

EXHIBIT 4

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

<hr/>)	
FLYERS RIGHTS EDUCATION)	
FUND, INC, <i>et al.</i> ,)	
)	
Plaintiffs,)	
)	
v.)	Civil Action No. 19-3749 (CKK)
)	
FEDERAL AVIATION ADMINISTRATION,)	
)	
Defendant.)	
)	
<hr/>)	

SUPPLEMENTARY DECLARATION OF PAUL HUDSON

I, Paul Hudson, hereby declare and state as follows:

1. Since 1993 I have represented airline passengers and the general public on the main safety advisory committee to the FAA, the Aviation Rulemaking Advisory Committee (ARAC) (Executive Committee, Occupant Safety Issue Group) which assists the FAA in developing safety regulations through subcommittees and working groups. During that tenure, I have attended and participated as a voting member in hundreds of meetings, and scores of agency proceedings and a number of court appeals. As such I am familiar with a broad range of aviation interests including Boeing and other plane makers, airlines, airline unions.

2. In 2013, after the Boeing 787 Dreamliner was grounded due to battery fires I petitioned with the Flyers Rights organization the National Transportation Safety Board (NTSB) and the FAA for intervention with three battery experts questioning the proposed fixes, and later opposed its certification to fly long distances over oceans without extra precautions. In those proceedings Boeing and the FAA, unlike here,

disclosed technical details of its battery fix and the testing that went into the decision to unground the plane. Boeing also agreed to discussion between our experts and theirs and although we did not fully agree, this led to a narrowing of disagreement and avoided a court appeal and allowed the ungrounding of the plane within 6 weeks.

See <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=xaqQuBac2ag>

[https://boeing.mediaroom.com/2013-03-14-Boeing-Provides-Details-on-787-Battery-](https://boeing.mediaroom.com/2013-03-14-Boeing-Provides-Details-on-787-Battery-Improvements)

[Improvements https://www.reuters.com/article/boeing-787-faa-idUSL1N0BM7YA20130222](https://www.reuters.com/article/boeing-787-faa-idUSL1N0BM7YA20130222)

3. In 1998 I petitioned the US Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia for judicial review of a decision by the FAA to waive emergency evacuation testing for a new model of the Boeing 777. During that proceeding under a judicially ordered protective agreement, email and correspondence communications were disclosed by FAA regarding the decision making that led to the waiver decision. See *Hudson v FAA*, 192 F3d 1031(1999).

4. In 1996, a Boeing 747-100 (TWA 800) exploded shortly after take-off from JFK Airport killing all 230 people on board. In the aftermath, I testified before a Presidential commission and subsequent advisory committee looking into causes including a center fuel tank explosion. Once again, the FAA unlike here publicly disclosed details of the proposed fixes and allowed to be vetted by independent and industry experts. See

http://flight800.org/nitrogen_inerting.htm

5. To the best of my knowledge, in no other ungrounding decision by the FAA after grounding an aircraft as a result of a crash causing high loss of life has the FAA or its sister agencies or even Boeing insisted on secrecy in the proposed fixes, the technical evaluations and testing. See <https://news.aviation-safety.net/2019/03/14/list-of-global-aircraft-groundings-in-history/>

6. Accordingly, it is not accurate as asserted by the Boeing and FAA representatives herein that they have a history and tradition of keeping their technical data, testing protocols secret.

7. I declare under the penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct to the best of my knowledge.

Executed on November 23, 2020

/s/ Paul Hudson

Paul Hudson