



RTCA Paper No: 221-21/SC241-010
EUROCAE Paper No: EUR 248-21/WG121-08

SUMMARY:

DATES: Wednesday, March 17, 2021, 10:00 AM – 1:00 PM (central time).

LOCATION: Meeting will be virtual via WebEx Contact POC for connection details.

POINT OF CONTACT: Contact Al Secen by email asecen@rtca.org, telephone 202-330-0647, or mailing address RTCA, 1150 18th Street, NW, Suite 910, Washington, DC, 20036.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION: Visit the RTCA Web site at

<https://www.rtca.org/content/special-committees>

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The agenda will include the following:

Wednesday, March 17, 2021

1. RTCA/EUROCAE Policy Statements
2. Welcome and Introductions
3. Approve Minutes from Meeting 4
4. Recap last meeting
5. Review of CDC document (Ken Mead CDC)
 - a. Ken
 - b. Iva reviewed her groups comments
 - c. Travis Ludwig (on behalf of John Taylor who could not attend today's meeting)
 - d. Hal
6. Date of next meeting
7. Action Item Review
8. Adjourn

Attendance is open to the interested public but limited to space availability. With the approval of the chairman, members of the public may present oral statements at the meeting. Persons wishing to present statements or obtain information should contact the person listed in the “**POINT OF CONTACT**” section. Members of the public may present a written statement to the committee at any time.

Meeting Minutes:

1.) RTCA/EUROCAE Policy Statements

- a. Policy statements and meeting tips were reviewed by Al and Sebastian

2.) Welcome and Introductions

- a. Chloe welcomed everyone and summarized the publication of the white paper last December. Chloe welcomed anyone to make an opening statement but there were no additional statements from the group. Chloe advised that ALPA nominated this WG for the national aeronautical association award, this WG was not selected but it was noted as an honor that this groups work was spotlighted.

3.) Approve Minutes from Meeting 4

- a. Al advised that meetings minutes from meeting 3 are posted, there were no questions from team. Chloe motioned to approved minutes from meeting 3, motioned from Iva, seconded by Travis Ludwig. Motion carried. Al will post minutes to public website this afternoon.

4.) Recap last meeting

5.) Work groups update (presentation)

Chloe advised that this meeting was called due to comments received from the CDC. Ken (CDC) advised that the review of this document was done as a courtesy and the comment were seen as helpful. Ken advised that he categorized his comments in 3 areas, importance of protecting working applying chemicals, ensuring the concept that the chemicals are applied appropriately and it is monitored (for wetness and contact time, often overlooked where people are trying to hurry), emerging technologies.

a. Document Review (WG1)

- i. Iva reviewed items applicable to WG1, she agreed several were editorial. Iva asked about a comment that advised training should include enhanced environmental control. There was confusion surrounding what that comment meant. It was translated into what the possible environmental impact of the use of the chemicals could be. Iva noted that it was a good point if that is what was meant. She advised that she was not able to get any information from member airlines on whether or not this type of training was included in their training or not. Ken advised that the worker applying the chemicals need to be knowledgeable about the application techniques so that they are aware that the chemicals they are applying could have and environmental impact on others within the aircraft at the time of the application due to aerosols being spread thought the aircraft. Iva advised that this should be captured in a future revision of the document so that additional information can be gathered. Iva advised of a comment surrounding frequency of application was not addressed intentionally due to RTCA/EuroCae are not regulators and we should not get into that arena. Iva addressed a comment of “wetness” and Hal advised that we are producing a guidance document not a prescriptive document, we don’t want to create a multi thousand-page document. Bryan advised that we could include a very brief discussion regarding dwell time of the chemical if it is not included in the documents. Steve Yates commented that with respect to both the chemical and non-chemical techniques there is a real lack of a good detailed study in an aircraft environment. Steve wished that someone would place virus substitutes, then measure efficacy. Bryan advised that this has been done by Boeing. Bryan advised how this was accomplished at Boeing. Chloe welcomed any comment from Ken (CDC) but there was none. (Iva advised mostly editorial, not a lot of work or prep time)

b. Compatibility of Chemicals (WG2)

- i. Travis was standing in for John Taylor, Travis advised most comments were also editorial. Three were covered in the SRA process. No other comments need to be addressed. Ken had no feedback. (Travis advised mostly editorial, not much work or prep time needed)

c. Non-Chemical (WG3)

- i. Hal advised as stated previously this is a guidance only document not a prescriptive doc. 01 was covered in the SRA process, 02 felt this was covered in the SRA process, recommended no change. 03 suggested typo changes, and Al advised that if there was a collection of errata, we can submit an errata doc if necessary. 04 need some clarification on this one. The HEPA filter people provided a doc and that was all we could find, there is data in section 3 that can be looked at, is it accurate or reliable data? That was deemed also part of the SMS process since the stakeholders were involved. Hal felt that there was no change necessary. Bryan from Boeing was going to check to see if they had any reference info on HEPA filleters. Al advised that if we needed to make a change due to bad info that could cause harm, we would need to get a doc revision out to advise everyone. If it is just a n improvement, we will need to wait till another revisions update. Ken (CDC) advised that this was clearly an error and the other four references are legit. If one out of 5 is incorrect its not an immediate change needed. 05 is deferred until the next revision. 06 Steve Yates advised that 264 or 265 nanometers, next revision will say 264-265 nanometers. Second comment regarding smooth surfaces, WG3 figured out that the commenter was correct, and this will be updated in the next revision. Next comment advised that will not include the statement in the next revision as it does not change anything. 09 can change guidance based on info not made avail. Dr. Yates would be very interested to see this information, this will remain open until information is reviewed. 10 will be fixed next revision as the commenter was correct. 011 was disinfection of fabrics, Dr. Yates disagreed with this comment. He would like to be educated on this topic. Fabric can be disinfected but needs ~10 times more dosage due to porous nature of fabric. (Hal advised that his group has the most amount of work to do to resolve these comments. Hal advised that they will need time to meet and resolve as a group probably about a month or two. Chloe gave two months to resolve, and there would be a group leader call two weeks after that two months).

6.) Date of next meeting

The target is to publish the Rev A in December 2021. Going backwards, in order to meet that goal, I put down the following dates:

- a. The final version ready for submission by November 10th.

- b. The last plenary before publishing will be October 20th for the final vote.
- c. Team leads to present draft on September 15th at the plenary. So that there will be 5 weeks for teams to work through/resolve comments and create final draft.

7.) Action Item Review

Patrick suggested that action items to be reviewed through meeting minutes and this was approved by Chloe and group.

8.) Adjourn

- a. Patrick motioned and Travis seconded to end meeting