issues. Analysis revealed the issues addressed in the NPRM were largely a product of inconsistent maintenance practices. The FAA determined that issuance of an advisory circular was the proper method of dealing with the maintenance issues, and that a rule was not necessary. Advisory Circular No. 20–143, Installation, Inspection, and Maintenance of Controls for General Aviation Reciprocating Aircraft Engines, issued on June 6, 2000, addresses the issues contained in the NPRM. Therefore, we withdraw Notice No. 92–14, published October 20, 1992 at 57 FR 47934.

Issued in Washington, DC, on April 26, 2002.

John Hickey,
Director, Aircraft Certification Service, (AIR–1).

[FR Doc. 02–10946 Filed 5–1–02; 8:45 am]
BILLING CODE 4910–13–P

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Federal Aviation Administration

14 CFR Part 71

[Airspace Docket No. 01–AEA–22]

Establishment of Class E Airspace

AGENCY: Federal Aviation Administration (FAA), DOT.

ACTION: Final rule; correction.

SUMMARY: This action corrects an error in the description of the established airspace designation that was published in the Federal Register on January 31, 2002, Airspace Docket No. 01–AEA–22.

EFFECTIVE DATE: May 2, 2002.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Mr. Francis Jordan, Airspace Specialist, Airspace Branch, AEA–520, Air Traffic Division, Eastern Region, Federal Aviation Administration, 1 Aviation Plaza, Jamaica, New York 11434–4809, telephone: (718) 553–4521.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

History

Federal Register Document 02–1006, Airspace Docket No. 01–AEA–22FR, published on January 31, 2002 (67 FR 4655), established Class E airspace at Easton Memorial Hospital as published in the Federal Register on January 31, 2002 (67 FR 4655) (Federal Register Document 02–1006), is corrected as follows:

§ 71.1 [Corrected]

On page 4655, column 3, the 25th line is corrected removing “AEA MD E5, Easton Memorial Hospital [NEW] and substituting “AEA MD E5 Oxford” [NEW].

Issued in Jamaica, New York on April 22, 2002.

Richard J. Ducharme,
Assistant Manager, Air Traffic Division, Eastern Region.

[FR Doc. 02–10937 Filed 5–1–02; 8:45 am]
BILLING CODE 4910–13–M

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Federal Aviation Administration

14 CFR Parts 121, 125, and 135

[Docket No. 27694, Notice No. 94–11]

RIN 2120–AE98

Operator Flight Attendant English Language Program

AGENCY: Federal Aviation Administration (FAA), DOT.

ACTION: Advance notice of proposed rulemaking (ANPRM), withdrawal.

SUMMARY: The FAA is withdrawing a previously published ANPRM that sought information to establish requirements to ensure that flight attendants understand sufficient English language to communicate, coordinate, and perform all required safety related duties. The ANPRM discussion concerned domestic, flag, and supplemental operations; airplanes having a seating capacity of 20 or more passengers or a maximum payload capacity of 6,000 pounds or more; and commuter and on demand operations. We are withdrawing the document because we are incorporating the flight attendant English language issue into a separate regulatory action on the broader subject of crewmember training. We believe that consolidating the flight attendant English language issue into the proposed training rulemaking will enable a more effective and efficient use of FAA resources, and the broader proposal will better serve the public interest.


SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION

Background

On April 18, 1994, the FAA published an Advance Notice of Proposed Rulemaking (ANPRM) (Notice No. 94–11, 59 FR 18456). The ANPRM informed the public that the FAA was considering amending parts 121, 125, and 135 of title 14 of the Code of Federal Regulations to require certificate holders to ensure flight attendants understand sufficient English to communicate, coordinate, and perform all required safety related duties. The comment period closed on July 18, 1994.

In 1996, the FAA’s Aviation Rulemaking Advisory Committee (ARAC) was tasked with providing advice and recommendations on the flight attendant English language issue. ARAC’s Operator Flight Attendant English Language Program Working Group was unable to reach consensus on an appropriate rulemaking action recommendation and asked ARAC to resolve the impasse. ARAC recommended proceeding with the rulemaking process. FAA determined that the most appropriate way to proceed with the rulemaking was to address the flight attendant English language issue in the overall context of crewmember training. ARAC concurred with the FAA’s decision. Therefore, the task was withdrawn from ARAC and incorporated into a separate Crewmember Qualification and Training proposed rulemaking currently being developed by the FAA.

Discussion of Comments

All but one of the fourteen commenters expressed support for the proposal under consideration. The Air Transport Association strongly opposed any English language proficiency requirement, believing it to be the source of an unreasonable economic burden and unsupported by any identified specific safety problem.

Two individual commenters related personal experiences of communication difficulties with flight attendants and requested the problem be addressed before it results in tragedy. One individual noted that the ANPRM excludes operations that do not require flight attendants and stated that mandatory compliance by these operators would be burdensome and unfair.

The Canadian Air Line Pilots Association expressed complete agreement with the possible rulemaking without further comment.
The Air Line Pilots Association (ALPA), the Association of Flight Attendants (AFA), the Association of Professional Flight Attendants, the National Transportation Safety Board, an aircraft manufacturer, and the International Brotherhood of Teamsters Airline Division all expressed support for the possible rulemaking and declared an English language proficiency requirement to be essential for aviation safety. ALPA further suggested that flight attendants be required to communicate in the language of the flight’s origin and destination. AFA added that the ability to understand a language does not assure an accompanying ability to communicate in that language, and requested that any rulemaking focus on communication, addressing problems with accents and speech impediments.

The FAA acknowledges these contributions to the rulemaking process, and we reaffirm our commitment to aviation safety regarding this issue by continuing to develop and implement training and qualification requirements for crewmembers. The FAA is currently developing a proposed rulemaking on the overall subject of Crewmember Qualification and Training that will encompass the issues of Notice No. 94–11.

Reason for Withdrawal

We are withdrawing Notice No. 94–11 because the flight attendant English language issue will be incorporated into a separate regulatory action currently being developed on the broader subject of Crewmember Qualification and Training. We believe that consolidating the flight attendant English language issue into the proposed training rulemaking will enable a more effective and efficient use of FAA resources, and the broader proposal will better serve the public interest.

Conclusion

Withdrawal of Notice No. 94–11 does not preclude the FAA from issuing another notice on the subject matter in the future or committing the agency to any future course of action. We will make any future necessary changes to the Code of Federal Regulations through an NPRM with opportunity for public comment.

The FAA has determined that this regulatory course of action is no longer necessary. Accordingly, the FAA withdraws Notice No. 94–11, published at 59 FR 18456 on April 18, 1994.

Issued in Washington, DC, on April 26, 2002.

James Ballough,
Director, Flight Standards Service.
[FR Doc. 02–10945 Filed 5–1–02; 8:45 am]
BILLING CODE 4910–13–P

SOCIAL SECURITY ADMINISTRATION

20 CFR Part 416

RIN 0960–AF43

Access to Information Held by Financial Institutions

AGENCY: Social Security Administration.

ACTION: Notice of proposed rulemaking.

SUMMARY: We are proposing new rules to implement a law that will enhance our access to bank account information of Supplemental Security Income (SSI) applicants and beneficiaries and other individuals whose income and resources we consider as being available to the applicant or beneficiary.

DATES: To consider your comments, we must receive them no later than July 1, 2002.

ADDRESSES: You may give us your comments by using: our Internet site facility (i.e., Social Security Online) at http://www.ssa.gov/regulations/, e-mail to regulations@ssa.gov, telefax to (410) 966–2830 or by sending a letter to the Commissioner of Social Security, PO Box 17703, Baltimore, Maryland 21235–7703. You may also deliver them to the Office of Process and Innovation Management, Social Security Administration, 2109 West Low Rise Building, 6401 Security Boulevard, Baltimore, Maryland 21235–6401, between 8:00 a.m. and 4:30 p.m. on regular business days. Comments are posted on our Internet site, or you may inspect them on regular business days by making arrangements with the contact person shown in this preamble.

Electronic Version: The electronic file of this document is available on the date of publication in the Federal Register on the Internet site for the Government Printing Office: http://www.access.gpo.gov/su—docs/aces/aces140.html. It is also available on the Internet site for SSA (i.e., Social Security Online): http://www.ssa.gov/regulations/. Electronic copies of public comments may also be found on this site.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Georgia E. Myers, Regulations Officer, Office of Process and Innovation Management, 2109 West Low Rise Building, Social Security Administration, 6401 Security Boulevard, Baltimore, MD 21235–6401, regulations@ssa.gov, (410) 965–3632 or TTY (410) 966–5609 for information about this rule. For information on eligibility or filing for benefits, call our national toll-free numbers, 1–800–772–1213 or TTY 1–800–325–0778, or visit our Internet Web site, Social Security Online, at http://www.ssa.gov.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

Section 1631(e)(1)(B) of the Social Security Act (the Act) requires the Commissioner to verify all relevant information provided regarding the eligibility of SSI applicants and beneficiaries. Section 213 of the Foster Care Independence Act of 1999, Public Law 106–169, amended section 1631(e)(1)(B) of the Act to grant the Commissioner new authority with respect to verifying financial accounts. Under section 213, the Commissioner may require each SSI applicant or beneficiary to provide us with permission to obtain any financial record (as defined in section 1101(2) of the Right to Financial Privacy Act) held by any financial institution (as defined in section 1101(1) of the Right to Financial Privacy Act) with respect to the applicant or beneficiary. This law also allows the Commissioner to require such permission from deemors (i.e., individuals whose income and resources we consider as being available to the applicant or beneficiary).

This law requires us to tell you, or any other person whose income and resources we consider as being available to you, how we will use the permission and how long the permission lasts. It also allows us to request the information from financial institutions without furnishing a copy of the permission to the financial institution. We may request the information from financial institutions at any time we think it is needed to determine your eligibility or payment amount. Requests under this provision are considered to meet the requirements of the Right to Financial Privacy Act regarding identification and description of the financial record(s) to be disclosed.

This law also allows us to deny your SSI eligibility or suspend your SSI eligibility if you, or any person whose income and resources we consider as being available to you, refuses to provide or cancels the permission.

Explanation of Proposed Changes

The Commissioner is exercising her authority under section 213 of the Foster Care Independence Act of 1999 by proposing new rules to make giving permission to contact financial...