DISPOSITION OF PUBLIC COMMENTS

POLICY MEMORANDUM NO. ANM-115-08-02, POLICY STATEMENT ON ACCESS TO AND OPENING OF TYPE III AND IV EXITS ON AIRPLANES WITH PASSENGER SEATING CAPACITIES OF 19 OR FEWER

Comments	Requested Change	FAA Responses to Comments
Commenter: GAMA		
GAMA provided the following comments: "This proposal contains a major shift in long standing regulatory interpretation and practice which is of a scale that can only be made through regulatory change. The two fundamental areas where GAMA believes the draft policy is flawed include: "- Assertion that placards are not an acceptable method of requiring passengers to follow safety instructions in aircraft which don't have a trained cabin attendant. "- Access to open an exit versus having unobstructed access to utilize the exit in aircraft with a capacity of 19 or less passengers."	The commenter asks the FAA to withdraw the proposed policy memorandum.	The FAA has always limited use of placards for demonstrating compliance with airworthiness requirements. An existing TAD memorandum, dated May 29, 1991 (PS-ANM100-1991-00024), set forth the policy that using placards and/or crew procedures to demonstrate exit access and openability is not acceptable. That memorandum may be accessed on the Internet at http://rgl.faa.gov. The May 29, 1991 memorandum states, "Interior features (galleys, closets, seats etc.) must not prevent an exit from being opened. For example, an adjustable seat that can translate into the exit opening such that the exit is not openable, is not acceptable. Procedural considerations, such as placarding the seat to be in a specific position for takeoff and landing, are not considered sufficient. Seats should have a positive design feature that prevents them from being moved into positions which render an exit unopenable." In regard to exit opening, the need to plan for emergencies has always been considered a necessary part of airplane certification. The Civil Air Regulations (CAR), which were the earliest rules governing American aviation, provided requirements to ensure rapid evacuation of an airplane in an emergency. They also provided requirements to ensure access to and opening of the airplane's exits, to ensure that rapid evacuation would be possible.

Comments	Requested Change	FAA Responses to Comments
		In 1965, the CAR 4b aircraft certification regulations were recodified into the current Title 14 Code of Federal Regulations (14 CFR) part 25. During the years between the initial recodification and now, the wording and organization of these emergency evacuation and exit access requirements have been changed somewhat, but their meaning and intent has remained the same for airplanes with passenger seating configurations of 19 or fewer. There was, however, a time requirement added to § 25.809 (the former CAR 4b.362(e)), in May, 1972. At that time, section 25.809 was revised at Amendment 25-32 to mandate that each emergency exit must be shown to be openable within 10 seconds. Section 25.813(c)(2)(ii) allows *"minor"* obstructions in the projected opening of Type III and IV exits on airplanes with 19 or fewer passengers. This is not allowed for airplanes with 20 or more passengers. However, the regulation states that minor obstructions are only allowed *if there are compensating factors to maintain the effectiveness of the exit*. The FAA has issued guidance on several occasions over the last 50 years to provide a better understanding of the types of configurations that may be considered to have minor obstructions with compensating features that maintain effectiveness of these exits. This guidance is replicated in the policy memorandum and provides examples that should be used as a baseline for determining compliance. Section 25.809 was revised at Amendment 25-32 to specify the amount of time in which each emergency exit must be capable of being opened. It states that emergency exits must be capable of being opened within 10 seconds, measured from the time when the

Comments	Requested Change	FAA Responses to Comments
		opening means is actuated to the time when the exit is fully opened. Before Amendment 25-32, the time in which an exit must be capable of being opened had not been codified in the airworthiness regulations. The predecessor regulations to § 25.809, however, in addition to the current § 25.809, do require the means of opening emergency exits to be *simple and obvious* and to *not require exceptional effort* of a person opening them. In order to meet these pre-Amendment 25-32 requirements, emergency exits should usually be capable of being opened in 10 seconds by persons either inside or outside the airplane. Exits that take more than 10 seconds to open may be acceptable if the means of opening are simple and obvious and if it does not require exceptional effort to open the exit. Any case involving an emergency exit that takes more than 10 seconds to open should be brought to the attention of the Transport Standards Staff. Note that the time to open an exit is just one factor that should be considered in demonstrating compliance with these requirements. For example, § 25.803 provides a related, but independent, requirement that expresses the intent that the emergency means allow rapid evacuation. It states the following: *Each crew and passenger area must have emergency means to allow rapid evacuation in crash landings, with the landing gear retracted, considering the possibility of the airplane being on fire.* Additionally, a survey of Aircraft Certification Offices (ACO) by the Transport Airplane Directorate (TAD) Standards Staff has established that, generally, seats have been placed in their most adverse configuration and location when exits are being evaluated for openability. This is consistent with current guidance.

Comments	Requested Change	FAA Responses to Comments
		That survey, however, uncovered non-standardized approaches to evaluating exit accessibility. When evaluating exit accessibility, the majority of evaluators place the seat in the most adverse position, as is done when evaluating exit openability. Some evaluators, however, place the seat in a position as noted on a placard (so-called take-off and landing position). This latter practice is not in keeping with the intent of the regulation. Section 25.813 is principally involved with ensuring that access is provided to exits. Since access to the exit is moot if the exit cannot be opened, prior guidance focused on openability. At the same time it must be acknowledged that the safety intent of the regulation is not addressed if, even though passengers would be able to open an exit, they cannot get to it. Previous guidance presumed that sufficient access would be provided when the position of the seat in its most adverse position permitted the exit to be opened. Therefore, there was no need for explicit guidance for exit accessibility. Unfortunately, some designs have been found that, with the seat placed in the most adverse position, allow the exit to be opened but do not allow access to the exit. Therefore, it is necessary and appropriate to provide the explicit guidance in this policy memorandum.
_____	_____	_____
"The assertions that without a trained cabin attendant, safety placards can not be relied upon is contrary to past practice and policy and while examples		As noted above, the FAA has historically limited use of placards requiring passenger actions for demonstrating compliance with airworthiness requirements. We consider it appropriate to also restrict their use in this

Comments	Requested Change	FAA Responses to Comments
of non-compliance by passengers can be found they are the exception."		case. This policy memorandum provides several reasons why placards and/or crew procedures are not appropriate for demonstrating compliance with the exit access and exit opening regulations. Following are some reasons why placards and/or crew procedures are not appropriate for demonstrating compliance with the exit access and exit opening regulations. See the policy memorandum to understand additional reasons. - During a flight with less than a full passenger complement, someone may sit in a seat, adjust it to a comfortable position that blocks the exit, and then, before landing, get up and move to another seat. In this likely scenario, when the seat must be reconfigured before landing, there may not be anyone in the seat to read and follow the placarded instructions. The same type of passenger movement around the cabin during flight may also negate the effectiveness of flightcrew announcements. If a seat is blocking the exit, but no one is sitting in it, it is likely that no one will get out of their own seat to adjust an empty one when a flightcrew announcement to properly configure the seat is made. - Passengers may ignore a flightcrew announcement or placarded instructions to configure their seats for taxi, take-off, or landing because the required configuration is uncomfortable (see the Relevant Past Practice section of the policy memorandum). They may also simply forget to follow the instructions. Additionally, passenger seats are not directly controllable by the cabin crew (when there is a cabin crew) and, unlike galleys or other interior

Comments	Requested Change	FAA Responses to Comments
		features, passenger seats are susceptible to passengers' actions after the crew has completed their preparatory duties.
"The assumption of this proposed policy, that it must be assumed that features such as seats are not in a takeoff and landing position when safety instructions require them to be that way, would prohibit the features and options which have been utilized safely on thousands of general aviation products. In the community of general aviation, passengers must follow safety placards of all types and the pilot in charge must assure they do so. GAMA strongly disagrees with the FAA's statements which indicate otherwise. "With regard to exit access, there has always been a clear distinction between the requirements for cabins which have capacities for more than 19 passengers and those for 19 or less passengers. This lower passenger density results in significant safety advantages with respect to evacuation and therefore all previous guidance and policy has permitted various interior configurations provided the exit can be opened in those configurations. There has been maintained in regulation and policy a clear distinction	GAMA requests that the FAA retract the policy memorandum.	These comments have been responded to above.

Comments	Requested Change	FAA Responses to Comments
between the requirement for large airplanes (unobstructed access to utilize the exit) and that of small airplanes (access to open the exit). Obviously the exit must be usable in smaller aircraft as well however as a result of much lower passenger densities, the same degree of overall safety can still be attained even with a lesser degree of accessibility (this concept is well documented in the regulatory background)."		
"GAMA insists the FAA reevaluate this major shift in policy which is unnecessary and inappropriate for the type of aircraft being address, GAMA believes the proposal should be retracted."		As explained above, this policy memorandum is consistent with existing guidance.
"Passenger Safety Instructions: "It is not acceptable to summarily dismiss the effectiveness and the necessity of passenger safety instructions simply because there is no trained cabin attendant. "		This comment has been responded to above.
"Safety instructions to the passengers, whether in verbal or placard form, assure that the passengers themselves		As noted above, the FAA has previously found cases where use of placards to provide passenger instructions to ensure part 25 compliance is acceptable

Comments	Requested Change	FAA Responses to Comments
have the information necessary to utilize those features provided on the aircraft in the safest manner. While the final responsibility for compliance to these instructions falls upon the pilot in command (§91.3), the passengers also maintain a great degree of responsibility to follow the safety requirements. There are infinite examples where the safety of the passengers is reliant upon their following safety instructions (seat belt use, baggage location, no smoking, carriage of materials, use of portable electronic devices, seated during takeoff and landing, etc.). It is inappropriate for the FAA to propose to dismiss these responsibilities at the expense of those features and amenities which add to comfort and can be used completely safety when used as clearly instructed. Such a categorization of placards would set an incorrect precedent in policy which would have an unacceptable effect in a growing number of areas. “		and cases where their use is unacceptable. These examples are documented in existing guidance. This policy memorandum is very specific. It only addresses use of placards or crew instructions for demonstrating compliance with the part 25 exit access and opening requirements. It clearly explains the reasons placards or crew instructions are not appropriate and not acceptable for this specific case. It also describes an accident that supports this position.
“Additionally in general aviation, when no cabin attendant is present, we rely upon the pilot in command to exercise his responsibility (§91.3) to assure all safety instructions are followed by the passengers. Despite the proposed policy’s statement that this places additional burden on the crew member,		The policy memorandum provides several reasons why placards and crew procedures are not acceptable for demonstrating compliance with the exit access and exit opening requirements of CAR 4b and part 25. It also relates the accident investigation findings for a recent accident that demonstrates that placards cannot be relied upon to ensure that safety objectives of the exit access and exit opening rules are met. The FAA

Comments	Requested Change	FAA Responses to Comments
there is regular and long standing practice over the history of aviation where this occurs. All of the arguments presented in the proposed policy which dispute that placards are unreliable were addressed in rulemaking activities when cabin attendant requirements were established. It is not appropriate for policy to redefine these relationships. "Further, there is long-standing FAA policy and practice which re-enforces the acceptability of placards and pilot instruction to passengers in assuring safe configuration. At its roots this is evidenced by the very presence of takeoff and landing placards. These takeoff and landing position placards are commonly used to assure that: "- Seats are in the position to assure the safest egress from the aircraft "- Seats are in a position which has been demonstrated to withstand emergency landing loads "- Baggage is stowed in a manner which retains them in a safe location during emergency landing loads "- Passengers wear their safety belts		considers the policy memorandum to be appropriate.

Comments	Requested Change	FAA Responses to Comments
"- Certain areas are not occupied during takeoff and landing "If as the policy contends, the majority of industry practice and previous policy did not utilize these placards, there would be no need for them and they would not exist." _____ "FAA guidance and policy throughout various amendment levels recognize the use of these placards for exit access. Reference FAA AC 25-17, *Transport Airplane Cabin Interiors Crashworthiness Handbook*, paragraph 411., b., (2), (viii) which states: *Galley and stowage unit doors, drawers, etc., that interfere with the opening of an emergency exit should be spring-loaded closed. The evaluation for interference is made with the stowage unit door in any position and opening the emergency exit from either the inside or the outside. If it is not possible to spring load the door, drawer, etc., there should be a special emphasis placard to close the latch for taxi, takeoff, and landing.* "Clearly there is longstanding policy and practice which allows for the utilization of takeoff and landing	_____	_____ The FAA accepts use of placards in certain cases, but does not find their use appropriate for demonstrating compliance with the exit access and exit opening requirements. The policy memorandum provides an explanation. This comment is addressed in more detail above.

Comments	Requested Change	FAA Responses to Comments
placards for a multitude of purposes including compliance to § 25.813."		
"The FAA's proposed statement which indicates that an exit must be free of obstruction in any interior configuration is not representative of current practice nor policy nor regulatory evolution. Current practice, policy and regulation requires that an exit can be opened with all interior configurations while taxi, takeoff and landing position can be relied upon for assuring access for exiting the aircraft."		Section 25.813(c)(ii) allows "minor" obstructions for airplanes with passenger seating configurations of 19 or fewer. The policy memorandum and the response to GAMA's first comment explain that the guidance in the policy memorandum is appropriate and is consistent with other existing guidance.
"Access to Open Exits: "It is important for the FAA to recognize that the limited available cabin space in smaller transport category airplanes significantly reduces the designer's options for providing the amenities expected in this type airplane while at the same time always maintaining access to Type III and IV emergency exits. In assessing the compensating factors, as allowed by § 25.813(c)(2)(ii), FAA should recognize that the reduced number of passengers inherently provides a significant benefit in egress time. These facts have been previously acknowledged by regulation, policy and past practice."		The part 25 exit access requirements are less stringent for airplanes with passenger seating configurations of 19 or fewer. For these airplanes, minor obstructions are allowed in the projected opening of the exit if compensating factors are present to maintain the effectiveness of the exit. The FAA agrees that a reduced number of passengers may provide a benefit to egress time. On the other hand, there are other factors to consider with regard to evacuation, such as the overall cabin layout, number and location of emergency exits and associated signage, number of trained attendants (if required), etc.

Comments	Requested Change	FAA Responses to Comments
"The regulations for aircraft with seating capacities for more than 19 passengers differ significantly from those for aircraft with seating capacities of 19 or less passengers. The larger capacity airplanes must assure unobstructed access to the exit while the lower capacity aircraft, referenced by the proposed policy, permits obstructions provided there are compensating factors. In addition to very low passenger densities compared the relative number of exits, appropriate takeoff and landing configuration has been utilized by the FAA as a compensating factor."		The Background and Relevant Past Practice section of the policy memorandum explains that some evaluators have previously accepted use of placards for determining compliance with the exit access requirements when they should not have. This policy memorandum is being issued to inform evaluators of existing guidance on this issue and its intent. It is also being issued to ensure appropriate compliance findings in the future. This policy memorandum is consistent with existing guidance and considered appropriate.
"There have been numerous equivalent levels of safety (ELOS) to § 25.813(e) granted which allow the use of sliding doors for lavatories which can be occupied during takeoff and landing. These ELOS require an instructional placard to secure the door in the open position during takeoff and landing as well as an annunciator notification of door configuration. "There are also many examples of the use of a placard alone for less obtrusive features such as swivel seats and berths."		The safety issues and considerations associated with using placards to control the position of lavatory doors for equivalent safety findings and to control other "less obtrusive features" are different than those associated with their use to ensure compliance with the exit access and exit opening requirements. The safety issues relating to using placards and crew procedures are explained in the background section of the policy memorandum and in response to the first comment. Note the following points in regard to the equivalent safety findings that allow a door on a lavatory that is occupied during taxi, take-off and landing: - The lavatory door is required to be frangible by a 5th

Comments	Requested Change	FAA Responses to Comments
_____ "Existing policy and past practice has set into place that these compensating factors are the assurance that the exit can be opened with cabin features in any position and minimal obstruction to access with cabin features in the takeoff and landing position. There have been no new developments which would create a need for change to this long standing policy. The proposed policy would have a tremendously negative effect on business aircraft as it is contrary to past practice and policy. "FAA assertions regarding the usage of placards and the requirements for exit access differ significantly from those which have existed for decades."	_____	percentile female. Exits and interior furnishings are not frangible. - Only one passenger is allowed to occupy the lavatory. An obstructed lavatory door would not affect evacuation of the entire airplane. Blocking of the only exit on one side of the airplane could. _____ The policy memorandum and above responses to comments explain how the guidance in the policy memorandum is consistent with existing guidance. Regarding the comment on "new developments," the policy memorandum discusses an accident that occurred in February 2005 as an example of the safety issues associated with using a placard to ensure proper exit access and openability. A placard on the airplane indicated that an armrest/cabinet must be removed before each take-off and landing. Passengers did not follow the instructions on the placard. The accident report by Transport Safety Board of Canada noted that the armrest of the side seat had not been removed as required and was blocking access to the emergency exit. One of the passengers tried unsuccessfully to open the emergency door. The passenger was unable to open the door and was required to exit through the forward door. This resulted in a delay of the passenger evacuation.
Commenter: Doug Helton		
Mr. Doug Helton provided the following comments:		The FAA agrees that placards should not be used in this case.

Comments	Requested Change	FAA Responses to Comments
"Current practices are more than adequate. More placards won't help. As a passenger with plenty of experience, the airlines are very attentive to ensuring people in the seats are qualified, the egress paths are clear during all but en route operations and that seats are not able to recline if they will extend into egress pathways. New placards will just add cost without improving safety in any way."		
Commenter: Embraer		
Embraer provided the following comments: "It is important to recognize that the limited available cabin space in smaller transport category airplanes significantly reduces the designer's options for providing the amenities expected in this type airplane while at the same time always maintaining access to Type III and IV emergency exits. In assessing the compensating factors, as allowed by §25.813(c)(2)(ii), FAA should recognize that the reduced number of passengers inherently provides a significant benefit in egress time. " _____	_____	This same comment was provided by GAMA and has been responded to above. _____

Comments	Requested Change	FAA Responses to Comments
"In addition, the FAA should consider the following type design features as providing (either singly or together) sufficient compensating factors to satisfy the requirement: "- An advisory CAS message to the flight crew in the flight deck will warn them that seats or any interior features in the passenger cabin are not in the taxi, take-off and landing positions. This warning message will allow the flight crew to monitor the cabin and it will not diminish the effective accomplishment of the crew duties, as they will be seated in their duty station. Moreover, a flight crew announcement could reinforce the necessity to passengers to configure their seats to TTL positions. This, in concept, is similar to the currently acceptable method to control the position of aisle way doors, and the way some manufacturers monitor access to baggage compartments. "- Instead of using placards, passengers could receive the information through the passenger advisory signs in the cabin, visible to all passengers when seated. The lighted signs followed by an audible sign will make the passengers aware to follow the crew's direction."		The policy memorandum explains why crew procedures and placards are not acceptable for demonstrating compliance with the part 25 exit access and exit opening requirements. The commenter's proposed methods do not address the safety issues explained in the policy memorandum. The commenter states that using an advisory CAS message to notify the flightcrew is similar to what has been found acceptable for controlling the position of interior doors that separate passenger compartments. This is not a valid comparison for the following reasons: - The advisory CAS message notification is accepted as a condition of an exemption (which might allow a lower level of safety than provided by compliance with the rule.) - The exemption does not allow the airplane to be operated for hire or for common carriage. - The exemption requires the interior to be frangible to maintain access. Interior furnishings and exits are not frangible. - The advisory CAS message is only one of several limitations that allow granting of the exemption.

Comments	Requested Change	FAA Responses to Comments
Commenter: Gulfstream		
Gulfstream provided the following comments: "The following is provided as a baseline to the interpretation of specific seat placement adjacent to emergency exits. Gulfstream current designs comply by including design features, such as swivel locks or limit travel, which meet most of this draft policy. In addition, each compliance inspection conducted tracks the seat to the worst case position before the exit is removed. However several items will need more clarification or rewording. "- §§ 25.561(d) and 25.562(c8) states that seat deformation from static and dynamic forces must not impede egress. "Gulfstream requests clarification if the FAA's intent of this policy is to consider seat deformation for a position other than the Taxi, Take-off and Landing (TT&L) position. If this is the intent then this policy will have a major impact to the business jet seating arrangements and almost all current allowable floor-plans. "This requirement is a major change to previously accepted compliance methods for seat placement in aircraft. Such a major or critical change should	Gulfstream requests clarification about whether the FAA's intent for this policy is to consider seat deformation for a position other than the taxi, take-off and landing position.	Providing guidance to §§ 25.561(d) and 25.562(c)(8) is beyond the scope of this policy memorandum. However, the intent of the policy memorandum is not to require consideration of seat deformations for positions other than taxi, take-off and landing.

Comments	Requested Change	FAA Responses to Comments
not be done without proper rulemaking being considered with all the appropriate justifications for change and public comment periods being performed.		
"- Although worded a few different ways throughout this document, it states that crew procedures or placards that specify a required TT&L configuration are not sufficient to ensure access to, or openability of, ...". "Gulfstream is concerned that this "not sufficient" statement has the potential to become expanded to a larger scale. For example: placards are currently required to meet aisle width of § 25.815, for access. In addition, a Gulfstream exemption to 25.813(e), require placards and cockpit warnings for mid cabin doors. This one, in particular, is a contrast to existing FAA "standards" for this type of exemption that require placards and cockpit warnings for the door system. "		The policy memorandum very clearly identifies its applicability. It applies to the part 25 exit access and exit opening requirements. Other existing FAA guidance materials and exemptions provide guidance and our views on the use of placards and cockpit warnings related to § 25.813(e) and § 25.815.
"The proposed policy introduces the argument that due to no flight attendant required; passengers may ignore placards and not reposition seats to the TT&L configuration. Gulfstream contends that it is not		The policy memorandum explains several reasons why placards and crew procedures are not acceptable for ensuring compliance with the exit access and exit opening requirements. These reasons are not based on a flight attendant being onboard. The FAA considers the policy memorandum to be appropriate

Comments	Requested Change	FAA Responses to Comments
reasonable to allow passengers to ignore placard requirements and still meet all safety and certification requirements. What if they don't wear seatbelts? What if the seat is in a rotated and tracked position that does not meet crashworthiness requirements? What if loose items of mass are all over the cabin? A passenger could sit in one seat, reposition it to non TT&L configuration and then sit in a different seat for the actual TT&L portion of the flight. What if.....? “		and consistent with existing guidance.
“Gulfstream recommends that this policy include provisions for Part 135 operations that carry a flight attendant. These airplane configurations should be allowed to have seats that track into an egress path but are positioned for TT&L as verified by the on-board flight attendant. The flight attendant would become a condition of approval for this type of configuration. This approach is similar to Part 121 operations having flight attendants that verify proper position for seat backs, tray tables, overhead bins, etc. “Additionally the FAA should provide a means for TT&L positions to be vacant provided means are taken to ensure that critical seats are in the proper		See the responses to comments above regarding flight attendants and crew indication. The policy memorandum discusses an accident that occurred in February 2005 as an example of the safety issues associated with using a placard to ensure proper exit access and openability. A placard on the airplane indicated that an armrest/cabinet must be removed before each take-off and landing. Passengers did not follow the instructions on the placard. The accident report by Transport Safety Board of Canada provides the following “Finding as to Risk”: “The armrest of the side seat had not been removed as required and was blocking access to the emergency exit, which could have delayed the evacuation, with serious consequences.”

Comments	Requested Change	FAA Responses to Comments
position, either through crew indication or in the case of operations with flight attendants as noted above. “Gulfstream’s overall position is that either the seat will be positioned in an appropriate TT&L position, or can be moved to such a position in order to provide an unobstructed egress path. Gulfstream proposes that the FAA provide tangible industry evidence supporting the inferred position to eliminate translating, rotating, and/or reclining seats in an exit window area. Gulfstream further contends that this draft policy if adopted as currently written constitutes rulemaking through policy without due process.”		See the above responses to comments which explain that the proposed policy memorandum is not “rulemaking through policy” but is consistent with existing guidance and appropriate.
Commenter: Imran		
The commenter stated the following: “This appears to be an attempt to regulate something that is covered by existing regulations already. It also likely means more expensive manufacturing or lesser usable/passenger space in smaller passenger planes. “The whole proposal states in several places that the seat in its "adverse position" should be push-able to a position that makes the exit accessible using about 35 lbs.		The FAA is not proposing to change the regulations. The background section of the policy memorandum explains the need for issuing this policy memorandum.

Comments	Requested Change	FAA Responses to Comments
"So, if the adversely positioned seat can be pushed by (a) person(s) who can reach out to and open the exit, then why is there a need to change the regulations?"		
Commenter: Michael Lieblich		
Mr. Michael Lieblich provided the following comments: "Please consider that often times the seats in the interior of transport category airplanes with 19 or less passenger are not rigidly attached and fixed. The seat base can often times track one to ten or more inches along seat tracks. The seat above the base often times has the ability to slide fore-aft (three to eight inches), sideward (three to six inches), and rotate 360 degrees. The seat back can often times recline to horizontal with a foot rest extended. These type of seats have been installed in executive class interiors (transport category airplanes with 19 or less passenger) for years. "14 CFR 25.815 sets minimum aisle width requirements at any point between seats. It is FAA policy that this rule applies only during the taxi, takeoff and landing phases of flight where placards are an acceptable means of assuring that this rule is being met during these critical phases of flight. Draft policy memo ANM-115-		The intent of this policy memorandum is to specifically address the exit access and exit opening requirements for transport airplanes with 19 or less passenger seats. The FAA has addressed the use of placards for meeting the aisle width requirements of § 25.815 in memorandum 99-115-24, dated November 24, 1999. That memorandum indicates that use of placards for meeting § 25.815 is only allowed on executive airplanes. The reasons for this limited allowance do not apply to the exit access and exit opening requirements.

Comments	Requested Change	FAA Responses to Comments
08-02 states on page 7, “The following are some reasons why placards are not acceptable for ensuring access to, or openability of, Type III and IV exits:” This statement seems to apply directly to 14 CFR 25.815 where surely part of the intent of the rule is to permit rapid egress and that access shall not be obstructed by seats.”		