inspection; 4.0 work hours to accomplish the vertical fin replacement, and 0.5 work hour to mark the fin, and that the average labor rate is \$60 per work hour. Required parts would cost approximately \$18,770. Based on these figures, the total cost impact of the proposed AD on U.S. operators is estimated to be \$19,220 per helicopter, or a total of \$2,383,280 for the entire fleet, to accomplish all the actions including replacing the fin.

#### Regulatory Impact

The regulations proposed herein would not have substantial direct effects on the States, on the relationship between the national government and the States, or on the distribution of power and responsibilities among the various levels of government. Therefore, in accordance with Executive Order 12612, it is determined that this proposal would not have sufficient federalism implications to warrant the preparation of a Federalism Assessment.

For the reasons discussed above, I certify that this proposed regulation (1) is not a "significant regulatory action" under Executive Order 12866; (2) is not a "significant rule" under the DOT Regulatory Policies and Procedures (44 FR 11034, February 26, 1979); and (3) if promulgated, will not have a significant economic impact, positive or negative, on a substantial number of small entities under the criteria of the Regulatory Flexibility Act. A copy of the draft regulatory evaluation prepared for this action is contained in the Rules Docket. A copy of it may be obtained by contacting the Rules Docket at the location provided under the caption ADDRESSES.

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

Air transportation, Aircraft, Aviation safety, Safety.

#### The Proposed Amendment

Accordingly, pursuant to the authority delegated to me by the Administrator, the Federal Aviation Administration proposes to amend part 39 of the Federal Aviation Regulations (14 CFR part 39) as follows:

## PART 39—AIRWORTHINESS DIRECTIVES

1. The authority citation for part 39 continues to read as follows:

Authority: 49 U.S.C. 106(g), 40113, 44701.

#### § 39.13 [Amended]

2. Section 39.13 is amended by adding a new airworthiness directive to read as follows:

## **Bell Helicopter Textron Canada:** Docket No. 99–SW–07–AD.

Applicability: Model 407 helicopters, with vertical fin (fin) assembly, part number (P/N) 206-020-113-223A, -223B, or -223S, with a serial number with a prefix of "BP", up to and including 2266 (except BP2260, BP2262, and BP2265), installed, certificated in any category.

**Note 1**: This AD applies to each helicopter identified in the preceding applicability provision, regardless of whether it has been otherwise modified, altered, or repaired in the area subject to the requirements of this AD. For helicopters that have been modified, altered, or repaired so that the performance of the requirements of this AD is affected, the owner/operator must request approval for an alternative method of compliance in accordance with paragraph (c) 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 the unsafe condition has not been eliminated, the request should include specific proposed actions to address it.

*Compliance*: Required within 100 hours time-in-service, unless accomplished previously.

To detect fin assemblies with reduced skin thickness which, if not corrected, reduce the strength of the skin, and could lead to failure of the vertical fin (fin) and subsequent loss of control of the helicopter, accomplish the following:

(a) Visually inspect the fin assembly for reduced skin thickness, indicated by notches, scratches, or grooves on the skin, in accordance with Part I of the Accomplishment Instructions contained in Bell Helicopter Textron Alert Service Bulletin No. 407–98–17, Revision A, dated June 26, 1998 (ASB). If notches, scratches, or grooves are found, repair or replace the fin assembly in accordance with Part II of the Accomplishment Instructions contained in the ASB.

(b) Identify any fin that has been inspected or repaired in accordance with Part III of the Accomplishment Instructions in the ASB.

(c) An alternative method of compliance or adjustment of the compliance time that provides an acceptable level of safety may be used if approved by the Manager, Rotorcraft Certification Office, Rotorcraft Directorate, FAA. Operators shall submit their requests through a FAA Principal Maintenance Inspector, who may concur or comment and then send it to the Manager, Rotorcraft Certification Office.

**Note 2:** Information concerning the existence of approved alternative methods of compliance with this AD, if any, may be obtained from the Rotorcraft Certification Office.

(d) Special flight permits may be issued in accordance with sections 21.197 and 21.199 of the Federal Aviation Regulations (14 CFR 21.197 and 21.199) to operate the helicopter to a location where the requirements of this AD can be accomplished.

**Note 3:** The subject of this AD is addressed in Transport Canada (Canada) AD No. CF–98–10R1, dated August 20, 1998.

Issued in Fort Worth, Texas, on July 26, 1999.

#### Henry A. Armstrong,

Manager, Rotorcraft Directorate, Aircraft Certification Service.

[FR Doc. 99–19744 Filed 7–30–99; 8:45 am] BILLING CODE 4910–13–U

#### **DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION**

#### **Federal Aviation Administration**

#### 14 CFR Part 39

[Docket No. 98-CE-61-AD; Amendment 39-11061; AD 99-05-13]

#### RIN 2120-AA64

Airworthiness Directives; Raytheon Aircraft Company Beech 17, 18, 19, 23, 24, 33, 35, 36/A36, A36TC/B36TC, 45, 50, 55, 56, 58, 58P, 58TC, 60, 65, 70, 76, 77, 80, 88, and 95 Series Airplanes

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

**ACTION:** Notice of proposed rulemaking; withdrawal of final rule.

**SUMMARY:** This document proposes to withdraw Airworthiness Directive (AD) 99-05-13, which currently applies to Raytheon Aircraft Company (Raytheon) Beech 17, 18, 19, 23, 24, 33, 35, 36/A36, A36TC/B36TC, 45, 50, 55, 56, 58, 58P, 58TC, 60, 65, 70, 76, 77, 80, 88, and 95 series airplanes. AD 99-05-13 requires installing a placard on the fuel tank selector to warn of the no-flow condition that exists between the fuel tank detents. Since the issuance of AD 99–05–13, the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) has re-evaluated all information related to this subject, and determined that the subject matter in this AD is an operational issue and does not address an unsafe condition. Accordingly, this action proposes to withdraw AD 99-05-13.

**DATES:** Comments must be received on or before September 9, 1999.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Mr. Scott West, Aerospace Engineer, Wichita Aircraft Certification Office, FAA, 1801 Airport Road, Mid-Continent Airport, Wichita, Kansas 67209; telephone: (316) 946–4146; facsimile: (316) 946–4407.

### 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. 98–CE–61–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 Regional Counsel, Attention: Rules Docket No. 98–CE–61–AD, Room 1558, 601 E. 12th Street, Kansas City, Missouri 64106.

#### Discussion

AD 99–05–13, Amendment 39–11061 (64 FR 10560), currently requires installing a placard on the fuel tank selector to warn of the no-flow condition that exists between the fuel tank detents on Raytheon Beech 17, 18, 19, 23, 24, 33, 35, 36/A36, A36TC/B36TC, 45, 50, 55, 56, 58, 58P, 58TC, 60, 65, 70, 76, 77, 80, 88, and 95 series airplanes.

The AD was the result of reports of engine stoppage on the affected airplanes where the cause was considered to be incorrect positioning of the fuel selector. The actions of AD 99–05–13 were intended to prevent a lack of fuel flow to the engine caused by the incorrect positioning of the fuel selector, which could result in loss of engine power.

### **Events Leading to This Proposed Action**

The FAA has since evaluated all information related the subject matter of AD 99–05–13 and has determined that:

- —The positioning of the fuel selector is an operational issue and not an unsafe condition under part 39 of the Federal Aviation Regulations (14 CFR part 39) and should be handled by other methods;
- —Normal operating and procedural information such as this should be handled through regular revisions to the Airplane Flight Manual (AFM) or Pilot's Operating Handbook (POH); and
- —By requiring a placard in an AD to convey normal operating information, the FAA reduces the pilots' sensitivity to true emergency information that should be conveyed by placards.

# The FAA's Determination and Provisions of This Proposed Action

Based on the above information, the FAA has determined that there is no need for AD 99–05–13 and that it should be withdrawn.

This proposed action would withdraw AD 99–05–13. Withdrawal of AD 99–05–13 would constitute only such action; and, if followed by a final action, would not preclude the agency from issuing another notice in the future, nor would it commit the agency to any course of action in the future.

#### **Regulatory Impact**

Since this proposed action would only withdraw an AD, it is neither a proposed AD nor a final 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 Proposed Withdrawal

Accordingly, AD 99–05–13, Amendment 39–11061, published in the **Federal Register** on March 5, 1999 (64 FR 10560), is proposed to be withdrawn.

Issued in Kansas City, Missouri, on July 26, 1999.

#### Mike Gallagher,

Manager, Small Airplane Directorate, Aircraft Certification Service.

[FR Doc. 99–19745 Filed 7–30–99; 8:45 am] BILLING CODE 4910–13–U

# COMMODITY FUTURES TRADING COMMISSION

#### 17 CFR Part 4

## Performance Data and Disclosure for Commodity Trading Advisors

**AGENCY:** Commodity Futures Trading Commission.

**ACTION:** Proposed rules.

SUMMARY: On June 18, 1998, the **Commodity Futures Trading** Commission ("CFTC" or "Commission") published in the Federal Register a "Concept Release" seeking public comment on issues relating to the computation and presentation of rate of return information and other disclosures concerning partially-funded accounts managed by commodity trading advisors ("CTAs"). The Concept Release discussed rules proposed by National Futures Association ("NFA") as well as several other issues related to the presentation of CTA and commodity pool operator disclosure which appeared to warrant further study and analysis. The Concept Release requested public comment on both the NFA proposal and the other issues. Based on its consideration of comments received in response to the Concept Release, the Commission has determined to propose revisions to its rules concerning the documentation, computation, and disclosure of CTA's past performance information. The rules are intended to simplify the recordkeeping and computational requirements for CTAs who accept partially-funded client accounts, while providing for meaningful and focused disclosure to clients regarding the past performance of the CTA, and the risks attendant upon trading on a partially-funded basis.

**DATES:** Comments must be received by October 1, 1999.

ADDRESSES: Comments on the proposed rules may be sent to Jean A. Webb, Secretary of the Commission, Commodity Futures Trading Commission, 1155 21st Street, NW., Washington, DC 20581. In addition, comments may be sent by facsimile transmission to facsimile number (202) 418–5221, or by electronic mail to secretary@cftc.gov. Reference should be made to "Performance Data and Disclosure for Commodity Trading Advisors."

#### FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Robert B. Wasserman, Associate Director, (202) 418–5092, electronic mail: "rwasserman@cftc.gov," or Eileen R. Chotiner, Futures Trading Specialist,