

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