

FINAL
RAILROAD SAFETY ADVISORY COMMITTEE (RSAC)

Minutes of Meeting
December 14, 2010
Washington, D.C.

The forty-third meeting of the RSAC was convened at 9:30 a.m., in the Board Room of the National Housing Center of the National Association of Home Builders, 1201 15th Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20005, by the RSAC Chairperson, the Federal Railroad Administration's (FRA) Deputy Associate Administrator for Regulatory and Legislative Operations, Robert C. Lauby.

As RSAC members, or their alternates, assembled, attendance was recorded by sign-in log. Sign-in logs for each Committee meeting are part of the permanent RSAC Docket. 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>).

For the December 14, 2010, meeting, ten of the fifty-four voting RSAC members were absent: The American Petroleum Institute (1 seat), The American Short Line and Regional Railroad Association (1 of 3 seats absent), The Association of Railway Museums (1 seat), The Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers and Trainmen (1 of 3 seats absent), The International Association of Machinists and Aerospace Workers (1 seat), The National Conference of Firemen and Oilers (1 seat), Safe Travel America (1 seat), The Transport Workers Union of America (1 of 2 seats absent), The Transportation Communications International Union/Brotherhood of Railway Carmen (1 of 3 seats absent) and The U.S. Transportation Security Administration (1 seat). Four of seven non-voting/advisory RSAC members were absent: The U.S. Federal Transit Administration, The Labor Council for Latin American Advancement, The League of Railway Industry Women, and Secretaria de Comunicaciones y Transporte (Mexico). Total meeting attendance, including presenters and support staff, was approximately 90.

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

Larry Woolverton (FRA) identifies the meeting room's fire and emergency exits. He asks for volunteers with cardiopulmonary resuscitation (CPR) qualification to identify themselves. A large number of attendees acknowledge having completed this training.

He says the National Association of Home Builders building has an automated external defibrillator (AED), located outside the rest rooms in the building's atrium lobby. Chairperson Lauby asks FRA Administrator Joseph C. Szabo for opening remarks.

Joseph Szabo (FRA Administrator) says he enjoys making introductory remarks to the Railroad Safety Advisory Committee (RSAC/Committee), an organization of which he was a part at its inception, but in a very different role than today.

Administrator Szabo says this has been an incredibly busy and challenging year for everyone, with even more challenges imposed by legislation. He says this has occurred during a time when the Office of Safety is losing some key players to retirements. He says Grady Cothen (FRA–Office of Safety, Deputy Associate Administrator for Safety Standards and Program Development) retired from Federal Service in June of 2010 and Edward Pritchard (FRA–Office of Safety, Director Office of Safety Assurance and Compliance) intends to follow Mr. Cothen into retirement by the end of 2010. He says Edward Pritchard started his Federal Service with FRA on October 5, 1970, which was over 40 years ago. He says FRA will miss Edward Pritchard's expertise. However, the agency has been fortunate to have found skilled and experienced people who will not let the agency miss a beat in its safety mission. He says Grady Cothen's replacement is the current Chairperson of RSAC, Robert Lauby, and the latest addition to the Office of Safety Leadership is Ronald Hynes who is the new Director of the Office of Safety Assurance and Compliance after Edward Pritchard's departure.

Administrator Szabo says he has watched with admiration and gratitude as RSAC working groups and task forces have worked together to deliver important products. He says RSAC's success has served as an example to other agencies and departments as a highly regarded federal advisory committee.

Administrator Szabo says enactment of the Rail Safety Improvement Act (RSIA) of 2008 [Public Law 110-432, 122 Stat. 4848-4970] (Act) marked the beginning of the most active and productive period in RSAC's 14 year history. He says since its inception in 1996, RSAC has accepted a total of 34 tasks of which 8 tasks have been accepted by RSAC since Rail Safety Act of was passed in 2008. He says FRA is currently working on 20 unmet mandates imposed by the Act, and it is vital for the both the public and railroad industry to continue to come together, roll up their sleeves and work together and overcome differences to find mutually satisfying solutions to critical safety issues.

Administrator Szabo says there are several recent highlights of this great work that he would like to acknowledge. First, Administrator Szabo praises the Passenger Hours of Service Working Group for delivering a consensus document to the full RSAC that will enhance railroad safety by reducing fatigue and promoting the fitness of passenger railroad employees for performing safety-critical duties. He says in only eighteen months the Passenger Hours of Service Working Group tackled this complex task and delivered a draft document to the full RSAC for approval. He says FRA is finalizing the

Notice of Proposed Rulemaking (NPRM) for Passenger Hours of Service with a target publication date of early Spring 2011.

Administrator Szabo says the Training Standards and Plans Working Group also deserves recognition for quickly delivering a consensus document to the full RSAC at today's meeting that will establish minimum training standards for each class and craft of safety-related railroad employee and their railroad contractor and subcontractor equivalents, as required by the RSIA.

Administrator Szabo says he recognizes the success of the Passenger Safety Working Group's Engineering Task Force (ETF) in completing the *Criteria and Procedures Crashworthiness and Passenger Safety Guidelines* that provide technical evaluation criteria and procedures for qualifying alternative trainset designs for Tier I equipment. He says it is important that the ETF continues its aggressive work to complete its next task of developing crashworthiness and occupant protection safety recommendations for high-speed passenger trains. He says the work of the re-tasked ETF is intended to assist FRA in developing appropriate safety standards for the high-speed rail projects planned in California and Florida.

Administrator Szabo says in light of these successes, there is more work to do. He encourages RSAC members to work together quickly and efficiently on the new Dark Territory Task to address the implementation of rail safety technology in non-signal territory.

Administrator Szabo says the rail industry needs RSAC members to work together to finish the long standing and important work on Medical Standards for railroad employees in safety-critical positions and to complete work on the Critical Incident Reporting task.

Administrator Szabo says as the critically important work of this body continues, he asks for a moment to reflect on the current state of railroad safety. He says despite impressive and nearly continuous long-term reductions in the number of train accidents, casualties, highway-rail grade crossing collisions, and other reportable events, the train accident rate has remained relatively flat over the past ten years. In addition, he says, other key indicators have leveled off in recent years. He says more recently, there has been an alarming increase in the number and frequency of employee fatalities. He says from FRA's perspective, this state of affairs is unacceptable, as he imagines it is to most everyone in this room.

Administrator Szabo says FRA is hopeful that its Risk Reduction Program will help pave the way for change by allowing FRA to acquire the knowledge needed to precisely address the underlying causal factors that contribute to train accidents and employee casualties. He says FRA is confident that these efforts will reap significant rewards in the years to come.

Administrator Szabo says he is looking forward to today's meeting and learning more about the wide range of safety issues that RSAC members are currently addressing. He thanks everyone for all that they do.

Chairperson Lauby thanks Administrator Szabo for his opening remarks.

Chairperson Lauby introduces senior FRA staff in attendance at today's meeting. They are Associate Administrator for Railroad Safety/Chief Safety Officer Jo Strang, Deputy Associate Administrator for Safety Compliance and Program Implementation Michael Logue, Director, Office of Safety Assurance and Compliance Edward Pritchard, and RSAC Counsel Patricia Sun.

Chairperson Lauby requests that the FRA Regional Administrators who are attending today's meeting stand and identify themselves.

Chairperson Lauby recognizes the FRA employees who were instrumental in the preparation for today's meeting: Larry Woolverton (FRA–Office of Safety), Catherine Buckley (FRA–Office of Safety), and Marvin Stewart (FRA–Office of Safety).

Chairperson Lauby recognizes two visitors at today's meeting from Russian Railways, the second largest rail network in the world: Sergey V. Palkin, and Oleg A. Senkovsyiy.

Chairperson Lauby asks for meeting attendees to identify themselves and their organizations.

Chairperson Lauby asks Mark McKeon (FRA–Office of Safety) for a status report on the Notice of Proposed Rulemaking (NPRM) for Passenger Hours of Service.

Mark McKeon (FRA) says at the last full RSAC meeting on September 23, 2010, draft rules for Passenger Hours of Service were approved by the Committee. He says in the interim, the draft NPRM for Proposed Amendments to Part 228–Hours of Service of Railroad Employees, has progressed to an advanced stage. He says FRA anticipates the publication of this NPRM in April 2011. He says in the packet of materials received by meeting attendees at today's meeting is the draft rule text as of September 17, 2010, containing a new Subpart F–Substantive Hours of Service Requirements for Train Employees Engaged in Commuter or Intercity Rail Passenger Transportation, and Appendix D: Guidance on Fatigue Management Plans.

Mark McKeon (FRA) asks for an RSAC motion to consider RSAC Task No.: 09-01 Passenger Hours of Service, to be completed. He thanks the Passenger Hours of Service Working Group for their hard work to complete this task.

Chairperson Lauby asks if anyone objects to moving RSAC Task No.: 09-01 Passenger Hours of Service to the “completed” column. He says RSAC does not usually vote to close a Task Statement.

THERE ARE NO OBJECTIONS TO MOVING RSAC TASK NO.: 09-01
PASSENGER HOURS OF SERVICE FROM THE “OPEN” TO THE
“COMPLETED” COLUMN.

Chairperson Lauby asks Michael Logue (FRA–Office of Safety) for a report on Training Standards and Plans Working Group activities.

Michael Logue (FRA) uses a series of Microsoft PowerPoint Presentation slides, projected onto a screen for “2008 Rail Safety Improvement Act, Section 401, Minimum Training Standards and Plans Working Group Consensus.” Photocopies of the Microsoft PowerPoint Presentation were distributed to meeting attendees. Also distributed to meeting attendees is “Draft Notice of Proposed Rulemaking, dated November 16, 2010, for Part 243 Training, Qualification, and Oversight for Safety-Related Railroad Employees.” All meeting handouts will be entered into the RSAC Docket and are not excerpted in their entirety in the RSAC Minutes.

Under slide 2, Mr. Logue says the Training Standards and Plans Working Group, consisting of about 70 people from rail management, rail labor, and rail contractors, reached consensus on draft rule text during a teleconference on November 23, 2010.

Under slides 2 through 3, Mr. Logue the following major elements of the draft rule text: (1) Purpose and scope—The purpose is to assure that safety-related railroad employees (as defined in the definitions) are trained and qualified on any Federal railroad safety laws, regulations, and orders with which the employee is required to comply; (2) Application and responsibility for compliance—This section has the traditional language found in most FRA regulations, but was re-written in November 2010 to specifically exclude plant, tourist, scenic, historic, or excursion operations that are not part of the general railroad system of transportation as defined in this particular regulation; and (3) Definitions—There are a number of new definitions, including many particular to the training process, including definitions for formal training, knowledge-based training, on-the-job training, and task-based training.

Under slides 4 through 6, Mr. Logue says the definition of “safety-related railroad employee” was the most vigorously discussed definition for the Training Standards and Plans Working Group. He says consensus was reached on eight employee categories that met both the legislative language and other criteria, as follows: Safety-related railroad employee means an individual who is engaged or compensated by an employer to: (1) Perform work covered under the hours of service laws found at 49 *United States Code* (U.S.C.) § 21101, et seq.; (2) Perform work as an operating railroad employee who is not subject to the hours of service laws found at 49 U.S.C. § 21101, et seq.;

(3) In the application of Parts 213 and 214 of this chapter, inspect, install, repair, or maintain track, roadbed, and signal and communication systems, including a roadway worker or railroad bridge worker as defined in § 214.7 of this chapter; (4) Inspect, repair, or maintain locomotives, passenger cars or freight cars; (5) Inspect, repair, or maintain other railroad on-track equipment when such equipment is a service that constitutes a train movement under Part 232 of this chapter; (6) Determine that an on-track roadway maintenance machine or hi-rail vehicle may be used in accordance with Part 214, Subpart D of this chapter, without repair of a non-complying condition; (7) Directly instruct, mentor, inspect, or test, as a primary duty, any person while that other person is engaged in a safety-related task; or (8) Directly supervise the performance of safety-related duties in connection with periodic oversight in accordance with Part 243.203.

Under slide 7, Mr. Logue outlines other major topics where consensus was reached by the Training Standards and Plans Working Group as follows: (1) The regulated community includes railroads (as specified in the applicability section), contractors (and subcontractors), and training organizations or learning institutions that offer training that is intended to prepare people for employment as safety-related railroad employees; (2) A three-year refresher training interval for current safety-related railroad employees, unless otherwise provided for in another FRA safety regulation; (3) The American Short Line and Regional Railroad Association and the National Railroad Construction and Maintenance Association will develop, and submit for FRA approval, training programs for small railroads and contractors to use if they wish. Other “master organizations,” if they exist, would be permitted to do the same;

Under slide 8, Mr. Logue outlines additional major topics where consensus was reached by the Training Standards and Plans Working Group as follows:

(1) Identification of training components employers will submit to FRA for review and approval; (2) The overall training program submission, review, and approval process; (3) Employee qualification requirements, including the criteria for grandfathering current safety-related railroad employees; (4) Recordkeeping requirements, which will mimic Part 217 requirements for electronic recordkeeping; and (5) Contractors will maintain their own training records, unless a railroad delivers the safety training to the contractor employees;

Under slide 9, Mr. Logue outlines additional major topics where consensus was reached by the Training Standards and Plans Working Group as follows:

(1) Modifications in periodic oversight requirements. Previously, oversight had a requirement for annual employee review, and included all task-related duties an employee could be called on to perform. This was changed to focus on those FRA regulations that are particular to personal or workgroup safety, i.e., Parts 214, 218, and 220. He says FRA believes that most or all railroads will modify the programs required by Part 217.9 to manage the oversight specified in the training regulation; (2) Contractors meeting certain criteria will be required to provide oversight for their own employees; railroads will provide oversight for all employees; and (3) Annual oversight

review applicability (railroads only, with less than 400,000 employee hours exclusion), and the criteria that will be used for analysis of the oversight data.

Michael Logue (FRA) says the last two meetings for the Training Standards and Plans Working Group were a teleconference/webinar. He says he believes this process went well. He thanks the Association of American Railroads for the use of their facilities and for arranging the teleconference/webinar. He asks for questions.

With no questions, Chairperson Lauby asks for a motion to adopt the consensus recommendations of the Training Standards and Plans Working Group for the draft Notice of Proposed Rulemaking for Part 243 Training, Qualification, and Oversight for Safety-Related Railroad Employees, dated November 16, 2010.

Gary Maslanka (Transport Workers Union of America) motions for acceptance of the consensus recommendations of the Training Standards and Plans Working Group for the draft Notice of Proposed Rulemaking for Part 243 Training, Qualification, and Oversight for Safety-Related Railroad Employees, dated November 16, 2010, as presented.

Rick Inclima (Brotherhood of Maintenance of Way Employees Division) seconds the motion.

BY VOICE VOTE, THE RAILROAD SAFETY ADVISORY COMMITTEE APPROVES THE MOTION TO ADOPT THE CONSENSUS RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE TRAINING STANDARDS AND PLANS WORKING GROUP FOR THE DRAFT NOTICE OF PROPOSED RULEMAKING FOR PART 243 TRAINING, QUALIFICATION, AND OVERSIGHT FOR SAFETY-RELATED RAILROAD EMPLOYEES, DATED NOVEMBER 16, 2010, AS PRESENTED.

Chairperson Lauby thanks the full RSAC for the acceptance of this document.

Chairperson Lauby asks Carlo Patrick (FRA–Office of Safety) for a report on Track Safety Standards Working Group Activities.

Carlo Patrick (FRA) uses a series of Microsoft PowerPoint Presentation slides, projected onto a screen for “Railroad Safety Advisory Committee, Track Safety Standards Working Group, December 14, 2010.” Photocopies of the Microsoft PowerPoint Presentation were distributed to meeting attendees. Also distributed to meeting attendees is Track Safety Standards Working Group consensus language for “Plug Rail–Consensus Addition to Part 213.237(b), dated October 26, 2010.” All meeting handouts will be entered into the RSAC Docket and are not excerpted in their entirety in the RSAC Minutes.

Under slide 2, Mr. Patrick says an open item from RSAC Task No.: 07-01 Track Safety Standards is: Review controls applied to reuse of rail in Continuous Welded Rail (“plug rail”).

Under slide 3, Mr. Patrick says the Track Safety Standards Working Group activities concerning RSAC Task No.: 07-01 Track Safety Standards was interrupted as a result of the higher priority assignment of RSAC Task No.: 08-03 Track Safety Standards—Rail Integrity. He says one of the issues requiring specific report under RSAC Task No.: 08-03 is: “Factors that can and should be included in determining the frequency of internal rail flaw testing and a methodology for taking those factors into consideration with respect to mandatory testing intervals,” which was resolved by proposed rules accepted by the full RSAC at its September 23, 2010, meeting.

Under slide 4, Mr. Patrick says the Track Safety Standards Working Group consensus recommendation is to add the following to Inspection of Rail, “Part 213.237(b)(A) Any rail used as a replacement plug rail in track that is required to be tested per 49 *Code of Federal Regulations* (CFR) Part 213.237, must have been tested for internal rail flaws; (B) The track owner must be able to verify that the plug rail has not accumulated more than a total of 30 million gross tons (MGT) in previous and new locations since the last internal rail flaw test before the next Part 213.237 test on the rail is performed; and (C) If plug rail not in compliance with (A) and (B) is in use after date of promulgation, trains over that rail must not exceed track Class 2 speeds until that rail is tested per Part 213.237.

Carlo Patrick (FRA) asks for questions.

Chairperson Lauby asks for a motion to accept the Track Safety Standards Working Group consensus recommendation for adding language to Part 213.237(b) for “plug rail,” as presented.

Rick Inclima (Brotherhood of Maintenance of Way Employees Division) motions for acceptance of the Track Safety Standards Working Group consensus recommendation for adding language to Part 213.237(b) for “plug rail,” as presented.

James Stem (United Transportation Union) seconds the motion.

BY VOICE VOTE, THE FULL RSAC APPROVES THE MOTION TO ACCEPT THE TRACK SAFETY STANDARDS WORKING GROUP CONSENSUS RECOMMENDATION FOR ADDING LANGUAGE TO PART 213.237(b) FOR “PLUG RAIL,” AS PRESENTED.

Chairperson Lauby thanks the full RSAC for acceptance of this motion. He says RSAC Task No.: 07-01 Track Safety Standards, is now completed.

Chairperson Lauby asks Olga Cataldi (FRA–Office of Safety) for a report on efforts surrounding RSAC Task No.: 10-02 Safety Technology in Dark Territory.

Olga Cataldi (FRA) uses a series of Microsoft PowerPoint Presentation slides, projected onto a screen for “Dark Territory Working Group, Task 10-02, December 14, 2010.” Photocopies of the Microsoft PowerPoint Presentation were distributed to meeting attendees. All meeting handouts will be entered into the RSAC Docket and are not excerpted in their entirety in the RSAC Minutes.

Under slide 2 “Agenda,” Ms. Cataldi outlines the topics to be covered as follows: (1) Interpretation of the Congressional Mandate; (2) Formation of the Working Group; and (3) Timelines for the task.

Under slide 3 “RSIA of 2008,” Ms. Cataldi identifies Section 406 under Title IV– Railroad Safety **Enhancements** of the Rail Safety Improvement Act (RSIA) of 2008 [49 U.S.C. § 20162, as enacted by section 406 of Division A, Public Law 110-432] which requires FRA to prescribe standards, guidance, regulations, or orders governing the development, use and implementation of rail safety technology in dark (non-signaled) territory. She says RSAC has previously addressed RSIA requirements under Section 104, Title I–Railroad Safety Railroad Safety **Improvements**, through RSAC Task No.: 1997-04 Positive Train Control Systems [PTC]–Technology, Definitions, and Capabilities; RSAC Task No.: 1997-05 Positive Train Control Systems–Implementation Issues; and RSAC Task No.: 1997-06 Standards for New Train Control Systems.

Under slide 4 “Sec. 406 Development and Use of Rail Safety Technology,” Ms. Cataldi says FRA has missed the RSIA’s one-year deadline [i.e., October 16, 2009] for prescribing standards, guidance, regulations or orders governing the development, use and implementation of rail safety technology in dark territory including the following: (1) Switch position monitoring devices or indicators; (2) Radio, remote control or other power-assisted switches; (3) Hot box, high water, or earthquake detectors; (4) Remote control locomotive zone limiting devices; (5) Slide fences; (6) Grade crossing video monitors; (7) Track integrity warning systems; and (8) Other technologies as defined by the Secretary of the U.S. Department of Transportation. She says the main task is for FRA to cover the gap of devices being used in dark territory in the United States. She says FRA may issue an Interim Final Rule, or a Notice of Proposed Rulemaking to deal with this issue.

Under slide 5 “Safe Technologies for Dark Territories–Is This a New Issue,” Ms. Cataldi answers “No.” She says on April 19, 2007, an FRA Technical Conference conducted an informal safety inquiry covering the following topics: (1) What technologies are being offered that are safety-relevant and pertain to railroad operations that are not already within some clearly defined regulatory program; (2) How the technology is being used, i.e., some technology is being used in a manner other than that which the manufacturer intended; and (3) What kind of safety analysis is being performed before it is introduced;

what kinds of safeguards are being utilized to implement the technology; and how personnel who are going to interact with the technology are being trained and familiarized with that technology.

Under slide 6, “PTC Technologies Versus New Technologies in Dark Territories: Similarities and Differences,” Ms. Cataldi makes comparisons as follows: (1) Is technology nature shifted (microprocessor-, communication-based): PTC–yes; Dark–predominantly; (2) Is voluntary participation encouraged: PTC–yes, under 49 CFR Part 236, Subpart H; Dark–yes, but this is not regulated; (3) Is implementation mandated: PTC–Yes under 49 CFR Part 236, Subpart I; Dark–no, but whether it should be is to be determined; (4) Are there performance-based regulations: PTC–yes; Dark–to be determined; and (5) Is safety and risk assessment set: PTC–yes; Dark–no, to be determined.

Under slide 7, “Route Mileage by Signal Control Type,” Ms. Cataldi shows an “exploding” pie chart depicting route mileage by signal control type: Dark Territories (68,000 route miles), Centralized Traffic Control (44,000 route miles), Automatic Block Signaling (18,000 route miles), and Cab Signaling (3,000 route miles). Ms. Cataldi says the data is based on the Volpe National Transportation Systems Center’s rail network for 1996. She says one of the primary Dark Territory Working Group tasks is to determine exact data for the amount of train traffic that is operated on signaled versus non-signaled tracks.

Under slide 8, “Portion of Dark Territories on U.S. Railroads,” Ms Cataldi says FRA estimates that approximately 40 percent of the track miles for all U.S. railroads are non-signaled (dark) territory.

Under slide 9, Ms. Cataldi shows a flow chart depicting how FRA intends to present the implementation of rail safety technology in dark territory task to the Dark Territory Working Group, which will be asked to determine the type of regulations (prescriptive or performance-based), if any.

Under slide 10, “Working Group Formation,” Ms. Cataldi show a listing of RSAC member organizations that have expressed an interest in participating in the Dark Territory Working Group. She says member organizations who have not notified FRA of their intension to participate in the Dark Territory Working Group may send nominations to Larry Woolverton (FRA–Office of Safety, RSAC Coordinator).

Under slide 11, “Timeline for the Working Group Task,” Ms. Cataldi outlines the following: (1) Goal: September 30, 2011–ro report Dark Territory Working Group recommendations to the FRA Administrator for a proposed Notice of Proposed Rulemaking, or Interim Final Rule; (2) Meetings: Every 5-6 weeks (a total of 5-6 meeting) starting February 2011; (3) Proposed date for the first meeting: Wednesday,

February 16, 2011; and (4) Scope of work and schedule—to be discussed during January 2011 and finalized during the first meeting of the Dark Territory Working Group.

Olga Cataldi (FRA) asks for questions.

Rick Inclima (Brotherhood of Maintenance of Way Employees Division) says the Proposed February 16, 2011, meeting date for the first meeting of the Dark Territory Working Group will occur at the same time as the Fatality Analysis of Maintenance-of-Way Employees and Signalmen (FAMES) group.

[Note: FAMES is patterned after the RSAC Switching Operations Fatality Analysis (SOFA) group, and includes representatives from Class I freight railroads, shortline railroads, Amtrak, the Association of American Railroads, the Brotherhood of Maintenance of Way Employees Division, the Brotherhood of Railroad Signalmen, and FRA. This group is in the process of analyzing the particulars of each incident that has occurred following the implementation of Roadway Worker Protection regulations to determine any common and contributing factors or characteristics that will allow additional focus on safety efforts to prevent these incidents.]

John Previsich (United Transportation Union) says the United Transportation Union has not yet submitted nominations for the Dark Territory Working Group.

Olga Cataldi (FRA) says nominations should be sent to the RSAC Coordinator, Larry Woolverton (FRA—Office of Safety).

Thomas McFarlin (FRA—Office of Safety) says the Dark Territory Working Group is going to have to consider some of the same types of devices that are used in both Positive Train Control Systems and in Dark Territory.

Olga Cataldi (FRA) says what Thomas McFarlin is saying is relevant. She says FRA will issue a “white paper” on the Dark Territory Task in January 2011.

Cynthia Gross (FRA—Office of Safety, RSAC meeting facilitator) requests that RSAC member organizations get nominations into the RSAC Coordinator Larry Woolverton (FRA—Office of Safety) as soon as possible so that FRA can shop dates for the Dark Territory Working Group’s first couple of meetings.

Chairperson Lauby says Olga Cataldi’s (FRA—Office of Safety) presentation on the Dark Territory Task is FRA’s initial cut on how to tackle this issue. He asks if everyone is onboard with this approach?

Jeffrey Moller (Association of American Railroads) says what FRA intends to do with Risk Reduction requirements under the RSIA needs to be considered as part of this discussion.

Keith Borman (American Short Line and Regional Railroad Association) asks how FRA intends to fill-in missing data on slide 8, "Portion of Dark Territories on U.S. Railroads?"

Olga Cataldi (FRA) says FRA will be making inquiries to the organizations for which data is missing to provide this data.

Chairperson Lauby says he hopes everyone will be prepared to support the Dark Territory Working Group task in February 2011.

Chairperson Lauby announces the morning break.

M O R N I N G B R E A K 10:30 A.M. - 10:50 A.M.

Chairperson Lauby reconvenes the meeting. He asks Dr. Bernard J. (B.J.) Arseneau (FRA—Office of Safety) for a report on Medical Standards Working Group activities.

B.J. Arseneau (FRA) uses a series of Microsoft PowerPoint Presentation slides, projected onto a screen for "Medical Standards Working Group Report, December 14, 2010." Photocopies of the Microsoft PowerPoint Presentation were distributed to meeting attendees. All meeting handouts will be entered into the RSAC Docket and are not excerpted in their entirety in the RSAC Minutes.

Under slide 2, Dr. Arseneau says the Medical Standards Working Group has two RSAC Tasks assigned as follows: (1) RSAC Task No.: 06-03 Medical Standards for Safety-Critical Personnel; and (2) RSAC Task No.: 2009-02 Critical Incident Programs.

Under slide 3, "Activities and Progress," Dr. Arseneau says since the full RSAC meeting of September 23, 2010, the Medical Standards Working Group held one meeting on October 25-26, 2010, and the Physicians' Task Force held one meeting on November 18-19, 2010.

Under slide 4, "Substantial Progress," Dr. Arseneau says necessary revisions are being made to FRA's draft rule text for Medical Standards for Safety-Critical Personnel in the following areas: (1) Specify who must undergo required medical assessments and the medical conditions to be assessed; (2) Specify appropriate dispute resolution procedures; (3) Reduce burdens placed on covered employers (i.e., railroads and contractors) and employees; (4) Improve safety by reducing the risk that covered employees will experience sudden incapacitation, or serious impairments in their abilities to see and hear, while performing safety-critical service; and (5) Make the proposed rule cost-effective.

Under slides 5 and 6, “Current Position,” Dr. Arseneau outlines the following: (1) Safety-critical employees who must undergo required medical assessments are limited to: (a) locomotive engineers who must be certified by regulation (Part 240); and (b) conductors who must be certified by regulation (Part 242 in draft); and (2) Medical assessments are to be limited to assessments of specified medical conditions that cause: (a) sudden incapacitation; and (b) serious impairments of vision and hearing.

Under slide 7, “Current Position: Prescription and OTC [Over-the-Counter] Medications,” Dr. Arseneau says the medical assessment for adverse medical effects of medications (e.g., sedating effects) that interfere with the safe performance of safety-critical service will be: (1) Regulated under 49 CFR Part 219.103, i.e., control of alcohol and drug use—not under the Medical Standards rule; and (2) The responsibility of employees covered under Part 219 and their treating physician (without requirement for assessment and certification by a railroad physician).

Under slide 8, “Action Items: Physicians’ Task Force,” Dr. Arseneau says the Physicians’ Task Force continues to: (1) Refine the list of medical conditions that cause sudden incapacitation and serious impairments of hearing or vision; (2) Refine elements of “health history: to be included in a Health History Form that covered employees will complete; and (3) Refine the medical criteria (standards) which a covered employee must meet to be certified.

Under slide 9, “Action Items: Industry and Labor,” Dr. Arseneau says industry and labor organizations have been invited to update positions and submit proposed rule text for sections of the rule, especially for dispute resolution.

Under slide 10, “Action Items: FRA Team,” Dr. Arseneau lists the following FRA action items: (1) Review and consider stakeholder positions concerning issues relevant to the rule such as minimum uniform standards and dispute resolution; (2) Make decisions and propose draft text that addresses outstanding issues; (3) Incorporate “medical assessment process” and “medical examiner text” presented at the October 25-26, 2010, Medical Standards Working Group meeting into the working draft rule text; and (4) Distribute updated rule text for the Medical Standards Working Group’s review and comment.

Under slide 11, “Critical Incident Response Task No.: 09-02,” Dr. Arseneau says FRA will work towards a Notice of Proposed Rulemaking that requires each Class I railroad, intercity passenger railroad, and commuter railroad to develop a critical incident response plan which offers appropriate support services to an employee affected by a critical incident as required in Section 410 of the RSIA.

Under slide 12, “Progress Report on Critical Incident Response Task No.: 09-02,” Dr. Arseneau outlines the following: (1) A request for grant applications was published in the *Federal Register* to study and report on critical incidents, practices and recommend

interventions; (2) The grantee is to be nominated for appointment to the Critical Incident Task Force, which has been established under the Medical Standards Working Group; (3) The U.S. Department of Health and Human Services and the U.S. Department of Labor have designated representatives who have offered to consult with FRA and the Critical Incident Task Force; and (4) The first Critical Incident Task Force meeting will be scheduled with the Grantee early in 2011. Dr. Arseneau says industry and labor have been invited to submit positions, e.g., a definition for “critical incident,” and to outline elements for a critical incident response plan.

Under slide 13, “Target Dates for Completion of Tasks,” Dr. Arseneau says FRA anticipates issuing the Notice of Proposed Rulemaking (NPRM) for Medical Standards for Safety-Critical Personnel in 2011. He says the target date for the NPRM for Critical Incident Programs will be announced at a later date.

B.J. Arseneau (FRA) asks for questions.

With no questions, Chairperson Lauby asks Thomas McFarlin (FRA–Office of Safety) to report on a Brotherhood of Railroad Signalmen (BRS) letter request for FRA to address “fall prevention” issues. He says FRA needs to determine whether the Railroad Safety Advisory Committee needs to take action on this topic.

Thomas McFarlin (FRA) says FRA received a letter from BRS President W. Dan Pickett requesting that FRA either draft “fall protection” regulations for railroad signalmen who work on signal towers and catenary towers, or return jurisdiction over this workplace issue to the U.S. Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA). He says FRA studied accident data on this topic for the past 5 years. He says this is an activity where there is always a risk for fall injury. He says FRA has had meetings on this topic with W. Dan Pickett (BRS) and John Bragg (BRS). He says FRA believes there is some value in presenting this topic before the Railroad Safety Advisory Committee at this time.

Thomas McFarlin (FRA) uses a series of Microsoft PowerPoint Presentation slides, projected onto a screen for “BRS Signal Employee Fall Prevention Issues, December 14, 2010.” Photocopies of the Microsoft PowerPoint Presentation were distributed to meeting attendees. All meeting handouts will be entered into the RSAC Docket and are not excerpted in their entirety in the RSAC Minutes.

Under a series of slides, Mr. McFarlin says the following: (1) In a Policy Statement published in the *Federal Register* in 1978, FRA claimed jurisdiction for fall protection/prevention over signal platforms and structures to the exclusion of OSHA jurisdiction; (2) 49 CFR Part 214, Subpart B–Bridge Worker Safety Standards, was first promulgated in 1992, with several rule amendments since, to address personnel working on railroad bridges; (3) These requirements, however, do not pertain to various signal structures where a signal employee is working at height. Concerns include:

deteriorated or cracked signal mast bases; bent or broken ladders; unstable platforms; working on catenary poles, and instances where employees are working in an environment where they could fall; (4) The BRS has requested that FRA either develop regulations, or give jurisdiction back to OSHA; (5) FRA is not opposed to opening the current requirements to address these concerns, and even update current language, but FRA resources for this task are limited; and (6) An interim measure could be a small task group to work on gathering the “best practices” from a number of railroads and other sources.

Thomas McFarlin (FRA) says the principle issue is resources. He says FRA has few resources to address this topic. He says FRA could establish a small task group to work on gathering a “best practices” approach to this topic. However, he adds, FRA does not want to take on a rulemaking on this topic at this time.

Joseph Mattingly (Brotherhood of Railroad Signalmen (BRS)) says Thomas McFarlin (FRA) has framed the issue well. He says it is difficult to prevent falls on deteriorating structures. He says there is currently no recourse when employees find unsafe conditions. He says even new signal structures are putting BRS members in jeopardy. He says the BRS is open to suggestions on how this issue should be handled. He says initially railroad bridges were handled by a “best practices” approach. He says the BRS is willing to participate in a “best practices” approach to resolve this issue.

Rick Inclima (Brotherhood of Maintenance of Way Employees Division (BMWED)) says maintenance-of-way employees fall into this category and the BMWED would like to participate in this process.

Chuck Baker (National Railroad Construction and Maintenance Association) asks if FRA has an idea of how many incidents have occurred involving railroad employees falling from towers and platforms?

Joseph Mattingly (BRS) says this has been a problem of few incidents. However, he adds, when an incident occurs, people often cannot return to work.

He says he is looking for some sort of protections, as is currently afforded to railroad bridge workers.

Jeffrey Moller (Association of American Railroads) asks if this issue could be looked-at locally, or regionally? He asks if there are problems with equipment being purchased today, or are the problems with old equipment purchased many years ago? He believes this topic could be examined as a local issue at first.

Chairperson Lauby says if there is a “fall prevention” issue, FRA should be proactive, i.e., FRA should get its arms around the problem and find a solution. He asks, “Should

FRA ask RSAC to establish a working group to look into fall prevention issues, or should FRA handle this topic off-line?”

Joseph Mattingly (BRS) says FRA returns jurisdiction for this topic. He suggests that FRA form a task group and have this group look at this topic with FRA input.

Rick Inclima (BMWED) says he supports a fact-finding committee to propose a “best practice” approach as in the case of railroad bridge safety management. He believes that the committee membership should be kept small to better discuss this issue informally.

Jo Strang (FRA) says FRA cannot call this group an “advisory group.” However, she adds, FRA can call the group an Ad Hoc group. She asks for input on this topic from management.

Jeffrey Moller (Association of American Railroads) says management is willing to discuss this topic.

Stephen Strachan (National Railroad Passenger Corporation (Amtrak)) says Amtrak will participate with management.

Chairperson Lauby says Thomas McFarlin (FRA–Office of Safety) will arrange an informal meeting at FRA Headquarters to discuss fall prevention for signal employees. He notes that every topic undertaken by the Railroad Safety Advisory Committee does not have to end up as a regulation.

The following organizations offer to participate on the “fall prevention” committee: The Brotherhood of Railroad Signalmen, The Brotherhood of Maintenance of Way Employees Division, The International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers, The National Railroad Passenger Corporation (Amtrak), Metra (Northeast Illinois Regional Commuter Railroad Corporation), and The Association of American Railroads.

Chairperson Lauby requests that RSAC members let Thomas McFarlin (FRA) or Larry Woolverton (FRA) know of intentions to participate on the “fall prevention” committee.

Thomas McFarlin (FRA) says FRA will distribute a “fall prevention issues paper” and then arrange for a conference call on this topic in Mid-January 2011.

Joseph Mattingly (FRA) says that proposal will work for the BRS.

Chairperson Lauby says based on the preliminary discussions on fall prevention, FRA will determine the best way to handle this issue. He asks Thomas McFarlin (FRA) to report back to the Railroad Safety Advisory Committee on this topic at the next full Committee meeting.

Chairperson Lauby asks Charles Bielitz (FRA–Office of Safety) for a report on Passenger Safety Working Group activities.

Charles Bielitz (FRA) says much of the heavy lifting of the Passenger Safety Working Group is being handled by the Engineering Task Force and the General Passenger Safety Task Force’s Door Subgroup. He asks David Tyrell (FRA–Volpe National Transportation Systems Center) for a report on Engineering Task Force activities.

David Tyrell (FRA) uses a series of Microsoft PowerPoint Presentation slides, projected onto a screen for “RSAC Engineering Task Force: Update on Activities.” Photocopies of the Microsoft PowerPoint Presentation were distributed to meeting attendees. All meeting handouts will be entered into the RSAC Docket and are not excerpted in their entirety in the RSAC Minutes.

Under the slide, “Outline,” Mr. Tyrell lists the following Engineering Task Force (ETF) activities topics that will be covered at today’s meeting: (1) Past–Tier I Crashworthiness Criteria and Procedures; (2) Safety Requirements for Interoperable High-speed Rail Equipment; and (3) Future: (a) Safety requirements for diesel motor units (DMUs); (b) Glazing safety requirements; (c) Occupant protection requirements; (d) Requirements for emergency preparedness features; and (e) Update of Tier I and Tier II safety requirements.

Under the slide, “Tier I Criteria and Procedures,” Mr. Tyrell outlines the past ETF activities as follows: (1) Description: (a) Develop a framework for presenting technical information in support of a waiver request to FRA; (b) Provide a means of establishing whether the crashworthiness of an alternative design is at least equal to the crashworthiness of designs compliant with Tier I standards; and (c) Design-neutral and facilitates the application of the latest in rail equipment crashworthiness technology to the United states; (2) Development: (a) started by the ETF on September 23, 2009; and (b) accepted by the full RSAC on September 23, 2010; and (3) Application, e.g., Denton County Transportation Authority.

Under the slide, “Safety Requirements for Interoperable High-speed Rail Equipment,” Mr. Tyrell outlines the present ETF activities as follows: (1) Safety requirements divided into four parts: (a) Crashworthiness, occupant protection, and glazing (ongoing); (b) Suspension and brake performance (planned); (c) Safety appliances, fire safety, and emergency preparedness features (planned); and (d) Inspection, test, monitoring, and maintenance (planned); and (2) Safety concerns parallel concerns addressed by current passenger equipment regulations.

Under the slide, “Crashworthiness, Occupant Protection, and Glazing,” Mr. Tyrell says the following for the second phase of ETF activities: (1) Objective–Develop recommended engineering requirements for assuring the structural crashworthiness,

occupant protection, and glazing performance of interoperable high-speed equipment; and (2) Purpose—Identify to the rail industry the crashworthiness requirements for passenger equipment intended for Tier I operation and operation above 125 miles per hour (mph) on dedicated track with sophisticated accident-avoidance measures.

Under the slide, “Key Issues,” Mr. Tyrell says the following for the present activities of the ETF: (1) Scenarios are difficult for Positive Train Control (PTC) to prevent including: (a) fouled right-of-way, e.g., highway equipment and maintenance-of-way equipment; (b) derailment due to track or equipment defect; (2) Structural crashworthiness topics including: (a) non-passenger occupied end cars; (b) high strength cab/end cars; and (c) energy absorption, e.g., crash energy management; (3) Occupant protection, e.g., luggage needs to be restrained; and (4) Glazing issues including: (a) repeatable test procedures; and (b) impact energy requirements for forward-facing glazing.

Under the slide, “Planned Targets and Schedule,” Mr. Tyrell outlines the following for the present activities of the ETF: (1) Meeting Number 1—October 20-21, 2010, in Cambridge, Massachusetts: (a) railroad reviews, equipment considerations, California High-Speed Train Project, Florida High-Speed Rail; (b) supplier reviews of crashworthiness features of high-speed rail equipment, e.g., Alstom, Ansaldo/Breda, Bombardier, Hyundai/Rotem, Kawasaki, Nippon Sharyo, Stadler, and Siemens; and (c) discussions of scenarios, structural crashworthiness, occupant protection, and glazing; (2) Meeting Number 2—January 11-12, 2011, in Orlando, Florida: (a) supplier homework results for compliance with Tier I C&P scenarios; (b) SNCF (Société Nationale des Chemins de fer français) review of crashworthiness requirements for TGV (Train à Grande Vitesse); and (c) consensus on scope of scenarios, structural crashworthiness, occupant protection, and glazing; (3) Meeting Number 3—April 2011 (date and location to be announced)—consensus on approach for engineering requirements; (4) Meeting Number 4—June 2011 (date and location to be announced)—consensus on numerical values for engineering requirements; and (5) Conference calls—consensus on text.

Under the slide, “Selected Research Efforts to Support Ongoing and Expected ETF Activities,” Mr. Tyrell outlines the following for the future activities of the ETF: (1) Structural crashworthiness: (a) Activities: model crippling using the methodology laid out in the C&P, and perform a quasi static crippling test (not required by the C&P); and (b) Purpose: validate C&P methodology to provide technical basis for potential regulations; (2) Occupant Protection: (a) Activities: development of alternative table testing techniques; development of operator protection strategies; and (b) Purpose: lower cost and increase confidence of table qualification tests; develop technical basis for potential operator protection requirements; and (3) Glazing: (a) Activities: development of techniques for analyzing glazing impacts; and (b) Purpose: facilitate development of robust qualification test techniques; make possible rapid evaluation of the influence of glazing characteristics on impact performance.

David Tyrell (FRA) asks for questions.

Chairperson Lauby explains that the Engineering Task Force (ETF) is concentrating on high-speed rail issues. He says FRA has regulations, but the regulations stop at 150 mph. He says the ETF is looking at Tier V Rail Passenger Service which includes train speeds up to 220 mph. He says at the ETF meetings it is refreshing for him to witness carbuilders making presentations that show competitors each other's carbody designs.

Stephen Bruno (Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers and Trainmen) asks if the ETF is considering occupant protection and glazing, in general?

David Tyrell (FRA) says for side facing glazing, FRA plans to keep the standards the way they are now. He says the biggest impact will be for forward facing glazing.

Stephen Bruno (Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers and Trainmen) says forward facing glazing is labor's concern for crew members riding in the lead vehicle.

Chairperson Lauby says the energy involved in glazing impacts doubles at high speeds. He says the glazing may become so thick that it acts as a prism and distorts the view. He says another issue is the "curved glazing" in European equipment. He says FRA wants to provide strength to glazing to prevent intrusions into the cab. He says this is subject matter that the ETF will jump into at the next ETF meeting.

Stephen Bruno (Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers and Trainmen) says at least one carrier is considering allowing passengers to sit behind forward facing glazing.

Chairperson Lauby says whether it is crew or passengers, FRA is concerned about glazing issues.

Chairperson Lauby announces the lunch break.

L U N C H B R E A K 12:00 P.M. - 1:00 P.M.

Chairperson Lauby reconvenes the meeting. He asks Brian Hontz (FRA—Office of Safety) for a report on the General Passenger Safety Task Force's Door Task Group activities.

Brian Hontz (FRA) uses a series of Microsoft PowerPoint Presentation slides, projected onto a screen for "Update from the Door Task Group, December 14, 2010." Photocopies of the Microsoft PowerPoint Presentation were distributed to meeting attendees. All meeting handouts will be entered into the RSAC Docket and are not excerpted in their entirety in the RSAC Minutes.

Under slide 2, Mr. Hontz says on April 19, 2007, FRA announced the formation of the Door Task Group.

Under slide 3, Mr. Hontz says after seven meetings, the Door Task Group reached consensus on October 7, 2009, on 46 of 47 door issues.

Under slide 4, Mr. Hontz says: (1) The one item on which the Door Task Group did not reach consensus was with safety features on new equipment with manually operated exterior side doors; and (2) This item may be added to a remanded list for reconsideration, pending the completion of an American Public Transportation Association (APTA) standard on door issues.

Under slide 5, Mr. Hontz says: (1) On September 16, 2010, the Passenger Safety Working Group accepted the General Passenger Safety Task Force's consensus recommendation for 46 of the 47 door issues; and (2) The Passenger Safety Working Group agreed to vote electronically on any remanded items when the APTA standard on door issues is complete.

Under slide 6, Mr. Hontz says on September 11, 2008, APTA created a "door group" to develop an APTA standard that incorporates FRA's Door Task Group's safety recommendations.

Under slide 7, Mr. Hontz says on September 16, 2010, APTA presented a 20-page, 34 item, draft door standard, which includes an Appendix that contains mathematical formulas for a variety of forces and measurements.

Under slide 8, Mr. Hontz says during November 2010, APTA made several editorial changes to the draft APTA door standard and have put the document out to APTA members for a vote.

Under slide 9, Mr. Hontz says once the APTA standard is complete, it will be incorporated by reference into FRA's regulations.

Brian Hontz (FRA) asks for questions.

With no questions, Jo Strang (FRA—Associate Administrator for Railroad Safety/Chief Safety Officer) announces the retirement of Edward Pritchard (FRA—Office of Safety, Director Office of Safety Assurance and Compliance).

There are numerous RSAC member acknowledgments of the assistance and service which RSAC members received during the long tenure of Edward Pritchard at FRA.

Chairperson Lauby announces the afternoon break.

AFTERNOON BREAK 1:20 P.M. - 1:40 P.M.

Chairperson Lauby reconvenes the meeting. He gives an update on other regulatory activities including: (1) Vehicle Track Interaction (VTI) Standards—FRA issued a Notice of Proposed Rulemaking (NPRM) on May 10, 2010; FRA is working on a Final Rule, however, there are issues with including Class 9 track standards; In addition, the U.S. Office of Management and Budget has determined VTI Standards to be a significant rule, making April 2011, the likely date for a Final Rule; (2) Roadway Worker Protection Final Rule estimated to be published in April 2011; (3) Training Standards and Plans (TSP)—the U.S. Office of Management and Budget has determined TSP to be a significant rule, making November 2011, the likely date for the issue of a NPRM; (4) Part 219 Alcohol and Substance Testing—Final Rule in April 2011; (5) Passenger Hours of Service—a NPRM to be issued in May 2011; and (6) Railroad Safety Risk Reduction Programs—due October 16, 2012. He says an Advance Notice of Proposed Rulemaking on Railroad Safety Risk Reduction was issued November 2010, requesting comments from the railroad industry.

Chairperson Lauby gives an update on non-significant regulatory activities including: (1) Amendment to Part 225 Accident/Incident Reporting Rules—Final rule issued November 2010; (2) an NPRM on concrete crossties was issued on August 26, 2010; Final Rule is due March 2011; is out; the comment period is through October 2010; the Final Rule will be released March 2011; (3) Safety Appliance Standards—issued July 2, 2010; Final Rule will be issued in January 2011; (4) Part 242, Conductor certification—release of NPRM in October 2010, Final Rule in September 2011; (5) Requirements for Highway-Rail Grade Crossing Telephone Services—November 2010; (6) Camp car sleeping quarters—December 2010; (7) Emergency escape breathing apparatus—Final Rule February 2011; and (8) Critical Incident Response Plans—end of 2011.

Scott Hinckley (Association of American Railroads) asks if FRA is changing its procedures for reserving blocks of rooms in hotels where RSAC Working Group meetings are held?

Chairperson Lauby says FRA is under a lot of budget pressures for travel, personnel, and RSAC. He says when FRA reserves a block of rooms, the agency pays for those rooms if the meeting participants reserve rooms in other locations. He says FRA can no longer guarantee a block of room at meeting locations. Also, he adds, budget pressures are putting the light refreshments that FRA provides at these meetings under attack. Therefore, he says, RSAC Working Group members should not expect light refreshments at future meetings.

Keith Borman (American Shortline and Regional Railroad Association) asks, "If the room block goes away, will the "government rate" for RSAC meeting hotel space also go away?"

Larry Woolverton (FRA–RSAC Coordinator) says FRA is looking for facilities that will grant the "government rate" for meeting participants, but not obligate that FRA enter into an agreement for a block of rooms.

Chairperson Lauby asks for additions and corrections to the Minutes of the 42nd meeting of the Railroad Safety Advisory Committee, held September 23, 2010, in Washington, D.C.

With no additions or corrections, Chairperson Lauby asks for a motion to accept the Minutes for the 42nd meeting of the Railroad Safety Advisory Committee, as presented.

Stephen Strachan (National Railroad Passenger Corporation (Amtrak)) motions that the Minutes for the 42nd meeting of the Railroad Safety Advisory Committee be accepted, as presented.

John Previsich (United Transportation Union) seconds the motion.

BY VOICE VOTE, THE RAILROAD SAFETY ADVISORY COMMITTEE
ACCEPTS THE MINUTES FOR THE 42ND MEETING, AS PRESENTED.

Chairperson Lauby asks RSAC members to check calendars and suggest dates for the next full RSAC meeting. He suggests a meeting date in May 2011.

There is a brief RSAC discussion on meeting dates in May 2011, after which FRA agrees to hold the 44th Meeting of the full RSAC on Thursday, May 19, 2011, in Washington, D.C., at a place to be determined.

Chairperson Lauby thanks RSAC members for attending today's meeting. He asks for a motion to adjourn the meeting.

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

Paul Worley (American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials) seconds the motion.

Chairperson Lauby adjourns the meeting at 2:00 pm.

M E E T I N G A D J O U R N E D 2:30 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.