other products and other interested persons. Some of these rulemakings may result in very large additional energy savings and economic benefits.

Third, Department officials met with representatives of the Electronics Industry Association (EIA) to discuss options for the proposed standards on televisions. EIA reiterated comments made in its written submissions, and urged DOE to terminate the rulemaking with regard to televisions. EIA's arguments stressed that: the energy usage of an individual television is relatively small; standards could adversely affect the utility of the product; the large number of options make it difficult to design an efficiency standard; the proposed standard might have anti-competitive effects; and standards could interfere with the development of the information superhighway.

Fourth, DOE officials met with a representative of the American Council for an Energy Efficient Economy (ACEEE) concerning the proposed television standards. ACEEE acknowledged that further data collection may be needed before pursuing the rulemaking, but advised DOE to continue with efforts to collect the necessary information. ACEEE also indicated that televisions need not be a top priority of the appliance program. However, they urged DOE to hold the rulemaking in abeyance pending collection of further data rather than affirmatively terminating the rulemaking.

3. Discussion

DOE acknowledges that, as some of the comments argued, its engineering analysis in support of the proposed television standards did not consider the energy use of the large number of special features now available on many televisions. Remedying that defect would require DOE to engage in expensive and time consuming testing of television sets, and it is impossible to know whether the results of such testing would support the establishment of Federal energy efficiency standards. Additionally some of those special features would require modifications to the DOE test procedure in order to adequately measure the impact of the features on energy consumption. If DOE were to undertake such testing and possible test procedure modifications, it would expend limited resources on a project with less potential benefits than currently mandated EPCA rulemakings. Moreover, devotion of additional resources to setting television standards would make it very difficult to respond to the requests of companies in other industries that are subject to mandatory standards and that are pressing the Department to assign higher priority to completion of updated test procedure and standards rulemakings that they view as beneficial. In view of the limited funds likely to be available for implementing this program, the Department has decided that priority must be assigned to completion of mandatory rulemakings and not to this discretionary rulemaking.

Several comments claim that there is a significant risk that the prospect of standards could adversely affect ongoing fundamental changes in television technology and markets. These technology changes could have significant implications for the energy use of televisions, as well as for the range of communication, data processing, and other services provided by the televisions of the future and their associated electronic equipment. Some of the possible developments in television technology that could significantly affect their energy use include: high definition television, emergency broadcast features, virtual reality entertainment, built-in video cassette recorders, on screen program guides, and interactive information and communication features necessary for access to the National Information Infrastructure (the so-called ''information superhighway''). These changes in technology distinguish televisions from other covered products that, for the most part, are based on well-established, relatively stable technologies. The Department recognizes that technology and product developments continuing throughout the 1990's and into the next decade will be critical to the future success of the U.S. television industry. The Department further also recognizes that the development of Federal energy efficiency standards for televisions could adversely affect the willingness of private industry to invest in new technologies or products that might otherwise produce substantial economic benefits. The Department believes this risk, although not precisely quantifiable, could be significant.

Accordingly, in order to focus its resources on mandatory rulemakings and to avoid the risk of undue interference in the development of new technology and products critical to the Nation's future economic health and international competitive position, the Department today gives notice of the withdrawal of its proposed energy efficiency standards for televisions.

Issued in Washington, DC, June 20, 1995.

Christine A. Ervin,

Assistant Secretary, Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy.

[FR Doc. 95–15474 Filed 6–22–95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6450–01–P

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Federal Aviation Administration

14 CFR Part 39

[Docket No. 93–CE–21–AD]

Airworthiness Directives; Fairchild Aircraft SA226 and SA227 Series Airplanes

AGENCY: Federal Aviation Administration, DOT.

ACTION: Notice of proposed rulemaking (NPRM).

SUMMARY: This document proposes to revise AD 94–07–10, which currently requires the following on Fairchild Aircraft SA226 and SA227 series airplanes: repetitively inspecting (visually) the wing skin for cracks; dye penetrant inspecting the spar straps if the wing skin is found cracked; and, if any crack is found in the spar straps, repairing the spar straps and modifying the wing skin. That AD references an incorrect dye penetrant inspection when the wing skin is found cracked. This action would maintain the requirements of AD 94–07–10, but would incorporate the correct dye penetrant inspection for when the wing skin is found cracked. The actions specified by the proposed AD are intended to prevent failure of the wing skin at the top aft outboard corner of the battery box, which could result in structural damage to the wing.

DATES: Comments must be received on or before August 25, 1995.

ADDRESSES: Submit comments in triplicate to the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA), Central Region, Office of the Assistant Chief Counsel, Attention: Rules Docket No. 93–CE–21–AD, Room 1558, 601 E. 12th Street, Kansas City, Missouri 64106. Comments may be inspected at this location between 8 a.m. and 4 p.m., Monday through Friday, holidays excepted.

Service information that applies to the proposed AD may be obtained from Fairchild Aircraft, P.O. Box 790490, San Antonio, Texas 78279–0490; telephone (512) 824–9421. This information also may be examined at the Rules Docket at the address above.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Mr. Hung Viet Nguyen, Aerospace Engineer, FAA, Airplane Certification Office, 2601

Meacham Boulevard, Fort Worth, Texas 76137–0150; telephone (817) 222–5155; facsimile (817) 222–5960.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Comments Invited

Interested persons are invited to participate in the making of the proposed rule by submitting such written data, views, or arguments as they may desire. Communications should identify the Rules Docket number and be submitted in triplicate to the address specified above. All communications received on or before the closing date for comments, specified above, will be considered before taking action on the proposed rule. The proposals contained in this notice may be changed in light of the comments received.

Comments are specifically invited on the overall regulatory, economic, environmental, and energy aspects of the proposed rule. All comments submitted will be available, both before and after the closing date for comments, in the Rules Docket for examination by interested persons. A report that summarizes each FAA- public contact concerned with the substance of this proposal will be filed in the Rules Docket.

Commenters wishing the FAA to acknowledge receipt of their comments submitted in response to this notice must submit a self-addressed, stamped postcard on which the following statement is made: ''Comments to Docket No. 93–CE–21–AD.'' The postcard will be date stamped and returned to the commenter.

Availability of NPRMs

Any person may obtain a copy of this NPRM by submitting a request to the FAA, Central Region, Office of the Assistant Chief Counsel, Attention: Rules Docket No. 93–CE–21–AD, Room 1558, 601 E. 12th Street, Kansas City, Missouri 64106.

Discussion

AD 94–07–10, Amendment 39–8868 (59 FR 15329; April 1, 1994), currently requires the following on certain Fairchild Aircraft SA226 and SA227 series airplanes: repetitively inspecting (visually) the wing skin for cracks; dye penetrant inspecting the spar straps if the wing skin is found cracked; and, if any crack is found in the spar straps, repairing the spar straps and modifying the wing skin. That AD also provides the option of modifying the wing skin as terminating action for the repetitive inspections. Accomplishment of the required actions would be in accordance with the following service bulletins (SB), as applicable:

- Fairchild Service Bulletin (SB) 226–57–018, Issued: January 28, 1993, Revised: June 3, 1993 (pages 4 through 11 and 13 through 15), Revised: July 1, 1993 (page 12) and Revised: October 25, 1993 (pages 1 through 3);
- Fairchild SB 227–57–005, Issued: December 21, 1992, Revised: June 3, 1993 (pages 2 through 11 and 13 through 15), and Revised: July 1, 1993 (pages 1 and 12); or
- Fairchild Aircraft SB CC7–57–002, Issued: January 28, 1993, Revised: June 3, 1993 (pages 2 through 11 and 13 through 15), and Revised: July 1, 1993 (pages 1 and 12).

Since issuing that AD, the FAA has received reports that AD 94–07–10 references an incorrect dye penetrant inspection in the applicable service information. The FAA has determined that reference to this dye penetrant inspection should be corrected and incorporated into the AD.

After examining the circumstances and reviewing all available information related to the incidents described above, the FAA has determined that AD action should be taken to prevent failure of the wing skin at the top aft outboard corner of the battery box, which could result in structural damage to the wing.

Since an unsafe condition has been identified that is likely to exist or develop in other Fairchild Aircraft SA226 and SA227 series airplanes of the same type design, the proposed AD would revise AD 94–07–10 to require the same repetitive visual inspections, but require the dye penetrant inspection in accordance with the correct portion of the ACCOMPLISHMENT INSTRUCTIONS section of the above-referenced service bulletins, as applicable.

The FAA estimates that 776 airplanes in the U.S. registry would be affected by the proposed AD, that it would take approximately 1 workhour per airplane to accomplish the proposed visual inspection of the upper wing skin on both wings, and that the average labor rate is approximately $60 an hour. Based on these figures, the total cost impact of the AD on U.S. operators is estimated to be $46,560. This figure does not include the cost of any dye penetrant inspections of the spar strap that would be required if the wing skin is found cracked, nor does it include the cost of the wing skin modification or the repetitive inspections. The optional modification would terminate the need for the repetitive inspection requirement. The figure above is based upon the assumption that no affected airplane owner/operator has accomplished this inspection-terminating modification.

In addition, the proposed actions impose the same cost impact upon U.S. operators as is already required by AD 94–07–10.

The regulations proposed herein would not have substantial direct effects on the States, on the relationship between the national government and the States, or on the distribution of power and responsibilities among the various levels of government. Therefore, in accordance with Executive Order 12612, it is determined that this proposal would not have sufficient federalism implications to warrant the preparation of a Federalism Assessment.

For the reasons discussed above, I certify that this action (1) is not a ''significant regulatory action'' under Executive Order 12866; (2) is not a ''significant rule'' under DOT Regulatory Policies and Procedures (44 FR 11034, February 26, 1979); and (3) if promulgated, will not have a significant economic impact, positive or negative, on a substantial number of small entities under the criteria of the Regulatory Flexibility Act. A copy of the draft regulatory evaluation prepared for this action has been placed in the Rules Docket. A copy of it may be obtained by contacting the Rules Docket at the location provided under the caption **ADDRESSES**.

List of Subjects in 14 CFR Part 39

Air transportation, Aircraft, Aviation safety, Safety.

The Proposed Amendment

Accordingly, pursuant to the authority delegated to me by the Administrator, the Federal Aviation Administration proposes to amend part 39 of the Federal Aviation Regulations (14 CFR part 39) as follows:

PART 39—AIRWORTHINESS DIRECTIVES

1. The authority citation for part 39 continues to read as follows:

Authority: 49 U.S.C. App. 1354(a), 1421 and 1423; 49 U.S.C. 106(g); and 14 CFR 11.89.

§ 39.13 [Amended]

2. Section 39.13, is amended by removing AD 94–07–10, Amendment 39–8868 (59 FR 15329; April 1, 1994), and adding a new AD to read as follows:

Fairchild Aircraft: Docket No. 93–CE–21–AD; Revises AD 94–07–10, Amendment 39–8868.

Applicability: The following model and serial number airplanes, certificated in any category:

Model	Serial Nos.
SA226–T	T201 through T275, and T277 through T291.
SA226–T(B) ..	T(B)276, and T(B)292 through T(B)417.
SA226–AT	AT001 through AT074.
SA226–TC	TC201 through TC419.
SA227–TT	TT421 through TT541.
SA227–AT	AT423 through AT631, and AT695.
SA227–AC	AC406, AC415, AC416, and AC420 through AC789.
SA227–BC	BC420 through BC789.
SA227–CC ...	CC784, and CC790 through CC822.
SA227–DC ...	DC784, and DC790 through DC822.

Note 1: This AD applies to each airplane identified in the preceding applicability provision, regardless of whether it has been modified, altered, or repaired in the area subject to the requirements of this AD. For airplanes that have been modified, altered, or repaired so that the performance of the requirements of this AD is affected, the owner/operator must use the authority provided in paragraph (e) of this AD to request approval from the FAA. This approval may address either no action, if the current configuration eliminates the unsafe condition, or different actions necessary to address the unsafe condition described in this AD. Such a request should include an assessment of the effect of the changed configuration on the unsafe condition addressed by this AD. In no case does the presence of any modification, alteration, or repair remove any airplane from the applicability of this AD.

Compliance: Required initially upon the accumulation of 2,500 hours time-in-service (TIS) or within the next 100 hours TIS after the effective date of this AD, whichever occurs later, unless already accomplished (compliance with AD 94–07–10), and thereafter as indicated in the body of the AD.

To prevent failure of the wing skin at the top aft outboard corner of the battery box, which could result in structural damage to the wing, accomplish the following:

Note 2: The paragraph structure of this AD is as follows:

Level 1: (a), (b), (c), etc.
Level 2: (1), (2), (3), etc.
Level 3: (i), (ii), (iii), etc.

Level 2 and Level 3 structures are designations of the Level 1 paragraph they immediately follow.

(a) Visually inspect the right and left upper wing skin by the top aft outboard corner of the battery box for cracks in accordance with Figure 1 and the ACCOMPLISHMENT INSTRUCTIONS, A. Inspection, section of whichever of the following is applicable:

(1) Fairchild Service Bulletin (SB) 226–57–018, Issued: January 28, 1993, Revised: June 3, 1993 (pages 4 through 11 and 13 through 15), Revised: July 1, 1993 (page 12) and Revised: October 25, 1993 (pages 1 through 3);

(2) Fairchild SB 227–57–005, Issued: December 21, 1992, Revised: June 3, 1993 (pages 2 through 11 and 13 through 15), and Revised: July 1, 1993 (pages 1 and 12); or

(3) Fairchild Aircraft SB CC7–57–002, Issued: January 28, 1993, Revised: June 3, 1993 (pages 2 through 11 and 13 through 15), and Revised: July 1, 1993 (pages 1 and 12).

(b) If cracks are not found during the visual inspection required by paragraph (a) of this AD, within 500 hours TIS after this initial visual inspection, accomplish one of the following:

(1) Reinspect the right and left upper wing skin by the top aft outboard corner of the battery box for cracks in accordance with Figure 1 and the ACCOMPLISHMENT INSTRUCTIONS, A. Inspection, section of the applicable service information presented in paragraphs (a)(1), (a)(2), and (a)(3) of this AD, and reinspect thereafter at intervals not to exceed 500 hours TIS; or

(2) Modify the upper wing skin in accordance with the ACCOMPLISHMENT INSTRUCTIONS, B. Removal and C. Installation, section of the service information referenced in paragraphs (a)(1), (a)(2), or (a)(3) of this AD, as applicable. Accomplishing this modification terminates the repetitive visual inspections that are specified in paragraph (b)(1) of this AD, and the modification may be accomplished at any time to eliminate this repetitive inspection requirement.

(c) If cracks are found during the inspection required by paragraph (a) of this AD, prior to further flight, dye penetrant inspect the 27–31130 straps in the wheel wells as specified in the ACCOMPLISHMENT INSTRUCTIONS, A. Inspection section, paragraph (1)(b), of the service information referenced in paragraphs (a)(1), (a)(2), or (a)(3) of this AD, as applicable.

(1) If cracks are found in either of the 27–31130 straps during the inspection required by paragraph (c) of this AD, prior to further flight, accomplish the following:

(i) Repair the 27–31130 strap in accordance with a scheme obtained from the manufacturer through the Fort Worth Airplane Certification Office (ACO) at the address specified in paragraph (e) of this AD; and

(ii) Modify the upper wing skin in accordance with the ACCOMPLISHMENT INSTRUCTIONS, B. Removal and C. Installation, section of the service information referenced in paragraphs (a)(1), (a)(2), or (a)(3) of this AD, as applicable.

(2) If no cracks are found in either of the 27–31130 straps, within 150 hours TIS after the initial dye penetrant inspection required by paragraph (c) of this AD, accomplish one of the following:

(i) Reinspect (dye penetrant) the 27–31130 straps in the wheel well for cracks as specified in the ACCOMPLISHMENT INSTRUCTIONS, A. Inspection section, paragraph (1)(b), of the service information referenced in paragraphs (a)(1), (a)(2), or (a)(3) of this AD, as applicable, and if no cracks are found, continue to reinspect at intervals not to exceed 150 hours TIS; or

(ii) Modify the upper wing skin in accordance with the ACCOMPLISHMENT INSTRUCTIONS, B. Removal and C. Installation, section of the service information referenced in paragraphs (a)(1), (a)(2), or (a)(3) of this AD, as applicable. Accomplishing this modification terminates the repetitive dye penetrant inspections that are specified in paragraph (c)(2)(i) of this AD, and the modification may be accomplished at any time to eliminate this repetitive inspection requirement.

Note 3: Certain Limited Approved Repair (LAR) and Approved Repair Procedure (ARP) documents issued by Fairchild Aircraft specify procedures for accomplishing the same modification referenced in paragraphs (b)(2), (c)(1)(ii), and (c)(2)(ii). Check with the Fort Worth ACO at the address presented in paragraph (e) of this AD to find out which LAR's and ARP's are considered ''unless already accomplished'' as they relate to this AD.

(d) Special flight permits may be issued in accordance with sections 21.197 and 21.199 of the Federal Aviation Regulations (14 CFR 21.197 and 21.199) to operate the airplane to a location where the requirements of this AD can be accomplished.

(e) An alternative method of compliance or adjustment of the initial or repetitive compliance times that provides an equivalent level of safety may be approved by the Manager, Fort Worth ACO, FAA, 2601 Meacham Boulevard, Fort Worth, Texas 76137–0150. The request shall be forwarded through an appropriate FAA Maintenance Inspector, who may add comments and then send it to the Manager, Fort Worth ACO.

Note 4: Information concerning the existence of approved alternative methods of compliance with this AD, if any, may be obtained from the Fort Worth ACO.

(f) All persons affected by this directive may obtain copies of the documents referred to herein upon request to Fairchild Aircraft, P.O. Box 790490, San Antonio, Texas 78279–0490; or may examine these documents at the FAA, Central Region, Office of the Assistant Chief Counsel, Room 1558, 601 E. 12th Street, Kansas City, Missouri 64106.

(g) This amendment revises AD 94–07–10, Amendment 39–8868.

Issued in Kansas City, Missouri, on June 19, 1995.

Henry A. Armstrong,

Acting Manager, Small Airplane Directorate, Aircraft Certification Service.

[FR Doc. 95–15462 Filed 6–22–95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–13–U

DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT

Office of the Assistant Secretary for Housing-Federal Housing Commissioner

24 CFR Parts 206 and 234

[Docket No. FR–3655–P–01]

RIN 2502–AG23

Mortgage Insurance on Condominium Units in Non-FHA Approved Projects

AGENCY: Office of the Assistant Secretary for Housing-Federal Housing Commissioner (HUD).