

RAILROAD SAFETY ADVISORY COMMITTEE (RSAC)

Minutes of Meeting May 28, 2015 Washington, D.C.

The fifty-third meeting of the Railroad Safety Advisory Committee (Committee) was convened at 9:30 a.m., in the Terrace Room of the DoubleTree Hilton Hotel, 1515 Rhode Island Avenue, N.W., Washington, DC 20005, by the Federal Railroad Administration's (FRA) RSAC Chairperson Jamie Rennert (FRA–Office of Railroad Safety, Deputy Associate Administrator). Also in attendance are the Acting Federal Railroad Administrator Sarah Feinberg (FRA) and the Associate Administrator for Railroad Safety/Chief Safety Officer Robert Lauby (FRA–Office of Railroad Safety).

As RSAC members, or their alternates, assembled, attendance was recorded by sign-in log. The records, reports, transcripts, minutes, and other documents that are made available to, or prepared for or by, the Committee are available for public inspection at the U. S. Department of Transportation docket management system Internet Web Site under FRA Docket #2000-7257 (<http://www.regulations.gov>). Meeting documents are also available on FRA's RSAC Internet Web Site (<http://rsac.fra.dot.gov>), under "Committee Documents".

For the May 28, 2015, meeting, six of the fifty-six voting RSAC members were absent: The Brotherhood of Maintenance of Way Employees Division (BMWED) (1 of 2 seats absent); The Brotherhood of Railroad Signalmen (1 of 2 seats absent); Safe Travel America (1 seat), Sheet Metal, Air, Rail, and Transportation Workers (1 of 4 seats absent); and The Transport Workers Union of America (2 seats). Five of seven non-voting/advisory RSAC members were absent: The Labor Council for Latin American Advancement, The League of Railway Industry Women, The National Association of Railway Business Women, The National Transportation Safety Board, and Secretaria de Comunicaciones y Transporte (Mexico). Total meeting attendance, including presenters and support staff, was approximately 90.

Chairperson Rennert welcomes RSAC (the Committee) Members and attendees. She asks Larry Woolverton (FRA–Office of Railroad Safety) for a meeting room safety briefing.

Larry Woolverton (FRA) identifies the meeting room's fire and emergency exits and an external meeting location where members should gather in the event of a building evacuation. He asks for volunteers with cardiopulmonary resuscitation (CPR) and automated external defibrillator (AED) qualification to identify themselves. A large

number of attendees acknowledge having completed this training. He says the DoubleTree Hilton Hotel does not have an AED.

Chairperson Rennert asks RSAC members and meeting attendees to introduce themselves and the organizations they represent.

Chairperson Rennert says it is her pleasure to introduce Sarah Feinberg to the Committee. She says Transportation Secretary Anthony Foxx appointed Sarah Feinberg to be the Acting Administrator of FRA on January 9, 2015. As Acting Administrator, Ms. Feinberg has assumed the role as the Nation's chief safety regulator for freight and passenger rail services.

Chairperson Rennert says Acting Administrator Feinberg is the second woman to lead the agency since its founding in 1966 and she leads a staff of nearly 900 professionals in Washington, DC and in eight regional offices across the country.

Chairperson Rennert says prior to her selection as Acting Administrator, Sarah Feinberg served as Transportation Secretary Anthony Foxx's Chief of Staff, where she provided strategic advice and counsel to the Secretary regarding operational and legislative initiatives across all modes of transportation. She says one of Sarah Feinberg's key priorities as Chief of Staff was to lead the effort on the Department's and Transportation Secretary's \$302 billion Surface Transportation Reauthorization Plan.

Chairperson Rennert says prior to joining the USDOT, Acting Administrator Feinberg served as the Director of Corporate and Strategic Communications at Facebook, where she managed the company's Washington, DC-based outreach and communications as well as the company's political and crisis communications. She says Sarah Feinberg also served as Bloomberg L.P.'s Director of Communications and Business Strategy.

Chairperson Rennert says from 2009-2010, Acting Administrator Feinberg served in the Obama Administration as Special Assistant to the President and Senior Advisor to White House Chief of Staff Rahm Emanuel. She says as the White House Chief of Staff's liaison to the Obama economic team, the national security team, and the press and communications departments, she most notably worked on the White House's strategic communications response to the country's fiscal and economic crisis, the H1N1 flu pandemic, and the coal mine disaster in West Virginia.

Chairperson Rennert says prior to serving in the White House, Acting Administrator Feinberg spent several years on Capitol Hill, serving as communications director for the House Democratic Caucus, and the as the national press secretary to former Senate Minority Leader Tom Daschle.

Chairperson Rennert says Acting Administrator Feinberg is a graduate of Washington and Lee University with a degree in politics.

Chairperson Rennert asks Acting FRA Administrator Feinberg for opening remarks.

Acting Administrator Feinberg says it is a pleasure to attend today's meeting and to discuss the important work of the Railroad Safety Advisory Committee (RSAC). She thanks RSAC Chairperson Jamie Rennert for her leadership of RSAC. She says there is no one more committed, more enthusiastic, or more dedicated to this committee and to the work that it does, than Jamie Rennert. She says, "Chairperson Rennert is constantly focused on what is happening here, she updates me, and the entire senior staff at FRA frequently, and she is a huge proponent for all of you and for the work that you do."

Acting Administrator Feinberg also acknowledges the work of FRA's Office of Safety, led by FRA's Chief Safety Officer Bob Lauby. She says there is no one in the rail industry who has worked harder, or dedicated more time, energy, focus, expertise, or passion to improving rail safety than Bob Lauby. She says there are few people in this industry who have left a mark on safety like Bob Lauby has. She says FRA is lucky and grateful to have both Bob Lauby and Jamie Rennert working with us.

Acting Administrator Feinberg says in the five months since Secretary Foxx appointed her as Acting Administrator of FRA, and in her previous position as the Secretary's Chief of Staff, she has had the opportunity to work with many in the railroad industry who are present at today's meeting. She thanks RSAC members for their work, knowing that they give time, energies, and their best work to this committee to prioritize safety. She says for those she has not yet had the pleasure to meet in person, she looks forward to meeting them today and to working with directly with them in the future. Acting Administrator Feinberg says her goal is to do everything she can to make certain that RSAC continues to be proactive and effective in the pursuit of safety improvements. She says she knows that RSAC members come to meetings with unique and valuable experience. She says she believes that everyone shares similar values and the same overarching goal – to make our national rail network the safest and most efficient in the world, while protecting the public and ensuring the safety of railroad employees.

Acting Administrator Feinberg says she believes that when you are laser-focused on a clearly defined goal in a committee such as this one, it turns collaboration and compromise into progress and success. She says she knows that the RSAC process has been working. She says some of the best work that RSAC has accomplished in recent years includes consensus-, or partial consensus-driven recommendations in the areas of: Passenger Hours of Service; Critical Incident Reporting; Minimum Training Standards; Passenger Train Door Operation and Safety; System Safety; Rail Failure; Securement of Unattended Equipment; and Hazardous Materials Issues.

Acting Administrator Feinberg says she also knows that RSAC, on occasion, has taken on issues where consensus was not achieved. She says that is not ideal. She says

FRA wishes that every safety challenge that the agency faces could be debated, discussed, and then wrapped up in a perfect bow of consensus, allowing for a quick and efficient rulemaking. However, she adds, the challenges that FRA and the rail industry face are often not easy to resolve, and the differing views on those challenges are disparate, and strongly held. She says she hopes that RSAC members know that the discussions in those working group and task force meetings which fail to reach consensus are not lost. She says all RSAC meetings provide FRA with invaluable information that the agency uses to make informed decisions which, she believes, results in better rulemaking.

Acting Administrator Feinberg says RSAC is FRA's principal rulemaking process. She says the problem with the phrase "rulemaking process" is that no one attaches the word "process" to anything unless it takes a long, long time. She says "process" is a self-important word that attempts to legitimize what it really means, which is—"yes, we're working on it and, no, it won't be done any time soon." She says at a recent congressional hearing, a member of congress was questioning her about the length of time that we at DOT were taking to complete our High Hazard Flammable Train rulemaking, and she finally summed it up with this comment – "The rulemaking process in the US is simply not built for speed."

Acting Administrator Feinberg says the rulemaking process in the US is built for many things – careful consideration of various viewpoints, transparency and public comment, exhaustive economic analysis, and the list goes on. She reiterates that the rulemaking process in the US is not built for speed. However, she says, when lives are on the line, a slow, methodical, rulemaking process can be frustrating, and problematic. She says, "Sometimes, we just cannot afford to take years talking about an issue; we have to act."

Acting Administrator Feinberg says there are important statutory requirements to rulemaking that require valuable input. But, she says, the question is: how do we speed up the process while still ensuring that we are as deliberate as is necessary? How can we be absolutely fair, while still giving ourselves room to move quickly to raise the bar on safety, and in turn, save lives? She says RSAC is designed to answer that question. She says FRA gathers directly-affected stakeholders, in one place, and attempts to gain a consensus rulemaking. When successful, there is better compliance with the rule. The alternative, i.e., the traditional rulemaking process, involves the agency publishing notices, reaching out to stakeholders one at a time, gathering stakeholder input, and then issuing a decision while taking and balancing varying concerns of stakeholders into account.

Acting Administrator Feinberg says RSAC does exactly what it was designed to do. RSAC not only providing FRA with valuable input, it also allows participants to resolve differences in opinion in order to achieve consensus. At that point, RSAC speaks with one voice—providing FRA with a direction forward that requires less balancing, saves time, and ultimately makes better public policy.

Acting Administrator Feinberg says to some degree, RSAC system is working well. However, she adds, she believes that RSAC can also be fine-tuned. She says RSAC needs to work on improving its process because the decisions that are made matter. She says the decisions RSAC makes saves lives. While she says collaboration is critical to the RSAC process, she says efficiency and timeliness are also critical. She says RSAC has accomplished a lot, but we have to do better. She says we must act deliberately and with a sense of urgency because the public, the men and women who work in this industry, the industry's shareholders, the families and communities along railroads, and all of our stakeholders are depending on us. She says we truly do not have as much time as we would always like.

Acting Administrator Feinberg says the marriage of improving safety to sound public policy cannot wait. She says every incident risks lives, or costs lives, or causes damage. She says we must do all we can – together – now – to move quickly to ensure that safety is strengthened and expanded.

Acting Administrator Feinberg lists FRA's promises to RSAC. She has instructed her staff to improve FRA's communications with RSAC members and stakeholders and to make sure we are talking openly and frequently. She says would like to see the RSAC convene more often. She says in the coming weeks, RSAC should look for FRA to announce more frequent meetings for both our working groups and the Committee as a whole. She asks RSAC to expect FRA to bring you together more often – To ask more of you – To expect more of you – But also to be a strong partner to you.

In conclusion, Acting Administrator Feinberg says FRA recognizes that the work that RSAC does is valuable. She says FRA is in an enviable position for a Federal agency - rarely do you see such a collection of stakeholders working to resolve issues that affect each member in different ways. She says, "Our shared values are grounded in safety."

Acting Administrator Feinberg thanks RSAC members for attending today's meeting. She says she looks forward to working with everyone.

Chairperson Rennert thanks Acting FRA Administrator Feinberg for her opening remarks.

Chairperson Rennert asks FRA Associate Administrator for Railroad Safety/Chief Safety Officer Robert (Bob) Lauby for comments.

Bob Lauby (FRA) welcomes RSAC members and meeting attendees to the fifty-third meeting of the Railroad Safety Advisory Committee. He says the last full RSAC meeting was held December 4, 2014. He says he always looks forward to these meetings because it is a good time to reflect on all the progress that is being made.

However, he adds, while there has been progress, 2015 continues to be a very difficult year.

Bob Lauby (FRA) says he recently conducted an “all hands” meeting for the Office of Railroad Safety. He says he told the Office of Railroad Safety staff that there are three things that keep him awake at night: (1) Crude Oil Transportation; (2) Highway-Rail Grade Crossing issues; and (3) Positive Train Control. He says he will give the full RSAC his perspective on these three serious safety issues at today’s meeting.

For Crude Oil and Ethanol Transportation, Mr. Lauby says these important rail commodities continue to grow in volume and with this growth, the resulting safety issues are also growing. He says it doesn’t seem to matter how many Emergency Orders, Safety Advisories, Voluntary Agreements, or Regulations are put in place—safety issues related to crude oil and ethanol transportation refuse to be solved and just keep coming back.

Bob Lauby (FRA) says in the first half of 2015, safety issues related to crude oil and ethanol transportation have come back in a rash of serious train wrecks complete with ruptured tank cars and fires. He says accidents involving crude oil and ethanol occurred on February 4, 2015, in Dubuque, Iowa, February 16, 2015, in Montgomery, West Virginia, and on March 5, 2015, in Galena, Illinois. He says during the same period there were also two very significant accidents in Ontario, Canada.

Bob Lauby (FRA) says crude oil transportation safety issues just won’t go away. He says these accidents have everyone’s attention, including the White House, the Secretary of Transportation and Acting FRA Administrator Feinberg. He says many RSAC members present today already know many of the details of these accidents. However, what is disturbing to him is that these significant accidents occurred at very low speeds, i.e., 33 m.p.h. in the Iowa accident and 23 m.p.h. in the Illinois accident. In addition, he says, these serious accidents involved relative new tank cars built to the latest CPC-1232 standards with ½ inch shells and half height head shields.

[Note: CPC stands for Casualty Prevention Circular. The AAR (Association of American Railroads) issued Circular letter CPC-1232 which specifies new rail tank cars standards for transporting crude oil or ethanol. As of October 10, 2011, new tank cars built for transporting crude oil and ethanol comply with these new specifications:

- (1) Half-Height Head Shields.
- (2) Thicker tank and head material.
- (3) Normalized steel.
- (4) Top fitting protection.
- (5) Pressure Relief Device (recloseable type).

According to a Wall Street Journal article, dated March 9, 2015, there are about 60,000 CPC-1232 tank cars hauling crude oil across North America as well as 100,000 of the older DOT-111 models.]

Bob Lauby (FRA) says the fact that these were newer tank cars and that they ruptured and burned after derailing at such low speeds is not lost on the media, the public, or the Congress, which are all demanding more action to protect lives and property from what they now refer to as “Bomb Trains.”

Bob Lauby (FRA) says the public and Congress demanded that new tank car rules, which had been under development by the Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration (PHMSA) and FRA, be issued immediately. He says the Final Rule was published on May 8, 2015 (89 *Federal Register* 26644), and is now in place. He says everyone does not agree with the new PHMSA tank car rule—some believe that it goes too far—others believe it does not go far enough. However, he says, one thing is very apparent: The safety issues related to crude oil and ethanol transportation are not going to be solved overnight, especially when tank cars built to the new standards will have to be manufactured. He says we are several years away from seeing the improvements included in the tank car rule having a positive effect on Crude Oil and Ethanol Transportation Safety.

Bob Lauby (FRA) says crude oil transportation is an issue we will have to live with for a long time. He says even with the new rule, FRA will continue to do more through Safety Advisories, Emergency Orders, and additional regulations. He says Karl Alexy (FRA—Office of Railroad Safety) will make a presentation at today’s meeting on the new tank car rule.

For Grade Crossing Safety, Mr. Lauby says about 270 people died in grade-crossing accidents in calendar year 2014. He says the death toll continues into 2015. He says in just the last few months, there have been several serious highway-rail grade crossing accidents including: (1) February 3, 2015, Valhalla, New York—a Metro-North Railroad accident with 6 fatalities and 15 injuries; (2) a February 24, 2015, Oxnard, California Metrolink accident with the train engineer killed and 29 injuries; and (3) March 9, 2015, Halifax, North Carolina Amtrak/CSX Transportation accident with 55 injuries. He says these three accidents netted 7 fatalities and 94 injuries, which is a lot. He says only one fatality was to the driver of a motor vehicle. He says 6 fatalities and 94 injuries were to passengers and train crew members.

Bob Lauby (FRA) says preventing highway-rail grade crossing accidents and trespasser fatalities is an important part of FRA’s program. He says FRA must be ready to act to address any known safety issues related to these accidents. He says some actions that have been taken include the following: (1) The FRA Administrator sent a letter to police organizations asking them to encourage officers to monitor grade crossings and enforce grade crossing laws; (2) The Secretary of Transportation drafted a letter that was issued

to the States and railroads to address signage, pavement markings, and testing of railroad-highway preemption circuits; and (3) Additional actions including additional safety advisories are also being contemplated.

Bob Lauby (FRA) says Chairperson Rennert will make a presentation on FRA's grade crossing initiatives at today's meeting. He says these actions will certainly not prevent all accidents, but it is up to us to identify strategies that will make a difference—even if we only eliminate one crossing accident at a time.

For Positive Train Control (PTC), Mr. Lauby says FRA's PTC Division is working hard to support implementation of PTC on all railroads that are required to deploy this technology. However, he adds, FRA realizes that most railroads will not be ready by the December 31, 2015, deadline to have this technology operational.

Bob Lauby (FRA) says for a PTC system to be certified, about 40 railroads must submit a PTC Safety Plan to FRA for review. He says the PTC Safety Plan is then reviewed and approved by FRA and used as a basis for certifying the PTC system. He says to date, FRA has received only one PTC Safety Plan for review and that plan has over 5,000 pages, i.e., 10 reams of paper.

Bob Lauby (FRA) says when not providing technical assistance, the PTC Division has been drafting a report to Congress on PTC implementation. He says the purpose of the report is to advise Congress and the industry on what to expect after December 31, 2015. He says it is apparent that Congress and the public expect FRA to enforce the PTC regulation. So, he says, FRA is preparing an enforcement strategy as part of its report to Congress on PTC implementation.

Bob Lauby (FRA) says right now, FRA does not have the authority to change the implementation date, or to provide a waiver or extension on the requirements for carrier PTC implementation. However, he adds, FRA does have options on what the agency can do to enforce the PTC rule. He says FRA's enforcement tools range from issuing Emergency Orders to prohibit operations, to assessing civil penalties for failure to comply with the PTC requirements. He says all alternatives are on the table and as with all FRA enforcement actions, the agency will assess each railroad's situation to determine what action is appropriate to gain compliance.

Bob Lauby (FRA) says one thing is clear: Short of some action by Congress, the PTC mandate will remain in place and those railroads that have not fully implemented PTC by December 31, 2015, will be in violation of Federal Law—regardless of how FRA exercises its enforcement authority. He says these and other questions need to be answered with FRA's PTC Implementation Report to Congress. He says there can be no surprises on January 1, 2016, when the PTC requirement is fully in place. He says Congress, the industry, and FRA all need to have a plan going into the New Year. He says everyone needs to know what is going to happen.

Bob Lauby (FRA) says along with the existing issues associated with PTC, FRA is also reacting to the tragic Philadelphia Amtrak accident, described by Acting Administrator Feinberg. He says eight passengers were killed and numerous passengers suffered severe injuries. He says the accident is still under investigation by FRA and the National Transportation safety Board, however, all indications point to a train that was traveling too fast at the time of the derailment. He says a train overspeed derailment is preventable by PTC.

Bob Lauby (FRA) says the Philadelphia Amtrak accident has also generated discussions on other safety and regulatory initiatives including crew size and inward-facing recording devices mounted in controlling locomotive cabs.

Bob Lauby (FRA) says the work FRA has done to provide a strategy on PTC implementation has been set back. He says some who were previously supporting a new implementation date or a modified implementation strategy have backed away and are insisting that FRA enforce the current regulation. He says FRA is not certain where the discussion will end up, but there is current a demand to determine the status of PTC implementation on each railroad. He says FRA has prepared a short list of information that the agency will request railroads to provide so that FRA and Congress can determine what work remains to be done. He says FRA will be meeting with the PTC technical representatives from all railroads this afternoon.

Bob Lauby (FRA) thanks everyone for their attention. He thanks RSAC members for all of their efforts over the past year to make the railroad system as safe as it can be.

Bob Lauby (FRA) asks for questions.

Chairperson Rennert thanks Bob Lauby for his remarks.

Chairperson Rennert asks Karl Alexy (FRA–Office of Railroad Safety) for a report on Enhanced Tank Car Standards and Operational Controls for High Hazard Flammable Trains (HM-251).

Karl Alexy (FRA) uses a series of Microsoft PowerPoint Presentation slides, projected onto a screen for “Enhanced Tank Car Standards and Operational Controls for High Hazard Flammable Trains (HM-251).” Photocopies of the Microsoft PowerPoint Presentation were distributed to meeting attendees. All meeting handouts will be entered into the RSAC Docket and posted on FRA’s RSAC Internet Web Site, under “Committee Documents,” and are not excerpted in their entirety in the RSAC Minutes.

Under slide 2, “History,” Mr. Alexy displays a time line of events beginning in 2011 with the Association of American Railroads’ Tank Car Committee deliberations on standards leading up to the Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration’s issuance of

the following: (1) 49 CFR Parts 173, 174, 178, 179, and 180 Hazardous Materials: Rail Petitions and Recommendations to improve the Safety of Railroad Tank Car Transportation; Advance Notice of Proposed Rulemaking (ANPRM), 78 *Federal Register* 54849, dated September 6, 2013; (2) 49 CFR Parts 171, 172, 173, 174, and 179; Hazardous Materials: Enhanced Tank Car Standard and Operational Controls for High-Hazard Flammable Trains; Notice of Proposed Rulemaking (NPRM), 79 *Federal Register* 45016, dated August 1, 2014; and (3) 49 CFR Parts 171, 172, 173, et al. Hazardous Materials: Enhanced Tank Car Standard and Operational Controls for High-Hazard Flammable Trains; Final Rule, 89 *Federal Register* 26644, dated May 8, 2015.

Under slide 3, "Elements of Rule," Mr. Alexy outlines elements of the Final Tank Car Rule, i.e., 89 *Federal Register* 26644, as follows: (1) Classification; (2) Routing/ Notification; (3) Speed Restrictions; (4) Braking; and (5) Tank Car Specifications.

Under slide 4, "Scope of Rule," Mr. Alexy says the Final Tank Car Rule, i.e., 89 *Federal Register* 26644, applies to the following: (1) High Hazard Flammable Train (HHFT): (a) 20 or more loaded cars in a continuous block; and (b) 35 loaded cars throughout the train; and (2) High Hazard Flammable Unit Train (HHFUT)—70 or more loaded tank cars in a single train.

Under slide 5, "Classification," Mr. Alexy says a new Part 49 CFR Section 173.41 Sampling and testing program for unrefined petroleum products, includes the following: (1) Frequency of sampling/testing; (2) Sample prior to offering/changes; (3) Sampling method; (4) Test methods; (5) Quality control measures; (6) Duplicate samples; (7) Criteria for modification of program; and (8) Other methods. Mr. Alexy says each person required to develop a sampling and testing program shall make the documentation available upon request to an authorized official of the Department of Transportation.

Under slide 6, "Routing," Mr. Alexy says a new Part 49 CFR Section 174.310, prescribes requirements for the operation of HHFTs. He says Paragraph (a)(1) requires that any rail carrier operating an HHFT is subject to the additional safety and security planning requirements in § 172.820 (i.e. routing). A rail carrier must comply with these additional requirements if they operate an HHFT (as defined in § 171.8), including (1) Risk assessment: (a) Routing analysis (27 safety and security factors); and (b) Select a route based on its findings; and (2) Notification: (a) Contact information for State and/or regional fusion centers and State, local, and tribal officials; (b) Request information related to the routing of hazardous materials through their jurisdictions; and (c) Replaces proposed requirements to notify State Emergency Response Commissions.

Under slide 7, "Speed Restriction," Mr. Alexy says a new Part 49 CFR Section 174.310, prescribes requirements for the operation of HHFTs. A rail carrier must comply with these additional requirements if they operate an HHFT (as defined in § 171.8), including

the requirement that all trains are limited to a maximum speed of 50 mph. The train is further limited to a maximum speed of 40 mph while that train travels within the limits of high-threat urban areas (HTUAs) as defined in § 1580.3 of this title, unless all tank cars containing a Class 3 flammable liquid meet or exceed the retrofit standard DOT Specification 117R, the DOT Specification 117P performance standards, or the standard for the DOT Specification 117 tank car.

Under slides 8-9, “Braking,” Mr. Alexy says a new Part 49 CFR Section 174.310, prescribes requirements for the operation of HHFTs. A rail carrier must comply with these additional requirements if they operate an HHFT (as defined in § 171.8), including the requirement that all trains are limited to a maximum speed of 50 mph, as follows: (1) Effective 60 days after the Final Rule is published, July 7, 2015: (a) Two-way end-of-train device (§ 232.5); or (b) Distributed Power (§ 229.5); and (c) Speed > 30 m.p.h.; (2) Effective January 1, 2021: (a) One car of Class 3 PGI material (Bakken Crude oil); (b) Speed > 30 m.p.h.; (c) Electronically controlled pneumatic (ECP) brakes (49 CFR Part 343, Subpart G); and (d) Not buffer cars; (3) Effective January 1, 2023—all HHFTs (includes denatured alcohol): (a) Buffer cars counted in determining effective and operative brakes (§ 232.609); (b) Alternate brake systems may be approved (49 CFR Part 232, Subpart F); and (c) See § 174.310.

Under slide 10, “Tank Car Specification,” Mr. Alexy outlines the following requirements: (1) New cars constructed after October 1, 2015: (a) Specification Standard DOT 117; and (b) Performance standard DOT 117P; (2) Existing cars to be retrofitted: (a) Specification standard DOT 117R; and (b) Performance standard; (3) Prescribed retrofit schedule; and (4) A car retrofit reporting requirement.

Under slides 11-12, “New Tank Cars,” Mr. Alexy lists the following requirements for new tank cars: (1) Specification Standard (DOT 117): (a) TC-128 Minimum shell/head thickness—9/16-inch; (b) Tank head puncture resistance system—§ 179.16(c); (c) Thermal protection system—§ 179.18; (d) Bottom outlet valve—prevent unintended actuation during a derailment; (e) Top fittings protection—AAR’s Tank CAR Manual, E 10.2.1; and (f) See 49 CFR Part 179, Subpart D; and (2) Performance Standard (DOT 117P): (a) Shell—12-inches X 12-inches indenter: 12 m.p.h.; (b) Tank head—18 m.p.h.; (c) Thermal protection system—§ 179.18; (d) Bottom outlet valve—prevent unintended actuation during a derailment; (e) Top fittings protection—AAR’s Tank Car Manual, E 10.2.1; and (f) See § 179.202-12.

Under slide 13, “Retrofit Tank Cars,” Mr. Alexy says retrofit tank car Specification Standard DOT 117R includes the following provisions: (1) Minimum shell/head thickness—7/16-inch; (2) Tank head puncture resistance system—§ 179.16(c); (3) Thermal protection system—§ 179.18—jacket is required (basis of all modeling); (4) Bottom outlet valve—prevent unintended activation during a derailment; (5) Top fittings protection—AAR’s Tank Car Manual, E.10.2.1; and (6) See § 179.202-13.

Under slide 14, “Retrofit Schedule,” Mr. Alexy displays the following tank car retrofit schedule:

Car Specification/ Service	U.S. Retrofit Timeline	Car Specification/ Service	Canadian Retrofit Timeline
DOT111 (NJ)/PGI	January 1, 2017 January 1, 2018	DOT111 (NJ)/ Crude Oil	May 1, 2017
DOT111 (J)/PGI	March 1, 2018	DOT111 (J)/Crude Oil	March 1, 2018
CPC-1232 (NJ)/PGI	April 1, 2020	CPC-1232 (NJ)/ Crude Oil	April 1, 2020
DOT111 (NJ)/PGII	May 1, 2023	DOT111 (NJ)/ Ethanol	May 1, 2023
DOT111 (J)/PGII	May 1, 2023	DOT111 (J)/ Ethanol	May 1, 2023
CPC-1232 (NJ)/PGII	July 1, 2023	CPC-1232 (NJ)/ Ethanol	July 1, 2023
CPC-1232 (J)/PGI and PGII and all remaining cars in PGIII	May 1, 2025	CPC-1232 (J)/ PGI and PGII all remaining cars in other flammable liquid service.	May 1, 2025

Under slide 15, “Retrofit Reporting,” Mr. Alexy says retrofit reporting is required by: (1) Owners of non-jacked DOT111 cars; (2) PGI service in HHFT; (3) Unable to meet the January 2017 deadline; and (4) See § 174.310. Mr. Alexy says the report is due to FRA by March 1, 2017, for the following: (a) DOT117R; (b) DOT117P; (c) DOT111 (not retrofitted); (d) DOT117; and (e) ECP (ready/equipped).

Under slide 16, “Alignment with Transport Canada,” Mr. Alexy says FRA tried to align the retrofit schedule with Transport Canada (TC) requirements, but in some cases they do not match. He contrasts the differences in requirements for the two authorities as follows: (1) Retrofit schedule: (a) U.S. based on packing group; and (b) TC is based on commodity; (2) Applicability: (a) U.S.–HHFT; and (b) TC is based on single tank car; and (3) ECP: (a) U.S. required for HHFUT after January 1, 2021 (PGI), and May 1, 2023 (PGII/PGIII); and (b) TC–not yet required. TC verbally committed to ECP brakes.

Karl Alexy (FRA) asks for questions.

Chairperson Rennert thanks Karl Alexy for his presentation. She announces the first morning break.

M O R N I N G B R E A K 10:25 A.M. - 10:45 A.M.

Chairperson Rennert reconvenes the meeting. She asks Christian Holt (FRA–Office of Railroad Safety) for a report on Inward- and Outward Facing Recording Devices Mounted in Controlling Locomotive Cabs (Recording Devices) Working Group activities.

Christian Holt (FRA) uses a series of Microsoft PowerPoint Presentation slides, projected onto a screen for “Recording Devices Working Group (RDWG) Update.” Photocopies of the Microsoft PowerPoint Presentation were distributed to meeting attendees. All meeting handouts will be entered into the RSAC Docket and posted on FRA’s RSAC Internet Web Site, under “Committee Documents,” and are not excerpted in their entirety in the RSAC Minutes.

Under slide 2, “Recording Devices Working Group (RDWG) Update,” Mr. Holt outlines the presentation as follows: (1) Review task statement; (2) List the RDWG meetings to date; (3) FRA position on recording devices; (4) Questions to be resolved: (a) Control and use of data; and (b) Technical requirements; and (5) Scheduled meetings and report to the full RSAC.

Under slide 3, “Purpose,” Mr. Holt says the purpose of RSAC Task No.: 14-01 is: “To develop regulatory recommendations addressing the installation and use of inward- and outward-facing image recorders in controlling locomotive cabs. The recommendations should address installation requirements and timelines, technical controls, recording retention periods, retrieval of recordings, controlled custody of recordings, crashworthiness standards at least equivalent to those for locomotive event recorders, use of recordings for accident investigation and railroad safety study purposes, and use of recordings in conducting operational tests.”

Under slide 4, “Background,” Mr. Holt outlines the following background information for RSAC Task No.: 14-01: “In light of National Transportation Safety Board (NTSB) recommendations R-10-1, R-10-2, and recent accidents, FRA believes it is appropriate to evaluate the adoption of regulations addressing inward- and outward-facing locomotive image and audio recorders to advance railroad safety. Recordings would be used to: (1) Assist in post-accident/incident investigations (railroad, highway-rail grade crossing, and trespasser); (2) To assist in evaluating railroad employee fatigue, distraction, and crew interactions; and (3) For use as a training tool for railroad employees, and for use in conducting operational tests of railroad employees.”

Under slide 5, “Description,” Mr. Holt reads the following description from RSAC Task No.: 14-01: “Review and evaluate the following: (1) NTSB Recommendations

R-10-1 and R-10-2; (2) 49 *Code of Federal Regulations* (CFR) Part 229 Railroad Locomotive Safety Standards; (3) 49 CFR Part 218, Subpart D, Prohibition Against Tampering with Safety Devices; (4) 49 CFR Part 217 Railroad Operating Rules; and (5) Railroad accidents (e.g., Chatsworth, California, Goodwell, Oklahoma, and Bronx, New York).

[Note: The following is a brief description of the cited railroad accidents: (1) Chatsworth, CA: On September 12, 2008, there was a head-on train collision between a Union Pacific Railroad freight train and a Metrolink commuter train resulting in 25 fatalities and 135 injuries; (2) Goodwell, OK: On June 24, 2012, there was a head-on train collision between two Union Pacific Railroad freight trains resulting in three train crew fatalities; and (3) Bronx, NY: On December 1, 2013, there was a Metro-North Railroad commuter train overspeed derailment resulting in four fatalities and 63 injuries.]

Under slide 6, “Issues Requiring Specific Report,” Mr. Holt outlines the following topics which the RDWG will report to the full Railroad Safety Advisory Committee: “All matters related to the development of regulatory standards governing the installation and use of inward- and outward-facing image and audio recorders in controlling locomotive cabs, including economic data required for regulatory analysis.”

Under slides 7-8, “NTSB Recommendations R-10-1 and R-10-2,” Mr. Holt reads the following National Transportation Safety Board (NTSB) Recommendations:

Require the installation, in all controlling locomotive cabs and cab car operating compartments, of crash- and fire-protected inward- and outward-facing audio and image recorders capable of providing recordings to verify that train crew actions are in accordance with rules and procedures that are essential to safety as well as train operating conditions. The devices should have a minimum 12-hour continuous recording capability with recordings that are easily accessible for review, with appropriate limitations on public release, for the investigation of accidents or for use by management in carrying out efficiency testing and system wide performance monitoring programs. (R-10-1)

Require that railroads regularly review and use in-cab audio and image recordings (with appropriate limitations on public release), in conjunction with other performance data, to verify that train crew actions are in accordance with rules and procedures that are essential to safety. (R-10-2)

Under slides 9 and 19, “RDWG Update,” Mr. Holt says the RDWG has met five times and received presentations as follows: (1) June 5, 2014: (a) Federal Aviation Administration presentation on cockpit audio recording devices; (b) American Public Transportation Association/Southern California Regional Rail Authority (Metrolink) and North County Transportation District (Coaster) presentations on the use of recording devices in transit and commuter rail operations; (c) Association of American Railroads

(AAR) presentation on recording devices; (d) Labor presentation on recording devices; (2) September 3, 2014: (a) Kansas City Southern Railway Company presentation on the use of inward- and outward-facing image recording devices; (3) October 28-29, 2014: (a) AAR presentation of use of image recording devices in the trucking industry; (b) FRA presentation of the Confidential Close Call Reporting System; and (c) Security Industry Association presentation on the use of image recording devices; (4) December 9-10, 2014: (a) Meeting adjourned December 9, 2014, after industry request to develop joint Pilot Project Proposal; (b) FRA agreed to delay and cancel scheduled January 27-29, 2015 meeting and requested status reports in January 2015 and February 2015; and (c) Notified in February 2015 that parties could not reach agreement on Pilot Project; and (5) March 3-4, 2015—meeting ended without RDWG reaching consensus on any areas of the task.

Under slide 10, “RDWG Update,” Mr. Holt states FRA’s position on recording devices as follows: (1) Mandate outward- and inward-facing image recording devices; (2) Audio allowed but not mandated; and (3) Allow operational testing using image recording devices with established random selection requirements for inward-facing recording devices.

Under slides 11-12, “Recording Protection and Handling,” Mr. Holt says FRA will develop rule text requiring railroads to adopt and comply with chain-of-custody and release protocols for locomotive recordings. Mr. Holt says there will be limitations on the release of locomotive recordings involving the following: (1) Freedom of Information Act–related issues; (2) Handling of locomotive recordings and chain-of-custody after an accident/incident; and (3) 49 *Code of Federal Regulations* (CFR) Part 229.135(e)-(f) event recorder requirements.

Under slides 13-15, “Recording Protection and Handling,” Mr. Holt reads FRA’s preliminary position regarding controls on Inward- and Outward Facing Recording Devices Mounted in Controlling Locomotive Cabs as follows: (1) Inward-facing image recordings: (a) Stricter controls due to elevated privacy interests, as recordings are of actions of employees inside the locomotive cab; and (b) FRA preliminary position: recordings shall only be retained and accessed by the railroad, or by FRA/NTSB, in the event of an accident/incident required to be reported under part 225; and (2) Outward-facing recordings: (a) Least restrictive controls due to a lack of privacy interest, i.e., merely recording the view of the environment outside of the locomotive cab that the public can also see; and (b) FRA preliminary position: in the event of an accident/incident required to be reported under part 225, railroads shall preserve such recordings for one year for potential analysis by FRA and/or the NTSB (49 CFR § 229.135(e)).

Under slides 16-17, “Recording Protection and Handling,” Mr. Holt says (1) Other specific triggering events are: (i) Violation of a Federal railroad safety law, regulation or order; (ii) Performance of operational tests in accordance with Part 217, with mandatory

“randomness” protocols for such testing; (iii) Investigation of violations of criminal or civil laws; and (iv) Original recording to FRA/NTSB if requested—railroad may retain copy; (2) Recordings must be retained for one year from the date of a triggering event and applicable chain-of-custody protocols must be followed; and (3) The use of recordings in Part 240/242 certification actions or as evidence in other administrative proceedings to be considered.

Under slide 18, “Technical Requirements,” Mr. Holt says which locomotives must be equipped and by what date are: (1) Defined by speed, similar to event recorders, e.g., required when locomotives operate at more than 30 mph; (2) Defined by Class of railroad, such as Class I, Class II, or Class III, and defined passenger operations; and (3) Defined by employee work hours, e.g., railroads with more than 400,000 total employee work hours per year.

[Note: Railroad Classification, based on railroad operating revenues, is determined by the Surface Transportation Board, formerly the Interstate Commerce Commission. The Surface Transportation Board's accounting regulations group rail carriers into three classes for purposes of accounting and reporting (49 CFR Part 1201 Subpart A):

For 2013,

Class I Railroads have annual carrier operating revenues of \$467.0 million* or more.

Class II Railroads have annual carrier operating revenues of less than \$467.0 million*, but in excess of \$37.4 million*.

Class III Railroads have annual carrier operating revenues of \$37.4 million* or less, and the Class III Railroad category includes all switching and terminal railroads regardless of operating revenues.

* These threshold figures are adjusted annually for inflation using the base year of 1991.]

Under slide 20, “Task No. 14-01,” Mr. Holt says (1) Recommendations to the full RSAC were due April 1, 2015; and (2) In the absence of consensus recommendations from the RDWG and RSAC, FRA will proceed with a Notice of Proposed Rulemaking (NPRM) through the traditional rulemaking process.

Christian Holt (FRA) asks for questions.

John Risch (Sheet Metal, Air, Rail and Transportation Workers) asks, “When do you expect the Recording Devices Notice of Proposed Rulemaking (NPRM) to be released.”

Chairperson Rennert says the Recording Devices NPRM is on the Acting FRA Administrator’s list of priorities. She says the agency is working on five other higher-priority rules. She says FRA is working hard, but it will take time.

James Cline (American Public Transportation Association) says State rules on recording devices are beginning to interfere with what Federal rules are saying.

John Tolman (Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers and Trainmen) says he is not seeing any discussion about crash-hardened memory for locomotive cab recording devices.

Jamie Rennert says this topic is on the Acting FRA Administrator's agenda and FRA will be working on crash-hardened memory aspects in its rule.

Chairperson Rennert asks Larry Woolverton (FRA– Office of Safety) for an update on FRA Regulatory Activity. She says Larry Woolverton is the Office of Railroad Safety's RSAC Coordinator.

Larry Woolverton (FRA) uses a series of Microsoft PowerPoint Presentation slides, projected onto a screen for "FRA Regulatory Activity Update." Photocopies of the Microsoft PowerPoint Presentation were distributed to meeting attendees. All meeting handouts will be entered into the RSAC Docket and posted on FRA's RSAC Internet Web Site, under "Committee Documents," and are not excerpted in their entirety in the RSAC Minutes.

Under slide 2, Mr. Woolverton says the following: (1) FRA continues to prioritize its rulemakings according to: (a) Greatest effect on safety while promoting economic growth, innovation, competitiveness, and job creation; (b) Expressed Executive Branch and Congressional interest; and (c) Statutory deadlines; (2) Despite its priorities, FRA does not control the timelines for coordination/publication of its rules; and (3) Office of Management and Budget (OMB) designation plays a great part in how quickly FRA's rules are published.

Under slide 3, "FRA Priority of Importance–Significant," Mr. Woolverton lists the following priority for significant rulemakings: (1) Risk Reduction Program Notice of Proposed Rulemaking (NPRM); (2) Passenger Equipment Alternative Compliance (NPRM); (3) System Safety Program (Final Rule); (4) Train Crew Staffing (NPRM); and (5) Securement of Unattended Equipment (Final Rule).

Under slide 4, "FRA Priority of Importance–Non-Significant," Mr. Woolverton lists the following priority for non-significant rulemakings: (1) Roadway Worker Protection; Miscellaneous Revisions (Final Rule); (2) Controlled Substance Testing/Maintenance Employees (Final Rule); (3) Passenger Train Door Operation and Door Safety (Final Rule); (4) Accident/Incident Reporting Threshold (NPRM); (5) Engineer Qualification and Certification Revisions (NPRM); (6) Safety Glazing Standards; Miscellaneous Revisions (Final Rule); and (7) Hours of Service Recordkeeping Amendments (NPRM).

Under slide 5, “OMB [Office of Management and Budget] Designation,” Mr. Woolverton answers the question, “What does it mean when a regulatory action is determined to be “significant? (Adds considerable time to the process...)” Mr. Woolverton says under Executive Order 12866, the Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs (under OMB) is responsible for determining which agency regulatory action are “significant” and, in turn, subject to interagency review. Significant regulatory actions are defined in the Executive Order as those that: (1) Have an annual effect on the economy of \$100 million or more or adversely affect in a material way the economy, a sector of the economy, productivity, competition, jobs, the environment, public health or safety, or State, local, or tribal governments or communities; (2) Create a serious inconsistency or otherwise interfere with an action taken or planned by another agency; (3) Materially alter the budgetary impact of entitlements, grants, user fees, or loan programs or the rights and obligations of recipients thereof; or (4) Raise novel legal or policy issues arising out of legal mandates, the President’s priorities or the principles set forth in this Executive Order.

Under slide 6, “Risk Reduction Program,” Mr. Woolverton describes the upcoming significant FRA Rulemaking for the Risk Reduction Program as follows: (1) NPRM published February 27, 2015; (2) This rulemaking proposes appropriate contents for risk reduction programs for freight railroads and how they should be implemented and reviewed by FRA, as mandated by Rail Safety Improvement Act (RSIA) of 2008; (3) Comment period closed April 28, 2015; and (4) Expect Final Rule in early 2016.

Under slide 7, “Passenger Equipment Safety Standards; Standards for Alternative Compliance and High-Speed Trainsets,” Mr. Woolverton describes the upcoming significant FRA Rulemaking for Passenger Equipment Safety Standards; Standards for Alternative Compliance and High-Speed Trainsets as follows: (1) NPRM Expected–Summer/Fall 2015; (2) Amends FRA’s Passenger Equipment Safety Standards by adding a new equipment tier (Tier III) to facilitate the safe implementation of high-speed rail at speeds up to 220 mph; (3) Establishes alternative crashworthiness performance requirements for Tier I passenger trainsets (operating at speeds not exceeding 125 mph); and (4) Proposes to increase the maximum speed for Tier II operations from 150 mph to 160 mph.

Under slide 8, “Railroad System Safety Program,” Mr. Woolverton describes the upcoming significant FRA Rulemaking for the Railroad System Safety Program as follows: (1) Final Rule expected–Summer 2015; (2) This rulemaking improves passenger railroad safety through structured, proactive processes and procedures developed by passenger railroads; (3) Requires each passenger railroad to establish a system safety program that would systematically evaluate and manage risks in order to reduce the number and rates of railroad accidents, incidents, injuries and fatalities; and (4) This rulemaking was bifurcated from the Risk Reduction Program rulemaking, to specifically implement the RSIA’s risk reduction mandate for passenger rail operations.

Under slide 9, “Train Crew Staffing,” Mr. Woolverton describes the upcoming significant FRA Rulemaking for Train Crew Staffing as follows: (1) NPRM Expected–Spring/Summer 2015; (2) Proposes regulations establishing minimum requirements for the size of train crew staffs depending on the type of operation. A minimum requirement of two crew members would be proposed for those operations that pose significant safety risks to railroad employees, the general public, and the environment; (3) Establishes minimum requirements for the roles and responsibilities of the second train crew member on a moving train, and promote safe and effective teamwork; and (4) NPRM is current under review by OMB.

Under slide 10, “Securement of Unattended Equipment,” Mr. Woolverton describes the upcoming significant FRA Rulemaking for Securement of Unattended Equipment as follows: (1) NPRM issued September 9, 2014 (79 *Federal Register* 53356); (2) Enhances the requirements concerning the securement of unattended rail equipment; (3) Codifies most of FRA’s Emergency Order No. 28 (EO 28), issued August 2013, in response to the catastrophic derailment of an unattended train carrying crude oil in Lac-Mégantic, Quebec, Canada; (4) Requires each locomotive left unattended outside a rail yard be equipped with an operative exterior locking mechanism and that such locks be applied on the controlling locomotive cab door of locomotives of trains transporting certain quantities of certain hazardous materials; and (5) Final Rule expected–Spring/Summer 2015.

Under slide 11, “Railroad Workplace Safety; Roadway Worker Protection Miscellaneous Revisions,” Mr. Woolverton describes the upcoming non-significant FRA Rulemaking for Railroad Workplace Safety; Roadway Worker Protection Miscellaneous Revisions as follows: (1) Final Rule Expected–Spring 2015; and (2) The Final Rule is intended to incorporate dozens of miscellaneous revisions and additions to resolve interpretative issues that have arisen since the 1996 promulgation of the original regulation.

Under slide 12, “Control of Alcohol and Drug Use: Coverage of Maintenance of Way Employees, Retrospective Regulatory Review-Based Amendments,” Mr. Woolverton describes the upcoming non-significant FRA Rulemaking for Control of Alcohol and Drug Use: Coverage of Maintenance of Way Employees, Retrospective Regulatory Review-Based Amendments as follows: (1) NPRM–July 28, 2014 (79 *Federal Register* 43829); (2) Expands the scope of FRA’s alcohol and drug regulations to cover employees who perform railroad maintenance-of-way activities as required by section 412 of the RSIA; (3) Proposes certain substantive amendments that either respond to National Transportation Safety Board (NTSB) recommendations or update and clarify the alcohol and drug regulations based on a retrospective analysis; and (4) Final Rule expected–late summer 2015.

Under slide 13, “Passenger Train Exterior Side Door Safety,” Mr. Woolverton describes the upcoming non-significant FRA Rulemaking for Passenger Train Exterior Side Door Safety as follows: (1) NPRM–March 26, 2014 (79 *Federal Register* 16978);

(2) Improves the integrity of passenger train exterior side door safety systems and reduces the number and severity of injuries involving passenger train exterior side doors; (3) Proposes new standards for both powered and manual exterior side doors and door safety systems on passenger trains; and (4) Final Rule—expected Summer 2015.

Under slide 14, “Revision of Method for Calculating Threshold for Accident Reporting,” Mr. Woolverton describes the upcoming non-significant FRA Rulemaking for Revision of Method for Calculating Threshold for Accident Reporting as follows: (1) NPRM Expected—Summer 2015; and (2) The NPRM would update the method for calculating the monetary threshold for reporting rail equipment accidents and incidents. The NPRM would involve a minor technical correction to the existing threshold calculation formula.

Under slide 15, “Qualification and Certification of Locomotive Engineers; Miscellaneous Revisions,” Mr. Woolverton describes the upcoming non-significant FRA Rulemaking for Qualification and Certification of Locomotive Engineers; Miscellaneous Revisions as follows: (1) NPRM Expected—Summer 2015; and (2) The NPRM would revise FRA’s regulation governing the qualification and certification of locomotive engineers to conform to the regulation governing the certification of conductors.

Under slide 16, “Safety Glazing Standards,” Mr. Woolverton describes the upcoming non-significant FRA Rulemaking for Safety Glazing Standards as follows: (1) NPRM—published September 26, 2014 (*79 Federal Register 57856*); (2) The NPRM would revise and clarify the existing regulations related to the use of glazing materials in the windows of locomotives, passenger cars, and cabooses; (3) Clarifies the application of the regulations to antiquated equipment and to the end locations of all equipment to provide more certainty; and (4) Final Rule expected Summer of 2015.

Under slide 17, “Hours of Service Recordkeeping Amendments,” Mr. Woolverton describes the upcoming non-significant FRA Rulemaking for Hours of Service Recordkeeping Amendments as follows: (1) NPRM Expected—Spring/Summer 2015; (2) Provides simplified recordkeeping requirements to allow railroads with less than 400,000 employee hours per year to utilize automated recordkeeping systems that are less complex than the electronic systems provided under the existing regulation; and (3) Expected to decrease burden on smaller entities.

Larry Woolverton (FRA) asks for questions.

John Risch (Sheet Metal, Air, Rail, and Transportation Workers) asks if fatigue management is part of Risk Reduction.

Jamie Rennert says she believes “fatigue management” has been separated out of the Risk Reduction Program and System Safety Program for now. She says she will attempt to obtain clarity on this topic for RSAC members.

Chairperson Rennert asks Devin Rouse (FRA–Office of Railroad Safety) for a report on Engineering Task Force (ETF) activities.

Devin Rouse (FRA) uses a series of Microsoft PowerPoint Presentation slides, projected onto a screen for “Engineering Task Force Update.” Photocopies of the Microsoft PowerPoint Presentation were distributed to meeting attendees. All meeting handouts will be entered into the RSAC Docket and posted on FRA’s RSAC Internet Web Site, under “Committee Documents,” and are not excerpted in their entirety in the RSAC Minutes.

Under slide 2, “Outline,” Mr. Rouse says he will cover the following topics: (1) Task Force Introduction and Background; (2) Status of Current Tasks; and (3) Updates from March 2015 Meeting.

Under slide 3, “ETF Background,” Mr. Rouse says the following: (1) The Engineering Task Force (ETF) was established by the Passenger Safety Working Group (PSWG) on August 12, 2009 to develop technical criteria and procedures for the crashworthiness of alternatively-designed Tier I equipment (published October 28, 2011); and (2) The ETF was re-tasked by the PSWG on July 28, 2010 to: (a) Address any type of passenger equipment, including Tier III equipment; and (b) Address any safety features of the equipment; and (3) The development of next generation high-speed rail trainset requirements (Tier III) is a major focus.

Under slide 4, “Passenger Equipment Rulemaking Regulatory Plan,” Mr. Rouse lists the following components for the “first NPRM” and the “second NPRM” for Tier III equipment: (1) NPRM 1: (a) Tier I alternative crashworthiness standards; (b) Tier III crashworthiness standards; (c) Align Tier II MAS [maximum allowable speed] with new VTI [Vehicle Track Interaction] rule (160 mph) (d) Codify Tier III Glazing and NPRM 1 consensus items; and (e) Tier III Braking Systems; and (NPRM 2): (a) Tier III Safety Appliances; (b) Incorporate 49 (CFR) Part 229 for Tier III; (c) Alternative crashworthiness for single car/locomotive; (d) Tier III Inspection, Testing and Maintenance (ITM) Requirements; (e) Update testing/Commissioning Requirements; and (f) Tier I passenger trainset/locomotive safety appliances.

Under slide 5, “Progress of NPRM 2 Topics to Date,” Mr. Rouse give the status on the following ETF assignments: (1) Substantially Complete: (a) Incorporate 49 CFR Part 229 for Tier III equipment; (2) In Progress: (a) Tier III safety appliances; (b) Tier III Safe Operation Plan (Subpart J); (2) Stalled–Alternative crashworthiness for single car/locomotive; and (c) Tier III Inspection, Testing and Maintenance; (3) Pending: (a) Alternative crashworthiness for single car/locomotive; and (b) Update 49 CFR 238.111 requirements; and (4) Not started: (a) Tier I passenger trainset/locomotive safety appliances.

Under slide 6, “Objectives from March Meetings,” Mr. Rouse lists the following:

Objective	Result
Present remaining proposals for application of 49 CFR Part 229 to Tier III—seek ETF concurrence.	Complete.
Present Tier III safety appliance—attachment strength proposal and seek ETF concurrence.	Complete.
Resolve open issues related to “single car/locomotive” alternative crashworthiness.	Technical Committee formed.
Receive feedback on Tier III Safe Operation Plan Proposal and determine path forward.	Need to further reconcile with System Safety Plan Rule.
Present concept for Tier III ITM to gain initial feedback.	Complete.

Under slide 7, “Tier III Safety Appliances—Task Status,” Mr. Rouse says a working committee was created to develop recommendations to the ETF for Tier III safety appliances. He says the “Safety Appliance Committee” has divided the task into four major areas: (1) Application (Proposal 1); (2) Location and size; (3) Appliance strength; and (4) Attachment strength.

Under slide 8, “Tier III Safety Appliances—Proposal 2 (Application and Attachment Strength),” Mr. Rouse says Tier III equipment safety appliance recommendations were developed by analyzing passenger car requirements from 49 CFR Part 231. He says the objectives of the 49 CFR Part 231 analysis were to: (1) Maintain the intent of the original requirements; (2) Establish whether the original application was appropriate; and (3) Determine how best to preserve intent for modern applications. Mr. Rouse says the Safety Appliance Committee recommendations were presented and approved by the ETF on March 18, 2015.

Under slide 9, “Tier III 229/ITM Task Group Update,” Mr. Rouse says the analysis of Part 229 application is complete—draft language is being developed. He says discussions have started on Tier III ITM requirements. He says the 229/ITM Task Group Tasks include the following: (1) Determine appropriate application of Part 229 to Tier III (complete); and (2) Develop requirements for Tier III Inspection, Testing, and Maintenance (ITM).

Under slide 10, "Future Meetings," Mr. Rouse says the ETF has meetings scheduled as follows: (1) ITM/229 Task Group teleconference: (a) May 14, 2015; (b) June 1, 2015; and (c) July 2015—to be determined (TBD); (2) Tier III Safety Appliances—July 27, 2015; and (3) Single Car/Locomotive Alternative Crashworthiness—dates TBD. Mr. Rouse says the next full Engineering Task Force meeting is scheduled for October/November 2015.

Devin Rouse (FRA) asks for questions.

Chairperson Rennert thanks Devin Rouse for his presentation. She announces the lunch break.

There is a brief discussion among RSAC members about continuing with additional presentations before the lunch break, to which Chairperson Rennert agrees.

Chairperson Rennert asks Christian Holt (FRA—Office of Railroad Safety) to for a presentation on a proposed new RSAC Task No.: 14-03 for Remote Control Locomotive Operations, which was introduced to, and accepted by the full Railroad Safety Advisory Committee during the December 4, 2014, meeting.

Christian Holt (FRA) uses a series of Microsoft PowerPoint Presentation slides, projected onto a screen for "Railroad Safety Advisory Committee Task Statement: Remote Control Locomotive Operations." Photocopies of the Microsoft PowerPoint Presentation were distributed to meeting attendees. All meeting handouts will be entered into the RSAC Docket and posted on FRA's RSAC Internet Web Site, under "Committee Documents," and are not excerpted in their entirety in the RSAC Minutes.

Under slide 2, "Purpose," Mr. Holt says the purpose of RSAC Task No.: 14-03 is (1) To review existing Remote Control Locomotive (RCL) operations and previous information regarding such operations; and (2) To determine whether specific regulations, guidance, or other responsive actions are needed so that appropriate processes and procedures are in place to ensure the safety of RCL operations.

Under slide 3, "Background," Mr. Holt says (1) RCL operations have occurred for a number of years and FRA has issued various Safety Advisories, reports, and other guidance documents regarding their use and safe operation; (2) RCL operations were also recently discussed at the emergency RSAC Crew Size Working Group Meeting; and (3) At that time, FRA agreed to propose the establishment of a separate RSAC working group to consider the current use of RCL operations and whether updated requirements or guidance are necessary to ensure their continued safety.

Under slide 4, "Description," Mr. Holt lists the following: (1) Review 49 CFR Parts 217, 218, 229, 240, 242, and 243 in regards to RCL Operations codified into regulations to

date; (2) Review other industry or FRA studies or reports (safety advisory) regarding RCL Operations for clarification or review; and (3) Address other issues identified by the working group.

Under slide 5, "Issues Requiring Specific Report," Mr. Holt says the RCL Working Group should consider, and specifically report on and, if appropriate, develop draft regulatory or guidance document language on issues presented in the description above.

Under slide 6, "Establish Following Working Group," Mr. Holt says during the December 4, 2014, meeting of the full RSAC, the Committee approved: (1) Establishing the Remote Control Locomotive Working Group; and (2) The target date for reporting to the Committee is September 2015.

Under slide 7, Mr. Holt says (1) Expressions of interest and working group member nominations were received and the group has been constructed in the RSAC database; (2) Due to competing RSAC and other FRA regulatory priorities, the agency has delayed the Remote Control Locomotive (RCL) Working Group kick-off; and (3) The Committee is being requested at today's meeting to vote to extend the target date for the RCL Working Group to report to the Committee to September 2016.

Christian Holt (FRA) asks for questions.

Michael Rush (Association of American Railroads) asks, "Given that RCL is a high-priority item, why have a date, i.e., September 2016, at all."

Chairperson Rennert replies, "That is a good point." She asks if the Committee would accept a date that would be "one year after the kick-off meeting of the RCL Working Group."

Vince Verna (Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers and Trainmen (BLET)) says he agrees with Michael Rush. He says setting a deadline is not necessary. He says the BLET is agreeable to "no date."

There is general RSAC acceptance of this proposed language change.

Chairperson Rennert asks for other questions and concerns on proposed RSAC Task No. 14-03.

Chairperson Rennert asks for a motion to accept RSAC Task No.: 14-03, Remote Control Locomotive Operations, as modified.

David Weisblatt (Association of American Railroads) motions to accept RSAC Task No.: 14-03, Remote Control Locomotive Operations, as modified.

Thomas Murta (Association of American Railroads) seconds the motion.

BY VOICE VOTE, THE FULL RAILROAD SAFETY ADVISORY COMMITTEE
ACCEPTS RSAC TASK NO.: 14-03 REMOTE CONTROL LOCOMOTIVE
OPERATIONS, AS MODIFIED.

Chairperson Rennert thanks the Committee for accepting RSAC Task No.: 14-03. She announces the lunch break.

Richard Johnson (Transportation Communications International Union/Brotherhood of Railway Carmen) requests that the Committee continue with the meeting presentations and adjourn the meeting early.

There is a brief discussion among RSAC members about continuing with the remaining presentations and adjourning the meeting early, to which Chairperson Rennert agrees.

Chairperson Rennert announces a second morning break.

M O R N I N G B R E A K 11:40 A.M. - 12:00 P.M.

Chairperson Rennert reconvenes the meeting. She asks Carlo Patrick (FRA–Office of Railroad Safety) for a report on Rail Integrity Working Group (RIWG) activities.

Carlo Patrick (FRA) uses a series of Microsoft PowerPoint Presentation slides, projected onto a screen for “Rail Integrity Working Group Update.” Photocopies of the Microsoft PowerPoint Presentation were distributed to meeting attendees. All meeting handouts will be entered into the RSAC Docket and posted on FRA’s RSAC Internet Web Site, under “Committee Documents,” and are not excerpted in their entirety in the RSAC Minutes.

Under slides 2-3, Mr. Patrick says (1) RSAC Task No.: 14-02, Rail Integrity, was accepted by the full RSAC on May 26, 2014; (2) The purpose of RSAC Task No.: 14-02 is: “To consider specific improvements to the Track Safety Standards Subpart A-G or other responsive actions designed to enhance rail safety by improving rail integrity, including updates to track Class 6-9 rail inspection frequencies and the possibility of implementing continuous testing;” (3) The 2014 Rail Integrity Final Rule resulted in changes in the requirements for Subpart A-F (Class 1 through 5 track) that are more stringent than current Subpart G (high-speed) concerning Continuous Welded Rail (CWR) plan content, rail inspection frequencies, and rail defect remedial action. FRA wishes to explore equalizing the standards for Subpart G for Class 6-9 track; and (4) Target date for recommendations to the Committee is July 2015.

[Note: 49 CFR § 213.9 Classes of track: operating speed limits.

Over track that meets all of the requirements prescribed in this part for—	The maximum allowable operating speed for freight trains is—	The maximum allowable operating speed for passenger trains is—
Excepted track	10 m.p.h.	N/A
Class 1 track	10 m.p.h.	15 m.p.h.
Class 2 track	25 m.p.h.	30 m.p.h.
Class 3 track	40 m.p.h.	60 m.p.h.
Class 4 track	60 m.p.h.	80 m.p.h.
Class 5 track	80 m.p.h.	90 m.p.h.

49 CFR § 213.307 Class of track: operating speed limits.

(a) Except as provided in paragraph (b) of this section and as otherwise provided in this subpart G, the following maximum allowable speeds apply:

Over track that meets all of the requirements prescribed in this subpart for	The maximum allowable operating speed for trains ¹ is
Class 6 track	110 m.p.h.
Class 7 track	125 m.p.h.
Class 8 track	160 m.p.h. ²
Class 9 track	220 m.p.h. ²

¹ Freight may be transported at passenger train speeds if the following conditions are met:

- (1) The vehicles utilized to carry such freight are of equal dynamic performance and have been qualified in accordance with Sections 213.329 and 213.345.
- (2) The load distribution and securement in the freight vehicle will not adversely affect the dynamic performance of the vehicle. The axle loading pattern is uniform and does not exceed the passenger locomotive axle loadings utilized in passenger service, if any, operating at the same maximum speed.
- (3) No carrier may accept or transport a hazardous material, as defined at 49 CFR 171.8, except as provided in Column 9A of the Hazardous Materials Table (49 CFR

172.101) for movement in the same train as a passenger-carrying vehicle or in Column 9B of the Table for movement in a train with no passenger-carrying vehicles.

² Operating speeds in excess of 125 m.p.h. are authorized by this part only in conjunction with FRA regulatory approval addressing other safety issues presented by the railroad system. For operations on a dedicated right-of-way, FRA's regulatory approval may allow for the use of inspection and maintenance criteria and procedures in the alternative to those contained in this subpart, based upon a showing that at least an equivalent level of safety is provided.

(b) If a segment of track does not meet all of the requirements for its intended class, it is to be reclassified to the next lower class of track for which it does meet all of the requirements of this subpart. If a segment does not meet all of the requirements for Class 6, the requirements for Classes 1 through 5 apply.]

Under slide 4, "July 30, 2014 Meeting," Mr. Patrick describes the events of the first RIWG meeting as follows: (1) Discussion of Task 14-02 requirements; (2) FRA presentation on continuous test process; (3) CSX Transportation presentation on continuous test waiver progress; (4) Amtrak recommendation on Gage Restraint Measurement System (GRMS); and (5) Discussion of areas in Track Safety Standards Subpart G, which the Association of American Railroads suggested that the RIWG review.

Under slide 5, "November 5-7, 2014," Mr. Patrick describes the events of the second RIWG meeting as follows: (1) Sperry Rail Service presentation on continuous track test history; (2) Presentation of FRA draft regulatory language for continuous track testing; (3) Association of American Railroads and Brotherhood of Maintenance of Way Employees Division presentations on views for continuous track testing language; and (4) Ongoing RIWG discussions of draft regulatory language for continuous track testing.

Under slide 6, "March 10-12, 2015," Mr. Patrick describes events of the third RIWG meeting as follows: (1) Discussion on labor-proposed changes to continuous test regulatory language for Subpart A-F from the November 7, 2014, RIWG meeting; and (2) Consensus reached on new Subpart G Part 213.340 Qualified Operator.

Under slide 7, "May 19-21, 2015," Mr. Patrick describes events of the fourth RIWG meeting as follows: (1) Discussion of draft language for CWR Subpart G, Part 213.343; and (2) Consensus reached on Inspection of Rail In Service, Subpart G, Part 213.339.

Under slide 8, "June 16-18, 2015 (Final meeting scheduled)," Mr. Patrick says the four remaining issues that need to be resolved are: (1) Continuous test; (2) CWR; (3) Rail Inspection Records; and (4) Defective Rail.

Carlo Patrick (FRA) asks for questions.

Chairperson Rennert thanks Carlo Patrick for his presentation. She says Patrick Warren (FRA–Office of Railroad Safety) could not attend today’s meeting. She says she will give the report on Highway-Rail Grade Crossing Safety.

Chairperson Rennert uses a series of Microsoft PowerPoint Presentation slides, projected onto a screen for “Highway-Rail Grade Crossing Safety.” Photocopies of the Microsoft PowerPoint Presentation were distributed to meeting attendees. All meeting handouts will be entered into the RSAC Docket and posted on FRA’s RSAC Internet Web Site, under “Committee Documents,” and are not excerpted in their entirety in the RSAC Minutes.

Under slide 2, “Rail-Related Fatalities CY 2014,” Chairperson Rennert displays a pie chart showing the number and percentage of the total of 813 rail-related fatalities for calendar year 2014 by the following categories: (1) Trespass–509 (63 percent); (2) Grade Crossing–270 (33 percent); (3) Rail Employee–10 (1 percent); and (4) Other–24 (3 percent).

Under slide 3, “Foundation for Risk Mitigation,” Chairperson Rennert outlines the “Three E’s” for risk mitigation as follows: (1) Enforcement; (2) Education; and (3) Engineering.

Under slide 4, “Number of Crossings as of January 2015,” Chairperson Rennert displays the following chart showing the number of railroad crossings by type as of January 2015:

Crossing Type	How Many	Percent of Total
Total	250,504	100.0
Public at Grade	129,502	51.7
Private at Grade	79,983	31.9
Pedestrian at Grade	2,188	0.9
Grade Separated (all)	38,831	15.5

Chairperson Rennert says only 15.5 percent of total crossings employ the most effective, but also the most expensive method of crossing protection–grade separation.

Under slide 5, “Where Collisions Occur 2014 (Public Grade Crossings),” Chairperson Rennert displays the following chart showing the percentage of collisions by crossing protection device type:

Device	Percentage Collisions	Percentage Crossings (2014)
Gates	49.6	35.6
Flashing Lights	16.4	15.1
STOP Signs	9.7	8.5
Crossbucks	22.3	35.3
Other	2.0	5.5

Under slide 6, “20 Year Fatality Trend at Grade Crossings, 1995-2014,” Chairperson Rennert displays a bar chart depicting the downward trend of highway-rail grade crossing fatalities from a high of 579 crossing fatalities in 1995 to 270 fatalities in 2014. However, she adds, during the 20 year period, crossing fatalities reached a low of 237 in calendar year 2012, and increased to 251 in calendar year 2013 and to 270 in calendar year 2014.

Under slide 7, “Fatality Trends At Grade Crossings–Last 6 Years, 2009-2014,” Chairperson Rennert displays says there has been no improvement in the reduction in fatalities at highway-rail grade crossings. She displays a bar chart which is depicting an upward trend in highway-rail grade crossing fatalities between calendar years 2009 and 2014.

Under slide 8, “Accident: Valhalla, NY–Feb 2015,” Chairperson Rennert describes the February 3, 2015 highway-rail grade crossing accident at Valhalla, New York as follows: (1) Facts: (a) Commuter train struck a sport utility vehicle; (b) 650 passengers on board the commuter train; and (c) 6 fatalities; and (2) Contributing factors: (a) Highway traffic had been routed to an alternate route, which may have been unfamiliar to the SUV driver; (b) Traffic had backed-up due to a traffic signal in close proximity to the crossing and the SUV driver was not initially sitting on the track, but drove forward into the path of the train; (c) The 3rd rail, used to power the train, was ripped-up from the roadbed and penetrated the first two passenger cars in segments; and (d) It appears the SUV driver did not know how to act when trapped in a vehicle with an approaching train.

Under slide 9, “Accident: Oxnard, CA–February 24, 2015,” Chairperson Rennert describes the February 2015 highway-rail grade crossing accident at Oxnard, California, as follows: (1) Facts: (a) Commuter train struck a pickup truck towing a trailer; and (b) 28 of 38 passengers and three crewmembers were injured; and (c) There was one fatality; and (2) Contributing Factors: (a) It was dark–just before dawn; (b) Rail crossing’s close proximity to the traffic intersection; and (c) The truck driver appeared to not know how to respond to being trapped on tracks.

Under slide 10, “Accident: Halifax Co., NC–March 9, 2015,” Chairperson Rennert describes the March 2015 highway-rail grade crossing accident in Halifax County, North Carolina, as follows:(1) Facts: (a) A passenger train struck a special rig truck-trailer (168 feet long); and (b) 50 of 212 passengers injured; and (2) Contributing Factors: (a) Truck difficulty maneuvering around lights; (b) Truck permit did not require notification of railroad; and (c) A police escort failed to call the Emergency Notification System number at the highway-rail grade crossing.

Under slide 11, “Problem Requires a Fresh Approach,” Chairperson Rennert outlines possible strategies to reducing highway-rail grade crossing accidents: (1) Maximize Strategic Partnerships–strategic programs to inform and drive local action; (2) Identify New Funding–public and private; and (3) Leverage New Technologies: (a) Social Media and Applications (“Apps”); (b) Emerging Rail Technology; (c) Cameras and other detection technologies; and (d) New data analysis systems.

Under slide 12, “Strategic Partnerships,” Chairperson Rennert says the first strategy for reducing highway-rail grade crossing accidents is through “Strategic Partnerships:” (1) FRA and the Railroad Industry have a shared goal–to improve coordination of highway-rail grade crossing efforts through efficiency and effectiveness; and (2) New Partners include the following: (a) Develop national enforcement programs through: (i) Association of Chiefs of Police; National Sheriffs Association; and the Fraternal Order of Police; and (ii) State Public Utilities–actions at “riskier grade crossings;” truck permitting; (b) Leverage new information systems to inform the public–Google; Garmin; Wayz; and (c) Challenge private industry to develop new systems to alert and/or prevent accidents.

Jeffrey Moller (Association of American Railroads) says the Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration (FMCSA) has an “RSAC” process and is going to publish a Notice of Proposed Rulemaking on an education process for Commercial Drivers. He says he and Jim Finnegan (Brotherhood of Railroad Signalmen) have been attending the FMCSA meetings.

Chairperson Rennert thanks Jeffrey Moller for that information.

Paul Worley (American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials (AASHTO)) describes an AASHTO program with States which is reaching out to stakeholders.

Under slide 13, “Funding,” Chairperson Rennert says the second strategy for reducing highway-rail grade crossing accidents is through “funding.” She lists the following sources of funding for highway-rail grade crossing projects: (1) Leverage existing (and petition for increases in) Federal grant programs to support State and Local enforcement and grade crossing improvements; (2) Seek increased funding for media/education support; and (3) Ask railroads to increase funding towards: (a)

Media/education campaigns; (b) Research (new technologies and information analysis); and (c) Grade Crossing Improvements.

Under slide 14, “New Technologies,” Chairperson Rennert says the third strategy for reducing highway-rail grade crossing accidents is through smarter uses of technology such as: (1) “Apps to” for First Responders to locate grade crossings; (2) Social Media, e.g., Facebook, Twitter, etc., to deliver “click it or ticket”-type messages; and (3) Increase research and development efforts to: (a) Improve crossing signal-dispatch-train interaction; and (b) Identify high risk crossing for action.

Under slide 15, “FRA Top 4 Priorities,” Chairperson Rennert says the top four priorities at FRA are topped by reducing highway-rail grade crossing and trespasser accidents. She says FRA’s top four priorities are: (1) Grade Crossing and Trespass Accident Reduction; (2) Reduction of risk for the shipment of Energy Products on Rail; (3) Implementation of Positive Train Control; and (4) Safe Passenger Rail Equipment.

Under Slide 16, “2015 Right-of-Way [ROW] Fatality and Trespass Prevention Workshop,” Chairperson Rennert says FRA will be conducting a ROW Fatality and Trespass Prevention Workshop on August 4-6, 2015, at the Sheraton Charlotte Hotel in Charlotte, North Carolina. She says the goal of this free workshop is to identify and share existing industry best practices and explore new trespass abatement and mitigation strategies that the rail industry can adopt to reduce the number of right-of-way and trespasser incidents and fatalities. She says the conference agenda is currently being developed by a team of industry experts and will cover the following five key areas: (1) Community Outreach; (2) Enforcement; (3) Design, Technology, and Infrastructure; (4) Intentional Acts/Deaths; and (5) Pedestrian Safety. She says to register for the free conference, visit: <http://www.fra.dot.gov/Page/P0612>

Chairperson Rennert asks for questions.

Ross Capon (National Association of Railroad Passengers) asks if under slide 4, “Number of Crossings as of January 2015,” the 38,831 grade separated crossings represents “bridges.”

Jamie Rennert says the 38,831 grade separated crossings does not represent bridges, but she is not certain of the breakdown of this number.

Chairperson Rennert asks members and alternates to check calendars for dates for the next meeting of the full Railroad Safety Advisory Committee.

There is a brief discussion about members’ availability for the next meeting, after which FRA announces that it will arrange the next meeting of the full Railroad Safety Advisory Committee for May 28, 2015.

Chairperson Rennert asks for additions and corrections to the Minutes for the 52nd meeting of the Railroad Safety Advisory Committee, held on December 4, 2014.

Andrew Corcoran (Association of American Railroads), Carl Tingle (Transportation Communications International Union/Brotherhood of Railway Carmen), and Rick Inclima (Brotherhood of Maintenance of Way Employees Division) offer corrections.

Chairperson Rennert asks for a motion to accept the Minutes for the 52nd meeting of Railroad Safety Advisory Committee, held on December 4, 2014, as corrected.

Rick Inclima (Brotherhood of Maintenance of Way Employees Division) motions to accept the Minutes for the 52nd meeting of the Railroad Safety Advisory Committee, held on December 4, 2014, as corrected.

Thomas Murta (Association of American Railroads) seconds the motion.

BY VOICE VOTE, THE FULL RSAC ACCEPTS THE MINUTES FOR THE 52nd MEETING OF THE RAILROAD SAFETY ADVISORY COMMITTEE, HELD ON DECEMBER 4, 2014, AS PRESENTED.

Chairperson Rennert thanks the full RSAC for approving this motion.

Chairperson Rennert asks for comments or new business to be brought before the Committee.

John Risch (Sheet Metal, Air, Rail and Transportation Workers) asks, if there will be a hearing on Risk Reduction.

Chairperson Rennert replies, "Yes, but one has not been scheduled yet."

Vince Verna (Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers and Trainmen) asks, "When the start date for the Remote Control Locomotive Working Group occur."

Larry Woolverton (FRA) replies, there will be a one-day meeting kick-off in September 2015.

Chairperson Rennert asks members and alternates to check calendars for dates for the next meeting of the full Railroad Safety Advisory Committee.

There is a brief discussion about members' availability for the next meeting, after which FRA announces that it will arrange the next meeting of the full Railroad Safety Advisory Committee for November 5, 2015.

Chairperson Rennert thanks Larry Woolverton (FRA–Office of Safety), Kenton Kilgore (FRA–Office of Safety), and Marvin Stewart (FRA–Office of Safety) for their efforts in making today’s meeting a success.

Chairperson Rennert thanks RSAC members for attending today’s meeting. She asks for a motion to adjourn the meeting.

Rick Inclima (Brotherhood of Maintenance of Way Employees Division) motions to adjourn the meeting.

Carl Tingle (Transportation Communications International Union/Brotherhood of Railway Carmen) seconds the motion.

Chairperson Rennert adjourns the meeting at 12:40 pm.

M E E T I N G A D J O U R N E D 12:40 P.M.

These minutes are not a verbatim transcript of the proceedings. Also, Microsoft PowerPoint overhead view graphs and handout materials distributed during presentations by RSAC Working Group Members, FRA employees, and consultants, generally become part of the official record of these proceedings and are not excerpted in their entirety in the minutes.

Respectively submitted by John F. Sneed, Event Recorder.