

that the placard requirement is similar to the IATA requirement, therefore, the requirement for the placard has been removed.

Discussion of Comments Received on Special Conditions No. 25–216–SC

Notice of final special conditions; request for comments, No. 25–216–SC, for Boeing Model 777 series airplanes was published in the **Federal Register** on October 11, 2002 (67 FR 63250). Three commenters responded to the notice.

The First Commenter

The first commenter requests changing the title of the special conditions to read “Boeing Model 777 Series * * *” since it is the intent to utilize these special conditions on various models of the 777. The FAA concurs with this comment and the change is incorporated.

Next, this commenter requests a revision to the section of the preamble entitled “Operational Evaluations and Approval.” This commenter has a concern that a prescribed procedure in a dynamic situation, such as a crew rest fire, could be detrimental to the ability of the firefighter to address the fire threat. The FAA agrees and this comment is incorporated.

In the preamble material for Special Condition No. 13, the commenter suggests adding the following text: “Training requirements for the occupants of the overhead crew rest area in the event of decompression are included in the requirement.” The commenter feels this clarification is needed to ensure consistency with Special Condition No. 13. The FAA concurs and the intent of this comment is incorporated.

The commenter’s next request is for an editorial correction in the preamble material for Special Condition No. 14; it should read Special Condition No. 14(a). The FAA concurs with the commenter and the editorial correction is made.

The commenter requests that Special Condition No. 2 be revised to add the phrase “if the open panel would impede evacuation from the main deck.” The FAA disagrees. This comment is not incorporated as it deals with the method of compliance. The current statement adequately states the objectives of the requirement.

The commenter requests that Special Condition No. 8 be changed to include the statement “Consideration can be given to bunks, walls, partitions, etc. that can be utilized to brace oneself during turbulence.” The FAA disagrees and this comment is not incorporated.

The suggested statement would be considered a method of compliance. The current statement adequately states the objectives of this requirement.

Additionally, the commenter requests that in the preamble for Special Condition No. 10, the term “* * * occupiable area * * *” be included to better clarify the intent. The FAA concurs and the words “occupiable area” are added to Special Condition No. 10.

The commenter’s next request is to add a paragraph requiring procedures describing methods to search the crew rest for fire sources. This requirement would ensure that the proper procedures are transmitted to the operators. The FAA agrees and this change is incorporated in Special Condition No. 11.

Another request by the commenter concerns an editorial change to Special Condition No. 13. The commenter suggests deleting the final paragraph because it is redundant to the text that immediately precedes it. The FAA agrees and the paragraph is deleted.

The commenter also requests that Special Condition No. 14(d) be revised to include the phrase, “except for curtained bunks.” The FAA agrees and this comment is incorporated in Special Condition No. 14 as it helps clarify the intent of the requirement.

The Second Commenter

The second commenter’s request concerns the requirements of Special Condition No. 9(b) that requires the installation of two protective breathing equipment (PBE) devices, or one PBE for each hand-held fire extinguisher, whichever is greater. The commenter however, does not feel that it would provide any additional safety benefit to require additional PBEs for all of the fire extinguishers. The FAA disagrees and this comment is not incorporated. The current statement adequately states the objective of the requirement. This special condition is intended to clarify the requirements of § 25.1439(a), that requires one PBE for each occupant of isolated, separate compartments; and § 121.337(b)(9)(iv), that requires a PBE for each required hand held fire extinguisher. As stated this requirement provides protection for each person engaged in fighting a fire.

Another request by this commenter addresses Special Condition No. 19. The commenter believes that the stowage areas in the entry vestibule should not be considered remote, and should be treated like similar compartments on the main deck such as a closet. The FAA disagrees, and this comment is not incorporated. The current statement

adequately states the objective of the requirement. All areas behind the overhead crew rest entry door are considered remote, the area is unoccupied during taxi, takeoff and landing, and the area is not required to be occupied during flight.

The Third Commenter

The third commenter requests that Special Condition No. 1 be revised as follows: “1: The occupancy of the overhead crew rest compartment is limited to the total number of installed bunks and seats in each compartment. There must be an approved seat or berth able to withstand the maximum flight loads when occupied for each occupant permitted in the overhead crew rest compartment. When being used for required flight crew rest, the maximum occupancy of the OFCR compartment is two. The maximum occupancy in the OFAR is twelve.”

The FAA disagrees and this comment is not incorporated. This issue should be covered during the Operational Evaluation and Approval as described in the preamble in the paragraph “Operational Evaluations and Approval.” The number of occupants in a specific phase of flight, such as when it is being used as a required flight crew rest, is an operational issue and is outside the scope of these special conditions. Also, these special conditions are for this specific project for an overhead crew rest and do not pertain specifically to either a Overhead Flight Crew Rest (OFCR) or an Overhead Flight Attendant Rest (OFAR), again, this is an operational issue is outside the scope of these special conditions.

The next comment concerns occupying the crew rest during taxi, takeoff, and landing. These special conditions do not cover occupancy during taxi, takeoff, and landing, therefore, this comment is not incorporated.

The commenter’s last request encompasses both Special Conditions No. 6 and 7. The commenter views the OFCR as being an extension of the flight deck. Except for emergency notifications, all communications to the OFCR should come from the flight deck. The FAA agrees and this comment is incorporated into Special Condition No. 6 to include provisions to provide only the relevant information to the flight crewmembers in the overhead crew rest. Special Condition No. 7 remains unchanged.

Applicability

As discussed above, these special conditions are applicable to Boeing Model 777 series airplanes. Should the