

Regional Planning Commission for Jefferson, Orleans, Plaquemines, St. Bernard, and St. Tammany Parishes (RPC), and in conjunction with the Louisiana Department of Transportation and Development (LADOTD), will prepare an EIS on alternatives for enhanced commercial interstate access for the Port of South Louisiana and St. John the Baptist Parish between Airline Highway (U.S. 61) and Interstate 10. While port facilities exist along a 54-mile stretch of the Mississippi River, the main focus of port activities and need for port access has been focused in the Reserve area. Reserve has no direct connection to the interstate system. Interchanges with I-10, the nearest interstate highway, lie either eight miles to the east at Highway 3188 or twelve miles to the west at Highway 641. Access to I-10 from the port facilities at Reserve via either of these routes is rather cumbersome, using one of three state highways to access U.S. 61, then traveling either west or east along this congested commercial thoroughfare to the state highways linking to I-10. The routes also pass through residential areas. The proposed EIS will explore not only enhanced I-10 access for the Port of South Louisiana, but also enhanced access for general commercial and non-commercial traffic in the Parish.

The study area limits of the EIS extend from ¼ mile to the east of U.S. 51 on the east to ¼ mile to the west of LA 3213/641 on the west, and from ¼ mile north of I-10 on the north to ¼ mile south of U.S. 61 on the south. It is anticipated that alternatives explored may include new roadways, possible new interchanges with I-10, improvements to existing roadways, as well as Transportation System Management (TSM) options. No transit alternatives are envisioned at this time.

Major arterials that may be traversed, incorporated into, or considered within this study area include: Interstate 10, Interstate 55, U.S. 61, U.S. 51, LA 3213, LA 641, LA 3188, LA 637, LA 54, LA 3179, LA 3223, and LA 3224.

The EIS will be initiated with a scoping process. The scoping process will include a program of public outreach and agency coordination which will be conducted over the next several months in order to elicit input on project purpose and need, potential alternatives, significant and insignificant issues, and collaborative methods for analyzing transportation alternatives and environmental impacts.

As part of scoping, RPC and LADOTD will hold a public scoping meeting and will contact and meet with local, State, and Federal agencies and officials as well as private individuals and

organizations concerned with the project. Public notice will be given of the time and place of the public scoping meeting and hearing. The information gained during the scoping process will be widely disseminated and used to guide the development of the EIS. All comments and input received during the scoping will be considered and documented.

Beginning with scoping, continuous and regular public involvement and agency coordination will continue throughout the preparation of the EIS. Letters describing the proposed action and soliciting comments will be sent to appropriate Federal, State, and local agencies, tribes, elected officials and to private organizations and citizens who have previously expressed or are known to have interest in this proposal. Numerous public meetings will be held throughout the term of the project. In addition, a public hearing will be held after the draft EIS is made available for public review. Public notice will be given of the time and place of the meetings and hearing. The draft EIS will be available for public and agency review and comment prior to the public hearing.

To ensure that the full range of issues related to this proposed project are addressed and all significant issues identified, comments and suggestions are invited from all interested parties. Comments or questions concerning this proposed action and the EIS should be directed to the LADOTD at the address provided above.

Issued on May 8, 2009.

**Charles W. Bolinger,**

*Division Administrator, FHWA.*

[FR Doc. E9-11371 Filed 5-14-09; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE P**

## DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

### Federal Aviation Administration

#### Aviation Rulemaking Advisory Committee Meeting on Transport Airplane and Engine Issues

**AGENCY:** Federal Aviation Administration (FAA), DOT.

**ACTION:** Notice of public meeting.

**SUMMARY:** This notice announces a public meeting of the FAA's Aviation Rulemaking Advisory Committee (ARAC) to discuss transport airplane and engine (TAE) issues.

**DATES:** The meeting is scheduled for Thursday, June 11, 2009, starting at 9 a.m. Pacific Daylight Time. Arrange for oral presentations by June 1, 2009.

**ADDRESSES:** FAA-Northwest Mountain Region Office, Transport Standards Staff conference room, 1601 Lind Ave., SW., Renton, WA 98057.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Ralen Gao, Office of Rulemaking, ARM-209, FAA, 800 Independence Avenue, SW., Washington, DC 20591, Telephone (202) 267-3168, FAX (202) 267-5075, or e-mail at [ralen.gao@faa.gov](mailto:ralen.gao@faa.gov).

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** Pursuant to Section 10(a)(2) of the Federal Advisory Committee Act (Pub. L. 92-463; 5 U.S.C. app. III), notice is given of an ARAC meeting to be held June 11, 2009.

The agenda for the meeting is as follows:

- Opening Remarks, Review Agenda and Minutes
- FAA Report
- Airplane-level Safety Analysis WG Report
- Task 4 Status
- EXCOM Report
- Transport Canada Report
- Ice Protection HWG Report
- Vote on final report
- Airworthiness Assurance HWG Report
- Avionics HWG Report
- Any Other Business
- Action Item Review

Attendance is open to the public, but will be limited to the availability of meeting room space. Please confirm your attendance with the person listed in the **FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT** section no later than June 1, 2009. Please provide the following information: Full legal name, country of citizenship, and name of your industry association, or applicable affiliation. If you are attending as a public citizen, please indicate so.

To participate by telephone, please contact the person listed in the **FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT** section for the teleconference call-in number and passcode. Anyone calling from outside the Renton, WA, metropolitan area will be responsible for paying long-distance charges.

The public must make arrangements by June 1, 2009, to present oral statements at the meeting. Written statements may be presented to the ARAC at any time by providing 25 copies to the person listed in the **FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT** section or by providing copies at the meeting. Copies of the documents to be presented to ARAC may be made available by contacting the person listed in the **FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT** section.

If you need assistance or require a reasonable accommodation for the meeting or meeting documents, please

**Aviation Rulemaking Advisory Committee (ARAC)  
Transport Airplane and Engine (TAE) Issues Area**

**Meeting Minutes**

**Date:** June 11, 2009  
**Time:** 9:00AM PST  
**Location:** FAA-Seattle, Northwest Mountain Region  
Renton, WA

**Call to Order /Administrative Reporting**

Mr. Craig Bolt (TAE Assistant Chair) called the meeting to order at 9:00AM.

Mr. Mike Kaszycki (TAE Assistant Executive Director) read the Federal Advisory Committee Act (FACA) statement.

Mr. Bolt reviewed the agenda.

*For attendance, please see **HANDOUT #1**.  
For the agenda, please see **HANDOUT #2**.*

<b>Item</b>	<b>March 11, 2009 TAEIG Meeting Action Items</b>	<b>Status</b>
1.	October 1, 2008 Minutes review.	CLOSED

**FAA Report**

Mr. James Wilborn and Mr. Mike Kaszycki presented this report. See Handout #3.

Mr. Kaszycki stated that Flightcrew Alerting NPRM should be the next rule reviewed by OMB, as the regulatory issues covered by the draft rule have been linked to several accident investigations, among other reasons.

Mr. Kaszycki stated part 25 has generally evolved to regulate metallic airframes; however, new aircraft are increasingly designed with composite materials. The FAA had been using special conditions to deal with this change in technology, but that should not be the long-term solution. Therefore, the proposed part 25 tasking is part of a “scoping exercise” to see, via comments received, what portions of part 25 needs up-dating in the future, and hopefully move towards performance-based standards.

The FAA is currently drafting a charter for a new ARC. This ARC will explore how the FAA could write ADs in a streamlined fashion such that industry could more efficiently utilize them. On why an ARC is being formed rather than an ARAC, Mr. Kaszycki stated it is because ARC was viewed as being faster, and Congress is expecting quick results. AIR will be leading this ARC, with AFS participating on key working groups.

Mr. Kaszycki clarified that when the FAA legal department review proposed rules, it proves edits based on promotion of legally defensible and performance based requirements. The changes submitted by FAA legal typically do not result in substantive changes. The changes legal makes also may need to be reflected in ACs accompanying the rules.

Mr. Kihm expressed a concern regarding the Digital Flight Recorder rule, and would like to verify that it is on the list for rulemaking harmonization between EASA and the FAA. Mr. Kaszycki stated that he would take an action item to verify.

### **Airplane-level Safety Analysis WG Report**

Roger Knepper presented this report. See Handout #4.

### **Task #4 Status**

Mr. Knepper stated the presentation of Task #4 will shift from July 2009 to September 2009. They will present the final report at the next TAEIG meeting.

Mr. Kaszycki asked that, without § 25.1309, how would industry assess the systems that protect the aircraft from lightning effects. Mr. Larsen stated that, in general, reliability analyses are not done at the component level for the protective elements such as ground-fault interrupts or any circuitry systems that protect the airplane. Rather, the airplanes are tested at their full-up (no failures assumed) configuration to show they meet safety standards, then maintain that safety level by calling out inspections or continuing airworthiness instructions to ensure the airplanes remain in configuration.

Mr. Knepper reviewed proposed changes to Task #4 Draft Report. See Handout #4.

Mr. Kaszycki asked about the likelihood of achieving concurrence on Task #4. Mr. Knepper replied that all the remaining issues have a good chance of concurrence, with the possible exception of latents.

Mr. Knepper briefly reviewed proposed draft MMEL Task 4 Recommendations.

Mr. Larsen stated he dispositioned all the public comments. He would like all remaining comments submitted, and ready for their Cedar Rapids meeting in July 9-11, 2009.

Mr. Knepper reviewed the Draft Aging and Wear Task 4 Recommendations. See Handout #4.

Mr. Knepper then reviewed Task #4 Latent/Active Task Group. This proposal will affect a number of regulations and advisory materials that would need revision to “point to” § 25.1309 regarding specific risk of latent failures. See Handout #4, slide entitled “Regulations /advisory materials affected.”

Mr. Kaszycki asked whether other organizations know about or understand the wide-spread effect of this proposal. Mr. Knepper replied that since this is still a draft proposal,

the group has not yet contacted other organizations about the potential effects. However, the group would like to solicit other organizations' position at their Cedar Rapids meeting.

Mr. Bolt asked whether the group has discussed how to handle situations where an affected rule is already undergoing changes, i.e. an ARAC-proposed revision to § 25.933 already adopted by EASA, but not yet adopted by the FAA. Mr. Knepper replied that they have not had the opportunity to discuss this.

Mr. Bolt stated that this recommendation will make § 25.1309 the regulation that oversees all other related regulations (but only in regard to latent failures). Groups responsible for these affected regulations would need to know as soon as possible. However, many of those groups also no longer exist.

Mr. Bolt asked whether the group can assess how the Latent/Active group's disposition (majority and minority positions) would affect the proposed AC. Mr. Kaszycki stated that ASAWG should give clear directions to the FAA on what its recommendations are. Its members should come to a resolution at their final meeting, and have thoroughly briefed their management and TAEIG representatives on the technical details, so that by the time TAEIG votes on the draft, they will be prepared to do so without revisiting the technical details and issues.

Mr. Greiner asked whether TAEIG could allow members to vote on issues that have group consensus, and postpone the final vote on the latent failure issue to later. Mr. Kaszycki stated this is not realistic, because the latent failure issue is the substance of this report. He would like to vote once on the final complete report, rather than approving it piecemeal. TAEIG members agreed.

Mr. Kaszycki stated that the regulating authorities would not support a final recommendation with filled with escape clauses and exclusions created solely to achieve consensus.

### **EXCOM Report**

Mr. Bolt presented this report. See Handout #5.

Next EXCOM meeting is in December 2009.

Mr. Kaszycki asked about whether there is a timeline for Rulemaking Process Working Group to deliver recommendations. Mr. Bolt stated there is not yet a timeline.

### **Transport Canada Report**

Mr. Oliver Rusch presented this report. See Handout #6.

TCCA has a new Director of General Civil Aviation, Mr. Martin Eley.

On May 25-27, TCCA held a Delegates Conference, which is a forum for technical discussions and concerns. This conference is held every 3 years, and is free.

Mr. Kihm asked about TCCA's position on part 26 Aging Aircraft regulations. Mr. Rusch replied that there is part 26 Aging Aircraft regulation in the works within TCCA; however, he does not have full information at this date.

Mr. Rusch stated TCCA is planning to implement a requirement for safety management system (SMS) for design organizations, through the use of Accredited Design Organizations. The time-frame for implementation is approximately two years.

Mr. Rusch remarked that any individual or organization can apply for design approval so long as that individual or organization meets the knowledge and technical capabilities requirement.

Ms. Carr with AIA stated that they had a conference call several months ago with TCCA and FAA, where they were talking about harmonization and the possible use of a joint cooperation team. In that presentation, they referenced CDO and ADO and ODA, saying these are all meant to align with each other. FAA, TCCA, and EASA met with industry (i.e. AIA, GAMA) and gave a presentation of what this harmonization will look like. Industry has an action to provide TCCA a follow-up response.

### **Ice Protection HWG Report**

Mr. Jim Hoppins presented this report. See Handout #7.

New concerns have appeared over the last couple of weeks, regarding the means of compliance for proposed supercooled large droplet (SLD) requirements that apply to airplane components such as windshield, radome, and air data probes.

Mr. Hoppins stated that, with exception of the 60,000 lbs limit, the draft requirements have not changed substantively since initial recommendation. The Phase 4 review noted some language change but no changes in intent.

Mr. Kihm stated that Boeing has prepared some charts on these issues that he would like to go through as talking points. See Handout #8. He stated that the draft § 25.1420 would required all applicants to comply with the SLD requirements for system components without providing sufficient guidance. Too much attention has been focused on the 60,000 lbs discriminant and the safety benefits resulting from compliance to § 25.1420. However, other relevant regulations do not have the 60,000 lbs discriminant—that is, the exemption clause that exists in § 25.1420. As a result, the proposed § 25.1420 does not make clear whether an exemption to § 25.1420 could be applied as exemption to other relevant regulations as well.

Mr. Kihm stated that, based on the materials available, it is unclear (1) whether large airplanes would have to comply with these other regulations regarding system components, and (2) what the means of compliance would be. Mr. Kaszycki replied that the FAA's intention is that large airplanes would have to comply to these system component regulations, given the similarity of the regulated systems involved. Further, no information has been given to the FAA as to why these areas should be excluded from compliance.

Mr. Kihm stated that the economic evaluation was done without reflecting the full cost of compliance with these system component regulations. Mr. Kaszycki reminded the group that the FAA utilized all cost estimates provided by the working group. Also, Mr. Kihm stated that for those airplanes that must comply with § 25.1420, the guidance does not make clear whether the compliance method (i.e. detect and exit) used with § 25.1420 could be used to comply with these system component regulations. Right now the worst case scenario is that these airplanes would have to comply based on a continuous operation in Appendix X.

Mr. Kihm continued with his presentation.

Mr. Kaszycki expressed surprise that the other manufacturers who participated, knowing they would have to comply with the system component regulations, did not raise these issues earlier during the HWG activities.

Mr. Kihm acknowledged that it was unfortunate that Boeing was providing these inputs very late in the process. He noted that within Boeing, the efforts to evaluate the impact of the rule have been focused primarily on aerodynamics, and the systems experts were not involved as early on as they should have been.

Mr. Hoppins stated that, from Cessna's perspective, they assumed all their airplanes would be detect-and-exit, so they did not consider this in their evaluation of the proposed rule.

Mr. Kihm stated Boeing would like additional clarification in the proposed NPRM. Mr. Hoppins referenced a section in the draft report which addressed considering exposures consistent with the operational icing exposure definitions (regarding §§ 25.1323, 25.1325, and 25.773), but stated he did not think this fully addressed Boeing's newly raised concerns.

Mr. Greiner stated that Airbus also had only recently become aware of this issue. He received responses from Airbus Icing department, expressing surprise and concern. Airbus agreed that Boeing's concerns are valid, and would like to participate in this discussion.

Ms. Carr asked whether the Working Group would be discussing these new concerns and if there was a timeline for deliverables? Mr. Hoppins stated that they have no more scheduled meetings because the group had completed its tasks. When asked to estimate,

he replied that if the task is only to provide clarification, that can be accomplished in perhaps 60 days; however, if it involves new economic evaluation, it would take more work and may cause further delays.

Ms. Ishimaru from the FAA stated that the guidance is fairly clear in that § 25.1420 does not exempt airplanes with maximum gross weights above 60,000 lbs from compliance to other system component regulations as it does for the performance and handling qualities requirements for Appendix X icing conditions. The main concern from industry is that it may be extremely expensive to comply with § 25.1420 as proposed for system components. The economic evaluation in the original draft—not Phase 4 draft—had used numbers provided by industry working group members.

Ms. Mason stated that some of the assumptions the group used in its economic evaluation is not what Boeing used in this new presentation. The radome analysis was done with a 45-minute holding condition, the inlet analysis was done by considering a 2-minute delayed activation. What Mr. Kihm and Boeing recently considered involves an inlet analysis with a holding condition.

Mr. Kaszycki stated that, at this date, the group may try to work on clarification, but since the comments were coming in late the issues may be better addressed through the public comment process. The most pressing issue is the rule and its regulatory evaluation, which is scheduled to be reviewed by OST and OMB shortly.

Mr. Kihm offered that Boeing has a streamlined process for providing data to the economic evaluation process. Would this be helpful? The consensus reply was the data is only one aspect of the issue.

Mr. Geiner suggested the Working Group schedule an interim meeting to discuss this, to come up with a proposal. Mr. Kaszycki raised concerns about commitments made to the NTSB and rulemaking schedules.

Mr. Kihm asked whether they could schedule online meetings through WebEx to discuss how to resolve this issue. Mr. Hoppins stated there are other methods of doing this analysis, and expressed concerns about some of the simplifying assumptions in Boeing's analysis and the numbers it produced. Doing new analyses with more detailed methods will definitely take more than 2 or 3 weeks, as it will involve many experts from industry, NASA, etc.

For this reason, Mr. Kaszycki proposed not delaying the promulgation of the rule at this time. Mr. Bolt agreed that the group should submit the core of its recommendation, with Boeing's presentations attached. In the meanwhile, the group could meet to see if it could try to resolve the concerns.

Mr. Badger asked a question regarding the applicability of § 25.1420. Ms. Ishimaru replied that the rule states if the aircraft has a maximum takeoff gross weight over 60,000 lbs, the aerodynamic surface do not need to comply; however, the sensors, windshield(s),

radome, and engine inlet would not be exempted based on the justification provided by the manufacturers in their dissenting position.

After some discussion, Mr. Kihm summarized that both the proposed § 25.1420 and accompanying draft AC indicate that a detect-and-exit airplane could use that detect-and-exit methodology to comply with the system components (windshields, probes, etc.).

Mr. Kihm and Mr. Bolt took an action item to put this issue into a short report.

Mr. Kaszycki stated for the record that the FAA was going to proceed forward with the NPRM and any work done by the HWG was at risk of not being included. The next best chance to get input to the rule would be during the NPRM public comment period.

Mr. Bolt called for a vote on this, and TAEIG members concurred.

**Airworthiness Assurance HWG Report**

Mr. R. Varanasi presented this report. See Handout #9.

Embraer will be joining this Working Group as an observer, and will host a meeting in the USA.

Mr. Kaszycki asked whether the AAWG's concern about harmonization is new, or a carry-over from before because EASA never responded to their harmonization concerns. Mr. Varanasi stated that this was a continued concern.

Mr. Kaszycki took an action item to speak with EASA.

**Avionics HWG**

Mr. Clark Badie presented this report.

He stated the group expects to submit a report by March 2010. They have draft outlines ready, with first draft due for August 2009.

**Any Other Business**

None.

**Action Item Review**

Item	March 11, 2009 TAEIG Meeting Action Items	Status
------	--	--------



1.	FAA (James Wilborn) to clarify why, on page 10 of the FAA Report, policy statement was used instead of revising Advisory Material.	
2.	Oliver Rusch to provide TCCA plans for addressing equivalent part 26 requirements and retroactive requirements to existing fleets.	
3.	Oliver Rusch to provide more details on who can attend TCCA's Delegates Conference.	
4.	Doug Kihm to send letter containing Boeing's comments to Craig Bolt by June 19, 2009, for attachment to IPHWG Phase 4 report.	
5.	Rao Varanasi to provide the FAA background on concerns regarding potential differences between the FAA and EASA's Aging Aircraft plans.	

**Future TAEIG Meetings**

The next meeting will be held in September 23, 2009, in Arlington, VA.

**Public Notification**

The *Federal Register* published a notice of this meeting on May 15, 2009.

**Approval**

I certify the minutes are accurate.



Craig R. Bolt  
Assistant Chair, ARAC

**HANDOUT #1**

<b>NAME</b>	<b>ORGANIZATION</b>	<b>EMAIL</b>	<b>TELEPHONE</b>
Oliver Rusch	Transport Canada		
Doug Kihm	Boeing		
C.W. Roberts	Cessna		
Craig Bolt	Pratt & Whitney		
Rolf Greiner	Airbus		
Mike Kaszycki	FAA		
James Wilborn	FAA		
Ray Holenda	NADA		
Rob ___	Airbus		
Bob Young	AIA		
Ralen Gao	FAA		
Renee Carr	AIA		
Jill DiMarco	Boeing		
Tom Peters	Embraer		
Mike Branch	Honeywell		
John White	ALPA (?)		
Roger Knepper	Airbus		
Kathi Ishimaru	FAA		
Hals Larsen	FAA		

# Transport Airplane and Engine Issues Group Meeting

FAA-NWR  
1601 Lind Ave. SW  
Renton, Wa. 98057

## Agenda

*DRESS: BUSINESS CASUAL- ALL TIMES PACIFIC DAYLIGHT*

**Thursday, June 11, 2009** – Call in number: 425-227-1570 passcode 2777#

9:00	Call to Order, Reading of the Procedures Statement, Review of Agenda, Meeting Logistics, Review of Action Items, Items of Interest, Review of Minutes from previous meeting	C. Bolt/M. Kaszycki
9:15	FAA Report	M. Kaszycki
9:45	Airplane-level Safety Analysis WG Report <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Task 4 Status</li></ul>	E. Wineman/R. Knepper
11:00	EXCOM Report	C. Bolt
11:15	Transport Canada Report	O. Rusch
11:30	-- <b>LUNCH</b> --	
12:30	Ice Protection HWG Report – Vote on Phase IV Report	J. Hoppins
1:15	Airworthiness Assurance HWG Report	R. Varanasi
1:45	Avionics HWG	C. Badie
2:15	Any Other Business	All
2:45	Action Item Review	C. Bolt
3:00	-- <b>ADJOURN</b> --	

# June 2009 FAA Status Update

## Transport Airplane and Engine Issues Group

Presented to: TAEIG

By: Mike Kaszycki, Manager, Transport Standards Staff

Date: June 11, 2009



Federal Aviation  
Administration



# June 2009 TAEIG Meeting

## Topics:

- Rulemaking project status
- Non-rulemaking project status
- Rulemaking harmonization



# June 2009 TAEIG Meeting

## Rulemaking Project Status: (since March 2009)

- Part 25/26 related Final Rules
  - Special Requirements for Private Use Transport Category Airplanes
    - Final Rule issued on 5/8/09
    - Effective 6/8/09
- Part 33/35 related Final Rules
  - None



# June 2009 TAEIG Meeting

## Rulemaking Project Status: (since March 2009) *continued*

- Part 25/26 related Notices of Proposed Rule Making
  - None since March 2009
- Part 33/35 related Notices of Proposed Rule Making
  - None since March 2009



# June 2009 TAEIG Meeting

## Rulemaking Project Status: (since March 2009)

*continued*

- FRs on “Regulatory Hold”
  - None
- FRs in OMB/OST:
  - 1 part 25 project
- FRs in Headquarters (HQ) for coordination:
  - 2 part 33 projects
  - 1 part 25/26 projects
- FRs in directorate coordination:
  - None
- FRs in development:
  - None





# June 2009 TAEIG Meeting

## Rulemaking Project Status: (since March 2009)

*continued*

- **NPRMs in OST/OMB:**
  - 1 part 25 project
- **NPRMs in HQ for coordination:**
  - 1 part 25 project
  - 1 part 121 project
- **NPRMs in ARAC WG Phase 4 Review:**
  - None
- **NPRMs in Directorate for coordination:**
  - 2 part 25 projects
- **NPRMs in development:**
  - 1 part 33 project
- **New tasking in development:**
  - Fuel System Lightning Protection
  - Certification Standards for Composite Airframes
  - Airworthiness Directives Implementation



# June 2009 TAEIG Meeting

## Non-Rulemaking Project Status:

(since March 2009)

- Part 25/26 Final Advisory Circulars (AC) issued:
  - AC 25-17A Transport Airplane Cabin Interiors Crashworthiness Standards
    - Issued May 18, 2009
- Part 33/35 Final ACs issued:
  - None



# June 2009 TAEIG Meeting

## Non-Rulemaking Project Status: (since March 2009) *continued*

- Part 25 Draft ACs issued:
  - None
- Part 33 Draft ACs issued:
  - None



# June 2009 TAEIG Meeting

## Non-Rulemaking Project Status:

(since March 2009) *continued*

- Part 25/26 Final Policy issued:
  - Flammability of Seat Cushions
    - Issued April 16, 2009
  - Certification of Flight Management Systems
    - Issued March 30, 2009
  - Policy on Issuance of Special Conditions and Exemptions Related to Lightning Protection of Fuel Tank Structure
    - Issued May 26, 2009
- Part 33/35 Final Policy issued:
  - Use of Structural Dynamic Analysis Methods for Blade Containment and Rotor Unbalance Tests on Derivative Engines.
    - Issued April 20, 2009



# June 2009 TAEIG Meeting

## Non-Rulemaking Project Status: (since March 2009) *continued*

- Part 25 Draft Policy issued:
  - Memo to Rescind Policy Statement PS-ANM100-2002-00102, Requirements for Flight Flutter Tests to Determine Freedom from Shock Induced Flutter Phenomena
  - Interaction of Interior Structures, Including Seats

# June 2009 TAEIG Meeting

## Non-Rulemaking Project Status: (since March 2009) *continued*

- Part 33/35 Draft Policy issued:
  - None



# June 2009 TAEIG Meeting

- **Rulemaking Harmonization**

- Regular communication with EASA on Flightcrew Alerting
  - Have not yet achieved harmonization, but made progress in last meeting in April 2009
  - NPA and NPRM will have some differences, but intent is expected to be the same
- FAA plans to publish NPRM enveloping CS 25.1302
- The AIR/EASA “Working Together” team has not met since September 2008
- FAA and EASA met in Cologne the week of April 27, 2009 to discuss certification, maintenance, and rulemaking



# ASAWG Task#4 Status

TAEIG 11 Jun 09



# Table of Content

## Reminder:

- ARAC Specific Risk Tasking
- Task#3 Executive Summary

## Overview:

- ASAWG Task#4 Planning
- ASAWG Task#4 Report Common Format Template

## Each Task Group:

- Task#4 Status
- Task#4 Planning

# Statement of Issue

- Previous ARAC harmonization working groups, and regulatory agencies, produced varying recommendations to handle specific risk
- Aircraft are becoming increasingly integrated where individual system functional boundaries may not be well defined
- Inconsistencies in the safety analysis across systems could result in the use of non-standardized system safety assessments across various critical systems making it hard to properly evaluate at the aircraft level

# SPECIFIC RISK TASKING

- FAA Notice on 3/21/06 - ARAC Tasking to TAEIG
  - Task#1 - Develop definition(s) and examples
  - Task#2 - Review of existing material and identify industry application
  - Task#3 - Determine adequacy of existing and proposed regulatory and guidance material
  - Task#4 - Develop recommendations for rulemaking and guidance material

# SPECIFIC RISK TASKING

- ASAWG Formulation on 7/25/06 – TAEIG Tasking to ASAWG
  - Co-Chairs
    - Roger Knepper – Airbus
    - Ed Wineman - Gulfstream
  - 18 Total members
    - 7 Airframers
    - 5 Suppliers
    - 4 Regulatory
    - 2 Users
  - Over 32 SMEs identified with half currently active in covering both operations and design

# ASAWG Status - Task#3

## (Executive Summary)

- The ASAWG reviewed during Task#3 the results of Tasks#1 & 2 and assessed the appropriateness, adequacy, and consistency of the relevant existing regulations, existing guidance material, ARAC recommendations, and industry practices for airplane-level safety analysis.
- The key approaches to addressing Specific Risk were identified as “fundamental issues”.
- Each fundamental issue recommendation for Task#4 was developed and reviewed by industry and regulators.
- This review generated comments, the disposition of which is documented in the report.
- The recommendations give rationales to go forward to Task#4 and announce, if the change of regulations/guidances are expected or not.

# ASAWG Status - Task#3

## (Executive Summary)

**The final recommendations from Task#3 focus on establishing consistent guidance / regulation for:**

- Conducting specific risk evaluations of latent and active failures.
- Conducting specific risk evaluation for dispatch under a MEL.
- FHA development when dealing with intensifying factors such as flight length, flight phase and diversions.
- Documenting component life limits that are necessary to protect against aging and wear out.

**These recommendations for Task#4 demonstrate where a more consistent approach across systems is necessary to:**

- Assure a warranted level of specific risk regulation, i.e. inconsistency potentially results in over- or under-regulation, and
- Avoid undue burden on the applicant and regulatory authorities.

# ASAWG Way Forward - Task#4

TASK	DESCRIPTION	DATE
3	Determine adequacy of the existing/proposed standards and if a change is warranted	MAR 2008
4	Prepare a report identifying recommendations	<b>Sep</b> <b>2009</b>

## Task#4 schedule:

- Meeting #8 complete
- Meeting #9 complete
- Meeting #10 Hamburg complete
- Meeting #11 Phoenix 07 to 09 Apr, 2009
- Meeting #12 Cedar Rapids 07 to 09 Jul, 2009
- Final Report to TAEIG Sep, 2009
- ASAWG Report presented to TAEIG Oct, 2009

# ASAWG Task#4 Report Common Format Template

I. Executive Summary

II. Benefits of the Recommended Changes

III. Applicability of the Recommended Rules/ACs

IV. The Recommendations

V. General Comments on Costs and Benefits (beyond Section II above) of the Recommendations.

VI. Alternatives Considered

VII. Dissenting Opinions



## ASAWG Status – Task#4

- Flight time, MMEL, Ageing & Wear -

Material that follows is in draft

Organizations provided positions and proposed modifications to draft Phoenix Task#4 Report

ASAWG will disposition comments and determine consensus at Cedar Rapids meeting prior to final Task #4 release

ASAWG Status – Task#4

**Flight Time Task Group**

# Planning - Flight Time Task

## **Two change recommendations were established:**

- Clarify Section 10, 11 and Appendix 4 Tables of AC 25.1309 Arsenal
- Incorporate the use of mission time and diversion time in ETOPS safety analysis defined in AC 1535-1X

## **Task #4 Report Drafted (Phoenix outcome):**



Microsoft  
Word-Dokument

## **Positions provided by organizations:**

- 6 agree (2 Industry, 4 Regulators), 3 partially agree (Industry), 2 disagree (Industry)

## **Final Tasking:**

- ASAWG to disposition comments at Cedar Rapids and determine consensus
- Establish Final Task#4 release at Cedar Rapids

ASAWG Status – Task#4

**MMEL Task Group**

# Status – MMEL

## **Two change recommendations were established:**

- Recommendations to Industry and the Authorities (FAA Flight Standards, EASA, TCCA, etc.) for potential incorporation into MMEL Development Process
- Change to AC 25.1309 Arsenal

## **Task #4 Report Drafted (Phoenix outcome):**



Microsoft  
Word-Dokument

## **Positions provided by organizations:**

- 6 agree (4 Industry, 2 Regulators), 3 partially agree (1 Industry, 2 Regulators), 1 disagree (Industry)

## **Final Tasking:**

- ASAWG to disposition comments at Cedar Rapids and determine consensus
- Establish Final Task#4 release at Cedar Rapids

# ASAWG Status – Task#4

## **Aging & Wear Sub-Task Group**

# Status – Aging & Wear

## **Change recommendation was established:**

- Clarify appendix 3, b (1) of AC 25.1309 (Arsenal) for the consideration of system component ageing & wear aspects

## **Task #4 Report Drafted (Phoenix outcome):**



Microsoft  
Word-Dokument

## **Positions provided by organizations:**

- 8 agree (4 Industry, 4 Regulators), 1 partially agree (Industry),  
1 disagree (Industry)

## **Final Tasking:**

- ASAWG to disposition comments at Cedar Rapids and determine consensus
- Establish Final Task#4 release at Cedar Rapids

# ASAWG Status – Task#4

## - Latent/Active Task Group -

Material that follows is in draft

Organizations to provide positions and to propose modifications for Cedar Rapids



# Status - Latent/Active

## **General Task 4 Objective:**

- Generate a single methodology that controls specific risk through limiting latency and limiting residual risk.
  - Existing simple proven mechanical / hydro systems must be encompassed within the methodology

## **Status:**

- Preliminary flowchart developed in Phoenix. Proposed new subparagraph added to 25.1309, and new Chapter added to AC25.1309-Arsenal.
- Open items on critical path:
  - Finish developing new Specific Risk material in 25.1309 and AC 25.1309 Arsenal
  - Finish revising “affected” regulations and advisory materials to “point to” 25.1309 (rule and advisory material) for latent failures

# Status - Latent/Active

## Status:

- Draft revision proposals for 25.1309 and AC 25.1309 Arsenal
- Draft revisions of affected regulations and advisory material to be revised to “point to” 25.1309 (rule and advisory material) for specific risk of latent failures (other aspects of these rules remain as they are)



Microsoft  
Word-Dokument



Microsoft  
Word-Dokument

# Regulations / advisory material affected

To accomplish the tasking, the following regulations and advisory material need to be revised to “point to” 25.1309 (rule and advisory material) in regards to how specific risk **of latent failures** is addressed.

Some of proposed changes are not applicable to the corresponding CS documents. A separate, similar list for those CS documents will be created.

- FAR 25.671(c)(2) revised to “point to” 25.1309
- FAR 25.1309(b) revised to include latent specific risk
- FAR 25.629(d) no revision required
- FAR 25.783 revised to “point to” 25.1309
- FAR 25.901(c) revised to “point to” 25.1309 (except for 3 specific cases)
- FAR 25.933 revised to “point to” 25.1309
- FAR 25.981(a)(3) proposal for revision pending
- ARAC 25.671 revised to “point to” 25.1309
- ARAC 25.933 Rule and AC proposal for revision pending
- AC 25-19 – CMRs no revision
- AC 25.629-1A deleted some text dealing with single + probable  
replace with SDAHWG recommended AC  
25.1309-Arsenal with changes
- AC/AMJ 25.1309 Arsenal revised to include latent specific risk
- ARAC AC 25.901(c) no revision required
- FAA Policy 25.901(c) superseded by proposed 25.901(c) rule change
- §25.1709 proposal for revision pending

# SUMMARY

- MMEL, Flight Time, and Aging/Wear have (good) chance of consensus
  - They have reasonably solid Task 4 reports out of Phoenix
  - Received company reviews and inputs following Phoenix
  - Team to disposition comments and determine consensus in Cedar Rapids
- **Latent/Active:**
  - Recommendations have yet to solidify
  - Prepare draft Task#4 report at Cedar Rapids. No more meetings are planned.
  - Establish Final Task#4 release up to mid Sep 09
  - **At High risk not to achieve consensus**

**Final Task #4 Report Issued by Sep 2009**



# EXCOM Update For TAEIG

June 11, 2009

# EXCOM Meeting – June 10, 2009

- **Accepted New Task for Maintenance Requirements for Commercial Air Tour Operations**
  - Part 91 and 135 operations with fewer than 9 seats
  - Response to NTSB recommendation
  - Expect Federal Register Notice of tasking by end of June
  - 12 month completion window, managed out of EXCOM
- **Reviewed Rescue and Firefighting Working Group**
  - Consensus not achieved in several areas
  - Will submit to FAA “as is” documenting all positions
- **Established sub-group of EXCOM to work rulemaking process improvement ideas**
- **EXCOM Chair Transition from C. Bolt to Norm Joseph – Airline Dispatchers Federation**



# Transport Canada update to TAEIG June 11, 2009

Oliver Rusch, AARTC





# Transport Canada Briefing Issues

1. New Director General of Civil Aviation
2. Delegates Conference
3. Recently Adopted Standards
4. Accredited Design Organization

Transport Canada update to TAEIG  
June 11, 2009



# New Director General of Civil Aviation

- Martin Eley
  - Formerly Director of National Aircraft Certification



# Delegates Conference 2009

- May 25- 27 2009
- Held every 3 years
- Forum for technical discussions and airing of concerns



# Recent Amendments

- **NPA 2008-013** : Adopts by reference FAR Amendment No. 25-123, dated 8 November 2007
  - Enhanced Airworthiness Program for Airplane Systems/Fuel Tank Safety (EAPAS/FTS)
- **NPA 2008-067** : Adopts by reference FAR Amendment No. 25-124, dated March 7, 2008
  - Revisions to Cockpit Voice Recorder and Digital Flight Data Recorder Regulations
- **NPA 2008-164** : Adopts by reference FAR Amendment No. 25-125, dated July 21, 2008
  - Reduction of Fuel Tank Flammability in Transport Category Airplanes



# TCCA Accredited Design Organization (ADO)

- Holders of TCCA issued operation certificates are required to implement a safety management system (SMS).
- SMS will be applicable to design organizations.
- Existing TCCA delegation system does not provide for:
  - the integration of SMS into design activities;
  - the accreditation of design organizations; and
  - A clear accountability framework.



# TCCA ADO $\cong$ “operating certificate” for design organizations

- A system is needed to recognize design organization knowledge and technical capabilities.
- Best approach is to build on expertise gained by 20+ years of our delegation system while clarifying the roles and responsibilities of all stakeholders.
- “Accreditation” is believed to be a tool to enable the introduction of a “operating certificate” for design organizations.



# TCCA ADO – What it means...

- Any person may apply for a design approval if the applicant meets knowledge and technical capability requirements.
- Knowledge and technical capability are function of design approval sought, category of aeronautical product and “criticality” or “risk severity”.



# TCCA ADO – the ABC's ...

- A: ADO will...
  - make determinations of compliance for every applicable airworthiness requirement; and
  - issue a single declaration of compliance for the design approval sought.
- B: TCCA will...
  - make a single finding of compliance;
  - conduct Project Surveillance through its Level of Involvement (LOI);
  - conduct System Oversight through SMS implementation.
- C: A design approval will be issued.





# TCCA ADO – some features...

- ADO may use subcontractor(s).
- ADO is 100% responsible for all compliance determinations for the design approval sought.
- ADO must have a design assurance system.
- ADO will be scalable to fit an individual to small, medium, large design organizations.
- Intent is aligned with EASA's DOA and FAA's CDO.

**Ice Protection HWG Status**

Presentation to ARAC TAEIG  
11 June 2009

## Task 2 Phase IV Review

---

- All IPHWG tasking completed except:
  - ⇒ Task 2 – Phase IV review (SLD/Mixed Phase Icing Rule)
    - Simulation methods, acceptable means of compliance (SLD)
  - ⇒ Submitted recommendations via letter dated 18 March 2009 for TAEIG vote
- Analytical and simulation techniques have matured since Task 2 report was submitted in 2005
  - ⇒ However, significant challenges in simulating large drop accretions & showing compliance still exist

## Rule Modifications/Harmonization

---

- FAA modified rule applicability from all Part 25 aircraft to a subset of aircraft
  - ⇒ Takeoff weights less than 60,000 lbs
  - or*
  - ⇒ Use of reversible flight controls
- Improved alignment of the Regulatory Evaluation
- FAA schedule for NPRM publication is Jan 15, 2010

- Drafted interim materials to (Appendix to proposed AC materials)
  - ⇒ Discusses limits of tools and provides guidance for compliance
  - ⇒ Use of interim methods, engineering standard approach where applicable
- Focused on the “detect & exit” option
  - ⇒ Limited exposures, limited accumulations
  - ⇒ Compliance with simulation methods provides sufficient accuracy when used in a conservative manner
- For aircraft operating unrestricted (all or portion)
  - ⇒ Longer exposures, larger accumulations
  - ⇒ Would likely require natural SLD testing

## Remaining Issues

---

- Some HWG members concerned that all certifying authorities may not concur with the limits on applicability
  - ⇒ Larger aircraft would likely seek unrestricted approval
  - ⇒ Would likely require flight testing in natural SLD
- Reviewed draft economic analysis, and provided comments

# Phase IV Review - Flight and Engine Compliance

---

## Engine/Engine Installation

- Task 2 report contains acceptable compliance methods
  - ⇒ Rely on similarity analysis for mixed phase and ice crystal conditions
- Anticipated that guidance material will be updated as engineering tools are improved

## Flight Test Compliance Methods

- Subpart B Flight recommendations were not altered

## Recent Issue

---

- New concerns have surfaced regarding component compliance methods
  - ⇒ Windshield, radome, air data probes
- Concerns are both technical and from a regulatory evaluation perspective
- Full IPHWG has not discussed the concerns due to timing
  - ⇒ Issue was raised within the last two weeks
  - ⇒ Two teleconferences with limited IPHWG member participation





## **Discussion/Questions**

# TAEIG Consideration of IPHWG Phase IV Review Materials

## Boeing's Concerns & Proposals

June 11, 2009

# Concerns

- **Recent realization** that Phase IV Review did not adequately consider **MOC for systems component regulations** (windshields, probes, etc.)
  - Draft rules require that all applicants comply with these component regs (including those exempt from 25.1420)
  - Very little compliance guidance is provided
- Rules & guidance lack clarity regarding what is expected of 25.1420 detect & exit applicants
  - Component rules require certification for all of App. X, guidance implies compliance based on 'unrestricted' operation in App. X
  - Some IPHWG (mis-)perception that component exposures would be limited to detect & exit only (e.g., not holding)
  - Questioning whether 'unrestricted' components make sense for detect & exit airplanes

# Concerns, p. 2

- Unrestricted or exempt applicants will also need more detailed guidance and/or alternative MOC
- Clear and consistent guidance is sought to ensure consistent ACO interpretations
- **Implications** of certifying to component regulations now being assessed by industry
  - Lack of engineering tools & validation data
  - No schedule for tool development (NASA Technology Roadmap)
  - Typical compliance analytical methodologies result in **significant compliance concerns** [see following example . . . ]
- These concerns and example analyses have been discussed with a few IPHWG members (including FAA) but not entire WG

# Concerns, p. 3

- Example: Conservative Compliance Methodology
  - Components analyzed using textbook methods, similar to current App. C practice
  - Some mitigating SLD characteristics not accounted for, but --
  - Results believed to be **representative**

# Concerns, p. 4

## ■ Example: Conservative Compliance Methodology (cont'd)

Assessment to design for SLD icing conditions (relative to current regulations):

- **Significantly greater radome ice** accumulation (>800 lb by analysis)  
(engine ice ingestion risk)  
*(the weight or performance effects have not been assessed)*
- **New technology windshield** (more heat required, exceeds temperature limits of vinyl layers)
- **Increased weight** (*4 fold increase in engine inlet anti-ice flow required, requires larger equipment*)
- **Increased drag** (*larger engine anti-ice exhaust holes*) (*and associated increase fuel burn*)
- **Increased bleed extraction** in icing conditions (*performance effects have not been assessed*)
- **Reduced** area on inlet available for acoustic treatment
- **Extensive** natural icing flight test may be required for certification
- Wing ice protection would be significantly affected if required to comply
- Air data probes may not require greater heat (but radome ice shape may affect air data reading)
- **Compliance costs** much higher than current NPRM estimates
  - Also, recurring costs for major modifications of ice protection systems were not available for regulatory evaluation

# Concerns, p. 4

- Note: There have not been any accidents ascribed to effects of SLD icing conditions on airplane components. Thus, proposed regulatory changes to include evaluation in App. X conditions cannot have a measureable safety benefit.

# Proposals

Due to **new awareness of concerns**, request that –

- IPHWG or FAA
  - **Consider revising** component regulations and/or guidance material --
    - Limit required exposure for 25.1420 detect & exit airplanes to detect & exit scenario
    - Or, Limit required exposure to detect & exit scenario for all applicants
  - **Clarify** component guidance material for detect & exit applicants, i.e., what is required for compliance



# Proposals, p. 2

- IPHWG or FAA (cont'd)
  - **Enhance** guidance material for component regulations
    - Mitigate lack of engineering tools & consequences of conservative analytical methodologies – examples:
      - Windshields – Allow service history as MOC so long as maximum possible/practical heat is provided
      - Engines - Allow use of proposed Table 33.77 ice slab to represent airframe-sourced ice ingestion to the engine
  - **Re-evaluate** cert compliance cost estimates re component rules for regulatory evaluation

# Proposals, p. 3

- NASA --
  - **Develop** increased engineering tool capability for systems component MOC
  - **Conduct** flight validation of engineering tools
  - **Lead** effort to develop facility or other means of evaluating FZRA accretion
  - **Provide** schedule for tool development per Technology Roadmap

# AAWG Report to TAEIG June 11, 2009

Dr. Rao Varanasi

Co Chair

Airworthiness Assurance  
Working Group (AAWG)

# Airworthiness Assurance Working Group

- Membership
- Meetings
- Current Task
- Status

# AAWG Membership

- Embraer wishes to participate in fully in AAWG meetings
- Recognizing that AAWG is nearing the end of its current FAA task, Embraer wishes to attend the AAWG meetings as an Observer, instead of going through with a formal application process for membership.
- Embraer wishes to host the next meeting of AAWG (tentatively scheduled in September 2009) at their facilities.

# AAWG Membership: No changes

<u>Name</u>	<u>Company</u>	<u>AAWG Member</u>	<u>E-mail Address</u>
Rao Varanasi	Boeing	Yes (Co-Chair)	rao.varanasi@boeing.com
Roger Skinner	Boeing	No	roger.a.skinner@boeing.com
Andreas Behrmann	Airbus	Yes	andreas.behrmann@airbus.com
Ralph Sykes	LMCO	Yes	r.sykes@LMCO.com
Mark Yerger	FedEx	Yes (Co-Chair)	Mdyerger@fedex.com
Phil Ashwell	British Airways	Yes	<b>phil.b.ashwell@britishairways.com</b>
Joe Moses	Continental Airlines	Yes	joe.moses@coair.com
Greg Pattison	Northwest Airlines	Yes	greg.pattison@nwa.com
Ed Walton	UPS	Yes	emwalton@ups.com
Harry Demarest	American Airlines	Yes	H.a.demarest@aa.com
Jon Oberdick	US Airways	Yes	jober@usairways.com
Larry Williams	United Airlines	Yes	Larry.Williams@united.com
Jun Yamanaka	Japan Airlines	No	jun.yamanaka@jal.com
Joe Freese	ABX Air	Yes	joe.freese@abxair.com

# AAWG Membership (cont'd)

<u>Name</u>	<u>Company</u>	<u>AAWG Member</u>	<u>E-mail Address</u>
Greg Schneider	FAA	Yes	greg.schneider@faa.gov
Rusty Jones	FAA	No	Rusty.Jones@faa.gov
Paul Tang	Transport Canada	Yes	TANGP@tc.gc.ca
Richard Minter	EASA	Yes	richard.minter@easa.europa.eu
Michael Tallarico	US Airways	No	michael.tallarico@usairways.com
Don Bethel	Embraer	No	don.bethel@embraer.com.br
Ethan Brandon	Lynden Air Cargo	No	ebrad@lynden.com
Mitch Lineberry	US Airways	No	Mitch_lineberry@usairways.com
Rafael Marques	Embraer	No	rafael.marques@embraer.com.br
Ron Pekny	American Airlines	No	Ron.Pekny@aa.com
Ian Won	FAA	No	Ian.Y.Won@faa.gov
Phil Yannacone	American Airlines	No	Phil.Yannacone@aa.com
Mark Eldred	Continental Airlines	No	

June 11, 2009

AAWG Report to the TAEIG Mark.Eldred@coair.com

# Meetings

- There were no meetings of the AAWG since the last TAEIG meeting in March 11, 2009
- The next AAWG meeting is tentatively scheduled in September 2009 at a TBD location of Embraer.



# Current Tasks

- AASFR Task:
  - Tasked - May 13, 2004;
  - Status - In work and on schedule;
  - Two Phases:
    - Phase 1 is complete as of April 2007
    - Scheduled Completion for Phase 2 is December 2009- Task 4
      - Development of model specific programs
      - AAWG to provide oversight function and guidance for some STG technical issues

# Task 4

## AAWG Discussions

- Technical Guidance Provided to STGs:
  - A Means of Compliance (MOC) for deviations from AC 120-93 Guidance
  - MOC for Replaceable Structural Components (RSC)
- Rule Issues Requiring TAEIG Help:
  - Non harmonized elements of FAA/EASA Aging Airplane Rules, remain as a concern to DAHs and Operators



Questions?

contact the person listed in the **FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT** section. Sign and oral interpretation, as well as a listening device, can be made available if requested 10 calendar days before the meeting.

Issued in Washington, DC, on May 12, 2009.

**Pamela Hamilton-Powell,**

*Director, Office of Rulemaking.*

[FR Doc. E9-11409 Filed 5-14-09; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 4910-13-P**

## DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

### Federal Aviation Administration

[Summary Notice No. PE-2009-17]

#### Petitions for Exemption; Summary of Petitions Received

**AGENCY:** Federal Aviation Administration (FAA), DOT.

**ACTION:** Notice of petitions for exemption received.

**SUMMARY:** This notice contains a summary of certain petitions seeking relief from specified requirements of 14 CFR. The purpose of this notice is to improve the public's awareness of, and participation in, this aspect of FAA's regulatory activities. Neither publication of this notice nor the inclusion or omission of information in the summary is intended to affect the legal status of any petition or its final disposition.

**DATE:** Comments on petitions received must identify the petition docket number involved and must be received on or before June 4, 2009.

**ADDRESSES:** You may send comments identified by Docket Number FAA-2009-0233 using any of the following methods:

- *Government-wide rulemaking Web site:* Go to <http://www.regulations.gov> and follow the instructions for sending your comments electronically.

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

- *Fax:* Fax comments to the Docket Management Facility at 202-493-2251.

- *Hand Delivery:* Bring comments to the Docket Management Facility in Room W12-140 of the West Building Ground Floor at 1200 New Jersey Avenue, SE., Washington, DC, between 9 a.m. and 5 p.m., Monday through Friday, except Federal holidays.

- *Docket:* To read background documents or comments received, go to <http://www.regulations.gov> at any time

or to the Docket Management Facility in Room W12-140 of the West Building Ground Floor at 1200 New Jersey Avenue, SE., Washington, DC, between 9 a.m. and 5 p.m., Monday through Friday, except Federal holidays.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** We will post all comments we receive, without change, to <http://www.regulations.gov>, including any personal information you provide. Using the search function of our docket Web site, anyone can find and read the comments received into any of our dockets, including the name of the individual sending the comment (or signing the comment for 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).

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Tyneka Thomas (202) 267-7626 or Ralen Gao (202) 267-3168, Office of Rulemaking, Federal Aviation Administration, 800 Independence Avenue, SW., Washington, DC 20591.

This notice is published pursuant to 14 CFR 11.85.

Issued in Washington, DC, on May 12, 2009.

**Pamela Hamilton-Powell,**

*Director, Office of Rulemaking.*

#### Petitions for Exemption

*Docket No.:* FAA-2009-0233.

*Petitioner:* Skywagon Corporation.

*Section of 14 CFR Affected:* 14 CFR 119.3.

*Description of Relief Sought:* Skywagon Corporation (Skywagon) seeks relief from § 119.3 to allow Skywagon to operate its Douglas DC-4 airplanes in on-demand operations with a maximum payload of greater than 7,500 pounds under part 135.

[FR Doc. E9-11363 Filed 5-14-09; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 4910-13-P**

## DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY

### Submission for OMB Review; Comment Request

May 12, 2009.

The Department of the Treasury will submit the following public information collection requirement(s) to OMB for review and clearance under the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, Public Law 104-13 on or after the date of publication of this notice. Copies of the submission(s) may be obtained by calling the Treasury Bureau Clearance Officer listed. Comments regarding this information collection should be addressed to the OMB reviewer listed

and to the Treasury Department Clearance Officer, Department of the Treasury, Room 11000, 1750 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW., Washington, DC 20220.

**DATES:** Written comments should be received on or before June 15, 2009 to be assured of consideration.

#### Financial Crimes Enforcement Network (FinCEN)

*OMB Number:* 1506-0035.

*Type of Review:* Extension.

*Title:* Anti-Money Laundering Programs for Insurance Companies.

*Description:* Insurance companies are required to establish and maintain a written anti-money laundering program. A copy of the written program must be maintained for five years. See 31 CFR 103.137.

*Respondents:* Businesses or other for-profits.

*Estimated Total Reporting Burden:* 1,200 hours.

*OMB Number:* 1506-0030.

*Type of Review:* Extension.

*Title:* Anti-Money Laundering Programs for Dealers in Precious Metals, Precious Stones, or Jewels.

*Description:* Dealers in precious metals, stones, or jewels are required to establish and maintain a written anti-money laundering program. A copy of the written program must be maintained for five years. See 31 CFR 103.140.

*Respondents:* Businesses or other for-profits.

*Estimated Total Reporting Burden:* 20,000 hours.

*OMB Number:* 1506-0020.

*Type of Review:* Extension.

*Title:* Anti-Money Laundering Programs for Money Services Businesses, Mutual Funds, and Operators of Credit Card Systems.

*Description:* Money services businesses, mutual funds, and operators of credit card systems are required to develop and implement written anti-money laundering program. A copy of the program must be maintained for five years. See 31 CFR 103.125, 103.130, and 103.135.

*Respondents:* Businesses or other for-profits.

*Estimated Total Reporting Burden:* 203,006 hours.

*Clearance Officer:* Russell Stephenson, (202) 354-6012, Department of the Treasury, Financial Crimes Enforcement Network, P.O. Box 39, Vienna, VA 22183.

*OMB Reviewer:* Shagufta Ahmed, (202) 395-7873, Office of Management and Budget, Room 10235, New