

Federal Aviation Administration
Aviation Rulemaking Advisory Committee

Transport Airplane and Engine Issue Area
Engine Harmonization Working Group

Task 17 – Bird Ingestion

Task Assignment

[Federal Register: July 12, 1999 (Volume 64, Number 132)]
[Notices]
[Page 37579]
From the Federal Register Online via GPO Access [wais.access.gpo.gov]
[DOCID:fr12jy99-130]

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Federal Aviation Administration

Aviation Rulemaking Advisory Committee; Transport Airplane and
Engine Issues--New Task

AGENCY: Federal Aviation Administration (**FAA**), DOT.

ACTION: Notice of new task assignment for the Aviation Rulemaking
Advisory Committee (ARAC).

SUMMARY: Notice is given of a new task assigned to and accepted by the
Aviation Rulemaking Advisory Committee (ARAC). This notice informs the
public of the activities of ARAC.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Marc Bouthillier, Engine and Propeller
Standards Staff (ANE-110), 12 New England Executive Park, Burlington,
MA 01803; phone (781) 238-7111; fax (781) 238-7199.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

The **FAA** has established an Aviation Rulemaking Advisory Committee
to provide advice and recommendations to the **FAA** Administrator, through
the Associate Administrator for Regulation and Certification, on the
full range of the **FAA**'s rulemaking activities with respect to aviation-
related issues. This includes obtaining advice and recommendations on
the **FAA**'s commitment to harmonize its Federal Aviation Regulations
(FAR) and practices with its trading partners in Europe and Canada.

One area ARAC deals with is Transport Airplane and Engine Issues.
These issues involve the airworthiness standards for transport category
airplanes and engines in 14 CFR parts 25, 33, and 35 and parallel
provisions in 14 CFR parts 121 and 135.

The Task

This notice is to inform the public that the **FAA** has asked ARAC to
provide advice and recommendation on the following harmonization task:

Task 17: Bird Ingestion

Review the comments received in response to NPRM 98-19 and
recommend disposition of those comments. ARAC recommendations that do
not support the proposals may include supporting data as appropriate.

The **FAA** expects ARAC to forward its recommendation to the **FAA** by November 30, 1999. The **FAA** will consider this recommendation in the development of the final rule.

Contrary to the usual practice, the **FAA** has not asked ARAC as part of this task to develop a final draft of the next action (i.e., supplemental notice, final rule, or withdrawal); rather, ARAC should provide a document setting forth the rationale for the recommended disposition of each of the comments.

Working Group Activity

The Engine Harmonization Working Group is expected to comply with the procedures adopted by ARAC. As part of the procedures, the working group is expected to:

1. Recommend a work plan for completion of the task, including the rationale supporting such a plan, for consideration at the meeting of ARAC to consider transport airplane and engine issues held following publication of this notice.
2. Provide a status report at each meeting of ARAC held to consider transport airplane and engine issues.

The Secretary of Transportation has determined that the formation and use of ARAC are necessary and in the public interest in connection with the performance of duties imposed on the **FAA** by law.

Meetings of ARAC will be open to the public. Meetings of the Engine Harmonization Working Group will not be open to the public, except to the extent that individuals with an interest and expertise are selected to participate. No public announcement of working group meetings will be made.

Issued in Washington, DC, on June 28, 1999.

Brenda D. Courtney,
Acting Executive Director, Aviation Rulemaking Advisory Committee.
[FR Doc. 99-17648 Filed 7-9-99; 8:45 am]
BILLING CODE 4910-13-M

Recommendation Letter

Pratt & Whitney
400 Main Street
East Hartford, CT 06108



Action: ARM
Pratt & Whitney
A United Technologies Company

December 13, 1999

Department of Transportation
Federal Aviation Administration
800 Independence Ave, SW
Washington, D.C. 20591

Attention: Mr. Tom McSweeney, Associate Administrator for Regulation and Certification

Reference: ARAC Tasking, Federal Register, July 12, 1999, Task 17 Bird Ingestion

Dear Tom,

In accordance with the reference tasking statement, the ARAC Transport Airplane and Engine Issues Group is pleased to forward the attached report which provides ARAC recommendations for the disposition of comments to NPRM 98-19, Bird Ingestion. This report has been prepared by the Engine Harmonization Working Group of TAEIG.

Sincerely,

C. R. Bolt
Assistant Chair, TAEIG
Phone: 860-565-9348, Fax 860-557-2277, M/S 162-24
Email: boltcr@pweh.com

cc: Marc Bouthillier – FAA-NER
Judith Watson – FAA-NER
Jerry McRoberts – RR-Allison, EHWG Chair*
Kristin Larson – FAA-NWR*
Tony Fazio – ARM-1*
*(letter only)

Acknowledgement Letter

Ack
LTV
#17

FEB 10 2000

Mr. Craig R. Bolt
Aviation Rulemaking Advisory Committee
Pratt & Whitney
400 Main Street
East Hartford, CT 06106

Dear Craig:

Thank you for your December 13, 1999, letter transmitting disposition of certain comments addressing the Federal Aviation Administration's (FAA) notice of proposed rulemaking (NPRM) on bird ingestion. The NPRM, Notice No. 98-19, was published in the Federal Register, on December 11, 1998 (63 FR 68636).

The disposition of comments will be incorporated into the final rulemaking action, which will then will be reviewed and coordinated within the FAA and the Offices of the Secretary of Transportation and Management and Budget, if appropriate. The FAA is under a legal commitment to issue the rule by July 11, 2000.

At this time the FAA will close out task No. 17 assigned to the Engine Harmonization Working Group (EHWG). I would like to thank the Aviation Rulemaking Advisory Committee on Transport Airplane Engines Issues and, particularly, the EHWG for its action in completing the task.

Sincerely,

**Original Signed By
Margaret Gilligan**

Thomas E. McSweeny
Association Administrator for
Regulation and Certification

ARM-209:EUpshaw:fs:02/01/00:PCDOCS #11018 v1
cc: ARM-1/20/200/209; ANE-110
File # 1340.12
CONTROL NO. 20000163-0

TAL
ANE-110/FA

CONCURRENCES	
ROUTING SYMBOL	ARM-209
INITIALS/SIGNATURE	eu
DATE	2/1/00
ROUTING SYMBOL	ANE-110 MB
INITIALS/SIGNATURE	See Attached Grid
DATE	2-1-00
ROUTING SYMBOL	ANE-110 JW
INITIALS/SIGNATURE	JW
DATE	2-1-00
ROUTING SYMBOL	ANE-110
INITIALS/SIGNATURE	See Attached Grid
DATE	2-1-00
ROUTING SYMBOL	ARM-20
INITIALS/SIGNATURE	fh
DATE	2/2/00
ROUTING SYMBOL	ARM-200
INITIALS/SIGNATURE	Courtney
DATE	2/7/00
ROUTING SYMBOL	ARM-1
INITIALS/SIGNATURE	T.F.
DATE	2/7/00
ROUTING SYMBOL	AVR-1
INITIALS/SIGNATURE	mg
DATE	2/10/00

2/19

SEP 20 2004

Mr. Craig R. Bolt
Assistant Chair, Aviation Rulemaking
Advisory Committee
Pratt & Whitney
400 Main Street, Mail Stop 162-14
East Hartford, CT 06108

Dear Mr. Bolt:

This letter acknowledges receipt of several letters that you sent for the Aviation Rulemaking Advisory Committee (ARAC) on Transport Airplane and Engine (TAE) Issues.

Date of Letter	Description of Recommendation	Working Group
01/06/2003	Proposed rule and draft advisory material on bird ingestion capability (§ 33.76)	Engine Harmonization Working Group (HWG)
✓ 10/22/2003	Final report and position statements on bird strike requirements (§ 25.631)	General Structures HWG
10/22/2003	Final report and draft advisory material on alternative composite structure material (§ 25.603)	General Structures HWG
05/14/2004	Final report, proposed rule language, and draft advisory material on warning, caution, and advisory alerts installed in the cockpit (§ 25.1322)	Avionics Systems HWG
06/17/2004	Final report and draft advisory material on fire protection of flight controls, engine mounts and other flight structures (§ 25.865)	Loads and Dynamics HWG
06/22/2004	Final report, proposed rule, and draft advisory material on installed systems and equipment for use by the flight crew (§ 25.1302)	Human Factor HWG

I wish to thank the ARAC and the working groups for the resources that industry gave to develop these recommendations. The recommendations from the Avionics Systems HWG, the Human Factor HWG, and the Loads and Dynamics HWG will remain open until these working groups complete a Phase 4 review. The remaining recommendations have been closed, as we consider submittal of the reports as completion of the tasks. All of these recommendations will be placed on the ARAC website at <http://www.faa.gov/avr/arm/arac/index.cfm>.

We will continue to keep you apprised of our efforts on the ARAC recommendations and the rulemaking prioritization at the regular ARAC TAE issues meetings.

Sincerely,

Original Signed By
Margaret Gilligan

Nicholas A. Sabatini
Associate Administrator for Regulation
and Certification

cc: ARM-1/20/200/204/207; AIR-100, ANM-110
ARM-207:JLinsenmeyer:fs:8/12/04:PCDOCS # 21644
Control Nos. 20041855-0; 20041944-0; 20042001-0

Recommendation

ENGINE HARMONIZATION WORKING GROUP (EHWG)
RECOMMENDATIONS FOR DISPOSITION OF CERTAIN COMMENTS
TO THE BIRD INGESTION NPRM

The EHWG was tasked with providing recommendations for disposition of comments received on the NPRM for 33.76 Bird Ingestion Standards. The task group covered four significant subject areas for which comments were received. These subject areas are 1) the JAA NPA intermediate flocking bird requirement of JAR E 800 (b)(2); 2) the Critical Ingestion Parameter (CIP) tolerance bands; 3) high speed operations below 10,000 ft. altitude; and 4) the validity and completeness of the database, and the method which the data was utilized.

The EHWG recommends that the FAA disposition the NPRM comments which fall into these categories as follows:

1. JAA NPA Intermediate Flocking Bird Requirement JAR E 800 (b)(2):

There is a general EHWG understanding that this requirement, in some form, will be adopted into JAR E. JAA's stated objective is to ensure that new engines will have the same integrity as current in-service engines against this bird threat. There is also general agreement that both JAR E and FAR Part 33 should eventually be harmonized relative to this issue.

It is also noted that the proposed requirement in its current form has not been optimized for its stated purpose. Consequently it is recommended that FAR 33 should not incorporate this provision at this time. Therefore, FAA should agree to work with JAA and industry to further study the intermediate flocking bird threat in service, and develop a suitable requirement to replace the current NPA 12% unbalance criteria, and revise 33.76 in a future rulemaking effort as appropriate.

[Note: JAA will continue to require compliance with draft JAR E 800 (b)(2) for engine certification purposes, and will maintain this requirement within the NPA for bird ingestion standards.]

2. Critical Ingestion Parameter (CIP):

There was general agreement that a new definition and a new AC guidance paragraph are necessary to put the proper perspective on what a CIP is, and how it is utilized for certification test/compliance purposes.

It is recommended that the following new definition be incorporated into the AC:

“Critical Impact Parameter: A parameter used to characterize the state of stress, strain, deflection, twist, or other condition which will result in the maximum impact damage to the engine for the prescribed bird ingestion condition.”

It is recommended that the following new AC paragraph be incorporated into the AC:

“GENERAL:

XX. Critical Impact Parameter (CIP): The parameter is generally a function of such things as bird mass, bird velocity, fan/rotor speed, impact location, and fan/rotor blade geometry. The state of maximum impact damage to the engine is relative to the ability to meet the criteria of Section 33.76. The CIP for most modern turbofan engines is fan blade leading edge stress, although other features or parameters may be more critical as a function of operating conditions or basic design. For turboprop and turbojet engines, a core feature will most likely be the critical consideration. Regardless of engine design, the most limiting parameter should be identified and understood prior to any demonstration, as any unplanned variations in controlling test parameters will be evaluated for the effect on the CIP and 33.76 requirements.

(1) Example Considerations for Determining the CIP: For turbofan first stage fan blades, increasing the bird velocity or bird mass will increase the slice mass, and could shift the CIP from leading edge stress to blade root stress. For fan blades with part span shrouds, it may be blade deflection that produces shroud shingling and either thrust loss or a blade fracture that could be limiting. For unshrouded wide chord fan blades it may be the twist of the blade in the dovetail that allows it to impact the trailing blade resulting in trailing blade damage.

(2) CIP Tolerance: For certification tests, the CIP variation should not be greater than 10% as a function of any deviations in test plan controlling parameters."

3. High Speed Operations Below 10,000 ft. Altitude:

Overall consensus is that additional review outside the scope of this comment disposition phase will be necessary to completely evaluate the subject. Comments within EHWG ranged from a need to change the rule now to accommodate higher bird speeds, to a belief that the 200 kts. default is acceptable as is with no changes necessary. Therefore, EHWG recommends that the NPRM go forward retaining the 200 kts. default speed for large bird, and retain the criticality analysis approach for medium bird speed. It is also recommended that a new AC section be incorporated to help identify situations where the 200 kts. default speed for large bird may not provide for the desired level of evaluation for the identified CIP's (see proposed AC text below). It is also recommended that a future rulemaking study be initiated to review the basis for the large bird speed requirements within the current proposal. The basis for this recommendation is that the medium bird speed criticality analysis requirement is adequate with respect to current aircraft operations; that the 200 kts. large bird speed is appropriate for many designs; and

should be adequate until a further review of the large bird requirements is completed; and that the new AC section will make ACOs and Applicants aware of this potential issue."

EHWG recommends the following new AC paragraph be incorporated:

"The 200 kts. ingestion speed for the large bird requirement was selected as the optimum speed to accommodate, within a single demonstration, the various critical ingestion parameters (CIP) associated with typical turbofan engine designs currently in service. However, for a specific engine design, an aircraft speed other than 200 kts. may be more appropriate when considering the overall criteria of 33.76(b). Therefore, if the applicant identifies and substantiates that a bird speed other than 200 kts. is more conservative or more completely evaluates the proposed design, then the tests and analyses required under 33.76(b) may be conducted at that ingestion speed and be so noted in the certification documentation as an equivalent level of safety finding."

4. Data Base Issues:

EHWG general consensus is that, as a matter of near term need, all appropriate sources of data should be studied to 1) define the current bird threat (all sizes; larger flocking birds as top priority), and evaluate recent trends and consider reasonably predictable changes to the current threat; 2) take a closer look at flocking birds larger than those addressed by the current rule; and 3) evaluate the match between the 33.76 rule and the above reviews, and also determine whether the basic design of the rule was accomplished in the most appropriate manner. In summary, it is recommended that FAA work with industry and JAA to further study these issues and update the rule if necessary. It is also noted that the situation should be periodically assessed, using all appropriate data sources, so as to maintain a continued awareness of threats in service.

date: 20 OCT 99

FAA Action: Airworthiness Standards; Bird Ingestion; NPRM -- [FAA-1998-4815](#)
and Final rule -- [FAA-1998-4815](#)