

Document Review Comment Log

Title of Document: AC 33.74/92-1B, Turbine Engine Continued Rotation and Rotor Locking	
Author:	Carlos Fernandes, 781-238-7189
Technical Writer/Editor:	John Donnell, 781-238-7181
Comments Disposition Date:	February 26, 2016

Commenter: • Complete Reviewing Office information and your Comments.						
Reviewing Office						
Organization:		Honeywell				
Comments Sent By:		- -				
Phone:		- -				
#	Name and Mail Stop	Page and Paragraph Number	Comment	Reason for Comment	Recommendation	Disposition/Response to Comment
1	- -	Page 4, 9.e.	Concern about addition of "These analysis techniques must be adequately validated by having demonstrated the capability"	There may be significant range of interpretation of what constitutes "validated by having demonstrated the capability"	Provide guidance on definition of "validated by having demonstrated the capability"	Now PARA 2.1.6.6 Agree. Added sentence to clarify guidance on validated analysis techniques.
2	- -	Page 4, 9.g.	Concern about addition of "should be validated"	There may be significant range of interpretation of what constitutes "should be validated"	Provide guidance on definition of "should be validated"	Now PARA 2.1.6.7 Agree. See description added under analysis methodologies.

Author:

Disposition the comments in the last column. Identify each disposition as:

- Agree;
- Partially Agree;
- Do Not Agree; or
- Outside of Scope (will consider in next change/revision).

Note: Provide enough explanation or justification to your comment disposition.

Substantive comments must be resolved and do not include the following unless they change the intent:

- correct grammar or sentence structure;
- correct term use
- simple text changes that clarify the intent, meaning, or to improve readability
- change in format/structure of the overall document

Note: Please forward editorial comments to the Tech Writer for resolution.

Commenter:

- Complete Reviewing Office information and your Comments.

Reviewing Office**Organization:** Williams International**Comments Sent By:** - -**Phone:** - -

#	Name and Mail Stop	Page and Paragraph Number	Comment	Reason for Comment	Recommendation	Disposition/Response to Comment
1	--	Page 3, Para. 8.b. Page 4, Para. 9.b.	These paragraphs refer to evaluation of unsafe conditions "as specified in 33.19(a)." The link to the 33.19(a) requirement is not necessary because the identified 33.75 paragraphs fully define the unsafe conditions to be considered.	14 CFR 33.74 specifically cites 14 CFR 33.75(g)(2)(i) through (vi) to define the unsafe conditions to be considered. Citing 33.19(a) as containing additional unsafe conditions to be considered seems to be beyond the scope of the rule text. Also, 33.19(a) and its related guidance material in AC 33-2C do not define any specific unsafe conditions, so reference to this paragraph does not provide clear guidance on the additional unsafe conditions to be considered.	Delete "Additionally, no other unsafe conditions should result from continued rotation, as specified in § 33.19(a)." from Para. 8.b. Delete "No other unsafe conditions should occur, as specified by § 33.19(a)." from Para. 9.b.	NOW PARA 2.1.5 & PARA 2.1.6.3 Agree. § 33.75 now includes failure of the engine mount system and other hazards referenced by § 33.74. Sentences referencing § 33.19(a) are deleted.
2	--	Page 4, Para. 9.a.	14 CFR 33.17(a) requires that the engine be designed and constructed to minimize the probability and spread of fire in normal operation and during failure conditions. AC 33.17-1A specifically identifies continued rotation as a failure condition that requires consideration.	Because the assessment of continued rotation is already addressed in AC 33.17-1A, the reference to 33.17 in this AC is not required.	Delete "The applicant should assess the applicable continued rotation conditions against the fire protection requirements of §§ 33.17 and 33.75." To further enhance the continued rotation discussion in AC 33.17-1A, suggest adding a statement to perform assessment of titanium rubbing during a continued rotation event.	NOW PARA 2.1.6.2 Do not agree. Fire hazard is a major concern for continued rotation; therefore it's prudent to reference the fire protection requirement of § 33.17. No change. Your suggestion to enhance AC 33.17-1A will be considered whenever it is up for revision.