

Federal Aviation Administration – [Regulations and Policies](#)
Aviation Rulemaking Advisory Committee

Training and Qualification Issue Area
Operator Flight Attendant English Language Program Working Group
Task 1 – Sufficient English Language

Task Assignment

Office of the Secretary**[Docket OST-95-703]****Application of AlphaJet International, Inc., For Certificate Authority**

AGENCY: Department of Transportation.
ACTION: Notice of Order to Show Cause (Order 96-2-18).

SUMMARY: The Department of Transportation is directing all interested persons to show cause why it should not issue an order finding AlphaJet International, Inc., fit, willing, and able, and awarding it a certificate of public convenience and necessity to engage in interstate charter air transportation of persons, property, and mail.

DATES: Persons wishing to file objections should do so no later than February 28, 1996.

ADDRESSES: Objections and answers to objections should be filed in Docket OST-95-703 and addressed to the Documentary Services Division (C-55, Room PL-401), U.S. Department of Transportation, 400 Seventh Street SW., Washington, D.C. 20590 and should be served upon the parties listed in Attachment A to the order.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Ms. Carol A. Woods, Air Carrier Fitness Division (X-56, Room 6401), U.S. Department of Transportation, 400 Seventh Street, SW., Washington, D.C. 20590, (202) 366-2340.

Dated: February 13, 1996.

Charles A. Hunnicutt,
Assistant Secretary for Aviation and International Affairs.

[FR Doc. 96-3809 Filed 2-20-96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910-62-P

Federal Aviation Administration**Aviation Rulemaking Advisory Committee; Training and Qualification Issues—New Task**

AGENCY: Federal Aviation Administration (FAA), DOT.

ACTION: Notice of New Task Assignment for the Aviation Rulemaking Advisory Committee (ARAC).

SUMMARY: Notice is given of a new task assigned to and accepted by the Aviation Rulemaking Advisory Committee (ARAC). This notice informs the public of the activities of ARAC.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Mr. Thomas Toula, Assistant Executive Director for Training and Qualification Issues, Flight Standards Service (AFS-210), 800 Independence Avenue, SW, Washington, DC 20591, telephone: (202) 267-3729; fax: (202) 267-5229.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:**Background**

The FAA has established an Aviation Rulemaking Advisory Committee to provide advice and recommendations to the FAA Administrator, through the Associate Administrator for Regulation and Certification, on the full range of the FAA's rulemaking activities with respect to aviation-related issues. This includes obtaining advice and recommendations on the FAA's commitment to harmonize its Federal Aviation Regulations (FAR) and practices with its trading partners in Europe and Canada.

One area ARAC deals with is training and qualification issues. These issues involve training and qualification of air carrier crewmembers and other air transport employees.

The Task

This notice is to inform the public that the FAA has asked ARAC to provide advice and recommendation on the following task:

Recommend disposition of comments made to the Advance Notice of Proposed Rulemaking No. 94-74, which proposes to amend the applicable portions of parts 123, 125, and 135 of the Federal Aviation Regulations to establish requirements to ensure that flight attendants understand sufficient English language to communicate, coordinate, and perform all required safety related duties.

The FAA also has asked ARAC to evaluate these comments and recommend an appropriate rulemaking action (e.g., notice of proposed rule making, withdrawal) or if advisory material should be issued. If so, ARAC has been asked to prepare the necessary documents, including economic analysis, to justify and carry out its recommendation(s). If ARAC determines that the NPRM or Advisory Circular would be appropriate, those documents are to be submitted in the format prescribed by the FAA.

ARAC Acceptance of Task

ARAC has accepted the task and has chosen to establish an Operator Flight Attendant English Language Program Working Group to which to assign the task. The working group serves as staff to ARAC to assist ARAC in the analysis of the assigned task. Working group recommendations must be reviewed and approved by ARAC. If ARAC accepts the working group's recommendations, it forwards them to the FAA as ARAC recommendations.

Working Group Activity

The Operator Flight Attendant English Language Program Working

Group is expected to comply with the procedures adopted by ARAC. As part of the procedures, the working group is expected to:

1. Recommend a workplan for completion of the task, including the rationale supporting such a plan, for consideration at the meeting of ARAC to consider training and qualification issues held following publication of this notice.

2. Give a detailed conceptual presentation of the proposed recommendations, prior to proceeding with the work stated in item 3 below.

3. For each task, draft appropriate regulatory documents with supporting economic and other required analyses, and/or any other related guidance material or collateral documents the working group determines to be appropriate; or, if new or revised requirements or compliance methods are not recommended, a draft report stating the rationale for not making such recommendations.

4. Provide a status report at each meeting of ARAC held to consider training and qualification issues.

Participation in the Working Group

The Operator Flight Attendant English Language Program Working Group will be composed of experts having an interest in the assigned task. A working group member need not be a representative of a member of the full committee.

An individual who has expertise in the subject matter and wishes to become a member of the working group should write to the person listed under the caption **FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT** expressing that desire, describing his or her interest in the task, and stating the expertise he or she would bring to the working group. The request will be reviewed by the assistant chair, the assistant executive director, and the working group chair, and the individual will be advised whether or not the request can be accommodated.

The Secretary of Transportation has determined that the formation and use of ARAC are necessary and in the public interest in connection with the performance of duties imposed on the FAA by law.

Meetings of ARAC will be open to the public, except as authorized by section 10(d) of the Federal Advisory Committee Act. Meetings of the Operator Flight Attendant English Language Program Working Group will not be open to the public, except to the extent that individuals with an interest and expertise are selected to participate. No public announcement of working group meetings will be made.

Issued in Washington, DC, on February 13, 1996.

Thomas Toula,

Assistant Executive Director, for Training and Qualifications, Aviation Rulemaking Advisory Committee.

[FR Doc. 96-3865 Filed 2-20-96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910-13-M

Notice of Passenger Facility Charge (PFC) Approvals and Disapprovals

AGENCY: Federal Aviation Administration (FAA), DOT.

ACTION: Monthly Notice of PFC Approvals and Disapprovals. In January 1996, there were seven applications approved. Additionally, two approved amendments to previously approved applications are listed.

SUMMARY: The FAA publishes a monthly notice, as appropriate, of PFC approvals and disapprovals under the provisions of 49 U.S.C. 40117 (Pub. L. 103-272) and Part 158 of the Federal Aviation Regulations (14 CFR Part 158). This notice is published pursuant to paragraph d of § 158.29.

PFC Applications Approved

Public Agency: Port of Oakland, Oakland, California.

Application Number: 95-05-C-00-OAK.

Application Type: Impose and use a PFC.

PFC Level: \$3.00.

Total Net PFC Revenue Approved in This Application: \$5,400,000.

Estimated Charge Effective Date: September 1, 1996.

Estimated Charge Expiration Date: February 1, 1997.

Class of Air Carriers Not Required to Collect PFC's:

Air taxi/commercial operators exclusively filing FAA Form 1800-31.

Determination: Approved. Based on information submitted in the public agency's application, the FAA has determined that the approved class accounts for less than 1 percent of the total annual enplanements at Metropolitan Oakland International Airport.

Brief Description of Project Approved for Collection and Use:

Construct passenger corridor between Terminals One and Two.

Decision Date: January 2, 1996.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Joseph R. Rodriguez, San Francisco Airports District Office, (415) 876-2805.
Public Agency: Town of Massena, New York.

Application Number: 95-01-C-00-MSS.

Application Type: Impose and use a PFC.

PFC Level: \$3.00.

Total Net PFC Revenue Approved in This Application: \$200,079.

Estimated Charge Effective Date: April 1, 1996.

Estimated Charge Expiration Date: November 1, 2005.

Class of Air Carriers Not Required to Collect PFC's: None.

Brief Description of Project Approved for Collection and Use:

Runway 5 obstruction removal, General aviation apron, Taxiway A rehabilitation and lighting, Runway 23 extension environmental assessment, Parallel taxiway A, Runway 5 visual aids and beacon, Runway 5 terrain removal, PFC application, Storm Water pollution prevention plan, Airport pavement management system.

Decision Date: January 11, 1996.

For Further Information Contact: Philip Brito, New York Airports District Office, (516) 227-3803.

Public Agency: City of Phoenix, Arizona.

Application Number: 95-03-C-00-PHX.

Application Type: Impose and use a PFC.

PFC Level: \$3.00.

Total Net PFC Revenue Approved in This Application: \$80,978,000.

Estimated Charge Effective Date: April 1, 1996.

Estimated Charge Expiration Date: February 1, 1998.

Classes of Air Carriers Not Required to Collect PFC's:

(1) Air taxi/commercial operators exclusively filing FAA Form 1800-31; (2) commuters-small certificated air carriers filing Department of Transportation Form 298-C schedule T-1 or E-1 with less than 7,500 enplanements per year at Phoenix Sky Harbor International Airport (PHX); and (3) large certificated route air carriers filing Research and Special Programs Administration Form T-100 providing nonscheduled service with less than 7,500 enplanements per year at PHX.

Determination: Approved. Based on information submitted in the public agency's application, the FAA has determined that each approved class accounts for less than 1 percent of the total annual enplanements at PHX.

Brief Description of Projects Approved for Collection Use:

Build out Terminal 4 Concourse N-4, Noise mitigation efforts, Realign taxiway F to eliminate jog, Combined third runway project.

Brief Description of Project Approved for Collection:

Extend north runway west.

Decision Date: January 26, 1996.

For Further Information Contact: John P. Milligan, Western Pacific Region Airports Division, (301) 725-3621.

Public Agency: County of Albany, Albany, New York.

Application Number: 95-02-U-00-ALB.

Application Type: Use PFC revenue.
PFC Level: \$3.00.

Total Approved Net PFC Revenue: \$40,737,924.

Charge Effective Date: March 1, 1994.

Estimated Charge Expiration Date: April 1, 2005.

Class of Air Carriers Not Required to Collect PFC's:

No change to class approved on December 3, 1993.

Brief Description of Projects Approved for Use:

Runway and taxiway improvements, Flood management improvements, Environmental remediation, Airport studies.

Decision Date: January 26, 1996.

For Further Information Contact: Philip Brito, New York Airports District Office, (516)227-3803.

Public Agency: Ogdensburg Bridge and Port Authority, Ogdensburg, New York.

Application Number: 95-01-C-00-OGS.

Application Type: Impose and use a PFC.

PFC Level: \$3.00.

Total Net PFC Revenue Approved in This Application: \$125,050.

Charge Effective Date: April 1, 1996.

Estimated Charge Expiration Date: March 1, 2006.

Class of Air Carriers Not Required to Collect PFC's: None.

Brief Description of Projects Approved for Collection and Use:

PFC application, Runway 9/27 rehabilitation.

Decision Date: January 26, 1996.

For Further Information Contact: Philip Brito, New York Airports District Office, (516) 227-3803.

Public Agency: Department of Port Control, Cleveland, Ohio.

Application Number: 96-04-U-00-CLE.

Application Type: Use PFC revenue.
PFC Level: \$3.00.

Total Approved Net PFC Revenue: \$54,018,042.

Charge Effective Date: November 1, 1992.

Estimated Charge Expiration Date: February 1, 1997.

Class of Air Carriers Not Required to Collect PFC's:

No change from previous decision.

Brief Description of Project Approved for Use:

Recommendation

Continental users

(1)

OPERATOR FLIGHT ATTENDANT ENGLISH LANGUAGE PROGRAM; PROPOSED RULE (Docket No. 27694)

FAA is considering creating requirements for Flight Attendants to understand sufficient English language to communicate, coordinate, and perform all required safety related duties. Such requirements would improve communication, coordination, and performance of required safety related duties that may benefit Crewmembers and Customers. This proposed requirement is similar to regulatory requirements for other crewmembers and dispatchers.

The background of this proposal originated from the necessity of all Flight Crewmembers, Dispatchers, and Air Traffic Controllers, being able to communicate with each other. The Aviation Rulemaking Advisory Committee, an entity comprised of Aviation related organizations that advised the FAA on various regulatory issues, states that it is inconsistent to assign Flight Attendant safety related duties on board a flight without confirming that the Flight Attendants have the ability to effectively communicate and coordinate these duties with other Crewmembers.

FAA is issuing this Advanced Notice of Proposed Rulemaking (ANPRM) to collect operational and economic data to use in the evaluation process in determining whether to develop the Notice of Proposed Rulemaking (NPRM). The FAA is trying to obtain information in the following areas:

Nature of the Problem

1. What are the safety related duties that would be affected by lack of proficiency in the English language?
 - Safety Demonstration
 - ABA Briefings
 - Evacuation Commands

2. What are the actual or potential safety related problems, if any, caused by a lack of English language proficiency on the part of the Flight Attendants?
 - Instructions given to ABAs in case of an emergency
 - Being able to follow emergency procedures contained within the Inflight Safety Manual
 - Informing the Cockpit about cabin emergencies
 - Instructions from the Cockpit (*i.e.*, *Brace/Evacuation signals*)

3. What level of understanding and fluency should a Flight Attendant have in order to perform safety related duties?
 - Should be the equivalent of passing the TOFEL Test in College

RECEIVED
JUL 11 9 03 AM '94

67:28
OFFICE OF CHIEF COUNSEL
RULES DOCKET

4. What constitutes sufficient English language proficiency for operations conducted by the certificate holders?
- Proficiency for operations conducted by the certificate holders should be about the same standards as other flight Crewmembers

Extent of the Problem

5. How many Flight Attendants are serving with United States operators who do not possess English language proficiency?
- Research unavailable (*All Flight Attendants employed by Continental Airlines are proficient in the English language*)

Cost

6. What would be the average cost of training each Flight Attendant who is not proficient in the English language, to the extent necessary to be proficient in the English language?
- Data not on file (*Cost analysis not on file, as all Initial new-hire candidates for Continental are proficient in the English language*)
7. What would be the cost of replacing a Flight Attendant who is not proficient in the English language?
- Data not on file
8. Would there be a need to hire additional personnel to train Flight Attendants who are not proficient in the English language?
- No

Present Practices

9. How are Flight Attendants, who are not proficient in the English language, given duty assignments?
- Not Applicable to Continental Airlines
10. Is an effort made to have at least one English speaking Flight Attendant on each flight?
- All Flight Attendants on Continental Aircraft are proficient in the English language

11. Are Flight Attendants, who are not proficient in the English language, routinely assigned to certain positions on a flight?
 - Not Applicable to Continental Airlines
12. When foreign operators function with Flight Attendants who do not speak the language of the operator or English, how are these Flight Attendants assigned to positions on the flight?
 - Not Applicable to Continental Airlines
13. How do foreign governments ensure that Flight Attendants possess the language skills necessary to perform crew coordination duties?
 - Research unavailable

Method of Ensuring Proficiency

14. What type of program, procedures, or standard should be used to ensure the Flight Attendants possess the necessary proficiency in the English language to communicate, coordinate and perform all safety related duties?
 - Standard used for the English language proficiency program should be the same as the other flight crewmembers and dispatchers
 - The possible program for the English language proficiency program are following the same structure as the Universities and Colleges in their English Departments for Foreign Students
 - Provide inhouse training to individuals who require proficiency in the English language
15. Should all Flight Attendants be proficient in the English language? If not, why not?
 - Flight Attendants should be proficient in the language of their carrier with some understanding of the English language, should they consistently carry English speaking Customers
16. What percentage of Flight Attendants on a flight should be proficient in the English language?
 - 100% if on a carrier governed by the English language (*Supernumeraries not included*)

REGULATORY PROCESS MATTERS

Economic Impact

The FAA is unable to calculate the cost of enforcing the regulations influencing an operator Flight Attendant English language program. After reviewing ANPRM, the FAA will determine what regulatory requirements will be proposed, if any, and will review the potential costs and benefits. FAA is seeking cost data for the evaluation of the proposed requirements.

Other Regulatory Matters

Presently, it is not possible to determine the economic impact or what the paperwork burden might be.

FAA Action – Not Available