

**Future of Aviation Advisory Committee
Aviation Safety Subcommittee
Record of Meeting**
November 17, 2010
General Aviation Manufacturers Association
Washington, DC

Public Announcement

The U.S. Department of Transportation (DOT), Office of the Secretary of Transportation, told the public of this Future of Aviation Advisory Committee (FAAC) Aviation Safety Subcommittee meeting in a Federal Register notice published November 3, 2010 (75 FR 67805).

Subcommittee Members in Attendance

Name	Affiliation(s)	
Nicole W. Piasecki (<i>Subcommittee Chair</i>)	Vice President, Business Development	Boeing Commercial Airplanes (Boeing)
Juan J. Alonso ¹	Associate Professor, Department of Aeronautics and Astronautics	Stanford University
Susan M. Baer ¹	Director, Aviation Department	Port Authority of New York & New Jersey (PANY/NJ)
John M. Conley	International Administrative Vice President and Air Transport Division Director	Transport Workers Union of America (TWU), American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations (AFL-CIO)
Daniel Grace	Safety Manager, Flight Operations	Cessna Aircraft Company (Cessna)
Robert L. Lekites	President	United Parcel Service Airlines (UPS)
William J. McGee	Travel and Aviation Consultant	Consumers Union
Steve Predmore (<i>attending for Mr. Barger</i>)	Vice President of Safety	JetBlue Airways Corporation (JetBlue)

Other Officials Present

Name	Affiliation(s)	
Tony Fazio	Designated Federal Official	Federal Aviation Administration (FAA)
Arnold Konheim	Alternate Designated Official	DOT
Susan Kurland	Assistant Secretary for Aviation and International Affairs (<i>FAAC Chair</i>)	DOT

¹ By phone.

**Future of Aviation Advisory Committee
Aviation Safety Subcommittee
Record of Meeting**
November 17, 2010
General Aviation Manufacturers Association
Washington, DC

Other Persons Present

Name	Affiliation(s)
Bob Bergman	UPS
Patty Clark	PANY/NJ
Andy Compart	Aviation World/Aviation Daily
Mike Derrick	PAI Consulting
Steve Douglas	FAA
Paul Feldman	General Aviation Manufacturers Association (GAMA)
Kate Fraser	GAMA
Keith Hagy	Air Line Pilots Association (ALPA)
Krister Holladay ¹	Goodrich
Dean Hubbard	TWU
Aloha Ley	DOT
Brian McCullagh	FAA
Bill Mosely	DOT
Tim Neale	Boeing
Salli Rowe	FAA
Mont Smith	Air Transport Association (ATA)
David Traynham	Boeing
Daniel Zuspan	Boeing

BACKGROUND AND WELCOMING REMARKS

This is the record of the fifth meeting of the Aviation Safety Subcommittee of the FAAC, a Federal advisory committee formed pursuant to and subject to the requirements of the Federal Advisory Committee Act (FACA).

Ms. Nicole Piasecki, Subcommittee Chair, Boeing, called the meeting to order at 8:41 a.m. She welcomed the subcommittee members and members of the public in attendance and opened the meeting by asking the members to introduce themselves to the subcommittee. The members made introductions.

Mr. Tony Fazio, FAA, read the formal statement required under FACA. He noted the meeting is recorded and asked the subcommittee to give supporting documents to Mr. Mike Derrick, PAI Consulting, for posting to the docket. Ms. Piasecki stated that the subcommittee needed to ratify the minutes from the previous meeting, and asked if any of the members had suggested revisions. No revisions were offered, and the minutes were ratified.

¹ By phone.

Future of Aviation Advisory Committee
Aviation Safety Subcommittee
Record of Meeting
November 17, 2010
General Aviation Manufacturers Association
Washington, DC

OPENING DISCUSSION

Ms. Piasecki stated the objective of the meeting was to finalize the subcommittee's recommendations for submission to the DOT on November 22, 2010 to allow adequate time for their review and inclusion in briefing packages for the final FAAC meeting on December 15, 2010. She thanked the subcommittee for their substantive inputs to the recommendations document since last month's meeting. Ms. Piasecki added that Mr. William McGee, Consumers Union, would cover the issue of how best to include the issue on use of child restraint systems on aircraft in the recommendations document, and that portions of the presentation by Mr. Brad Brugger, TWU, from the subcommittee's August 24, 2010 meeting would be considered for inclusion in the recommendations document.

RECOMMENDATIONS PAPER DISCUSSION

Ms. Piasecki asked Mr. David Traynham, Boeing, to cover changes made to the subcommittee's draft recommendations, an internal working document for use by the subcommittee, since the last meeting on October 19, 2010. Mr. Traynham noted the version distributed to the subcommittee members was largely the same as they had seen at the last meeting.

Background Section

Mr. Traynham explained the wording on a "just" safety culture that had been added on page 2 of the recommendations paper was largely based on the presentation given by Mr. Brugger at the subcommittee's August 24, 2010 meeting. Ms. Piasecki suggested an edit to Mr. Traynham to clarify the need to capture data from ground maintenance employees, which seemed to be excluded by use of the phrase, "data collected on flights." Mr. Keith Hagy, ALPA, suggested that air carrier maintenance and flight attendant employee groups have recently established Aviation Safety Action Programs, and those may be worthy of mention when clarifying which air carrier employees are submitting voluntary safety data. Mr. Traynham noted the changes.

Discussion continued to page 3 of the document, and Ms. Piasecki asked if the subcommittee was comfortable with the language on Safety Management Systems (SMS). Mr. Fazio explained that the FAA had recently published a notice of proposed rulemaking on SMS that mandates its implementation at air carriers. Mr. Steve Predmore, JetBlue, added that SMS lays out authorities and responsibilities in a safety culture, and provided a suggested edit to the SMS language.

Mr. Hagy pointed out that use of the phrase, "large airline accidents," in the background section could be misleading, and suggested a broader term be used to reflect that the subcommittee was discussing all air carrier accidents, not just those that have occurred at the largest airlines. The subcommittee agreed with Mr. Hagy's input, citing the need to be inclusive of the aviation industry as a whole.

Legal Protection of Voluntary Safety Data

Mr. Traynham then discussed the issue of increased legal protections of voluntary safety data. He explained the expansion of the problem/challenge statement to capture the distinctions of the industry operating under a purely voluntary nature versus the future under mandated SMS programs. Mr. Fazio

Future of Aviation Advisory Committee
Aviation Safety Subcommittee
Record of Meeting
November 17, 2010
General Aviation Manufacturers Association
Washington, DC

asked for clarification of the term “study,” and whether it simply was a request for a study or formation of a committee to explore the topic. Ms. Susan Baer, PANY/NJ, added her belief that the subcommittee should recommend that the Secretary of Transportation should propose legislation to better protect voluntary safety data. Ms. Baer further stated her belief that the subcommittee was asking for more than just a study, and the subcommittee agreed. Changes in the wording of the recommendation were discussed, and Mr. Fazio suggested that addition of the phrase, “with industry stakeholder input,” could be helpful in crafting the recommendation.

Mr. Daniel Zuspan, Boeing, asked for clarification of the use of the terms, “safety data” and “safety information,” and whether they were one and the same. Mr. Predmore and Mr. Hagy offered clarification and added information about the request for safety data from plaintiffs’ attorneys in the case of an aircraft accident involving a Comair Airlines flight at Lexington, Kentucky to further explain the subcommittee’s intent with this recommendation. Mr. Predmore suggested the problem/challenge statement for this recommendation needed some clarification. Mr. Traynham asked Mr. Predmore to submit his suggested revisions to better state the problem.

Analytic Capabilities for Safety Data and Information

Mr. Traynham continued to the second recommendation in the paper suggesting a shift from traditional forensic safety studies to more predictive searches for future vulnerabilities by increasing analytic capability for parties that analyze safety data and information. Ms. Piasecki suggested the word “predictive” be used in the title and the recommendation to better clarify the subcommittee’s intent on this topic. Mr. Juan Alonso, Stanford University, noted that in being predictive the subcommittee also has to anticipate the introduction of risk as new technologies, including the Next Generation Air Transportation System (NextGen), are implemented. He agreed to provide suggested edits to Mr. Traynham. Mr. Zuspan added that he believed an additional sentence was needed detailing the culture change within the federal government required to accomplish this recommendation. The subcommittee agreed.

Expanding Sources of Voluntary Safety Data

Mr. Traynham continued to the third issue area, expanded sources of voluntary safety data. Mr. McGee suggested the addition of aircraft dispatchers to the potential sources for expansion. Mr. Fazio proposed broadening the language to capture other communities, including general aviation. Mr. Zuspan noted that Aviation Rulemaking Committees (ARC) and other advisory committees could be sources of data, as well. Mr. Fazio suggested use of the term “advisory bodies” as a broad term to capture ARCs and other committees. Ms. Susan Kurland, DOT, suggested “other constituencies” as a term to more broadly capture the intent of the subcommittee. The subcommittee further discussed language for this recommendation, and Ms. Piasecki asked that suggestions be sent to Mr. Traynham.

Future of Aviation Advisory Committee
Aviation Safety Subcommittee
Record of Meeting
November 17, 2010
General Aviation Manufacturers Association
Washington, DC

NextGen and Enhanced Safety Performance

Mr. Traynham stated the fourth recommendation was to incorporate safety enhancements into implementation of NextGen. Mr. Zupan cautioned the subcommittee that this was an area where duplication with existing work being done by other parties was a concern, and suggested language to note that the subcommittee was not attempting to replicate existing efforts. The subcommittee agreed. Mr. Hagy added that there are a vast number of entities involved with NextGen. Ms. Kurland asked whether the recommendation needed more specific language, or if the work of an existing body needed expanding. Ms. Baer expressed her concern that the suggested steps may cause the recommendation to become overly prescriptive. Mr. Alonso agreed.

Ms. Kurland asked for the subcommittee's input on improving the recommendation. Mr. Predmore suggested language to capture the subcommittee's intent to embed enhanced safety performance into NextGen without being overly prescriptive. The subcommittee agreed with the suggested language and acknowledged the need to give the Secretary of Transportation leeway to determine how best to implement safety enhancements in NextGen, and Mr. Predmore agreed to provide his revisions to Mr. Traynham.

Ms. Piasecki sought to clarify the subcommittee's intent on how to acknowledge the vast amount of NextGen work underway through multiple parties. Ms. Kurland suggested that placing language in the problem/challenge statement of the recommendation may be helpful.

Mr. McGee brought up a theory previously discussed by the subcommittee at prior meetings, stating that risk is inherent with new technologies, and the need to capture that theory within the rationale of this recommendation. Ms. Piasecki agreed, and asked Mr. McGee to provide suggested language to Mr. Traynham.

Identification of Safety Priorities

Mr. Traynham stated the focus of recommendation number 5 pertains to prioritizing aviation safety issues, as there are a multitude of safety initiatives championed by interest groups and recommendations from government agencies and committees. He stated the need to focus on the large areas of concern, while not expending limited resources on issues with little potential for enhancing aviation safety. Mr. Traynham explained the subcommittee's recommendation would propose the Secretary of Transportation determine a methodology to effectively prioritize aviation safety initiatives to ensure that those having the most benefit are the top priority for implementation. Mr. Predmore asked if the problem was actually too many regulations, or a lack of methodology to determine priorities. Mr. Fazio stated that both of these were problematic for the FAA. He noted that the subcommittee's recommendation should take both into account and state the need to determine how to effectively implement the most needed safety initiatives.

Future of Aviation Advisory Committee
Aviation Safety Subcommittee
Record of Meeting
November 17, 2010
General Aviation Manufacturers Association
Washington, DC

Mr. Feldman asked for clarification on whether all proposed regulations affecting aviation safety would go through this envisioned process. Mr. Fazio stated he did not envision all regulations doing so, and likely it would be around 40 percent of the FAA's rulemaking activities that would be rational for such a process. Ms. Kurland asked whether the description of this recommendation needed clarification on this matter and whether a team of experts was needed to develop a prioritization methodology. Mr. Fazio agreed and noted the need to collaborate on the topic because of the number of parties and agencies involved. Ms. Baer cited the need to strengthen the recommendation without being overly prescriptive. The subcommittee further discussed how to word the recommendation.

Mr. Robert Lekites, UPS, raised the issue that in an SMS-based safety culture, data originates from the air carriers on a multitude of parameters, and he sees a challenge for regulators to determine how to use the data to the benefit of aviation safety, rather than for enforcement. Ms. Piasecki clarified with the subcommittee where Mr. Lekites' comments were most pertinent in the recommendations document. Mr. Lekites added that there is a tremendous amount of safety data available to the aviation industry, including unstabilized approaches, encounters with terrain, and others. He noted the large volume of data was beneficial but questioned how it is best used. Mr. Predmore cited the work of the Commercial Aviation Safety Team as an example of using data to improve aviation safety.

Ms. Piasecki offered her opinion that Mr. Lekites' comments were best suited for recommendation number 5. The subcommittee further discussed placement of the comments and suggested language. Mr. Fazio stated there was also a need to eliminate "personalization" of safety initiatives, such as an action championed by a single air carrier or industry association, through an industry-accepted methodology for prioritization of safety initiatives. Mr. Predmore noted this was essentially SMS for the regulator, and several subcommittee members expressed agreement. Mr. Fazio expressed reservation, as it seemed to him two critical issues were being combined into one. Mr. Predmore stated that the need for a prioritization methodology should capture this issue. Ms. Piasecki asked Mr. Predmore and Mr. Fazio to work with Mr. Zuspan to finalize the language.

Mr. McGee asked if language to solicit input from foreign carriers would be useful. He also added that smaller carriers may not have the resources to do the level of work that the larger carriers are doing. Mr. Zuspan asked Mr. Lekites to clarify his thoughts on the link between data collection and decisionmaking on regulations. A short discussion followed and potential language was captured.

Mr. John Conley, TWU, asked if the phrase, "truly important," which referred to safety initiatives, was necessary. After a short discussion, the subcommittee deleted the entire sentence containing this statement from the recommendations document. Mr. Hagy discussed the need to incorporate SMS principles into field enforcement of regulations. He stated the headquarters level of federal agencies may embrace programs, but sometimes the principles of these programs don't make it to the field level. Mr. Daniel Grace, Cessna added that change management is a critical portion of SMS, and that it is important to include this philosophy in execution of an SMS program. Ms. Piasecki clarified the subcommittee's intent on the topic and asked for any further input. There were no further comments.

Future of Aviation Advisory Committee
Aviation Safety Subcommittee
Record of Meeting
November 17, 2010
General Aviation Manufacturers Association
Washington, DC

Child Safety on Airliners

Recommendation number 6 covered safety issues of small children flying in passengers' laps on air carrier aircraft. Mr. McGee noted that consumer stakeholders have reviewed the language, and that he felt it was unnecessary to further discuss the topic due to previous discussions at the subcommittee's meetings. Mr. Fazio expressed his concern with the phrase "potentially flawed" used to describe FAA's methodology associated with diversion for child safety seat use on air carrier aircraft. Mr. McGee explained that the more accurate meaning was that the methodology was outdated, and many changes had occurred in the aviation industry since it was completed. Mr. Fazio expressed satisfaction with Mr. McGee's clarification, and they agreed to work together on refining the language in the recommendation.

Mr. Alonso noted the need to cite sources when discussing studies in the recommendations to give added credibility, rather than using a generic phrase, such as "scientific research." The subcommittee agreed. Mr. Feldman asked if the approach given in this recommendation was too specific, as all of the subcommittee's other recommendations dealt with broad actions the Secretary of Transportation could take. The subcommittee discussed how to ensure the recommendation was suggestive, as opposed to prescriptive, and how best to word the subject of public awareness of the dangers of small children flying in adults' laps. Several examples of lack of awareness were raised based on the subcommittee members' own experiences and observations, and input given to them by air carrier employees.

Mr. Predmore asked if it would be appropriate to mention in the rationale for this recommendation why it was more specific than the others. The subcommittee briefly discussed the need for modification of the rationale but ultimately decided to leave the wording as it was.

Mr. Hagy asked a general question on the lack of security topics in the subcommittee's recommendations, noting this was his first attendance at one of the meetings. Ms. Piasecki clarified that the subcommittee charter focused solely on safety topics. She suggested this may be beneficial to state in the introduction to the recommendations, and the subcommittee agreed. Ms. Kurland asked whether it would be beneficial to mention the cooperative relations with the Department of Homeland Security and Transportation Security Administration (TSA) in the introduction, as well. The subcommittee agreed it may be beneficial.

Ms. Piasecki called for a break at 10:02 a.m., and the meeting resumed at 10:18 a.m.

Future of Aviation Advisory Committee
Aviation Safety Subcommittee
Record of Meeting
November 17, 2010
General Aviation Manufacturers Association
Washington, DC

Single Safety Standard for Aircraft Maintenance

Ms. Piasecki cited the extensive discussions on contract aircraft maintenance that have occurred at previous subcommittee meetings and briefly summarized the topic based on previous discussions with Mr. Conley and Mr. McGee. She added that several subcommittee members have discussed positive experiences with contract maintenance providers. Ms. Piasecki stated that based on the previous discussions, it was not evidently clear that this was a safety issue, there was a general lack of data to support it as a concern, and that there was not consensus among the subcommittee members on the topic. She stated that a paper titled “Is There a Single Safety Standard for Maintenance of all U.S. Aircraft? Should There Be?” from Mr. Dean Hubbard, TWU, had been circulated to the subcommittee members for their consideration.

Ms. Piasecki turned the discussion over to Mr. Conley for his views on the topic. He reviewed his thoughts on the need for a single standard for conduct of criminal history records checks, background checks, and drug and alcohol testing for personnel performing aircraft maintenance, regardless of where the work occurs, including outside the United States.

Ms. Piasecki noted Mr. Hubbard’s paper referenced a report by the DOT Office of Inspector General (OIG), and asked Mr. Fazio for his input. Mr. Fazio stated he had concerns with some areas of Mr. Hubbard’s paper, and that they could work together to correct them. He asked Mr. Steve Douglas, FAA Aircraft Maintenance Division, for his input on the topic. Mr. Douglas began by explaining standard terms used by the FAA to describe what is commonly referred to as “outsourced maintenance,” stating that it is better described as “contract maintenance” completed by “maintenance providers.” He then highlighted the FAA’s progress on complying with the OIG’s recommendations in the report and stated they continue to work with the OIG to update them on the FAA’s progress. Mr. Douglas noted the FAA has validated documents and processes put into place after the OIG investigation, and has revised processes put in place from 2001 right up to the investigation because they were already in need of updating.

Mr. Douglas continued the discussion, and covered the differences between FAA certificated repair stations in the United States and foreign countries. Mr. Fazio added that a notice of proposed rulemaking issued by the TSA addressed many of Mr. Conley’s concerns over the security of foreign repair stations. Mr. Douglas agreed, provided a brief summation of some of the changes that the proposed regulation would implement, and stated that the TSA expected to finalize the rule in early 2011.

Future of Aviation Advisory Committee
Aviation Safety Subcommittee
Record of Meeting
November 17, 2010
General Aviation Manufacturers Association
Washington, DC

Mr. McGee asked for clarification of the terms “contract maintenance” and “maintenance provider.” Mr. Douglas provided further explanation. Mr. McGee asked how these terms differed from “outsourced maintenance.” Mr. Douglas explained that the terms are based on regulatory language and are more standard. Mr. Hagy raised the issue of coordination between safety and security agencies on oversight of repair stations. Mr. Fazio explained that the FAA inspects repair stations certificated under Title 14, Code of Federal Regulations part 145, both in the United States and abroad but that TSA has the mandate to develop security requirements for foreign repair stations. It was noted that the FAA and TSA had coordinated on inspections of foreign repair stations. Mr. Fazio stated that FAA and TSA had coordinated on the TSA NPRM proposal and even noted that the TSA lead for the rule is a former FAA employee.

A brief discussion of the bilateral agreement process and general discussion of the safety and security of repair stations in foreign countries followed. Ms. Piasecki expressed that it seemed to her the subcommittee was suggesting global harmonization and cooperation between government agencies to obtain consistent standards among repair stations, regardless of where they are located.

Mr. Hubbard began to discuss his paper, covering three topics he believed were gaps in safety: non-certificated repair stations, whether the FAA has adequate resources to oversee all maintenance providers, and a lack of security standards and alcohol/drug testing programs at foreign repair stations. He stated he would like to take one more opportunity for the subcommittee to achieve consensus on this topic. Mr. Douglas explained air carrier oversight of maintenance providers, and the use of certificated and non-certificated providers. He noted the FAA approves the air carriers’ standards, and the maintenance providers have to meet the air carriers’ standards.

Mr. Douglas then covered the process of air carriers sending on-site representatives to accompany their aircraft during heavy maintenance events performed by maintenance providers. He noted there are multiple layers of people overseeing the process, regardless of whether the facility was certificated or not. Mr. Hubbard agreed that the oversight of contract maintenance is complex and still evolving, and suggested that continuing dialogue on the topic among aviation industry stakeholders is prudent.

Ms. Piasecki stated that in an SMS environment, the air carrier is ultimately accountable for the work conducted on its aircraft. Mr. Hubbard agreed but noted as the transition away from maintenance performed by the air carriers themselves to contracted maintenance continues, in the view of maintenance workers, consumers, and flight attendants, there continue to be gaps in oversight of contracted maintenance. Mr. McGee added that two of the biggest changes in the air carrier industry have been the outsourcing of flying to regional air carriers and outsourcing of maintenance to contract providers. He noted the shift is still evolving and that large changes in regional flying and contracted maintenance had occurred in the last decade, and from a predictive safety standpoint it would seem that risk would be present with such a large change in how the air carrier industry conducts business.

Future of Aviation Advisory Committee
Aviation Safety Subcommittee
Record of Meeting
November 17, 2010
General Aviation Manufacturers Association
Washington, DC

Mr. McGee continued by stating that while forensic safety studies may not show these changes to be a safety risk, noting that he could not specifically cite hard data on the topic, common sense would show that shifting from the traditional model of an FAA office near an air carrier maintenance facility in the United States to a newer model of work performed by contract maintenance providers outside of the United States would be more difficult to oversee. Mr. Hubbard stated that a study of air carrier accidents from 1976-2004 showed that human factors were decreasing as a cause of accidents, while organizational factors increased. He noted market factors, including outsourcing of air carrier work functions, could potentially be to blame and called for more study on the topic.

Ms. Piasecki asked Mr. Predmore to provide input from an air carrier perspective on contract maintenance. Mr. Predmore stated that there was not broad consensus on this topic among the subcommittee members, while noting the members had raised good questions and more discussion of the topic could be helpful. Mr. Lekites noted there was a general absence of data to support the issue, though suggestions that it is a problem could warrant further exploration. He discussed air carrier oversight of maintenance providers and noted air carriers' records are readily available for inspection by the FAA.

Mr. Lekites added that he has not heard concerns from FAA inspectors on the inability to oversee maintenance providers and noted that FAA inspectors have visited most of UPS' maintenance providers worldwide and the inspectors were impressed with UPS' oversight of the maintenance providers. Mr. Lekites also noted that his air carrier's growth has been strongest internationally and represents a global shift in the aviation industry, and added the international growth has created jobs in the United States.

Mr. Conley asked Mr. Hubbard and Mr. Hagy to work with Mr. Douglas to further refine the topic of contract maintenance. He then asked the subcommittee members to take a vote on whether the third issue area in Mr. Hubbard's paper regarding maintenance providers in foreign countries was a concern to them. Ms. Piasecki and Ms. Kurland informed Mr. Conley this was not an appropriate action, and a vote did not take place. Ms. Kurland then described the consensus process for subcommittee recommendations.

Ms. Piasecki asked Ms. Salli Rowe, FAA, for further input on contract maintenance. Ms. Rowe explained that while the OIG report is publicly available, the FAA's responses to the recommendations are not, and this may create the impression that the FAA is not taking action. She stated data validation work on maintenance providers was underway as well as an inventory of non-certificated maintenance providers. She noted there was a shift in the contract maintenance industry even since the release of the OIG report and that dynamics have changed even for non-certificated maintenance providers. Ms. Rowe added that the OIG is expected to do another audit on oversight of maintenance providers, likely in 2011.

Future of Aviation Advisory Committee
Aviation Safety Subcommittee
Record of Meeting
November 17, 2010
General Aviation Manufacturers Association
Washington, DC

Mr. Fazio expressed his agreement that aviation is a dynamic industry, and there are many areas that the FAA must oversee. He noted the OIG oversees the FAA's oversight activities, as well. Mr. Douglas and Ms. Rowe added that the FAA conducts surveillance on non-certificated maintenance facilities to better understand their roles and noted this segment of the aviation maintenance industry is still evolving.

Mr. McGee reminded the subcommittee that in previous meetings, discussion had taken place on the introduction of risk with changes in systems. He reiterated his belief that the fundamental shift from a traditional air carrier maintenance scenario of work being done by the carriers and overseen by a local FAA office to work being performed by contractors, often in foreign countries, would certainly introduce risk into the aviation industry. Mr. McGee expressed his desire to ensure the recording of this topic as part of the Aviation Safety Subcommittee's discussions in the FAAC's final report.

Mr. Fazio stated the OIG works directly for the Secretary of Transportation, and this issue is visible to him. Ms. Piasecki shared what she had captured as the subcommittee's thoughts on the topic of contract maintenance from the subcommittee, including: acknowledgement that aircraft maintenance is increasingly being performed by contractors and air carriers must retain oversight of and accountability for the work; that it is important the FAA remain responsive to the OIG report; the FAA is to be commended for continuing to respond to changes in the aviation industry; and there is a perceived safety risk with contract maintenance providers, but a lack of data to show that there is indeed a risk.

Ms. Piasecki expressed her belief the subcommittee could agree there are changes evolving in the aviation industry, and that SMS is a critical component of aviation safety. She stated her proposal would be for the subcommittee to focus on areas of common ground and document the discussion on the topic of contract maintenance and include it in the background of the Aviation Safety Subcommittee's submission for the FAAC final report. However, Ms. Piasecki noted there did not appear to be consensus among the subcommittee members that contract maintenance was a risk to aviation safety. Ms. Baer reaffirmed Ms. Piasecki's statement. Ms. Piasecki asked subcommittee members with input on this topic to provide their suggestions to Mr. Traynham.

CLOSING REMARKS

Ms. Piasecki thanked the subcommittee for its work, and recognized the Boeing team and Mr. Traynham in particular, for their assistance with transitioning the subcommittee's thoughts into recommendations for the FAAC. She asked Ms. Kurland for her input on the final FAAC meeting on December 15, 2010. Ms. Kurland first thanked Ms. Piasecki for her leadership in chairing the Aviation Safety Subcommittee, and the meaningful discussions of the subcommittee. She stated the subcommittee's recommendations were due to the DOT on November 22, 2010, so that they may be packaged in time for review by the final FAAC meeting. Ms. Kurland noted at the FAAC meeting, the subcommittee chairs would first report out in the morning then work on consensus on overall recommendations from the FAAC to the Secretary of Transportation. Ms. Kurland added that the committee would work to resolve cross cutting issue areas, and officially present its recommendations to the Secretary in the afternoon.

Future of Aviation Advisory Committee
Aviation Safety Subcommittee
Record of Meeting
November 17, 2010
General Aviation Manufacturers Association
Washington, DC

Mr. Traynham reminded the subcommittee members that those providing suggested and revised language for the recommendations document needed to have their submissions to him by close of business on Thursday, November 18, 2010. He stated a revised document would be circulated to the subcommittee for review the morning of November 22, 2010 and then the document would be submitted to the DOT by close of business that day.

ADJOURNMENT

Ms. Piasecki adjourned the meeting at 11:20 a.m.

I hereby certify that, to the best of my knowledge, the foregoing minutes are accurate and complete.

Approved by:  _____
Tony Fazio, Designated Federal Official

Dated: December 14, 2010