County, Pa.; Approval Date: April 21, 2010, including a partial waiver of 18 CFR § 806.15.

40. Ultra Resources, Inc., Pad ID: State 815, ABR–20100440, Elk Township, Tioga County, Pa.; Approval Date: April 22, 2010, including a partial waiver of 18 CFR § 806.15.

41. Chesapeake Appalachia, LLC, Pad ID: Angie, ABR–20100441, Auburn Township, Susquehanna County, Pa.; Approval Date: April 22, 2010.

42. East Resources, Inc., Pad ID: Vandergrift 290, ABR–20100442, Charleston Township, Tioga County, Pa.; Approval Date: April 23, 2010.

43. East Resources, Inc., Pad ID: Topf 416, ABR–20100443, Delmar Township, Tioga County, Pa.; Approval Date: April 23, 2010.

44. East Resources, Inc., Pad ID: Gee 832, ABR–20100444, Middlebury Township, Tioga County, Pa.; Approval Date: April 26, 2010.

45. Talisman Energy USA, Inc., Pad ID: Storch 03 035, ABR–20100445, Wells Township, Bradford County, Pa.; Approval Date: April 28, 2010.

46. Chesapeake Appalachia, LLC, Pad ID: Holtan, ABR–20100446, Auburn Township, Susquehanna County, Pa.; Approval Date: April 28, 2010.

47. Chesapeake Appalachia, LLC, Pad ID: Polomski, ABR–20100447, Wyalusing Township, Bradford County, Pa.; Approval Date: April 28, 2010.

48. Chesapeake Appalachia, LLC, Pad ID: Way, ABR–20100448, Wyalusing Township, Bradford County, Pa.; Approval Date: April 28, 2010.

49. Chesapeake Appalachia, LLC, Pad ID: Brink, ABR–20100449, Herrick Township, Bradford County, Pa.; Approval Date: April 28, 2010.

50. Chesapeake Appalachia, LLC, Pad ID: Champdale, ABR–20100450, Tuscarora Township, Bradford County, Pa.; Approval Date: April 29, 2010.

51. Chief Oil & Gas, LLC, Pad ID: Warner Drilling Pad #1, ABR–20100451, Franklin Township, Lycoming County, Pa.; Approval Date: April 29, 2010.

52. Chief Oil & Gas, LLC, Pad ID: Emig Drilling Pad #1, ABR–20100452, Cogan House Township, Lycoming County, Pa.; Approval Date: April 29, 2010.

53. Talisman Energy USA, Inc., Pad ID: Ferguson 01 023, ABR–20100453, Granville Township, Bradford County, Pa.; Approval Date: April 30, 2010.

54. Williams Production Appalachia, LLC, Pad ID: Alder Run Land LP #2H, ABR–20100454, Cooper Township, Clearfield County, Pa.; Approval Date: April 30, 2010.

55. Range Resources—Appalachia, LLC, Pad ID: Gray's Run Club Unit #2H, ABR–20100455, Jackson Township, Lycoming County, Pa.; Approval Date: April 30, 2010.

56. Range Resources—Appalachia, LLC, Pad ID: Dog Run Hunting Club Unit, ABR–20100456, Cummings Township, Lycoming County, Pa.; Approval Date: April 30, 2010.

**Authority:** Public Law 91–575, 84 Stat. 1509 *et seq.,* 18 CFR Parts 806, 807, and 808.

Dated: May 24, 2010.

**Stephanie L. Richardson,**
*Secretary to the Commission.*
[FR Doc. 2010–13296 Filed 6–2–10; 8:45 am]
**BILLING CODE 7040–01–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 on June 16, 2010, 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:** Gerri Robinson, Federal Aviation Administration, 800 Independence Avenue, SW., Washington, DC 20591, telephone (202) 267–9678; fax (202) 267–5075; e-mail *Gerri.Robinson@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 December 9, 2009, at the Federal Aviation Administration, 800 Independence Avenue, SW., Washington, DC 20591. The agenda includes:

1. Continuous Improvement (Committee Process)
   ARAC Task—Advice and Recommendations to FAA about current ARAC process.
   FAA Update on Charter Renewal
2. Status Reports
3. 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 June 7. 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 June 7 to present oral statements at the meeting. Members of 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 May 28, 2010.

**Pamela A. Hamilton-Powell,**
*Executive Director, Aviation Rulemaking Advisory Committee.*
[FR Doc. 2010–13326 Filed 6–2–10; 8:45 am]
**BILLING CODE 4910–13–P**

---

## DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

### Federal Highway Administration

### Rescinding the Notice of Intent for an Environmental Impact Statement: Prince George's County, MD

**AGENCY:** Federal Highway Administration.

**ACTION:** Notice.

**SUMMARY:** This notice rescinds the Notice of Intent for preparing an Environmental Impact Statement that was issued on June 11, 2008, for a proposed roadway improvement project in Prince George's County, Maryland.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Ms. Jeanette Mar, Environmental Program Manager, FHWA, DelMar Division, 10 S. Howard Street, Suite 2450, Baltimore, MD 21201, Telephone: (410) 779–7152, e-mail address *Jeanette.Mar@dot.gov.*

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** The FHWA, in cooperation with the Maryland State Highway Administration (SHA), U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Maryland Department of the Environment, and University of Maryland, is rescinding the NOI to prepare an EIS for roadway improvements which would address mobility and safety for travelers to and from the University of Maryland (UM) Campus from I–95/I–495 and points north, while providing enhanced access

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

**MEETING DATE:**       June 16, 2010

**MEETING TIME:**       10 a.m.

**LOCATION:**        Federal Aviation Administration
800 Independence Avenue SW.
10th Floor
MacCracken Room
Washington, DC 20519

**PUBLIC
ANNOUNCEMENT:**      The Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) told the public of this
Aviation Rulemaking Advisory Committee (ARAC) meeting in a
Federal Register notice published June 3, 2010 (75 FR 31509) and
correction published June 8, 2010 (75 FR 32536).

**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* |
| Walter Derosier | General Aviation Manufacturers Association (GAMA), *Aircraft Certification Procedures Aeronautical Technical Subject Area, Assistant Chair* |
| William Edmunds | Air Line Pilots Association, *Air Carrier Operations Aeronautical Technical Subject Area, Assistant Chair* |

| | |
|---|---|
| Pam Hamilton | Federal Aviation Administration, Office of Rulemaking, *Executive Director* |
| Rebecca MacPherson | Federal Aviation Administration, Assistant Chief Counsel for Regulations |
| Sarah MacLeod | Aeronautical Repair Station Association, *Air Carrier/General Aviation Maintenance Aeronautical Technical Subject Area, Assistant Chair* |
| Dennis McGrann | NOISE (National Organization to Insure a Sound-controlled Environment), *Noise Certification Aeronautical Technical Subject Area, Assistant Chair* |
| David York | Helicopter Association International, *Rotorcraft Aeronautical Technical Subject Area, Assistant Chair* |
| Daniel Zuspan | Boeing Commercial Airplanes *Occupant Safety Aeronautical Technical Subject Area, Assistant Chair* |

**Attendees**

| | |
|---|---|
| Tim Anderson | Soaring Society of America |
| Edmond Boullay | U.S. Center for Research and Education on Science and Technology (U.S.-CREST) |
| Jennifer Ciaccio | Federal Aviation Administration, *Flight Standards Service, AFS–310* |
| Brenda Courtney | Federal Aviation Administration, *Office of Rulemaking, ARM–200* |
| Sean Denniston | Federal Aviation Administration, *Office of Rulemaking, ARM–200* |
| Katie Haley | Federal Aviation Administration, *Office of Rulemaking, ARM–200* |
| Joseph Hawkins | Federal Aviation Administration, *PAI Consulting (Office of Rulemaking, ARM–20)* |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Julie Lynch | Federal Aviation Administration, *Office of Rulemaking, ARM–20* | |
| Bob Robeson | Federal Aviation Administration, *Office of Aviation Policy and Plans, APO–200* | |
| Gerri Robinson | Federal Aviation Administration, *Office of Rulemaking, ARM–20* | |
| Melissa Sabatine | American Association of Airport Executives | |
| Harold Summers | Helicopter Association International | |
| Frank Wiederman | Federal Aviation Administration, *Aircraft Maintenance Division, AFS–330* | |
| Christa Brolley | PAI Consulting | |

## COMMITTEE ADMINISTRATION

The ARAC Chair, Mr. Norman Joseph, called the meeting to order at 10:10 a.m. The Executive Director, Ms. Pam Hamilton, read the required Federal Advisory Committee Act (FACA) statement.

Mr. Joseph stated that all attendees were welcome to speak; however, he noted voting was limited to ARAC Executive Committee members. Mr. Joseph also noted Mr. Ric Peri was absent because he was attending the ARM-sponsored rulemaking training course. He further noted Mr. Ty Prettyman is no longer working for the National Air Carrier Association; however, he continues to contribute actively to ARAC. Ms. Hamilton added the National Air Carrier Association proposed to replace Mr. Prettyman, the Training and Qualifications Aeronautical Technical Subject Area Assistant Chair, with Mr. Oakley Brooks, and Mr. George Paul as an alternate. Ms. Hamilton asked the Executive Committee members to send any other nominations to her and Ms. Gerri Robinson by June 30, 2010. She noted the plan is to appoint Mr. Prettyman's replacement before the next ARAC Executive Committee meeting.

## CERTIFICATION OF MINUTES

Mr. Joseph asked for any corrections or comments to the draft minutes from the December 9, 2009, meeting. Mr. Daniel Zuspan noted on page 4, the minutes refer to the Committee Process Working Group. The working group has been working under the name Process Improvement Working Group (PIWG), which he believes is the name in the charter. Ms. Hamilton noted the minutes will be corrected to recognize the PIWG name. Noting no other objections, Mr. Joseph certified the minutes, with the discussed correction.

**ISO FEEDBACK FORM**

Ms. Robinson noted the ISO–9001 ARC/ARAC Comments/Feedback form has changed.  She explained the FAA reviewed the information being collected and noted it was mostly numbers and not useful.  Therefore, the FAA changed the form to allow users to report their thoughts.  Mr. Joseph asked if the form could be completed and mailed back to the FAA after the meeting to allow the participants to collect their thoughts.  Ms. Robinson responded that the form should be returned during the meeting.

**CONTINUOUS IMPROVEMENT**

*1.  ARAC Task—Advice and recommendations to FAA about current ARAC process*

Mr. Craig Bolt gave a report from the PIWG.  He provided the Executive Committee with a copy of his PowerPoint presentation and provided a brief review.  He noted the slides include data from the survey and feedback from informal briefings with Ms. Hamilton and Ms. Rebecca MacPherson.

Slide 2

Mr. Bolt noted the PIWG was tasked in October 2009 to provide advice and recommendations to the FAA about the current ARAC process.  He stated the PIWG continues to meet every 2 weeks, usually by teleconference.  He also noted the PIWG met for 2 ½ days in Seattle, Washington, in April 2010 to focus on reviewing the survey results.

Slide 3

Mr. Bolt noted that since the last Executive Committee meeting, the working group composition has changed.  Ms. Leisha Bell and Mr. Don McCune changed jobs and are no longer able to participate in the working group.  He noted the current PIWG membership is shown on slide 3.

Slide 4

Mr. Bolt noted the PIWG has been focused on gathering information.  He said the working group used a Boeing survey analyst, Dr. Mehdi Ghods, to help organize the survey questions.  He noted the PIWG also reviewed five reports dating back to 1997 for common lessons learned.  He explained the five reports contain the following key ideas:

- Accountability in the process,

- Roles and responsibilities,

- Clear task definition,

- Having a leader in the FAA to sponsor the activity, and

- A commitment, from the FAA and industry, to take the task to its conclusion, whether rulemaking or advisory material.

He stated ARAC has been asked to write technical reports rather than notices of proposed rulemaking (NPRM) and associated materials in the past.  Mr. Bolt noted the balance of the briefing focuses on the survey results.

<u>Slide 5</u>

Mr. Bolt explained the PIWG sent the survey to over 300 participants and received 84 responses. He noted that Dr. Ghods considered this a good response rate.  He stated the pie chart on slide 5 represents the backgrounds of the individuals who responded to the survey.  He added the survey respondents include individuals from industry, associations, the FAA, and other regulatory authorities.  He also noted that Dr. Ghods performed a regression analysis that determined the survey results were statistically significant.

<u>Slide 6</u>

With Dr. Ghods' help, the PIWG classified the survey questions into the following five areas:

1.  FAA tasking the ARAC

2.  ARAC team formation and effectiveness

3.  ARAC addressing the tasks

4.  FAA considering and addressing ARAC recommendations

5.  ARAC addressing the FAA response to ARAC recommendations.

<u>Slide 7</u>

Mr. Bolt said the PIWG noted the survey suggested that ARAC tasking was rather good and has been reasonably clear.  He emphasized one of the key responses was the subject of consensus. Mr. Bolt noted the survey results showed that 71% of respondents noted the importance of reaching consensus.  However, the results also showed that consensus was difficult to achieve in complex tasks.  He stated ARAC may put too much emphasis on consensus, when a better goal may be a good airing of the issues surrounding a topic.  He further noted some survey respondents indicated consensus may suppress minority opinions or technical views that need to be addressed and documented for the FAA.  Mr. Bolt stated the FAA's commitment to tasking was a key item in the survey responses, as well as in previous reports.  Lastly, he noted there was significant energy around harmonization and cooperation in rulemaking.  He added the survey respondents pointed out it should be clear whether harmonization and cooperation with other rulemaking authorities was part of the tasking.

<u>Slide 8</u>

Mr. Bolt suggested the respondents had concerns about tasks that ask for answers to detailed questions, rather than writing of regulatory text or an NPRM.  He noted there was interest in establishing an appropriate time limit for a tasking.  He stated there was wide disparity on how long is appropriate.  He added the survey asked about a 1-year time limit, and most of the

feedback showed this was too short.  He also noted that 73% of respondents want ARAC to have an opportunity to respond to draft regulations.  Mr. Bolt noted this is a problem because of ex parte communication issues.  Mr. Bolt also noted a high percent of respondents wanted ARAC to be able to assist the FAA in responding to public comments.

Slides 9, 11, 14, 16, and 19

Mr. Bolt stated these slides presented graphs of individual survey responses.  He is willing to share the full survey results, if anyone is interested.

Slide 10

Mr. Bolt stated the survey was consistent with the previous reports.  He added ARAC needs people with good teamwork and project management skills.  Mr. Bolt stated that 73% of respondents experienced good teamwork skills, and 61% understood their roles and responsibilities. He also noted the size of the working groups should be manageable, which he defined as about 10 people.  He stated the survey respondents acknowledged that working groups should have support for technical information, but the core group should be small.

Slide 12

Mr. Bolt stated the first ARAC meeting should include reviewing the task to assure understanding; identifying any questions, clarifications, or background material the team needs; establishing a work plan that is consistent with the schedule; and understanding the importance of engaging FAA staff.  He also noted there were interesting comments on the Committee Manual.  He explained that 50% of the respondents did not know about the manual, and 50% of those aware of it did not find it useful.  He hypothesized this could be because people don't read what is available.  He added the PIWG recommendations will include revisions to the Committee Manual.  He further added the manual explains the Committee's process, roles, and responsibilities.  However, he believes there may need to be a process for actively sharing this information with newly formed working groups.  Mr. Walter Derosier raised the concept of consensus and stated the manual includes a good discussion on consensus, general consensus, and how a working group should approach the situation.  Mr. Bolt agreed the manual presents the concept of consensus.  His concern is how to get working group members to read it. Mr. Zuspan added the PIWG found not everyone understands the roles and responsibilities of ARAC.  He noted the upfront work group orientation could include information on the scope of ARAC.  Mr. Bolt agreed and observed it needs to be noted upfront that ARAC makes recommendations and is not negotiated rulemaking.  He emphasized the importance of everyone understanding ARAC's mission. He also noted a theme of responses around harmonization tasks and that respondents were keen on keeping rules aligned and engaging other regulatory authorities.

Slide 13

Mr. Bolt noted the respondents strongly supported ARAC taskings requiring written recommendations.  He stated another recommendation is to use a standard report template that emphasizes consensus but allows for the working group to document agreements and dissenting opinions.  He added the majority should be able to comment on the dissenting opinion and the

rationale for the majority recommendation.  Mr. Bolt also noted the working group should be able to include input from APO, the FAA Office of the Chief Counsel (AGC), and other agency staff in the working group report.

Slide 15

Mr. Bolt discussed the working group's recommendation the FAA consider and address ARAC recommendations.  He noted the survey respondents stated they would like the FAA to address the ARAC recommendations in the NPRM preamble.  He added that respondents want to have dialogue with the FAA during the rulemaking phase, particularly if the ARAC recommendation was a report that answered detailed questions.

Slide 17

Mr. Bolt stated that the recommendation that ARAC be given an opportunity to address the FAA response to ARAC recommendations is going to be the most difficult topic because of ex parte communication requirements.  He added the objective of the dialogue is to ensure an understanding between the FAA and ARAC about the intent of the report.  He observed that respondents thought dialogue is helpful because it could reduce the number of unexpected negative comments when the NPRM is published.  Mr. Bolt summarized that working group members want an opportunity to respond to and communicate with the FAA.  He noted a process would need to be developed, consistent with ex parte requirements, to do this.  He added the FAA has the authority to determine whether further communications would be beneficial and during what phase of the process it is appropriate.  He suggested the FAA can use an issue paper to get clarification from the working group on its report.  Mr. Bolt stated he believes this has happened in the past, when APO needed clarification from an ARAC working group.

Ms. Sarah MacLeod commented that it may not be that difficult.  She stated the FAA already has a process for gathering information before an official rulemaking project is assigned.  She also noted ex parte communication requirements allow the FAA to ask for a meeting as long as it is documented properly.  She noted the FAA may not want to encourage ex parte communications, but it could be used when needed.  Ms. MacPherson agreed, but stated it still is a difficult issue because some of the respondents' expectations are not based on fact.  She further noted that, in the past, members of ARAC working groups have been aggressive, telling the FAA how the ARAC working group should provide their recommendations and that the FAA must adopt them.  She agreed there are ways for conversation to happen when needed.  She further noted that before a Phase II Rulemaking Project Record (RPR) is approved by the Rulemaking Management Council there are no ex parte communication issues.  She added the problems occur when the FAA is about to publish an NPRM and ARAC wants to review and revise the preamble.  She noted a similar concern when the ARAC working group wants to respond to the comments received to the NPRM.  Ms. MacPherson also noted that most communication issues are resolved by involving APO and AGC early in the process.  She explained that ARAC working groups also need to understand the FAA regularly makes changes to notices based on comments.  She stressed that working group members need to better understand the FAA cannot delegate its rulemaking authority to anyone, not even in negotiated rulemakings.

Referring to slide 10, Ms. MacLeod commented on the statement, "The working group should have a good balance of individuals representing all key stakeholders." Why not use "interested parties" as in the Administrative Procedure Act? Referring to the bullet on slide 12, Ms. MacLeod noted it is important for everyone on an ARAC working group to have general rulemaking training and FACA committee role training. Ms. Hamilton commented that at the last ARAC Executive Committee meeting, ARM agreed to fund rulemaking training for all members of the Executive Committee. Ms. MacLeod stated she would take it further and offer training to working group members. Ms. MacPherson agreed that working group members often misunderstand the role of a FACA committee; therefore, FACA training would be good.

Referring to the discussion on consensus, Mr. Derosier noted that many working groups used a negotiated approach. He stated it is better to define the expectations at the beginning of a tasking, then the working group does not need to barter to reach consensus. He added that working group recommendations do not identify the trades the working group made to reach consensus. He noted one of the reasons the working group members are interested in reviewing the rule product is their concern that only part of their trade is included in the FAA's rule. Mr. Joseph stated, and Ms. MacPherson agreed, this is a good reason not to task ARAC to draft an NPRM. Ms. MacLeod noted working group consensus papers, discussion papers, and minority reports can be used by the FAA in developing its NPRM. She stated that properly delivered recommendations should identify the disagreements and issues. Mr. Zuspan agreed that consensus can mask trading. He noted writing a draft NPRM provides its own continuity and the knowledge in the working group can transfer directly to the final rule. He added that occasionally a few words can make a significant difference for implementation. Ms. MacLeod offered that information can be shared during the NPRM comment period. She stated there is no reason individuals from industry cannot meet and develop a set of consensus comments to the NPRM. She added that members of industry, collectively, are not experts at regulatory language. Mr. Zuspan countered that it would be best to share information early in the process to reduce later misunderstandings. Mr. Derosier stated that one area for process improvement is the opportunity for the FAA to ask for more information or to communicate with a working group. He added this is more important when the FAA did not accept or does not agree with a working group's recommendations. He added this process for communication would allow the FAA to ask about any new, unintended impacts based on its course of action. He emphasized this could be more important in a highly technical rule, where the FAA needs information from technical members of industry. Ms. MacLeod noted this may depend on the time between the ARAC recommendations and when the FAA starts to consider rulemaking. She added if it has been a long time, the working group may be scattered. She stated the ARAC Executive Committee should be careful in selecting working group chairs so there is a greater chance of being able to contact the chair in the future. Ms. MacLeod also noted industry needs to recognize that government and industry have different roles in rulemaking.

Slide 18

Mr. Bolt commented most of the items on this slide already have been discussed. He added any dialogue between the FAA and an ARAC working group should include the entire FAA rulemaking team. He also discussed the issue of public comments to the NPRM and added the FAA should have the opportunity to re-task the ARAC working group to aid in the disposition of public comments.

Mr. Bolt noted that slide 20 summarizes the issues already discussed.

Mr. Bolt stated the PIWG has finished its information gathering phase.  The next step is to draft the recommendation report.  He advised that the PIWG is on schedule to submit its recommendations to the ARAC Executive Committee in September 2010 for discussion and voting at the December 2010 meeting.

Mr. Joseph thanked the co-chairs and the PIWG for its commitment to this task and asked the attendees if they had any comments.  Mr. Zuspan noted the PIWG received valuable feedback, but asked for comments if anyone had a significant objection to the PIWG's path.  Ms. MacLeod stressed the importance of ensuring a working group has a good balance of individuals representing all interested parties, and providing training for working group members on rulemaking processes, as well as FACA roles and responsibilities.

Mr. Dan Elwell noted the most interesting point of discussion is encouraging working groups not to strive for complete consensus, but rather to report differences of opinions.  He added this could significantly shorten the process.  He also stated that not drafting an NPRM may allow working groups to share information beyond the recommendation, which typically isn't included in official rule language.  Mr. Derosier noted the importance of setting the participants' expectations about the ARAC working group's role and limitations.  Ms. MacPherson agreed there is an expectation that these taskings evolve into negotiated rulemaking.  She added that even when the FAA adopts the working group's recommendations, members of the working group object when a NPRM is published.  This is not allowed in true negotiated rulemaking.  Mr. Bob Robeson noted he has been on working groups and it was always made very clear the FAA is the party responsible for issuing a rule.  He noted that sometimes on the industry side, a working group reaches a consensus that FAA management does not support.  Mr. Derosier noted that working group members need to bring these types of issues to the working group.

Ms. MacPherson noted the FAA cannot control or predict the feedback from the Office of Management and Budget.  She also noted that in some situations, economists have contacted the working group for cost information and received erroneously high estimates, which would stop all activity on a rule.  Ms. MacLeod noted she thought there was an internal FAA pre-rulemaking worksheet, and it would be valuable to share the worksheet with the ARAC and any associated working groups.  She emphasized it would be helpful to know what the office of primary responsibility intends with the proposed rulemaking.  Ms. Hamilton noted ARM is in the process of revising those documents; however, she noted the process is not appreciably changed.  She stated the FAA does its due diligence after the Rulemaking Management Council's approval of the Phase I RPR and before approval of the Phase II RPR.  She added this is when the FAA can have robust conversations with industry and members of the ARAC working group to better understand recommendations.  She further noted the FAA can share documents, but not until they are finalized.

Ms. MacLeod emphasized the importance of training.  She noted she has been part of a working group developing recommendations she knew would not pass through the rulemaking process. She also noted the training should point out the U.S. Department of Transportation (DOT) urges rulemaking as a last resort.  Ms. MacLeod added that another outcome of training is that the working group can learn what other choices exist besides rulemaking.  Ms. Hamilton agreed and noted the due diligence between the Phase I RPR and the Phase II RPR allows for the FAA rulemaking team to review all the alternatives and determine if there is a suitable option, other than rulemaking.  Ms. Hamilton stated the training package can include templates. Ms. MacLeod noted it would be good for ARAC working groups to better understand the rulemaking timeline compared to the working group's schedule.

Returning to the discussion on consensus, Mr. Zuspan stated it is a big move to stop encouraging working groups to strive for consensus.  He noted this recommendation may not be warmly received because a document with minority opinions allows the FAA more room to choose something most of the ARAC working group isn't recommending.  He acknowledged that if the FAA already is involved, the FAA should know the interested parties' positions.  He stated that he believes there will be some negative responses from industry about this recommendation. Mr. Derosier noted the survey had some discussion on reporting minority positions and allowing the working group to provide its response to the minority opinion.  Ms. MacPherson stated the individuals with a minority opinion would not necessarily like that limitation, because it gives the majority an extra opportunity to make its case.  Mr. Zuspan offered that it could include supporting arguments, opposing arguments, and one rebuttal for each position.

Mr. Joseph stated he would encourage training to include the responsibility of working group participants to ensure they have support from their management and all of their represented members.

## 2.  FAA update on charter renewal

Ms. Hamilton reminded the members that at the previous meeting, she expressed her desire to review the ARAC structure, especially considering the ARAC charter renewal required by early September 2010.  Ms. Hamilton noted she suggested the PIWG review the ARAC structure as well as the process; however, review of the ARAC structure was determined to be outside the PIWG tasking.  At that meeting, Ms. Hamilton agreed to have ARM review the ARAC structure and subsequently enlisted the help of Mr. Joe Hawkins, PAI Consulting, to complete that review. She explained the review is not yet complete but Mr. Hawkins would present what he has accomplished so far.

Mr. Hawkins noted the pending retirement of Ms. Robinson and her contributions to ARAC.

Slides 1 & 2

In his introduction, Mr. Hawkins thanked those who offered feedback and contributed to the review of the ARAC structure.  He noted the purpose of the briefing — to update the members on the initiative to review ARAC structure and whether changes are warranted.

Mr. Hawkins noted that, in keeping with the commitment for continuous improvement and to reinvigorate ARAC, he was charged with reviewing the current ARAC structure. He explained he would recommend steps for ARAC to consider in meeting its mission. He reiterated the PIWG is tasked with reviewing the ARAC process.

Slide 4

Mr. Hawkins explained the two combined efforts (review of the ARAC structure and review of the ARAC process) are expected to transform ARAC into a nimble and efficient process. He further explained the goals of the review of the ARAC structure are to (1) assess the ARAC's effectiveness, (2) determine if changes are needed, and (3) make recommendations.

Slide 5

Mr. Hawkins described the method of the review:

- Meet with current and former ARM personnel to discuss their experiences and insights.

- Interview a cross-section of ARAC Executive Committee members.

- Collect and review key advisory committee documentation, including Government Accountability Office reports.

- Study structures and practices of other FACA committees.

Slide 6

Mr. Hawkins explained that through this methodology, he intended to draw some conclusions and understand ARAC's strengths and weaknesses. He noted the perceived strengths:

- Ability to quickly secure needed expertise to address each task.

- Strong representation from the regulated community.

- A forum for smaller groups who do not have lobbyist resources to more actively participate in the process.

- FAA responsiveness.

- The FAA's commitment to engage the aviation community in working regulatory issues.

Slide 7

Mr. Hawkins explained that portions of ARAC are suboptimal. The following are related to the ARAC structure:

- Excessive bureaucracy. Mr. Hawkins explained that some individuals interviewed question whether the Rulemaking Management Council must approve taskings to be assigned to the ARAC.

- Too many layers. Mr. Hawkins noted that ARAC consists of over 50 members, an executive committee, committee chairs overseeing subject areas, working groups, and task groups to working group areas. He explained that when ARAC was assigned many projects, this structure was necessary to adequately control the projects. However, with the smaller number of projects, Mr. Hawkins suggested this structure is outdated.

- Membership duplication. Mr. Hawkins stated that some who offered feedback noted some entities were over-represented and similar entities seem to have differing priorities. He noted the need to think about possible changes to ARAC membership.

Mr. Hawkins stated that while the following perceived weaknesses are not related strictly to the ARAC structure, they still need attention.

- Slow FAA responsiveness. Mr. Hawkins explained the FAA often fails to act quickly in responding to ARAC recommendations.

- Vision. Mr. Hawkins explained that because ARAC tasks dwindled and the use of aviation rulemaking committees (ARC) increased, the ARAC vision has become unclear.

- Insufficient communication internally at the FAA on ARAC developments. Mr. Hawkins noted concerns that management's disapproval, inaction, or excessive delay in acting on ARAC deliverables could have been avoided had there been proper communication within the FAA during the development of ARAC products.

- Web site. Mr. Hawkins noted the ARAC Web site is not useful to the public for tracking or seeking rulemaking information.

Slide 8

Mr. Hawkins noted there were consistent sentiments that the FAA commitment to ARAC is lacking. He explained that while there is praise for FAA willingness to engage with industry on issues, there is also disappointment at the FAA over resource commitment. Mr. Hawkins explained a lack of clear balance between the current level of work and the corresponding ARAC bureaucracy. There is concern that working group representatives may not have enough experience to contribute in a meaningful way. They may also lack rulemaking knowledge, which hinders ARAC effectiveness and productivity.

Slide 9

Mr. Hawkins noted there is a direct correlation between visibility and whether work is performed in a timely manner. He explained a key to success in an ARAC task is assigning personnel who have the necessary access to senior management. He also noted that few, if any, other FACA committees involve industry in the regulatory process to the extent the FAA does.

Slide 10

Mr. Hawkins stated the FAA is recommending a few short-term actions that can be completed quickly and would be captured in the new charter:

- Establish a more formal process to identify and empower alternate members to stand in for Executive Committee members, when necessary.

- Establish regular quarterly Executive Committee meetings.

- Keep the European Aviation Safety Agency (EASA) as a non-voting member and add Transport Canada as a non-voting member.

Slide 11

Mr. Hawkins reiterated Ms. Hamilton's statement that as this review continues, the FAA will consider structural changes to further address perceived ARAC weaknesses and will present specific proposals to the ARAC Executive Committee for discussion in early 2011.

Mr. Joseph asked if there were any questions for Mr. Hawkins on his briefing. He noted his understanding of the three recommendations with regard to the ARAC structure to be discussed during this meeting, with more to come.

Alternate Members

Mr. Joseph opened the discussion of the recommendations, beginning with the topic of alternate members. He noted he had sent an e-mail to the members asking their opinion on this topic. He further noted Mr. Peri responded to the e-mail, stating he does not support alternate members because coordinating positions could be cumbersome.

Ms. Hamilton noted her support of alternate members. She noted there was previously a formal process for alternates. She raised a concern that some ARAC members informally use alternates but don't formally have appointed alternates, which she sees as vulnerability. Ms. Hamilton suggested ARAC needs to be more consistent about the use of alternates, either naming an alternate for each position or ending the use of alternates. She explained the position needs to be clear to everyone. Ms. Hamilton further explained the findings from the ARAC structure review: there are several ARAC member organizations that are not active. Using the Airport Certification Aeronautical Technical Subject Area as an example, in which Mr. Chris Oswald, Airports Council International, is the appointed member, but Ms. Melissa Sabatine, American Association of Airport Executives, is the unofficial alternate, she suggested having an association representative as an alternate.

Mr. Joseph confirmed ARAC previously had a formal alternate member process that worked well, citing he was the alternate for Mr. William Edmunds - Air Carrier Operations Aeronautical Technical Subject Area. He stated his concern that Mr. Peri may not have had the benefit of discussion with regard to his e-mail response. Mr. Joseph explained he and Mr. Edmunds would attend each meeting and would keep one another informed about who would be able to represent

the group at each meeting.  He stated he does not recall having difficulty maintaining a unified position with regard to the aeronautical technical subject area tasks.

Mr. Elwell stated his concern with the potential dwindling authority of the ARAC body as more alternates are used.  He suggested, based on experience with other boards, establishing a limit; for example, a member can establish a formal alternate, but there is a limit to the number of times that alternate can serve.

Ms. MacLeod sought clarification of whether the Executive Committee was discussing alternate ARAC Executive Committee members or alternate ARAC members.  Mr. Joseph and Ms. Hamilton confirmed the discussion is regarding alternate ARAC Executive Committee members.  Ms. MacLeod, seeking further clarification, asked if the discussion is about alternates within an organization or alternates outside an organization.  Ms. MacPherson explained the individual would not have to be within the same organization to be an alternate, but would need to represent the same aeronautical technical subject area, for example, Air Carrier Operations.  With that explanation, Ms. MacLeod noted her support for alternates.

Mr. Joseph noted Ms. Hamilton's earlier suggestion of trying to involve more organizations in ARAC and suggested it is likely an alternate would not be from the same organization as the official ARAC Executive Committee member.  Ms. MacPherson stated that while that may be true, she would not suggest making it a requirement.  Ms. Hamilton agreed with Ms. MacPherson.  Ms. MacLeod stated that if the alternate must be from another organization, she would be against using alternates because of the different perspectives people bring to a group.  Mr. Robeson stated that typically the members of an aeronautical technical subject area already represent different perspectives.  It was noted that this discussion is centered on the ARAC Executive Committee, not issue groups.  Mr. Robeson noted that many members of the ARAC Executive Committee are members by being members of an aeronautical technical subject area.  Ms. MacLeod noted that Mr. Robeson is stating the ARAC Executive Committee comprises members from the aeronautical technical subject areas.  She explained her attempt to understand what organization an alternate would be from; for example, would Ms. MacLeod's alternate be from the National Air Disaster Alliance Foundation (NADA/F) or would it be Mr. Craig Fabian from the Aeronautical Repair Station Association (ARSA) (Ms. MacLeod's organization).  She stated if ARSA has been chosen to represent repair stations/maintenance community on ARAC, she believes the alternate should be from ARSA.  Mr. Derosier noted that for active aeronautical technical subject areas, it would be more appropriate to draw from an area of interest, not necessarily from an aeronautical technical subject area.

Ms. Hamilton explained the FAA appoints ARAC Executive Committee members and typically reaches out to the ARAC Executive Committee for input.  She stated she believes they would do the same for the alternates.  Ms. Hamilton expects the alternate process will be formalized.  She stated that NADA/F has a formal alternate and the Airport Certification Aeronautical Technical Subject Area has an unofficial alternate.  Ms. Hamilton explained that to formalize the process, the FAA would send Ms. Melissa Sabatine an appointment letter making her the alternate for the Airport Certification Aeronautical Technical Subject Area, representing the American Association of Airport Executives.  She stated currently there is no alternate for Mr. Dennis McGrann, Assistant Chairperson for the Noise Certification Aeronautical Technical Subject Area.  She would reach out to Mr. McGrann with the 55 member listing of ARAC, and

ask who he would recommend appointing as his alternate. Ms. Hamilton noted Mr. McGrann could suggest someone else from the aeronautical technical subject area, suggest someone from another organization, or state he does not want an alternate.

Ms. MacPherson added the primary member should be allowed to choose the alternate, but to require the primary member to choose an alternate seems excessively intrusive. She further stated, to Mr. Zuspan's point, if a primary member cannot make the commitment to attend meetings and be involved, perhaps they should be in the alternate position.

Ms. Hamilton reiterated her desire to have a diverse group and pull in other members of the ARAC, if possible. She agreed with Ms. MacPherson that input from the existing ARAC Executive Committee members is important.

Mr. Derosier suggested at charter renewal or some other appointed time, ARAC Executive Committee members should be required to give, in writing, their commitment to supporting this group and to name an alternate. He suggested the FAA provide the written response to the appointed ARAC Executive Committee member and alternate.

Ms. Hamilton noted the members need to find a way to make this work. She added that neither the members nor the alternates appear in the charter.

Mr. Derosier noted there are over 50 groups represented in ARAC. He asked if there is a level of commitment from those groups each time the charter is renewed. Ms. Hamilton explained the FAA reaches out to ensure the groups are still interested in participating, but there is not a formal process of ensuring that commitment. She added that in the past, the ARAC charter contained the list of ARAC members. During the ARAC structure review, it was determined no other FACA committee charters contain a member list so that practice will be suspended. Ms. MacPherson noted the DOT may require the member list to be included in the charter as the DOT imposes separate requirements from FACA. Ms. Hamilton asked Mr. Hawkins if he compared the ARAC charter against other DOT charters; he responded that he performed that comparison and did not see any member lists in the charters he reviewed. Ms. Hamilton stated they will reconfirm DOT's requirements. Ms. Robinson noted that she believes the FACA database requires a member list, but she will double-check that requirement.

Ms. MacLeod sought clarification on the final decision regarding the language to be included in the charter about the requirement for alternate members to attend a limited number of meetings. Ms. MacPherson stated that she believes requiring an affirmative statement at each charter renewal, which is every 2 years, would help encourage a certain level of involvement. Ms. Hamilton suggested considering this particular portion of the alternate membership process during the phase 2 discussion, later. Mr. Joseph asked if there were objections. There were none.

<u>Schedule of Regular ARAC Executive Committee Meetings</u>

Mr. Joseph noted the ARAC Executive Committee, in the past, met quarterly, which decreased to two to three times a year when taskings decreased. He asked if quarterly meetings should resume and whether each of those meetings must be face-to-face meetings under FACA

requirements.  He wondered if, when the agenda is limited, the ARAC Executive Committee could meet through a teleconference.

Ms. MacPherson noted that ARAC Executive Committee meetings are public meetings, which could pose a problem.  Ms. Robinson stated that for teleconference meetings, a Federal Register notice is published, similar to a notice for a face-to-face meeting, but the teleconference dial-in number is included.  Ms. Hamilton noted that a teleconference could be awkward and she is not sure how effective such a meeting would be.

Mr. Robeson asked if it was possible to have a face-to-face meeting, but with a teleconference line available for those who couldn't attend in person.  Ms. MacPherson agreed that having a room available, with accessibility by teleconference makes sense.  Mr. Bolt noted that most people who would attend are in the Washington, DC, area.  Mr. Joseph stated that for meetings with a robust agenda, most people probably would attend in person, but for those meetings with a small agenda, teleconferencing may work well.  Mr. Hawkins recalled an experience where a teleconference worked for a meeting with an agenda focused on one issue; those that were interested or had a stake in the decision called in.

Mr. Joseph asked if the charter could be revised to reflect the use of meetings with a teleconference line when suitable.  Ms. MacPherson stated she does not believe the charter needs to include an alternative to add a teleconference line to a meeting; meeting solely by telephone would not be the best option and it's not worth the hassle.

Ms. Hamilton stated the charter needs to state that the ARAC Executive Committee will meet at least a specific number of times a year, more than the current two times per year.  Ms. Hamilton explained if ARAC wants to be more nimble and efficient, and would like to move future advisory opportunities to ARAC, then meeting twice a year is not enough.  Ms. MacLeod stated the current charter does not stop the group from meeting four times a year; it states the ARAC Executive Committee must meet at least twice a year.

Ms. MacLeod moved that the ARAC Executive Committee plan for four regular meetings a year, but include in the charter that the group must meet at least two times a year for the next 2 years.  She clarified that the group should schedule four meetings because it is easier to cancel a meeting as the date approaches than to schedule one.  Mr. Joseph asked for any objections.

Mr. Derosier asked, in terms of attempting to reinvigorate ARAC, does the perception of having only two meetings scheduled impact the consideration for ARAC taskings.  He asked if the group should agree to four meetings, because with only two meetings, the committee is not viewed as nimble.  Ms. MacPherson stated that because tasking the ARAC is an internal FAA decision, she does not believe so.  She explained that it might be an issue if the FAA had to get DOT approval to task ARAC, but that is not the case.  Ms. MacPherson added that an ad hoc meeting can be called if necessary.  Mr. Joseph asked for agreement to meet as often as necessary, with a minimum of two meetings a year, to ensure ARAC is available to the FAA when needed.  There was no disagreement.

EASA and Transport Canada as Non-voting Members

Mr. Joseph opened the discussion to continue to have EASA as a non-voting member and to add Transport Canada as a non-voting member of the Executive Committee. He stated he agreed with this recommendation. Mr. Bolt also agreed. Mr. Joseph asked if non-voting membership should be opened to other interested governmental authorities. Ms. Hamilton stated she is not opposed.

Ms. Hamilton explained that Transport Canada specifically asked to be included as a non-voting member, and EASA was included about a year ago. She added that Transport Canada requested to be added several times. She does not recall any other entities making such a request. Ms. Hamilton stated the charter could be revised to clarify that other governmental authorities could be included as non-voting members upon request. Ms. MacPherson agreed the language should include that the interested party must request such membership.

Mr. Zuspan asked the difference between a non-voting member and the public. Mr. Elwell added that a non-voting member is included in ARAC e-mail distributions and other notifications. Ms. Robinson further added that a non-voting member also can sit at the ARAC Executive Committee table. Mr. Joseph clarified that a non-voting member has full member status, except for a vote; the public does not.

Ms. Hamilton stated that EASA has representatives in the Washington, DC, area. She noted that Mr. Julian Hall, liaison to the FAA, is the non-voting EASA representative to the ARAC Executive Committee. Ms. Hamilton explained that she's unsure whether Transport Canada has an equivalent representative in the local area or how involved that person would be in meetings, but they have requested membership.

Mr. Zuspan asked if Brazil, Mexico, or the International Civil Aviation Organization (ICAO) should be considered for non-voting membership. Ms. MacLeod noted that ICAO comprises all agencies, and asked if the non-voting membership could be a more general representation. She added she is interested in other agencies' input to the ARAC and understanding the way they do rulemaking.

Ms. Hamilton noted the ARAC charter clearly could state that EASA and Transport Canada are non-voting members, and include language stating other national aviation authorities can be added as non-voting members at their request. Ms. MacLeod asked if that would include regional authorities (for example, the Central American Authority) not yet recognized by ICAO. Ms. Hamilton asked if that would be similar to EASA. Ms. MacPherson stated it is slightly different, but noted she does not believe the charter language needs to include ICAO as a non-voting member. With regard to perspective, she added reaching out to Mexico and other large civil aviation authorities with direct involvement with U.S. regulations would be valuable, especially with regard to certification issues. Ms. MacLeod stated that it would be beneficial to consider any aviation authorities with which the United States is negotiating a bilateral agreement. The group discussed the appropriate language to be used in the charter and agreed to "civil aviation authorities."

Mr. Zuspan noted the ARAC Executive Committee is opening up an already large group to many other entities and cautioned that before opening the membership to the world aviation authorities, the group should consider the question about the size and scope of the ARAC membership. It was noted they would be non-voting members. He wondered if ARAC should request that they show interest by first attending as a member of the public. Ms. MacPherson noted that appointing them as non-voting members would enable them to justify their travel to their civil aviation authority. Mr. Zuspan asked if they can have observer status. Ms. MacPherson noted her belief that observer status is the same as non-voting member status. Ms. MacLeod noted that Mr. Hall holds that status. Ms. MacLeod clarified that Mr. Zuspan seems to be talking about ARAC, but this discussion is centered on the ARAC Executive Committee. She added that clarifying the difference between ARAC and the ARAC Executive Committee is what needs to be done. She stated the interested parties need to be identified.

Ms. Hamilton suggested adding Transport Canada as a non-voting member. Having heard no objections to that action, she further suggested adding language to the charter about considering other civil aviation authorities on request and doing limited outreach to specific authorities. Ms. MacPherson further clarified the ARAC Executive Committee will consider accepting non-voting membership of a civil aviation authority, if requested. Ms. Hamilton noted that as the committee approaches more robust discussion of phase 2 charter updates regarding ARAC and ARAC Executive Committee, it will talk more about the international component. Mr. Joseph confirmed that EASA would continue as a non-voting member.

Mr. Joseph asked if there were any other issues with regard to re-chartering. Ms. Hamilton confirmed there were not. She said she will share the final draft with everyone for their review. She noted the charter needs to move quickly through the FAA to the DOT for processing in order to address the expiration of the current charter.

Mr. Joseph stated Ms. Hamilton was appointed as the Designated Federal Official for the DOT Secretary's Future of Aviation Advisory Committee. He explained this may limit the time she can give to the FAA. He noted it is an honor for Ms. Hamilton to have been given this assignment.

### 3. *"One stop shopping" Website*

Ms. Hamilton discussed ARM's project to refresh the ARAC Website. She added that one part of the project is consolidating ARAC and ARC material. She noted the material currently is not consolidated because ARM does not manage each ARC. She stated a goal is to have one place for the public to go to find information on ARCs and ARAC. She stated this is a large task, and ARM is working with the individual program offices that sponsor each ARC to ensure information is accessible. Ms. Hamilton stated the goal is to launch this Web site within the next 60 to 90 days.

Ms. Hamilton noted the Website should contain ARC and ARAC charters, recommendations, and FAA responses, if applicable. Mr. Joseph asked whether the Website would be limited to completed work, or whether it would contain newly established work. Ms. Hamilton responded the current plan is to include charters for newly developed ARCs and ARAC taskings.

Ms. MacPherson noted it has not been decided whether the Website would include membership information. She noted that ARCs and ARAC are governed by different regulations. She added that everything related to the ARAC is public, which is not necessarily the case for an ARC. Ms. MacPherson stated that, in some cases, ARC material would not be available until the FAA publishes an NPRM.

## UPDATE, COMMERCIAL AIR TOUR MAINTENANCE (CATM) WORKING GROUP

Mr. Harold Summers stated that working group recommendations currently are undergoing a final edit. Mr. Summers noted the working group meetings have been very interesting. He stated the working group held its first meeting November 17, 2010, and has held nine meetings so far, with three of them being face-to-face meetings and the other six being teleconferences or Web conferences. He noted the working group consists of 10 individuals including FAA support staff. He stated it is a small but experienced group consisting of representation from two specific aviation communities: part 91 of Title 14, Code of Federal Regulations (14 CFR) and 14 CFR part 135. He explained the group also includes people with aviation and helicopter maintenance experience. Mr. Summers stated the working group also has drawn on the expertise of other people to present them with information or help with issues. Mr. Summers noted the working group collected as much data as possible. He stated the working group plans to have its report done in the next 90 days, and would be happy to brief the Executive Committee at the next meeting.

Mr. Frank Wiederman, representing the office of primary responsibility, noted the FAA formally asked for information from the National Transportation Safety Board (NTSB) but has not yet received a response. He stated they verbally requested this information and then followed up with a memorandum. He added that the request was for information on some of the accidents on which the NTSB based its recommendations referenced in an NTSB letter to the FAA. Mr. Weiderman explained they wanted to obtain accident reports to verify the NTSB-claimed inadequacies. Mr. Weiderman noted these NTSB accident reports are the only documents the working group has not been able to obtain. Ms. MacPherson recommended that Mr. Weiderman reach out to the Office of Accident Investigation and Prevention (AVP). Ms. MacLeod noted the request needs to be formal and probably needs to reach higher in the chain of command. Ms. Hamilton stated that she could draft a formal letter for ARAC. She recommended Mr. Hooper Harris in AVP calls the senior staff-level contact at NTSB. Mr. Weiderman stated he would call. Ms. Hamilton requested that she be kept informed of any progress so she could get involved if necessary. Mr. Weiderman noted that depending on the data received, the ARAC working group may need an extra meeting to review the data.

## STATUS REPORTS FROM ASSISTANT CHAIRS

### *Air Carrier Operations*

Mr. Edmunds noted that the All Weather Operations Working Group had a meeting scheduled, but it was canceled because of the volcanic ash. He added that the working group is scheduling another meeting.

### Air Carrier/General Aviation Maintenance

Ms. MacLeod stated she had no activities to report.

### Aircraft Certification Procedures

Mr. Derosier noted this aeronautical technical subject area has not met in a few years. He stated if the FAA intends to use this aeronautical technical subject area for a potential 14 CFR part 21 rulemaking, it would need to task the Aeronautical Technical Subject Area to reconstitute and recruit new members. However, he added that he believes there is strong support for such an activity. Ms. Hamilton agreed to relay his message.

### Airport Certification

Ms. Sabatine stated there were no activities to report.

### Occupant Safety

Mr. Zuspan stated that he had no activities to report.

### General Aviation Certification and Operations

There was no report from the General Aviation Certification and Operations Aeronautical Technical Subject Area.

### Noise Certification

Mr. McGrann stated he had no activities to report.

### Rotorcraft

Mr. David York stated he had no activities to report.

### Training and Qualifications

There was no report from the Training and Qualifications Aeronautical Technical Subject Area.

### Transport Airplane and Engine (TAE)

Mr. Bolt stated the TAE Aeronautical Technical Subject Area met in April 2010 and voted on three recommendations, which it then submitted to the FAA. He stated that one recommendation was from the Airplane-Level Safety Analysis Working Group on the topic of risk. He added the other two recommendations were from the Avionics Systems Harmonization Working Group and related to advisory material for heads-up and other displays. He noted the report includes several minority opinions, but a thorough discussion on each topic.

Mr. Bolt noted that the Low Speed Alerting Working Group recently has been formed and its first meeting is scheduled. He added the working group hopes to complete its work in 9 months.

## OFF AGENDA REMARKS FROM EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEMBERS

Mr. Joseph noted that Ms. Robinson is retiring from the FAA and this will be her last ARAC Executive Committee meeting. He thanked her for her help and wished her the best in

retirement.  Ms. Robinson commented that she has thoroughly enjoyed working with the ARAC Executive Committee.  Ms. Hamilton noted that Ms. Julie Lynch is working to find a replacement for Ms. Robinson and hopes to hire someone before Ms. Robinson retires.  Ms. Hamilton further emphasized the ARM staff will do everything they can to ensure the transition is seamless in terms of support for ARAC.  She also noted ARM will also present Ms. Robinson a token of appreciation from the ARAC Executive Committee.

**NEXT MEETING**

Ms. Robinson stated that the next meeting will be in mid-December 2010.

**ADJOURNMENT**

Mr. Joseph accepted a motion to adjourn from Mr. Bolt, seconded by Mr. Derosier.  All were in favor and none opposed.  The meeting was adjourned at 12:15 p.m.

Approved by:  _____signed_____
                        Norman Joseph, Chair

Dated:  _____ 9/8/2010_____

Ratified on:  ___12/16/10_____