

**§ 308.546 Limitations.**

(a) The notice of hearing with respect to a claim or statement will be served in the manner specified in § 308.507 of this subpart within 6 years after the date on which such claim or statement is made.

(b) If the defendant fails to file a timely answer, service of notice under § 308.509(b) of this subpart will be deemed a notice of a hearing for purposes of this section.

(c) The statute of limitations may be extended by agreement of the parties.

By order of the Board of Directors.

Dated at Washington, D.C., this 27th day of July, 2000.

Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation.

**Robert E. Feldman,**

*Executive Secretary.*

[FR Doc. 00-21999 Filed 8-28-00; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6714-01-P

**DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION****Federal Aviation Administration****14 CFR Part 39**

[Docket No. 99-CE-35-AD]

RIN 2120-AA64

**Airworthiness Directives; Pilatus Britten-Norman Limited Models BN-2T and BN-2T-4R Airplanes**

**AGENCY:** Federal Aviation Administration, DOT.

**ACTION:** Proposed rule; Withdrawal.

**SUMMARY:** This document withdraws a notice of proposed rulemaking (NPRM) that would have applied to all Pilatus Britten-Norman Limited (Britten-Norman) Models BN-2T and BN-2T-4R airplanes. The proposed AD would have required you to revise the Airplane Flight Manual (AFM) to include requirements for activation of the airframe pneumatic deicing boots. The proposed AD was the result of reports of in-flight incidents and an accident (on airplanes other than the referenced Britten-Norman airplanes) that occurred in icing conditions where the airframe pneumatic deicing boots were not activated. Britten-Norman has demonstrated that the language currently included in the AFM is adequate to address the conditions identified in the proposed AD for these airplanes. Therefore, AD action is not necessary to address the conditions on these airplanes and we are withdrawing the NPRM.

**ADDRESSES:** You may look at information related to this action at the

Federal Aviation Administration (FAA), Central Region, Office of the Regional Counsel, Attention: Rules Docket No. 99-CE-35-AD, 901 Locust, Room 506, Kansas City, Missouri 64106, between 8 a.m. and 4 p.m., Monday through Friday, except holidays.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Mr. Larry E. Werth, Airworthiness Directive Coordinator, FAA, Small Airplane Directorate, 901 Locust, Room 301, Kansas City, Missouri 64106; telephone: (816) 329-4147; facsimile: (816) 329-4090.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:****Discussion**

*What action has FAA taken to date?* 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 all Britten-Norman Models BN-2T and BN-2T-4R airplanes that are equipped with pneumatic deicing boots. The proposal was published in the **Federal Register** as an NPRM on October 8, 1999 (64 FR 54829). The NPRM proposed to require revising the Limitations Section of the AFM to include requirements for activation of pneumatic deicing boots at the first sign of ice accumulation on the airplane.

*Was the public invited to comment?* The FAA invited interested persons to participate in the making of this amendment. We received one comment on the proposed AD. Our analysis and disposition of this comment follow:

**Comment Disposition**

*What is the commenter's concern?* Britten-Norman believes that the present wording within the AFM has provided for safe operation of the affected airplanes for many years. Therefore, Britten-Norman states that FAA should withdraw the NPRM because the requirements would be redundant.

*What is FAA's response to the concern?* After reviewing the current wording in the Britten-Norman AFM, we agree that the actions included in the NPRM are not necessary. We will withdraw the NPRM per the Britten-Norman request.

**The FAA's Determination**

*What is FAA's final determination on this issue?* Based on the above information, we have determined that there is no need for the NPRM, Docket No. 99-CE-35-AD, and that we should withdraw it.

Withdrawal of this NPRM does not prevent us from issuing another notice in the future, nor will it commit us to any course of action in the future.

**Regulatory Impact**

*Does this AD involve a significant rule or regulatory action?* Since this action only withdraws a proposed AD, it is not an AD and, therefore, is not covered under Executive Order 12866, the Regulatory Flexibility Act, or DOT Regulatory Policies and Procedures (44 FR 11034, February 26, 1979).

**List of Subjects in 14 CFR Part 39**

Air transportation, Aircraft, Aviation safety, Safety.

**The Withdrawal**

Accordingly, FAA withdraws the notice of proposed rulemaking, Docket No. 99-CE-35-AD, published in the **Federal Register** on October 8, 1999 (64 FR 54829).

Issued in Kansas City, Missouri, on August 23, 2000.

**Marvin R. Nuss,**

*Acting Manager, Small Airplane Directorate, Aircraft Certification Service.*

[FR Doc. 00-21984 Filed 8-28-00; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910-13-P

**DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION****Federal Aviation Administration****14 CFR Part 39**

[Docket No. 99-CE-45-AD]

RIN 2120-AA64

**Airworthiness Directives; Cessna Aircraft Company Models 208, 208A, and 208B Airplanes**

**AGENCY:** Federal Aviation Administration, DOT.

**ACTION:** Proposed rule; Withdrawal.

**SUMMARY:** This document withdraws a notice of proposed rulemaking (NPRM) that would have applied to all Cessna Aircraft Company (Cessna) Models 208, 208A, and 208B airplanes. The proposed AD would have required you to revise the Airplane Flight Manual (AFM) to include requirements for activation of the airframe pneumatic deicing boots. The proposed AD was the result of reports of in-flight incidents and an accident (on airplanes other than the referenced Cessna airplanes) that occurred in icing conditions where the airframe pneumatic deicing boots were not activated. Cessna has demonstrated that the design of the affected airplanes, including the language currently in the AFM, is adequate to address the conditions identified in the proposed AD for these airplanes. Therefore, AD action is not necessary to address the

conditions on these airplanes and we are withdrawing the NPRM.

**ADDRESSES:** You may look at information related to this action at the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA), Central Region, Office of the Regional Counsel, Attention: Rules Docket No. 99-CE-45-AD, 901 Locust, Room 506, Kansas City, Missouri 64106, between 8 a.m. and 4 p.m., Monday through Friday, except holidays.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Mr. Larry E. Werth, Airworthiness Directive Coordinator, FAA, Small Airplane Directorate, 901 Locust, Room 301, Kansas City, Missouri 64106; telephone: (816) 329-4147; facsimile: (816) 329-4090.

#### SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

##### Discussion

*What action has FAA taken to date?* 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 all Cessna Models 208, 208A, and 208B airplanes that are equipped with pneumatic deicing boots. The proposal was published in the **Federal Register** as an NPRM on October 12, 1999 (64 FR 55181). The NPRM proposed to require revising the Limitations Section of the AFM to include requirements for activation of pneumatic deicing boots at the first sign of ice accumulation on the airplane.

*Was the public invited to comment?* The FAA invited interested persons to participate in the making of this amendment. We received a comment on the proposed AD from Cessna. Our analysis and disposition of this comment follow:

##### Comment Disposition

*What is the commenter's concern?* Cessna provides data it believes demonstrates that the design of the affected airplanes, including the language currently in the AFM, is adequate to address the conditions identified in the proposed AD for these airplanes. Therefore, Cessna requests that FAA withdraw the NPRM.

*What is FAA's response to the concern?* After evaluating the data that Cessna submitted, we have determined that the design of the affected airplanes, including the language currently in the AFM, is adequate to address the conditions identified in the proposed AD for these airplanes. We will withdraw the NPRM per the Cessna request.

##### The FAA's Determination

*What is FAA's final determination on this issue?* Based on the above

information, we have determined that there is no need for the NPRM, Docket No. 99-CE-45-AD, and that we should withdraw it.

Withdrawal of this NPRM does not prevent us from issuing another notice in the future, nor will it commit us to any course of action in the future.

##### Regulatory Impact

*Does this AD involve a significant rule or regulatory action?* Since this action only withdraws a proposed AD, it is not an AD and, therefore, is not covered under Executive Order 12866, the Regulatory Flexibility Act, or DOT Regulatory Policies and Procedures (44 FR 11034, February 26, 1979).

##### List of Subjects in 14 CFR Part 39

Air transportation, Aircraft, Aviation safety, Safety.

##### The Withdrawal

Accordingly, FAA withdraws the notice of proposed rulemaking, Docket No. 99-CE-45-AD, published in the **Federal Register** on October 12, 1999 (64 FR 55181).

Issued in Kansas City, Missouri, on August 23, 2000.

**Marvin R. Nuss,**

*Acting Manager, Small Airplane Directorate, Aircraft Certification Service.*

[FR Doc. 00-21985 Filed 8-28-00; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 4910-13-P**

## DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

### Federal Aviation Administration

#### 14 CFR Part 39

[Docket No. 99-CE-39-AD]

RIN 2120-AA64

#### Airworthiness Directives; LET, a.s. Model L-420 Airplanes

**AGENCY:** Federal Aviation Administration, DOT.

**ACTION:** Proposed rule; Withdrawal.

**SUMMARY:** This document withdraws a notice of proposed rulemaking (NPRM) that would have applied to all LET, a.s. (LET) Model L-420 airplanes. The proposed AD would have required you to revise the Airplane Flight Manual (AFM) to include requirements for activation of the airframe pneumatic deicing boots. The proposed AD was the result of reports of in-flight incidents and an accident (on airplanes other than the referenced LET airplanes) that occurred in icing conditions where the airframe pneumatic deicing boots were not activated. LET only manufactured

one Model L-420 airplane and LET controls that airplane. For an unsafe condition to exist, there must be a condition that could exist or develop on other airplanes of the same type design. Because there is only one affected airplane, an AD is not necessary and we are withdrawing the NPRM.

**ADDRESSES:** You may look at information related to this action at the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA), Central Region, Office of the Regional Counsel, Attention: Rules Docket No. 99-CE-39-AD, 901 Locust, Room 506, Kansas City, Missouri 64106, between 8 a.m. and 4 p.m., Monday through Friday, except holidays.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Mr. Larry E. Werth, Airworthiness Directive Coordinator, FAA, Small Airplane Directorate, 901 Locust, Room 301, Kansas City, Missouri 64106; telephone: (816) 329-4147; facsimile: (816) 329-4090.

#### SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

##### Discussion

*What action has FAA taken to date?* 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 all LET Model L-420 airplanes that are equipped with pneumatic deicing boots. The proposal was published in the **Federal Register** as an NPRM on October 8, 1999 (64 FR 54801). The NPRM proposed to require revising the Limitations Section of the AFM to include requirements for activation of pneumatic deicing boots at the first sign of ice accumulation on the airplane.

*Was the public invited to comment?* The FAA invited interested persons to participate in the making of this amendment. LET provided a comment to the proposed AD. Our analysis and disposition of this comment follow:

##### Comment Disposition

*What is the commenter's concern?* LET states that it only manufactured one Model L-420 airplane and controls this airplane. LET will work with the FAA to revise the AFM to incorporate appropriate AFM language to address this condition for this airplane and any manufactured in the future. LET requests that FAA withdraw the NPRM because, for an unsafe condition to exist, there must be a condition that could exist or develop on airplanes of the same type design.

*What is FAA's response to the concern?* Since LET only manufactured one Model L-420 airplane and LET controls that airplane, we have determined that an AD is not necessary.