AIA/ATA Air Transport Industry Alternate Proposal to NPRM 85–10

1. Introduction and summary.
February 27, 1986

The AIA and the ATA committee on December 19, 1985 to deliver an alternative proposal to NPRM 85–10 to the FAA by February 28, 1986. The alternative has been formulated and is described herein. The AIA and ATA have requested and received strong support and participation from IATA and European airframe manufacturers (Airbus Industrie, Fokker, and British Aerospace) in its development.

The FAA intent in NPRM 85–10 is effectively summarized in the cost-benefit analysis. It is "to upgrade the fire safety standards for cabins in transport category airplanes . . . using state-of-the-art materials." "Looking at today's state-of-the-art . . . the major support materials, when set with certain phenolic resins, will pass the flammability standards proposed in this NPRM. The technology required to pass the standards exists today. The major impact of the adoption of the proposal would be elimination of the use of certain materials and a change of resins." "It is not the intent of the FAA to require a new technology by these proposals."

In its responses to NPRM 85–10, the air transport industry (manufacturers and operators) has uniformly and consistently supported the FAA's intent. This position is emphasized by industry's having unilaterally applied improved safety standards as the state-of-the-art developed, and having systematically established requirements and objectives beyond existing regulatory standards.

The industry has also supported the general technical basis used for the NPRM. In 1980, the SAFER committee in its report to the FAA recommended heat release as the appropriate combustion parameter that should be explored for use in a new fire standard, and cited the OSU calorimeter as being (at the time) the only available test device designed to monitor heat release.

Industry analysis of the NPRM's specifics however identified several important deficiencies:

• While the FAA full-scale C–133 test results showed conclusive differences between generic panels containing phenolic resins that were judged "desirable" by the FAA and ones judged "less desirable" that contained epoxides, differences in results from the proposed OSU bench-scale heat release test are much smaller and in fact overlap. Thus the proposed OSU test cannot be used to distinguish between these materials.

• The proposed acceptance criteria were based solely on FAA tests of non-production "generic" panels. Industry test results on these panels and on production materials show that the proposed pass/fail limits must be increased by more than 50% to reflect the actual performance of "desirable" materials. The resulting criteria would eliminate the use of high heat release materials, but the overlap in OSU performance of "desirable" and "less desirable" materials would allow continued use of "less desirable" materials. The safety objectives cannot therefore be achieved by a rule based on the NPRM.

• According to industry data, the best state-of-the-art materials will not meet the pass/fail limits proposed in the NPRM. Industry could not comply with a final rule based on the NPRM.

• Owing to the complexity of the proposed test procedures and the length of time, special equipment, and highly trained personnel needed to perform them, the amount of testing that would be required for certification and quality control would be severely burdensome for both the airframe manufacturers and the materials suppliers if the test procedure were required to be applied to individual parts.

• The proposed 2-year compliance time for production airplanes cannot be achieved.

Our proposal avoids these problems. It represents a technically viable approach which, if adopted, would accomplish the intent of the NPRM in its entirety.

Our proposal does not contain a test for toxic gas release. Industry experience has shown that control of heat release and smoke emission to a great extent controls toxic gas emissions as well. The NPRM includes discussion of FAA full-scale C–135 tests that support this finding and the statement that "a satisfactory separate test for toxicity is not available".

[FR Doc. 86–16284 Filed 7–18–86; 8:45 am]
BILLING CODE 4910–13–M

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES

Food and Drug Administration

21 CFR Parts 335 and 369

[Docket No. 78N–036D]

Antidiarrheal Drug Products for Over-the-Counter Human Use; Tentative Final Monograph

Correction

In FR Doc. 86–9598 beginning on page 16138 in the issue of Wednesday, April 30, 1986, make the following corrections:

1. On page 16145, in the second column, Reference (2), third line, the third word should read "Lomotil® ", and in Reference (3), second line, "OBOO64" should read "OB0064";

2. On the same page, in the same column, in the paragraph designated "24.", in the tenth line, "and" should read "as", and in the twelfth line, "which" should read "when";

3. On page 16146, in the third column, in the paragraph designated "1", in the ninth line, "and" should read "to"; and

4. On page 16147, in the first column, in the first column of the table, sixth entry, "salo" should read "salol".

BILLING CODE 1505–01–M

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

40 CFR Part 799

[OPTS–42084B; FRL–3051–9]

Methylcyclopentane and Commercial Hexane; Proposed Test Rule; Extension of Comment Period

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

ACTION: Proposed rule; extension of comment period.

SUMMARY: EPA is extending the comment period for the proposed test rule on methylcyclopentane and commercial hexane. Extension of the comment period is necessary to allow industry additional time to better define the composition of commercial hexanes in current production and commerce and, in so doing, determine which manufacturers and processors should be subject to the final rule.

DATES: Written comments on the proposed rule should be submitted on or before September 15, 1986. Requests to make oral comments at a public meeting have already been submitted to the