEC effort", and once the plan is developed it will go through the voting process.

Bobby Doyle cautioned that there are many variables "be careful of the output."

Kevin Kesler replied, "at FRA our hope is that it moves towards condition based maintenance not calendar based and that it gives guidance for maintaining fleets in the future".

Amtrak High Speed Rail Plans for the Future – Andrew Wood:

Andrew Wood, Amtrak gave a presentation on Amtrak's Vision for the Northeast Corridor.

The NEC and its branches:

- 870 Route Miles
- 548 Miles Amtrak Owned
- 2,340 track miles 71% electrified
- 12 states, DC
- 8 commuter operators

- Class 1 and regional freight
- Amtrak Acela, Regional, State supported and Long Distance
- 2,200 daily train movements

The Northeast Region is Densely Populated and Growing:

- Significant growth of past 20 years projected to continue
- Population density is the highest in the US – 80% live within 25 miles of Amtrak service

Washington to New York Air-Rail Market:

- Amtrak carries more than twice as many passengers on this route than all of the airlines put together

NEC NextGen HSR Vision – A High Capacity & performance Railway

- Travel times – Existing and future
  NYC-Was Existing = 2:42; Master Plan (2030) = 2;15; NextGen HSR Vision (2040)= 1:34

- HST Requirements-Existing and Future
  Existing Acela Fleet (2015) – Acquire 40 additional coaches
  Existing Acela and NextGen HSR Fleets (2020) – Acquire 10 new NextGen I HSR Train Sets
  NextGen HSR Fleet (2030) – acquire 32 New NextGen II Train Sets
  NextGen HSR Fleet (2040) – acquire 10 New NextGen II HSR Train Sets

NEC NextGen HSR – Updated Conceptual Alignment:

Note: Please see the graphics contained in the presentation that has been distributed to all and posted on website – the alignment is more direct and straighter in comparison to the current alignment.

The presentation also described the steps to realizing the future of the NEC – highlighting steps taken, and to be taken, from 2008 – 2015.

Andrew also pointed out the UIC 8th World Congress on HSR as a key event which will take place in Philadelphia July 10-13.

- It is a global event organized by UIC and APTA with support from Amtrak, AAR, FRA, and VIA Rail Canada.
- Amtrak is hosting a welcome reception at the 30th Street Station, as well as tours of its HSR mechanical facility in Sunnyside New York, and its dispatching and training centers in Wilmington, DE
- It is expected that there will be up to 1,000 worldwide attendees to exchange views on development and achievements of HSR.
- It will include internationally selected speakers, a trade exhibition, technical tours, and networking activities.
- Amtrak and APTA are looking for student volunteers to help staff the congress.
- http://uic-highspeed2012.com/

A short discussion following Andrew's presentation, especially in regards to the timeline being 2040. Andrew responded that the 2040 date is for the full build-out. Andrew also reminded attendees that the cost is around $151 billion.

Closing Comments – Mario Bergeron:

With no further business to come before the subcommittee at this time, Mario Bergeron closed the meeting by emphasizing that "our meeting goals were fulfilled – and I thank you all."

Next Technical subcommittee Conference call – July 5, 2012

Decisions and Action Items

Steve Hewitt will transmit a note to Bill Bronte on behalf of Mario Bergeron informing him of the approval and asking that he re-convene the DMU Review panel.
Dave Warner will send the changes agreed to today to Camren Cordell for finalization of the specification as approved by the technical subcommittee – once final –Steve Hewitt will send to all subcommittee members and

the Review panel, and post to the website.
Steve Hewitt will distribute all presentations to subcommittee members and have them posted to the web site.

ATTACHMENTS

PRIIA 305 Boston
Technical Sub-Committee Meeting
June 14, 2012
Agenda

9:00—9:30 am	Coffee Service
9:30 – 9:35 am	Mario Bergeron -Call Meeting to Order
9:35—9:45 am	Steve Hewitt -Roll Call and Review of Meeting Packets
9:45—9:55 am	Mario Bergeron -Approval of June 7th Technical Subcommittee Meeting Minutes

9:55—10:10 am	Mario Bergeron-Welcoming comments, Agenda and Objectives for Today's Meeting
10:10—10:20 am	Dale Engelhardt Specification Development and Approval Process
10:20—10:30 am	Break
10:30—12:00 pm	Specification Review Individual Proposals for Change Requests
12:00—12:15 pm	Vote for Acceptance of DMU Specification
12:15—1:15 pm	Lunch
	Acquisition Update—Stan Hunter
	Tech. Sub Comm. Subgroup Leaders Elections—Dale Engelhardt
	Break
	Evolution of the Technical Sub Committee—Mario Bergeron
	Amtrak High Speed Rail Plans for the Future—Andrew Wood
	Mario Bergeron – Closing Comments