Source	Comment	Steering Committe Response
		Before addressing the individual comments which have been formulating our position, the steering commitee feels we need to frame the point of reference we are approaching changes to the standards and recommended practices. The standards define Modules and sections. The proposals for double track apply only to the module endplate. A module builder is free to deviate from the track spacing at section boundaries.The module endplates are the piece of the module that ensures compatability between modules.
Groups.io	- I like the RP better. -In the RP2.6.1 I suggest clarification that track spacing is 1.125 from center to center of the two tracks.	Thanks for the comment. We will definitely add some clarification on the point of reference.
groups.io	It looks like two separable issues are in here. One is adding a standard for double tracks. It seems to me that that ought to be a standard if it's going to be a standard. That is, the standard says it's allowed and specifies the spacing to provide for interoperability. The other issue is whether to relax the requirement for the track or tracks to be centered on the endplate, perhaps changing it to be a requirement to be at least six inches from the edge instead. I'd be in favor of this change, of the increased flexibility. Since endplate size isn't fixed, the fascia already don't necessarily align. I could see an RP suggesting an optional wedge piece that brings an off-center endplate up to a more common size but I think I'd wait on that until there was some experience with the idea. Putting on my pedantic hat for writing standards: For double tracks, does the six inch requirement mean the center of the two tracks or the center of the nearest track to the edge? That is, would a 12" endplate still be proper if you have two tracks crossing it or would it have to be a bit wider so the centerlines of both tracks were at least six inches from both edges? Maybe no-one would ever put a double-track main on a 12" wide module so it doesn't really matter.	Yes, there are definitely two related issues. We are defining a standard for a module endplate that doesn't exist in the current standards. We agree that the definition needs to be more clear than it was written in the proposals
groups.io	I think perhaps it would be best to have a standard with a set end plate width, such as is the case in HO scale (see S2.2 & S2.3) to maximize interfunctionality.	The current standard is 12" or wider, and it is the goal of the commitee to not make existing modules obsolete
groups.io	In Reply to: "I think perhaps it would be best to have a standard with a set end plate width, such as is the case in HO scale (see S2.2 & S2.3) to maximize interfunctionality." I can see the attraction to this. However, imagine picking a size, whatever it is, and telling all the people who built their modules to a different size that they are now not compliant. I think that ship has sailed.	The commitee agrees. See above.

groups.io	the end plate standard is not the topic of discussion here and the end plate standard in N scale does not need to be altered, in fact making it a set size will virtually end the N scale version of free mo. We have far more flexibility with the smaller size and the end plate standard needs to reflect that flexibility. I would also expect that if the steering committee were to select a end plate standard that there would be an exception for existing modules to be exempt from any compliant issues based on the end plate size. I believe it would be hard for the committee to make that decision since at least one of the members of the committee has virtually all of his modules in a non compliant one size fits no one style. As far as double track goes. Either option is fine to me because I will never build a double track module so the standard for it does not apply to me.	The commitee agrees. See above.
groups.io	There should also be a standard for double track spacing on curves based on the radius. Not just Tangent track at the end plate. Photos are 1.125" on 22" inner radius.	Because we are specifying the minimum radius, but a modeler can choose to exceed the minimum radius, We feel the best course of action is to follow the minimum track spacing for curves specified in NMRA RP-7.2. NMRA RP-7.2 specifies mimimum track spacing for for 21 11/32" radius track as 1 11/32". We will add an RP indicating the NMRA spacing should be followed for double track curvature.
groups.io	I vote for the standard to include the double track standard as a standard and not an RP. I would also like to see an addition to the proposal that the double track module owner is responsible for providing a single track connecting module if required by the show organizers. I'd like to see this since I have zero chance of building a double track module and for protecting equipment at shows.	We agree that it should be a recommended pratice that any modeler with modules with double track should also provide one or more conversion modules to single track.
direct e-mail	Double Track etc. WRT - discussion about standard width. The variety of widths is a huge benefit and should not be discouraged. Minimum width at 12” as it is currently. I don’t see a need for the track to be centered on the module endplate. Having the mating or via track(s) centerline (center of the outer most via track) at least 6 inches from the edge of the module would be prudent. (1) Double track also need not be centered but as prior. (1) 1.25 parallel track centering is fine. Standard vs. Recommended Practice: Recommended Practice … Free-moN is NOT a multi track standard. It is a mater of principle. Double Track is a race track. There is nothing limiting as a RP - it provides the ability for mating never before mated modules BUT conveys or emphasizes that Free-moN is not a multi track standard.	The principle reason for considering a double track spacing is to allow individuals to contribute to passing sidings, which are required for operation of a single track railroad.
direct e-mail	Given the two choices, I believe the second proposal linked here http://drafts.free-mon.net/standard-MultiTrackAsRP.html?fbclid=IwAR3PgtS-vKBY_RI_LGci8CyL3CDdoqccGC0_4pZMQaH1ehZ2jC9qjI03Jeg#Track will be the most beneficial to the community.	Thanks for your perspective
direct e-mail	Well, since the steering committee is intent on forcing a two track endplate on everyone instead of the kiss design originally set by the creator of free-mon, Wesley Steiner, I’ll give my observations regarding YOUR standards. The S2.6d provides the ability to have two independently built modules to be connected from either end without altering the smooth side edges of equal width modules. Whereas 2.6 seems to kind of set no standard other than approximating the endplate track to be near center on modules wider than 12”. RP2.6.1 further attempts to suggest a further elimination or confusion to what is left of the end track standard. Neither draft indicates who becomes responsible for providing transition modules to allow mating new "compliant” modules to the original kiss standard of single, centered track module.	Today, there is no endplate that allows more than one track to cross at the module endplate. The principle reason for considering a double track spacing is to allow individuals to contribute to passing sidings, which are required for operation of a single track railroad. The addition of double track does not eliminate the single track endplate. In reference to the alignment of fascia, the existing standard doesn't garantee a smooth transition, because it only specifies a minimum module endplate width, not a maximum. We agree that it should be a recommended pratice that any modeler with modules with double track should also provide one or more conversion modules to single track.
direct e-mail	If you make it a Standard there is no language about what side of the track needs to be 0.5625" from the track center. So I could align the inside rail of the track, the track center or the outside rail 0.5625 from the centerline of the module and I'd be in perfect compliance - but there's no guarantee that my double track would match anyone else's.	Thanks for the comment. We will definitely add some clarification on the point of reference.

direct e-mail	I have been considering the double track options you have proposed. Putting it in as a standard might cause some confusion for new module builders. Adding it as an RP will keep it in line with what we have been seeing so far from module builders. With the double track RP, the transitions needs to be addressed at the same time. Please don't omit adding a corresponding RO that would have the double to single transition be the responsibility of the double track module owner. Having a double track module butted up to a single track would create visual inconsistency. I say this as I'm planning to double track my next module set. This RP add-on would keep the double track RP in line with the current standards.	Again, we are specifically addressing module endplates, and nothing is requring a modeler to build a double track module Today, a double track endplate must be a section boundary, because there is only a single track standard. The commitee intendeds to add an RP addressing the transition modules.
Facebook	RP. no specific reasons. just seems logical	Thanks for your perspective
Facebook	RP, totally. Much more "Free". And of course, local clubs can adopt a stricter local standard, that still meets the overall requirement.	Thanks for your perspective
Facebook	In Reply to "And of course, local clubs can adopt a stricter local standard, that still meets the overall requirement." Not sure how choosing Single vs Double module is any LESS free than having an RP? This just makes layout designers life easier knowing all Double track modules will work together because their is a standard.	Thanks for your perspective Having a double track spacing standard gives confidence to module builders that their modules will interconnect. An RP does not provide this assurance.
Facebook	With the generous curves why not keep it simple ?? Use modern prototype spacing, 14 ft on center.	the reason 1.125" was chosen is because the majority of existing double track sections are already built to that dimension. Using this spacing would allow those sections to be considered modules.
Facebook	Making it a formal standard is an absolute no-brainer. 15ft on center is prototypical and looks good.	Thanks for your perspective
Facebook	"1.125" spacing" needs more specific information. Between centers, between adjacent rails, etc. Also should the center-line between 2-track be "near center on the width" or should one of the tracks be "near center"?	Thanks for your perspective, the final proposal will provide more clarity.
Facebook	S2.6 At the endplate, track shall cross near center on the width, not less than 6" from either side edge. All track crossing the endplate shall perpendicular straight, and level for at least 4 inches from the outside face of the endplate. This is the wording for the RP option. It is VASTLY different than the Double Track as a Standard. This is saying the track can be anywhere, as long as it's 6 inches away from the edge. This is another change that I feel should be separate from the Double Track addition. I vote for Double Track as a standard not a RP even if the language was the same, which is not.	Yes, there are definitely two related issues. We are defining a standard for a module endplate that doesn't exist in the current standards. We agree that the definition needs to be more clear than it was written in the proposals
Facebook	I say RP. I believe that keeping the single track standard is more in line with the original spirit of free-mo as well as the fact that most railroads in America aren't double tracked. There is also the factor that many iconic railroad scenes in the country are single tracked and if double track were to become the standard it could potentially throw a pretty big wrench into the plans of someone that is trying to faithfully recreate a prototype scene. On top of that this could also affect those that either already do or want to incorporate their free-mo modules into their home layout. I think that by keeping the single track standard that it would make things much easier for those who want to model a specific prototype, build a simple starter module, or incorporate their modules into their at home layout. I do like the idea of having a well defined standard for how double track modules are to be built but I personally don't think that it should become the standard.	This conversation provides a great deal of insight into the thinking of the community. All of these thoughts are being considered as we draft the final proposal
	Reply from a group member: This is "addition to" NOT "changing from" Double to Single. Which we have already been using for years in consensus.	
	Reply from original author: Oohhhhhhhhhh. Man am I glad that I didn't become a lawyer, I would've disappointed so many people. In that case I favor proposal 1. I can see trying to coordinate the double track spacing between multiple modules with different track spacings could cause some significant problems in the future. My bad for the misunderstanding.	
	Reply from Group Member: How does a RP force them into staying in 1.125 spacing??	
	Reply from original Author: Ok I now change my mind for a second time and prefer the RP. I like the freedom of design of being able to change where on the module end the double track is as long as the 1.125 spacing is maintained.	
Facebook	The wording on both versions seems to be lacking slightly. I'm supportive of a double track option, and I know it should be 1.125". I'd be fine with an RP with a transition provision. If the DT standard is an RP, it could also include an RP that the DT module owner should be responsible for the double to single transition module (as the original standard still is ST) at shows.	Thanks for your perspective. The final wording will be clarified using your input, and will include an provision for who provides the transition modules.
Facebook	RP. It gives more flexibility	Thanks for your perspective

groups.io	I support the idea that the track location on the endplate be located 6 inches from either side edge plus the track spacing. Therefore, the minimum width of the endplate for one track is 12 inches and for two tracks is 13.125 inches. For a 24 inch width endplate, the track(s) location would be anywhere between 6 inches to 18 inches, preferring 12 inches for one track or 11.4375 inches and 12.5625 for two tracks. This flexibility would allow the module builder to place the track(s) without the use of a s-curve. A s-curve minimum length is 18 inches, curve 6 inches, straight 6 inches, and curve 6 inches. If the builder uses easements the s-curve minimum length is 42 inches, easement, curve, easement, straight, easement, curve, and easement. Double track implies an increase in speed, length of trains, increasing the curve radius, and more sidings that are serving industries. Remember do not foul the main. To support pushing rail cars, the minimum length for straights, easements, and curves shall be 6 inches. The curvature rails in a switch, curvature point to frog point, the minimum length shall be 6 inches or Frog 11 or higher.	Thanks for noting that the 6" minimum spacing to the edge would require double track modules of minimum width to be wider at the endplate than a single track module. We consider this to be unworkable, due to the existance of existing double track sections, which we would like to redesignate as modules. The eased S-curve requirement is not something we had considered. This will be considered in future standard revisions. The information about switches is something for the commitee to consider. We also must ensure that the standard does not preclude the use of comercially available turnouts.