

From: Bates, George
To: Inada, Brian T; Marnemoto, Eileen E; DeJager, Alan; Fay, Dennis M
CC: Loukusa, Steven M; Johnson, Richard A
Sent: 10/26/2007 3:10:55 PM
Subject: RE: Toxicity??

No, I have not been signing for Toxicity other than to make sure my parts have MI numbers. Hydraulic Mist is another toxic product I refuse to get involved with even though our respirator filters have the capability to coalesce the mist. Further, the situation has not changed from what Brian has described.

I will add the Propulsion folks do not account or certify the bleed air quality they feed to us. For the 747-8, John Elyns was the most recent to try to get the Propulsion folks to step up to owning their system by-products. All he got was the run around like I got in 2000 for the 767-400. Pratt & Whitney has some guarantees in their spec but GE and Rolls Royce engine specs do not mention bleed air quality when it comes to CO/CO2 or Hydromarbon by-products. The Engine Specs are the hole no one has addressed.

Given the number of OOSF events for the 757 / RB211-535C & -535E engines resulting from failed Fan and Forward IPC Bearing Oil Seals allowing oil by-products in the bleed ducts, I would have thought the FAA would have forced the issue. With all diversions (about 1 every 2 weeks) and Return to Base events due to Haz in the Cabin, I would have thought the FAA would have made the Engine Manufacturers address this by now. Some of the 757 events have been pretty significant in that the crew reported blue smoke with defined waves in the smoke. The visibility was limited so that the attendants in the aft galley could not see to the mid cabin over-wing exits. This is more than a light haze that we debate endlessly about for smoke evacuation. Who knows what the by-products are in hot synthetic Turbine Oil. The Material Data Sheet has warnings about skin contact and breathing the fumes of the oil, let alone the complication of partial combustion products.

The 767 / GE CF6-80A and 747 / GE CF6-80X airplane and engine combinations are better than Rolls Royce as far as frequency, but it still happens. The thing to note is the wide body events are no where as severe or dense as the 757 has experienced. The common theme is these are mostly old engines more than 15 years old. While SACO has informally discussed with me the widebody events, the thing I took away from the FAA/SACO discussion is the New England FAA is not interested in following up or supporting SACO on these events that are generally resulting from out of production engines. Bottom line is I think we are looking for a tombstone before anyone with any horsepower is going to take interest.

Thank you,
George Bates
Boeing Environmental Controls
Wide Body Lav/Galley Vent, Cargo Cond / 767 Air Dist Cert
Office Phone: (425) 294-6996
Fax: (425) 294-7434
M/S DT-29

-----Original Message-----

From: Inada, Brian T
Sent: Friday, October 26, 2007 10:54 AM
To: Marnemoto, Eileen E; DeJager, Alan; Fay, Dennis M; Bates, George
Cc: Loukusa, Steven M; Johnson, Richard A
Subject: RE: Toxicity??

We specifically limited the coverage for failures & malfunctions to
It didn't look like we had