

# Proposed Rules

Federal Register

Vol. 64, No. 94

Monday, May 17, 1999

This section of the FEDERAL REGISTER contains notices to the public of the proposed issuance of rules and regulations. The purpose of these notices is to give interested persons an opportunity to participate in the rule making prior to the adoption of the final rules.

## DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

### Immigration and Naturalization Service

#### 8 CFR Part 103

[INS No. 1933-98; AG Order No. 2223-99]

RIN 1115-AE42

#### Adjustment of Small Volume Application Fees of the Immigration Examinations Fee Account

**AGENCY:** Immigration and Naturalization Service, Justice.

**ACTION:** Proposed rule.

**SUMMARY:** This rule proposes to adjust the Immigration and Naturalization Service's (Service) fee schedule of the Immigration Examinations Fee Account (IEFA) for certain small volume immigration adjudication and naturalization applications and petitions (Forms I-360, N-300, N-336, and N-470). Fees collected from persons filing these applications and petitions are deposited into the IEFA and used to fund the cost of processing immigration adjudication and naturalization applications and petitions and associated support services. The Service has determined that the current fees for these four small volume applications and petitions need to be adjusted. Of the four small volume applications and petitions, the fees for two are being increased and two are being decreased. This rule is necessary to ensure that the fees charged accurately reflect the cost of processing immigration adjudication and naturalization applications and petitions.

**DATES:** Written comments must be submitted on or before July 16, 1999.

**ADDRESSES:** Please submit written comments, in triplicate, to the Director, Policy Directives and Instructions Branch, Immigration and Naturalization Service, 425 I Street, NW., Room 5307, Washington, DC 20536. To ensure proper handling, please reference INS Number 1933-98 on your correspondence. Comments are available for public inspection at the

above address by calling (202) 514-3291 to arrange for an appointment.

#### FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Charles J. Yaple, Senior Staff Accountant, Fee Policy and Rate Setting Branch, Office of Budget, Immigration and Naturalization Service, on (202) 616-2754, or in writing at 425 I Street, NW., Room 6240, Washington, DC 20536.

Detailed documentation of the rate-setting process is available upon request by calling (202) 616-2754.

#### SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

#### What Legal Authority Does the Service Have To Charge Fees?

1. *Departments of Commerce, Justice, and State, the Judiciary, and Related Agencies Appropriation Acts of 1989 and 1991*

The Department of Commerce, Justice, and State, the Judiciary, and Related Agencies Appropriation Act, 1989 (Public Law 100-459) authorized the Service to prescribe and collect fees to recover the cost of providing certain immigration adjudication and naturalization services. Public Law 100-459 also authorized the establishment of the IEFA in the Treasury of the United States. All revenue from fees collected for the provision of immigration adjudication and naturalization services are deposited in the IEFA and "remain available until expended to the Attorney General to reimburse any appropriation the amount paid out of such appropriation for expenses in providing immigration adjudication and naturalization services and the collection, safeguarding and accounting for fees \* \* \*." 8 U.S.C. 1356(n).

In subsequent legislation, the Departments of Commerce, Justice, and State, the Judiciary, and Related Agencies Appropriation Acts, 1991, (Public Law 101-515), Congress further provided that "fees for providing adjudication and naturalization services may be set at a level that will ensure recovery of the full costs of providing all such services, including the costs of similar services provided without charge to asylum applicants or other immigrants. Such fees may also be set at a level that will recover any additional costs associated with the administration of the fees collected." 8 U.S.C. 1356(m).

#### 2. *The Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1952*

The Service also employs the authority granted through the Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1952, Pub. L. 82-137 (IOAA) 31 U.S.C. 9701, commonly referred to as the "user fee statute," to develop its fees. The user fee statute directs Federal agencies to identify services provided to unique segments of the population and to charge fees for those services, rather than supporting such services through general tax revenues. The IOAA states that "[i]t is the sense of Congress that each service or thing of value provided by an agency \* \* \* to a person \* \* \* is to be self-sustaining to the extent possible." 31 U.S.C. 9701(a). The IOAA further provides that charges for such services or things of value should be based on "the costs to the Government; the value of the service or thing to the recipient; the public policy or interest served; and other relevant facts." 31 U.S.C. 9701(b).

#### 3. *The Chief Financial Officers Act of 1990*

The Service must also conform to the requirements of the Chief Financial Officers Act of 1990 ("CFO Act"), Public Law 101-576. Section 205(a)(8) of the CFO Act requires each agency's Chief Financial Officer to "review, on a biennial basis, the fee, royalties, rents, and other charges imposed by the agency for services and things of value it provides, and make recommendations on revising those charges to reflect costs incurred by it in providing those services and things of value." 31 U.S.C. 902(a)(8).

#### What Federal Cost Accounting and Fee Setting Standards and Guidelines Are Being Used?

##### 1. *Office of Management and Budget (OMB) Circular No. A-25, User Charges*

When developing fees for services, the Service adheres to the principles contained in OMB Circular Number A-25, User Charges. OMB Circular A-25 states that, as a general policy, a "user charge \* \* \* will be assessed against each identifiable recipient for special benefits derived from Federal activities beyond those received by the general public."

The guidance contained in OMB Circular A-25 is applicable to the extent that it is not inconsistent with any

Federal statute. Specific legislative authority to charge fees for services takes precedence over OMB Circular A-25 when the statute expressly designates "who pays the charge; how much is the charge; [or] where collections are deposited." When a statute does not address issues of how to calculate fees or what costs to include in the fee calculation, Federal agencies must follow the principles and guidance contained in OMB Circular A-25 to the fullest extent allowable. The guidance directs Federal agencies to charge the "full cost" of providing services when calculating fees that provide a specific benefit to recipients. The OMB Circular A-25 defines full cost as "all direct and indirect costs to any part of the Federal Government of providing a good, resource, or service." These costs include, but are not limited to, an appropriate share of:

- Direct and indirect personnel costs, including salaries and fringe benefits such as medical insurance and retirement;
- Physical overhead, consulting, and other indirect costs including material and supply costs, utilities, insurance, travel and rents or imputed rents on land, buildings, and equipment;
- The management and supervisory costs; and
- The costs of enforcement, collection, research, establishment of standards, and regulation.

**2. Federal Accounting Standards Advisory Board Statement of Federal Financial Accounting Standards No. 4: Managerial Cost Accounting Concepts and Standards for the Federal Government**

When developing fees for services, the Service also adheres to the cost accounting concepts and standards recommended by the Federal Accounting Standards Advisory Board (FASAB). The FASAB was established in 1990, and its purpose is to recommend accounting standards for the Federal Government. In developing its recommendations, the FASAB considers the financial and budgetary

information requirements of the Congress, executive agencies, and other users of Federal financial information.

**How Did the Service Determine the Full Cost of Processing Immigration Adjudication and Naturalization Applications?**

**1. Phase I—Large Volume Applications/Petitions**

The Service conducted a review of the IEFA in two phases to determine the full cost of processing immigration adjudication and naturalization applications. Phase I sought to develop a more consistent and reliable cost accounting methodology focusing on 30 large volume applications and petitions (volumes in excess of 10,000 per year). This resulted in a proposed rule, which detailed the Activity Based Costing (ABC) approach and methodology used, and proposed adjusted fees for 30 immigration adjudication and naturalization petitions based on the determination of the full cost to the Service to perform the required activities. The proposed rule was published in the **Federal Register** on January 12, 1998, at 63 FR 1775. The final rule was published in the **Federal Register** on August 14, 1998, at 63 FR 43604.

**2. Phase II—Small Volume Applications/Petitions**

In a continuing effort to refine and build upon the methodology and results of the first study, the Service implemented Phase II of the IEFA fee study. The primary objective was to add more precision to the cost model for certain small volume applications. For the purposes of the IEFA studies, small volume applications were defined as those applications and petitions that have annual volumes of less than 10,000 application and petition receipts. The Service selected the ABC approach because it is an operationally-based technique that focuses on work activities performed that produce an output and consumes resources. Table 1 provides the small volume applications

that are the subject of this proposed rule.

TABLE 1.—SMALL VOLUME APPLICATIONS

| Form        | Description   |
|-------------|---|
| I-360 ..... | Petition for Amerasian, Widow(er), or Special Immigrant.        |
| N-300 ..... | Application to File Declaration of Intention.                   |
| N-336 ..... | Request for Hearing on a Decision in Naturalization Procedures. |
| N-470 ..... | Application to Preserve Residence for Naturalization Purposes.  |

**What Processes Were Used To Determine the Adjustment of Fees?**

**1. Scope of Small Volume Application Review**

One of the primary objectives of the IEFA Study was to evaluate the small volume applications and include the applications in the IEFA cost model. The small volume application evaluation and analysis included: (1) incorporating small volume application expenses deducted from the IEFA budget base; and (2) assigning activity processing model activities to the small volume applications.

**2. Small Volume Applications Resources**

Since small volume applications were not included in the Phase I IEFA Study, amounts representing the imputed cost of the small volume applications were deducted from the budget base. For the purposes of the Phase I IEFA Study, it was assumed that the cost of processing a small volume application was equal to the fee in effect at the time. As a result, the small volume application fees were multiplied by the projected FY 1998 small volume application workload volume to identify the projected revenue to deduct from the budget base. Table 2 provides the small volume application resources deducted from the Phase I IEFA Study cost model.

TABLE 2.—SMALL VOLUME APPLICATION RESOURCES DEDUCTED FROM THE PHASE I IEFA COST MODEL

| Form No.                                 | Phase I projected FY 1998 volume | Current fee | Projected resources |
|--|----------------------------------|-------------|---------------------|
| I-360 .....                              | 8,196                            | \$80.00     | \$655,680           |
| N-300 .....                              | 991                              | 75.00       | 74,325              |
| N-336 .....                              | 3,956                            | 110.00      | 435,160             |
| N-470 .....                              | 423                              | 115.00      | 48,645              |
| Total of small volume applications ..... | .....                            | .....       | 1,213,810           |

The \$1.2 million in projected resources for processing small volume applications was deducted from the budget base of each IEFA funded program involved in processing these applications. The amount deducted from each program was based on the percentage of full time equivalents (FTEs) represented by the program in proportion to the total FTEs of the programs combined. The inclusion of small volume applications in the Phase II IEFA Study required incorporating the \$1.2 million small volume application resources deducted during the Phase I IEFA Study.

The small volume application resources were assigned to the program areas from which the resources were deducted in the Phase I IEFA Study. After the small volume application resources were assigned to the respective program areas, the resources were assigned to the Application Processing Model (APM) activities based on the results of the Phase I IEFA Study FTE surveys for each program area. The APM is a narrative and graphical representation (i.e., a map or flowchart of the activities, worksteps, or

tasks) of an application process. The APM was developed to show the activities involved in processing applications and to serve as the primary basis for associating resources with cost objects (applications). The APM enabled the study team to link the resources required by the Service to perform its processing activities with the applications.

**3. Assigning Activities to Small Volume Applications**

With the small volume expenses included in the Phase II cost model, the next step was to assign the activities to these applications. Small volume applications are processed in the same manner as other IEFA funded applications. Therefore, the activities identified in the Phase I IEFA Study APM were used to evaluate the small volume applications. To ensure consistency with the Phase I study, the same methodology and approach was used to assign activities to applications.

In the Phase I study, the nine primary activities were assigned to the immigration adjudication and naturalization applications and

petitions based on the percentage of projected workload volume for the application or petition. These assignments were then weighted by the time required to perform each activity (cycle time) for each application or petition. The percentage of weighted volume represented by an application determines the percentage of activity cost assigned to the application.

Including the small volume applications in the Phase II IEFA cost model required identifying the FY 1998 workload projections, and determining the time required to perform each small volume application activity. Once these data elements were identified, the percentage of activity costs applicable to the small volume applications was calculated.

**4. Small Volume Application Volumes**

The first step in assigning the APM activities to small volume applications was to identify the projected FY 1998 workload volumes for the applications. The volumes in Table 3 represent the most recent workload projections developed by the Service and used in the fee study.

TABLE 3.—PROJECTED ANNUAL APPLICATION WORKLOAD VOLUMES

| Small volume form | Description  | Phase II projected annual volume |
|-------------------|--|----------------------------------|
| I-360 .....       | Petition for Amerasian, Widow(er), or Special Immigrant .....        | 8,919                            |
| N-300 .....       | Application to File Declaration of Intention .....                   | 1,015                            |
| N-336 .....       | Request for Hearing on a Decision in Naturalization Procedures ..... | 4,500                            |
| N-470 .....       | Application to Preserve Residence for Naturalization Purpose .....   | 382                              |

**5. Small Volume Application Data Gathering Approach**

Once the small volume application business volumes were identified, the next step was to determine the activity cycle times for each application. In the Phase I IEFA Study, applications and petitions activity cycle times were identified by performing statistical sampling and observation at various service centers and district offices. The Phase I study cycle time collection relied on observing enough application activity combinations to ensure statistical validity.

Small volume applications by definition are not processed in the same volume as other IEFA applications. The service centers and district offices do not process enough small volume applications to ensure that personal observations could be performed during site visits. As a result, the Phase II study determined that observing enough small volume application and activity combinations to ensure statistical

validity could not be performed in a timely or cost effective manner.

The study determined that the best approach to identify small volume application activity cycle times would be to conduct telephone interviews with highly experienced Service personnel involved in processing small volume applications. The highly experienced Service personnel identified were from different geographical locations. The objective of each telephone interview was to identify the activities and tasks required to process each small volume application and to identify the estimated time required to perform the activity or task.

**6. Telephone Interview Preparation**

Prior to conducting each telephone interview, procedures were developed for conducting the interview. The following steps were performed prior to the interview:

*Step 1.* In this step, the contact person was provided with a description of the fee study and the APM definitions, and

asked to review the APM, identifying the areas of the APM that applied to their application. The contact person was requested to identify any questions they had on the activities and tasks listed on the APM.

*Step 2.* This step consisted of a discussion, after the initial review by the contact person, of any questions that he/she had on the APM. It was important that the contact person and the interviewer have the same understanding of the APM prior to asking timing questions. The contact person was asked to determine if there were any activities or tasks for the application not listed in the APM.

*Step 3.* Preparation for this step involved a discussion of the application processing activities, including the "unique" and "common" activities. A determination was made on whether the small volume application was processed the same as other applications for "common" activities. It was made clear that the interviewee had to understand the terms "unique" and "common"

before discussing application cycle times.

*Step 4.* This phase involved determining whether an activity was "unique," and making a listing of all tasks the contact person completes in the processing of the application. If the contact person does not list a particular task under an activity, the person must ascertain whether the task is either not done for that activity, or processed by another person. If processed by another person, obtain a contact person for that particular activity.

*Step 5.* This step was performed after the first four initial steps and involved the timing interview, which consisted of the following steps:

- (1) For each task listed, ask the contact person how long it takes on average to complete the task;
- (2) Ask the contact person how long they have worked for the Service, and how much experience the contact person has with their application;
- (3) Determine when the contact person last worked on adjudicating the application;
- (4) Ask the contact person if there are any circumstances that would make processing of the application different at other Service offices;
- (5) Determine the volume of applications processed at the contact person's location; and
- (6) Determine if the contact person is aware of any changes to the form that may affect its processing time.

**7. Cycle Time Collection**

After the telephone interview procedures were conducted, the Service collected cycle time estimates from the small volume application interviewees. Cycle time estimates were provided by the interviewee for each "unique" task performed in processing the small volume application. The interviewee also identified each "common" task performed in processing the small volume application. Common activity and task cycle times were collected in the Phase I IEFA Study, and represent the time required to perform an activity or task regardless of the type of application. For example, opening the mail is one of the tasks performed within the common activity "Receive Application or Petition." The activity and task are common because they require the same amount of time to perform regardless of the type of application in the envelope.

The results of the telephone interviews were compiled to determine the cycle time required to perform each activity and task for an application. Each small volume application cycle time estimate identified in the telephone interview was weighted by the volume of the application processed at the location of the interviewee. As a result, the response of interviewees at locations processing higher quantities of an application were weighted more than the results from locations that process fewer volumes. The weighted cycle times for each location were then

summed and divided by the total applications processed at all locations. The result was the normalized cycle time to perform each small volume activity.

In addition to performing interviews, the study team collected Form I-360 adjudication cycle times at the Nebraska Service Center (NSC). The study team collected cycle times by making personal observations of the time required to adjudicate the Form I-360. These procedures consisted of the following data collection assumptions:

- (1) Selection of persons to be observed would be on a random basis;
- (2) All applications received by the Service are in random order, therefore, the observation of applications processing on a first-in, first-out basis would maintain this randomness;
- (3) Site visit team members would not be restricted in their observations by site personnel; and
- (4) All site visit team members would have similar equipment and training.

The Form I-360 adjudication cycle times were weighted by the volume of the applications processed at the NSC. These results were combined with the Vermont Service Center Form I-360 telephone interview estimates to determine the cycle time to process each activity and task for the Form I-360. The cycle time estimates to perform each small volume application activity in minutes and fractions are provided in Table 4.

TABLE 4.—SMALL VOLUME APPLICATION CYCLE TIMES (MINUTES)

| Activity                      | I-360        | N-300        | N-336        | N-470        |
|-------------------------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|
| Receive .....                 | 4.71         | 2.24         | .89          | .89          |
| Record Fee .....              | 1.40         | 1.40         | 1.40         | 1.40         |
| Input Application Data .....  | 4.68         | .95          | N/A          | N/A          |
| Manage Records .....          | 5.65         | 13.93        | 6.02         | 5.57         |
| Adjudicate Applications ..... | 49.06        | 7.90         | 77.48        | 26.16        |
| Prepare Outgoing .....        | 1.67         | .65          | 1.83         | 3.35         |
| Issue End Product .....       | N/A          | 9.25         | 7.42         | N/A          |
| Respond to Inquiry .....      | 7.68         | N/A          | 2.73         | 9.87         |
| <b>Total .....</b>            | <b>74.85</b> | <b>36.32</b> | <b>97.77</b> | <b>47.24</b> |

**8. Small Volume Application Costs**

The final step in performing the small volume application analysis was to calculate the cost to process each application. With the APM activities assigned to small volume applications based on projected FY 1998 workload volumes weighted by application activity cycle times, the study team

determined the total annual cost to process each small volume application. The total small volume application activity costs were divided by the projected FY 1998 workload volumes to determine a unit cost for each small volume application activity. The sum of the small volume application activity costs is the total unit cost to process the

small volume application. (The unit cost per application identifies the cost required to produce one unit, e.g., one application, based on the activities consumed in producing that unit/application.) Table 5 provides the FY 1998 activity unit cost and total unit cost to process each small volume application.

TABLE 5.—SMALL VOLUME APPLICATION FY 1998 UNIT COSTS

| Activity                             | I-360         | N-300        | N-336         | N-470        |
|--------------------------------------|---------------|--------------|---------------|--------------|
| Receive .....                        | \$3.78        | \$1.10       | \$ .44        | \$ .44       |
| Record Fee .....                     | 1.69          | 1.66         | 1.66          | 1.66         |
| Input Application Data .....         | 7.00          | 1.02         | .00           | .00          |
| Manage Records .....                 | 6.75          | 20.42        | 8.83          | 8.17         |
| Adjudicate Application .....         | 75.34         | 14.02        | 137.50        | 46.42        |
| Prepare Outgoing .....               | 4.35          | 1.61         | 4.54          | 8.31         |
| Issue End Product .....              | .00           | 10.94        | 12.40         | .00          |
| Respond to Inquiry .....             | 10.95         | .00          | 3.89          | 14.07        |
| <b>Total FY 1998 Unit Cost .....</b> | <b>109.86</b> | <b>50.77</b> | <b>169.26</b> | <b>79.07</b> |

The Service is authorized to set the immigration and naturalization fees at a level that will recover the costs of providing all immigration adjudication and naturalization services “including the costs of similar services provided without charge to asylum applicants or other immigrants.” 8 U.S.C. 1356(m). In addition, the fees must be set sufficiently high enough to recover the costs of fee waivers that are granted. However, because of the small volumes associated with these applications, the amount derived from the calculation to determine waiver/exempt costs and the asylum and refugee surcharge was so

insignificant that it has not been included as part of the costs for these applications.

**What Are Our Conclusions and Proposed Fee Adjustments?**

The objectives of the small volume application analysis were to determine the full cost of processing the applications and to include the applications in the IEFA cost model. The small volume application analysis was performed in accordance with the methodology implemented in the Phase I IEFA Study. The analysis required incorporating small volume application

revenues into the IEFA cost model that were deducted during the Phase I IEFA Study, and identifying and quantifying drivers to assign the APM activities to the small volume applications. The unit costs identified in Table 5 represent the Service’s cost to process each small volume application.

The Service is proposing to increase two and decrease two of the small volume fees associated with this study. Table 6 identifies the proposed fees to be increased as well as the fees to be decreased. The proposed fee has been rounded to the nearest whole \$5 amount.

TABLE 6.—SMALL VOLUME APPLICATION PROPOSED FEE SCHEDULE ADJUSTMENTS

| Form        | Description  | Total cost | Current fee | Proposed fee |
|-------------|--|------------|-------------|--------------|
| I-360 ..... | Petition for Amerasian, Widow(er), or Special Immigrant .....        | \$109.86   | \$80.00     | \$110.00     |
| N-300 ..... | Application to File Declaration of Intention .....                   | 50.77      | 75.00       | 50.00        |
| N-336 ..... | Request for Hearing on a Decision in Naturalization Procedures ..... | 169.26     | 110.00      | 170.00       |
| N-470 ..... | Application to Preserve Residence for Naturalization Purposes .....  | 79.07      | 115.00      | 80.00        |

**Regulatory Flexibility Act**

The Attorney General, in accordance with 5 U.S.C. 605(b), has reviewed this regulation and, by approving it, certifies that this rule will not have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities. Of the four applications or petitions covered under this proposed rule, only two of the fees are being increased and the other two fees are being decreased. In addition, small volume applications refer to fewer than 10,000 applications per year. Total projected revenues for all four applications or petitions for FY 1998 amounts to \$1,827,400. Normally, these applications and petitions would generally be filed by individuals as opposed to small businesses.

**Unfunded Mandates Reform Act of 1995**

This rule will not result in the expenditure by State, local, and tribal governments, in the aggregate, or by the private sector, of \$100 million or more

in any 1 year, and it will not significantly or uniquely affect small governments. This rule will only affect persons who file certain applications or petitions for immigration benefits. Therefore, no actions were deemed necessary under the provisions of the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act of 1995.

**Small Business Regulatory Enforcement Fairness Act of 1996**

This rule is not a major rule as defined by section 251 of the Small Business Regulatory Enforcement Fairness Act of 1996. 5 U.S.C. 804. This rule will not result in an annual effect on the economy of \$100 million or more; a major increase in costs or prices; or significant adverse effects on competition, employment, investment, productivity, innovation, or on the ability of United States-based companies to compete with foreign-based companies in domestic and export markets.

**Executive Order 12866**

This rule is not considered by the Department of Justice to be a “significant regulatory action” under Executive Order 12866, section 3(f), Regulatory Planning and Review, because it will have an annual effect on the economy of less than \$100 million. Without the proposed increases/decreases, the Service estimates that it will collect \$1.3 million in fees for immigration and adjudication services for these four small volume applications in FY 1998. With the proposed fee adjustments, the Service will collect approximately \$1.8 million. The implementation of this proposed rule will provide the Service with an additional \$.5 million in revenue over the revenue that would be collected under the current fee structure. This revenue increase is a recovery of costs based on workload volumes required to process these applications.

**Executive Order 12612**

The regulations proposed herein will 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 rule does not have sufficient federalism implications to warrant the preparation of a Federalism Assessment.

**Executive Order 12988: Civil Justice Reform**

This proposed rule meets the applicable standards set forth in sections 3(a) and 3(b)(2) of Executive Order 12988.

**List of Subjects in 8 CFR Part 103**

Administrative practice and procedure, Authority delegations (Government agencies), Fees, Forms, Freedom of information, Privacy, Reporting and recordkeeping, requirements, Surety bonds.

Accordingly, part 103 of chapter I of title 8 of the Code of Federal Regulations is proposed to be amended as follows:

**PART 103—POWERS AND DUTIES OF SERVICE OFFICERS; AVAILABILITY OF SERVICE RECORDS**

1. The authority citation for part 103 continues to read as follows:

**Authority:** 5 U.S.C. 552, 552(a); 8 U.S.C. 1101, 1103, 1201, 1252 note, 1252b, 1304, 1356; 31 U.S.C. 9701; E.O. 12356, 47 FR 14874, 15557; 3 CFR, 1982 Comp., p.166; 8 CFR part 2.

2. In § 103.7, paragraph (b)(1) is amended by revising the entries for the following forms listed, to read as follows:

**§ 103.7 Fees.**

\* \* \* \* \*

(b) \* \* \*

(1) \* \* \*

\* \* \* \* \*

Form I-360. For filing a petition for an Amerasian, Widow(er), or Special Immigrant—\$110.00, except there is no fee for a petition seeking classification as an Amerasian.

\* \* \* \* \*

Form N-300. For filing an application for declaration of intention—\$50.00.

Form N-336. For filing request for hearing on a decision in naturalization proceedings under section 336 of the Act—\$170.00.

\* \* \* \* \*

Form N-470. For filing an application for section 316(b) or 317 of the Act benefits—\$80.00.

\* \* \* \* \*

Dated: May 11, 1999.

**Janet Reno,**

*Attorney General.*

[FR Doc. 99-12375 Filed 5-14-99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4410-10-P

**DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION**

**Federal Aviation Administration**

**14 CFR Part 39**

[Docket No. 98-NM-372-AD]

RIN 2120-AA64

**Airworthiness Directives; Learjet Model 23, 24, 25, 28, 29, 31, 55, and 60 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 certain Learjet Model 23, 24, 25, 28, 29, 31, 55, and 60 series airplanes. This proposal would require a one-time detailed visual inspection of the electrical wire leads of the horizontal stabilizer anti-ice system to verify that the numbers on the wire leads correctly correspond to the numbers on the connected airframe wiring; installation of a wire ID strap on the left- and right-hand sides of each terminal block; and installation of a warning placard. This proposal is prompted by a report of severe flight control buffeting of a Learjet Model 55 series airplane due to a malfunction of the horizontal stabilizer anti-ice system. The actions specified by the proposed AD are intended to prevent undetected accretion of ice on the leading edge of the horizontal stabilizer, which could result in the loss of pitch control and consequent reduced controllability of the airplane.

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

**ADDRESSES:** Submit comments in triplicate to the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA), Transport Airplane Directorate, ANM-114, Attention: Rules Docket No. 98-NM-372-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 Learjet, Inc., One Learjet Way, Wichita, Kansas 67209-2942. This information may be examined at the FAA, Transport Airplane Directorate, 1601 Lind Avenue, SW., Renton, Washington; or at the FAA, Small Airplane Directorate, Wichita Aircraft Certification Office, 1801 Airport Road, Room 100, Mid-Continent Airport, Wichita, Kansas.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Jose Flores, Senior Aerospace Engineer, Systems and Propulsion Branch, ACE-116W, FAA, Small Airplane Directorate, Wichita Aircraft Certification Office, 1801 Airport Road, Room 100, Mid-Continent Airport, Wichita, Kansas 67209; telephone (316) 946-4133; fax (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 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 98-NM-372-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-114, Attention: Rules Docket No. 98-NM-372-AD, 1601 Lind Avenue, SW., Renton, Washington 98055-4056.