NATIONAL TRANSPORTATION SAFETY BOARD

IN RE:

THE ACCIDENT INVOLVING : NTSB Accident No. AMTRAK TRAIN #89 AND MOW : DCA16FR007

EQUIPMENT AND EMPLOYEES NEAR CHESTER, PENNSYLVANIA: ON APRIL 3, 2016

INTERVIEW OF: JED DODD, DAVE INGERSOLL, AND ROCCO CARBINONA

> 25th day of August, 2016

30th Street Station 2955 Market Street Philadelphia, Pennsylvania

BEFORE

RICHARD HIPSKIND, NTSB DONALD HILL, BLET THERESA IMPASTATO, AMTRAK STEVE STEARN, BMWE BOB BEATON, NTSB FRAN WALKER, FRA RYAN FRIGO, NTSB CHRISTOPHER SCHULTE, FRA HUGH CAMPBELL, BRS

This transcript was produced from audio provided by the National Transportation Safety Board.

P-R-O-C-E-E-D-I-N-G-S

MR. HIPSKIND: Good afternoon everybody. My name is Richard Hipskind and I'm the Track Engineer and Group Chairman for NTSB for this accident.

We are here today on August 25, 2016 at
Amtrak's 30th Street Station in Philadelphia,
Pennsylvania to conduct an interview with Mr. Jed Dodd,
who works for the Brotherhood of Maintenance of Way
Employees Division, and Mr. Dave Ingersoll, who works
for the Brotherhood of Railroad Signalmen, and Mr.
Rocco Carbinona who represents ARSA, the American
Railway Supervisor's Association.

This interview is in conjunction with NTSB's investigation of a collision of an Amtrak Train 89 with Maintenance Way equipment and employees on April 3, 2016 at Mile Post 15.7 on Amtrak's PW Line near Chester, Pennsylvania in Delaware County. The NTSB Accident Reference Number is DCA16FR007.

Before we begin our interview and questions, let's go around the table and introduce ourselves.

Please spell your last name, and please identify who you are representing and your title.

I would remind everybody to speak loudly and clearly enough so we get an accurate recording. I'll lead off and then pass off to my right.

	Again, my name is kichard Hipskind. The
2	spelling of my last name is H-I-P-S-K-I-N-D. I am the
3	Track and Engineering Group Chairman for NTSB for this
4	accident.
5	MR. BEATON: I'm Bob Beaton, B-E-A-T-O-N,
6	with NTSB.
7	MR. HILL: Donald Hill, H-I-L-L, Safety Task
8	Force, BLET.
9	MS. WALKER: Fran Walker, W-A-L-K-E-R, and
10	I'm an FRA Track Safety Inspector.
11	MR. SCHULTE: Christopher Schulte, S-C-H-U-
12	L-T-E, FRA Supervisor, Safety Specialist.
13	MR. CAMPBELL: Hugh Campbell, BRS. Vice-
14	General Chairman. C-A-M-P-B-E-L-L, Observation
15	(inaudible).
16	MR. STEARN: Steve Stearn, S-T-E-A-R-N.
17	Party Spokesman for the Brotherhood of Way Employees.
18	MS. IMPASTATO: Theresa Impastato, I-M-P-A-
19	S-T-A-T-O, Amtrak, Deputy Chief Safety Officer.
20	MR. FRIGO: Ryan Frigo, F-R-I-G-O.
21	Investigator in Charge, NTSB.
22	MR. HIPSKIND: All right, Gentlemen, if you
23	want to go ahead and introduce yourselves to put
24	yourself on the record.
25	ROCCO CARBINONA: ROCCO CARBINONA. C-U-R-B-
ı	I

1	I-N-O-N-A. Standing for ARSA Organization.
2	DAVID INGERSOLL: David Ingersoll, I-N-G-E-
3	R-S-O-L-L. General Chairman, Brotherhood of Railroad
4	Signalmen.
5	JED DODD: I'm Jed Dodd, D-O-D-D. I'm the
6	General Chairman of the Brotherhood of Maintenance of
7	Way Employees.
8	MR. HIPSKIND: All right, thank you
9	gentlemen.
10	It would be helpful, but I'm going to ask your
11	permission. Do you mind if we proceed on a first-name
12	basis?
13	CONSENSUS RESPONSE: No.
14	MR. HIPSKIND: Okay, thank you very much.
15	And when I'm asking some of these questions, I'm asking
16	it to all three of you.
17	Gentlemen, do we have your permission to
18	record our discussion, our interview with you today?
19	CONSENSUS RESPONSE: Yes.
20	MR. HIPSKIND: So, all three have answered
21	in the affirmative.
22	And do any of you wish to have a
23	representative with you at this interview?
24	DAVE AND ROCCO: No, and I do not.
25	JED DODD: Jed Dodd. No.

MR. HIPSKIND: Thank you, Jed, for remembering to identify yourself. I know it's going to be a little bit of a curve here, but for the transcriptionist, let's try to remember that.

So, I'll ask all three of you this general question, and if you want to let the transcriptionist know who's talking, just give me a synopsis of your background, and taking up to your current position, and what you're doing today. Okay?

And we'll start off with you, Jed.

JED DODD: (inaudible) Jed Dodd. (inaudible) office. Hired at the Amtrak City of Newark Division(inaudible) in 1977. Worked as a molder helper, track and machine operator, spent most of my time in the (inaudible) gangs and in the unit of the earlier rehabilitation projects.

I was active in the local union as President and local chairman, eventually I worked as the general chairman, and was elected general chairman on September 1, 1983. I've been the general chairman of the union since 1983, surviving seven successful elections.

In 1996 -- 1994, we also represented Conover workers, and following the death and mutilation of three employees in the Harrisburg area that winter, we entered into a wild-cat strike and shut down 17 states

and 1,000 trains, and forced the FRA to adopt the first negotiated rule making, federal worker protection. I represented the Brotherhood on the NWP Committee that negotiated the RWP rules.

Subsequent to that, we began to approach

Amtrak, and we negotiated the first safety agreements

for the railroad industry in 1996 and 1997. And were

able to, over a period of eight or 10 years,

significantly reduce lost time injuries by 10% of what

they were 10 years before and significantly reduce

reportable (inaudible) injuries over that period of

time.

At that time, I served as the Chairman of the Safety Advisory Committee, with the Amtrak counterpart, (inaudible) and put that stuff together.

Later on, we did the Amtrak -- began -- you want to go into the broader stuff on safety?

MR. HIPSKIND: If you have given me a synopsis of bringing us up to date to your current position, we'll ask each of the other gentlemen to do the same, and then Jed, we'll get into the discussion about why we're here today.

JED DODD: I'd like to talk about our changing rules on the Safety Advisory Committee, the changing functions over that 20-year-period of time.

1 MR. HIPSKIND: And we will get to that, and 2 you will have more than ample opportunity to -That's fine. 3 JED DODD: 4 DAVID INGERSOLL: Yes, my name is David 5 Ingersoll. General Chairman, BRS. Hired with Amtrak 6 on August 21, 1989, elected to BRS General Chairman, January 1, 2006. I've been the General Chairman of BRS 7 8 since 2006. 9 MR. HIPSKIND: Okay, thanks. Do you prefer 10 Dave or David? 11 DAVID INGERSOLL: Dave's fine. 12 Okay. A lot of my friends MR. HIPSKIND: 13 prefer David. 14 ROCCO CARBINONA: ROCCO CARBINONA, hired at 15 Amtrak in 1983, as a signal helper. Qualified as a 16 signal maintainer in 1984, and progressed to the position of foreman in 1985, and 1991 I went into the 17 Amtrak Management. I was a field coordinator on a 18 19 joint venture, PSCC Project in New York, also an assistant engineer on the division side for testing and 20 21 maintenance. 22 I left management in 1997, came back out 23 into the field as an inspector foreman, stayed there 24 until and in the position of inspector foreman, until 25 2008, and then took the position of supervisor, CNS.

1 A year later, I took the position of local 2 chairman, in the ARSA Organization. As local chairman for the local New York region. 3 And as a BRS, I also 4 held the position of local chairman for approximately 5 20 years, (inaudible). MR. HIPSKIND: Okay, thank you Rocco and 6 7 Thank all of you. Dave, and Jed. 8 I did want to explain, take a couple of 9 seconds here. The reason we have you go through that 10 synopsis is, that we want to make sure that you have a 11 background. I know each of you do, but we just kind of 12 like to have that detail to put on the record. 13 You've worked in the railroad industry. 14 know about it, and you know about railroad safety and 15 railroad safety issues. 16 So, with that, I know it's going to be a 17 little bit cumbersome, but as we go around the table and people ask you questions, you just kind of figure 18 19 out amongst you three, announce who is speaking, and 20 you'll have your time to talk about what we want to 21 talk about. 22 So, with that, I'm going to pass over the 23 interview to our Investigator in Charge, Ryan Frigo. 24 Ryan?

Thanks, Dick.

MR. FRIGO:

Gentlemen, thank you all for being here I'm looking forward to, you know, hearing your thoughts on the Safety Advisory Committee. Jed, you started going into that in your introduction, and maybe we could just begin with that. If you want to take us through the formation of the Safety Advisory Committee. I believe you mentioned that in your -- that you were part of that process, when it was developed, and if you could walk us through where it is today. JED DODD: Okay, the -- it's 20 years of history. (inaudible) Geez, forget his name. Anyway, a foreman was killed outside (inaudible) The issue at the time for us was that we had members of the union that tried to enforce the safety rules and the RWP rules, but were unable to, because of the fear of discipline and insubordination (inaudible) service was the mantra of the entire management at that time.

When (inaudible) was, lived alone, had no dependents and as far as Amtrak was concerned, there was no liability associated with this fatality. There was nobody to pay, and so, he was actually the perfect

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

person, in which we couldn't approach Amtrak because there wasn't liability as an issue, and attempted to change the relationship.

I was sitting in John Cunningham's office, who was the Chief Engineer at the time, and a lot of us got (inaudible) and he was like on (inaudible) track, he shouldn't have been there, and (inaudible) were tied up, and the problem is he had been killed working the same route worked every night since time began, and basically wasn't in a position to enforce the rules.

And so, our issue was, how do you enforce the rules under those circumstances, and our issue was that should (inaudible) a no-fault right to refuse in order to enforce the rules until somebody, or other people can come and look at the situation.

Cunningham was looking at me, and he was of the opinion that there should be a (inaudible) services, as service procedures, and he says, well, what are you going to do?

I said, I don't know what you're going to do John, but if we don't begin to get to the process of no-fault right to refuse before the morning sun comes up, I'm going to start walking the guys out of New York division and right down to Washington, DC, and stop all the trains on this railroad.

And I don't really give a shit if I have your permission or the National Union or not.

And he goes, and he's smoking cigarettes, and drinking whiskey, because at the time that was the culture of the railroad. And he goes, okay, (inaudible) begins the right to refuse.

And he put his hard hat on in the joint committee, and we put our hard hats on in the joint committee, and basically they drafted a policy that John and I eventually endorsed, along with the signalmen and the ARSA, and created a policy where any employee could insist that the safety RWP rules should be followed, and if they were wrong, nothing would happen to them until a senior manager or a senior labor official came together to investigate the situation.

And that agreement employed the groundwork for our mutual cooperation that begin to morph into a broader agreement around safety in general.

And we begin to sit down and negotiate with safety in general to come up with Amtrak Safety's and negotiate I think it was 1996 or 1997, where basically we would establish a joint safety committee -- or actually labor safety committees on the property in each division (inaudible) territory, and join and investigate all accidents, give recommendations,

(inaudible) why they shouldn't happen again, and employing full time union members as so-called safety liaisons, that would then go out and enforce the rules, organize the safety committees, and create better job security. (inaudible)

And, we noted the number of safety liaisons and what not in the agreement.

That agreement actually proved to be wildly successful. The lost time was significantly reduced over a six, eight or 10 year period of time to 10% of what it was and FRA reported injuries were reduced then to the point, where if (inaudible) were classified as a Class I Railroad, well, we were the best in early new railroad in terms of our safety record after 8 or 10 years (inaudible) and were beginning to broaden (inaudible) Class I Railroads in terms of our FRA effort and engineering (inaudible).

And so, what happened is (inaudible)
Woolbrandt took over. Woolbrandt didn't like certain
aspects of the safety agreement. He was an old-school
guy, (inaudible) in fact this guy was stuck(inaudible)
in 1994, and so there was like animosity between myself
and the union over some of these issues, but Woolbrandt
eventually insisted that the agreement be renegotiated,
and basically what he ended up with was joint labor

management chairman of the safety committees.

At that time, it was only labor chairman of the safety committees, and there was no managers (inaudible) on the safety committee. And some of the reforms he insisted on were -- made the agreements stronger, because at the time, it was difficult to get some management to cooperate because management wasn't participating in the safety committee process.

And so we renegotiated that and continued to have pretty good records with safety.

Towards the end of 2008 and Joel Gordon became the President. By the time 2010 and 2011 comes along, he begins to institute the Safe-2-Safer Program. As if there's not even a recognition that we have this safety committee, the safety agreement on Amtrak, that reduces the numbers and reducing lost time, and enforcing good conditions out on the property.

His Safe-2-Safer Program and they devote all their energy into the Safe-2-Safer -- in other words, our safety agreement requires cooperation, and if management's not going to cooperate on basically what's wrong, it's not possible to make that agreement work.

And management (inaudible) approved beforehand safety agreement, and put all their energy into the Safe-2-Safer operations, which we entered

into and negotiated, because we were of the opinion, that we were better if we came to an agreement around Safe-2-Safer rather than to just allow it to serve like, languish out there on the property.

I'm now of the opinion that we made the wrong decision then, because Safe-2-Safer turned out to be like a disaster. And the signal action (inaudible) never entered into the Safe-2-Safer, and I think they probably made the right decision at the time.

But at the time, I thought they were better off making the agreement over that issue and what we saw, the minute the Safe-2-Safer was instituted, was this tremendous spike in injuries and FRA reporting in lost time and FRA reported injuries.

And they spent \$70 to \$80 Million on this program. And they (inaudible) program where they actually didn't count lost time reported injuries or FRA reported injuries. In fact, the program sold to Amtrak said counting injuries is incorrect.

I mean, I'm old school. I mean -- I think like if you're going to have a safety program, there's gotta be some way of measuring the effectiveness of that program. And the effectiveness of the program is there's fewer injuries and fewer severe injuries.

And we started to have a real spike in that

stuff, around 20 -- I don't remember the exact dates, but around 2013 or so, Bruce Pohlot was the Chief Engineer at the time, and we began to realize that, like the property was out of control, and that we had to do something about it.

Bruce Pohlot (inaudible) Safe-2-Safer was ridiculous. And so we decided to revitalize the Safety Advisory Committee (inaudible) and the safety agreement stuff.

And we interviewed every liaison and every Safe-2-Safer coordinator with a series of questions, and we sat there for two or three days, interviewing each one of them, to find out what they thought could be done to make the Amtrak properties safer.

And we came up with an action list of about 10 hours in order to move the Amtrak property in a better direction, and then Amtrak fired Bruce, you know, because for whatever reason, and all that stuff just died on the vine.

But we were doing things, for instance, some of the things the old Safety Advisory Committee used to do was these NORAC classes and these accident and prevention classes. And we'd bring all the foremen and the operators and the supervisors into a room, divide them up into tables with five or six guys each, and

give them all the information related to (inaudible) violation or accident, and the statements and everything, and ask them to stand up on a clipboard and ask them a series of questions about the accident.

And what we found was, like for the first time supervisors, managers, foremen, and equipment operators, were talking to each other across the table about accidents.

And with respect to NORAC, we had a spike in NORAC violations in what particular area, we'd do the NORAC safety congress, and we'd have like no NORAC violations for like three or four months after that.

In other words, the attention and the thinking and the give and take across the table was helpful there.

And so, what happened is in 2014, after

Pohlot was dismissed, they appointed this guy

Haverstick to be Chief Engineer of the Railroad, who

has like no engineering degree, and he has now being

the senior vice president, or whatever, under Boardman,

and Haverstick cancels the close call policy, that had

been in effect, and functioned very well for us during

that period of time.

And they cancelled the safety agreements.

They cancelled both the safety agreement and the Safe-

2-Safer (inaudible). And began to, like just -- and like for two years, we're renegotiating the safety agreement and trying to renegotiate our thinking, and the properties are in complete disarray.

I mean, accidents are going up. FRA statistics are going up.

We finally renegotiated the safety agreement and we include some aspects of the behavior based (inaudible) Safe-2-Safer program, in the agreement, because it was important to management, and wasn't particularly important to the union.

And what we saw, was like last year, the agreement went back in to effect, and the liaison program and the safety committee program, we started to see a reduction in injuries, and reduction in FRA reportable injuries. The structure of the agreement is responsible, in my opinion, for that.

The relationship for management and labor on the Safety Advisory Committee, in my opinion, is basically non-existent right now. It's very difficult to function, because we have the close call policy that's been cancelled, and they've instituted this cardinal rule policy, where that any minor violation or any of the earlier warning protection rules or NORAC rules, are resulting in - (inaudible)

And so, what you have is a property that's afraid to report something out on the property, in terms of like a close call, that was something that you used to be able to investigate together and fix. And the other, the rank and file that's afraid they're going to be fired for reporting any infraction, and so the Safety Advisory Committee is trying to function within that framework.

And then we have the framework of the training department that is in complete disarray, you can't separate Safety Advisory Committee and Training from itself. I mean that's bull. Training is definitely an aspect of safety. And so, the training department had been marginalized over the last several years, to the point where it was really no longer training anybody.

And then you have this situation where half the work force changed hands, and you have half the work force undertake their service, and you have a bunch of foreman out there, that had like four and five years service, and so we you get this recipe for disaster, and you have four people killed in like, a two-year period of time at all the properties.

And those situations -- those conditions exist today with the cardinal rules, the lack of the

1 close call policy, the lack of effective training, 2 inexperienced people on the new job sites; and we're just waiting for another disaster to happen. 3 4 I would like to have the safety agreements 5 back in place, the liaison programs and safety 6 committees are up and functioning again. 7 But we're just waiting until somebody else to helpful. 8 be killed on these properties because of these 9 policies. 10 (inaudible) 11 MR. FRIGO: Dave, can you tell me a little 12 bit more about how the structure -- can you walk me 13 through a typical Safety Advisory Committee meeting? 14 Is there an agenda that's drawn up? Do you 15 16 DAVID INGERSOLL: (inaudible) there's talk 17 or minutes that are established. We go by whatever anybody brings up, 18 19 you know, at the table. 20 MR. FRIGO: Is there a chair of the 21 committee? 22 DAVID INGERSOLL: We joint chair on labor, 23 Jed and I, and Sonny. And then we -- the chair I quess, would be Matt and Andy Keefe. 24 25 Go ahead.

MR. FRIGO: I'm just trying to understand a little bit more about the structure. Who -- so, you mentioned that you would work off of minutes, that would be the previous -- so almost as if you're working off of open-action items? DAVID INGERSOLL: Okay, let's just. 2006 to 2000 -- geez. It wasn't until -- we never met -- we didn't meet for years. I can honestly say we didn't meet for five years. BRS didn't join the committee JED DODD: until much later. Part of the engineering --So what about today though? What MR. FRIGO: about the last meeting that was held of the Safety Advisory Committee? Who generated the -- when was the last meeting held? JED DODD: It was supposed to be monthly. DAVID INGERSOLL: We supposed to meet every month, every month -Multiple speakers (inaudible) DAVID INGERSOLL: Yes. It really just started meeting again. When Bruce Pohlot brought us in, and said, look, we gotta do something. You know, we actually --To me, truthfully. I didn't get involved, I didn't sign on to Safe-2-Safer, because I went to Joe

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

Gorman, and said, Joe, look, we got guys here that are
five years in the signal draft. There's no training.
The signal training stinks. And I'm not buying into
the Safe-2-Safer Program until you actually address the
shortage of maintainers, you know.
And he says, Dave, I'll be there February in
2011. Joe Gorman's retiring and he's never been to the
signal school.
So I'd never bought into the Safe-2-Safer,
didn't go into safety meetings. Because to me, it was
a farce.
MR. FRIGO: So monthly meetings, though?
DAVID INGERSOLL: You're supposed to meet on
a monthly basis. The summer time, vacations, everybody
says, hey are you available?
I think we're scheduled for Monday morning,
right? This Monday on the calender?
MR. FRIGO: Was there a meeting in July that
was held?
DAVID INGERSOLL: I wasn't there in July.
MR. FRIGO: So Jed, were you at the July
meeting?
JED DODD: Yeah, there's an agenda, where we
go over safety statistics, that's why I know production
dropping, they're improving

1 MR. FRIGO: And that agenda, that gets 2 generated by Matt and --DAVID INGERSOLL: By the committee. By Matt, 3 4 Andy, Jed and I, and Sonny, we all --5 Okay. All right. So safety MR. FRIGO: 6 statistics are discussed. What are some of the other 7 items that are -- that always appear on the agenda? 8 DAVID INGERSOLL: That I always bring up? 9 Training. MR. FRIGO: 10 Training, okay. 11 DAVID INGERSOLL: And the dialogue is, as 12 Jed was saying, is the training department is the human 13 capital department, and the safety department is the 14 safety department, and the human capital sets the 15 agenda and the training curriculum. 16 JED DODD: At the last meeting, they brought 17 --they're in the process of transferring training from 18 human capital to the engineering department, which we 19 think is a good thing. And we're also in the process of making 20 21 everybody in the current training department reapply 22 for their positions. And they had a bunch of job 23 descriptions, and qualifications for the changes in 24 positions, and they asked us to comment on them. And

they made it clear that we're allowed to comment, but

that doesn't mean we're going to have, like any say, and over who the new trainers are going to be, or even qualifications for the positions.

MR. FRIGO: But you're given the opportunity to comment? Okay.

Multiple speakers: (inaudible)

JED DODD: We've been having a hard time with the technology, trying to get the investigation of accidents up and off the ground. And we're supposed to get copies of these 405 (inaudible) on a regular basis, so that we can read them, and make recommendations at the next meeting, til we can see if we (inaudible)

Amtrak does for accidents (inaudible)

And we've been having a really hard time getting at that (inaudible) and we also have been discussing -- we have these safety alerts that we used to do on a regular basis, that actually informed employees about other accidents on the property or other close calls, or in violations. And they were effective in the past when they had information in them. The legal department has taken over the formation of the safety orders (inaudible) and they've become the (inaudible) in terms of the information they're able to give to the employees. And so there's very little to discuss.

We've been discussing trying to make -change that -- to make those safety alerts more
informative so they can be discussed in the morning
meetings and at the job briefings on a daily basis.

And at the Safety Committee Meetings. And we're making
a little bit of progress on that, but nowhere near what
it should be, or (inaudible) response in terms of what
we're able to present to the employees to discuss.

And we have a concern that some of our safety committees are not a trained meeting (inaudible), and we wanted to do -- at the last safety committee meeting, at the last Safety Advisory Committee meeting, we discussed how we can like, bring the liaisons in, and ask them a series of questions about the progress they're making in organizing safety committees on the job sites.

And so we then can find out, if there are safety committees, that they're functioning, if they're not, going on and what kind of help we can provide to try to change that approach.

So, but nothing really substantive. I mean, I can't emphasize enough that with no close call policy and a cardinal rule policy, it's very difficult to cooperate with management under those circumstances, to correct the problems out on the job.

MR. FRIGO: And let's stick with that theme about the correction of problems on the job site. mentioned that there were other committees at play. That there were other committees that existed, local committees? Do they report into -would they report information to you and to Dave, which

JED DODD: I don't know how -- have you seen a copy of the safety agreement?

would then bring forward that information to this high-

I have not. MR. FRIGO:

level joint committee?

Well, I can forward that to you JED DODD: at some point. And when you make your decision about the other documents for the record -- you can discuss that one too.

But the safety agreement provides for three levels, and provides for the first level to meet with the division engineer and the liaison, and the safety committee members, the rank and file members.

And they're supposed to generate issues, and then the committees that are meeting are actually being pretty effective in terms of fixing some infrastructure stuff, and while Safe-2-Safer, for instance, one of the things that did occur on the Safe-2-Safer, and all of the agreement, was the program obviously wasn't able to

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

1 reduce injuries. It did or was able to generate 2 repairs in the infrastructure with respect to safety. 3 The safety committees were able to generate 4 problems that railroads that needed to be fixed, and 5 stuff like that. And actually, it was pretty effective. 6 7 MR. FRIGO: The low hanging fruit. 8 JED DODD: Yes. 9 ROCCO CARBINONA: It got done. 10 MR. FRIGO: Stuff that could be corrected out in the field. 11 12 JED DODD: And one of the problems that the 13 original agreement had, the original safety agreement 14 had is that all the safety committees had ideas on how 15 to fix things, but the division engineers didn't have 16 the budget to get them fixed. 17 And the Safe-2-Safer -- they poured a lot of money into it, and so those budgets were used up for 18 19 like infrastructure stuff was able to get fixed, and (inaudible) 20 21 I'm not a fan of Safe-2-Safer obviously, but 22 there were, I mean, there was some positive things 23 about it. 24 MR. FRIGO: Sounds like an improvement. 25 JED DODD: And the Safety Agreement is

supposed to be doing kind of the same thing. And to my knowledge --

I can't testify personally --

Yes, it does come up to us. And the question -- and our view was, if it came up to us, then it's to assume that something broken, that it should be corrected at the local level, but I can't say for certain if it's getting corrected at the local level or not.

I think you asked who else you should be interviewing, and I think maybe if you brought in a few of the liaisons that actually chaired the safety committees, you might find that out in terms of what they have to offer.

But then there's another local committee
that hears issues, and then there's the Safety
Advisory Committee that hears issues. And everything's
done on consensus. There's no voting for instance.
You either agree or you don't, or.

And I think one of the problems that we have in our Safety Advisory Committee level is that the management of the people on the committee sometimes don't have the authority to make a decision, and it bogs things down.

1	MR. FRIGO: That's on, at your level?
2	JED DODD: Yes.
3	MR. FRIGO: So that would be Andy Keefe?
4	JED DODD: And Matt Porto. That they report
5	to people that before they can reach a consensus.
6	MR. FRIGO: Do you know, is there a some
7	of these items that decisions aren't made or the items
8	where decisions are made, is there a corrective action
9	log? That the committee keeps?
10	JED DODD: No, but there should be.
11	(inaudible)
12	MR. FRIGO: Okay. I'm going to start going
13	around the room, actually. I do have some more
14	questions.
15	Don Hill?
16	DON HILL: Good Morning, Gentlemen. How you
17	guys doing?
18	I just have a couple questions for you guys.
19	And I guess this one is going to be directed to Jed,
20	because you've done quite a bit of talking about the
21	culture prior to Safe-2-Safer Program being initiated.
22	It was kind of hard to hear you on this end,
23	so, would you repeat, what did the program, prior to
24	Safe-2-Safer, being instituted, did it have a name or
25	title?

1 JED DODD: The Amtrak BMW Safety Agreement. 2 It was the first negotiated safety agreement the 3 railroad instituted. 4 DON HILL: And what would you say would be 5 the primary difference between that program, for lack 6 of a better word, and Safe-2-Safer? 7 JED DODD: All right. The Safe-2-Safer was 8 based entirely on behavior based program. 9 unclear to me exactly what they did, they reported 10 behaviors in an attempt to correct bad behavior, to 11 correct accidents and injuries on the job. 12 And our program was more of an attempt to get to the root cause of accidents, and correct -- and 13 make corrections in terms of the root causes. 14 15 DON HILL: And when you use the term 16 behavior --17 JED DODD: The root cause wasn't necessarily behavior. 18 19 DON HILL: Okay, but when you say the term 20 behavior, I just want to make sure I've got that clear in my head. 21 22 Did that come across as more discipline? 23 JED DODD: Safe-2-Safer itself was a non-24 disciplinary program, and then that's how the program 25 was sold to the employees. That, even though you have

all these guys running around, and like writing down, like your behavior, and then (inaudible), I'm not exactly sure what was entered into. It was entered into this like, software program, that Amtrak bought from this company, in my opinion, just sold them a bill of goods. It was supposed to generate reports and allow people to focus on certain behaviors, (inaudible), but at no point was the Safe-2-Safer to be used as a disciplinary tool.

DON HILL: Okay.

JED DODD: That all started -- the discipline all started to occur when they terminated the Safe-2-Safer agreements, because I think, like it became obvious to management that the Safe-2-Safer wasn't working, at least in the engineering department.

And in terms of by reducing accidents, and in fact, because management was actually only concerned with the liability and not reducing accidents, and no (inaudible) report had come out during that period, in which they started to pay significantly more money in terms of accident claims, than they had before -- prior to Safe-2-Safer being instituted.

And so, what was occurring is, Amtrak did about an about-face, terminating the Safe-2-Safer agreement, terminated the safety agreement,

simultaneously. And instituted the cardinal rule program, in which you would be terminated for like, infractions of like, (inaudible), one of which is RWP. And so what we have happen is people being terminated for relatively minor violations under the RWP rules, which by the way, for the record, the union thinks all the RWP rules should be followed. We just don't think if you do, like a version of jay walking, you should be terminated for it.

DON HILL: And you mentioned that there were 10 items to enhance safety earlier, that were proposed by, I believe, Mr. Pohlot, that you guys agreed to?

JED DODD: Ten items of ideas that we have rules about. We're bringing new life back into the safety committees, but re-instituting the NORAC congresses, and many -- and the safety congresses, like from -- it was a copy of an education program that we do within the federation that we copy off the (inaudible) -- we don't stand up on the road and teach people about the issues, what we do is give small groups of people the information that they need to, like look at a situation, and come up with their own conclusions.

And what we have found, when people are given the facts and the information, they pretty much

all come up with the same conclusions, and what we did is we forced managers, supervisors, and rank and file, foremen, and equipment operators, to all sit at the same table and come up with solutions, and report back to the main group about what they thought could be done to fix things. And we found those congresses to be noticeably effective in targeting issues within a specific area, and so we were in the process of putting the effort into re-instituting those congresses up and down the property. And, I actually forget what the other issues were, that we were going to do, but there was a list of about 10 issues.

And by the way, it wasn't generated by Bruce Pohlot and Jed Dodd, it was generated by the interviews we did with like 25 safety guys out in the field, that answered our questions and we made a list of like, of their commonalities, and this is the list that we were getting ready to work on before he was fired. Scott Haverstick, was appointed chief engineer, and the reign of terror began.

DON HILL: I guess the short, would it just be fair to say that you believe that a collective and in atmosphere where communication was open, is a better environment for enhancing safety?

JED DODD: I think it's actually the only

environment. I mean, look at them right now, is there is a reduction of loss of life and reported injuries. Since the safety agreement was renegotiated and the liaison's are back functioning, and the safety committees are up and running again, but that -- they - it could be so much better.

I mean, it's not done in an atmosphere of cooperation and trust. And, for instance, we believe there is many close calls out on the property that are going unreported.

In the past, under the close call policy, we were able to report a close call, know that the individuals involved were not going to be disciplined, and we could get labor and management out to the job site and figure out what that close call was caused by, and take corrective action to prevent it from happening again.

And, we're actually afraid of what's going on in the property right now. Because, the close calls are not being reported. Because the close calls, cardinal rule violation, and the cardinal rule violation means you're discharged.

DON HILL: Thanks. That's all I have for right now.

MS. WALKER: Question, now. I guess it's

1 focused to all of you, but training perspective. 2 dealt with, sat in on classes, 213 training, that Henry Dew and Dave Keely, and I think that training's good. 3 4 Other training modes, NORAC, or RWP, maybe 5 is not as good, or maybe it's just adequate. 6 So, my question is, do you feel that 7 training is an issue or is it actually the on the-job-8 training and mentoring that's causing these injuries or fatalities? 9 10 The way I see it, it's sort of a mentoring 11 -you grasp a lot of knowledge in all these classes, 12 whether it's a three week or a four week class or a 13 NORAC class, but going out into the field and having 14 these new guys actually apply all of this knowledge, is 15 what I see as a problem. 16 Now, I guess my comment is, do you think 17 it's a training issue or more of a mentoring on-the-job training where it's lacking? 18 Multiple speakers: 19 (inaudible) DON HILL: Well, individually speaking. 20 21 The training is designed ROCCO CARBINONA: 22 to dictate their program. It's not like, Jed said, a 23 cooperative type-training situation where, they take 24 our input and teach us the right way or the wrong way.

The cardinal rules, as well as other rules, they made

it so confusing.

This is what I see as a supervisor first, then a union rep. But the rules have changed so much and so frequently by every manager that's come in here that they've changed these titles and positions with, that there's no consistency or continuity in the training.

We understand the argument they make. We understand how to protect ourselves out there. But it's too much change and it's too confusing.

Sometimes you just gotta keep it simple.

And the more simple it is, the easier it is for everybody to understand.

I've watched people come into these classes, NORAC classes, physical characteristics classes, and ask questions, and the instructors couldn't answer the questions.

Now if they don't understand it, and their confused, there's always that answer, I'll get back to you, and it very rarely happens.

So, we're left out there with a bunch of scared people, that know how to work safely, but they're scared of the cardinal rules, that God Forbid, I forgot to cross that "T" or dot that "I" and I get caught, I'm going to be terminated.

So they do one of two things. They do nothing, but they go out there and do it as quickly as possible, and sometimes, and I don't want to say that it happens all the time, but unsafely, because they just want to get out of there. Get the job done, and get out of there.

DAVID INGERSOLL: I just took NORAC for the first time in 10 years. And the guy giving the class, he gave the information okay. He has three years on the railroad. He's answering -- he doesn't know the answer himself.

As Rocco just said, how can this guy TE, he was a block operator for a year, and a dispatcher for two, and he's asking me as a signalman, when do I take that signal away from that train?

Well, I'm going to know from control, I never take that signal away from that train.

And he says, well, you're wrong. I'm not wrong. But these are the guys teaching the examination.

I did an investigation up in New England. The manager of safety didn't know if the gentleman was NORAC C Qualified, A Qualified, C Qualified. How do you not know that in your own investigation, if a man's qualifications are wrong there.

They don't know the different -- when you go to NORAC now, you take a NORAC class, it's confusing.

Don't put a -- and if you do know, there's NORAC A,B, and C.

Signals are C employees. I'm sitting in there with a guy with an A Guide and a B Guide. There giving just the information, and then say, oh you sit

It's confusing as anything. We have guys that are failing NORAC that have taken it for 27 years now. Why? There's an issue, there's an issue. You know, did you all of a sudden become dumb? No.

here, here's your test, here's yours.

It's being presented by a transportation guy, just as you wouldn't be able to -- I know that you've walked track, and that's I know who you are, you've walked track in the area when I was out here.

We had guys teaching guys that have no clue what their doing.

JED DODD: We have found that the training is sub-standard in that respect. Particularly with respect to this accident in Chester.

We have found that some of the trainers were actually the use of shunt straps in an improper way, and I think that has actually been corrected since then.

But with respect to the mentoring, I'd like to address that a little bit.

Shortly after the accident in Chester, these three unions wrote to Joe Boardman, and made a list of recommendations, and one of them was to correct the situation.

And one of those recommendations, was to significantly improve the mentoring program. We believe that -- at the time, there was one supervisor mentor for 256 trackman, and since then, they've increased that by three or four, and I don't know if those three or four new supervisors, are actually operational, but from our point of view, there's the book training and the passing of the regulatory test, but then there's actually practical experience out in the field.

And you put a guy with three, four, five years of service, with the book training and passing the regulatory test, out on the job site, every foreman's job site is a little different.

And some of them are significantly different. And what we think is that every new foreman should be mentored for a period of several weeks, individually, until they understand the job. And then that whenever a foreman changes assignments, and goes from like a contractor protection job to a surfacing

gang foreman to like a welding foreman, to all these other different types of foreman, that when the assignment is changed, that that foreman also receives mentoring around the new assignment, because there is significantly different duties expected of that foreman from job site to job site.

And, then, of course that requires a release of resources that the company is unwilling to do. At one point, they decided to do another mentoring program, in which they hired some retired managers that we didn't like or get along with when they were managers, and brought them down into the field, and said that they're going to be the mentors.

And you know, that didn't work out too well.

But there's gotta be a way in which -- in the unions opinion, and my opinion, it's criminal to put these guys on three, four, five years service, out on the job site, with like four weeks training or pass a regulatory exam, and expect them to do the job in a safe and productive way.

And there needs to be more support for that guy to learn that job and take care of business.

DAVID INGERSOLL: I'd just like to go on the record. I don't want to speak on behalf of ARSA, but, just in the signaling department, there's no training

for a foreman whatsoever. You take a test, you're a 1 2 foreman. I mean -- they give you a white hard hat, 3 4 and now you're a foreman. 5 ARSA, there's no training. I won't speak for 6 ARSA. 7 ROCCO CARBINONA: I will. 8 We have no training other than the Safe-2-9 Safer Program, that was basically pushed on us, and 10 then never was followed through. The Safe-2-Safer Program, in my opinion, was 11 nothing but a program that drove down safety statistics 12 13 in the favor of, we're working safer. 14 Nobody believed in the program, but if you 15 spoke against, especially managers, they were deathly 16 afraid to say anything because their superiors would 17 take action against them. This was something they knew they had to do, 18 19 regardless if they thought it worked or not. was quite apparent it didn't work. 20 It was taking away. 21 And that was the only safety training, formal training, and when I say formal, other than RWP, 22 23 NORAC, AMT-2. Nothing to teach me as a supervisor how to instruct people on working safely, what to look for. 24 25 That came from experience over 33 years.

1 MS. WALKER: All right, no other questions. Chris? 2 MR. FRIGO: MR. SCHULTE: Yes, one quick question. 3 4 close call reporting, what time span did that exist, 5 and was that -- did that involve all crafts or just certain crafts. 6 7 JED DODD: It involves all crafts. 8 started in 2000 and stopped in 2014. It was like a 14-9 year- period. 10 From our perspective, it was extremely 11 successful. And many of the objections that management 12 has to it, we don't really see rooted in reality. It didn't -- that reality didn't exist in 13 14 the 14-year-period that it was in effect. And the committee of all crafts -- the 15 16 engineers sat on that committee, and what was 17 occurring, engineers were reluctant sometimes to report close calls with track gangs, because they didn't want 18 19 to involve the track gang in discipline. And so what occurred, with the close call 20 21 policy that was adopted in either late '99 or 2000 --22 that close calls could be reported, and even be 23 properly investigated and corrected. 24 Of course, that's not happening now, after 25 2014.

1 MR. SCHULTE: Thank you. 2 MR. STEARN: Thank you. To any of you gentlemen, interviewees. 3 My question would be, what do you think is 4 5 one of the biggest eroders or the biggest impediment, 6 for a Safety Advisory Committee to have the same 7 vitality and productivity as was back in the late 90's? 8 What's caused that program to diminish so much, or what would be the biggest stumbling block to 9 10 bring it back up to present? 11 JED DODD: I think the general theme to what 12 been trying to get across. The reinstatement of I've the old close call policy, so that people can report 13 these issues without fearing of getting themselves or 14 15 other people fired. 16 And, re-examination of the cardinal rule 17 policy, so that people aren't afraid to be terminated, for especially minor violations. 18 And because you have this like, tremendous 19 20 fear in the rank and file above, it's difficult for us 21 to impress management across the table at the Safety 22 Advisory Committee and avoid -- what I think would be 23 actually geared towards reducing injuries and accidents. 24

DAVID INGERSOLL:

25

To get into the safety.

A lot of times, even when a 405 is written, we've asked in meeting after meeting, we say, will we get a copy of the 405? It always appears that a thirdparty has to review that and release it. And to me, it's the law department has to -- before we can put out an alert so Rocco can put it out to his men. know the avenue, we never -- gosh, the fatality in Chester? There was a stand down. There were quys out here for a week, before they were even told anything about the fatalities. It shouldn't never have happened. It's kept a Everything's a secret. In my opinion. secret. ROCCO CARBINONA: Safety in general is to dollars on Amtrak. If it costs money, we'll see what we can do. Fall protection. I'll just give you a guick example. Fall protection is now a cardinal rule. We've asked for fall protection since 1986, and we've gotten trickles of monies to fall protect signal bridges. And the reason we ask for this is because we had signal employees falling through the decking on bridges. Because they weren't being maintained. There was a period when they put about

\$250,000.00 a year into fall protecting bridges, and it

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

was only on the New York division, because we were the only ones complaining.

I can speak because I was a BRS representative at the time. Philadelphia? There was nobody complaining, so they felt, we don't need to fall protect anything in Philadelphia.

The tie off lines, tie off bridges, vertical life lines, and the body harnesses that we're required to wear now -- that was non-existent back then. But it took over 20 years.

Now it's a cardinal rule because somebody fell, and got killed, basically. And Amtrak had liability there. So now it's a mandatory thing. It's a cardinal rule.

I don't think we need to do that when it comes to safety. We all know, whether you're a worker, to a union rep, to a supervisor. We know what safe practices are here. It's the culture and the thinking that's gotta be changed.

And until we do that, and get together as a group, which Jed's being try to do with Dave for years, I can't speak for that because I haven't been part of that committee, but until that committee functions as a committee. This is never going to work.

We're going to continue to be here and

1 investigate these accidents. 2 DAVID INGERSOLL: Just to touch on fall One of the cardinal rules, is you don't 3 protection. 4 violate Amtrak's fall protection policy. There is no 5 fall protection policy on Amtrak. So what are we 6 governed by? 7 It's just a fact. 8 MS. WALKER: In respect to regulations. Ι 9 haven't seen a -- I mean I haven't really looked to see 10 if there is a written policy. 11 DAVID INGERSOLL: I need to address it, 12 Dick. 13 MR. HIPSKIND: Okay. DAVID INGERSOLL: It's a co-mingled -- it's 14 15 an agency issue. OSHA, FRA, and Amtrak's policy. 16 says you need it, the FRA says it's not a stick, it's 17 not a railroad bridge, therefore, railroad fall protection doesn't mean -- so it means OSHA standards. 18 19 In our opinion. 20 Amtrak's opinion says you have to follow 21 fall protection. Where's the fall protection? You're 22 going to fire men if -- violating Amtrak's fall 23 protection policy, but don't provide me with fall

protection or a policy that I have to follow.

It's absurd.

24

1 MS. WALKER: (? - Speaker not identified) 2 So, thank you. This question would be to the BRS General 3 4 Chairman. You touched on recent NORAC Training that 5 you went through, and I trust you successfully 6 completed. But my question would be, do you know who 7 those NORAC trainers report up to? How are --8 DAVID INGERSOLL: I'm -- and this is my 9 understanding and how I thought this was presented to 10 me, is that engineering was going to take --11 transportation does NORAC training, they control it, 12 I'm almost certain, 13 I'm under the understanding that engineering 14 was taking over all training. In my experience, backhoe, both on the railroad, we had a lot better 15 16 dialogue in the classroom than you had the crafts, 17 teaching the crafts. You have a guy that has 20 years on the 18 19 railroad that can lay it out. Now, there's inexperience, Everybody's young now. 20 You know? younger guys are applying for these positions. 21 22 don't have, you know, they don't have the whiskers 23 like the old guys of this day do. 24 ROCCO CARBINONA: The guys that do "have the 25 whiskers" only have 10 years. So you're looking at

people to mentor people that don't have the experience 2 or knowledge themselves. Years ago, people stayed in the positions 3 4 People are leaving these positions in fear. 5 You have, and Jed can speak on this himself, in Penn 6 Station New York, track inspector's positions, they had 7 to give them \$5.00 an hour allotment to get people to 8 stay in them, because of the fear that they were being 9 taken out of service for every little infraction. 10 they reported track conditions that there should have 11 been speed restrictions on, they were pressured into 12 either overlooking it, or changing their reports. 13 And I know this for a fact. I've seen it. 14 And I'm the one that would be the bad quy, and take a 15 switch out of service because somebody else wasn't 16 putting stuff down in their report in fear of the 17 retaliation. And it's gotta stop. That's the bottom 18 19 (inaudible) Right or wrong. line. 20 MR. HIPSKIND: Jed, do you want to comment 21 on that? 22 JED DODD: No. 23 MS. WALKER: (inaudible) This is the second time in a series of 24 25 dialogue between interviewees that we have heard about

incentives that have been provided in order to attract employees to positions, many times, very safety sensitive positions. I'm wondering, you know, do you guys have thoughts on whether these incentives are doing what is intended, or is it working?

DAVID INGERSOLL: I don't have any incentive positions.

JED DODD: Well, the tracks record position in Penn Station, New York, was corrected with the incentives. I mean, there was no vacancies there, and all of the positions had been filled, and it's a two year -- it's an agreement where the employee, for an additional hourly rate, agrees to stay in the job for two years.

And that's attracted people, and people are there to stay. We've negotiated foreman incentives in general, and we don't -- and according to Amtrak, they're not working to the extent that they would like them to work. I think -- I don't have any evidence myself one way or the other whether or not they're serving the function that they were negotiated to serve.

But, what I will say is that, the Amtrak property is a dangerous, high speed property to work on, and that many of the commuter railroads in the same

area, are making significantly more money than the Amtrak worker. I think there's a 14% pay differential between the average commuter rate and the average Amtrak rate. And I think that impacts — they ask me not to speak about the bargaining issues, but the whole issue of incentive to be the foreman, I think they're grossly underpaid in terms of responsibilities that they're asked to have on these high speed properties.

MS. WALKER: Nothing further, thank you.

Theresa?

MS. IMPASTATO: Just a quick question for all three relative to the work loads that our foremen and supervisors's face.

Do you feel that the workloads are manageable, and that you're given the tools that you need as a foreman or supervisor, to execute all the tasks within the scope of your responsibility?

ROCCO CARBINONA: I'll speak to that. The workload's have increased tremendously over the last, probably eight years I would say, tremendously. We're given less resources and manpower. We're scrutinized about the amount of people we need to do the jobs correctly. And when you take the manpower away, you increase the conditions that create an injury or a hazard of some sort.

And as far as material? You know, materials have been plentiful. It seems like they're giving us more material now than ever.

But it is the manpower and the workloads that have increased tremendously. And, just too much on the few that are here. And especially a few that have the knowledge, because the training is inadequate as Dave spoke, and Jed both spoke about the training. It's not adequate enough to keep up with the pace in which we're progressing.

DAVID INGERSOLL: It's been 10 years since
I've been out. I can't honestly answer that. I don't
know the reportable(inaudible) needs these guys have.
I mean, it would have to be the guy that's working out
in the field for me to answer that.

I can't answer that.

JED DODD: Again, I think if you're interested in interviewing people with more knowledge, it would be a good place to bring in some senior foreman to do that.

But I know when I was back on the railroad, the qualifications for being a foreman were to read and write the official language and have a valid driver's license. And now the qualifications are a list of about 12 things, that would include a 4 to 6 week

training program, in order to pass the W-1000 Test.

And so like obviously, the qualifications and the responsibilities have changed significantly.

And while I think that there is a significant manpower shortage out on most of the job sites, I think the increase in responsibilities is really the key with respect to what the foremen are having to deal with in terms of those issues.

The Electric Traction Department used to have a version of -- called a general foreman, and gang foremen, and they are none. And the general foreman would take care of the union work, and manage the administrative duties of the job, and the gang foreman would direct the crew, and they've eliminated both gang foreman and expect -- and eliminated all the general foreman, and they expect the gang foreman to simultaneously handle the administrative duties, and at the same time direct the construction crew, and in my opinion, that's asking (inaudible) to function.

DAVID INGERSOLL: I agree with Jed on that. We used to have a signal inspector, and then an assistant inspector. The assistant's are gone. The work force has been, you know, decimated to the point where you just barely have enough to get along, and we can't have that --oh, that guy is sitting there, in

reality he's an apprentice to the foreman, and he's going to step up, and I'm sure that was the mind set of the Pennsylvania Railroad when the collective bargaining agreements were written. They were the stepping stones. Well, those stepping stones are gone. You're either a maintained, and then oh, if you can pass the test, then you're a

They did away with that craft or

8 9

middle.

classification.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

10

11

12 13

14 15

16

17 18

19 20

21

22 23

24

25

MS. IMPASTATO: I had one other question with regard to training.

There's no training, there's nobody in the

Are you able to review the training materials and provide comment on the training materials? DAVID INGERSOLL: The only one that I'm allowed to even have any minimum input is in the signal training school, which we have (inaudible) written.

Do we have any input in NORAC or RWP or any other training? That all comes from the union capital, and then they do not talk liaisons. They don't talk (inaudible).

ROCCO CARBINONA: As a signal supervisor and ARSA representative, I have no avenue to review any training material other than what I get when I go to

1 the class myself. We don't get to question -- as Dave 2 said, if you pass the test, you're qualified. 3 As a supervisor, we know the caliber of 4 people, we have no say so on whether or not the 5 employee actually knows what he's doing here, or he's 6 just book smart and got through the test. There's no 7 interaction with us in any of the training at all. 8 JED DODD: I've never been given access to 9 the training materials since I've been (inaudible). 10 MS. IMPASTATO: Thank you. 11 MR. HIPSKIND: Is it back to me now? 12 Unidentified Speaker: It's back to you, 13 sir. MR. HIPSKIND: All right. Dick Hipskind. 14 15 Gentlemen, you have filled my head with a 16 I don't know if I'm going to be able lot of questions. to get to all of them or not. 17 I want to just draw a couple of 18 19 generalizations about some of the things I've heard, that in general, things were better kind of the farther 20 21 back in time we go, but not too far back in time. 22 We go back too far in time, there weren't 23 any of these committees, there wasn't any of this 24 dialoque. But after things got bad, there was 25 some recognition, and some committees and safety

1 initiatives were formed. 2 And so a second period of time that you all 3 seem to say was better than now. 4 Am I correct in understanding that, that 5 way? 6 JED DODD: Yes. You're correct. say the period of like 1996 to 2009 or 2010, there was 7 a much greater willing and cooperation for these 8 9 issues. 10 Okay. Did you want to add MR. HIPSKIND: 11 something, Dave? 12 DAVID INGERSOLL: I wasn't around as long as 13 But yes, once the Safe-2-Safer and I refused to, 14 you know, I just decided to leave and address the 15 signal school issue, there was no dialogue with me. 16 You know, I was the outcast. I was the BRS 17 troublemaker, they don't want to listen to that. 18 There was no dialogue until really the three 19 organizations went (inaudible) pushed Pohlot out. 20 Because, he basically came to us and said, 21 look, you know, we have to fix this and we would like 22 to sit down and cooperatively work together. 23 that's improving. (inaudible) open dialogue to where 24 what we thought mattered.

And then they fired us.

JED DODD:

ROCCO CARBINONA: Other than the collective bargaining, we've been -- the employees haven't always in the safety congress as it was, where when we did get together as a group, the division management, the division safety, the organization and all the employees were in one room, putting their heads together to come up with safe work practices. And learning how to figure it out themselves. That no longer exists.

They're just thrown out there and either they know or they're going to be charged with not knowing.

And I think the only way to get back on courses is start working together as a group, listen to each other.

JED DODD: Back in that period, you understand I represent Conover workers and (inaudible) workers, as well as Southern Workers, and we had struck Conover in '94 and there was like bitter, bitter relations between myself and the engineering department, who was eventually hired over on the Amtrak, but Bruce Willburn and I would stand in front of these safety congresses together. And say the same things about safety to the managers that were present in the room.

We'd say the same thing together with Steve Falkinstein. He and I $\operatorname{\mathsf{--}}$ I mean we butted heads and

romped on each other all the time, but when it came to these issues, we would stand in front of these congresses, in front of these assemblies of men and managers, and say the same things.

In different ways, but what we expected of the men, and what the men could expect of us. And I've never stood, since 2010, with any manager in front of any group of men or managers to talk about safety or many of these issues.

And in fact, after the Chester accident, do you know that no member of Amtrak management has ever called me, and informed me about the accident?

I mean that would have been unheard of back in the early days in which we were having their cooperation. We honestly heard it on the news. And quys told me about it.

But in the past, what would occur is that an Amtrak manager, a senior manager, would call me, and we would get in the truck and we would go to the job site together. Because when something important, that the union and management do together, because it was important for the men to see that, that we were there together, trying to fix this.

And that simply doesn't occur anymore.

MR. HIPSKIND: Jed, I do want to address

your last comment about the Chester accident.

And as NTSB, I would just offer, not an excuse, but an explanation. We trigger certain processes and procedures, protocols, and sometimes a lot of individuals understand, well, you're not to talk about the accident investigation, and so maybe some of the lines of communications were shut down, and maybe NTSB has had some influence on that.

I'm not taking all of that. I'll just offer that as a little bit of an explanation.

You don't have to agree with that --

JED DODD: For the record, in the past, when an accident of this nature has occurred, Amtrak management and chief engineers on call would call me and inform me about the accident, and in general, we would go to the job site together.

MR. HIPSKIND: Okay. The other general thing that I kind of picked up on is that it seems without giving specific dates and names of people, that some of what you're detailing is, there has not been a sustained commitment, in that sometimes when people change in the higher offices or places where decisions can be made, and on a system wide basis, it seems to me like you're indicating there has been some kind of decline.

58 And the other thing that I consistently here in your answers is, changes in commitment on close calls and changes in implementing cardinal rules. Have I understood all of that fairly correctly? JED DODD: We spent the last several Yes. years with management, basically renegotiating everything. And from our perspective, we're renegotiating a system that worked pretty well for us for many years, and that during that renegotiations period, we get into dealing with a lot of fears that management has across the table, about if we do this, what happens, what happens, what happens?

To give you an example. You're a boy scout. You're taking the first aid class. You're not expected to fix it. And that's (inaudible), you know.

We're in the process of trying to do that.

From our perspective, management was so fearful that we would no longer see them as the bosses, or as managers, or as people in charge. We know they're in charge.

For instance, but that doesn't mean we think that they're effective managers or effective leaders.

The problem we have right now is, we're like the guy in the English Channel in 1942, that's rolling across the channel, and we're the soldier, and we're

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

looking over at our Lieutenant, who we know is in charge, but the Lieutenant is crying, bombing over the side of the boat, and we're getting people landing on the beach. And we would like some managers and some leaders that we can work with that would actually lead us through this process rather than demand that we address every fear that we have on every sentence, on every document that we negotiate.

DAVID INGERSOLL: The close call policy, and I sat there, they will not release that language where, we know discipline (inaudible), that was the bottom line. They want to be able to fire you if you do that.

JED DODD: Three specific instances in the revised close call policy where employees could be disciplined, that we didn't think was necessary to actually agree to in order to get the policy up and running again. We're willing to do that.

Once was up for actually deliberate sabotage. That's a no brainer. That's a federal offense, your home land security to sabotage the railroad, so that's not an issue for us.

The line to the investigator during -- with close call policies, they've been revoked. We're okay with that, because we want the truth as well in terms of (inaudible) those issues.

And the third one was -- anyway, but what bogged down the close call policy discussions, finally, was that they wanted a catch-all phrase, that in the event that the other three can't be disciplined, we can discipline you under any circumstances. And that was unacceptable to us. That's not going to get close calls reported in a way that they should be reported to be investigated. MR. HIPSKIND: Rocco, anything to add? I have nothing further. ROCCO CARBINONA: MR. HIPSKIND: Well, let me make another comment, and see if we get some more dialogue going. So, briefly, how are things right now? We talked about this from a historic perspective. We've put this kind of 14-years of 1996 to 2010 as a better, or a more model type era, and we've talked about decline or implementing programs, the cardinal rules, and getting away from the close calls. But, how are things today? Are they on the Is there hope? Or, how do you guys think uptick? about that? ROCCO CARBINONA: We're still declining. It's declining. Actually, no offense, but I JED DODD:

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

disagree with Rocco a little bit.

The unions have come up with and is of the opinion that this management is absolutely useless in terms of making a cooperative program together. And what we've done is embarked on an organizing drive to reorganize the property under the auspices of the union, to enforce the rules that we think should be enforced.

As for instance, the shunting rules. We think there's a significant increase in shunting, and the use of shunt straps and enforce the rules as a result of the program that we've embarked on. In terms of overall -- but there's just so much that the union can do, and that's where I would agree with Rocco, that in terms of like, if the management and labor were actually willing to join together and enforce the rules out on the property, together, I think we'd have a much more effective operation.

What we're afraid of is the inexperience foreman on the job site, the lack of training, the lack of mentoring, the confusion over some of the rules, we think another accident is virtually guaranteed.

And so when you ask me, are things better?

Things are better since the Chester accident, because
we made a decision that while work with this management

is impossible, this management is not going to work with us, so we have to adopt our own program, and we've trained over 400 people in two-day training classes, to go out on the property and organize on the job site around these rules. But in terms of like, the general specifics of things, (inaudible) in other words, it's a complex question, is what I'm trying to say.

And we're actually in the process of rethinking ourselves, how to make the properties safer now that we have a management that absolutely refuses to cooperate with us on any (inaudible). It would be much easier, of course, if they did.

On the other hand, the fact that they won't, we have some stuff we can share with the committee about how -- what we've given to the rank and file out on the property, in terms of getting -- making the job sites safer.

MR. HIPSKIND: Thank you. I want to ask you a couple of follow ups to this, and if you want to chime in, let me clear up a couple of things.

DAVID INGERSOLL: I agree -- I'm more in the position of Rocco. I mean, the overall -- it's really declined. There's no dialogue, everybody -- it's fear. I mean you talk to the managers, they're afraid. And you can talk to the youngest guy. It's fear.

1 Right now, they're managed by fear. 2 they're all afraid to go out on the track, because somehow, one of them cardinal rules had to be in there 3 4 somewhere, and I'm not willing to go into it. 5 And just to elaborate, when RWP was 6 originated, that was before my time, but that was a joint effort by labor and management, sit down and 7 8 make a book. 9 Here, at Amtrak, RWP has changed without any 10 input from, to the best of my knowledge, not from 11 anybody in our committee. It was just changed, and 12 revamped, and rewritten, (inaudible) RWP. 13 MR. HIPSKIND: Okay, and I do want to talk a little bit more about that. 14 15 Jed, your last comment. When I was 16 listening to you, it almost sounds -- and I need to 17 understand, and when you talk about the shunting rules, things like that, should I think of that post-Chester, 18 19 or was that something you were doing prior to Chester? 20 Definitely post-Chester. JED DODD: 21 MR. HIPSKIND: Well, I wanted to clear that 22 up. 23 Then the other thing is, it almost -- if I'm 24 wording this wrong, you correct me. I want you to 25 correct me.

But the impression I got is almost in the absence of somebody doing anything, you guys decided to do something. And it's almost like you're trying to be in a leadership role with your training. Is that fair to say that or? JED DODD: It's fair to say that. trying to do that. MR. HIPSKIND: You are trying to do that? JED DODD: Yes. MR. HIPSKIND: Okay, but that comes from your characterization that you think things are broken Right? down. JED DODD: That's correct. Things are broken down. MR. HIPSKIND: Okay. Now here's -- they leave all the tough questions to me. I know that. And I sit here and I listen -(inaudible) Okay, all right, and they MR. HIPSKIND: should. I want you guys to grab the rings of power. And we've talked a lot about how things got off kilter and what not. Tell me, if you have the power to change things, what do you change, how do you do it, and how do you want it to look? Any of you want to start out?

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

65 ROCCO CARBINONA: I'll start. First of all, I think the organization should have a voice in the safety of this company and how we operate. And what they say should be listened to and should be agreed upon, amongst everybody, before any change is made. Secondly, the training. The people that are doing the training have to have the experience. can't just teach out of a book. It doesn't work. you have a question that person doesn't know, (inaudible) and they're confused, and you're just sticking this rule in front of them, and saying, read it, that's what it means. They're still confused when they leave the classroom. They've read it, they've memorized the

They're still confused when they leave the classroom. They've read it, they've memorized the question, they've memorized the answer, and they put it on the test.

Secondly, the feedback. When something's changed, we never go back and look at how it's working. It's a change and it's got its own book (inaudible). This is what you're to follow from here on out. It seems like we're dictated to more than treated like an asset.

There is something like, you do as you're told, or else. The threats have gotta stop. It's fear.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

1 This company is driven by fear. 2 And just like Dave and Jed said both, this management, as well as the rank and file, everybody's 3 4 scared. Nobody wants to say anything in fear of the 5 retaliation or possibly losing their job. 6 MR. HIPSKIND: And Rocco, and some of what 7 you're saying there, do you think, if there is an 8 atmosphere of fear, do you think that's affecting 9 people's judgment in the work environment? 10 ROCCO CARBINONA: Definitely. 11 MR. HIPSKIND: Okay. Dave, any comment, 12 you're running the show now. 13 DAVID INGERSOLL: Yes. There's no 14 collaboration whatsoever, and that goes from (inaudible) International President of (inaudible) 15 16 calls Joe Boardman to ask him a question. Doesn't even 17 get back to him. What are you thinking or is subordinate treatment the same way. 18 19 There is no dialoque. It is a -- this 20 railroad is Marshall law, it's ran by Marshall law, 21 it's always been. You shoot and (inaudible) do as I'm told, or else. 22 23 And that's the mentality. 24 MR. HIPSKIND: Okay, but I'm going to

pressure you on your last comment.

1 You're still pointing to what's wrong, and 2 I'm asking you what are you going to do, you're in 3 charge, what are you going to do to make it right? The 4 way you want it? 5 DAVID INGERSOLL: As Rocco just said, put us 6 in a room, and let's fix it. We're ignored. 7 MR. HIPSKIND: You mean like back in the 1996 8 to 2010 era? 9 DAVID INGERSOLL: That was before my time, 10 but --MR. HIPSKIND: I'm going by what you've heard 11 12 here today. 13 DAVID INGERSOLL: Absolutely. There's no dialogue whatsoever. 14 15 It's shut up, you don't know what you're 16 talking about. Although I've been here 27 years, and 17 you've been here two. Everyone of us need this, you 18 know, Amtrak to survive. You know, we all make a 19 living off it. Why wouldn't we? You know, even from training to 20 talk about, you know, Nikki Kline, when she was -- you 21 22 had a helper with 9 months on the railroad, taking 23 tracking and time. To me, it doesn't -- you know. 24 Because that was the need at that time, and Why?

that's how we addressed that issue.

1 And then when I would go there, and say you 2 can't put on the ground there. What do you know? 3 know. There's no dialogue there, Dick. 4 Why? I'd welcome it. 5 MR. HIPSKIND: Okay, so, I don't want to put 6 words in your mouth, but you as a leader, you would put 7 a premium on collaboration and communication? 8 DAVID INGERSOLL: Absolutely. 9 And then you would set in MR. HIPSKIND: 10 place forums or vehicles for that to function at a 11 greater level? 12 DAVID INGERSOLL: Sure. I need to elaborate 13 I do have a say in my signal training 14 program, but as soon as I go to human capital 15 department, they tell me we're going to do whatever we 16 want, final time. (inaudible) That's (inaudible) 17 I'd just like to say, ROCCO CARBINONA: every committee or joint chair thing we've ever held 18 19 with Amtrak, with the exception of RedLock, when it was 20 real late before they changed it without our changes, 21 the -I'm listening. 22 MR. HIPSKIND: 23 ROCCO CARBINONA: Our opinions don't really 24 We're there for a formality. They listen to matter.

It gets tabled, as you've seen with SAC Committee,

25

us.

and how infrequent it's met. Where are the minutes, what has been accomplished? We never go back to look at it. What did we start? Did we finish it? How did we achieve our goals? It doesn't get done. It just stays an open-ended conversation or, the positions, or the people in the positions change, and you don't have the continuity anymore. Or the consistence.

I mean -- it looks like Baskins-Robbins to me here. Flavor of the month. We have so many people coming and going, we don't know who is where anymore. It's musical chairs most of the time. There's no consistency in what we do.

So it's changing constantly for them. I don't sit on that committee, but I'm sure there's been people in and out of there, I see it from my level, that have different opinions, and whatever I talked about with somebody yesterday, how we were going to achieve something. Well no, that's changed. We're going to do it this way.

MR. HIPSKIND: Rocco, do you have an idea to improve what you just identified?

ROCCO CARBINONA: Yes. Appoint people and keep them there. When you get success, keep the people doing what they're doing. You don't keep people that your getting nothing from, and tell them to stay there,

1 and promote them. You keep people that achieve or accomplish, 2 and keep them doing what they're doing. 3 4 MR. HIPSKIND: Okay, but one problem with 5 I agree with what you're saying as a potential that. 6 But you don't want to abridge people's solution. 7 to go work other jobs either? Right? 8 ROCCO CARBINONA: Oh, of course not. 9 MR. HIPSKIND: So there has to be a balance 10 discussed about how you get to what you want to do and 11 12 ROCCO CARBINONA: Whether they're promoted 13 or not, they can still be part of the committee 14 mean, you're position can change, but your duties can 15 remain, you can still have that as part of your duties. 16 I mean, I'm just going to say, the vice-17 president or the president, if I have a group of people that are productive, they're accomplishing tasks, the 18 19 safety number are well, people are not getting injured and not getting killed, I don't want to change 20 anything, I want to embellish upon it, and just keep it 21 22 going. Help keep it working. 23 Okay, thanks, Rocco. Dave? MR. HIPSKIND: 24 DAVID INGERSOLL: I just wanted to comment,

just on tenure of how many presidents there's been to

date. How many presidents have been at Amtrak since I've been here? Probably seven? The assistant Chief So they keep constantly, he has his Engineer, seven? agenda. You know, and you just keep -- it is, it's the flavor of the month, you know, it constantly changes. MR. HIPSKIND: Jed, you're the top guy. Everybody's gotta do what you say, what do you want them to do? It's a complex question, and I JED DODD: don't think it goes beyond (inaudible) because (inaudible) necessarily accident prevention. Ι think their safety program is a reflection of their general anti-employee, anti-union attitude that they bring to the table. Their top managers (inaudible) for instance, the unions, the collective bargaining, and their programs reflect that. From my point of view, ne of the things that occurred in the last couple of years on the Amtrak property, is Joe Boardman (inaudible) from Wisconsin, and completely decimates the managerial and health benefits, eliminates their pension, and (inaudible) And so, we actually had a situation where

the bargaining unit employee benefits were better than

Amtrak benefits. And we have a situation in the

facility, and the first thing we'll do is restore

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

respect for the middle and upper management in terms of their health benefits and pensions, in terms of that.

That's completely demoralizing, the management that we report to which has made it very difficult to fix that.

The second thing I would do is eliminate the term human capital, in terms of like what a labor relations department should be. And eliminate the programs of hiring only lawyers to fill the labor relations positions, because the lawyers are there for one thing, to argue and obstruct, rather than find problems and find solutions to problems and fix things.

And it's apparent Barry Makovich and his human capital department is that these lawyers -- all the labor relations officers are now lawyers, and they're not there fix things, there not there to correct problems. They're there to make sure that grievances piled up, things don't go unresolved, and that they've created a mechanism in which employee grievances can be addressed, and that the departments can sit down with the labor organizations and fix them.

I would then begin to address the gorilla in the room, and that's like 200 foreman out on the job sites with less than five years service, and then I've gotta really spend some serious money in terms of mentoring and training out on the property to try to

merge the inexperience with training with the job site in a way that would reduce the accidents and the problems out on the property.

So, I would make a significant investment in the employees in terms of mentoring and training. I would eliminate the human capital department so that labor relations department that was assigned to correct problems rather than obstruct problems. And I would then put some emphasis into the safety grievance and bring back the close call policy, and I would trash the cardinal rule policy.

But one of the things we found as union officers, when we did these safety congresses, is that many of the recommendations for accidents and NORAC violations, people thought some discipline should be involved.

In other words, rank and file guys got together with middle level managers, and if there was a bonehead mistake out on the property with respect to NORAC, people thought that the bonehead should be disciplined in some way. And they didn't really think they should be fired, because the purpose of discipline is to correct, not punish.

And so, we would at some point in the process of correcting safety problems, have in our

arsenal the ability to discipline, and put the idea of correcting problems above punishment.

And this is what I say sometimes to employees. Regardless of the union, (inaudible) of that opinion.

It's true. We have a duty to you as an individual member of the union to defend you in the collective bargaining unit, and your rights. Even though you've done this bonehead thing out there on the property.

But we also have a duty to the rest of the members of the union, that could have been hurt or killed because of the bonehead thing that you did, and so that somewhere along the line, we have to draw a balance between those two duties.

And the duty isn't necessarily the term I use(inaudible), but the duties are probably going to put you back in school and to disqualify you for a period of time, and have you go out to the gangs and the job sites, and explain what you did wrong.

You know? In the hopes that it doesn't continue. And because, yes, we all like to eat. We all have bills to pay, and families to support, and we should be able to do that. We should be able to go to work, understanding that when we do something stupid,

we're still going to be able to pay our bills.

And so, that's the policies of the programs that I'd like to see put into effect. And that would go a long way to correcting the problems on this property.

MR. HIPSKIND: All right, gentlemen. With your permission, would you mind if we take a short bible break? And we'll come back and have a little bit more dialogue, and kind of close out our interview.

(Whereupon, the above-entitled
matter went off the record at
 (time) and resumed at (time).

MR. HIPSKIND: Okay, gentlemen, we're back from our break, and those are all the questions that I have for right now. And I, again, I'm speaking on behalf of NTSB.

We greatly appreciate the dialogue we've had thus far. But, our esteemed Dr. Beaton is with us. He has not had a chance to dialogue with you.

So, Dr. Beaton.

DR. BEATON: Gentlemen, thanks for coming in and spending time with us today. I'm really interested in the stories that you're telling me and want to dig into a little bit more detail, but I know that I have to really kind of respect the time and respect your time, and the committee's time here, so I'm not going

to take a long, a large amount of time.

I would also like to preface this by saying, my interest in being here -- I'm interested in understanding what happened in Chester.

And I know that you weren't directly involved in Chester, so I'm not going to ask you about Chester per se, but I'd like to have you at least keep in mind the circumstances, the situation, the type of work, the type of gangs, the type of supervision, that you are aware of about Chester, and use that as maybe a frame of reference to answer some of the questions that I have.

And I'll just throw out a general question here. One thing I heard, over and over again, from you guys, is that employees are afraid.

And I took that to mean both trackmen as well as well as managers, or supervisors, or maybe midlevel managers.

Is it a fair statement to say that they're afraid because they're going to lose their job if they get outside of the lines in anyway?

I mean, you've talked about the cardinal rules and you talked about some of the Safe-2-Safer programs, behavior based programs, not being very effective, but for grown men and women to be afraid at

1	work that's an odd situation to find yourself in.
2	What's really behind the afraid terminology
3	there?
4	ROCCO CARBINONA: Fear of losing their jobs.
5	They're not afraid for their safety in a sense that
6	they don't know how to protect themselves. They're
7	afraid of making a mistake and getting terminated. And
8	that's what I hear from the people I work with.
9	DR. BEATON: Okay. And, afraid of making a
10	mistake. If I would apply that concept to the
11	circumstances of the Chester accident, would that have
12	come into play? Or how would afraid of making a
13	mistake come into play, given the kind of work that was
14	being done at Chester?
15	ROCCO CARBINONA: I can't answer, not
16	knowing all the details of what really happened.
17	Honestly.
18	DR. BEATON: Okay. No, I appreciate that.
19	Thank you for, you know.
20	Jed?
21	Dave?
22	DAVID INGERSOLL: Can you give me that
23	question one more time?
24	DR. BEATON: Yeah, I mean, you're a grown
25	man, what's going to make you stay up at night and be
I	I

afraid at work?

DAVID INGERSOLL: The fear of not understanding or having complete confidence in my job would keep me up at night.

DR. BEATON: But you get training, don't you?

DAVID INGERSOLL: Sure I do. I think we've pounded that home again, fifty times. There is no training, there really is no -- I can go to Signal School, can I talk about the Signal School, and the training program?

DR. BEATON: Please.

DAVID INGERSOLL: The training program is laid out to be taught in three different modules. When we sat down and negotiated the training agreement, which Amtrak -- I'll give you a little history.

When I first hired, after three months you were a signal trainee, and then you were considered into the training program.

Then that was changed to 12 months, and then it was changed to two years. The time -- the reason it was changed, was because the carrier could not fulfill their obligation and train people in the negotiated time frame, which still goes on as we speak.

The training program, the trainee enters

1 into the training program, and by written agreement, 2 he's supposed to be out in nine months. We have helpers here for five years. 3 4 still not even through the training program. There is 5 no --6 DR. BEATON: There's no classes being 7 offered? 8 DAVID INGERSOLL: Again, when we're talking about people that apply for these jobs. And this is, 9 10 and I'll quote the words, "He was the only qualified bidder, so we made him a signal instructor." This man 11 12 had nine months as a signal maintained, in the field, four years on the railroad, and he is teaching railroad 13 14 signal. Be careful when you're (inaudible). 15 16 That's the fear. There is -- you don't know 17 your job, and we promote people that don't. And it's all because we're -- the majority of the work force is 18 19 You can't -- you don't get trained, so yes, and now we come out with these cardinal rules. Oh my God. 20 21 Yeah. I am afraid, because you will be fired. 22 JED DODD: The fear is essentially an 23 arbitrary manner in which you're afraid you're going to 24 lose your job. 25 And while management will argue that the

cardinal rules are designed to make sure it's not arbitrary, and that any minor infraction means termination.

The fact is, minor infractions occur all the time, and you're not terminated. But when you're caught, you are terminated. And so, like it becomes arbitrary, capricious in the way that that's applied. And that makes you afraid.

Within the bargaining unit, at least you get some sort of due process, under the collective bargaining agreement. If you're a middle-level manager, you get no due process. And I can think of eight or ten people right now that were fired for minor violations of RWP rules, that probably, in my opinion, should not have been fired.

That they -- I mean, at one point, one guy was fired because he got out of a truck on a, basically a dead track, where the grass is this high, and didn't get RWP protection. A train hasn't been on that track for 25 years.

And that, by the way, doesn't mean that we don't -- and I think the majority of the rank and file, doesn't think that some issues require discipline and termination.

If I can digress a little, and give some

examples of that.

A couple of years ago, we had a foreman and a watchman that were screwing off, and allowed an engine to hit a welder down in the Washington terminal. The welder survived, fortunately. I mean, he's no longer with the railroad as far as I know, but the tape on the engine showed that the foreman and the watchman were screwing off, and allowed that to occur.

They were fired. And the union declined to arbitrate it. You know, from our perspective, that was a very serious violation that resulted in a serious accident that should never have occurred.

We have two guys that's in contrast in Chicago, that are working on basically a dead track, there's a broken down engine 100 feet up there under blue flag protection, that the other end of the track terminates. There's nothing coming from there. They walk across it, they're doing their job. They walk across the track and plug their power tool in and they're terminated for being on the track without RWP protection.

And that's where it becomes arbitrary. And we're going to arbitrate those cases, and probably win, a year and a half or two years from now. And like, that sends terror into every man's thought and family,

when you're without that income for a couple of years.

And so, the idea is that every decision you're trying to make is micro-managed to the point where you're afraid of slipping up and making the wrong decision, by instinct or mistake, or whatever, and so you second guess everything you're doing, and you become afraid to make decisions.

DR. BEATON: It sounds like this afraid attitude is pervasive across craft, so it's not isolated just in one craft.

I also heard, that the unions will take on a challenge themselves. I mean, when management or the company isn't providing you with the resource, you're going to stand up a version to help your members. And you talked about a training program that you stood up.

Are there other examples of things that you've provided to the workers, that management hasn't provided to you?

JED DODD: And what we've done, is we've started on an organizing program because we recognize that we have a lot of new members in the union as well, that no longer understand the history of the union or the history of what we've done.

And so we've embarked on an internal organizing program that was going to be geared mainly

around advancing the collective bargaining agreement. And on the freight sides, it's still advancing the collective bargaining agreement, but we've turned its focus on the Amtrak side to improving safe working conditions, and enforcing the rules. And what that does is, we've put on Amtrak 400 -- basically new hires, through a training program that teaches people how to basically organize out on the job.

And from our point of view, we have three rules on Amtrak that have a certain amount of discretion in terms of how they're applied.

One is the shunting rule. One is how many watchmen you put out on a job site, and the third is the piggy-back rule. About whether or not foremen have track out of service, and can put other jobs that come into their service. And that creates a certain source of conflict, in terms of like arguing about how those rules are to be applied, or responsibilities with the foreman, and the local management out on the property.

And what we decided to do, is embark on a training program where we produced training materials, and used the guys who had organized around the collective bargaining struggle, to go out on the property and give the most conservative interpretation of each of these rules, that our interpretations are

correct, and actually the interpretations were taken, sometimes, from Amtrak materials.

But, we no longer took the discretion out of the application of those rules, so there's no longer, like a confusion, about how they applied, that from the point of view of the union, we apply the most conservative end to that, and we've called upon the foreman to eliminate piggy-backing, to apply shunt straps under all circumstances, and to take the number of watchmen in this RWP book that we've developed, as the minimum number required, as opposed to like a discretion number, in terms of the job sites, if you're protecting with watchmen. And we've gone out on the job sites and organized around those issues ourselves.

DAVID INGERSOLL: Fall protection is the issue that I've most recently addressed. People will not climb until you provide us with the proper equipment or the training or a letter. There's nothing. You have to -- we feel that we have to take it upon ourselves, because the cardinal rule says you're going to fire me and the history is, you're are enforcing your cardinal rules. So, don't be -- don't put yourself in that position.

ROCCO CARBINONA: As a supervisor and ARSA member, I have to enforce the rules.

There's no discretion and I have no authority to do anything other than report and enforce the cardinal rules, for something I may think is a corrective action I could take, and possibly educate an employee a little more. I don't have that discretion.

It's just a matter of I have to report it up to a higher up, and I'm sorry whatever's going to happen, is going to happen, there's nothing I can do for you.

Otherwise, my job is on the line.

So, there's the fear of not even being involved in an infraction, but just knowing of it, you're also held accountable for that same level of termination.

DAVID INGERSOLL: I'd like to add on that. When there is discipline, I'm with Jed, you know?

Discipline is needed, you know, I'm not going to say that it is not. But every infraction -- I may be wrong -- every infraction is overlooked? Is there a cardinal rule violation in that? Okay. Send it to Washington to get a review on that. Even before they present charges on a local level, they want to know, is there a cardinal rule involved in that, and if it is, make sure you're charged with that.

DR. BEATON: Okay. As a result of the Chester accident, are the unions standing up anything special that, based on what you see in Chester?

DAVID INGERSOLL: What we did was try to enforce, you know, the safety aspect and the rules. Follow the rules. You know, if it says, as a signalman, I can honestly -- we never hesitated on putting a shunt down. You know, we could open up -- we're more, you know, we have a better advantage of protecting ourselves through the signal system than the track operator, but you know if you think you may foul, get a foul, and put a shunt down.

It doesn't -- you can always pick it up.

You're not get in trouble, you know. Just take the

safest course of action, and we try to, you know, push
that.

DR. BEATON: Will there be any alerts to your members? Judged on Chester?

JED DODD: Some of the material we've provided to Mr. Frigo, were letters we've written to the membership and the management about Chester, and we've included those letters to management. We've also sent them to our membership, but since then, we've produced training materials and leaflets, that are specifically as a result of the Chester accident.

DR. BEATON: What's the subject of the training that you developed that was a result of Chester?

JED DODD: All right. The training is a generic training, that teaches young members of the union that have no idea what a union is, or how to organize, how to organize around issues on the job, and to basically, stick together and promote the idea to the young.

That's the generic training. What we've done is we've coupled that with these safety leaflets we've developed, that allowed them -- what we call front line coordinators, to go out into the job sites and then discuss with the other members of the gang, using the leaflet as an education tool, to talk about basically those three issues that I've discussed before, the shunting rules, the watchman rules, and the piggy-backing.

DR. BEATON: Are you guys, is your Brotherhood doing anything because of Chester?

Unidentified Speaker?: Are we doing -yeah, we're basically doing more in depth inspections
on the on track briefings, to ensure that the foreman,
and/or maintainers in my case, are protecting
themselves properly, with respect to whether have local
control or am interlocking, or use of an SSB or not
using SSB. What are they using as a form of
protection. Proper documentation.

DR. BEATON: Okay.

JED DODD: The one thing I would say is that the leaflets we've put out have got the three union locals on the bottom of them, and the letters we've sent to the memberships and the management have all been signed by the three unions, jointly.

DR. BEATON: Okay. Without asking you for specifics on the Chester, but when you look at the circumstances of Chester, you're probably not seeing a new type of accident. I'm sure with your experience, you've seen run-throughs before, and there's lessons that have been learned and paid for in blood in the past, because of accidents like this.

How well do you think Amtrak is going to be able to learn the lessons, and act on the lessons from Chester?

Do you have any opinion about that? Or, and I don't want to just restrict it to Chester, but it's the context in which I'm motivated to ask these questions.

DAVID INGERSOLL: I don't think they learned anything from Nikki Kline's fatality.

So, I don't know what they'll learn from the Chester fatality. In my opinion.

You know, they still have helpers out there

1 taking tracking and time. What did they learn? state the mission and they do it out there all the 2 3 time. 4 They didn't learn anything. 5 JED DODD: I personally think this 6 management is so ideologically opposed, to like any 7 type of real cooperation with the unions, that they 8 can't get out of their own way, to like, promote any 9 programs that will actually change things. 10 DR. BEATON: Okay. So you're not optimistic 11 that they'll learn anything? 12 JED DODD: No I'm not. We wrote to Mr. 13 Boardman, the three unions, wrote to Mr. Boardman 14 shortly after the accident, with a list of items that 15 we thought should be corrected. And we've met with 16 senior management a few times, and it appeared at one 17 point, that we were making some headway, and then things just collapsed. 18 19 I mean a couple of minor issues, relatively 20 minor issues, in the letter we had written, were 21 addressed, and the major ones were not. 22 DR. BEATON: Did you include that letter 23 that you'd written to Boardman in the materials? In the materials? Yes I did. 24 JED DODD: 25 DR. BEATON: Okay. Thank you.

1	I think that's all the questions I have for
2	you.
3	MR. HIPSKIND: All right. Let me look
4	around the room and see if there are any seeing a
5	lot of head shaking, no.
6	Ryan, anything?
7	MR. FRIGO: I have nothing further.
8	MR. HIPSKIND: All right. Gentlemen. Let
9	me get out my script, and make sure I read these
10	questions correctly.
11	Is there any questions that we should have -
12	- or is there anything that you would like to change or
13	add to the discussion that we had here today?
14	I'll ask each of you. Jed?
15	JED DODD: No, I'm satisfied.
16	MR. HIPSKIND: Dave?
17	DAVID INGERSOLL: No.
18	MR. HIPSKIND: And Rocco:
19	ROCCO CARBINONA: I would just like to say
20	that as an ARSA representative, we are always willing
21	and able to come together to discuss improvement on
22	safety, or anything with the facet of improving our
23	working conditions, for all employees. And we're
24	willing.
25	MR. HIPSKIND: Dave, Jed, do you agree with
l	I

1	that?
2	DAVID INGERSOLL: I agree with that.
3	JED DODD: Yes, certainly.
4	DAVID INGERSOLL: I'll go on the record.
5	MR. HIPSKIND: All right. And, are there
6	any questions we should have asked, but did not?
7	No, across the board?
8	Do you have any suggestions for preventing a
9	reoccurrence, and I'll add to that, or to improve
10	safety communication, the safety culture, as you've
11	characterized it here on Amtrak?
12	Jed?
13	JED DODD: I would reinstate the close call
14	policy. I would abandon the cardinal rule policy, and
15	I would eliminate the undue influence of the legal
16	department in the Safety Advisory Committee, and what
17	those of us that have to deal with these issues on a
18	daily basis, get to the work of fixing some of these
19	problems.
20	MR. HIPSKIND: And you are committed to that
21	effort, of improving the Safety Advisory Committee?
22	JED DODD: Absolutely.
23	MR. HIPSKIND: Dave?
24	DAVID INGERSOLL: I agree with Jed. There's
25	not a time that I haven't been for all to just sit down

1	and try to rectify an issue. As Jed has said, within
2	the last few years, it's either my way or the highway,
3	and we, me speaking for me, I'm always on the outside
4	looking in.
5	MR. HIPSKIND: A positive change or
6	improvement would be welcome by all of you?
7	JED DODD: Oh, absolutely yes.
8	DAVID INGERSOLL: It would make my life
9	easier.
10	MR. HIPSKIND: Rocco, anything to add that
11	question on the
12	ROCCO CARBINONA: I would just say, a
13	truthful commitment from management to listen to the
14	organizations, would be of benefit to us all.
15	MR. HIPSKIND: Okay. And just a detail.
16	Maybe it got lost. The Safety Advisory Committee
17	are you meeting on a regular basis?
18	Yes?
19	JED DODD: Yes, except with August, things
20	got a little confused. But we're meeting since the
21	Chester accident regularly except for this last month,
22	and we'll continue to meet I'm sure.
23	MR. HIPSKIND: And how should I think of
24	that schedule? It's every
25	DAVID INGERSOLL: It's supposed to be the
	I

1 first Monday of the month. 2 MR. HIPSKIND: So monthly? DAVID INGERSOLL: 3 But there was years that 4 we didn't meet. I mean, a long time. 5 Well, what happened is when they JED DODD: 6 instituted the Safe-2-Safer, they started to, like 7 basically on have the Safe-2-Safer meeting, that the Safety Advisory Committee was supposed to be doing 8 9 other stuff, but we never did other stuff, because we -10 - they had this thing they called a dashboard, that to 11 this day, I don't know what that God damn dashboard is. 12 But we reviewed it in depth at the Safety 13 Advisory Committee meetings, but signal wasn't involved 14 in the Safe-2-Safer program. So, for several years, 15 they didn't go. 16 Okay, last question to each MR. HIPSKIND: 17 of you. Is there anyone else who we should 18 19 interview? Rocco? ROCCO CARBINONA: I have no people to give 20 21 you to interview. 22 Okay. Dave? MR. HIPSKIND: 23 DAVID INGERSOLL: I do. I think the safety 24 liaisons from the signal department would be an asset, 25 just because they are the front line guys that are

1 seeing the guys on a daily basis. MR. HIPSKIND: Okay, and the benefit of that 2 is they would give us visibility into --3 4 DAVID INGERSOLL: They would give you the 5 insight of the actual daily tasks or the obstacles that 6 are faced with on a daily basis. 7 MR. HIPSKIND: Boots on the ground. 8 world. 9 DAVID INGERSOLL: Correct. 10 MR. HIPSKIND: Okay. And Jed? 11 JED DODD: The safety liaisons. 12 there is a supervisor mentor that recently retired, 13 Rich Sullivan, that I think would be able to add a lot 14 to this discussion. And I think if you just 15 interviewed, like a random sampling, or perhaps 16 candidates, we could suggest some of the older and 17 younger foreman, and they wouldn't necessarily agree with us, or even with each other, but you'd get a 18 19 greater idea of, like what's actually going on there. 20 Because it's -- the answers aren't simple. 21 The answers are complex, and it wouldn't surprise me at 22 all if people had different opinions of the shape of 23 the table. 24 MR. HIPSKIND: Okay. I know we engaged in a 25 little bit of added information.

1	Any comments, questions from anybody?
2	MR. HIPSKIND: Okay, Gentlemen. It was our
3	honor to have you here today and we greatly appreciate
4	the open dialogue and the way you conducted yourself.
5	And with that, let's close the interview.
6	(Whereupon the interview went off
7	the record at(time).
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

CERTIFICATE

MATTER: Accident Involving Amtrak Train

89 and MOW Equipment, April 3, 2016

Accident No. DCA16FR0

Interview of Jeff Dodd, Dave Ingersoll

and Rocco Carbinona

DATE: 08-25-16

I hereby certify that the attached transcription of page 1 to 96 inclusive are to the best of my professional ability a true, accurate, and complete record of the above referenced proceedings as contained on the provided audio recording; further that I am neither counsel for, nor related to, nor employed by any of the parties to this action in which this proceeding has taken place; and further that I am not financially nor otherwise interested in the outcome of the action.

NEAL R. GROSS