of this AD. The request should include an assessment of the effect of the modification, alteration, or repair on the unsafe condition addressed by this AD; and, if you have not eliminated the unsafe condition, specific actions you propose to address it.

(g) *Where can I get information about any already-approved alternative methods of compliance?* Contact the Fort Worth Airplane Certification Office, 2601 Meacham Boulevard, Fort Worth, Texas 76193–0150; telephone: (817) 222–5133; facsimile: (817) 222–5960.

(h) *What if I need to fly the airplane to another location to comply with this AD?* The FAA can issue a special flight permit under §§ 21.197 and 21.199 of the Federal Aviation Regulations (14 CFR 21.197 and 21.199) to operate your airplane to a location where you can accomplish the requirements of this AD.

(i) *How do I get copies of the documents referenced in this AD?* You may obtain copies of the documents referenced in this AD from Fairchild Aircraft, Inc., P.O. Box 790490, San Antonio, Texas 78279–0490. You may examine these documents at FAA, Central Region, Office of the Regional Counsel, 901 Locust, Room 506, Kansas City, Missouri 64106.

Issued in Kansas City, Missouri, on November 28, 2000.

William J. Timberlake,

Acting Manager, Small Airplane Directorate, Aircraft Certification Service.

[FR Doc. 00–30948 Filed 12–4–00; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–13–U

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Federal Aviation Administration

14 CFR Part 39

[Docket No. 91–CE–87–AD]

RIN 2120–AA64

Airworthiness Directives; Bombardier Inc. Models DHC–6–1, DHC–6–100, DHC–6–200, and DHC–6–300 Airplanes

AGENCY: Federal Aviation Administration, DOT.

ACTION: Proposed rule; withdrawal.

SUMMARY: This document withdraws a supplemental notice of proposed rulemaking (NPRM) that would have applied to all Bombardier Inc. Models DHC–6–1, DHC–6–100, DHC–6–200, and DHC–6–300 airplanes. The NPRM would have superseded both AD 80–13–11 R2 and AD 80–03–08, which currently require repetitive inspections of the flight control rods for cracks on the above-referenced airplanes, with replacement of any cracked flight control rods. The NPRM would have required replacement of these flight control rods with improved design parts and would have reduced the need for the number of repetitions of the inspections. After evaluating all the comments received on the proposal, we have determined that, since the need for repetitive inspections is not eliminated by the replacements, the requirements of the current AD's should stand. We have not received any recent service problems regarding this subject on the affected airplanes. For these reasons, we are withdrawing the supplemental 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. 91–CE–87–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: Jon Hjelm, Aerospace Engineer, FAA, New York Aircraft Certification Office, 10 Fifth Street, 3rd Floor, Valley Stream, New York 11581; telephone (516) 256–7523; facsimile (516) 568–2716.

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 Bombardier Inc. Models DHC–6–1, DHC–6–100, DHC–6–200, and DHC–6–300 airplanes. The proposal was published in the **Federal Register** as a supplemental NPRM on April 1, 1997 (62 FR 15443).

The NPRM proposed to supersede both AD 80–13–11 R2 and AD 80–03–08, which currently require repetitive inspections of the flight control rods for cracks on the above-referenced airplanes, with replacement of any cracked flight control rods. The NPRM would have required replacement of these flight control rods with improved design parts and would have reduced the need for the number of repetitions of the inspections.

Was the Public Invited To Comment?

The FAA invited interested persons to participate in the making of this amendment. The comments, in most part, reflect the public's desire to have FAA withdraw the proposal and let the current AD's stand. The reason for this is because the need for repetitive inspections is not eliminated by replacing flight control rods with improved design parts.

The FAA's Determination

What Is FAA's Final Determination on This Issue?

After re-evaluating all information related to this subject, we have determined that:

—The unsafe condition is currently addressed through AD 80–13–11 R2 and AD 80–03–08;

—Because we have not received any recent service problems regarding this subject on the affected airplanes, there is no need for the supplemental NPRM, Docket No. 91–CE–87–AD; and

—We should withdraw the supplemental NPRM.

Withdrawal of this action does not prevent us from taking or commit us to any future action.

Regulatory Impact

Does This Proposed AD Withdrawal 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 supplemental notice of proposed rulemaking, Docket No. 91–CE–87–AD, published in the **Federal Register** on April 1, 1997 (62 FR 15443).

Issued in Kansas City, Missouri, on November 28, 2000.

William J. Timberlake,

Acting Manager, Small Airplane Directorate, Aircraft Certification Service.

[FR Doc. 00–30947 Filed 12–4–00; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–13–U

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES

Food and Drug Administration

21 CFR Part 101

[Docket No. 94P–0036]

Food Labeling: Trans Fatty Acids in Nutrition Labeling, Nutrient Content Claims, and Health Claims; Reopening of the Comment Period

AGENCY: Food and Drug Administration, HHS.

ACTION: Proposed rule; reopening of the comment period.

SUMMARY: The Food and Drug Administration (FDA) is reopening to January 19, 2001, the comment period for a document published in the **Federal Register** of November 17, 1999 (64 FR 62746). In that document, FDA proposed to amend its regulations on nutrition labeling to require that the amount of *trans* fatty acids present in a food, including dietary supplements, be included in the amount and percent Daily Value declared for saturated fatty acids. FDA also proposed that, wherever saturated fat limits are placed on nutrient content claims, health claims, or disclosure or disqualifying levels, the amount of *trans* fatty acids be limited as well. Finally, FDA proposed to define the nutrient content claim ''*trans* fat free.'' FDA is taking this action in response to comments on the November 17, 1999, proposal to ensure that interested parties have an adequate opportunity to comment on the issue of whether the agency should define the nutrient content claims ''reduced *trans* fat'' and ''reduced saturated and *trans* fats.''

DATES: Submit written comments on nutrient content claims for ''reduced *trans* fat'' and ''reduced saturated and *trans* fats'' by January 19, 2001.

ADDRESSES: Submit written comments to the Dockets Management Branch (HFA–305), Food and Drug Administration, 5630 Fishers Lane, rm. 1061, Rockville, MD 20852. You may also send comments to the Dockets Management Branch at the following e-mail address: FDADockets@oc.fda.gov or via the Internet at http://www.accessdata.fda.gov/scripts/oc/dockets/comments/commentdocket.cfm.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Susan Thompson, Center for Food Safety and Applied Nutrition (HFS–832), Food and Drug Administration, 200 C St. SW., Washington, DC 20204, 202–205–5587.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

I. Reopening of Comment Period

In the **Federal Register** of November 17, 1999 (64 FR 62746), FDA (we) proposed to amend our regulations on nutrition labeling to require that the amount of *trans* fatty acids present in a food, including dietary supplements, be included in the amount and percent Daily Value declared for saturated fatty acids. We also proposed that, wherever saturated fat limits are placed on nutrient content claims, health claims, or disclosure or disqualifying levels, the amount of *trans* fatty acids be limited as well. Finally, we proposed to define the nutrient content claim ''*trans* fat free.'' In that document, we requested comments on the proposal by February 15, 2000. In the **Federal Register** of February 16, 2000 (65 FR 7806), we extended the comment period to April 17, 2000.

Ten comments responding to the proposal (see Docket 94P–0036, Comment numbers 1776, 2113, 2117, 2125, 2128, 2133, 2135, 2138, 2139, and EMC 475) requested that the final rule define the nutrient content claim ''reduced *trans* fat.'' We had not proposed a definition for this claim, and had suggested that persons who believe that such a claim is useful could petition the agency under § 101.69 (21 CFR 101.69) (64 FR 62746 at 62760). Other comments (see Docket 94P–0036, Comment numbers 2136 and 2139) suggested a criterion (i.e., 25 percent less saturated fat and *trans* fat combined) for the claim ''reduced saturated fat'' that we believe may be more appropriate as a criterion for the claim ''reduced saturated and *trans* fats.''

We have considered these comments and believe that some members of the public may not have anticipated these issues and thus did not address them in comments. To ensure that all interested parties have had an opportunity to comment on whether the final rule should define the claims ''reduced *trans* fat'' and ''reduced saturated and *trans* fats,'' we are reopening the comment period for the November 17, 1999, proposed rule for a period of 45 days. Comments submitted during this period are to be limited to those that directly address the two claims identified above. We are not requesting comments on any other issue, and we do not intend to consider such comments if submitted.

II. How to Submit Comments

Interested persons may submit to the Dockets Management Branch (address above) written comments by January 19, 2001. You may also send comments to the Dockets Management Branch at the following e-mail address: FDADockets@oc.fda.gov, or via the Internet at http://www.accessdata.fda.gov/scripts/oc/dockets/comments/commentdocket.cfm. You must submit two copies of comments, identified with the docket number found in brackets in the heading of this document, except that you may submit one copy if you are an individual. You may review received comments in the Dockets Management Branch between 9 a.m. and 4 p.m., Monday through Friday.

Dated: November 29, 2000.

Margaret M. Dotzel,

Associate Commissioner for Policy.

[FR Doc. 00–30827 Filed 12–4–00; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4160–01–F

NATIONAL INDIAN GAMING COMMISSION

25 CFR Part 580

[RIN 3141–AA04]

Environment, Public Health and Safety

AGENCY: National Indian Gaming Commission.

ACTION: Proposed rule: Notice of extension of time.

SUMMARY: On July 24, 2000, the National Indian Gaming Commission (Commission) issued a Proposed Rule (65 FR 45558, July 24, 2000) promulgating draft regulations to provide for adequate protection of the environment, public health and safety under the Indian Gaming Regulatory Act (Act). The date for filing comments is being extended.

DATES: Comments shall be filed on or before January 19, 2001.

ADDRESSES: Comments may be mailed to: Environment, Public Health and Safety Comments, National Indian Gaming Commission, 1441 L Street, N.W., Suite 9100, Washington, D.C. 20005, delivered to that address between 8:30 a.m. and 5:30 p.m., Monday through Friday, or faxed to 202/632–7066 (this is not a toll-free number). Comments received may be inspected between 9:00 a.m. and noon, and between 2:00 p.m. and 5:00 p.m., Monday through Friday.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Christine Nagle at 202/632–7003; fax 202/632–7066 (these are not toll-free numbers).

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The Indian Gaming Regulatory Act (IGRA, or the Act), enacted on October 17, 1988, established the National Indian Gaming Commission (Commission). Under the Act, the Commission is charged with ensuring that tribal gaming facilities are constructed, maintained and operated in a manner, which adequately protects the environment and the public health and safety. The proposed regulations establish a process for carrying out this Commission responsibility. The Commissioners have been requested to allow additional time for preparation of comments on the proposed regulations. The Commission has determined that these regulations are of such