

## **RAILROAD SAFETY ADVISORY COMMITTEE (RSAC)**

### **Minutes of Meeting December 4, 2014 Washington, D.C.**

The fifty-second meeting of the Railroad Safety Advisory Committee (Committee) was convened at 9:30 a.m., in the Board Room of the National Housing Center of the National Association of Home Builders, 1201 15<sup>th</sup> Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20005, by the Federal Railroad Administration's (FRA) Associate Administrator for Railroad Safety/Chief Safety Officer Robert Lauby (FRA–Office of Railroad Safety). Also in attendance are the FRA Administrator Joseph Szabo (FRA), the RSAC Chairperson Jamie Rennert (FRA–Office of Railroad Safety, Deputy Associate Administrator for Regulatory and Legislative Operations), Patrick Warren (FRA–Office of Railroad Safety, Deputy Associate Administrator for Safety Compliance and Program Implementation) and Brenda Moscoso (FRA Office of Railroad Safety, Director Office of Safety Analysis).

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 December 4, 2014, meeting, five of the fifty-six voting RSAC members were absent: The Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers and Trainmen (1 of 3 seats absent); The Brotherhood of Maintenance of Way Employees Division (BMWED) (1 of 2 seats absent); Safe Travel America (1 seat), The Transport Workers Union of America (1 of 2 seats absent), and the Transportation Security Administration (1 seat). Six of seven non-voting/advisory RSAC members were absent: The Federal Transit Administration, 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 100.

Robert (Bob) Lauby (FRA) welcomes RSAC (the Committee) Members and attendees. He asks Kenton Kilgore (FRA–Office of Railroad Safety) for a meeting room safety briefing.

Kenton Kilgore (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 National Association of Home Builders building has an AED, located outside the rest rooms in the building's atrium lobby.

Bob Lauby (FRA) introduces FRA Administrator Joseph (Joe) C. Szabo. He says he has had the honor of introducing Administrator Szabo to the Railroad Safety Advisory Committee several times over the past few years, so the Committee already knows a lot about him. He says Administrator Szabo is a 5<sup>th</sup> generation railroader, a former United Transportation Union conductor, and a former Mayor of Riverdale, Illinois. He says he believes that he may have referred to Administrator Szabo as God's gift to railroading. However, he adds, what he never included in previous introductions, probably because it was already obvious, is the strong leadership and advocacy for railroad safety that Joe has been during his tenure as FRA Administrator. He says Administrator Szabo always has a clear vision of FRA's roles and responsibilities and a strategy to take railroad safety to the next level. He says Administrator Szabo continuously pushed FRA career staff to achieve far-reaching goals. He adds, no matter how far out on a limb Joe pushed us, he was always there to encourage us, support us, and to protect our backs. He says Joe Szabo is a great FRA Administrator, a great leader, and a great boss.

Bob Lauby (FRA) says it is his privilege, probably for the last time, to ask Administrator Szabo for opening remarks.

Administrator Szabo welcomes RSAC members and meeting attendees. He says he is glad to have this opportunity to talk with the full Committee before he heads home to Chicago and begin a new chapter as a Senior Fellow at the Chicago Metropolitan Agency for Planning.

Administrator Szabo says when he thinks back on his time with RSAC – both as a labor representative beginning in 1996, and as the FRA Administrator for nearly the past 6 years, he is convinced of the value of the process and believes it serves as a model for other agencies and industries.

Administrator Szabo observes that the RSAC process is not perfect. He says sometimes RSAC is criticized for taking too long. However, he says, as long as safety remains the priority – the driving motivation for why this diverse group of stakeholders convenes - then together we can ensure that rail employees, passengers and the public will be as safe as possible.

Administrator Szabo explains that FRA is required to follow a comprehensive process that appropriately weighs and considers all aspects of a potential rulemaking. He says RSAC plays a vital role in this process by making sure we understand the nuances of the most difficult issues so that we make sound decisions on rulemakings that ensure continuous safety improvement. He notes that RSAC may not always reach consensus – and consensus is not necessary - but everyone will be heard. He says RSAC Working Group and Task Force activities serve to increase our collective knowledge of safety issues.

Administrator Szabo says the past six years are possibly the most productive in FRA's history – and RSAC has been a key contributor to that record of achievement as evidenced by 16 final rules and 4 current notices of proposed rulemakings (NPRMs). Additionally, he says, RSAC provided input or recommendations for additional 3 final rules and 4 NPRM's that FRA will issue in 2015.

Administrator Szabo says during 2014, FRA convened the first-ever emergency meeting of the RSAC to work on an expedited timeline to address the movement of hazardous materials, including crew staffing, securement requirements, and other issues critically needed to improve the safe transportation of crude oil.

However, Administrator Szabo says, RSAC's efforts are only part of the picture. He says between February 1, 2009 to November 30, 2014, FRA published about 85 major regulatory documents, including 75 advanced notices of proposed rulemaking, notices of proposed rulemaking, and final rules; 3 emergency orders and 7 interpretations. He says that is an average of more than 14 major regulatory documents per year.

Administrator Szabo says FRA's regulatory oversight, along with the industry's and workforce emphasis on safety, has led to a historically low number of accidents during the last ten calendar years. He says total train accidents decreased nearly 50 percent and total highway-rail grade crossing accidents decreased 35 percent. He says it was especially important for him, coming out of the employee ranks, that the most meaningful improvement was in the number of on-duty employee fatalities. He says in 2008, the year before he came to FRA as Administrator, 26 workers perished from on-duty accidents. So far this year, he says, the railroad industry has reported five on-duty employee fatalities, which is still too many, but ever so close to the goal of zero.

Administrator Szabo says he is passionate about rail safety and proud of what these numbers represent, i.e., the rail industry's sustained commitment to drive continuous safety improvement.

However, Administrator Szabo adds, we cannot rest on past accomplishments. He says the rail network must grow safely, reliably, and efficiently to move up to 100 million additional people and an estimated four more billion tons of freight by 2050.

Administrator Szabo says the dramatic growth in transporting energy products like crude oil and ethanol by rail is a game changer. He says U. S. Secretary of Transportation Anthony Foxx is laser-focused on safety issues and along with FRA has a zero tolerance policy for any track-caused derailment on a crude oil or passenger route.

Administrator Szabo observes that RSAC is now working on rules for inward- and outward-facing locomotive recording devices. He says he is convinced that RSAC engagement in this working group is the best way to ensure that the right balance is achieved by developing a sound rule that adequately protects employee privacy while enabling technology that can provide important information to help drive continuous safety improvement. He says the Recording Devices Working Group must finish your work promptly.

Administrator Szabo says he believes RSAC will prove even more valuable as the Committee tackles these and other issues that will drive the next generation of safety. He says he sees benefits to developing creative and proactive partnerships between management and labor to successfully implement innovative Risk Reduction and System Safety programs like Confidential Close Call Reporting, and to continue to develop or modify rules to allow flexibility for new technology to be effectively implemented so that we ensure every possible means to improve railroad safety is optimized. He says the bottom line is that FRA and the rail industry must be proactive to identify and mitigate risk before an accident occurs, not after.

Administrator Szabo says as he heads home to Chicago – America’s rail hub - he will miss working daily with the dedicated men and women who are responsible for making the US rail system as safe as possible. However, he adds, “I’m confident that you are up to the task to make rail transportation safer even as it grows to meet future freight and passenger mobility needs, and makes America’s economy stronger.”

Bob Lauby (FRA) introduces two new members of FRA’s Office of Railroad Safety’s senior staff. He says Patrick Warren (FRA–Office of Railroad Safety) is the new Deputy Associate Administrator for Safety Compliance and Program Implementation. He says Mr. Warren manages FRA Regional Inspection Program and replaces Michael Logue and Bonnie Murphy, who previously held that position. He says Jamie Rennert (FRA–Office of Railroad Safety) is the new Deputy Associate Administrator for Regulatory and Legislative Operations), and replaces Robert Lauby and Grady Cothen, who previous held that position.

Bob Lauby (FRA) says he will be turning over the reins of the Railroad Safety Advisory Committee (RSAC) at today’s meeting to Jamie Rennert (FRA), who becomes the new Chairperson for RSAC. He says Chairperson Rennert joined FRA in April 2014, coming from the Surface Transportation Board where she held a variety of positions including Deputy Direct for Public and Governmental Affairs and Chief of Staff for the Surface

Transportation Board where she supervised 140 employees and a \$27 million budget. He says Chairperson Rennert received her undergraduate degree in political science from the University of Michigan and her law degree from the University of Pennsylvania Law School. He says Chairperson Rennert has credentials as a senior rail industry counsel and government affairs professional with policy, legislative, regulatory, and litigation experience. He says she brings 20 years of senior management experience in transportation, legislative and public affairs, coalition building, and outreach programs with both public and private sectors.

Chairperson Rennert says she appreciates her welcome to RSAC. She says she is learning about the culture and customs of this process as the Team Leader for the Inward- and Outward Facing Recording Devices Mounted in Controlling Locomotive Cabs (Recording Devices) Working Group and sees the passion for this process first hand through the community of individuals and organizations that are dedicated to railroad safety.

Chairperson Rennert says today is her first full RSAC meeting. She says she is excited about the breadth of initiatives that RSAC undertakes. She says at today's meeting the Committee will hear reports from RSAC Working Groups and FRA staff members that span where railroad safety has been, where railroad safety is now, and where the railroad safety is headed in the future. She says she looks forward to moving current RSAC Tasks to completion and taking on new RSAC Tasks next year.

Bob Lauby (FRA) asks for RSAC members and meeting attendees to introduce themselves and the organizations they represent.

Chairperson Rennert asks Bob Lauby (FRA) for a report on efforts to abate crude oil and ethanol derailments.

Bob Lauby (FRA) uses a series of Microsoft PowerPoint Presentation slides, projected onto a screen for "FRA Crude Oil 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, "Overview," Mr. Lauby says the U.S. Department of Transportation, including FRA and the Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration (PHMSA), have taken action on multiple fronts to mitigate risks and ensure the safe transportation of crude oil, ethanol, and other flammable hazardous materials by rail.

Under slide 3, "Crude Oil and Ethanol Derailments," Mr. Lauby says there have been many crude oil and ethanol derailments, including the following locations: (1) Casselton, ND—two separate incidents; (2) York, ND; (3) Albany, NY; (4) LaSalle, CO;

(5) Brownwood, TX; (6) Vandergrift, PA; (7) New Augusta, MS; (8) Plaster Rock, Ontario; (9) Aliceville, AL; (10) Lac-Mégantic, Quebec; (11) Plevna, MT; (12) Columbus, OH; (13) Tiskilwa, IL; (14) Arcadia, OH; (15) Rockford, IL; (16) Plainessville, OH; and (17) New Brighton, PA.

Under slide 4, “Response,” Mr. Lauby says the U.S. Department of Transportation, the Federal Railroad Administration, and the railroad industry came together to respond quickly and decisively to the crude oil and ethanol derailments.

Under slides 5-7, “Emergency Orders and Safety Advisories,” Mr. Lauby lists the following FRA Emergency Orders and Safety Advisories that were issued to deal with crude oil and ethanol derailments: (1) August 7, 2013: (a) Emergency Order No. 28: Emergency Order establishing additional requirements for attendance and securement of certain freight trains and vehicles on mainline track or mainline siding outside of a yard or terminal; and (b) Safety Advisory 2013-06: Addresses preventing unintended movement of freight trains and vehicles on mainline track or mainline siding outside of a yard or terminal; (2) November 20, 2013–Safety Advisory 2013-07: Safety and security plans for Class 3 hazardous materials transported by rail; and (3) May 7, 2014: (a) Emergency Order DOT-OST-2014-0067: Requires railroads to notify state emergency response commissions regarding the operation of crude oil trains passing through their state; and (b) Safety Advisory 2014-01: Recommends that crude oil be transported in the safest tank cars possible (when practical).

Under slide 8, “Safety Initiatives,” Mr. Lauby outlines other FRA activities to respond to crude oil and ethanol derailments as follows: (1) Emergency Meeting of the Railroad Safety Advisory Committee on August 29, 2013; (2) “Call to Action” Meeting with industry resulting in voluntary initiatives; and (3) RSAC Working Group meetings.

Under slides 9-10, “Regulatory Initiatives–RSAC,” Mr. Lauby outlines the following RSAC initiatives to deal with crude oil and ethanol derailments: (1) Securement Working Group: (a) Work completed; and (b) RSAC approved consensus regulatory text recommendations on April 1, 2014; (2) Hazmat Issues Working Group: (a) Consensus reach on four items; (b) RSAC approved consensus recommendations on April 8, 2014; and (c) Letter from FRA Administrator to PHMSA is in development; and (3) Train Crew Size: (a) Consensus not reached; (b) Input from stakeholders will inform the proposed rule; and (c) Developing rule text to be issued as an Notice of Proposed Rulemaking (NPRM).

Under slide 11, “Regulatory Initiatives,” Mr. Lauby outlines other regulatory initiatives to deal with crude oil and ethanol derailments as follows: (1) PHMSA issues an NPRM on Enhanced Tank Car Standards and Operational Controls for High-Hazard Flammable Trains; (2) PHMSA issued an Advanced Notice of Proposed Rulemaking (ANPRM) for Oil Spill Response Planning. He says the comment period for both proposed PHMSA rules closed on September 30, 2014.

Under slides 12-14, “Current Environment,” “Statistics,” and “Ten-Year Trend for Accident Reductions,” Mr. Lauby displays bar charts depicting an environment where the industry has enjoyed continuous safety improvement over the past 10 years with 2013 being the safest year ever including: (1) Over the past decade, train accidents have declined 47 percent; (2) Highway-rail grade crossing accidents are down 35 percent; and (3) Employee fatalities have been reduced by 59 percent.

Under slides 15-16, “Train Accidents by Disciplines,” Mr. Lauby displays a bar chart and an exploding pie chart depicting train accidents by railroad discipline (signal, equipment, miscellaneous, human factor, and track) between 2009 and 2013. He says for 2013, human factor-caused train accidents accounted for 38 percent of all train accidents and track-caused accidents accounted for 31 percent of all train accidents.

Under slides 17-20, “Track Safety Strategy,” Mr. Lauby describes the following actions FRA is taking to mitigate track-caused train accidents: (1) Short-term Actions: (a) Focused audits of track maintenance practices; (b) Engagement with railroads and inspectors—minimum standards versus best practices; (c) Safety Advisories to identify areas of risk and way to mitigate; and (d) Better use of FRA enforcement tools—violations, fines, special notice of repair, and other strategies; (2) Mid-range Objectives: (a) RSAC Rail Integrity Working Group to look at rail flaw detection; (b) Complete review of existing Track Safety Standards; (c) Removal of disincentives to test or inspect track, i.e., currently the policy is “if you find a track defect, you must fix it quickly;” and (d) Rewrite existing Track Safety Standards to “raise the bar” to prevent track-caused accidents; and (3) Long-term Objectives: (a) Develop autonomous track inspection technology; (b) Use revenue trains to conduct continuous testing; (c) Perform trending analysis; and (d) Support the technology roll out with appropriate regulations.

Under slide 21, “FRA Regulatory Summary,” Mr. Lauby outlines the following new regulations that impact crude oil transportation: (1) Tank car construction and operational requirements; (2) Securement issues (with PHMSA); (3) Hazardous Material issues (with PHMSA); (4) Train Crew Size; (5) Track Integrity Modifications; and (6) Updated Track Safety Standards.

Under slides 22-25, “Future Actions,” Mr. Lauby says despite the good work of the Federal Government and Industry: (1) Accidents involving crude petroleum and ethanol rail cars continue to occur; (2) The public and public officials continue to be concerned; and (3) Any event on a crude oil route becomes an automatic headline in the news media. He says it no longer seems to matter how severe the accident may be or even if a crude oil train is involved in the accident, the public sensitivity to any train accident is now extreme.

Under slides 26-34, "Recent Examples," Mr. Lauby shows photographs and describes the following 2014 train accidents involving crude oil routes: (1) Lynchburg, VA, April 30, 2014; (2) Casselton, ND, November 13, 2014; and (3) Belden, CA, November 25, 2014.

Under slides 35-36, "Crude Oil Initiatives Update," Mr. Lauby says the following: (1) FRA and the U.S. Department of Transportation has zero tolerance for derailments on crude oil routes; (2) Derailments, especially on crude oil routes, can never be considered a cost of doing business; and (3) FRA will be doing everything it can to proactively address ongoing risk on crude oil routes—Secretary of Transportation Secretary Foxx and FRA Administrator Szabo expect railroads to do the same.

Bob Lauby (FRA) asks for questions.

Jeffrey Moller (AAR) says this topic is something that is a concern to everyone in the room. He says none of the derailments that FRA has cited has occurred as a result of a carrier violating an FRA rule. He says the rail industry has been taking steps to preventing accidents involving crude oil and alcohol shipments through voluntary agreements with the U.S. Secretary of Transportation. He says these include (1) Putting resources into rail flaw detection; (2) Increasing inspections of track; (3) Making improvements to braking systems; (4) Using Rail Traffic Routing Technology; and (5) Lowering speeds for certain train consists.

Bob Lauby (FRA) says this topic will take a lot of discussion to get our arms around these issues. He says FRA has a number of tools available to it including: (1) Safety Advisories; (2) Emergency Orders; (3) Compliance Orders; (4) Mass Inspections; and (5) Fines. He says FRA will use all of the tools at its disposal to stop these accidents from occurring.

Chairperson Rennert says FRA's Track Safety Strategy is looking into (1) Track Safety processes; and (2) Safety culture.

Kelly Haley (Brotherhood of Railroad Signalmen) asks, "What steps is California taking on crude oil shipments and what can California do if FRA is in charge of railroad safety?"

Paul King (Association of State Rail Safety Managers) explains that following an accident in Sacramento, California, the State of California placed a restriction on the particular track that was involved in the accident. However, on appeal, a court ruled that the State of California could not place a restriction on track. Now, he adds, the State of California is considering the restriction of crude oil shipments into the state.

Kelly Haley (Brotherhood of Railroad Signalmen) asks, "From a legal standpoint, can California restrict crude oil shipments?"



Bob Lauby (FRA) says that is something for the courts to decide. He says FRA needs to be prepared for whatever happens. He says railroads, not highways are the place where these shipments belong.

Paul King (Association of State Rail Safety Managers) says the Governor of California may have the authority to revoke permits to refineries for receiving shipments of crude oil and alcohol products.

Kelly Haley (Brotherhood of Railroad Signalmen) asks, "Is California going to be able to prevent crude oil shipments from the State of California?"

Bob Lauby (FRA) replies, "I do not know. However, FRA needs to be prepared to show it is taking an active role in monitoring crude oil shipments."

John Tolman (Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers and Trainmen) says to reduce the risk of injury to train crews, RSAC should consider revisiting buffer cars in unit trains.

Chairperson Rennert asks Steven Zuiderveen (FRA—Office of Railroad Safety) for a report on Tourist and Historic Railroads and Private Passenger Car Working Group activities.

Steven (Steve) Zuiderveen (FRA) uses a series of Microsoft PowerPoint Presentation slides, projected onto a screen for "Task 13-01: Tourist and Historic Railroads and Private Passenger Cars 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. Zuiderveen says the Tourist and Historic Railroads and Private Car Working Group (THRWG) was established in 1996 to promote the safe operation of tourist and historic rail operations. He says in 2013, the THRWG was tasked to ensure appropriate applicability of FRA regulations to tourist, excursion and historic railroads on and off the general rail system.

Under slide 3, Mr. Zuiderveen says Task Statement 13-01 requires the THRWG to report-on and draft regulatory recommendations to update: (1) FRA's safety glazing standards (49 CFR Part 223) on issues outside the scope of FRA's Notice of Proposed Rulemaking (NPRM) on glazing; (2) FRA's freight car safety standards (49 CFR Part 215) for freight cars that are 50+ years old; and (3) 49 CFR Part 232, Appendix B, of FRA's freight power brake standards.

Under slide 4, Mr. Zuiderveen says the THRWG was also asked to identify other issues involving FRA's regulatory treatment of Tourist and Historic Railroad operations and equipment. He says opportunities include: (1) Reflectorization (Part 224); and

(2) Steam locomotive reporting (Part 230).

Under slide 5, Mr. Zuiderveen says the following: (1) The THRWG meet twice: (a) April 9-10, 2014 in Washington, DC; and (b) December 3, 2014, in Washington, DC; and (2) A Task Group of the THRWG developed rule text regarding 50-year-old cars, reflectorization, and steam locomotives, which was accepted by the THRWG in November 2014.

Under slides 6-8, "Proposed 50-Year-Old Car Rule (Part 215)," Mr. Zuiderveen says the following for cars older than 50 years: (1) Defines a tourist/historic railroad freight car: (a) Not used to transport freight for hire; (b) Not used in a train containing placarded cars; (c) Speeds limited to  $\leq 30$  mph; (d) Car used solely on the railroad that owns or controls it; and (e) Railroad must comply with recording and maintenance requirements of proposed Appendix E; (2) Proposed Appendix E: (a) Requires official records in lieu of stenciling; (b) Requires periodic inspections by designated inspectors; (c) Center plate inspection every 5/15 years (service based); (d) Cast iron wheels permitted with annual inspection plus derating of speed and capacity of car; (e) Cars not subject to air brake requirements of Part 232 or with obsolete air brake require 5 year single car test; and (f) Requires notification of lessors of requirements of Part 215 when equipment is used for photography or film work.

Under slides 9-11, "Proposed Air Brake Rule (Part 232, Appendix B)," Mr. Zuiderveen says the following air brake rules are proposed for tourist/historic rail cars: (1) The Association of American Railroads (AAR)–referenced standard is changed from the obsolete S-045 to the updated S-4045-13; (2) The standard federal rule language "Incorporated by Reference" has been added to legitimize the AAR Standard; (3) Allows the use of schedules not included in AAR Standards to be used if maintained in a safe and suitable condition: (a) Railroad shall have a written maintenance plan; and (b) The maintenance plan must be based upon recognized industry standards and periods; and appropriate to the utilization of the equipment; and (4) Addition of a "Modification Clause:" (a) Modification may be made to S-4045-13 through publication and a 60-day comment period; (b) If there are no written public objections, or FRA does not issue a written objection, modification becomes effective on the 75<sup>th</sup> day; and (c) Clause is similar to modification clauses for Single Car Test Standards in Part 232 and 238.

Under slide 12, Mr. Zuiderveen offers the following additional changes: (1) Proposed reflectorization (Part 224)–a tourist/historical rail car as defined in Part 215 is excepted from reflectorization requirements; and (2) Proposed Steam Locomotive Reporting (Part 230)–Form No. 4 "Boiler Specification Card," and Form No. 19 "Report of Alteration of Welded or Riveted Repair," are now to be filed with the FRA Associate Administrator for Railroad Safety/Chief Safety Officer, rather than with the FRA Regional Administrator.

Under slides 13-15, "Glazing NPRM (Part 223)," Mr. Zuiderveen highlights the following from the Glazing Notice of Proposed Rulemaking, issued September 26, 2014:

(1) Published September 26, 2014—closed to comments on November 25, 2014; (2) Definition of “antiquated” changed to “at least 50 years old;” (3) Downgrading glazing from compliant to non-compliant prohibited; (4) Anachronistic transition dates from the 1980's have been cleaned from the standard; and (5) “Fully Compliant Part 223” stencil or plate is eliminated; (6) The term “private car” is removed, and the term “private transportation service” is used to align with FRA’s guidance that the use of equipment rather than the circumstance of ownership triggers regulation; (7) “End facing glass” is redefined to no longer include interior vestibule doors and end glass on semi-permanently coupled equipment, e.g., MU (multiple unit) cars; and (8) The THRWG met on December 3, to review public comments to the revisions proposed for Part 223 Safety Glazing Standards, as provided for in RSAC Task No.: 13-01.

Under slide 16, “Future Tasks,” Mr. Zuiderveen says the THRWG has identified several items under the fifth bullet of RSAC Task Statement No.: 13-01, i.e., Identify any other issues involving FRA’s regulatory treatment of tourist and historic railroad operations and equipment. These include: (1) Emergency preparedness; and (2) Part 213 Track Inspection Frequency.

Steve Zuiderveen (FRA) says the full Railroad Safety Advisory Committee will be asked to accept proposed Amendments to Part 215, Part 224, Part 230, Part 232, as they relate to FRA’s regulatory treatment of tourist and historic railroad operations and equipment, and private rail cars. Photocopies of the Microsoft Word document 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.

Steve Zuiderveen (FRA) asks for questions.

Jeffrey Moller (Association of American Railroads) asks how this rule will affect business cars.

Steve Zuiderveen (FRA) says the majority of business cars do not fall under FRA rules for Part 238. However, he adds the codification of AAR Standards for brake equipment on passenger cars means that many of these business cars fall under AAR Standards

Chairperson Rennert asks for a motion to accept proposed Amendments to Part 215, Part 224, Part 230, Part 232, as they relate to FRA’s regulatory treatment of tourist and historic railroad operations and equipment, and private rail cars.

Bob Opal (Association of Tourist Railroads and Railway Museums) motions to accept proposed Amendments to Part 215, Part 224, Part 230, Part 232, as they relate to FRA’s regulatory treatment of tourist and historic railroad operations and equipment, and private rail cars.

Brad Black (Railway Passenger Car Alliance) seconds the motion.

BY HAND VOTE, THE FULL RAILROAD SAFETY ADVISORY COMMITTEE APPROVES THE MOTION TO ACCEPT PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO PART 215, PART 224, PART 230, PART 232, AS THEY RELATE TO FRA'S REGULATORY TREATMENT OF TOURIST AND HISTORIC RAILROAD OPERATIONS AND EQUIPMENT, AND PRIVATE RAIL CARS.

Chairperson Rennert thanks the full RSAC for the approval of this motion. She announces the morning break.

M O R N I N G   B R E A K   10:50 A.M. - 11:10 A.M.

Chairperson Rennert reconvenes the meeting. She asks Richard Connor (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.

Richard Connor (FRA) uses a series of Microsoft PowerPoint Presentation slides, projected onto a screen for "Recording Devices 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 slide 2, "Recording Devices Working Group (RDWG) Update," Mr. Connor 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. Connor 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. Connor 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.” He cites an in-flight audio recording of Eastern Airlines crash into the Florida everglades as an example of recordings that helped the NTSB determine an accident cause.

John Risch (International Association of Sheet Metal, Air, Rail and Transportation Workers) says the Eastern Airlines crash into the Florida everglades was post-accident, and audio only.

[Note: On December 29, 1972, Eastern Air Lines Flight 401 crashed into the Florida Everglades at 11:42 pm, causing 101 fatalities. The crash occurred as a result of the entire flight crew becoming preoccupied with a burnt-out landing gear indicator light, and failing to notice the autopilot had inadvertently been disconnected. As a result, while the flight crew was distracted with the indicator problem, the aircraft gradually lost altitude and crashed.]

Under slide 5, “Description,” Mr. Connor 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. Connor 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. Connor 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 9-11, "RDWG Update," Mr. Connor says the RDWG has met three 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; and (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.

Richard Connor (FRA) says Patrick McFall (FRA—Office of Railroad Safety) is serving as the RDWG's meeting facilitator, replacing long time RSAC Facilitator Cynthia (Cindy) Gross (FRA—Office of Railroad Safety) who retired. He says FRA will conduct a search for a permanent RSAC Facilitator.

Under slide 12, "FRA Positions on Recording Devices," Mr. Connor states FRA's position on recording devices as follows: (1) Mandate outward- and inward-facing image recording devices; and (2) Allow operational testing using image recording devices with established random selection requirements for inward-facing recording devices.

Under slides 13-14, "Recording Protection and Handling," Mr. Connor says FRA will develop rule text requiring railroads to adopt and comply with chain-of-custody and release protocols for locomotive recordings. Mr. Connor 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 15-17, “Recording Protection and Handling,” Mr. Connor says FRA’s preliminary position regarding controls on two types of locomotive recordings are as follows: (1) Outward-facing recordings: (a) Least restrictive controls due to lack of privacy interest—merely recording the view of the environment outside of the locomotive cab that the public can also see; and (b) FRA preliminary position (49 *Code of Federal Regulations* (CFR) Part 229.135(e))—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 NTSB; and (2) Inward-facing 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: (i) An accident/incident required to be reported under Part 225—other specific triggering events to be contemplated by the RDWG, e.g., stop signal violations; (ii) Violation of a Federal railroad safety law, regulation or order; (iii) Performance of operational tests in accordance with Part 217, with mandatory “randomness” protocols for such testing; (iv) Investigation of violations of criminal or civil laws; and (v) Original recording to FRA/NTSB if requested—railroad may retain copy; (c) Recordings must be retained for one year from the date of a triggering event and applicable chain-of-custody protocols must be followed; and (d) The use of recordings in Part 240/242 certification actions or as evidence in other administrative proceedings to be considered.

John Risch (International Association of Sheet Metal, Air, Rail and Transportation Workers) asks, “What is meant by Part 240/242 certification action?”

Richard Connor (FRA) says consideration of the inward-facing recording will be given if there is a Part 240/242 decertification event in which case the data must be downloaded and preserved.

Under slide 20, “Technical Requirements,” Mr. Connor says the preliminary questions to be resolved include the following: (1) Which locomotives must be equipped and by what date; (2) What hardware components are required; (3) What software is required; (4) What are the inspection, testing, and maintenance requirements; and (5) Are there any additional requirements, such as tampering prohibitions.

Under slide 21, “Which Locomotives Must Be Equipped,” Mr. Connor outlines the following considerations: (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.

Under slide 22, “Required Components,” Mr. Connor lists the following: (1) Outward-facing image recorders; (2) Inward-facing image recorders; (3) Memory Module; (4) Review and download interface; and (5) Software.

Under slide 23, “Outward-facing Image Recorders,” Mr. Connor lists the following considerations for outward-facing image recorders: (1) Number of image recorders; (2) Resolution (whether High Definition Television, or not) and focal length; (3) Recording frames per second (5, 15, 23, or more); (4) Night time sensitivity—is current headlight illumination adequate; and (5) Capable of distinguishing wayside signal aspects.

Under slides 24-25, “Inward-Facing Image Recorders,” Mr. Connor outlines the following considerations: (1) Cab camera system design: (a) Field of view sufficient to show every person in the cab, allowing facial recognition in at least some of the views; (b) Prohibition on cameras in the sanitation compartment; and (c) Light sensitivity—able to record using daytime ambient light levels in the cab, and switching to infra-red illumination when light levels fall too low; (2) Functional requirements: (a) Record electronic device use in the cab; (b) Records signs of fatigue; and (c) Show departure from the seat and/or cab; and (3) Record at least five frames per second.

Under slides 26-27, “Memory Module,” Mr. Connor outlines the following considerations: (1) Establish recording capacity requirements for both inward- and outward-facing image recording devices—NTSB recommendation: 12-hour capacity; (2) Determine minimum capacity to meet accident investigation and operational testing requirements; (3) Crashworthy standards for recording devices—use of established standards for Event Recorder Memory Module (ERMM), defined in Part 229 Appendix D; and (4) Determine if data used for non-accident events, such as operational testing, needs to be preserved in a crashworthy ERMM.

Under slide 28, “Review and Download Interface,” Mr. Connor lists the following considerations: (1) Inspection, testing and maintenance purposes, limited to 30-second recordings, and made specifically for that purpose; and (2) Wired or wireless downloads, must be secured against unauthorized access by encryption, password use and/or other measures.

Under slide 29, “Software,” Mr. Connor outlines the following considerations: (1) If intermittent recording is required, software must monitor defined parameters to turn system on/off; (2) Security features will need to be embedded in software to prevent unauthorized downloading; and (3) Software should perform basic equipment health monitoring and display a warning.

Under slides 30-31, “Inspection, Testing, and Maintenance,” Mr. Connor lists the following for inspection, testing and maintenance of recording device systems: (1) Recording device system to be inspected or tested: (a) Every 92 days; and (b) Every



184 days; (2) For failure or partial failure of the system, the locomotive with the defective device shall not be used in the lead position: (a) Past next forward point where repairs can be made; and (b) Past next daily inspection; and (3) May move locomotive to trailing position.

Under slides 32-33, "Tampering," Mr. Connor says the following: (1) Tampering provision is similar to that for the locomotive event recorder provision at Part 229.135(g), which includes: (a) Tampering with the hardware; and (b) Tampering with (destroying or altering) recorded data; and (2) Tampering sanctions include civil penalties and disqualification from performing safety-sensitive functions on a railroad: (a) Civil Penalties, as provided for in Part 218, Appendix B; and (b) Disqualification could occur under the procedures specified in Part 209.

Under slide 34, Mr. Connor says the RDWG has scheduled meetings for December 9-10, 2014, January 21-22, 2015, and March 3-4, 2015, with recommendations due to the full RSAC by April 1, 2015.

Richard Connor (FRA) asks for questions.

Chairperson Rennert thanks Richard Connor (FRA) and Patrick McFall (FRA) for their efforts with the RDWG.

Thomas (Tom) Streicher (American Short Line and Regional Railroad Association) says most short line railroads do not run 24 hours a day/7 days a week operations. He says there are approximately 560 Class III railroads and 32 Class II railroads. He asks, "How many accidents have recording devices prevented worldwide and what are the economic savings to the railroad industry from having cameras?"

[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.]

Richard Connor (FRA) says some of the larger Class III railroads act like Class II railroads. He says FRA does not have data from camera use accident prevention because these devices are not now required and there has been no data collection from their use. He says in recent accident investigations, both FRA and the NTSB have found gaps to the tools for accident reconstruction and investigation which can be filled by both inward- and outward-facing recording devices.

Tom Streicher (American Short Line and Regional Railroad Association) asks if there is any economic data available to support a requirement to install this equipment on all locomotives.

Chairperson Rennert says FRA is working on a required economic analysis that will accompany the rulemaking on this topic. She says the required economic analysis will be a topic of discussion at the December 9-10, 2014, meeting of the Recording Devices Working Group.

Jeffrey Moller (Association of American Railroads) cites slide 11 of the Recording Devices Working Group Update presentation, i.e., "Limitations on the Release of Locomotive Recordings." He says so far, the industry caucus has not seen a lot of protection afforded to these recordings outside of recordings under the control of the NTSB.

Paul King (Association of State Rail Safety Managers) says it is not reasonable to comment on data that is not currently collected.

Ed Dowell (American Train Dispatchers Association) asks about State-owned commuter railroads. He asks, "How will a State be able to protect data from Freedom of Information Act requests under State "sunshine laws."

Joseph St. Peter (FRA—Office of Chief Counsel) says State Freedom of Information Act sunshine laws do apply. He says if the NTSB takes control of the data, the NTSB has an exemption from having to release data under the Freedom of Information Act.

Vince Verna (Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers and Trainmen) says protection from the release of recording device data is a critical issue to rail labor. He says FRA has not submitted evidence that inward-facing cameras are beneficial. He says the labor caucus has provided documents showing that inward-facing cameras cause stress to employees.

[Note: Eleven studies from the labor caucus have been posted on the RSAC Internet Web Site for the RDWG as Reference Documents, i.e., RDWG-REF 01 through RDWG-REF 11.]

Vince Verna (Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers and Trainmen) says the size of a railroad or the speed at which a railroad conducts operations does not play a role in whether a train conductor or train engineer can be decertified. He says a train engineer missing a stop signal at 10 mph on a Class III carrier can be decertified. He says to not have crash hardened memory modules for camera recording devices may make it unlikely that the NTSB and FRA will recover data following accidents involving fires such as recent petroleum and alcohol car derailments. He says preliminary information presented to the RDWG suggests that crash-hardened memory may be ten times more expensive than conventional memory and that while the memory may be crash-hardened, the cable that links the camera to the memory may not survive the initial accident. He says labor has concerns about second guessing the minds of locomotive engineers, following a reportable accident/incident. He notes that airline cockpit voice recordings are strictly used for post-accident analysis, but not for operational testing. He says labor has concerns that cameras in locomotives will interfere with Confidential Close Call Reporting System Programs because everything will be on cameras. He says he believes the RDWG has many questions to answer, issues to resolve, and a long way to go before the labor caucus can embrace rules in this area. And, he adds, FRA is demanding an April 2015 deadline for the RDWG to complete its work.

Chairperson Rennert says quality control is something the RDWG will discuss at its December 9-10, 2014, meeting. She says, "Like it or not, our society is being more and more recorded." She says carriers are starting to install cameras in locomotives now and FRA believes there should be some uniformity in how these devices are deployed.

Chairperson Rennert announces the lunch break.

#### LUNCH BREAK 12:00 P.M. - 1:00 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 slide 2, "Recent Published Rulemakings," Mr. Patrick says in response to Section 403 of the Rail Safety Improvement Act of 2008, FRA issued Track Safety Standards; Improving Rail Integrity–Notice of Proposed Rulemaking on January 24, 2014– with a correction to the "Remedial Action Table" published January 29, 2014, and a Final Rule issued March 25, 2014. He says the Final Rule: (1) Established minimum qualification

requirements for operators of rail flaw detection equipment; (2) Revised requirements for effective rail inspection frequencies, rail flaw remedial actions, and rail inspection records; and (3) Removed requirements for reporting of joint bar fractures.

Carlo Patrick (FRA) says RSAC Task No.: 14-02, Rail Integrity, was accepted by the full RSAC on May 26, 2014. Mr. Patrick says 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 Class 6-9 rail inspection frequencies and the possibility of implementing continuous testing."

Under slide 3, "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 4, "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 5, "What is FRA Asking in Its Language," Mr. Patrick says the following: (1) Continuous test is a choice; FRA is not mandating continuous testing of track; (2) FRA is asking railroads to designate continuous test locations; (3) There are three phases to continuous test; FRA is requiring a qualified operator for each phase of continuous test; in contrast, the "start/stop testing of track for internal rail flaw detection is performed by a single qualified operator; (4) FRA is requiring reporting procedures (verification date and results) for continuous test; (5) FRA is requiring carriers to provide written continuous test procedures to the agency; (6) FRA will require a consequence, i.e., reduced speed, for non-compliance on the allotted time for verification of a track defect under continuous test; and (7) Notification of continuous test locations within 10 days.

Carlo Patrick (FRA) asks for questions.

Rick Inclima (Brotherhood of Maintenance of Way Employees Division) asks about the CSX Transportation waiver for continuous testing. He asks, "At what frequency is CSX Transportation operating?"

Carlo Patrick (FRA) says CSX Transportation is operating under a 60-day testing program, six times a year from Jacksonville, Florida to Buffalo, New York.

Rick Inclima (Brotherhood of Maintenance of Way Employees Division) says the Brotherhood of Maintenance of Way Employees Division's position is that delayed verification is not desirable, absent other regulatory changes, and that an increase in inspection frequency is necessary.

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) ETF Background and Tasks; (2) Review Passenger Equipment Regulatory Plan; (3) Notice of Proposed Rulemaking "2" update: (a) Tier III equipment Safety Appliances Committee activities; and (b) Tier III equipment Part 229/Inspection, Testing, and Maintenance (ITM) Task Group activities; and (4) Future Meetings.

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; (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 49 CFR Part 238.111 requirements; and (f) Tier I passenger road locomotive safety appliances.

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

Under slide 6, “Objectives from November 2014 ETF Meetings,” Mr. Rouse lists the following: (1) Review Tier III safety appliance proposal (stage 1) and see concurrence to develop strawman regulatory requirements; (2) Present proposals for application of 49 CFR Part 229 to Tier III and seek ETF concurrence (agreement in principle); (3) Present proposal for Tier III Safe Operation Plan Requirements (proposed Subpart J); and (4) Determine the appropriate path forward for “single car/locomotive” alternative crashworthiness standards.

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 1 (Application),” 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 still applicable; and (3) Determine how best to achieve the intent in a high-speed rail environment. Mr. Rouse says the Safety Appliance Committee recommendations were presented to the ETF and approved in principle on November 13, 2014.

Under slides 9-10, “Tier III 229/ITM Task Group Update,” Mr. Rouse says the Tier III 229/ITM Task Group has held five meetings during 2014. He says the work has been divided into two parts: (1) Determine appropriate application of Part 229 regulations to Tier III equipment; and (2) Develop requirements for Tier III Inspection, Testing and Maintenance (ITM) for Tier III equipment. He says six Subgroups were created to look at Part 229 requirements for (a) Trucks/Suspension systems (assignment completed); (b) Electrical systems (assignment completed); (c) Cab equipment and electronics (assignment completed); (d) Exterior appurtenances (two of four items completed); (e) Industrial hygiene (three of four items completed); and (f) General safety requirements (zero of five items completed).

Under slide 11, “Future Meetings,” Mr. Rouse says the ETF has meetings scheduled for January and February 2015 as follows: (1) December 19, 2014, Tier III Safety Appliance

Teleconference; (2) January 6, 2015, ITM/229 Task Group teleconference; (3) January 21, 2015, ITM/229 Task Group face-to-face meeting; (4) January 22, 2015, Single Car/Locomotive Alternative Crashworthiness Standards face-to-face meeting; and (5) January 2015, Tier III Safety Appliance face-to-face meeting—to be announced. Mr. Rouse says the next full Engineering Task Force meeting is scheduled for February 24-25, 2015, in Washington, DC.

Devin Rouse (FRA) asks for questions.

Jeffrey Moller (Association of American Railroads) asks, "What is ITM?"

Devin Rouse (FRA) replies, "Inspection, Testing, and Maintenance."

Chairperson Rennert asks Christian Holt (FRA—Office of Railroad Safety) to introduce a proposed new RSAC Task No.: 14-03 for Remote Control Locomotive Operations.

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 to review existing Remote Control Locomotive (RCL) operations and previous information regarding such operations, and 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 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. RCL operations were also recently discussed at the emergency RSAC Crew Size Working Group Meeting. 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.

Christian Holt (FRA) asks for questions.

Jeffrey Moller (Association of American Railroads) says the single page "hard copy" of RSAC Task No.: 14-03, which was included in today's handout materials has a different "Description."

Christian Holt (FRA) says the "Description" of RSAC Task No.: 14-03 that was presented during the PowerPoint Presentation is the correct description, i.e., (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.

Jeffrey Moller (Association of American Railroads) says as an observation, RSAC Task No.: 14-03 was originally presented electronically to the full RSAC in September 2014 with no opportunity for a discussion. He says during past Committee meetings there has been an opportunity to discuss a Task before it is presented to the Committee for vote. He says the management caucus is not in favor of open-ended RSAC Task Statements. He says the management caucus has a concern over the current direction of the RSAC process. He asks, "Has the RSAC process changed and if it has changed, does that change need to be discussed by the full RSAC?"

John Tolman (Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers and Trainmen) says RCL has been around quite a while. He says he is surprised that an RSAC entity has not looked at the RCL process on a continuous basis. He says there is Switching Operations Fatality Analysis (SOFA) data on this topic.

John Risch (International Association of Sheet Metal, Air, Rail and Transportation Workers) asks if there are things on RSAC Task Statement No.: 14-03 that need to be debated and modified.

Jeffrey Moller (Association of American Railroads) says he did not think that option was available.

Andrew (Andy) Corcoran (Association of American Railroads) says he has been a very strong proponent of RSAC. He says a Task Statement would generally look at the safety justification for RCL. He says the third bullet under slide 4, "Description," is so broad, it makes the rest of the document meaningless, i.e., Address other issues identified by the working group. He says if the Working Group wants to expand the scope of an RSAC Task, the Working Group comes back before the full RSAC and asks



permission to expand the scope. He says if a Working Group proceeds with the broad mandate offered by the third bullet under slide 4, and tackles an issue that is not on the Table by the RSAC Task Statement, the full RSAC may say that the Working Group was not authorized to work on that issue.

Chairperson Rennert says she sees Andy Corcoran's concern.

Rick Inclima (Brotherhood of Maintenance of Way Employees Division) says he recalls a discussion concerning an RSAC Task Statement, whereby FRA's Robert Lauby responded saying "The Task Statement is what it is." He says we have crossed this boundary already. He says Robert Lauby says the important items in an RSAC Task Statement are the "purpose," and the "issues requiring specific report." He says he believes an RSAC Working Group will decide whether something is germane or not. He says SOFA is not in Task No.: 14-03, but he believes he should be able to bring SOFA data to the Table in an RCL Working Group.

Andy Corcoran (Association of American Railroads) says he understands what Rick Inclima is saying, but does not fully agree with what Rick Inclima is saying.

John Tolman (Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers and Trainmen) says he is not following what Andy Corcoran is saying.

David Weisblatt (Association of American Railroads) suggests a language change to the third bullet, slide 4, "Description," which could narrow the scope of the task as follows: "Address other remote control locomotive operations issues identified by the working group."

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.

John Risch (International Association of Sheet Metal, Air, Rail and Transportation Workers) motions to accept RSAC Task No.: 14-03, Remote Control Locomotive Operations, as modified.

Andy Corcoran (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 afternoon break.

A F T E R N O N   B R E A K   2:00 P.M. - 2:15 P.M.

Chairperson Rennert reconvenes the meeting. She asks Brenda Moscoso (FRA—Office of Safety) for an update on FRA Regulatory Activity. She says Brenda Moscoso is the Office of Railroad Safety's Director, Office of Safety Analysis.

Brenda Moscoso (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, "Critical Incident Stress Plan," Ms. Moscoso describes the recently published rulemaking for Critical Incident Stress Plan as follows: (1) Final Rule issued March 25, 2014; (2) Defined "critical incident;" (3) Requires certain railroads to develop and implement critical incident stress plans: (a) Providing appropriate support services; and (b) Limited relief from an employee's normal tour of duty to railroad employees who are involved in or witness a "critical incident;" (4) Required under Section 410 of the Rail Safety Improvement Act (RSIA) of 2008; and (5) Rules were developed with RSAC assistance.

Under slide 3, "Passenger Train Exterior Side Door Safety," Ms. Moscoso describes the recently published rulemaking for Passenger Train Exterior Side Door Safety as follows: (1) Notice of Proposed Rulemaking (NPRM) issued March 26, 2014; (2) Designed to reduce the number and severity of injuries involving passenger train exterior side doors; (3) Improves the integrity of passenger train exterior side door safety systems; (4) New standards for door safety systems on passenger trains; (5) Covers both powered and manual exterior side doors; and (6) Rules were developed with RSAC assistance.

Under slide 4, "Revisions to Passenger Train Emergency Preparedness Regulations," Ms. Moscoso describes the recently published rulemaking for Revisions to Passenger Train Emergency Preparedness Regulations as follows: (1) Final Rule issued March 31, 2014; (2) Clarifies that requirements for initial and periodic training, operational efficiency tests apply not only to on-board crewmembers and control center personnel, but also to the railroad's emergency response communications center personnel, who communicate or coordinate with first responders; (3) Clarifies that railroads must develop procedures that specifically address the safety of passengers with disabilities

during actual and simulated emergency situations; and (4) Streamlines approval for certain purely administrative changes to approved emergency preparedness plans.

Under slide 5, “Signal Systems Reporting Requirements,” Ms. Moscoso describes the recently published rulemaking for Signal Systems Reporting Requirements as follows: (1) Final Rule issued July 2, 2014; (2) Eliminates requirement for signal system status report every five years; (3) The signal system status report is no longer necessary because FRA receives more updated information regarding railroad signal systems through alternative sources; and (4) This is a paperwork reduction initiative.

Under slide 6, “Control of Alcohol and Drug Use: Coverage of Maintenance of Way Employees,” Ms. Moscoso describes the recently published rulemaking for Control of Alcohol and Drug Use: Coverage of Maintenance of Way Employees as follows: (1) NPRM issued July 28, 2014; (2) Expanded the scope of FRA’s alcohol and drug regulations to cover employees who perform railroad maintenance-of-way activities; (3) Required under Section 412 of the RSIA of 2008; and (5) Updates and clarifies existing regulations based on a retrospective analysis.

Under slide 7, “Positive Train Control Systems,” Ms. Moscoso describes the recently published rulemaking for Positive Train Control (PTC) Systems as follows: (1) Final Rule issued August 22, 2014; (2) Broadens an existing regulatory exception to the requirement to install a PTC system for track segments carrying freight only that present a de minimis safety risk; (3) Adds new exception for PTC-unequipped freight trains associated with certain freight yard operations to operate within PTC systems; (4) Contains provisions for failures of a PTC system; and (5) Addresses applications for approval of certain modifications of signal and train control systems.

Under slide 8, “Securement of Unattended Equipment,” Ms. Moscoso describes the recently published rulemaking for Securement of Unattended Equipment as follows: (1) NPRM issued September 9, 2014; (2) Codify most of the requirements of Emergency Order No. 28 (EO 28), issued in August 2013; (3) Applies the verification and securement requirements of EO 28 to trains left unattended in yards as well as outside yards; and (4) Each locomotive left unattended outside of a rail yard must be equipped with an operative exterior locking mechanism and such locks must be applied on the controlling locomotive cab door if the locomotive is part of a train transporting certain quantities of certain hazardous materials.

Under slide 9, “Safety Glazing Standards,” Ms. Moscoso describes the recently published rulemaking for Safety Glazing Standards as follows: (1) NPRM published September 26, 2014; (2) Revise and clarify the existing regulations related to the use of glazing materials in the windows of locomotives, passenger cars, and cabooses; (3) Removes stenciling requirements for locomotives, passenger cars, and cabooses required to be equipped with compliant glazing; (4) Clarifies the application of the

regulations to antiquated equipment; and (5) Type II glazing is not required at certain end-facing locations of passenger cars.

Under slide 10, “Training Standards for Safety-Related Railroad Employees,” Ms. Moscoso describes the recently published rulemaking for Training Standards for Safety-Related Railroad Employees as follows: (1) Final Rule issued November 2014; (2) Establishes minimum training standards for each class or craft of safety-related employee and equivalent railroad contractor and subcontractor employee, as mandated by the RSIA of 2008; (3) Guidance to be issued in early 2015; and (4) Electronic submission tool development is underway.

Under slide 11, “OMB [Office of Management and Budget] Designation,” Ms. Moscoso answers the question, “What does it mean when a regulatory action is determined to be “significant?” Ms. Moscoso 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 12, “Risk Reduction Program,” Ms. Moscoso describes the upcoming significant FRA Rulemaking for the Risk Reduction Program as follows: (1) NPRM; (2) Requirements for risk reduction programs for Class I freight railroads and other freight railroads with inadequate safety performance; and (3) Each railroad systematically evaluates railroad safety risks on its system and manages those risks in order to reduce the number and rates of railroad accidents, incidents, injuries, and fatalities.

Under slide 13, “Railroad System Safety Program,” Ms. Moscoso describes the upcoming significant FRA Rulemaking for the Railroad System Safety Program as follows: (1) NPRM; (2) Commuter and intercity passenger railroads; and (3) 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.

Under slide 14, “Train Crew Staffing,” Ms. Moscoso describes the upcoming significant FRA Rulemaking for Train Crew Staffing as follows: (1) NPRM; (2) Establish minimum requirements for the size of train crew staffs; (3) Address operations that pose significant safety risks to railroad employees, the general public, and the environment;

and (4) Establish minimum requirements for the roles and responsibilities of the second train crew member on a moving train, and promote safe and effective teamwork.

Under slide 15, “Passenger Equipment Safety Standards; Standards for Alternative Compliance and High-Speed Trainsets,” Ms. Moscoso describes the upcoming significant FRA Rulemaking for Passenger Equipment Safety Standards; Standards for Alternative Compliance and High-Speed Trainsets as follows: (1) NPRM; (2) Amend 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) Establish alternative crashworthiness performance requirements for Tier I passenger trainsets (operating at speeds not exceeding 125 mph); and (4) Increase the maximum speed for Tier II operations from 150 mph to 160 mph.

Under slide 16, “Emergency Escape Breathing Apparatus,” Ms. Moscoso describes the upcoming significant FRA Rulemaking for Emergency Escape Breathing Apparatus as follows: (1) Final Rule; (2) Suitable to provide head and neck coverage with respiratory protection for all crewmembers in locomotive cabs on freight trains carrying hazardous materials that would pose an inhalation hazard; (3) Provide convenient storage in each freight train locomotive; (4) Maintain such equipment in proper working condition; and (5) Provide crew member training.

Under slide 17, “Railroad Workplace Safety; Roadway Worker Protection Miscellaneous Revisions, Ms. Moscoso describes the upcoming non-significant FRA Rulemaking for Railroad Workplace Safety; Roadway Worker Protection Miscellaneous Revisions as follows: (1) Final Rule; (2) Incorporate dozens of miscellaneous revisions and additions to resolve interpretative issues that have arisen since the 1996 promulgation of the original regulation.

Under slide 18, “National Highway-Rail Crossing Inventory Reporting Requirements,” Ms. Moscoso describes the upcoming non-significant FRA Rulemaking for National Highway-Rail Crossing Inventory Reporting Requirements as follows: (1) Final Rule; (2) Require railroads to submit information to the U.S. DOT National Highway-Rail Crossing Inventory about highway-rail crossings and pathway crossings over which they operate; (3) Information about previously unreported and new public and private highway-rail crossings and pathway crossings; and (4) Periodic update of the inventory.

Under slide 19, “Qualification and Certification of Locomotive Engineers; Miscellaneous Revisions,” Ms. Moscoso describes the upcoming non-significant FRA Rulemaking for Qualification and Certification of Locomotive Engineers; Miscellaneous Revisions as follows: (1) NPRM; (2) Revise regulation governing the qualification and certification of locomotive engineers to conform to the regulation governing the certification of conductors.

Brenda Moscoso (FRA) asks for questions.

Rick Inclima (Brotherhood of Maintenance of Way Employees Division) asks, "When will the Risk Reduction Program NPRM be issued?" He asks, "When will the Railroad System Safety Program Final Rule be issued?"

Brenda Moscoso (FRA) says the Risk Reduction Program NPRM is in clearance for publication. She says the Railroad System Safety Program Rule is undergoing review for Final Rule publication.

Rick Inclima (Brotherhood of Maintenance of Way Employees Division) says he has seen no mention about the Section 103(g) provision of the RSIA of 2008, which affords labor involvement with carrier Risk Reduction Program Plans and carrier Railroad System Safety Program Plans. He says he hopes the 103(g) provision has not been lost when these final rules are issued.

Brenda Moscoso (FRA) says the 103(g) provision has not been lost and will be present for Technology Plans and Fatigue Management Plans.

Chairperson Rennert says she spoke briefly with John Risch about that status of FRA's regulatory activity. She asks if Brenda Moscoso's presentation on FRA Regulatory Activity answers his concerns.

John Risch (International Association of Sheet Metal, Air, Rail and Transportation Workers) replies, "Yes."

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 51<sup>st</sup> meeting of the Railroad Safety Advisory Committee, held on March 6, 2014.

With no corrections offered, Chairperson Rennert asks for a motion to accept the Minutes for the 51<sup>st</sup> meeting of Railroad Safety Advisory Committee, held on March 6, 2014, as presented.

Thomas Murta (Association of American Railroads) motions to accept the Minutes for the 51<sup>st</sup> meeting of the Railroad Safety Advisory Committee, held on March 6, 2014, as presented.

Gary Vaughn (American Short Line and Regional Railroad Association) seconds the motion.

BY VOICE VOTE, THE FULL RSAC ACCEPTS THE MINUTES FOR THE 51<sup>ST</sup> MEETING OF THE RAILROAD SAFETY ADVISORY COMMITTEE, HELD ON MARCH 6, 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.

Jeffrey Moller (Association of American Railroads) says in the past there has been a lot of discussion leading-up to the adoption of an RSAC Task. He says today, that process happened. He says he hopes that FRA will reach out to RSAC members in advance of asking the Committee to accept new Tasks.

Kathy Waters (American Public Transportation Association) says not every voting representative in RSAC is a participant in every Working Group.

Chairperson Rennert asks if there is anything that FRA needs to be on guard about.

Kathy Waters (American Public Transportation Association) says an RSAC Task Statement should not be so broad that interest groups that might not participate in a Working Group feel they must participate in a Working Group because the task and resulting rules may affect that interest group.

Bob Opal (Association of Tourist Railroads and Railway Museums) says this issue has affected the Tourist and Historic Railroad Working Group (THRWG) as well. He says sometimes the THRWG gets drawn into a Working Group because the resulting rules will adversely affect Tourist and Historic Railroads.

Paul King (Association of State Rail Safety Managers) says there are 50 States and only two States are represented at today's RSAC meeting. He says he is concerned about the preemption of Federal Rules over State Rules. He says he does not believe that States' interests are being represented on the full RSAC. He says part of this problem is the availability of travel funds to attend these meetings. He asks if the next time the RSAC Charter is renewed, if "travel funds" might be included in the Charter process to keep State interests in play.

Tom Streicher (American Short Line and Regional Railroad Association) says he does not understand why all RSAC meetings continue to convene in Washington, DC, where travel in the winter months is problematic, particularly if there is a government shut-down after RSAC members have traveled to attend meetings. He says he believes it is an "optics" problem, i.e., traveling to Florida, or Arizona, in the winter months, versus a budget problem.

Chairperson Rennert says she has heard from many members about how RSAC used to conduct its meetings. However, she adds, she does not even have a budget for FRA after December 11, 2014. She says she is open to exploring other venues for RSAC meetings on a case-by-case basis. She says the Rail Integrity Working Group will be meeting in Atlanta, Georgia, on January 27-29, 2015, due in part to a railroad offering a meeting space and FRA only needing a small staff to attend this meeting. She says the current RSAC Charter has just been renewed for a 2-year period through 2016.

John Salvey (American Train Dispatchers Association) says the American Train Dispatcher Association would like RSAC to put Train Dispatcher Certification on its agenda for 2015. He says he believes it will be beneficial to have this discussion.

Chairperson Rennert asks for other topics for the RSAC agenda for 2015.

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

Thomas Murta (Association of American Railroads) motions to adjourn the meeting.

John Salvey (American Train Dispatchers Association) seconds the motion.

Chairperson Rennert adjourns the meeting at 3:00 pm.

M E E T I N G   A D J O U R N E D   3:00 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.