

- Reports and Meeting Management.
- Closing Plenary (Other Business, Document Production and PMC Meeting Schedule Meeting, Adjourned).

Attendance is open to the interested public but limited to space availability. With the approval of the chairman, members of the public may present oral statements at the meeting. Persons wishing to present statements or obtain information should contact the person listed in the **FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT** section.

Members of the public may present a written statement to the committee at any time.

Issued in Washington, DC, February 28, 2011.

Kathy Hitt,

RTCA Advisory Committee.

[FR Doc. 2011-4774 Filed 3-2-11; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910-13-P

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Federal Aviation Administration

Executive Committee of the Aviation Rulemaking Advisory Committee; Meeting

AGENCY: Federal Aviation Administration (FAA), DOT.

ACTION: Notice of meeting.

SUMMARY: The FAA is issuing this notice to advise the public of a meeting of the Executive Committee of the Aviation Rulemaking Advisory Committee.

DATES: The meeting will be held on March 30, 2011, at 10 a.m.

ADDRESSES: The meeting will take place at the Federal Aviation Administration, 800 Independence Avenue, SW., Washington, DC 20591, 10th floor, MacCracken Room.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Renee Butner, Federal Aviation Administration, 800 Independence Avenue, SW., Washington, DC 20591, telephone (202) 267-5093; fax (202) 267-5075; e-mail Renee.Butner@faa.gov.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: Under section 10(a)(2) of the Federal Advisory Committee Act (5 U.S.C. App. 2), we are giving notice of a meeting of the Executive Committee of the Aviation Rulemaking Advisory Committee taking place on March 30, 2011, at the Federal Aviation Administration, 800 Independence Avenue, SW., Washington, DC, 20591. The Agenda includes:

1. Discussion of potential restructuring of ARAC.
2. Discussion of ARAC ExCom role in implementing Future of Aviation

Advisory Committee (FAAC) recommendation #22.

3. Update on FAA response to Process Improvement Working Group (PIWG) recommendations.

4. Future work.

5. Issue Area Status Reports from Assistant Chairs.

6. Remarks from other EXCOM members.

Attendance is open to the interested public but limited to the space available. The FAA will arrange teleconference service for individuals wishing to join in by teleconference if we receive notice by March 23. Arrangements to participate by teleconference can be made by contacting the person listed in the **FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT** section. Callers outside the Washington metropolitan area are responsible for paying long-distance charges.

The public must arrange by March 23 to present oral statements at the meeting. The public may present written statements to the executive committee by providing 25 copies to the Executive Director, or by bringing the copies to the meeting.

If you are in need of assistance or require a reasonable accommodation for this meeting, please contact the person listed under the heading **FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT**.

Issued in Washington, DC, on February 28, 2011.

Pamela Hamilton-Powell,

Executive Director, Aviation Rulemaking Advisory Committee.

[FR Doc. 2011-4750 Filed 3-2-11; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910-13-P

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

National Highway Traffic Safety Administration

[Docket No. NHTSA-2011-0001]

Reports, Forms, and Recordkeeping Requirements

AGENCY: National Highway Traffic Safety Administration (NHTSA), Department of Transportation (NHTSA).

ACTION: Request for extension of a currently approved collection of information.

SUMMARY: This document solicits public comments on continuation of the requirements for the collection of information entitled "Consolidated Child Restraint System Registration, Labeling and Defect Notifications" (OMB Control Number: 2127-0576).

Before a Federal agency can collect certain information from the public, it

must receive approval from the Office of Management and Budget (OMB). Under procedures established by the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, before seeking OMB approval, Federal agencies must solicit public comment on proposed collections of information, including extensions and reinstatement of previously approved collections.

DATES: You should submit your comments early enough to ensure that Docket Management receives them no later than May 2, 2011.

ADDRESSES: You may submit comments (identified by the DOT Docket ID Number above) by any of the following methods:

- *Federal eRulemaking Portal:* Go to <http://www.regulations.gov>. Follow the online instructions for submitting comments.

- *Mail:* Docket Management Facility: U.S. Department of Transportation, 1200 New Jersey Avenue, SE., West Building Ground Floor, Room W12-140, Washington, DC 20590-0001.

- *Hand Delivery or Courier:* West Building Ground Floor, Room W12-140, 1200 New Jersey Avenue, SE., Washington, DC 20590-0001 between 9 a.m. and 5 p.m. ET, Monday through Friday, except Federal holidays.

- *Fax:* 202-493-2251.

Regardless of how you submit your comments, you should mention the docket number of this document. You may call the Docket at (202) 366-9324. Please identify the proposed collection of information for which a comment is provided, by referencing its OMB clearance number. It is requested, but not required, that two copies of the comment be provided.

Note that all comments received will be posted without change to <http://www.regulations.gov>, including any personal information provided. Anyone is able to search the electronic form of all comments received into any of our dockets by the name of the individual submitting the comment (or signing the comment, if submitted on behalf of an association, business, labor union, etc.). You may review DOT's complete Privacy Act Statement in the **Federal Register** published on April 11, 2000 (65 FR 19477-78).

Docket: For access to the docket to read background documents or comments received, go to <http://www.regulations.gov> or the street address listed above. Follow the online instructions for accessing the dockets.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Complete copies of each request for collection of information may be obtained at no charge from Cristina Echemendia, US. Department of

**AVIATION RULEMAKING ADVISORY COMMITTEE
EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE
RECORD OF MEETING**

MEETING DATE: March 30, 2011

MEETING TIME: 10:00 am

LOCATION: Federal Aviation Administration
800 Independence Avenue, S.W.
10th Floor
MacCracken Room
Washington, DC 20591

PUBLIC ANNOUNCEMENT: The Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) told the public of this Aviation Rulemaking Advisory Committee (ARAC) meeting in a Federal Register notice published March 3, 2011 (75 FR 11845).

ATTENDEES: Executive Committee Members

Norman Joseph Airline Dispatchers Federation,
ARAC Chair

Dan Elwell Aerospace Industries Association,
ARAC Vice Chair

Craig Bolt Pratt & Whitney,
*Transport Airplane and Engine
Aeronautical Technical Subject Area,
Assistant Chair*

Rosemary Dillard National Air Disaster Alliance (NADA)

William Edmunds Air Line Pilots Association,
International (ALPA),
*Air Carrier Operations Aeronautical
Technical Subject Area,
Assistant Chair*

Julian Hall European Aviation Safety Agency
(EASA)

Pam Hamilton	Federal Aviation Administration, Office of Rulemaking, <i>ARAC Executive Director</i>
Dennis McGrann	NOISE (National Organization to Insure a Sound-controlled Environment), <i>Noise Certification Aeronautical Technical Subject Area, Assistant Chair</i>
Sarah MacLeod	Aeronautical Repair Station Association (ARSA) <i>Air Carrier/General Aviation Maintenance Technical Subject Area, Assistant Chair</i>
Rebecca MacPherson	Federal Aviation Administration, <i>Office of the Chief Counsel, AGC-200</i>
Bob Robeson	Federal Aviation Administration, <i>Office of Aviation Policy and Plans, APO-200</i>
Daniel Zuspan	Boeing Commercial Airplanes (Boeing) <i>Occupant Safety Aeronautical Technical Subject Area, Assistant Chair</i>

Attendees

Renee Butner	Federal Aviation Administration, <i>Office of Rulemaking, ARM-20</i>
Sherry Borener	Federal Aviation Administration, <i>Office of Accident Investigation and Prevention, AVP-220</i>
Brenda Courtney	Federal Aviation Administration, <i>Office of Rulemaking, ARM-200</i>
Emily Dziedzic	PAI Consulting
Robert Frenzel	Federal Aviation Administration, <i>Office of the Chief Council, AGC-220</i>
Ralen Gao	Federal Aviation Administration, <i>Office of Rulemaking, ARM-209</i>
Katie Haley	Federal Aviation Administration, <i>Office of Rulemaking, ARM-200</i>

Joseph Hawkins	PAI Consulting
Tom Howard	Chromalloy
Ida Klepper	Federal Aviation Administration, <i>Office of Rulemaking, ARM-100</i>
Katie Knoll	Federal Aviation Administration, <i>Office of Accident Investigation and Prevention, AVP-220</i>
Melissa Loughlin	Federal Aviation Administration, <i>Office of Rulemaking, ARM-200</i>
Julie Lynch	Federal Aviation Administration, <i>Office of Rulemaking, ARM-200</i>
Suzette Matthews	
Debbi McElroy	Airports Council International, North America (ACI-NA)
Neil Modzelewski	PAI Consulting
Jeffrey Watson	U.S. Army

COMMITTEE ADMINISTRATION

The ARAC Vice Chair, Mr. Dan Elwell, called the meeting to order at 10:05 a.m. Mr. Elwell noted the ARAC Chair, Mr. Norman Joseph, would be late because of travel delays. The Executive Director, Ms. Pam Hamilton, read the required Federal Advisory Committee Act (FACA) statement.

CERTIFICATION OF MINUTES

Mr. Elwell asked for any corrections or comments to the draft minutes of the December 16, 2010, meeting. Noting no objections, he ratified the minutes.

DISCUSSION OF POTENTIAL RESTRUCTURING OF THE ARAC

Ms. Hamilton stated the next agenda item was discussion of the potential restructuring of the ARAC. She noted the ARAC Executive Committee (EXCOM) members have been discussing this topic for roughly 12 to 18 months. Ms. Hamilton reiterated the FAA does not intend to modify anything that is already working well within the ARAC and does not want to disrupt activities currently underway. She stated some bureaucratic layers can be simplified to help the ARAC work more efficiently.

Ms. Hamilton noted Ms. Brenda Courtney would present several slides (see Handout #1) and the ARAC members would be invited to discuss the presentation. Ms. Hamilton reminded the members that at the previous EXCOM meeting, they were invited to submit comments on the notional organizational chart showing what a restructured ARAC might look like. She stated the FAA received a few comments and considered them while creating the presentation. She noted the presentation and the FAA responses to the members' comments are in the reading material provided.

Ms. Hamilton introduced Ms. Courtney. Ms. Courtney thanked Ms. Hamilton and explained she is one of a few people who has worked in support of the ARAC for many years. Ms. Courtney stated the ARAC is entering its third decade, and it is time to evaluate the process and improve it where possible.

Slide 2

Ms. Courtney began the presentation by discussing the briefing outline, which included actions taken by the FAA since the December 16, 2010 EXCOM meeting; a summary of questions and issues raised by the EXCOM members; FAA-proposed responses; and next actions.

Slide 3

Ms. Courtney stated that since the previous EXCOM meeting, the FAA distributed a notional chart illustrating the possible new ARAC structure to the EXCOM members and sought their comments by February 17, 2011. She noted the FAA received detailed comments from some members. Ms. Courtney explained the FAA issued a Federal Register notice offering ARAC members and the general public the opportunity to provide input on restructuring, with comments due April 4, 2011. Ms. Courtney noted that to date no comments have been submitted to the docket.

Slide 4

Ms. Courtney stated the FAA identified several questions and issues from the EXCOM members' comments. EXCOM members asked—

- What the member makeup of the new ARAC will be.
- How members will be selected.
- How the responsibilities of the restructured ARAC and its members will differ from those of the current EXCOM.
- How much interaction the ARAC will have with working groups.
- If ARAC members will have the technical expertise necessary to vote intelligently on recommendations.
- If ARAC members will be able to join working groups.
- How the ARAC will send recommendations to the FAA.
- How current issue groups and working groups will be affected.
- How continuity and commitment in active areas will be maintained if existing working groups become task groups.

Slide 5

Ms. Courtney stated the FAA spent time reviewing the questions and benchmarking other agencies with Federal Advisory committees that may be similar to the FAA's. She explained the FAA grouped responses to the questions into several categories. Ms. Courtney noted the most important issues deal with the membership, size, and function of the new ARAC. She stated the new ARAC will reflect a balanced representation of the aviation community, which includes aircraft owners, operators, manufacturers, airports, U.S. Government, equipment and avionics providers, maintenance providers, pilots, other crewmembers and flight attendants, academia, environmentalists, passengers, and non-voting participants from other aviation authorities.

Mr. Elwell asked whether limiting the new ARAC to U.S. Government representatives would mean the committee loses members such as EASA. Ms. Courtney stated members such as representatives from EASA would be non-voting participants classified as "other aviation authorities."

Mr. Zuspan asked how the FAA will consolidate the ARAC representation from 55 down to 25 members. Specifically, he asked how the FAA will choose which associations and members to include and what responsibility the remaining members will have to represent the interests of former members and the aviation community at large. Ms. Courtney responded she will address this question later in the presentation.

Ms. Sarah MacLeod asked how equipment and avionics providers differ from manufacturers. Ms. Courtney stated the term manufacturer refers to corporations like Boeing and Airbus.

Mr. Elwell asked the EXCOM members whether the FAA should extend the Federal Register notice comment period, since the comment period closes on April 4, 2011, and they have received no comments have been received. He stated the EXCOM members represent organizations, companies, and individuals, and the members should highlight the important issues affecting those entities and request their comments.

Ms. MacLeod stated the normal rulemaking process accepts late comments, provided a decision has not yet been made. She noted an education process to solicit comments would be far too laborious because the general public is unaware of the topic. Ms. Rebecca MacPherson stated the FAA does not expect comments from the general public, but rather from members present at this meeting.

Ms. MacLeod noted the ARAC is a Federal Advisory Committee Act (FACA) committee, which requires a balanced membership. She asserted the ARAC is a government entity and should strive for efficiency. Ms. Hamilton stated the General Services Administration (GSA) recently distributed new requirements for balanced membership, which the FAA will consider when determining the restructured ARAC membership.

Ms. Hamilton stated there is no need to formally extend the comment period, as late comments will be accepted. She encouraged the ARAC members to urge their constituencies to submit comments within the next 10 days. No one objected to this approach.

Mr. Zuspan stated he sent an email with comments directly to the FAA and asked whether he needs to replicate those comments in the docket. Ms. Hamilton responded that he did not; the FAA received and considered the comments.

Slide 6

Ms. Courtney stated that when selecting ARAC members, the FAA will consider knowledge and expertise in one or more aviation specialties; demonstrated ability to work in cooperative forums to solve complex, controversial, and time-critical technical, safety, and aviation issues; and demonstrated commitment to the principles, goals, and objectives embodied in the ARAC charter. She noted the members should be able to exchange ideas in a collaborative environment. Ms. Courtney stressed that demonstrated commitment represents the ability to stay engaged in long-term tasks since most tasks last one to two years and sometimes longer. This selection approach is similar to how current members are selected.

Slide 7

Ms. Courtney identified several changes in how the restructured ARAC's responsibilities would differ from those of the current ARAC. She stated the FAA would expect members to actively seek input from non-ARAC members in their communities. Ms. Courtney added the ARAC will hold meetings more frequently to facilitate working group recommendations. She noted the meetings will provide sufficient opportunity for the full committee to oversee ARAC operations. Ms. Courtney stated the full ARAC must vet and approve all recommendations, which the ARAC chair will then sign and transmit to the FAA.

Mr. Zuspan sought clarification on how working groups would interact with the restructured ARAC. He asked whether working groups would report to the entire committee or to a subset of the committee responsible for oversight as working groups address their taskings. Ms. Courtney stated working groups formed from existing issue groups will have chairs attend the ARAC as members and report on their progress.

Mr. Zuspan noted there are many working groups, and asked whether a member from the restructured ARAC would have to chair a working group. Ms. Courtney stated chairs of existing issue groups will continue in that role after the transition to working groups. She explained for new working groups, the chairs appointed by the ARAC will present the working groups' recommendations to the ARAC.

Mr. Zuspan sought clarification on whether new working groups will require oversight by an ARAC member. Ms. Hamilton stated the process for ad hoc working groups will not change. She added that currently some ad hoc working groups have a chairman and some report directly to the EXCOM because they do not have a member of the EXCOM as a chair.

Ms. MacLeod asked if having some working groups report directly to the ARAC would remove a layer of bureaucracy from the process. Ms. Hamilton stated yes, in some cases. Ms. Hamilton noted an agenda item for this meeting is a discussion on establishing an ad hoc working group to address the Future of Aviation Advisory Council (FAAC) recommendation #22. She stated she envisions having an EXCOM member chair that working group. Ms. Hamilton noted a working group that addresses technical subject matter needs an industry chair who will report to

the ARAC. She explained the intent is to create flexibility and simplify bureaucracy where appropriate.

Mr. Zuspan stated that in some instances the core body has a level of knowledge on a topic, but in other cases, such as the Transport Airplane and Engine Issue Group (TAEIG), a much higher level of technical expertise is required. If, in the future, the ARAC has to approve the TAEIG recommendations before they are transmitted to the FAA, the ARAC membership would require a much different knowledge base to evaluate the recommendations effectively.

Ms. Hamilton noted the FAA does not believe the TAEIG is broken; rather the concern is that the current structure allows recommendations to go directly to the FAA without ARAC approval. She noted the structure of the TAEIG has been in place for more than 20 years. Ms. Hamilton stated the FAA has done benchmarking against other agencies and does not believe the current process would be considered acceptable practice by the U.S. General Services Administration (GSA) or our other overseers today. She explained that in the future, recommendations from TAEIG will require review and approval by ARAC. Ms. Hamilton acknowledged that not everyone in EXCOM is an expert in Transport Airplane and Engine (TAE) issues, but the diverse perspective of its membership can benefit the work done by TAEIG. She argued the task groups provide guidance and useful recommendations to the FAA. Mr. Craig Bolt noted the new process would create a time lag depending on the date of the next meeting, and added he wants to ensure the FAA understands that.

Mr. Bolt asked whether all 35 organizations under the new ARAC structure would be attending the committee meetings. Ms. Hamilton stated the new ARAC structure would notionally include 20 to 25 members. Mr. Bolt asked whether those organizations would all attend. Ms. Hamilton indicated they would. Mr. Elwell asserted the meetings would then become meetings of the whole ARAC. Ms. MacLeod asked whether the Executive Committee would cease to exist. Ms. Hamilton stated that layer would be removed from the ARAC structure.

Slide 8

Ms. Courtney stated the next question addresses how much interaction the ARAC members would have with the working groups. She explained oversight responsibility will extend to all ARAC activities, down to the working group level, and would require ARAC members to gain a basic understanding of all issues sent to the committee for review and approval. Ms. Courtney stated the ARAC members may also serve on working groups or task groups, and assist the working group chairs in resolving issues.

Mr. Elwell asked for clarification of the term “ARAC members.” He noted ALPA is a member of the ARAC. He asked whether members of an organization other than the organization’s representative to the ARAC could be assigned to working groups, and whether those individuals could address the ARAC when presenting the working groups’ recommendations. Ms. Courtney stated they could.

Ms. Hamilton noted when working groups need broader representation, the ARAC will continue to solicit additional members through a notice in the Federal Register. Mr. Elwell asked whether working group meetings will continue to be private. Ms. Courtney stated the issue groups will

become working groups. She noted, for example, TAEIG will be a working group, with subgroups under it. Ms. Courtney stated those meetings will continue to be closed. Ms. Hamilton added the ARAC will have permanent working groups and continue to form ad hoc working groups for specific tasks of a limited duration.

Ms. Courtney noted the working groups under TAEIG will convert to task groups. She stated some of those task groups are working on several tasks and their work will continue. Ms. Hamilton noted this change is intended to be a change in name only.

Slide 9

Ms. Courtney addressed how the status of current issue groups would be affected. The issue groups will be converted to permanent working groups. She stated there will be no change to the groups' internal functions. Ms. Courtney explained current issue groups will continue to form task groups (formerly working groups), provide quality control and guidance to task group functions, and conduct in-depth reviews of task group products and reports. She noted working group (formerly issue group) meetings will continue to be open and new working group meetings can be open or closed, with encouragement for open meetings in the spirit of transparency. Ms. Courtney explained the ARAC will vet working group recommendations in an open meeting of the full committee for approval, and it will submit all approved recommendations to the FAA.

Ms. Hamilton noted the only change in process is the slide's last bullet point, which states recommendations will be brought to the ARAC for committee approval before being forwarded to the FAA.

Mr. Thomas Howard, asked about the ARAC's process to resolve minority opinions on recommendations. He stated with 20 or 25 committee members, there may be a 13/12 split. Ms. Courtney stated there is still a need for minority positions, as that information is needed to move forward in responding to recommendations. Mr. Zuspan explained the Process Improvement Working Group (PIWG) recommended documenting minority opinions, which would allow the FAA to see the range of thought on the issues. He added he believes the ARAC would be interested in those opinions as well.

Slide 10

On the issue of converting working groups to task groups, the question was raised about how the status of current on-going working groups (soon to be task groups) will be affected. Ms. Courtney stated there will be no changes to the internal functions. She explained membership will remain intact, meetings will continue to be closed, and newly titled working groups will continue to provide oversight to task groups (formerly working groups). Ms. Courtney noted the task groups' work must be submitted to their respective working groups, who will incorporate that input into the final products they submit to the ARAC for review and approval.

Mr. Bolt asked about the membership of task groups. Ms. Courtney stated a notice will be published in the Federal Register seeking membership, as well as coming from this body of members. Ms. Hamilton noted the process will not change.

Slide 11

Ms. Courtney stated the FAA's next step is to consider any comments submitted to the docket. Agreement needs to be reached on the path forward for restructuring ARAC as discussed today. She explained the FAA can then move forward with restructuring the ARAC, considering term limits, addressing alternatives, finalizing its composition, selecting additional members, re-chartering it by September 2012, and issuing new guidance on its responsibilities.

Ms. Hamilton asked whether there are any objections to this plan. Ms. MacLeod noted she does not object, but she worries the new ARAC structure is more complex. Ms. MacLeod stated if the ARAC, which represents the public interest, passes tasks to working groups, then those working groups should also represent the interest as the ARAC on that issue. She asserted working groups should be able to solicit first from the ARAC for task group membership, rather than publicly inviting input through the Federal Register. Ms. MacLeod contended the working groups need technical expertise, either to assist members in their considerations, or to educate the ARAC members on the technical details necessary to make a decision. She maintained these processes should be less cumbersome. Ms. MacLeod stressed the topics are technical, and the ARAC members need education in those areas. She stated the working groups need technical experts in the fact gathering stage. The task groups do not need to go out in the Federal Register. The ARAC should be able to point to the expertise that should be on the work group and if a task group is necessary, the work group should inform the ARAC so that the ARAC can help to populate it.

Ms. Hamilton noted there is the flexibility to do that, but in her experience with ad hoc groups, the ARAC does not have a full balance of expertise, which is why the notices in the Federal Register are necessary, but it is not a requirement. Ms. MacLeod agreed the ARAC does not have a full balance of expertise. Ms. Hamilton noted there is a need to broaden the membership of the group, which should occur when the number of members is expanded.

Ms. MacLeod asked whether the presentation included more detail on the 12 categories of membership. Ms. Courtney stated it did not, but she returned to slide 5. Ms. MacLeod explained she has a strong recommendation regarding the categories for membership.

Mr. Zuspan asked how many recommendations TAEIG makes in a typical year. Mr. Bolt stated it made four in the last year, and averages three or four a year. Mr. Zuspan noted this can be a measuring stick to determine whether the ARAC can accommodate the amount of recommendations it would likely receive. Mr. Bolt noted TAEIG has gone from 10 to 15 recommendations per year down to about five. He stated the workload is different than it was in the past.

Ms. Hamilton directed the discussion back to slide 5 of the presentation. Ms. MacLeod stated the ARAC's attention has focused almost exclusively on the AVS-related areas of design, production, operation, and maintenance, as well as the overarching public interest and she would group membership using these main categories. Ms. MacLeod explained design includes manufacturers, design, and production. She stated operation would include flightcrew, operators, and owners. She asked what the difference between owner and operator is and whether this

attempts to address part 61 of Title 14, Code of Federal Regulations. Ms. MacPherson stated that could be a registration issue the ARAC has never addressed.

Ms. MacLeod noted airports would fall under the operations category as well. Ms. MacPherson stated she believes airports would be separate.

Ms. MacLeod stated airports are a small section under the category of operations. She would have smaller groupings. She noted design and production would include original equipment manufacturers. Ms. MacLeod stated she strongly recommends that the ARAC review its memberships to ensure members have a vested interest in the topics that come forward. She would list each rule that falls within each category. Ms. Hamilton noted this is a useful way to categorize membership.

Ms. Courtney noted this body was not originally focused on just aviation standards, but included airport organizations, which touched on environmental and energy topics. She stated it is important to understand topics can go beyond the scope of aviation standards.

Ms. MacLeod stated that based on her groupings there are now four categories rather than 12, and other interests can be added. Mr. Elwell stated he understands Ms. MacLeod's points about airports and operators. He noted the interests of airports are very different from those of other sectors.

Ms. MacLeod recognized Mr. Elwell's comment and stated if there are four categories, the ARAC can appoint three people within a specific category to represent the diverse interests in that category. She stated the ARAC has never had a mechanic. ARAC has always had trade associations that would represent the interests of maintenance providers. Ms. MacLeod asserted there is a need to review the rules and identify the interested parties.

Mr. Bob Robeson argued this categorization does not reflect the proposed list of working groups. Ms. MacLeod responded she was referring to ARAC membership and how to get interested parties involved who are directly affected. She stated there is a need to bring 25 interested parties to the ARAC.

Ms. Debbie McElroy asked, if the four-category approach is adopted, would the ARAC seek only members of the affected category to join a working group, or would it invite all ARAC members? Ms. MacPherson stated it would depend on the ARAC's structure; if airports are represented by the operations category, then airports would not have representation at the ARAC. Ms. McElroy and Ms. Hamilton stated that cannot happen.

Ms. MacPherson noted Ms. MacLeod seems to recommend mission-oriented categorization. Ms. MacLeod reiterated most of the work is aviation safety work in the areas of design, operations, production, and maintenance. She recommended looking at rules and placing the interests within them. She asserted it will be important to find a group that can represent those interests and identify individuals with appropriate expertise, both to populate working groups and as ARAC members to evaluate recommendations to be forwarded to the FAA..

Mr. Elwell noted the four categories are helpful. He stated there are currently 55 ARAC members and the intent is to reduce membership to 20 to 25. Mr. Elwell added some of the

55 members may argue to remain on the committee, despite never submitting comments or participating in ARAC meetings. He contended the categories will help place entities in the appropriate groups. Mr. Elwell argued that the less relevant an organization is to a category, the less compelling the argument is for the entity to remain a member of ARAC. He noted the categories will help the ARAC achieve a balanced membership and fill holes in membership with interested individuals versus associations.

Ms. Hamilton noted the FAA will take an action item to develop the categorization idea. She stated there may be more than four categories, to include the public interest and airports. Ms. MacLeod predicted there may be more than four categories, as the four suggested are technical categories.

Ms. MacLeod asked whether the ARAC membership would be composed of individual members or corporate entities. She asked whether it is possible to designate, for example, Aerospace Industries Association (AIA) as a member and General Aviation Manufacturers Association (GAMA) as an alternate. Ms. Hamilton noted under the proposed restructuring, the organizational composition will remain as it is now with the organization as the member. She stated that the topic of setting up alternates has been discussed several times. There is an opportunity for one organization to have another organization as its alternate. Ms. MacLeod asked whether the FAA will be able to appoint members. Ms. Hamilton stated it will. Ms. MacLeod suggested the FAA reduce membership by designating some current members as alternates. Ms. Hamilton confirmed the FAA is considering that idea, and agreed the alternate member list is an effective way to keep current members of the full ARAC from feeling disenfranchised.

Ms. Hamilton reiterated the FAA Office of Rulemaking (ARM) will take an action item on the revamped ARAC membership composition. She stated they will return to the EXCOM with read-ahead material once decisions have been made based on the feedback received.

Ms. Hamilton stated the re-charter of the ARAC must be completed by September 2012. She explained much coordination needs to take place with the Department of Transportation (DOT) and the GSA before a new charter can be signed. Ms. Hamilton stated September 2012 will come quickly. She noted at the next Executive Committee meeting members will re-address the membership composition proposal from the FAA, alternates, and whether term limits should be considered.

At this point, Mr. Joseph arrived to the meeting, apologized for being late, and thanked Mr. Elwell and Ms. Hamilton for conducting the meeting.

DISCUSSION OF THE ARAC EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE ROLE IN IMPLEMENTING FAAC RECOMMENDATION 22

Ms. Hamilton stated she spent the last year working part time on the FAAC. She noted the FAAC completed its work on December 15, 2010. Ms. Hamilton referred to the EXCOM meeting on December 16, 2010, in which she briefly mentioned the FAAC recommendation #22. Ms. Hamilton explained recommendation #22 addresses rulemaking and the FAA asked the Executive Committee members to help with implementation. She noted the

FAA has worked hard to understand the fundamentals of the recommendation, and ARM has partnered with the Office of Accident Investigation and Prevention (AVP).

Ms. Hamilton introduced Dr. Sherry Borener to make a presentation on recommendation #22 (see Handout #2), which includes a proposal for a new ad hoc ARAC task.

Dr. Borener thanked Ms. Hamilton and stated she appreciated the opportunity to make a presentation. Dr. Borener noted she has been studying this topic since 1982 and works for AVP in the modeling and simulation area. She added she is delighted to be working on this project with Ms. Katie Haley.

Dr. Borener prefaced the presentation by noting that models do not make decisions; rather, models help people with the decision-making process. Dr. Borener stated this task addresses how to manage the decision-making process for all of the recommendations for rulemaking.

Slide 2

Dr. Borener stated DOT Secretary Ray LaHood formed the FAAC on April 16, 2010. She explained phase I of the FAAC was designed to provide information, advice, and recommendations to ensure the competitiveness of the U.S. aviation industry, as well as address the evolving transportation needs, challenges, and opportunities of the U.S. and global economies.

Slide 3

Dr. Borener stated the FAAC submitted 23 recommendations to Secretary LaHood on December 15, 2010. She stated phase II of the FAAC was designed to implement the recommendations. Dr. Borener noted Secretary LaHood set a 2-year goal to implement most of the recommendations. She stated AVP and ARM are responsible for implementing recommendation #22.

Slide 4

Dr. Borener stated recommendation #22 suggests Secretary LaHood quickly review the existing regulatory and safety initiative calendar to provide parameters and criteria for the FAA to prioritize its current and future rulemaking program. She asserted this review should include industry—or at a minimum seek industry input—and the results should be made publicly available.

Slide 5

Dr. Borener stated the FAA is proposing to task the ARAC with examining FAAC recommendation #22. She noted the goal of the task is to provide advice and recommendations on developing a framework and methodology to assist the FAA with assessing and sequencing potential rulemaking projects. Dr. Borener explained this is important because safety initiatives are often overcome by events that trigger industry-wide change. She contended it is necessary to decide whether an item has merit and how to prioritize it.

Slide 6

Dr. Borener stated under the proposed task, the ARAC would define a process to evaluate rulemaking projects. She explained the ARAC would use the Commercial Aviation Safety Team (CAST) methodology, which identifies the top safety areas through historic accident and incident data analysis. Dr. Borener noted the ARAC can reference the CAST methodology to determine the drivers for rulemaking, which include safety, environment, capacity, operations, and harmonization, both domestic and international. She stated the proposal asks the ARAC to adapt the CAST process to develop parameters and criteria to complete the assessment. Dr. Borener noted there are currently 554 open recommendations from the National Transportation Safety Board (NTSB) and 100 open recommendations from CAST.

Slide 7

Dr. Borener explained the ARAC will use a subset of 10 or 12 notional issues with potential for rulemaking—which would be selected from the NTSB and CAST recommendations—to develop a prototype model. She stated the model will help estimate risk classification suitable for use in a Safety Management System protocol and will help summarize findings on the drivers of rulemaking. Dr. Borener explained the findings will be applied to the rulemaking agenda. She stated in the long term, the FAA will implement this model. She stated under the proposed task, the ARAC will design the process, identify the criteria, and determine the parameters for the model. Dr. Borener used CAST's risk measures of severity and likelihood to demonstrate safety criteria that could be used in the model. She noted the ad hoc working group will develop the capability over the next 9 months and address the notional issues.

Slide 8

Dr. Borener stated the FAA is asking the EXCOM to accept the task, form an ad hoc core working group that would stay with the task for the entire duration (just less than two years), create several technical evaluation working groups, and assign the task to the Executive Committee for oversight. She explained if the EXCOM accepts, ARM will publish the task in the Federal Register, seek working group volunteers, and create the working group.

Ms. Hamilton noted the task's deadline for completion is December 2012. She stated it may be completed earlier, but it is imperative the ARAC meets the deadline. Ms. Hamilton stated the first 9 months of the task will be labor intensive, and after that, when the working group is making the model more universally applicable, the workload is uncertain. Dr. Borener stated the workload will depend on the number of topics associated with the process. She noted that AVP will staff the task.

Mr. Joseph asked whether the 10 or 12 issues will be broad or specific rulemaking issues. Ms. Hamilton responded the issues will be fairly broad. She stated the FAA is considering rulemaking on the issues. Ms. Hamilton noted this will not affect active working projects; rather, it would include broader areas for future rulemaking.

Mr. Joseph stated there is a need for a function that will be applied broadly. Dr. Borener responded this model will work for any topic.

Mr. Joseph asked if once the model is built, will the FAA manage it or will the ARAC be involved on individual issues. Ms. Hamilton responded the FAA will use the tool to consider issues and determine prioritization. She added the FAA could create a process in which it seeks EXCOM members' input. Mr. Joseph asked whether the ARAC could participate. Ms. Hamilton stated it could. Dr. Borener noted with the CAST model, an organization meets monthly to comment on the issues, and that could be part of this concept.

Mr. Zuspan asked whether the FAA expects the Executive Committee members to define the process and give the model to the FAA. He asked whether the process would include the restructured ARAC body. Mr. Zuspan noted the Safety Standards Consultative Committee offers routine consultation in the European rulemaking process and could be used as a model.

Mr. Zuspan stated the ARAC is tasked to provide advice to the FAA on a full range of rulemaking activities. He asserted the group has the authority to provide advice on any appropriate topic. Mr. Zuspan contended there should be a provision for the ad hoc group to consider an ongoing role for the ARAC to offer periodic review and advice. Ms. Hamilton stated that is an appropriate conversation for the working group, as well as an appropriate recommendation to the FAA.

Dr. Borener noted the FAA wants the model to help determine how decisions are made and what elements of the criteria dominate. She stated some issues address the public interest, but the industry must pay the costs of those issues. Dr. Borener asserted the model will help explain issue prioritization.

Ms. MacLeod asked whether the FAA wants to create a model from current requirements. She noted there are already laws that establish how to promulgate rules, and that guidance already exists in the form of orders. She asked whether the model will address the guidance, allotting appropriate weight to concerns such as safety and politics. Ms. Hamilton stated it will. She explained the FAA recognizes the difficulties that arise when Congress requires rulemaking on a specific topic. Ms. MacLeod noted public meetings and hearings can help address questions on the politics of aviation safety.

Dr. Borener suggested members discuss important topics to include in the model. She stated, as an example, if there are six topic areas driving a prioritization model, it may not be possible to cross weight their importance. Dr. Borener explained within each category, it is possible to describe the impact on the other categories if a given topic is selected for rulemaking.

Ms. MacLeod noted the ARAC must address certain executive orders, mandates from Congress, and safety initiatives. She predicted the ARAC members will more readily be able to identify criteria on safety, capacity, environment, and operations than they will for the political topics.

Ms. Hamilton recognized the need to capture the political implications because it will help the FAA. She reminded the ARAC members this recommendation came from industry, not the FAA. She stated from the FAA perspective, there is twice as much demand for rulemaking as there is capacity to deliver. Ms. Hamilton stated the model will help the FAA consider the

capacity and resources to determine which topics are best to address. She noted that includes the rulemaking requests that fall under legal mandate.

Ms. MacLeod asked whether the EXCOM members will evaluate the model. Ms. Hamilton stated it is an option. Ms. MacPherson noted the tools exist, but the recommendation came from industry. She asserted industry believes it is not given sufficient input early enough. Ms. Hamilton invited Mr. Zuspan to offer his industry perspective, as he was a participant in the FAAC.

Mr. Zuspan noted Boeing executive Ms. Nicole Piasecki chaired the FAAC Safety subcommittee. He explained he was tasked to help with the staff work. He stated he believes industry does feel involved in determining which issues go through the rulemaking process. Mr. Zuspan noted the FAAC's concern is with the volume of demand relative to the FAA's rulemaking capacity, and with the importance of decisions regarding which topics will move forward. He asserted industry's desire is for the FAA to make the decision to move forward with rulemaking activities in the context of the full range of possible initiatives that could be pursued. Mr. Zuspan noted legislation requiring rulemaking would, of course, bear on this decision.

Mr. Zuspan predicted this model could add rationality to both the FAA rulemaking process, which all industry members would support, and to the FAA's responses to the NTSB and to Congress. He noted it could be a two-way benefit. Mr. Zuspan explained GAMA was insistent that the safety criterion not take precedence in the model. He stated in the past, the decision-making models were built around lives saved versus past accidents. Mr. Zuspan noted as the accident rate gets lower, statistical data on lives lost in past accidents becomes less significant.

Dr. Borener noted it is important for the FAA to take credit for its successes. She stated the FAA helped lower fatality rates by improving the flame-retardant properties of aircraft seats. Dr. Borener contended that as the fatality rates decrease, the risk calculation shows the risk is reduced as well. She stated survivability rates should be improved while maintaining the current level of safety. Dr. Borener explained the model's parameters will address this. She argued that the tool should capture reduced risk and manage operational performance so we stay in a safety buffer. Dr. Borener noted the ad hoc group will be formed to help the FAA identify the criteria and determine the parameters. She stated the front end of the task is developing the model, then it needs to be tested to ensure it is logical. Dr. Borener noted the model should be transparent and amendable, and the parameters can be adjusted if necessary.

Ms. MacLeod stated the ARAC's task is to define a process to evaluate rulemaking processes; however, the process is already defined by laws and executive orders. She noted the FAA will plug potential rulemaking projects into the model. Ms. MacLeod asked what happens if the NTSB recommends a rulemaking project that is impossible to pass. She asked whether the rule would be put into the model regardless.

Ms. MacPherson stated the model is a scoring system in which the FAA receives a recommendation, inputs the data, and gets a score based on the data. She contended the scores will help the FAA prioritize the rulemaking project and give it a standardized, quantitative way to explain to entities like the NTSB why their requests are not higher on the priority list.

Ms. MacLeod noted the model is designed to provide balance, scoring, and objective reasons for the particular priority of a project. She asked how helpful the model will be if there are already laws determining the rulemaking criteria.

Ms. MacPherson stated the rulemaking process is adversarial and industry's priorities often change after a notice of proposed rulemaking is published. Ms. MacPherson contended having the involvement of industry in a scoring system very early in the process has value.

Ms. MacPherson explained the FAA will continue to follow the Executive Orders, but the FAA can point to the scoring system if industry questions decisions. The value is when industry acknowledges the rulemaking has value versus a fluke that rulemaking will not really be able to fix.

Dr. Borener noted the FAA makes rules for reasons unrelated to safety. She explained rules may be written to make aircraft NexGen compliant or to increase aircraft resale value. Dr. Borener added rulemaking addressing equipage problems are harmonization issues, not safety issues. She contended these rules could determine how operations will be run over the next 2 years.

Dr. Borener noted if another rulemaking issue, such as bird strikes, goes before the FAA at the same time as a harmonization issue, the model will help identify available resources before the prioritization process.

Ms. MacLeod asked what role the ARAC will have once the model is created. Mr. Joseph responded, in the interest of time, the EXCOM members need to decide whether they want to take this task on, and then determine the ARAC's role. He recommended EXCOM members to put the task to a vote. Mr. Joseph asked whether anyone opposed the EXCOM taking on this task. Hearing no further comments or objections, Mr. Joseph noted the task was accepted.

Mr. Joseph asked Ms. Hamilton whether the EXCOM members should discuss selecting the leadership for the new working group to be formed. Ms. Hamilton stated the FAA will publish the task in the Federal Register to solicit working group volunteers. She explained there is a draft notice in the read-ahead package and directed members to submit comments on the notice to Ms. Renee Butner, FAA ARM-20, by April 1, 2011. Ms. Hamilton urged members to consider joining the working group, and to consider taking on a leadership role. She stated members should advise Ms. Butner by April 1, 2011 whether they, or any other members of their organizations, are interested in joining or leading the working group. She stated if no one volunteers to chair the working group, she will have a discussion with Mr. Joseph and Mr. Elwell about how to proceed.

Ms. Hamilton explained the FAA intends to expend significant resources on this project, but it cannot lead the working group. She stated the working group must be chaired by an industry group or representative because the FAA cannot make recommendations to itself. Ms. Hamilton reiterated the task will be fast-tracked, and the first meeting will be held by the end of May 2011, pending Federal Register notice requirements.

Mr. Joseph suggested an EXCOM member should lead the working group. He stated there appeared to be two interested parties in the room and encouraged one of them to volunteer to chair the working group to ensure the task moves forward under EXCOM. Mr. Joseph reminded the EXCOM members to submit comments to Ms. Butner by April 1, 2011.

UPDATE ON FAA RESPONSE TO PROCESS IMPROVEMENT WORKING GROUP (PIWG) RECOMMENDATIONS

Mr. Joseph moved to the next item on the agenda and asked about the update on the FAA response to PIWG recommendations. Ms. Hamilton responded the FAA has been working on a rewrite of the Committee Manual. She stated the FAA has captured the less complex issues from the PIWG recommendations and has incorporated those into a revised draft of the Committee Manual. Ms. Hamilton explained the Manual needs to go through management review and get posted for comments, at which point it will become part of the International Organization for Standardization (ISO) process on committees. She stated she expects this process to take four to six weeks. Ms. Hamilton noted the FAA will conduct a second round of revisions to include some of the PIWG recommendations that are not as straightforward. She stated phase I will cover incorporating straightforward recommendations into the Committee Manual immediately, and then the FAA will move forward with phase II.

FUTURE WORK

Mr. Joseph thanked Ms. Hamilton for the update and moved to the next agenda item, future work. Ms. Hamilton announced the FAA has tasked two items to the TAEIG and its working groups. She stated the first item is phase II of the low-speed alerting project that is already in place. Ms. Hamilton explained a recently published Federal Register notice details the tasks for phase II. She noted the second item is a new rudder reversal task. Ms. Hamilton stated the FAA asked EXCOM members for comments on the topic, and those are available in the read-ahead package. She noted the new rudder reversal task was published in the Federal Register on March 28, 2011.

STATUS REPORTS FROM ASSISTANT CHAIRS

Mr. Joseph moved to the agenda item on status reports from assistant chairs.

Air Carrier Operations

Mr. William Edmunds noted the All Weather Operations Working Group has an upcoming meeting in Cologne, Germany. Mr. Edmunds will not be in attendance.

TAE

Mr. Bolt stated the TAE Aeronautical Technical Subject Area Working Group will meet on April 13, 2011. He stated the working group will review and approve the final report for phase I of low-speed alerting, which sets the stage for phase II. He stated TAE is working to organize the rudder reversal task working groups. He stated TAE also has the Material Flammability Working Group underway, and its members are reviewing the work plan for the task.

OFF AGENDA REMARKS FROM EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEMBERS

Mr. Joseph invited members to make additional comments prior to the close of the meeting. Ms. Hamilton noted there are a few administrative notes to address. She stated Ms. Courtney,

the manager of ARM-200 division, will be the alternate Designated Federal Official (DFO). Ms. Hamilton noted a message was sent out asking EXCOM members to designate an alternate. She stated if other appointments of alternates still need to be made, the EXCOM members must notify Ms. Butner by April 1, 2011, so all appointment letters can be written at one time.

Ms. Hamilton recognized Mr. Joseph Hawkins, PAI, who announced he will retire April 15, 2011. Ms. Hamilton noted Mr. Hawkins has served ARM as a contractor the past few years. She stated he has done fabulous work for her over the years, including his work on the ARAC restructuring, benchmarking against other federal advisory committees, and revising the Committee Manual.

Mr. Joseph noted Mr. Hawkins got him involved in this process. He expressed his appreciation for Mr. Hawkins' direction and guidance over the years. Mr. Hawkins stated it was his pleasure working with everyone on the ARAC EXCOM. He explained he enjoyed seeing the organization and process evolve under Ms. Hamilton's leadership.

Mr. Joseph noted the next EXCOM meeting should take place sooner rather than later. Ms. Hamilton stated the next meeting will probably be held by the end of June 2011, because of the amount of activity with the ARAC restructuring and the FAAC recommendation. She took an action item to determine the availability of the conference room and stated she will send three choices for meeting dates.

Mr. Joseph asked whether there were any other concerns or comments. With no comments or objections, Mr. Joseph adjourned the meeting at 11:52 p.m.

ADJOURNMENT

Approved by: signed
Norman Joseph, Chair

Dated: 6/15/2011

Ratified on: 6/29/11