

**AGING TRANSPORT SYSTEMS RULEMAKING  
ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
MEETING MINUTES**

**Date:** July 9 and 10, 2002  
**Time:** 9:00 a.m. (9<sup>th</sup>) 8:00 a.m. (10<sup>th</sup>)  
**Place:** Federal Aviation Administration  
MacCracken Room  
800 Independence Ave., SW  
Washington, D.C.

July 11, 2002  
8:00 a.m.  
Boeing Company  
1200 Wilson Blvd.  
Rosslyn, VA

**DAY ONE: July 9, 2002**

**Administrative**

Mr. Kent Hollinger, the Aging Transport Systems Rulemaking Advisory Committee (ATSRAC) Chair, called the meeting to order at 9:05 a.m., after which Mr. Charles Huber, the ATSRAC Executive Director, read the advisory committee briefing statement. After Mr. Huber's statement, Mr. Hollinger welcomed the group and reviewed the agenda items (Handout 1), which was followed by introductions.

Approval of April 2002 Minutes (Handout 2)

Mr. Hollinger opened the floor for comments on the April 2002 minutes. After a request for minor changes, the Committee unanimously approved the minutes with approved changes.

Future Meeting Locations

Mr. Hollinger asked for discussion about future meeting locations. Mr. Eli Cotti (NBAA) recommended holding the October meeting in Wichita, Kansas, with Cessna as a possible host. The purpose would be to tour production sites and the Raytheon Electrical Build-up Shop. Mr. Cotti indicated that he would verify this location for the October meeting and inform Mr. Hollinger within one week of the outcome. The group then discussed a location for the January 2003, meeting. Suggestions were made for holding the meeting at the FAA Training Center in Palm Coast, FL or in Savannah GA, possibly with Gulfstream as the host. Mr. Huber agreed to follow-up on these changes of venue for the October and January meetings and report back to the Committee.

**Working Group 8 Final Report (Handout 3, 3a)**

Mr. Spencer Bennett (FedEx) gave Working Group (WG) 8's final report (Handout 3), which included a proposed Advisory Circular titled "Aircraft Wiring Systems Training Program," and the FAA WG Report Format—Handout 3a. Mr. Bennett indicated that WG9 may have additional input for WG8, but he did not expect it to change WG8's products. However, there may be an update from the group to present at the October 2002 meeting.

Discussion

Following Mr. Bennett's report, a discussion ensued regarding the current focus on wire training versus a focus on improper wire installation. A participant indicated that while wire training was a good foundation, there should be some focus on training for detecting improper wire installation. Mr. Fred Sobeck (FAA) suggested that WG8 could make a recommendation in their report to include training on improper wire installation for Aviation Maintenance Technician Schools (CFR, part 147). Mr. Bennett stated that WG8 would make this recommendation.

Mr. Richard Peri (American Electronics Association) indicated that wording from the AC would be appropriate to add to the preamble of the rule. Dr. Chris Smith added that the FAA Technical Center could provide pictures and actual test materials of damage to wiring to help meet the requirements of WG8's products. Following these remarks, a brief discussion occurred about the need to complete the economic analysis for the EAPAS (Enhanced Airworthiness Program for Airplane Systems) rule. Mr. Anthony Apostolides (FAA) indicated that he still needed cost data

**AGING TRANSPORT SYSTEMS RULEMAKING  
ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
MEETING MINUTES**

on CFR, parts 125 and 135, but had “pretty good” data on part 121. In answer to a question from Mr. Wayne Maxey (Boeing), Mr. Apostolides indicated that some parts of the rule may vary in terms of the cost to benefit ratio. It was agreed that Mr. Michael Lukacs (FAA) would follow-up with WG8 to obtain the additional economic data needed for that portion of the economic analysis.

Mr. David Johnson (Department of Defense) questioned whether there would be a recommendation about keeping training programs up-to-date. Mr. Hollinger responded that the AC does not speak to specific information on which to train personnel, but speaks to general training areas. Mr. Randy Boren (Northwest Airlines) added that the rule would require updates to training to include new technology. Mr. Sobeck commented that the FAA would consider amending new part 145 (Repair Stations) to include basic wiring training.

**NOTE:** Mr. Ed Block (Global Air Safety Institute) was not present during the discussion but presented the written comments shown in Attachment I.

Vote on WG8 Products

Following Mr. Bennett’s presentation, the follow-on discussion, and the Committee’s recommendations for changes, all Committee members, with one exception, voted to approve the products. The opposing vote was from Mr. Kirk Thornburg (Northwest Airlines). However, after WG9’s report in which some of his concerns were satisfied, he elected to revise his vote on WG 8’s products to an abstention.

**Working Group 6 Final Report (Handout 4)**

Mr. Vid Variakojis (Boeing) presented WG6’s products. He indicated that all but two sub-tasks, 6.6 and 6.9, were completed. In addition, the economic data were not yet available. Therefore, WG6 was submitting a draft final report to the Committee and would hold another meeting from July 22 to 26, 2002, to resolve the pending items. Following the resolution of these items, the WG would submit its final report to the Committee in August 2002.

Discussion

The Committee discussed each product at length and made recommendations for updating each. Areas of discussion included Mr. Jim Shaw’s (Vice-Chair, ATSRAC) recommendation to prepare a letter to the FAA for the Committee’s approval, supporting the FAA’s research into wire separation criteria, which the Committee approved unanimously. The group also discussed developing a definition for heavy current cables. The outcome was a 7 to 8 vote against developing such a definition. Mr. Hollinger proposed that since there was no clear mandate on the issue, the presentation should move forward. In response, Mr. Sobeck indicated that WG9 would speak to heavy current cables and the EZAP logic would also address this. He said that any WG6 definition should correspond to that of WG9’s. Mr. Cotti recommended that section 91.410 of the CFR be reviewed to ensure accuracy with products from WG8 and 9. Mr. Huber asked Mr. Cotti to discuss this recommendation further with Mr. Sobeck.

Another discussion centered on how the FAA would address smoke and toxic fumes. Mr. Variakojis questioned how testing for levels of smoke and toxic fumes might be done. Mr. Huber responded that there are no criteria to show compliance in this area and attempting to make this a part of the certification process would only delay the process. Mr. Hollinger indicated that even though this issue might be outside the purview of the Committee, the WG could make a recommendation in a separate appendix for “other recommendations” that the FAA develop test methods and criteria for smoke and toxicity levels. Mr. Huber indicated that he agreed with the comments that this issue must be addressed, but he believed it should be addressed at the point when the wiring is being developed. After more discussion, Mr. Huber indicated that he would verify if the FAA was doing research in this specific area and would report back to the Committee. If such research was underway and the results were completed by the time the EAPAS final rule is issued, Mr. Huber noted that appropriate language addressing this issue could be added to the rule. Mr. Hollinger proposed that paragraph 25.1713a of the rule language should be shortened

**AGING TRANSPORT SYSTEMS RULEMAKING  
ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
MEETING MINUTES**

and the essence of that paragraph placed in the "Other Recommendations" appendix, specifically Appendix F, recommending that the FAA pursue this issue. The Committee voted 12 in favor and 3 opposed to this action. Several Committee members voiced concern that the issue was being removed from the rule language and AC/ACJ. They said the issue was too important to not address now. Mr. Bill Schultz (GAMA) suggested that perhaps this issue could be addressed by assigning a different implementation date in the rule for smoke and toxicity levels. Such a date, he noted, would be one that coincides with the completion of the research and development effort in this area. But, the FAA should ensure that this method could work with this particular rule. Mr. Huber responded that this may be a way to satisfy both sides of this issue. Mr. Schultz added that a similar approach had been taken with the Change Product Rule, but he was not sure how this might work with the part 25 portion of the EAPAS rule. Mr. Huber then recommended that the following statement be added to the minutes: "FAA needs to consider toxicity levels of smoke and noxious products." Mr. Hollinger noted that WG6 could include this recommendation in Appendix F of their final report.

During other discussions, Mr. Huber stated that he would contact NEMA to obtain a document discussing issues about different platings on wires and consider if such material could be added to the AC/ACJ.

**DAY TWO: July 10, 2002**

**Continuation of Working Group 6 Final Report**

Mr. Variakojs continued his presentation and received additional comments from the Committee for changes to WG6's products.

Vote on WG6's Products

Following the end of the presentation, Mr. Hollinger proposed that since several items remained to be completed on WG6's products, their report could be changed to a Preliminary Final Report, which meant that they would incorporate all the changes the Committee had recommended in the preliminary report. The WG could then resolve the outstanding items at their July meeting and submit their final report at the October 2002 ATSRAC meeting. The Committee voted unanimously to accept this proposal. It was further agreed that WG6's Preliminary Final Report is due to ATSRAC by August 15.

Address by Deputy Associate Administrator for Regulation and Certification

Ms. Peggy Gilligan (FAA's Deputy Associate Administrator for Regulation and Certification) addressed the group, on behalf of Mr. Nicholas Sabatini (Associate Administrator for Regulation and Certification), following the mid-morning break. In her remarks, she indicated that Mr. Sabatini was in a meeting outside the building and apologized on behalf of Mr. Sabatini for being unable to personally address the group. Ms. Gilligan thanked the Committee for their "tremendous work," and recognized them for their high level of commitment. She told them that their work "has really benefited the American public and the travelling public of the world." In addition, she specifically thanked Mr. Hollinger for his leadership role on the Committee. In closing, she recognized the quality of the Committee's products and indicated that it was now the FAA's responsibility to act on those products. She also noted that the Committee had "contributed in a meaningful and measurable way to the future of aviation safety."

**Working Group 9's Final Report (Handout 5 and 5a)**

Mr. Randy Boren (Northwest Airlines) presented WG9's final report as indicated in Handout 5 (Task 9 Harmonization Working Group—Report to ATSRAC Committee) and 5a (Task 9 Final Report). Mr. Boren noted that all sub-tasks were completed, including the SEDLP (single element dual load path) tasking.

Discussion

Mr. Hollinger asked how the group had come to resolve the SEDLP tasking since the Committee had requested and received a delay in the completion of this task. A participant indicated that

**AGING TRANSPORT SYSTEMS RULEMAKING  
ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
MEETING MINUTES**

based on his knowledge of MSG-3, he believed that it would satisfy the SEDLP tasking. After additional questions from Mr. Hollinger, Mr. Boren responded that some members of Working Group 3 (the initial WG that current WG9 recommendations will implement) also worked on updates to MSG-3; and, it was clear to those members that MSG-3 was deficient in the analysis of SEDLP devices. The MSG-3 members, therefore, included updates to MSG-3 to address this deficiency. Given that WG9 was to assess whether current analysis methods regarding SEDLP devices were adequate, and assuming that most of industry is using the current, updated version of MSG-3, WG9 believes that the SEDLP component of its tasking has been completed to the extent possible. After further discussion, the following recommendation was made about how WG9 should respond in their final report to this portion of their tasking: "All safety-critical SEDLP components must be analyzed using a process that specifically considers the failure of each load path separately, regardless of the maintenance program being applied to the aircraft." Following Mr. Hollinger's request for a vote, the Committee voted in favor (with 2 opposing votes) of accepting the recommendation. Mr. Glapa and Mr. Schultz submitted the opposing votes with the following explanations:

Mr. Glapa (Airbus)

As I explained after the events of September 11<sup>th</sup>, industry resources were seriously affected by events and priorities had to be redefined accordingly. That is why a decision was made at the October 2001 ATSRAC meeting to postpone the work on the SEDLP until the January 2003 meeting. Therefore, Airbus is not ready today to analyze in detail the consequences of such a proposal. Airbus prefers that this important issue be addressed during the January 2003 ATSRAC meeting where we could be well prepared to fully address the question of SEDLP with a more constructive approach.

Mr. Schultz (GAMA)

The applicability of this recommendation should not be applied to private operations FAR 25 and CAR (4b) airplanes.

The Committee agreed that given the vote to accept the proposal on how WG9 should resolve the SEDLP component, no further work was required of the group on this part of their tasking.

**Working Group 9's Final Report--Handout 5 and 5a--(Continued)**

Mr. Boren continued his report, discussing the WG's draft Advisory Circular and recommended Notice of Proposed Rulemaking.

Discussion

A discussion about inclusion of training for flight crews in WG9's proposed rule language ensued. The result of the discussion was a vote (13 in favor 4 opposed) to make training for flight crews voluntary. Attendees also discussed at length the compliance dates WG9 presented for their products. The result of this portion of the discussion was the following proposal: Change the wording in the compliance chart (See page 30 of Handout 5a) that references "6Y or Repeat Interval, whichever is less" for the three critical areas of the airplane to state: "Comply with the revised maintenance program." After a call for a vote, the Committee voted 13 in favor (with 1 opposing and 2 abstaining) of accepting the proposal. Regarding the WG's recommendation of a "3Y or Repeat Interval, whichever is less," Mr. Hollinger asked for a vote on the 3Y time frame without regard to the age of the airplane. The Committee voted 13 in favor (with 1 opposing and 2 abstaining) to accept this time frame. Regarding the age thresholds of the airplanes to accomplish the initial EZAP, WG9 made two recommendations. The first recommendation sets the thresholds for age of the airplanes at 0-20-years and greater than 20-years. The second sets these thresholds at 0-10-years and greater than 10 years. After discussing these two options, the Committee decided to include a third option in their report to the FAA. This third alternative would leave it up to the FAA to determine the 20- or 10-year-age threshold based on the agency's review of economic data of both thresholds.

Vote on WG9's Products

**AGING TRANSPORT SYSTEMS RULEMAKING  
ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
MEETING MINUTES**

The Committee gave its input on both the AC and NPRM, and voted unanimously to accept them with their recommended changes. In addition, the Committee voted to accept (with 1 member abstaining) WG9's final report with the addition of the third option for the compliance schedule.

Administrative

Mr. Hollinger indicated that WG7's presentation would be moved to day three because of the time allotted today for WG9's report. In addition, Mr. Sobeck may present the FAA's proposed implementation plan. Mr. Hollinger reminded the group that the meeting for July 11<sup>th</sup> would be held at Boeing's Rosslyn location, due to unavailability of a meeting room at FAA headquarters.

**DAY THREE: July 11, 2002**

Administrative

Mr. Hollinger opened the session by thanking Boeing for hosting day three of the meeting. He indicated that WG7 would present their final report today, followed by the other presentations, if time permitted. Additionally, he said that Northwest Airlines had agreed to give the Committee an EZAP Prototype update at the October 2002 meeting.

Statement from ATSRAC Vice-Chair/ALPA Representative: Following Mr. Hollinger's remarks, he turned the floor over to Mr. Shaw, who indicated that because of various personal reasons, he was resigning his position on ATSRAC. He thanked the group for the time and effort they had put into the wiring taskings and for the opportunity to participate in this effort. He said he was proud of the products the group has produced. He ended his comments by introducing Mr. Ken Elias as the new ALPA representative to ATSRAC.

Mr. Hollinger gave his personal thanks to Mr. Shaw for his role as Vice-Chair as well as his active participation in ATSRAC, including his detailed reviews and comments on the Committee's products.

Call for Vice-Chair Volunteers

Mr. Hollinger asked for volunteers to fill the Vice-Chair position, whereby Mr. Don Andersen (Boeing) nominated Mr. Bill Schultz to fill the position. Another participant seconded the nomination. This was followed by a call for additional nominees and/or volunteers. After receiving no further names for consideration, Mr. Schultz accepted the nomination. Mr. Hollinger stated that, assuming the FAA approves Mr. Schultz's nomination, his appointment would be appropriate given the phase (work of the Small Transport Airplane Working Group—Working Group 10) the Committee was moving to.

**Working Group 7's Final Report (Handouts 6)**

Mr. Don Andersen (Boeing) provided WG7's report as indicated in Handout 6 (Task 7 Working Group Report to ATSRAC) and in the draft ESWPM (Electrical Standard Writing Practice Manual). He indicated that the WG had not been able to achieve consensus on Task 7.3 (Define a Standard Format) and requested an additional month for the group to work on their issues to achieve consensus. He said that they had developed two proposals to address this sub-task and would be able to determine in a follow-on meeting, which one to include in their final report to the Committee. All other sub-tasks had been completed. Mr. Hollinger mentioned that if the group could not come to full consensus, both options could be recommended to the FAA for their decision.

Discussion

Following a discussion of this issue, Mr. Hollinger asked the Committee to vote on the proposal to: Let WG7 present their report today minus resolution of sub-task 7.3 (Define a Standard Format); This would allow them to meet later in July 2002 to complete (via a consensus or by providing further details about why a consensus could not be met) sub-task 7.3 and submit their completed, final report to the Committee in August 2002 for review. The Committee would review the report and vote on it at the October 2002 ATSRAC meeting. The Committee voted unanimously in favor of the proposal.

**AGING TRANSPORT SYSTEMS RULEMAKING  
ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
MEETING MINUTES**

**Working Group 7's Final Report (Continued)**

Mr. Andersen continued his presentation of the remaining subtasks as outlined in Handout 6 (Task 7 Working Group Report to ATSRAC). He asked the Committee to keep in mind as they review the WG's products that the ESWPM is a maintenance document instead of a design document. For example, the document would not answer the question of how to install wiring. A participant asked if this disclaimer had been included in the document. Mr. Andersen responded, saying that while the document might be used for design purposes, it was not all-inclusive. Therefore, one could not use this document to design a system.

Discussion

After Mr. Andersen completed his presentation, Mr. Huber commented about how the FAA would handle STC programs. He said after the rule is issued the requirements for STC applicants to provide standard wiring practices would be in place for each new STC holder that installs wiring. He added that compliance with the 1529 requirement (section 25.1529 of the CFR) could be done in two ways. First, with the MBI (Master Breakdown Index), the applicant can identify standard practices for their installation and identify in which section of the MBI this information should be placed. Second, if the applicant has an ESWPM for the airplane model for which the STC was issued and the applicant can identify that the existing standard wiring practices documented in that manual are acceptable, all the FAA would need is a written statement to this effect to satisfy the requirements of 25.1529.

**Presentation of the FAA's Draft Compliance Schedule (Handout 7)**

Mr. Fred Sobeck presented the FAA's draft compliance schedule for part 121 operators, as outlined in Handout 7 (Draft Compliance Schedule), to meet the proposed EZAP (Enhanced Zonal Analysis Procedures) requirement for cleaning and inspection of the three critical areas (cockpit, electrical equipment bays, power feeder cables). In addition, any other critical areas identified by the type design holder would be included in this compliance schedule.

Discussion

Discussion about the compliance schedule included several comments about the need to involve more operators in determining the schedule. Mr. Wayne Maxey (Boeing) said he would like to see more operator input to the schedule. Mr. Huber responded that while the Committee had approved WG9's compliance schedule yesterday, he liked the concept of getting comments from a wider population of operators. Mr. Hollinger supported this view, saying that the Committee could review information gathered from such a session along with WG9's recommendations and provide comments at the October 2002 ATSRAC meeting. There was additional discussion, stating that the IMRBPB was meeting in Seattle in September and would include many of the same participants that would be invited to discuss the compliance issue. Mr. Kirk Thornburg suggested that Spec-111 could be used as the basis of a meeting on the compliance issue in that the lead airlines would be responsible for inviting their respective operators. Mr. Maxey commented that it would be best to hold such a meeting before the FAA begins drafting the NPRM. Mr. Huber indicated that he would take an action item to follow-up on holding the meeting in Seattle in September.

**Working Group 10 Status Update (Handout 8)**

Mr. Jon Haag (Philip Morris) provided a status of WG 10 as indicated in Handout 8 (Harmonization Working Group #10 Status Report). Mr. Haag's presentation was followed by a discussion about the inspection and data collection processes for WG10.

**Intrusive Inspection Recommendation Status (Handout 9)**

Mr. Massoud Sadeghi (FAA) gave an update on the Intrusive Inspection Recommendations as detailed in Handout 10 (Intrusive Inspection Recommendation resolution Plan Status). He extended his appreciation to the group for their work in reviewing the Intrusive Inspection Action Plan and providing their comments. He added that the FAA would carefully review each

**AGING TRANSPORT SYSTEMS RULEMAKING  
ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
MEETING MINUTES**

comment and reach a decision, and that the final status would be presented to ATSRAC at the October 2002 meeting.

Discussion

Mr. Mike Nancarrow (Integration Leader) indicated that his role as Integration Leader would end on July 25, 2002. Following additional remarks, Mr. Huber thanked him for his work in leading the integration effort for the Working Groups.

**Intrusive Inspection Recommendation Status (continued)**

Mr. Sadeghi continued his presentation. He introduced the EAPAS rulemaking team members in attendance and thanked the WG-10 members for their tremendous work in the small transport airplane area.

**Raytheon Presentation (Handout 10)**

Mr. Joe Kurek (Raytheon Technical Services Co.) provided an overview of the FAA Technical Center's wire-performance research as indicated in Handout 10 (Wire Performance Specification for Aircraft Electrical Systems).

**Brookhaven National Laboratory Presentation (Handout 11)**

Mr. R. Hall and Mr. U. von Wimmersperg of Brookhaven National Laboratory presented the group with their research efforts, on behalf of the FAA, as outlined in Handout 11 (Development of a Tera-Hertz Reflectometry-Based System).

**Review of Open Action Items**

Mr. Hollinger reviewed the status of the action items from the April 2002 meeting. He indicated that item 1 of that list, to appoint WG 10 Co-Chairs was 50 percent complete in that the U.S. Co-Chair had been appointed. However the European Co-Chair position remained open. Therefore, this action item would be carried over to the list from the current meeting. All other action items from the April 2002 meeting are complete. Following Mr. Hollinger's report, Ms. Stroman reviewed the list of action items compiled from the current meeting.

Discussion

A discussion occurred regarding the action item to hold a follow-on meeting in Seattle to review compliance dates. Comments included concern that the participants in the IMRBPB meeting probably would not be the same as those who should attend the compliance meeting. With respect to using the lead-airline concept of Spec-111, this is almost always used in relation to AD's, which involve an engineering audience. And, discussion of the compliance issue would require a different audience. Another comment noted that engineering personnel might be used in contacting the individuals at the airlines who should be represented in discussions about compliance. In response, a participant noted that this was an "unusual" use of Spec-111. The results of the discussion was to revise the action item to assign it to Mr. Sobeck to look into the possibility of holding a meeting in Washington, D.C. to discuss compliance in relation to part 121.

Other Business: Mr. Hollinger thanked the group for staying late and coming in early for the 3-day meeting. He commented that this meeting had been the longest and most intense in the Committee's three-year history.

Adjournment: 3:00 p.m.

Attendees (Handout 12)

**AGING TRANSPORT SYSTEMS RULEMAKING  
ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
MEETING MINUTES**

**ACTION ITEMS**

1. Appoint Working Group 10 co-chairs. (Kent Hollinger, Chuck Huber, Elli Cotti)-- Item 5 from January 2002 Action Items. (Carry-over from April list)
2. Look into holding the October 2002 meeting in Wichita, Kansas and provide Mr. Hollinger with a response within one week from the current meeting. (Eli Cotti)
3. Follow-up on holding the January 2003 meeting in either Palm Coast, Florida at the FAA Training Center or in Savannah, Georgia possibly hosted by Gulfstream. (Chuck Huber)
4. Obtain waivers for change in venue for the October 2002 and January 2003 meeting as necessary. (Chuck Huber and Shirley Stroman)
5. Provide Spencer Bennett with a list of the Committee's recommendations for changes to WG8's products within one week of the meeting. (Shirley Stroman)
6. Provide the Committee with a written statement explaining vote on WG8's products. (Kirk Thornburg)
7. Prepare a letter to the FAA for the Committee's approval supporting the FAA's research into wire separation.(Jim Shaw)
8. Discuss issue of possible discrepancies in WG8's and WG9's products in relation to 91.410. (Eli Cotti and Fred Sobeck)
9. Obtain document from NEMA regarding different platings on wires and consider if this additional material should be added to WG6's AC. (Chuck Huber)
10. Submit WG6's preliminary final report to the Committee by August 15, 2002. WG6's final report is to be submitted at the October 2002 ATSRAC meeting.
11. Provide pictures and actual test materials of damage to wiring that WG8 may use to better meet its requirements. (Dr. Chris Smith)
12. Obtain the USA report on the shuttle about the size of cracks, flaws, and breaches. (Luci Crittenden)
13. Coordinate the logistics (e.g., date—possibly late September--, place, prepare agenda, etc.) to discuss compliance times for the enhanced maintenance program. Base the process on Spec. 111 (Lead Airline Process). (Airbus and Boeing to contact operators, Fred Sobeck to coordinate logistics).

**Key Decisions**

The Committee agreed to--

1. Seek a change of venue for the October 2002 meeting to Wichita, Kansas and the January 2003 meeting to either Palm Cost, Florida or Savannah, Georgia.
2. Have the Working Groups make any additional recommendations to the FAA by adding those recommendations in a separate appendix at the end of their final reports.
3. Change WG6's products to a Preliminary Final Report; have them complete pending items at their July 22-26 meeting; complete pending items by August 15, 2002; and, submit their final report at the October 2002 ATSRAC meeting.
4. Approve WG8's products with recommended changes. All members voted in favor of approval with one member abstaining.
5. Table the discussion on whether MSG3 satisfied the SEDLP component of WG9's tasks. Also, agreement was reached, with the exception of two members who voted to oppose, that "All safety critical SEDLP components must be analyzed using a process that specifically considers the failure of each load path separately, regardless of the maintenance program being applied to the aircraft." With this decision, WG9 has met its requirement of the SEDLP task and no further action on it is necessary.
6. Approve WG9's AC (all but one member voted in the affirmative with one abstention) with recommended changes.

**AGING TRANSPORT SYSTEMS RULEMAKING  
ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
MEETING MINUTES**

7. Approve WG9's NPRM by unanimous vote.
8. Approve, by a 13 to 4 vote, to make training for flight crews voluntary.
9. Unanimously approve Bill Schultz's (GAMA) nomination to replace Jim Shaw as the ATSRAC Vice-Chair. Jim Shaw is leaving for personal reasons, but intends to keep abreast of ATSRAC activities and attend meetings whenever possible.
10. To allow WG7 additional time to resolve task 7.3 by August 2002 and send Kent Hollinger their completed, final report. Mr. Hollinger will forward the report to ATSRAC members for review and comment prior to the October ATSRAC meeting. The Committee will vote on WG7's products at that meeting.