

Administration (FAA), Central Region, Office of the Assistant Chief Counsel, Attention: Rules Docket No. 94-CE-22-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 (210) 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 76193-0150; telephone (817) 222-5155; facsimile (817) 222-5959.

**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. 94-CE-22-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. 94-CE-22-AD, Room

1558, 601 E. 12th Street, Kansas City, Missouri 64106.

**Discussion**

AD 93-19-06, Amendment 39-8705 (58 FR 51771, October 5, 1993), currently requires repetitively inspecting acrylic cabin and cockpit side windows for cracks on certain Fairchild Aircraft SA26, SA226, and SA227 series airplanes, and, if cracks are found that exceed certain limitations, replacing that window.

Since issuance of AD 93-19-06, the FAA has received several incident reports of cockpit side window failures on the affected airplanes in compliance with that AD.

After examining the circumstances and reviewing all available information related to the action referenced above including the referenced incident reports, the FAA has determined that (1) A modification should be incorporated on cockpit side windows that do not have inner window panes; (2) the crack limitations specified in AD 93-19-06 should coincide with the applicable service information; and (3) AD action should be taken to prevent acrylic cockpit or cabin side window failures, which, if not detected and corrected, could result in airframe damage and decompression injuries.

Since an unsafe condition has been identified that is likely to exist or develop in other Fairchild Aircraft SA26, SA226, and SA227 series airplanes of the same type design, the proposed AD would supersede AD 93-19-06 with a new AD that would maintain the repetitive inspection requirements of AD 93-19-06, and add the modification referenced above. The proposed modification would be accomplished in accordance with the following service bulletins (SB), as applicable:

Fairchild SB 26-56-10-045, which incorporates the following table of effective pages:

Page Nos.	Date
3, 4, 5, and 9 .....	Revised: December 1, 1994.
1, 2, 6, 7, 8, and 10 through 14.	Issued: August 11, 1994.

Fairchild SB 226-56-005, which incorporates the following table of effective pages:

Page Nos.	Date
3 through 7, and 9 ...	Revised: December 1, 1994.
1, 2, and 8 .....	Revised: August 11, 1994.
10 through 16 .....	Issued: July 31, 1991.

and Fairchild SB 227-56-005, which incorporates the following table of effective pages:

Page Nos.	Date
3 through 7, and 9 ...	Revised: December 1, 1994.
1, 2, and 8 .....	Revised: August 11, 1994.
10 through 16 .....	Issued: July 31, 1991.

The proposed repetitive inspections would be accomplished in accordance with the following SB's, as applicable:

- Fairchild SB 226-56-001, Issued: February 2, 1983; Revised: November 26, 1991.
- Fairchild SB 227-56-001, Issued: February 2, 1983; Revised: November 26, 1991.
- Fairchild SB 226-56-002, Issued: March 3, 1983; Revised: May 29, 1992.
- Fairchild SB 227-56-002, Issued: January 5, 1984; Revised: May 29, 1992, and April 1, 1993.
- Fairchild SB 226-56-003, Issued: September 13, 1984; Revised: November 2, 1989.
- Fairchild SB 227-56-003, Issued: September 13, 1984; Revised: November 2, 1989.
- Fairchild SB 26-56-10-038, Issued: October 8, 1984; Revised: February 7, 1991.
- Fairchild SB 26-56-20-042, Issued: November 28, 1988; Revised: February 7, 1991.

The compliance time for the proposed AD is presented in both hours time-in-service (TIS) and calendar time. The referenced acrylic cabin and cockpit side windows are affected by those conditions present while the airplane is in flight and while the airplane is on the ground. In addition, the utilization rates of the affected airplanes vary among operators. For example, operators in unscheduled service utilize their airplanes an average of approximately 200 to 300 hours TIS annually, while those in commuter service (scheduled) utilize their airplanes an average of approximately 2,000 hours TIS annually. Based on this wide utilization rate variance and the fact that these windows are affected when the airplane is in flight and on the ground, the FAA has determined that the compliance time for the proposed rule should be in hours TIS and calendar time.

The FAA estimates that 633 airplanes in the U.S. registry would be affected by the proposed AD, that it would take approximately 14 workhours per airplane to accomplish the proposed modification, and that the average labor rate is approximately \$60 an hour. Parts cost approximately \$5,000 per airplane. Based on these figures, the total cost impact of the proposed AD on U.S. operators is estimated to be \$3,696,720. AD 93-19-06 currently requires the same inspections as the proposed AD for all of the affected airplanes. Therefore, the cost impact of the