

Carl Fountain, Aerospace Engineer, Los Angeles Aircraft Certification Office, FAA, 3960 Paramount Boulevard, Lakewood, California, 90712; telephone: (562) 627-5222; facsimile: (562) 627-5210; and

—For the airplanes manufactured in the United States (Type Certificate A10SW): Mr. Andy McAnaul, Aerospace Engineer, FAA, Airplane Certification Office, 2601 Meacham Boulevard, Fort Worth, Texas 76193-0150; telephone: (817) 222-5156; facsimile: (817) 222-5960.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Comments Invited

How Do I Comment on This Proposed AD?

The FAA invites comments on this proposed rule. You may submit whatever written data, views, or arguments you choose. You need to include the rule's docket number and submit your comments to the address specified under the caption **ADDRESSES**. We will consider all comments received on or before the closing date. We may amend this proposed rule in light of comments received. Factual information that supports your ideas and suggestions is extremely helpful in evaluating the effectiveness of this proposed AD action and determining whether we need to take additional rulemaking action.

Are There Any Specific Portions of This Proposed AD I Should Pay Attention to?

The FAA specifically invites comments on the overall regulatory, economic, environmental, and energy aspects of this proposed rule that might suggest a need to modify the proposed rule. You may view all comments we receive before and after the closing date of the proposed rule in the Rules Docket. We will file a report in the Rules Docket that summarizes each contact we have with the public that concerns the substantive parts of this proposed AD.

How Can I Be Sure FAA Receives My Comment?

If you want FAA to acknowledge the receipt of your mailed comments, you must include a self-addressed, stamped postcard. On the postcard, write "Comments to Docket No. 97-CE-27-AD." We will date stamp and mail the postcard back to you.

Discussion

What Events Have Caused This Proposed AD?

The Japanese Civil Airworthiness Bureau (JCAB), which is the airworthiness authority for Japan,

notified the FAA that an unsafe condition may exist on certain Mitsubishi MU-2B series airplanes. The JCAB reports that several Mitsubishi MU-2B series airplanes have had windshield or window separation during flight. Separation is defined as shattering glass. Further analysis shows that the separation is happening as a result of repeated cabin pressurization cycles.

What Are the Consequences if the Condition Is Not Corrected?

This condition, if not corrected, could result in shattering or separation of the cockpit windshield or cabin windows during flight, which could cause loss of control of the airplane.

Has FAA Taken Any Action to This Point?

We issued a proposal to amend part 39 of the Federal Aviation Regulations (14 CFR part 39) to include an AD that would apply to certain Mitsubishi MU-2B series airplanes. This proposal was published in the **Federal Register** as a notice of proposed rulemaking (NPRM) on April 14, 1998 (63 FR 18151). The NPRM proposed to require you to repetitively inspect the cockpit windshield and cabin window surfaces for damage (damage would be defined as crazing, scratches, and cracks). If any of the windshield or window surfaces have damage that exceeds certain limits, the NPRM proposed to require you to replace the windshield or window. If the damage does not exceed certain limits, then the NPRM proposed to allow blending out the damage following maintenance manual procedures.

Accomplishment of these proposed actions would be in accordance with Mitsubishi MU-2 Service Bulletin (SB) No. 224, dated June 30, 1995, and MU-2 SB No. 224A, dated October 30, 1995.

Was the Public Invited To Comment?

The FAA encouraged interested persons to participate in the making of this amendment. The following presents the comments received on the proposal and FAA's response to each comment:

Comment Issue No. 1: Add Additional Models to the Applicability of the Proposed AD To Cover the Total MU-2B Fleet

What Is the Commenter's Concern?

The manufacturer states that an identical service bulletin exists which addresses the same condition on airplanes listed on Type Certificate Data Sheet (TCDS) No. A10SW. The manufacturer suggests that those airplane models and the applicable

service bulletin be included in the proposed AD.

What Is FAA's Response to the Concern?

We agree with the manufacturer's suggestion and are incorporating the changes in this proposed AD. Because of the additional airplanes being added to the applicability of this proposed AD and the additional burden on the public, we will reopen the comment period for this proposed AD.

Comment Issue No. 2: Exclude Heated Windshields From the Applicability of the Proposed AD

What Is the Commenter's Concern?

The manufacturer states that heated windshields should be excluded from the applicability of this proposed AD, as specified in MU-2 Service Bulletin No. 224A, dated October 30, 1995.

What Is FAA's Response to the Concern?

We agree with the manufacturer's comment and are changing this proposed AD to reflect this change.

Comment Issue No. 3: Correct Part Number Referenced in the Proposed AD

What Is the Commenter's Concern?

The manufacturer states that reference to the cockpit side window, part number 010A-81874-1/-2, is incorrect on MU-2B Service Bulletin No. 224A, dated October 30, 1995. Revision C of MU-2B Service Bulletin will correct this number.

What Is FAA's Response to the Concern?

We agree with the manufacturer's comment and are incorporating the correct part number reference in this proposed AD.

Comment Issue No. 4: Change the Cost Information to Reflect that Mitsubishi Will Not Provide Replacement Parts At No Cost

What is the Commenter's Concern?

The manufacturer states that the cost impact statement in the proposed AD indicates that replacement parts will be provided at no cost. The manufacturer stated that parts will not be provided at no cost and has provided a current price list for replacement parts; therefore, changing the cost impact on the public.

What Is FAA's Response to the Concern?

We agree that the cost impact statement should be changed to reflect the cost for replacement parts. Because this shifts the cost burden from the manufacturer to the owner/operator, we will reopen the comment period for this proposed AD.