

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 the following new airworthiness directive:

Dornier Luftfahrt GmbH: Docket 97-NM-114-AD.

**Applicability:** Model 328-100 series airplanes equipped with Aerospace Restraint Company (ARC) restraints having part number (P/N) 1180002-403-100, part serial number 0101 up to and including 0315 inclusive, 0328, and 0329; certificated in any category.

**Note 1:** This AD applies to each airplane 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 airplanes 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 (b) 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 as indicated, unless accomplished previously.

To prevent failure of the screw of the crew seat belt buckle, which could result in injury to the flightcrew during an emergency landing, accomplish the following:

(a) Within 90 days after the effective date of this AD, remove and replace the center screw of the crew seat belt buckle in accordance with Dornier Service Bulletin SB-328-25-196, dated November 12, 1996.

**Note 2:** The Dornier service bulletin references Aerospace Restraint Company (ARC) Service Bulletin 1180002-25-01, dated October 11, 1996, as an additional source of service information for accomplishment of the removal and replacement.

(b) 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, International Branch, ANM-116, FAA, Transport Airplane Directorate. Operators shall submit their request through an appropriate FAA Principal Maintenance Inspector, who may add comments and then send it to the Manager, International Branch, ANM-116.

**Note 3:** Information concerning the existence of approved alternative methods of compliance with this AD, if any, may be obtained from the International Branch, ANM-116.

(c) 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 airplane to a location where the requirements of this AD can be accomplished.

**Note 4:** The subject of this AD is addressed in German airworthiness directive 97-001, dated January 16, 1997.

Issued in Renton, Washington, on November 21, 1997.

**Stewart R. Miller,**

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

[FR Doc. 97-31332 Filed 11-28-97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910-13-U

#### DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

#### Federal Aviation Administration

#### 14 CFR Part 39

[Docket No. 97-NM-152-AD]

RIN 2120-AA64

#### Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Model A320-111, -211, -212, -214, -231, -232, and -233 Series Airplanes

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

**ACTION:** Notice of proposed rulemaking (NPRM).

**SUMMARY:** This document proposes the adoption of a new airworthiness directive (AD) that is applicable to all Airbus Model A320-111, -211, -212, -214, -231, -232, and -233 series airplanes. This proposal would require repetitive ultrasonic inspections to detect fatigue cracking in the wing/fuselage joint cruciform fittings, and corrective actions, if necessary. This proposal is prompted by issuance of mandatory continuing airworthiness information by a foreign civil airworthiness authority. The actions specified by the proposed AD are intended to detect and correct fatigue cracks on the wing/fuselage joint cruciform fittings, which could result in reduced structural integrity of the wing/fuselage.

**DATES:** Comments must be received by December 31, 1997.

**ADDRESSES:** Submit comments in triplicate to the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA), Transport Airplane Directorate, ANM-103, Attention: Rules Docket No. 97-NM-152-AD, 1601 Lind Avenue, SW., Renton, Washington 98055-4056. Comments may be inspected at this location between 9:00 a.m. and 3:00 p.m., Monday through Friday, except Federal holidays.

The service information referenced in the proposed rule may be obtained from Airbus Industrie, 1 Rond Point Maurice Bellonte, 31707 Blagnac Cedex, France. This information may be examined at the FAA, Transport Airplane Directorate, 1601 Lind Avenue, SW., Renton, Washington.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** International Branch, ANM-116, FAA, Transport Airplane Directorate, 1601 Lind Avenue, SW., Renton, Washington 98055-4056; telephone (425) 227-2110; fax (425) 227-1149.

#### 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 shall 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 summarizing 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 Number 97-NM-152-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, Transport Airplane Directorate, ANM-103, Attention: Rules Docket No. 97-NM-152-AD, 1601 Lind Avenue, SW., Renton, Washington 98055-4056.

#### Discussion

The Direction Générale de l'Aviation Civile (DGAC), which is the airworthiness authority for France, notified the FAA that an unsafe condition may exist on all Airbus Model A320-111, -211, -212, -214, -231, -232, and -233 series airplanes. The DGAC advises that it received a report indicating that, during full-scale fatigue testing on a Model A320 test article, fatigue cracks were found in the structure at the wing/fuselage joint area cruciform fitting. The cracking occurred after 104,720 and 116,536 simulated flights. This condition, if not detected and corrected in a timely manner, could result in reduced structural integrity of the wing/fuselage.

#### Explanation of Relevant Service Information

Airbus has issued Service Bulletin A320-57-1051, Revision 01, dated March 21, 1996, which describes procedures for repetitive ultrasonic inspections to detect fatigue cracking in the wing/fuselage joint cruciform fittings, and corrective action, if necessary. The DGAC classified this service bulletin as mandatory and issued French airworthiness directive 96-299-094(B), dated December 18, 1996, in order to assure the airworthiness of these airplanes in France.

#### FAA's Conclusions

This airplane model is manufactured in France and is type certificated for operation in the United States under the provisions of Section 21.29 of the Federal Aviation Regulations (14 CFR 21.29) and the applicable bilateral airworthiness agreement. Pursuant to this bilateral airworthiness agreement, the DGAC has kept the FAA informed of the situation described above. The FAA has examined the findings of the DGAC, reviewed all available information, and determined that AD action is necessary for products of this type design that are certificated for operation in the United States.

#### Explanation of Requirements of Proposed Rule

Since an unsafe condition has been identified that is likely to exist or develop on other airplanes of the same type design registered in the United States, the proposed AD would require accomplishment of actions specified in the service bulletin described previously.

#### Differences Between the Proposal and Relevant Service Information

Operators should note that, unlike the procedures described in the referenced service bulletin, this proposed AD would not permit further flight with cracking detected in the wing/fuselage joint cruciform fittings. The FAA has determined that, due to the safety implications and consequences associated with such cracking, all fittings that are found to be cracked must be repaired prior to further flight.

#### Cost Impact

The FAA estimates that 132 of U.S. registry would be affected by this proposed AD. It would take approximately 8 work hours per airplane to accomplish the proposed inspection, at an average labor rate of \$60 per work hour. Based on these figures, the cost impact of the inspection proposed by this AD on U.S. operators is estimated to be \$63,360, or \$480 per airplane.

The cost impact figure discussed above is based on assumptions that no operator has yet accomplished any of the proposed requirements of this AD action, and that no operator would accomplish those actions in the future if this AD were not adopted.

#### 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 the following new airworthiness directive:

**Airbus Industrie:** Docket 97-NM-152-AD.

*Applicability:* Model A320-111, -211, -212, -214, -231, -232, and -233 series airplanes, all serial numbers, certificated in any category.

**Note 1:** This AD applies to each airplane identified in the preceding applicability provision, regardless of whether it has been modified, altered, or repaired in the area subject to the requirements of this AD. For airplanes 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 (b) 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 as indicated, unless accomplished previously.

To detect and correct fatigue cracks on the wing/fuselage joint cruciform fittings, which could result in reduced structural integrity of the wing/fuselage, accomplish the following:

(a) Prior to the accumulation of 28,000 total landings, or within 60 days after the effective date of this AD, whichever occurs later, perform an ultrasonic inspection to detect fatigue cracking in the wing/fuselage joint cruciform fittings, in accordance with Airbus Service Bulletin A320-57-1051, Revision 01, dated March 21, 1996.

(1) If no cracking is detected, repeat the inspection thereafter at intervals not to exceed 20,000 landings.

(2) If any crack is detected, prior to further flight, repair it in accordance with the service bulletin. Thereafter, repeat the inspection at the times specified in paragraph (a)(2)(i) or (a)(2)(ii) of this AD, as applicable.

(i) If the crack that was detected and repaired was greater than 2.5 mm: Repeat the inspection prior to the accumulation of 32,000 landings since accomplishment of the repair; and thereafter at intervals not to exceed 32,000 landings.

(ii) If the crack that was detected and repaired was less than or equal to 2.5 mm: Repeat the inspection prior to the accumulation of 28,000 landings since accomplishment of the repair; and thereafter at intervals not to exceed 20,000 landings.

(b) 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, International Branch, ANM-116, FAA, Transport Airplane Directorate. Operators shall submit their request through an appropriate FAA Principal Maintenance Inspector, who may add comments and then send it to the Manager, International Branch, ANM-116.

**Note 2:** Information concerning the existence of approved alternative methods of compliance with this AD, if any, may be obtained from the International Branch, ANM-116.

(c) 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 airplane to a location where the requirements of this AD can be accomplished.

**Note 3:** The subject of this AD is addressed in French airworthiness directive 96-299-094(B), dated December 18, 1996.

Issued in Renton, Washington, on November 21, 1997.

**Stewart R. Miller,**

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

[FR Doc. 97-31333 Filed 11-28-97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910-13-U

## DEPARTMENT OF STATE

### 22 CFR Parts 22, 51, and 53

[Public Notice 2653]

#### Schedule of Fees for Consular Services, Department of State and Overseas Embassies and Consulates

**AGENCY:** Bureau of Consular Affairs, State Department.

**ACTION:** Proposed rule.

**SUMMARY:** This proposed rule sets forth the fees for consular services that are proposed to take effect on February 1, 1998, and makes appropriate implementing and other related changes in affected portions of title 22 of the Code of Federal Regulations.

Specifically, the rule makes changes in the Schedule of Fees for Consular Services ("Schedule of Fees" or "Schedule") published in 22 CFR section 22.1 and makes technical changes to 22 CFR Part 51 (concerning passport fees) and 22 CFR Part 53. The changes to the Schedule of Fees include adjustments to existing fees and a new processing fee for diversity visa applicants (see 22 CFR 42.33(i)), for which the proposed rule was published in the **Federal Register** on June 16, 1997. The primary objective of the proposed adjustments to the Schedule of Fees is to ensure that the Department recovers the costs of consular services through user fees to the maximum extent appropriate and permitted by law. As a result of new data on the cost of services, the passport fee is being lowered while most other fees are being increased. In addition, the proposed Schedule of Fees is being restructured and streamlined. Fees for antiquated services no longer performed are being removed and fees for other services are being consolidated or more appropriately located, making the proposed Schedule easier to read and understand. Consular services that will be performed for no fee are being added to the Schedule to facilitate tracking the costs of these services and to inform the public of all significant consular services provided by the Department.

**DATES:** Written comments must be received on or before December 31, 1997.

**ADDRESSES:** Interested persons are invited to submit comments to: Office of the Executive Director, Bureau of Consular Affairs, Room 4820A, Department of State, Washington, DC 20520.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:**

Sally Light, Office of the Executive Director, Bureau of Consular Affairs,

telephone (202) 647-1148; telefax (202) 647-3677.

#### SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

##### Background

The majority of the Department of State's consular fees are established pursuant to the general user charges statute, 31 U.S.C. 9701, and/or 22 U.S.C. 4219, which, as implemented through Executive Order 10718 of June 27, 1957, authorizes the Secretary of State to establish fees to be charged for official services by embassies and consulates. Fees established under these authorities include fees for immigrant visas, for expedited passport processing, for fingerprints and FBI name checks, and for overseas consular services. In addition, a number of statutes address specific fees: Passport issuance fees are authorized by 22 U.S.C. 214, as are fees for the execution of passport applications. Section 636 of the Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act of 1996, Pub. L. 104-208, 110 Stat. 3009-703-704 (Sept. 30, 1996), authorizes establishment of a diversity visa application fee to recover the full costs of the visa lottery conducted pursuant to Sections 203 and 222 of the Immigration and Nationality Act ("INA"), 8 U.S.C. 1153, 1202. (The Department published a proposed rule establishing that fee on June 16, 1997.) Nonimmigrant visa reciprocity fees are authorized pursuant to Section 281 of the INA, 8 U.S.C. 1351. The establishment of a nonimmigrant visa processing fee for machine readable visas (commonly known as the "MRV fee") notwithstanding Section 281 of the INA is authorized by Section 140(a) of the Foreign Relations Authorization Act, Fiscal Years 1994 and 1995, Pub. L. 103-236, 108 Stat. 399 (April 30, 1994), as amended. Certain persons are exempted by law from payment of specific fees. (These statutory exemptions are noted in the fee schedule.) Various statutes also permit the Department to retain some of the consular fees it collects. These are, at present, the MRV fee, the passport expedite fee, the fingerprint fee, and the diversity visa lottery fee.

With the exception of nonimmigrant visa reciprocity fees, which are established based on the practices of other countries, all consular fees are established on a basis of cost recovery and in a manner consistent with general user charges principles, regardless of the specific statutory authority under which they are promulgated. The Department of State is required to review consular fees periodically to determine the appropriateness of each fee in light of