

**AGING TRANSPORT SYSTEMS RULEMAKING
ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Meeting Minutes**

Date: April 25-26, 2001

Time: 9:00 a.m.

Place: FAA Headquarters
Bessie Coleman Conference Center
Washington, DC

DAY ONE

Administrative

Mr. Kent Hollinger, the Aging Transport Systems Rulemaking Advisory Committee (ATSRAC) Chair, called the meeting to order at 9:10 a.m. after which Mr. Charles Huber, the ATSRAC Executive Director, read the advisory committee briefing statement.

New Web Site for ATSRAC

Following Mr. Huber's statement, Mr. Hollinger began discussion about ATSRAC's new web site by referring to the Committee's growing visibility in terms of several recent news articles. He went on to say that given this increased attention, there will very likely be an increased need to make information available to the public. Therefore, a new web site (www.mitreaasd.org/atrac/index.html) will be made available to the public, in addition to the FAA web site, which will include ATSRAC related information and will educate the public about issues related to aviation. Mr. Hollinger added that the new web site will also include a link to the FAA web site. Following this discussion, Mr. Hollinger introduced Ms. Brenda Courtney (FAA) via teleconference from Seattle, Washington and noted that she would be joining the first part of the meeting. He then ended this discussion by requesting that all future presentations to the Committee at public meetings be sent to him electronically so that he could have them posted on the new web site.

E-mails

Mr. Hollinger advised the group that there had been several requests from individuals on the ATSRAC mailing list not to receive so many e-mails; therefore, he requested that e-mails be sent to only those individuals who need to be copied.

JASZ Codes

Mr. Hollinger discussed that at the end of the January meeting they were told that the JASZ codes now have a 97 sub-chapter that may take care of the wire reporting issue. He asked the group to think about whether this does resolve that issue.

Following this discussion, Mr. Hollinger asked the group to note any changes to the attendee sign-in sheet (Handout 1) that was going around so that he could update the roster and send an electronic copy to everyone.

**AGING TRANSPORT SYSTEMS RULEMAKING
ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Meeting Minutes**

General Discussion: Minutes

Following the introduction of attendees, Mr. Patrick Glapa (Airbus) commented on the extended turn-around time for finalizing the minutes. Mr. Huber responded by saying that he would consult with Ms. Shirley Stroman (FAA) and FAA management to determine how best to improve the timeliness of completing the minutes.

Following Mr. Huber's response, Mr. Edward Block commented that he had an issue with the accuracy of the October 2000 minutes in that the acknowledgement by the Task 5 chairperson of his contribution to the Task 5 working group had been omitted from the October minutes. Mr. Block indicated that he had raised this point at the January meeting. In response, Ms. Brenda Courtney indicated that she had re-reviewed the tapes of the January meeting and had not found the discussion in question. Following additional comments concerning this issue, the Committee unanimously agreed to a note in the April 2001 minutes that would acknowledge that Mr. Block's group, IASA, was among those that had provided feedback to working group 5 on its activities. That note is as follows:

On page 6 of the October 2000 minutes under the heading "Training Working Group Presentation," it states "...The Curriculum [sic] and Lesson Plans include feedback from Flight Safety Boeing Training International, OEMs, working group 5, ATA Aviation Technical Education Council, IATA and regulatory agencies (FAA, CAA, JAA, TC)." This list of organizations that provided feedback also includes IASA.

After this decision, Mr. Hollinger reiterated his earlier comment to the group that any changes to the minutes must be made at the time the Committee reviews the minutes and must be made in an open forum before the Committee to become an official part of the record.

Meeting Agenda (Handout 2)

Mr. Hollinger reviewed the agenda and informed the group that the official taskings had not yet been publicly presented, so the working group co-chairs would make presentations today that reflected their thoughts on what the plans and objectives of the working groups might be. This, Mr. Hollinger continued, would better ensure that the working groups' expectations, once they began their work, would be aligned with those of the Committee's. He then announced to the group that no one from working group 8 was present to give that group's presentation, so the agenda would be shortened.

Approval of January Minutes (Handout 3)

Mr. Hollinger began discussion of the January minutes, which led to statements from Mr. Block questioning the accuracy of the minutes concerning his dissenting opinion on the Intrusive Inspection Report. Following considerable discussion of this topic, Mr. Hollinger asked for a vote by the Committee on the accuracy of the minutes, specifically the first paragraph on page 7 of the January 2001 minutes, which references Mr. Block's dissenting opinions. The Committee voted unanimously that the minutes were accurate in this regard; however, Mr. Glapa pointed out that the same topic as noted in item # 8 of

**AGING TRANSPORT SYSTEMS RULEMAKING
ADVISORY COMMITTEE**

Meeting Minutes

the “Action Items and Key Decisions and Conclusions,” showed a different date than the one referenced on page 7 of the minutes. Following these comments, the Committee agreed to revise the date in item # 8 from December 2000 to January 12, 2001. After further discussion of the minutes and requests for additional, minor typographical corrections, a motion was made and seconded to accept the January minutes with the corrections approved by the Committee.

ATSRAC and EAPAS Presentation (Handout 4)

Following the morning break, Mr. Hollinger introduced Mr. Huber’s presentation by referring the group to the ATSRAC Operating Procedures where he briefly summarized the process for acceptance of taskings and announcement of them to the public. He advised the group that, per ATSRAC’s operating procedures, the taskings had not yet been signed by the Associate Administrator for Regulation and Certification; therefore, they could not yet be formally announced to the public. Following these remarks, Mr. Huber began his presentation by stating that he hoped to have the taskings signed by the Associate Administrator, Mr. Tom McSweeney, by the end of the meeting so that the taskings could be officially announced at today’s meeting. He continued his presentation by stating that per ATSRAC’s operating procedures, once Mr. McSweeney signs the tasking statements, the Committee had two options for announcing them; they could either announce them at a public meeting or publish them in the Federal Register. Mr. Huber indicated that the Committee would do both. He continued his presentation by discussing the process for announcing and issuing the taskings. He noted that finalization of the working group members would be done 30 days after the announcement of the taskings in the Federal Register, which would include an invitation to interested persons to apply for membership in the working groups.

Discussion: Timeframe for Working Groups to Begin Work

Following Mr. Huber’s comments, a lengthy discussion ensued regarding whether “start-up” work in the working groups could begin before all the members were selected. The discussion focused on the need to get started as quickly as possible given the tight timeframe of 10 months from approval of the taskings to providing the FAA with the Committee’s final reports. Mr. Victor Card (JAA) commented that the JAA was “very concerned” about the schedule, particularly with regard to tasks 6 and 9. He went on to say that based on prior experience with ARAC, he was not sure the work of these groups could be achieved in the stated timeframe. He further commented that many of the experts needed for the current taskings were already working on ARAC and other tasks, which would make it even more difficult to meet the timeframe in the current schedule. Mr. Norman Vincent (IATA) suggested that the Committee decide on a case-by-case basis whether a particular working group could begin work immediately given its specific tasks and current membership, or wait until the full working group was selected. Another participant indicated that it would be redundant to begin work with a partial group only to have to cover the same ground to bring new members up-to-date. Mr. Hollinger asked the group to table the discussion until Mr. Huber completed the next slide titled “Process” of his presentation.

**AGING TRANSPORT SYSTEMS RULEMAKING
ADVISORY COMMITTEE**

Meeting Minutes

Following the end of Mr. Huber's discussion of the "Process" slide and some additional comments on the pros and cons of the working groups' starting work immediately, Mr. Hollinger asked that further discussion on the topic be put on hold and taken up again during the individual working group presentations.

ATSRAC and EAPAS Presentation Continued (Handout 4a)

Mr. Huber continued his presentation with a discussion of the revised tasking statements, which he indicated was the official tasking statements to be signed by Mr. McSweeney. Mr. Huber followed these comments with a detailed review of each task in Handout 4a. In his discussion of task 6, he noted that the Committee would need to assist working group 6 with developing a process to coordinate with other related harmonization working groups. He also noted that task 6.7 (Identify Requirements for Wire Separation) would be particularly challenging to accomplish because of the many differing opinions about what wire separation actually is.

Discussion: Wire Performance Requirements

Following the end of Mr. Huber's review of task 6, a lengthy discussion ensued about ATSRAC's role in addressing wire performance. Mr. Block expressed concern about what the ATSRAC was doing in relation to the issues raised in the Intrusive Inspection Report about wire performance. In response to this and similar comments, Mr. Hollinger read from ATSRAC's Operating Procedures the process for the FAA's tasking of the Committee and the Committee's acceptance of the taskings. He noted that ATSRAC could undertake only those tasks approved by FAA and accepted by the Committee. And, once accepted, the Committee could not modify the tasks, but it could recommend to the FAA that it be tasked with a particular issue. Therefore, since wire performance was not included in the current set of tasks, the Committee could not modify them to include this issue. Mr. Huber added that while wire performance is not a part of the ATSRAC taskings, it was being addressed elsewhere under EAPAS. He added that any citizen could suggest to the FAA that it pursue rulemaking in a particular area.

ATSRAC and EAPAS Presentation Continued (Handout 4a)

Following the wire performance discussion, Mr. Huber returned to his presentation by reviewing task 7. In his discussion, he noted that task 7.5 was probably the most difficult task of all as it involved advising the FAA if it needs rulemaking to require updates to the Standard Wire Practice Manuals (SWPM) throughout the transport fleet. He added that task group 4 had found that the SWPM had formatting problems, so a part of task 7 includes recommending a standard format and defining what the basic content should be. Regarding task 8, Mr. Huber stated that coordinating with other ATSRAC harmonization working groups was key for this task. He went on to say that while a good lesson planning curriculum came out of task 5, it is important to ensure that training is based on the new enhanced maintenance program. This means there needs to be strong ties between working groups 8 and 9 because if there are additions to the maintenance program that come from working group 9, those additions need to be updated in the training program. In his discussion about task 9, Mr. Huber stated that the Wire Systems Instructions for Continued Airworthiness was included in task 9.5 because the body of expertise exists there as opposed to task group 6. However, task 9.5 should be closely

**AGING TRANSPORT SYSTEMS RULEMAKING
ADVISORY COMMITTEE**

Meeting Minutes

coordinated with task 6 because it will ultimately involve revisions to part 25, Appendix H.

EAPAS Graphic Presentation (Handout 4b)

Mr. Huber discussed Handout 4b at length. He included an explanation about the difference between EAPAS (Enhanced Airworthiness Program for Airplane Systems) and ATSRAC. He indicated that EAPAS consists of long term and near term strategies. Some of the near term strategies, which will happen before the end of the year, include the ADs that resulted from the Non-Intrusive Inspection Report, Hand Book Bulletins that are being developed, and training programs within the FAA that are on-going. These strategies, Mr. Huber stated, are intended to effect some simple but beneficial change. The long-term strategies, he added, involve ATSRAC, which falls under the EAPAS umbrella. The ATSRAC component of EAPAS includes its assigned taskings and associated rulemaking and is one way the FAA is addressing wire systems safety. Following Mr. Huber's discussion of Handout 4b, Mr. Hollinger asked if any Committee members would like to have periodic updates on EAPAS tasks other than the ATSRAC-related tasks. There was a consensus that the group wanted an informational update on these other activities, whereby Mr. Hollinger responded that the updates would begin at the July meeting.

Acceptance of Tasks

At the end of Mr. Huber's presentation of the taskings, Mr. Hollinger called for a vote on acceptance of the tasks. In response, concern was raised about whether acceptance of the tasks meant acceptance of the completion date referenced in the current schedule, which some of the working groups had already expressed would be a challenge to achieve. Mr. Hollinger indicated that the points were well taken, given that the working groups would present individual recommendations during their presentations regarding the schedule for their particular task. Therefore, he rephrased his statement to ask the Committee for a vote on their acceptance of the intent and objective of the taskings irrespective of the current schedule and of any additional taskings. The Committee voted unanimously to accept the taskings with the noted conditions.

ATSRAC Rulemaking Process Presentation

Mr. Huber began the afternoon session by asking the group if they had a copy of the ATSRAC Operating Procedures. Several members indicated that they did not, whereby Mr. Hollinger stated that he would e-mail a copy to them. Mr. Huber then began his presentation. He noted that ATSRAC was organized by authority of the FAA Administrator and operates, like ARAC, via FACA (Federal Advisory Committee Act). FACA, for example, requires the Committee to have operating procedures. In the past, ATSRAC was more of a technical organization. However, in this implementation phase, the Committee would become more administrative and "a little bit referee." The group was advised of the importance of the working groups —

- Developing a clear work plan for ATSRAC's approval;
- Doing a lot of their work in between meetings so as to stay on schedule;

**AGING TRANSPORT SYSTEMS RULEMAKING
ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Meeting Minutes**

- Having working group chairs communicate frequently with Committee members in their respective organizations so that those members can report back to the full Committee on the status of working group activities; and
- Bringing any issues before the Committee that are roadblocks to the working groups' getting their work done and advising the Committee of any need of assistance that will help the working groups achieve their objectives.

Following Mr. Huber's presentation, Mr. Hollinger told the group to make a note to review the ATSRAC Operating Procedures (Green Book), specifically section IV under the heading "Process." He covered the following points:

- Section A is pre-ATSRAC, which is being covered today, and which goes through task approval and discussion at the meeting.
- Section B is "Working Group Formation," which is what the group is embarking on.
- Section C is the "Work Plan Phase," which is prepared by the working group and approved by ATSRAC.
- Section D is the "Concept Approval Phase," which the working group also develops and obtains approval from ATSRAC.
- Section E, "Recommendation Development Phase," involves the working groups' developing their recommendation documents.
- Section F, the "FAA Action Phase," involves the FAA's development of the Committee's recommendations.

Mr. Hollinger advised the group that this process should be done sequentially, so considering the schedule, the work plan and concept approval could be done via e-mail and presented at the July meeting.

Working Group 6 Presentation (Handout 5)

The working group 6 co-chairs, Mr. Vid Variakojis (Boeing) and Mr. Jean-Luc Ballenghien (Airbus) presented a proposed draft Statement of Work that is summarized below.

- The objective is to develop identical text to the greatest extent possible that FAA and JAA will adopt so that the OEMs don't have to certify items twice to different regulatory agencies.
- This is a harmonization effort, not a report writing, data collection, or review effort.

Discussion: Should Working Groups Provide Recommended Rule Language?

Following Mr. Variakojis' comments, Mr. Huber said that the focus of the working group should be report writing, not development of regulatory language unless the working group has time to do that. Mr. Variakojis indicated that he understood this and referred to the proposed working group report format that says: For the development of any recommended regulation or advisory circulars, the working group should provide suggested wording—not necessarily in the standard format but in specific terms. Mr. Variakojis added that he was concerned about not taking advantage of the expertise within the working groups to recommend language. Mr. Huber reiterated that the intent

**AGING TRANSPORT SYSTEMS RULEMAKING
ADVISORY COMMITTEE**

Meeting Minutes

is to comply with the tasking statements in the form of a report, but if the working groups have time, they could develop rulemaking language. However, the first priority is to respond to the questions in the tasking statements. Mr. Variakojis responded that if working group 6 was only required to provide recommendations without guidance, that could be done within the 10-month schedule. However, if guidance was required, the schedule was too tight. Mr. Huber commented that the taskings do require that guidance be provided. The complete tasks include providing reports that answer the questions in the taskings and give appropriate guidance. For example, with respect to paragraph 1353 that requires wire separation, there is no AC that addresses this issue. Therefore, if guidance already exists in another form (e.g., SAE specs.) that sufficiently explains what the rule should contain, that existing guidance could be offered by the working group to fulfill the guidance requirement of the tasking. Mr. Variakojis voiced agreement with these comments and continued his presentation.

Following a brief resumption of the presentation, the discussion concerning guidance began again after a comment by Mr. Variakojis about the content of the working group's recommendations. Mr. Frederick Sobeck (FAA) indicated that based on his experience with ARAC working groups, ARAC, in response to its taskings, may propose rule language along with its technical reports and background material that supports its recommendations. The FAA's technical writers, then, would use this information to develop preamble and rule language. Mr. Hollinger added, and another participant agreed, that his personal opinion was that the working groups should be as specific as possible in developing a product that is at least 92 percent a complete rule as opposed to giving general nonspecific recommendations. Otherwise, the Committee would not be much further along than it is currently.

Working Group 6 Presentation Continued (Handout 5)

Following the above comments, Mr. Variakojis continued his presentation of Handout 5. Under section (II)(b), that discusses coordination with other working groups, Mr. Patrick Glapa (Airbus) asked why working group 8 was not included. Mr. Hollinger noted that in the tasking statements (Handout 4a), task 6.3 also does not include coordination with task group 8. Mr. Huber agreed that task 8 should be included under paragraph 6.3 of the taskings and should also be included in corresponding areas of task group 6's Statement of Work.

Discussion: Working Group 6 Schedule

Mr. Variakojis ended his presentation with a discussion of the schedule, indicating that it is based on a 12-month period, which is very ambitious. Mr. Hollinger noted that this would go beyond the 10-month period in the schedule and asked if the extended schedule included working group 6's offering specific, unpolished rule language. Mr. Variakojis responded that it would take at least 2 years to accomplish that level of detail, especially in the advisory circular area. Mr. Hollinger asked for clarification in that if the working group agreed that certain wires being separated was required, would the 12-month schedule include the working groups' noting exactly how far they would be separated but not include specific rule language to this effect. Mr. Variakojis responded that that was correct. The discussion continued with a question by Mr. Glapa. He asked if all of the

**AGING TRANSPORT SYSTEMS RULEMAKING
ADVISORY COMMITTEE**

Meeting Minutes

sub-tasks in task 6 had to be completed before rulemaking could begin. Mr. Hollinger asked a follow-up question about whether the group's work would be done in parallel for each sub-task and the complete results presented in July 2002 or whether the group could submit results to the FAA sequentially as each sub-task is completed. Mr. Variakojis responded that he would have to discuss this with the working group before providing an answer and would respond to the question at the July meeting.

NOTE: Mr. Hollinger interrupted the discussion to advise the group that the Committee had just received a signed copy of the tasking statements from the FAA's Associate Administrator, Regulation and Certification. As a result, he was giving official public notice of the signed tasks, which would also be published in the Federal Register.

Following additional discussion about the schedule, Mr. Hollinger asked for a vote on the acceptance of working group 6's schedule as indicated in handout 5. The group voted unanimously to accept the July 2002 date for completion of task 6. After the vote, there was additional discussion and concerns expressed about whether the Committee's acceptance of the taskings meant that they were also accepting the current schedule. Mr. Hollinger suggested that he could write a letter to Mr. McSweeney stating that the Committee had accepted the taskings with the schedule provided by the working group co-chairs, then asked for other suggestions. Mr. Card commented that the July 2002 date for working group 6 to complete its final report coincided with the timeframe for the ATSRAC meeting. Given that, he asked if the group intended to finish its report in early July so that the Committee had the opportunity to review it for discussion at the July meeting. Mr. Variakojis responded that the group would do everything possible to complete its work by early July. Following several suggestions for specific wording of Mr. Hollinger's letter, he asked for a vote on his proposal to send the letter with the suggested content. The Committee voted unanimously in favor of the proposal. Given the concern about whether the Committee's earlier vote on the tasks meant that they accepted the timeframes in the corresponding schedule, Mr. Hollinger asked for a second vote on whether the Committee accepted the tasks with the schedule that would be included in the letter to Mr. McSweeney. The Committee voted unanimously to accept the taskings with the revised schedule.

Ms. Tracey Johnson (Boeing), one of the working group 7 co-chairs indicated that the other co-chair, Mr. Tony Poole (Airbus) had not yet arrived and asked that their presentation be delayed. Mr. Hollinger informed the group that the agenda would be revised to have working group 9 do their presentation today and the working group 7 and 8 discussion would be presented on day two.

Working Group 9 Presentation (Handout 6)

Mr. Randy Boren (Northwest Airline) presented a high-level overview of working group 9 that included detailed discussion of the schedule. He commented that the schedule, as indicated in the handout, was based on the November 2001

**AGING TRANSPORT SYSTEMS RULEMAKING
ADVISORY COMMITTEE**

Meeting Minutes

completion date, which he said the nominated working group members believed was unrealistic. Therefore, he asked that the completion date be revised to July 2002.

Discussion: Working Group 9 Proposed Schedule

The Committee discussed the implications of accepting the proposed schedule. One participant expressed concern that the working groups may get out of sync if they all have the same completion date because certain groups needed information from other groups to complete their work. Therefore, it was suggested that the co-chairs keep a "hot list" of items, like wire separation, where specific information had to be shared with another group and get that preliminary information to that group within a shorter timeframe. Mr. Hollinger indicated that work was already being done to develop a formal process for coordination among the working groups that is expected to be ready for presentation at the July meeting. Mr. Card expressed that the JAA would support the July 2002 date for completion of task 9. He also noted that the current nominees for this working group had the core expertise in place so could possibly meet before the Federal Register announcement. Mr. Hollinger asked for discussion on Mr. Card's proposal to "jump start" working group 9. One participant proposed that this decision be left to the working group chairs. Mr. Hollinger called for a vote on allowing working group 9 to get started once its core membership had been confirmed. The Committee voted unanimously to allow this. He then asked for a vote on the revised schedule for this working group. The vote was unanimous to accept the revised schedule.

DAY TWO:

Mr. Hollinger reconvened the meeting and introduced the co-chairs for working group 7, Ms Tracey Johnson and Mr. Tony Poole.

Working Group 7 Presentation (Handout 7)

Mr. Poole began the presentation with a discussion of the current working group members and noted that it was imperative that the group include a heavy representation from the airlines. The following points were covered:

- The reference to the ESPM was added to refer to the European counterpart to the SWPM.
- The co-chairs could do quite a bit of work on task 7.3 before the working group gets started.
- The formatting of two OEMs into one format will have a large impact on industry.
- The development of standard content is limited because content between OEMs will slightly differ.
- The 2001 deadline is not realistic mainly because feedback from other working groups is required to update the manuals and review the impact. Therefore, the proposed schedule is to complete the task by January 2002.

**AGING TRANSPORT SYSTEMS RULEMAKING
ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Meeting Minutes**

Discussion: Working Group 7 Proposed Schedule

Mr. Hollinger asked the presenters to discuss their recommendation for completing the tasks. Ms. Johnson indicated that the group could complete the task 9 subtasks from task 4 by the October 2001 Committee meeting. Mr. Hollinger asked that given the group's dependence on information from other working groups that wouldn't have their reports completed until July 2002, was January 2002 a realistic date to complete task 9. Ms. Johnson and Mr. Poole responded that the January date was reasonable since they could complete part of the task by October. However, there may be some updates to the task 7 report once other working groups complete their reports in July 2002. It was agreed that working group 7 would provide an interim report in January 2002 and provide updates in August 2002 based on input from other working groups.

Discussion: Working Group 8

Mr. Hollinger indicated that many of the working group nominees were not present, so no presentation by that group would be made. However, he believed that this report would be fairly straightforward as a lot of the work had been done in task 5. Therefore, this working group would probably have the least amount of work to do compared to the other working groups. Mr. Huber indicated that quite a bit of coordination had to be done with tasks 6, 7, and 9, so there should be dates in the task 9 schedule to provide working group 8 with the information it needs. The Committee voted unanimously on using the same proposed schedule for task 8 as referenced for task 7.

A participant raised a question about whether there was precedence for developing recurrent training programs. Mr. Sobeck indicated that he would explore if there were such precedence.

Following the working group 8 discussion, Ms. Luci Critenden (NASA) asked for a one-page description of the taskings for the Committee members to submit to their manager. Mr. Hollinger asked if other members wanted this information. After receiving several acknowledgements that this information would be helpful, Mr. Hollinger asked the working group chairs to provide this information to him electronically.

Training Presentation (Handout 8)

Mr. Kirk Thornburg (Northwest Airlines) provided a presentation that he had previously given at the 2001 EMMC (Engineering Maintenance and Material Council) Forum in Dallas, Texas, which outline steps to operators of what they could immediately do to enhance their electrical systems maintenance programs.

Discussion: Wire Performance Standards

- Following Mr. Thornburg's presentation, a lengthy discussion ensued about the wire performance standards issues and the ATSRAC's role in this area. Comments included the need for harmonization of wire performance standards and industry's

**AGING TRANSPORT SYSTEMS RULEMAKING
ADVISORY COMMITTEE**

Meeting Minutes

involvement in this process. In response, Mr. Huber indicated that while wire performance standards was an EAPAS task, it did not fall under ATSRAC. Discussion was then directed at whether ATSRAC should be tasked with this function. After a number of additional comments, the Committee agreed to table the discussion about whether it should recommend to the FAA that it task ATSRAC with wire performance standards until after the July 2001 meeting. It was proposed that the Tech. Center, which is currently reviewing this issue, give a presentation on the status of its work in this area and possibly hold the July meeting at the Tech. Center.

Review Action Items

Mr. Hollinger reviewed the status of the action items from the January 2001 minutes. He noted that the first item was still pending and he would ask Mr. Skip Jones (AIA) to coordinate a presentation by engine manufacturers about wiring for the July meeting. He reiterated the dates in item two for future meetings and stated that all meetings would be held in D.C. unless there was a valid reason to hold them elsewhere. He told the group that they could make suggestions for alternative locations. It was noted that items three and five (putting meeting handouts and Committee reports on the web) were being worked on and item four had been implemented. Following review of the January action items, Mr. Hollinger and Ms. Stroman reviewed the list of action items to be distributed for the April 2001 meeting.

Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 12: 30 p.m. on April 26, 2001.

Kent Hollinger

Chair

Approved:

**AGING TRANSPORT SYSTEMS RULEMAKING
ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Meeting Minutes**

ACTION ITEMS

1. Contact engine manufacturers about wiring and have them refer someone to make a presentation to ATSRAC. (Bob Robeson)—Action Item from July 2000 meeting.
2. Review alternatives for preparing meeting minutes to improve the turn-around time between meetings and the submission of minutes to the Committee. (Courtney, Stroman)
3. Provide Committee with update of FAA Projects (Near and Long Term Strategies) included in EAPAS graphic handed out as part of Chuck's EAPAS presentation. (Hollinger)
4. Send copy of ATSRAC Operating Procedures (Green Book) to Committee members per Kent's list. (Hollinger)
5. Prepare a letter to Tom McSweeney stating Committee has accepted taskings and that the Committee accepted the schedule provided by the Working Group Co-Chairs. (Hollinger)
6. Provide electronic copies to attendees of all presentations at April meeting. (Hollinger)
7. Contact ATA to solicit participation on Working Group 7. (Hollinger)
8. Bill Schultz will follow-up on GAMA's providing participation in WG 7.
9. Fred Sobeck will explore if there is precedence for training manual formats for recurring training.
10. Each WG Co-Chair will provide a summary of his/her WG's tasks and send it to Kent in electronic form.
11. Chuck Huber will look into having the Tech. Center do a presentation at the July meeting on wiring performance. He will also investigate the possibility of having the July meeting at that facility.
12. Chuck Huber will check with John Hickey on any existing policy for retaining/not retaining tape recordings of ATSRAC meeting minutes.
13. The taskings and accompanying schedule will be published in the Federal Register with a request for volunteers for Working Groups 6-9. (Stroman)
14. Working Group Co-Chairs for tasks 1-5 will provide Kent with electronic copies of their taskings to include in his ATSRAC web site.

**AGING TRANSPORT SYSTEMS RULEMAKING
ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Meeting Minutes**

KEY DECISIONS AND CONCLUSIONS

- The Chair advised the group that official changes to meeting minutes must be brought before the Committee at a public meeting and discussed in an open forum to be acknowledged and confirmed.
- The Chair requested that all future meeting presentations be provided to him in electronic form in addition to any hardcopies provided to meeting attendees.
- The Committee voted unanimously on the following item:
ATSRAC would request that FAA allow 14 months (July 2002) for Working Groups to complete Tasks 6 and 9 and submit draft reports to ATSRAC for approval, with final reports submitted to FAA by August 2002. Tasks 7 and 8 would supply interim reports by January 2002. These interim reports would be updated in August 2002 with any new information from working groups 6 and 9.
- The Committee agreed to table the discussion about whether it should request that FAA task ATSRAC with wire performance until after the July 2001 meeting where it was proposed that the Tech. Center give a presentation on the status of its work in this area.

**AGING TRANSPORT SYSTEMS RULEMAKING
ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Meeting Minutes**