3–15–95
Vol. 60 No. 50
Pages 13889–14200

federal register

Wednesday
March 15, 1995

Briefings on How To Use the Federal Register
For information on briefings in Washington, DC, and Dallas, TX, see announcement on the inside cover of this issue.

FEDERAL REGISTER Published daily, Monday through Friday, (not published on Saturdays, Sundays, or on official holidays), by the Office of the Federal Register, National Archives and Records Administration, Washington, DC 20408, under the Federal Register Act (49 Stat. 500, as amended; 44 U.S.C. Ch. 15) and the regulations of the Administrative Committee of the Federal Register (1 CFR Ch. I). Distribution is made only by the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, DC 20402.

The **Federal Register** provides a uniform system for making available to the public regulations and legal notices issued by Federal agencies. These include Presidential proclamations and Executive Orders and Federal agency documents having general applicability and legal effect, documents required to be published by act of Congress and other Federal agency documents of public interest. Documents are on file for public inspection in the Office of the Federal Register the day before they are published, unless earlier filing is requested by the issuing agency.

The seal of the National Archives and Records Administration authenticates this issue of the **Federal Register** as the official serial publication established under the Federal Register Act. 44 U.S.C. 1507 provides that the contents of the **Federal Register** shall be judicially noticed.

The **Federal Register** is published in paper, 24x microfiche and as an online database through *GPO Access*, a service of the U.S. Government Printing Office. The online database is updated by 6 a.m. each day the **Federal Register** is published. The database includes both text and graphics from Volume 59, Number 1 (January 2, 1994) forward. It is available on a Wide Area Information Server (WAIS) through the Internet and via asynchronous dial-in. The annual subscription fee for a single workstation is $375. Six-month subscriptions are available for $200 and one month of access can be purchased for $35. Discounts are available for multiple-workstation subscriptions. To subscribe, Internet users should telnet to swais.access.gpo.gov and login as newuser (all lower case); no password is required. Dial-in users should use communications software and modem to call (202) 512–1661 and login as swais (all lower case); no password is required; at the second login prompt, login as newuser (all lower case); no password is required. Follow the instructions on the screen to register for a subscription for the **Federal Register** Online via *GPO Access.* For assistance, contact the *GPO Access* User Support Team by sending Internet e-mail to help@eids05.eids.gpo.gov, or a fax to (202) 512–1262, or by calling (202) 512–1530 between 7 a.m. and 5 p.m. Eastern time, Monday through Friday, except Federal holidays.

The annual subscription price for the **Federal Register** paper edition is $494, or $544 for a combined **Federal Register**, Federal Register Index and List of CFR Sections Affected (LSA) subscription; the microfiche edition of the **Federal Register** including the Federal Register Index and LSA is $433. Six month subscriptions are available for one-half the annual rate. The charge for individual copies in paper form is $8.00 for each issue, or $8.00 for each group of pages as actually bound; or $1.50 for each issue in microfiche form. All prices include regular domestic postage and handling. International customers please add 25% for foreign handling. Remit check or money order, made payable to the Superintendent of Documents, or charge to your GPO Deposit Account, VISA or MasterCard. Mail to: New Orders, Superintendent of Documents, P.O. Box 371954, Pittsburgh, PA 15250–7954.

There are no restrictions on the republication of material appearing in the **Federal Register.**

How To Cite This Publication: Use the volume number and the page number. Example: 60 FR 12345.

SUBSCRIPTIONS AND COPIES

PUBLIC

Subscriptions:

Paper or fiche	**202–512–1800**
Assistance with public subscriptions	**512–1806**

Online:

Telnet swais.access.gpo.gov, login as newuser <enter>, no password <enter>; or use a modem to call (202) 512–1661, login as swais, no password <enter>, at the second login as newuser <enter>, no password <enter>.

Assistance with online subscriptions	**202–512–1530**

Single copies/back copies:

Paper or fiche	**512–1800**
Assistance with public single copies	**512–1803**

FEDERAL AGENCIES

Subscriptions:

Paper or fiche	**523–5243**
Assistance with Federal agency subscriptions	**523–5243**

For other telephone numbers, see the Reader Aids section at the end of this issue.

THE FEDERAL REGISTER

WHAT IT IS AND HOW TO USE IT

FOR: Any person who uses the Federal Register and Code of Federal Regulations.

WHO: The Office of the Federal Register.

WHAT: Free public briefings (approximately 3 hours) to present:

1. The regulatory process, with a focus on the Federal Register system and the public's role in the development of regulations.
2. The relationship between the Federal Register and Code of Federal Regulations.
3. The important elements of typical Federal Register documents.
4. An introduction to the finding aids of the FR/CFR system.

WHY: To provide the public with access to information necessary to research Federal agency regulations which directly affect them. There will be no discussion of specific agency regulations.

WASHINGTON, DC

(THREE BRIEFINGS)

WHEN: March 23 at 9:00 am and 1:30 pm
April 20 at 9:00 am

WHERE: Office of the Federal Register Conference Room, 800 North Capitol Street NW., Washington, DC (3 blocks north of Union Station Metro)

RESERVATIONS: 202–523–4538

DALLAS, TX

WHEN: March 30 at 9:00 am

WHERE: Conference Room 7A23
Earle Cabell Federal Building and Courthouse
1100 Commerce Street
Dallas, TX 75242

RESERVATIONS: 1–800–366–2998

Printed on recycled paper containing 100% post consumer waste

Contents

Federal Register

Vol. 60, No. 50

Wednesday, March 15, 1995

Administrative Conference of the United States
NOTICES
Meetings:
Governmental Processes and Regulation Committees, 13953–

Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry
NOTICES
Meetings:
Scientific Counselors Board, 13999

Agricultural Marketing Service
RULES
Oranges and grapefruit grown in Texas, 13891–13893
PROPOSED RULES
Grapes, table (European or Vinifera); grade standards, 13926–13928

Agriculture Department
See Agricultural Marketing Service
See Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service
See Consolidated Farm Service Agency
See Food and Consumer Service
See Forest Service
See Rural Business and Cooperative Development Service
See Rural Housing and Community Development Service
See Rural Utilities Service

Air Force Department
NOTICES
Meetings:
Scientific Advisory Board, 13969

Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service
RULES
Animal welfare:
Licensing and records; dealers, exhibitors, and auction sales operators, 13893–13896
Exportation and importation of animals and animal products:
Cattle imported in-bond for feeding and return to Mexico, 13896–13898
Sheep and goats from Canada and Mexico, 13898–13900
PROPOSED RULES
Exportation and importation of animals and animal products:
African horse sickness; disease status change—
United Arab Emirates, 13929–13930

Antitrust Division
NOTICES
National cooperative research notifications:
Fieldbus Foundation, 14003
Portland Cement Association, 14003
PowerOpen Association, Inc., 14003–14004
SCM Glidco Organics, 14004
X Consortium, Inc., 14004

Civil Rights Commission
NOTICES
Meetings; State advisory committees:
California, 13968
Nevada, 13969

Commerce Department
See Foreign-Trade Zones Board
See International Trade Administration
See National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration

Commodity Futures Trading Commission
RULES
Commodity Exchange Act:
Risk assessment for holding company systems; correction, 13901–13902

Consolidated Farm Service Agency
PROPOSED RULES
Program regulations:
Environmental program, 13928–13929

Defense Department
See Air Force Department
PROPOSED RULES
Federal Acquisition Regulation (FAR):
Contract financing, 14156–14170
Privacy Act; implementation, 13936–13937
NOTICES
Federal Acquisition Regulation (FAR):
Agency information collection activities under OMB review, 14171

Drug Enforcement Administration
NOTICES
Applications, hearings, determinations, etc.:
Leslie, Robert A., M.D., 14004–14005
Malone, William W., M.D.; correction, 14058

Education Department
NOTICES
Grants and cooperative agreements; availability, etc.:
Job Training Partnership Act—
School-to-work opportunities; Indian program, 14136–14154

Employment and Training Administration
NOTICES
Grants and cooperative agreements; availability, etc.:
Job Training Partnership Act—
School-to-work opportunities; Indian program, 14136–14154

Energy Department
See Federal Energy Regulatory Commission
NOTICES
Atomic energy agreements; subsequent arrangements, 13969–13970
Meetings:
Environmental Management Site Specific Advisory Board—
Idaho National Engineering Laboratory, 13970–13971

Environmental Protection Agency
RULES
Air programs; State authority delegations:
Utah, 13912–13914

Air quality implementation plans; approval and promulgation; various States:
Louisiana, 13908–13912
Pesticides; tolerances in food, animal feeds, and raw agricultural commodities:
Avermectin B1 and delta-8,9-isomer, 13914–13915
PROPOSED RULES
Air pollution; standards of performance for new stationary sources:
Medical waste incinerators; public hearing, 13937–13938
Air programs; State authority delegations:
Utah, 13938
Air quality implementation plans; approval and promulgation; various States:
Louisiana, 13937
Pesticides; tolerances in food, animal feeds, and raw agricultural commodities:
2-[1-(Ethoxyimino)butyl]-5-[2-ethylthio)propyl]-3-hydroxy-2-cyclohexen-1-one, 13941–13943
Paraquat, 13939–13941
Triasulfuron, 13938–13939
Superfund program:
National oil and hazardous substances contingency plan—
National priorities list update, 13944–13945
NOTICES
Air programs:
Enhanced monitoring protocols, 13976–13977
Dermal absorption studies of pesticides; guideline availability, 13977–13978
Meetings:
Environmental Policy and Technology National Advisory Council, 13978
Pesticide, food, and feed additive petitions:
Monsanto Co. et al., 13978–13979
Pesticide programs:
Voluntary reduced-risk pesticides initiative update; availability, 13979–13980
Pesticide registration, cancellation, etc.:
Asahi Chemical Co., 13980
Bear Country Products, 13980–13981
Church & Dwight Co., 13981–13982
D-I-1-4, Inc., 13982
Pesticides; emergency exemptions, etc.:
Cypermethrin, etc., 13982–13984
Pesticides; temporary tolerances:
Northrup King Co. et al., 13984
Reports; availability, etc.:
Paper products recovered materials advisory notice, 14182–14191

Executive Office of the President
See Presidential Documents
See Trade Representative, Office of United States

Federal Aviation Administration
RULES
Class D airspace, 13900–13901
PROPOSED RULES
Class D and Class E airspace, 13931–13932
NOTICES
Exemption petitions; summary and disposition, 14052–14053

Federal Communications Commission
RULES
Personal communications services:
Licenses in 2 GHz band (broadband PCS) and 900 MHz band (narrowband PCS), 13915–13918
Radio stations; table of assignments:
Texas, 13918
PROPOSED RULES
Radio stations; table of assignments:
Texas, 13947–13948
NOTICES
Agency information collection activities under OMB review, 13984–13985
Rulemaking proceedings; petitions filed, granted, denied, etc., 13985

Federal Emergency Management Agency
PROPOSED RULES
Flood insurance program:
Individual and family grant program; group flood insurance policy, 13945–13947

Federal Energy Regulatory Commission
NOTICES
Electric rate and corporate regulation filings:
Cincinnati Gas & Electric Co. et al., 13971–13972
Sunnyside Cogeneration Associates, 13975–13976
Environmental statements; availability, etc.:
Tuolumne Utilities District, 13972
Natural gas certificate filings:
Southern Natural Gas Co. et al., 13972–13974
Applications, hearings, determinations, etc.:
Greeley Gas Co., 13974–13975
KN Interstate Gas Transmission Co., 13975
National Fuel Gas Supply Corp., 13975
Williams Natural Gas Co., 13976

Federal Maritime Commission
NOTICES
Agreements filed, etc., 13985
Freight forwarder licenses:
Maracargo Inc. et al., 13985

Federal Reserve System
NOTICES
Agency information collection activities under OMB review, 13985–13986
Meetings; Sunshine Act, 14057
Applications, hearings, determinations, etc.:
Barber, Ralph Neal, 13986
Dauphin Deposit Corp. et al., 13986–13987
Mellon Bank Corp. et al., 13987
Norton Capital Corp. et al., 13987
Norwest Corp., 13987–13988

Federal Trade Commission
NOTICES
Prohibited trade practices:
Schnuck Markets, Inc., 13988–13993
Schwegmann Giant Super Markets, Inc., 13993–13998

Federal Transit Administration
RULES
Buy America requirements; small purchases and purchases with operating assistance (micro-purchases); waiver, 14174–14176
PROPOSED RULES
Buy America requirements; small purchases and purchases with operating assistance (micro-purchases); waiver, 14178–14179

Financial Management Service
See Fiscal Service

Fiscal Service
RULES
Marketable book-entry Treasury bills, notes, and bonds; sale and issue, 13906–13907

Fish and Wildlife Service
PROPOSED RULES
Endangered and threatened species:
Findings on petitions, etc.—
Preble's meadow jumping mouse, 13950–13952
Migratory bird hunting:
Migratory bird harvest information program, 14194–14196

Food and Consumer Service
NOTICES
Child nutrition programs:
Free and reduced price meals or free-milk; income eligibility guidelines; correction, 14058

Foreign-Trade Zones Board
NOTICES
Applications, hearings, determinations, etc.:
Texas
Tuboscope Vetco International, Inc.; steel tubular products inspection and coating facility, 13955

Forest Service
NOTICES
Appealable decisions; legal notice:
Pacific Southwest region, 13953–13955

General Services Administration
PROPOSED RULES
Federal Acquisition Regulation (FAR):
Contract financing, 14156–14170
NOTICES
Environmental statements; availability, etc.:
Jamaica, New York; FDA regional office and laboratory, 13998–13999
Federal Acquisition Regulation (FAR):
Agency information collection activities under OMB review, 14171

Health and Human Services Department
See Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry
See Health Resources and Services Administration
See National Institutes of Health

Health Resources and Services Administration
NOTICES
Health education assistance loan (HEAL) program:
Defaulted borrowers; list, 14060–14133

Interior Department
See Fish and Wildlife Service
See Land Management Bureau
See National Park Service
See Surface Mining Reclamation and Enforcement Office

International Development Cooperation Agency
See Overseas Private Investment Corporation

International Trade Administration
NOTICES
Antidumping:
Disposable pocket lighters from—
Thailand, 13956–13958
Fresh cut roses from—
Colombia and Ecuador, 13958–13961
Antidumping and countervailing duties:
Administrative review requests, 13955–13956
Countervailing duties:
Disposable pocket lighters from—
Thailand, 13961–13963

International Trade Commission
NOTICES
Import investigations:
Facsimile machines and components, 14002

Justice Department
See Antitrust Division
See Drug Enforcement Administration
RULES
Inmate grievance procedures standards, 13902–13904

Labor Department
See Employment and Training Administration
See Pension and Welfare Benefits Administration

Land Management Bureau
RULES
Public land orders:
New Mexico; correction, 13915
NOTICES
Environmental statements; availability, etc.:
La Paz County Regional Landfill, AZ; expansion project, 14000–14001
Motor vehicle use restrictions:
California, 14001

National Aeronautics and Space Administration
PROPOSED RULES
Federal Acquisition Regulation (FAR):
Contract financing, 14156–14170
NOTICES
Federal Acquisition Regulation (FAR):
Agency information collection activities under OMB review, 14171

National Archives and Records Administration
RULES
Records management:
Micrographic records management; correction, 13908

National Credit Union Administration
NOTICES
Meetings; Sunshine Act, 14057

National Highway Traffic Safety Administration
NOTICES
Motor vehicle safety standards:
Nonconforming vehicles—
Importation eligibility; determinations, 14053–14054

National Institutes of Health
NOTICES
Meetings:
Genome Research Review Committee, 13999
National Heart, Lung, and Blood Institute, 13999–14000
National Institute of Child Health and Human Development, 14000
National Institute on Deafness and Other Communication Disorders, 14000

National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration
RULES
Fishery conservation and management:
Gulf of Mexico stone crab, 13918–13925
NOTICES
Grants and cooperative agreements; availability, etc.:
Chesapeake Bay stock assessments, 13963–13967
Meetings:
Caribbean Fishery Management Council, 13968
South Atlantic Fishery Management Council, 13968

National Park Service
NOTICES
Environmental statements; availability, etc.:
Hamilton Grange National Memorial, NY, 14001
Grants and cooperative agreements; availability, etc.:
Preservation technology and training projects, 14001–14002
Meetings:
National Preservation Technology and Training Board, 14002

National Transportation Safety Board
PROPOSED RULES
Public aircraft accident reporting requirements, 13948–13950

Nuclear Regulatory Commission
NOTICES
Meetings:
Cost beneficial licensing actions and technical specifications improvement program; workshop, 14013–14015
Operating licenses, amendments; no significant hazards considerations; biweekly notices, 14015–14040
Applications, hearings, determinations, etc.:
Toledo Edison Co. et al., 14040

Office of United States Trade Representative
See Trade Representative, Office of United States

Overseas Private Investment Corporation
NOTICES
Meetings; Sunshine Act, 14057

Pension and Welfare Benefits Administration
NOTICES
Employee benefit plans; prohibited transaction exemptions:
Boston Cement Masons Union Local No. 534 et al., 14005–14012

Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation
RULES
Single-employer and multiemployer plans:
Valuation of plan benefits, etc.—
Interest rates, etc., 13904–13906

Postal Rate Commission
NOTICES
Visits to facilities, 14040–14041

Presidential Documents
PROCLAMATIONS
Special observances:
Public Health Week, National (Proc. 6776), 13889
EXECUTIVE ORDERS
Israel-United States Binational Industrial Research and Development Foundation; designation (EO 12956), 14199

Public Health Service
See Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry
See Health Resources and Services Administration
See National Institutes of Health

Rural Business and Cooperative Development Service
PROPOSED RULES
Program regulations:
Environmental program, 13928–13929

Rural Housing and Community Development Service
PROPOSED RULES
Program regulations:
Environmental program, 13928–13929

Rural Utilities Service
PROPOSED RULES
Program regulations:
Environmental program, 13928–13929

Securities and Exchange Commission
NOTICES
Agency information collection activities under OMB review, 14041
Self-regulatory organizations; proposed rule changes:
Boston Stock Exchange, Inc., 14041–14042
Chicago Board Options Exchange, Inc., 14042–14043
Philadelphia Stock Exchange, Inc., 14043–14044
Applications, hearings, determinations, etc.:
Aetna Insurance Co. of America et al., 14044–14047
First Trust Special Situations Trust et al., 14047–14048
ML Venture Partners II, L.P., et al., 14048–14050

Selective Service System
RULES
Conscientious objectors classification; registrant processing procedures, 13907–13908

Sentencing Commission, United States
See United States Sentencing Commission

Surface Mining Reclamation and Enforcement Office
PROPOSED RULES
Permanent program and abandoned mine land reclamation plan submissions:
Montana, 13932–13935
Utah, 13935–13936

Toxic Substances and Disease Registry Agency
See Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry

Trade Representative, Office of United States
NOTICES
Meetings:
Industry Policy Advisory Committee, 14040

Transportation Department
See Federal Aviation Administration
See Federal Transit Administration
See National Highway Traffic Safety Administration
NOTICES
Meetings:
Centralization and computerization of dockets; information request on policy statement, 14050–14052

Treasury Department
See Fiscal Service

United States Sentencing Commission
NOTICES
Sentencing guidelines and policy statements for Federal courts, 14054–14055

Veterans Affairs Department
NOTICES
Agency information collection activities under OMB review:
VA MATIC change, 14055–14056
Privacy Act:
Systems of records, 14056

Separate Parts In This Issue

Part II
Department of Health and Human Services, Health Resources and Services Administration, 14060–14133

Part III
Department of Labor, Employment and Training Administration, and Department of Education, 14136–14154

Part IV
Department of Defense, General Services Administration, and National Aeronautics and Space Administration, 14156–14171

Part V
Department of Transportation, Federal Transit Administration, 14174–14176

Part VI
Department of Transportation, Federal Transit Administration, 14178–14179

Part VII
Environmental Protection Agency, 14182–14191

Part VIII
Department of the Interior, Fish and Wildlife Service, 14194–14196

Part IX
The President, 14199

Reader Aids
Additional information, including a list of public laws, telephone numbers, and finding aids, appears in the Reader Aids section at the end of this issue.

Electronic Bulletin Board
Free **Electronic Bulletin Board** service for Public Law numbers, **Federal Register** finding aids, and a list of documents on public inspection is available on 202–275–1538 or 275–0920.

CFR PARTS AFFECTED IN THIS ISSUE

A cumulative list of the parts affected this month can be found in the Reader Aids section at the end of this issue.

3 CFR
Proclamations:
6776.....13889
Executive Orders:
12956.....14199
7 CFR
906.....13891
Proposed Rules:
51.....13926
1940.....13928
9 CFR
2.....13893
91.....13896
92 (2 documents) 13896, 13898
Proposed Rules:
92.....13929
14 CFR
71.....13900
Proposed Rules:
71.....13931
17 CFR
1.....13901
28 CFR
40.....13902
29 CFR
2619.....13904
2676.....13904
30 CFR
Proposed Rules:
926.....13932
944.....13935
31 CFR
356.....13906
32 CFR
1636.....13907
Proposed Rules:
311.....13936
36 CFR
1230.....13908
40 CFR
52.....13908
61.....13912
180.....13914
Proposed Rules:
52.....13937
60.....13937
61.....13938
180 (3 documents) 13938, 13939, 13941
300.....13944
43 CFR
Public Land Orders:
7124.....13915
44 CFR
Proposed Rules:
61.....13945
206.....13945
47 CFR
24.....13915
73 (2 documents) 13918
Proposed Rules:
73.....13947
48 CFR
Proposed Rules:
32.....14156
52.....14156
49 CFR
661.....14174
Proposed Rules:
661.....14178
800.....13948
830.....13948
831.....13948
50 CFR
654.....13918
Proposed Rules:
17.....13950
20.....14194

Federal Register
Vol. 60, No. 50
Wednesday, March 15, 1995

Presidential Documents

Title 3—

The President

Proclamation 6776 of March 13, 1995

National Public Health Week, 1995

By the President of the United States of America

A Proclamation

A clean bill of health is one of life's most precious gifts. But for many Americans, and for millions around the world, good health can seem almost a luxury. The AIDS epidemic, the prevalence of poor nutrition, unplanned pregnancies, and environmental degradation—these are just some of the pressing crises facing hardworking public health officials everywhere. While our society's medical technology has advanced to a level unimaginable to the generations before, the crucial job of ensuring basic public health for all remains just beyond our reach.

Now, more than ever, public health programs and services are needed so that we can ensure the best possible health for everyone. Providing safe living and working environments, developing methods to immunize populations against infectious disease, maintaining good nutritional standards, and having good prenatal care for everyone are vital endeavors—and such primary and preventive measures can mean the difference between life and death.

Every day, thousands of individuals across our country are working to build healthy communities, meet the needs of our diverse population, plan appropriate responses to natural disasters, educate individuals about workplace hazards, and encourage responsible behavior in all that we do. Their leadership is helping America to address one of humanity's most essential concerns, and their service is building a safer, healthier future for all of our people.

NOW, THEREFORE, I, WILLIAM J. CLINTON, President of the United States of America, by virtue of the authority vested in me by the Constitution and laws of the United States, do hereby proclaim the week of April 3 through April 9, 1995, as ''National Public Health Week.'' I call upon all Federal, State, and local public health agencies to join with appropriate private organizations and educational institutions in celebrating this occasion with activities to promote healthy lifestyles and to heighten awareness of the many benefits good health brings.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand this thirteenth day of March, in the year of our Lord nineteen hundred and ninety-five, and of the Independence of the United States of America the two hundred and nineteenth.

William J. Clinton

[FR Doc. 95–6524
Filed 3-13-95; 2:28 pm]
Billing code 3195–01–P

Rules and Regulations

Federal Register
Vol. 60, No. 50
Wednesday, March 15, 1995

This section of the FEDERAL REGISTER contains regulatory documents having general applicability and legal effect, most of which are keyed to and codified in the Code of Federal Regulations, which is published under 50 titles pursuant to 44 U.S.C. 1510.

The Code of Federal Regulations is sold by the Superintendent of Documents. Prices of new books are listed in the first FEDERAL REGISTER issue of each week.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Agricultural Marketing Service

7 CFR Part 906

[Docket No. FV94–906–4FIR]

Oranges and Grapefruit Grown in the Lower Rio Grande Valley in Texas; Revision of Container and Container Pack Requirements and Rules and Regulations for Special Purpose Shipments

AGENCY: Agricultural Marketing Service, USDA.

ACTION: Final rule.

SUMMARY: The Department of Agriculture (Department) is adopting as a final rule, with appropriate modifications, the provisions of an interim final rule which revised container requirements and added a new container to those authorized for use by handlers of Texas citrus. This final rule continues a relaxation of pack requirements by requiring containers to have at least one-third Texas citrus by volume, rather than 50 percent citrus by count. This rule allows for more efficient use of containers and provides handlers with more flexibility in packing mixed packs.

EFFECTIVE DATE: April 14, 1995.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Charles L. Rush, Marketing Order Administration Branch, Fruit and Vegetable Division, AMS, USDA, P.O. Box 96456, Room 2523–S, Washington, D.C. 20090–6456, telephone: (202) 720–2431; or Belinda G. Garza, McAllen Marketing Field Office, Fruit and Vegetable Division, AMS, USDA, 1313 East Hackberry, McAllen, Texas 78501; telephone: (210) 682–2833.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: This rule is issued under Marketing Agreement and Order No. 906 [7 CFR Part 906] regulating the handling of oranges and grapefruit grown in the Lower Rio Grande Valley in Texas, hereinafter referred to as the order. The agreement and order are effective under the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937, as amended [7 U.S.C. 601–674], hereinafter referred to as the Act.

The Department of Agriculture (Department) is issuing this rule in conformance with Executive Order 12866.

This rule has been reviewed under Executive Order 12778, Civil Justice Reform. This rule is not intended to have retroactive effect. This rule will not preempt any State or local laws, regulations, or policies, unless they present an irreconcilable conflict with this rule.

The Act provides that administrative proceedings must be exhausted before parties may file suit in court. Under section 608c(15)(A) of the Act, any handler subject to an order may file with the Secretary a petition stating that the order, any provision of the order, or any obligation imposed in connection with the order is not in accordance with law and requesting a modification of the order or to be exempted therefrom. Such handler is afforded the opportunity for a hearing on the petition. After the hearing, the Secretary would rule on the petition. The Act provides that the district court of the United States in any district in which the handler is an inhabitant, or has his or her principal place of business, has jurisdiction in equity to review the Secretary's ruling on the petition, provided a bill in equity is filed not later than 20 days after date of the entry of the ruling.

Pursuant to the requirements set forth in the Regulatory Flexibility Act (RFA), the Administrator of the Agricultural Marketing Service (AMS) has considered the economic impact of this rule on small entities.

The purpose of the RFA is to fit regulatory actions to the scale of business subject to such actions in order that small businesses will not be unduly or disproportionately burdened. Marketing orders issued pursuant to the Act, and rules issued thereunder, are unique in that they are brought about through group action of essentially small entities acting on their own behalf. Thus, both statutes have small entity orientation and compatibility.

There are approximately 15 handlers of oranges and grapefruit regulated under the marketing order each season and approximately 750 orange and grapefruit producers in South Texas. Small agricultural producers have been defined by the Small Business Administration [13 CFR 121.601] as those having annual receipts of less than $500,000, and small agricultural service firms are defined as those whose annual receipts are less than $5,000,000. The majority of these handlers and producers may be classified as small entities.

Section 906.40(d) of the order authorizes the Secretary to fix the size, weight, capacity, dimensions, or pack of the container or containers which may be used in the packaging, transportation, sale, shipment, or other handling of Texas oranges or grapefruit. Consistent with this authority, § 906.340 of the order's rules and regulations specifies the containers that may be used by Texas citrus handlers. These containers include cardboard cartons; mesh, poly, and vexar bags; and a number of master or bulk containers. Additionally, experimental containers may be approved by the Texas Valley Citrus Committee (committee), the agency responsible for local administration of the order. The handling of each lot of fruit in such test containers is subject to prior committee approval and is under the supervision of the committee.

The committee met on August 18, 1994, and unanimously recommended that the container requirements be revised. The recommended changes were to (1) revise the inside dimension specifications of two authorized master containers; (2) eliminate certain restrictions on the packing of mesh or poly bags; and (3) add a new fiberboard display bin to the list of approved containers. These changes were included in an interim final rule which became effective December 9, 1994 [59 FR 63691].

Two of the containers authorized for use prior to issuance of the interim final rule were (1) closed fiberboard cartons with inside dimensions of 20 inches in length by 13¼ inches in width by 9¾ to 10¾ inches in depth, and (2) fiberboard cribs with dimensions of 46 inches in length by 38 inches width by 24 inches high. These containers were authorized, respectively, in subparagraphs (iii) and (viii) of § 906.340(a)(1). They were used as master containers for shipping bags of fruit or for shipping fruit in bulk.

In recent seasons, handlers have used experimental containers with different dimensions than those authorized under § 906.340(a). The use of these containers has been successful, and, thus, the committee recommended that the dimensions specified for these two containers be revised to provide for more flexibility in packing Texas citrus. Specifically, subparagraph (iii) of § 906.340(a)(1) was revised to specify inside dimensions for closed fiberboard containers of 20 inches in length by 13¼ inches in width by 9¾ to 13 inches in depth. The revised dimensions for the fiberboard crib authorized by § 906.340(a)(1)(viii) are 46 to 47½ inches in length by 37 to 38 inches in width by 24 inches in depth. These revisions enable handlers to use a wider variety of containers without having to receive prior committee approval or to use such containers under the committee's supervision.

Section 906.340 authorizes a number of mesh, poly, and vexar bags that may be used in packing Texas citrus, and, prior to issuance of the interim final rule specified the master containers that can be used to ship these bags of fruit. For example, mesh type bags having a capacity of 10 pounds of fruit could only be packed in closed fiberboard cartons with inside dimensions of 20 inches by 13¼ inches by 9¾ to 10¾ inches. The committee recommended that such restrictions be eliminated to permit the industry to pack any authorized bag in any approved master container. This revision provides handlers with additional flexibility in packing oranges and grapefruit without having to follow the procedures governing the use of experimental containers. This rule maintains the revision to subparagraphs (iii), (iv), (vii), (viii), (ix), and (x) of § 906.340(a)(1). The committee's recommendation that the master containers utilized experimentally during the past few seasons become permanent was implemented in the interim final rule.

The committee's recommendation for a new fiberboard display bin was added to the list of approved containers and continues in effect. The new fiberboard display bin is being successfully used by the Florida citrus industry. The high-graphic bulk bin works as an in-store advertisement, increasing traffic and volume movement in the produce department. Because the bin is vented, the fruit holds up better during shipping. The bin can be shipped on pallets or ''slip'' boards. By adding these containers which were previously approved for experimental use to the permanent list of containers, there is no longer a requirement that each lot of fruit shipped in such containers receive prior approval from the committee.

The interim final rule added subparagraph (xi) to § 906.340(a)(1) to authorize the use of this container. Subparagraphs (ix), (x) and (xi) of § 906.340(a)(1) are redesignated, respectively, as subparagraphs (x), (xi) and (xii).

Section 906.42 authorizes the Secretary to modify, suspend, or terminate regulations based upon recommendations and information submitted by the committee, or other available information pursuant to §§ 906.34, 906.40, 906.45, or any combination thereof, in order to facilitate the handling of fruit.

Consistent with § 906.42, § 906.120 of the order's rules and regulations provides that oranges and/or grapefruit mixed with other types of fruit may be handled exempt from container and pack regulations, subject to certain conditions. One of those conditions prior to issuance of the interim final rule, was that the oranges and/or grapefruit constitute at least 50 percent by count of the contents of any container. The rule continues to allow handlers to pack ⅓ Texas citrus by volume rather than 50 percent by count as authorized in § 906.120(c)(4)(ii). This change provided handlers with the flexibility to pack a variety of products (e.g., pecans, jalapeno jelly, Washington apples, avocadoes, etc.) in the mixed packs. The committee recognized the need to specify that mixed packs contain at least ⅓ Texas citrus by volume. The committee believes that the change will allow the Texas citrus industry to improve producer returns.

The Department's opinion is that specifying ''Texas'' is redundant. As a result the Department did not include the term in the revision of § 906.120(c)(4)(ii).

The interim final rule concerning this action was published in the December 9, 1994, **Federal Register** [59 FR 63691], with a 30-day comment period ending January 9, 1995.

One comment was received from Ms. Darlene Barter, manager of the committee. Ms. Barter suggested that the revision to § 906.120(c)(4)(ii) in the interim final rule should specify ''Texas citrus.'' The Department's position is that the industry will be better served by stating ''grown in the production area'' rather than stating ''Texas citrus''. This will encourage handlers to ship oranges and grapefruit grown in the Lower Rio Grande Valley. While citrus is well defined in the order, the Department agrees that there is a need for additional clarity in the order's handling regulations. The best way to improve the clarity of the handling regulations is by stating ''grown in the production area''. While Ms. Barter's request is not accepted, a change in the regulation for clarity will be incorporated.

The information collection requirements contained in the referenced sections have been previously approved by the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) under the provisions of 44 U.S.C. chapter 35 and have been assigned OMB number 0581–0068 for Texas oranges and grapefruit.

There is no reporting burden on handlers of oranges and grapefruit who have been using experimental containers because no application is required.

Based on the above, the Administrator of the AMS has determined that this action will not have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities.

After consideration of all relevant matter presented, including the information and recommendations submitted by the committee and other available information, it is hereby found that this rule as hereinafter set forth will tend to effectuate the declared policy of the Act.

List of Subjects in 7 CFR Part 906

Grapefruit, Marketing agreements and Reporting and recordkeeping requirements.

For the reasons set forth in the preamble, 7 CFR Part 906 is amended as follows:

PART 906—[AMENDED]

1. The authority citation for 7 CFR Part 906 continues to read as follows:

Authority: 7 U.S.C. 601–674.

§ 906.120 Fruit exempt from regulations.

2. Section 906.120(c)(4) is revised to read as follows:

* * * * *

(c) * * *

(4) Oranges and grapefruit grown in the production area may be handled exempt from container and pack regulations issued pursuant to § 906.40(d), under the following conditions:

(i) Such oranges and/or grapefruit grown in the production area are mixed with other types of fruit;

(ii) Such oranges and/or grapefruit grown in the production area constitute at least one-third by volume of the contents of any container, and any such container is not larger than a 7/10 bushel carton.

(iii) Such grapefruit grown in the production area grade at least U.S. No.

1, and such oranges grown in the production area grade at least U.S. Combination (with not less than 60 percent, by count, of the oranges in any lot grading at least U.S. No.1).

* * * * *

Dated: March 9, 1995.

Sharon Bomer Lauritsen,

Deputy Director, Fruit and Vegetable Division.

[FR Doc. 95–6368 Filed 3–14–95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3410–02–W

Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service

9 CFR Part 2

[Docket No. 92–158–2]

Animal Welfare; Licensing and Records

AGENCY: Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, USDA.

ACTION: Final rule.

SUMMARY: We are amending the Animal Welfare regulations to require dealers, exhibitors, and operators of auction sales who apply for license renewal to certify that, to the best of their knowledge and belief, they are in compliance with the regulations before a renewal is issued. We are also amending the regulations to require dealers and exhibitors to use certain forms to make, keep, and maintain the animal identification records required by the regulations, unless a variance has been granted that would allow the use of a computerized recordkeeping system that has been determined by the Administrator to meet the requirements of the regulations. These changes will help ensure that applicants for license renewal are in compliance with the regulations and that dealers and exhibitors keep accurate and complete records, thus promoting compliance with the Animal Welfare Act.

EFFECTIVE DATE: April 14, 1995.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Dr. Debra E. Beasley, Senior Staff Veterinarian, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, Regulatory Enforcement and Animal Care, Animal Care, 4700 River Road Unit 84, Riverdale, MD 20737–1234; (301) 734–7833.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

The Animal Welfare regulations contained in 9 CFR part 2 (referred to below as the regulations) pertain to the administrative and institutional responsibilities of regulated persons under the Animal Welfare Act (7 U.S.C. 2131, *et seq.*) (the Act).

On December 28, 1993, we published in the **Federal Register** (58 FR 68559–68561, Docket No. 92–158–1) a proposal to amend the regulations to require that an applicant for license renewal certify that, to the best of the applicant's knowledge and belief, he or she is in compliance with the regulations and standards and agrees to continue to be in compliance upon issuance of a renewed license. In that same document, we also proposed to amend the regulations to require dealers and exhibitors to use Veterinary Services (VS) Form 18–5, ''Record of Dogs and Cats on Hand,'' and VS Form 18–6, ''Record of Disposition of Dogs and Cats,'' to make, keep, and maintain the information required by § 2.75(a)(1) of the regulations. We also proposed to add Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service (APHIS) form numbers in front of the VS form numbers that appear in several places in the regulations.

We solicited comments concerning our proposal for a 60-day comment period ending February 28, 1994. We received 11 comments by that date. The comments were submitted by a scientific society, animal breeders and distributors, humane and animal rights organizations, and private citizens. We carefully considered all of the comments we received. They are discussed below by topic.

Recordkeeping

Comment: The use of VS Forms 18–5 and 18–6 should remain optional since many facilities have accurate and efficient computerized recordkeeping systems. The forms that APHIS proposes to require are cumbersome, repetitive, and outdated and they do not provide spaces for all the information that is required by the regulations.

Response: We understand that many dealers and exhibitors, especially the larger operations, may be using computerized systems to make, keep, and maintain the records required by § 2.75(a)(1) of the regulations. Because it would be difficult for some dealers and exhibitors to switch over to a paper system, we have added a provision to the regulations that will enable a dealer or exhibitor to apply for a variance from the requirement to use VS Forms 18–5 and 18–6. If APHIS determines that a dealer or exhibitor is maintaining a computerized recordkeeping system that is adequate to keep the required information, a variance will be granted. An appeal procedure is also included for dealers or exhibitors who have had their request for a variance denied. The variance is an option only for those dealers and exhibitors who are using a computerized recordkeeping system; a variance will not be granted for alternative paper records. With regard to the complaint that the forms are outdated, APHIS is currently developing updated forms that reflect the requirements of the regulations. The updated forms will be distributed as supplies of the existing forms are depleted.

License Renewal

Comment: The proposed certification will be effective only if it supports APHIS in denying the license renewal applications of facilities not in compliance with the regulations and standards. Otherwise, the certification will not encourage compliance any more than the statement that applicants are currently required to sign.

Response: The regulations in § 2.5 state that a license will be renewed if, before the expiration of the license, the licensee files an application for license renewal, submits an annual report as required by § 2.7, and pays the required fees. There are no provisions in the regulations for denying a license renewal application as long as the licensee has complied with those requirements. However, as provided in § 2.1(f) of the regulations, a person who fails to comply with any provision of the Act or any provision of the regulations and standards shall be liable to having his or her license suspended or revoked.

Comment: If a facility was in the process of correcting a deficiency, it would be unable to certify that it is in compliance with the regulations and standards until the deficiency was completely corrected, which could take up to 30 days or even longer. Similarly, it would be difficult for a licensee with more than one facility to be certain that all his or her facilities were, at any given time, in compliance with the regulations and standards. The delays that could result from having to be certain that all the regulations and standards had been satisfied could cause a facility to miss its deadline for license renewal.

Response: If a licensee who had been cited for a deficiency was actively working to correct that deficiency, APHIS would be aware—or could be informed—that the licensee was addressing the problem and was making a good-faith effort to comply with the regulations. Such a situation would be no reason for a licensee to delay filing a license renewal application. With regard to the example of a licensee with more than one facility, it is the responsibility of a licensee, either personally or through his or her

employees, to ensure that each facility is maintained and operated in compliance with the regulations. If a licensee is aware of a deficiency in one of his or her facilities, it is incumbent upon the licensee to address the deficiency in order to remain in compliance with the regulations. Having responsibility for more than one facility is not an excuse for knowingly operating in violation of the regulations and standards.

Comment: Prior to 1979, APHIS allowed license applicants to submit an affidavit stating that their premises, facilities, and equipment were in compliance with the regulations and standards, in lieu of an APHIS inspection. However, in 1979, APHIS amended the regulations to remove the applicant affidavit method of ascertaining compliance because of misrepresentation and misuse of the method by some applicants. In light of that experience, there does not appear to be any advantage to requiring license applicants to agree to comply with the regulations and standards. Therefore, if APHIS finalizes its proposed certification requirement in § 2.2, the text of § 2.2 must contain a reference to the inspection provisions of § 2.3.

Response: The proposed certification requirement was not presented as an alternative means of ascertaining compliance or as a substitute for inspections. The certification requirement will have no effect on the provisions of § 2.3, which requires applicants for an initial license or license renewal to make their animals, premises, facilities, vehicles, equipment, other premises, and records available for inspection so that an APHIS inspector may ascertain the applicant's compliance with the standards and regulations.

Comment: It is unclear how APHIS intends licensees to certify that they are in compliance. A simple statement would be ineffective, and any documented statement would entail the use of lengthy forms, which impose a significant additional paperwork burden on licensees. Either way, new regulations are no substitute for APHIS performing rigorous inspections.

Response: As described in the proposed rule, an applicant for license renewal would certify that he or she is, to the best of the applicant's knowledge and belief, in compliance with the regulations and standards and agrees to continue to comply with the regulations and standards by signing the application form, which will contain a statement to that effect. The certification will not necessitate the use of lengthy forms or the imposition of significant additional paperwork burdens. As mentioned above, APHIS does not intend for the certification to take the place of inspections.

Comment: The proposed certification requirement should help encourage compliance. However, to promote even greater compliance, the certification should actually take the form of an affidavit, signed by the applicant, stating that the applicant has read the Act, its amendments, and the applicable regulations and standards in their totality and understands their contents fully. Further, the applicant should verify that he or she is in compliance with, and will continue to comply with, the Act and its implementing regulations and standards. The applicant should have to have paid any outstanding fines levied by the USDA for violations of the Act. Additionally, the application should include a warning stating that, under 18 U.S.C. 1001, anyone making a false, fictitious, or fraudulent statement on the application could be subject to a fine of $10,000 and 5 years in prison.

Response: We believe that an affidavit would accomplish no more than the signed statement currently required. Similarly, because APHIS already supplies each applicant a copy of the applicable regulations and standards, we do not believe that supplying a copy of the Act and its amendments would add to an applicant's knowledge of his or her responsibilities, which are spelled out in the regulations and standards. Because a person who fails to comply with the Act or the regulations and standards is liable to having his or her license suspended or revoked, it is in each licensee's best interests to know what is required of him or her. We cannot, however, reasonably require a person to swear that he or she has read the Act, its amendments, and the applicable regulations and standards in their totality and understands their contents fully. With regard to denying renewals to persons with unpaid fines, we stated above that the regulations make no provision for the denial of a license renewal as long as the licensee filed an application for license renewal on time, submitted an annual report as required by § 2.7, and has paid the required fees. Other avenues are utilized by APHIS to collect unpaid fines. Finally, the commenter mentioned the penalties provided under 18 U.S.C. 1001. Those penalties can be applied in matters within the jurisdiction of APHIS, and we will post a warning to that effect on the license renewal application form that we are developing.

Addition of APHIS Form Numbers

Three commenters mentioned our proposal to add APHIS form numbers in front of the VS form numbers that appear in several places in the regulations. Each of those commenters supported the proposed change.

Comments Outside the Scope of This Rulemaking

One commenter strongly supported the mandatory use of VS forms, but added that a photograph of each individual dog or cat should be required as part of the record. Similarly, another commenter suggested that additional information be required, such as a second piece of identification, a notarized verification of exempt status and a signed statement, when applicable, verifying that a random-source animal was held for the mandated period. However, the proposed rule did not propose any changes to the type of information that dealers and exhibitors must keep as part of the required animal identification records. Rather, we proposed that specific forms be used to record and maintain the information already required by the regulations in § 2.75(a)(1). Because of this, such comments are outside the scope of the proposed rule and no changes have been made in this final rule as a result of those comments. Any such changes would have to be proposed as part of a separate proposed rule.

Other commenters submitted comments concerning individual identification of animals, the definitions of Class A and B dealers, requiring the use of other forms, individually notifying licensees of proposed rules and other regulatory actions, and the development of new forms. Again, such comments are outside the scope of the proposed rule and, therefore, no changes have been made in this final rule as a result of those comments. Any such changes would have to be proposed as part of a separate proposed rule.

Therefore, based on the rationale set forth in the proposed rule and in this document, we are adopting the provisions of the proposal as a final rule, with the changes discussed in this document.

Miscellaneous

As mentioned above, APHIS is currently developing an updated version of VS Form 18–5, ''Record of Dogs and Cats on Hand.'' The updated form includes new spaces for the recording of information pertaining to the acquisition of the dogs or cats

covered by the form. To reflect the inclusion of the new spaces, VS Form 18–5 has been renamed ''Record of Acquisition and Dogs and Cats on Hand.'' The two places in the regulations where the title of VS Form 18–5 is mentioned—in §§ 2.35(d)(1) and 2.75(a)(2)—have been amended in this document to reflect the title change.

We have slightly adjusted the language of § 2.2(b) for the purpose of greater clarity.

Executive Order 12866 and Regulatory Flexibility Act

This rule has been reviewed under Executive Order 12866. The rule has been determined to be not significant for the purpose of Executive Order 12866 and, therefore, has not been reviewed by the Office of Management and Budget.

We are amending the Animal Welfare regulations to require applicants for license renewal to certify that they are in compliance with the regulations before a renewal is issued. We are also amending the regulations to require dealers and exhibitors to use certain forms to make, keep, and maintain the animal identification records required by the regulations. These changes will help ensure that applicants for license renewal are in compliance with the regulations and that dealers and exhibitors keep accurate and complete records. We do not expect there to be an economic impact on any entities, large or small, that will be affected by these changes in the regulations.

Because all licensees are currently required to operate in compliance with the regulations, the requirement for license renewal applicants to certify that they are in compliance with the regulations will have no effect in terms of increased operational costs or burdens. Similarly, requiring dealers and exhibitors to use VS Form 18–5 and VS Form 18–6 to make, keep, and maintain the required animal identification records will involve no new costs or burdens. Dealers and exhibitors are already required to keep the records, so they will not have to gather or record any new information in order to complete the forms. The forms are provided by APHIS to dealers and exhibitors free of charge, and we will not require any existing records to be converted over to the new forms. Additionally, a dealer or exhibitor who wished to do so could obtain a variance from the requirement to use the forms if the computerized recordkeeping system has been determined by the Administrator to meet the requirements of the regulations.

Under these circumstances, the Administrator of the Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service has determined that this action will not have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities.

Executive Order 12372

This program/activity is listed in the Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance under No. 10.025 and is subject to Executive Order 12372, which requires intergovernmental consultation with State and local officials. (See 7 CFR part 3015, subpart V.)

Executive Order 12778

This final rule has been reviewed under Executive Order 12778, Civil Justice Reform. It is not intended to have retroactive effect. This rule does not preempt any State or local laws, regulations, or policies, unless they present an irreconcilable conflict with this rule. The Act does not provide administrative procedures which must be exhausted prior to a judicial challenge to the provisions of this rule.

Paperwork Reduction Act

In accordance with the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1980 (44 U.S.C. 3501 *et seq.*), the information collection or recordkeeping requirements included in this final rule have been submitted for approval to the Office of Management and Budget.

List of Subjects in 9 CFR Part 2

Animal welfare, Pets, Reporting and recordkeeping requirements, Research.

Accordingly, 9 CFR part 2 is amended as follows:

PART 2—REGULATIONS

1. The authority citation for part 2 continues to read as follows:

Authority: 7 U.S.C. 2131–2159; 7 CFR 2.17, 2.51, and 371.2(g).

2. Section 2.2 is revised to read as follows:

§ 2.2 Acknowledgment of regulations and standards.

(a) *Application for initial license.* APHIS will supply a copy of the applicable regulations and standards to the applicant with each request for a license application. The applicant shall acknowledge receipt of the regulations and standards and agree to comply with them by signing the application form before a license will be issued.

(b) *Application for license renewal.* APHIS will supply a copy of the applicable regulations and standards to the applicant for license renewal with each request for a license renewal. Before a license will be renewed, the applicant for license renewal shall acknowledge receipt of the regulations and standards and shall certify by signing the application form that, to the best of the applicant's knowledge and belief, he or she is in compliance with the regulations and standards and agrees to continue to comply with the regulations and standards.

§ 2.5 [Amended]

3. In § 2.5, paragraph (b), the first sentence is amended by adding the words ''APHIS Form 7003/'' immediately before the words ''VS Form 18–3''.

§ 2.35 [Amended]

4. In § 2.35, paragraph (d)(1) is amended by adding the words ''APHIS Form 7001/'' immediately before the words ''VS Form 18–1''; by adding the words ''Acquisition and'' before the words ''Dogs and Cats on Hand''; and by adding the words ''APHIS Form 7005/'' immediately before the words ''VS Form 18–5''.

5. In § 2.35, paragraph (d)(2) is amended by adding the words ''APHIS Form 7001/'' immediately before the words ''VS Form 18–1'' and by adding the words ''APHIS Form 7006/'' immediately before the words ''VS Form 18–6''.

§ 2.38 [Amended]

6. In § 2.38, paragraph (h)(3) is amended by adding the words ''APHIS Form 7001/'' immediately before the words ''VS Form 18–1''.

7. In § 2.38, paragraph (i)(3), the beginning of the second sentence is amended by removing the words ''Veterinary Services'' and adding the words ''APHIS Form 7009/VS'' in their place.

8. Section 2.75 is amended as follows:

a. Paragraph (a)(2) is revised to read as set forth below.

b. In paragraph (a)(3), the words ''APHIS Form 7001/'' are added immediately before the words ''VS Form 18–1'', and the words ''paragraph (a)(1) of this section and'' are removed.

c. In paragraph (b)(2), the words ''APHIS Form 7019/'' are added immediately before the words ''VS Form 18–19'', and the words ''APHIS Form 7020/'' are added immediately before the words ''VS Form 18–20''.

§ 2.75 Records: Dealers and exhibitors.

(a) * * *

(2) Each dealer and exhibitor shall use Record of Acquisition and Dogs and Cats on Hand (APHIS Form 7005/VS Form 18–5) and Record of Disposition of Dogs and Cats (APHIS Form 7006/VS Form 18–6) to make, keep, and maintain the information required by paragraph

(a)(1) of this section: *Provided*, that if a dealer or exhibitor who uses a computerized recordkeeping system believes that APHIS Form 7005/VS Form 18–5 and APHIS Form 7006/VS Form 18–6 are unsuitable for him or her to make, keep, and maintain the information required by paragraph (a)(1) of this section, the dealer or exhibitor may request a variance from the requirement to use APHIS Form 7005/VS Form 18–5 and APHIS Form 7006/VS Form 18–6.

(i) The request for a variance must consist of a written statement describing why APHIS Form 7005/VS Form 18–5 and APHIS Form 7006/VS Form 18–6 are unsuitable for the dealer or exhibitor to make, keep, and maintain the information required by paragraph (a)(1) of this section, and a description of the computerized recordkeeping system the person would use in lieu of APHIS Form 7005/VS Form 18–5 and APHIS Form 7006/VS Form 18–6 to make, keep, and maintain the information required by paragraph (a)(1) of this section. APHIS will advise the person as to the disposition of his or her request for a variance from the requirement to use APHIS Form 7005/VS Form 18–5 and APHIS Form 7006/VS Form 18–6.

(ii) A dealer or exhibitor whose request for a variance has been denied may request a hearing in accordance with the applicable rules of practice for the purpose of showing why the request for a variance should not be denied. The denial of the variance shall remain in effect until the final legal decision has been rendered.

* * * * *

§ 2.78 [Amended]

9. In § 2.78, paragraph (d) is amended by adding the words ''APHIS Form 7001/'' immediately before the words ''VS Form 18–1''.

§ 2.102 [Amended]

10. In § 2.102, paragraph (a)(3), the beginning of the second sentence is amended by removing the words ''Veterinary Services'' and adding the words ''APHIS Form 7009/VS'' in their place.

Done in Washington, DC, this 9th day of March 1995.

Terry L. Medley,

Acting Administrator, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service.

[FR Doc. 95–6369 Filed 3–14–95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3410–34–P

9 CFR Parts 91 and 92

[Docket No. 94–076–1]

Cattle Imported In-Bond for Feeding and Return to Mexico

AGENCY: Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, USDA.

ACTION: Interim rule and request for comments.

SUMMARY: We are amending the animal exportation and importation regulations by removing provisions that allow the temporary, in-bond importation of cattle from Mexico into the United States for feeding and return to Mexico for slaughter. We are taking this action because the U.S. Customs Service, to comply with provisions of the North American Free Trade Agreement, has discontinued its collection of duties and bonds on cattle imported into the United States from Mexico. Without a bond, we are unable to meaningfully penalize importers who fail to return those cattle to Mexico. We believe, therefore, that the current in-bond program must be terminated to prevent the dissemination into the United States of animal diseases by in-bond cattle that remain in the United States in violation of the regulations.

DATES: Interim rule effective March 30, 1995. Consideration will be given only to comments received on or before May 15, 1995.

ADDRESSES: Please send an original and three copies of your comments to APHIS, PPD, Regulatory Analysis and Development, 4700 River Road Unit 118, Riverdale, MD 20737–1238. Please state that your comments refer to Docket No. 94–076–1. Comments received may be inspected at USDA, room 1141, South Building, 14th Street and Independence Avenue SW., Washington, DC, between 8 a.m. and 4:30 p.m., Monday through Friday, except holidays. Persons wishing to inspect comments are requested to call ahead on (202) 690–2817 to facilitate entry into the comment reading room.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Dr. David Vogt, Senior Staff Veterinarian, APHIS, Veterinary Services, Import/Export Animals Staff, 4700 River Road Unit 39, Riverdale, MD 20737–1231; (301) 734–8170.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

The regulations in 9 CFR part 92 prohibit or restrict the importation of certain animals into the United States to prevent the introduction of communicable diseases of livestock and poultry. Subpart D of part 92 (§§ 92.400 through 92.435), referred to below as the regulations, pertains to the importation of ruminants. Sections 92.424 through 92.429 of the regulations contain specific provisions regarding the importation of ruminants, including cattle, from Mexico.

Before the effective date of this rule, § 92.427(e) of the regulations provided for the temporary importation of cattle from Mexico into the United States under United States Customs bond for feeding and return to Mexico for slaughter. Cattle imported under this in-bond program were exempt from some requirements that applied to the importation of other cattle from Mexico, but were subject to additional restrictions during the time they were in the United States that did not apply to other cattle imported from Mexico.

Specifically, in-bond cattle from Mexico could be imported without meeting the requirements of § 92.427(c)(1) regarding herd tests for tuberculosis and without meeting the requirements of § 92.427(d)(1) regarding herd tests for brucellosis if the cattle were: (1) Moved directly by land from the port of entry to an approved quarantined feedlot; (2) removed from the quarantined feedlot only to be moved directly to a Mexican port of entry for return to Mexico for slaughter; and (3) moved only in trucks or railway cars that had been sealed with a seal applied by a U.S. Department of Agriculture inspector.

Additionally, in-bond cattle from Mexico could be imported without the official record of negative brucellosis test required by § 92.424(b) and without meeting the requirements of § 92.427(d) regarding brucellosis if the cattle were under 24 months of age and were accompanied by a certificate stating that the cattle had been vaccinated for brucellosis.

The movement, quarantine, and vaccination requirements discussed above were designed to prevent the transmission of animal diseases from in-bond Mexican cattle to other animals in the United States. However, if the importer of the in-bond Mexican cattle did not adhere to those requirements, there was a serious risk that those cattle, which had not been tested for tuberculosis or brucellosis prior to entering the United States, would spread disease to domestic livestock. As a means of ensuring that the in-bond Mexican cattle were maintained in accordance with the regulations while in the United States and were actually returned to Mexico upon completion of their feeding period in the United States, the regulations required that the importer of the Mexican cattle post a

bond with the U.S. Customs Service at the port of entry. The bond required by the Customs Service could be as high as three times the duty value of the cattle, so it was clearly in an importer's best interests to meet all the requirements of the regulations.

However, on January 1, 1994, the U.S. Customs Service discontinued its collection of duties and bonds on imported Mexican cattle in order to comply with provisions of the North American Free Trade Agreement. As a consequence, importers no longer had to post a bond when importing cattle from Mexico into the United States for feeding and return to Mexico, although the Customs Service continued to track such cattle entering and leaving the United States. The penalty for failing to return in-bond Mexican cattle to Mexico upon completion of their feeding period has been reduced to $400.

Since the Customs Service discontinued its collection of bonds, the Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service (APHIS) has monitored the in-bond program to determine whether the program could remain viable despite the lack of a posted bond. Recently, some importers of cattle under the in-bond program have indicated to APHIS that they would be willing to accept the $400 fine—a relatively insignificant amount when compared to the bond that would have been forfeited before the Customs Service discontinued collecting the bond—if the importers could move their cattle to slaughter or other destinations in the United States without returning the cattle to Mexico for slaughter, as required under the in-bond program's regulations. Evidently, those importers believe that even with the $400 fine, it would be more profitable to sell their cattle in the United States than in Mexico. In fact, we are now aware of at least one case in which an importer did remove his in-bond Mexican cattle from a quarantined feedlot and send the cattle to slaughter in the United States. APHIS has the option of pursuing civil and criminal action against an importer in such cases, but we believe that there remains the strong possibility that importers will choose to accept the risk of criminal and civil action against them sometime in the future in order to move their in-bond Mexican cattle to slaughter or other destinations in the United States.

As stated above, in-bond Mexican cattle were exempted from meeting certain testing requirements for tuberculosis and brucellosis; clearly, cattle that have not met those testing requirements present a greater than average risk of spreading disease to domestic livestock. The quarantine and movement restrictions of the in-bond program were specifically designed to mitigate that increased disease risk, so it follows that cattle moved in violation of those quarantine and movement restrictions would present a greater than average disease risk. It has become evident that the posting of a bond is necessary to ensure compliance with the provisions of the in-bond program, but APHIS has no statutory authority to institute a bond system similar to that which had been administered by the U.S. Customs Service at U.S. ports of entry on the Mexican border prior to January 1, 1994. Therefore, we believe that it is necessary for us to terminate the in-bond program described in § 92.427(e) in order to prevent the introduction into, and dissemination within, the United States of disease.

Therefore, we are removing § 92.427(e), ''Cattle imported in bond for feeding and return to Mexico,'' in its entirety. The termination of the in-bond program also entails the removal of five references to the in-bond program that are found elsewhere in part 92 and in the animal export regulations in 9 CFR part 91. Specifically, we are amending:

- Section 91.3(a) by removing a provision that exempts in-bond Mexican cattle from the requirement that all animals intended for exportation to Mexico be accompanied from the State of origin of the export movement to the border of the United States by an origin health certificate;
- Section 91.5 by removing a provision that exempts in-bond Mexican cattle from certain pre-export health testing requirements;
- Section 92.424(b) by removing a provision that exempts in-bond Mexican cattle from the requirement for an official record of brucellosis testing;
- Section 92.426(a) by removing a provision requiring in-bond Mexican cattle to be inspected at the port of entry and found free from communicable disease and fever tick infestation; and
- Section 92.427(c)(2) by removing a provision that exempts in-bond Mexican cattle from the M-branding requirement.

Miscellaneous

As noted above, we are removing § 92.427(e) in its entirety, including footnote 10, which cites regulations of the U.S. Customs Service concerning movement in bond. Therefore, to keep the footnotes in the subpart numbered consecutively, we are amending §§ 92.430, 92.431, 92.433, 92.434, and 92.435 by redesignating footnotes 11 through 22 as footnotes 10 through 21.

Emergency Action

The Administrator of the Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service has determined that conditions exist that warrant publication of this interim rule without prior opportunity for public comment. The recent steep devaluation of the Mexican peso has created a strong economic incentive for importers of in-bond cattle from Mexico to send such cattle to slaughter in the United States, rather than in Mexico as required by the regulations. Because Customs has discontinued collecting bonds, prompt action is necessary to prevent the dissemination into the United States of animal diseases by in-bond Mexican cattle that remain in the United States in violation of the regulations. We are making this rule effective 15 days after its publication in the **Federal Register** to provide importers in the United States and exporters in Mexico adequate notice of this action in order to prevent undue stress on cattle already in transit from Mexico and undue hardship on the owners, importers, and exporters of cattle from Mexico.

Because prior notice and other public procedures with respect to this action are impracticable and contrary to the public interest under these conditions, we find good cause under 5 U.S.C. 553 to make this rule effective 15 days after its publication in the **Federal Register**. We will consider comments that are received within 60 days of publication of this rule in the **Federal Register**. After the comment period closes, we will publish another document in the **Federal Register**. It will include a discussion of any comments we receive and any amendments we are making to the rule as a result of the comments.

Executive Order 12866 and Regulatory Flexibility Act

This rule has been reviewed under Executive Order 12866. The rule has been determined to be not significant for purposes of Executive Order 12866 and, therefore, has not been reviewed by the Office of Management and Budget.

This rule amends the animal exportation and importation regulations by removing provisions regarding the temporary, in-bond importation of cattle from Mexico into the United States for feeding and return to Mexico for slaughter.

Several feedlots in the United States could be economically affected by this proposed change in the regulations, but we anticipate that the impact will be minimal. In fiscal year 1993, approximately 61,000 Mexican cattle were imported into the United States for feeding and return to Mexico for

slaughter under U.S. Customs bond. They included 24,811 cattle imported into Arizona, 3,878 into California, 69 into New Mexico, and 32,059 into Texas. APHIS estimates that as many as 18 different feedlots in Arizona, California, New Mexico, and Texas were used for the feeding of in-bond Mexican cattle during the height of in-bond activity. Currently, there are about 10 feedlots that have facilities for the feeding of in-bond Mexican cattle, but only about 5 of those feedlots have been used recently to feed in-bond Mexican cattle.

The termination of the in-bond program is expected to have a negligible impact on feedlots in the United States. Most are large businesses (defined as having more than $1.0 million in annual gross receipts, according to Small Business Administration size criteria) and usually use only a small portion of the feedlot for in-bond Mexican cattle. The majority of the area in the feedlots is generally used to feed either other imported Mexican cattle or domestic cattle. With the termination of the in-bond program, we anticipate that any affected feedlots will use their entire areas to feed other imported Mexican cattle or domestic cattle.

Under these circumstances, the Administrator of the Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service has determined that this action will not have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities.

Executive Order 12778

This rule has been reviewed under Executive Order 12778, Civil Justice Reform. This rule: (1) Preempts all State and local laws and regulations that are inconsistent with this rule; (2) has no retroactive effect; and (3) does not require administrative proceedings before parties may file suit in court challenging this rule.

Paperwork Reduction Act

This rule contains no information collection or recordkeeping requirements under the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1980 (44 U.S.C. 3501 *et seq.*).

List of Subjects

9 CFR Part 91

Animal diseases, Animal welfare, Exports, Livestock, Reporting and recordkeeping requirements, Transportation.

9 CFR Part 92

Animal diseases, Imports, Livestock, Poultry and poultry products, Quarantine, Reporting and recordkeeping requirements.

Accordingly, 9 CFR parts 91 and 92 are amended as follows:

PART 91—INSPECTION AND HANDLING OF LIVESTOCK FOR EXPORTATION

1. The authority citation for part 91 is revised to read as follows:

Authority: 21 U.S.C. 105, 112, 113, 114a, 120, 121, 134b, 134f, 136, 136a, 612, 613, 614, and 618; 46 U.S.C. 466a and 466b; 49 U.S.C. 1509(d); 7 CFR 2.17, 2.51, and 371.2(d).

§ 91.3 [Amended]

2. In § 91.3, paragraph (a), the second sentence is amended by removing the words ‘‘, except cattle from Mexico imported into the United States in bond for temporary feeding and return to Mexico,’’.

§ 91.5 [Amended]

3. In § 91.5, the introductory text is amended by removing the words ‘‘, except cattle from Mexico imported into the United States in bond for temporary feeding and return to Mexico, except cattle from Mexico imported into the United States in bond for temporary feeding and return to Mexico,’’.

PART 92—IMPORTATION OF CERTAIN ANIMALS AND POULTRY AND CERTAIN ANIMAL AND POULTRY PRODUCTS; INSPECTION AND OTHER REQUIREMENTS FOR CERTAIN MEANS OF CONVEYANCE AND SHIPPING CONTAINERS THEREON

4. The authority citation for part 92 continues to read as follows:

Authority: 7 U.S.C. 1622; 19 U.S.C. 1306; 21 U.S.C. 102–105, 111, 114a, 134a, 134b, 134c, 134d, 134f, 135, 136, and 136a; 31 U.S.C. 9701; 7 CFR 2.17, 2.51, and 371.2(d).

§ 92.424 [Amended]

5. In § 92.424, paragraph (b), the second sentence is amended by removing the words ‘‘pursuant to § 92.427(e)(2), or’’.

§ 92.426 [Amended]

6. In § 92.426, paragraph (a), the first sentence is amended by removing the words ‘‘or in bond for temporary entry in accordance with § 92.427(e) of this part’’.

§ 92.427 [Amended]

7. In § 92.427, paragraph (c)(2), the first sentence is amended by removing the words ‘‘or in bond for temporary entry in accordance with § 92.427(e) of this part’’.

8. In § 92.427, paragraph (e), including footnote 10, is removed.

§§ 92.430 through 92.435 [Amended]

9. In §§ 92.430 through 92.434, footnotes 11 through 21 and their references in the text are redesignated as footnotes 10 through 20, respectively.

Done in Washington, DC, this 9th day of March 1995.

Terry L. Medley,

Acting Administrator, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service.

[FR Doc. 95–6371 Filed 3–14–95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3410–34–P

---

9 CFR Part 92

[Docket No. 94–085–1]

Importation of Sheep and Goats From Canada and Mexico

AGENCY: Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, USDA.

ACTION: Interim rule.

SUMMARY: We are amending the regulations for importing sheep and goats from Canada and Mexico to require that, with the exception of sheep and goats imported through land border ports for immediate slaughter, and wethers imported through land border ports, all sheep and goats imported into the United States from Canada and Mexico be accompanied by an import permit. This change is necessary to prevent the importation of sheep and goats that may be affected with scrapie.

DATES: Interim rule effective March 10, 1995. Consideration will be given only to comments received on or before May 15, 1995.

ADDRESSES: Please send an original and three copies of your comments to Docket No. 94–085–1, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, Policy and Program Development, Regulatory Analysis and Development, 4700 River Road Unit 118, Riverdale, MD 20737–1228. Please state that your comments refer to Docket No. 94–085–1. Comments received may be inspected at USDA, room 1141, South Building, 14th Street and Independence Avenue SW., Washington, DC, between 8 a.m. and 4:30 p.m., Monday through Friday, except holidays. Persons wishing to inspect comments are requested to call ahead on (202) 690–2817 to facilitate entry into the comment reading room.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Dr. Joyce Bowling, Staff Veterinarian, or Dr. Roger Perkins, Staff Veterinarian, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, Veterinary Services, National Center for Import and Export, 4700 River Road Unit 38, Riverdale, MD 20737–1228. Telephone: (301) 734–8170.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

The regulations in 9 CFR part 92 (referred to below as ''the regulations'') govern the importation into the United States of live animals, including sheep and goats, to prevent those infected with scrapie from transmitting the disease to livestock in the United States.

Scrapie is a progressive degenerative disease of the central nervous system of sheep and goats. Scrapie occurs more often in certain flocks and herds and certain bloodlines, indicating that these animals may be genetically predisposed to become infected with or develop the disease. Scrapie may also be transmitted by breeding and other physical contact between animals.

The disease develops slowly, with an incubation period lasting up to 5 years. The signs which then become manifest may include nervousness, incoordination, slight muscular tremors, visible weight loss, lack of luster in the animals' wool, and itching. Affected animals become debilitated and die. There is no diagnostic test for confirming the presence of the disease in a live animal. Therefore, presence of the disease cannot be detected until an animal becomes clinically ill. There is no known treatment for the disease. The impact of the disease in the United States could increase if spread of the disease is not controlled, or if incidence of the disease increases. The regulations are intended to prevent the importation of animals that could transmit scrapie.

Import Permits

One way we have of ensuring that sheep and goats intended for importation into the United States are healthy is by reviewing background information concerning the animals that is supplied when an importer applies for a permit to import the animals. The requirements for obtaining a permit to import sheep and goats and other ruminants are contained in § 92.404.

Before the effective date of this interim rule, the regulations required that importers obtain an import permit for all sheep and goats intended for importation into the United States from any part of the world, except for certain sheep and goats imported from Canada or Mexico through land border ports, and certain sheep and goats moved from the British Virgin Islands to the U.S. Virgin Islands for immediate slaughter. These exceptions were contained in §§ 92.417(a), 92.424(a), and 92.422(a), respectively.

With two exceptions, this interim rule requires all sheep and goats imported into the United States from Canada or Mexico to be accompanied by an import permit. This is because sheep and goats, with the exceptions explained below, that are imported from Canada or Mexico through a land border port could be infected with and transmit scrapie to livestock in the United States. The exceptions are sheep and goats imported for immediate slaughter and wethers.

Sheep and goats, as well as other ruminants imported from Canada and Mexico for immediate slaughter must, under our regulations, be consigned from the port of entry to a recognized slaughtering establishment and be slaughtered there within 2 weeks of importation (see § 92.400, the definition of immediate slaughter, and §§ 92.420 and 92.429). Wethers are castrated male sheep or goats. They are incapable of breeding and are imported for feeding and subsequent slaughter. According to industry practice, wethers are kept in confinement during feeding. Under these circumstances, neither wethers nor sheep and goats imported for immediate slaughter from Canada or Mexico pose any significant threat of transmitting scrapie to livestock in the United States.

By requiring a permit for other sheep and goats intended for importation from Canada or Mexico through a land border port, we will have an opportunity to review background information on the animals and determine whether the animal may be infected with scrapie, which cannot be detected by visual inspection at the border.

We are not exempting from our permit requirements sheep and goats imported for immediate slaughter from countries other than Canada or Mexico. Neither are we exempting from our permit requirements wethers imported from countries other than Canada or Mexico. The exemption from our permit requirements for wethers and for sheep and goats for immediate slaughter are only for those sheep and goats that are imported from Canada and Mexico through a land border port, where inspectors can check the animals for disease and ectoparasites before the animals cross the border into the United States.

In connection with the amendments discussed above, we are adding a definition for wether to the definitions in § 92.400, as follows: ''A castrated male sheep or goat.''

Effective Date

The Administrator of the Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service has determined that there is good cause for publishing this interim rule without prior opportunity for public comment. We have been made aware that sheep and goats impregnated with embryos from animals in countries affected with scrapie will be presented for importation into the United States from Canada in the next few days or weeks. We will be unable to identify these animals because our regulations currently allow them to be imported into the United States without an import permit.

We are not aware of any similar animals to be presented for importation from Mexico. However, a similar situation could occur at any time with regard to sheep and goats from Mexico because certain sheep and goats imported into the United States from Mexico through land border ports are not required to have an import permit. If such a situation did occur, we would probably have little or no notice, and without a permit requirement we could not identify animals from Mexico which could transmit scrapie to livestock in the United States.

The only other sheep and goats which can be imported into the United States without a permit are certain ruminants moving from the British Virgin Islands to the U.S. Virgin Islands for immediate slaughter. Because these animals are moving to slaughter, they do not pose any disease threat.

Immediate action is therefore necessary to prevent the importation of sheep and goats that may transmit scrapie to U.S. livestock. Because prior notice and other public procedures with respect to this action are impracticable and contrary to the public interest under these conditions, we find good cause under 5 U.S.C. 553 to make it effective upon signature. We will consider comments that are received within 60 days of publication of this rule in the **Federal Register**. After the comment period closes, we will publish another document in the **Federal Register**. It will include a discussion of any comments we receive and any amendments we are making to the rule as a result of the comments.

Executive Order 12866 and Regulatory Flexibility Act

This rule has been reviewed under Executive Order 12866. The rule has been determined to be not significant for purposes of Executive Order 12866 and, therefore, has not been reviewed by the Office of Management and Budget.

This rule requires an import permit for certain sheep and goats imported into the United States from Canada and Mexico through a land border port.

Between December of 1993 and December of 1994, 30,614 sheep and goats were imported from Canada

through a land border port; none were imported from Mexico through a land border port. Over 97 percent of these sheep and goats were wethers or were imported for immediate slaughter. Wethers and sheep and goats imported through land border ports for immediate slaughter continue to be exempt from the requirement for an import permit. Based on these numbers, we expect that only 3 percent of sheep and goats imported from Canada or Mexico through land border ports will be required to be accompanied by an import permit under this rule. There is no fee for the import permit.

Under these circumstances, the Administrator of the Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service has determined that this action will not have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities.

Executive Order 12778

This rule has been reviewed under Executive Order 12778, Civil Justice Reform. This rule: (1) Preempts all State and local laws and regulations that are inconsistent with this rule; (2) has no retroactive effect; and (3) does not require administrative proceedings before parties may file suit in court challenging this rule.

Paperwork Reduction Act

In accordance with the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1980 (44 U.S.C. 3501 *et seq.*), the information collection or recordkeeping requirements included in this rule have been approved by the Office of Management and Budget (OMB), and there are no new requirements. The assigned OMB control number is 0579–0040.

List of Subjects in 9 CFR Part 92

Animal diseases, Imports, Livestock, Poultry and poultry products, Quarantine, Reporting and recordkeeping requirements.

Accordingly, 9 CFR part 92 is amended as follows:

PART 92—IMPORTATION OF CERTAIN ANIMALS AND POULTRY AND CERTAIN ANIMAL AND POULTRY PRODUCTS; INSPECTION AND OTHER REQUIREMENTS FOR CERTAIN MEANS OF CONVEYANCE AND SHIPPING CONTAINERS THEREON

1. The authority citation for part 92 continues to read as follows:

Authority: 7 U.S.C. 1622; 19 U.S.C. 1306; 21 U.S.C. 102–105, 111, 114a, 134a, 134b, 134c, 134d, 134f, 135, 136, and 136a; 31 U.S.C. 9701; 7 CFR 2.17, 2.51, and 371.2(d).

2. Section 92.400 is amended by adding a definition for *Wether,* in alphabetical order, to read as follows:

§ 92.400 Definitions.

* * * * *

Wether. A castrated male sheep or goat.

* * * * *

3. Section 92.417 is amended as follows:

a. In paragraph (a), the introductory text is amended by adding, immediately before the colon at the end of the text, the word: ''is''.

b. Paragraphs (a)(1) and (a)(2) are redesignated as paragraphs (a)(3)(i) and (a)(3)(ii), respectively; and new paragraphs (a)(1), (a)(2), and (a)(3) are added to read as follows:

§ 92.417 Import permit and declaration for ruminants.

(a) * * *

(1) A wether;

(2) A sheep or goat imported for immediate slaughter; or

(3) A ruminant other than a sheep or goat and that ruminant:

* * * * *

4. Section 92.424 is amended as follows:

a. In paragraph (a), the introductory text is amended by adding, immediately before the colon at the end of the text, the word ''is''.

b. Paragraphs (a)(1), (a)(2), and (a)(3) are redesignated as paragraphs (a)(3)(i), (a)(3)(ii), and (a)(3)(iii), respectively; and new paragraphs (a)(1), (a)(2), and (a)(3) are added to read as follows:

§ 92.424 Import permits and applications for inspection of ruminants.

(a) * * *

(1) A wether;

(2) A sheep or goat imported for immediate slaughter; or

(3) A ruminant other than a sheep or goat and that ruminant:

* * * * *

Done in Washington, DC, this 10th day of March 1995.

Terry L. Medley,

Acting Administrator, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service.

[FR Doc. 95–6372 Filed 3–14–95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3410–34–P

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Federal Aviation Administration

14 CFR Part 71

[Airspace Docket No. 95–AWP–4]

Alteration of Class D Airspace; Williams Air Force Base (AFB), AZ

AGENCY: Federal Aviation Administration (FAA), DOT.

ACTION: Final rule.

SUMMARY: This action changes the name of the Class D airspace area to Williams Gateway, AZ. This alteration is necessary due to the closure of Williams AFB, AZ, and the renaming of the airport to Williams Gateway Airport, AZ. This action reflects the name change and title description of the Class D airspace area to Williams Gateway, AZ.

EFFECTIVE DATE: 0901 UTC, May 25, 1995.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Scott Speer, System Management Specialist, System Management Branch, AWP–530, Air Traffic Division, Western-Pacific Region, Federal Aviation Administration, 15000 Aviation Boulevard, Lawndale, California 90261, telephone (310) 297–0010.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

The Rule

This amendment to part 71 of the Federal Aviation Regulations (14 CFR part 71) changes the name of the Class D airspace area at Williams AFB, AZ, to the Class D airspace area at Williams Gateway, AZ. This alteration is necessary due to the closure of the Williams AFB, AZ, and the renaming of the airport to Williams Gateway Airport, AZ. This action reflects the name change and title description of the Class D airspace area to Williams Gateway, AZ. This action is editorial in nature. I find that notice and public procedure under 5 U.S.C. 553(b) are unnecessary, because this action is a minor technical amendment in which the public is not particularly interested. Class D airspace areas designations are published in paragraph 5000 of FAA Order 7500.9B dated July 18, 1994, and effective September 16, 1994, which is incorporated by reference in 14 CFR 71.1. The Class D airspace designation listed in this document will be published subsequently in this Order.

The FAA has determined that this regulation only involves an established body of technical regulations for which frequent and routine amendments are

necessary to keep them operationally current. It, therefore–(1) is not a ''significant regulation action'' under Executive Order 12866; (2) is not a ''significant rule'' under DOT Regulatory Policies and Procedures (44 FR 11034; February 26, 1970); and (3) does not warrant preparation of a regulatory evaluation as the anticipated impact is so minimal. Since this is a routine matter that will not affect air traffic procedures and air navigation, it is certified that this rule will have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities under the criteria of the Regulatory Flexibility Act.

List of Subjects in 14 CFR Part 71

Airspace, Incorporation by reference, Navigation (air).

Adoption of the Amendment

In consideration of the foregoing, the Federal Aviation Administration amends 14 CFR part 71 as follows:

PART 71—[AMENDED]

1. The authority citation for 14 CFR 71 continues to read as follows:

Authority: 49 U.S.C. app. 1348(a), 1354(a), 1510; E.O. 10854, 24 FR 9565, 3 CFR, 1959–1963 Comp., p. 389; 49 U.S.C. 106(g); 14 CFR 11.69.

§ 71.1 [Amended]

2. The incorporation by reference in 14 CFR 71.1 of the Federal Aviation Administration Order 7400.9B, Airspace Designations and Reporting Points, dated July 18, 1994, and effective September 16, 1994, is amended as follows:

Paragraph 5000 Class D Airspace

* * * * *

AWP AZ D Williams Gateway, AZ [Revised]

Williams Gateway Airport, AZ
(Lat. 33°18′28″ N, long. 111°39′19″ W)

That airspace extending upward from the surface to and including 3,900 feet MSL within a 5-mile radius of the Williams Gateway Airport. This Class D airspace area is effective during the specific dates and times established in advance by a Notice to Airmen. The effective date and time will thereafter be continuously published in the Airport/Facility Director.

* * * * *

Issues in Los Angeles, California, on March 3, 1995.

Dennis T. Koehler,

Acting Manager, Air Traffic Division, Western-Pacific Region.

[FR Doc. 95–6380 Filed 3–14–95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–13–M

COMMODITY FUTURES TRADING COMMISSION

17 CFR Part 1

Risk Assessment for Holding Company Systems; Correction

AGENCY: Commodity Futures Trading Commission.

ACTION: Correction to final rules.

SUMMARY: This document contains a correction to the final rules which were published Wednesday, December 28, 1994 (59 FR 66674). The rules implemented the risk assessment authority set forth in Section 4f(c) of the Commodity Exchange Act and imposed reporting and recordkeeping requirements for certain registered futures commission merchants (''FCMs'').

EFFECTIVE DATE: March 15, 1995.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Lawrence B. Patent, Associate Chief Counsel, or Lawrence T. Eckert, Attorney Adviser, Division of Trading and Markets, Commodity Futures Trading Commission, 2033 K Street N.W., Washington D.C. 20581. Telephone (202) 254–8955.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

On December 28, 1994, the Commission published notice of the adoption of Rules 1.14 and 1.15 to implement the risk assessment authority set forth in Section 4f(c) of the Commodity Exchange Act. The rules generally require FCMs that are subject to the rules to maintain and file with the Commission certain information concerning their financial activities and the activities of their material affiliates.

Rule 1.15(a)(1) required that each FCM subject to the rule file copies of its organizational chart and financial, operational and risk management policies, procedures and systems ''with the regional office with which it files periodic financial reports and with its designated self-regulatory organization * * *'' Rule 1.15(a)(2), however, required that an FCM's consolidated and consolidating financial statements be filed only with ''the regional office with which [the FCM] files periodic financial reports * * *'' The inclusion of a filing requirement with the FCM's designated self-regulatory organization (''DSRO'') in Rule 1.15(a)(1) was inadvertent and is at odds with the Commission's intent as discussed in the preamble to the **Federal Register** release accompanying the risk assessment rules. In discussing the degree of confidentiality to be afforded information filed by FCMs with the Commission under the risk assessment rules, and in particular the issue of whether risk assessment information should be made available to self-regulatory organizations, the Commission stated that ''[t]he Commission recognizes the sensitivity of certain information required to be reported under these rules [and] * * * plans to make the information reported to it available only on an as-needed basis, as determined in its sole discretion.'' [1] Because the inclusion of a requirement that FCMs file certain information with their DSROs was not intended, the Commission is publishing this notice deleting from Rule 1.15(a)(1) and (a)(4) the references to a filing requirement with FCMs' DSROs.

Need for Correction

As published, the final rules contain errors which may prove to be misleading and are in need of clarification.

List of Subjects in 17 CFR Part 1

Commodity futures consumer protection, Reporting and recordkeeping requirements.

Correction of Publication

Accordingly, the publication on December 28, 1994 of the final rules (59 FR 66674) which were the subject of FR Doc. 94–31828, is corrected as follows:

PART 1—[CORRECTED]

On pages 66690 and 66691 paragraphs (a)(1) introductory text and (a)(4) of § 1.15 are corrected to read as follows:

§ 1.15 Risk assessment reporting requirements for futures commission merchants.

(a) *Reporting requirements with respect to information required to be maintained by § 1.14.* (1) Each futures commission merchant registered with the Commission pursuant to Section 4d of the Act, unless exempt pursuant to paragraph (c) of this section, shall file the following with the regional office with which it files periodic financial reports by no later than April 30, 1995, provided that in the case of a futures commission merchant whose registration becomes effective after December 31, 1994, such futures commission merchant shall file the following within 60 calendar days after the effective date of such registration, or by April 30, 1995, whichever comes later:

* * * * *

[1] 59 FR 66674, 66687 (December 28, 1994).

(4) The reports required to be filed pursuant to paragraphs (a)(1) and (a)(2) of this section shall be considered filed when received by the regional office of the Commission with whom the futures commission files financial reports pursuant to § 1.10.

* * * * *

Issued in Washington, D.C. on March 8, 1995, by the Commission.

Jean A. Webb,

Secretary of the Commission.

[FR Doc. 95–6212 Filed 3–14–95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6351–01–P

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Office of the Attorney General

28 CFR Part 40

[AG Order No. 1955–95]

Standards for Inmate Grievance Procedures

AGENCY: Department of Justice.

ACTION: Interim rule with request for comments.

SUMMARY: This interim rule modifies the standards for state prison inmate grievance procedures to allow for certification of a procedure which, if not in substantial compliance with minimum standards promulgated by the Attorney General, nevertheless is found by the Attorney General to be otherwise fair and effective. This interim rule also adjusts the time limits for processing grievances to help ensure final disposition within the period of time allowed for judicial continuance. These amendments are necessary to implement new statutory authority .

DATES: This interim rule is effective March 15, 1995; comments must be submitted on or before May 15, 1995.

ADDRESSES: Please submit comments to Office of General Counsel, Bureau of Prisons, HOLC room 709, 320 First Street NW., Washington, DC 20534.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: John Megathlin, Administrator, National Inmate Appeals, Federal Bureau of Prisons, 320 First Street NW., Washington, DC 20534, telephone (202) 514–6165.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

In an effort to reduce unnecessary prisoner litigation, Congress enacted the Civil Rights of Institutionalized Persons Act (42 U.S.C. 1997). Section 7 of the Act, 42 U.S.C. 1997e, adopted a qualified exhaustion requirement for civil rights actions filed by state prisoners in federal district court under 42 U.S.C. 1983. That section allowed the court, if appropriate and in the interests of justice, to continue proceedings for a period of 90 days in order to compel prisoners to exhaust local administrative prison grievance procedures. Exhaustion could not be required unless the Attorney General had certified or the court had determined that such administrative grievance procedure was in substantial compliance with the minimum standards promulgated by the Attorney General pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 1997e(b).

The Violent Crime Control and Law Enforcement Act of 1994 (Pub. L. 103–322) amended 42 U.S.C. 1997e. As amended, 42 U.S.C. 1997e now allows the court to continue proceedings for up to 180 days. In addition, exhaustion may be required if the Attorney General certifies or the court determines that the administrative grievance procedure in question, even if it is not in compliance with the minimum standards promulgated by the Attorney General, is ''otherwise fair and effective.''

This interim rule accordingly revises § 40.11 in 28 CFR part 40 in order to address the evaluation of an applicant's submission under the ''otherwise fair and effective'' standard as well as under the existing standards. Sections 40.14, 40.15, 40.16, 40.18 (a) and (b), 40.19(a), and 40.22 are amended to include reference to determination that a grievance procedure is otherwise fair and effective.

In addition, § 40.7(e) is amended to specify that in all instances grievances must be processed from initiation to final disposition within 180 days, including any extensions. Formerly, paragraph (e) had required final disposition within 90 days, excluding any extension of time agreed to in writing by the grievant. This amendment is intended to provide applicants the flexibility to set time limits for the final disposition of grievances within the extended period of time allowed under newly revised 42 U.S.C. 1997e(a)(1). As revised, paragraph (e) no longer requires written consent from the grievant for an extension of time on a response. However, notification to the grievant of an extension of time for a response at any stage of the process remains necessary in order to require exhaustion of that stage.

Regulatory Process Matters

The Department of Justice's implementation of this rule as an interim rule, with provisions for post-promulgation public comment, is based on the ''good cause'' exception of 5 U.S.C. 553(d)(3). This rule is necessary to conform existing regulations to recent statutory amendments. Immediate implementation will allow the Attorney General to use without undue delay the statutory ''otherwise fair and effective'' standard in consideration of current applications by States or local jurisdictions for certification, and consequently reduce regulatory burdens on these government entities.

The Attorney General has determined that this rule is not a significant regulatory action under Executive Order 12866, section 3(f), and accordingly this rule was not reviewed by the Office of Management and Budget. This rule does not have federalism implications warranting the preparation of a Federalism Assessment in accordance with section 6 of Executive Order 12612. The Attorney General, in accordance with the Regulatory Flexibility Act (5 U.S.C. 605(b)), has reviewed this regulation and by approving it certifies that this regulation will not have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities.

List of Subjects in 28 CFR Part 40

Administrative practice and procedure, Civil rights, Inmate grievance procedures, Prisoners.

Accordingly, by virtue of the authority vested in the Attorney General by law, including 5 U.S.C. 301, 28 U.S.C. 509, and 42 U.S.C. 1997e, part 40 of Chapter I of title 28 of the Code of Federal Regulations is amended as follows:

PART 40—STANDARDS FOR INMATE GRIEVANCE PROCEDURES

1. The authority citation for part 40 continues to read as follows:

Authority: 42 U.S.C. 1997e.

2. In § 40.7, paragraph (e) is revised to read as follows:

§ 40.7 Operation and decision.

* * * * *

(e) *Fixed time limits.* Responses shall be made within fixed time limits at each level of decision. Time limits may vary between institutions, but expeditious processing of grievances at each level of decision is essential to prevent grievance from becoming moot. Unless the grievant has been notified of an extension of time for a response, expiration of a time limit at any stage of the process shall entitle the grievant to move to the next stage of the process. In all instances grievances must be processed from initiation to final

disposition within 180 days, inclusive of any extensions.

* * * * *

3. Section 40.11 is revised to read as follows:

§ 40.11 Submissions by applicant.

(a) *Written statement.* An application for certification of a grievance procedure under the Act shall be submitted to the Office of the Attorney General, U.S. Department of Justice, Main Justice Building, Washington, DC 20530, and shall include a written statement describing the grievance procedure, a brief description of the institution or institutions covered by the procedure, and accompanying plans for or evidence of implementation in each institution.

(b) *Evidence of compliance with established standards.* An applicant seeking certification of a grievance procedure as being in substantial compliance with the standards promulgated herein should submit evidence of compliance with those standards, including the following information:

(1) *Instructional materials.* A copy of the instructional materials for inmates and employees regarding use of the grievance procedure together with a description of the manner in which such materials are distributed, a description of the oral explanation of the grievance procedure, including the circumstances under which it is delivered, and a description of the training, if any, provided to employees and inmates in the skills necessary to operate the grievance procedure.

(2) *Form.* A copy of the form used by inmates to initiate a grievance and to obtain review of the disposition of a grievance.

(3) *Information regarding past compliance.* For a grievance procedure that has operated for more than one year at the time of the application, the applicant shall submit information regarding the number and types of grievances filed over the preceding year, the disposition of the grievances with sample responses from each level of decision, the remedies granted, evidence of compliance with time limits at each level of decision, and a description of the role of inmates and employees in the formulation, implementation, and operation of the grievance procedure.

(4) *Plan for collecting information.* For a grievance procedure that has operated for less than one year at the time of the application, the applicant shall submit a plan for collecting the information described in paragraph (b)(3) of this section.

(5) *Assurance of confidentiality.* A description of the steps taken to ensure the confidentiality of records of individual use of or participation in the grievance procedure.

(6) *Evaluation.* A description of the plans for periodic evaluation of the grievance procedure, including identification of the group, individuals or individual who will conduct the evaluation and identification of the person or entity not under the control of supervision of the institution who will review the evaluation, together with two copies of the most recent evaluation, if one has been performed.

(c) *Fair and effective procedures.* The Attorney General shall also certify a grievance procedure under the Act, even if the procedure is not in substantial compliance with the standards promulgated herein, if the Attorney General determines that the procedure is otherwise fair and effective for the consideration and disposition of grievances filed by inmates. If a grievance procedure is not in substantial compliance with all standards herein, the applicant shall identify the aspects in which the procedure is in substantial compliance and those in which it is not, describe the other relevant features of the procedure, and explain why the procedure is otherwise fair and effective.

4. Section 40.14 is revised to read as follows:

§ 40.14 Conditional certification.

If, in the judgment of the Attorney General, a grievance procedure that has been in existence less than one year is at the time of application in substantial compliance with the standards promulgated herein or is otherwise fair and effective, the Attorney General shall grant conditional certification for one year or until the applicant satisfies the requirements of § 40.15, whichever period is shorter.

5. Section 40.15 is revised to read as follows:

§ 40.15 Full certification.

If, in the judgment of the Attorney General, a grievance procedure that has been in existence longer than one year at the time of application is in substantial compliance with the standards promulgated herein or is otherwise fair and effective, the Attorney General shall grant full certification. Such certification shall remain in effect unless and until the Attorney General finds reasonable cause to believe that the grievance procedure is no longer in substantial compliance with the minimum standards or is no longer fair and effective, and so notifies the applicant in writing.

6. Section 40.16 is revised to read as follows:

§ 40.16 Denial of certification.

If the Attorney General finds that the grievance procedure is not in substantial compliance with the standards promulgated herein or is no longer fair and effective, the Attorney General shall deny certification and inform the applicant in writing of the area or areas in which the grievance procedure or the application is deemed inadequate.

7. In § 40.18, paragraphs (a) and (b) are revised to read as follows:

§ 40.18 Suspension of certification.

(a) *Reasonable belief of non-compliance.* If the Attorney General has reasonable grounds to believe that a previously certified grievance procedure may no longer be in substantial compliance with the minimum standards or may no longer be fair and effective, the Attorney General shall suspend certification. The suspension shall continue until such time as the deficiency is corrected, in which case certification shall be reinstated, or until the Attorney General determines that substantial compliance no longer exists or that the procedure is no longer fair and effective, in which case, except as provided in paragraph (b) of this section, the Attorney General shall withdraw certification pursuant to § 40.19 of this part.

(b) *Defect may be readily remedied; good faith effort.* If the Attorney General determines that a grievance procedure is no longer in substantial compliance with the minimum standards or is no longer fair and effective, but has reason to believe that the defect may be readily corrected and that good faith efforts are underway to correct it, the Attorney General may suspend certification until the grievance procedure returns to compliance with the minimum standards or is otherwise fair and effective.

* * * * *

8. In § 40.19, paragraph (a) is revised to read as follows:

§ 40.19 Withdrawal of certification.

(a) *Finding of non-compliance.* If the Attorney General finds that a grievance procedure is no longer in substantial compliance with the minimum standards or is no longer otherwise fair and effective, the Attorney General shall withdraw certification, unless the Attorney General concludes that suspension of certification under § 40.18(b) of this part is appropriate.

* * * * *

9. Section 40.22 is revised to read as follows:

§ 40.22 Significance of certification.

Certification of a grievance procedure by the Attorney General shall signify only that on the basis of the information submitted, the Attorney General believes the grievance procedure is in substantial compliance with the minimum standards or is otherwise fair and effective. Certification shall not indicate approval of the use or application of the grievance procedure in a particular case.

Dated: March 3, 1995.

Janet Reno,

Attorney General.

[FR Doc. 95–6287 Filed 3–14–95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4410–01–M

PENSION BENEFIT GUARANTY CORPORATION

29 CFR Parts 2619 and 2676

Valuation of Plan Benefits in Single-Employer Plans; Valuation of Plan Benefits and Plan Assets Following Mass Withdrawal; Amendments Adopting Additional PBGC Rates

AGENCY: Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation.

ACTION: Final rule.

SUMMARY: This final rule amends the Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation's regulations on Valuation of Plan Benefits in Single-Employer Plans and Valuation of Plan Benefits and Plan Assets Following Mass Withdrawal. The former regulation contains the interest assumptions that the PBGC uses to value benefits under terminating single-employer plans. The latter regulation contains the interest assumptions for valuations of multiemployer plans that have undergone mass withdrawal. The amendments set out in this final rule adopt the interest assumptions applicable to single-employer plans with termination dates in April 1995, and to multiemployer plans with valuation dates in April 1995. The effect of these amendments is to advise the public of the adoption of these assumptions.

EFFECTIVE DATE: April 1, 1995.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Harold J. Ashner, Assistant General Counsel, Office of the General Counsel, Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation, 1200 K Street, NW., Washington, DC 20005, 202–326–4024 (202–326–4179 for TTY and TDD).

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: This rule adopts the April 1995 interest assumptions to be used under the Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation's regulations on Valuation of Plan Benefits in Single-Employer Plans (29 CFR part 2619, the ''single-employer regulation'') and Valuation of Plan Benefits and Plan Assets Following Mass Withdrawal (29 CFR part 2676, the ''multiemployer regulation'').

Part 2619 sets forth the methods for valuing plan benefits of terminating single-employer plans covered under title IV of the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974, as amended. Under ERISA section 4041(c), all single-employer plans wishing to terminate in a distress termination must value guaranteed benefits and ''benefit liabilities,'' *i.e.*, all benefits provided under the plan as of the plan termination date, using the formulas set forth in part 2619, subpart C. (Plans terminating in a standard termination may, for purposes of the Standard Termination Notice filed with PBGC, use these formulas to value benefit liabilities, although this is not required.) In addition, when the PBGC terminates an underfunded plan involuntarily pursuant to ERISA section 4042(a), it uses the subpart C formulas to determine the amount of the plan's underfunding. Part 2676 prescribes rules for valuing benefits and certain assets of multiemployer plans under sections 4219(c)(1)(D) and 4281(b) of ERISA.

Appendix B to part 2619 set forth the interest rates and actors under the single-employer regulation. Appendix B to part 2676 sets forth the interest rates and factors under the multiemployer regulation. Because these rates and factors are intended to reflect current conditions in the financial and annuity markets, it is necessary to update the rates and factors periodically.

The PBGC issues two sets of interest rates and factors, one set to be used for the valuation of benefits to be paid as annuities and one set for the valuation of benefits to be paid as lump sums. The same assumptions apply to terminating single-employer plans and to multiemployer plans that have undergone a mass withdrawal. This amendment adds to appendix B to parts 2619 and 2676 sets of interest rates and factors for valuing benefits in single-employer plans that have termination dates during April 1995 and multiemployer plans that have undergone mass withdrawal and have valuation dates during April 1995.

For annuity benefits, the interests rates will be 7.10% for the first 20 years following the valuation date and 5.75% thereafter. For benefits to be paid as lump sums, the interest assumptions to be used by the PBGC will be 5.75% for the period during which benefits are in pay status, 5.00% during the seven-year period directly preceding the benefit's placement in pay status, and 4.0% during any other years preceding the benefit's placement in pay status The above annuity interest assumptions represent a decrease (from those in effect for March 1995) of .20 percent for the first 20 years following the valuation date are otherwise unchanged. The lump sum interest assumptions represent a decrease (from those in effect for March 1995) of .25 percent for the period during which benefits are in pay status and the seven years directly preceding that period; they are otherwise unchanged.

Generally, the interest rates and factors under these regulations are in effect for at least one month. However, the PBGC publishes its interest assumptions each month regardless of whether they represent a change from the previous month's assumptions. The assumptions normally will be published in the Federal Register by the 15th of the preceding month or as close to that date as circumstances permit.

The PBGC has determined that notice and public comment on these amendments are impracticable and contrary to the public interest. This finding is based on the need to determine and issue new interest rates and factors promptly so that the rates and factors can reflect, as accurately as possible, current market conditions.

Because of the need to provide immediate guidance for the valuation of benefits in single-employer plans whose termination dates fall during April 1995, and in multiemployer plans that have undergone mass withdrawal and have valuation dates during April 1995, the PBGC finds that good cause exists for making the rates and factors set forth in this amendment effective less than 30 days after publication.

The PBGC has determined that this action is not a ''significant regulatory action'' under the criteria set forth in Executive Order 12866, because it will not have an annual effect on the economy of $100 million or more or adversely affect in a material way the economy, a sector of the economy, productivity, competition, jobs, the environment, pubic health or safety, or State, local, or tribal governments or communities; create a serious inconsistency or otherwise interfere with an action taken or planned by another agency; materially alter the budgetary impact of entitlements, grants, user fees, or loan programs or the rights and obligations of recipients thereof; or raise novel legal or policy

issues arising out of legal mandates, the President's priorities, or the principles set forth in Executive Order 12866.

Because no general notice of proposed rulemaking is required for this amendment, the Regulatory Flexibility Act of 1980 does not apply. See 5 U.S.C. 601(2).

List of Subjects

29 CFR Part 2619

Employee benefit plans, Pension insurance, and Pensions.

29 CFR Part 2676

Employee benefit plans, Pensions.

In consideration of the foregoing, parts 2619 and 2676 of chapter XXVI, title 29, Code of Federal Regulations, are hereby amended as follows:

PART 2619—[AMENDED]

1. The authority citation for part 2619 continues to read as follows:

Authority: 29 U.S.C. 1301(a), 1302(b)(3), 1341, 1344, 1362.

2. In appendix B, Rate Set 18 is added to Table I, and a new entry is added to Table II, as set forth below. The introductory text of both tables is republished for the convenience of the reader and remains unchanged.

Appendix B to Part 2619—Interest Rates Used to Value Lump Sums and Annuities

Lump Sum Valuations

In determining the value of interest factors of the form $v^{0:n}$ (as defined in § 2619.49(b)(1)) for purposes of applying the formulas set forth in § 2619.49 (b) through (i) and in determining the value of any interest factor used in valuing benefits under this subpart to be paid as lump sums (including the return of accumulated employee contributions upon death), the PBGC shall employ the values of i_t set out in Table I hereof as follows:

(1) For benefits for which the participant or beneficiary is entitled to be in pay status on the valuation date, the immediate annuity rate shall apply.

(2) For benefits for which the deferral period is y years (y is an integer and $0<y \leq n_1$), interest rate i_1 shall apply from the valuation date for a period of y years; thereafter the immediate annuity rate shall apply.

(3) For benefits for which the deferral period is y years (y is an integer and $n_1<y \leq n_1+n_2$), interest rate i_2 shall apply from the valuation date for a period of $y-n_1$ years, interest rate i_1 shall apply for the following n_1 years; thereafter the immediate annuity rate shall apply.

(4) For benefits for which the deferral period is y years (y is an integer and $y>n_1+n_2$), interest rate i_3 shall apply from the valuation date for a period of $y-n_1-n_2$ years, interest rate i_2 shall apply for the following n_2 years, interest rate i_1 shall apply for the following n_1 years; thereafter the immediate annuity rate shall apply.

TABLE I

[Lump Sum Valuations]

Rate set	For plans with a valuation date		Immediate annuity rate (percent)	Deferred annuities (percent)				
	On or after	Before		i_1	i_2	i_3	n_1	n_2
*	*		*	*	*	*		*
18	4–1–95	5–1–95	5.75	5.00	4.00	4.00	7	8

Annuity Valuations

In determining the value of interest factors of the form $v^{0:n}$ (as defined in § 2619.49(b)(1)) for purposes of applying the formulas set forth in § 2619.49 (b) through (i) and in determining the value of any interest factor used in valuing annuity benefits under this subpart, the plan administrator shall use the values of i_t prescribed in Table II hereof.

The following table tabulates, for each calendar month of valuation ending after the effective date of this part, the interest rates (denoted by i_1, i_2, * * *, and referred to generally as i_t) assumed to be in effect between specified anniversaries of a valuation date that occurs within that calendar month; those anniversaries are specified in the columns adjacent to the rates. The last listed rate is assumed to be in effect after the last listed anniversary date.

TABLE II

[Annuity Valuations]

For valuation dates occurring in the month—	The values of i_t are:					
	i_t	for t =	i_t	for t =	i_t	for t =
*	*		*			*
April 1995	.0710	1–20	.0575	>20	N/A	N/A

PART 2676—[AMENDED]

3. The authority citation for part 2676 continues to read as follows:

Authority: 29 U.S.C. 1302(b)(3), 1399(c)(1)(D), 1441(b)(1).

4. In appendix B, Rate Set 18 is added to Table I, and a new entry is added to Table II, as set forth below. The introductory text of both tables is republished for the convenience of the reader and remains unchanged.

Appendix B to Part 2676—Interest Rates Used to Value Lump Sums and Annuities

Lump Sum Valuations

In determining the value of interest factors of the form $v^{0:n}$ (as defined in § 2676.13(b)(1)) for purposes of applying the formulas set forth in § 2676.13 (b) through (i) and in determining the value of any interest factor used in valuing benefits under this subpart to be paid as lump sums, the PBGC shall use the values of i_t prescribed in Table I hereof. The interest rates set forth in Table I shall be used by the PBGC to calculate benefits payable as lump sum benefits as follows:

(1) For benefits for which the participant or beneficiary is entitled to be in pay status on the valuation date, the immediate annuity rate shall apply.

(2) For benefits for which the deferral period is y years (y is an integer and $0<y \leq n_1$), interest rate i_1 shall apply from the valuation date for a period of y years; thereafter the immediate annuity rate shall apply.

(3) For benefits for which the deferral period is y years (y is an integer and $n_1<y \leq n_1+n_2$), interest rate i_2 shall apply from the valuation date for a period of $y-n_1$ years,

interest rate i_1 shall apply for the following n_1 years; thereafter the immediate annuity rate shall apply.

(4) For benefits for which the deferral period is y years (y is an integer and $y>n_1+n_2$), interest rate i_3 shall apply from the valuation date for a period of $y-n_1-n_2$ years, interest rate i_2 shall apply for the following n_2 years, interest rate i_1 shall apply for the following n_1 years; thereafter the immediate annuity rate shall apply.

TABLE I

[Lump Sum Valuations]

Rate set	For plans with a valuation date		Immediate annuity rate (percent)	Deferred annuities (percent)				
	On or after	Before		i	i_2	i_3	n_1	n_2
*	*		*	*	*	*		*
18	4–1–95	5–1–95	5.75	5.00	4.00	4.00	7	8

Annuity Valuations

In determining the value of interest factors of the form $v^{0:n}$ (as defined in § 2676.13(b)(1)) for purposes of applying the formulas set forth in § 2676.13 (b) through (i) and in determining the value of any interest factor used in valuing annuity benefits under this subpart, the plan administrator shall use the values of i_t prescribed in the table below.

The following table tabulates, for each calendar month of valuation ending after the effective date of this part, the interest rates (denoted by i_1, i_2, * * *, and referred to generally as i_t) assumed to be in effect between specified anniversaries of a valuation date that occurs within that calendar month; those anniversaries are specified in the columns adjacent to the rates. The last listed rate is assumed to be in effect after the last listed anniversary date.

TABLE II

[Annuity Valuations]

For valuation dates occurring in the month—	The values of it are:					
	i	for t =	it	for t =	it	for t =
*	*	*	*	*		*
April 1995	.0710	1–20	.0575	>20	N/A	N/A

Issued in Washington, DC, on this 8th day of March 1995.

Martin Slate,

Executive Director, Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation.

[FR Doc. 95–6359 Filed 3–14–95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7708–01–M

DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY

Fiscal Service

31 CFR Part 356

Sale and Issue of Marketable Book-Entry Treasury Bills, Notes, and Bonds (Department of the Treasury Circular, Public Debt Series No. 1–93)

AGENCY: Bureau of the Public Debt, Fiscal Service, Department of the Treasury.

ACTION: Final rule.

SUMMARY: The Department of the Treasury (''Department'') is issuing in final form an amendment to 31 CFR Part 356, published as a final rule on January 5, 1993 (58 FR 412). This amendment clarifies the definition of the term ''bid'' and changes the required format for competitive bids for Treasury notes and bonds from two decimals to three decimals.

EFFECTIVE DATE: February 22, 1995.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Michael W. Sunner, Deputy Assistant Commissioner, Office of Financing, Bureau of the Public Debt (202) 219–3350, or Margaret Marquette, Attorney-Adviser, Office of the Chief Counsel, Bureau of the Public Debt (202) 219–3320.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: 31 CFR Part 356, also referred to as the uniform offering circular, sets out the terms and conditions for the sale and issuance by the Department of the Treasury to the public of marketable Treasury bills, notes, and bonds. The final rule contained herein amends §§ 356.2 and 356.12 of the uniform offering circular.

In § 356.2, the definition of the term ''bid'' has been modified. The Department has become aware that securities dealers may enter into transactions whereby they effectively ''guarantee'' the amount and price of securities their customers will receive following a Treasury auction.[1] The price guaranteed may be simply an agreed-upon price, or it may be a price fixed in terms of an agreed-upon standard, *e.g.*, the weighted average auction price. The dealer may obtain securities to fulfill such a guarantee either through an auction bid or through the when-issued market, or both.

The Department views the guarantee described above to be the equivalent of a when-issued trade between the dealer and its customer. Therefore, the Department has determined that, for purposes of Treasury's auction rules, any bid of the dealer to obtain securities to fulfill such a guarantee is a bid for the dealer's own account and not a bid for a customer, as the term customer is defined in the offering circular. This means that the recipient of the guarantee may not be listed as a customer in connection with any bid to fulfill the guarantee. Rather, the depository institution or dealer that has made the guarantee is considered the bidder and must include such amount as part of its own bid. The guaranteeing entity may reflect the guaranteed amount being included in its bid as a short position in calculating its net long position. If the recipient of the guarantee for a specific security also bids for that same security in its own name either directly or through a submitter, it must treat the amount of any guarantee as a long position in calculating its net long position.

[1] The guarantee described herein is not intended to refer to a securities dealer submitting or forwarding a noncompetitive bid for a customer.

The definition of the term ''bid'' in § 356.2 has been expanded to clarify that an offer to purchase a stated par amount of a security by a depository institution or dealer to fulfill a guarantee as described above is a bid for the depository institution's or dealer's own account and not a bid for a customer.

In § 356.12, the requirement to express a competitive bid with two decimals has been changed with regard to Treasury notes and bonds. Prior to the publication of this rule, a competitive bid for a note or bond had to show the yield bid, expressed with two decimals. Effective with the publication of this rule, such bids must show the yield bid, expressed with three decimals. The requirement for a competitive bid for a Treasury bill to show the discount rate bid, expressed with two decimals, remains unchanged. Further, the restriction against using fractions still applies to bids for all securities.

The change from two decimal places to three decimal places for notes and bonds is being made to encourage greater participation in Treasury auctions.

Procedural Requirements

This final rule does not meet the criteria for a ''significant regulatory action'' pursuant to Executive Order 12866.

Because this rule relates to public contracts and procedures for United States securities, the notice, public comment, and delayed effective date provisions of the Administrative Procedure Act are inapplicable, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 553(a)(2).

As no notice of proposed rulemaking is required, the provisions of the Regulatory Flexibility Act (5 U.S.C. 601, *et seq.*) do not apply.

There are no collections of information required by this final rule, and, therefore, the Paperwork Reduction Act does not apply.

List of Subjects in 31 CFR Part 356

Bonds, Federal Reserve System, Government securities, Securities.

Dated: March 9, 1995.

Gerald Murphy,

Fiscal Assistant Secretary.

31 CFR Chapter II, Subchapter B, Part 356, is hereby amended as follows:

PART 356—SALE AND ISSUE OF MARKETABLE BOOK-ENTRY TREASURY BILLS, NOTES, AND BONDS (DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY CIRCULAR, PUBLIC DEBT SERIES NO. 1–93)

1. The authority citation for Part 356 continues to read as follows:

Authority: 5 U.S.C. 301; 31 U.S.C. 3102, *et seq.*

2. Section 356.2 is amended by revising the definition of ''bid'' to read as follows:

§ 356.2 Definitions.

* * * * *

Bid means an offer to purchase a stated par amount of securities, either competitively or noncompetitively, in an auction. An offer to purchase a stated par amount of securities submitted by a depository institution or dealer to fulfill a guarantee to sell a specified amount of securities at an agreed-upon price or a price fixed in terms of an agreed-upon standard is a bid of the depository institution or dealer and not a bid of a customer.

* * * * *

3. Section 356.12 is amended by revising paragraph (c)(1) to read as follows:

§ 356.12 Noncompetitive and competitive bidding.

* * * * *

(c) * * *

(1) *Bid format.*

(i) *Treasury bills.* A competitive bid must show the discount rate bid, expressed with two decimals. Fractions may not be used.

(ii) *Treasury notes and bonds.* A competitive bid must show the yield bid, expressed with three decimals. Fractions may not be used.

* * * * *

[FR Doc. 95–6394 Filed 3–14–95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4810–39–P

SELECTIVE SERVICE SYSTEM

32 CFR Part 1636

Selective Service Regulations; Registrant Processing Procedures

AGENCY: Selective Service System.

ACTION: Final rule.

SUMMARY: Procedures for the processing of registrants under the Military Selective Service Act are amended to assure greater fairness and efficiency in administration in the processing of registrants.

EFFECTIVE DATE: March 15, 1995.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Henry N. Williams, General Counsel, Selective Service System, 1515 Wilson Blvd., Arlington, VA 22209–2425. Phone (703) 235–2050.

Analysis of Comments

The proposed amendment to Selective Service Regulations was published in the **Federal Register** on December 28, 1994 (59 FR 66839) for public comment. No comment was received.

The proposed regulation will become the final rule.

Executive Order 12866

In promulgating this regulation, I have adhered to the regulatory philosophy and the applicable principles of regulation set forth in section 1 of Executive Order 12866, Regulatory Planning and Review. This amendment has not been reviewed by the Office of Management and Budget under that Executive order, as it is not deemed ''significant'' thereunder.

Regulatory Flexibility Act

I certify under the Regulatory Flexibility Act (5 U.S.C. chapter 6) that this rulemaking will not have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities.

Paperwork Reduction Act

The Paperwork Reduction Act (44 U.S.C. chapter 35) does not apply because this rulemaking does not contain information collection requirements that require the approval of the Office of Management and Budget.

Certificate

Whereas, on December 28, 1994, the Director of Selective Service published a Notice of Proposed Amendments of Selective Service Regulations at 59 FR 66839; and whereas such publication complied with the publication requirement of section 13(b) of the Military Selective Service Act (50 App. U.S.C. 463(b)) in that more than 30 days have elapsed subsequent to such publication during which period comments from the public (summarized above) have been received and considered; and I certify that I have requested the view of officials named in section 2(a) of Executive Order 11623 and none of them has timely requested that the matter be referred to the President for decision.

Now therefore by virtue of the authority vested in me by the Military Selective Service Act, as amended (50 App. U.S.C. section 451 et seq.) and Executive Order 11623 of October 12, 1971, the Selective Service Regulations

constituting a portion of Chapter XVI of Title 32 of the Code of Federal Regulations, are hereby amended, as stated below.

List of Subjects in 32 CFR Part 1636

Armed Forces—draft.

Dated: March 7, 1995.

Gil Coronado,

Director of Selective Service.

For the reasons set out in the preamble, 32 CFR Part 1636 is amended as follows:

PART 1636—CLASSIFICATION OF CONSCIENTIOUS OBJECTORS

1. The authority citation for part 1636 continues to read as follows:

Authority: Military Selective Service Act (50 App. U.S.C. 451 et seq.); E.O. 11623.

2. In § 1636.8, paragraph (b) is revised to read as follows:

§ 1636.8 Considerations relevant to granting or denying a claim for classification as a conscientious objector.

* * * * *

(b) The registrant's stated convictions should be a matter of conscience.

* * * * *

[FR Doc. 95–6288 Filed 3–14–95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 8015–01–M

NATIONAL ARCHIVES AND RECORDS ADMINISTRATION

36 CFR Part 1230

[3095–AA22]

Micrographic Records Management

AGENCY: National Archives and Records Administration.

ACTION: Correcting amendments.

SUMMARY: This document contains corrections to the final regulations which were published Wednesday, September 22, 1993 (58 FR 49195). The regulations related to micrographic records management including standards for microfilming records in 36 CFR 1230.12(d)(1)(i).

EFFECTIVE DATE: March 15, 1995.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Mary Ann Hadyka or Nancy Allard on 301–713–6730.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

The final regulations that are the subject of these corrections established Federal agency micrographic program responsibilities, revised micrographic standards, modified coverage of temporary records, and clarified inspection provisions. The regulations affected Federal agencies.

Need for Corrections

The final regulation intended to revise the title of the Part from ''Micrographics'' to ''Micrographic Records Management'' to better reflect the subject matter; due to a technical drafting error, the change in title was not made although the final rule displayed the revised title. In § 1230.12(d)(1)(i), a typographical error was made in the ANSI/AIIM standard referenced of aperture card formats.

List of Subjects in 36 CFR Part 1230

Archives and records, Incorporation by reference, Micrographics.

PART 1230—MICROGRAPHICS

Accordingly, 36 CFR 1230 is corrected by making the following correcting amendments:

1. The authority citation for part 1230 continues to read:

Authority: 44 U.S.C. 2907, 3302, and 3312.

2. The title of Part 1230 is revised to read:

PART 1230—MICROGRAPHIC RECORDS MANAGEMENT

§ 1230.12 [Corrected]

3. In § 1230.12(d)(1)(i), in the fourth sentence, the phrase ''ANSI/AIIM MS19–1987'' is revised to read ''ANSI/AIIM MS32–1987''.

Dated: March 9, 1995.

Mary Ann Hadyka,

Federal Register Liaison.

[FR Doc. 95–6360 Filed 3–14–95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7515–01–M

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

40 CFR Part 52

[LA–10–1–5937a; FRL–5172–2]

Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plan: Louisiana 1990 Base Year Ozone Emissions Inventories

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

ACTION: Direct final rule.

SUMMARY: The EPA today fully approves the 1990 base year ozone emission inventories submitted by Louisiana for the purpose of bringing about the attainment of the national ambient air quality standard (NAAQS) for ozone. The inventories were submitted by the State to satisfy certain Federal requirements for an approvable nonattainment area (NAA) ozone State Implementation Plan (SIP) for the Baton Rouge and Calcasieu Parish areas of Louisiana.

DATES: This action will become effective on May 15, 1995, unless adverse or critical comments are received by April 14, 1995. If the effective date is delayed, timely notice will be published in the **Federal Register**.

ADDRESSES: Copies of the documents relevant to this action are available for public inspection during normal business hours at the following locations. Interested persons wanting to examine these documents should make an appointment with the appropriate office at least 24 hours before the visiting day.

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region 6, Air Programs Branch (6T–A), 1445 Ross Avenue, suite 700, Dallas, Texas 75202–2733.

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Air and Radiation Docket and Information Center, 401 M Street, SW., Washington, DC 20460.

Louisiana Department of Environmental Quality, Air Quality Division, 7290 Bluebonnet, Baton Rouge, Louisiana 70810.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Herbert R. Sherrow, Jr., Planning Section (6T–AP), Air Programs Branch, USEPA Region 6, 1445 Ross Avenue, Dallas, Texas 75202–2733, telephone (214) 665–7237.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

Under the 1990 Clean Air Act Amendments (CAAA), States have the responsibility to inventory emissions contributing to NAAQS nonattainment, to track these emissions over time, and to ensure that control strategies are being implemented that reduce emissions and move areas towards attainment. The CAAA require ozone nonattainment areas designated as moderate, serious, severe, and extreme to submit a plan within three years of 1990 to reduce volatile organic compounds (VOC) emissions by 15 percent within six years after 1990. The baseline level of emissions, from which the 15 percent reduction is calculated, is determined by adjusting the base year inventory to exclude biogenic emissions and to exclude certain emission reductions not creditable towards the 15 percent. The 1990 base year emissions inventory is the primary inventory from which the periodic inventory, the Reasonable Further Progress projection inventory, and the modeling inventory

are derived. Further information on these inventories and their purpose can be found in the ''Emission Inventory Requirements for Ozone State Implementation Plans,'' U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Office of Air Quality Planning and Standards, Research Triangle Park, North Carolina, March 1991. The base year inventory plays an important role in modeling demonstrations for areas classified as moderate and above outside transport regions.

The air quality planning requirements for marginal to extreme ozone nonattainment areas are set out in section 182(a)–(e) of title I of the CAAA. The EPA has issued a General Preamble describing the EPA's preliminary views on how the EPA intends to review SIP revisions submitted under title I, including requirements for the preparation of the 1990 base year inventory (see 57 FR 13502; April 16, 1992, and 57 FR 18070; April 28, 1992). Because the EPA is describing its interpretations here only in broad terms, the reader should refer to the General Preamble (57 FR 18070, Appendix B, April 28, 1992) for a more detailed discussion of the interpretations of title I advanced in today's action and the supporting rationale.

Those States containing ozone nonattainment areas classified as marginal to extreme are required under section 182(a)(1) of the 1990 CAAA to submit a final, comprehensive, accurate, and current inventory of actual ozone season, weekday emissions from all sources by November 15, 1992. This inventory is for calendar year 1990 and is denoted as the base year inventory. It includes both anthropogenic and biogenic sources of VOC, nitrogen oxides (NO_X), and carbon monoxide (CO). The inventory is to address actual VOC, NO_X, and CO emissions for the area during a peak ozone season, which is generally comprised of the summer months. All stationary point and area sources, as well as highway mobile sources within the nonattainment area, are to be included in the compilation. Available guidance for preparing emission inventories is provided in the General Preamble (57 FR 13498, April 16, 1992).

Emission inventories are first reviewed under the completeness criteria established under section 110(k)(1) of the CAAA (56 FR 42216, August 26, 1991). According to section 110(k)(1)(C), if a submittal does not meet the completeness criteria, ''the State shall be treated as not having made the submission.'' Under sections 179(a)(1) and 110(c)(1), a finding by the EPA that a submittal is incomplete is one of the actions that initiates the sanctions and Federal Implementation Plan processes (see David Mobley memorandum, November 12, 1992).[1]

Analysis of State Submission

1. Procedural Background

The Act requires States to observe certain procedural requirements in developing emission inventory submissions to the EPA. Section 110(a)(2) of the Act provides that each emission inventory submitted by a State must be adopted after reasonable notice and public hearing.[2] Final approval of the inventory will not occur until the State revises the inventory to address public comments. Changes to the inventory that impact the 15 percent reduction calculation and require a revised control strategy will constitute a SIP revision. The EPA created a ''de minimis'' exception to the public hearing requirement for minor changes. The EPA defines ''de minimis'' for such purposes to be those in which the 15 percent reduction calculation and the associated control strategy or the maintenance plan showing do not change. States will aggregate all such ''de minimis'' changes together when making the determination as to whether the change constitutes a SIP revision. The State will need to make the change through a formal SIP revision process, in conjunction with the change to the control measure or other SIP programs.[3] Section 110(a)(2) of the Act similarly provides that each revision to an implementation plan submitted by a State under the Act must be adopted by such State after reasonable notice and public hearing.

The State of Louisiana submitted the 1990 base year inventories for Baton Rouge (BTR) and Calcasieu Parish (CAL) on November 16, 1992, as a SIP revision by cover letter from the Governor. The inventories were reviewed by the EPA to determine completeness shortly after their submittal, in accordance with the completeness criteria set out at 40 CFR part 51, appendix V (1991), as amended by 57 FR 42216 (August 26, 1991). The inventories were complete except for public hearings. The EPA determined that for inventories that were lacking only public hearings a finding of completeness would be made, contingent upon the State fulfilling the public hearing requirement.[4] The submittal was found to be complete contingent upon the State fulfilling the public hearing requirment, and a letter dated January 15, 1993, was forwarded to the Governor indicating the completeness of the submittal and the next steps to be taken in the review process.

The State of Louisiana subsequently held public hearings on October 22, 1993, to entertain public comment on the 1990 base year emission inventories. The State provided evidence to EPA Region 6 that the public hearings were held and that the State responded to comments.

EPA Region 6, EPA's Office of Air Quality Planning and Standards (OAQPS) Emissions Inventory Branch (EIB), EPA's Office of Mobile Sources (OMS), and Midwest Research Institute, contractor to EIB, reviewed the inventories. Comments were sent to Louisiana, and the State responded with a resubmittal. The resubmittal underwent a second review. The Level III review comments were sent to Louisiana on December 21, 1993.

The State addressed the final Level III comments and submitted responses to Region 6 on January 28, 1994. The State submitted the final revised inventory to Region 6 on September 27, 1994. In addition, the State of Louisiana held additional public hearings on the final revised inventory on October 28, 1994, to accept public comments. The State provided evidence to EPA Region 6 that the public hearings were held and that the State responded to comments.

Region 6 compared the Louisiana responses with the deficiencies noted in the final Level III review and concluded that Louisiana had adequately addressed the remaining deficiencies so that Region 6 was satisfied that Louisiana had completed the Level III criteria for the BTR and CAL ozone nonattainment areas.

2. Emission Inventory Review

Section 110(k) of the Act sets out provisions governing the EPA's review of base year emission inventory submittals in order to determine approval or disapproval under section

[1] Memorandum from J. David Mobley, Chief, Emission Inventory Branch, to Air Branch Chiefs, Region I–X, ''Guidance on States' Failure to Submit Ozone and CO SIP Inventories,'' November 12, 1992.

[2] Also section 172(c)(7) of the Act requires that plan provisions for nonattainment areas meet the applicable provisions of section 110(a)(2).

[3] Memorandum from John Calcagni, Director, Air Quality Management Division, and William G. Laxton, Director, Technical Support Division, to Regional Air Division Directors, Region I–X, ''Public Hearing Requirements for 1990 Base-Year Emission Inventories for Ozone and Carbon Monoxide Nonattainment Areas,'' September 29, 1992.

[4] Memorandum from John Calcagni, Director, Air Quality Management Division, to Regional Air Division Directors, Regions I–X, ''State Implementation Plan (SIP) Actions Submitted in Response to Clean Air Act (ACT) Deadlines,'' October 28, 1992.

182(a)(1) (see 57 FR 13565–13566, April 16, 1992). The EPA is proposing to grant approval of the Louisiana ozone base year emissions inventories based on the Level I, II, and III review findings. This section outlines the review procedures performed to determine if the base year emission inventory is acceptable or is disapproved.

Today's action describes the review procedures associated with determining the acceptability of a 1990 base year emission inventory, and discusses the levels of acceptance that can result from the findings of the review process.

A. The Following Discussion Reviews the State Base Year SIP Inventory Approval Requirements

The Level I and II review process is used to determine that all components of the base year inventory are present. The review also evaluates the level of supporting documentation provided by the State, and assesses whether the emissions were developed according to current EPA guidance.

The Level III review process outlined below consists of 10 points that the inventory must include. For a base year emission inventory to be acceptable, it must pass all of the following acceptance criteria:

1. An approved Inventory Preparation Plan (IPP) was provided, and the Quality Assurance (QA) program contained in the IPP was performed and its implementation documented.
2. Adequate documentation was provided that enabled the reviewer to determine the emission estimation procedures and the data sources used to develop the inventory.
3. The point source inventory must be complete.
4. Point source emissions must have been prepared or calculated according to the current EPA guidance.
5. The area source inventory must be complete.
6. The area source emissions must have been prepared or calculated according to the current EPA guidance.
7. Biogenic emissions must have been prepared according to current EPA guidance or another approved technique.
8. The method (e.g., Highway Performance Monitoring System or a network transportation planning model) used to develop vehicle miles travelled (VMT) estimates must follow EPA guidance, which is detailed in the document, ''Procedures for Emission Inventory Preparation, Volume IV: Mobile Sources'', U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Office of Mobile Sources and Office of Air Quality Planning and Standards, Ann Arbor, Michigan, and Research Triangle Park, North Carolina, December 1992.
9. The MOBILE model (or EMFAC model for California only) was correctly used to produce emission factors for each of the vehicle classes.
10. Nonroad mobile emissions were prepared according to current EPA guidance for all of the source categories.

The base year emission inventory will be approved if it passes Levels I, II, and III of the review process. Detailed Level I and II review procedures can be found in the following document: ''Quality Review Guidelines for 1990 Base Year Emission Inventories'', U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Office of Air Quality Planning and Standards, Research Triangle Park, North Carolina, July 27, 1992. Level III review procedures are specified in a memorandum from David Mobley and G.T. Helms to the Regions, ''1990 O_3/CO SIP Emission Inventory Level III Acceptance Criteria'', October 7, 1992,[5] and revised in a memorandum from John Seitz to the Regional Air Directors dated June 24, 1993.[6]

B. The following Is a Summary of the Level III Review of the Louisiana 1990 Base Year Submittal

1. The IPP and QA plan were submitted and approved. The QA plan was implemented and documented in the submission.
2. The documentation was adequate for the reviewer to determine the estimation procedures and data sources used to develop the inventory for all emission types.
3. The point source inventory was found to be complete.
4. The point source emissions were estimated according to EPA guidance.
5. The area source inventory was found to be complete.
6. The area source emissions were estimated according to EPA guidance.
7. The biogenic emissions were developed from a consultant's site-specific study of the BTR area and the emissions were calculated using the EPA PC–BEIS model for the CAL area.
8. The method used to develop VMT estimates was adequately described and documented.
9. The MOBILE model was used correctly.
10. The nonroad mobile emission estimates were correctly prepared according to current EPA guidance or acceptable alternatives.

Documentation of the Region 6 evaluation, including details of the review procedure, is contained in a memorandum (Attachment A) in the Technical Support Document (TSD). A general summary of the inventories is contained in Attachment B of the TSD.

Final Action

Louisiana has submitted complete inventories containing point, area, biogenic, on-road mobile, and non-road mobile source data, and accompanying documentation. Emissions from these sources are presented in the following table:

VOC

[Ozone Seasonal Emissions in Tons Per Day]

NAA	Point source emissions	Area source emissions	On-road mobile emissions	Non-road mobile emissions	Biogenic	Total emissions
BTR	115.20	26.25	55.50	23.46	120.91	341.32
CAL	57.90	7.20	14.64	13.30	16.47	109.51

[5] Memorandum from J. David Mobley, Chief, Emissions Inventory Branch, to Air Branch Chiefs, Region I–X, ''Final Emission Inventory Level III Acceptance Criteria,'' October 7, 1992.

[6] Memorandum from John S. Seitz, Director, Office of Air Quality Planning and Standards, to Regional Air Division Directors, Region I–X, ''Emission Inventory Issues,'' June 24, 1993.

NOX

[Ozone Seasonal Emissions in Tons Per Day]

NAA	Point source emissions	Area source emissions	On-road mobile emissions	Non-road mobile emissions	Biogenic	Total emissions
BTR	234.68	0.78	71.70	38.40	NA	345.56
CAL	119.20	0.25	20.31	40.86	NA	180.62

CO

[Ozone Seasonal Emissions in Tons Per Day]

NAA	Point source emissions	Area source emissions	On-road mobile emissions	Non-road mobile emissions	Biogenic	Total emissions
BTR	282.91	2.30	434.50	193.02	NA	912.73
CAL	42.10	0.50	117.35	75.03	NA	234.98

Based on Region 6's review of the inventories, Louisiana has satisfied all of the EPA's requirements for providing a comprehensive, accurate, and current inventory of actual emissions in the ozone nonattainment areas. These inventories are complete and approvable according to the criteria set out in the November 12, 1992, memorandum from J. David Mobley, Chief Emission Inventory Branch, TSD and G.T. Helms, Chief Ozone/Carbon Monoxide Programs Branch, Air Quality Management Division.

In today's final action, the EPA is fully approving the SIP 1990 base year ozone emission inventories submitted by Louisiana to the EPA on September 27, 1994, for the Baton Rouge and Calcasieu Parish nonattainment areas as meeting the requirements of section 182(a)(1) of the Act.

The EPA is publishing this action without prior proposal because the Agency views this as a noncontroversial amendment and anticipates no adverse comments. However, in a separate document in this FR publication, the EPA is proposing to approve the SIP revision should adverse comments be received. Thus, this action will be effective on May 15, 1995 unless, by April 14, 1995 adverse or critical comments are received.

If the EPA receives such comments, this action will be withdrawn before the effective date by publishing a subsequent notice which will withdraw the final action. All public comments will then be addressed in a subsequent final rule on this action serving as a proposed rule. The EPA will not institute a second comment period on this action. Any parties interested in commenting on this action should do so at this time. If no comments are received, the public is advised that this action will be effective May 15, 1995.

Nothing in this action should be construed as permitting or allowing or establishing a precedent for any future request for revision to any SIP. Each request for revision to the SIP shall be considered separately in light of specific technical, economic, and environmental factors, in relation to relevant statutory and regulatory requirements.

Regulatory Flexibility

Under the Regulatory Flexibility Act, 5 U.S.C. 600 *et seq.*, the EPA must prepare a regulatory flexibility analysis assessing the impact of any proposed or final rule on small entities (5 U.S.C 603 and 604). Alternatively, the EPA may certify that the rule will not have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities. Small entities include small businesses, small not-for-profit enterprises, and government entities with jurisdiction over populations of less than 50,000.

SIP approvals under section 110 and subchapter I, part D of the Clean Air Act do not create any new requirements, but simply approve requirements that the State is already imposing. Therefore, because the Federal SIP-approval does not impose any new requirements, I certify that it does not have a significant impact on small entities affected. Moreover, due to the nature of the Federal-State relationship under the CAA, preparation of a regulatory flexibility analysis would constitute Federal inquiry into the economic reasonableness of State action. The CAA forbids the EPA to base its actions concerning SIPs on such grounds. (*Union Electric Co.* v. *U.S. E.P.A.*, 427 U.S. 246, 256–66 (S. Ct. 1976); 42 U.S.C. 7410 (a)(2)).

Under section 307(b)(1) of the CAA, petitions for judicial review of this action must be filed in the United States Court of Appeals for the appropriate circuit by May 15, 1995. Filing a petition for reconsideration by the Administrator of this final rule does not affect the finality of this rule for the purposes of judicial review, nor does it extend the time within which a petition for judicial review may be filed, and shall not postpone the effectiveness of such rule or action. This action may not by challenged later in proceedings to enforce its requirements (see section 307(b)(2)).

The Office of Management and Budget has exempted this action from review under Executive Order 12866.

List of Subjects in 40 CFR Part 52

Environmental protection, Air pollution control, Carbon monoxide, Hydrocarbons, Intergovernmental relations, Nitrogen dioxide, Reporting and recordkeeping requirements, Volatile organic compounds.

Dated: March 3, 1995.

Jane N. Saginaw,

Regional Administrator.

Part 52, chapter I, title 40 of the Code of Federal Regulations is amended as follows:

PART 52—[AMENDED]

1. The authority citation for part 52 continues to read as follows:

Authority: 42 U.S.C. 7401–7671q.

Subpart T—Louisiana

2. Section 52.993 is added to read as follows:

§ 52.993 Emissions inventories.

(a) The Governor of the State of Louisiana submitted the 1990 base year emission inventories for the Baton Rouge (BTR) and Calcasieu Parish (CAL) ozone nonattainment areas on November 16, 1992 as a revision to the State Implementation Plan (SIP). The 1990 base year emission inventory requirement of section 182(a)(1) of the Clean Air Act, as amended in 1990, has been satisfied for each of these areas.

(b) The inventories are for the ozone precursors which are volatile organic compounds, nitrogen oxides, and carbon monoxide. The inventories cover point, area, non-road mobile, on-road mobile, and biogenic sources.

(c) The BTR nonattainment area is classified as Serious and includes Ascension, East Baton Rouge, Iberville, Livingston, Point Coupee, and West Baton Rouge Parishes; the CAL nonattainment area is classified as Marginal and includes Calcasieu Parish.

[FR Doc. 95–6299 Filed 3–14–95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560–50–P

---

40 CFR Part 61

[FRL–5169–9]

Approval of Delegation of Authority; National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants; Radionuclides; Utah

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

ACTION: Direct final rule.

SUMMARY: EPA is granting delegation of authority to the State of Utah to implement and enforce five National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants (NESHAP) for radionuclides. The Governor of Utah requested delegation from EPA Region VIII in a letter dated June 4, 1993. EPA has reviewed the application and has reached a decision that the State of Utah has satisfied all of the requirements necessary to qualify for approval of delegation. The effect of this action allows the State of Utah to implement and enforce specific radionuclide NESHAP.

DATES: This action is effective May 15, 1995 unless adverse comments are received by April 14, 1995. If the effective date is delayed due to comments, timely notice will be published in the **Federal Register**.

ADDRESSES: Written comments should be submitted to Patricia D. Hull, Director, Air, Radiation & Toxics Division, Environmental Protection Agency, Region VIII, 999 18th Street, Suite 500, Denver, Colorado 80202–2466 and concurrently to Russell A. Roberts, Director, Division of Air Quality, Department of Environmental Quality, 1950 West North Temple, Salt Lake City, Utah 84114–4820. A docket containing the State of Utah's submittals are available for public inspection during normal business hours at the above locations.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: T. Scott Whitmore at (303) 293–1758.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

Due to the unique nature of radionuclide materials, delegation of authority to states to implement and enforce a NESHAP program for radionuclides has not been automatic. EPA's regional offices have traditionally assumed the lead responsibility for administering the radionuclides NESHAP. Because of the EPA Administrator's commitment to enable state and local governments, as partners, to implement and enforce the requirements of the Clean Air Act as amended in 1990 (CAA), EPA wishes to extend delegated authority for the radionuclides program to the states.

The State of Utah received financial assistance from EPA to develop the radiation expertise and experience in implementing and enforcing an effective radionuclides NESHAP program. Under a radionuclides NESHAP grant workplan, the Department of Environmental Quality, State of Utah, has developed an approvable program which includes the following regulatory elements: emission limits, test methods, reporting and monitoring requirements, enforcement authority, surveillance and public notification procedures. Accordingly, the Governor of Utah submitted a letter, dated June 4, 1993, requesting delegation of authority to implement and enforce the radionuclides NESHAP, 40 CFR part 61, subparts B, Q, R, T, and W.

As required by 40 CFR 63.91(a)(2), the EPA is seeking public comments for 30 days. The comments shall be submitted concurrently to the State of Utah and to EPA. The State of Utah can then submit a response to the comments to EPA.

EPA is approving the State of Utah's request for delegation as a direct final rule without prior proposal because EPA views this as a noncontroversial action and anticipates no adverse comments. If no adverse comments are received in response to this rule, this **Federal Register** document will serve as the final notice of the approval to delegate the implementation and enforcement of this program. The effective date will be 60 days from the date of this publication and no further activity will be contemplated in relation to this rule. If EPA receives adverse comments, the direct final rule will be withdrawn and all public comments received will be addressed in a subsequent final rule based on the accompanying proposed rule which appears in the Proposed Rule Section of this **Federal Register**. However, EPA will not institute a second comment period on this action. Any parties interested in commenting on this action should do so at this time.

Final Action

EPA has reviewed the pertinent statutes and regulations of the State of Utah and the grant workplan accomplishments and has determined that the State of Utah meets all of the statutory and regulatory requirements established by Section 112 of the Clean Air Act as amended in 1990 for the implementation and enforcement of the radionuclides NESHAP. Therefore pursuant to section 112(l) of the Clean Air Act as amended in 1990, 42 U.S.C. 7412(l), and 40 CFR 63.91, EPA hereby delegates its authority for the implementation and enforcement of the following National Emission Standards for Radionuclides for all sources located, or to be located in the State of Utah:

(1) National Emission Standards for Radon Emissions from Underground Uranium Mines (40 CFR part 61, subpart B),

(2) National Emission Standards for Radon Emissions from Department of Energy Facilities (40 CFR part 61, subpart Q),

(3) National Emission Standards for Radon Emissions from Phosphogypsum Stacks (40 CFR part 61, subpart R),

(4) National Emission Standards for Radon Emissions from the Disposal of Uranium Mill Tailings (40 CFR part 61, subpart T). Note that subpart T was amended on July 15, 1994 (59 FR 36283) and now only applies to unlicensed disposal sites that are under the control of the Department of Energy.

(5) National Emission Standards for Radon emissions from Operating Mill Tailings (40 CFR part 61, subpart W).

Not all authorities for the NESHAP can be delegated to the state. The EPA Administrator retains authority to implement those sections of the NESHAP that require approval of equivalency determinations and alternative test methods, decision-making to ensure national consistency, and EPA rulemaking to implement including but not limited to the following provisions of 40 CFR part 61:

(1) 40 CFR 61.04(b), which pertains to permitting the submission of reports to the state only, instead of EPA and the state,

(2) 40 CFR 61.12(d)(1), which pertains to permitting an alternative means of emission limitation,

(3) 40 CFR 61.13(h)(1)(ii), which pertains to approval of the use of an alternative method of emission tests.

As the radionuclides NESHAP are updated, Utah should revise its rules

and regulations accordingly and in a timely manner.

EPA retains concurrent enforcement authority. If at any time there is a conflict between the state and federal regulations, the federal regulations must be applied if they are more stringent than the state regulations.

Note that the only NESHAP for radionuclides for which Utah did not request delegation and for which Utah may presently have sources is 40 CFR part 61, subpart I, National Emission Standards for Radionuclide Emissions from Facilities Licensed by the Nuclear Regulatory Commission and Federal Facilities Not Covered by subpart H. Subpart I was stayed by EPA. The stay expired on November 15, 1992 and subpart I reporting began on March 31, 1994.

Effective May 15, 1995 all notices, reports, and other correspondence required under subparts B, Q, R, T, and W should be sent to the State of Utah rather than to EPA Region VIII, Denver, Colorado.

List of Subjects in 40 CFR Part 61

Environmental protection, Air pollution control, Intergovernmental relations, Radiation protection.

Dated: February 23, 1995.

Kerrigan Clough,

Acting Regional Administrator, Region VIII.

For reasons set forth in the preamble, 40 CFR part 61 is amended as follows:

PART 61—NATIONAL EMISSION STANDARDS FOR HAZARDOUS AIR POLLUTANTS

1. The authority citation for part 61 continues to read as follows:

Authority: 42 U.S.C. 7412.

Subpart A—General Provisions

2. Section 61.04 is amended by revising paragraph (c) to read as follows:

§ 61.04 Address.

* * * * *

(c) * * *

REGION VIII.—DELEGATION STATUS OF NATIONAL EMISSION STANDARDS FOR HAZARDOUS AIR POLLUTANTS [1]

Subpart	CO	MT [2]	ND [2]	SD [2]	UT [2]	WY
A—General Provisions	(*)	(*)	(*)	(*)	(*)	.....
B—Radon Emissions from Underground Uranium Mines	.....	.....	.....	.....	(*)	.....
C—Beryllium	(*)	(*)	(*)	.....	(*)	.....
D—Beryllium Rocket Motor Firing	(*)	(*)	(*)	.....	(*)	.....
E—Mercury	(*)	(*)	(*)	.....	(*)	.....
F—Vinyl Chloride	(*)	(*)	(*)	.....	(*)	.....
H—Emissions of Radionuclides other than Radon from Department of Energy Facilities	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
I—Radionuclide Emissions from Facilities Licensed by the Nuclear Regulatory Commission and Federal Facilities not covered by Subpart H	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
J—Equipment Leaks (Fugitive Emission Sources) of Benzene	(*)	(*)	(*)	.....	(*)	.....
K—Radionuclide Emissions from Elemental Phosphorus Plants	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
L—Benzene Emissions from Coke By-Product Recovery Plants	.....	(*)	(*)	.....	(*)	.....
M—Asbestos	(*)	(*)	(*)	(*)	(*)	[3] (*)
N—Inorganic Arsenic Emissions from Glass Manufacturing Plants	.....	(*)	(*)	.....	(*)	.....
O—Inorganic Arsenic Emissions from Primary Copper Smelters	.....	(*)	(*)	.....	(*)	.....
P—Inorganic Arsenic Emissions from Arsenic Trioxide and Metallic Arsenic Production Facilities	.....	(*)	(*)	.....	(*)	.....
Q—Radon Emissions from Department of Energy Facilities	.....	.....	.....	.....	(*)	.....
R—Radon Emission from Phosphogypsum Stacks	.....	.....	.....	.....	(*)	.....
T—Radon Emissions from the Disposal of Uranium Mill Tailings	.....	.....	.....	.....	(*)	.....
V—Equipment Leaks (Fugitive Emission Sources)	.....	(*)	(*)	.....	(*)	.....
W—Radon Emissions from Operating Mill Tailings	.....	.....	.....	.....	(*)	.....
Y—Benzene Emissions from Benzene Storage Vessels	.....	(*)	(*)	.....	(*)	.....
BB—Benzene Emission from Benzene Transfer Operations	.....	(*)	(*)	.....	(*)	.....
FF—Benzene Waste Operations	.....	(*)	.....	.....	(*)	.....

(*) Indicates approval of delegation of subpart to state.

[1] Authorities which may not be delegated include 40 CFR 61.04(b), 61.12(d)(1), 61.13(h)(1)(ii), 61.112(c), 61.164(a)(2), 61.164(a)(3), 61.172(b)(2)(ii)(B), 61.172(b)(2)(ii)(C), 61.174(a)(2), 61.174(a)(3), 61.242–1(c)(2), 61.244, and all authorities listed as not delegable in each subpart under Delegation of Authority.

[2] Indicates approval of National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants as part of the State Implementation Plan (SIP) with the exception of the radionuclide NESHAP Subparts B, Q, R, T, W which were approved through Section 112(l) of the Clean Air Act.

[3] Delegation only for asbestos demolition, renovation, spraying, manufacturing, and fabricating operations, insulating materials, waste disposal for demolition, renovation, spraying, manufacturing and fabricating operations, inactive waste disposal sites for manufacturing and fabricating operations, and operations that convert asbestos-containing waste material into nonasbestos (asbestos-free) material.

[FR Doc. 95–5976 Filed 3–14–95; 8:45 am]
BILLING CODE 6560–50–P

40 CFR Part 180

[PP 4F4373/R2113; FRL–4940–9]

RIN 2070–AB78

Pesticide Tolerance for Avermectin B_1 and Its Delta-8,9-Isomer

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

ACTION: Final rule.

SUMMARY: This document establishes tolerances for residues of the insecticide avermectin B_1 and its delta-8,9-isomer in or on the raw agricultural commodity head lettuce. Merck Research Laboratories requested this regulation to establish maximum permissible levels for residues of the insecticide.

EFFECTIVE DATE: This regulation becomes effective March 15, 1995.

ADDRESSES: Written objections and hearing requests, identified by the document control number, [PP 4F4373/R2113], may be submitted to: Hearing Clerk (1900), Environmental Protection Agency, Rm. M3708, 401 M St., SW., Washington, DC 20460. A copy of any objections and hearing requests filed with the Hearing Clerk should be identified by the document control number and submitted to: Public Response and Program Resources Branch, Field Operations Division (7506C), Office of Pesticide Programs, Environmental Protection Agency, 401 M St., SW., Washington, DC 20460. In person, bring copy of objections and hearing requests to Rm. 1132, CM #2, 1921 Jefferson Davis Hwy., Arlington, VA 22202. Fees accompanying objections shall be labeled ''Tolerance Petition Fees'' and forwarded to: EPA Headquarters Accounting Operations Branch, OPP (Tolerance Fees), P.O. Box 360277M, Pittsburgh, PA 15251.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: By mail: George T. LaRocca, Product Manager (PM) 13, Registration Division (7505C), Office of Pesticide Programs, Environmental Protection Agency, 401 M St., SW., Washington, DC 20460. Office location and telephone number: Rm. 204, CM #2, 1921 Jefferson Davis Hwy., Arlington, VA 22202, (703)-305-6100; e-mail: LaRocca.George@epamail.epa.gov.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: EPA issued a notice, published in the **Federal Register** of May 29, 1991 (56 FR 24189), which announced that Merck Sharp & Dohme Research Laboratories, Division of Merck & Co., Inc., Hillsborough Rd., Three Bridges, NJ 08887, had submitted a pesticide petition (PP 1F3973) to EPA requesting that the Administrator, pursuant to section 408(d) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (FFDCA), 21 U.S.C. 346a(d), establish tolerances for residues of the pesticide abamectin (same as avermectin B_1) and its delta-8, 9-isomer in or on the raw agricultural commodities (RAC) lettuce at 0.05 part per million (ppm) and almonds and walnuts at 0.005 ppm.

In a letter dated June 9, 1994, Merck Research Laboratories requested a separation of PP 1F3973 into two distinct petitions. Almonds and walnuts were to be processed under PP 1F3973, and head lettuce was assigned a new petition number, PP 4F4373. No comments were received on the notice of filing (56 FR 24189, May 29, 1991).

The data submitted in support of this tolerance and other relevant material have been reviewed. The toxicological and metabolism data and analytical methods for enforcement purposes considered in support of these tolerances are discussed in detail in related documents published in the **Federal Registers** of May 31, 1989 (54 FR 23209) for cottonseed and August 2, 1989 (54 FR 31836) for citrus.

The Agency used a two-generation rat reproduction study with an uncertainty factor of 300 to establish a Reference Dose (RfD). The 300-fold uncertainty factor was utilized for (1) inter- and intra-species differences, (2) the extreme seriousness of pup death observed in the reproduction study, (3) maternal toxicity (lethality) no-observable-effect level (NOEL)(0.05 mg/kg/day), and (4) cleft palate in the mouse developmental toxicity study with isomer (NOEL = 0.06 mg/kg/day). Thus, based on a NOEL 0f 0.12 mg/kg/day from the two-generation rat reproduction and an uncertainty factor of 300, the RfD is 0.0004 mg/kg/body weight (bwt)/day.

A chronic dietary exposure/risk assessment has been performed for abamectin using the above RfD. Available information on anticipated residues and 100% crop treated was incorporated into the analysis to estimate the Anticipated Residue Contribution (ARC). The ARC is generally considered a more realistic estimate than an estimate based on tolerance-level residues. The ARC from established tolerances and the current action is estimated at 0.000022 mg/kg bwt/day and utilizes 5.4 percent of the RfD for the U.S. population. The ARC for children, aged 1 to 6 years old, and nonnursing infants (subgroups most highly exposed) utilizes 13 and 18 percent of the RfD, respectively. Generally speaking, the Agency has no cause for concern if anticipated residues contribution for all published and proposed tolerances is less than the RfD.

Because of the developmental effects seen in animal studies, the Agency used the mouse teratology study (with a NOEL of 0.06 mg/kg/day for developmental toxicity for the delta-8,9 isomer) to assess acute dietary exposure and determine a margin of exposure (MOE) for the overall U.S. population and certain subgroups. Since the toxicological end-point pertains to developmental toxicity, the population group of interest for this analysis is women aged 13 and above, the subgroup which most closely approximates women of child-bearing age. The MOE is calculated as the ratio of the NOEL to the exposure. For this analysis, the Agency calculated the MOE for high-end exposures for women ages 13 and above. The MOE for the high-end exposure is 200. Generally speaking, MOEs greater than 100 for data derived from animal studies are acceptable to the Agency.

The metabolism of the chemical in plants and livestock for this use is adequately understood. Any secondary residues occurring in meat, meat byproducts, or milk will be covered by existing tolerances for those commodities. There is no reasonable expectation of finite residues in poultry and swine commodities; therefore, no tolerances are necessary at this time. Adequate analytical methodology (HPLC-Fluorescence Methods) is available for enforcement purposes. Prior to publication in the Pesticide Analytical Manual, Vol. II, the enforcement methodology is being made available in the interim to anyone who is interested in pesticide enforcement when requested from: Calvin Furlow, Public Reponse and Program Resource Branch, Field Operations Division (7506C), Office of Pesticide Programs, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, 401 M St., SW., Washington, DC 20460. Office location and telephone number: Rm 1132, CM #2, 1921 Jefferson Davis Hwy., Arlington, VA 22202, (703)-304-5232.

The tolerances established by amending 40 CFR part 180 will be adequate to cover residues in or on lettuce. There are currently no actions pending against the continued registration of this chemical. Based on the information and data considered, the Agency has determined that the tolerances established by amending 40 CFR part 180 will protect the public health. Therefore, the tolerance is established as set forth below.

Any person adversely affected by this regulation may, within 30 days after publication of this document in the **Federal Register**, file written objections to the regulation and may also request a hearing on those objections. Objections and hearing requests must be filed with the Hearing Clerk, at the address given above (40 CFR 178.20). A copy of the objections and/or hearing requests filed with the Hearing Clerk should be submitted to the OPP docket for this rulemaking. The objections submitted must specify the provisions of the regulation deemed objectionable and the grounds for the objections (40 CFR 178.25). Each objection must be accompanied by the fee prescribed by 40 CFR 180.33(i). If a hearing is requested, the objections must include a statement of the factual issue(s) on which a hearing is requested, the requestor's contentions on such issues, and a summary of any evidence relied upon by the objector (40 CFR 178.27). A request for a hearing will be granted if the Administrator determines that the material submitted shows the following: There is genuine and substantial issue of fact; there is a reasonable possibility that available evidence identified by the requestor would, if established, resolve one or more of such issues in favor of the requestor, taking into account uncontested claims or facts to the contrary; and resolution of the factual issue(s) in the manner sought by the requestor would be adequate to justify the action requested (40 CFR 178.32).

Under Executive Order 12866 (58 FR 51735, Oct. 4, 1993), the Agency must determine whether the regulatory action is ''significant'' and therefore subject to all the requirements of the Executive Order (i.e., Regulatory Impact Analysis, review by the Office of Management and Budget (OMB)). Under section 3(f), the order defines ''significant'' as those actions likely to lead to a rule (1) having an annual effect on the economy of $100 million or more, or adversely and materially affecting a sector of the economy, productivity, competition, jobs, the environment, public health or safety, or State, local, or tribal governments or communities (also known as ''economically significant''); (2) creating serious inconsistency or otherwise interfering with an action taken or planned by another agency; (3) materially altering the budgetary impacts of entitlement, grants, user fees, or loan programs; or (4) raising novel legal or policy issues arising out of legal mandates, the President's priorities, or the principles set forth in this Executive Order.

Pursuant to the terms of this Executive Order, EPA has determined that this rule is not ''significant'' and is therefore not subject to OMB review.

Pursuant to the requirements of the Regulatory Flexibility Act (Pub. L. 96-354, 94 Stat. 1164, 5 U.S.C. 601-612), the Administrator has determined that regulations establishing new tolerances or raising tolerance levels or establishing exemptions from tolerance requirements do not have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities. A certification statement to this effect was published in the **Federal Register** of May 4, 1981 (46 FR 24950).

List of Subjects in 40 CFR Part 180

Environmental protection, Administrative practice and procedure, Agricultural commodities, Pesticides and pests, Reporting and recordkeeping requirements.

Dated: March 3, 1995.

Stephen L. Johnson,

Director, Registration Division, Office of Pesticide Programs.

Therefore, 40 CFR part 180 is amended as follows:

PART 180—AMENDED

1. The authority citation for part 180 continues to read as follows:

Authority: 21 U.S.C. 346a and 371.

2. In § 180.449, by revising paragraph (b), to read as follows:

§ 180.449 Avermectin B_1 and its delta-8,9-isomer; tolerances for residues.

* * * * *

(b) Tolerances are established for the combined residues of the insecticide avermectin B_1 and its delta-8,9-isomer [a mixture of avermectin containing greater than 80 percent avermectin B_{1a} (5-O-demethyl avermectin A_{1a}) and less than 20 percent avermectin B_{1b} (5-O-demethyl-25-di(1-methylpropyl)-25-(1-methylethyl) avermectin A_{1a})] in or on the following commodities:

Commodity	Parts per million
Celery	0.05
Lettuce, head	0.05
Strawberry	0.02
Tomatoes, fresh	0.01

[FR Doc. 95–6416 Filed 3–14–95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560–50–F

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Bureau of Land Management

43 CFR Public Land Order 7124

[NM–930–1430–01; NMNM 88049]

Public Land Order No. 7067, Correction; Withdrawal of National Forest System Land for Guadalupe Canyon Zoological Botanical Area; New Mexico

AGENCY: Bureau of Land Management, Interior.

ACTION: Public land order.

SUMMARY: This order will correct an error in the land description in Public Land Order No. 7067.

EFFECTIVE DATE: March 15, 1995.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Jeanette Espinosa, BLM New Mexico State Office, P.O. Box 27115, Santa Fe, New Mexico 87502, 505–438–7597.

By virtue of the authority vested in the Secretary of the Interior by Section 204 of the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976, 43 U.S.C. 1714 (1988), it is ordered as follows:

The land description in Public Land Order 7067, 59 FR 35859, July 14, 1994, is hereby corrected as follows:

The third column, line 3, which reads ''sec. 24, NE¼NW¼ and S½SE¼;'' is hereby corrected to read ''sec. 24, NE¼SE¼ and S½SE¼;''.

Dated: March 2, 1995.

Bob Armstrong,

Assistant Secretary of the Interior.

[FR Doc. 95–6279 Filed 3–14–95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4310–FB–P

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

47 CFR Part 24

[GEN Docket No. 90–314, ET Docket No. 92–100, FCC 95–92]

Personal Communications Service

AGENCY: Federal Communications Commission.

ACTION: Final rule; petition for reconsideration.

SUMMARY: On March 3, 1995, the Commission released a Memorandum Opinion and Order revising certain sections of its Rules governing the Personal Communications Services (PCS). The action in the instant Order responds to petitions for reconsideration filed by Morgan Stanley Partnerships on September 6 and October 7, 1994 in the Commission's broadband and

narrowband PCS proceedings. The Order refines and clarifies the Commission's Rules concerning the ownership attribution of licenses in view of the Commission's decisions to use a multiplier when assessing indirect ownership interests. The rule amendments are intended to encourage investment in PCS, particularly by institutional investors, and promote the rapid deployment of such new services in the public interest.

EFFECTIVE DATE: March 15, 1995.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Jackie Chorney, Wireless Telecommunications Bureau, (202) 418–0600.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: This is a synopsis of the Commission's Memorandum Opinion and Order in GEN Docket No. 90–314, ET Docket No. 92–100m, FCC 95–92, adopted March 2, 1995, and released March 3, 1995. The complete text of this Order is available for inspection and copying during normal business hours in the FCC Dockets Branch (Room 230), 1919 M Street, N.W., Washington, D.C., and also may be purchased from the Commission's copy contractor, International Transcription Service, at (202) 857–3800, 2100 M Street, N.W., Suite 140, Washington, D.C. 20037.

Synopsis of Order

1. The Commission's PCS proceedings are designed to promote four primary goals: competitive delivery, a diverse array of services, rapid deployment, and wide-area coverage. The Commission notes that the ability of PCS entrants to attract capital is essential to achieving these goals. In essence, Morgan Stanley Partnerships argues in its petitions for reconsideration that the Commission's PCS attribution rules do not promote this ability sufficiently. The Commission states that while promoting PCS investment is an important public interest component of its PCS policies, its attribution rules are designed principally to operate in conjunction with ownership limits to maintain a competitive PCS industry. The Commission expresses that the real question, therefore, is whether treating institutional investors differently under its PCS attribution rules will improve investment incentives without undercutting those rules' primary goal of serving as anticompetitive safeguards. The Commission answers that question affirmatively.

2. The Commission states that it has long recognized a distinction between institutional investors and other investors, and that this results, in part, because the term ''institutional investors'' identifies a category of investors that may be defined with some precision. The Commission agrees with Morgan Stanley Partnerships that institutional investors' market activities generally do not raise the type of ''control'' issues that led the Commission to adopt ''bright line'' PCS attribution rules. Indeed, the Commission observes that it recently amended its rules in this regard to further clarify the definition of institutional investor under the PCS rules and to promote such investors' opportunities to serve as an important source of funding for designated entity PCS companies. The Commission finds that modifying the narrowband and broadband PCS attribution rules in light of the request of Morgan Stanley Partnerships is consistent with the Commission's traditional policy and recent action regarding institutional investors. Moreover, the Commission believes that these modifications will serve as an important means for encouraging increased passive investment in PCS. Accordingly, the Commission states that it is amending its PCS rules to: (1) exempt from attribution insulated limited partnership interests held by institutional investors, subject to those investors certifying to the Commission that they are not materially involved directly or indirectly in the management or operation of the carrier activities of the partnership; and (2) increase from five to ten percent the level at which institutional investors' PCS license ownership interests will be attributed. Consistent with this change, the Commission is clarifying that for purposes of the reporting requirements of section 24.813 of its rules, institutional investors are not considered attributable investors in an applicant unless they hold an ownership interest of 10 percent or more in the applicant. The Commission is amending section 24.813(a)(2) to require applicants to report ownership interests held by institutional investors only if such ownership interests are 10 percent or more.

3. The Commission declines, however, to adopt the single majority shareholder exception requested by Morgan Stanley. The Commission believes that such an exception is unnecessary to address the issues raised by Morgan Stanley regarding the application of the multiplier to indirect institutional investments and to enable PCS applicants to attract capital from institutional investors given the above-described modifications to its attribution rules.

4. In addition, the Commission concludes that institutional investors who held limited partnership interests prior to the adoption date of this order shall be granted one year from that date to amend their limited partnership agreements to comply with the insulation rules. During this transition period, affected licensees shall certify to the Commission that the limited partners are not materially involved, directly or indirectly, in the management or operation of a PCS licensee.

5. The Commission notes that it decided previously not to apply the multiplier rule to nationwide narrowband PCS licenses granted under its pioneer preference rules prior to August 16, 1994, or to nationwide narrowband PCS licenses auctioned before August 16, 1994 (the date on which it adopted the narrowband PCS multiplier rule). The Commission continues to believe that it would not be equitable to apply the multiplier rule to those licensees. In keeping with that rationale, however, the Commission clarifies that this exemption will expire with respect to a particular interest in a license if in the future that exempt interest is transferred or assigned to another entity.

Ordering Clauses

6. It is Further Ordered That the petitions for reconsideration filed by Morgan Stanley on September 6 and October 7, 1994, in our broadband and narrowband PCS proceedings, respectively, Are Granted to the extent discussed above.

7. Accordingly, It is Ordered that Part 24 of the Commission's Rules Is Amended as specified below, And Will Become Effective immediately upon publication in the **Federal Register.**

8. This action is taken pursuant to sections 4(i), 7(a), 302, 303(c), 303(f), 303(g), and 303(r) of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, 47 U.S.C. Sections 154(i), 157(a), 302, 303(c), 303(f), 303(g), and 303(r).

List of Subjects in 47 CFR Part 24

Communication common carriers, Radio, Reporting and recordkeeping requirements.

47 CFR Part is amended as follows:

PART 24—PERSONNEL COMMUNICATIONS SERVICE

1. The authority citation for Part 24 continues to read as follows:

Authority: 47 U.S.C. 154, 301, 302, 303, 309 and 332, unless otherwise noted.

2. Section 24.101 is revised to read as follows:

§ 24.101 Multiiple ownership restrictions.

(a) Narrowband PCS licensees shall not have an ownership interest in more than three of the 26 channels listed in § 24.129 in any geographic area. For purposes of this restriction, a narrowband PCS licensee is:

(1) Any institutional investor, as defined in § 24.720(h), with an ownership interest of ten or more percent in a narrowband PCS license; and

(2) Any other person or entity with an ownership interest of five or more percent in a narrowband PCS license.

(b) In cases where a party had indirect ownership, through an interest in an interving entity (or entities) that has ownership in the narrowband license, that indirect ownership shall be attributable if the percentages of ownership at each level, multiplied together, equal five or more percent ownership of the narrowband PCS license, except that if the ownership percentage for an interest in any link in the chain exceeds 50 percent or represents actual control, it shall be treated as if it were a 100 percent interest.

Example: Party X has a non-controlling ownership interest of 25 percent in Company Y, which in turn has a non-controlling ownership interest of 10 percent in Company Z, the narrowband PCS licensee. Party X's effective ownership interest in Company Z is Party X's ownership interest in Company Y (25 percent) times Company Y's ownership interest in Company Z (10 percent). Therefore, Party X's effective ownership interest in Company Z is 2.5 percent, and is not attributable.

(c) Notwithstanding paragraph (b) of this section, the following interests shall not constitute attributable ownership interests for purposes of paragraph (a) of this section:

(1) A limited partnership interest held by an institutional investor (as defined § 24.720(h)) where the limited partner is not materially involved, directly or indirectly, in the management or operation of the PCS holdings of the partnership, and the licensee so certifies. The criteria which would assure adequate insulation for the purposes of this certification require:

(i) Prohibiting limited partners from acting as employees of the limited partnership if responsibilities relate to the carrier activities of the licensee;

(ii) Barring the limited partners from serving as independent contractors;

(iii) Restricting communication among limited partners and the general partner regarding day-to-day activities of the licensee;

(iv) Empowering the general partner to veto admissions of new general partners;

(v) Restricting the circumstances in which the limited partners can remove the general partner;

(vi) Prohibiting the limited partners from providing services to the partnership relating to the PCS holdings of the licensee; and

(vii) Stating that the limited partners may not become involved in the management or operation of the licensee. See 47 CFR 73.3555 Note 2(g)(2); Memorandum of Opinion and Order in MM Docket 83–46, FCC 85–252 (released June 24, 1985), as modified on reconsideration in the Memorandum of Opinion and Order in MM Docket No. 83–46, FCC 86–410 (released November 28, 1986).

(2) Institutional investors who held limited partnership interests prior to March 2, 1995 shall be granted one year from that date to amend their limited partnership agreements to comply with the insulation rules and so certify to the Commission. During this transition period, the licensee in which an institutional investor holds an interest shall also certify to the Commission that the institutional investor limited partner(s) are not materially involved, directly or indirectly, in the management or operation of the licensee.

3. In § 24.204, paragraph (d)(2)(viii) is redesignated as paragraph (d)(2)(viii)(A) and new paragraph (d)(20(viii)(B) is added to read as follows:

§ 24.204 Cellular eligibility.

* * * * *

(d) * * *

(2) * * *

(viii) * * *

(B) Notwithstanding paragraph (d)(2)(viii)(A) of this section, the following interests shall not constitute attributable ownership interests for purposes of § 24.229(c):

(*1*) A limited partnership interest held by an institutional investor (as defined Section 24.720(h)) where the limited partner is not materially involved, directly or indirectly, in the management or operation of the PCS holdings of the partnership, and the licensee so certifies. The criteria which would assure adequate insulation for the purposes of this certification require:

(*i*) Prohibiting limited partners from acting as employees of the limited partnership if responsibilities relate to the carrier activities of the licensee;

(*ii*) Barring the limited partners from serving as independent contractors;

(*iii*) Restricting communication among limited partners and the general partner regarding day-to-day activities of the licensee;

(*iv*) Empowering the general partner to veto admissions of new general partners;

(*v*) Restricting the circumstances in which the limited partners can remove the general partner;

(*vi*) Prohibiting the limited partners from providing services to the partnership relating to the PCS holdings of the licensee; and

(*vii*) Stating that the limited partners may not become involved in the management or operation of the licensee. See 47 CFR 73.3555 Note 2(g)(2); Memorandum of Opinion and Order in MM Docket 83–46, FCC 85–252 (released June 24, 1985), as modified on reconsideration in the Memorandum of Opinion and Order in MM Docket No. 83–46, FCC 86–410 (released November 28, 1986).

(*2*) Institutional investors who held limited partnership interests prior to March 2, 1995 shall be granted one year from that date to amend their limited partnership agreements to comply with the insulation rules and so certify to the Commission. During this transition period, the licensee in which an institutional investor holds an interest shall also certify to the Commission that the institutional investor limited partner(s) are not materially involved, directly or indirectly, in the management or operation of the licensee.

* * * * *

4. Section 24.229 is amended by revising paragraph (c) to read as follows:

§ 24.229 Frequencies.

* * * * *

(c) PCS licenses shall not have an ownership interest in frequency blocks that total more than 40 MHz and serve the same geographic area. For purposes of this section, PCS licensees are:

(1) Any institutional investor, as defined in Section 24.720(h), with an ownership interest of 10 or more percent in a broadband PCS license; and

(2) Any other entities having an ownership interest of 5 or more percent or other attributable ownership interest, as defined in Section 24.204(d), in a PCS license.

* * * * *

5. Section 24.813 is amended by revising paragraph (a)(2) to read as follows:

§ 24.813 General application requirements.

(a) * * *

(2) A list of any party which holds a five percent or more interest (or a ten percent or more interest for institutional investors as defined in § 24.720(h)) in

the applicant, or any entity in which a five percent or more interest (or a ten percent or more interest for institutional investors as defined in § 24.720(h)) is held by another party which holds a five percent or more interest (or a ten percent or more interest for institutional investors as defined in Section 24.720(h)) in the applicant. (e.g., If company A owns 5% of Company B (the applicant) and 5% of Company C then Companies A and C must be listed on Company B's application.

* * * * *

Federal Communications Commission.

William F. Caton,

Acting Secretary.

[FR Doc. 95–6488 Filed 3–14–95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6712–01–M

47 CFR Part 73

[MM Docket No. 88–257, RM–6299]

Radio Broadcasting Services; Kingsville and Ingleside, Texas

AGENCY: Federal Communications Commission.

ACTION: Final rule; waiver of automatic stay.

SUMMARY: This document grants a motion for waiver of automatic stay filed by Kingsville Radio Company on the effect of the substitution of Channel 224C2 for Channel 224A at Kingsville, TX and the modification of its license for Station KNGV(FM) accordingly. *See Report and Order* 57 FR 3952 (February 3, 1992). This action is granted by the Commission without prejudice to any further action the Commission may take regarding the application for review in MM Docket No. 88–257.

EFFECTIVE DATE: March 15, 1995.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Arthur D. Scrutchins, Mass Media Bureau, (202) 776–1660.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: This is a synopsis of the Commission's Order, *Memorandum Opinion and Order*, MM Docket No. 88–257, adopted March 3, 1995 and released March 10, 1995. The full text of this Commission decision is available for inspection and copying during normal business hours in the FCC Reference Center (Room 239), 1919 M Street, NW, Washington, D.C. The complete text of this decision may also be purchased from the Commission's copy contractors, International Transcription Service, Inc., (202) 857–3800, 2100 M Street, NW, Suite 140, Washington, D.C. 20037.

List of Subjects in 47 CFR Part 73

Radio broadcasting.

Federal Communications Commission.

Douglas W. Webbink,

Chief, Policy and Rules Division, Mass Media Bureau.

[FR Doc. 95–6335 Filed 3–14–95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6712–01–F

47 CFR Part 73

[MM Docket No. 94–72; RM–8479]

Radio Broadcasting Services; Odessa and Los Ybanez, Texas

AGENCY: Federal Communications Commission.

ACTION: Final rule.

SUMMARY: The Commission, at the request of Ruben Velasquez, substitutes Channel 300C1 for Channel 299C2 at Odessa, Texas, and modifies the construction permit of Station KADM(FM) to specify operation on the higher powered channel. To accommodate the upgrade at Odessa, the Commission also substitutes Channel 253C2 for Channel 300C2 at Los Ybanez, Texas, and modifies the license of Station KYMI(FM) to specify the alternate Class C2 channel. *See* 59 FR 35893, July 14, 1994, and Supplemental Information, *infra*. With this action, this proceeding is terminated.

EFFECTIVE DATE: April 27, 1995.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Pam Blumenthal, Mass Media Bureau, (202) 418–2180.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: This is a synopsis of the Commission's *Report and Order*, MM Docket No. 94–72, adopted March 1, 1995, and released March 10, 1995. The full text of this Commission decision is available for inspection and copying during normal business hours in the FCC Reference Center (Room 239), 1919 M Street, NW, Washington, D.C. The complete text of this decision may also be purchased from the Commission's copy contractor, ITS, Inc., (202) 857–3800, 2100 M Street, NW, Suite 140, Washington, D.C. 20037.

Both channels can be allotted to the noted communities in compliance with the Commission's minimum distance separation requirements. Channel 300C1 can be allotted to Odessa without the imposition of a site restriction. The coordinates for Channel 300C1 at Odessa, Texas, are North Latitude 31–51–30 and West Longitude 102–22–30. Channel 253C2 can be allotted to Los Ybanez at the transmitter site specified in Station KYMI(FM)'s license. The coordinates for Channel 253C2 at Los Ybanez are North Latitude 32–43–22 and West Longitude 102–01–50. Mexican concurrence in each of the allotments has been received because Odessa and Los Ybanez are located within 320 kilometers (199 miles) of the U.S-Mexican border.

List of Subjects in 47 CFR Part 73

Radio broadcasting.

PART 73—[AMENDED]

1. The authority citation for Part 73 continues to read as follows:

Authority: Secs. 303, 48 Stat., as amended, 1082; 47 U.S.C. 154, as amended.

§ 73.202 [Amended]

2. Section 73.202(b), the Table of FM Allotments under Texas, is amended by removing Channel 299C2 and adding Channel 300C1 at Odessa and by removing Channel 300C2 and adding Channel 253C2 at Los Ybanez.

Federal Communications Commission.

John A Karousos,

Chief, Allocations Branch, Policy and Rules Division, Mass Media Bureau.

[FR Doc. 95–6338 Filed 3–14–95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6712–01–F

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration

50 CFR Part 654

[Docket No. 950203034–5034–01; I.D. 092794B]

RIN 0648–AG23

Stone Crab Fishery of the Gulf of Mexico; Amendment 5

AGENCY: National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS), National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA), Commerce.

ACTION: Final rule.

SUMMARY: NMFS issues this final rule to implement Amendment 5 to the Fishery Management Plan for the Stone Crab Fishery of the Gulf of Mexico (FMP). This rule establishes a temporary moratorium, ending not later than June 30, 1998, on the Federal registration of stone crab vessels. In addition, NMFS changes the regulations that implement the FMP to correct and clarify them, conform them to current agency standards, and enhance enforcement.

EFFECTIVE DATE: April 14, 1995. The incorporation by reference of certain sections of the Florida Administrative Code is approved by the Director of the Office of the Federal Register as of April 14, 1995.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Peter J. Eldridge, 813–570–5305.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The FMP was prepared by the Gulf of Mexico Fishery Management Council (Council) and is implemented by regulations at 50 CFR part 654 under the authority of the Magnuson Fishery Conservation and Management Act (Magnuson Act).

Detailed descriptions, backgrounds, and rationales for the management measures in Amendment 5 and the additional measures proposed by NMFS were included in the preamble to the proposed rule (59 FR 55405, November 7, 1994) and are not repeated here. The U.S. Coast Guard commented that they had reviewed Amendment 5 and the proposed rule and had identified no enforcement or safety concerns. No other comments on the amendment or the proposed rule were received. Accordingly, the proposed rule is adopted as final with three minor changes. The geographic scope of the regulations is clarified by providing in the definition of ''management area'' appropriate latitude and longitude boundaries in lieu of ''off the west coast of Florida and off the south side of the Florida Keys.'' An explanation of the nature and duration of the moratorium on the Federal registration of stone crab vessels is added at § 654.3(d). A new section (§ 654.26) is added to specify the management measures that may be established or modified under the framework procedure in Amendment 5.

Classification

The Director, Southeast Region, NMFS, determined that Amendment 5 is necessary for the conservation and management of the stone crab fishery and that it is consistent with the national standards, other provisions of the Magnuson Act, and other applicable laws.

This final rule has been determined to be not significant for purposes of E.O. 12866.

The Assistant General Counsel for Legislation and Regulation of the Department of Commerce certified to the Chief Counsel for Advocacy of the Small Business Administration when this rule was proposed that it would not have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities. The reasons were summarized in the preamble to the proposed rule (59 FR 55405, November 7, 1994). As a result, a regulatory flexibility analysis was not prepared.

List of Subjects in 50 CFR Part 654

Fisheries, Fishing, Incorporation by reference.

Dated: March 8, 1995.

Gary Matlock,

Program Management Officer, National Marine Fisheries Service.

For the reasons set out in the preamble, 50 CFR part 654 is revised to read as follows:

PART 654—STONE CRAB FISHERY OF THE GULF OF MEXICO

Subpart A—General Measures

Sec.
654.1 Purpose and scope.
654.2 Definitions.
654.3 Relation to other laws.
654.4 Permits and fees. [Reserved]
654.5 Recordkeeping and reporting. [Reserved]
654.6 Vessel and gear identification.
654.7 Prohibitions.
654.8 Facilitation of enforcement.
654.9 Penalties.

Subpart B—Management Measures

654.20 Seasons.
654.21 Harvest limitations.
654.22 Gear restrictions.
654.23 Southwest Florida seasonal trawl closure.
654.24 Shrimp/stone crab separation zones.
654.25 Prevention of gear conflicts.
654.26 Adjustment of management measures.
654.27 Specifically authorized activities.

Appendix A to Part 654—Figures

Authority: 16 U.S.C. 1801 *et seq.*

Subpart A—General Measures

§ 654.1 Purpose and scope.

(a) The purpose of this part is to implement the Fishery Management Plan for the Stone Crab Fishery of the Gulf of Mexico, prepared by the Gulf of Mexico Fishery Management Council under the Magnuson Act.

(b) This part governs conservation and management of stone crab and restricts the trawl fishery in the management area.

(c) ''EEZ'' refers to the EEZ in the management area, unless the context clearly indicates otherwise.

§ 654.2 Definitions.

In addition to the definitions in the Magnuson Act and in § 620.2 of this chapter, the terms used in this part have the following meanings:

Management area means the EEZ off the coast of Florida from a line extending directly south from the Alabama/Florida boundary (87°31′06″ W. long.) to a line extending directly east from the Dade/Monroe County, FL boundary (25°20.4′ N. lat.).

Regional Director means the Director, Southeast Region, NMFS, 9721 Executive Center Drive N., St. Petersburg, FL 33702, telephone: 813–570–5301; or a designee.

Stone crab means *Menippe mercenaria, M. adina* or the hybrid, *M. adina* X *M. mercenaria,* or a part thereof.

§ 654.3 Relation to other laws.

(a) The relation of this part to other laws is set forth in § 620.3 of this chapter and paragraphs (b), (c), and (d) of this section.

(b) The regulations in this part are intended to be compatible with, and do not supersede, similar regulations in effect for the Everglades National Park (36 CFR 7.45).

(c) The regulations in this part are intended to be compatible with similar regulations and statutes in effect in Florida's waters.

(d) Under Amendment 5 to the Fishery Management Plan for the Stone Crab Fishery of the Gulf of Mexico, there is a temporary moratorium on the issuance by the Regional Director of Federal numbers and color codes to mark vessels and gear in the stone crab fishery in the management area. The moratorium will end not later than June 30, 1998. During the moratorium, fishermen must obtain numbers and color codes from Florida. (See § 654.6(a).)

§ 654.4 Permits and fees. [Reserved]

§ 654.5 Recordkeeping and reporting. [Reserved]

§ 654.6 Vessel and gear identification.

(a) An owner or operator of a vessel that is used to harvest stone crabs by traps in the management area must comply with the vessel and gear identification requirements applicable to the harvesting of stone crabs by traps in Florida's waters in effect as of April 14, 1995, in Rule 2N–8.001 and Rule 46–13.002(2) (e) and (f), Florida Administrative Code. This incorporation by reference was approved by the Director of the Office of the Federal Register in accordance with 5 U.S.C. 552(a) and 1 CFR part 51. Copies may be obtained from the Florida Marine Fisheries Commission, 2540 Executive Center Circle West, Suite 106, Tallahassee, FL 32301; telephone: 904–487–0554. Copies may be inspected at the office of the Regional Director; the Office of Fisheries Conservation and Management, NMFS, 1315 East-West Highway, Silver Spring, MD 20910; or the Office of the Federal Register, 800 North Capitol Street, NW, Suite 700, Washington, DC.

(b) A stone crab trap or buoy in the EEZ that is not in compliance with the gear identification requirements

specified in paragraph (a) of this section is illegal. Such trap or buoy, and any connecting lines, will be considered unclaimed or abandoned property and may be disposed of in any manner considered appropriate by the Assistant Administrator or an authorized officer. An owner of such trap or buoy remains subject to appropriate civil penalties. A stone crab trap will be presumed to be the property of the most recently documented owner.

§ 654.7 Prohibitions.

In addition to the general prohibitions specified in § 620.7 of this chapter, it is unlawful for any person to do any of the following:

(a) Falsify or fail to display and maintain vessel and gear identification, as required by § 654.6(a).

(b) Possess a stone crab in the management area during the period specified in § 654.20(a).

(c) Possess a stone crab trap in the management area during the period specified in § 654.20(c).

(d) Remove from a stone crab in or from the management area, or possess in the management area, a claw that is less than the minimum size limit specified in § 654.21(a).

(e) Fail to return immediately to the water unharmed an egg-bearing stone crab, or strip eggs from or otherwise molest an egg-bearing stone crab; as specified in § 654.21(b).

(f) Hold a stone crab in or from the management area aboard a vessel other than as specified in § 654.21(c).

(g) Use or possess in the management area a stone crab trap that does not have a biodegradable panel, as specified in § 654.22(a).

(h) Pull or tend a stone crab trap in the management area other than during daylight hours, as specified in § 654.22(b).

(i) Willfully tend, open, pull, or otherwise molest another fisherman's trap, buoy, or line in the management area, as specified in § 654.22(c).

(j) Trawl in a closed area or during a closed season, as specified in §§ 654.23 or 654.24, or as may be implemented under § 654.25(b).

(k) Place a stone crab trap in a closed area or during a closed season, as specified in § 654.24, or as may be implemented under § 654.25(b).

(l) Interfere with fishing or obstruct or damage fishing gear or the fishing vessel of another, as specified in § 654.25(a).

(m) Make any false statement, oral or written, to an authorized officer concerning the taking, catching, harvesting, landing, purchase, sale, possession, or transfer of stone crab.

(n) Interfere with, obstruct, delay, or prevent by any means an investigation, search, seizure, or disposition of seized property in connection with enforcement of the Magnuson Act.

§ 654.8 Facilitation of enforcement.

See § 620.8 of this chapter.

§ 654.9 Penalties.

See § 620.9 of this chapter.

Subpart B—Management Measures

§ 654.20 Seasons.

(a) *Closed season.* No person may possess a stone crab in the management area from 12:01 a.m., local time, May 16, through 12 p.m. midnight, local time, October 14, each year. Holding a stone crab in a trap in the water during a soak period or during a removal period (see paragraph (b) of this section), or during any extension thereto, is not deemed possession, provided that, if the trap is removed from the water during such period, such crab is returned immediately to the water with its claws unharvested.

(b) *Placement of traps.* (1) *Prior to the fishing season.* The period of October 5 through October 14 is established as a trap soak period. A stone crab trap may be placed in the management area not earlier than 1 hour before sunrise on October 5.

(2) *After the fishing season.* The period of May 16 through May 20 is established as a trap removal period. A stone crab trap must be removed from the management area not later than 1 hour after sunset on May 20, unless an extension to the removal period is granted under paragraph (b)(2)(i) of this section and the extension authorization is carried aboard the fishing vessel as specified in paragraph (b)(2)(ii) of this section.

(i) An extension of the removal period may be granted by Florida in accordance with Rule 46–13.002(2)(b), Florida Administrative Code, in effect as of April 14, 1995. This incorporation by reference was approved by the Director of the Office of the Federal Register in accordance with 5 U.S.C. 552(a) and 1 CFR part 51. Copies may be obtained from the Florida Marine Fisheries Commission, 2540 Executive Center Circle West, Suite 106, Tallahassee, FL 32301; telephone: 904–487–0554. Copies may be inspected at the office of the Regional Director, or the Office of the Federal Register, 800 North Capitol Street, N.W., Suite 700, Washington, DC.

(ii) The extension authorization must be carried aboard the fishing vessel. The operator of a fishing vessel must present the authorization for inspection upon request of an authorized officer.

(c) *Possession of stone crab traps.* A stone crab trap may not be possessed in the management area from the end of the trap removal period, or an extension thereto, to the beginning of the trap soak period, as specified in paragraph (b) of this section. A stone crab trap, float, or rope in the management area during this period will be considered unclaimed or abandoned property and may be disposed of in any manner considered appropriate by the Assistant Administrator or an authorized officer. An owner of such trap, float, or rope remains subject to appropriate civil penalties.

§ 654.21 Harvest limitations.

(a) *Claw size.* No person may remove from a stone crab in or from the management area, or possess in the management area, a claw with a propodus measuring less than 2.75 inches (7.0 cm), measured in a straight line from the elbow to the tip of the lower immovable finger. The propodus is the largest section of the claw assembly that has both a movable and immovable finger and is located farthest from the body when the entire appendage is extended. (See Appendix A, Figure 1, of this part.)

(b) *Egg-bearing stone crabs.* An egg-bearing stone crab in or from the management area must be returned immediately to the water unharmed—without removal of a claw. An egg-bearing stone crab may not be stripped of its eggs or otherwise molested.

(c) *Holding stone crabs.* A live stone crab in or from the management area may be held aboard a vessel until such time as a legal-sized claw is removed, provided it is held in a container that is shaded from direct sunlight and it is wet with sea water as necessary to keep it in a damp condition. Containers holding stone crabs must be stacked in a manner that does not compress the crabs. A stone crab body from which a legal-sized claw has been removed must be returned to the sea before the vessel reaches shore or a port or dock.

§ 654.22 Gear restrictions.

(a) *Biodegradable panels.* A stone crab trap used or possessed in the management area must have a panel constructed of wood or cotton and located on a side of the trap at least two slats above the bottom, or on the top of the trap, which, when removed, will leave an opening in the trap measuring at least 2.5 inches by 5 inches (6.35 cm by 12.7 cm).

(b) *Daylight hours.* A stone crab trap in the management area may be pulled or tended during daylight hours only—

that is, from 1 hour before sunrise to 1 hour after sunset.

(c) *Gear belonging to others.* No fisherman may willfully tend, open, pull, or otherwise molest another fisherman's trap, buoy, or line in the management area without the prior written consent of that fisherman.

§ 654.23 Southwest Florida seasonal trawl closure.

From January 1 to 1 hour after sunset (local time) May 20, each year, the area described in this section is closed to trawling, including trawling for live bait. The area is that part of the management area shoreward of a line connecting the following points (see Appendix A, Figure 2, of this part):

Point	North Latitude	West Longitude
B[1]	26°16′	81°58.5′
C	26°00′	82°04′
D	25°09′	81°47.6′
E	24°54.5′	81°50.5′
M[1]	24°49.3′	81°46.4′

[1] On the seaward limit of Florida's waters.

§ 654.24 Shrimp/stone crab separation zones.

Five zones are established in the management area and Florida's waters off Citrus and Hernando Counties for the separation of shrimp trawling and stone crab trapping. The zones are as shown in Appendix A, Figure 3, of this part. Although Zone II is entirely within Florida's waters, it is included in this section and Appendix A, Figure 3, of this part for the convenience of fishermen. Restrictions that apply to Zone II and those parts of the other zones that are in Florida's waters are contained in Rule 46–38.001, Florida Administrative Code. Geographical coordinates of the points referred to in this paragraph and shown in Appendix A, Figure 3, of this part are as follows (loran readings are unofficial and are included only for the convenience of fishermen):

Point	North latitude	West longitude	Loran Chain 7980			
			W	X	Y	Z
A	28°59′30″	82°45′36″	14416.5	31409.4	45259.1	62895.3
B	28°59′30″	83°00′10″	14396.0	31386.3	45376.8	63000.0
C	28°26′01″	82°59′47″	14301.5	31205.9	45103.2	63000.0
D	28°26′01″	82°56′54″	14307.0	31212.2	45080.0	62981.3
E	28°41′39″	82°55′25″	14353.7	31300.2	45193.9	62970.0
F	28°41′39″	82°56′09″	14352.4	31298.6	45199.4	62975.0
G	28°48′56″	82°56′19″	14372.6	31337.2	45260.0	62975.0
H	28°53′51″	82°51′19″	14393.9	31371.8	45260.0	62938.7
I	28°54′43″	82°44′52″	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)
J	28°51′09″	82°44′00″	(2)	(2)	(2)	(2)
K	28°50′59″	82°54′16″	14381.6	31351.8	45260.0	62960.0
L	28°41′39″	82°53′56″	14356.2	31303.0	45181.7	62960.0
M	28°41′39″	82°38′46″	(3)	(3)	(3)	(3)
N	28°41′39″	82°53′12″	14357.4	31304.4	45176.0	62955.0
O	28°30′51″	82°55′11″	14323.7	31242.4	45104.9	62970.0
P	28°40′00″	82°53′08″	14352.9	31295.7	45161.8	62955.0
Q	28°40′00″	82°47′58″	14361.3	31305.4	45120.0	62920.0
R	28°35′14″	82°47′47″	14348.6	31280.6	45080.0	62920.0
S	28°30′51″	82°52′55''	14327.7	31247.0	45086.6	62955.0
T	28°27′46″	82°55′09″	14315.2	31225.8	45080.0	62970.0
U	28°30′51″	82°52′09″	14329.1	31248.6	45080.0	62949.9

[1] Crystal River Entrance Light 1A.
[2] Long Pt. (southwest tip).
[3] Shoreline.

(a) *Zone I* is enclosed by rhumb lines connecting, in order, points A, B, C, D, T, E, F, G, H, I, and J, plus the shoreline between points A and J. It is unlawful to trawl in that part of Zone I that is in the EEZ during the period October 5 through May 20, each year.

(b) *Zone II* is enclosed by rhumb lines connecting, in order, points J, I, H, K, L, and M, plus the shoreline between points J and M.

(c) *Zone III* is enclosed by rhumb lines connecting, in order, points P, Q, R, U, S, and P. It is unlawful to trawl in that part of Zone III that is in the EEZ during the period October 5 through May 20, each year.

(d) *Zone IV* is enclosed by rhumb lines connecting, in order, points E, N, S, O, and E.

(1) It is unlawful to place a stone crab trap in that part of Zone IV that is in the EEZ during the periods October 5 through December 1, and April 2 through May 20, each year.

(2) It is unlawful to trawl in that part of Zone IV that is in the EEZ during the period December 2 through April 1, each year.

(e) *Zone V* is enclosed by rhumb lines connecting, in order, points F, G, K, L, and F.

(1) It is unlawful to place a stone crab trap in that part of Zone V that is in the EEZ during the periods October 5 through November 30, and March 16 through May 20, each year.

(2) It is unlawful to trawl in that part of Zone V that it is in the EEZ during the period December 1 through March 15, each year.

(f) A stone crab trap, float, or rope in the management area during a period not authorized by this section will be considered unclaimed or abandoned property and may be disposed of in any manner considered appropriate by the Assistant Administrator or an authorized officer. An owner of such trap, float, or rope remains subject to appropriate civil penalties. A stone crab trap will be presumed to be the property of the most recently documented owner.

§ 654.25 Prevention of gear conflicts.

(a) No person may knowingly place in the management area any article, including fishing gear, that interferes with fishing or obstructs or damages fishing gear or the fishing vessel of another; or knowingly use fishing gear in such a fashion that it obstructs or damages the fishing gear or fishing vessel of another.

(b) In accordance with the procedures and limitations of the Fishery

Management Plan for the Stone Crab Fishery of the Gulf of Mexico, the Regional Director may modify or establish separation zones for shrimp trawling and the use of fixed gear as may be necessary and appropriate to prevent gear conflicts. Necessary prohibitions or restrictions will be published in the **Federal Register**.

§ 654.26 Adjustment of management measures.

In accordance with the procedures and limitations of the fishery management plan for the Stone Crab Fishery of the Gulf of Mexico, the Regional Director may establish or modify the following management measures: Limitations on the number of traps that may be fished by each vessel; construction characteristics of traps; gear and vessel identification requirements; gear that may be used or prohibited in a directed fishery; bycatch levels in non-directed fisheries; seasons; soak/removal periods and requirements for traps; use, possession and handling of stone crabs aboard vessels; and minimum legal sizes.

§ 654.27 Specifically authorized activities.

The Regional Director may authorize, for the acquisition of information and data, activities otherwise prohibited by the regulations in this part.

Appendix A to Part 654—Figures

Figure 1—Stone Crab Claw
Figure 2—Southwest Florida Seasonal Trawl Closure
Figure 3—Shrimp/Stone Crab Separation Zones

BILLING CODE 3510–22–P



FIGURE 1. STONE CRAB CLAW



FIGURE 2. SOUTHWEST FLORIDA SEASONAL TRAWL CLOSURE



FIGURE 3. SHRIMP/STONE CRAB SEPARATION ZONES

[FR Doc. 95–6334 Filed 3–14–95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–22–C

Proposed Rules

Federal Register

Vol. 60, No. 50

Wednesday, March 15, 1995

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 AGRICULTURE

Agricultural Marketing Service

7 CFR Part 51

[Docket Number FV–94–301]

Table Grapes (European or Vinifera Type); Grade Standards

AGENCY: Agricultural Marketing Service, USDA.

ACTION: Proposed rule.

SUMMARY: This proposed rule would revise the United States Standards for Grades of Table Grapes (European or Vinifera Type). The proposal would lower the present minimum bunch size as well as provide a separate tolerance for off-size bunches for the U.S. No. 1 Institutional grade only. It would also include a technical update which would correct the variety name ''Superior Seedless'' to ''Sugraone.''

DATES: Comments must be postmarked or courier dated on or before May 15, 1995.

ADDRESSES: Interested parties are invited to submit written comments concerning this proposal. Comments must be sent to the Fresh Products Branch, Fruit and Vegetable Division, Agricultural Marketing Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture, P.O. Box 96456, Room 2056 South Building, Washington, D.C. 20090–6456. Comments should make reference to the date and page number of this issue of the **Federal Register** and will be made available for public inspection in the above office during regular business hours.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Frank O'Sullivan, at the above address or call (202) 720–2185.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The Department of Agriculture (Department) is issuing this rule in conformance with Executive Order 12866.

Pursuant to the requirements set forth in the Regulatory Flexibility Act (5 U.S.C. 601 *et. seq.*), the Administrator of the Agricultural Marketing Service (AMS) has determined that this action will not have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities. This proposed rule for the revision of U.S. Standards for Grades of Table Grapes (European or Vinifera Type) will not impose substantial direct economic cost, recordkeeping, or personnel workload changes on small entities, and will not alter the market share or competitive position of these entities relative to large businesses.

This proposed rule has been reviewed under Executive Order 12778, Civil Justice Reform. This action is not intended to have retroactive effect. This proposed rule will not preempt any State or local laws, regulations, or policies, unless they present an irreconcilable conflict with this rule. There are no administrative procedures which must be exhausted prior to any judicial challenge to the provisions of this rule.

Agencies periodically review existing regulations. An objective of the review is to ensure that the grade standards are serving their intended purpose, the language is clear, and the standards are consistent with AMS policy and authority.

The United States Standards for Grades of Table Grapes (European or Vinifera Type) was revised in April 1991. This revision established a new grade, U.S. No. 1 Institutional. This grade—used in sales to restaurant and other food service concerns—provides for grape lots which have very small bunch sizes. In recent years, new marketing and packaging techniques have developed very small, individual consumer size servings of grapes. Under previous grade requirements these ''single serving'' type grape bunches were too small to meet any U.S. grade. Therefore, the Department developed, at the request of the table grape industry, a separate grade reflecting today's modern marketing and packaging methods for the growing food service market while preserving the integrity of the ''regular'' fresh pack grades for grapes sold to consumers in supermarkets and other retail outlets. Thus, grades for two different types of pack could be contained in one standard allowing the grades to share common characteristics while at the same time maintaining grades for two distinct types (packs) of table grapes.

This proposed revision concerns only the institutional pack and not the ''regular'' fresh pack grades. Growers and shippers of the institutional pack type table grape represented by the California Grape and Tree Fruit League (CGTFL) have requested a revision to the institutional grade only, to address a new market which is emerging that would utilize extremely small clusters and/or bunches of grapes. According to the CGTFL, these buyers typically want a smaller grouping of grapes than is allowed under the current two ounce minimum bunch size requirement in the institutional grade. As an example, certain restaurant chains presently garnish some of their plates with institutional pack grapes, but must cut the existing small bunches to even smaller clusters of grapes (as little as two berries to a cluster) to fit their particular needs. Changing the minimum bunch requirement on the U.S. No. 1 Institutional grade would allow the industry to develop contract specifications and otherwise use the U.S. grade to satisfy that growing segment of the restaurant and food service industry market that utilizes grapes as a garnish.

Therefore, this proposal would change § 51.885 U.S. No. 1 Institutional to resemble § 51.884 (the format for U.S. No. 1 table) except for the elimination of straggliness requirements and trimming away of defective berries for bunches. The initial grade requirements will read as follows: '' 'U.S. No. 1 Institutional' grapes must have no less than 95 percent of the containers in the lot legibly marked 'Institutional Pack.' Further requirements for this grade include grapes which consist of clusters and/or bunches of well developed grapes of one variety, except when designated as assorted varieties, which are at least fairly well colored, uniform in appearance when so specified in connection with the grade, and which meet the following requirements:''

As mentioned above, the requirements will be the same as for U.S. No. 1 table except paragraph (b)(1) ''Not Straggly'' and (g)(4) ''Trimming away of defective berries'' will be omitted. Also, paragraphs (h)(2) and (h)(2)(i) will include size requirements for clusters and/or berries:

''(2) For clusters/bunches:

(i) In this grade grapes shall consist of at least a two berry cluster ranging to

clusters and/or bunches of grapes not greater than five ounces in weight. See § 51.913.''

The present § 51.913, Metric Conversion Table, will be redesignated § 51.914 and a new § 51.913 would be added to define a cluster. Since grape bunches are normally thought of as a series of grapes attached to small lateral stems which are in turn attached to a common main stem, the term bunch does not seem entirely appropriate when referring to two berries which share a common point of attachment. Therefore, for the purpose of the U.S. No. 1 Institutional grade only, § 51.913 shall define a cluster as ''two or more berries sharing a common point of attachment.''

In addition, Table Ia, Tolerances at Shipping Point for U.S. No. 1 Institutional Only, and Table IIa, Tolerances En Route or at Destination for U.S. No. 1 Institutional Only, would be added. The CGTFL requested that a separate tolerance of four percent be provided for offsize clusters or bunches to maintain the integrity of the grade in relation to size requirements. Presently, Tables I and II combine both the offsize and remaining grade requirements in one tolerance (eight percent for tolerances at shipping point, Table I, and 12 percent for tolerances en route or at destination, Table II). The corresponding new tables, Table Ia and IIa for U.S. No. 1 Institutional grade only, will maintain an eight and twelve percent tolerance, respectively, for remaining grade requirements but would include a separate tolerance of four percent for offsize clusters or bunches.

This proposed rule would also make a technical change which is unrelated to the U.S. No. 1 Institutional grade. Presently, §§ 51.882(i)(1)(ii) and 51.884(i)(1)(i) make reference to ''Superior Seedless'' as a varietal name. It has been brought to the attention of the Department by representatives of Sunworld International, Inc., California, that ''Superior Seedless'' is in fact, a registered trademark name and not the varietal name. ''Sugraone'' according to Sunworld, is the correct varietal name.

Research into this matter by the Department has shown that both the International Union for the Protection of New Varieties of Plants (UPOV) and the Office International de la Vigne et du Vin (OIV), the United States being a signatory of each, as well as the United Nations Economic Commission for Europe (ECE) have determined that ''Sugraone'' is the actual varietal designation while ''Superior Seedless'' represents a registered trademark.

Therefore, to maintain proper conformity with these designations, the words ''Superior Seedless'' will be removed in these sections and will be replaced with ''Sugraone.''

List of Subjects in 7 CFR Part 51

Agricultural commodities, Food grades and standards, Fruits, Nuts, Reporting and recordkeeping requirements, Vegetables.

PART 51—[AMENDED]

For reasons set forth in the preamble, it is proposed that 7 CFR Part 51 be amended as follows:

1. The authority citation for 7 CFR Part 51 continues to read as follows:

Authority: 7 U.S.C. 1622, 1624.

§ 51.882 [Amended]

2. Section 51.882(i)(1)(ii) is amended by removing the words ''Superior Seedless'' and adding in its place ''Sugraone.''

§ 51.884 [Amended]

3. Section 51.884(i)(1)(i) is amended by removing the words ''Superior Seedless'' and adding in its place ''Sugraone.''

4. Section 51.885 is revised to read as follows:

§ 51.885 U.S. No. 1 Institutional.

''U.S. No. 1 Institutional'' grapes must have no less than 95 percent of the containers in the lot legibly marked ''Institutional Pack.'' Further requirements for this grade include grapes which consist of clusters and/or bunches of well developed grapes of one variety, except when designated as assorted varieties, which are at least fairly well colored, uniform in appearance when so specified in connection with the grade, and which meet the following requirements:

(a) Basic requirements for berries:
(1) Mature;
(2) Firm;
(3) Firmly attached to capstem;
(4) Not weak;
(5) Not materially shriveled at capstem;
(6) Not shattered;
(7) Not split or crushed;
(8) Not wet.

(b) Basic requirements for stems: Not weak, or dry and brittle.

(c) Berries free from:
(1) Decay;
(2) Waterberry;
(3) Sunburn.

(d) Stems free from:
(1) Mold;
(2) Decay.

(e) Berries not damaged by: Any other cause.

(f) Bunches not damaged by:
(1) Shot berries;
(2) Dried berries;
(3) Other defective berries;
(4) Any other cause.

(g) Stems not damaged by:
(1) Freezing;
(2) Any other cause.

(h) Size:

(1) For berries: Exclusive of shot berries and dried berries, 75 percent, by count, of the berries on each bunch shall have the minimum diameters indicated for varieties as follows:

(i) Thompson Seedless, Perlette, Delight, Beauty Seedless, Sugraone, Flame Seedless and other seedless varieties nine-sixteenths of an inch.

(ii) Other varieties ten-sixteenths of an inch.

(2) For clusters/bunches:

(i) In this grade grapes shall consist of at least a two berry cluster ranging to clusters and/or bunches of grapes not greater than five ounces in weight. See Section 51.913.

(ii) For tolerances see § 51.886.

5. Section 51.886 is amended by revising paragraph (b) and adding a new paragraph (c) and Tables Ia and IIa to read as follows:

§ 51.886 Tolerances.

(a) * * *

(b) In order to allow for variations incident to proper grading and handling in each of the foregoing grades except U.S. No. 1 Institutional, tolerances, by weight, other than for maturity, are provided as set forth in Tables I and II of this section.

* * * * *

(c) In order to allow for variations incident to proper grading and handling in the U.S. No. 1 Institutional grade only, tolerances, by weight, other than for maturity, are provided as set forth in Tables Ia and IIa of this section.

TABLE Ia.—TOLERANCES AT SHIPPING POINT FOR U.S. NO. 1 INSTITUTIONAL GRADE ONLY [1]

[Percent]

Factor	U.S. No. 1 institutional
(A) For clusters/bunches failing to meet color requirements	10
(B) For clusters/bunches failing to meet requirements for minimum diameter of berries	10
(C) For offsize clusters/bunches	4
(D) For clusters/bunches and berries failing to meet the remaining requirements for the grade	8
Including in (D):	
(a) For Serious damage and, including in (a)	2
(i) For Decay	1/2 of 1

TABLE IIa.—TOLERANCES EN ROUTE OR AT DESTINATION FOR U.S. NO. 1 INSTITUTIONAL ONLY

Factor	U.S. No. 1 institutional
(A) For clusters/bunches failing to meet color requirements	10
(B) For clusters/bunches failing to meet requirements for minimum diameter of berries	10
(C) For offsize clusters/bunches	4
(D) For clusters/bunches and berries failing to meet the remaining requirements for the grade	12
Including in (D):	
(a) For permanent defects	8
(b) For serious damage and, including in (b)	4
(i) For serious damage by permanent defects	2
(ii) For decay	1

[1] Shipping point, as used in these standards, means the point of origin of the shipment in the producing area or at port of loading for ship stores or overseas shipment, or, in the case of shipments from outside the continental United States, the port of entry into the United States.

§ 51.913 [Redesignated as § 51.914]

6. In Part 51, Subpart—United States Standards for Grades of Table Grapes (European or Vinifera Type), § 51.913 is redesignated as § 51.914 and a new § 51.913 is added to read as follows:

§ 51.913 Clusters.

''Clusters'' as used in these standards in reference to the U.S. No. 1 Institutional grade only shall be defined as two or more berries sharing a common point of attachment.

Dated: March 9, 1995.

Lon Hatamiya,

Administrator.

[FR Doc. 95–6367 Filed 3–14–95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3410–02–P

Rural Housing and Community Development Service

Rural Business and Cooperative Development Service

Rural Utilities Service

Consolidated Farm Service Agency

7 CFR Part 1940

RIN 0575–AB66

Environmental Program

AGENCIES: Rural Housing and Community Development Service, Rural Business and Cooperative Development Service, Rural Utilities Service, and Consolidated Farm Service Agency, USDA.

ACTION: Proposed rule.

SUMMARY: The Agencies propose to revise their Environmental regulation. This action is necessary to streamline the environmental review process. The intended effect of this action is to provide guidance on sending individual copies of notices to affected property owners when utility systems are involved.

DATES: Comments must be received on or before May 15, 1995.

ADDRESSES: Submit written comments in duplicate to the office of the Chief, Regulations Analysis and Control Branch, Rural Economic and Community Development, U.S. Department of Agriculture, Room 6348, South Agriculture Building, 14th Street and Independence Avenue SW., Washington, D.C. 20250–0700.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Donald O. Lander, Senior Environmental Protection Specialist, Environmental Support Branch, Program Support Staff, Rural Housing and Community Development Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture, Room 6309, South Agriculture Building, 14th Street and Independence Avenue SW., Washington, D.C. 20250–0700; telephone (202) 720–9619.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Classification

We are issuing this proposed rule in conformance with Executive Order 12866, and the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) has determined that it is a ''significant regulatory action''.

Intergovernmental Consultation

This rule affects the following Agency programs as listed in the Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance (CFDA):

10.760—Water and Waste Disposal Systems for Rural Communities
10.762—Solid Waste Management Grants
10.763—Emergency Community Water Assistance Grants
10.766—Community Facilities Loans
10.770—Water and Waste Disposal Loans and Grants (Section 306C)

Executive Order 12372 requires intergovernmental consultation with State and local officials. Of the FmHA programs affected by this rule, the following are subject to the provisions of Executive Order 12372: 10.760, 10.763, 10.766, and 10.770.

Regulatory Flexibility Act

In compliance with the Regulatory Flexibility Act (5 U.S.C. 601–602), the undersigned has determined and certified by signature of this document that this rule will not have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities since this rulemaking action does not involve a new or expanded program. Therefore a regulatory flexibility analysis was not prepared.

Civil Justice Reform

This document has been reviewed in accordance with Executive Order 12778. It is the determination of the Agencies that this action does not unduly burden the Federal Court System in that it meets all applicable standards provided in Section 2 of the Executive Order.

Environmental Impact Statement

This document has been reviewed in accordance with 7 CFR part 1940, subpart G, ''Environmental Program.'' The Agencies have determined that this action does not constitute a major Federal action significantly affecting the quality of the human environment, and in accordance with the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969, Pub. L. 91–190, an Environmental Impact Statement is not required.

Paperwork Reduction Act

The information collection requirements contained in this regulation have been approved by the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) under the provisions of 44 U.S.C. Chapter 35 and have been assigned OMB control number 0575–0094 in accordance with the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1980 (44 U.S.C. 3507). This proposed rule does not revise or impose any new information collection or recordkeeping requirement from those imposed by OMB.

Background

Section 1940.331 describes the public notice requirements for actions undergoing an environmental review by the Agencies.

In § 1940.331(b)(4) there has been confusion about identifying the names and mailing addresses of individual property owners who may be affected by a project when large areas of important land resources may be affected. This confusion has caused delays and added expense in the preparation and review of Class I and Class II environmental assessments for those projects.

The regulation is proposed to be revised to allow the State Environmental Coordinator to select the methods for notifying affected property owners, and to provide examples of some other methods that may be considered.

List of Subjects in 7 CFR Part 1940

Endangered and threatened wildlife, Environmental protection, Floodplains, National Wild and Scenic Rivers System, Natural resources, Recreation, Water supply.

Accordingly, the Agencies propose to amend chapter XVIII, title 7, Code of Federal Regulations as follows.

PART 1940—GENERAL

1. The authority citation for part 1940 continues to read as follows:

Authority: 7 U.S.C. 1989; 42 U.S.C. 1480; 5 U.S.C. 301; 7 CFR 2.23 and 2.70.

Subpart G—Environmental Program

2. Section 1940.331 is amended by revising paragraph (b)(4) to read as follows:

1940.331 Public involvement.

* * * * *

(b) * * *

(4) The public notice procedures for actions that will affect floodplains, wetlands, important farmland, prime rangelands, or prime forest lands are contained in exhibit C of this subpart. These procedures apply to actions that require either an EIS, Class II assessment or Class I assessment. However, whenever an action normally classified as a categorical exclusion requires a Class I assessment because of a potential impact to one of these important land resources, no public notice procedures apply in the course of completing the Class I assessment. When applicable to an action, as specified in exhibit C of this subpart, these public notice procedures can apply at two distinct stages. The first stage, a preliminary notice, is followed by a 30 day public review period, and applies to actions that may impact any of the five important land resources. The second stage, a final notice, is followed by a fifteen-day public review period, and applies only to actions that will impact floodplains or wetlands. For Class II actions, this final notice procedure must be combined with any applicable finding of no significant environmental impact, which is described in paragraph (b)(3) of this section. Individual copies of the preliminary and final notices will be sent to the same parties that are required to be sent a notice of a finding of no significant impact, as specified in paragraph (b)(3) of this section, with the following exceptions:

(i) Whenever property owners affected by proposed mitigation measures, such as proposed hook-up restrictions on portions of water or sewer lines that will traverse floodplains, are advised of these proposed mitigation measures in a preliminary notice, these property owners need not be sent copies of the final notice as long as the mitigation measures in the final notice are unchanged from the preliminary notice and no property owners raised objections or concerns over the proposed mitigation measures.

(ii) With respect to utility systems, notification of affected property owners will normally be achieved by distributing an individual copy of the public notice. However, when the SEC determines that this method would result in an excessive burden on the applicant, notification may be achieved by another method or a combination of methods tailored to the specific needs of the particular case. For example, in lieu of being individually identified, affected property owners may be notified by a mass mailing to all of the taxpayers in each of the taxing areas through which the system will pass. On the other hand, if the system traverses coterminous taxing areas, with the smaller area not completely describing the service area of the utility system, affected property owners might be notified by a mass mailing to the small taxing area plus identifying the remaining affected property owners to receive an individual copy. The objective is to notify all property owners affected by the action and offer them an opportunity to comment on the action. If affected property owners are not individually notified, the SEC shall document as part of the environmental review file, why individual notification is not being used and what other methods will be used to achieve the stated objective.

* * * * *

Dated: February 27, 1995.

Michael V. Dunn,

Acting Under Secretary for Rural Economic and Community Development.

[FR Doc. 95–6366 Filed 3–14–95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3410–07–U

Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service

9 CFR Part 92

[Docket No. 95–014–1]

Horses From the United Arab Emirates; Change in Disease Status

AGENCY: Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, USDA.

ACTION: Proposed rule.

SUMMARY: We are proposing to amend the regulations concerning the importation of horses to remove the United Arab Emirates from the list of countries in which African horse sickness exists. We believe that the United Arab Emirates is free of African horse sickness, and that restrictions on the importation of horses from the United Arab Emirates to prevent the spread of African horse sickness into the United States are no longer necessary. This action would relieve unnecessary restrictions on the importation of horses from the United Arab Emirates.

DATES: Consideration will be given only to comments received on or before March 30, 1995.

ADDRESSES: Please send an original and three copies of your comments to Docket No. 95–014–1, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, Policy and Program Development, Regulatory Analysis and Development, 4700 River Road Unit 118, Riverdale, MD 20737–1228. Please state that your comments refer to Docket No. 95–014–1. Comments received may be inspected at USDA, room 1141, South Building, 14th Street and Independence Avenue SW., Washington, DC, between 8 a.m. and 4:30 p.m., Monday through Friday, except holidays. Persons wishing to inspect comments are requested to call ahead on (202) 690–2817 to facilitate entry into the comment reading room.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Dr. John Cougill, Staff Veterinarian, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, Veterinary Services, National Center for Import and Export, Import/Export Products, 4700 River Road Unit 40, Riverdale, MD 20737–1228.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

The regulations in 9 CFR part 92 (referred to below as the regulations) state the provisions for the importation into the United States of specified animals to prevent the introduction of various animal diseases, including African horse sickness (AHS). AHS, a fatal equine viral disease, is not known to exist in the United States. Section 92.308(a)(2) of the regulations lists countries that the Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service (APHIS) considers affected with AHS, and sets forth specific requirements for horses which are imported from those countries. APHIS requires horses intended for importation from any of the countries listed, including horses that have stopped in or transited those countries, to enter the United States only at the port of New York and be quarantined at the New York Animal Import Center in Newburgh, NY, for at least 60 days.

The United Arab Emirates (UAE) has applied to the United States Department of Agriculture to be recognized as free from AHS. The UAE's last diagnosed case of AHS was over 29 years ago. The UAE has been testing horses for AHS. Additionally, they have an active surveillance program to monitor for AHS.

APHIS has reviewed the documentation submitted by the Government of the UAE in support of its request. APHIS officials also performed on-site inspections of the UAE's surveillance program and veterinary infrastructure. APHIS officials reviewed the qualifications of the UAE's veterinarians, microbiologists, and histopathologists. APHIS officials inspected the virology, parasitology, and bacteriology lab facilities at the Central Veterinary Research Laboratory in Dubai. Additionally, APHIS officials evaluated the UAE's import-export practices, including airports, border crossings, and quarantine facilities. The airports and border crossings are tightly controlled with adequate fencing and other physical barriers to control entry into the UAE. The APHIS officials conducting the on-site evaluation concluded that the veterinary infrastructure, laboratory facilities, and import-export practices are effective and contribute to the AHS-free status of the UAE.

Based on the information discussed above, we believe that the UAE qualifies for removal from the list of countries, in § 92.308(a)(2) of the regulations, which APHIS considers affected with AHS. This proposed action would relieve restrictions which require horses imported from the UAE to enter the United States only at the port of New York and be quarantined at the New York Animal Import Center in Newburgh, NY, for at least 60 days. This proposed action would allow horses from the UAE to be shipped to and quarantined at ports designated in § 92.303, and would reduce the quarantine period to an average of 3 days to meet the quarantine and testing requirements specified in § 92.308.

Comment Period

The Administrator of the Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service has determined that this rulemaking proceeding should be expedited by allowing a 15-day comment period on this proposal. U.S importers have requested that this rulemaking be completed in time to allow them to import horses from the UAE for this year's Kentucky Derby, to be held May 6, 1995. The comment period would allow the agency to promulgate and implement a final rule on an expedited basis. Prompt implementation of a final rule would facilitate the importation of horses by removing unnecessary quarantine restrictions. Removing the UAE from the list of AHS countries would significantly reduce the quarantine period for horses imported from the UAE. Additionally, this proposal would allow more flexibility in the ports used for the importation of horses from the UAE, making the importation of horses from the UAE logistically easier.

Executive Order 12866 and Regulatory Flexibility Act

This proposed rule has been reviewed under Executive Order 12866. For this action, the Office of Management and Budget has waived its review process required by Executive Order 12866.

The primary impact of this proposal will be on U.S. importers of horses from the UAE. The horses imported from the UAE tend to be higher-valued, purebred horses. These horses are worth 10 to 20 times more than the average price per horse from the rest of the world. Few, if any, of these importers can be considered a small entity. These importers will no longer be required to quarantine horses from the UAE for 60 days at the New York Animal Import Center in Newburgh, NY. The proposed rule would allow horses from the UAE to be shipped to and quarantined at ports designated in § 92.303, and would reduce the quarantine and testing period to an average of three days to meet quarantine requirements specified in § 92.308.

While no horses are reported in the ''Foreign Agricultural Trade of the United States'' as being imported directly from the UAE, we believe that each year an average of 10 to 20 horses are imported indirectly from the UAE through Europe. Removing the requirement for a 60-day quarantine at the New York Animal Import Center in Newburgh, NY, for horses from the UAE will make the importation of these horses less expensive and logistically easier. We anticipate that the number of horses imported from the UAE may slightly increase. We estimate approximately 50 to 100 horses may be imported per year, though some of these horses will only be temporarily imported to the United States for particular events, and then transported back to the UAE. With the very small number of horses imported from the UAE, we anticipate the overall economic impact on businesses and individuals would be minimal.

Under these circumstances, the Administrator of the Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service has determined that this action would not have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities.

Executive Order 12778

This proposed rule has been reviewed under Executive Order 12778, Civil Justice Reform. If this proposed rule is adopted: (1) All State and local laws and regulations that are inconsistent with this rule will be preempted; (2) no retroactive effect will be given to this rule; and (3) administrative proceedings will not be required before parties may file suit in court challenging this rule.

Paperwork Reduction Act

This proposed rule contains no information collection or recordkeeping requirements under the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1980 (44 U.S.C. 3501 *et seq.*).

List of Subjects in 9 CFR Part 92

Animal diseases, Imports, Livestock, Poultry and poultry products, Quarantine, Reporting and recordkeeping requirements.

Accordingly, 9 CFR part 92 would be amended as follows:

PART 92—IMPORTATION OF CERTAIN ANIMALS AND POULTRY AND CERTAIN ANIMAL AND POULTRY PRODUCTS; INSPECTION AND OTHER REQUIREMENTS FOR CERTAIN MEANS OF CONVEYANCE AND SHIPPING CONTAINERS THEREON

1. The authority citation for part 92 would continue to read as follows:

Authority: 7 U.S.C. 1622; 19 U.S.C. 1306; 21 U.S.C. 102–105, 111, 114a, 134a, 134b, 134c, 134d, 134f, 135, 136, and 136a; 31 U.S.C. 9701; 7 CFR 2.17, 2.51, and 371.2(d).

§ 92.308 [Amended]

2. In § 92.308, paragraph (a)(2) would be amended by removing ''the United Arab Emirates,''.

Done in Washington, DC, this 9th day of March 1995.

Terry L. Medley,

Acting Administrator, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service.

[FR Doc. 95–6373 Filed 3–14–95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3410–34–P

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Federal Aviation Administration

14 CFR Part 71

[Airspace Docket No. 95–AWP–2]

Proposed Amendment to Class E Airspace; Luke Air Force Base (AFB), AZ and Class D Airspace; Glendale, AZ

AGENCY: Federal Aviation Administration (FAA), DOT.

ACTION: Notice of proposed rulemaking.

SUMMARY: This notice proposes to amend the Class E airspace area at Luke AFB, AZ, and Class D airspace at Glendale, AZ due to the relocation of the Luke AFB TACAN. The effect of this proposal is to provide adequate Class E and Class D airspace for instrument flight rules (IFR) operations at Luke AFB, AZ, and Glendale, AZ.

DATES: Comments must be received on or before April 17, 1995.

ADDRESSES: Send comments on the proposal in triplicate to: Federal Aviation Administration, Attn: Manager, System Management Branch, AWP–530, Docket No. 95–AWP–2, Air Traffic Division, P.O. Box 92007, Worldway Postal Center, Los Angeles, California, 90009.

The official docket may be examined in the Office of the Assistant Chief Counsel, Western Pacific Region, Federal Aviation Administration, Room 6007, 15000 Aviation Boulevard, Lawndale, California, 90261.

An informal docket may also be examined during normal business hours at the Office of the Manager, System Management Branch, Air Traffic Division at the above address.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Scott Speer, System Management Specialist, System Management Branch, AWP–530, Air Traffic Division, Western-Pacific Region, Federal Aviation Administration, 15000 Aviation Boulevard, Lawndale, California 90261, telephone (310) 297–0010.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Comments Invited

Interested parties are invited to participate in this proposed rulemaking by submitting such written data, views, or arguments as they may desire. Comments that provide the factual basis supporting the views and suggestions presented are particularly helpful in developing reasoned regulatory decisions on the proposal. Comments are specifically invited on the overall regulatory, aeronautical, economic, environmental, and energy-related aspects of the proposal. Communications should identify the airspace docket and be submitted in triplicate to the address listed above. Commenters wishing the FAA to acknowledge receipt of their comments on this notice must submit with the comments a self-addressed, stamped postcard on which the following statement is made. ''Comments to Airspace Docket No. 95–AWP–2.'' The postcard will be date/time stamped and returned to the commenter. All communications received on or before the specified closing date for comments will be considered before taking action on the proposed rule. The proposal contained in this notice may be changed in light of comments received. All comments submitted will be available for examination in the System Management Branch, Air Traffic Division, 1500 Aviation Boulevard, Lawndale, California 90261, both before and after the closing date for comments. A report summarizing each substantive public contact with FAA personnel concerned with this rulemaking will be filed in the docket.

Availability of NPRM

Any person may obtain a copy of this Notice of Proposed Rulemaking (NPRM) by submitting a request to the Federal Aviation Administration, System Management Branch, P.O. Box 92007, Worldway Postal Center, Los Angeles, California 90009. Communications must identify the notice number of this NPRM. Persons interested in being placed on a mailing list for future NPRM's should also request a copy of Advisory Circular No. 11–2A, which describes the application procedures.

The Proposal

The FAA is considering an amendment to part 71 of the Federal Aviation Regulations (14 CFR part 71) to modify the Class E airspace area at Luke AFB, AZ, and Class D airspace area at Glendale, AZ. The relocation of the Luke AFB TACAN has made this proposal necessary. The intended effect of this proposal is to provide adequate Class E and Class D airspace for aircraft executing instrument approach procedures at Luke AFB, AZ, and Glendale, AZ. Class E and Class D airspace designations are published in paragraphs 6002 and 5000 of FAA Order 7400.9B, dated July 1994, and effective September 16, 1994, which is incorporated by reference in 14 CFR 71.1. The Class E and Class D airspace designations listed in this document would be published subsequently in this Order.

The FAA has determined that this proposed regulation only involves established body of technical regulations for which frequent and routine amendments are necessary to keep them operationally current. Therefore, this proposed regulation—(1) is not a ''significant regulatory action'' under Executive Order 12866; (2) is not a ''significant rule'' under DOT Regulatory Policies and Procedures (44 FR 10034; February 26, 1979); and (3) does not warrant preparation of a Regulatory Evaluation as the anticipated impact is so minimal. Since this is a routine matter that will only affect air traffic procedures and air navigation, it is certified that this proposed rule will not have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities under the criteria of the Regulatory Flexibility Act.

List of Subjects in 14 CFR Part 71

Airspace, Incorporation by reference, Navigation (air).

The Proposed Amendment

Accordingly, pursuant to the authority delegated to me, the Federal Aviation Administration proposes to amend part 71 of the Federal Aviation Regulations (14 CFR part 71) as follows:

PART 71—[AMENDED]

1. The authority citation for part 71 continues to read as follows:

Authority: 49 U.S.C. app. 1348(a), 1354(a), 1510; E.O. 10854, 24 FR 9565, 3 CFR, 1959–1963 Comp., p. 389; 49 U.S.C. 106(g); 14 CFR 11.69.

§ 71.1 [Amended]

2. The incorporation by reference in 14 CFR 71.1 of the Federal Aviation Administration Order 7400.9B, Airspace Designations and Reporting Points, dated July 18, 1994, and effective September 16, 1994, is amended as follows:

Paragraph 6002 Class E Airspace Areas Designated as a Surface Area for an Airport.

* * * * *

AWP AZ E2 Phoenix, Luke Air Force Base, AZ [Revised]

Phoenix Luke Air Force Base, AZ
(Lat. 33°32′06″ N, long. 112°22′59″ W)
Luke Air Force Base TACAN
(Lat. 33°32′16″ N, long. 112°22′49″ W)

That airspace extending upward from the surface to and including 3,600 feet MSL within a 4.4-mile radius of the Luke AFB and within 2 miles each side of the Luke TACAN 220° radial, extending from the 4.4-mile radius to 5.2 miles southwest of the Luke TACAN, excluding that portion within the Glendale, AZ Class D airspace area. This Class E airspace area is effective during the

specific dates and times established in advance by a Notice to Airmen. The effective date and time will thereafter be continuously published in the Airport/Facility Directory.

* * * * *

Paragraph 5000 Class D Airspace

* * * * *

AWP AZ D Glendale, AZ [Revised]

Glendale Municipal Airport, AZ
(Lat. 33°31′38″ N, long. 112°17′42″ W)

That airspace extending upward from the surface to including 3,100 feet MSL within a 3-mile radius of the Glendale Municipal Airport excluding that portion west of a line beginning at lat. 33°29′00″ N, long. 112°19′26″ W; to lat. 33°29′29″ N, long. 112°19′29″ W; to lat. 33°33′24″ N, long. 112°18′04″ W; to lat. 33°34′32″ N, long. 112°16′43″ W. This class D airspace area is effective during the specific dates and times established in advance by a Notice to Airmen. The effective date and time will thereafter be continuously published in the Airport/Facility Director.

* * * * *

Issued in Los Angeles, California, on March 3, 1995.

Dennis T. Koehler,

Acting Manager, Air Traffic Division, Western-Pacific Region.

[FR Doc. 95–6381 Filed 3–14–95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–13–M

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Office of Surface Mining Reclamation and Enforcement

30 CFR Part 926

Montana Regulatory Program

AGENCY: Office of Surface Mining Reclamation and Enforcement (OSM), Interior.

ACTION: Proposed rule; public comment period and opportunity for public hearing on proposed amendment.

SUMMARY: OSM is announcing the receipt of a proposed amendment to the Montana regulatory program (hereinafter, the ''Montana program'') under the Surface Mining Control and Reclamation Act of 1977 (SMCRA). The proposed amendment consist of revisions to Title 26, Chapter 4, Subchapters 3 through 12 of the Administrative Rules of Montana (ARM). The amendment is intended to revise the Montana program to be consistent with the corresponding Federal regulations, incorporate the additional flexibility afforded by the revised Federal regulations, clarify ambiguities, and improve operational efficiency

This document sets forth the times and locations that the Montana program and proposed amendment to that program are available for public inspection, the comment period during which interested persons may submit written comments on the proposed amendment, and procedures that will be followed regarding the public hearing if one is requested.

DATES: Written comments must be received by 4:00 p.m., m.s.t. April 14, 1995. If requested, a public hearing on the proposed amendment will be held on April 10, 1995. Requests to present oral testimony at the hearing must be received by 4:00 p.m., m.s.t. on March 30, 1995.

ADDRESSES: Written comments should be mailed or hand delivered to Guy Padgett at the address listed below.

Copies of the Montana program, the proposed amendment, and all written comments received in response to this notice will be available for public review at the addresses listed below during normal business hours, Monday through Friday, excluding holidays. Each requester may receive one free copy of the proposed amendment by contacting OSM's Casper Field Office.

Guy Padgett, Director, Casper Field Office, Office of Surface Mining Reclamation and Enforcement, 100 East B Street, Room 2128, Casper, WY 82601–1918, Casper, WY 82601–1918, Telephone: (307) 261–5776.

Gary Amestoy, Administrator, Montana Department of State Lands, Reclamation Division, Capitol Station, 1625 Eleventh Avenue, Helena, Montana 59620, (406) 444–2074.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Guy V. Padgett, Telephone: (307) 261–5776.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

I. Background on the Montana Program

On April 1, 1980, the Secretary of the Interior conditionally approved the Montana program as administered by the Department of State Lands. General background information on the Montana program, including the Secretary's findings, the disposition of comments, and conditions of approval of the Montana program can be found in the April 1, 1980, **Federal Register** (45 FR 21560). Subsequent actions concerning Montana's program and program amendments can be found at 30 CFR 926.15 and 926.16.

II. Proposed Amendment

By letters dated February 1, 1995, and February 28, 1995, Montana submitted a proposed amendment to its program pursuant to SMCRA (Administrative Record Nos. MT–12–01 and MT–12–05, State Program Amendment Tracking System (SPATS) No. MT–003–FOR). Montana's proposed amendment consist of changes to the Montana program as required by 30 CFR 926.16; in response to program deficiency letters from OSM dated April 29, 1985, May 11, 1989, and March 29, 1990; and on its own initiative. The Montana proposed amendment consists of changes to Title 26, Chapter 4, Subchapters 3 through 12 of the State's ARM. The proposed revisions and rule changes are located at: ARM 26.4.301, definitions; ARM 26.4.304, legal, financial, compliance related information; ARM 26.4.304, baseline information for environmental resources; Arm 26.4.308, operation plans; ARM 26.314, plans for protection of the hydrologic balance; ARM 26.4.321, transportation facilities plans; ARM 26.4.304, review of applications; ARM 26.4.405, findings and notices of decision; ARM 26.4.405A, improvidently issued permits general requirements; ARM 26.4.405B, improvidently issued permits: revocation; ARM 26.4.407, conditions of permits; ARM 26.4.410, permit renewal; ARM 26.4.501A, final grading requirements; ARM 26.4.505, burial and treatment of waste materials; ARM 26.4.519A, thick overburden and excess spoil; ARM 26.4.524, signs and markers; ARM 26.4.601, general requirements for road and railroad loop construction; ARM 26.4.602, location of roads and railroad loops; ARM 26.4.603, embankments; ARM 26.4.605, Hydrologic impacts of roads and railroad loops; ARM 26.4.623, blasting schedules; ARM 26.4.633, water quality performance standards; ARM 26.4.634, reclamation of drainages; ARM 26.4.638, sediment control measures; ARM 26.4.639, sedimentation ponds and other treatment facilities; ARM 26.4.642, permanent and temporary impoundments; ARM 26.4.645, ground water monitoring; ARM 26.4.646, surface water monitoring; ARM 26.4.702, redistribution and stockpiling of soil; ARM 26.4.711, establishment of vegetation; ARM 26.4.711, eradication of rills and gullies; ARM 26.4.724, use of revegetation comparison standards; ARM 26.4.726, vegetation production, cover, diversity, density, and utility requirements; ARM 26.4.821, alternate reclamation: submission of plan; ARM 26.4.825, alternate reclamation: Alternate revegetation; ARM 26.4.924, disposal of underground development waste: general requirements; ARM 26.4.927, disposal of underground development waste: durable rock fills; ARM 26.4.930, placement and disposal of coal processing waste: special application requirements; ARM

26.4.923, disposal of coal processing waste; ARM 26.4.1001, permit requirements; ARM 26.4.1001A, notice of intent to prospect; ARM 26.4.1002, information and monthly reports; ARM 26.4.1005, drill holes; ARM 26.4.1006, roads and other transportation facilities; ARM 26.4.107, grading, soil salvage, storage, and redistribution; ARM 26.4.1009, diversions; ARM 26.4.1011, hydrologic balance; ARM 26.4.1014, test pits: application requirements, review procedures, bonding and additional performance standards; ARM 26.4.1116, bonding: criteria and schedule for release of bond; ARM 26.4.1116A, reassertion of jurisdiction; ARM 26.4.1141, designation of lands unsuitable; ARM 26.4.1206, notices, orders of abatement and cessation orders: issuance and service; and ARM 26.4.1212, point system for civil penalties and waivers.

Specifically, Montana proposes to:

—Revise ARM 26.4.301 to add the definitions of ''Owned or controlled'' and ''Waste disposal structure;'' to modify the definition of ''Test pit;'' and to recodify the numbering of definitions affected by this action.

—Revise ARM 26.4.303 to require new information on ownership and control, and status of violations in the permit application requirements.

—Revise ARM 26.4.304 to clarify baseline informational needs regarding groundwater and surface water resources in the permit application.

—Revise ARM 26.4.308 to require cross sections, design drawings, and other specifications for other support facilities.

—Revise ARM 26.4.314 to provide a list of considerations when summarizing the probable hydrologic consequences of the proposed mining operation.

—Revise ARM 26.4.321 to demonstrate that transportation facilities are in compliance with performance standards.

—Revise ARM 26.4.404 to identify under what situations the department would conditionally issued a permit.

—Revise ARM 26.4.405 to require the applicant to provide any new information regarding ownership/control and violations prior to making a decision to approve the permit application.

—Provide new rule requirements at ARM 26.4.405A to allow the department to consider, if it has reason to believe, that a permit has been improvidently issued.

—Provide new rule requirements at ARM 26.4.405B concerning revocation of an improvidently issued permit.

—Revise ARM 26.4.407 to require certain information from the permittee when a cessation order has been issued.

—Revise ARM 26.4.410 to clarify when a permit need not be renewed.

—Revise ARM 26.4.501A to require that grading and backfilling may not be more than four rather than two spoil ridges behind the pit being worked.

—Revise 26.4.505 concerning waste disposal structure location, design criteria, and inspection requirements.

—Revise 26.4.519A to delete the requirement that all highwalls and depressions must be eliminated when mining in thick overburden.

—Revise ARM 26.4.524 to require identification of the mine safety and health administration number and contractor identification (if applicable) on mine area access signs.

—Revise ARM 26.4.601 to require a report that roads have been constructed or reconstructed in accordance with the approved plan.

—Revise ARM 26.4.602 to identify when stream fords can be used.

—Revise ARM 26.4.603 to remove the ability for a registered land surveyor to design and certify embankments and require all embankments to have a minimum seismic safety factor of 1.2.

—Revise ARM 26.4.605 to require that all roads used to haul coal or spoil or be retained in the post mining land use, must meet certain design criteria for water-control structures.

—Revise ARM 26.4.623 to allow the department to impose more restrictive conditions when explosives are to be detonated.

—Revise ARM 26.4.633, to correct an incorporated cite regarding revegetation performance requirements as related to sediment control through BTCA practices.

—Revise ARM 26.4.634 to clarify drainage systems/drainage channel reclamation requirements and when detailed reclamation plans prior to reclaiming a drainage channel is required.

—Revise ARM 26.4.638 to correct an incorporated citation on revegetation performance standards in relation to sedimentation control measures.

—Revise ARM 26.4.639 to allow for a single spillway in the construction of sedimentation ponds, provide design criteria/size relationship when a spillway is not needed, require that a sediment pond constructed per 30 CFR 77.216(a) must meet certain spillway discharge standards, and delete certain requirement before a sedimentation pond can be removed.

—Revise ARM 26.4.642 to clarify when inspection reports are needed for dams and embankments.

—Revise ARM 26.4.645 and .646 to require that sampling and water quality analysis be conducted in accordance with ''Circular WOB–7, Montana Numeric Water Quality Standards.''

—Revise ARM 26.4.702 to require the determination of the physicochemical nature of surficial spoil material in soil prior to redistribution and to scarify soil to a minimum 12-inch depth when replaced.

—Revise ARM 26.4.711 to require consultation and approval by certain State agencies concerning cover, planting, and stocking of vegetation on certain land uses.

—Revise ARM 26.4.721 to require treatment of rills and gullies under certain conditions.

—Revise ARM 26.4.724 to delete special success of revegetation considerations on operations of less than 100 acres.

—Revise ARM 26.4.726 to require ''live'' vegetative cover.

—Revise ARM 26.4.821 to allow technical standards derived from historical data for comparison when releasing bond for alternate revegetation areas.

—Revise ARM 26.4.825 to specify what performance standard criteria is to be used on special use pasture.

—Revise ARM 26.4.924 to clarify the applicability for use of waste disposal structures plus design criteria that must be met.

—Revise ARM 26.4.927 to require that durable rock fills meet a minimum safety factor of 1.5, rather than this minimum factor at the end of construction.

—Revise ARM 26.4.930 to provide design information and impoundment operation, demonstration of compliance with performance standards, results and analysis of geotechnical investigations, stability analysis, and description assumptions/calculations of design options and considerations in selection of specific design parameters for coal processing waste impoundments.

—Revise ARM 26.4.932 to clarify the inspection requirements for coal processing waste disposal areas.

—Revise ARM 26.4.1001 to clarify that a prospecting permit will be required when areas designated as unsuitable for mining are involved; that ethnological values, pits and disposal areas for extracted materials, and roads/access routes must be identified; that the yearly prospecting permit is subject to renewal,

suspension, and revocation; and that a copy of the permit must be available for review by the department upon request.

—Provide new rule requirements at ARM 26.4.1001 for filing of a notice of intent to prospect.

—Revise ARM 26.4.1002 to clarify informational requirements and report requirements concerning prospecting activities.

—Revise ARM 26.4.1005 to specify requirements for treatment of drill holes upon completion of exploration when circulation is not lost and detail description requirements for wells and drill holes that are to be retained after exploration.

—Revise ARM 26.4.1006 to include consideration and performance requirements for other transportation facilities involved in prospecting.

—Revise ARM 26.4.1007 to require that excavations or embankments created during prospecting must be reclaimed to the approximate original contour.

—Revise ARM 26.4.1009 to require that diversions needed in prospecting, meet applicable performance standards at ARM 26.4.635 and .636.

—Revise ARM 26.4.10011 to require that the prevailing hydrologic balance in prospecting be minimized in accordance with ARM 26.4.631 through .634 and .638 through .651.

—Revise ARM 26.4.1014 to demonstrate that a test pit is necessary and include such information as the name of the firm doing the testing, types of tests, amount of mineral needed, that sufficient reserves are available for future markets, and why other means of prospecting are not adequate to determine feasibility.

—Revise ARM 26.4.1116 to incorporate revegetation performance standards that need to be met for bond release.

—Provide new rule at ARM 26.4.1116A to allow the department reassertion of jurisdiction.

—Revise ARM 26.4.1141 to correct the definition of ''national'' to ''natural'' hazard lands.

—Revise ARM 26.4.1206 to require the department to notify owners and controllers that a cessation order or noncompliance notice has been issued the mining operation.

—Revise ARM 26.4.1212 to clarify when a violation must be counted in the ''history of recent violations'' review during the assessment of penalties.

II. Public Comment Procedures

In accordance with the provisions of 30 CFR 732.17(h), OSM is seeking comments on whether the proposed amendment satisfies the applicable program approval criteria of 30 CFR 732.15. If the amendment is deemed adequate, it will become part of the Montana program.

Written Comments

Written comments should be specific, pertain only to the issues proposed in this rulemaking, and include explanations in support of the commenter's recommendations. Comments received after the time indicated under **DATES** or at locations other than the Casper Field Office will not necessarily be considered in the final rulemaking or included in the administrative record.

Public Hearing

Persons wishing to testify at the public hearing should contact the person listed under **FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT** by 4:00 p.m., m.s.t. March 30, 1995. Any disabled individual who has need for a special accommodation to attend a public hearing should contact the individual listed under **FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT.** The location and time of the hearing will be arranged with those persons requesting the hearing. If no one requests an opportunity to testify at the public hearing, the hearing will not be held.

Filing of a written statement at the time of the hearing is requested as it will greatly assist the transcriber. Submission of written statements in advance of the hearing will allow OSM officials to prepare adequate responses and appropriate questions.

The public hearing will continue on the specified date until all persons scheduled to comment have been heard. Persons in the audience who have not been scheduled to testify, and who wish to do so, will be heard following those who have been scheduled. The hearing will end after all persons scheduled to testify and persons present in the audience who wish to testify have been heard.

Public Meeting

If only one person requests an opportunity to testify at a hearing, a public meeting, rather than a public hearing, may be held. Persons wishing to meet with OSM representatives to discuss the proposed amendment may request a meeting by contacting the person listed under **FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT.** All such meetings will be open to the public and, if possible, notices of meetings will be posted at the locations listed under **ADDRESSES.** A written summary of each meeting will be made a part of the administrative record.

IV. Procedural Determinations

Executive Order 12866

This rule is exempted from review by the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) under Executive Order 12866 (Regulatory Planning and Review).

Executive Order 12778

The Department of the Interior has conducted the reviews required by section 2 of Executive Order 12778 (Civil Justice Reform) and has determined that, this rule meets the applicable standards of subsection (a) and (b) of that section. However, these standards are not applicable to the actual language of State regulatory programs and program amendments since each such program is drafted and promulgated by a specific State, not by OSM. Under sections 503 and 505 of SMCRA (30 U.S.C. 1253 and 1255) and the Federal regulations at 30 CFR 730.11, 732.15, and 732.17(h)(1)), decisions on proposed State regulatory programs and program amendments submitted by the States must be based solely on a determination of whether the submittal is consistent with SMCRA and its implementing Federal regulations and whether the other requirements of 30 CFR Parts 730, 731, and 732 have been met.

National Environmental Policy Act

No environmental impact statement is required for this rule since section 702(d) of SMCRA [30 U.S.C. 1292(d)] provides that agency decisions on proposed State regulatory program provisions do not constitute major Federal actions within the meaning of section 102(2)(C) of the National Environmental Policy Act (42 U.S.C. 4332(2)(C)).

Paperwork Reduction Act

This rule does not contain information collection requirements that require approval by the Office of Management and Budget under the Paperwork Reduction Act (44 U.S.C. 3507 *et seq.*).

Regulatory Flexibility Act

The Department of the Interior has determined that this rule will not have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities under the Regulatory Flexibility Act (5 U.S.C. 601 *et seq.*). The State submittal that is the subject of this rule is based upon counterpart Federal regulations for which an economic analysis was prepared and certification made that such regulations would not have a significant economic effect upon a substantial number of small entities.

Accordingly, this rule will ensure that existing requirements previously promulgated by OSM will be implemented by the State. In making the determination as to whether this rule would have a significant economic impact, the Department relied upon the data and assumptions for the counterpart Federal regulations.

List of Subjects in 30 CFR Part 926

Intergovernmental relations, Surface mining, Underground mining.

Dated: March 8, 1995.

Charles E. Sandberg,

Acting Assistant Director, Western Support Center.

[FR Doc. 95–6302 Filed 3–14–95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4310–05–M

---

30 CFR Part 944

Utah Regulatory Program

AGENCY: Office of Surface Mining Reclamation and Enforcement (OSM), Interior.

ACTION: Proposed rule; public comment period and opportunity for public hearing on proposed amendment.

SUMMARY: OSM is announcing receipt of a proposed amendment to the Utah regulatory program (hereinafter, the ''Utah program'') under the Surface Mining Control and Reclamation Act of 1977 (SMCRA). The proposed amendment consists of revisions to rules pertaining to permit application requirements and normal husbandry practices and Utah's ''Vegetation Information Guidelines.'' The amendment is intended to improve operational efficiency.

DATES: Written comments must be received by 4:00 p.m., m.d.t. April 14, 1995. If requested, a public hearing on the proposed amendment will be held on April 10, 1995. Requests to present oral testimony at the hearing must be received by 4:00 p.m., m.s.t. on March 30, 1995.

ADDRESSES: Written comments should be mailed or hand delivered to Thomas E. Ehmett at the address listed below.

Copies of the Utah program, the proposed amendment, and all written comments received in response to this document will be available for public review at the addresses listed below during normal business hours, Monday through Friday, excluding holidays. Each requester may receive one free copy of the proposed amendment by contacting OSM's Albuquerque Field Office.

Thomas E. Ehmett, Acting Director, Albuquerque Field Office, Office of Surface Mining Reclamation and Enforcement, 505 Marquette Avenue, NW., Suite 1200, Albuquerque, New Mexico 87102

Utah Coal Regulatory Program, Division of Oil, Gas, and Mining, 355 West North Temple, 3 Triad Center, Suite 350, Salt Lake City, Utah 84180–1203, Telephone: (801) 538–5340.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Thomas E. Ehmett, Telephone: (505) 766–1486.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

I. Background on the Utah Program

On January 21, 1981, the Secretary of the Interior conditionally approved the Utah program. General background information on the Utah program, including the Secretary's findings, the disposition of comments, and the conditions of approval of the Utah program can be found in the January 21, 1981, **Federal Register** (46 FR 5899). Subsequent actions concerning Utah's program and program amendments can be found at 30 CFR 944.15, 944.16, and 944.30.

II. Proposed Amendment

By letter dated February 6, 1995, Utah submitted a proposed amendment to its program pursuant to SMCRA (administrative record No. UT–1025). Utah submitted the proposed amendment at its own initiative. Utah proposes to revise its Coal Mining Rules at Utah Administrative (Utah Admin. R.) 645–301–321.100 and .200, 645–301–322.332, and 645–301–342.352, concerning permit application requirements, and Utah Admin. R. 645–301–357.300 through 365, concerning normal husbandry practices. Utah also proposes to revise its ''Vegetation Information Guidelines,'' concerning a Bibliography of referenced publications for the proposed normal husbandry practices.

Specifically, Utah proposes to revise Utah Admin. R. 645–301–321.100 and .200, 645–301–322.332, and 645–301–342.352 by adding the terms ''surface coal mining and reclamation activities'' and/or ''underground coal mining and reclamation activities;'' Utah Admin. R. 645–301–357.300 by deleting existing general information concerning Utah's authority to approve selective husbandry practices; and Utah Admin. R. 645–301–357.301 through .365 by adding, as proposed normal husbandry practices, (1) Limited reseeding or replanting of trees or shrubs, (2) chemical, mechanical , and biological weed control and associated revegetation, (3) control of pests including big game, small mammals, and insects, (4) reseeding and/or replanting as a result of third-party interference or natural disasters, excluding climatic variation and including vandalism which is not caused by any lack of planning, design, or implementation of the mining and reclamation plan, wildfires, earth quakes, and mass movement originating outside the disturbed area, (5) limited irrigation, and (6) limited repair of highly erodible areas and rills and gullies. Utah also proposes to revise its ''Vegetation Information Guidelines'' by adding Appendix C, a bibliography of referenced publications supporting the proposed normal husbandry practices.

III. Public Comment Procedures

In accordance with the provisions of 30 CFR 732.17(h), OSM is seeking comments on whether the proposed amendment satisfies the applicable program approval criteria of 30 CFR 732.15. If the amendment is deemed adequate, it will become part of the Utah program.

1. Written Comments

Written comments should be specific, pertain only to the issues proposed in this rulemaking, and include explanations in support of the commenter's recommendations. Comments received after the time indicated under **DATES** or at locations other than the Albuquerque Field Office will not necessarily be considered in the final rulemaking or included in the administrative record.

2. Public Hearing

Persons wishing to testify at the public hearing should contact the person listed under **FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT** by 4:00 p.m., m.s.t. on March 30, 1995. Any disabled individual who has need for a special accommodation to attend a public hearing should contact the individual listed under **FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT.** The location and time of the hearing will be arranged with those persons requesting the hearing. If no one requests an opportunity to testify at the public hearing, the hearing will not be held.

Filing of a written statement at the time of the hearing is requested as it will greatly assist the transcriber. Submission of written statements in advance of the hearing will allow OSM officials to prepare adequate responses and appropriate questions.

The public hearing will continue on the specified date until all persons scheduled to testify have been heard. Persons in the audience who have not been scheduled to testify, and who wish

to do so, will be heard following those who have been scheduled. The hearing will end after all persons scheduled to testify and persons present in the audience who wish to testify have been heard.

3. Public Meeting

If only one person requests an opportunity to testify at a hearing, a public meeting, rather than a public hearing, may be held. Persons wishing to meet with OSM representatives to discuss the proposed amendment may request a meeting by contacting the person listed under **FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT.** All such meetings will be open to the public and, if possible, notices of meetings will be posted at the locations listed under **ADDRESSES**. A written summary of each meeting will be made a part of the administrative record.

IV. Procedural Determinations

1. Executive Order 12866

This rule is exempted from review by the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) under Executive Order 12866 (Regulatory Planning and Review).

2. Executive Order 12778

The Department of the Interior has conducted the reviews required by section 2 of Executive Order 12778 (Civil Justice Reform) and has determined that this rule meets the applicable standards of subsections (a) and (b) of that section. However, these standards are not applicable to the actual language of State regulatory programs and program amendments since each such program is drafted and promulgated by a specific State, not by OSM. Under sections 503 and 505 of SMCRA (30 U.S.C. 1253 and 1255) and the Federal regulations at 30 CFR 730.11, 732.15, and 732.17(h)(10), decisions on proposed State regulatory programs and program amendments submitted by the States must be based solely on a determination of whether the submittal is consistent with SMCRA and its implementing Federal regulations and whether the other requirements of 30 CFR parts 730, 731, and 732 have been met.

3. National Environmental Policy Act

No environmental impact statement is required for this rule since section 702(d) of SMCRA (30 U.S.C. 1292(d)) provides that agency decisions on proposed State regulatory program provisions do not constitute major Federal actions within the meaning of section 102(2)(C) of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4332(2)(C)).

4. Paperwork Reduction Act

This rule does not contain information collection requirements that require approval by OMB under the Paperwork Reduction Act (44 U.S.C. 3507 *et seq.*).

5. Regulatory Flexibility Act

The Department of the Interior has determined that this rule will not have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities under the Regulatory Flexibility Act (5 U.S.C. 601 *et seq.*). The State submittal that is the subject of this rule is based upon counterpart Federal regulations for which an economic analysis was prepared and certification made that such regulations would not have a significant economic effect upon a substantial number of small entities. Accordingly, this rule will ensure that existing requirements previously promulgated by OSM will be implemented by the State. In making the determination as to whether this rule would have a significant economic impact, the Department relied upon the data and assumptions for the counterpart Federal regulations.

List of Subjects in 30 CFR Part 944

Intergovernmental relations, Surface mining, Underground mining.

Dated: March 7, 1995.

Charles E. Sandberg,

Acting Assistant Director, Western Support Center.

[FR Doc. 95–6301 Filed 3–14–95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4310–05–M

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

Office of the Secretary

32 CFR Part 311

Privacy Program

AGENCY: Office of the Secretary, DOD.

ACTION: Proposed rule.

SUMMARY: The Office of the Secretary of Defense proposes to exempt a system of records identified as DGC 16, entitled Political Appointment Vetting Files.

The DoD General Counsel performs suitability screening of individuals seeking, or who have been recommended for, non-career positions within the DoD.

EFFECTIVE DATE: Comments must be received no later than May 15, 1995, to be considered by the agency.

ADDRESSES: Send comments to the OSD Privacy Act Officer, Washington Headquarter Services, Correspondence and Directives Division, Records Management Division, 1155 Defense Pentagon, Washington, DC 20301–1155.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Mr. Dan Cragg at (703) 695–0970.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Executive Order 12866

The Director, Administration and Management, Office of the Secretary of Defense has determined that this proposed Privacy Act rule for the Department of Defense does not constitute 'significant regulatory action'. Analysis of the rule indicates that it does not have an annual effect on the economy of $100 million or more; does not create a serious inconsistency or otherwise interfere with an action taken or planned by another agency; does not materially alter the budgetary impact of entitlements, grants, user fees, or loan programs or the rights and obligations of recipients thereof; does not raise novel legal or policy issues arising out of legal mandates, the President's priorities, or the principles set forth in Executive Order 12866 (1993).

Regulatory Flexibility Act of 1980

The Director, Administration and Management, Office of the Secretary of Defense certifies that this Privacy Act rule for the Department of Defense does not have significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities because it is concerned only with the administration of Privacy Act systems of records within the Department of Defense.

Paperwork Reduction Act

The Director, Administration and Management, Office of the Secretary of Defense certifies that this Privacy Act proposed rule for the Department of Defense imposes no information requirements beyond the Department of Defense and that the information collected within the Department of Defense is necessary and consistent with 5 U.S.C. 552a, known as the Privacy Act of 1974.

The DoD General Counsel performs suitability screening of individuals seeking, or who have been recommended for, non-career positions within the DoD. Confidentialilty is needed to maintain the Government's continued access to information from persons who otherwise might refuse to give it. During the screening process, investigatory material is compiled for the purpose of determining the suitability of candidates for Schedule 'C' positions, taking character, security and other personal suitability factors into account. This exemption is limited to disclosures that would reveal the identity of a confidential source.

List of Subjects in 32 CFR Part 311

Privacy.

Accordingly, 32 CFR part 311 is amended as follows:

1. The authority citation for 32 CFR part 311 continues to read as follows:

Authority: Pub. L. 93–579, 88 Stat 1896 (5 U.S.C.552a).

2. Section 311.7, paragraph (c)(1) is added as follows:

§ 311.7 Procedures for exemptions.

* * * * *

c. *Specific exemptions.* * * *

(1) *System identifier and name*--DGC 16, Political Appointment Vetting Files.

Exemption. Portions of this system of records that fall within the provisions of 5 U.S.C. 552a(k)(5) may be exempt from the following subsections (d)(1) through (d)(5).

Authority. 5 U.S.C. 552a(k)(5).

Reasons. From (d)(1) through (d)(5) because the agency is required to protect the confidentiality of sources who furnished information to the Government under an expressed promise of confidentiality or, prior to September 27, 1975, under an implied promise that the identity of the source would be held in confidence. This confidentiality is needed to maintain the Government's continued access to information from persons who otherwise might refuse to give it. This exemption is limited to disclosures that would reveal the identity of a confidential source.

* * * * *

Dated: March 7, 1995.

L. M. Bynum,

Alternate OSD Federal Register Liaison Officer, Department of Defense.

[FR Doc. 95–6422 Filed 03–14–95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 5000–04–F

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

40 CFR Part 52

[LA–10–1–5937b; FRL–5172–3]

Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plan: Louisiana 1990 Base Year Ozone Emissions Inventories

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

ACTION: Proposed rule.

SUMMARY: The EPA is proposing to approve the 1990 base year ozone emission inventories submitted by Louisiana for the purpose of bringing about the attainment of the national ambient air quality standard (NAAQS) for ozone. The inventories were submitted by the State to satisfy certain Federal requirements for an approvable nonattainment area (NAA) ozone State Implementation Plan (SIP) for the Baton Rouge and Calcasieu Parish areas of Louisiana.

In the final rules section of this **Federal Register**, the EPA is approving the State's SIP revision as a direct final rule without prior proposal because the Agency views this as a noncontroversial amendment and anticipates no adverse comments. A detailed rationale for the approval is set forth in the direct final rule. If no adverse comments are received in response to this proposed rule, no further activity is contemplated in relation to this rule. If the EPA receives adverse comments, the direct final rule will be withdrawn, and all public comments received will be addressed in a subsequent final rule based on this proposed rule. The EPA will not institute a second comment period on this action. Any parties interested in commenting on this action should do so at this time.

DATES: Comments on this proposed rule must be received in writing by April 14, 1995.

ADDRESSES: Written comments on this action should be addressed to Mr. Guy Donaldson, Acting Chief, Planning Section, at the EPA Regional Office listed below. Copies of the documents relevant to this action are available for public inspection during normal business hours at the following locations. The interested persons wanting to examine these documents should make an appointment with the appropriate office at least 24 hours before the visiting day.

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region 6, Air Programs Branch (6T–A), 1445 Ross Avenue, Suite 700, Dallas, Texas 75202–2733.

Louisiana Department of Environmental Quality, Air Quality Division, 7290 Bluebonnet, Baton Rouge, Louisiana 70810.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Mr. Herbert R. Sherrow, Jr., Planning Section (6T–AP), Air Programs Branch, U.S. EPA Region 6, 1445 Ross Avenue, Dallas, Texas 75202–2733, telephone (214) 665–7237.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: See the information provided in the Direct Final action of the same title which is located in the Rules Section of the **Federal Register**.

Dated: March 3, 1995.

Jane N. Saginaw,

Regional Administrator.

[FR Doc. 95–6300 Filed 3–14–95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560–50–P

40 CFR Part 60

[AD-FRL–5172–8]

RIN 2060–AC62

Standards of Performance for New Stationary Sources and Emission Guidelines for Existing Sources: Medical Waste Incinerators; Public Hearing

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency.

ACTION: Notice of public hearing.

SUMMARY: The Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) will hold a public hearing to allow interested parties the opportunity to offer oral testimony on recently proposed air emission standards and guidelines for medical waste incinerators (MWI's).

DATES: *Public Hearing.* The public hearing will be held on March 28, 1995, beginning at 9:00 a.m. Eastern Standard Time. If necessary, the hearing will continue on March 29, 1995 to allow all parties the opportunity to speak.

Request to Speak at Hearing. Persons wishing to present oral testimony at the public hearing must call Ms. Julia Latta at (919) 541–5578 on or before March 22, 1995.

ADDRESSES: The public hearing will be held at the Best Western Olde Colony Inn, 625 First Street, Alexandria, Virginia, telephone (703) 548–6300. Persons interested in attending the hearing or wishing to present oral testimony should notify Ms. Julia Latta, Emission Standards Division (MD–13), U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Research Triangle Park, North Carolina 27711, telephone (919) 541–5578.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Mr. Rick Copland at (919) 541–5265 or Mr. Fred Porter at (919) 541–5251, Emission Standards Division (MD–13), U.S. EPA, Research Triangle Park, North Carolina 27711.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: On February 27, 1995 standards of performance limiting air pollution emissions from new MWI's and emission guidelines initiating State action to reduce air pollution from existing MWI's were proposed in the **Federal Register** (60 FR 10654). In the February 27 document, the EPA stated that a public hearing would be held in the Washington, D.C. area in mid- to

late-March 1995. The purpose of the public hearing is to allow interested parties an opportunity to offer oral testimony on the proposed standards and guidelines for MWI's. The purpose of this notice is to provide specific information regarding the date, time, and location of the public hearing. The hearing is open to the public. Seating will be on a first-come, first-served basis. Speakers are asked to limit their testimony to 15 minutes.

Dated: March 6, 1995.

Mary D. Nichols,

Assistant Administrator for Air and Radiation.

[FR Doc. 95–6389 Filed 3–14–95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560–50–P

40 CFR Part 61

[FRL–5169–8]

Approval of Delegation of Authority; National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants; Radionuclides; Utah

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

ACTION: Proposed rule.

SUMMARY: EPA proposes to grant delegation of authority to the State of Utah to implement and enforce five National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants (NESHAP) for radionuclides. The Governor of Utah requested delegation from EPA Region VIII in a letter dated June 4, 1993. In the final rules section of this **Federal Register**, EPA is approving the State of Utah's request for delegation as a direct final rule without prior proposal because EPA views this as a noncontroversial action and anticipates no adverse comments. EPA's rationale for the approval is set forth in the direct final rule. If no adverse comments are received in response to this proposed rule, no further activity is contemplated in relation to this rule. If EPA receives adverse comments, the direct final rule will be withdrawn and all public comments received will be addressed in a subsequent final rule based on this proposed rule. EPA will not institute a second comment period on this action. Any parties interested in commenting on this action should do so at this time.

DATES: Comments on this proposed rule must be received in writing by April 14, 1995.

ADDRESSES: Written comments should be submitted to Patricia D. Hull, Director, Air, Radiation & Toxics Division, Environmental Protection Agency, Region VIII, 999 18th Street, Suite 500, Denver, Colorado 80202–2466 and concurrently to Russell A. Roberts, Director, Division of Air Quality, Department of Environmental Quality, 1950 West North Temple, Salt Lake City, Utah 84114–4820. Copies of State of Utah's submittal are available for public inspection during normal business hours at the above locations.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: T. Scott Whitmore at (303) 293–1758.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: See the information provided in the final action which is located in the final rules section of this **Federal Register**.

List of Subjects in 40 CFR Part 61

Environmental protection, Air pollution control, Intergovernmental relations, Radiation protection.

Authority: 42 U.S.C. 7412.

Dated: February 23, 1995.

Kerrigan Clough,

Acting Regional Administrator, Region VIII.

[FR Doc. 95–5977 Filed 3–14–95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560–50–P

40 CFR Part 180

[PP 8F3658/P605; FRL–4936–5]

RIN 2070–AC18

Pesticide Tolerances for Triasulfuron

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

ACTION: Proposed rule.

SUMMARY: EPA proposes to establish permanent tolerances for residues of the herbicide triasulfuron, [3-(6-methoxy-4-methyl-1,3,5-triazin-2-yl)-1-(2-(2-chloroethoxy)phenylsulfonyl)urea], in or on barley and wheat grain at 0.02 part per million (ppm); barley and wheat straw at 2.0 ppm; barley and wheat forage at 5.0 ppm; meat, fat, and meat byproducts (excluding kidney) of cattle, goats, hogs, horses, and sheep at 0.1 ppm; kidney of cattle, goats, horses, and sheep at 0.2 ppm; and milk at 0.02 ppm. Ciba-Geigy has fulfilled certain testing requirements, and EPA proposes to change to permanent tolerances the current time-limited tolerances.

DATES: Comments, identified by the document control number [PP 8F3658/P605], must be received on or before April 14, 1995.

ADDRESSES: By mail, submit written comments to: Public Response and Program Resources Branch, Field Operations Division (7506C), Office of Pesticide Programs, Environmental Protection Agency, 401 M St., SW., Washington, DC 20460. In person, bring comments to: Rm. 1132, CM #2, 1921 Jefferson Davis Hwy., Arlington, VA 22202.

Information submitted as a comment concerning this notice may be claimed confidential by marking any part or all of that information as ''Confidential Business Information'' (CBI). Information so marked will not be disclosed except in accordance with procedures set forth in 40 CFR part 2. A copy of the comment that does not contain CBI must be submitted for inclusion in the public record. Information not marked confidential may be disclosed publicly by EPA without prior notice. All written comments will be available for public inspection in Rm. 1132 at the address given above, from 8 a.m. to 4 p.m., Monday through Friday, excluding legal holidays.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: By mail: Robert J. Taylor, Product Manager (PM) 25, Registration Division (7505C), Office of Pesticide Programs, Environmental Protection Agency, 401 M St. SW., Washington, DC 20460. Office location and telephone number: Rm. 241, CM #2, 1921 Jefferson Davis Hwy., Arlington, VA 22202, (703)-305-6800.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: In the **Federal Register** of March 13, 1992 (57 FR 8844), EPA issued a final rule which established tolerances for residues of the herbicide triasulfuron, [3-(6-methoxy-4-methyl-1,3,5-triazin-2-yl)-1-(2-(2-chloroethoxy)phenylsulfonyl)urea], in or on barley and wheat grain at 0.02 ppm; barley or wheat forage at 5.0 ppm; barley and wheat straw at 20 ppm; meat, fat, and meat byproducts (excluding kidney) of cattle, goats, hogs, horses, and sheep at 0.1 ppm; and milk at 0.02 ppm, with an expiration date of March 13, 1995. In the **Federal Register** of August 31, 1994 (59 FR 44931), the Agency issued a notice extending these tolerances until March 13, 1996. These tolerances with an expiration date were required by EPA to allow the peititioner, Ciba-Geigy Corp., to submit additional data required for environmental fate and groundwater, and to allow the Agency to complete the regulatory assessment of EPA's scientific findings. The petitioner has submitted all the required data. The Agency has completed the regulatory assessment of the data and determined that adequate work has been done to fulfill these requirements. EPA is preparing to amend 40 CFR 180.459 to establish permanent tolerances on the wheat, barley, and animal commodities.

Based on the information cited above and in the document establishing the time-limited tolerances for triasulfuron (57 FR 8844, March 13, 1992 and 59 FR

44931, August 31, 1994), EPA has determined that when used in accordance with good agricultural practice, this ingredient is useful and that the tolerances will protect the public health. Therefore, EPA is proposing to establish permanent tolerances as set forth below.

Any person who has registered or submitted an application for registration of a pesticide, under the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act (FIFRA) as amended, which contains any of the ingredients listed herein, may request within 30 days after publication of this document in the **Federal Register** that this rulemaking proposal be referred to an Advisory Committee in accordance with section 408(e) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act.

Interested persons are invited to submit written comments on the proposed regulation. Comments must bear a notation indicating the document control number, [PP 8F3658/P605]. All written comments filed in response to this petition will be available in the Public Response and Program Resources Branch, at the address given above, from 8 a.m. to 4 p.m., Monday through Friday, except legal holidays.

The Office of Management and Budget has exempted this rule from the requirements of section 3 of Executive Order 12866. Pursuant to the requirements of the Regulatory Flexibility Act (Pub. L. 96-354, 94 Stat. 1164, 5 U.S.C. 601-612), the Administrator has determined that regulations establishing exemptions from tolerance requirements do not have a significant impact on a substantial number of small entities. A certification statement to this effect was published in the **Federal Register** of May 4, 1981 (46 FR 24950).

Pursuant to the requirements of the Regulatory Flexibility Act (Pub. L. 96-354, 94 Stat. 1164, 5 U.S.C. 601-612), the Administrator has determined that regulations establishing new tolerances or raising tolerance levels or establishing exemptions from tolerance requirements do not have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities. A certification statement to this effect was published in the **Federal Register** of May 4, 1981 (46 FR 24950).

List of Subjects in 40 CFR Part 180

Environmental protection, Administrative practice and procedure, Agricultural commodities, Pesticides and pests, Reporting and recordkeeping requirements.

Dated: February 15, 1995.

Stephen L. Johnson,

Director, Registration Division, Office of Pesticide Programs.

Therefore, it is proposed that 40 CFR part 180 be amended as follows:

PART 180—[AMENDED]

1. The authority citation for part 180 continues to read as follows:

Authority: 21 U.S.C. 346a and 371.

2. By revising § 180.459, to read as follows:

§ 180.459 Triasulfuron; tolerances for residues.

Tolerances are established for residues of the herbicide triasulfuron, [3-(6-methoxy-4-methyl-1,3,5-triazin-2-yl)-1-(2-(2-chloroethoxy)phenylsulfonyl)urea] in or on the following raw agricultural commodities:

Commodity	Parts per million
Barley, forage	5.0
Barley, grain	0.02
Barley, straw	2.0
Cattle, fat	0.1
Cattle, kidney	0.2
Cattle, mbyp (except kidney)	0.1
Cattle, meat	0.1
Goats, fat	0.1
Goats, kidney	0.2
Goats, mbyp (except kidney)	0.1
Goats, meat	0.1
Hogs, fat	0.1
Hogs, kidney	0.2
Hogs, mbyp (except kidney)	0.1
Hogs, meat	0.1
Horses, fat	0.1
Horses, kidney	0.2
Horses, mbyp (except kidney)	0.1
Horses, meat	0.1
Milk	0.02
Sheep, fat8	0.1
Sheep, kidney	0.2
Sheep, mbyp (except kidney)	0.1
Sheep, meat	0.1
Wheat, forage	5.0
Wheat, grain	0.02
Wheat, straw	2.0

[FR Doc. 95–6417 Filed 3–14–95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560–50–F

40 CFR Part 180

[PP 4E4359/P604; FRL–4936–3]

RIN 2070–AC18

Pesticide Tolerance for Paraquat

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

ACTION: Proposed rule.

SUMMARY: EPA proposes to establish tolerances for residues of the desiccant, defoliant, and herbicide paraquat in or on the raw agricultural commodities lentils, lentil forage, and lentil hay. The proposed regulation to establish maximum permissible levels for residues of the herbicide was requested in a petition submitted by the Interregional Research Project No. 4 (IR-4).

DATES: Comments, identified by the document control number, [PP 4E4359/P604], must be received on or before April 14, 1995.

ADDRESSES: By mail, submit written comments to: Public Response and Program Resources Branch, Field Operations Division (7506C), Office of Pesticide Programs, Environmental Protection Agency, 401 M St., SW., Washington, DC 20460. In person, bring comments to: Rm. 1132, CM #2, 1921 Jefferson Davis Hwy., Arlington, VA 22202.

Information submitted as a comment concerning this notice may be claimed confidential by marking any part or all of that information as ''Confidential Business Information'' (CBI). Information so marked will not be disclosed except in accordance with procedures set forth in 40 CFR part 2. A copy of the comment that does not contain CBI must be submitted for inclusion in the public record. Information not marked confidential may be disclosed publicly by EPA without prior notice. All written comments will be available for public inspection in Rm. 1132 at the address given above, from 8 a.m. to 4 p.m., Monday through Friday, excluding legal holidays.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: By mail: Hoyt L. Jamerson, Registration Division (7505W), Office of Pesticide Programs, Environmental Protection Agency, 401 M St. SW., Washington, DC 20460. Office location and telephone number: Sixth Floor, Crystal Station #1, 2800 Jefferson Davis Hwy., Arlington, VA 22202, (703)-308-8783.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The Interregional Research Project No. 4 (IR-4), New Jersey Agricultural Experiment Station, P.O. Box 231, Rutgers University, New Brunswick, NJ 08903, has submitted pesticide petition (PP) 4E4359 to EPA on behalf of the Agricultural Experiment Stations of Idaho and Washington. This petition requests that the Administrator, pursuant to section 408(e) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (FFDCA), 21 U.S.C. 346a(e), amend 40 CFR 180.205 by establishing tolerances for residues of paraquat (1,1'-dimethyl-4,4'-

bipyridinium-ion) derived from application of either the bis (methyl sulfate) or the dichloride salt (both calculated as the cation), in or on the raw agricultural commodities lentils at 0.3 part per million (ppm), lentil forage at 0.1 ppm, and lentil hay at 0.4 ppm.

The scientific data submitted in the petition and other relevant material have been evaluated. The toxicological data considered in support of the proposed tolerances include:

1. A 1-year feeding study in dogs fed diets containing 0, 15, 30, and 50 ppm (equivalent to 0, 0.45, 0.93, and 1.51 milligrams/kilogram (mg/kg) of body weight (bwt) day with a no-observed-effect level (NOEL) of 15 ppm (0.45 mg/kg/day) based on increased severity and extent of chronic pneumonitis in both sexes, especially males, at the 30-ppm dose level.

2. A 23-month chronic feeding/carcinogenicity study in mice fed diets containing 12.5, 37.5, and 100/125 ppm paraquat ion (the highest dose tested (HDT) was increased from 100 to 125 ppm at week 36) with a systemic NOEL of 12.5 ppm (equivalent to 1.87 mg/kg/day) based on renal tubular degeneration in male mice, and weight loss and decreased food intake in female mice. There were no carcinogenic effects observed under the conditions of the study.

3. A 2-year chronic feeding/carcinogenicity study in Fischer rats fed diets containing 0, 1.25, 3.75, and 7.5 mg/kg/day with equivocal (uncertain) evidence of carcinogenicity (squamous cell carcinomas) in the head region (ear, nasal cavity, oral cavity, and skin) of male rats of the highest dose level group, and an approximate systemic NOEL of 1.25 mg/kg/day based on incidence of opacities, cataracts, and nonneoplastic lung lesions (alveolar macrophages and epithelialization and slight peribronchiolar lymphoid hyperplasia). The squamous cell carcinomas were not associated with oral exposure, but were the result of topical exposure (through powdered diet).

4. A 2-year chronic feeding/carcinogenicity study in Wistar rats fed diets containing 6, 30, 100, and 300 ppm (paraquat dichloride) with a systemic NOEL of 100 ppm (equivalent to 5 mg/kg/day) based on increased mortality in males and females; decreased erythrocytes, hemoglobin, and serum protein in males and females; decreased hematocrit, glucose and corpuscular cholinesterase activity in males; decreased leukocytes, albumin-to-globulin ratio, and alkaline phosphatase; increased polymorphonucleocytes in males; increased potassium and glucose in females; decreased absolute and/or relative weights of heart (males and females), liver and brain (females); and increased absolute weights of kidneys (males and females) at the highest dose tested (HDT) (equivalent to 15 mg/kg/day). There was no evidence of carcinogenicity observed under the conditions of the study.

5. A developmental toxicity study in rats given gavage dosages of 1, 5, and 10 mg paraquat ion/kg of body weight from day 6 through day 15 of pregnancy with NOEL's for fetotoxic effects and maternal toxicity of 1.0 mg/kg/day. The lowest effect level (LEL) was established at 5 mg/kg/day based on weight reduction and slight retardation in ossification (fetotoxicty) and piloerection, weight loss, and hunched appearance (maternal toxicity).

6. A developmental toxicity study in mice given gavage dosages of 1, 5, and 10 mg/kg/day with no developmental toxicity observed under the conditions of the study at any dosage level tested.

7. A three-generation reproduction study with rats fed diets containing 25, 75, and 150 ppm with a systemic NOEL of 25 ppm (equivalent to 1.25 mg/kg/day) based on an increased incidence of alveolar histiocytosis in the lungs of male and female parents. There were no reproductive effects observed under the conditions of the study.

8. Paraquat was negative in 10 mutagenicity studies (mostly gene mutation and chromosome aberration studies and one DNA damage/repair assay); weakly positive in four studies (two gene mutation, one chromosome aberration, and one DNA damage/repair assay); and positive in four studies (all DNA damage/repair assays).

The Agency (Peer Review Committee) initially classified paraquat as a category ''C'' carcinogen based on the significant increase of squamous cell carcinomas in the head region of the high-dose males in the Fisher rat chronic feeding/carcinogenicity study. Review of the study by an independent laboratory concluded that those tumor sites should not be combined; without the combination, there were no statistically significant tumor increases for any particular tumor type. Discussion and review by the Agency (Peer Review Committee) concluded that these tumor sites normally should not be combined when the exposure to the chemical is by the oral route and that these tumors are likely the result of topical exposure to paraquat contained in the powdered diet (paraquat is a topical irritant), not the result of exposure through the gastrointestinal tract. The Agency considered two additional studies (rat and mouse carcinogenicity studies) and further evaluated the tumors in the male rats. Based on all the information, the Agency concluded that there is no evidence of carcinogenicity in male Wistar rats at 12 mg/kg/day (HDT) and female Wistar rats at 15 mg/kg/day. The Agency concluded that there was at best equivocal evidence of carcinogenicity in male Fisher rats at 7.5 mg/kg/day and that this equivocal evidence was associated with irritation due to topical exposure, and not with oral exposure. Paraquat was, therefore, placed in Category E (not a human carcinogen). Because paraquat is a restricted-use pesticide and precautionary measures are required to protect applicators from the acute toxicity of the chemical, the potential for carcinogenic effects by excessive (irritating) topical exposure is not a concern for applicators.

The reference dose (RfD) is established at 0.0045 mg/kg body weight/day based on a NOEL of 0.45 mg/kg/day from the 1-year dog study and an uncertainity factor of 100. The theoretical maximum residue contribution (TMRC) from existing uses of paraquat utilizes 42% of the RfD for the general U.S. population, or 95.7% of the RfD for children, aged 1 to 6 years old (the population subgroup most highly exposed). The proposed tolerance for lentils would utilize 0.008% of the RfD for the U.S. population, or 0.007% of the RfD for children, aged 1 to 6 years.

The nature of the residue is adequately understood for the purpose of these tolerances. An adequate analytical method is available for enforcement purposes. The analytical method for enforcing these tolerances has been published in the Pesticide Analytical Manual, Vol. II (PAM II). Any secondary residues in milk, eggs, or meat of livestock and poultry will fall within existing tolerances for these commodities.

There are currently no actions pending against the continued registration of this chemical.

Based on the information and data considered, the Agency has determined that the tolerances established by amending 40 CFR part 180 would protect the public health. Therefore, it is proposed that the tolerances be established as set forth below.

Any person who has registered or submitted an application for registration of a pesticide, under the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act (FIFRA) as amended, which contains any of the ingredients listed herein, may request within 30 days after publication of this document in the **Federal Register** that this rulemaking

proposal be referred to an Advisory Committee in accordance with section 408(e) of the FFDCA.

Interested persons are invited to submit written comments on the proposed regulation. Comments must bear a notation indicating the document control number, [PP 4E4359/P604]. All written comments filed in response to this petition will be available in the Public Response and Program Resources Branch, at the address given above from 8 a.m. to 4 p.m., Monday through Friday, except legal holidays.

Under Executive Order 12866 (58 FR 51735, Oct. 4, 1993), the Agency must determine whether the regulatory action is ''significant'' and therefore subject to all the requirements of the Executive Order (i.e., Regulatory Impact Analysis, review by the Office of Management and Budget (OMB)). Under section 3(f), the order defines ''significant'' as those actions likely to lead to a rule (1) having an annual effect on the economy of $100 million or more, or adversely and materially affecting a sector of the economy, productivity, competition, jobs, the environment, public health or safety, or State, local or tribal governments or communities (also known as ''economically significant''); (2) creating serious inconsistency or otherwise interfering with an action taken or planned by another agency; (3) materially altering the budgetary impacts of entitlement, grants, user fees, or loan programs; or (4) raising novel legal or policy issues arising out of legal mandates, the President's priorities, or the principles set forth in this Executive Order.

Pursuant to the terms of this Executive Order, EPA has determined that this rule is not ''significant'' and is therefore not subject to OMB review.

Pursuant to the requirements of the Regulatory Flexibility Act (Pub. L. 96-354, 94 Stat. 1164, 5 U.S.C. 601-612), the Administrator has determined that regulations establishing new tolerances or raising tolerance levels or establishing exemptions from tolerance requirements do not have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities. A certification statement to this effect was published in the **Federal Register** of May 4, 1981 (46 FR 24950).

List of Subjects in 40 CFR Part 180

Environmental protection, Administrative practice and procedure, Agricultural commodities, Pesticides and pests, Reporting and recordkeeping requirements.

Dated: February 28, 1995.

Stephen L. Johnson,

Director, Registration Division, Office of Pesticide Programs.

Therefore, it is proposed that 40 CFR part 180 be amended as follows:

PART 180—[AMENDED]

1. The authority citation for part 180 continues to read as follows:

Authority: 21 U.S.C. 346a and 371.

2. In § 180.205, paragraph (a) is amended in the table therein by adding and alphabetically inserting the raw agricultural commodities lentils, lentil forage, and lentil hay, to read as follows:

§ 180.205 Paraquat; tolerances for residues.

(a) * * *

Commodity	Parts per million
* * * * *	
Lentils	0.3
Lentil, forage	0.1
Lentil, hay	0.4
* * * * *	

* * * * *

[FR Doc. 95–6418 Filed 3–14–95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560–50–F

40 CFR Part 180

[PP 0E3909, 2E4052, 2E4065, 2E4092, and 3E4162/P602; FRL–4936–1]

RIN 2070–AC18

Pesticide Tolerances for 2-[1-(Ethoxyimino)Butyl]-5-[2-(Ethylthio)Propyl]-3-Hydroxy-2-Cyclohexen-1-One

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

ACTION: Proposed rule.

SUMMARY: EPA proposes to establish time limited tolerances for the combined residues of the herbicide 2-[1-(ethoxyimino)butyl]-5-[2-(ethylthio)propyl]-3-hydroxy-2-cyclohexen-1-one (also referred to in this document as sethoxydim) and its metabolites in or on various raw agricultural commodities. The Interregional Research Project No. 4 (IR-4) requested the proposed regulation to establish maximum permissible levels for residues of the herbicide. These time-limited tolerances would expire on December 31, 1996.

DATES: Comments, identified by the document control number [PP 0E3909, 2E4052, 2E4065, 2E4092, and 3E4162/P602], must be received on or before April 14, 1995.

ADDRESSES: By mail, submit written comments to: Public Response and Program Resources Branch, Field Operations Division (7506C), Office of Pesticide Programs, Environmental Protection Agency, 401 M St., SW., Washington, DC 20460. In person, bring comments to: Rm. 1132, CM #2, 1921 Jefferson Davis Hwy., Arlington, VA 22202.

Information submitted as a comment concerning this notice may be claimed confidential by marking any part or all of that information as ''Confidential Business Information'' (CBI). Information so marked will not be disclosed except in accordance with procedures set forth in 40 CFR part 2. A copy of the comment that does not contain CBI must be submitted for inclusion in the public record. Information not marked confidential may be disclosed publicly by EPA without prior notice. All written comments will be available for public inspection in Rm. 1132 at the address given above, from 8 a.m. to 4 p.m., Monday through Friday, excluding legal holidays.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: By mail: Hoyt L. Jamerson, Registration Division (7505W), Office of Pesticide Programs, Environmental Protection Agency, 401 M St., SW., Washington, DC 20460. Office location and telephone number: Sixth Floor, Crystal Station #1, 2800 Jefferson Davis Hwy., Arlington, VA 22202, (703)-308-8783.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The Interregional Research Project No. 4 (IR-4), New Jersey Agricultural Experiment Station, P.O. Box 231, Rutgers University, New Brunswick, NJ 08903, has submitted pesticide petitions (PP) 0E3909, 2E4052, 2E4065, 2E4092, and 3E4162 to EPA on behalf of the named Agricultural Experiment Stations.

These petitions request that the Administrator, pursuant to section 408(e) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (FFDCA), 21 U.S.C. 346a(e), amend 40 CFR 180.412 by establishing time-limited tolerances for combined residues of the herbicide 2-[1-(ethoxyimino)butyl]-5-[2-(ethylthio)propyl]-3-hydroxy-2-cyclohexen-1-one) and its metabolites containing the 2-cyclohexen-1-one moiety (calculated as the herbicide) in or on certain raw agricultural commodities as follows:

1. *PP 0E3909*. Petition submitted on behalf of the Experimental Stations of Massachusetts, Washington, and

Wisconsin proposing a tolerance for cranberry at 2.0 parts per million (ppm).

2. *PP 2E4052*. Petition submitted on behalf of the Experimental Stations of South Dakota and Washington proposing tolerances for peppermint and spearmint at 30 ppm.

3. *PP 2E4065*. Petition submitted on behalf of the Experimental Station of Florida proposing a tolerance for endive at 2.0 ppm. The petitioner proposed that use of sethoxydim on endive be limited to Florida based on the geographical representation of the residue data submitted. Additional residue data will be required to expand the area of usage. Persons seeking geographically broader registration should contact the Agency's Registration Division at the address provided above.

4. *PP 2E4092*. Petition submitted on behalf of the Experimental Stations of California, Florida, Maryland, Michigan, New Jersey, North Carolina, and Tennessee proposing a tolerance for carrot at 1.0 ppm.

5. *PP 3E4162*. Petition submitted on behalf of the Experimental Stations of Arkansas, Arizona, Michigan, North Carolina, Oklahoma, and Washington proposing a tolerance for asparagus at 4.0 ppm.

The scientific data submitted in the petitions and other relevant material have been evaluated. The toxicological data considered in support of the proposed tolerances include:

1. Several acute toxicology studies place technical sethoxydim in acute toxicity category IV for primary eye and dermal irritation and acute toxicity category III for acute oral, dermal, and inhalation. The dermal sensitization - guinea pig study was waived because no sensitization was seen in guinea pigs dosed with the end-use product Poast (18 percent a.i.).

2. A 1-year feeding study with dogs fed diets containing 0, 8.86/9.41, 17.5/19.9, and 110/129 milligrams (mg)/kilogram (kg)/day (males/females) with a no-observed-effect-level (NOEL) of 8.86/9.41 mg/kg/day (males/females) based on equivocal anemia in male dogs at the 17.5-mg/kg/day dose level.

3. A 2-year chronic feeding/carcinogenicity study with mice fed diets containing 0, 40, 120, 360, and 1,080 ppm (equivalent to 0, 6, 18, 54, and 162 mg/kg/day) with a systemic NOEL of 120 ppm (18 mg/kg/day) based on non-neoplastic liver lesions in male mice at the 360-ppm (54 mg/kg/day) dose level. There were no carcinogenic effects observed under the conditions of the study. The maximum tolerated dose (MTD) was not achieved in female mice.

4. A 2-year chronic feeding/carcinogenic study with rats fed diets containing 0, 2, 6, and 18 mg/kg/day with a systemic NOEL greater than or equal to 18 mg/kg/day (highest dose tested). There were no carcinogenic effects observed under the conditions of the study. This study was reviewed under current guidelines and was found to be unacceptable because the doses used were insufficient to induce a toxic response and an MTD was not achieved.

5. A second chronic feeding/carcinogenic study with rats fed diets containing 0, 360, and 1,080 ppm (equivalent to 18.2/23.0, and 55.9/71.8 mg/kg/day (males/females). The dose levels were too low to elicit a toxic response in the test animals and failed to achieve an MTD or define a lowest effect level (LEL). Slight decreases in body weight in rats at the 1,080-ppm dose level, although not biologically significant, support a free-standing no-observed-adverse-effect-level (NOAEL) of 1,080 ppm (55.9/71.8 mg/kg/day (males/females)). There were no carcinogenic effects observed under the conditions of the study.

6. A developmental toxicity study in rats fed dosages of 0, 50, 180, 650, and 1,000 mg/kg/day with a maternal NOAEL of 180 mg/kg/day and a maternal LEL of 650 mg/kg/day (irregular gait, decreased activity, excessive salivation, and anogenital staining); and a developmental NOAEL of 180 mg/kg/day, and a developmental LEL of 650 mg/kg/day (21 to 22 percent decrease in fetal weights, filamentous tail, and lack of tail due to the absence of sacral and/or caudal vertebrae, and delayed ossification in the hyoids, vertebral centrum and/or transverse processes, sternebrae and/or metatarsals, and pubes).

7. A developmental toxicity study in rabbits fed doses of 0, 80, 160, 320, and 400 mg/kg/day with a maternal NOEL of 320 mg/kg/day and a maternal LOEL of 400 mg/kg/day (37% reduction in body weight gain without significant differences in group mean body weights and decreased food consumption during dosing); and a developmental NOEL greater than 400 mg/kg/day (highest dose tested).

8. A two-generation reproduction study with rats fed diets containing 0, 150, 600, and 3,000 ppm (approximately 0, 7.5, 30, and 150 mg/kg/day) with no reproductive effects observed under the conditions of the study.

Although the dose levels were insufficient to elicit a toxic response, the Agency considers this study usable for regulatory purposes and has established a free-standing NOEL of 3,000 ppm (approximately 150 mg/kg/day).

9. Mutagenicity studies including: Ames assays were negative for gene mutation in *Salmonella typhimurium* strains TA98, TA100, TA1535, and TA 1537, with and without metabolic activity; a Chinese hamster bone marrow cytogenetic assay was negative for structural chromosomal aberrations at doses up to 5,000 mg/kg in Chinese hamster bone marrow cells in vivo; and recombinant assays and forward mutations tests in *Bacillus subtilis*, *Escherichia coli*, and *S. typhimurium* were all negative for genotoxic effects at concentrations of greater than or equal to 100 percent.

10. In a rat metabolism study, excretion was extremely rapid and tissue accumulation was negligible.

The reference dose (RFD) is calculated at 0.09 mg/kg of body weight/day, based on a NOEL of 8.86 mg/kg/day from the 1-year feeding study in dogs and an uncertainty factor of 100. The theoretical maximum residue contribution (TMRC) from existing tolerances for the overall U.S. population is estimated at 0.031961 mg/kg of body weight/day, or 36% of the RfD. The proposed tolerances for asparagus, carrot, cranberry, endive, peppermint, and spearmint will increase the TMRC by 0.000701 mg/kg of body weight/day and will utilize less than 1 percent of the RfD for the overall U.S. population. EPA estimates indicate that dietary exposure will not exceed the RfD for any population subgroup for which EPA has data.

These tolerances are proposed as time-limited tolerances since an acceptable carcinogenicity study is needed in one rodent species. A repeat chronic feeding/carcinogenicity study in rats is underway and is due to be submitted to EPA in November of 1995. The Agency will reassess sethoxydim tolerances based on the outcome of the rat chronic feeding/carcinogenicity study and, if appropriate, will establish permanent tolerances for asparagus, carrot, cranberry, endive, peppermint and spearmint. In the interim, the Agency concludes that there is little risk from establishment of the proposed tolerances since available studies in rats and mice indicate no carcinogenic effects, there are adequate data to establish a RfD, existing tolerances and the proposed tolerances do not exceed the RfD, and the proposed tolerances utilize less than 1 percent of the RfD.

The nature of the residue is adequately understood, and adequate analytical methods are available for enforcement purposes. Enforcement methods for sethoxydim are listed in the Pesticide Analytical Manual, Vol. II (PAM II). Enforcement methods have

also been submitted to the Food and Drug Administration for publication in PAM II. Because of the long lead time for publication of the analytical methods in PAM II, the analytical methods are being made available in the interim to anyone interested in pesticide enforcement when requested from: Calvin Furlow, Public Response and Program Resources Branch, Field Operations Divisions (7506C), Office of Pesticide Programs, Environmental Protection Agency, 401 M St., SW., Washington, DC 20460. Office location and telephone number: Rm. 1132, CM #2, 1921 Jefferson Davis Hwy., Arlington, VA 22202, (703)-305-5937.

There is no reasonable expectation that secondary residues will occur in milk, eggs or meat of livestock and poultry from the proposed uses of sethoxydim on asparagus, cranberries, endive, and mint; there are no livestock feed items associated with these commodities. Any secondary residues occurring in meat, fat, meat byproducts and milk of cattle, goats, hogs, horses and sheep from the proposed use on carrots will be covered by existing tolerances. There are no residues expected to occur in poultry meat, meat byproducts, fat or eggs since carrots are not considered a poultry feed item.

Based on the information and data considered, the Agency has determined that the tolerances established by amending 40 CFR part 180 would protect the public health. Therefore, it is proposed that the tolerances be established as set forth below.

Any person who has registered or submitted an application for registration of a pesticide, under the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act (FIFRA) as amended, which contains any of the ingredients listed herein, may request within 30 days after publication of this document in the **Federal Register** that this rulemaking proposal be referred to an Advisory Committee in accordance with section 408(e) of the FFDCA.

Interested persons are invited to submit written comments on the proposed regulation. Comments must bear a notation indicating the document control number, [PP 0E3909, 2E4052, 2E4065, 2E4092, and 3E4162/P602]. All written comments filed in response to these petitions will be available in the Public Response and Program Resources Branch, at the address given above from 8 a.m. to 4 p.m., Monday through Friday, except legal holidays.

Under Executive Order 12866 (58 FR 51735, Oct. 4, 1993), the Agency must determine whether the regulatory action is ''significant'' and therefore subject to all the requirements of the Executive Order (i.e., Regulatory Impact Analysis, review by the Office of Management and Budget (OMB)). Under section 3(f), the order defines ''significant'' as those actions likely to lead to a rule (1) having an annual effect on the economy of $100 million or more, or adversely and materially affecting a sector of the economy, productivity, competition, jobs, the environment, public health or safety, or State, local or tribal governments or communities (also known as ''economically significant''); (2) creating serious inconsistency or otherwise interfering with an action taken or planned by another agency; (3) materially altering the budgetary impacts of entitlement, grants, user fees, or loan programs; or (4) raising novel legal or policy issues arising out of legal mandates, the President's priorities, or the principles set forth in this Executive Order.

Pursuant to the terms of this Executive Order, EPA has determined that this rule is not ''significant'' and is therefore not subject to OMB review.

Pursuant to the requirements of the Regulatory Flexibility Act (Pub. L. 96-354, 94 Stat. 1164, 5 U.S.C. 601-612), the Administrator has determined that regulations establishing new tolerances or raising tolerance levels or establishing exemptions from tolerance requirements do not have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities. A certification statement to this effect was published in the **Federal Register** of May 4, 1981 (46 FR 24950).

List of Subjects in 40 CFR Part 180

Environmental protection, Administrative practice and procedure, Agricultural commodities, Pesticides and pests, Reporting and recordkeeping requirements.

Dated: February 28, 1995.

Stephen L. Johnson,

Director, Registration Division, Office of Pesticide Programs.

Therefore, it is proposed that 40 CFR part 180 be amended as follows:

PART 180—[AMENDED]

1. The authority citation for part 180 continues to read as follows:

Authority: 21 U.S.C. 346a and 371.

2. In § 180.412, by revising the section heading and the introductory text of paragraphs (a) and (b) to correct the spelling of the chemical name and by adding new paragraphs (c) and (d), to read as follows:

§ 180.412 2-[1-(Ethoxyimino)butyl]-5-[2-(ethylthio)propyl]-3-hydroxy-2-cyclohexen-1-one; tolerances for residues.

(a) Tolerances are established for the combined residues of the herbicide 2-[1(ethoxyimino)butyl]-5-[2-(ethylthio)propyl]-3-hydroxy-2-cyclohexen-1-one) and its metabolites containing the 2-cyclohexen-1-one moiety (calculated as the herbicide) in or on the following raw agricultural commodities:

* * * * *

(b) Tolerances with regional registration, as defined in § 180.1(n), are established for the combined residues of the herbicide 2-[1-(ethoxyimino) butyl]-5-[2-(ethylthio)propyl]-3-hydroxy-2-cyclohexen-1-one) and its metabolites containing the 2-cyclohexen-1-one moiety (calculated as the herbicide) in or on the following raw agricultural commodities:

* * * * *

(c) Time-limited tolerances to expire December 31, 1996, are established for combined residues of the herbicide 2-[1-(ethoxyimino)butyl]-5-[2-(ethylthio)propyl]-3-hydroxy-2-cyclohexen-1-one) and its metabolites containing the 2-cyclohexen-1-one moiety (calculated as the herbicide) in or on the following raw agricultural commodities:

Commodity	Parts per million
Asparagus	4.0
Carrot	1.0
Cranberry	2.0
Peppermint	30.0
Spearmint	30.0

(d) Time-limited tolerances to expire December 31, 1996, are established with regional registration, as defined in § 180.1(n), for combined residues of the herbicide 2-[1-(ethoxyimino)butyl]-5-[2-(ethylthio)propyl]-3-hydroxy-2-cyclohexen-1-one) and its metabolites containing the 2-cyclohexen-1-one moiety (calculated as the herbicide) in or on the following raw agricultural commodities:

Commodity	Parts per million
Endive	2.0

[FR Doc. 95–6419 Filed 3–14–95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560–50–F

40 CFR Part 300

[FRL–5171–8]

National Oil and Hazardous Substances Pollution Contingency Plan; National Priorities List

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency.

ACTION: Notice of intent to delete the Dakhue Sanitary Landfill Site from the National Priorities List; request for comments.

SUMMARY: The United States Environmental Protection Agency (U.S. EPA) Region V announces its intent to delete the Dakhue Sanitary Landfill Site from the National Priorities List (NPL) and requests public comment on this action. The NPL constitutes Appendix B of 40 CFR part 300 which is the National Oil and Hazardous Substances Pollution Contingency Plan (NCP), which EPA promulgated pursuant to Section 105 of the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980 (CERCLA) as amended. This action is being taken by U.S. EPA because it has been determined that all Fund-financed response actions under CERCLA have been implemented and EPA, in consultation with the State of Minnesota, has determined that no further cleanup actions are necessary. Moreover, EPA and the State have determined that remedial activities conducted at the Site to date have been protective of public health, welfare, and the environment.

DATES: Comments concerning the proposed deletion of the Site from the NPL must be postmarked no later than April 14, 1995.

ADDRESSES: Comments may be mailed to Gladys Beard (HSRM–6J) Associate Remedial Project Manager, Office of Superfund, U.S. EPA, Region V, 77 W. Jackson Blvd., Chicago, IL 60604. Information on the Site is available at the local information repository located at: Cannon Falls Public Library, 306 West Mill St., Cannon Falls, MN 55009. Requests for comprehensive copies of documents should be directed formally to the appropriate Region V's Docket Officer. The address for the Region V's Docket Officer is Jan Pfundheller (H–7J), U.S. EPA, Region V, 77 W. Jackson Blvd., Chicago, IL 60604, (312) 353–5821.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Gladys Beard (HSRM–6J) Associate Project Manager, Office of Superfund, U.S. EPA, Region V, 77 W. Jackson Blvd., Chicago, IL 60604, (312) 886–7253; or Cheryl Allen (P–19J), Office of Public Affairs, U.S. EPA, Region V, 77 W. Jackson Blvd., Chicago, IL 60604, (312) 353–6196.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Table of Contents

I. Introduction
II. NPL Deletion Criteria
III. Deletion Procedures
IV. Basis for Intended Site Deletion

I. Introduction

The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) Region V announces its intent to delete the Dakhue Sanitary Landfill Site from the National Priorities List (NPL), Appendix B to the National Oil and Hazardous Substances Pollution Contingency Plan, 40 CFR Part 300 (NCP), and requests comments on the deletion. The EPA identifies sites which appear to present a significant risk to public health, welfare or the environment, and maintains the NPL as the list of those sites. Sites on the NPL may be the subject of Superfund (Fund) Fund-financed remedial actions. Pursuant to § 300.425(e)(3) of the NCP, any site deleted from the NPL remains eligible for additional Fund-financed remedial actions in the unlikely event that conditions at the site warrant such action.

The U.S. EPA will accept comments on this proposal for thirty (30) days after publication of this notice in the **Federal Register**.

Section II of this notice explains the criteria for deleting sites from the NPL. Section III discusses procedures that EPA is using for this action. Section IV discusses the history of this site and explains how the site meets the deletion criteria.

Deletion of sites from the NPL does not itself create, alter, or revoke any individual's rights or obligations. Furthermore, deletion from the NPL does not in any way alter EPA's right to take enforcement actions, as appropriate. The NPL is designed primarily for informational purposes and to assist in Agency management.

II. NPL Deletion Criteria

The NCP establishes the criteria the Agency uses to delete sites from the NPL. In accordance with 40 CFR 300.425(e), sites may be deleted from the NPL where no further response is appropriate.

In making this determination, EPA will consider, in consultation with the State, whether any of the following criteria have been met:

(i) Responsible parties or other persons have implemented all appropriate response actions required; or

(ii) All appropriate Fund-financed response under CERCLA has been implemented, and no further response action by responsible parties is appropriate; or

(iii) The remedial investigation has shown that the release poses no significant threat to public health or the environment and, therefore, taking of remedial measures is not appropriate.

III. Deletion Procedures

Upon determination that at least one of the criteria described in § 300.425(e) has been met, U.S. EPA may formally begin deletion procedures, that is if the State has concurred with the intent to delete. This **Federal Register** notice, and a concurrent notice in the local newspaper in the vicinity of the Site, announce the initiation of a 30-day comment period. The public is asked to comment on U.S. EPA's intention to delete the Site from the NPL. Documents in support of U.S. EPA's decision to issue this notice are included in the information repository and the deletion docket.

Upon completion of the public comment period, the U.S. EPA will evaluate comments received during the comment period prior to reaching a final decision to delete the Site and the Regional Office will prepare a Responsiveness Summary which addresses comments received. The public is welcome to contact the U.S. EPA Region V Office to obtain a copy of this Responsiveness Summary, if one is prepared. If U.S. EPA determines the decision to delete the Site from the NPL is appropriate after the public has had an opportunity to comment, then the final Notice of Deletion will be published in the **Federal Register**.

IV. Basis for Intended Site Deletion

The Dakhue Sanitary Landfill is located in Section 24 and 25 Township 113 North, Range 18 West, in Hampton Township, Dakota County, Minnesota. The Site encompasses approximately 80 acres, of which 26 acres have been actively landfilled. The landfill began operations in 1971 receiving mixed municipal and industrial solid waste. A solid waste landfill permit was issued to the owner of the Site on October 1, 1971. Dakhue Landfill operated until May 31, 1988, at which time waste disposal activities ceased. Since opening, the landfill has been utilized for the disposal of mixed municipal and commercial waste and small amounts of industrial waste. The landfill was initially opened on a part-time basis until 1973 when the landfill extended its operation to six days per week. It is

estimated that 1,500,000 cubic yards of waste were disposed of at this-site.

In a letter dated July 22, 1988, representatives of the landfill owner stated that Dakhue Landfill, Inc. was financially unable to undertake closure and postclosure activities required at the landfill. On October 11, 1988, Dakhue Landfill, Inc. filed for Chapter 11 bankruptcy.

The Site was proposed for the NPL on October 26, 1989 and finalized on August 30, 1990 with a score of 42.

The U.S. EPA funded the MPCA to conduct of Remedial Investigation (RI) and Feasibility Study (FS) activities. RI work involves determining the nature and extent of contamination and FS work involves developing and evaluating remedial alternatives.

During the course of those activities, U.S. EPA and MPCA decided to divide the remedy for the Site into two units or discrete actions, referred to as ''operable units'' (OUs). They are as follows:

OU One: Source control of contaminates from the landfill.

OU Two: Contaminated groundwater migration management.

A focused FS was completed in March, 1991 for the first OU and a Record of Decision (ROD) was issued on June 28, 1991 outlining work necessary to address the source of the contamination, the landfill itself.

An RI was completed for the second OU in August, 1992 and a FS was completed in December, 1992. A ROD was issued on June 30, 1992 outlining work necessary to address the migration of contaminated groundwater.

The objective of the remedial action initiated for the Dakhue Sanitary Landfill was to meet the overall goal of protecting human health and the environment. This objective will be achieved through the construction of the landfill cover and maintaining a groundwater monitoring system so that the potential risks associated with the Site are reduced. This will be accomplished through reducing the infiltration of water into the landfill waste mass; reducing the build-up of combustible gases; and reducing the generation and discharge of landfill leachate and continued monitoring of the Site will ensure the future effectiveness of the remedy.

On June 28, 1991, a Record of Decision (ROD) which documented remedial actions for OU one (source control) was signed. The first operable unit addresses the source of the contamination by containing the wastes and contaminated soil on-site. The function of this operable unit is to provide a final cover for the Dakhue Sanitary Landfill which will prevent or minimize groundwater contamination and risks associated with the exposure to the contaminated materials. The major components of the selected remedy for this operable unit include:

Capping with a final cover system consisting of a gas control layer, a barrier layer of low permeable material, a drainage layer, topsoil cover and vegetation.

The remedy for the second operable unit includes the following components: The institutional Controls contained in Dakota County Ordinance No. 114 and Minnesota Rules 4725.2000 and 4725.4300 which restrict well development. A long-term groundwater monitoring program to: (1) Ensure that contaminated groundwater is not migrating off-site (2) assess trends in water quality in the Sand and Gravel aquifer; (3) verify that the deep aquifer is not affected; and (4) to provide adequate protection to aquatic life in Judicial Ditch No. 1 from adverse effects resulting from possible discharge of contaminated groundwater.

Construction of the landfill cover provided for in OU one was completed during the 1992 construction season. Groundwater monitoring as provided in OU two was initiated and several rounds of sampling have been completed to date.

EPA, with concurrence of the State of Minnesota, has determined that all appropriate Fund-financed responses under CERCLA at the Dakhue Sanitary Landfill Site have been completed, and no further Superfund response is appropriate in order to provide protection of human health and the environment. Therefore, U.S. EPA proposes to delete this Site from the NPL.

Dated: March 1, 1995.

Valdas V. Adamkus,

Regional Administrator, U.S. EPA, Region V.

[FR Doc. 95–6270 Filed 3–14–95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560–50–P

FEDERAL EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT AGENCY

44 CFR Parts 61 and 206

RIN 3067–AC35

National Flood Insurance Program; Group Flood Insurance Policy for Individual and Family Grant Program

AGENCY: Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA).

ACTION: Proposed rule.

SUMMARY: This proposed rule would establish a Group Flood Insurance Policy (GFIP) and the criteria for its implementation by the National Flood Insurance Program (NFIP) when Federal disaster assistance is provided under the Individual and Family Grant Program after the President makes a disaster declaration.

EFFECTIVE DATE: We invite your comments which will be accepted until May 1, 1995.

ADDRESSES: Please send comments to the Rules Docket Clerk, Office of the General Counsel, Federal Emergency Management Agency, 500 C Street SW., room 840, Washington, DC 20472, (facsimile) (202) 646–4536.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Charles M. Plaxico, Jr., Federal Emergency Management Agency, Federal Insurance Administration, (202) 646–3422, (facsimile) (202) 646–3445; or Laurence W. Zensinger in FEMA's Response and Recovery Directorate, (202) 646–3642, (facsimile) (202) 646–2730.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: Section 411, Individual and Family Grant (IFG) Programs the Stafford Act (42 U.S.C. § 5178) authorizes the President to make grants to States for the purpose of making grants to individuals or families adversely affected by a major disaster. This disaster assistance is provided to eligible individuals or families who are unable to meet disaster-related necessary expenses or serious needs through insurance or other means of assistance. The maximum grant amount provided under the State-administered IFG program is $12,600 in Fiscal Year 1995, and is adjusted annually as the Consumer Price Index for All Urban Consumers changes.

In past presidentially declared major disasters, IFG recipients were required to purchase and maintain ''adequate flood insurance'' if they had flood damage and were in a special flood hazard area of a community in which the sale of flood insurance was available under the NFIP. According to the regulations published to carry out the purposes of § 411(a), ''adequate flood insurance'' is defined as a flood insurance policy that provides coverage at least for the grant award, for which the maximum in Fiscal Year 1995 is $12,600. A homeowner is able to apply that amount to building or contents damage, or to both kinds of damage, whereas a renter can apply up to $12,600 solely for damage to contents.

Our experience has shown that many IFG recipients historically have not used the part of the grant award that was provided to them to purchase the required flood insurance for that intended purpose. These individuals

frequently have been unable to obtain adequate assistance from other means and have endured hardship as a result of the disaster. Often they have such low incomes that they cannot afford to repay a loan, even if the interest rate is as low as four percent and the repayment schedule is spread over a number of years. Therefore, FEMA developed an NFIP Group Flood Insurance Policy (GFIP) for IFG homeowners or renters who experience flood damage, in an effort to assist these individuals to protect themselves from future flood losses and to comply with the purchase and maintenance requirements of the IFG program. By using the GFIP concept, FEMA can achieve significant administrative savings and can offer a premium rate for the 3-year GFIP that is approximately $50 more than the 1-year premium for a conventional Standard Flood Insurance Policy for a property with the insurance-rating characteristics that most of the properties that are anticipated to be covered under the GFIP have.

On September 23, 1994, while FEMA was in the process of preparing regulations to implement the GFIP, the President signed Public Law 103–325, the Riegle Community Development and Regulatory Improvement Act of 1994. Title V of Pub. L. 103–325 reformed major portions of the National Flood Insurance Act of 1968, and is cited as the National Flood Insurance Reform Act of 1994 (NFIRA). Section 582 of Pub. L. 103–325 states:

''No Federal disaster relief assistance made available in a flood disaster area may be used to make a payment * * * to a person for repair, replacement, or restoration for damage to any personal, residential, or commercial property if that person at any time has received flood disaster assistance that was conditional on the person first having obtained flood insurance under applicable Federal law and subsequently having failed to obtain and maintain flood insurance as required under applicable Federal law on such property.''

We interpret this section as a requirement in flood disasters for each grantee who receives Federal disaster assistance for flood damage to property located in a special flood hazard area and who is required to purchase flood insurance (or had insurance purchased for them) to maintain at least a minimum amount of flood insurance on the property forever, or until they move to another address. If flood insurance is not maintained, then no Stafford Act assistance may be provided for IFG under sec. 411(a) for real or personal property in any subsequent flood disasters. This maintenance provision also applies to individuals who bought, or otherwise had transferred to them, any real estate for which the flood insurance maintenance requirement was previously levied.

To enable States to provide affordable policies to IFG recipients, FEMA proposes to limit IFG assistance to individuals and families with $200 or more of real or personal property damage or loss. Assisting individuals with damage of less than $200 is not cost-effective.

For individuals who qualify for IFG assistance, FEMA proposes that a fixed premium amount, initially in the amount of $200, will be added to the IFG awards (subject to the current grant maximum) to cover the cost of the grantee's flood insurance coverage for the first 3 years. If the grantee has disaster needs that meet or exceed the maximum grant amount, this fixed premium amount shall be withheld from the grant and provided to the NFIP to pay the premium, thus ensuring the grantee is provided with a policy. The policy coverage will be equivalent to the maximum IFG grant amount each fiscal year. This amount is $12,600 in Fiscal Year 1995 as mentioned earlier.

The State IFG program staff would provide the NFIP with records of the individuals to be insured. The records, which the State would provide NFIP on a weekly basis, would be accompanied by payments to cover the premium amounts for each grantee/policyholder for the 3-year policy term. The NFIP would then issue a Certificate of Flood Insurance to each insured. During the 3-year term of the coverage, the amount(s) of coverage listed in the Certificate of Flood Insurance would be adjusted annually on October 1 to reflect changes in the Consumer Price Index for All Urban Consumers.

Approximately 60 days before the end of the 3-year term of the GFIP, the NFIP would notify the IFG grantee/policy-holder of the procedures to follow for applying for a new flood insurance policy and of the amount of coverage that the IFG grantee/policyholder must obtain in order to comply with the flood insurance maintenance requirements established under the NFIRA. For purposes of complying with the maintenance requirement, a ''minimal amount of flood insurance'' means an amount equal to the IFG program's maximum grant amount in effect at the time the new policy is obtained. Further, at the time of each subsequent renewal, the notification concerning the amount of coverage that must be maintained would be revised to reflect the IFG program's maximum grant amount then in effect.

NFIP's Standard Flood Insurance Policy (which would be made available to grantees upon request) specifies a number of restrictions and limitations. While most exclusions pertain only to certain items in the building, some of the exclusions mean that there is no coverage at all for the building or the contents in the building. The coverage exclusions would be specified in the Addendum that would accompany the Certificate of Flood Insurance, which the NFIP would send to each IFG grantee/policyholder. If a Certificate of Flood Insurance is issued for a grantee whose property is ineligible for GFIP coverage, the NFIP, upon discovery of such ineligibility, would notify the grantee that the Certificate is rescinded and then refund the full premium costs to the President's Fund. The State's 25% share would then be forwarded to the State. The State would then return the $200 only to those grantees who received maximum grant awards and had their premium costs deducted from those awards.

NFIRA requires a 30-day waiting period, with two specific exceptions, before flood insurance coverage becomes effective under the Standard Flood Insurance Policy. Neither exception applies to the GFIP. Therefore, to comply with the NFIRA, GFIP coverage would become effective on the 30th day following the date that the records and premium payment are received by the NFIP from the State.

National Environmental Policy Act

This rule is categorically excluded from the requirements of 44 CFR Part 10, Environmental Consideration. No environmental impact assessment has been prepared.

Executive Order 12866, Regulatory Planning and Review

This proposed rule is not a significant regulatory action within the meaning of § 2(f) of E.O. 12866 of September 30, 1993, 58 FR 51735, but attempts to adhere to the regulatory principles set forth in E.O. 12866. The rule has not been reviewed by the Office of Management and Budget under E.O. 12866.

Paperwork Reduction Act

FEMA requests that commenters address their concerns about any additional paperwork or recordkeeping reporting burden this proposed rule may place upon them. Comments on paperwork or recordkeeping issues including burden estimates (i.e., the time it would take a State to research

and compile the information and send premium payments to the NFIP) may be addressed to the points of contact identified in the ''For Further Information Contact'' section of this proposed rule, and to Donald Arbuckle, Office of Management and Budget, Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs, 3255 New Executive Office Building, Washington, DC 20503.

Executive Order 12612, Federalism

This rule involves no policies that have federalism implications under E.O. 12612, Federalism, dated October 26, 1987.

Executive Order 12778, Civil Justice Reform

This rule meets the applicable standards of § 2(b)(2) of E.O. 12778.

List of Subjects in 44 CFR Parts 61 and 206

Flood insurance; Disaster assistance.

Accordingly, 44 CFR Parts 61 and 206 are proposed to be amended as follows:

PART 61—INSURANCE COVERAGE AND RATES

1. The authority citation for Part 61 continues to read as follows:

Authority: 42 U.S.C. 4001 et seq.; Reorganization Plan No. 3 of 1978, 43 FR 41943, 3 CFR, 1978 Comp., p. 329; E.O. 12127 of Mar. 31, 1979, 44 FR 19367, 3 CFR, 1979 Comp., p. 376.

2. Section 61.17 is added to read as follows:

§ 61.17 Group Flood Insurance Policy

(a) A Group Flood Insurance Policy (GFIP) is a policy covering all individuals named by a State as recipients under § 411 of the Stafford Act (42 U.S.C. 5178) of an Individual and Family Grant program award for flood damage as a result of a Presidential disaster declaration. The premium for the GFIP, initially, is a flat fee of $200 per policyholder. The amount of coverage would be equivalent to the maximum grant amount established under § 411. Coverage under the GFIP would become effective on the 30th day following the date the NFIP receives the records and premium payments from the State.

(b) The GFIP is the Standard Flood Insurance Policy Dwelling Form (a copy of which is included in Appendix A(1) of this part), except that:

(1) The GFIP provides coverage for losses caused by land subsidence, sewer backup, or seepage of water without regard to the requirement in paragraph B.3. of Article 3 that the structure be insured to 80 percent of its replacement cost or the maximum amount of insurance available under the National Flood Insurance Program.

(2) *Article 7—Deductibles* does not apply to the GFIP. The deductible is $200 (applicable separately to any building loss and any contents loss) for insured flood damage losses sustained by the insured property in the course of any subsequent flooding event during the policy term. No deductible shall apply to Article 3 B.3.

(3) Article 9 E., Cancellation of Policy By You, does not apply to the GFIP.

(4) Article 9 G., Policy Renewal, does not apply to the GFIP.

PART 206—FEDERAL DISASTER ASSISTANCE FOR DISASTERS DECLARED ON OR AFTER NOVEMBER 23, 1988

3. The authority citation for Part 206 is amended to read as follows:

Authority: The Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act, 42 U.S.C. 5121 *et seq.;* 42 U.S.C. 4001 *et seq.*; Reorganization Plan No. 3 of 1978, 43 FR 41943, 3 CFR, 1978 Comp., p. 329; E.O. 12127 of Mar. 31, 1979, 44 FR 19367, 3 CFR, 1979 Comp., p. 376.

Subpart E—Individual and Family Grant Programs

4. Section 206.131(d)(1)(iii)(C)(*2*) is revised to read as follows:

§ 206.131 Individual and Family Grant Programs.

* * * * *

(d) * * *

(1) * * *

(iii) * * *

(C) * * *

(*2*) The National Flood Insurance Program (NFIP) regulations, at 44 CFR 61.17, establish the Group Flood Insurance Policy (GFIP), which is a policy that covers eligible individuals named by a State as recipients under section 411 of the Stafford Act of an IFG program award for flood damage as a result of a Presidential disaster declaration.

(i) IFG assistance will be provided to individuals or families with residential or personal property damage or losses of $200 or more. Individuals with damage of $199 or less will not be eligible for IFG assistance.

(ii) The premium for the GFIP is a necessary expense within the meaning of this section. The State shall withhold this portion of the IFG award and provide it to the NFIP on behalf of individuals and families who are eligible for coverage. The coverage shall be equivalent to the maximum grant amount established under § 411(f) of the Stafford Act.

(iii) The State IFG program staff would provide the NFIP with records of individuals who received an IFG award and are, therefore, to be insured. Grantees would not be covered if they are determined to be ineligible for coverage based on a number of exclusions established by the NFIP. Records of IFG grantees to be insured shall be accompanied by payments to cover the premium amounts for each grantee for the 3-year policy term. The NFIP will then issue a Certificate of Flood Insurance to each grantee.

(iv) Once the grantee/policyholder receives the Certificate of Flood Insurance, the grantee should review the list of the types of buildings that are ineligible for coverage. If the damaged building and its contents are ineligible, the grantee must notify the NFIP in writing. The NFIP will then reimburse the State IFG program for the premium, so the IFG program can issue a check for the premium amount to the grantee when a premium amount was withheld from a maximum grant award. (If the grantee wishes to refer to or review a Standard Flood Insurance Policy, it will be made available by the NFIP upon request.)

(Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance No. 83.100, ''Flood Insurance''; No. 83.516, ''Disaster Assistance'').

Dated: February 24, 1995.

Elaine A. McReynolds,

Administrator, Federal Insurance Administration.

Richard W. Krimm,

Associate Director, Response and Recovery.

[FR Doc. 95–6361 Filed 3–14–95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6718–02–P

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

47 CFR Part 73

[MM Docket No. 94–84, RM–8478]

Radio Broadcasting Services; Driscoll, Gregory and Robstown, Texas

AGENCY: Federal Communications Commission

ACTION: Proposed rule.

SUMMARY: The Commission requests comments on the deletion of vacant Channel 283A at Gregory, Texas. The deletion of Channel 283A at Gregory is necessary in order to accommodate the proposed substitution of Channel 283C3 for Channel 286A at Robstown, Texas, the reallotment of Channel 283C3 from Robstown to Driscoll, Texas, and the modification of Station KMIQ(FM)'s

license to specify Driscoll as Station KMIQ(FM)'s community of license. *See* 59 FR 38950, August 1, 1994.

DATES: Comments must be filed on or before May 1, 1995, and reply comments on or before May 16, 1995.

ADDRESSES: Federal Communications Commission, Washington, D.C. 20554. In addition to filing comments with the FCC, interested parties should serve the petitioner, or its counsel or consultant, as follows: Lee J. Peltzman, Esq., Shainis & Peltzman, Suite 200, 2000 L Street, Washington, D.C. 20036 (Counsel for petitioner).

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Pam Blumenthal, Mass Media Bureau, (202) 418–2180.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: This is a synopsis of the Commission's *Further Notice of Proposed Rule Making,* MM Docket No. 94–84, adopted March 1, 1995, and released March 10, 1995. The full text of this Commission decision is available for inspection and copying during normal business hours in the FCC's Reference Center (Room 239), 1919 M Street, NW, Washington, D.C. The complete text of this decision may also be purchased from the Commission's copy contractor, ITS, Inc., (202) 857–3800, 2100 M Street, NW, Suite 140, Washington, D.C. 20037.

Provisions of the Regulatory Flexibility Act of 1980 do not apply to this proceeding.

Members of the public should note that from the time a Notice of Proposed Rule Making is issued until the matter is no longer subject to Commission consideration or court review, all *ex parte* contacts are prohibited in Commission proceedings, such as this one, which involve channel allotments. See 47 CFR 1.1204(b) for rules governing permissible *ex parte* contacts.

For information regarding proper filing procedures for comments, see 47 CFR 1.415 and 1.420.

List of Subjects in 47 CFR Part 73

Radio broadcasting.

Federal Communications Commission.

John A. Karousos,

Chief, Allocations Branch, Policy and Rules Division, Mass Media Bureau.

[FR Doc. 95–6339 Filed 3–14–95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6712–01–F

NATIONAL TRANSPORTATION SAFETY BOARD

49 CFR Parts 800, 830, and 831

Reporting of Public Aircraft Accidents

AGENCY: National Transportation Safety Board.

ACTION: Notice of proposed rule and request for comments.

SUMMARY: The NTSB is proposing various revisions to its rules to implement P.L. No. 103–411, which expands the scope of its jurisdiction to include investigations of certain public aircraft accidents.

DATES: Comments are invited by April 14, 1995.

ADDRESSES: An original and 2 copies of any comments must be submitted to: Office of General Counsel, National Transportation Safety Board, 490 L'Enfant Plaza East, SW., Washington, DC 20594, Attention: Public Aircraft Rules.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Jane F. Mackall, (202) 382–6540.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: On October 25, 1994, President Clinton signed H.R. 2440, the Independent Safety Board Act Amendments of 1994. Codified as Public Law No. 103–411 (the Act), it is effective on April 23, 1995, and directly affects aircraft operated by and for Federal, State and local governments. The core of the legislation is amendments to the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 to expand the Federal Aviation Administration's (FAA) safety regulation to previously exempt ''public'' aircraft, and the FAA is in the process of developing implementing rules and guidance. The Act, however, also changed the jurisdiction of the National Transportation Safety Board (NTSB or Safety Board).

Presently, jurisdiction of the Safety Board to investigate aircraft accidents depends on whether the aircraft involved are ''civil'' or ''public.'' An aircraft is either one or the other. These two terms are defined in the Federal Aviation Act of 1958, as amended, 49 U.S.C. 40102(a) (17) and (37). Until now, the Safety Board's statutory investigation authority extended only to civil aircraft, although accidents and incidents involving certain public aircraft are required to be reported to the NTSB within 10 days. *See* 49 CFR 830.20.[1]

Section 3(c) of the Act expands the Safety Board's statutory role in investigating aircraft accidents to include all ''public'' aircraft other than those operated by the Armed Forces or by a United States intelligence agency. Thus, with these two exceptions, aircraft operated by Federal, State and local governments will, as of April 23, 1995, be subject to Board jurisdiction for the purposes of accident investigation in the U.S., in addition to any reporting requirements. We propose in this proceeding to make changes to our regulations, as necessary to reflect the Act.

The key question the Safety Board must answer is: when does an accident ''involve'' an aircraft ''operated by'' the Armed Forces or ''intelligence agencies'' so as to qualify for the exception to our public aircraft jurisdiction? As to what organizations would be included in the term ''Armed Forces,'' we consider the National Guard, and the Coast Guard, for example, to be within the definition, and propose to continue that practice. We construe the term ''intelligence agency'' strictly, and propose only to apply it to those Federal agencies that are so named or categorized (for example, in their enabling statutes).

In defining the term ''operated by,'' there is no issue of interpretation when the military is flying military-owned aircraft (assuming only one aircraft is involved in any accident/incident). Such an accident would be outside our jurisdiction. But, if the aircraft is not actually owned and operated by the military, we have in the past used a ''single-flight'' test for Federal use of otherwise private aircraft to determine whether the aircraft is civil or public and, thus, determine our jurisdiction. That is, if the Navy contracted for a civilian aircraft to transport troops, during the aircraft's use for that purpose it might have been deemed a public aircraft and outside our mandatory jurisdiction—even though by inter-agency agreement we might have investigated an accident. After April 23, this matter is to be analyzed differently. Irrespective of the aircraft status as civil or public, we propose to interpret the statute as requiring that any such accident will be investigated by NTSB unless the aircraft was actually operated by Armed Forces personnel.

The new definition of public aircraft is complex, and has generated considerable discussion and interpretation concerning the scope and application of the civil/public aircraft division for the purposes of FAA safety regulation. The distinction between civil and public aircraft (as opposed to the distinction between military and

[1] The Board has also investigated some public aircraft accidents under memoranda of understanding with various Federal agencies and State and local governments.

public aircraft), however, is no longer critical to our investigation authority—under the Act we now investigate all accidents in the U.S. other than those involving aircraft operated by the Armed Forces or intelligence agencies. Although we recognize that the civil/public distinction remains relevant to us for statistical and reporting purposes and in the case of jurisdiction over accidents abroad, as International Civil Aviation Authority agreements only apply to civil aircraft, we see little purpose at this point in adding ourselves to this debate.

Finally, those responsible for aircraft now subject to our broadened investigation authority should also be aware that the Board may investigate occurences beyond those that involve serious injury or loss of an aircraft. For example, any flight control system failure or inflight fire is a reportable incident. Title 49 of the Code of Federal Regulations, part 800, identifies all the instances we investigate and sets forth rules (at part 830) for notifying us of what are termed ''accidents or incidents.'' [2]

Accordingly, 49 CFR parts 800, 830, and 831 are proposed to be amended as set forth below. We invite comments on our interpretations and proposed rule changes, as well as suggestions for other possible rule changes needed or useful to accommodate our expanded jurisdiction.[3]

List of Subjects in 49 CFR Part 800

Authority delegations—Government agencies, Organization and functions—Government agencies.

49 CFR Part 830

Aviation safety, Reporting and recordkeeping requirements.

49 CFR Part 831

Aviation safety, Highway safety, Investigations, Marine safety, Pipeline safety, Railroad safety.

[2] In light of our expanded investigatory role for public aircraft, the reporting requirement heretofore included in § 830.20 is superseded by the § 830.5 and § 830.15 rules. Thus, one of our proposals is to eliminate part 830 subpart E, § 830.20.

[3] Readers may notice that various provisions subject to the proposals in this notice require other changes to reflect current organization at the Safety Board (*e.g.*, § 800.2) or recent legislative change (*e.g.*, § 800.3 to reflect provisions of P.L. No. 102–345, the FAA Civil Penalty Administrative Assessment Act of 1992). Other rulemakings will shortly be conducted to update provisions, as necessary. This proceeding proposes only the changes needed to implement P.L. No. 103–411.

PART 800—ORGANIZATION AND FUNCTIONS OF THE BOARD AND DELEGATIONS OF AUTHORITY

1. The authority citation for part 800 is proposed to be revised to read as follows:

Authority: Independent Safety Board Act of 1974, as amended (49 U.S.C. 1101 *et seq.*); Federal Aviation Act of 1958, as amended (49 U.S.C. 40101 *et seq.*).

2. Section 800.3 is proposed to be amended by revising paragraph (a) to read as follows:

§ 800.3 Functions.

(a) The primary function of the Safety Board is to promote safety in transportation. The Safety Board is responsible for the investigation, determination of facts, conditions, and circumstances and the cause or probable cause or causes of: all accidents involving civil aircraft and certain public aircraft; highway accidents including railroad grade-crossing accidents, the investigation of which is selected in cooperation with the States; railroad accidents in which there is a fatality, substantial property damage, or which involve a passenger train; pipeline accidents in which there is a fatality or substantial property damage; and major marine casualties and marine accidents involving a public and non-public vessel or involving Coast Guard functions. The Safety Board makes transportation safety recommendations to Federal, State, and local agencies and private organizations to reduce the likelihood of recurrence of transportation accidents. It initiates and conducts safety studies and special investigations on matters pertaining to safety in transportation, assesses techniques and methods of accident investigation, evaluates the effectiveness of transportation safety consciousness and efficacy in preventing accidents of other Government agencies, and evaluates the adequacy of safeguards and procedures concerning the transportation of hazardous materials.

* * * * *

PART 830—NOTIFICATION AND REPORTING OF AIRCRAFT ACCIDENTS OR INCIDENTS AND OVERDUE AIRCRAFT, AND PRESERVATION OF AIRCRAFT WRECKAGE, MAIL, CARGO, AND RECORDS

4. The authority citation for part 830 is proposed to be revised to read as follows:

Authority: Federal Aviation Act of 1958, as amended (49 U.S.C. 40101 *et seq.*), and the Independent Safety Board Act of 1974, as amended (49 U.S.C. 1101 *et seq.*).

4a. Section 830.1 is proposed to be amended by revising the introductory text and paragraphs (a) and (b) to read as follows:

§ 830.1 Applicability.

This part contains rules pertaining to:

(a) Initial notification and later reporting of aircraft incidents and accidents and certain other occurrences in the operation of aircraft, wherever they occur, when they involve civil aircraft of the United States; when they involve certain public aircraft, as specified in this Part, wherever they occur; and when they involve foreign civil aircraft where the events occur in the United States, its territories, or its possessions.

(b) Preservation of aircraft wreckage, mail, cargo, and records involving all civil and certain public aircraft accidents, as specified in this Part, in the United States and its territories or possessions.

* * * * *

5. Section 830.2 is proposed to be amended by revising the definition of ''public aircraft'' to read as follows:

§ 830.2 Definitions.

* * * * *

Public aircraft means an aircraft used only for the United States Government, or an aircraft owned and operated (except for commercial purposes) or exclusively leased for at least 90 continuous days by a government other than the United States Government, including a State, the District of Columbia, a territory or possession of the United States, or a political subdivision of that government. ''Public aircraft'' does not include a government-owned aircraft transporting property for commercial purposes and does not include a government-owned aircraft transporting passengers other than: Transporting (for other than commercial purposes) crewmembers or other persons aboard the aircraft whose presence is required to perform, or is associated with the performance of, a governmental function such as firefighting, search and rescue, law enforcement, aeronautical research, or biological or geological resource management; or transporting (for other than commercial purposes) persons aboard the aircraft if the aircraft is operated by the Armed Forces or an intelligence agency of the United States. Notwithstanding any limitation relating to use of the aircraft for commercial purposes, an aircraft shall be considered to be a public aircraft without regard to whether it is operated by a unit of

government on behalf of another unit of government pursuant to a cost reimbursement agreement, if the unit of government on whose behalf the operation is conducted certifies to the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration that the operation was necessary to respond to a significant and imminent threat to life or property (including natural resources) and that no service by a private operator was reasonably available to meet the threat.

* * * * *

6. Section 830.5 is proposed to be amended by revising the introductory text to read as follows:

§ 830.5 Immediate notification.

The operator of any civil aircraft, or any public aircraft not operated by the Armed Forces or an intelligence agency of the United States, or any foreign aircraft shall immediately, and by the most expeditious means available, notify the nearest National Transportation Safety Board (Board) field office [1] when:

* * * * *

7. Section 830.15 is proposed to be amended by revising paragraph (a) to read as follows:

§ 830.15 Reports and statements to be filed.

(a) Reports. The operator of a civil, public (as specified in § 830.5), or foreign aircraft shall file a report on Board Form 6120.½ (OMB No. 3147–0001) [2] within 10 days after an accident, or after 7 days if an overdue aircraft is still missing. A report on an incident for which immediate notification is required by § 830.5(a) shall be filed only as requested by an authorized representative of the Board.

* * * * *

Subpart E [Removed]

8. Subpart E of part 830 is proposed to be removed.

PART 831—ACCIDENT/INCIDENT INVESTIGATION PROCEDURES

9. The authority citation for part 831 is proposed to be revised to read as follows:

Authority: Federal Aviation Act of 1958, as amended (49 U.S.C. 40101 *et seq.*), and the Independent Safety Board Act of 1974, as amended (49 U.S.C. 1101 *et seq.*).

10. Section 831.2 is proposed to be amended by revising paragraph (a)(1) to read as follows:

§ 831.2 Responsibility of Board.

(a) Aviation. (1) The Board is responsible for the organization, conduct and control of all accident investigations within the United States, its territories and possessions, where the accident involves civil aircraft and certain public aircraft (as specified in § 830.5 of this chapter), including an accident investigation involving civil or public aircraft on the one hand and an Armed Forces or intelligence agency aircraft on the other hand. It is also responsible for investigating accidents that occur outside the United States, and which involve civil aircraft and certain public aircraft, when the accident is not in the territory of another state (*i.e.*, in international waters).

* * * * *

11. Section 831.9 is proposed to be amended to revise paragraph (b) to read as follows:

§ 831.9 Authority of Board Representatives.

* * * * *

(b) *Aviation.* Any employee of the Board, upon presenting appropriate credentials, is authorized to examine and test to the extent necessary any civil or public aircraft, aircraft engine, propeller, appliance, or property aboard such aircraft involved in an accident in air commerce.

* * * * *

Issued in Washington, D.C. on this 8th day of March, 1995.

Jim Hall,

Chairman.

[FR Doc. 95–6216 Filed 3–14–95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7533–01–P

[1] The Board field offices are listed under U.S. Government in the telephone directories of the following cities: Anchorage, AK, Atlanta, GA, West Chicago, IL, Denver, CO, Arlington, TX, Gardena (Los Angeles), CA, Miami, FL, Parsippany, NJ (metropolitan New York, NY), Seattle, WA, and Washington, DC.

[2] Forms are available from the Board field offices (see footnote 1), from Board headquarters in Washington, DC, and from the Federal Aviation Administration Flight Standards District Offices.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Fish and Wildlife Service

50 CFR Part 17

Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants: 90-Day Finding for a Petition to List the Preble's Meadow Jumping Mouse as Threatened or Endangered

AGENCY: Fish and Wildlife Service, Interior.

ACTION: Notice of 90-day petition finding.

SUMMARY: The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (Service) announces a 90-day finding for a petition to list the Preble's meadow jumping mouse (*Zapus hudsonius preblei*) under the Endangered Species Act of 1973, as amended. The Service finds that there is substantial information to indicate that listing the species may be warranted.

DATES: The finding announced in this document was approved on February 27, 1994. To be considered in the 12-month finding for this petition, information and comments should be submitted to the Service by May 15, 1995.

ADDRESSES: Information, questions, or comments concerning this petition finding may be sent to the Field Supervisor, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, 730 Simms Street, Room 290, Golden, Colorado 80401. The petition, finding, supporting data, and comments are available for public inspection by appointment during normal business hours at the above office.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: LeRoy W. Carlson (see **ADDRESSES**) (303/231–5280).

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

Section 4(b)(3)(A) of the Endangered Species Act (Act) of 1973, as amended (16 U.S.C. 1531 *et seq.*), requires that the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (Service) make a finding on whether a petition to list, delist, or reclassify a species presents substantial scientific or commercial information to demonstrate that the petitioned action may be warranted. To the maximum extent practicable, this finding is to be made within 90 days of the receipt of the petition, and a notice regarding the finding is to be published promptly in the **Federal Register**. If the finding is that substantial information was presented, the Service also is required to commence a review of the status of the involved species if one has not already been initiated by the Service. The Service initiated a status review for Preble's meadow jumping mouse (*Zapus hudsonius preblei*) when it categorized the species as a category 2 candidate species in the 1985 Animal Notice of Review (50 FR 37958). This notice meets the requirement for the 90-day finding made earlier on the petition as discussed below.

A petition dated August 9, 1994, was received by the Service from the Biodiversity Legal Foundation on August 16, 1994. The petition requests the Service to list Preble's meadow jumping mouse as endangered or threatened throughout its range and to designate critical habitat within a

reasonable amount of time following the listing.

The petitioner submitted information that Preble's meadow jumping mouse populations in Colorado and Wyoming are imperiled by ongoing and increasing urban, industrial, agricultural, ranching, and recreational development; wetland and riparian habitat destruction and/or conversion; and inadequacy or lack of governmental protection for the subspecies and its habitats.

The Preble's meadow jumping mouse is a small rodent in the family Zapodidae. The coloration and the skull characteristics of the Preble's meadow jumping mouse were described by Krutzsch (1954).

Krutzsch (1954), Quimby (1951), and Armstrong (1972) concur that this species dwells mostly in low undergrowth consisting of grasses, forbs, or both; in open wet meadows and riparian corridors near forests (coniferous and deciduous hardwoods); or where tall shrubs and low trees provide adequate cover. It prefers lowlands with medium to high moisture over dry uplands. However, current research at Rocky Flats (M. Bakeman and F. Harrington, pers. comm. 1994) indicates that the dryer upland habitats are preferred to construct their winter hibernaculums whereas moist lowlands are utilized during the spring and summer months when the Preble's meadow jumping mouse is most active and reproducing.

Local mammalogists believe that the Preble's meadow jumping mouse has never been common, but the apparent extirpation of this species from previously occupied habitats in Wyoming and Colorado and the difficulties finding it in apparently adequate habitats may be indicative of a precipitous decline in populations of the Preble's meadow jumping mouse (D. Armstrong, University of Colorado, pers. comm. 1992) throughout its range. Current information indicates that Preble's meadow jumping mouse is restricted to only two known populations in Colorado and apparently none in Wyoming. It is unclear if two other populations in Colorado still exist. Known populations in Colorado are located at the Department of Energy's Rock Flats Plant in northern Jefferson County and adjacent City of Boulder Open Space land in southern Boulder County. A specimen tentatively identified as a Preble's meadow jumping mouse was captured in 1994 at the Air Force Academy in El Paso County (C. Pague, Colorado Natural Heritage Program, pers. comm. 1994).

Listing Factors

The following are the five listing criteria as set forth in section 4(a)(1) of the Act and regulations (50 CFR Part 424) promulgated to implement the listing provisions of the Act and their applicability to the current status of Preble's meadow jumping mouse.

A. *The present or threatened destruction, modification, or curtailment of its habitat or range.* The main cause for Preble's meadow jumping mouse's decline is directly or indirectly linked to habitat alteration. The habitat alteration includes widespread destruction and/or modification of wet meadows and riparian corridors and indirect hydrological impacts by anthropogenic structures, including—biking/hiking trails; riprap and other bank stabilization structures and activities; road and bridge construction; urban, industrial, commercial, agricultural, and ranching development; and sand and gravel mining operations. Gravel mining operations continue to expand as housing and road construction activities increase, and these mines are located within wetlands, wet meadows, and riparian habitats.

The Front Range region in Colorado has changed from a predominantly prairie habitat intermixed with wet meadows and intermittent streams and gulches to a more agricultural and urban setting with its associated housing, recreational, commercial, and industrial development. These developments have brought about profound changes in the hydrology of the streams along the Front Range. With urbanization has come the expansion of park areas and forestation. With park and open space development has come the expansion of hiking and biking trails along and crossing riparian habitats that have caused further fragmentation of this mouse's habitats.

Grazing has been identified by some researchers as one of the leading causes for its decline (F. Harrington, pers. comm. 1994), but there is little scientific information to adequately show a relationship between moderate grazing and population declines of this mouse. Reservoir impoundments could also impact this mouse by inundating individuals and/or its habitats.

B. *Overutilization for commercial, recreational, scientific, or educational purposes.* Preble's meadow jumping mouse has no known commercial or recreational value. Scientific and educational collecting was not widespread over the past century. Overutilization apparently did not contribute to population declines of this mouse population.

C. *Disease or predation.* Knowledgeable mammalogists (D. Armstrong, pers. comm. 1994; F. Harrington, pers. comm. 1994) do not believe that an epizootic disease caused the demise of the subspecies. Competition from nonnative rodents (i.e., the Norway rat, *Rattus norvegicus;* and house mouse, *Mus Musculus*) and predation by domestic pets (dogs and cats) might also be reasons for this mouse's disappearance. Both of these nonnative rodents have been recently trapped during small mammal surveys from relatively undisturbed riparian habitats.

D. *The inadequacy of existing regulatory mechanisms.* Since 1990, the Colorado Division of Wildlife (Division) has classified Preble's meadow jumping mouse as a ''nongame'' subspecies and a ''species of special concern''. This designation protects the species by denying permits for the take of the species (J. Sheppard, Colorado Division of Wildlife, pers. comm. 1994). In 1992, the Wyoming Game and Fish Department (Department) classified the species *Zapus hudsonius* as a nongame species under the Wyoming Game and Fish Commission Chapter LII. This designation protects the species from take and requires a special permit for the purposes of scientific collection. However, this designation does not protect the species from incidental taking or from actions that may harm the species in order to protect public health. Furthermore, protection by both States is limited to the mouse, itself, and measures to protect the habitat are not included.

E. *Other natural or manmade factors affecting its continued existence.* The introduction of nonnative grasses associated with the recent urbanization of Colorado's Front Range may also have contributed to the demise of Preble's jumping mouse by the replacement of indigenous grasses which this species is dependent upon. These introduced grasses have less nutritional food value (F. Harrington, pers. comm. 1994).

The use of pesticides and herbicides have increased with the urbanization and agricultural development of the Front Range. These chemicals could be contaminating this mouse's food sources and could cause direct poisoning of the species, itself.

Finding

The Service has reviewed the petition and accompanying documentation on the status of Preble's jumping mouse and information concerning potential threats to the species. On the basis of the best scientific and commercial information available, the Service

concludes that substantial information exists to indicate that the requested action may be warranted. The Service believes that habitat destruction and modification are the main cause for the species decline.

The petitioner requested that the critical habitat also be designated. If the 12-month finding determines that the petitioned action to list Preble's jumping mouse is warranted, then the Act requires that designation of critical habitat be addressed in a subsequent proposed rule.

The Service's 90-day finding contains more detailed information regarding the above decisions. A copy can be obtained from the Service's Colorado Field Office (see **ADDRESSES** above).

References Cited

Armstrong, D.M. 1972. Distribution of mammals in Colorado. University of Kansas, Museum of Natural History Monograph 3:1–415.

Krutzsch, P.H. 1954. North American jumping mice (genus Zapus). Univ. Kansas Publ., Mus. Natural History 7:349–472.

Quimby, D.C. 1951. The life history and ecology of the jumping mouse, *Zapus hudsonius*. Ecological Monographs 21:61–95.

Whitaker, J.O. 1972. Zapus hudsonius. Mammalian Species 11:1–7.

Author

The primary author of this document is José Bernardo Garza (See **ADDRESSES** section).

Authority

The authority for this action is the Endangered Species Act of 1973, as amended (16 U.S.C. 1531 *et seq.*).

List of Subjects in 50 CFR Part 17

Endangered and threatened Species, Exports, Imports, Reporting and recordkeeping requirements, and Transportation.

Dated: February 27, 1995.

Mollie H. Beattie,

Director, Fish and Wildlife Service.

[FR Doc. 95–6332 Filed 3–14–95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4310–55–M

Notices

Federal Register
Vol. 60, No. 50
Wednesday, March 15, 1995

This section of the FEDERAL REGISTER contains documents other than rules or proposed rules that are applicable to the public. Notices of hearings and investigations, committee meetings, agency decisions and rulings, delegations of authority, filing of petitions and applications and agency statements of organization and functions are examples of documents appearing in this section.

ADMINISTRATIVE CONFERENCE OF THE UNITED STATES

Committee on Governmental Processes; Committee on Regulation

ACTION: Notice of public meetings.

SUMMARY: Pursuant to the Federal Advisory Committee Act (Pub. L. No. 92–463), notice is hereby given of meetings of the Committee on Governmental Processes and the Committee on Regulation of the Administrative Conference of the United States.

Agency: Committee on Governmental Processes.

Dates: Thursday, March 23, 1995, at 2:00 p.m.

Location: Office of the Chairman, Administrative Conference of the United States, Suite 500, 2120 L Street, NW., Washington, DC (Library, 5th Floor).

For Further Information: Deborah S. Laufer, Office of the Chairman, Administrative Conference of the United States, 2120 L Street, NW., Suite 500, Washington, DC 20037. Telephone: (202) 254–7020.

Agency: Committee on Regulation.

Date: Wednesday, March 22, 1995, at 10:00 a.m.

Location: Office of Steptoe & Johnson, 1330 Connecticut Avenue, NW., Washington, DC, 4th Floor Conference Room.

For Further Information: David M. Pritzker, Office of the Chairman, Administrative Conference of the United States, 2120 L Street, NW., Suite 500, Washington, DC 20037. Telephone: (202) 254–7020.

Supplementary Information: The Committee on Governmental Processes will meet to continue discussion of when federal government lawyers and other government employees may participate in public service activities. There are possible restrictions in conflict of interest statutes, and both government-wide and agency specific regulations governing employee participation in outside activities, ethics laws, and the use of government property.

The Committee on Regulation will meet to continue discussion of a draft report by Professor Douglas C. Michael of the University of Kentucky College of Law on self-enforcement, or self-implementation, as a regulatory alternative to direct enforcement. This draft report follows an earlier study by Professor Michael, which led to Recommendation 94–1, The Use of Audited Self-Regulation as a Regulatory Technique, adopted by the Administrative Conference in June 1994. The Committee on Regulation will also discuss a new draft report, by Professor Ann C. Hodges of the T.C. Williams School of Law, University of Richmond, concerning Dispute Resolution under the Americans with Disabilities Act.

Attendance is open to the interested public, but limited to the space available. Persons wishing to attend should call the Office of the Chairman of the Administrative Conference at least one day before the meeting. The committee chair, if he deems it appropriate, may permit members of the public to present oral statements at a committee meeting. Any member of the public may file a written statement with the committee before, during, or after the meeting. Minutes of each meeting will be available upon request.

Dated: March 10, 1995.

Jeffrey S. Lubbers,

Research Director.

[FR Doc. 95–6461 Filed 3–14–95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6110–01–W

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Forest Service

Newspapers Used for Publication of Legal Notice of Appealable Decisions for Pacific Southwest Region, California

AGENCY: Forest Service, USDA.

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: This notice lists the newspapers that will be used by all ranger districts, forests, and the Regional Office of the Pacific Southwest Region to publish legal notice of all decisions subject to appeal under 36 CFR 215 and 217. The intended effect of this action is to inform interested members of the public which newspapers will be used to publish legal notices of decisions, thereby allowing them to receive constructive notice of a decision, to provide clear evidence of timely notice, and to achieve consistency in administering the appeals process.

DATES: Publication of legal notices in the listed newspapers will begin with decisions subject to appeal that are made on or after January 1, 1995.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Sue Danner, Regional Appeals Coordinator, Pacific Southwest Region, 630 Sansome Street, San Francisco, CA 94111, phone: (415) 705–2553.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: On November 4, 1993, 36 CFR Parts 215 and 217 were published requiring publication of legal notice of decisions subject to appeal. Sections 215.5 and 217.5 require notice published in the **Federal Register** advising the public of the principal newspapers to be utilized for publishing legal notices. This newspaper publication of notices of decisions is in addition to direct notice to those who have requested notice in writing and to those known to be interested and affected by a specific decision.

The legal notice is to identify the decision by title and subject matter; the date of the decision; the name and title of the official making the decision; and how to obtain copies of the decision. In addition, the notice is to state the date the appeal period begins is the day following publication of the notice.

In addition to the principal newspaper listed for each unit, some Forest Supervisors and District Rangers have listed newspapers providing additional notice of their decisions. The timeframe for appeal shall be based on the date of publication of the notice in the first (principal) newspaper listed for each unit.

The newspapers to be used are as follows:

Angeles National Forest

Angeles Forest Supervisor decisions:
Los Angeles Times, Los Angeles, California
Arroyo-Seco District Ranger decisions:
Pasadena Star News, Pasadena, California
Newspaper providing additional notice of Arroyo-Seco decisions:
Daily News, Los Angeles, California
Mount Baldy District Ranger decisions:
Inland Valley Daily Bulletin, Ontario, California
Newspaper providing additional notice of Mount Baldy decisions:
San Gabriel Valley Tribune, West Covina, California
Saugus District Ranger decisions:
Daily News, Los Angeles, California
Tujunga District Ranger decisions:
Daily News, Los Angeles, California
Valyermo District Ranger decisions:

Antelope Valley Press, Palmdale, California

Cleveland National Forest

Cleveland Forest Supervisor decisions:
San Diego Union, San Diego, California
Descanso District Ranger decisions:
San Diego Union, San Diego, California
Palomar District Ranger decisions:
San Diego Union, San Diego, California
Newspaper providing additional notice of Palomar decisions:
Riverside Press-Enterprise, Riverside, California
Trabuco District Ranger decisions:
Orange County Register, Santa Ana, California
Riverside Press-Enterprise, Riverside, California

Eldorado National Forest

Eldorado Forest Supervisor decisions:
Mountain Democrat, Placerville, California
Amador District Ranger decisions:
Mountain Democrat, Placerville, California
Georgetown District Ranger decisions:
Mountain Democrat, Placerville, California
Pacific District Ranger decisions:
Mountain Democrat, Placerville, California
Placerville District Ranger decisions:
Mountain Democrat, Placerville, California

Inyo National Forest

Inyo Forest Supervisor decisions:
Inyo Register, Bishop, California
Mammoth District Ranger decisions:
Inyo Register, Bishop, California
Mono Lake District Ranger decisions:
Inyo Register, Bishop, California
Mount Whitney District Ranger decisions:
Inyo Register, Bishop, California
White Mountain District Ranger decisions:
Inyo Register, Bishop, California

Klamath National Forest

Klamath Forest Supervisor decisions:
Siskiyou Daily News, Yreka, California
Happy Camp District Ranger decisions:
Siskiyou Daily News, Yreka, California
Goosenest District Ranger decisions:
Siskiyou Daily News, Yreka, California
Oak Knoll District Ranger decisions:
Siskiyou Daily News, Yreka, California
Salmon River District Ranger decisions:
Siskiyou Daily News, Yreka, California
Scott River District Ranger decisions:
Siskiyou Daily News, Yreka, California
Ukonom District Ranger decisions:
Siskiyou Daily News, Yreka, California

Lake Tahoe Basin

Lake Tahoe Basin Forest Supervisor decisions:
Tahoe Daily Tribune, So. Lake Tahoe, Ed Dorado County, California

Lassen National Forest

Lassen Forest Supervisor decisions:
Lassen County Times, Susanville, Lassen County, California
Almanor District Ranger decisions:
Chester Progressive, Plumas County, California
Eagle Lake District Ranger decisions:
Lassen County Times, Susanville, Lassen County, California
Hat Creek District Range decisions:
Intermountain News, Burney, Shasta County, California
Newspaper providing additional notice of Hat Creek decisions:
Mountain Echo, Fall River Mills, Shasta County, California

Los Padres National Forest

Los Padres Forest Supervisor decisions:
Santa Barbara News Press, Santa Barbara, California
Ojai District Ranger decisions:
Star Free Press, Ventura, California
Monterey District Ranger decisions:
Salinas Californian, Monterey, California
Mount Pinos District Ranger decisions:
The Bakersfield Californian, Kern, California
Santa Barbara District Ranger decisions:
Santa Barbara News Press, Santa Barbara, California
Santa Lucia District Ranger decisions:
Telegram Tribune, San Luis Obispo, California

Mendocino National Forest

Mendocino Forest Supervisor decisions:
Chico Enterprise-Record, Chico, California
Corning District Ranger decisions:
Chico Enterprise-Record, Chico, California
Covelo District Ranger decisions:
Ukiah Daily Journal, Ukiah, California
Stonyford District Ranger decisions:
Chico Enterprise-Record, Chico, California
Upper Lake District Ranger decisions:
Ukiah Daily Journal, Ukiah, California
Chico Tree Improvement Center Director decisions:
Chico Enterprise-Record, Chico, California

Modoc National Forest

Modoc Forest Supervisor decisions:
Modoc County Record, Alturas, Modoc County, California
Big Valley District Ranger decisions:
Modoc County Record, Alturas, Modoc County, California
Devil's Garden District Ranger decisions:
Modoc County Record, Alturas, Modoc County, California
Doublehead District Ranger decisions
Modoc County Record, Alturas, Modoc County, California
Newspaper providing additional notice of Doublehead decisions:
Herald News, Klamath Falls, Oregon
Warner Mountain District Ranger decisions:
Modoc County Record, Alturas, Modoc County, California

Plumas National Forest

Plumas Forest Supervisor decisions:
Feather River Bulletin, Quincy, California
Beckwourth District Ranger decisions:
Portola Reporter, Portola, California
Greenville District Ranger decisions:
Indian Valley Record, Greenville, California
La Porte District Ranger decisions:
Oroville Mercury Register, Oroville, California
Milford District Ranger decisions:
Lassen County Times, Susanville, Lassen County, California
Oroville District Ranger decisions:
Oroville Mercury Register, Oroville, California
Quincy District Ranger decisions:
Feather River Bulletin, Quincy, California

San Bernardino National Forest

San Bernardino Forest Supervisor decisions:
San Bernardino Sun, San Bernardino, California
Arrowhead District Ranger decisions:
Mountain News, Blue Jay, California
Big Bear District Ranger decisions:
Big Bear Life and Grizzly, Big Bear, California
Cajon District Ranger decisions:
San Bernardino Sun, San Bernardino, California
San Gorgonio District Ranger decisions:
Yucaipa News Mirror, Yucaipa, California
San Jacinto District Ranger decisions:
Idyllwild Town Crier, Idyllwild, California

Sequoia National Forest

Sequoia Forest Supervisor decisions:
Porterville Recorder, Porterville, California
Cannell Meadow District Ranger decisions:

Porterville Recorder, Porterville, California
Greenhorn District Ranger decisions:
Porterville Recorder, Porterville, California
Hot Springs District Ranger decisions:
Porterville Recorder, Porterville, California
Hume Lake District Ranger decisions:
Porterville Recorder, Porterville, California
Tule River Ranger District decisions:
Porterville Recorder, Porterville, California

Shasta-Trinity National Forest

Shasta-Trinity National Forest decisions:
Record Searchlight, Redding, Shasta County, California
Big Bar District Ranger decisions:
Record Searchlight, Redding, Shasta County, California
Hayfork District Ranger decisions:
Record Searchlight, Redding, Shasta County, California
McCloud District Ranger decisions:
Record Searchlight, Redding, Shasta County, California
Mount Shasta District Ranger decisions:
Record Searchlight, Redding, Shasta County, California
Shasta Lake District Ranger decisions:
Record Searchlight, Redding, Shasta County, California
Weaverville District Ranger decisions:
Record Searchlight, Redding, Shasta County, California
Yolla Bolla District Ranger decisions:
Record Searchlight, Redding, Shasta County, California

Sierra National Forest

Sierra Forest Supervisor decisions:
Fresno Bee, Fresno, California
Kings River District Ranger decisions:
Fresno Bee, Fresno, California
Pineridge District Ranger decisions:
Fresno Bee, Fresno, California
Mariposa District Ranger decisions:
Fresno Bee, Fresno, California
Minarets District Ranger decisions:
Fresno Bee, Fresno, California

Six Rivers National Forest

Six Rivers Forest Supervisor decisions:
Times Standard, Eureka, California
Gasquet District Ranger decisions:
Del Norte Triplicate, Crescent City, California
Lower Trinity District Ranger decisions:
The Kourier, Willow Creek, California
Mad River District Ranger decisions:
Times Standard, Eureka, California
Orleans District Ranger decisions:
The Kourier, Willow Creek, California

Stanislaus National Forest

Stanislaus Forest Supervisor decisions:
The Union Democrat, Sonora, California
Calaveras District Ranger decisions:
The Union Democrat, Sonora, California
Groveland District Ranger decisions:
The Union Democrat, Sonora, California
Mi-Wok District Ranger decisions:
The Union Democrat, Sonora, California
Summit District Ranger decisions:
The Union Democrat, Sonora, California

Tahoe National Forest

Tahoe Forest Supervisor decisions:
Grass Valley Union, Grass Valley, California
Downieville District Ranger decisions:
Mountain Messenger, Downieville, California
Foresthill District Ranger decisions:
Auburn Journal, Auburn, California
Nevada City District Ranger decisions:
Grass Valley Union, Grass Valley, California
Sierraville District Ranger decisions:
Mountain Messenger, Downieville, California
Newspapers providing additional notice of Sierraville decisions:
Sierra Booster, Loyalton, California
Portola Recorder, Portola, California
Truckee District Ranger decisions:
Sierra Sun, Truckee, Nevada County, California
Newspaper providing additional notice of Truckee decisions:
Tahoe World, Tahoe City, Placer County, California

Dated: March 8, 1995.

James A. Lawrence,

Deputy Regional Forester.

[FR Doc. 95–6317 Filed 3–14–95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3410–02–M

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

[Docket A(32b1)–1–95

Foreign-Trade Zones Board; Foreign-Trade Zone 84—Houston, Texas; Tuboscope Vetco International, Inc., (Steel Tubular Products), Harris County, Texas; Request for Modification of Restriction

A request has been submitted to the Foreign-Trade Zones Board (the Board) by the Port of Houston Authority, grantee of FTZ 84, pursuant to § 400.32(b)(1) of the Board's regulations for modification of the export-only restriction in FTZ Board Order 609 authorizing Subzone 84I at the Tuboscope Vetco International, Inc. (Tuboscope) plant in Harris County, Texas. It was formally filed on February 8, 1995.

The FTZ Board approved subzone status for the Tuboscope steel tubular products inspection and coating facility in Harris County, Texas, in 1992 (Subzone 84I; Board Order 609; 57 FR 57729; 12/7/92). The approval was subject to a restriction that allowed the use of zone procedures for export activity only.

Tuboscope is now requesting that the export-only restriction be modified so that Customs duties can be deferred while the company conducts activity for the domestic market under zone procedures. The modified restriction would require the company to elect privileged foreign status on all merchandise admitted to the subzone. While the change would not result in significant new Customs savings, it would allow the company to operate the plant under a single inventory control system that meets Customs requirements. The request indicated that the use of zone procedures as proposed would help the facility maintain its international competitiveness.

Public comment on the proposal is invited from interested parties. Submissions (original and 3 copies) shall be addressed to the Board's Executive Secretary at the address below. The closing period for their receipt is May 1, 1995.

A copy of the application and accompanying exhibits will be available for public inspection at the following location: Office of the Executive Secretary, Foreign-Trade Zones Board, U.S. Department of Commerce, Room 3716, 14th and Pennsylvania Avenue, NW., Washington, DC 20230.

Dated: March 6, 1995.

John J. Da Ponte, Jr.,

Executive Secretary.

[FR Doc. 95–6388 Filed 3–14–95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–DS–P

International Trade Administration

Initiation of Antidumping and Countervailing Duty Administrative Reviews

AGENCY: Import Administration, International Trade Administration, Department of Commerce.

ACTION: Notice of initiation of antidumping and countervailing duty administrative reviews.

SUMMARY: The Department of Commerce (the Department) has received requests to conduct administrative reviews of various antidumping and countervailing duty orders and findings with February

anniversary dates. In accordance with the Commerce Regulations, we are initiating those administrative reviews.

EFFECTIVE DATE: March 15, 1995.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Holly A. Kuga, Office of Antidumping Compliance, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue NW., Washington, DC 20230, telephone: (202) 482–4737.

SUPPLEMENTATY INFORMATION:

Background

The Department has received timely requests, in accordance with 19 CFR 353.22(a) and 355.22(a) (1994), for administrative reviews of various antidumping and countervailing duty orders and findings with February anniversary dates.

Initiation of Reviews

In accordance with sections 19 CFR 353.22(c) and 355.22(c), we are initiating administrative reviews of the following antidumping and countervailing duty orders and findings. We intend to issue the final results of these reviews not later than February 29, 1996.

	Period to be reviewed
Antidumping duty proceedings	
India:	
Forged Stainless Steel Flanges:	
A–533–809	
Akai Impex Ltd.	02/09/94–01/31/95
Japan:	
Mechanical Transfer Presses:	
A–588–810	
Aida Engineering, Ltd., Hitachi Zosen Corporation, Ishikawajima-Harima Heavy Industries Co., Ltd., Komatsu, Ltd., Kurimoto, Ltd	02/01/94–01/31/95
The People's Republic of China:	
Axes/Adzes; Bars/Wedges; Hammers/Sledges; and Picks/Mattocks:	
A–570–803	
Fujian Machinery & Equipment Import & Export Corporation (FMEC), Henan Machinery Import & Export Co., Shandong Machinery Import & Export Corporation (SMC), Tianjin Machinery Import & Export Co	02/01/94–01/31/95
All other exporters of axes/adzes, bars/wedges, hammers/sledges, or picks/mattocks from the People's Republic of China are conditionally covered by this review	
The People's Republic of China:	
Natural Paint Brushes:	
A–570–501	
Yixing Sanai Brush Making Co. Ltd., Eastar B.F. (Thailand) Company Ltd., Hebei Animal By-Products I/E Corp., China National Metals & Minerals I/E Corp., Zhenjiang Trading Corp., Inner Mongolia Autonomous Region Light Industrial Products I/E Corp., China National Native Produce and Animal By-Products I/E Corp	02/01/94–01/31/95
All other exporters of paint brushes from the People's Republic of China are conditionally covered by this review	
Countervailing duty proceedings	
Peru:	
Cotton Yarn, C–333–002	01/01/94–12/31/94

Interested parties must submit applications for disclosure under administrative protective orders in accordance with 19 CFR 353.34(b) and 355.34(b).

These initiations and this notice are in accordance with section 751(a) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (19 U.S.C. 1675(a)) and 19 CFR 353.22(c)(1) and 355.22(c)(1).

Dated: March 8, 1995.

Joseph A. Spetrini,

Deputy Assistant Secretary for Compliance.

[FR Doc. 95–6395 Filed 3–14–95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–DS–M

[A–549–810]

Notice of Preliminary Negative Determination of Critical Circumstances: Disposable Pocket Lighters From Thailand

AGENCY: International Trade Administration, Import Administration, Department of Commerce.

EFFECTIVE DATE: March 15, 1995.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: David R. Boyland, Office of Countervailing Investigations, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20230; telephone (202) 482–4198.

Preliminary Negative Determination of Critical Circumstances: The Department of Commerce (the ''Department'') published its preliminary determination of sales at less than fair value in this investigation on October 24, 1994 (59 FR 53414). On February 1, 1995, petitioner alleged that critical circumstances exist with respect to imports of the subject merchandise. On February 10, 1995, we received data from Thai Merry Co., Ltd. (''Thai Merry''), the respondent in this investigation, on U.S. shipment to the United States.

In accordance with 19 CFR 353.16(b)(2)(ii), when a critical circumstances allegation is filed later than 20 days before the scheduled date of the preliminary determination, we must issue our preliminary determination no later than 30 days after the allegation is filed.

Section 733(e)(1) of the Act provides that the Department will preliminarily determine that critical circumstances exist if we determine that there is a reasonable basis to believe or suspect:

(A)(i) There is a history of dumping in the United States or elsewhere of the class or kind of merchandise which is the subject of the investigation, or (ii) the person by whom, or for whose account, the merchandise was imported knew or should have known that the exporter was selling the merchandise which is the subject of the investigation at less than its fair value, and

(B) there have been massive imports of the class or kind of merchandise which is the subject of the investigation over a relatively short period.

History of Dumping: To support the claim that the first prong of the statutory requirement is met, petitioner cited the European Community's November 19, 1991, imposition of antidumping duties on gas-fueled, non-refillable pocket flint lighters from the People's Republic of China, Japan, Korea, and Thailand (Council Regulation (EEC) No. 3433/91). Therefore, because petitioner established a history of dumping of the subject merchandise, we are not required to consider whether the importer knew or should have known that the exporter was selling the subject merchandise at less than fair value.

Massive Imports: Because we have preliminarily determined that the first statutory criterion is met for finding critical circumstances, we must consider whether imports of the merchandise have been massive over a relatively short period in accordance with 19 CFR 353.16(f) and (g).

19 CFR 353.16(f) and 353.16(g) directs the Department to look at the following factors to determine whether imports have been massive over a relatively short period of time: (1) The volume and value of the imports; (2) seasonal trends (if applicable); and (3) the share of domestic consumption accounted for by the imports.

When examining volume and value data, the Department typically compares the export volume for equal periods immediately preceding and following the filing of the petition (*see, Preliminary Affirmative Determination of Critical Circumstances: Certain Cased Pencils From the People's Republic of China,* (59 FR 44128 (August 26, 1994)). Under 19 CFR 353.16(f)(2), unless imports of the subject merchandise have increased by at least 15 percent, we will not consider the imports to have been ''massive.''

Because a determination of critical circumstances should be based on company-specific shipment information (*see, Final Determination of Sales at Less Than Fair Value: Certain Hot-Rolled Carbon Steel Flat Products, Certain Cold-Rolled Carbon Steel Flat Products, and Certain Cut-to-Length Carbon Steel Plate from Belgium,* 58 FR 37083 (July 9, 1993)), we requested that Thai Merry provide shipment information for the period from December 1, 1993 through April 30, 1994 (''pre-petition'' period) and May 1, 1994 through September 30, 1994 (''post-petition'' period). Pursuant to section 353.16(g) of the Department's antidumping regulations, in making critical circumstances determination, the Department normally considers the period beginning on the first day of the month of the initiation and ending at least three months later. The Department considers this period because it is the period immediately prior to a preliminary determination in which exporters of the subject merchandise could take advantage of the knowledge of the dumping investigation to increase exports to the United States without being subject to antidumping duties (*see, Final Determination of Sales at Less Than Fair Value of Certain Internal-Combustion, Industrial Forklift Trucks from Japan,* (53 FR 12552, April 15, 1988)). For purposes of this final determination we are using as our comparison period five months prior to and five months subsequent to the initiation of this investigation.

Based on Thai Merry's shipment data, imports increased by an amount greater than 15 percent between the pre- and post-petition periods.

Seasonality: We found no evidence of seasonality, pursuant to section 353.16(1)(ii) of the Department's regulations.

Share of Domestic Consumption: Based on the information supplied in the critical circumstances allegation, Thai Merry's market share of domestic consumption (*i.e.,* total imports from Thailand as a percentage of total domestic consumption) between the pre- and post-petition periods did not change by an amount greater than three percentage points. (*See,* the February 27, 1995 memorandum to Susan H. Kuhbach, Director of Countervailing Investigations from David R. Boyland, Case Analyst for a full discussion of this issue.)

Other Factors: Respondent argues that the increase in shipment was in response to a Consumer Product Safety Commission (''CPSC'') regulation which came into effect on July 12, 1994, and was not an attempt to circumvent a potential antidumping duty order.

Respondent also argues that section 353.16(f)(2) and past precedent allow the Department to consider the impact of the CPSC regulation on imports in determining whether they were massive. Respondent cites a DOC position comment in Antidumping Duties: Final Rule which states that the 15 percent test is ''not intended to limit the Department's discretion or responsibility to consider in each case the factors relevant to a decision regarding whether imports are 'massive' '' (*see,* Final Rule, 54 FR 12742, 12751 (March 28, 1989)).

With respect to the increase in shipment between the pre- and post-petition periods, and the circumstances that surround it, May 1994 is the month within the post-petition period which has been examined most closely by the Department. Based on an examination of past imports from Thailand, the highest volume of imports prior to the post-petition period occurred in August 1993. May 1994's volume of shipments was the only month during the post-petition period in which the level of shipments went outside the range established in August 1993. Hence, the surge in shipments that occurred in May represented a unique ''spike'' in the trend of shipments.

Also, the information provided to the Department shows that this dramatic increase in shipments was not sustained. If respondent was attempting to take advantage of the knowledge of an antidumping investigation to export prior to suspension of liquidation, we would expect the increase in shipment to be sustained up until the preliminary determination. This did not occur.

Finally, a significant percentage of the May 1994 shipments consisted of standard lighters which were to be banned pursuant to the July 1994 CPSC regulation. (Note: the CPSC gave notice of the impending ban on July 12, 1993. Thus, respondent was aware of the CPSC ban one year prior to its effective date. Additionally, orders shipped in May 1994 would arrive in the United States in June 1994; *i.e.,* prior to the CPSC ban.) Based on this information, it is reasonable to assume that the CPSC regulation drove the sharp increase in imports between the pre- and post-petition periods, as opposed to the possible suspension of liquidation.

Conclusion: Based on (1) an evaluation of apparent domestic consumption during the pre- and post-petition period, as calculated by petitioner, (2) Thai Merry's share of domestic consumption during the pre- and post-petition periods, (3) the shipment data provided by respondent as compared to previous periods, and (4) consideration of the circumstances surrounding the large increase in shipment in May 1994, we preliminarily determine that critical circumstances do not exist. (A more detailed analysis of the critical circumstances allegation is contained in the February 27, 1995 memorandum to Susan H. Kuhbach, Director, Office of Countervailing Investigations from David R. Boyland, Case Analyst.)

ITC Notification: In accordance with section 733(f) of the Act, we have notified the ITC of our determination.

Public Comment: Since this determination is being made subsequent to the due dates for public comment as published in our notice of preliminary determination of sales at less than fair value, we will accept written comments

limited to this preliminary determination on critical circumstances if they are submitted to the Assistant Secretary for Import Administration no later than March 6, 1995

This determination is published pursuant to section 733(f) of the Act.

Dated: March 3, 1995.

Susan G. Esserman,

Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.

[FR Doc. 95–6402 Filed 3–14–95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–DS–P

[A–301–801 and A–331–801]

Amended Final Determinations of Sales at Less Than Fair Value: Fresh Cut Roses From Colombia and Ecuador

AGENCY: Import Administration, International Trade Administration, Department of Commerce.

EFFECTIVE DATE: March 15, 1995.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: James Maeder or James Terpstra, Office of Antidumping Investigations, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, NW., Washington, DC 20230; telephone: (202) 482–3330 or (202) 482–3965, respectively.

Amendments to the Final Determinations

We are amending the final determinations of sales at less than fair value of fresh cut roses from Colombia and Ecuador to reflect the correction of ministerial errors made in the margin calculations in these determinations. Because corrections of ministerial errors for one company in the Colombian investigation results in its exclusion from any potential antidumping order, we are issuing this notice prior to the final determination of the U.S. International Trade Commission. These amendments to the final determinations are being published in accordance with 19 CFR 353.28(c).

Applicable Statute and Regulations

Unless otherwise indicated, all citations to the statute and to the Department's regulations are in reference to the provisions in effect on December 31, 1994.

Case History and Amendments of the Final Determinations

In accordance with section 735(d) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (the Act), on February 6, 1995, the Department of Commerce (the Department) published its final determinations that fresh cut roses from Colombia and Ecuador were being sold at less than fair value (60 FR 6980, 7019). Subsequent to the final determinations, we received timely ministerial error allegations from certain respondents in the Colombian and Ecuadorian investigations pursuant to 19 CFR 353.28. Section 751(f) of the Act defines a ''ministerial error'' to be an error ''in addition, subtraction or other arithmetic function, clerical error resulting from inaccurate copying, duplication, or the like, and any other type of unintentional error which the Secretary considers ministerial.'' Below is a discussion of the alleged errors that we determined to be ministerial errors as defined by section 751(f) of the Act. These, and the alleged errors that the Department determined not to be ministerial in nature, are detailed further in the Decision Memoranda from Gary Taverman to Barbara R. Stafford, dated March 3, 1995, which is on file in the Import Administration Central Records Unit, Room B–099 of the Main Commerce Building.

Colombia

On February 7 and 8, respondents Rosex Group, Prisma Group, Agricola Bojaca, Grupo Sabana, Flores Mocari, Caicedo Group, Grupo Intercontinental, and Grupo Papagayo, alleged that the Department made ministerial errors in its final determination and requested that the Department correct these errors. Petitioner provided comments on these allegations on February 14, 1995.

Rosex Group

Issue 1: Rosex Group states that the Department made a ministerial error in the calculation of its per unit credit expense. Rosex Group stated that it changed its reported interest rate in its December 5, 1994, sales listing from a dollar-denominated rate to a peso-denominated interest rate. Because Rosex Group calculated its U.S. imputed credit using a peso-denominated rate, it contends that the Department should have adjusted this rate instead of a dollar-denominated rate. Petitioner maintains that the Department's computer instructions to change the peso-based interest rate to a dollar-based rate appear to be correct.

We agree with respondent that this error constitutes a ministerial error as defined by section 751(f) of the Act. It was the Department's intention to use a U.S. interest rate of 7.575 percent in Rosex Group's imputed credit calculation. Therefore, we have corrected this ministerial error.

Prisma

Issue 1: Prisma argues that the computer program used to calculate its margin contained an error which incorrectly computed the per-unit commission for all U.S. sales observations. Stating that the Department intended to calculate a U.S. commission for ten specific U.S. sales observations, Prisma asserts that the program mistakenly caused every U.S. sales commission to be recalculated. In addition, Prisma claims that there is also a typographical error in the calculation of commissions for one sales observation.

We agree with Prisma that these are ministerial errors, and have revised the computer program accordingly.

Issue 2: With respect to inventory carrying costs, Prisma notes that it included the period normally covered by inventory carrying cost in its imputed credit calculation. As such, Prisma argues that the Department double-counted this expense by calculating a separate inventory carrying cost. Petitioner maintains that the Department imputed inventory carrying cost for seven days as best information available (BIA) for those respondents that failed to provide the data, and argues that because Prisma did not submit the data in the requested form, it cannot now argue double-counting to circumvent the application of BIA.

We agree with Prisma. We used BIA for inventory carrying cost for those respondents who had related parties in the United States and did not report inventory carrying costs on their exporter's sales price (ESP) sales. However, because Prisma does not have a related party in the United States, we incorrectly calculated inventory carrying costs. Therefore, we have adjusted for this ministerial error.

Issue 3: Prisma contends that the Department's inflation adjustment computation incorrectly assumed that all companies within the Prisma Group did not include the 1992 inflation adjustment in their submitted amortization expense. However, respondent notes that the cost verification report demonstrates that Prisma did include the 1992 inflation adjustment for farm Del Campo in its submitted amortization expenses.

We agree. The cost verification report at page 9 indicates that one of the seven Prisma Group farms (Del Campo) did include in its submitted cost information its inflation adjusted pre-production material amortization costs for years prior to the period of investigation (POI). The other six farms that make up the Prisma Group did not

make adjustments for inflation. Because we did not intend to make an adjustment for Del Campo that had already been made, we have recalculated the inflation adjustment.

Bojaca

Issue 1: Bojaca contends that it was incorrect for the Department to use BIA to impute amounts for brokerage and duties whenever the values for those expenses were reported as zero for U.S. ESP customers. Bojaca asserts that it was only for customer 4 that there were zero values for brokerage or duties, and maintains that because it could not segregate these amounts, it reported the combined amounts under air freight.

Petitioner argues that Bojaca failed to cite to any questionnaire response or verification exhibit which informed the Department that brokerage and duty expenses were consolidated with air freight. Petitioner asserts that Bojaca did not explain why a reasonable allocation methodology could not segregate these amounts, and adds that it is not clear that brokerage and duty expenses were always included in air freight. Therefore, petitioner asserts that the Department's choice of BIA to fill Bojaca's reported zero values does not constitute a ministerial error.

We agree with respondent in part. We verified that Bojaca had included its duty and brokerage expenses in its air freight expenses for customer 4. Therefore, we incorrectly applied BIA to customer 4. However, we found that there are zero values for other ESP customers. Therefore, we have continued to use BIA for the other ESP customers that have a zero value reported in these fields.

Issue 2: Bojaca argues that the Department incorrectly calculated constructed value (CV) packing expense by using total packing expenses for roses, irrespective of destination, rather than total U.S. packing expense.

We agree. We intended to use total U.S. packing expenses rather than total packing expenses in our CV calculation. We have recalculated CV packing expense to correct this error.

Issue 3: Bojaca argues that the Department erroneously allocated the entire group-wide interest expense to roses, when it should have allocated only the proportion of the group-wide interest expense associated with rose activities. Bojaca argues that the interest expense associated with the dairy farm and mini-roses should not have been included in the calculation.

We agree. We intended to exclude from our cost calculations the portion of interest expense related to the dairy farm. We purposely did not allocate any interest expense to the mini-roses because: (1) Respondent indicated that an insignificant portion (less than one percent) of the total cultivated area of one of the three farms within the Bojaca Group produced mini-roses; and, (2) because the cost of production for mini-roses, the basis used to allocate interest expense to Bojaca's different products, was not provided by the company. We intended to compute interest expense by excluding only the portion of interest expense that relates to the dairy farm. We have made this adjustment, but only as it related to the dairy farm.

Mocari

Issue 1: Mocari argues that the Department mistakenly deducted air freight expenses which it did not incur on its purchase price (PP) sales transactions. Mocari points out that these sales were made on an FOB Bogota basis, and requests that the Department deduct the air freight expenses from only the ESP sales transactions. The petitioner argues that Mocari had ample opportunity throughout the investigation to correct any error in reporting air freight. In addition, the petitioner maintains that Mocari has not provided a basis which demonstrates that its proposed correction would be limited only to removing erroneous expenses.

We agree with respondent. We verified that Mocari did not pay air freight for PP sales. Therefore, we have corrected the error by deducting amounts for air freight from ESP sales only.

Issue 2: Mocari claims that the Department mistakenly included it in the list of companies that had no U.S. borrowings during the POI and should not have used BIA to calculate imputed credit expenses and inventory carrying cost. Mocari maintains that the Department should have used its actual borrowing rate instead of the publicly ranged interest rate to calculate imputed credit expenses and inventory carrying costs.

We agree with respondent. We intended to use Mocari's actual interest rate in our imputed credit expenses and inventory carrying costs calculations. Mocari's financial statements show that it paid interest on short-term borrowings during the POI. Accordingly, we have revised Mocari's imputed credit calculation and inventory carrying cost to use its short-term dollar-denominated interest rate.

Issue 3: Mocari claims that the Department should not have subtracted the total number of stems returned from the sales quantity indicated on the CV tables because the amount reported was already net of returns. Therefore, Mocari requests that the Department recalculate its cost of manufacture (COM) using the sales quantity indicated on line 8 of the CV tables. In addition, Mocari requests that the Department not subtract additional stems from the amount reported on line 8 of the CV tables because such action represents an improper double-counting of returns.

The petitioner states that Mocari should have reported an amount which was inclusive of returns in line 8 of the CV tables instead of an amount which was net of returns. The petitioner argues that Mocari should have notified the Department earlier that the amount reported on line 8 of the CV table was net of returns. Therefore, petitioner maintains that clerical error comments are not the forum in which to determine new factual claims.

We agree with respondent. Sales verification exhibit 19 shows that the amount Mocari reported on line 8 of the CV tables is net of returns. Accordingly, we have recalculated the COM, interest, and general and administrative expenses for Mocari using the quantity amount on line 8 of the CV tables. Further, because this figure is net of returns, we did not deduct an additional amount for returns from this figure; this action would have represented double-counting.

Grupo Intercontinental

Issue 1: Grupo Intercontinental (Intercontinental) alleges that in its CV calculation, the Department erred in its calculation of a home market packing cost as BIA. Intercontinental argues that the Department should have used its U.S. packing cost, as required by section 353.50(a)(3) of the Department's regulations. Intercontinental further states that instead of using the verified U.S. packing expense in its CV calculation, the Department used a home market BIA amount that should have been applied only to home market sales of export quality roses for which no packing costs were reported. Therefore, Intercontinental requests that the Department apply the U.S. packing expense in its CV calculation.

We agree that the Department erred in using the BIA home market packing expense for CV. While we properly applied the per stem packing cost for purposes of the cost test, we intended to use the verified U.S. packing amount for calculating CV. Therefore, we revised our calculation to correct this clerical error.

Issue 2: Intercontinental states that the Department intended to correct Colombian Flower Council (CFC) fees for certain customers in certain months

and that, in making the programming changes necessary to accomplish this task, the Department mistakenly changed the CFC fees for all customers in all months. We agree, and have corrected this error.

Caicedo Group

Issue 1: Caicedo states that the Department's inflation adjustment was intended to be a reasonable estimate of the effects of inflation on depreciation and amortization expenses denominated in historical pesos. Caicedo argues, however, that the Department erred in applying its inflation adjustment to the company's total reported cost of cultivation, including current cultivation costs, and that this is the equivalent of punitive ''BIA.'' Caicedo further argues that its record provides information regarding the company's 1993 depreciation and amortization of pre-production expenses.

We agree that the Department mistakenly adjusted Caicedo's current cultivation costs for inflation. Accordingly, we have recalculated the inflation adjustment by applying the determined inflation rate to non-current, pre-production amortization and depreciation costs only.

Issue 2: Caicedo argues that the Department should adjust the cull revenue to recognize the insurance compensation proceeds the company received for hailstorm damage. Caicedo states that the insurance proceeds, which were originally reported as an offset to overhead, were subsequently reclassified by Caicedo and included in the balance for cull revenue. Caicedo concludes that the Department made a ministerial error by excluding the reduction in rose production costs resulting from the insurance proceeds.

We agree. We have reduced Caicedo's total costs by the insurance proceeds received.

Issue 3: Caicedo contends that the Department made two ministerial errors in its allocation of interest expenses. First, Caicedo argues that the Department erred in allocating interest expense over total export quality rose stems sold during the POI. Because the particular companies involved produce and sell other types of flowers, Caicedo maintains that the Department should have allocated interest expense over total flower stems. Second, Caicedo claims that the Department failed to allocate any of the combined interest expense to Great American Bouquet S.A. (GAB), a division of Inverfloral LTDA (Inverfloral) that does not grow flowers, but, rather, incorporates numerous flower types, including roses, into bouquets. Caicedo concludes that the Department's failure to allocate the combined interest expenses to GAB was inadvertent, and that the Department intended to allocate the combined interest expenses of the four grower/exporters over their combined stems sold for all flower types.

We agree. We intended to allocate the combined interest expense of the four grower/exporters to the rose operations of those companies, including Inverfloral's GAB division. Therefore, we recalculated Caicedo's interest expense by first allocating the total combined interest expenses of the four companies between Inverfloral/GAB (non-grower) and the other three companies (which all grow flowers) based on the ratio of Inverfloral/GAB's productive and long-term assets to the total productive and long-term assets of all four companies. Because companies generally borrow capital in order to finance the purchase of such assets, we consider this approach to be the most reasonable indicator of the borrowing needs of the rose production versus bouquet assembly sides of Caicedo's operations. For each of the four grower/exporters, we included in productive assets the year-end 1993 financial statement balances for inventory, crop investments, crops in development, and long-term assets, including fixed assets.

In order to allocate the remaining interest expense between rose and other flower growing operations at the three production companies, we used the ratio of rose cultivation area to total cultivation area, for the three companies that grow flowers. This methodology is consistent with that used for several of the other Colombian rose growing companies.

Ecuador

On February 8, 1995, Arbusta-Agritab (Arbusta) and Guanguilqui Agro Industrial S.A. (Guaisa) made timely allegations that the Department made ministerial errors in its final determination. On February 16, 1995, petitioner provided its comments on the alleged errors.

Arbusta

Issue 1: Arbusta states that the Department incorrectly multiplied DHL delivery charges by quantity before subtracting this expense from U.S. price.

We agree. Because we did not intend to multiply the per stem DHL expense by quantity, we have corrected this error.

Issue 2: Arbusta argues that the Department incorrectly disallowed the company's capitalization of costs incurred during the vegetative period.

We agree. Because we inadvertently overlooked the inclusion of the capitalization and amortization of prior period vegetative period costs, we have adjusted the CV to allow for the current period capitalization of vegetative period costs.

Issue 3: Arbusta alleges that the Department mistakenly added actual historical depreciation expenses to CV instead of only the revaluation of those expenses. Arbusta contends that this addition double counts the amount of historical depreciation.

We agree. We inadvertently added historical depreciation to CV. Therefore, because we unintentionally double-counted this expense, we have corrected the error.

Issue 4: Arbusta states that in its CV calculation the Department used an incorrect packing expense. Petitioner also notes that the packing cost used in the CV calculation for Arbusta conflicts with the Department's analysis memorandum.

We agree with both petitioner and respondent, and determine this to be a ministerial error. Accordingly, we have corrected the packing expenses used in CV.

Guaisa

Guaisa contends that the Department reallocated certain expenses to roses based on an incorrect rose area percentage for Guaisa farm.

We agree with Guaisa in part. We found a typographical error in our calculation of the correct roses cultivated area. However, the rose area calculated by Guaisa that it requested the Department use in its recalculation is incorrect. Accordingly, we have corrected the typographical error we found in our original calculation and rejected the figure calculated by Guaisa.

Scope of Investigation

The products covered by these investigations are fresh cut roses, including sweethearts or miniatures, intermediates, and hybrid teas, whether imported as individual blooms (stems) or in bouquets or bunches. Loose rose foliage (greens), loose rose petals and detached buds are excluded from these investigations. Roses are classifiable under subheadings 0603.10.6010 and 0603.10.6090 of the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States (*HTSUS*). The *HTSUS* subheadings are provided for convenience and customs purposes. The written description of the scope of these investigations is dispositive.

Suspension of Liquidation

In accordance with 19 U.S.C. 1673b, we are directing the U.S. Customs

Service to continue to suspend liquidation of all entries of fresh cut roses from Colombia and Ecuador, as defined in the ''Scope of Investigation'' section of this notice, that are entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption on or after the date of publication of this notice in the **Federal Register**. The Customs Service shall require a cash deposit or the posting of a bond on all entries equal to the estimated weighted-average amount by which the foreign market value of the merchandise subject to this investigation exceeds United States price as shown in the table below. The following is a list of all the final margins, including the amended final margins, in these investigations.

Manufacturer/Producer/Exporter	Margin percent
Colombia	
Flores Mocari S.A. (and its related farms Cultivos Miramonte and Devor Colombia)	2.86
Rosex (and its related farms Rosex Ltda. La Esquina and Paraiso Farms), Induflora Ltda., and Rosas Sausalito Ltda.)	2.44
Grupo Prisma (and its related farms Flores del Campo Ltda., Flores Prisma S.A., Flores Acuarela S.A., Flores el Pincel S.A., Rosas del Colombia Ltda., Agropecuaria Cuernavaca Ltda.)	0.00
Grupo Bojaca (and its related farms Agricola Bojaca Ltda., Universal Flowers, and Plantas y Flores Tropicales Ltda. (Tropifora))	20.66
Caicedo Group (and its related farms Agrobosque, Productos el Rosal S.A., Productos el Zorro S.A., Exportaciones Bochia S.A. - Flora Ltda., Flores del Cauca, Aranjuez S.A., Andalucia S.A., Inverfloral S.A., and Great America Bouquet)	15.07
Grupo Intercontinental (and its related farms Flora Intercontinental and Flores Aguablanca)	3.92
All Others	5.53
Ecuador	
Arbusta-Agritab (and its related farms Agrisabe, Agritab, and Flaris)	4.01
Guanguilqui Agro Industrial S.A. (and its related farm Indipasisa)	14.29
All Others	5.41

These amended final determinations are published in accordance with section 751(f) of the Act and 19 CFR 353.28(c).

Dated: March 3, 1995.

Susan G. Esserman,

Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.

[FR Doc. 95–6403 Filed 3–14–95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–DS–P

[C–549–811]

Final Negative Countervailing Duty Determination: Disposable Pocket Lighters From Thailand

AGENCY: Import Administration, International Trade Administration, Department of Commerce.

EFFECTIVE DATE: March 15, 1995.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Elizabeth A. Graham, Office of Countervailing Investigations, Import Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, Room 3099, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20230; telephone (202) 482–4105.

Final Determination. The Department of Commerce (''the Department'') determines that no benefits which constitute subsidies within the meaning of section 701 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (''the Act''), are being provided to manufacturers, producers, or exporters in Thailand of disposable pocket lighters.

Case History

Since the publication of the preliminary determination in the **Federal Register**, 59 FR 40525 (August 9, 1994), the following events have occurred.

On September 13, 1994, at petitioner's request, we extended the final determination in this investigation to coincide with the final determination in the companion antidumping investigation (59 FR 46961).

On November 3, 1994, respondents requested that the Department postpone the final antidumping and countervailing duty determinations. Therefore, on November 16, 1994, the Department published in the **Federal Register** a notice postponing the final antidumping and countervailing duty determinations until no later than March 8, 1995 (59 FR 59211).

We conducted verification of the responses submitted on behalf of the Government of Thailand (GOT) and Thai Merry Co., Ltd. (Thai Merry) from October 17–18, and on October 28, 1994, respectively. We received case briefs on February 23, 1995, from petitioner and respondent, and received a rebuttal brief from respondent on March 1, 1995.

Scope of Investigation

The products covered by this investigation are disposable pocket lighters, whether or not refillable, whose fuel is butane, isobutane, propane, or other liquified hydrocarbon, or a mixture containing any of these, whose vapor pressure at 75 degrees fahrenheit (24 degrees Celsius) exceeds a gauge pressure of 15 pounds per square inch. Non-refillable pocket lighters are imported under subheading 9613.10.0000 of the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States (''HTSUS''). Refillable, disposable pocket lighters would be imported under subheading 9613.220.0000. Although the HTSUS subheadings are provided for convenience and Customs purposes, our written description of the scope of this proceeding is dispositive.

Applicable Statute and Regulations

Unless otherwise indicated, all citations to the statute and to the Department's regulations are references to the provisions as they existed on December 31, 1994.

References to the *Countervailing Duties: Notice of Proposed Rulemaking and Request for Public Comments,* 54 FR 23366 (May 31, 1989) (*Proposed Regulations*), which were withdrawn on January 3, 1995 (60 FR 80), are provided solely for further explanation of the Department's CVD practice. The subject matter of these regulations is being considered in connection with an ongoing rulemaking proceeding which, among other things, is intended to conform the Department's regulations to the Uruguay Round Agreements Act.

Injury Test

Although Thailand is not a ''country under the Agreement'' within the meaning of section 701(b) of the Tariff

Act of 1930, as amended (''the Act''), the merchandise being investigated is non-dutiable under the Generalized System of Preferences and Thailand is a contracting party to the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade. Thailand, therefore, is entitled to an injury test on imports of the subject merchandise pursuant to section 303(a)(2) of the Act. On June 20, 1994, the ITC preliminarily determined that imports of the subject merchandise from Thailand materially injure, or threaten material injury to, a U.S. industry.

Period of Investigation

For purposes of this final determination, the period for which we are measuring bounties or grants (the period of investigation (''POI'')) is calendar year 1993.

Analysis of Programs

Based upon our analysis of the petition, the responses to our questionnaires, verification and comments made by interested parties, we determine the following:

A. Programs Determined to be Countervailable

1. Section 31 of the Investment Promotion Act

The Investment Promotion Act of 1977 (''IPA'') provides incentives for investment to promote the development of the Thai economy. The IPA authorizes an array of tax exemptions and exclusions. The IPA is administered by the Board of Investment (BOI) through promotion certificates. These certificates list the various sections of the IPA under which a company is eligible to receive benefits.

Under section 31, companies may obtain a three-to-eight year exemption from payment of corporate income tax on profits derived from promoted activities, as well as deductions from net profits for losses incurred during the tax exemption period. The 1977 IPA Act has been amended several times and, in 1991, the GOT passed the Investment Promotion Act No. 2 of 1991. This 1991 Act was the law in effect during the POI. Section 16 of this law states that eligible activities for this exemption include '' * * * activities which involve production for export.''

We verified that Thai Merry applied for and received section 31 income tax exemptions during the POI. The approval certificate received by Thai Merry for participation in this program states that ''the company has received a promoted status in the business for production of gas lighters for export.''

Because Thai Merry received these benefits for exported lighters, we determine that this program confers an export bounty or grant. To calculate the benefit for the POI, we divided the tax savings by the total value of export sales, pursuant to 355.47(c)(1)(ii) of the *Proposed Regulations (Countervailing Duties: Notice of Proposed Rulemaking and Request for Public Comments,* 54 FR 23366 (May 31, 1989)). On this basis, we calculated a net bounty or grant of 0.23 percent *ad valorem*.

Because this is the only countervailable program and the rate is *de minimis,* pursuant to 19 CFR 355.7 (1994), we determine that no benefits which constitute bounties or grants within the meaning of the countervailing duty law are being provided to manufacturers, producers, or exporters of disposable pocket lighters in Thailand.

B. Programs Determined to be Not Used

We established at verification that the following programs were not used during the POI.

A. *Industrial Estates/Export Processing Zones*
B. *Preferential Short-term Loans Under the Export Packing Credit Program*
C. *Tax and Duty Exemptions Under the Investment Promotion Act (sections 28, 33, 34, 36(1), 36(2), 36(3) and 36(4)*
D. *Tax Certificates for Exporters*
E. *Rediscount of Industrial Bills*
F. *International Trade Promotion Fund*

Interested Party Comments

Comment 1: Petitioner asserts that the Department should countervail government subsidies provided to two plants which provide assembly services under subcontract to Thai Merry. These assembly plants are not owned by Thai Merry, although the materials processed in these facilities are the property of Thai Merry. These assembly plants were discussed in the course of the antidumping (AD) verification, not in the CVD verification. Petitioner believes that because one of these plants assembles safety-lock lighters, which are only sold in the United States, the facility may be benefitting from being located in an export processing zone. Petitioner asserts that unless respondent can provide proof that these facilities are not located in an export processing zone, the Department should presume that these plants receive subsidies and that Thai Merry benefits from such subsidies, and should apply a countervailing duty rate to Thai Merry based on BIA.

Respondent contends that petitioner's brief should be rejected due to the inclusion of arguments based on information not on the record of the CVD investigation. (The fact that Thai Merry subcontracted some assembly operations to unrelated firms was only raised in the AD investigation.)

Respondent emphasizes that the Department verified that Thai Merry is not located in an export processing zone and that the company did not benefit from this program during the POI. Additionally, respondent asserts that since the Department chose not to verify the location of the subcontractor's assembly plants in connection with the CVD verification, it would be unfair to assign a margin to Thai Merry based on BIA.

DOC Position: We consider petitioner's allegation untimely and, therefore, have not considered its allegation in this investigation. Pursuant to § 353.31(c)(i) of the *Proposed Regulations,* ''the Secretary will not consider any subsidy allegation submitted by the petitioner or other interested party, as defined in paragraph (i)(3), (i)(4), (i)(5), or (i)(6) of section 355.2, later than: (i) In an investigation, 40 days prior to the scheduled date of the Secretary's preliminary determination.'' Petitioner first alleged that subsidies could have been provided to Thai Merry's unrelated assembly plants in its case briefs, 13 days prior to the final determination.

We further note that section 355.39 of the *Proposed Regulations* does not apply in this case. Section 355.39 provides that if ''the Secretary discovers a practice which appears to provide a subsidy with respect to the merchandise and the practice was not alleged or examined in the proceeding, the Secretary will examine the practice if the Secretary concludes that sufficient time remains before the scheduled date for the Secretary's final determination or final results of review.'' In the context of the companion AD investigation, the Department verified that Thai Merry subcontracts certain of its assembly operations. The Department then verified the location and function of these plants, and the fact that Thai Merry did not own these assembly plants. However, in the context of this proceeding, we did not discover ''a practice which appears to provide a subsidy.'' Therefore, the Department would not have been obligated to conduct an examination of the situation, even had there been ''sufficient time'' to do so.

We agree with respondents that it is inappropriate to apply BIA to Thai Merry based on an unsupported allegation that subsidies may have been granted to the assembly plants owned by its unrelated subcontractor(s). Petitioner has not made a sufficiently

detailed allegation either that the assembly plants received countervailable benefits, or how such countervailable benefits might be accruing to Thai Merry through either of these plants.

Petitioner has acknowledged that these assembly plants are not owned by Thai Merry. Petitioner has provided no argument as to why the Department should countervail alleged subsidies provided to an unrelated subcontractor of a company under investigation. Therefore, we conclude that Thai Merry did not benefit from this program.

Verification

In accordance with section 776(b) of the Act, we verified the information used in making our final determination. We followed standard verification procedures, including meeting with government and company officials, examination of relevant accounting records and examination of original source documents. Our verification results are outlined in detail in the public versions of the verification reports, which are on file in the Central Records Unit (Room B–099 of the Main Commerce Building).

ITC Notification

In accordance with section 705(d) of the Act, we will notify the ITC of our determination. Since we have determined that no bounties or grants are being provided to manufacturers, producers or exporters of disposable pocket lighters in Thailand, the investigation will be terminated upon publication of this notice in the **Federal Register**. Hence, the ITC is not required to make a final injury determination with respect to this countervailing duty proceeding.

Return of Destruction of Proprietary Information

This notice serves as the only reminder to parties subject to Administrative Protective Order (APO) of their responsibility concerning the return or destruction of proprietary information disclosed under APO in accordance with 19 CFR 355.34(d). Failure to comply is a violation of the APO.

This determination is published pursuant to section 705(d) of the Act and 19 CFR 355.20(a)(4).

Dated: March 8, 1995.

Susan G. Esserman,

Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.

[FR Doc. 95–6400 Filed 3–14–95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–DS–P

National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration

[Docket No. 95–0222054–5054–01; I.D. 021495A]

RIN 0648–ZA15

Financial Assistance for Chesapeake Bay Stock Assessments to Encourage Research Projects for Improvement in the Stock Conditions of the Chesapeake Bay Fisheries

AGENCY: National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS), National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA), Commerce.

ACTION: Notice of availability of funds.

SUMMARY: A total of $540,000 in Fiscal Year (FY) 1995 funds is available through the NOAA/NMFS Chesapeake Bay Office to assist interested state fishery agencies, academic institutions, and other nonprofit organizations relating to cooperative research units, in carrying out research projects to provide information for Chesapeake Bay Stock Assessments through cooperative agreements. About $180,000 of the base amount is available to initiate new projects in FY 1995, as described in this announcement. NMFS issues this notice describing the conditions under which eligible applications will be accepted and how NMFS will determine which applications will be selected for funding.

DATES: Applications for funding under this program will be accepted until May 1, 1995, 6 p.m. eastern standard time. Applications received after that time will not be considered for funding. No applications will be accepted by facsimile machine submission.

Successful applicants generally will be selected approximately 90 days from the date of publication in the **Federal Register** of this notice. The earliest date for awards will be approximately 180 days after the date of publication in the **Federal Register** of this notice.

ADDRESSES: Send applications to: M. Elizabeth Gillelan, Division Chief, NOAA Chesapeake Bay Office, NMFS, 410 Severn Avenue, Suite 107A, Annapolis, MD 21403.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: M. Elizabeth Gillelan, 410/267–5660.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

I. Introduction

A. *Authority*. The Fish and Wildlife Act of 1956, as amended, at 16 U.S.C. 753 (a), authorizes the Secretary of Commerce (Secretary), for the purpose of developing adequate, coordinated, cooperative research and training programs for fish and wildlife resources, to continue to enter into cooperative agreements with colleges and universities, with game and fish departments of the several states, and with nonprofit organizations relating to cooperative research units. The Departments of Commerce (DOC), Justice, State, the Judiciary, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act of 1995 makes funds available to the Secretary.

B. *Catalog of Federal assistance*. The research to be funded is in support of the Chesapeake Bay Studies (CFDA 11.457), under the Chesapeake Bay Stock Assessment Committee (CBSAC).

C. *Program description*. The CBSAC was established in 1985 to plan and review Bay-wide resource assessments, coordinate relevant actions of state and Federal agencies, report on fisheries status and trends, and determine, fund and review research projects. The program implements a Bay-wide plan for the assessment of commercially, recreationally, and selected ecologically important species in the Chesapeake Bay. In 1988, CBSAC developed a Bay-wide Stock Assessment Plan, in response to provisions in the Chesapeake Bay Agreement of 1987. The plan identified that key obstacles to assessing Bay stocks were the lack of consistent, Bay-wide, fishery-dependent and fishery-independent data. Research projects funded since 1988 have focused on developing and improving fishery-independent surveys and catch statistics for key Bay species, such as striped bass, oysters, blue crabs, and alosids. Stock assessment research is essential, given the recent declines in harvest and apparent stock condition for many of the important species of the Chesapeake Bay.

II. Areas of Special Emphasis

A. Proposals should exhibit familiarity with related work that is completed or ongoing. Where appropriate, proposals should be multidisciplinary. Coordinated efforts involving multiple eligible applicants or persons are encouraged. Eligible women and minority owned and operated non-profit organizations are encouraged to apply.

Consideration for funding will be given to applications that address the following stock assessment research and management priorities for the Chesapeake Bay. These are listed in priority order:

1. Design and development of a Bay-wide recreational survey for blue crabs. This study should provide not only estimates of blue crab harvest by category (eg., hard, soft, peeler) and associated effort, but also biological

sample data on size or age distribution of the recreational harvest. This could be designed as a stand-alone survey, or as a supplement to the NMFS Marine Recreational Fisheries Statistics Survey (MRFSS).

A major impediment to understanding the status of the fishery resources in the Chesapeake Bay is the lack of knowledge of the total removals, by fishing, of important fish and shellfish species. While estimates of commercial catches from both Maryland and Virginia are available based on state reporting requirements, estimates of recreational blue crab harvest are not available for most years. A main concern to be addressed in the design of this survey is the difficulty in obtaining estimates of recreational blue crab catches since much of the harvest is landed at private, rather than public, docks and ramps.

The recreational survey design should be consistent with the model of the NMFS MRFSS, with its two principal design components. First, a telephone survey instrument used to enumerate total period and seasonal directed fishing effort by mode. Secondly, an access intercept survey component to estimate period/seasonal mean catch-rate by mode and category, and the collection of biological characterization data.

Proposals for this priority must address the following aspects of the survey design.

a. *Identification of the access-intercept sampling frame,* including:

(1) List of all access sites.

(2) Detailed model for scheduling the temporal and geographic distribution of field interviews within the sampling frame, and the routing scheme among access sites.

(3) Description of information to be obtained from interviews, specifically the interview survey questionnaire.

(4) Description of the nature and manner of collection of biological samples which will minimally include size, sex, and category by mode.

b. *Identification of the telephone survey sampling frame,* including:

(1) Specifications of who is included in the sampling frame and how this was determined.

(2) Complete description of the temporal distribution of telephone calls and associated sample size requirements.

(3) Specification of the interview survey questionnaire.

c. *Completion of a pilot study,* which will successfully demonstrate the effectiveness of the above two survey components for the estimation and characterization of blue crab recreational harvest. The pilot study should minimally address the following:

(1) Comparisons of catch rates among the various fishing modes, methods, and times, etc. which will serve as the basis for determining the proportional sampling needed to provide unbiased estimates.

(2) Identification and resolution of any deficiencies in the sampling frame.

(3) Final estimates of the pilot study period recreational harvest by category, mode (with associated effort) and measures of percent standard error about the point estimates.

Copies of a report of a workshop which discussed concerns specific to the design of a recreational blue crab survey may be obtained from the NOAA Chesapeake Bay Office.

2. Design and conduct a study to determine the discard mortality and discard size frequencies in the commercial and recreational fisheries in Chesapeake Bay. This study should provide information on the reason for discard (e.g., minimum size regulation, lack of market, etc.), the length distribution of discards, and discard mortality rates, primarily for summer flounder and bluefish, as well as other important Bay species. This is to be a onetime study, not a design effort for future implementation.

Discard information is limited and current assessments are forced to use analogous information from other species and limited areas. Data from this study would be a valuable improvement in coastwide assessments.

3. Design of a cost-effective American shad mark-and-recapture (tagging) study which would provide abundance and mortality estimates for Chesapeake Bay stocks. There is currently a Bay-wide moratorium on the harvest of American shad, yet coastal intercept fisheries continue to harvest this species. This study should be designed to identify which fisheries harvest Bay stocks, and provide estimates of the abundance and mortality rates for those stocks.

B. Applications addressing the priorities should build upon, or take into account, any related past or current work.

III. How to Apply

A. *Eligible Applicants.* Applications for cooperative agreements under the Chesapeake Bay Studies Program may be submitted, in accordance with the procedures set forth in this notice, by any state game and fish department, college or university, or other nonprofit organizations relating to cooperative research units. Other Federal agencies or institutions are not eligible to receive Federal assistance under this notice.

DOC/NOAA/NMFS employees, including full-time, part-time, and intermittent personnel (or their spouses or blood relatives who are members of their immediate households) are not eligible to submit an application under this solicitation or aid in the preparation of an application, except to provide information on program goals, funding priorities, application procedures, and completion of application forms. Since this is a competitive program, assistance will not be provided in conceptualizing, developing, or structuring proposals.

Eligible applicants outside the Chesapeake Bay region may submit proposals, as long as their objectives support the technical and management priorities of the Chesapeake Bay, as defined in section II.A. above. All solicited proposals received by the closing date will be considered by NMFS.

B. *Duration and terms of funding.* Under this solicitation, NMFS will fund Chesapeake Bay Stock Assessment Research Projects for 1 year cooperative agreements. The cooperative agreement has been determined as the appropriate funding instrument because of the substantial involvement of NMFS in:

1. Developing program research priorities;

2. Evaluating the performance of the program for effectiveness in meeting regional goals for Chesapeake Bay stock assessments;

3. Monitoring the progress of each funded project;

4. Holding periodic workshops with investigators; and

5. Working with recipients in preparation of annual reports summarizing current accomplishments of the Chesapeake Bay Stock Assessment Committee. Project dates should be scheduled to begin no later than 1 October 1995. Cooperative agreements are approved on an annual basis but may be considered eligible for continuation beyond the first project and budget period subject to the approved scope of work, satisfactory progress, and availability of funds at the total discretion of NMFS. However, there are no assurances for such continuation. Publication of this notice does not obligate NMFS to award any specific cooperative agreement or to obligate any part of the entire amount of funds available.

C. *Cost Sharing.* Applications must reflect the total budget necessary to accomplish the project, including contributions and/or donations. Cost sharing is not required under the Chesapeake Bay Stock Assessment Research Program. However, cost sharing is encouraged to enhance the

value of a project, and in case of a tie in considering proposals for funding, cost sharing may affect the final decision. The appropriateness of all cost sharing will be determined on the basis of guidance provided in applicable Federal cost principles. If an applicant chooses to share costs, and if that application is selected for funding, the applicant will be bound by the percentage of cost sharing reflected in the award documents.

The non-Federal share may include funds received from private sources or from state or local governments or the value of in-kind contributions. Federal funds may not be used to meet the non-Federal share of matching funds, except as provided by Federal statute. In-kind contributions are noncash contributions provided by the applicant or non-Federal third parties. In-kind contributions may be in the form of, but are not limited to, personal services rendered in carrying out functions related to the project, and permission to use real or personal property owned by others (for which consideration is not required) in carrying out the project. To support the budget, the applicant must describe briefly the basis for estimating the value of the non-Federal funds derived from in-kind contributions.

The total cost of a project begins on the effective date of a cooperative agreement between the applicant and an authorized representative of the U.S. Government and ends on the date specified in the award. Accordingly, the time expended and costs incurred in either the development of a project or the financial assistance application, or in any subsequent discussions or negotiations prior to the award, are neither reimbursable nor recognizable as part of the recipient's cost share.

D. *Format*. 1. Applications for project funding must be complete. Applicants must identify the specific research priority or priorities to which they are responding. For applications containing more than one project, each project component must be identified individually using the format specified in this section. If an application is not in response to a priority, it should be so stated. Applicants should not assume prior knowledge on the part of NMFS as to the relative merits of the project described in the application. Applications are not to be bound in any manner and should be one-sided. All incomplete applications will be returned to the applicant. Applicants must submit one signed original and two copies of the complete application.

2. Applications must be submitted in the following format:

a. *Cover sheet*: An applicant must use OMB Standard Form 424 (revised 4–92) as the cover sheet for each project. Applicants may obtain copies of these forms from the NOAA Grants Management Division or the NOAA Chesapeake Bay Office (see **ADDRESSES**).

b. *Project summary*: Each proposal must contain a summary of not more than one page that provides the following:

(1) Project title.

(2) Project status (new).

(3) Project duration (beginning and ending dates).

(4) Name, address, and telephone number of applicant.

(5) Principal Investigator(s).

(6) Project objectives.

(7) Summary of work to be performed.

(8) Total Federal funds requested.

(9) Cost sharing to be provided from non-Federal sources, if any. Specify whether contributions are project-related cash or in-kind.

(10) Total project cost.

c. *Project description*: Each project must be completely and accurately described. Each project description may be up to 15 pages in length. If an application is awarded, NMFS will make all portions of the project description available to the public for review; therefore, NMFS cannot guarantee the confidentiality of any information submitted as part of any project, nor will NMFS accept for consideration any project requesting confidentiality of any part of the project.

Each project must be described as follows:

(1) *Identification of problem(s)*: Describe the specific problem to be addressed and the area of emphasis to which the project responds (see section II above).

(2) *Project objectives*: This is one of the most important parts of the Project Proposal. Use the following guidelines for stating the objective of the project.

(a) Keep it simple and easily understandable.

(b) Be as specific and quantitative as possible.

(c) Specify the ''what and when;'' avoid the ''how and why.''

(d) Keep it attainable within the time, money, and human resources available.

(e) Use action verbs that are accomplishment oriented.

(3) *Need for Government financial assistance*: Demonstrate the need for assistance. Any appropriate database to substantiate or reinforce the need for the project should be included. Explain why other funding sources cannot fund all the proposed work. List all other sources of funding that are or have been sought for the project.

(4) *Benefits or results expected*: Identify and document the results or benefits to be derived from the proposed activities.

(5) *Project statement of work*: The Statement of Work is the scientific or technical action plan of activities that are to be accomplished during each budget period of the project. This description must include the specific methodologies, by project job activity, proposed for accomplishing the proposal's objective(s). If the work described in this section does not contain sufficient detail to allow for proper technical evaluation, NMFS will not consider the application for funding and will return it to the applicant.

Investigators submitting proposals in response to this announcement are strongly encouraged to develop inter-institutional, inter-disciplinary research teams in the form of single, integrated proposals or as individual proposals that are clearly linked together. Such collaborative efforts will be factored into the final funding decision.

Each Statement of Work must include the following information:

(a) The applicant's name.

(b) The inclusive dates of the budget period covered under the Statement of Work.

(c) The title of the proposal.

(d) The scientific or technical objectives and procedures that are to be accomplished during the budget period. Devise a detailed set of objectives and procedures to answer who, what, how, when, and where. The procedures must be of sufficient detail to enable competent workers to be able to follow them and to complete scheduled activities.

(e) Location of the work.

(f) A list of all project personnel and their responsibilities.

(g) A milestone table that summarizes the procedures (from item III.D.2.c.(5)(d)) that are to be attained in each month covered by the Statement of Work.

(6) *Participation by persons or groups other than the applicant*: Describe the level of participation required in the project(s) by NOAA or other government and non-government entities. Specific NOAA employees should not be named in the initial proposal.

(7) *Federal, state and local government activities*: List any programs (Federal, state, or local government or activities, including Sea Grant, state Coastal Zone Management Programs, NOAA Oyster Disease Research Program, the state/Federal Chesapeake Bay Program, etc.) this project would affect and describe the relationship

between the project and those plans or activities.

(8) *Project management*: Describe how the project will be organized and managed. Include resumes of principal investigators. List all persons directly employed by the applicant who will be involved with the project. If a consultant and/or subcontractor is selected prior to application submission, include the name and qualifications of the consultant and/or subcontractor and the process used for selection.

(9) *Monitoring of project performance*: Identify who will participate in monitoring the project.

(10) *Project impacts*: Describe the impact of the project in terms of anticipated increased production, sales, product quality and safety, improved management, or any other values that will be produced by this project. Describe how these products or services will be made available to the fisheries and management communities.

(11) *Evaluation of project*: The applicant is required to provide an evaluation of project accomplishments at the end of each budget period and in the final report. The application must describe the methodology or procedures to be followed to determine technical feasibility, or to quantify the results of the project in promoting increased production, product quality and safety, management effectiveness, or other measurable factors.

(12) *Total project costs*: Total project cost is the amount of funds required to accomplish what is proposed in the Statement of Work, and includes contributions and donations. All costs must be shown in a detailed budget. A standard budget form (SF–424A) is available from the offices listed (see **ADDRESSES**). NMFS will not consider fees or profits as allowable costs for grantees. Additional cost detail may be required prior to a final analysis of overall cost allowability, allocability, and reasonableness. The date, period covered, and findings for the most recent financial audit performed, as well as the name of the audit firm, the contact person, and phone number and address, must be also provided.

d. *Supporting documentation*: Provide any required documents and any additional information necessary or useful to the description of the project. The amount of information will depend on the type of project proposed, but should be no more than 20 pages. The applicant should present any information that would emphasize the value of the project in terms of the significance of the problems addressed. Without such information, the merits of the project may not be fully understood, or the value of the project may be underestimated. The absence of adequate supporting documentation may cause reviewers to question assertions made in describing the project and may result in lower ranking of the project. Information presented in this section should be clearly referenced in the project description.

IV. Evaluation Criteria and Selection Procedures

A. *Initial evaluation of applications*. Applications will be reviewed by NOAA to assure that they meet all requirements of this announcement, including eligibility and relevance to the Chesapeake Bay Stock Assessment Research Program.

B. *Consultation with experts in the field of stock assessment research*. For applications meeting the requirements of this solicitation, NMFS will conduct a technical evaluation of each project prior to any other review. This review normally will involve experts from non-NOAA as well as NOAA organizations. All comments submitted to NMFS will be taken into consideration in the technical evaluation of projects. Technical evaluators will submit independent reviews to NMFS. Reviewers will be asked to comment on the following evaluation criteria:

1. Problem description and conceptual approach for resolution, especially the applicant's comprehension of the problem(s), familiarity with related work that is completed or ongoing, and the overall concept proposed to resolve the problem(s) (30 points).

2. Soundness of project design/technical approach, especially whether the applicant provided sufficient information to technically evaluate the project and, if so, the strengths and weaknesses of the technical design proposed for problem resolution (35 points).

3. Project management and experience and qualifications of personnel, including organization and management of the project, and the personnel experience and qualifications (15 points).

4. Justification and allocation of the budget in terms of the work to be performed (20 points).

C. *Review Panel*. NMFS will convene a review panel consisting of at least three regionally recognized experts in the scientific and management aspects of stock assessment research who will conduct reviews as follows:

1. Evaluate technical reviews.

2. Provide independent review based on the same criteria as the technical review.

3. Discuss all review comments as a panel.

4. Provide individual panelist scores and suggestions for modifications (i.e., budget, personnel, technical approach, etc.).

D. *Funding decision*. 1. Applications will be ranked by NMFS into two groups: (a) Recommended, and (b) not recommended. As previously stated (section III A.1.), collaborative proposals and applications which propose a cost share are strongly encouraged, and therefore will be given added weight in the selection process. Numeric ranking will be the major consideration for deciding which of the ''recommended'' proposals will be selected for funding.

2. After projects have been ranked for funding, the Chief of the NOAA/NMFS Chesapeake Bay Office, in consultation with the Assistant Administrator for Fisheries, NOAA, will determine the projects to be recommended for funding based upon the technical evaluations, panel review, and the evaluation factors; ascertain which projects do not substantially duplicate other projects that are currently funded by NOAA or are approved for funding by other Federal offices; and, determine the amount of funds available for the program. The exact amount of funds awarded to each project will be determined in preaward negotiations between the applicant, the Grants Office, and the NOAA/NMFS Chesapeake Bay Office staff.

V. Administrative Requirements

A. *Obligations of the applicant*. 1. *Deliverables*—In addition to quarterly status and budget reports, and at the time of submission of the final report of results of funded projects, recipients must submit a four-to-five page summary of project work and results that will be compiled in a report of Chesapeake Bay Stock Assessment Research Program results. Projects that produce non-experimental data must have copies of these data transferred to the NOAA/NMFS Chesapeake Bay Office in both compiled, hard copy format, and as a verified, electronic data file. Full, clearly stated documentation of the contents of such data files must be submitted with these data.

2. *Periodic workshops*—Investigators will be expected to attend one or two workshops with other Stock Assessment Research Program researchers to encourage interdisciplinary dialogue and forge synthesis of results.

3. *Primary applicant certifications*—All primary applicants must submit a

completed Form CD–511, ''Certifications Regarding Debarment, Suspension and Other Responsibility Matters; Drug-Free Workplace Requirements and Lobbying,'' and the following explanations are hereby provided:

a. *Nonprocurement debarment and suspension*—Prospective participants (as defined at 15 CFR 26.105) are subject to 15 CFR part 26, ''Nonprocurement Debarment and Suspension,'' and the related section of the certification form prescribed above applies;

b. *Drug-free workplace*—Grantees (as defined at 15 CFR 26.605) are subject to 15 CFR part 26, subpart F, ''Governmentwide Requirements for Drug-Free Workplace (Grants),'' and the related section of the certification form prescribed above applies;

c. *Anti-lobbying*—Persons (as defined at 15 CFR 28.105) are subject to the lobbying provisions of 31 U.S.C. 1352, ''Limitation on use of appropriated funds to influence certain Federal contracting and financial transactions,'' and the lobbying section of the certification form prescribed above applies to applications/bids for grants, cooperative agreements, and contracts for more than $100,000, and loans and loan guarantees for more than $150,000, or the single family maximum mortgage limit for affected programs, whichever is greater; and

d. *Anti-lobbying disclosure*—Any applicant who has paid or will pay for lobbying using any funds must submit an SF-LLL, ''Disclosure of Lobbying Activities,'' as required under 15 CFR part 28, appendix B.

4. *Lower tier certifications*—Recipients shall require applicants/bidders for subgrants, contracts, subcontracts, or other lower tier covered transactions at any tier under the award to submit, if applicable, a completed Form CD–512, ''Certifications Regarding Debarment, Suspension, Ineligibility and Voluntary Exclusion-Lower Tier Covered Transactions and Lobbying'' and disclosure form SF-LLL, ''Disclosure of Lobbying Activities.'' Form CD–512 is intended for the use of recipients and should not be transmitted to DOC. SF-LLL submitted by any tier recipient or subrecipient should be submitted to DOC in accordance with the instructions contained in the award document.

B. *Other requirements.* 1. *Federal policies and procedures*—Recipients and subrecipients are subject to all Federal laws and Federal and DOC policies, regulations, and procedures applicable to Federal financial assistance awards.

2. *Indirect cost rates*—The total dollar amount of the indirect costs proposed in an application under this program must not exceed the current indirect cost rate negotiated and approved by a cognizant Federal agency. NOAA's acceptance of negotiated rates is subject to total indirect costs not to exceed 100% of total direct costs. This language is pursuant to the NOAA Grants and Cooperative Agreements Policy Manual, Chapter 3(B)(2).

3. *Past performance*—Unsatisfactory performance under prior Federal awards may result in an application not being considered for funding. In addition, any recipient and/or researcher who is past due for submitting acceptable progress reports on any previous project funded under this program may be ineligible to be considered for new awards until the delinquent reports are received, reviewed and deemed acceptable by NMFS.

4. *Financial management certifications/preaward accounting survey*—Successful applicants, at the discretion of the NOAA Grants Officer, may be required to have their financial management systems certified by an independent public accountant as being in compliance with Federal standards specified in the applicable OMB Circulars prior to execution of the award. Any first-time applicant for Federal grant funds may be subject to a preaward accounting survey by the DOC prior to execution of the award.

5. *Delinquent Federal debts*—No award of Federal funds shall be made to an applicant who has an outstanding delinquent Federal debt until either:

a. The delinquent account is paid in full;

b. A negotiated repayment schedule is established and at least one payment is received; or

c. Other arrangements satisfactory to DOC are made.

6. *Name checks*—Potential recipients may be required to submit an ''Identification-Application for Funding Assistance'' (Form CD–346), which is used to ascertain background information on key individuals associated with the potential recipient. All non-profit and for-profit applicants are subject to a name check review process. Name checks are intended to reveal if any key individuals associated with the applicant have been convicted of or are presently facing, criminal charges such as fraud, theft, perjury, or other matters that significantly reflect on the applicant's management honesty or financial integrity. Applicants will also be subject to credit check reviews.

7. *False statements*—A false statement on the application is grounds for denial or termination of funds and grounds for possible punishment by a fine or imprisonment as provided in 18 U.S.C. 1001.

8. *Preaward activities*—If applicants incur any costs prior to an award being made, they do so solely at their own risk of not being reimbursed by the Government. Notwithstanding any verbal or written assurance that may have been received, there is no obligation on the part of DOC to cover preaward costs.

9. *Purchase of American-made equipment and products*—Applicants are hereby notified that they will be encouraged, to the greatest extent practicable, to purchase American-made equipment and products with funding provided under this program in accordance with Congressional intent as set forth in the resolution contained in Public Law 103–317, sections 607(a) and (b).

10. *Other*—If an application is selected for funding, DOC has no obligation to provide any additional funding in connection with that award. Renewal of an award to increase funding or extend the period of performance is at the total discretion of DOC.

Cooperative agreements awarded pursuant to pertinent statutes shall be in accordance with the Fisheries Research Plan (comprehensive program of fisheries research) in effect on the date of the award.

Classification

This action has been determined to be not significant for purposes of E.O. 12866.

Applications under this program are subject to Executive Order 12372, ''Intergovernmental Review of Federal Programs.''

Prior notice and an opportunity for public comment are not required by the Administrative Procedure Act or any other law for this notice concerning grants, benefits, and contracts. Therefore, a regulatory flexibility analysis is not required for purposes of the Regulatory Flexibility Act.

This notice contains collections of information subject to the Paperwork Reduction Act, which have been approved by OMB under OMB control numbers 0348–0043, 0348–0044, and 0605–0001.

Dated: March 7, 1995.

Gary Matlock,

Program Management Officer, National Marine Fisheries Service.

[FR Doc. 95–6312 Filed 3–14–95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–22–F

[I.D. 030795C]

South Atlantic Fishery Management Council; Public Meeting

AGENCY: National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS), National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA), Commerce.

ACTION: Notice of public meeting.

SUMMARY: The South Atlantic Council's (Council) Ad Hoc Rock Shrimp Advisory Panel (Panel) will meet on March 30, 1995, at the Town and Country Inn, 2008 Savannah Highway, Charleston, SC; telephone: (803) 571–1000.

The Panel will discuss options for Amendment 1 to the Shrimp Fishery Management Plan that will protect bottom habitat while allowing the rock shrimp industry to operate. The Panel also will discuss options for permits and mandatory reporting requirements in the fishery, as well as the information provided by industry on harvest areas and landings of rock shrimp in the South Atlantic region.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: South Atlantic Fishery Management Council, One Southpark Circle, Suite 306, Charleston, SC 29407–4699; telephone: (803) 571–4366.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: This meeting is physically accessible to people with disabilities. Requests for sign language interpretation or other auxiliary aids should be directed to the Council office at the above address by March 23, 1995.

Dated: March 9, 1995.

David S. Crestin,

Acting Director, Office of Fisheries Conservation and Management, National Marine Fisheries Service.

[FR Doc. 95–6315 Filed 3–14–95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–22–F

[I.D. 030795D]

Caribbean Fishery Management Council; Public Meetings

AGENCY: National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS), National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA), Commerce.

ACTION: Notice of public meetings.

SUMMARY: The Caribbean Fishery Management Council (Council) and its Administrative Committee will hold separate meetings. The Council will hold its 83rd regular public meeting to discuss the Draft Queen Conch Fishery Management Plan, among other topics.

The Council will convene on March 29, 1995, from 9:00 a.m. until 5:00 p.m. and on March 30, from 9:00 a.m. until approximately 12:00 noon.

The Administrative Committee will meet on March 28, from 10:00 a.m. until 12:00 noon, to discuss administrative matters regarding Council operation and in closed session to discuss personnel matters at the Council office, from 2:00 p.m. until 5:00 p.m.

Except as noted, both meetings will be held at the Conference Room of the Travelodge Hotel, in Isla Verda, PR.

Except for the closed session above, all other meetings are open to the public, and will be conducted in English. However, simultaneous translation (Spanish-English) will be available during the Council meeting (March 29 and 30). Fishers and other interested persons are invited to attend and participate with oral or written statements regarding agenda issues.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Caribbean Fishery Management Council, 268 Muñoz Rivera Avenue, Suite 1108, San Juan, PR 00918–2577; telephone: (809) 766–5926.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: These meetings are physically accessible to people with disabilities. For more information or requests for sign language interpretation and/or other auxiliary aids please contact Mr. Miguel A. Rolón, Executive Director, Caribbean Fishery Management Council, at the above address and telephone number, at least 5 days prior to the meeting date.

Dated: March 9, 1995.

David S. Crestin,

Acting Director, Office of Fisheries Conservation and Management, National Marine Fisheries Service.

[FR Doc. 95–6314 Filed 3–14–95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–22–F

[I.D. 030795E]

Caribbean Fishery Management Council; Meeting

AGENCY: National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS), National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA), Commerce.

ACTION: Notice of public meetings.

SUMMARY: The Scientific and Statistical Committee (SSC) and the Advisory Panel (AP) of the Caribbean Fishery Management Council (Council) will hold separate meetings to discuss the Draft Queen Conch Fishery Management Plan.

The SSC will meet on March 21, 1995, at the Travelodge Hotel, San Juan, Puerto Rico. The AP will meet on March 27, at the same location. Both meetings will begin at 10:00 a.m. and adjourn at 4:00 p.m.

The meetings are open to the public, and will be conducted in the English language. However, simultaneous translation (English/Spanish) will be available at the AP meeting.

Fishers and other interested persons are invited to attend. Members of the public will be allowed to submit oral or written statements regarding agenda issues.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Caribbean Fishery Management Council, 268 Muñoz Rivera Avenue, Suite 1108, San Juan, Puerto Rico 00918–2577; telephone: (809) 766–5926.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: These meetings are physically accessible to people with disabilities. For more information or requests for sign language interpretation and/or other auxiliary aids please contact Mr. Miguel A. Rolón, Executive Director, Caribbean Fishery Management Council, at the above address and telephone number, at least 5 days prior to the meeting date.

Dated: March 9, 1995.

David S. Crestin,

Acting Director, Office of Fisheries Conservation and Management, National Marine Fisheries Service.

[FR Doc. 95–6313 Filed 3–14–95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–22–F

COMMISSION ON CIVIL RIGHTS

Notice of Public Meeting Cancellation of the California Advisory Committee

Notice is hereby given, pursuant to the provisions of the rules and regulations of the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, that a meeting of the California Advisory Committee to the Commission which was to have convened on Friday, March 17, 1995, at 10:00 a.m. and adjourned at 5:00 p.m., at the Holiday Inn-Marine World, 1000 Fairgrounds Drive, Vallejo, California 94589, has been canceled.

The original notice for the March 17, 1995, meeting was announced in the **Federal Register** on February 24, 1995, FR Doc. 95–4528, 60 FR–10350, No. 37.

Persons desiring additional information should contact Philip Montez, Director of the Western Regional Office, 213–894–3437 (TTD 213–894–0508).

Dated at Washington, DC, March 10, 1995.

Carol-Lee Hurley,

Chief, Regional Programs Coordination Unit.

[FR Doc. 95–6476 Filed 3–14–95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6335–01–P

Agenda and Notice of Public Meeting of the Nevada Advisory Committee

Notice is hereby given, pursuant to the provisions of the rules and regulations of the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, that a meeting of the Nevada Advisory Committee to the Commission will convene on 9:30 a.m. to 12:00 p.m. on Friday, April 7, 1995, at the Offices of Walther, Key, Maupin, et al, 3500 Lakeside Drive, 2nd Floor, Reno, Nevada 89509. The purpose of the meeting is to review current civil rights developments in the State and plan future program activities.

Persons desiring additional information, or planning a presentation to the Committee, should contact Committee Chairperson Margo Piscevich, or Philip Montez, Director of the Western Regional Office, 213–894–3437 (TDD 213–894–0508). Hearing-impaired persons who will attend the meeting and require the services of a sign language interpreter should contact the Regional Office at least five (5) working days before the scheduled date of the meeting.

The meeting will be conducted pursuant to the provisions of the rules and regulations of the Commission.

Dated at Washington, DC, March 3, 1995.

Carol-Lee Hurley,

Chief, Regional Programs Coordination Unit.

[FR Doc. 95–6290 Filed 3–14–95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6335–01–P

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

Department of the Air Force

USAF Scientific Advisory Board Meeting

The USAF Scientific Advisory Board's Science & Technology Review of Advanced Weapons will meet on 3–7 April 1995 at Kirtland AFB, NM from 8:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m.

The purpose of the meeting is to fulfill the yearly SAB Science and Technology Review in the area of Advanced Weapons.

The meeting will be closed to the public in accordance with Section 552b of Title 5, United States Code, specifically subparagraphs (1) and (4) thereof.

For further information, contact the Scientific Advisory Board Secretariat at (703) 697–8845.

Patsy J. Conner,

Air Force **Federal Register** Liaison Officer.

[FR Doc. 95–6281 Filed 3–14–95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3910–01–P

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

Office of Arms Control and Nonproliferation; Proposed Subsequent Arrangement

Pursuant to Section 131 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended (42 U.S.C. 2160), notice is hereby given of a proposed ''subsequent arrangement'' under the Additional Agreement for Cooperation between the Government of the United States of America and the European Atomic Energy Community (EURATOM) Concerning Peaceful Uses of Atomic Energy, as amended, and the Agreement for Cooperation between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of Switzerland Concerning Civil Uses of Atomic Energy, as amended.

The subsequent arrangement would give approval, which must be obtained under the above-mentioned agreements, for the following transfer of special nuclear materials of United States origin, or of special nuclear materials produced through the use of materials of United States origin, as follows: Switzerland to the United Kingdom for the purpose of reprocessing 112 irradiated fuel assemblies containing approximately 20,000 kilograms of uranium and containing 165 kilograms of the isotope uranium-235 (enriched to approximately 0.83%) and 185 kilograms of plutonium from the Muhleberg nuclear power station. This subsequent arrangement is designated as RTD/EU(SD)–81.

The United States has received assurance from the Government of Switzerland that the recovered uranium and plutonium will be stored in the United Kingdom, and will not be transferred from the United Kingdom, nor put to any use, without the prior consent of the United States Government.

In accordance with Section 131 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, it has been determined that this subsequent arrangement will not be inimical to the common defense and security.

This subsequent arrangement will take effect no sooner than fifteen days after the date of publication of this notice and after fifteen days of continuous session of the Congress, beginning the day after the date on which the reports required by section 131(b)(1) of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended (42 U.S.C. 2160), are submitted to the Committee on International Relations of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate. The two time periods referred to above shall run concurrently.

Issued in Washington, D.C. on March 8, 1995.

Edward T. Fei,

Acting Director, International and Regional Security Division, ffice of Arms Control and Nonproliferation.

[FR Doc. 95–6385 Filed 3–14–95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6450–01–M

Office of Arms Control and Nonproliferation; Proposed Subsequent Arrangement

Pursuant to Section 131 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended (42 U.S.C. 2160), notice is hereby given of a proposed ''subsequent arrangement'' under the Additional Agreement for Cooperation between the Government of the United States of America and the European Atomic Energy Community (EURATOM) Concerning Peaceful Uses of Atomic Energy, as amended, and the Agreement for Cooperation between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of Switzerland Concerning Civil Uses of Atomic Energy, as amended.

The subsequent arrangement would give approval, which must be obtained under the above-mentioned agreements, for the following transfer of special nuclear materials of United States origin, or of special nuclear materials produced through the use of materials of United States origin, as follows: Switzerland to France for the purpose of reprocessing 14 irradiated fuel assemblies containing approximately 2,500 kilograms of uranium and containing 21 kilograms of the isotope uranium-235 (enriched to approximately 0.84%) and 23 kilograms of plutonium from the Muhleberg nuclear power station. This subsequent arrangement is designated as RTD/EU(SD)–82.

The United States has received assurance from the Government of Switzerland that the recovered uranium and plutonium will be stored in France, and will not be transferred from France, nor put to any use, without the prior consent of the United States Government.

In accordance with Section 131 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, it has been determined that this subsequent arrangement will not be inimical to the common defense and security.

This subsequent arrangement will take effect no sooner than fifteen days after the date of publication of this notice and after fifteen days of continuous session of the Congress,

beginning the day after the date on which the reports required by section 131(b)(1) of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended (42 U.S.C. 2160), are submitted to the Committee on International Relations of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate. The two time periods referred to above shall run concurrently.

Issued in Washington, D.C. on March 10, 1995.

Edward T. Fei,

Acting Director, International and Regional Security Division, Office of Arms Control and Nonproliferation.

[FR Doc. 95–6383 Filed 3–14–95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6450–01–M

Office of Arms Control and Nonproliferation; Proposed Subsequent Arrangement

Pursuant to Section 131 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended (42 U.S.C. 2160), notice is hereby given of a proposed ''subsequent arrangement'' under the Agreement for Cooperation between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of Switzerland concerning Civil Uses of Atomic Energy, as amended, and the Additional Agreement for Cooperation between the Government of the United States of America and the European Atomic Energy Community (EURATOM) concerning Peaceful Uses of Atomic Energy, as amended.

The subsequent arrangement to be carried out under the above-mentioned agreements involves approval for the transfer of 315 kilograms of fissile plutonium from the reprocessing site in France to either the Siemens facility in Hanau, the Federal Republic of Germany, the Compagnie Generale des Matieres Nucleaires (COGEMA) in France or the British Nuclear Fuels, plc in the United Kingdom. The plutonium will be used for fabrication of mixed plutonium-uranium oxide fuel for use in power reactors within the European Community.

In accordance with Section 131 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, it has been determined that this subsequent arrangement will not be inimical to the common defense and security.

This subsequent arrangement will take effect no sooner than fifteen days after the date of publication of this notice and after fifteen days of continuous session of the Congress, beginning the day after the date on which the reports required by section 131(b)(1) of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended (42 U.S.C. 2160), are submitted to the Committee on International Relations of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate. The two time periods referred to above may run concurrently.

Issued in Washington, D.C., on March 8, 1995.

Edward T. Fei,

Acting Director, Division of International and Regional Security, Office of Arms Control and Nonproliferation.

[FR Doc. 95–6384 Filed 3–14–95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6450–01–M

Environmental Management Site Specific Advisory Board, Idaho National Engineering Laboratory

AGENCY: Department of Energy.

ACTION: Notice of Open Meeting.

SUMMARY: Pursuant to the provisions of the Federal Advisory Committee Act (Public Law 92–463, 86 Stat. 770) notice is hereby given of the following Advisory Committee meeting: Environmental Management Site Specific Advisory Board (EM SSAB), Idaho National Engineering Laboratory.

DATES: Tuesday, March 21, 1995 from 8:00 a.m. Mountain Standard Time (MST) until 6:00 pm MST and Wednesday, March 22, 1995 from 8:00 a.m. MST until 5:00 p.m. MST. There will be a public comment availability session Tuesday, March 21, 1995 from 5:00 to 6:00 p.m. MST.

ADDRESSES: Shilo Inn, 780 Lindsay Blvd, Idaho Falls, ID 83402, (208)523–0088.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Idaho National Engineering Laboratory Information 1–800–708–2680 or Marsha Hardy, Jason Associates Corporation Staff Support 1–208–522–1662.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Purpose of the Committee

The Board will be developing a recommendation on the Idaho National Engineering Laboratory Future Land Use Plan, studying budget prioritization activities for the DOE-ID FY 1997 budget, and continue its study of risk management. The Board also intends to adopt revised operating procedures.

Tentative Agenda

March 21, 1995

7:30 a.m. *Sign-in and Registration*
8:00 a.m. *Miscellaneous Business:*
- Agenda Review/Revision/Acceptance

Old Business
- DDFO Report
- Chair Report

Member Reports
Standing Committee Reports
- Public Communications
- Member Selection

9:15 a.m. Break
9:30 a.m. Amendments to procedures—review, discussion, vote
11:00 a.m. *BWID Risk Management Film*
12:15 p.m. Lunch
1:15 p.m. *INEL Future Land Use:* committee presents proposed response to assumptions and conclusions of plan—discussion
3:15 p.m. Break
3:30 p.m. *INEL Future Land Use*—Consensus Building
5:00 p.m. Public Comment Availability
6:00 p.m. Adjourn

Wednesday, March 22, 1995

7:30 a.m. *Sign-In and Registration*
8:00 a.m. *Miscellaneous Business*
- Day Two Agenda review, revision, acceptance
- Old Business from Day 1

8:30 a.m. *Prioritization/Budget*—discuss and review committee work
10:30 a.m. Break
10:45 a.m. *Prioritization/Budget*
12:00 noon Lunch
1:15 p.m. *Board Work:* Spent Nuclear Fuel Committee Follow-up
3:15 p.m. Break
3:30 p.m. *Action plan*—Develop agenda for May meeting—priority setting DSTP Committee Follow-Up
5:00 p.m. Adjourn

A final agenda will be available at the meeting.

Public Comment Availability

The two-day meeting is open to the public, with a Public Comment Availability session scheduled for Tuesday, March 21, 1995 from 5:00 p.m. to 6:00 p.m. MST. The Board will be available during this time period to hear verbal public comments or to review any written public comments. If there are no members of the public wishing to comment or no written comments to review, the board will continue with it's current discussion. Written statements may be filed with the Committee either before or after the meeting. Individuals who wish to make oral statements pertaining to agenda items should contact the Idaho National Engineering Laboratory Information line or Marsha Hardy, Jason Associates, at the addresses or telephone numbers listed above. Requests must be received 5 days prior to the meeting and reasonable provision will be made to include the presentation in the agenda. The Designated Federal Official is empowered to conduct the meeting in a fashion that will facilitate the orderly conduct of business. Each individual

wishing to make public comment will be provided a maximum of 5 minutes to present their comments. This notice is being published less than 15 days before the date of the meeting, due to programmatic issues that had to be resolved prior to publication.

Minutes

The minutes of this meeting will be available for public review and copying at the Freedom of Information Public Reading Room, 1E–190, Forrestal Building, 1000 Independence Avenue, SW, Washington, DC 20585 between 9:00 a.m. and 4 p.m., Monday-Friday, except Federal holidays.

Issued at Washington, DC on March 9, 1995.

Rachel M. Samuel,

Acting Deputy, Advisory Committee Management Officer.

[FR Doc. 95–6382 Filed 3–14–95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6450–01–P

Federal Energy Regulatory Commission

[Docket No. ER93–879–000, et al.]

Cincinnati Gas & Electric Company, et al.; Electric Rate and Corporate Regulation Filings

March 8, 1995.

Take notice that the following filings have been made with the Commission:

1. Cincinnati Gas & Electric Company

[Docket No. ER93–879–000]

Take notice that the Cincinnati Gas & Electric Company (CG&E) on March 2, 1995 tendered for filing revised Service Schedules A through D to an Interchange Agreement with the Wabash Valley Power Authority.

The Interchange Agreement proposes interchange service schedules for emergency service, interchange power, short-term power, limited term power and transmission service. The Agreement is proposed to be made effective immediately. Copies of the revised Service Schedules were served upon the Public Utilities Commission of Ohio and the Wabash Valley Power Authority.

Comment date: March 22, 1995, in accordance with Standard Paragraph E at the end of this notice.

2. Cincinnati Gas & Electric Company

[Docket No. ER94–1579–000]

Take notice that the Cincinnati Gas & Electric Company (CG&E) on March 2, 1995, tendered for filing revised Service Schedules A through E to an Interchange Agreement with the City of Hamilton, Ohio.

The Interchange Agreement proposes interchange service schedules for emergency service, interchange power, short-term power, limited term power and transmission service. The service schedules have been modified to achieve consistency with Commission policy. The Agreement is proposed to be made effective March 1, 1994. Copies of the revised Service Schedules were served upon the Public Utilities Commission of Ohio and the City of Hamilton.

Comment date: March 22, 1995, in accordance with Standard Paragraph E at the end of this notice.

3. The Washington Water Power

[Docket No. ER95–397–000]

Take notice that on March 2, 1995 The Washington Water Power Company (WWP), tendered for filing with the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission an amendment to its Agreement for the sale of capacity and associated energy to Modesto Irrigation District (MID). WWP states the purpose of the amendment is to clarify the pricing of capacity and energy sold to MID.

Comment date: March 22, 1995, in accordance with Standard Paragraph E at the end of this notice.

4. Montaup Electric Company

[Docket No. ER95–449–000]

Take notice that on February 23, 1995, Montaup Electric Company tendered for filing a Notice of Withdrawal of its filing of January 17, 1995 in the above-referenced docket.

Comment date: March 22, 1995, in accordance with Standard Paragraph E at the end of this notice.

5. Southwestern Electric Power Company

[Docket No. ER95–660–000]

Take notice that on February 28, 1995, Southwestern Electric Power Company (SWEPCO) tendered for filing the Final return on common equity (Final ROE) to be used in redetermining or ''truing-up'' cost-of-service formula rates for wholesale service in 1994 to Northeast Texas Electric Cooperative, inc., the City of Bentonville, Arkansas, the City of Hope, Arkansas, the Oklahoma Municipal Power Authority, Rayburn Country Electric Cooperative, Inc., Cajun Electric Power Cooperative, inc. and TEX-LA Electric Cooperative of Texas, Inc., and East Texas Electric Cooperative, Inc. SWEPCO provides service to these Customers under contracts which provide for periodic changes in rates and charges determined in accordance with cost-of-service formulas, including a formulaic determination of the return on common equity.

Copies of the filing were served upon the affected wholesale Customers, the Public Utility Commission of Texas, the Oklahoma Corporation Commission, the Louisiana Public Service Commission and the Arkansas Public Service Commission.

Comment date: March 22, 1995, in accordance with Standard Paragraph E at the end of this notice.

6. Consolidated Edison Company of New York

[Docket No. ER95–661–000]

Take notice that on February 28, 1995, Consolidated Edison Company of New York, Inc. (Con Edison) tendered for filing an agreement with Enron Power Marketing, Inc. (Enron) to provide for the sale of energy and capacity. For energy sold by Con Edison the ceiling rate is 100 percent of the incremental energy cost plus up to 10 percent of the incremental energy cost plus up to 10 percent of the SIC (where such 10 percent is limited to 1 mill per KWhr when the SIC in the hour reflects a purchased power resource). The ceiling rate for capacity sold by Con Edison is $7.70 per megawatt hour. For energy and capacity sold by Enron the rates will be market based.

Con Edison states that a copy of this filing has been served by overnight delivery upon Enron.

Comment date: March 22, 1995, in accordance with Standard Paragraph E at the end of this notice.

7. Idaho Power Company

[Docket No. ER95–662–000]

Take notice that on February 28, 1995, Idaho Power Company (IPC) tendered for filing revisions to Idaho Power Company FERC Rate Schedule No. 77, Transmission Service Agreement between Idaho Power and Bonneville Power Administration (BPA). The revision of several exhibits was necessary to reflect the addition of certain transmission facilities necessary for providing service to BPA. Idaho Power requests an effective date of May 1, 1995 for said revisions.

Comment date: March 22, 1995, in accordance with Standard Paragraph E at the end of this notice.

8. Southern Company Services, Inc.

[Docket No. ER95–663–000]

Take notice that on March 1, 1995, Southern Company Services, Inc., as agent for Alabama Power Company, Georgia Power Company, Gulf Power

Company, Mississippi Power Company, and Savannah Electric and Power company (the ''Southern Companies'') tendered for filing amendments to various unit power sale and/or transmission service agreements between Southern Companies and various neighboring electric utilities. The purpose of the amendments is to ensure the required adoption of SFAS No. 109 will have no effect on billings under the agreements.

Comment date: March 22, 1995, in accordance with Standard Paragraph E at the end of this notice.

9. Gulf Power Company

[Docket No. ER95–665–000]

Take notice that on March 1, 1995, Gulf Power Company filed a letter agreement dated January 6, 1995 revising the contract executed by the United States of America, Department of Energy, acting by and through the Southeastern Power Administration and Gulf Power Company. The letter agreement extends the term of the existing Contract until the effective date of new arrangements or the filing of a notice of termination, whichever occurs first.

Comment date: March 22, 1995, in accordance with Standard Paragraph E at the end of this notice.

10. Southern California Edison Company

[Docket No. ER95–666–000]

Take notice that Southern California Edison Company on March 1, 1995, tendered for filing a Notice of Cancellation of FERC Rate Schedule Nos. 247.27, 248.27 and 249.27.

Comment date: March 22, 1995, in accordance with Standard Paragraph E at the end of this notice.

11. Tampa Electric Company

Docket No. ER95–667–000

Take notice that on March 1, 1995, Tampa Electric Company (Tampa Electric) tendered for filing an agreement to provide non-firm transmission service for Enron Power Marketing, Inc. (Enron).

Tampa Electric proposes that the agreement be made effective on the earlier of the date it is accepted for filing or April 30, 1995, and therefore requests waiver of the Commission's notice requirement.

Copies of the filing have been served on Enron and the Florida Public Service Commission.

Comment date: March 22, 1995, in accordance with Standard Paragraph E at the end of this notice.

12. Unitil Power Corporation

[Docket No. ER95–668–000]

Take notice that on March 1, 1995, Unitil Power Corporation tendered for filing a Notice of Cancellation of FERC Rate Schedule No. 2.

Comment date: March 22, 1995, in accordance with Standard Paragraph E at the end of this notice.

13. Exeter & Hampton Electric Company

[Docket No. ER95–669–000]

Take notice that on March 1, 1995, Exeter & Hampton Electric Company tendered for filing a Notice of Cancellation of FERC Rate Schedule No. 1.

Comment date: March 22, 1995, in accordance with Standard Paragraph E at the end of this notice.

Standard Paragaphs

E. Any person desiring to be heard or to protest said filing should file a motion to intervene or protest with the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, 825 North Capitol Street, N.E., Washington, D.C. 20426, in accordance with Rules 211 and 214 of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure (18 CFR 385.211 and 18 CFR 385.214). All such motions or protests should be filed on or before the comment date. Protests will be considered by the Commission in determining the appropriate action to be taken, but will not serve to make protestants parties to the proceeding. Any person wishing to become a party must file a motion to intervene. Copies of this filing are on file with the Commission and are available for public inspection.

Lois D. Cashell

Secretary.

[FR Doc. 95–6311 Filed 3–14–95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6717–01–P

[Project No. 11322–000 California]

Tuolumne Utilities District; Availability of Draft Environmental Assessment

March 9, 1995.

In accordance with the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 and the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission's (Commission) regulations, 18 CFR Part 380 (Order No. 486, 52 F.R. 47897), the Office of Hydropower Licensing has reviewed the application for a minor license for the Columbia Water Supply Hydroelectric Project, located near the town of Sonora, in Tuolumne County, California, and has prepared a Draft Environmental Assessment (DEA) for the project. In the DEA, the Commission's staff has analyzed the potential future environmental impacts of the project and has concluded that approval of the project, with appropriate environmental protection and enhancement measures, would not constitute a major federal action that would significantly affect quality of the human environment.

Copies of the DEA are available for review in the Public Reference Branch, Room 3104, of the Commission's offices at 941 North Capitol Street, N.E., Washington, D.C. 20426.

Any comments should be filed within 30 days from the date of this notice and should be addressed to Lois D. Cashell, Secretary, Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, 925 North Capitol Street, N.E., Washington, D.C. 20426. For further information, contact Michael Strzelecki, Environmental Coordinator, at (202) 219–2827.

Linwood A. Watson, Jr.,

Acting Secretary.

[FR Doc. 95–6305 Filed 3–14–95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6717–01–M

[Docket No. CP94–793–001, et al.]

Southern Natural Gas Company, et al.; Natural Gas Certificate Filings

March 8, 1995.

Take notice that the following filings have been made with the Commission:

1. Southern Natural Gas Company

[Docket No. CP94–793–001]

Take notice that on February 23, 1995, as amended on February 27, 1995, Southern Natural Gas Company (Southern), Post Office Box 2563, Birmingham, Alabama 35202–2563, filed in Docket No. CP94–793–001 an amendment to the request filed by Southern on September 22, 1994, in Docket No. CP94–793–000 pursuant to Sections 157.205 and 157.211 of the Commission's Regulations under the Natural Gas Act (18 CFR 157.205 and 157.211) for authorization to construct and operate a delivery point for service to International Paper under Southern's blanket certificate issued in Docket No. CP82–406–000. Southern hereby requests authorization to construct the delivery point facilities authorized under Southern's Part 157 Blanket Certificate in the above-referenced proceeding to serve Alabama Gas Corporation (Alagasco) instead of International Paper, all as more fully set forth in the request which is on file with the Commission and open to public inspection.

Southern states that the construction of the facilities proposed in Docket No.

CP94–793–000 was automatically authorized under Southern's Blanket Certificate pursuant to Section 157.206 of the Commission's Regulations on November 15, 1994. In the Amendment to the Request, Southern states that it proposes to construct and operate the measurement and other facilities at the delivery point to deliver gas to Alagasco instead of directly to International Paper at International Paper's Riverdale plant in Dallas County, Alabama. Southern states that the location and siting of the facilities, the configuration of the facilities, the estimated cost of the facilities and the projected load to be served all remains the same as filed in the Request. Further, Southern states that the only change to the Request is that Southern will serve Alagasco at the delivery point by providing Alagasco with transportation service under its Rate Schedule IT as set forth in its FERC Gas Tariff.

Comment date: April 24, 1995, in accordance with Standard Paragraph G at the end of this notice.

2. NorAm Gas Transmission Company

[Docket No. CP95–225–000]

Take notice that on February 24, 1995, NorAm Gas Transmission Company (NGT), 1600 Smith Street, Houston, Texas 77002, filed in Docket No. CP95–225–000 a request pursuant to Sections 157.205 and 157.216 of the Commission's Regulations under the Natural Gas Act (18 CFR 157.205, 157.216) for authorization to abandon certain facilities in Oklahoma under NorAm's blanket certificate issued in Docket No. CP82–384–000 and CP82–384–001 pursuant to Section 7 of the Natural Gas Act, all as more fully set forth in the request that is on file with the Commission and open to public inspection.

NorAm proposes to abandon in place and transfer by sale to Arkla (Arkla), a division of NorAm Energy Corp, at an estimated net book value of $80,732.78, Lines ADM–8 and ADM–9 which are located in Pontotoc County, Oklahoma. Line ADM–8 is 13,700 feet in length of 2-inch pipe extending from Section 4, Township 4N, Range 5E to Section 16, Township 4N, Range 5E and serves 12 Arkla customers. NGT proposes to abandon the entire line in place from station 0+00 to 137+00. Line ADM–9 is 6,402 feet in length of 2-inch pipe extending from Section 4, Township 4N, Range 5E to Section 11, Township 4N, Range 5E and serves 13 Arkla customers. NGT proposes to abandon the entire line in place from station 0+00 to 64+02. After the transfer by sale, Arkla will operate these two lines and incorporate them into its distribution system thus continuing service to its 25 existing rural domestic customers. No customers or service will be abandoned as a result of the facilities transfer.

Lines ADM–8 and ADM–9 were originally constructed in 1930 as gas supply lines and through a merger NGT acquired them from Southwest Natural Gas Company, they were later certificated in Docket No. CP62–216. Production has since depleted on these two lines.

Comment date: April 24, 1995, in accordance with Standard Paragraph G at the end of this notice.

3. Williston Basin Interstate Pipeline Company

[Docket No. CP95–233–000]

Take notice that on March 1, 1995, Williston Basin Interstate Pipeline Company (Williston Basin), 200 North Third Street, Suite 300, Bismarck, North Dakota 58501, filed in Docket No. CP95–233–000 an application pursuant to Section 7(c) of the Natural Gas Act, requesting authorization to construct and operate approximately 13.4 miles of replacement mainline in Sheridan and Johnson Counties, Wyoming, all as more fully set forth in the application on file with the Commission and open to public inspection.

Specifically, Williston Basin states that it proposes to replace approximately 13.4 miles of the 8-inch Billy Creek-Sheridan transmission line beginning in Johnson County, Wyoming and terminating in Sheridan County, Wyoming. It is averred that the Billy Creek-Sheridan line was installed in 1930 and that severe corrosion and leaks have been found throughout the line. Williston Basin further states that this proposal represents the final replacement portion of the Billy Creek-Sheridan line. Williston Basin states that environmental and safety considerations has prompted it to relocate approximately 40 percent of the replacement line outside of its existing right-of-way. It is stated that the proposed replacement line will enable Williston Basin to maintain a safe and reliable gas transmission pipeline to the cities of Buffalo and Sheridan, Wyoming.

It is estimated that the cost of the proposed replacement facilities for this project will be approximately $1,133,950, which Williston Basin proposes to finance through internally generated funds and/or interim short term bank loans.

Comment date: March 29, 1995, in accordance with Standard Paragraph F at the end of this notice.

4. Columbia Gas Transmission Corporation

[Docket No. CP95–240–000]

Take notice that on March 2, 1995, Columbia Gas Transmission Corporation (CGT), PO Box 1273, 1700 MacCorkle Avenue, S.E., Charleston, West Virginia 26031, filed in an abbreviated application pursuant to Section 7(c) and 7(b) of the Natural Gas Act for a certificate of public convenience and necessity authorizing CGT to construct and operate approximately 12.1 miles of 24-inch pipeline, replacing approximately 11 miles of deteriorating bare, coupled 20-inch pipeline in two segments. The proposal will permit the replacement of certain deteriorating facilities as well as the provision of additional firm transportation services to WV Power and Westvaco under CGT's Part 284 Blanket Certificate.

Specifically, CGT is requesting authorization in this application for the following:

1a. The construction and operation of approximately 7.0 miles of 24-inch pipeline replacing approximately 6.4 miles of 20-inch pipeline designated as CGT's Line KA and a 0.1 mile extension of 8-inch Line KA–26 in Wyoming County, West Virginia.

b. The transfer of approximately 0.7 mile of the 20-inch Line KA being replaced in Segment 1a above to low pressure transmission service.

c. Abandonment of the remaining approximately 5.7 miles of 20-inch Line KA being replaced as described in Segment 1a above.

2a. The construction and operation of approximately 5.1 miles of 24-inch pipeline to replace approximately 4.6 miles of 20-inch pipeline designated as Line KA, and a 0.1 mile extension of 3-inch Line KA–14, both in Wyoming and Raleigh Counties, West Virginia, and

b. Abandonment of the 4.6 miles of 20-inch pipeline being replaced as described in Segment 2a., all as more fully set forth in the application which is on file with the Commission and open to public inspection.

The construction cost is estimated by CGT to be $12,541,000. WV Power and Westvaco have agreed to pay a portion ($300,294) of the incremental costs associated with increasing the pipe size to 24-inch.

Comment date: March 28, 1995, in accordance with Standard Paragraph F at the end of this notice.

5. Florida Gas Transmission Company

[Docket No. CP95–241–000]

Take notice that on March 3, 1995, Florida Gas Transmission Company (FGT), 1400 Smith Street, Houston,

Texas 77002, filed in Docket No. CP95–241–000 a request pursuant to Sections 157.205 and 157.216 of the Commission's Regulations under the Natural Gas Act (18 CFR 157.205 and 157.216) for permission and approval to abandon and remove a meter station and any related appurtenant facilities, located in San Patricio County, Texas. FGT makes such request, under its blanket certificate issued in Docket No. CP82–553–000 pursuant to Section 7 of the Natural Gas Act, all as more fully set forth in the request that is on file with the Commission and open to public inspection.

FGT states that it is proposing to abandon facilities which once served as a point of measurement for natural gas which bypassed the Warren processing plant. It is stated that the Warren plant has not been used for some time and is not expected to be used in the future. The estimated cost of removal is $15,800 with an estimated salvage value of $15,825.

It is averred that the proposed activity is not prohibited by FGT's existing tariff and that it has sufficient capacity to continue all services without detriment or disadvantage to FGT's firm customers.

Comment date: April 24, 1995, in accordance with Standard Paragraph G at the end of this notice.

6. Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company

[Docket No. CP95–242–000]

Take notice that on March 3, 1995, Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company (Tennessee), P.O. Box 2511, Houston, Texas 77252, filed in Docket No. CP95–242–000 a request pursuant to Sections 157.205 and 157.212 of the Commission's Regulations under the Natural Gas Act (18 CFR 157.205, 157.212) for authorization to establish a new delivery point under Tennessee's blanket certificate issued in Docket No. CP82–413–000 pursuant to Section 7 of the Natural Gas Act, all as more fully set forth in the request that is on file with the Commission and open to public inspection.

Tennessee proposes to establish an additional delivery point in order to properly meter expanded volumes of up to 6,000 Dekatherms per day for Central Gas Company (Central Gas), a subsidiary of Alabama-Tennessee Natural Gas Company. Tennessee states that it would install a 3-inch meter and associated piping adjacent to an existing delivery meter (Meter No. 2–0431) located at M.P. 554–1+1.10 on the 500–1 Line and M.P. 554–3+1.10 on the 500–3 Line in Lauderdale County, Alabama. [1] Tennessee explains that the additional meter is necessary to handle gas measurement on peak days. Tennessee further states that while the increased deliveries of gas to Central Gas would be through release capacity, IT, or authorized overruns, the total quantities to be delivered for Central Gas' account after establishment of the new delivery meter would not exceed the total quantities authorized prior to this request. Tennessee states that it would be reimbursed for the cost of the project, estimated to be $27,446.

Comment date: April 24, 1995, in accordance with Standard Paragraph G at the end of this notice.

Standard Paragraphs

F. Any person desiring to be heard or to make any protest with reference to said application should on or before the comment date, file with the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, Washington, D.C. 20426, a motion to intervene or a protest in accordance with the requirements of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure (18 CFR 385.214 or 385.211) and the Regulations under the Natural Gas Act (18 CFR 157.10). All protests filed with the Commission will be considered by it in determining the appropriate action to be taken but will not serve to make the protestants parties to the proceeding. Any person wishing to become a party to a proceeding or to participate as a party in any hearing therein must file a motion to intervene in accordance with the Commission's Rules.

Take further notice that, pursuant to the authority contained in and subject to the jurisdiction conferred upon the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission by Sections 7 and 15 of the Natural Gas Act and the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure, a hearing will be held without further notice before the Commission or its designee on this application if no motion to intervene is filed within the time required herein, if the Commission on its own review of the matter finds that a grant of the certificate and/or permission and approval for the proposed abandonment are required by the public convenience and necessity. If a motion for leave to intervene is timely filed, or if the Commission on its own motion believes that a formal hearing is required, further notice of such hearing will be duly given.

Under the procedure herein provided for, unless otherwise advised, it will be unnecessary for applicant to appear or be represented at the hearing.

G. Any person or the Commission's staff may, within 45 days after issuance of the instant notice by the Commission, file pursuant to Rule 214 of the Commission's Procedural Rules (18 CFR 385.214) a motion to intervene or notice of intervention and pursuant to Section 157.205 of the Regulations under the Natural Gas Act (18 CFR 157.205) a protest to the request. If no protest is filed within the time allowed therefor, the proposed activity shall be deemed to be authorized effective the day after the time allowed for filing a protest. If a protest is filed and not withdrawn within 30 days after the time allowed for filing a protest, the instant request shall be treated as an application for authorization pursuant to Section 7 of the Natural Gas Act.

Lois D. Cashell,

Secretary.

[FR Doc. 95–6310 Filed 3–14–95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6717–01–P

[1] *See* 34 FPC 452 (1965).

[Docket No. CP95–237–000]

Greeley Gas Company; Application for Service Area Determination

March 9, 1995.

Take notice that on March 2, 1995, Greeley Gas Company (Greeley), a Division of Atmos Energy Corporation, Three Lincoln Centre, 5430 LBJ Freeway, Dallas, Texas 75265, filed in Docket No. CP95–237–000, an application pursuant to Section 7(f) of the Natural Gas Act (NGA) for a service area determination for its Lamar System in the states of Colorado and Kansas, all as more fully set forth in the application which is on file with the Commission and open to public inspection.

Greeley states that its Lamar System serves consumers in approximately six towns in southwest Kansas and 16 towns in southeast Colorado, as well as certain irrigation customers and right-of-way grantors. Greeley submits that grant of this application would assist Greeley to maximize gas cost benefits and enhance supply options for its Lamar System customers.

Greeley asserts its Lamar System meets the Commission's criteria for granting a service area determination. Greeley states the following: All of its sales are regulated by either the Colorado or the Kansas public service commission; there are no sales for resale on the Lamar System, only retail sales and transportation for other customers; the Lamar System is essentially one integrated local distribution system with certain gathering areas; the system is limited to a specific geographical area in rural Kansas and Colorado, and connects to only one interstate pipeline, Colorado Interstate Gas Company; and

there are no other distribution companies in the area.

Greeley requests that the Commission treat its Lamar System as a local distribution company for purposes of Section 311 of the Natural Gas Policy Act. Greeley further requests a waiver of all reporting and accounting requirements and rules and regulations which are ordinarily applicable to natural gas companies.

Any person desiring to be heard or to make any protest with reference to said application should on or before March 30, 1995, file with the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, Washington, D.C. 20426, a motion to intervene or a protest in accordance with the requirements of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure (18 CFR 385.214 and 385.211) and the regulations under the Natural Gas Act (18 CFR 157.10). All protests filed with the Commission will be considered by it in determining the appropriate action to be taken but will not serve to make the protestants parties to the proceeding. Any person wishing to become a party in any proceeding herein must file a motion to intervene in accordance with the Commission's rules.

Take further notice that, pursuant to the authority contained in and subject to the jurisdiction conferred upon the Commission by Sections 7 and 15 of the Natural Gas Act and the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure, a hearing will be held without further notice before the Commission or its designee on this application if no motion to intervene is filed within the time required herein, if the Commission on its own review of the matter finds that a service area determination is required by the public convenience and necessity. If a motion for leave to intervene is timely filed, or if the Commission on its own motion believes that formal hearing is required, further notice of such hearing will be duly given.

Under the procedure herein provided for, unless otherwise advised, it will be unnecessary for Greeley to appear or to be represented at the hearing.

Linwood A. Watson, Jr.,

Acting Secretary.

[FR Doc. 95–6303 Filed 3–14–95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6717–01–M

[Docket No. RP94–93–007]

K N Interstate Gas Transmission Company; Revised Compliance Filing

March 9, 1995.

Take notice that on March 7, 1995, K N Interstate Gas Transmission Co. (KNI) tendered for filing a revised tariff sheet in compliance with the Commission's February 10, 1995 Letter Order in the referenced proceeding. KNI states that its February 27, 1995 tariff compliance filing inadvertently did not contain the correct IT rate on Sheet No. 4 of First Revised Volume No. 1–C of its FERC Gas Tariff. KNI further states that Sub. First Revised Sheet No. 4, submitted with its filing, makes the appropriate correction.

KNI states that copies of the filing were served upon each person designated on the official service list complied by the Secretary in this proceeding.

Any person desiring to protest said filing should file a protest with the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, 825 North Capitol Street, N.E., Washington D.C. 20426, in accordance with Section 385.211 of the Commission's Rules and Regulations. All such protests should be filed on or before March 16, 1995. Protests will be considered by the Commission in determining the appropriate action to be taken, but will not serve to make any protestants parties to the proceeding. Copies of this filing are on file with the Commission and are available for public inspection in the Public Reference Room.

Linwood A. Watson, Jr.,

Acting Secretary.

[FR Doc. 95–6306 Filed 3–14–95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6717–01–M

[Docket No. TM95–2–16–003]

National Fuel Gas Supply Corporation; Compliance Filing

March 9, 1995.

Take notice that on March 6, 1995, National Fuel Gas Supply Corporation (National) tendered for filing as part of its FERC Gas Tariff, Third Revised Volume No. 1, Third Substitute Fifth Revised Sheet No. 6.

National states that this tariff sheet is filed in response to the Commission's order issued on October 21, 1994, in the above-captioned proceeding. Specifically, National states that the October 21 Letter Order rejected Second Substitute Fifth Revised Sheet No. 6 filed in this proceeding as premature because the tariff sheet included the P–2 and IR–2 Rate Schedules which had not yet been approved by the Commission. National states that this left a tariff sheet in effect as of October 1, 1994, that did not include the P–2 and IR–2 Rate Schedules. National states that since the Commission approved the P–2 and IR–2 Rate Schedules in a February 13, 1995, Order in Docket No. RP94–80–000, et al., effective August 24, 1994, it is filing to supersede the sheet effective as of October 1, 1994, which did not include the P–2 and IR–2 rates.

Any person desiring to protest said filing should file a protest with the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, 825 North Capitol Street, NE., Washington, D.C. 20426, in accordance with Rule 211 of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure (18 CFR 385.211). All such protests should be filed on or before March 16, 1994. Protests will be considered by the Commission in determining the appropriate action to be taken but will not serve to make protestants parties to the proceeding. Copies of this filing are on file with the Commission and are available for public inspection.

Linwood A. Watson, Jr.,

Acting Secretary.

[FR Doc. 95–6308 Filed 3–14–95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6717–01–M

[Docket No. QF86–556–004]

Sunnyside Cogeneration Associates; Application for Commission Recertification of Qualifying Status of a Small Power Production Facility

March 9, 1995.

On February 28, 1995, Sunnyside Cogeneration Associates (applicant), c/o B&W Sunnyside L.P., 20 South Van Buren Avenue, Barberton, OH 44203, and c/o NRG Sunnyside Inc., 1221 Nicollet Mall, Suite 700, Minneapolis, MN 55403, submitted for filing an application for recertification of a facility as a small power production facility pursuant to Section 292.207(b) of the Commission's Regulations. No determination has been made that the submittal constitutes a complete filing.

According to the applicant, the bituminous coal refuse-fueled small power production facility is located at Carbon County, Utah, and consists of a circulating fluidized bed boiler and an extraction/condensing steam turbine generating unit. the facility commenced commercial operation on March 19, 1993.

In Docket No. QF86–556–000, the applicant was granted certification for a 45 MW topping-cycle cogeneration facility [39 FERC ¶ 62,091 (1987)]. In

Docket No. QF86–556–001, the facility was recertified to reflect a change in the steam host [49 FERC ¶ 62,288 (1989)]. In Docket No. QF86–566–002, the facility was recertified to reflect changes in the facility's design and an increase in the net electric power production capacity to 51.1 MW [53 FERC ¶ 62,029 (1990)]. In Docket No. QF86–566–003, the applicant was granted recertification for a small power production facility with a maximum net electric power production capacity of 52 MW. The instant recertification is submitted to reflect a change in the ownership structure.

Any person desiring to be heard or objecting to the granting of qualifying status should file a motion to intervene or protest with the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, 825 North Capitol Street NE., Washington, DC 20426, in accordance with rules 211 and 214 of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure. All such motions or protests must be filed within 30 days after the date of publication of this notice in the **Federal Register**, and must be served on the applicant. Protests will be considered by the Commission in determining the appropriate action to be taken, but will not serve to make protestants parties to the proceeding. Any person wishing to become a party must file a petition to intervene. Copies of this filing are on file with the Commission and are available for public inspection.

Linwood A. Watson, Jr.,

Acting Secretary.

[FR Doc. 95–6309 Filed 3–14–95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6717–01–M

[Docket No. RP95–201–000]

Williams Natural Gas Company; Filing

March 9, 1995.

Take notice that on March 1, 1995, Williams Natural Gas Company (WNG) filed Schedule A, Pages 2 and 3 from its December 1, 1994 filing, in Docket No. TM95–2–45–001, which shows no under or over recovery for October through December 1993 for its Storage and West Panhandle gathering area. Therefore, no tariff filing is being made at this time. WNG will make a filing to be effective June 1, 1995 to eliminate the under or over recovery component that has been in the percentages for all other areas for twelve months.

WNG states that it failed on December 1, 1994, in Docket No. TM95–2–43–001 to reflect revised fuel and loss reimbursement percentages effective January 1, 1995. In the filing, WNG did not include under recoveries for the three-month period October through December, 1993 under the assumption that under recoveries for this period, which were included in WNG's prior filing in Docket Nos. RP95–172 and RP94–205, would be permitted to be included in that prior filing. In this regard, WNG also proposed that such under recovery component, which represents the October through December 1993 period, be permitted to remain in effect for a full twelve months. Such twelve-month period ends on March 31, 1995 for Storage and the West Panhandle gathering area, and on May 31, 1995 for all other areas. Accordingly, WNG proposed to file revised tariff sheets effective April 1, 1995 and June 1, 1995 to eliminate the under or over recovery component applicable to October through December 1993.

WNG states that copies of this filing are being served on all participants listed on the service lists maintained by the Commission in the dockets referenced above and on all the WNG's jurisdictional customers and interested state commissions.

Any person desiring to be heard or to protest said filing should file a motion to intervene or protest with the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, 825 North Capitol Street, N.E., Washington, D.C. 20426, in accordance with 18 CFR 385.214 and 385.211 of the Commission's Rules and Regulations. All such motions or protests should be filed on or before March 16, 1995. Protests will be considered by the Commission in determining the appropriate action to be taken, but will not serve to make protestants parties to the proceeding. Any person wishing to become a party must file a motion to intervene. Copies of this filing are on file with the Commission and are available for public inspection in the public reference room.

Linwood A. Watson, Jr.,

Acting Secretary.

[FR Doc. 95–6307 Filed 3–14–95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6717–01–M

[Docket No. FA90–68–003]

Williams Natural Gas Company; Filing

March 9, 1995.

Take notice that Williams Natural Gas Company (WNG) on November 23, 1995, tendered for filing a report of refunds made to jurisdictional customers.

WNG states that Commission order issued October 14, 1994 required WNG to refund the principal amount of $1,088,254 at issue in this proceeding, with interest from the time customers first paid these carrying charges to the date of the refund. On November 14, 1994, WNG refunded $1,503,020, which included interest from July 1, 1990 through November 14, 1994, to the customers who paid such carrying charges.

WNG states that a copy of its filing was served on all jurisdictional customers receiving a refund, all participants listed on the service lists maintained by the Commission in the docket referenced above, and interested state commissions.

Any person desiring to be heard or to protest said filing should file a motion to intervene or protest with the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, 825 North Capitol Street, N.E., Washington, D.C. 20426, in accordance with Rules 211 and 214 of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure (18 CFR 385.211 and 18 CFR 385.214). All such motions or protests should be filed on or before March 23, 1995. Protests will be considered by the Commission in determining the appropriate action to be taken, but will not serve to make protestants parties to the proceeding. Any person wishing to become a party must file a motion to intervene. Copies of this filing are on file with the Commission and are available for public inspection.

Linwood A. Watson, Jr.,

Acting Secretary.

[FR Doc. 95–6304 Filed 3–14–95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6717–01–M

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

[FRL–5172–6]

Draft Example Enhanced Monitoring Protocols

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency, Office of Enforcement and Compliance Assurance and Office of Air and Radiation.

ACTION: Notice of availability.

SUMMARY: The Offices of Compliance and Air Quality Planning and Standards are announcing the availability of thirteen draft example enhanced monitoring protocols for public review and comment through the Technology Transfer Network electronic bulletin board system (919–541–5742 or Internet: TELNET ttnbbs.rtpnc.epa.gov).

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Peter R. Westlin, Office of Air Quality and Standards, Environmental Protection Agency, Mail Drop 19,

Research Triangle Park, North Carolina 27711, (919–541–1058).

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The EPA is publishing today through the Technology Transfer Network (TTN), Emission Measurement Technical Information Center (EMTIC) electronic bulletin board, Enhanced Monitoring Menu, thirteen draft example enhanced monitoring protocols (EMPs) for public review and comment. These example protocols have been prepared in response to needs expressed by state and local permitting authorities and industry source owners and operators in implementing the forthcoming 40 CFR Part 64, the Enhanced Monitoring Rule, proposed in the **Federal Register**, October 22, 1993 (58 FR 54648). Comments on the draft EMPs are requested by April 10, 1995, and may be sent to Peter Westlin either in hard copy at the address above or via the TTN electronic mail.

The draft example EMPs include specific process, pollutant, and control device applicability statements, executive summaries, monitoring protocol design, and measurement and calculation procedures to produce data in units consistent with applicable emission limits. The EPA intends the final EMPs to serve as examples upon which source owners or operators can design site-specific protocols to include in operating permit applications. Note that publication of example EMPs does not imply automatic approval of any site-specific EMP described in a permit application submitted to the relevant permitting authority; however, for a permit application for an emission unit with operating characteristics consistent with those described in a published example EMP and including a proposed site-specific EMP analogous to the example EMP, the EPA intends that the EMP can be presumed acceptable. Presumptive acceptability would not preclude the need to verify that the performance of the EMP is consistent with applicable requirements which will be described in detail in the final Part 64 rule scheduled for promulgation in April 1995. Additional information on the presumptive acceptability of example EMPs and the permit application review process is provided in the December 28, 1994, **Federal Register** notice (59 FR 66844) which reopened the comment period on the proposed enhanced monitoring rule for a limited number of issues. Note that the comment period ended on February 3, 1995.

The first thirteen example EMPs represent the first of about 300 that the Agency anticipates producing over the next five years to assist in the implementation of the Enhanced Monitoring Rule. The Agency is seeking comments on these draft EMPs regarding their applicability, technical merit, and appropriate level of flexibility. Commenters with additional supporting data for these or other example EMPs are encouraged to submit those data. Comments on the draft EMPs are requested by April 14, 1995, and may be sent to Peter Westlin either in hard copy at the address above or via the TTN electronic mail. The Agency will review the comments, consider changes resulting from the promulgation of the rule, revise the EMPs as appropriate, and issue final versions of the EMPs in the following few months through the EMTIC electronic bulletin board, and will announce their availability through a notice in the **Federal Register**.

The thirteen example EMPs are as follows:

Predictive NO_X Emission Monitoring System for Natural Gas Fired Electric Utility Boilers: NO_X emissions in ng/J calculated from boiler parameter measurements.

Fuel Sampling and Sulfur Analysis for Oil-Fired Electric Utility Boilers: SO_2 emissions in ng/J and kg/hr based on fuel sulfur content, heat content, and flow rate measurements.

Predictive Effluent Flow Rate Monitoring System for Fossil Fuel-Fired Electric Utility Boilers: Total gas exhaust volume flow rate based on fuel and boiler operating parameter measurements, m^3/hr.

Record Keeping and Calculation Procedures for Coating and Inking Processes that Use Compliance Coatings: Total VOC emissions calculated from coating organic content and use rate measurements.

Continuous NO_X Emission Monitoring System for Stationary Gas Turbines: Application of a CEMS for NO_X concentration measurements for gas turbines that do not use water or steam injection rate for NO_X control.

Operation and Maintenance Protocol for Processes Using Venturi Scrubber Control for Particulate Matter: Application of control device operating parameter measurements and specific corrective actions applied in combination and in lieu of direct particulate emission monitoring.

Operation and Maintenance Protocol for Processes Using Positive Pressure Fabric Filters for Particulate Matter Control: Application of visible emissions monitoring and specific corrective actions applied in combination and in lieu of direct particulate emission monitoring.

Manual Monitoring of Fuel Gas Sulfur Content for Process Heaters at Petroleum Refineries: Twice daily measurement of fuel H_2S content for fuels with sulfur content less than 20 percent of compliance limit.

Demonstrated Compliance Parameter Limit Monitoring for Permanent Total Enclosure and Thermal Incinerator Used for a Magnetic Tape Coating Line: Monitoring of incinerator combustion temperature, enclosure flow rate differential pressure, and process operating times as indicators of compliance operation.

Demonstrated Compliance Parameter Limit Monitoring for Vented Curing Oven and Thermal Incinerator Used for a Metal Coil Coating Line: Monitoring of incinerator combustion temperature, curing oven flow rate differential pressure, and process operating times as indicators of compliance operation.

Continuous NO_X Emission Monitoring System and Conversion Factor for Nitric Acid Plants: Application of a CEMS and site-specific conversion factor to calculate mg/MG of NO_X emissions per acid production rate.

Continuous SO_2 and NO_X Emission Monitoring System for Coal-Fired Industrial Boilers: Application of a CEMS and F-factors to calculate ng/J emission rates.

Generic Continuous Emissions Monitoring System Protocol: A generally applicable protocol for applying CEMS for SO_X, NO_X, and diluent measurements to calculate emissions in units of the applicable standard.

Dated: March 3, 1995.

Steven A. Herman,

Assistant Administrator for Enforcement and Compliance Assurance.

[FR Doc. 95–6406 Filed 3–14–95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560–50–P

[OPP–00367A; FRL–4942–1]

Dermal Absorption Studies of Pesticides; Availability of Guideline

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

ACTION: Notice of availability.

SUMMARY: This notice announces the availability of the guideline for Dermal absorption Studies of Pesticides. This guideline is part of Subdivision F of the Pesticide Assessment Guidelines, which provide guidance for registrants in the conduct of tests to support registration of pesticides under the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act (FIFRA). The Agency has made arrangements for the Dermal Absorption of Pesticides guideline to be made

available through the U.S. Department of Commerce, National Technical Information Service (NTIS).

ADDRESSES: Copies of the guideline for Dermal Absorption of Pesticides may be obtained through the U.S. Department of Commerce, National Technical Information Service, 5285 Port Royal Road, Springfield, Virginia 22161, (703) 487–4650. Orders may be placed by telephone to the NTIS Order Desk and charged against a deposit account or American Express, VISA, or Mastercard, or sent by mail with check, money order, or deposit account number. For rush orders, telephone 1–800–336–4700. From Virginia, Canada, Mexico, or International, call (703) 487–4650. The publication number is PB 95–148615.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Robert P. Zendzian, Health Effects Division (7509C), Office of Pesticide Programs, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, 401 M St., SW., Washington, DC 20460. (703) 305–5495).

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: Under the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act (FIFRA) pesticides must be tested for a variety of health effects. Specific data requirements are codified in 40 CFR part 158. Guidelines for the conduct of such studies have been developed by the Office of Pesticide Programs and are made available through the National Technical Information service (NTIS). The Pesticide Assessment guidelines, Subdivision F, describe protocols for performing toxicology and related tests to support registration of pesticides under the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act and the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act.

Subdivision F was proposed for public comment in 1978 and published in October 1982. At that time the Agency published criteria for performing a dermal absorption study on a pesticide and reserved a line item, section 85–3, for a guideline on Dermal Absorption Studies of Pesticides. The Agency had available a protocol for dermal absorption studies but did not consider it ready for publication. Following 9 years of experience with studies on the dermal absorption of pesticides, a proposed guideline for Dermal Absorption Studies of Pesticides was made available for public comment by publication in the **Federal Register** of March 13, 1991 and a revised proposed guideline in the **Federal Register** of October 21, 1993. The revised proposed guideline was presented to the FIFRA Scientific Advisory Panel on December 15, 1993 at a public meeting. This final guideline for Dermal Absorption studies of Pesticides incorporates comments of the public and the FIFRA Scientific Advisory Panel. It is specifically designed to assist in the risk assessment of pesticide exposure by the dermal route, following the determination of a significant toxic effect in toxicology studies performed by the oral or inhalation route.

Dated: February 27, 1995.

Stephanie R. Irene,

Acting Director, Health Effects Division, Office of Pesticide Programs.

[FR Doc. 95–6409 Filed 3–14–95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560–50–F

[FRL–5173–1]

Environmental Statistics Subcommittee of the National Advisory Council for Policy and Technology; Public Meeting

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency.

ACTION: Notice of Public Meeting.

SUMMARY: Pursuant to the Federal Advisory Committee Act, Public Law 92–463, notice is hereby given that the Environmental Statistics Subcommittee (of the Environmental Information and Assessment Committee) of the National Advisory Council for Environmental Policy and Technology (NACEPT) will hold a one and one-half day meeting of the full Subcommittee.

The Environmental Statistics Subcommittee was formed to provide key recommendations and strategic advice on the statistical products and activities necessary to enhance the Agency's knowledge about environmental statistics and trends, and to explore information gaps from the perspective of the users/producers of these data products. The meeting is being held to discuss and offer critical advice on an information policy initiative, 305b reports, and the role, functions, and information needs of a Federal statistical agency.

Scheduling constraints preclude oral comments from the public during the meeting. Written comments can be submitted by mail, and will be transmitted to Committee members for consideration.

DATES: The public meeting will be held on April 3, 1995 from 9:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. and April 4, 1995 from 9:00 a.m. to 1:00 p.m. The meetings will be held at the Hall of States, 444 North Capitol Street, NW., Rooms 383–385, Washington, DC 20011. The hall telephone number is (202) 624–5490. This meeting is open to the public. Due to the limited space, seating at the meeting will be on a first-come basis.

ADDRESSES: Written comments should be sent to: James Morant, Chief, National Environmental Statistics Branch, Environmental Statistics and Information Division, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Mail Code 2163, 401 M Street, SW., Washington, DC 20460.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTRACT: James Morant, Designated Federal Official, Direct Line (202) 260–2266, General Line (202) 260–2680, Fax (202) 260–4968.

Dated: March 3, 1995.

James Morant,

Designated Federal Official.

[FR Doc. 95–6408 Filed 3–14–95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560–50–M

[PF–619; FRL–4930–8]

Pesticide Tolerance Petitions

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: This notice announces receipt by EPA of an initial filing of two feed additive petitions (FAPs), and it announces one amendment to a previously published pesticide petition (PP).

ADDRESSES: By mail, submit written comments to: Public Response and Program Resources Branch, Field Operations Division (7506C), Office of Pesticide Programs, Environmental Protection Agency, 401 M St., SW., Washington, DC 20460. In person, bring comments to: Rm. 1132, CM #2, 1921 Jefferson Davis Hwy., Arlington, VA 22202.

Information submitted as a comment concerning this notice may be claimed confidential by marking any part or all of that information as ''Confidential Business Information'' (CBI). Information so marked will not be disclosed except in accordance with procedures set forth in 40 CFR part 2. A copy of the comment that does not contain CBI must be submitted for inclusion in the public record. Information not marked confidential may be disclosed publicly by EPA without prior notice. All written comments will be available for public inspection in Rm. 1132 at the address given above, from 8 a.m. to 4 p.m., Monday through Friday, excluding legal holidays.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: By mail: Registration Division (7505C), Office of Pesticide Programs,

Environmental Protection Agency, 401 M St., SW., Washington, DC 20460. In person, contact the PM named in each petition at the following office location/telephone number:

Product Manager	Office location/telephone number	Address
George LaRocca (PM 13)	Rm. 204, CM #2, 703-305-6100.	1921 Jefferson Davis Hwy., Arlington, VA.
Bob Taylor (PM 25)	Rm. 241, CM #2, 703-305-6027.	Do.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: EPA has received a food/feed additive petitions and one amendment to a previously published pesticide petition as follows:

Initial Filings

1. *FAP 4H5701.* Monsanto Co., 800 N. Lindberg Blvd., St. Louis, MO 63167, has submitted the feed additive petition to EPA that proposes amendment to 40 CFR 186.3500 to establish a regulation permitting residues of the herbicide glyphosate (*N*-(phosphonomethyl) glycine) resulting from the application of the isopropylamine salt of glyphosate and/or the monoammonium salt of glyphosate in or on the feed commodity soybean, aspirated grain fractions, at 30 parts per million (ppm). (PM 25)

2. *FAP 5H5719.* AgrEvo USA Co., Little Falls Centre One, 2711 Centerville Rd., Wilmington, DE 19808 (formerly Hoechst-Roussel Agri-Vet Co.), has submitted a feed additive petition to EPA that proposes amendment to 40 CFR part 185 to establish a regulation permitting residues of the pesticide deltamethrin (1R,3R)-3(2,2-dibromovinyl)-2,2-dimethylcyclopropane-carboxylic acid (S)-alpha-cyano-3-phenoxybenzyl ester and its metabolites, trans-deltamethrin: (1R,3S)-3(2,2-dibromovinyl)-2,2-dimethylcyclopropane-carboxylic acid (S)-alpha-cyano-3-phenoxybenzyl ester and alpha-R-deltamethrin: (1R,3R)-3-(2,2-dibromovinyl)-2,2-dimethylcyclopropane-carboxylic acid (R)-alpha-cyano-3-phenoxybenzyl ester calculated as parent, in or on the food commodity cottonsed oil at 0.20 ppm (PM-13)

Amended Filing

3. *PP 2F4055.* In a notice issued in the **Federal Register** of March 11, 1992 (48 FR 8659), it was announced that Hoechst-Roussel Agri-Vet Co., Route 202-206, P.O. Box 2500, Somerville, NJ 08876-1258, proposed to amend 40 CFR part 180 by establishing a regulation to permit residues of the insecticide deltamethrin (1R,3R)-3(2,2-dibromovinyl)dimethylcyclopropane-carboxylic acid (S)-alpha-cyano-3-phenoxybenzyl ester and its metabolites, *trans*-deltamethrin: (1R,3S)-3(2,2-dibromovinyl)-2,2-dimethylcyclopropane-carboxylic acid (S)-alpha-cyano-3-phenoxybenzyl ester and alpha-R-deltamethrin: (1R,3R)-3(2,2-dibromovinyl)-2,2-dimethylcyclopropane-carboxylic acid (R)-alpha-cyano-3-phenoxybenzyl ester calculated as parent, in or on cottonseed at 0.02 ppm. Since the filing, the section F has been changed to reflect an increase in tolerance for cottonseed to 0.04 ppm. (PM 13)

Authority: 7 U.S.C. 136a.

Dated: March 1, 1995.

Stephen L. Johnson,

Director, Registration Division, Office of Pesticide Programs.

[FR Doc. 95–6420 Filed 3–14–95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560–50–F

[OPP–00404; FRL–4939–6]

Voluntary Reduced-Risk Pesticides Initiative Update; Notice of Availability and Request for Comments

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: EPA is soliciting comments on the Agency's proposal to slightly expand its Voluntary Reduced-Risk Pesticides Initiative. Under this proposal, the Agency would request additional information to be submitted as part of the reduced-risk rationale provided for new chemical registrations. In addition, the Agency would consider certain applications for new uses of already-registered pesticides for inclusion in the voluntary program. This policy is described in a draft Pesticide Regulation (PR) Notice entitled, ''Voluntary Reduced-Risk Pesticides Initiative Update'' which is available upon request. Interested parties may request a copy of the Agency's proposed policy as set forth in the ADDRESSES unit of this notice.

DATES: Written comments, identified by the docket number [OPP–00404], must be received on or before May 1, 1995.

ADDRESSES: The draft PR Notice is available from Leonard Cole, By mail: Registration Division (7505C), Office of Pesticide Programs, Environmental Protection Agency, 401 M St., SW., Washington, DC 20460. Office location and telephone number: Rm. 713, Crystal Mall #2, 1921 Jefferson Davis Highway, Arlington, VA, (703) 308–7618. Submit written comments to: By mail: Public Docket and Freedom of Information Section, Field Operations Division (7506C), Office of Pesticide Programs, Environmental Protection Agency, 401 M St., SW., Washington, DC 20460. In person bring comments to: Rm. 1128, CM #2, 1921 Jefferson Davis Highway, Arlington, VA.

Information submitted and any comment(s) concerning this notice may be claimed confidential by marking any part or all of that information as ''Confidential Business Information'' (CBI). Information so marked will not be disclosed except in accordance with procedures set forth in 40 CFR part 2. A copy of the comment(s) that does not contain CBI must be submitted for inclusion in the public record. Information not marked confidential may be disclosed publicly by EPA without prior notice to the submitter. Information on the proposed text and any written comments will be available for public inspection in Rm. 1128 at the Virginia address given above, from 8 a.m. to 4 p.m., Monday through Friday, excluding legal holidays.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: By mail: Leonard Cole (7505C), Environmental Protection Agency, 401 M St., SW., Washington, DC 20460. Office location and telephone number: Rm. 713, Crystal Mall #2, 1921 Jefferson Davis Highway, Arlington, VA, (703) 308–7618.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: This **Federal Register** notice announces the availability of the draft PR Notice and solicits comment. If, after reviewing any comments, EPA determines that changes are warranted, the Agency will revise the draft PR Notice prior to release.

List of Subjects

Environmental protection, Administrative practice and procedure, Agricultural commodities, Pesticides and pests.

Dated: March 1, 1995.

Stephen L. Johnson,

Director, Registration Division, Office of Pesticide Programs.

[FR Doc. 95–6411 Filed 3–14–95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560–50–F

[OPP–30327A; FRL–4938–9]

Asahi Chemical Co.; Approval of Pesticide Product Registrations

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: This notice announces Agency approval of applications to register the pesticide products Atonik Plant Growth Stimulator, Sodium-p-Nitrophenolate Technical, Sodium-o-Nitrophenolate Technical, Sodium-5-Nitroguaiacolate Technical, and Atonik Manufacturing Use Product, containing active ingredients not included in any previously registered products pursuant to the provisions of section 3(c)(5) of the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act (FIFRA), as amended.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: By mail: Connie Welch, Product Manager (PM) 21, Registration Division (7505C), Office of Pesticide Programs, 401 M St., SW., Washington, DC 20460. Office location and telephone number: Rm. 227, CM #2, Environmental Protection Agency, 1921 Jefferson Davis Hwy, Arlington, VA 22202, (703–305–6900).

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: EPA issued a notice, published in the **Federal Register** of December 11, 1991 (56 FR 64621), which announced that Asahi Chemical Manufacturing Co., Ltd., c/o M-D Group Incorporation (U.S. Agent), 6708 S. Atlanta Place, Tulsa, OK 74136, (now located at Nara Prefecture Japan), had submitted applications to register the pesticide products Sodium-p-Nitrophenolate Technical, Sodium-o-Nitrophenolate Technical, and Sodium-5-Nitroguaiacolate Technical (EPA File Symbols 64922–G, 64922–U, and 64922–E), containing the active ingredients sodium-p-nitrophenolate, sodium-o-nitrophenolate, and sodium-5-nitroguaiacolate at 82, 98, and 98 percent respectively, The product, Atonik (File Symbol 64922–R), also included in this notice, contains the three active ingredients listed above at 0.3, 0.2, and 0.1 percent respectively, active ingredients not included in any previously registered products.

EPA subsequently received an application from Asahi Chemical Co., to register the pesticide product Atonik Manufacturing Use Product (File Symbol 64922–L), containing the active ingredients sodium-p-nitrophenolate, sodium-o-nitrophenolate, sodium-5-nitroguaiacolate at 0.334, 0.223, and 0.111 percent. However, since the notice of receipt of application was not published in **Federal Register** as required by FIFRA, as amended, interested parties may submit written comments within 30 days from the date of publication of this notice for this product only.

On January 20, 1995, EPA approved five new products as follows:

1. Atonik Plant Growth Stimulator (EPA Registration Number 64922–1) for use to increase nutrient intake in cotton, rice, and soybeans.
2. Sodium-p-Nitrophenolate Technical (EPA Registration Number 64922–3) for formulation of plant regulators and use on cotton, rice, and soybeans.
3. Sodium-o-Nitrophenolate Technical (EPA Registration Number 64922–4) for formulation of plant regulators and use on cotton, rice, and soybeans.
4. Sodium-5-Nitroguaiacolate Technical (EPA Registration Number 64922-2) for formulation of plant regulators and use on cotton, rice, and soybeans.
5. Atonik Manufacturing Use Product (EPA Registration Number 64922–5) for for formulation of plant regulators and use on cotton, rice, and soybeans.

The Agency has considered all required data on risks associated with the proposed use of sodium-p-nitrophenolate, sodium-o-nitrophenolate, and sodium-5-nitroguaiacolate, and information on social, economic, and environmental benefits to be derived from use. Specifically, the Agency has considered the nature of the chemical and its pattern of use, application methods and rates, and level and extent of potential exposure. Based on these reviews, the Agency was able to make basic health safety determinations which show that use of sodium-p-nitrophenolate, sodium-o-nitrophenolate, and sodium-5-nitroguaiacolate when used in accordance with widespread and commonly recognized practice, will not generally cause unreasonable adverse effects to the environment.

More detailed information on these registrations is contained in a Chemical Fact Sheet on sodium-p-nitrophenolate, sodium-o-nitrophenolate, and sodium-5-nitroguaiacolate.

A copy of this fact sheet, which provides a summary description of the chemical, use patterns and formulations, science findings, and the Agency's regulatory position and rationale, may be obtained from the National Technical Information Service (NTIS), 5285 Port Royal Road, Springfield, VA 22161.

In accordance with section 3(c)(2) of FIFRA, a copy of the approved label and the list of data references used to support registration are available for public inspection in the office of the Product Manager. The data and other scientific information used to support registration, except for material specifically protected by section 10 of FIFRA, are available for public inspection in the Public Response and Program Resources Branch, Field Operations Division (7506C), Office of Pesticide Programs, Environmental Protection Agency, Rm. 1132, CM #2, Arlington, VA 22202 (703–305–5805). Requests for data must be made in accordance with the provisions of the Freedom of Information Act and must be addressed to the Freedom of Information Office (A–101), 401 M St., SW., Washington, D.C. 20460. Such requests should: (1) Identify the product name and registration number and (2) specify the data or information desired.

Authority: 7 U.S.C. 136.

List of Subjects

Environmental protection, Pesticides and pests, Product registration.

Dated: February 27, 1995.

Stephen L. Johnson,

Director, Registration Division, Office of Pesticide Programs.

[FR Doc. 95–6413 Filed 3–14–95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560–50–F

[OPP–30233A; FRL–4940–4]

Bear Country Products; Approval of a Pesticide Product Registration

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: This notice announces Agency approval of an application to register the pesticide product Bear Skunker, containing active ingredients not included in any previously registered product pursuant to the provisions of section 3(c)(5) of the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act (FIFRA), as amended.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: By mail: Robert Forrest, Product Manager (PM) 14, Registration Division (7505C), Office of Pesticide Programs, 401 M St., SW., Washington, DC 20460. Office location and telephone number: Rm. 219, CM #2, Environmental Protection Agency, 1921 Jefferson Davis Hwy, Arlington, VA 22202, (703) 305–6600; e-mail: forrest.robert@epamail.epa.gov.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: EPA issued a notice, published in the **Federal Register** of November 30, 1983 (48 FR 54116) which announced that Bear Country Products, 144 Commercial St., Sunnyvale, CA 94086, had submitted an appplication to register the pesticide product Bear Skunker (File Symbol 48099–R), containing the active ingredients diethyl sulfide (CAS No. 352–93–2) and 1-butanethiol (CAS No. 109–79–5) not included in any previously registered product.

The application was approved on February 15, 1995, as Bear Skunker to deter human/bear contact (EPA Registration Number 48099–1). This is the first bear deterrent registered by the Agency and the first product containing the two active ingredients diethyl sulfide and 1-butanethiol.

The Agency has considered all required data on risks associated with the proposed use of diethyl sulfide and 1-butanethiol, and information on social, economic, and environmental benefits to be derived from use. Specifically, the Agency has considered the nature of the chemical and its pattern of use, application methods and rates, and level and extent of potential exposure. Based on these reviews, the Agency was able to make basic health safety determinations which show that use of diethyl sulfide and 1-butanethiol when used in accordance with widespread and commonly recognized practice, will not generally cause unreasonable adverse effects to the environment.

More detailed information on this registration is contained in a Chemical Fact Sheet on Bear Skunker [Registration: First bear deterrent and its two new active ingredients, diethyl sulfide and 1-butanethiol].

A copy of this fact sheet, which provides a summary description of the chemical, use patterns and formulations, science findings, and the Agency's regulatory position and rationale, may be obtained from the National Technical Information Service (NTIS), 5285 Port Royal Road, Springfield, VA 22161.

In accordance with section 3(c)(2) of FIFRA, a copy of the approved label and the list of data references used to support registration are available for public inspection in the office of the Product Manager. The data and other scientific information used to support registration, except for material specifically protected by section 10 of FIFRA, are available for public inspection in the Public Response and Program Resources Branch, Field Operations Division (7506C), Office of Pesticide Programs, Environmental Protection Agency, Rm. 1132, CM #2, Arlington, VA 22202 (703–305–5805). Requests for data must be made in accordance with the provisions of the Freedom of Information Act and must be addressed to the Freedom of Information Office (A–101), 401 M St., SW., Washington, D.C. 20460. Such requests should: (1) Identify the product name and registration number and (2) specify the data or information desired.

Authority: 7 U.S.C. 136.

List of Subjects

Environmental protection, Pesticides and pests, Product registration.

Dated: March 2, 1995.

Stephen L. Johnson,

Director, Registration Division, Office of Pesticide Programs.

[FR Doc. 95–6414 Filed 3–14–95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560–50–F

[OPP–30375A; FRL–4938–8]

Church and Dwight Co.; Approval of Pesticide Product Registrations

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: This notice announces Agency approval of applications submitted by Church and Dwight Co., Inc, to register the pesticide products Armicarb Potassium Bicarbonate, F.C.C. and Armicarb Sodium Bicarbonate, F.C.C., containing active ingredients not included in any previously registered products pursuant to the provisions of section 3(c)(5) of the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act (FIFRA), as amended.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: By mail: Connie Welch, Product Manager (PM) 21, Registration Division (7505C), Office of Pesticide Programs, 401 M St., SW., Washington, DC 20460. Office location and telephone number: Rm. 227, CM #2, Environmental Protection Agency, 1921 Jefferson Davis Hwy, Arlington, VA 22202, (703–305–6900).

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: EPA issued a notice, published in the **Federal Register** of November 2, 1994 (59 FR 54903), which announced that Church and Dwight Co., Inc, 469 North Harrison St., Princeton, NJ 08543-5297, had submitted applications to register the pesticide products Armicarb Potassium Bicarbonate, F.C.C. and Armicarb Sodium Bicarbonate, F.C.C., (EPA File Symbols 10772–E and 10772–G), containing the active ingredients potassium bicarbonate and sodium bicarbonate both at 99.9 percent respectively, active ingredients not included in any previously registered products.

The applications were approved on December 20, 1994, as Armicarb Potassium Bicarbonate, F.C.C. and Armicarb Sodium Bicarbonate, F.C.C., (EPA Registration Numbers 10772–2 and 10772–3), for formulating use into fungicides for plant disease control on flowers, ornamentals, turf, fruits, vegetables, and field crops.

The Agency has considered all required data on risks associated with the proposed use of potassium bicarbonate and sodium bicarbonate, and information on social, economic, and environmental benefits to be derived from use. Specifically, the Agency has considered the nature of the chemical and its pattern of use, application methods and rates, and level and extent of potential exposure. Based on these reviews, the Agency was able to make basic health safety determinations which show that use of potassium bicarbonate and sodium bicarbonate when used in accordance with widespread and commonly recognized practice, will not generally cause unreasonable adverse effects to the environment.

More detailed information on these registrations is contained in a Chemical Fact Sheet on potassium bicarbonate and sodium bicarbonate.

A copy of this fact sheet, which provides a summary description of the chemical, use patterns and formulations, science findings, and the Agency's regulatory position and rationale, may be obtained from the National Technical Information Service (NTIS), 5285 Port Royal Road, Springfield, VA 22161.

In accordance with section 3(c)(2) of FIFRA, a copy of the approved label and the list of data references used to support registration are available for public inspection in the office of the Product Manager. The data and other scientific information used to support registration, except for material specifically protected by section 10 of FIFRA, are available for public inspection in the Public Response and Program Resources Branch, Field Operations Division (7506C), Office of

Pesticide Programs, Environmental Protection Agency, Rm. 1132, CM #2, Arlington, VA 22202 (703-305–5805). Requests for data must be made in accordance with the provisions of the Freedom of Information Act and must be addressed to the Freedom of Information Office (A-101), 401 M St., SW., Washington, D.C. 20460. Such requests should: (1) Identify the product name and registration number and (2) specify the data or information desired.

Authority: 7 U.S.C. 136.

List of Subjects

Environmental protection, Pesticides and pests, Product registration.

Dated: February 27, 1995.

Stephen L. Johnson,

Director, Registration Division, Office of Pesticide Programs.

[FR Doc. 95–6412 Filed 3–14–95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560–50–F

[OPP–30383; FRL–4940–2]

D-I-1-4, Inc.; Approval of a Pesticide Product Registration

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: This notice announces Agency approval of an application to register the pesticide product 1,4Sight, containing an active ingredient not included in any previously registered product pursuant to the provisions of section 3(c)(5) of the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act (FIFRA), as amended.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: By mail: Cynthia Giles-Parker, Product Manager (PM) 22, Registration Division (7505C), Office of Pesticide Programs, 401 M St., SW., Washington, DC 20460. Office location and telephone number: Rm. 229, CM #2, Environmental Protection Agency, 1921 Jefferson Davis Hwy, Arlington, VA 22202, (703–305–5540).

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: EPA received an appplication from D-I-1-4, Inc., 15401 Cartwright Road, Boise, ID 83703, to register the pesticide product 1,4Sight (File Symbol 67727–R), containing the active ingredient 1,4-dimethylnaphthalene at 94.7 percent, an active ingredient not included in any previously registered product. However, since the notice of receipt of application was not published in the **Federal Register**, as required by FIFRA, as amended, interested parties may submit written comments within 30 days from the date of publication of this notice.

The application was approved on February 2, 1995, as 1,4Sight for use as an aerosol to control the sprouting of potatoes during the storage phase (EPA Registration Number 67727–1).

The Agency has considered all required data on risks associated with the proposed use of 1,4-dimethylnaphthalene, and information on social, economic, and environmental benefits to be derived from use. Specifically, the Agency has considered the nature of the chemical and its pattern of use, application methods and rates, and level and extent of potential exposure. Based on these reviews, the Agency was able to make basic health safety determinations which show that use of 1,4-dimethylnaphthalene when used in accordance with widespread and commonly recognized practice, will not generally cause unreasonable adverse effects to the environment.

More detailed information on this registration is contained in a Chemical Fact Sheet on 1,4-dimethylnaphthalene.

A copy of this fact sheet, which provides a summary description of the chemical, use patterns and formulations, science findings, and the Agency's regulatory position and rationale, may be obtained from the National Technical Information Service (NTIS), 5285 Port Royal Road, Springfield, VA 22161.

In accordance with section 3(c)(2) of FIFRA, a copy of the approved label and the list of data references used to support registration are available for public inspection in the office of the Product Manager. The data and other scientific information used to support registration, except for material specifically protected by section 10 of FIFRA, are available for public inspection in the Public Response and Program Resources Branch, Field Operations Division (7506C), Office of Pesticide Programs, Environmental Protection Agency, Rm. 1132, CM #2, Arlington, VA 22202 (703–305–5805). Requests for data must be made in accordance with the provisions of the Freedom of Information Act and must be addressed to the Freedom of Information Office (A–101), 401 M St., SW., Washington, D.C. 20460. Such requests should: (1) Identify the product name and registration number and (2) specify the data or information desired.

Authority: 7 U.S.C. 136.

List of Subjects

Environmental protection, Pesticides and pests, Product registration.

Dated: March 2, 1995.

Stephen L. Johnson,

Director, Registration Division, Office of Pesticide Programs.

[FR Doc. 95–6410 Filed 3–14–95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560–50–F

[OPP–180960; FRL–4935–3]

Emergency Exemptions

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: EPA has granted specific exemptions for the control of various pests to the 10 States listed below. There were four crisis exemptions initiated by various States. Quarantine exemptions have been granted to the United States Department of Agriculture/Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service. These exemptions, issued during the months of October, November, and December 1994, are subject to application and timing restrictions and reporting requirements designed to protect the environment to the maximum extent possible. EPA has denied four specific and one Public Health exemption requests. Information on these restrictions is available from the contact persons in EPA listed below.

DATES: See each specific, crisis, and quarantine exemption for its effective date.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: See each emergency exemption for the name of the contact person. The following information applies to all contact persons: By mail: Registration Division (7505W), Office of Pesticide Programs, Environmental Protection Agency, 401 M St., SW., Washington, DC 20460. Office location and telephone number: 6th Floor, CS #1, 2800 Jefferson Davis Highway, Arlington, VA, (703) 308–8417; e-mail: group.ermus@epamail.epa.gov.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: EPA has granted specific exemptions to the:

1. Arkansas State Plant Board for the use of cypermethrin on mustard greens to control various insects; October 20, 1994, to October 19, 1995. (Libby Pemberton)
2. California Environmental Protection Agency for the use of methyl bromide on watermelon to control nematodes, weeds, and soil diseases; November 18, 1994, to April 30, 1995. (Libby Pemberton)
3. California Environmental Protection Agency for the use of naled on swiss chard to control aphids; November 23, 1994, to November 22, 1995. (Margarita Collantes)

4. California Environmental Protection Agency for the use of metalaxyl on mustard greens to control white rust; October 10, 1994, to August 21, 1995. California had initiated a crisis exemption for this use. (Susan Stanton)

5. California Environmental Protection Agency for the use of prometryn on parsley to control weeds; December 21, 1994, to December 21, 1995. (Andrea Beard)

6. California Environmental Protection Agency for the use of clethodim on dry bulb onions to control annual bluegrass; December 14, 1994, to December 13, 1995. (Margarita Collantes)

7. Florida Department of Agriculture and Consumer Services for the use of avermectin on strawberries to control spider mites; October 10, 1994, to June 30, 1995. (Larry Fried)

8. Florida Department of Agriculture and Consumer Services for the use of avermectin on head lettuce to control leafminers; November 14, 1994, to November 13, 1995. (Larry Fried)

9. Florida Department of Agriculture and Consumer Services for the use of avermectin on potatoes to control leafminers; December 22, 1994, to June 1, 1995. (Libby Pemberton)

10. Florida Department of Agriculture and Consumer Services for the use of imidacloprid on tomatoes to control whiteflies; December 14, 1994, to December 14, 1995. A notice of receipt published in the **Federal Register** of November 16, 1994 (59 FR 59223). The situation was determined to be urgent and nonroutine, and significant economic losses were expected without this use. (Andrea Beard)

11. Florida Department of Agriculture and Consumer Services for the use of fenpropathrin on tomatoes to control whiteflies; December 14, 1994, to December 14, 1995. (Andrea Beard)

12. Georgia Department of Agriculture for the use of sethoxydim on canola to control Italian ryegrass; October 10, 1994, to April 15, 1995. (Susan Stanton)

13. Hawaii Department of Agriculture for the use of hydramethylnon on pineapples to control big-headed and Argentine ants; December 22, 1994, to December 21, 1995. (Libby Pemberton)

14. Idaho Department of Agriculture for the use of imazalil on sweet corn seed to control dieback syndrome; October 7, 1994, to October 1, 1995. (Susan Stanton)

15. New Jersey Department of Agriculture for the use of Pro-Gro (carboxin/thiram) on onion seed to control onion smut; October 19, 1994, to June 1, 1995. (Susan Stanton)

16. Puerto Rico Commonwealth, Department of Agriculture, for the use of avermectin on tomatoes to control leafminers; October 3, 1994, to October 2, 1995. (Larry Fried)

17. Texas Department of Agriculture for the use of avermectin on peppers to control broad mites; November 23, 1994, to November 22, 1995. (Larry Fried)

18. Washington Department of Agriculture for the use of zinc phosphide on dormant timothy and timothy/alfalfa mixtures to control meadow voles; October 4, 1994, to April 15, 1995. (Susan Stanton)

Crisis exemptions were initiated by the:

1. Arkansas State Plant Board on October 17, 1994, for the use of metolachlor on spinach to control weeds. This program has ended. (Susan Stanton)

2. Georgia Department of Agriculture on October 20, 1994, for the use of metalaxyl on collards, mustard greens, and turnip greens to control downy mildew. This program is expected to last until June 30, 1995. (Susan Stanton)

3. Hawaii Department of Agriculture on November 10, 1994, for the use of imidacloprid on tomatoes to control whiteflies. This program is expected to last until November 10, 1995. (Andrea Beard)

4. Pennsylvania Department of Agriculture on October 5, 1994, for the use of chlorothalonil on mushrooms to control *verticillium* diseases. This crisis exemption was revoked on October 7, 1994, due to dietary risk issues and lack of progress toward registration of this use. (Susan Stanton)

EPA has denied specific and public health exemption requests from the:

1. Connecticut Department of Agriculture for the use of oxyfluorfen on strawberries to control weeds. This specific exemption was denied because the Agency was not able to conclude that strawberry growers will experience significant economic losses if oxyfluorfen is not available. (Larry Fried)

2. Georgia Department of Agriculture for the use of chlorothalonil on collards, mustard greens, and turnip greens to control fungal diseases. This specific exemption was denied because of unacceptable dietary risk, lack of adequate progress toward registration, and the State's failure to satsify data requirements imposed last year as a condition for consideration of future section 18 requests for this use. (Susan Stanton)

3. New Hampshire Department of Agriculture for the use of oxyfluorfen on strawberries to control weeds. This specific exemption was denied because the Agency was not able to conclude that strawberry growers will experience significant economic losses if oxyfluorfen is not available. (Larry Fried)

4. Pennsylvania Department of Agriculture for the use of chlorothalonil on mushrooms to control *verticillium* fungicola. This specific exemption was denied because the estimated lifetime dietary cancer risk from the registered uses of chlorothalonil and the use on mushrooms exceeds the level generally considered acceptable by EPA. The current estimates of cancer risk from this use preclude any further progress toward registration. (Susan Stanton)

5. Texas Department of Agriculture for the use of sodium fluoroacetate on certain mammalian vectors to control gray fox rabies. A notice of receipt of this public health exemption was published in the **Federal Register** of August 24, 1994 (59 FR 43580), an extension of comment period later published September 8, 1994 (59 FR 46428). The Agency concluded that the proposed vector control program cannot be expected with any degree of certainty to be effective in halting the spread of the epizootic. For this reason, the Agency denied the request for a public health exemption. This conclusion is based on the following: the geographical area encompassed by the epizootic appears to be too large to ensure that the landowner executed vector control efforts could be managed and coordinated efficiently; the type of bait proposed for use could not, on the basis of available relevant data, be expected to selectively target gray foxes and the primary host organisms or the purported ancillary vector species efficiently or effectively; and the proposed spacing of individual baits and the baiting density suggest that the expected taking of most baits by nontarget species would create significant gaps in the proposed barrier treatment that is intended to reduce gray fox populations and confine the epizootic. (Libby Pemberton)

EPA has granted a quarantine exemption to the United States Department of Agriculture/Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service for the use of diazinon soil treatments and malathion in quarantined areas within the State of Florida to eradicate exotic subtropical members of the fruit fly family Tephritidae. November 30, 1994, to November 29, 1997. (Susan Stanton).

Authority: 7 U.S.C. 136.

List of Subjects

Environmental protection, Pesticides and pests, Crisis exemptions.

Dated: March 6, 1995.

Stephen L. Johnson,

Director, Registration Division, Office of Pesticide Programs.

[FR Doc. 95–6415 Filed 3–14–95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560–50–F

[PP 4G4409 and 5G4448/T668; FRL–4939–9]

Northrup King Co. and Ciba-Geigy Corp.; Initial Filings of Exemptions from the Requirement of Tolerances; Technical Amendment

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

ACTION: Notice; Technical amendment.

SUMMARY: EPA is issuing a technical amendment to clarify a notice on establishing temporary exemptions from the requirement of tolerances for the delta endotoxin protein produced in field corn by a CryIA(b) gene from *Bacillus thuringiensis* subsp. *kurstaki* HD-1 and inserted in the plant expression vector pZ01502 and for the plant pesticide *Bacillus-thuringiensis* subsp. *kurstaki* CryIA(b) insect control protein as produced in corn plants and the genetic material necessary for its production. EPA has not yet granted the temporary tolerance exemptions; instead, EPA is announcing that it has received the petitions and is considering whether or not to grant them.

EFFECTIVE DATE: March 15, 1995.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Michael Mendelsohn, Biopesticides and Pollution Prevention Division (7501W), Office of Pesticide Programs, Environmental Protection Agency, 401 M St., SW., Washington, DC 20460. Office location and telephone number: Crystal Station, 5th Fl. 2800 Crystal Drive, Arlington, VA 22202, (703)-308-8712; e-mail: Mendelsohn.Mike@epamail.epa.gov.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: In the **Federal Register** of February 15, 1995 (60 FR 8658), EPA issued a notice of temporary tolerance exemptions for PP 4G4409 filed by Northrup King Co. and PP 5G4448 filed by Ciba-Geigy Corp. EPA is issuing this technical amemdment to that notice to state that the petitions have not yet been granted, but are being considered. PP 4G4409 filed by Northrup King Co., 7500 Olson Memorial Hwy., Golden Valley, MN 55427, has requested the establishment of an exemption from the requirement of a tolerance for the delta endotoxin protein produced in field corn by a CryIA(b) gene from *Bacillus thuringiensis* subsp. *kurstaki* HD-1 and inserted in the plant expression vector pZ01502. PP 5G4448 filed by Ciba-Geigy Corp., P.O. Box 12257, Research Triangle Park, NC 27709-2257, has requested the establishment of an exemption from the requirement of a tolerance for the plant pesticide *Bacillus thuringiensis* subsp. *kurstaki* CryIA(b) insect control protein as produced in corn plants and the genetic material necessary for its production.

EPA reiterates that these filings have been received, but they are not yet granted. If the temporary tolerances are granted, notice to this effect will be published in the **Federal Register**.

This document contains technical amendments only and does not require notice and comment, 5 U.S.C. 553.

List of Subjects

Environmental protection, Agricultural commodities, Pesticides and pests, Reporting and recordkeeping requirements.

Dated: March 2, 1995.

Janet L. Andersen,

Acting Director of Biopesticides and Pollution Prevention Division, Office of Pesticide Programs.

[FR Doc. 95–5800 Filed 3–7–95; 3:17 pm]

BILLING CODE 6560–50–F

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

Public Information Collections Approved by Office of Management and Budget

March 8, 1995.

The Federal Communications Commission (FCC) has received Office of Management and Budget (OMB) approval for the following public information collections pursuant to the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1980, Pub. L. 96–511. For further information contact Shoko B. Hair, Federal Communications Commission, (202) 418–1379.

Federal Communications Commission.

OMB Control No.: 3060–0458.

Expiration Date: 02/28/98.

Title: Regulation of International Accounting Rates (CC Docket No. 90–337).

Estimated Annual Burden: 240 total annual hours; 2 hours per response.

Description: CC Docket No. 90–337 implemented rules making it easier for U.S. carriers engaged in international telecommunications to negotiate lower accounting rates. Simple reductions in rates are made pursuant to a notification approach; other changes are subject to the International Settlements Policy (ISP) waiver approach. Such carriers are required to file copies of operating agreements. See 47 CFR Sections 43.51, 64.1001, and 63.01. The information is used for monitoring and enforcement purposes.

OMB Control No.: 3060–0253.

Expiration Date: 02/28/98.

Title: Connection of Telephone Equipment to the Telephone Network, Part 68, Sections 68.106, 68.108, 68.110.

Estimated Annual Burden: 57,540 total annual hours; .057 hours per response.

Description: Section 68.106 requires customers connecting terminal equipment or protective circuitry to the telephone network to provide, upon request, certain information to the telephone company. Section 68.108 requires telephone companies to notify customers of possible discontinuance of service when customer's equipment is malfunctioning and to inform them of their right to file a complaint. Section 68.110 requires telephone companies to provide technical information concerning inter-face parameters not specified in Part 68 and to notify customers of changes in telephone company facilities, equipment, operations or procedures where such changes can be reasonably expected to render any customer's terminal equipment incompatible with the telephone company's communication facilities. The collections are designed to prevent harm to the telephone network when customer-provided equipment is connected to telephone company lines and assures that customers will not overload the telephone lines with excessive equipment which would degrade service to the customers and others.

OMB Control No.: 3060–0450.

Expiration Date: 02/28/98.

Title: Detariffing the Installation and Maintenance of Inside Wiring Services, Reports on State Regulatory Activities (CC Docket No. 79–105).

Description: 47 CFR Section 43.41 requires that each local exchange carrier (LEC) with annual operating revenues of $100 million or more file, within thirty days of its publication or release, a copy of any state or local statute, rule order, or other document that regulates, or proposes to regulate, the price or prices the LEC charges for inside wiring services. The rules applies only to the LEC serving the greatest number of access lines within the portions of the state that are, or would be, subject to the state regulation. The information filed is used by the Commission to monitor the activities of state agencies that desire to

impose price regulation for inside wiring services provided by telephone companies. The information is used to help ensure that such actions do not impede federal policies.

OMB Control No.: 3060–0439.

Expiration Date: 02/28/98.

Title: Regulations Concerning Indecent Communications by Telephone.

Estimated Annual Burden: 10,200 total annual hours; .166 hours per response.

Description: Section 223 of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, 47 U.S.C. Section 223, as amended imposes fines and penalties on those who knowingly use the telephone to make obscene or indecent communications for commercial purposes. 47 CFR Section 64.201 implements the statute. Section 64.201 contains several requirements which are imposed on carriers, adult message service providers and those who solicit their services to ensure that minors are denied access to material deemed indecent.

Federal Communications Commission.

William F. Caton,

Acting Secretary.

[FR Doc. 95–6391 Filed 3–14–95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6712–01–F

[Correction To Report No. 2060]

Petition for Reconsideration of Actions in Rulemaking Proceedings

March 10, 1995.

Report No. 2060, released March 6, 1995 erroneously listed the Docket Number as 91–113. The Docket Number is corrected as listed below.

Subject: Transport Rate Structure and Pricing. (CC Docket No. 91–213)

Number of Petition Field: 1

Federal Communications Commission.

William F. Caton,

Acting Secretary.

[FR Doc. 95–6336 Filed 3–14–95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6712–01–M

[Report No. 2062]

Petition for Reconsideration and Clarification of Actions in Rulemaking Proceedings

March 10, 1995.

Petition for reconsideration have been filed in the Commission rulemaking proceedings listed in this public notice and published pursuant to 47 CFR 1.429(e). The full text of these documents are available for viewing and coping in Room 239, 1919 M Street, NW., Washington, DC or may be purchased from the Commission's copy contractor, ITS, Inc., (202) 875–3800. Opposition to these petitions must be filed March 30, 1995. See § 1.4(b)(1) of the Commission's rules (47 CFR 1.4(b)(2)). Replies to an opposition must be filed within 10 days after the time for filing oppositions has expired.

Subject: Amendment of the Amateur Service Rules to Implement a Vanity Call Sign System. (PR Docket No. 93–305)

Number of Petitions Filed: 3

Federal Communications Commission.

William F. Caton,

Acting Secretary.

[FR Doc. 95–6337 Filed 3–14–95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6712–01–M

FEDERAL MARITIME COMMISSION

Notice of Agreement(s) Filed

The Federal Maritime Commission hereby gives notice of the filing of the following agreement(s) pursuant to section 5 of the Shipping Act of 1984.

Interested parties may inspect and obtain a copy of each agreement at the Washington, DC Office of the Federal Maritime Commission, 800 North Capitol Street, NW., 9th Floor. Interested parties may submit comments on each agreement to the Secretary, Federal Maritime Commission, Washington, DC 20573, within 10 days after the date of the **Federal Register** in which this notice appears. The requirements for comments are found in § 572.603 of Title 46 of the Code of Federal Regulations. Interested persons should consult this section before communicating with the Commission regarding a pending agreement.

Agreement No.: 232–011481–001.

Title: Hanjin/AMA Agreement.

Parties: Hanjin Shipping Co., Ltd., Cho Yang Shipping Co., Ltd., DSR-Senator Lines.

Synopsis: The proposed amendment modifies Article 5.10 of the Agreement by deleting the language that restricted the parties to maintain membership in the Conference.

By Order of the Federal Maritime Commission.

Dated: March 9, 1995.

Joseph C. Polking,

Secretary.

[FR Doc. 95–6295 Filed 3–14–95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6730–01–M

Ocean Freight Forwarder License Applicants

Notice is hereby given that the following applicants have filed with the Federal Maritime Commission applications for licenses as ocean freight forwarders pursuant to section 19 of the Shipping Act of 1984 (46 U.S.C. app. 1718 and 46 CFR 510).

Persons knowing of any reason why any of the following applicants should not receive a license are requested to contact the Office of Freight Forwarders, Federal Maritime Commission, Washington, DC 20573.

Maracargo Inc., 2503B NW 72nd Ave., Miami, Fl 33122
Officers: V. Enrique Camejo, President, Pedro Enrique Garcia Arcaya, Vice President

American Custom Inc., 700 Rockaway Turnpike, Lawrence, NY 11559,
Officer: Key Y. Chung, President

Rio Bravo Freight Forwarders, Inc., 1919 S. Shiloh, Ste. 234, Garland, TX 75042
Officers: Everett Claborn, President, Mildred L. Coker, Vice President

A M Logistics Services, 4311 Pan American Boulevard, Laredo, TX 78043
Alberto H. Magnon, III, Sole Proprietor

Tradestar Shipping Corp., 147–182nd Street, Jamaica, NY 11413
Officer: Richard Weinstock, President

Time Definite Services, Inc., 2745 South Armstrong Court, Des Plaines, IL 60018
Officer: Michael Suarez, President

By the Federal Maritime Commission.

Dated: March 9, 1995.

Joseph C. Polking,

Secretary.

[FR Doc. 95–6296 Filed 3–14–95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6730–01–M

FEDERAL RESERVE SYSTEM

Agency Forms Under Review

AGENCY: Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System.

ACTION: Request for comment; extension of comment period.

SUMMARY: On January 5, 1995, the Board requested comment on proposed revisions to the Annual Report of Foreign Banking Organizations (FR Y-7) including the Nonbank Financial Information Summary (NFIS), the Structure Report on U.S. Banking and Nonbanking Activities (FR Y-7A), and the Foreign Banking Organization Confidential Report of Operations (FR 2068). On January 27, the Board

announced that the comment period would be extended by 30 days until March 9. The Deputy Secretary of the Board, acting under delegated authority, has again extended the comment period to give the public additional time to comment. The comment period for the FR Y-7, other than the NFIS, and for the FR 2068 has been extended until March 31, 1995. The comment period for the NFIS and the FR Y-7A has been extended until May 31, 1995.

DATES: Comments must be received by March 31, 1995 (FR Y-7; FR 2068), or by May 31, 1995 (FR Y-7A; NFIS).

ADDRESSES: Comments may be mailed to Mr. William W. Wiles, Secretary, Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, 20th and C Streets, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20551, or delivered to the Board's mail room between 8:45 a.m. and 5:15 p.m., and to the security control room outside of those hours. Both the mail room and the security control room are accessible from the courtyard entrance on 20th Street between Constitution Avenue and C Street, N.W. Comments received may be inspected in room B-1122 between 9:00 a.m. and 5:00 p.m., except as provided in section 261.8 of the Board's Rules Regarding Availability of Information, 12 CFR 261.8(a).

A copy of the comments may also be submitted to the OMB desk officer for the Board: Milo Sunderhauf, Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs, Office of Management and Budget, New Executive Office Building, Room 3208, Washington, D.C. 20503.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: A copy of the proposed form, the request for clearance (OMB 83-I), supporting statement, instructions, and other documents that will be placed into OMB's public docket files once approved may be requested from the agency clearance officer, Mary M. McLaughlin, Federal Reserve Board Clearance Officer (202-452-3829), Division of Research and Statistics, Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, Washington, D.C. 20551. For the hearing impaired *only*, Telecommunications Device for the Deaf (TTD) Dorothea Thompson (202-452-3544), Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, Washington, D.C. 20551.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The Board has received a request to extend the comment period on the proposed revisions to the Annual Report of Foreign Banking Organizations (FR Y-7) including the Nonbank Financial Information Summary (NFIS), the Structure Report on U.S. Banking and Nonbanking Activities (FR Y-7A), and the Foreign Banking Organization Confidential Report of Operations (FR 2068). In view of the significance of the procedural changes that are proposed in the reports, the Board is extending the comment period to March 31, 1995, for the FR Y-7, other than the NFIS, and the FR 2068, and to May 31, 1995, for the NFIS and the FR Y-7A.

Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, March 9, 1995

William W. Wiles,

Secretary of the Board.

[FR. Doc. 95–6375 Filed 3–14–95; 8:45am]

BILLING CODE 6210–01–F

Ralph Neal Barber; Change in Bank Control Notice

Acquisition of Shares of Banks or Bank Holding Companies

The notificant listed below has applied under the Change in Bank Control Act (12 U.S.C. 1817(j)) and § 225.41 of the Board's Regulation Y (12 CFR 225.41) to acquire a bank or bank holding company. The factors that are considered in acting on notices are set forth in paragraph 7 of the Act (12 U.S.C. 1817(j)(7)).

The notice is available for immediate inspection at the Federal Reserve Bank indicated. Once the notice has been accepted for processing, it will also be available for inspection at the offices of the Board of Governors. Interested persons may express their views in writing to the Reserve Bank indicated for the notice or to the offices of the Board of Governors. Comments must be received not later than March 29, 1995.

A. Federal Reserve Bank of Atlanta (Zane R. Kelley, Vice President) 104 Marietta Street, N.W., Atlanta, Georgia 30303:

1. Ralph Neal Barber, Duluth, Georgia; to retain 18.26 percent of the voting shares of First Security Corporation, Norcross, Georgia, and thereby indirectly acquire First Security National Bank, Norcross, Georgia.

Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, March 9, 1995.

Jennifer J. Johnson,

Deputy Secretary of the Board.

[FR Doc. 95–6346 Filed 3–14–95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6210–01–F

Dauphin Deposit Corporation, et al.; Notice of Applications to Engage de novo in Permissible Nonbanking Activities

The companies listed in this notice have filed an application under § 225.23(a)(1) of the Board's Regulation Y (12 CFR 225.23(a)(1)) for the Board's approval under section 4(c)(8) of the Bank Holding Company Act (12 U.S.C. 1843(c)(8)) and § 225.21(a) of Regulation Y (12 CFR 225.21(a)) to commence or to engage *de novo*, either directly or through a subsidiary, in a nonbanking activity that is listed in § 225.25 of Regulation Y as closely related to banking and permissible for bank holding companies. Unless otherwise noted, such activities will be conducted throughout the United States.

Each application is available for immediate inspection at the Federal Reserve Bank indicated. Once the application has been accepted for processing, it will also be available for inspection at the offices of the Board of Governors. Interested persons may express their views in writing on the question whether consummation of the proposal can ''reasonably be expected to produce benefits to the public, such as greater convenience, increased competition, or gains in efficiency, that outweigh possible adverse effects, such as undue concentration of resources, decreased or unfair competition, conflicts of interests, or unsound banking practices.'' Any request for a hearing on this question must be accompanied by a statement of the reasons a written presentation would not suffice in lieu of a hearing, identifying specifically any questions of fact that are in dispute, summarizing the evidence that would be presented at a hearing, and indicating how the party commenting would be aggrieved by approval of the proposal.

Unless otherwise noted, comments regarding the applications must be received at the Reserve Bank indicated or the offices of the Board of Governors not later than March 29, 1995.

A. Federal Reserve Bank of Philadelphia (Michael E. Collins, Senior Vice President) 100 North 6th Street, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19105:

1. Dauphin Deposit Corporation, Harrisburg, Pennsylvania; to engage *de novo* in providing financial advice to state and local governments and foreign governments, pursuant to § 225.25(b)(4)(v) of the Board's Regulation Y.

B. Federal Reserve Bank of San Francisco (Kenneth R. Binning, Director, Bank Holding Company) 101 Market Street, San Francisco, California 94105:

1. Wells Fargo & Company, San Francisco, California; to engage *de novo* through its *de novo* subsidiary Wells Fargo Equity Capital Inc., San Francisco, California, in making and servicing commercial loans, pursuant to § 225.25(b)(1) of the Board's Regulation Y.

Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, March 9, 1995.

Jennifer J. Johnson,

Deputy Secretary of the Board.

[FR Doc. 95–6348 Filed 3–14–95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6210–01–F

Mellon Bank Corporation, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, and Chemical Banking Corporation, New York, New York; Notices to engage in certain Nonbanking Activities

Mellon Bank Corporation, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania (Mellon), and Chemical Banking Corporation, New York, New York (Chemical), have applied pursuant to section 4(c)(8) of the Bank Holding Company Act (12 U.S.C. 1843(c)(8)) (BHC Act) and § 225.23(a)(3) of the Board's Regulation Y (12 CFR 225.23(a)(3)), to each acquire a 50 percent interest in a Delaware partnership, Chemical Mellon Shareholder Services, Ridgefield Park, New Jersey (Partnership). Mellon and Chemical would transfer substantially all the assets of their respective shareholder services businesses to Partnership, and Partnership would provide the following services to issuers of equity securities: shareholder account maintenance; dividend disbursement; mailings to equity security holders; annual meeting services; transfer and issuance, as agent, of equity security certificates; investor relations; reorganization services; stock option processing, recordkeeping and account maintenance; restricted securities processing and recordkeeping; stock watch services and proxy solicitation; and dividend reinvestment and stock purchase plan administration. In addition, Partnership would provide ''private label'' bondholder account maintenance for certain existing customers of Mellon. Chemical and Mellon maintain that the Board previously has determined that the proposed activities are closely related to banking. *See* 12 CFR 225.25 (b)(3). These activities will be conducted nationwide.

In order to approve the proposal, the Board must determine that the proposed activities to be conducted by Partnership ''can reasonably be expected to produce benefits to the public, such as greater convenience, increased competition, or gains in efficiency, that outweigh possible adverse effects, such as undue concentration of resources, decreased or unfair competition, conflicts of interests, or unsound banking practices.'' 12 U.S.C. 1843(c)(8). Chemical and Mellon believe that the proposal will produce public benefits that outweigh any potential adverse effects. In particular, Chemical and Mellon maintain that the proposal will enhance competition and enable Chemical and Mellon to offer their customers greater convenience and accessibility. Chemical and Mellon also maintain that their proposal would not diminish competition in light of the qualitative characteristics of the industry.

In publishing the proposal for comment, the Board does not take a position on issues raised by the proposal. Notice of the proposal is published solely to seek the views of interested persons on the issues presented by the application and does not represent a determination by the Board that the proposal meets, or is likely to meet, the standards of the BHC Act. Any comments or requests for hearing should be submitted in writing and received by William W. Wiles, Secretary, Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, Washington, D.C. 20551, not later than March 31, 1995. Any request for a hearing on this application must, as required by § 262.3(e) of the Board's Rules of Procedure (12 CFR 262.3(e)), be accompanied by a statement of the reasons why a written presentation would not suffice in lieu of a hearing, identifying specifically any questions of fact that are in dispute, summarizing the evidence that would be presented at a hearing, and indicating how the party commenting would be aggrieved by approval of the proposal.

This application may be inspected at the offices of the Board of Governors, the Federal Reserve Bank of Cleveland, or the Federal Reserve Bank of New York.

Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, March 9, 1995.

Jennifer J. Johnson,

Deputy Secretary of the Board.

[FR Doc. 95–6347 Filed 3–14–95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6210–01–F

Norton Capital Corporation, et al.; Formations of; Acquisitions by; and Mergers of Bank Holding Companies

The companies listed in this notice have applied for the Board's approval under section 3 of the Bank Holding Company Act (12 U.S.C. 1842) and § 225.14 of the Board's Regulation Y (12 CFR 225.14) to become a bank holding company or to acquire a bank or bank holding company. The factors that are considered in acting on the applications are set forth in section 3(c) of the Act (12 U.S.C. 1842(c)).

Each application is available for immediate inspection at the Federal Reserve Bank indicated. Once the application has been accepted for processing, it will also be available for inspection at the offices of the Board of Governors. Interested persons may express their views in writing to the Reserve Bank or to the offices of the Board of Governors. Any comment on an application that requests a hearing must include a statement of why a written presentation would not suffice in lieu of a hearing, identifying specifically any questions of fact that are in dispute and summarizing the evidence that would be presented at a hearing.

Unless otherwise noted, comments regarding each of these applications must be received not later than April 7, 1995.

A. Federal Reserve Bank of Chicago (James A. Bluemle, Vice President) 230 South LaSalle Street, Chicago, Illinois 60690:

1. Norton Capital Corporation, Morris, Illinois; to merge with Sheridan Bancorp, Inc., Sheridan, Illinois, and thereby indirectly acquire Sheridan State Bank, Sheridan, Illinois.

B. Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis (Randall C. Sumner, Vice President) 411 Locust Street, St. Louis, Missouri 63166:

1. Mercantile Bancorporation, Inc., St. Louis, Missouri; to acquire 100 percent of the voting shares of Mercantile Bank of Lebanon, Lebanon, Missouri, a *de novo* bank.

C. Federal Reserve Bank of Minneapolis (James M. Lyon, Vice President) 250 Marquette Avenue, Minneapolis, Minnesota 55480:

1. Norwest Corporation, Minneapolis, Minnesota; to acquire 100 percent of the voting shares of Norwest Bank Grand Forks, N.A., Grand Forks, North Dakota, a *de novo* bank.

Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, March 9, 1995.

Jennifer J. Johnson,

Deputy Secretary of the Board.

[FR Doc. 95–6349 Filed 3–14–95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6210–01–F

Norwest Corporation; Application to Engage in Nonbanking Activities

Norwest Corporation, Minneapolis, Minnesota, (Applicant), has filed notice pursuant to section 4(c)(8) of the Bank Holding Company Act (12 U.S.C. 1843(c)(8)) (BHC Act) and § 225.23(a)(3) of the Board's Regulation Y (12 CFR 225.23(a)(3)) to engage in the activity of providing for a fee employment information, including salary, length of employment and name of employer,

through its wholly-owned subsidiary, Norwest Mortgage Corporation, Des Moines, Iowa (Norwest Mortgage). Norwest Mortgage would provide this information to affiliated and unaffiliated depository institutions, and to other creditors for use in connection with an extension of credit including a lease transaction that is the functional equivalent of an extension of credit. These activites will be conducted nationwide.

Section 4(c)(8) of the BHC Act provides that a bank holding company may, with Board approval, engage in any activity which the Board, after due notice and opportunity for hearing, has determined (by order or regulation) to be so closely related to banking or managing or controlling banks as to be a proper incident thereto. This statutory test requires that two separate tests be met for an activity to be permissible for a bank holding company. First, the Board must determine that the activity is, as a general matter, closely related to banking. Second, the Board must find in a particular case that the performance of the activity by the applicant bank holding company may reasonably be expected to produce public benefits that outweigh possible adverse effects.

A particular activity may be found to meet the ''closely related to banking'' test if it is demonstrated that banks have generally provided the proposed activity; that banks generally provide services that are operationally or functionally similar to the proposed activity so as to equip them particularly well to provide the proposed activity; or that banks generally provide services that are so integrally related to the proposed activity as to require their provision in a specialized form. *National Courier Ass'n v. Board of Governors*, 516 F.2d 1229, 1237 (D.C. Cir. 1975). In addition, the Board may consider any other basis that may demonstrate that the activity has a reasonable or close relationship to banking or managing or controlling banks. Board Statement Regarding Regulation Y, 49 FR 806 (1984).

Applicant believes that the proposed activities meet the *National Courier* standard because: (1) employment and salary history information is information that is routinely obtained by a bank in connection with an extension of credit; (2) the information to be provided is primarily financial in nature because the relevant information is the amount of salary or wages earned by an individual over a period of time; and (3) the proposed activities are operationally and functionally similar to operating a credit bureau pursuant to § 225.25(b)(24) of Regulation Y.

In order to satisfy the proper incident to banking test, section 4(c)(8) of the BHC Act requires the Board to find that the performance of the activities by Company can reasonably be expected to produce benefits to the public, such as greater convenience, increased competition, or gains in efficiency that outweigh possible adverse effects, such as undue concentration of resources, decreased or unfair competition, conflicts of interest, or unsound banking practices. Applicant believes that the proposed activities will benefit the public by promoting competition. Applicant believes that the proposed activities will not result in any unsound banking practices or other adverse effects.

In publishing the proposal for comment, the Board does not take a position on issues raised by the proposal. Notice of the proposal is published solely in order to seek the views of interested persons on the issues presented by the application and does not represent a determination by the Board that the proposal meets, or is likely to meet, the standards of the BHC Act.

Any comments or requests for hearing should be submitted in writing and received by William W. Wiles, Secretary, Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, Washington, D.C. 20551, not later than March 29, 1995. Any request for a hearing on this application must, as required by § 262.3(e) of the Board's Rules of Procedure (12 CFR 262.3(e)), be accompanied by a statement of the reasons why a written presentation would not suffice in lieu of a hearing, identifying specifically any questions of fact that are in dispute, summarizing the evidence that would be presented at a hearing, and indicating how the party commenting would be aggrieved by approval of the proposal.

This application may be inspected at the offices of the Board of Governors or the Federal Reserve Bank of Minneapolis.

Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, March 9, 1995.

Jennifer J. Johnson,

Deputy Secretary of the Board.

[FR Doc. 95–6350 Filed 3–14–95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6210–01–F

FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION

[File No. 941 0131]

Schnuyck Markets, Inc.; Proposed Consent Agreement With Analysis to Aid Public Comment

AGENCY: Federal Trade Commission.

ACTION: Proposed consent agreement.

SUMMARY: In settlement of alleged violations of federal law prohibiting unfair acts and practices and unfair methods of competition— in connection with Schnuck Markets' proposed acquisition of supermarkets currently owned by National Holdings, Inc.—this consent agreement, accepted subject to final Commission approval, would require, among other things, the Missouri-based corporation to divest 24 stores in the St. Louis area to Commission-approved purchasers, and would require the respondent, for ten years, to obtain Commission approval before acquiring an interest in a supermarket, or another entity that operates a supermarket, in the relevant area.

DATES: Comments must be received on or before May 15, 1995.

ADDRESSES: Comments should be directed to: FTC/Office of the Secretary, Room 159, 6th St. and Pa. Ave., N.W., Washington, D.C. 20580.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Ronald Rowe, FTC/S–2105, Washington, D.C. 20580. (202) 326–2610.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: Pursuant to Section 6(f) of the Federal Trade Commission Act, 38 Stat. 721, 15 U.S.C. 46 and § 2.34 of the Commission's Rules of Practice (16 CFR 2.34), notice is hereby given that the following consent agreement containing a consent order to cease and desist, having been filed with and accepted, subject to final approval, by the Commission, has been placed on the public record for a period of sixty (60) days. Public comment is invited. Such comments or review will be considered by the Commission and will be available for inspection and copying at its principal office in accordance with § 4.9(b)(6)(ii) of the Commission's Rules of Practice (16 CFR 4.9(b)(6)(ii)).

Agreement Containing Consent Order

The Federal Trade Commission (''Commission'') having initiated an investigation of Schnuck Markets, Inc.'s (''Schnucks'') proposed acquisition of certain assets of National Holdings, Inc. and certain affiliates (''National''), and it now appearing that Schnucks, hereinafter sometimes referred to as ''proposed respondent,'' is willing to

enter into an agreement containing an Order to divest certain assets and to cease and desist from certain acts, and providing for other relief.

It is hereby agreed by and among proposed respondent, its duly authorized officers and attorneys, and counsel for the Commission that:

1. Proposed respondent Schnuck Markets, Inc. is a corporation organized, existing, and doing business under and by virtue of the laws of the State of Missouri, with its office and principal place of business located at 11420 Lackland Road, St. Louis, MO 63146–6928.

2. Proposed respondent admits all the jurisdictional facts set forth in the draft of complaint.

3. Proposed respondent waives:

a. Any further procedural steps;

b. The requirement that the Commission's decision contain a statement of findings of fact and conclusions of law;

c. All rights to seek judicial review or otherwise to challenge or contest the validity of the Order entered pursuant to this agreement; and

d. Any claim under the Equal Access to Justice Act.

4. This agreement shall not become part of the public record of the proceeding unless and until it is accepted by the Commission. If this agreement is accepted by the Commission it, together with the draft of complaint contemplated thereby, will be placed on the public record for a period of sixty (60) days and information in respect thereto publicly released. The Commission thereafter may either withdraw its acceptance of this agreement and so notify the proposed respondent, in which event it will take such action as it may consider appropriate, or issue and serve its complaint (in such form as the circumstances may require) and decision, in disposition of the proceeding.

5. This agreement is for settlement purposes only and does not constitute an admission by proposed respondent that the law has been violated as alleged in the draft of the complaint, or that the facts as alleged in the draft complaint, other than jurisdictional facts, are true.

6. This agreement contemplates that, if it is accepted by the Commission, and if such acceptance is not subsequently withdrawn by the Commission pursuant to the provisions of § 2.34 of the Commission's Rules, the Commission may, without further notice to the proposed respondent, (1) Issue its complaint corresponding in form and substance with the draft of the complaint and its decision containing the following Order to divest and to cease and desist in disposition of the proceeding, and (2) make information public with respect thereto. When so entered, the Order shall have the same force and effect and may be altered, modified, or set aside in the same time provided by statute for other orders. The Order shall become final upon service. Delivery by the United States Postal Service of the complaint and decision containing the agreed-to-Order to proposed respondent's address as stated in this Agreement shall constitute service. Proposed respondent waives any right it may have to any other manner of service. The complaint may be used in construing the terms of the Order, and no agreement, understanding, representation, or interpretation not contained in the Order or the Agreement may be used to vary or contradict the terms of the Order.

7. Proposed respondent has read the proposed complaint and Order contemplated hereby. Proposed respondent understands that once the Order has been issued, it will be required to file verified written reports showing that it has fully complied with the Order. Proposed respondent further understands that it may be liable for civil penalties in the amount provided by law for each violation of the Order after it becomes final.

Order

I

It is ordered that, as used in this Order, the following definitions shall apply:

A. *Respondent* or *Schnuck Markets, Inc.* means Schnuck Markets, Inc., its predecessors, subsidiaries, divisions, and groups and affiliates controlled by Schnuck Markets, Inc., their successors and assigns, and their directors, officers, employees, agents, and representatives.

B. *Assets to be divested* means the supermarket assets described in Paragraph II.A. of this Order.

C. *Commission* means the Federal Trade Commission.

D. *Supermarket* means a full-line retail grocery store that carries a wide variety of food and grocery items in particular product categories, including bread and dairy products; refrigerated and frozen food and beverage products; fresh and prepared meats and poultry; produce, including fresh fruits and vegetables; shelf-stable food and beverage products, including canned and other types of packaged products; staple foodstuffs, which may include salt, sugar, flour, sauces, spices, coffee, and tea; and other grocery products, including nonfood items such as soaps, detergents, paper goods, other household products, and health and beauty aids.

E. The term *St. Louis MSA* means the metropolitan statistical area consisting of the following areas: in Missouri, the counties of Franklin, Jefferson, Lincoln, St. Charles, St. Louis, Warren, and the city of St. Louis; in Illinois, the counties of Clinton, Jersey, Madison, Monroe, and St. Clair.

II

It is further ordered that:

A. Respondent shall divest, absolutely and in good faith, within twelve months from the date this Order becomes final:

1. The following supermarkets located in the city of St. Louis, Missouri:

a. National Store no. 15 located at 2700 S. Grand Avenue, St. Louis, MO 63118;

b. National store no. 30 located at 5433 Southwest Avenue, St. Louis, MO 63139;

c. National store no. 50 located at 8945 Riverview Drive, St. Louis, MO 63137; and

d. National store no. 60 located at 1605 S. Jefferson, St. Louis, MO 63104.

2. The following supermarkets located in St. Louis County, Missouri:

a. National store no. 26 located at 8823 Ladue Road, Ladue, MO 63124;

b. National store no. 45 located at 6 S. Old Orchard, Webster, MO 63119;

c. National store no. 46 located at 10431 St. Charles, St. Ann, MO 63074;

d. National store no. 47 located at 13041 New Halls Ferry, Florissant, MO 63033;

e. National store no. 62 located at 421 N. Kirkwood Road, Kirkwood, MO 63122;

f. National store no. 63 located at 7434 Olive Street Road, University City, MO 63130;

g. National store no. 77 located at 4432 Lemay Ferry Road, Mehlville, MO 63129;

h. National store no. 85 located at 14855 Clayton Road, Chesterfield, MO 63011;

i. Schnucks store no. 103 located at 9719 Crestwood Road, Crestwood, MO 63126;

j. Schnucks store no. 124 located at 3661 Reavis Barracks, St. Louis, MO 63125;

k. Schnucks store no. 130 located at 10223 Lewis & Clark, Bellefontaine, MO 63136; and

l. Schnucks store no. 195 located at 6965 Parker Road, St. Louis, MO 63033.

3. The following supermarkets located in St. Charles County, Missouri:

a. National store no. 22 located at 850 Jungerman, St. Peters, MO 63376; and

b. Schnucks store no. 126 located at 1355 South 5th Street, St. Charles, MO 63301.

4. The following supermarkets located in Jefferson County, Missouri:

a. National store no. 65 located at 1200 Sugar Creek Square, Fenton, MO 63026; and

b. National store no. 70 located at 215 Arnold Cross Road, Arnold, MO 63010.

5. The following supermarkets located in Madison County, Illinois:

a. National store no. 35 located at 1716 Vandalia Road, Collinsville, IL 62234; and

b. Schnucks store no. 175 located at 1435 Vaughn Road, Wood River, IL 62095.

6. The following supermarkets located in St. Clair County, Illinois:

a. National store no. 64 located at 1290 Camp Jackson Road, Cahokia, IL 62206; and

b. National store no. 80 located at 4 Market Place, Fairview Heights, IL 62208.

The assets to be divested shall include the supermarket business operated, and all assets, leases, properties, business and goodwill, tangible and intangible, utilized in the supermarket operations at the locations listed above, but shall not include those assets consisting of or pertaining to Schnucks or National trade names, trade dress, trade marks, service marks, and such other intangible assets that respondent also utilizes in its business at locations other than those listed above.

B. Respondent shall divest the assets to be divested only to an acquirer or acquirers that receive the prior approval of the Commission and only in a manner that receives the prior approval of the Commission. The purpose of the divestiture is to ensure the continuation of the assets to be divested as ongoing viable enterprises engaged in the supermarket business and to remedy the lessening of competition resulting from the acquisition alleged in the Commission's complaint.

C. Pending divestiture of the assets to be divested, respondent shall take such actions as are necessary to maintain the viability, competitiveness, and marketability of the assets to be divested to comply with Paragraphs II and III of this Order and to prevent the destruction, removal, wasting, deterioration, or impairment of the assets to be divested except in the ordinary course of business and except for ordinary wear and tear.

D. Respondent shall comply with all the terms of the Asset Maintenance Agreement attached to this Order and made a part hereof as Appendix I. The Asset Maintenance Agreement shall continue in effect until such time as all assets to be divested have been divested as required by this Order.

III

It is further ordered that:

A. If respondent has not divested, absolutely and in good faith and with the Commission's prior approval, the assets to be divested within twelve months from the date this Order becomes final, the Commission may appoint a trustee to divest any of the assets to be divested. In the event that the Commission or the Attorney General brings an action pursuant to section 5(1) of the Federal Trade Commission Act, 15 U.S.C. 45(1), or any other statute enforced by the Commission, respondent shall consent to the appointment of a trustee in such action. Neither the appointment of a trustee nor a decision not to be appoint a trustee under this Paragraph shall preclude the Commission or the Attorney General from seeking civil penalties or any other relief available to it, including a court-appointed trustee, pursuant to § 5(1) of the Federal Trade Commission Act, or any other statute enforced by the Commission, for any failure by the respondent to comply with this Order.

B. If a trustee is appointed by the Commission or a court pursuant to Paragraph III.A. of this Order, respondent shall consent to the following terms and conditions regarding the trustee's powers, duties, authority, and responsibilities:

1. The Commission shall select the trustee, subject to the consent of respondent, which consent shall not be unreasonably withheld. The trustee shall be a person with experience and expertise in acquisitions and divestitures. If respondent has not opposed, in writing, including the reasons for opposing, the selection of any proposed trustee within ten (10) days after written notice by the staff of the Commission to respondent of the identity of any proposed trustee, respondent shall be deemed to have consented to the selection of the proposed trustee.

2. Subject to the prior approval of the Commission, the trustee shall have the exclusive power and authority to divest the assets to be divested.

3. Within ten (10) days after appointment of the trustee, respondent shall execute a trust agreement that, subject to the prior approval of the Commission and, in the case of a court-appointed trustee, of the court, transfers to the trustee all rights and powers necessary to permit the trustee to effect the divestitures required by this Order.

4. The trustee shall have twelve (12) months from the date the Commission or court approves the trust agreement described in Paragraph III. B. 3. to accomplish the divestitures, which shall be subject to the prior approval of the Commission. If, however, at the end of the twelve-month period, the trustee has submitted a plan of divestiture or believes that divestiture can be achieved within a reasonable time, the divestiture can be achieved within a reasonable time, the divestiture period may be extended by the Commission, or, in the case of a court-appointed trustee, by the court; provided, however, the Commission may extend this 12-month period only one (1) time for one (1) year.

5. The trustee shall have full and complete access to the personnel, books, records, and facilities related to the assets to be divested or to any other relevant information, as the trustee may request. Respondent shall develop such financial or other information as such trustee may reasonably request and shall cooperate with the trustee. Respondent shall take no action to interfere with or impede the trustee's accomplishment of the divestitures. Any delays in divestiture caused by respondent shall extend the time for divestiture under this Paragraph in an amount equal to the delay, as determined by the Commission or, for a court-appointed trustee, by the court.

6. The trustee shall use his or her best efforts to negotiate the most favorable price and terms available in each contract that is submitted to the Commission, subject to respondent's absolute and unconditional obligation to divest at no minimum price. The divestitures shall be made in the manner and to the acquirer or acquirers as set out in Paragraph II. of this Order; provided, however, if the trustee receives bona fide offers for an asset to be divested from more than one acquiring entity, and if the Commission determines to approve more than one such acquiring entity, the trustee shall divest such asset to the acquiring entity or entities selected by respondent from among those approved by the Commission.

7. The trustee shall serve, without bond or other security, at the cost and expense of respondent, on such reasonable and customary terms and conditions as the Commission or a court may set. The trustee shall have the authority to employ, at the cost and expense of respondent, such consultants, accountants, attorneys, investment bankers, business brokers, appraisers, and other representatives

and assistants as are necessary to carry out the trustee's duties and responsibilities. The trustee shall account for all monies derived from the sale and all expenses incurred. After approval by the Commission and, in the case of a court-appointed trustee, by the court, of the account of the trustee, including fees for his or her services, all remaining monies shall be paid at the direction of the respondent, and the trustee's power shall be terminated. The trustee's compensation shall be based at least in significant part on a commission arrangement contingent on the trustee's divesting the assets to be divested to satisfy Paragraph II of this Order.

8. Respondent shall indemnify the trustee and hold the trustee harmless against any losses, claims, damages, liabilities, or expenses arising out of, or in connection with, the performance of the trustee's duties, including all reasonable fees of counsel and other expenses incurred in connection with the preparation for, or defense of any claim, whether or not resulting in any liability, except to the extent that such liabilities, losses, damages, claims, or expenses result from misfeasance, gross negligence, willful or wanton acts, or bad faith by the trustee.

9. If the trustee ceases to act or fails to act diligently, a substitute trustee shall be appointed in the same manner as provided in Paragraph III.A. of this Order.

10. The Commission or, in the case of a court-appointed trustee, the court, may on its own initiative or at the request of the trustee issue such additional Orders or directions as may be necessary or appropriate to accomplish the divestiture required by this Order.

11. The trustee shall have no obligation or authority to operate or maintain the assets to be divested.

12. The trustee shall report in writing to respondent and the Commission every sixty (60) days concerning the trustee's efforts to accomplish divestiture.

IV

It is further ordered that, for a period of ten (10) years from the date this Order becomes final, respondent shall not, without the prior approval of the Commission, directly or indirectly, through subsidiaries, partnerships, or otherwise:

A. Acquire any ownership or leasehold interest in any facility that has operated as a supermarket within six (6) months of the date of such proposed acquisition in the St. Louis MSA.

B. Acquire any stock, share capital, equity, or other interest in any entity that owns any interest in or operates any supermarket or owned any interest in or operated any supermarket within six (6) months of such proposed acquisition in the St. Louis MSA.

Provided, however, that these prohibitions shall not apply to the construction of new facilities by respondent or the acquisition of or leasing of a facility that has not operated as a supermarket within six (6) months of respondent's offer to purchase or lease.

V

It is further ordered that, for a period of ten (10) years commencing on the date this Order becomes final:

A. Respondent shall neither enter into nor enforce any agreement that restricts the ability of any person (as defined in Section 1(a) of the Clayton Act, 15 U.S.C. § 12(a)) acquiring any supermarket owned or operated by respondent, any leasehold interest in any supermarket, or any interest in any retail location used as a supermarket on or after January 1, 1995 in the St. Louis MSA to operate a supermarket at that site; provided however, that nothing in this Paragraph shall prevent respondent from entering into or enforcing any agreement requiring its approval of any sublease, assignment, or change in occupancy, which approval shall not be unreasonably withheld; provided further that use of a site for the operation of a supermarket shall not be a basis for withholding such approval.

B. Respondent shall not remove any equipment from a supermarket owned or operated by respondent in the St. Louis MSA prior to a sale, sublease, assignment, or change in occupancy, except for replacement or relocation of such equipment in or to any other supermarket owned or operated by respondent in the ordinary course of business, or as part of any negotiation for a sale, sublease, assignment, or change in occupancy of such supermarket.

VI

It is further ordered that:

A. Within sixty (60) days after the date this Order becomes final and every sixty (60) days thereafter until respondent has fully complied with the provisions of Paragraphs II or III of this Order, respondent shall submit to the Commission verified written reports setting forth in detail the manner and from in which it intends to comply, is complying, and has complied with Paragraphs II and III of this Order. Respondent shall include in its compliance reports, among other things that are required from time to time, a full description of the efforts being made to comply with Paragraphs II and III of the Order, including a description of all substantive contacts or negotiations for the divestiture and the identity of all parties contacted. Respondent shall include in its compliance reports copies of all written communications to and from such parties, all internal memoranda, and all reports and recommendations concerning divestiture.

B. One (1) year from the date this Order becomes final, annually for the next nine (9) years on the anniversary of the date this Order becomes final, and at other times as the Commission may require, respondent shall file verified written reports with the Commission setting forth in detail the manner and form in which it has complied and is complying with this Order.

VII

It is further ordered that respondent shall notify the Commission at least thirty (30) days prior to any proposed change in respondent such as dissolution, assignment, sale resulting in the emergence of a successor corporation, or the creation or dissolution of subsidiaries or any other change in respondent that may affect compliance obligations arising out of the Order.

VIII

It is further ordered that, for the purpose of determining or securing compliance with this Order, respondent shall permit and duly authorized representative of the Commission:

A. Upon five days' written notice to respondent, access, during office hours and in the presence of counsel, to inspect and copy all books, ledgers, accounts, correspondence, memoranda and other records and documents in the possession or under the control of respondent relating to any matters contained in this Order; and

B. Upon five days' written notice to respondent and without restraint or interference from it, to interview respondent or officers, directors, or employees of respondent in the presence of counsel.

Asset Maintenance Agreement

This Asset Maintenance Agreement (''Agreement'') is by and between Schnuck Markets, Inc. (''Schnucks''), a corporation organized under the laws of the State of Missouri, with its principal offices located at 11420 Lackland Road, St. Louis, MO 63146–6928, and the Federal Trade Commission (''Commission''), an independent agency of the United States

Government, established under the Federal Trade Commission Act of 1914, 15 U.S.C. 41, *et seq.* (collectively ''the Parties'').

Premises

Whereas, Schnucks, pursuant to an agreement dated November 23, 1994, agreed to purchase certain assets of National Holdings, Inc. and certain affiliates (hereinafter ''Acquisition''); and

Whereas, the Commission is now investigating the Acquisition to determine if it would violate any of the statutes enforced by the Commission; and

Whereas, if the Commission accepts the attached Agreement Containing Consent Order, the Commission is required to place it on the public record for a period of sixty (60) days for public comment and may subsequently withdraw such acceptance pursuant to the provisions of § 2.34 of the Commission's Rules; and

Whereas, the Commission is concerned that if an agreement is not reached preserving the *status quo ante* of the assets to be divested as described in II.A. of the attached Agreement Containing Consent Order (''Assets'') during the period prior to their divestitures, when those Assets will be in the hands of Schnucks, that any divestiture resulting from any administrative proceeding challenging the legality of the Acquisition might not be possible, or might produce a less than effective remedy; and

Whereas, the Commission is concerned that prior to divestiture to the acquirer, it may be necessary to preserve the continued viability and competitiveness of the Assets; and

Whereas, the purpose of this Agreement and of the Consent Order is to preserve the Assets pending the divestiture to the acquirer approved by the Federal Trade Commission under the terms of the Order, in order to remedy any anticompetitive effects of the Acquisition; and

Whereas, Schnucks entering into this Agreement shall in no way be construed as an admission by Schnucks that the Acquisition is illegal; and

Whereas, Schnucks understands that no act or transaction contemplated by this Agreement shall be deemed immune or exempt from the provisions of the antitrust laws, or the Federal Trade Commission Act by reason of anything contained in this Agreement;

Now, therefore, in consideration of the Commission's agreement that, unless the Commission determines to reject the Consent Order, it will not seek further relief from the parties with respect to the Acquisition, except that the Commission may exercise any and all rights to enforce this Agreement and the Consent Order annexed hereto and made a part thereof, and, in the event the required divestiture is not accomplished, to appoint a trustee to seek divestiture of the Assets, the Parties agree as follows:

Terms of Agreement

1. Schnucks agrees to execute, and upon its issuance to be bound by, the attached Consent Order. The Parties further agree that each term defined in the attached Consent Order shall have the same meaning in this Agreement.

2. Unless the Commission brings an action to seek to enjoin the proposed Acquisition pursuant to Section 13(b) of the Federal Trade Commission Act, 15 U.S.C. 53(b), and obtains a temporary restraining order or preliminary injunction blocking the proposed Acquisition, Schnucks will be free to close the Acquisition after 11:59 p.m., March 8, 1995.

3. Schnucks agrees that from the date this Agreement is accepted until the earliest of the dates listed in subparagraphs 3.a–3.b it will comply with the provisions of this Agreement:

a. Three business days after the Commission withdraws its acceptance of the Consent Order pursuant to the provisions of § 2.34 of the Commission's Rules; or

b. On the day the divestiture set out in the Consent Order has been completed.

4. From the time Schnucks acquires the Assets until the divestiture set out in the Consent Order has been completed, Schnucks shall maintain the viability, competitiveness and marketability of the Assets, and shall not cause the wasting or deterioration of the Assets, nor shall it sell, transfer, encumber or otherwise impair their marketability or viability.

5. Should the Commission seek in any proceeding to compel Schnucks to divest itself of the Assets or to seek any other injunctive or equitable relief, Schnucks shall not raise any objection based upon the expiration of the applicable Hart-Scott-Rodino Antitrust Improvements Act waiting period or the fact that the Commission has not sought to enjoin the Acquisition. Schnucks also waives all rights to contest the validity of this Agreement.

6. For the purpose of determining or securing compliance with this Agreement, subject to any legally recognized privilege, and upon written request with reasonable notice to Schnucks to its principal offices, Schnucks will permit any duly authorized representative or representatives of the Commission:

a. Access during the office hours of Schnucks, in the presence of counsel, to inspect and copy all books, ledgers, accounts, correspondence, memoranda and other records and documents in the possession or under the control of Schnucks relating to compliance with this Agreement; and

b. Upon five (5) days' notice to Schnucks and without restraint or interference from them, to interview officers or employees of Schnucks, who may have counsel present, regarding any such matters.

7. This Agreement shall not be binding until approved by the Commission.

Analysis of Proposed Consent Order to Aid Public Comment

The Federal Trade Commission (''Commission'') has accepted for public comment from Schnuck Markets, Inc. (''Schnucks'') an agreement containing a proposed consent order. The agreement is designed to remedy anticompetitive effects stemming from Schnucks' acquisition of a number of supermarkets owned by National Holdings, Inc. and certain affiliates (''National'').

The agreement has been placed on the public record for sixty (60) days for receipt of comments by interested persons. Comments received during this period will become part of the public record. After sixty days, the Commission will again review the agreement and the comments received and will decide whether it should withdraw from the agreement or make final the agreement's proposed order.

The Commission's draft complaint charges that on or about November 23, 1994, Schnucks agreed to acquire supermarkets owned by National in Missouri and Illinois. The Commission has reason to believe that the acquisition, as well as the agreement to enter into the acquisition, would substantially lessen competition in violation of Section 7 of the Clayton Act, as amended, 15 U.S.C. 18, and Section 5 of the FTC Act, as amended, 15 U.S.C. 45.

According to the draft complaint, Schnucks and National are direct competitors for the retail sale of food and grocery items in supermarkets, or narrower product markets contained therein, in the St. Louis MSA, or narrower geographic markets contained therein. The St. Louis MSA consists of the Missouri counties of Franklin, Jefferson, Lincoln, St. Charles, St. Louis, Warren; the City of St. Louis; and the Illinois counties of Clinton, Jersey, Madison, Monroe, and St. Clair.

According to the draft complaint, these markets are highly concentrated and entry is difficult or unlikely. Schnucks' acquisition of National may reduce competition in these markets by eliminating the direct competition between Schnucks and National, by increasing the likelihood that Schnucks will become a dominant firm, and by increasing the likelihood of collusive behavior among the remaining competitors.

The agreement containing consent order attempts to remedy the Commission's competitive concerns about the acquisition. Under the terms of the proposed order, Schnucks must divest 24 supermarkets within twelve months, to a purchaser approved by the Commission. If Schnucks fails to satisfy the divestiture provisions, the Commission may appoint a trustee to divest supermarkets to satisfy the terms of the order. The 24 supermarkets to be divested are:

1. The following supermarkets located in the city of St. Louis, Missouri:

a. National store No. 15 located at 2700 S. Grand Avenue, St. Louis, MO 63118;
b. National store No. 30 located at 5433 Southwest Avenue, St. Louis, MO 63139;
c. National store No. 50 located at 8945 Riverview Drive, St. Louis, MO 63137; and
d. National store No. 60 located at 1605 S. Jefferson, St. Louis, MO 63104.

2. The following supermarkets located in St. Louis County, Missouri:

a. National store No. 26 located at 8823 Ladue Road, Ladue MO 63124;
b. National store No. 45 located at 6 S. Old Orchard, Webster, MO 63119;
c. National store No. 46 located at 10431 St. Charles, St. Ann, MO 63074;
d. National store No. 47 located at 13041 New Halls Ferry, Florissant, MO 63033;
e. National store No. 62 located at 421 N. Kirkwood Road, Kirkwood, MO 63122;
f. National store No. 63 located at 7434 Olive Street Road, University City, MO 63130;
g. National store No. 77 located at 4432 Lemay Ferry Road, Mehlville, MO 63129;
h. National store No. 85 located at 14855 Clayton Road, Chesterfield, MO 63011;
i. Schnucks store No. 103 located at 9719 Crestwood Road, Crestwood, MO 63126;
j. Schnucks store No. 124 located at 3661 Reavis Barracks, St. Louis, MO 63125;
k. Schnucks store No. 130 located at 10223 Lewis & Clark, Bellefontaine, MO 63136; and
l. Schnucks store No. 195 located at 6965 Parker Road, St. Louis, MO 63033.

3. The following supermarkets located in St. Charles County, Missouri:

a. National store No. 22 located at 850 Jungerman, St. Peters, MO 63376; and
b. Schnucks store No. 126 located at 1355 South 5th Street, St. Charles, MO 63301.

4. The following supermarkets located in Jefferson County, Missouri:

a. National store No. 65 located at 1200 Sugar Creek Square, Fenton, MO 63026; and
b. National store No. 70 located at 215 Arnold Cross Road, Arnold MO 63010.

5. The following supermarkets located in Madison County, Illinois:

a. National store No. 35 located at 1716 Vandalia Road, Collinsville, IL 62234; and
b. Schnucks store No. 175 located at 1435 Vaughn Road, Wood River, IL 62095.

6. The following supermarkets located in St. Clair County, Illinois:

a. National store No. 64 located at 1290 Camp Jackson Road, Cahokia, IL 62206; and
b. National store No. 80 located at 4 Market Place, Fairview Heights, IL 62208

For a period of ten years from the date the order becomes final, the order also prohibits Schnucks from acquiring, without prior Commission approval, supermarket assets located in, or any interest (such as stock) in any entity that owns or operates a supermarket located in, the St. Louis MSA. This does not prevent Schnucks from constructing new supermarket facilities on its own; nor does it prevent Schnucks from leasing facilities not operated as supermarkets within the previous six months.

For a period of ten years, if Schnucks sells or leases a supermarket to another person, Schnucks may not enter into or enforce any agreement that would restrict the ability of that person to operate a supermarket. In addition, subject to certain exceptions, Schnucks may not remove any equipment from a supermarket it owns or operates prior to a sale, sublease, assignment, or change in occupancy.

The respondent is required to provide to the Commission a report of compliance with the order within sixty (60) days following the date the order becames final, every sixty (60) days thereafter until the divestitures are completed, and annually for a period of ten years.

The purpose of this analysis is to invite public comment on the proposed consent order to aid the Commission in its determination of whether it should make final the proposed consent order contained in the agreement.

This analysis is not intended to constitute an official interpretation of the agreement and proposed consent order, nor is it intended to modify the terms of the agreement and proposed consent order in any way.

Donald S. Clark,

Secretary.

Concurring Statement of Commissioner Mary L. Azcuenaga

Re: *Schnuck Markets, Inc.,* File No. 941–0131; *Schwegmann Giant Super Markets, Inc.,* File No. 941–0130

The two complaints allege geographic markets comprising ''the St. Louis MSA, and narrower markets contained therein'' and ''metro New Orleans, Louisiana area, which consists of the parishes of Orleans, Jefferson, and St. Bernard, and narrower markets contained therein.'' Although I question the board geographic markets alleged, the investigational record contains sufficient information to support a finding of reason to believe with respect to small, discrete geographic markets located within the broad regions alleged in the complaint, and the stores to be divested were selected with a view to remedying competitive concerns in the small, discrete markets.

In addition, the complaints allege as the product market ''the retail sale of food and grocery products in supermarkets, and narrow markets contained therein.'' A serious argument can be made that the market should include sales of food and groceries in certain stores other than traditional supermarkets. Since the investigational record suggests that the concentration is high even if additional sales are included in the market, the issue need not be resolved at this time. Accordingly, I concur in the decision to accept the consent agreements for publication.

[FR Doc. 95–6342 Filed 3–14–95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6750–01–M

[File No. 941 0130]

Schwegmann Giant Super Markets, Inc.; Proposed Consent Agreement With Analysis to Aid Public Comment

AGENCY: Federal Trade Commission.

ACTION: Proposed consent agreement.

SUMMARY: In settlement of alleged violations of federal law prohibiting unfair acts and practices and unfair methods of competition—in connection with Schwegmann's proposed acquisition of supermarkets currently owned by National Holdings, Inc.—this consent agreement, accepted subject to final Commission approval, would require, among other things, the Louisiana-based corporation to divest seven stores in the New Orleans area to Commission-approved purchasers, and would require the respondent, for ten years, to obtain Commission approval before acquiring an interest in a supermarket, or another entity that operates a supermarket, in the relevant area.

DATES: Comments should be received on or before May 15, 1995.

ADDRESSES: Comments should be directed to: FTC/Office of the Secretary, Room 159, 6th St. and Pa. Ave., NW., Washington, DC 20580.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Ronald Rowe, FTC/S–2105, Washington, DC 20580. (202) 326–2610.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: Pursuant to Section 6(f) of the Federal Trade Commission Act, 38 Stat. 721, 15 U.S.C. 46 and § 2.34 of the Commission's Rules of Practice (16 CFR 2.34), notice is hereby given that the following consent agreement containing a consent order to cease and desist, having been filed with and accepted, subject to final approval, by the Commission, has been placed on the public record for a period of sixty (60) days. Public comment is invited. Such comments or views will be considered by the Commission and will be available for inspection and copying at its principal office in accordance with § 4.9(b)(6)(ii) of the Commission's Rules of Practice (16 CFR 4.9(b)(6)(ii)).

Agreement Containing Consent Order

The Federal Trade Commission (''Commission'') having initiated an investigation of Schwegmann Giant Super Markets, Inc.'s (''Schwegmann'') proposed acquisition of certain assets of National Holdings, Inc. and certain affiliates (''National''), and it now appearing that Schwegmann, hereinafter sometimes referred to as ''proposed respondent,'' is willing to enter into an agreement containing an Order to divest certain assets and to cease and desist from certain acts, and providing for other relief.

It is hereby agreed by and among proposed respondent, its duly authorized officers and attorneys, and counsel for the Commission that:

1. Proposed respondent Schwegmann Giant Super Markets, Inc. is a corporation organized, existing, and doing business under and by virtue of the laws of the State of Louisiana, with its office and principal place of business located at 5300 Old Gentilly Road, New Orleans, Louisiana 70126.

2. Proposed respondent admits all the jurisdictional facts set forth in the draft of complaint.

3. Proposed respondent waives:

a. Any further procedural steps;

b. The requirement that the Commission's decision contain a statement of findings of fact and conclusions of law;

c. All rights to seek judicial review or otherwise to challenge or contest the validity of the Order entered pursuant to this agreement; and

d. Any claim under the Equal Access to Justice Act.

4. This agreement shall not become part of the public record of the proceeding unless and until it is accepted by the Commission. If this agreement is accepted by the Commission it, together with the draft of complaint contemplated thereby, will be placed on the public record for a period of sixty (60) days and information in respect thereto publicly released. The Commission thereafter may either withdraw its acceptance of this agreement and so notify the proposed respondent, in which event it will take such action as it may consider appropriate, or issue and serve its complaint (in such form as the circumstances may require) and decision, in disposition of the proceeding.

5. This agreement is for settlement purposes only and does not constitute an admission by proposed respondent that the law has been violated as alleged in the draft of the complaint, or that the facts as alleged in the draft complaint, other than jurisdictional facts, are true.

6. This agreement contemplates that, if it is accepted by the Commission, and if such acceptance is not subsequently withdrawn by the Commission pursuant to the provisions of § 2.34 of the Commission's Rules, the Commission may, without further notice to the proposed respondent, (1) issue its complaint corresponding in form and substance with the draft of the complaint and its decision containing the following Order to divest and to cease and desist in disposition of the proceeding, and (2) make information public with respect thereto. When so entered, the Order shall have the same force and effect and may be altered, modified, or set aside in the same time provided by statute for other orders. The Order shall become final upon service. Delivery by the United States Postal Service of the complaint and decision containing the agreed-to Order to proposed respondent's address as stated in this Agreement, to the attention of the officer signing this agreement, shall constitute service. Proposed respondent waives any right it may have to any other manner of service. The complaint may be used in construing the terms of the Order, and no agreement, understanding, representation, or interpretation not contained in the Order or the Agreement may be used to vary or contradict the terms of the Order.

7. Proposed respondent has read the proposed complaint and Order contemplated hereby. Proposed respondent understands that once the Order has been issued, it will be required to file verified written reports showing that it has fully complied with the Order. Proposed respondent further understands that it may be liable for civil penalties in the amount provided by law for each violation of the Order after it becomes final.

Order

I

It is ordered that, as used in this Order, the following definitions shall apply:

A. *Respondent* or *Schwegmann* means John F. Schwegmann and Schwegmann Giant Super Markets, Inc., its predecessors, subsidiaries, divisions, and groups and affiliates controlled by Schwegmann Giant Super Markets, Inc., their successors and assigns, and their directors, officers, employees, agents, and representatives.

B. *Assets to be divested* means the supermarket assets described in Paragraph II.A. of this Order.

C. *Commission* means the Federal Trade Commission.

D. *Supermarket* means a full-line retail grocery store that carries a wide variety of food and grocery items in particular product categories, including bread and dairy products; refrigerated and frozen food and beverage products; fresh and prepared meats and poultry; produce, including fresh fruits and vegetables; shelf-stable food and beverage products, including canned and other types of packaged products; staple foodstuffs, which may include salt, sugar, flour, sauces, spices, coffee, and tea; and other grocery products, including nonfood items such as soaps, detergents, paper goods, other household products, and health and beauty aids.

E. *New Orleans metro area* means the area consisting of Jefferson, Orleans, and St. Bernard parishes in Louisiana.

II

It is further ordered that:

A. Respondent shall divest, absolutely and in good faith, within twelve months from the date this Order becomes final:

1. That Stanley supermarket located at 315 E. Judge Perez Drive (store No. 79), Chalmette, LA;
2. Canal Villere supermarket located at 4726 Paris Avenue (store No. 24), New Orleans, LA;
3. Canal Villere supermarket located at 2125 Caton Street (store No. 25), New Orleans, LA;
4. That Stanley supermarket located at 4223 Chef Menteur Highway (store No. 8), New Orleans, LA;
5. That Stanley supermarket located at 9319 Jefferson Highway (store No. 33), River Ridge, LA;
6. Canal Villere supermarket located at 5245 Veterans Memorial Boulevard (store No. 93), Metairie, LA; and
7. Canal Villere supermarket located at 135 Robert E. Lee Boulevard (store No. 83), New Orleans, LA.

The assets to be divested shall include the supermarket business operated, and all assets, leases, properties, business and goodwill, tangible and intangible, utilized in the supermarket operations at the locations listed above, but shall not include those assets consisting of or pertaining to any Schwegmann or National trade names, trade dress, trade marks, service marks, computer software, vehicles and other assets except fixtures also used or to be used by respondent at locations other than those listed above in connection with the Schwegmann or National business operations.

B. Respondent shall divest the assets to be divested only to an acquirer or acquirers that receive the prior approval of the Commission and only in a manner that receives the prior approval of the Commission. The purpose of the divestiture is to ensure the continuation of the assets to be divested as ongoing viable enterprises engaged in the supermarket business and to remedy the lessening of competition resulting from the acquisition alleged in the Commission's complaint.

C. Pending divestiture of the assets to be divested, respondent shall take such actions as are necessary to maintain the viability, competitiveness, and marketability of the assets to be divested to comply with Paragraphs II and III of this Order and to prevent the destruction, removal, wasting, deterioration, or impairment of the assets to be divested except in the ordinary course of business and except for ordinary wear and tear.

D. Respondent shall comply with all the terms of the Asset Maintenance Agreement attached to this Order and made a part hereof as Appendix I. The Asset Maintenance Agreement shall continue in effect until such time as all assets to be divested have been divested as required by this Order.

III

It is further ordered that:

A. If respondent has not divested, absolutely and in good faith and with the Commission's prior approval, the assets to be divested within twelve months from the date this Order becomes final, the Commission may appoint a trustee to divest any of the assets to be divested. In the event that the Commission or the Attorney General brings an action pursuant to section 5(l) of the Federal Trade Commission Act, 15 U.S.C. 45(l), or any other statute enforced by the Commission, respondent shall consent to the appointment of a trustee in such action. Neither the appointment of a trustee nor a decision not to appoint a trustee under this Paragraph shall preclude the Commission or the Attorney General from seeking civil penalties or any other relief available to it, including a court-appointed trustee, pursuant to § 5(l) of the Federal Trade Commission, for any failure by the respondent to comply with this Order.

B. If a trustee is appointed by the Commission or a court pursuant to Paragraph III.A. of this Order, respondent shall consent to the following terms and conditions regarding the trustee's powers, duties, authority, and responsibilities:

1. The Commission shall select the trustee, subject to the consent of respondent, which consent shall not be unreasonably withheld. The trustee shall be a person with experience and expertise in acquisitions and divestitures. If respondent has not opposed, in writing, including the reasons for opposing, the selection of any proposed trustee within ten (10) days after written notice by the staff of the Commission to respondent of the identity of any proposed trustee, respondent shall be deemed to have consented to the selection of the proposed trustee.

2. Subject to the prior approval of the Commission, the trustee shall have the exclusive power and authority to divest the assets to be divested.

3. Within ten (10) days after appointment of the trustee, respondent shall execute a trust agreement that, subject to the prior approval of the Commission and, in the case of a court-appointed trustee, of the court, transfers to the trustee all rights and powers necessary to permit the trustee to effect the divestitures required by this Order.

4. The trustee shall have twelve (12) months from the date the Commission or court approves the trust agreement described in Paragraph III. B. 3. to accomplish the divestitures, which shall be subject to the prior approval of the Commission. If, however, at the end of the twelve-month period, the trustee has submitted a plan of divestiture or believes that divestiture can be achieved within a reasonable time, the divestiture period may be extended by the Commission, or, in the case of a court-appointed trustee, by the court; provided, however, the Commission may extend this 12-month period only one (1) time for one (1) year.

5. The trustee shall have full and complete access to the personnel, books, records, and facilities related to the assets to be divested or to any other relevant information, as the trustee may request. Respondent shall develop such financial or other information as such trustee may reasonably request and shall cooperate with the trustee. Respondent shall take no action to interfere with or impede the trustee's accomplishment of the divestitures. Any delays in divestiture caused by respondent shall extend the time for divestiture under this Paragraph in an amount equal to the delay, as determined by the Commission or, for a court-appointed trustee, by the court.

6. The trustee shall use his or her best efforts to negotiate the most favorable price and terms available in each contract that is submitted to the Commission, subject to respondent's absolute and unconditional obligation to divest at no minimum price. The divestitures shall be made in the manner and to the acquirer or acquirers as set out in Paragraph II of this Order; provided, however, if the trustee receives bona fide offers for an asset to be divested from more than one acquiring entity, and if the Commission determines to approve more than one such acquiring entity, the trustee shall divest such asset to the acquiring entity or entities selected by respondent from among those approved by the Commission.

7. The trustee shall serve, without bond or other security, at the cost and expense of respondent, on such reasonable and customary terms and conditions as the Commission or a court may set. The trustee shall have the authority to employ, at the cost and expense of respondent, such

consultants, accountants, attorneys, investment bankers, business brokers, appraisers, and other representatives and assistants as are necessary to carry out the trustee's duties and responsibilities. The trustee shall account for all monies derived from the sale and all expenses incurred. After approval by the Commission and, in the case of a court-appointed trustee, by the court, of the account of the trustee, including fees for his or his services, all remaining monies shall be paid at the direction of the respondent, and the trustee's power shall be terminated. The trustee's compensation shall be based at least in significant part on a commission arrangement contingent on the trustee's divesting the assets to be divested to satisfy Paragraph II of this Order.

8. Respondent shall indemnify the trustee and hold the trustee harmless against any losses, claims, damages, liabilities, or expenses arising out of, or in connection with, the performance of the trustee's duties, including all reasonable fees of counsel and other expenses incurred in connection with the preparation for, or defense of any claim, whether or not resulting in any liability, except to the extent that such liabilities, losses, damages, claims, or expenses result from misfeasance, gross negligence, willful or wanton acts, or bad faith by the trustee.

9. If the trustee ceases to act or fails to act diligently, a substitute trustee shall be appointed in the same manner as provided in Paragraph III.A. of this Order.

10. The Commission or, in the case of a court-appointed trustee, the court, may on its own initiative or at the request of the trustee issue such additional Orders or directions as may be necessary or appropriate to accomplish the divestiture required by this Order.

11. The trustee shall have no obligation or authority to operate or maintain the assets to be divested.

12. The trustee shall report in writing to respondent and the Commission every sixty (60) days concerning the trustee's efforts to accomplish divestiture.

IV

It is further ordered that, for a period of ten (10) years from the date this Order becomes final, respondent shall not, without the prior approval of the Commission, directly or indirectly, through subsidiaries, partnerships, or otherwise:

A. Acquire any ownership or leasehold interest in any facility that has operated as a supermarket within six (6) months of the date of such proposed acquisition in the New Orleans metro area.

B. Acquire any stock, share capital, equity, or other interest in any entity that owns any interest in or operates any supermarket or owned any interest in or operated any supermarket within six (6) months of such proposed acquisition in the New Orleans metro area.

Provided, however, that these prohibitions shall not apply to the construction of new facilities by respondent or the acquisition of or leasing of a facility that has not operated as a supermarket within six (6) months of respondent's offer to purchase or lease.

V

It is further ordered that, for a period of ten (10) years commencing on the date this Order becomes final:

A. Respondent shall neither enter into nor enforce any agreement that restricts the ability of any person (as defined in Section 1(a) of the Clayton Act, 15 U.S.C. 12(a)) acquiring any supermarket owned or operated by respondent, any leasehold interest in any supermarket, or any interest in that portion of any retail location used as a supermarket on or after January 1, 1995 in the New Orleans metro area to operate a supermarket at that site; provided however, that nothing in this Paragraph shall prevent respondent from entering into or enforcing any agreement requiring its approval of any sublease, assignment, or change in occupancy, which approval shall not be unreasonably withheld; provided further that use of a site for the operation of a supermarket shall not be a basis for withholding such approval.

B. Respondent shall not remove any equipment for a supermarket owned or operated by respondent in the New Orleans metro area prior to a sale, sublease, assignment, or change in occupancy, except for replacement or relocation of such equipment in or to any other supermarket owned or operated by respondent in the ordinary course of business, or as part of any negotiation for a sale, sublease, assignment, or change in occupancy of such supermarket.

VI

It is further ordered that:

A. Within sixty (60) days after the date this Order becomes final and every sixty (60) days thereafter until respondent has fully complied with the provisions of Paragraphs II or III of this Order, respondent shall submit to the Commission verified written reports setting forth in detail the manner and form in which it intends to comply, is complying, and has complied with Paragraphs II and III of this Order. Respondent shall include in its compliance reports, among other things that are required from time to time, a full description of the efforts being made to comply with Paragraphs II and III of the Order, including a description of all substantive contacts or negotiations for the divestiture and the identity of all parties contacted. Respondent shall include in its compliance reports copies of all written communications to and from such parties, all internal memoranda, and all reports and recommendations concerning divestiture.

B. One year (1) from the date this Order becomes final, annually for the next nine (9) years on the anniversary of the date this Order becomes final, and at other times as the Commission may require, respondent shall file verified written reports with the Commission setting forth in detail the manner and form in which it has complied and is complying with this Order.

VII

It is further ordered that respondent shall notify the Commission at least thirty (30) days prior to any proposed change in respondent such as dissolution, assignment, sale resulting in the emergence of a successor corporation, or the creation or dissolution of subsidiaries or any other change in respondent that may affect compliance obligations arising out of the Order.

VIII

It is further ordered that, for the purpose of determining or securing compliance with this Order, respondent shall permit any duly authorized representative of the Commission:

A. Upon five days' written notice to respondent, access, during office hours and in the presence of counsel for respondent, to inspect and copy all books, ledgers, accounts, correspondence, memoranda and other records and documents in the possession or under the control of respondent relating to any matters contained in this Order; and

B. Upon five days' written notice to respondent and without restraint or interference from it, to interview respondent or officers, directors, or employees of respondent in the presence of counsel for respondent relating to any matters contained in this Order.

Asset Maintenance Agreement

This Asset Maintenance Agreement (''Agreement'') is by and between

Schwegmann Giant Super Markets, Inc. (''Schwegmann''), a corporation organized under the laws of the State of Louisiana, with its principal offices located at 5300 Old Gentilly Road, New Orleans, Louisiana 70126, and the Federal Trade Commission (''Commission''), an independent agency of the United States Government, established under the Federal Trade Commission Act of 1914, 15 U.S.C. § 41, *et seq.* (collectively ''the Parties'').

Premises

Whereas, Schwegmann, pursuant to an agreement dated November 23, 1994, agreed to purchase certain assets of National Holdings, Inc. and certain affiliates (hereinafter ''Acquisition''); and

Whereas, the Commission is now investigating the Acquisition to determine if it would violate any of the statutes enforced by the Commission; and

Whereas, if the Commission accepts the attached Agreement Containing Consent Order, the Commission is required to place it on the public record for a period of sixty (60) days for public comment and may subsequently withdraw such acceptance pursuant to the provisions of §§ 2.34 of the Commission's Rules; and

Whereas, the Commission is concerned that if an agreement is not reached preserving the *status quo ante* of the assets to be divested as described in II.A. of the attached Agreement Containing Consent Order (''Assets'') during the period prior to their divestitures, when those assets will be in the hands of Schwegmann, that any divestiture resulting from any administrative proceeding challenging the legality of the Acquisition might not be possible, or might produce a less than effective remedy; and

Whereas, the Commission is concerned that prior to divestiture to the acquirer, it may be necessary to preserve the continued viability and competitiveness of the Assets; and

Whereas, the purpose of this Agreement and of the Consent Order is to preserve the Assets pending the divestiture to the acquirer approved by the Federal Trade Commission under the terms of the Order, in order to remedy any anticompetitive effects of the Acquisition; and

Whereas, Schwegmann entering into this Agreement shall in no way be construed as an admission by Schwegmann that the Acquisition is illegal; and

Whereas, Schwegmann understands that no act or transaction contemplated by this Agreement shall be deemed immune or exempt from the provisions of the antitrust laws, or the Federal Trade Commission Act by reason of anything contained in this Agreement;

Now, therefore, in consideration of the Commission's agreement that, unless the Commission determines to reject the Consent Order, it will not seek further relief from the parties with respect to the Acquisition, except that the Commission may exercise any and all rights to enforce this Agreement and the Consent Order annexed hereto and made a part thereof, and, in the event the required divestiture is not accomplished, to appoint a trustee to seek divestiture of the Assets, the Parties agree as follows:

Terms of Agreement

1. Schwegmann agrees to execute, and upon its issuance to be bound by, the attached Consent Order. The Parties further agree that each term defined in the attached Consent Order shall have the same meaning in this Agreement.

2. Unless the commission brings an action to seek to enjoin the proposed Acquisition pursuant to Section 13(b) of the Federal Trade Commission Act, 15. U.S.C. § 53(b), and obtains a temporary restraining order or preliminary injunction blocking the proposed Acquisition, Schwegmann will be free to close the Acquisition after 11:59 p.m., March 8, 1995.

3. Schwegmann agrees that from the date this Agreement is accepted until the earliest of the dates listed in subparagraphs 3.a—3.b it will comply with the provisions of this Agreement:

a. Three business days after the Commission withdraws its acceptance of the Consent Order pursuant to the provisions of § 2.34 of the Commission's Rules; or

b. On the day the divestitute set out in the Consent Order has been completed.

4. From the time Schwegmann acquires the Assets until the earliest of the dates listed in subparagraphs 3.a—3.b, Schwegmann shall maintain the viability, competitiveness and marketability of the Assets, and shall not cause the wasting or deterioration of the Assets, nor shall it sell, transfer, encumber or otherwise impair their marketability or viability.

5. Should the Commission seek in any proceeding to compel Schwegmann to divest itself of the Assets or to seek any other injunctive or equitable relief, Schwegmann shall not raise any objection based upon the expiration of the applicable Hart-Scott-Rodino Antitrust Improvements Act waiting period or the fact that the Commission has not sought to enjoin the Acquisition. Schwegmann also waives all rights to contest the validity of this Agreement.

6. For the purpose of determining or securing compliance with this Agreement, subject to any legally recognized privilege, and upon written request with reasonable notice to Schwegmann to its principal offices, Schwegmann shall permit any duly authorized representative or representatives of the Commission:

a. Access during the office hours of Schwegmann, in the presence of counsel for Schwegmann, to inspect and copy all books, ledgers, accounts, correspondence, memoranda and other records and documents in the possession or under the control of Schwegmann relating to compliance with this Agreement; and

Without restraint or interference from them, to interview officers or employees of Schwegmann, who may have counsel present, regarding any such matters.

7. This Agreement shall not be binding until approved by the Commission.

Analysis of Proposed Consent Order to Aid Public Comment

The Federal Trade Commission (''Commission'') has accepted for public comment from Schwegmann Giant Super Markets, Inc. (''Schwegmann'') an agreement containing a proposed consent order. The agreement is designed to remedy anticompetitive effects stemming from Schwegmann's acquisition of a number of supermarkets owned by National Holdings, Inc. and certain affiliates (''National'').

The agreement has been placed on the public record for sixty (60) days for receipt of comments by interested persons. Comments received during this period will become part of the public record. After sixty days, the Commission will again review the agreement and the comments received and will decide whether it should withdraw from the agreement or make final the agreement's proposed order.

The Commission's draft complaint charges that on or about November 23, 1994, Schwegmann agreed to acquire National's supermarkets located in Louisiana, Mississippi, and Alabama. The Commission has reason to believe that the acquisition, as well as the agreement to enter into the acquisition, would substantially lessen competition in violation of Section 7 of the Clayton Act, as amended, 15 U.S.C. 18, and Section 5 of the FTC Act, as amended, 15 U.S.C. 45.

According to the draft complaint, Schwegmann and National are direct competitors for the retail sale of food

and grocery items in supermarkets, or narrower product markets contained therein, in the ''New Orleans metro area,'' which consists of the parishes of Orleans, Jefferson, and St. Bernard, or narrower geographic markets contained therein. According to the draft complaints, the relevant markets are highly concentrated and entry is difficult or unlikely. Schwegmann's acquisition of National may reduce competition in these markets by eliminating the direct competition between Schwegmann and National, by increasing the likelihood that Schwegmann will become a dominant firm, and by increasing the likelihood of collusive behavior among the remaining competitors.

The agreement containing consent order attempts to remedy the Commission's competitive concerns about the acquisition. Under the terms of the proposed order, Schwegmann must divest seven supermarkets within twelve months, to a purchaser approved by the Commission. If Schwegmann fails to satisfy the divestiture provisions, the Commission may appoint a trustee to divest supermarkets to satisfy the terms of the order. The seven supermarkets to be divested are:

1. That Stanley supermarket located at 315 E. Judge Perez Drive (store No. 79), Chalmette, LA;
2. Canal Villere supermarket located at 4726 Paris Avenue (store No. 24), New Orleans, LA;
3. Canal Villere supermarket located at 2125 Caton Street (store No. 25), New Orleans, LA;
4. That Stanley supermarket located at 4223 Chef Menteur Highway (store No. 8), New Orleans, LA;
5. That Stanley supermarket located at 9319 Jefferson Highway (store No. 33), River Ridge, LA;
6. Canal Villere supermarket located at 5245 Veterans Memorial Boulevard (store No. 93), Metairie, LA;
7. Canal Villere supermarket located at 135 Robert E. Lee Boulevard (store No. 83), New Orleans, LA.

For a period of ten years from the date the order becomes final, the order also prohibits Schwegmann from acquiring, without prior Commission approval, supermarket assets located in, or any interest (such as stock) in any entity that owns or operates a supermarket located in, the New Orleans metro area. This does not prevent Schwegmann from constructing new supermarket facilities on its own; nor does it prevent Schwegmann from leasing facilities not operated as supermarkets within the previous six months.

For a period of ten years, if Schwegmann sells or leases a supermarket to another person, Schwegmann may not enter into or enforce any agreement that would restrict the ability of that person to operate a supermarket. In addition, subject to certain exceptions, Schwegmann may not remove any equipment from a supermarket it owns or operates prior to a sale, sublease, assignment, or change in occupancy.

The respondent is required to provide to the Commission a report of compliance with the order within sixty (60) days following the date the order becomes final, every sixty (60) days thereafter until the divestitures are completed, and annually for a period of ten years.

The purpose of this analysis is to invite public comment on the proposed consent order to aid the Commission in its determination of whether it should make final the proposed consent order contained in the agreement.

This analysis is not intended to constitute an official interpretation of the agreement and proposed consent order, nor is it intended to modify the terms of the agreement and proposed consent order in any way.

Donald S. Clark,

Secretary.

Concurring Statement of Commissioner Mary L. Azcuenaga

Re: *Schnuck Markets, Inc.*, File No. 941–0131; *Schwegmann Giant Super Markets, Inc.*, File No. 941–0130

The two complaints allege geographic markets comprising ''the St. Louis MSA, and narrower markets contained therein'' and ''metro New Orleans, Louisiana area, which consists of the parishes of Orleans, Jefferson, and St. Bernard, and marrower markets contained therein.'' Although I question the broad geographic markets alleged, the investigational record contains sufficient information to support a finding of reason to believe with respect to small, discrete geographic markets located within the broad regions alleged in the complaint, and the stores to be divested were selected with a view to remedying competitive concerns in the small, discrete markets.

In addition, the complaints allege as the product market ''the retail sale of food and grocery products in supermarkets, and narrower markets contained therein.'' A serious argument can be made that the market should include sales of food and groceries in certain stores other than traditional supermarkets. Since the investigational record suggests that the concentration is high even if additional sales are included in the market, the issue need not be resolved at this time. Accordingly, I concur in the decision to accept the consent agreements for publication.

[FR Doc. 95–6343 Filed 3–14–95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6750–01–M

GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION

Construction of FDA Regional Office and Laboratory; Environmental Impact Statement; Jamaica, Queens County, New York

AGENCY: General Services Administration (GSA).

ACTION: Notice of Intent to hold a public scoping meeting and prepare and file an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS).

SUMMARY: The GSA is issuing this notice to advise the public that an EIS will be prepared for the construction of the FDA Regional Office and Laboratory in Jamaica, Queens County, New York.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Mr. Peter A. Sneed, Asset Manager, U.S. General Services Administration, Public Buildings Service, 26 Federal Plaza, Room 1609, New York City, NY 10278, (212) 264–3581.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The GSA will serve as lead agency and project sponsor in the preparation and filing of an EIS for the construction of the FDA Regional Office and Laboratory in Jamaica, Queens County, New York. The proposed action would involve the construction and operation of the facility on an assemblage of two properties located at the intersection 158th Street and Liberty Avenue. Combined, these two properties are 4.25 acres (1.73 hectares) in size. The existing FDA regional facilities are located in Federal Building #2 of the Federal Complex in Sunset Park, Brooklyn, New York. Due to the deteriorated condition of, and space constraints in, the present facility, FDA has requested relocation to a modern expanded facility to accommodate the additional staffing required to provide increased oversight and product monitoring. This action is intended to provide 175,000 occupiable square feet (16,250 square meters) of office, storage, and special space.

The EIS will evaluate the FDA regional facility alternatives, including the No-Action Alternative. It will also evaluate impacts on the affected environment, including, but not limited to, socioeconomics, hazardous materials, traffic/transportation, land use, cultural resources, and noise.

PUBLIC SCOPING MEETING: To ensure that all issues relating to the proposed project are identified and all potentially significant issues are addressed and satisfied in the EIS, public comments and suggestions are being solicited. To facilitate the receipt of comments, a public scoping meeting will be held on Monday, March 20, 1995 from 2 p.m. to 4 p.m. and from 6 p.m. to 8 p.m. in the auditorium of the Joseph Addabbo Federal Building, 1 Jamaica Center Plaza, Jamaica, New York.

Written comments may be mailed to the informational contact person no later than April 7, 1995.

Issued in New York City, New York on March 7, 1995.

Karen R. Adler,

Regional Administrator, General Services Administration, Region 2.

[FR Doc. 95–6289 Filed 3–14–95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6820–23–M

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES

Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry

Board of Scientific Counselors, Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry: Meeting

In accordance with section 10(a)(2) of the Federal Advisory Committee Act (Pub. L. 92–463), the Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry (ATSDR) announces the following committee meeting.

Name: Board of Scientific Counselors, ATSDR.

Times and dates: 8:30 a.m.–5:00 p.m., April 20, 1995. 8:30 a.m.–12:40 p.m., April 21, 1995.

Place: The Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, Auditorium A, 1600 Clifton Road, NE, Atlanta, Georgia 30333.

Status: The entire meeting will be open to the public.

Purpose: The Board of Scientific Counselors, ATSDR, advises the Administrator, ATSDR, on ATSDR programs to ensure scientific quality, timeliness, utility, and dissemination of results. Specifically, the Board advises on the adequacy of the science in ATSDR-supported research, emerging problems that require scientific investigation, accuracy and currency of the science in ATSDR reports, and program areas to emphasize and/or to de-emphasize.

Agenda: The Agenda will include an update on Superfund reauthorization and will also focus on other issues of concern to ATSDR, including ATSDR's programs for physician and community education, development of the medical assistance program, progress report by the Board of Scientific Counselors, ATSDR, work group on health studies, and an overview of the ATSDR Great Lakes Human Health Effects Research Program.

Written comments are welcome and should be received by the contract person listed below prior to the opening of the meeting.

Contact person for more information: Charles Xintaras, Sc.D., Executive Secretary, Board of Scientific Counselors, ATSDR, Mailstop E–28, 1600 Clifton Road, NE., Atlanta, Georgia 30333, telephone 404/639–0708.

Dated: March 8, 1995.

Carolyn J. Russell,

Director, Management Analysis and Services Office, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC).

[FR Doc. 95–6318 Filed 3–14–95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4163–70–M

National Institutes of Health Genome Research Review Committee; Notice of Cancellation of Meeting

Notice is hereby given of the cancellation of the meeting of the Genome Research Review Committee, National Center for Human Genome Research, March 14, 1995, Embassy Suites Hotel, Chevy Chase Pavilion, Washington, D.C. which was published in the Federal Register on March 3, 1995 (60 FR 11975).

The meeting was cancelled due to complications of other commitments of several members of the committee and will be rescheduled at a later date.

Dated: March 9, 1995.

Margery G. Grubb,

Senior Committee Management Specialist, NIH.

[FR Doc. 95–6326 Filed 3–14–95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4140–01–M

National Heart, Lung, and Blood Institute; Notice of a Closed Meeting

Pursuant to Section 10(d) of the Federal Advisory Committee Act, as amended (5 U.S.C. Appendix 2), notice is hereby given of the following Heart, Lung, and Blood Special Emphasis Panel (SEP) meeting:

Name of SEP: Review of the Vascular Disease Academic Award.

Date: April 9–10, 1995.

Time: 7 p.m.

Place: Holiday Inn, Chevy Chase, Maryland.

Contact Person: S. Charles Selden, Ph.D., 5333 Westbard Avenue, Room 552, Bethesda, Maryland 20892, (301) 594–7476.

Purpose/Agenda: To review and evaluate grant applications.

The meeting will be closed in accordance with the provisions set forth in sec. 552b(c)(4) and 552b(c)(6), Title 5, U.S.C. Applications and/or proposals and the discussions could reveal confidential trade secrets or commercial property such as patentable material and personal information concerning individuals associated with the applications and/or proposals, the disclosure of which would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy.

(Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance Programs Nos. 93.837, Heart and Vascular Diseases Research; 93.838, Lung Diseases Research; and 93.839, Blood Diseases and Resources Research, National Institutes of Health.)

Dated: March 9, 1995.

Margery G. Grubb,

Senior Committee Management Specialist, NIH.

[FR Doc. 95–6398 Filed 3–14–95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4140–01–M

National Heart, Lung, and Blood Institute; Notice of a Closed Meeting

Pursuant to Section 10(d) of the Federal Advisory Committee Act, as amended (5 U.S.C. Appendix 2), notice is hereby given of the following Heart, Lung, and Blood Special Emphasis Panel (SEP) meeting:

Name of SEP: Mechanisms of Post Bone Marrow Transplantation Lung Injury.

Date: April 5–6, 1995.

Time: 7:30 p.m.

Place: Holiday Inn, Chevy Chase, Maryland.

Contact Person: Dr. Lynn M. Amende, 5333 Westbard Avenue, Room 5A10, Bethesda, Maryland 20892, (301) 594–7480.

Purpose/Agenda: To review and evaluate grant applications.

The meeting will be closed in accordance with the provisions set forth in sec. 552b(c)(4) and 552b(c)(6), Title 5, U.S.C. Applications and/or proposals and the discussions could reveal confidential trade secrets or commercial property such as patentable material and personal information concerning individuals associated with the applications and/or proposals, the disclosure of which would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy.

(Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance Programs Nos. 93.837, Heart and Vascular Diseases Research; 93.838, Lung Diseases Research; and 93.839, Blood Diseases and Resources Research, National Institutes of Health.)

Dated: March 9, 1995.

Margery G. Grubb,

Senior Committee Management Specialist, NIH.

[FR Doc. 95–6397 Filed 3–14–95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4140–01–M

National Heart, Lung, and Blood Institute; Amendment Notice of Meeting

Notice is hereby given of a change in the meeting of the NHLBI SEP on Dietary Protein and Blood Pressure, April 20, 1995, which was published in the **Federal Register** on February 21 (60 FR 9692).

This Special Emphasis Panel was to have convened at 9:00 a.m. on April 20, at the Rockledge Building, Conference Room 8115, 8th Floor, National Institutes of Health, but has been changed to 9:00 a.m. on April 20, 1995, at the Natcher Building, Building 45, Conference Room B, National Institutes of Health.

The entire meeting will be open to the public to provide concept review of the proposed contract or grant solicitations.

Dated: March 8, 1995.

Susan K. Feldman,

Committee Management Officer, NIH.

[FR Doc. 95–6327 Filed 3–14–95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4140–01–M

National Institute of Child Health and Human Development; Notice of Meeting of the National Advisory Board on Medical Rehabilitation Research

Pursuant to Pub. L. 92–463, notice is hereby given of the meeting of the National Advisory Board on Medical Rehabilitation Research, National Institute of Child Health and Human Development, April 6–7, 1995, Radisson Plaza Lord Hotel, 20 West Baltimore Street, Baltimore, Maryland 21201.

The meeting will be open to the public from 9:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. on April 6 and 9:00 a.m. to adjournment on April 7. Attendance by the public will be limited to space available. Board topic will include: (1) A report on fiscal issues concerning the National Center for Medical Rehabilitiation Research (Center) and the Institute; (2) reports on program activities of the Center; (3) a discussion of general priority areas of research for the Center; (4) reports by the National Science Foundation and the Department of Veterans Affairs; and (5) a discussion of support for medical rehabilitiation research by government agencies.

Ms. Mary Plummer, Committee Management Specialist, NICHD, 6100 Building, Room 5E03, National Institutes of Health, Bethesda, Maryland 20892, Area Code 301, 496–1485, will provide a summary of the meeting and a roster of Advisory Board members as well as substantive program information. Individuals who plan to attend and need special assistance, such as sign language interpretation or other reasonable accommodations, should contact Ms. Plummer.

Dated: March 8, 1995.

Susan K. Feldman,

Committee Management Officer, NIH.

[FR Doc. 95–6329 Filed 3–14–95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4140–01–M

National Institute on Deafness and Other Communication Disorders; Notice of Closed Meeting

Pursuant to Section 10(d) of the Federal Advisory Committee Act, as amended (5 U.S.C. Appendix 2), notice is hereby given of the following meeting:

Name of Committee: National Institute on Deafness and Other Communication Disorders Special Emphasis Panel.

Dates: April 11–13, 1995.

Time: 8 am to 5 pm each day.

Place: Hyatt Regency, Bethesda, MD.

Contact Person: Marilyn Semmes, Ph.D., Acting Chief, Scientific Review Branch, NIDCD, NIH, ESP Suite 400C, 6120 Executive Boulevard, MSC 7180, Bethesda, MD 20892–7180, 301/496–8683.

Purpose/Agenda: To review and evaluate grant applications.

The meeting will be closed in accordance with the provisions set forth in sec. 552b(c)(4) and 552b(c)(6), Title 5, U.S.C. Applications and/or proposals and the discussions could reveal confidential trade secrets or commercial property such as patentable material and personal information concerning individuals associated with the applications and/or proposals, the disclosure of which would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy.

(Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance Program No. 93.173 Biological Research Related to Deafness and Communication Disorders).

Dated: March 9, 1995.

Margery G. Grubb,

Senior Committee Management Specialist, NIH.

[FR Doc. 95–6396 Filed 3–14–95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4140–01–M

National Institute of Deafness and Other Communications Disorders; Notice of Meeting of the Board of Scientific Counselors, NIDCD

Pursuant to Pub. L. 92–463, notice is hereby given of a meeting of the Board of Scientific Counselors, NIDCD, on April 13, 1995. The meeting will be conducted as a telephone conference call originating from Building 31C, Room 3C05, National Institutes of Health, 9000 Rockville Pike, Bethesda, Maryland.

The meeting will be open to the public from 2 to 4 pm to present reports and discuss issues related to business of the Board. Attendance by the public will be limited to space available.

A summary of the meeting and a roster of committee members may be obtained from James F. Battey, M.D., Ph.D., Executive Secretary of the Board of Scientific Counselors, NIDCD, 5 Research Ct., Room 2B–28, Rockville, Maryland 20850.

Individuals who plan to attend and need special assistance, such as sign language interpretation or other reasonable accommodations, should contact Dr. Battey at least two weeks prior to the meeting.

(Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance Program No. 93.173 Biological Research Related to Deafness and Communication Disorders)

Dated: March 8, 1995.

Susan K. Feldman,

Committee Management Officer, NIH.

[FR Doc. 95–6328 Filed 3–14–95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4140–01–M

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Bureau of Land Management

[AZ–050–05; 1790–00]

Intent To Prepare an Environmental Assessment and/or Environmental Impact Statement for the La Paz County Regional Landfill Expansion Project, Yuma District, AZ

AGENCY: Bureau of Land Management, Interior.

ACTION: Notice of Intent To Prepare an Environmental Assessment and/or Environmental Impact Statement for the La Paz County Regional Landfill Expansion Project.

SUMMARY: The Yuma District's Havasu Resource Area Office is preparing an Environmental Assessment and/or Environmental Impact Statement for the expansion of the La Paz County Regional Landfill, and the construction of a railroad drill track (spur) and haul road. The landfill is located near the intersection of Arizona State Highways 72 and 95, approximately 15 miles southeast of Parker, Arizona. La Paz County has submitted an application for 6.3 miles of right-of-way across public lands pursuant to the Federal Land Policy Management Act of 1976, and a request for the sale of 480 acres of public land pursuant to the Recreation and Public Purposes Act of 1926, as amended. The Bureau of Land Management has responsibility for the environmental review of the right-of-way and land sale application pursuant

to the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA). Preparation of appropriate NEPA documentation will follow Council on Environmental Quality Regulations for implementing the procedural provisions of NEPA, pertinent guidance contained in the Department of Interior Manual on Environmental Quality (DM 516), and the BLM NEPA Handbook (H–1790–1).

La Paz County proposes the expansion of an existing 160-acre landfill, with an additional 480 acres, and the construction of 6.3 miles of drill track and/or haul road to service the facility. Construction of the drill track will require a Clean Water Act (CWA) Section 404 Nationwide Permit for the crossing of Bouse Wash. Implementation of the proposed project will provide regional, long-term waste disposal capacity.

The Environmental Assessment and/or Environmental Impact Statement will be developed by a third party contractor who has been approved by the Bureau of Land Management. The contractor will use an interdisciplinary team to develop the document. The Bureau of Land Management will retain overall responsibility for preparation and review of the document.

Complete records of all phases of the environmental documentation process will be available for public review at the Bureau of Land Management, Havasu Resource Area Office, 3189 Sweetwater Avenue, Lake Havasu City, Arizona.

The public is invited to participate in the NEPA process beginning with scoping and the identification of issues in April 1995.

DATES: Public Scoping Meetings to identify issues will be held as follows: Wednesday, April 5, 1995 (1–3 pm), Quartzsite Town Hall Complex, Public Library Meeting Room, 465 North Plymouth Avenue, 465 North Plymouth Avenue, Quartzsite, Arizona; telephone (602) 927–6593; and Wednesday, April 5, 1995 (6–8 pm), La Paz County Board of Supervisor's Meeting Room, 1112 Joshua Avenue, Parker, Arizona; telephone (602) 669–6138.

The comment period for this Notice of Intent ends April 14, 1995.

COMMENTS/FURTHER INFORMATION: Send comments and/or requests for further information to: Bureau of Land Management, Havasu Resource Area, Attention: Joe Liebhauser, 3189 Sweetwater Avenue, Lake Havasu City, Arizona 86403. Telephone: (602) 855–9017.

Dated: March 7, 1995.

Don Applegate,

Nonrenewable Resource Advisor/Acting District Manager.

[FR Doc. 95–6331 Filed 3–14–95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4310–32–P

[CA–010–03–1220–01; 5–00160–GP5–010–001]

Temporary Vehicle Use Restriction Order for Caliente Resource Area

AGENCY: Bureau of Land Management, Interior.

ACTION: Establishment of temporary vehicle use restriction in the Kelso Creek and Isabella Management Areas within Kern County in the Caliente Resource Area, Bakersfield District, California.

SUMMARY: This emergency action restricts vehicle use on BLM-administered public land in the Isabella Management Area due top trash dumping and erosion problems and restricts vehicle use on BLM-administered public lands in the Kelso Creek Management Area due to severe vandalism of range developments. Both areas will be addressed on a permanent basis in a Resource Management Plan. Vehicle use on roadways is restricted to ''Administrative Access Only'' and shall be limited to persons specifically designated by the Area Manager to drive on said roadways. The public lands over which these roads travel and located in portions of NW¼ Section 12, Township 27 South, Range 32 East; SE¼ Section 29 and SW¼ Section 28, Township 26 South, Range 35 East; N½ Section 4 and N½ Section 9, Township 27 South, Range 35 East, all Mount Diablo Base and Meridian, in the County of Kern, State of California. This restriction will apply from the date of publication in the Federal Register and remain in effect until an amendment thereof or until publication of a Resource Management Plan which adequately addresses public access on these lands.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: This emergency road closure is intended to control vehicle use on public lands for protection of range developments, to prevent further trash dumping, and to abate erosion on sensitive hillsides. Authority for this restriction order is contained in CFR Title 43, Chapter II, 8364.1(a).

DATES: This order will be effective on March 15, 1995.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: James Abbott, Caliente Resource Area Manager, Caliente Resource Area, Bureau of Land Management, 3801 Pegasus Drive, Bakersfield, California 93308; (805) 391–6000.

Dated: March 6, 1995.

James Wesley Abbot,

Caliente Resource Area Manager.

[FR Doc. 95–6235 Filed 3–14–95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4310–40–M

National Park Service

Hamilton Grange National Memorial, New York County, New York; Final General Management Plan and Environmental Impact Statement

In accordance with the National Environmental Policy Act 102(2)(C) of 1969, the National Park Service, U.S. Department of the Interior announces that a Final Environmental Impact Statement (FEIS) has been prepared on the four alternatives for future management and use of Hamilton Grange National Memorial.

This notice announces the availability of the FEIS for public review. Following a 30-day no-action period, a Record of Decision will be written documenting the range of alternatives considered and evaluated, the preferred alternative selected, and the rationale for its selection.

For further inquiries about the FEIS, and requests for additional copies should be directed to the Superintendent, Manhattan Sites, 26 Wall Street, New York, New York 10005 or by calling (212) 825–6992.

Dated: March 9, 1995.

Sandy Corbett,

Acting Regional Director.

[FR Doc. 95–6323 Filed 3–14–95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4310–70–P

National Center for Preservation Technology and Training: Grant Program Announcement

AGENCY: National Park Service, Department of the Interior.

ACTION: Grant program announcement and publication of selection criteria.

The National Center for Preservation Technology and Training, an office of the National Park Service, is accepting proposals for its 1995 Preservation Technology and Training Grants. Only proposals postmarked no later than April 1, 1995 will be considered.

The Center's grant program supports preservation technology and training projects in the fields of archeology, architecture, historic landscapes, materials conservation, and history or interpretation. Approximately $900,000.00 will be awarded; each grant

is limited to $40,000.00 and proposals for smaller amounts are encouraged. Grantee's total direct and indirect administrative costs shall not exceed 25 percent of their total grant award.

Proposals from government agencies and non-profit institutions are eligible. Principal criteria for selection include:

1. Proposed projects shall be innovative in their disciplines and shall not duplicate current or recent developments in preservation research or training.
2. Proposed projects shall have broad application in preservation practice.
3. Proposed projects shall address identifiable national needs.
4. Proposed projects shall be cost-efficient and practical.
5. Proposed work shall be completed approximately one year from award.

Grants will be selected in a two-tier process. The first tier will be comments by expert readers; the second tier will be a selection panel comprised of Federal employees.

Funds for the 1995 grants program will be obligated no later than September 30, 1995.

Dated: March 6, 1995.

E. Blaine Cliver,

Chief, Preservation Assistance Division.

[FR Doc. 95–6393 Filed 3–14–95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4310–70–P

National Preservation Technology and Training Board; Meeting

AGENCY: National Park Service, Department of the Interior.

ACTION: Notice of meeting of the National Preservation Technology and Training Board.

Notice is hereby given in accordance with the Federal Advisory Committee Act, 5 U.S.C. Appendix (1988), that the National Preservation Technology and Training Board will meet on May 2–4, 1995, in Washington, DC.

The Board was established by Congress to provide leadership, policy advice, and professional oversight to the National Center for Preservation Technology and Training, as required under the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966, as amended (16 U.S.C. 470).

The Board will meet each day, May 2–4, in the Board Room of the American Institute of Architects (AIA) at 1735 New York Avenue, NW., in Washington, DC. Matters to be discussed will include: A summary of the FY 1995 grant applications received and discussion of the grant review procedures; reports on the Center's working groups meetings held in the spring 1995; report of activities since the November 1994 Board meeting; review of the Center's budget and discussion of a five-year plan for the organization.

The Board will meet on Tuesday, May 2nd, from 8:30 am until 12 noon and from 1:15 until 5 pm. On Wednesday, May 3rd, the meeting will start at 9 am and end at 12 noon and on Thursday, May 4th, it will be held from 9 am until 2 pm (the Board will be served a working lunch in order to complete miscellaneous business). Meetings will be open to the public. However, facilities and space for accommodating members of the public are limited and persons will be accommodated on a first-come, first-served basis. Any member of the public may file a written statement concerning the matters to be discussed with Dr. Elizabeth A. Lyon, Chair, Preservation Technology and Training Board, P.O. Box 1269, Flowery Branch, Georgia 30542.

Persons wishing more information concerning this meeting, or who wish to submit written statements, may do so by contacting Mr. E. Blaine Cliver, Designated Federal Official, Preservation Technology and Training Board, National Park Service, Preservation Assistance Division, P.O. Box 37127, Washington, DC 20013–7127, telephone: (202) 343–9573. Draft summary minutes of the meeting will be available for public inspection about eight weeks after the meeting at the office of the Preservation Assistance Division, Suite 200, 800 North Capitol Street, Washington, DC.

Dated: March 7, 1995.

E. Blaine Cliver,

Chief, Preservation Assistance, National Park Service.

[FR Doc. 95–6392 Filed 3–14–95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4310–70–P

INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION

[Investigation No. 337–TA–367]

Notice of Commission Determination not to Review an Initial Determination Terminating the Investigation on the Basis of a Settlement Agreement

AGENCY: U.S. International Trade Commission.

ACTION: Notice.

In the Matter of: Certain Facsimile Machines and Components Thereof

SUMMARY: Notice is hereby given that the U.S. International Trade Commission has determined not to review the presiding administrative law judge's (ALJ's) initial determination (ID) (Order No. 3) in the above-captioned investigation terminating the investigation on the basis of a settlement agreement.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Mark D. Kelly, Esq., Office of the General Counsel, U.S. International Trade Commission, telephone 202–205–3106.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: On August 1, 1994, Ricoh Co., Ltd. and Ricoh Corp. filed a complaint with the Commission alleging violation of section 337 in the importation, sale for importation, and the sale within the United States after importation of certain facsimile machines and components thereof that allegedly infringed claims 1, 5, 7, 8, 9 or 10 of U.S. Letters Patent 4,249,216, or claims 1, 2, 4, 8, or 10 of U.S. Letters Patent 4,494,149, owned by complainants.

The Commission instituted an investigation of the complaint, and published a notice of investigation in the **Federal Register** on September 8, 1994, 59 FR 46447 (1994). The notice named Samsung Electronics Co., Ltd. of Seoul, Korea, and Samsung Electronics America, Inc. of Ridgefield Park, New Jersey as respondents.

On December 22, 1994, complainants and respondents filed a joint motion to terminate the investigation based on a settlement agreement. On February 10, 1995, the ALJ granted the joint motion and issued an ID (Order No. 3) terminating the investigation on the basis of the settlement agreement. No petitions for review, or agency or public comments were received.

This action is taken under the authority of section 337 of the Tariff Act of 1930, 19 U.S.C. 1337, and Commission rule 210.42, 19 C.F.R. § 210.42.

Copies of the public version of the ALJ's ID, and all other nonconfidential documents filed in connection with this investigation are or will be available for inspection during official business hours (8:45 a.m. to 5:15 p.m.) in the Office of the Secretary, U.S. International Trade Commission, 500 E Street SW., Washington, DC 20436, telephone 202–205–2000. Hearing-impaired persons are advised that information on the matter can be obtained by contacting the Commission's TDD terminal on 202–205–1810.

By order of the Commission.

Issued: March 7, 1995.

Donna R. Koehnke,

Secretary.

[FR Doc. 95–6376 Filed 3–14–95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7020–02–P

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Antitrust Division

Notice Pursuant to the National Cooperative Research and Production Act of 1993—Fieldbus Foundation

Notice is hereby given that, on December 8, 1994, supplemented by filings of December 20, 1994 and December 22, 1994, pursuant to Section 6(a) of the National Cooperative Research and Production Act of 1993, 15 U.S.C. 4301 *et seq.* (''the Act''), the Fieldbus Foundation (''Fieldbus'') has filed written notifications simultaneously with the Attorney General and the Federal Trade Commission disclosing certain changes. Specifically, the December 8, 1994 notification advises that effective September 23, 1994, InterOperable System Project Foundation (''ISPF'') merged with WorldFip North America, Inc.; ISPF was the surviving entity, changed its name to Fieldbus Foundation (''Fieldbus'') and identified the following new members: Allen-Bradley Company, Inc., Highland Heights, OH; Allen-Bradley Japan Co., Ltd, Tokyo, Japan; Bailey Controls Co., Wickliffe, OH; E.I. duPont De Nemours & Co., Inc., Wilmington, DE; Honeywell, Inc., Phoenix, AZ; K.K. CODIX, Tokyo, Japan; Nagano Keiki Seisakusho, Ltd., Tokyo, Japan; Niigata Masoneilan Co., Ltd., Chiba, Japan; Proctor & Gamble Company, Cincinnati, OH; Square D Company, Knightdale, NC; Tokyo Keiso Co., Ltd., Tokyo, Japan; Uticor Technology, Inc., Bettendorf, IA; and Yamatake-Honeywell Co., Ltd. Tokyo, Japan. The December 20, 1994, notification discloses that DKK Corporation, Tokyo, Japan; Glaxo, Inc., Research Triangle Park, NC; and Presys Instrumentos E Sistemas Ltda, San Paulo, Brazil, have become new members. Lastly, the December 22, 1994, notification discloses that Pacific Avionics Corp., Redmond, WA has become a new member. These notifications were filed for the purpose of extending the Act's provisions limiting the recovery of antitrust plaintiffs to actual damages under specified circumstances.

No other changes have been made in either membership or planned activity of the group research project. Membership in this group research project remains open, and Fieldbus intends to file additional written notifications disclosing all changes in membership.

On May 7, 1993, Fieldbus filed its original notification pursuant to Section 6(a) of the Act. The Department of Justice published a notice in the **Federal Register** pursuant to Section 6(b) of the Act on September 23, 1993 (58 Fed. Reg. 49529).

The last notification was filed with the Department on July 5, 1994. This notice has not yet been published in the **Federal Register**.

Constance K. Robinson,

Director of Operations, Antitrust Division.

[FR Doc. 95–6285 Filed 3–14–95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4410–01–M

Notice Pursuant to the National Cooperative Research and Production Act of 1993—Portland Cement Association

Notice is hereby given that, on November 22, 1994, pursuant to Section 6(a) of the National Cooperative Research and Production Act of 1993, 15 U.S.C. 4301 *et seq.* (''the Act''), Portland Cement Association (''PCA'') has filed written notification simultaneously with the Attorney General and the Federal Trade Commission disclosing changes in its membership. The notifications were filed for the purpose of extending the Act's provisions limiting the recovery of antitrust plaintiffs to actual damages under specified circumstances. Specifically, Herzog Automation Corp., Cleveland, Ohio has become an Associate Member of PCA; and Passamaquoddy Technology and Cemtech LP have resigned as Associate Members of PCA.

No other changes have been made in either the membership or planned activity of the group research project. Membership in this group research project remains open, and PCA intends to file additional written notification disclosing all changes in membership.

On January 7, 1985, PCA filed its original notification pursuant to Section 6(a) of the Act. The Department of Justice published a notice in the **Federal Register** pursuant to Section 6(b) of the Act on February 5, 1985, 50 FR 5015.

The last notification was filed with the Department on August 9, 1994. A notice was published in the **Federal Register** pursuant to Section 6(b) of the Act on October 18, 1994, 59 FR 52556.

Constance K. Robinson,

Director of Operations, Antitrust Division.

[FR Doc. 95–6284 Filed 3–14–95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4410–01–M

Notice Pursuant to the National Cooperative Research and Production Act of 1993—Poweropen Association, Inc.

Notice is hereby given that, on September 30, 1994, pursuant to Section 6(a) of the National Cooperative Research and Production Act of 1993, 15 U.S.C. 4301 *et seq.* (''the Act''), PowerOpen Association, Inc. (''PowerOpen''), has filed written notifications simultaneously with the Attorney General and the Federal Trade Commission disclosing changes in its membership. The notifications were filed for the purpose of extending the Act's provisions limiting the recovery of antitrust plaintiffs to actual damages under specified circumstances. Specifically, the identities of the new members of PowerOpen are: AVD Systems, Moscow, RUSSIA; Bell & Howell, Lincolnwood, IL; Digital Equipment Corporation, Rocky Hill, CT; Dun & Bradstreet Software Service, Inc., Framingham, MA; EMC Corporation, Hopkinton, MA; Federal Express Corporation, Memphis, TN; Finsiel—Consulenza ed Applicazioni Informatiche, Napoli, ITALY; Hewlett-Packard, Cupertino, CA; Industrial Technology Research Institute, Taiwan, ROC; Infotech Automatisering, AH Nymegen, NETHERLANDS; Institute for Information Industry, Taipei, Taiwan, ROC; Kendall Square Research, Waltham, MA; Northern Telecom MBA, Ottawa, Ontario, CANADA; OC Systems, Inc., FAirfax, VA; Ohio! Uniforum, Cleveland, OH; Open Networks Engineering, Inc., Ann Arbor, MI; PowerHouse Systems, Inc., Menlo Park, CA; Scott & Scott Systems, Inc., Seattle, WA; SKY Computers, Chemlsford, MA; Tidalwave Microtech, Fremont, CA; TriGem Computers, Inc., Amsam City, Kyunggi, KOREA; Warthman Associates, Palo Alto, CA; Zuken-Redac LTD, Tewkesbury, Gloucestershire, UNITED KINGDOM.

No other changes have been made in either the membership or planned activity of the group research project. Membership in this group research project remains open, and PowerOpen intends to file written notifications disclosing all changes in membership.

On April 21, 1993, PowerOpen filed its original notification pursuant to Section 6(a) of the Act. The Department of Justice published a notice in the **Federal Register** pursuant to Section 6(b) of the Act on June 22, 1993 (58 Fed. Reg. 33954).

The last notification was filed with the Department on July 1, 1994. A notice was published in the **Federal Register** pursuant to Section 6(b) of the

Act on November 14, 1994 (59 Fed. Reg. 56533).

Constance K. Robinson,

Director of Operations Antitrust Division.

[FR Doc. 95–6286 Filed 3–14–95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4410–01–M

Notice Pursuant to the National Cooperative Research and Production Act of 1993—Pine Oil Joint Venture

Notice is hereby given that, on December 28, 1994, pursuant to Section 6(a) of the National Cooperative Research and Production Act of 1993 15 U.S.C. 4301 *et seq.* (''the Act''), SCM Glidco Organics has filed written notifications simultaneously with the Attorney General and the Federal Trade Commission disclosing changes in its membership. The notifications were filed for the purpose of extending the Act's provisions limiting the recovery of antitrust plaintiffs to actual damages under specified circumstances. Specifically, the following members have withdrawn their membership with SCM Glidco Orgnaics: Sistesis quimica S.A. de C.V. and Johnson Chemical Co., Inc.

No other changes have been made in either the membership or planned activity of the joint venture. Membership in this joint venture remains open, and SCM Glidco Organics intends to file additional written notification disclosing all changes in membership.

On January 5, 1987, American Cyanamid Company filed its original notification pursuant to Section 6(a) of the Act. The Department of Justice published a notice in the **Federal Register** pursuant to Section 6(b) of the Act on February 5, 1987, 52 F. R. 37190. The last notification was filed with the Department on August 13, 1993. A notice was published in the **Federal Register** pursuant to Section 6(b) of the Act on September 20, 1993, 58 F.R. 51103.

Constance K. Robinson,

Director of Operations, Antitrust Division.

[FR Doc. 95–6282 Filed 3–14–95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4410–01–M

Notice Pursuant to the National Cooperative Research and Production Act of 1993—X Consortium, Inc.

Notice is hereby given that, on December 8, 1994, pursuant to Section 6(a) of the National Cooperative Research and Production Act of 1993, 15 U.S.C. 4301 *et seq.* (''the Act''), X Consortium, Inc. (the ''Corporation'') has filed written notification simultaneously with the Attorney General and the Federal Trade Commission disclosing changes in its membership. The notifications were filed for the purpose of extending the Act's provisions limiting the recovery of antitrust plaintiffs to actual damages under specified circumstances. Specifically, the following have become members of the Corporation: Institut National de Recherche en Informatique et en Automatique, Le Chesnay, FRANCE; and KL Group, Inc., Toronto, CANADA.

No other changes have been made in either membership or planned activity of the group research project. Membership in this group research project remains open, and the Corporation intends to file additional written notifications disclosing all changes in membership.

On September 15, 1993, the Corporation filed its original notification pursuant to Section 6(a) of the Act. The Department of Justice published a notice in the **Federal Register** pursuant to Section 6(b) of the Act on November 10, 1993 (58 FR 59737). The last notification was filed with the Department on June 14, 1994. A notice was published in the **Federal Register** pursuant to Section 6(b) of the Act on November 7, 1994 (59 FR 55490).

Constance K. Robinson,

Director of Operations, Antitrust Division.

[FR Doc. 95–6283 Filed 3–14–95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4410–01–M

Drug Enforcement Administration

[Docket No. 93–52]

Robert A. Leslie, M.D.; Denial of Application

On May 13, 1993, the Deputy Assistant Administrator (then-Director), Office of Diversion Control, Drug Enforcement Administration (DEA), issued an Order to Show Cause to Robert A. Leslie, M.D., of Los Angeles, California, proposing to deny his application for registration as a practitioner. The Order to Show Cause alleged that the Respondent's registration would be inconsistent with the public interest as that term is used in 21 U.S.C. 823(f).

Respondent, acting pro se, requested a hearing on the issues raised by the Order to Show Cause, and the matter was placed on the docket of Administrative Law Judge Mary Ellen Bittner. Following prehearing procedures, a hearing was held in Los Angeles, California, on December 8 and 9, 1993. On July 27, 1994, in her opinion and recommended ruling, findings of fact, conclusions of law and decision, the administrative law judge recommended that Respondent's application for DEA registration be denied. In a footnote of her recommended decision, the administrative law judge referenced specific documents that were submitted by Respondent after the administrative hearing. The administrative law judge recommended that the Deputy Administrator not consider these submissions, since most of the documents pertained to matters previously litigated and conclusively decided in a previous criminal action, and therefore, consideration of them was barred by the doctrine of res judicata. No exceptions were filed by either party.

On August 16, 1994, Respondent filed a Petition for Reconsideration of the administrative law judge's decision recommending denial of his application for DEA registration. On August 17, 1994, the administrative law judge denied this petition as lacking in merit.

On August 30, 1994, the administrative law judge transmitted the record to the Deputy Administrator. The Deputy Administrator has carefully considered the entire record in this matter and pursuant to 21 CFR 1316.67, hereby issues his final order in this matter based upon findings of fact and conclusions of law as hereinafter set forth. The Deputy Administrator concurs with Judge Bittner's recommendation not to consider specific post hearing submissions of the Respondent. Accordingly, these submissions were not considered in rendering this decision.

The administrative law judge found that Respondent graduated from medical school in 1955, became licensed as a physician in 1958, and practiced medicine in Los Angeles during the period at issue in this case. On April 1, 1986, a complaint was filed in the Municipal Court of Long Beach, California, charging Respondent with seventeen misdemeanor counts, sixteen of which related to the unlawful handling of controlled substances. Following a jury trial, on October 9, 1986, Respondent was found guilty on eight counts of unlawfully prescribing, administering, furnishing or dispensing controlled substances between July 1985 and January 1986. Respondent's convictions were affirmed on appeal by the Appellate Department of the Superior Court, State of California, in a Memorandum Judgement issued on May 18, 1988.

Based on his criminal convictions, on August 17, 1988, the California Board of

Medical Quality Assurance (BMQA) filed an accusation against Respondent seeking to suspend his medical license. Following an administrative hearing, on July 24, 1989, the state administrative law judge recommended that Respondent's medical license be revoked, but that the revocation be stayed for five years, that Respondent be placed on probation subject to certain conditions, and that he be suspended from the practice of medicine for 90 days. After the BMQA adopted the decision of the state administrative law judge, Respondent sued BMQA, but was unsuccessful both in the lower court and on appeal. The court subsequently fined Respondent $10,000, and found that his appeal was frivolous.

On June 21, 1989, DEA issued an Order to Show Cause, seeking to revoke Respondent's prior DEA Certificate of Registration, AL0033186. Respondent requested a hearing, but later submitted a written statement of his position in lieu of participating in a hearing. Based on Respondent's statement and the Government's investigative file, effective August 17, 1990, the then-Acting Administrator revoked Respondent's DEA registration, based upon the finding that his continued registration would be inconsistent with the public interest. *See Robert A. Leslie, M.D.*, 55 FR 29278 (1990). Respondent subsequently filed a new application for DEA registration on February 6, 1992, which is the subject of this proceeding.

Respondent testified at the administrative hearing to matters surrounding his criminal conviction. Respondent argued that his prescribing to undercover operatives was justified based upon their physical conditions and complaints of pain, and that he was entrapped; during the criminal trial, the operatives perjured themselves regarding events that took place during their visits with Respondent; his direct appeal of his criminal convictions was denied, and his subsequent filing of ten petitions for habeas corpus in state and federal courts were unsuccessful; and, he sued his attorney for malpractice based upon the latter's failure to provide adequate legal representation.

Respondent also contended that the 1990 final order of the then-Acting Administrator relied on false statements supplied by BMQA that were not part of the original court record. Respondent testified that he filed a petition for reconsideration of that final order, however, since the **Federal Register** notice of the final order was not timely sent to him, the period for filing a motion for reconsideration elapsed before he became aware of the revocation. The administrative law judge found this argument without merit based on the provisions of 21 U.S.C. 877, regarding judicial review, and the fact that there is no provision in the Code of Federal Regulations for filing requests for reconsideration.

Pursuant to 21 U.S.C. 823(f), the Deputy Administrator may deny any application for registration, if he determines that the continued registration would be inconsistent with the public interest. In determining the public interest, the following factors are considered:

(1) The recommendation of the appropriate State licensing board or professional disciplinary authority.

(2) The applicant's experience in dispensing controlled substances.

(3) The applicant's conviction record under Federal or State laws relating to the distribution, or dispensing of controlled substances.

(4) Compliance with applicable State, Federal, or local laws relating to controlled substances.

(5) Such other conduct which may threaten the public health and safety.

It is well established that these factors are to be considered in the disjunctive, i.e., the Deputy Administrator may properly rely on any one or a combination of the factors and give each factor the weight he deems appropriate. *See Henry J. Schwarz, Jr., M.D.*, Docket No. 88–42, 54 FR 16422 (1989). In considering whether grounds exist to deny Respondent's application for DEA registration, the administrative law judge found all of the above factors relevant.

The administrative law judge found that Respondent's testimony, documentary evidence and pleadings in this proceeding contended that his criminal conviction was invalid. The administrative law judge concluded however, that the conviction is res judicata, and that Respondent should not be allowed to relitigate the matter.

The administrative law judge found that during the administrative hearing, although Respondent was free to offer new evidence that he would never again engage in the type of conduct that resulted in his conviction, he failed to do so. The administrative law judge also found that while Respondent offered evidence and expended time arguing the invalidity of his criminal convictions, he offered no evidence of remorse for his prior conduct, that he has taken rehabilitative steps, or that he recognizes the severity of his actions. The administrative law judge concluded that Respondent is either unwilling or unable to discharge the responsibilities inherent in a DEA registration, and therefore, recommended that his application for DEA registration be denied.

The Deputy Administrator having considered the entire record adopts the administrative law judge's findings of fact, conclusions of law, and recommended ruling in its entirety. Accordingly, the Deputy Administrator of the Drug Enforcement Administration, pursuant to the authority vested in him by 21 U.S.C. 823 and 824 and 28 CFR 0.100(b) and 0.104, hereby orders that the application for registration, executed by Robert A. Leslie, M.D., be, and it hereby is, denied. This order is effective March 15, 1995.

Dated: March 8, 1995.

Stephen H. Greene,

Deputy Administrator.

[FR Doc. 95–6297 Filed 3–14–95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4410–09–M

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Pension and Welfare Benefits Administration

[Prohibited Transaction Exemption 95–24; Exemption Application No. D–09787, et al.]

Grant of Individual Exemptions; Boston Cement Masons Union Local No. 534 Deferred Income Plan, et al.

AGENCY: Pension and Welfare Benefits Administration, Labor.

ACTION: Grant of individual exemptions.

SUMMARY: This document contains exemptions issued by the Department of Labor (the Department) from certain of the prohibited transaction restrictions of the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 (the Act) and/or the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 (the Code).

Notices were published in the **Federal Register** of the pendency before the Department of proposals to grant such exemptions. The notices set forth a summary of facts and representations contained in each application for exemption and referred interested persons to the respective applications for a complete statement of the facts and representations. The applications have been available for public inspection at the Department in Washington, DC. The notices also invited interested persons to submit comments on the requested exemptions to the Department. In addition the notices stated that any interested person might submit a written request that a public hearing be held (where appropriate). The applicants have represented that they have complied with the requirements of

the notification to interested persons. No public comments and no requests for a hearing, unless otherwise stated, were received by the Department.

The notices of proposed exemption were issued and the exemptions are being granted solely by the Department because, effective December 31, 1978, section 102 of Reorganization Plan No. 4 of 1978 (43 FR 47713, October 17, 1978) transferred the authority of the Secretary of the Treasury to issue exemptions of the type proposed to the Secretary of Labor.

Statutory Findings

In accordance with section 408(a) of the Act and/or section 4975(c)(2) of the Code and the procedures set forth in 29 CFR Part 2570, Subpart B (55 FR 32836, 32847, August 10, 1990) and based upon the entire record, the Department makes the following findings:

(a) The exemptions are administratively feasible;

(b) They are in the interests of the plans and their participants and beneficiaries; and

(c) They are protective of the rights of the participants and beneficiaries of the plans.

Boston Cement Masons Union Local No. 534 Deferred Income Plan (the Deferred Income Plan), Boston Cement Masons Union Local No. 534 Pension Plan (the Pension Plan), Boston Cement Masons Union Local No. 534 Health and Welfare Plan (the Welfare Plan) and Boston Cement Masons Union Local No. 534 Apprenticeship Plan (the Apprenticeship Plan; Collectively, the Plans) Located in Boston, Massachusetts

[Prohibited Transaction Exemption 95–24; Application Nos. D–9787, D–9788, L–9789 and L–9790, respectively]

Exemption

The restrictions of sections 406(a), 406(b)(1) and (b)(2) of the Act and the sanctions resulting from the application of section 4975 of the Code, by reason of section 4975(c)(1)(A) through (E) of the Code, shall not apply to the proposed leasing of office space in a building (the Building) owned by the Deferred Income Plan to the Boston Cement Masons Union Local No. 534, a party in interest with respect to the Deferred Income Plan.

In addition, the restrictions of section 406(b)(2) of the Act shall not apply to the proposed leasing of office space in the Building by the Deferred Income Plan to the Pension Plan, the Welfare Plan and the Apprenticeship Plan.

This exemption is conditioned upon the following requirements: (1) The terms of all such leasing arrangements are at least as favorable to the Plans as those obtainable in an arm's length transaction with an unrelated party; (2) an independent, qualified fiduciary, who has approved of the leasing arrangements, agrees to monitor all leases on behalf of the Deferred Income Plan as well as the terms and conditions of the exemption at all times; (3) the rental charged by the Deferred Income Plan under each lease is based upon the fair market rental value of the premises as determined by an independent, qualified appraiser; (4) the Building is revalued annually by the independent, qualified appraiser; (5) if appropriate, the independent, qualified fiduciary adjusts the rentals charged for the office space based upon the annual appraisals of the Building; and (6) the trustees determine that the leasing arrangements are in the best interests of the Pension Plan, the Welfare Plan and the Apprenticeship Plan.

For a more complete statement of the facts and representations supporting the Department's decision to grant this exemption, refer to the notice of proposed exemption published on January 18, 1995 at 60 FR 3659.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Kathryn Parr of the Department, telephone (202) 219–8971. (This is not a toll-free number.)

General Motors Hourly-Rate Employes Pension Plan (the Plan) Located in Detroit, Michigan

[Prohibited Transaction Exemption No. 95–25; Application No. D–9734]

Exemption

The restrictions of sections 406(a), 406(b)(1) and (b)(2), and 407(a) of the Act and the sanctions resulting from the application of section 4975 of the Code, by reason of section 4975(c)(1)(A) through (E) of the Code [1] shall not apply to:

(1) The transfer of shares of Class E common stock (the Class E stock) of General Motors Corporation (GM) to the Plan through the in-kind contribution of such shares by GM, a party in interest with respect to such Plan;

(2) The holding of the Class E stock by the Plan;

(3) The sale for cash of shares of Class E stock by the Plan to GM or its affiliates or to certain defined contribution plans sponsored by GM or its affiliates;

(4) The exchange of shares of Class E stock for publicly-traded securities between the Plan and GM or its affiliates under the same terms and conditions as are made available to all shareholders of Class E stock; and

(5) The acquisition, holding, and exercise by the Plan of a put option granted by GM which permits the Plan to sell the Class E stock or a successor security for which the Class E stock has been exchanged to GM.

This exemption is conditioned upon the satisfaction of the following requirements:

(a) GM contributes to the Plan at least 177 million shares of Class E stock but no more than 186 million shares plus $4 billion in cash, with at least $2 billion contributed in conjunction with or prior to the contribution of the Class E stock, and the remaining $2 billion contributed no later than September 30, 1995;

(b) If less than 177 million shares of Class E stock are contributed, GM will contribute additional cash in an amount equal to the difference between 177 million and the number of shares of Class E stock contributed times the per-share value of such stock at the time of contribution, or a weighted average price if such stock is not contributed on a single date;

(c) United States Trust (UST), an independent qualified fiduciary, or a successor independent fiduciary acceptable to the Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation (PBGC) represents the Plan's interests with respect to the acquisition of Class E stock and also will serve as trustee of the Plan with sole discretion respecting the management and disposition of the Class E stock after the acquisition. UST must determine, prior to entering into any of the transactions described herein, that each such transaction, including the contribution of the Class E stock, is in the interest of the Plan;

(d) UST negotiates and approves the terms of any of the transactions between the Plan and GM or its affiliates or certain defined contribution plans sponsored by GM or its affiliates;

(e) UST manages the holding and disposition of the Class E stock and takes whatever action it deems necessary to protect the rights of the Plan;

(f) The terms of any of the transactions between the Plan and parties in interest are no less favorable to such Plan than terms negotiated at arm's length under similar circumstances with unrelated third parties;

(g) A credit balance reserve is maintained in the Plan consisting of the cash credit balance or cash generated from stock that has been sold in an amount equal to at least 25 percent

[1] For purposes of this exemption, references to specific provisions of Title I of the Act, unless otherwise specified, refer also to the corresponding provisions of the Code.

(25%) of the contributed value[2] of the Class E stock which remains unsold in the Plan, for so long as such stock or any securities received in exchange exceeds the percentage limitations described in sections 407(a) and 407(f) of the Act (the ERISA Limits);

(h) An independent qualified appraiser determines the fair market value of the Class E stock contributed to the Plan as of the date of such contribution, and determines the fair market value of the Class E stock at various other times as required under the agreement between GM and the PBGC (the Agreement);

(i) With respect to any sale or exchange of Class E stock by the Plan to GM or its affiliates or to any defined contribution plans sponsored by GM or its affiliates, no commission will be charged to or paid by the Plan;

(j) Any sale or exchange of Class E stock between the Plan and GM or its affiliates will be for no less than ''adequate consideration'' within the meaning set forth in section 3(18) of the Act, and any sale of Class E stock by the Plan to a defined contribution plan sponsored by GM or its affiliates will be at the prevailing price for such stock on the New York Stock Exchange (NYSE); and

(k) The Plan incurs no fees, costs, or other charges or expenses as a result of its participation in transaction (1), above and, with regard to other transactions described herein, will not incur fees and other costs payable by the issuer under the Registration Rights Agreement (RRA).

EFFECTIVE DATE: This exemption will be effective on March 13, 1995.

Written Comments

In the Notice of Proposed Exemption (the Notice), the Department invited all interested persons to submit written comments and requests for a hearing on the exemption. All comments and requests for hearing were due by December 29, 1994.

The Department received 157 letters from interested persons commenting on the exemption. In addition, a number of interested persons telephoned the Department. These individuals were assisted with their questions by members of the staff of the Office of Exemption Determinations of the Department. With respect to all the written comments submitted by interested persons, the Department forwarded copies to the applicant and requested that the applicant address the concerns raised by the commentators in writing. A description of the comments and the applicant's responses are summarized below.

Several of the written comments received by the Department supported adoption of the exemption. In this regard, after review of GM's application for exemption and the terms of the Agreement between GM and PBGC, the International Union, United Automobile, Aerospace and Agricultural Implement Workers of America (the UAW), the certified collective bargaining representative for approximately 215,000 employees of GM who are participants in the Plan and approximately 255,000 retired former employees of GM who are participants in the Plan, expressed support for the application and stated its belief that the transactions which are the subject of this exemption are in the best interest of the Plan's participants and beneficiaries.

Some commentators neither supported nor opposed the exemption but either expressed a lack of understanding of the exemption or raised other concerns that are beyond the scope of this exemption proceeding. Other commentators opposed the exemption and raised questions and concerns regarding the transactions described therein. The concerns expressed by these commentators generally related to: (a) The impact on pension or health benefits; (b) the holding by the Plan of more than 5% of its assets in any company; (c) the preference for a cash contribution over that of stock; (d) the potential loss of value of the Class E stock; (e) the restrictions on the Plan's ability to sell the Class E stock under the terms of the RRA; (f) the fact that the Class E stock is not a qualifying employer security; (g) the control by the Plan of more than 10% of the voting shares of a company; (h) the presence of a financial flexibility exception in the Agreement given GM's recent financial history; (i) the effect of an EDS sale on GM's future contributions to the Plan; (j) the tax advantages to GM of the contribution of Class E stock; and (k) the lack of a mandatory requirement in the exemption to convert the Class E stock into cash.

The following summarizes the response to these concerns submitted to the Department by GM. With respect to (a) above, GM states that the exemption does not change or affect in any way the pension benefits payable under the Plan or health benefits for active or retired employees. As a result, the exemption will not affect a participant's eligibility to receive a pension benefit, the amount of a pension benefit check, or the terms of any health care plan.

With respect to (b), GM states that UST, the independent fiduciary, has represented that the Plan's receipt of the Class E stock will not violate the general diversification rule of the Act, which requires that a plan's assets be sufficiently diversified in order to minimize the risk of large losses.

With respect to (c), GM responded that while in the abstract the contribution of cash may be superior to that of stock, the issue posed by the exemption application was not whether the Plan could choose to acquire Class E Stock where an equivalent value of cash is available. In this regard, as the Plan is significantly underfunded, GM believes it is offering a way to substantially improve the Plan's funding with a combined contribution of Class E stock and cash.

With respect to (d), GM maintains that the Agreement, deferring credit for the contribution of Class E stock and the $4 billion in cash, provides considerable security because in all likelihood the Plan will receive further cash contributions from GM in excess of minimum funding rules of the Act in the years between 1995 and 2003. In addition, GM states that the Agreement contains other protective features that adequately address the potential for future losses in value, if any, in the Class E stock. Finally, because the dividends on Class E stock are based on the earnings of Electronic Data Systems Corporation (EDS), GM believes the contribution provides more diversification than a security whose dividends are based on the performance of GM.

With respect to (e), GM states that UST, the independent fiduciary, is required by law to act solely in the interest of the Plan and its participants and beneficiaries. In this regard, UST is satisfied that, given the size of the block and the likely means of disposition, that the RRA affords ample opportunity for UST to sell or otherwise dispose of the Plan's Class E stock while maximizing the value of such stock to the Plan.

With respect to (f), GM states that although the Class E stock is not a qualifying employer security because the Plan will acquire and hold in excess of the limits imposed by the Act, there are sufficient safeguards to protect the interest of the Plan and the participants and beneficiaries. In addition, GM points out the Class E stock is widely traded on the NYSE, and an independent fiduciary, UST, has negotiated a RRA that will allow it, as trustee for the Class E stock, to dispose

[2] Contributed value means the value of the Class E stock when contributed to the Plan, as determined by Duff & Phelps Capital Markets Co. (formerly Duff & Phelps Financial Consulting Co.).

of the stock efficiently while maximizing its value to the Plan.

With respect to (g), GM states that the Class E stock is widely traded on the NYSE and generates dividends based on the earnings of EDS rather than on the performance of GM. Further, an independent fiduciary, UST, has negotiated a RRA that will allow UST, as trustee for the Class E stock, to dispose of the stock efficiently while maximizing its value to the Plan, and UST is satisfied that it can do so given the size of the block of Class E stock.

With respect to (h), GM states that the commentator erroneously alleges that GM's North American Operations (the NAO) has met the ''bad year'' definition under the Agreement in each of the past five (5) years and asserts that this pattern will continue in the future, allowing GM to access more of the credit balance than ''what would appear to the common layperson.'' In fact, the NAO did not meet the ''bad year'' definition in 1994. Moreover, GM notes that, although the proposed exemption is complex, the Department's notice and comment process is fair and comprehensive and the financial flexibility provisions of the Agreement in principle were disclosed in the Notice on the same basis and in the same fashion as all other parts of the exemption transaction.

With respect to (i), GM states that the commentator erroneously concludes that if GM sells EDS, GM's obligation to contribute to the Plan will be nullified. In this regard, GM represents that the Agreement provides that the credit balance rules generally apply to stock for which the Plan's Class E stock has been exchanged. Further, GM asserts that if the credit balance is unavailable, GM will still make at least the minimum contributions required by the Act.

With respect to (j), GM states that the contribution of Class E stock to the Plan does not defer or eliminate any income taxes that otherwise would be payable on GM's disposition of Class E stock. With respect to (k), GM states that the commentator erroneously assumes that GM will have control of the Plan's portfolio after the Class E stock is contributed. In this regard, GM represents that it will have no control over the management of such stock. UST, the independent trustee, will have complete discretion over the management and disposition of the Class E stock, and, in its sole discretion, will determine how and when the Class E stock will be liquidated.

In addition to the comments described above, the Department also received comments from the applicant, GM. The comments from GM requested certain modifications and clarifications to the exemption as proposed and to the Summary of Facts and Representations (SFR). GM's comments fall into three categories: (1) clarification regarding the relationship of the exemption to the Agreement between the PBGC and GM regarding the contribution of cash and Class E stock; (2) issues relating to the conditions of the exemption; and (3) certain technical corrections to the SFR.

With respect to the first category of the comment, GM informed the Department that, since May 1994, GM and the PBGC have been negotiating the terms of a definitive Agreement. In its application for exemption, GM described the tentative terms of this Agreement, as reflected in an agreement in principle (the AIP) executed on May 9, 1994, between the PBGC and GM. The Department summarized certain terms of the AIP in the SFR. The proposed exemption provided that any final exemption would be conditioned upon adherence to the material facts and representations described in the SFR. GM notes that the terms of the AIP have now been superseded by the executed Agreement. Thus, GM believes that there is a substantial risk that any change in or non-adherence to a material provision will vitiate the exemption and, thereby, preclude the Plan from continuing to hold contributed Class E stock above the limits set forth in sections 407(a) and 407(f)(1) of the Act. This situation in turn would place the independent fiduciary, UST, in the position of potentially having to engage in a forced liquidation of a sufficient quantity of Class E stock to bring the Plan within the limits of such sections of the Act. As a result, GM requests clarification as to whether any change in or non-adherence to either the terms of the AIP, as described in the SFR, or the Agreement would render the exemption unavailable.

GM states that the Agreement is a contract between GM and the PBGC. It is lengthy and complicated, reflecting the nature, size, and complexity of its subject. Assets likely to be valued in excess of $10 billion will be at issue, and the terms of the Agreement will require numerous complex calculations to be performed. The Agreement will continue in force until at least October 1, 2003, and, as with any such complex document, it is possible that good faith differences may arise between GM and the PBGC over the meaning and application of its terms.

GM notes in its comment that it believes that the Plan is fully protected by the reporting and enforcement provisions set forth in the Agreement, and the interests of the Plan and its participants and beneficiaries are better served by application of such procedures than by enforcement through the exemption. These reporting and enforcement provisions are carefully crafted to facilitate the timely and effective resolution of disputes, while permitting the Plan to continue the orderly disposition of Class E stock. The Agreement provides for annual reporting by GM to the PBGC, and contains a dispute resolution mechanism through which the PBGC can enforce the terms and conditions of such Agreement. GM represents that it will comply in all material respects with the reporting provisions in the Agreement (including as they may be changed from time to time by mutual agreement of GM and the PBGC). In addition, the Agreement provides, among other things, for access to the courts, and under certain circumstances, for the posting of collateral by GM if a disputed amount exceeds a certain threshold. Accordingly, GM suggests that the exemption, if granted, contain the following language, ''Several aspects of the Agreement are of special importance to the Department and were included as requirements (a), (b), and (g) of the proposed exemption * * * . Accordingly, if GM violates a term or condition of the Agreement, *other than the specific requirements noted above* (emphasis added), the violation will be addressed by PBGC under the Agreement and not by withdrawal or other invalidation of the exemption itself.''

In this regard, the Department requested the views of the PBGC concerning whether a breach of the Agreement by GM in the future should void the exemption. The PBGC confirmed that the Agreement contains adequate enforcement mechanisms in the event of a breach. GM is required under the Agreement to provide information to the PBGC that will enable the PBGC to monitor and confirm that the restrictions have been properly applied. Also, the PBGC will monitor and enforce those terms of the Agreement adopted by the Department as conditions of the exemption, as summarized in sections (a), (b), and (g) therein. As a result, the PBGC stated that it does not believe that voiding the exemption is a necessary or appropriate enforcement mechanism to ensure compliance with the Agreement, and that it would not recommend that the exemption be voided for violation of a term of the Agreement after GM has contributed the stock and cash required by the Agreement and by sections (a)

and (b) of the proposed exemption. In addition, the PBGC is of the opinion that voiding the exemption after the stock is contributed could harm the Plan if the independent fiduciary were forced to sell stock held by the Plan to bring the Plan's employer securities within the ERISA Limits.

UAW in its comment letter also concurred with the views expressed by GM on the question of whether the exemption should be voided in the event of an alleged breach of the Agreement. UAW believes that the enforcement mechanisms described in the Agreement are adequate and appropriate and that termination of the exemption in the event of a breach of that Agreement would only be harmful to participants and beneficiaries, in that termination of the exemption would by necessity force a massive and precipitous sale of the Class E stock. In the opinion of the UAW, selling the Class E stock under such conditions is not likely to result in the realization of optimum proceeds and would therefore diminish the assets in the Plan.

However, the UAW noted that the language suggested by GM to address this issue, as quoted above, would create the impression that these requirements of the exemption are precisely co-extensive with the analogous sections of the Agreement. The UAW further noted that the language in (a), (b), and (g), as set forth in the Notice, summarized but did not recite word for word such sections from the Agreement. Accordingly, the UAW suggested that the word, ''included'' in the first sentence of GM's language quoted above be replaced with the word, ''summarized,'' and the underlined portion of the second sentence of GM's language quoted above be changed to read, ''without violating one of the express conditions of the exemption.''

The Department concurs with GM, the PBGC, and the UAW that the rights embodied in the reporting and dispute resolution provisions of the Agreement provide protection to the Plan, and that enforcement by the PBGC through the procedures negotiated in the Agreement will serve the interest of the Plan and its participants and beneficiaries. Further, the Department believes that any ''fire sale'' of Class E stock which may result from the unavailability of the exemption through a change in or non-adherence to the terms of the AIP described in the SFR or the Agreement would not be in the interest of the Plan. However, the Department has determined that compliance with certain provisions of the Agreement, as summarized in paragraphs (a), (b), and (g) of the proposed exemption, are important and necessary to the continued availability of the exemption. Accordingly, it is the view of the Department that, if GM violates a term or condition of the Agreement, without violating one of the express conditions of the exemption, the violation will be addressed by the PBGC in accordance with the enforcement terms of such Agreement and will not result in the unavailability of the exemption. The Department is of the further view that the exemption will be available despite the fact that the terms of the final Agreement differed in some respects from the terms of the AIP which was summarized in the SFR.

With respect to the second category of the comment, GM requests modifications to the language of certain conditions of the exemption, as set forth in the Notice. In this regard, condition (c) on page 56541 and repeated in item 18(c) on page 56549 of the Notice as published in the **Federal Register**, states: ''United States Trust (UST), an independent qualified fiduciary, or a successor independent fiduciary acceptable to the Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation (PBGC) represents the Plan's interests *for all purposes with respect to the Class E stock and determines* (emphasis added), prior to entering into any of the transactions described herein, that each such transaction, including the contribution of the Class E stock, is in the interest of the Plan.'' GM believes this to be an overly broad description of the independent fiduciary's responsibilities. GM suggests striking the underlined phrase above and substituting in lieu thereof, ''with respect to the acquisition of Class E stock and also will serve as trustee of the Plan with sole discretion respecting the management and disposition of the Class E stock after the acquisition. UST must determine * * *.'' The Department concurs with this comment and has modified the final exemption accordingly.

Condition (k) on page 56541 and repeated in item 18(k) on page 56549 of the Notice, as published in the **Federal Register**, states: ''The Plan incurs no fees, costs, or other charges or expenses as a result of its participation in *any of the transactions* (emphasis added).'' GM is concerned that this condition would preclude the payment by the Plan to UST or any other independent fiduciary of fees for asset management services as independent fiduciary. In this regard, the applicant notes that the application indicated that GM would bear the costs of UST's fees in connection with the Plan's acquisition of the Class E stock but that fees for UST's trustee services will be payable by the Plan. It is intended that all fees associated with the management and disposition of Class E stock, other than certain underwriting and other fees and costs described in section 9 of the RRA, will be borne by the Plan. GM suggests striking the underlined phrase above and substituting the phrase, ''transaction (1), above and, with regard to other transactions addressed herein, will not incur fees and other costs payable by the issuer under the Registration Rights Agreement.'' The Department concurs with this comment and has revised the language of condition (k).

With respect to the third category of the comment, GM believes that certain revisions to the SFR would more accurately describe the transactions. As mentioned above, the AIP was summarized in the SFR. Subsequently, the AIP was superseded by the terms of the Agreement. Consequently, GM wishes to point out the following four (4) provisions of the AIP which were summarized in the SFR but which have now been modified by the Agreement.

The second sentence of item 6 of the SFR on page 56543, states that GM's stock contribution will consist of, ''* * * all of the remaining, 222 million unissued shares of Class E stock less approximately 45 million shares reserved for conversion of GM's Series C Preference Stock, or approximately 177 million shares.'' In accordance with the terms of the Agreement, GM suggests that the phrase, ''and the number of shares of GM Class E stock that, as of the last contribution of such stock, are reserved or committed (as Treasury shares or otherwise) for employee benefit plans, stock bonus plans, or employee stock programs,'' should have been inserted after the words, ''Preference Stock,'' in the above-quoted language.

Item 12 of the SFR, on page 56545 (center column, third full paragraph), refers to GM's ''* * * access annually to an amount of up to $1.5 billion of the stock credit balance generated by the stock which has been sold.'' GM suggests that in accordance with the Agreement the phrase, ''an average of approximately,'' should have been inserted in the above-quoted language between the words, ''to'' and ''$1.5,'' because $1.5 assumes GM's access to the stock credit balance at approximately the mid-point of a plan year and reflects interest over the first portion of the plan year at the Plan's funding standard account rate.

Item 12 of the SFR states on page 56545 (center column, sixth sentence of the second full paragraph) that, the restriction relating to the 25% credit

balance reserve ''* * * will expire on October 1, 2003, if the Class E stock has been exchanged for non-employer securities.'' GM notes that the Agreement provides that, the restriction will expire when the contributed Class E stock or any shares received in exchange therefor no longer exceed the ERISA Limits. If the contributed Class E shares are exchanged for non-employer securities, the restriction will expire on the later of October 1, 2003 or the date on which the Class E stock has been exchanged for non-employer securities.

Item 12 of the SFR states on page 56546 (center column, top carryover paragraph, last sentence) that, ''GM's independent auditor will provide a statement to the PBGC once GM utilizes the financial flexibility provisions described above.'' GM suggests that in accordance with the Agreement, striking the quoted sentence and substituting in lieu thereof, ''[f]or any plan year through the 2002 plan year for which GM utilizes the financial flexibility provisions of the Agreement, GM will include in its submission to the PBGC a statement from its independent auditor confirming the accuracy of the schedule showing GM's cash. In addition, upon request by the PBGC, GM also will furnish for such plan years a report from its independent auditor describing agreed upon procedures it has performed in order to assist the PBGC in evaluating the restructuring charges included in GM's financial statements, if and to the extent those charges were used to determine GM's adjusted net income.'' The Department concurs and notes that the above four (4) clarifications to the SFR are consistent with the terms of the Agreement.

Also, as part of the third category of the comments, GM has suggested the following modifications to the language of the SFR.

In item 5 of the SFR on page 56543 (center column), the first and second sentences in the first full paragraph stated: ''[g]enerally, in order to correct the unfunded liability of its main U.S. plans, GM has revised the mortality assumptions in such plans to more closely reflect recent actual experience. Further, effective for 1993, GM has lowered the asset earnings rate assumption for its main U.S. plans.'' GM points out that the mortality and asset earnings rate assumptions were not adopted in order to correct the unfunded liability of GM's main US plans but rather to accurately reflect recent experience. Accordingly, GM believes that the two sentences quoted above should have read, ''[d]uring 1992, GM revised the mortality assumptions for its main U.S. plans to reflect recent experience and, effective 1993, lowered the asset earnings rate assumption for those plans, to reflect GM's reevaluation of the expected long-term rate of return on Plan assets.'' The Department concurs with this comment.

In item 5 of the SFR on page 56543 (center column) in the first full paragraph, the fourth sentence stated that GM ''* * * will continue to contribute additional amounts above those required in 1994 and future years.'' Although GM anticipates making such contributions, GM suggests that substituting in the phrase quoted above, the words, ''intends to,'' in lieu of the word, ''will,'' and the words, ''1994–1996,'' in lieu of the phrase, ''1994 and future years,'' would have been more accurate. The Department concurs with this comment.

In the third sentence of item 8 of the SFR on page 56543 (right column) GM suggests the underlined word, ''or,'' in the phrase, ''assets remaining after payments to creditors or (emphasis added) to preferred or preference stockholders,'' should have been the word, ''and.'' The Department concurs.

In the first sentence of the first paragraph of item 10 of the SFR on page 56544 (left column), GM suggests that the phrase, ''based upon,'' should have been substituted for ''linked to'' in the sentence, ''[d]ividends on Class E stock are linked to the earnings performance of EDS.'' The Department concurs.

In item 12 of the SFR on page 56545 (center column, first sentence, first full paragraph), GM suggests that the phrase, ''* * * GM has agreed to defer for two (2) years the use of the credit balance * * *,'' should have read, ''GM will defer until 1997 use of the credit balance arising from the contribution (except for interest on the cash portion thereof and as otherwise noted below). * * *'' GM states that because the cash portion of the contribution need not be completed until September 30, 1995, the deferral period could be as short as one (1) year. The Department concurs.

In item 12 of the SFR, in the last clause of the first full sentence in the center column of page 56545, GM suggests that the underlined portion of the phrase, ''* * * to phase in full access by GM to *the credit balance in the Plan's funding standard account,*'' (emphasis added) should have read, ''such credit balance.'' The Department concurs.

In item 16 of the SFR in the first sentence of the first full paragraph in the right column of page 56548, GM suggests, and UST agrees, that in the phrase, ''[b]ecause the marketability and dividends of Class E stock are based on the earnings and financial performance of EDS, UST has reviewed the business of EDS, as well as that of GM,'' the words, ''under the current policy of the GM board,'' should have been inserted before the word, ''dividends.'' The Department concurs.

In footnote 15 on page 56544 (left column), the fourth sentence stated, ''[a]t the discretion of the Board, as appropriate, the number in the denominator from time to time decreases as shares of Class E stock are purchased and increases as shares are needed in order to meet certain requirements of GM's employee benefit plans.'' GM suggests that while the above-quoted statement is correct, in the interest of accuracy and completeness, the following quoted sentence should have been added to the footnote: ''[t]he denominator is subject to adjustment from time to time (but never to a number greater than one) by GM's Board, the discretion of which is limited in accordance with criteria specified in GM's Certificate of Incorporation intended to preserve fairness as between the interests of both the holders of Class E stock and the holders of $1⅔ per value common stock.'' Accordingly, the Department does not object to the inclusion of GM's additional clarifying language.

The following GM comments relate to the RRA and the Transfer Rights Agreement (TRA), as described in the SFR.

GM has commented upon the need of UST to be able to amend the RRA due to circumstances that may arise in the future. In GM's view, the exemption, if granted, should permit UST to execute amendments to the RRA that UST believes are in the interest of the Plan and its participants and beneficiaries, without forcing GM or the Plan to request another exemption. The Department concurs.

Footnote 20 on page 56546, states that the term, ''transfer'' includes an ''offer.'' GM suggests that, to more closely reflect the RRA and TRA, the word, ''offer,'' should have been omitted from the definition of the term, ''transfer.'' The Department concurs.

In the second full paragraph in the right column of page 56546, GM suggests that, to more closely reflect the RRA, it would have been more complete to insert the words ''in the aggregate,'' in the first sentence of the paragraph such that the first sentence would have read as follows: ''It is represented that there will be no limit, except for market considerations on the amount of Class E stock that can be sold *in the aggregate* (emphasis added) pursuant to a 'demand' transfer by the Plan.'' Further,

the word, ''[s]imilarly,'' should have been substituted in lieu of the phrase, ''[i]n addition,'' at the beginning of the third sentence of the paragraph, such that the third sentence should have read as follows, ''*[s]imilarly* (emphasis added), in a negotiated transaction, the Plan may not transfer more than 2 percent (2%) of the outstanding Class E stock to any person or related group. * * *'' The Department concurs.

In the carryover paragraph at the top of the right column on page 56546, GM suggests that, to more closely reflect the RRA, the last sentence should have read, ''[u]nder the RRA, as long as the Plan owns 2 percent (2%) or more of the outstanding Class E stock, the Plan may transfer such stock only under certain terms and conditions summarized in the paragraphs below.'' The Department concurs.

In the second full paragraph in the right column on page 56546, GM suggests that, to more closely reflect the RRA, in the second sentence the adjective, ''reasonable,'' should have been inserted before the phrase, ''best efforts,'' in the sentence, ''However, in any public offering the lead underwriters must agree to use their best efforts to assure that no more than 2 percent (2%) of the outstanding Class E stock is transferred to any person or related group.'' The Department concurs.

In the last paragraph in the right column on page 56546, GM suggests that, to more closely reflect the RRA, the underlined phrases below should have been inserted so that the third sentence should have read as follows, ''[i]f, *at any time that the Plan owns at least 25 million shares of Class E stock* (emphasis added), as a result of such postponements or such market holdbacks, the Plan is not able to effect a 'demand' transfer for a period of thirteen (13) months, *and during such period the Plan has not otherwise transferred 25 million or more shares of Class E stock or had the opportunity to include at least 25 million shares of Class E stock in a piggyback registration* (emphasis added), GM must terminate the postponement within sixty (60) days of the Plan's notification to GM of such fact and take all reasonable actions necessary to effect such transfer.'' The Department concurs.

In the first full paragraph in the left column on page 56547, in the definition of Strategic Partner, GM suggests that to more closely reflect the RRA, the second sentence of the paragraph should have read, ''[a] Strategic Partner is an investor or group of investors acting in concert and designated as such by the Board of GM (or any successor issuer) that acquires 10 percent (10%) or more of the outstanding Class E stock (or securities convertible or exchangeable therefor) in a transaction or series of related transactions intended to achieve a strategic objective.'' The Department concurs.

In the second full paragraph in the left column on page 56547, GM suggests that, to more closely reflect the RRA, the second sentence should have read, ''[i]n a 'piggyback' registration, if GM, in its reasonable judgment, expects that at least 25 percent (25%) of the total number of shares of Class E stock to be included in the offering are shares owned by the Plan, the Plan may select a co-manager reasonably acceptable to GM.'' The Department concurs.

In its comment, GM states that the Plan and a Strategic Partner will participate on an equal, not on a *pro rata* basis in piggyback registrations. Accordingly, GM suggests that, to more closely reflect the RRA, the phrase, ''an equal basis,'' should have been substituted for the phrase, ''a *pro rata* basis,'' in the last sentence of the carryover paragraph in the center column on the top of page 56547. The Department concurs.

In the first full paragraph of the center column on page 56547, GM suggests that, to more closely reflect the RRA, in the first sentence the phrase, ''below 7.5 percent (7.5%) should have read ''7.5 percent (7.5%) or less.'' Further, the fourth and fifth sentences in the same paragraph should have read, ''In general, if a stockholders rights plan is in effect when the third-party tender offer commences but, in connection with such offer, the stockholders rights plan is revoked or invalidated (or the rights issued thereunder are revoked or redeemed) either by GM's Board of Directors or by a final and non-appealable court order, the Plan may tender its shares of Class E stock into such offer. If there is no stockholders rights plan in effect (other than as described above), generally the Plan may tender its shares of Class E stock into a tender offer so long as either the GM Board or at least one-half of the independent directors on the Board have not recommended to stockholders that such tender offer be rejected or there are fewer than the two independent directors on the Board.'' The Department concurs.

In the second full paragraph in the center column on page 56547, GM suggests that, to more closely reflect the RRA, the first sentence should have read, ''[i]n the event the Plan is prohibited as described above from tendering into a third-party offer and GM does not otherwise consent to the Plan tendering, in general, if the tender results in a bidder in the tender offer owning more than 50 percent (50%) of the total combined voting power of all outstanding securities of GM or other issuer, the Plan will have the option to put to GM or other issuer up to the same number of shares that would have been purchased if tendered in the tender offer for a purchase price in cash equal to the price per share offered in the tender.'' The Department concurs.

In item 14 of the SFR, GM suggests that, to more closely reflect the TRA, the first sentence in the second full paragraph in the right column of page 56547 should have read, ''[t]he Transfer Agreement is intended to preserve GM's ability to consummate at a later date a tax-free reorganization, including a split-off in which the Class E stock is converted into or exchanged for shares of capital stock of EDS in a transaction that results in GM no longer controlling EDS ('Split-Off'). In this regard, unless and until a Split-Off is consummated, the Plan will not be permitted to transfer Class E stock if such transfer will result in more than 5 percent (5%) of the total value of Class E stock then outstanding being owned by any foreign person, as defined in the Code.'' The Department concurs.

In the second full paragraph in the right column of page 56547, the third sentence stated, ''[u]nder certain circumstances after the Split-Off, the Plan may not transfer any Class E stock if, as a result, the Plan would own less than 50 percent (50%) of the Class E stock that it owned immediately after it received notice from GM of the Split-Off.'' GM suggests that, to more closely reflect the TRA, the words, ''after the Split-Off'' should not have been included in that sentence and the words, ''a proposed'' should have been inserted in lieu of the word, ''the,'' before the word, ''Split-Off'' the last time it appears.

GM suggests that, to more closely reflect the TRA, the following quoted sentence should have been included as the next to the last sentence in the second full paragraph in the right column of page 56547 of the Notice, ''[f]rom the date of the initial contribution until the first anniversary of the Split-Off, if any, the Plan may not transfer Class E stock to any person or group, if, as a result, such person or group would own 5 percent (5%) or more of the Class E stock then outstanding.'' In addition, GM in its comment provides further clarification regarding the relationship of the above-quoted sentence to the last sentence of the second full paragraph in the right column of page 56547 of the Notice.

That sentence reads, ''[f]rom the date of the initial contribution until the second anniversary of the Split-Off, unless EDS announces a merger with one or more corporations, the Plan may not transfer Class E stock to any person or related group, if, as a result, such person or group would own 5 percent (5%) or more of the Class E stock then outstanding.'' GM states that the two sentences quoted above, when read together, mean that during the period that begins on the initial contribution date and ends on the first anniversary of the Split-Off date, the Plan may not transfer Class E stock to a person who is (or, as a result of the transfer would be) a ''5 percent person.'' However, during the period that begins on the day after the first anniversary of the Split-Off date and ends on the second anniversary of the Split-Off date (or later, in the case of a merger event occurring before the second anniversary of the Split-Off date), the Plan may transfer Class E stock to a person who would, as a result of the transfer, constitute a ''5 percent person,'' if that person agrees to be bound by the TRA. The Department concurs.

In addition, to the comments from GM described above, GM informed the Department of an event which transpired after the Notice was published in the **Federal Register**. In this regard, in item 12 on page 56545 of the SFR, GM indicated that it anticipated contributing $750 million to the Plan before the end of 1994 which, at its option, along with previous cash contributions, could be considered part of the $4 billion dollar contribution which is the subject of this exemption. In this regard, GM, in a letter dated December 22, 1994, advised the Department that this $750 million contribution in cash was made on December 12, 1994.

GM also clarified certain representations regarding the approximately 17 million shares of Class E stock held by the Plan prior to the contribution. On page 56546 of the Notice, in the third full paragraph of the center column, it is stated that the RRA and the TRA ''* * * will apply to all Class E stock held by the Plan whether acquired pursuant to the proposed contribution in-kind or otherwise held by the Plan at the time the exemption is granted. In this regard, the 17 million shares of Class E stock held by the Plan prior to the contribution will be surrendered to GM so that restrictions may be placed on such shares.'' Subsequent to the publication of the Notice, it came to the attention of GM that approximately 300,000 shares of the 17 million shares were acquired on the open market by several independent investment managers in the course of implementing their respective portfolio management strategies. These shares are registered and tradable without restriction. Because these shares are registered, not subject to any trading restrictions, and under management of independent managers, GM believes that it would be inappropriate to transfer management of these shares to UST pursuant to the exemption. Rather, GM believes that these shares should remain under the control of their respective managers to be held and disposed of in their discretion, as they pursue their respective portfolio management strategies. As a result, these shares will not be subject to the RRA and the TRA and will continue under the control of their respective managers, to be held or disposed of in their discretion, rather than UST's.

A number of individual commentators requested a hearing with respect to the exemption. Most of these commentators appear to have requested a hearing because of their belief that the transaction would reduce their retirement benefits. In addition, several commentators requested a hearing but did not state a reason for such request. In response to these requests for hearing, GM states that, given the number of participants and beneficiaries receiving the Notice of Proposed Exemption, the number of requests for a hearing is *de minimis*. Moreover, none of the requests for a hearing presented a compelling reason why such hearing should be held.

The Department has considered the concerns expressed by the individuals who had requested a hearing and the applicant's written response addressing such concerns. After consideration of the materials provided, the Department does not believe that any issues have been raised which would require the convening of a hearing. Further, after giving full consideration to the record, including the comments by commentators and the responses of the applicant, the Department has determined to grant the exemption, as described herein. In this regard, the comments submitted to the Department have been included as part of the public record of the exemption application. The complete application file, including all supplemental submissions received by the Department, is made available for public inspection in the Public Documents Room of the Pension Welfare Benefits Administration, room N–5507, U.S. Department of Labor, 200 Constitution Avenue NW., Washington, DC 20210.

For a more complete statement of the facts and representations supporting the Department's decision to grant this exemption refer to the Notice published on Monday, November 14, 1994, 59 FR 56541.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Angelena C. Le Blanc of the Department, telephone (202) 219–8883 (This is not a toll-free number.)

General Information

The attention of interested persons is directed to the following:

(1) The fact that a transaction is the subject of an exemption under section 408(a) of the Act and/or section 4975(c)(2) of the Code does not relieve a fiduciary or other party in interest or disqualified person from certain other provisions to which the exemptions does not apply and the general fiduciary responsibility provisions of section 404 of the Act, which among other things require a fiduciary to discharge his duties respecting the plan solely in the interest of the participants and beneficiaries of the plan and in a prudent fashion in accordance with section 404(a)(1)(B) of the Act; nor does it affect the requirement of section 401(a) of the Code that the plan must operate for the exclusive benefit of the employees of the employer maintaining the plan and their beneficiaries;

(2) These exemptions are supplemental to and not in derogation of, any other provisions of the Act and/or the Code, including statutory or administrative exemptions and transactional rules. Furthermore, the fact that a transaction is subject to an administrative or statutory exemption is not dispositive of whether the transaction is in fact a prohibited transaction; and

(3) The availability of these exemptions is subject to the express condition that the material facts and representations contained in each application accurately describes all material terms of the transaction which is the subject of the exemption.

Signed at Washington, DC, this 10th day of March, 1995.

Ivan Strasfeld,

Director of Exemption Determinations, Pension and Welfare Benefits Administration, Department of Labor.

[FR Doc. 95–6345 Filed 3–14–95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4510–29–P

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

Cost Beneficial Licensing Actions (CBLA) and Technical Specifications Improvement Program (TSIP) Public Workshop

AGENCY: Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

ACTION: Notice of public workshop.

SUMMARY: The Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) will conduct a public workshop on April 13, 1995, to discuss the Commission's Cost Beneficial Licensing Actions (CBLA) program, and its Administrative Letter addressing the program. The Administrative Letter was issued to inform licensees of the CBLA program. The CBLA program directs increased management attention to license amendments designated as cost beneficial licensing actions and provides for a more expeditious review. Participation in the CBLA program is voluntary. However, the purpose of the workshop is also to encourage licensees to develop CBLA programs if they have not already done so, and receive public comments on these activities.

Current activities within the Technical Specification Improvement Program (TSIP) will also be discussed. The Technical Specification Improvement Program was developed to establish criteria for relocating certain technical specifications from the facility license to licensee-controlled documents such as the final safety analysis report. In July 1994 the NRC proposed to amend the Technical Specification regulations pertaining to nuclear power reactors in order to codify criteria for determining the content of technical specifications. Licensees may propose converting their current technical specifications either in parts, or at once (the preferred method) to the improved Standard Technical Specifications (STS). Participation in the TSIP is voluntary. The principal focus of this workshop will be on both CBLA programs, and conversion to STS at commercial power reactors. While the NRC presentations will be broad in nature, NRC staff representatives will be present to address specific questions with regard to the CBLA process or STS conversions.

DATES: March 24, 1995—Advance notification of intent to attend the workshop, desire to comment or make a statement during the workshop, or both is requested by the NRC. Participants are encouraged to submit written comments, summaries, or both to the staff by this date.

April 13, 1995—The Workshop will be held at the NRC Auditorium from 7:30 am to 4:30 pm.

May 26, 1995—All written comments on matters covered by the workshop received by this date will be considered by the staff. Written comments received after May 26, 1995, will be considered to the extent practical. Written comments on the CBLA program and the TSIP will be accepted before, during, and after the workshop. Advance comments, which could serve to enhance the effectiveness of the workshop, are particularly solicited.

ADDRESSES: The workshop will be held in the NRC Auditorium. The NRC Auditorium is located on an underground level between the One White Flint North Building and the Two White Flint North Building at 11545 Rockville Pike, Rockville, Maryland 20852. The NRC buildings are located across from the entrance to the White Flint Metro Station.

Notification of intent to attend, and desire to make a statement should be sent to Elizabeth L. Doolittle, Mail Stop 0–12–D–22, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC 20555–0001. These notifications can also be transmitted via facsimile or telephone. The facsimile number is (301) 415–2279 and the telephone number is (301) 415–1247. The facsimile cover sheet should contain the address information listed above. Letter or facsimile notifications should contain, and people giving notification via telephone should be prepared to provide, the following pre-registration information: full name of participants/attendees, name of organization or business, mailing address, daytime telephone, facsimile number, a statement concerning whether the person or organization wishes to provide comments or a statement during the workshop, a statement concerning whether the person or organization intends to provide written comments before or after the workshop, and any specific questions or comments that the participant or organization would like to be considered and/or addressed at the workshop.

Copies of documents cited in the Supplementary Information section are available for inspection and/or for reproduction for a fee at the NRC Public Document Room, 2120 L Street NW (Lower Level), Washington, DC 20037.

Written comments may be sent to the Chief, Rules Review and Directives Branch, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC 20555–0001. Hand-delivered comments to Two White Flint North, 11545 Rockville Pike, Rockville, Maryland 20852 will be received between 7:30 am and 4:15 pm on Federal Workdays.

Copies of comments received and relevant reference documents may be examined at the NRC Public Document Room at 2120 L Street NW (Lower Level), Washington, DC, between the hours of 7:45 am and 4:15 pm on Federal workdays.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Elizabeth L. Doolittle, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation, Mail Stop OWFN 12–D–22, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC 20555–0001, telephone (301) 415–1247.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

I. Background
II. Tentative Agenda
III. Workshop Content and Structure

I. Background

Executive Order 12866, ''Regulatory Planning and Review,'' issued by President Clinton on September 30, 1993, required all agencies to perform a periodic review of existing regulations to eliminate unnecessary and unproductive requirements. Although the NRC already had several initiatives underway that were focused on improving the regulatory process by identifying and eliminating requirements that provided marginal safety benefits, in May 1994 the Commission established the policies, practices and framework for institutionalizing its ''Continuing Program for Regulatory Improvement.'' The Continuing Program for Regulatory Improvement described in SECY–94–090 consists of three NRC initiatives:

1. The Marginal to Safety Program,
2. The Regulatory Review Group Implementation Plan, and
3. The Cost Beneficial Licensing Actions Program.

The NRC initiated its Marginal to Safety Program (MSP) in the 1980s with the purpose of identifying requirements that were considered to be marginal to safety and impose a substantial regulatory burden on licensees, and therefore should be relaxed or eliminated. Over time the program was redirected to focus on petitions for rulemaking and regulatory guidance identified by industry, since industry was considered to be in the best position to identify inefficient regulations that impose heavy economic burden.

Currently the NRC is proposing to modify its regulations in 10 CFR 2.802 to provide guidance on the scope and level of detail needed on petitions for rulemaking to reduce regulatory burden.

The NRC prepared its Regulatory Review Group (RRG) Implementation Plan in 1993 with the purpose of identifying topic areas within NRC's regulations and guidance where prescriptive requirements might be substituted with performance-based requirements and guidance. The RRG identified areas with significant potential for relief of burden with little or no adverse safety impact, as did NRC as part of the MIS program.

More than 60 recommendations for changes to the NRC's regulations and guidance were made, and the NRC continues to make significant progress toward completing these changes.

The NRC began its Cost Beneficial Licensing Actions (CBLA) program on a pilot basis in mid-1993, and beginning in calendar year 1994, the CBLA option was made available to all licensees with the purpose of encouraging licensees to request plant specific license amendments that reduce or eliminate license requirements that have an incrementally small effect on safety but a high economic burden. In the past, licensee submittals of marginal safety significance but high cost savings were given the lowest priority for NRC staff review, which may have discouraged licensees from submitting this type of request.

On February 23, 1995, the NRC issued Administrative Letter 95–02, ''Cost Beneficial Licensing Actions'' to inform addressees of the CBLA program. The letter explains that the CBLA program will direct increased management attention to license amendments designated as cost beneficial licensing actions and will provide for a more expeditious review of certain amendment requests. Participation in the CBLA program is voluntary. Placing additional emphasis on processing CBLAs was meant to directly improve safety by allowing licensees to shift resources from activities that improve safety by only an incrementally small amount to those that more significantly enhance safety.

CBLAs are not new. Many licensee requests seek to modify or delete requirements that have a small effect on safety and are costly to implement. However, before June 1993, the NRR priority ranking system assigned the lowest priority (priority 4) to most licensing submittals addressing items that benefited safety an incrementally small amount without consideration of the cost of implementation or restriction of operational flexibility. As discussed in Administrative Letter 95–02, the priority ranking of CBLAs will be further increased within the current priority 3 ranking, so that a CBLA could be expected to be reviewed before other priority 3 licensing actions.

To assist in developing the CBLA policy and tracking CBLAs, members of the NRC staff have been dedicated to serve in a CBLA group for a limited time. The CBLA group, led by Eugene V. Imbro, gives general CBLA policy guidance to NRC and licensee staffs, tracks and trends CBLA submittal and approval data, and works with the staff and industry to identify CBLAs with generic implications. The CBLA group has determined, based on licensee estimates, that CBLAs approved in 1994 will result in an estimated industry lifetime saving in excess of $257.2 million. Although the NRC licensing project manager remains the primary point of contact for all licensing actions including CBLAs, licensees should contact Mr. Imbro on (303) 415–2969 if they have questions about the staff's implementation of the CBLA program.

One goal of the Technical Specification Improvement Program is similar to the goal of the CBLA program, and that is to substantially reduce regulatory burden. And, like the CBLA program, participation in the Technical Specification Improvement Program is voluntary.

In July 1994, the NRC proposed to amend technical specification regulations pertaining to nuclear power reactors through a rule change to 10 CFR 50.36, Technical Specifications. The purpose of the rule was to codify the July 1993, final policy statement criteria for determining the content of technical specifications. These criteria were developed in recognition that the broad use of technical specifications to impose requirements has diverted both NRC and licensee attention from the more important requirements in the technical specification documents. Broad use of technical specifications has resulted in an adverse but unquantifiable impact on safety. Under this rule change licensees may voluntarily use the criteria as a basis to propose relocation of existing technical specifications that do not meet any of the criteria, from the facility license to licensee-controlled documents, such as the final safety analysis report. Voluntary licensee conversion of current technical specifications in this manner is expected to produce an improvement in the safety of nuclear power plants through a reduction in unnecessary plant transients and more efficient use of NRC and industry resources. While the NRC will allow licensees to take advantage of the opportunity to convert their current technical specifications in parts, the NRC strongly encourages and gives priority to licensees considering complete conversion of their current technical specifications to the improved Standard Technical Specifications. The conversion to the improved Standard Technical Specifications can save licensees' financial and staff resources by relocating 30 to 40% of existing technical specifications to licensee-controlled documents and by incorporating the benefits of numerous Generic Letters, at once. While the benefits of converting to the new technical specifications are hard to quantify, licensee owners' groups project annual saving of between $150,000 and $1.13 million per unit. Licensees for about 40 units are currently pursuing conversion to the improved Standard Technical Specifications.

II. Tentative Agenda

April 13, 1995

7:30 a.m. Registration
8:30 a.m. Introduction
8:45 a.m. CBLA Administrative Letter Overview
9:45 a.m. BREAK
10:00 a.m. Participant Presentations/ Panel Discussion in Response to Participant Comments
11:45 a.m. Lunch
1:00 p.m. Technical Specification Improvement Program
2:30 p.m. BREAK
2:45 p.m. Participant Presentations/ Panel Discussion in Response to Participant Comments
4:15 p.m. Summary and Conclusions (NRC)
4:30 p.m. Adjourn

III. Workshop Content and Structure

The workshop is structured to include both NRC staff and licensees' presentations during the morning and afternoon. An opportunity for other questions and comments following the presentations is planned.

Participants will be allowed to express their views during specific comment periods. Participants who wish to make statements will be scheduled in the order in which they notified the staff of their desire to make a statement, and as time permits. Comments will be taken from parties in the order in which they notified the staff of their intent to comment. The order of comments will be:

(1) Parties who notified the staff by April 10, 1995;

(2) Parties registering to comment before 8:30 am the day of the workshop; and

(3) Parties who have not given prior notice.

Participants wishing to make comments will be limited to 5 minutes.

These time limits may be adjusted depending on the number of presentations and comment. The workshop will be transcribed, and the transcript will be available at the NRC Public Document Room.

To foster meaningful discussions during this session and to aid participants in preparing their presentations and comments, participants should consider the following set of questions:

- What impact will the CBLA Administrative Letter have on those organizations that the NRC regulates?
- Should the NRC develop a CBLA database that could be made available to the public?
- What are the reasons that the CBLA program has not been used more widely by licensees?
- What are the savings that can result from conversion to the improved Standard Technical Specifications?

Dated In Rockville, Maryland, this 9th day of March , 1995.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

Eugene V. Imbro,

Director, RRG/CBLA Programs, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation.

[FR Doc. 95–6341 Filed 3–14–95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590–01–M

Biweekly Notice

Applications and Amendments to Facility Operating Licenses Involving No Significant Hazards Considerations

I. Background

Pursuant to Public Law 97-415, the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (the Commission or NRC staff) is publishing this regular biweekly notice. Public Law 97-415 revised section 189 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended (the Act), to require the Commission to publish notice of any amendments issued, or proposed to be issued, under a new provision of section 189 of the Act. This provision grants the Commission the authority to issue and make immediately effective any amendment to an operating license upon a determination by the Commission that such amendment involves no significant hazards consideration, notwithstanding the pendency before the Commission of a request for a hearing from any person.

This biweekly notice includes all notices of amendments issued, or proposed to be issued from February 16, 1995, through March 3, 1995. The last biweekly notice was published on March 1, 1995.

Notice Of Consideration Of Issuance Of Amendments To Facility Operating Licenses, Proposed No Significant Hazards Consideration Determination, And Opportunity For A Hearing

The Commission has made a proposed determination that the following amendment requests involve no significant hazards consideration. Under the Commission's regulations in 10 CFR 50.92, this means that operation of the facility in accordance with the proposed amendment would not (1) involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated; or (2) create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated; or (3) involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety. The basis for this proposed determination for each amendment request is shown below.

The Commission is seeking public comments on this proposed determination. Any comments received within 30 days after the date of publication of this notice will be considered in making any final determination.

Normally, the Commission will not issue the amendment until the expiration of the 30-day notice period. However, should circumstances change during the notice period such that failure to act in a timely way would result, for example, in derating or shutdown of the facility, the Commission may issue the license amendment before the expiration of the 30-day notice period, provided that its final determination is that the amendment involves no significant hazards consideration. The final determination will consider all public and State comments received before action is taken. Should the Commission take this action, it will publish in the **Federal Register** a notice of issuance and provide for opportunity for a hearing after issuance. The Commission expects that the need to take this action will occur very infrequently.

Written comments may be submitted by mail to the Rules Review and Directives Branch, Division of Freedom of Information and Publications Services, Office of Administration, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC 20555, and should cite the publication date and page number of this **Federal Register** notice. Written comments may also be delivered to Room 6D22, Two White Flint North, 11545 Rockville Pike, Rockville, Maryland from 7:30 a.m. to 4:15 p.m. Federal workdays. Copies of written comments received may be examined at the NRC Public Document Room, the Gelman Building, 2120 L Street, NW., Washington, DC. The filing of requests for a hearing and petitions for leave to intervene is discussed below.

By April 14, 1995, the licensee may file a request for a hearing with respect to issuance of the amendment to the subject facility operating license and any person whose interest may be affected by this proceeding and who wishes to participate as a party in the proceeding must file a written request for a hearing and a petition for leave to intervene. Requests for a hearing and a petition for leave to intervene shall be filed in accordance with the Commission's ''Rules of Practice for Domestic Licensing Proceedings'' in 10 CFR Part 2. Interested persons should consult a current copy of 10 CFR 2.714 which is available at the Commission's Public Document Room, the Gelman Building, 2120 L Street, NW., Washington, DC and at the local public document room for the particular facility involved. If a request for a hearing or petition for leave to intervene is filed by the above date, the Commission or an Atomic Safety and Licensing Board, designated by the Commission or by the Chairman of the Atomic Safety and Licensing Board Panel, will rule on the request and/or petition; and the Secretary or the designated Atomic Safety and Licensing Board will issue a notice of a hearing or an appropriate order.

As required by 10 CFR 2.714, a petition for leave to intervene shall set forth with particularity the interest of the petitioner in the proceeding, and how that interest may be affected by the results of the proceeding. The petition should specifically explain the reasons why intervention should be permitted with particular reference to the following factors: (1) the nature of the petitioner's right under the Act to be made a party to the proceeding; (2) the nature and extent of the petitioner's property, financial, or other interest in the proceeding; and (3) the possible effect of any order which may be entered in the proceeding on the petitioner's interest. The petition should also identify the specific aspect(s) of the subject matter of the proceeding as to which petitioner wishes to intervene. Any person who has filed a petition for leave to intervene or who has been admitted as a party may amend the petition without requesting leave of the Board up to 15 days prior to the first prehearing conference scheduled in the proceeding, but such an amended petition must satisfy the specificity requirements described above.

Not later than 15 days prior to the first prehearing conference scheduled in the proceeding, a petitioner shall file a supplement to the petition to intervene which must include a list of the contentions which are sought to be litigated in the matter. Each contention must consist of a specific statement of the issue of law or fact to be raised or controverted. In addition, the petitioner shall provide a brief explanation of the bases of the contention and a concise statement of the alleged facts or expert opinion which support the contention and on which the petitioner intends to rely in proving the contention at the hearing. The petitioner must also provide references to those specific sources and documents of which the petitioner is aware and on which the petitioner intends to rely to establish those facts or expert opinion. Petitioner must provide sufficient information to show that a genuine dispute exists with the applicant on a material issue of law or fact. Contentions shall be limited to matters within the scope of the amendment under consideration. The contention must be one which, if proven, would entitle the petitioner to relief. A petitioner who fails to file such a supplement which satisfies these requirements with respect to at least one contention will not be permitted to participate as a party.

Those permitted to intervene become parties to the proceeding, subject to any limitations in the order granting leave to intervene, and have the opportunity to participate fully in the conduct of the hearing, including the opportunity to present evidence and cross-examine witnesses.

If a hearing is requested, the Commission will make a final determination on the issue of no significant hazards consideration. The final determination will serve to decide when the hearing is held.

If the final determination is that the amendment request involves no significant hazards consideration, the Commission may issue the amendment and make it immediately effective, notwithstanding the request for a hearing. Any hearing held would take place after issuance of the amendment.

If the final determination is that the amendment request involves a significant hazards consideration, any hearing held would take place before the issuance of any amendment.

A request for a hearing or a petition for leave to intervene must be filed with the Secretary of the Commission, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC 20555, Attention: Docketing and Services Branch, or may be delivered to the Commission's Public Document Room, the Gelman Building, 2120 L Street, NW., Washington DC, by the above date. Where petitions are filed during the last 10 days of the notice period, it is requested that the petitioner promptly so inform the Commission by a toll-free telephone call to Western Union at 1-(800) 248-5100 (in Missouri 1-(800) 342-6700). The Western Union operator should be given Datagram Identification Number N1023 and the following message addressed to **(Project Director)**: petitioner's name and telephone number, date petition was mailed, plant name, and publication date and page number of this **Federal Register** notice. A copy of the petition should also be sent to the Office of the General Counsel, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC 20555, and to the attorney for the licensee.

Nontimely filings of petitions for leave to intervene, amended petitions, supplemental petitions and/or requests for a hearing will not be entertained absent a determination by the Commission, the presiding officer or the Atomic Safety and Licensing Board that the petition and/or request should be granted based upon a balancing of factors specified in 10 CFR 2.714(a)(1)(i)-(v) and 2.714(d).

For further details with respect to this action, see the application for amendment which is available for public inspection at the Commission's Public Document Room, the Gelman Building, 2120 L Street, NW., Washington, DC, and at the local public document room for the particular facility involved.

Baltimore Gas and Electric Company, Docket Nos. 50-317 and 50-318, Calvert Cliffs Nuclear Power Plant, Unit Nos. 1 and 2, Calvert County, Maryland

Date of amendments request: January 31, 1995

Description of amendments request: The proposed amendments would revise the Technical Specifications (TSs) for Calvert Cliffs, Unit Nos. 1 and 2, to increase the amount of Trisodium Phosphate Dodecahydrate (TSP) located in the containment sump baskets required to be verified by TS surveillance. The requested change is the result of an reanalysis of the amount of TSP necessary to maintain the appropriate pH in the containment sump water subsequent to a Loss of Coolant Accident. Specifically, the request would change the TS value of TS 4.5.2.e.3 from the existing amount of 100 ft^3 to 289 ft^3. TS 4.5.2.e.4 would also be changed by moving the amounts of TSP and refueling water storage tank water to be used in the required tests to the TS Bases Section 3/4.5.2 and 3/4.5.3. These Bases sections would also be changed by modifying the test methods.

Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination: As required by 10 CFR 50.91(a), the licensee has provided its analysis of the issue of no significant hazards consideration, which is presented below:

1. Would not involve a significant increase in the probability orconsequences of an accident previously evaluated.

Trisodium Phosphate Dodecahydrate (TSP) is stored in the containment lower level to raise the pH of the sump and spray water following a Loss of Coolant Accident (LOCA). As the pH of the water increases, more radioactive iodine is kept in solution and the possibility of airborne radioactivity leakage is decreased. An additional advantage of a higher pH is the beneficial reduction in chloride stress corrosion cracking of metal components in the containment following an accident.

This chemical is an accident mitigator, not an accident initiator in that it is not used until after an accident has occurred. At the time it goes into solution, the accident has occurred, containment spray has been activated and water has collected in the containment sump. Therefore, increasing the Technical Specification minimum amount verified to be in each containment will not involve a significant increase in the probability of an accident previously evaluated.

Updated Final Safety Analysis Report, Chapter 14.24, ''Maximum Hypothetical Accident'', uses an assumption of a pre-RAS minimum containment spray pH of 5.0 for the iodine removal calculation and a post-RAS sump pH of 7.0 for iodine retention. Raising the pH to 7.0 does not increase the consequences of an accident previously evaluated.

The proposed change to Technical Specification 4.5.2.e.4 would remove the amounts of chemical and water used in the test to the Bases. This relocation will not alter the test method or acceptance criteria, but will allow adjustments to the ratio of TSP and borated water under the controls of 10 CFR 50.59 to reflect changes in plant conditions. In the Bases, the amount of TSP used in the test is changed to reflect the ratio of TSP to water that would be found in the containment following a LOCA. The specified concentration of boron in the test reflects the highest concentration that could be found in the containment following a LOCA. The test temperature is changed to 120°F which is well below the temperature expected to be found in the containment sump following a LOCA. The decanting of the solution does not change the intent of the test method since the dissolving period will still be conducted without agitation.

Therefore, this change does not involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated.

2. Would not create the possibility of a new or different type of accident from any accident previously evaluated.

The addition of more TSP does not represent a significant change in the configuration or operation of the plant. Trisodium Phosphate Dodecahydrate is currently present in the containment lower level. There are no physical changes which result from the increase in volume. The proposed change to Technical Specification 4.5.2.e.4 would move the amounts of chemical and water used in the test to the Bases. This relocation will not alter the test method or acceptance criteria, but will allow adjustments to the ratio of TSP and borated water under the controls of 10 CFR 50.59 to reflect changes in plant conditions. In the Bases, the amount of TSP used in the test is changed to reflect the ratio of TSP to water that would be found in the containment following a LOCA. The specified concentration of boron in the test reflects the highest concentration that could be found in the containment following a LOCA. The test temperature is changed to 120°F which is well below the temperature expected to be found in the containment sump following a LOCA. The decanting of the solution does not change the intent of the test method since the dissolving period will still be conducted without agitation.

Therefore, this change would not create the possibility of a new or different type of accident from any accident previously evaluated.

3. Would not involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety.

Trisodium Phosphate Dodecahydrate is stored in the containment lower level to raise the pH of the sump and spray water following a LOCA. As the pH of the water increases, more radioactive iodine is kept in solution and the possibility of airborne radioactivity leakage is decreased. Additionally, a higher pH has a beneficial effect on chloride stress corrosion cracking of metal components in the containment.

Technical Specification 4.5.2.e.3 requires verification that a minimum volume of TSP is contained in the storage baskets in each containment. This change proposes to increase that volume. The increased volume will ensure the containment sump, when filled with water, will have an acceptable pH following a LOCA.

The proposed change to Technical Specification 4.5.2.e.4 would move the amounts of chemical and water used in the test to the Bases. This relocation will not alter the test method or acceptance criteria, but will allow adjustments to the ratio of TSP and borated water under the controls of 10 CFR 50.59 to reflect changes in plant conditions. In the Bases, the amount of TSP used in the test is changed to reflect the ratio of TSP to water that would be found in the containment following a LOCA. The specified concentration of boron in the test reflects the highest concentration that could be found in the containment following a LOCA. The test temperature is changed to 120°F which is well below the temperature expected to be found in the containment sump following a LOCA. The decanting of the solution does not change the intent of the test method since the dissolving period will still be conducted without agitation.

Therefore, this change would not involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety.

The NRC staff has reviewed the licensee's analysis and, based on this review, it appears that the three standards of 50.92(c) are satisfied. Therefore, the NRC staff proposes to determine that the amendments request involves no significant hazards consideration.

Local Public Document Room location: Calvert County Library, Prince Frederick, Maryland 20678.

Attorney for licensee: Jay E. Silbert, Esquire, Shaw, Pittman, Potts and Trowbridge, 2300 N Street, NW., Washington, DC 20037.

NRC Project Director: Ledyard B. Marsh

Boston Edison Company, Docket No. 50-293, Pilgrim Nuclear Power Station, Plymouth County, Massachusetts

Date of amendment request: February 9, 1995

Description of amendment request: The proposed amendment would increase the Reactor High Water Level Trip Level Setting for the Group 1 isolation. The change will allow an increase to the main steam isolation valve (MSIV) high water level isolation setpoint.

Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination: As required by 10 CFR 50.91(a), the licensee has provided its analysis of the issue of no significant hazards consideration, which is presented below:

In accordance with 10 CFR 50.91, Boston Edison submits the following analysis addressing the no significant hazards consideration. The proposed changes do not:

(1) Involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated.

Operation of the station in accordance with the proposed Trip Level Setting will not significantly increase the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated. The MSIV high water level isolation signal is provided to protect against rapid depressurization due to a pressure regulator malfunction during plant startup. The high water level isolation signal is not functional when the mode switch is in the RUN position. A high water level in the reactor vessel indicates that fuel is covered. Increasing the Trip Level Setting will have minimal effect on moisture carryover in the event of a pressure regulator failure at low reactor power. MSIV closure (Group 1) is initiated by low reactor pressure (810 psig) approximately 30 seconds into the event. The resulting reactor water level swell is not sufficient to reach the bottom elevation of the main steam lines.

The proposed Technical Specification allowable value for the Reactor Low Level Trip Level Setting and the Reactor Low Low Water Level Trip Level setting does not involve significant increase in the probability or consequence of an accident.

(2) Create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any previously analyzed.

The proposed change does not affect the Group 1 isolation safety function. The change does not involve any plant hardware changes that could introduce any new failure modes or effects; thus, the change can not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any previously analyzed.

(3) Involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety.

The proposed change does not affect the Group 1 isolation safety function. The proposed change is consistent with the FSAR [Final Safety Analysis Report] and Technical Specification basis associated with reactor vessel inventory control and main steam line flooding.

The proposed change to the instrument calibration range does not affect the margin of safety for systems or components affected by the change. Operating Pilgrim in accordance with the proposed Trip Level Setting does not involve a significant reduction in the margin of safety.

The NRC staff has reviewed the licensee's analysis and, based on this review, it appears that the three standards of 50.92(c) are satisfied. Therefore, the NRC staff proposes to determine that the amendment request involves no significant hazards consideration.

Local Public Document Room location: Plymouth Public Library, 11 North Street, Plymouth, Massachusetts 02360.

Attorney for licensee: W. S. Stowe, Esquire, Boston Edison Company, 800 Boylston Street, 36th Floor, Boston, Massachusetts 02199.

NRC Project Director: Walter R. Butler

Carolina Power & Light Company, et al., Docket No. 50-400, Shearon Harris Nuclear Power Plant, Unit 1, Wake and Chatham Counties, North Carolina

Date of amendment request: February 6, 1995

Description of amendment request: The change proposes to relocate the cycle specific core operating limits of Figure 3.1-1, Shutdown Margin Versus Boron Concentration, from Technical Specification (TS) 3.1.1.2, Shutdown Margins - Modes 3, 4, and 5, to the Core Operating Limits Report (COLR).

Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination: As required by 10 CFR 50.91(a), the licensee has provided its analysis of the issue of no significant hazards consideration, which is presented below:

1. The proposed amendment does not involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated.

The proposed change of relocating TS Figure 3.1-1, Shutdown Margin Versus Boron Concentration to the COLR has no influence

or impact to the probability or consequences of an accident. The revised TS will continue to implement the shutdown margin limits through reference to the Shutdown Margin Curve in the COLR. In addition, the COLR is subject to the existing controls of TS 6.9.1.6. Given that this change is an administrative relocation of the Shutdown Margin Curve to another TS controlled document, there would be no increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated.

2. The proposed amendment does not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated.

No safety-related equipment, safety function, or plant operation will be altered as a result of this proposed change. The TS will continue to require operation within the required core operating limits. Therefore, the proposed changes do not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated.

3. The proposed amendment does not involve a significant reduction in the margin of safety.

Relocation of the Shutdown Margin Curve to the TS controlled COLR has no effect on the core operating limits currently in force in TS 3.1.1.2. Future revisions to the Shutdown Margin Curve are governed by TS 6.9.1.6 which stipulates the specific TS that reference the COLR limits and the methodologies utilized in developing those limits. Given that the change is an administrative relocation of the Shutdown Margin Curve to another TS controlled document, the proposed changes do not involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety.

The NRC staff has reviewed the licensee's analysis and, based on this review, it appears that the three standards of 10 CFR 50.92(c) are satisfied. Therefore, the NRC staff proposes to determine that the amendment request involves no significant hazards consideration.

Local Public Document Room location: Cameron Village Regional Library, 1930 Clark Avenue, Raleigh, North Carolina 27605

Attorney for licensee: R. E. Jones, General Counsel, Carolina Power & Light Company, Post Office Box 1551, Raleigh, North Carolina 27602

NRC Project Director: William H. Bateman

Duke Power Company, Docket Nos. 50-369 and 50-370, McGuire Nuclear Station, Units 1 and 2, Mecklenburg County, North Carolina

Date of amendment request: January 12, 1995

Description of amendment request: The proposed amendments would revise and clarify portions of Technical Specification (TS) Section 6.0, ''Administrative Controls,'' for the McGuire, Catawba, and Oconee nuclear stations. The licensee submitted a combined amendment request covering the three Duke Power nuclear stations. The proposed changes are described below.

1. Remove the specific assignment of responsibilities for the review, distribution, and approval activities contained in the Technical Review and Control Section of each station's TS. The proposed specifications state that these activities will be performed by a knowledgeable individual/organization. Approval of the affected documents is to be at the appropriate manager/superintendent level as specified in Duke administrative controls.

2. Move the requirement for the review of proposed changes in the stations' TS and Operating Licenses by the Duke Nuclear Safety Review Board (NSRB) to Duke administrative procedures (Selected Licensee Commitments documents) and change the wording of the requirements covering NSRB meeting frequency. The Oconee TS covering the NSRB are being rewritten to be consistent with McGuire and Catawba.

3. Add Technical Review and Control Program implementation and Plant Operations Review Committee (PORC) implementation to the list of required procedures and programs for each nuclear station.

4. Change or clarify certain TS administrative requirements covering technical review and control activities or records retention requirements.

5. For Oconee only, under ''Station Operating Procedures,'' revise the TS requirements covering the review and approval of station procedures and temporary procedure changes such that these are now consistent with the corresponding requirements for McGuire and Catawba.

Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination: As required by 10 CFR 50.91(a), the licensee has provided its analysis of the issue of no significant hazards consideration, which is presented below:

(It should be noted that the licensee submitted a combined analysis that covers McGuire, Catawba, and Oconee nuclear stations.)

Standard ı1. The proposed amendments will not involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated.

The provisions of these proposed amendments concern administrative changes in the stations' Technical Specifications involving the Technical Review and Control, Procedures and Programs/Station Operating Procedures, and Records Retention/Station Operating Records portions of the Administrative Controls Section. The requested changes primarily affect review and control activities, but also include other administrative changes affecting the approval of station procedures (Oconee only), records retention, and definition of the term ODCM [offsite dose calculation manual] (McGuire and [Catawba]). The provisions of the proposed amendment primarily involve the relocation of existing Technical Specifications review, distribution, or approval requirements to internal Duke administrative controls. However, implementation of the proposed amendment does involve changes to several review/distribution activities. Theses review/distribution activities are primarily for: 1) Proposed changes to the stations' Technical Specifications, 2) Proposed tests and experiments which affect nuclear safety and are not addressed in the stations' FSAR [Final Safety Analysis Report] or Technical Specifications, 3) Environmental radiological procedures, 4) Reportable events documentation and reports of violations of Technical Specifications, 5) Reports of special reviews and investigations, and 6) Reports of unplanned onsite releases of radiological material to the environs. Planned implementation of the proposed Technical Specifications amendments utilizing Selected Licensee Commitments will result in the above items being reviewed/received by a different organizational unit in the future. The organizational unit is to be either the recently initiated Plant Operations Review Committee (PORC) or the General Manager, Environmental Services. Personnel serving on the PORC, and the General Manager, Environmental Services will be qualified based upon education and experience to review the operational and technical considerations involved with the applicable items listed above. No required reviews are being eliminated by the requested amendments, only the organizational units responsible for performing the reviews will be changed. Future reviews of theses items under the auspices of the PORC or the General Manager, Environmental Services will maintain a quality level equivalent to that being currently achieved by Duke's Qualified Reviewer Program, the Station Managers, or the

Duke Nuclear Safety Review Board as applicable. Consequently, merely changing the organizational units performing future reviews, or making the additional administrative changes described above, results in no increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated because the review function will continue to be conducted in an equivalent manner.

The implementing SLC will also permit proposed amendments to the stations' Technical Specifications and Operating Licenses to be approved for the Station Manager by a designee. However, this individual will occupy a position equivalent to, or higher, in the Duke organization as the Station manager.

Additionally, the proposed changes do not directly impact the design or operation of any plant systems or components any more so than the review and approval processes currently being conducted in accordance

with existing approved Technical Specifications.

Standard ι2. The proposed amendments will not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any previously evaluated.

The proposed changes are administrative in nature and primarily cover the review, distribution, and/or approval function performed for items identified in existing Technical Specifications. The quality level of the future reviews will not decrease and the ability of Duke to identify the possibility for the concurrence of new or different kinds of accidents prior to implementation will be maintained. Of specific interest in the consideration of Standard ι2 is the review of proposed tests and experiments which affect station nuclear safety and are not addressed in the FSAR or Technical Specifications. The Technical Specifications required reviews of these tests and experiments are not being proposed for removal by these requested amendments. Only the organizational unit conducting the review of proposed tests and experiments is being changed by the requested amendments. The PORC, instead of the Station Manager, is being assigned the responsibility for conducting the reviews of proposed tests and experiments in the future. It is believed that the combined expertise of the PORC membership will enhance Duke's ability to identify potential situations which could possibly involve a new, or different, kind of accident.

Standard ι3. The proposed amendments will not involve a significant reduction in any margin of safety.

The changes contained in the requested amendments are administrative in nature and do not impact the design capabilities or operation of any plant structures, systems, or components. There will be no reduction in margin of safety as a result of implementing these requested amendments. Impact upon margin of safety is a consideration primarily included in the 10 CFR 50.59 evaluation process conducted for station procedures, procedure changes, and nuclear station modifications. The 10 CFR 50.59 evaluation process in conducted under the auspices of the Duke Qualified Reviewer Program and is not affected by these requested amendments. The impact on margin of safety for future Technical Specifications and Operating License changes will be reviewed by the PORC, but these reviews will be equivalent in quality to the reviews presently conducted by the Qualified Reviewers.

The NRC staff has reviewed the licensee's analysis and, based on this review, it appears that the three standards of 10 CFR 50.92(c) are satisfied. Therefore, the NRC staff proposes to determine that the amendment request involves no significant hazards consideration.

Local Public Document Room location: Atkins Library, University of North Carolina, Charlotte (UNCC Station), North Carolina 28223

Attorney for licensee: Mr. Albert Carr, Duke Power Company, 422 South Church Street, Charlotte, North Carolina 28242

NRC Project Director: Herbert N. Berkow

Duke Power Company, Docket Nos. 50-369 and 50-370, McGuire Nuclear Station, Units 1 and 2, Mecklenburg County, North Carolina

Date of amendment request: January 13, 1995

Description of amendment request: The proposed amendments would increase the surveillance test intervals and allowed outage times for Reactor Trip System (RTS) and Engineered Safety Features Actuation System (ESFAS) equipment based upon analyses by Westinghouse for the Westinghouse Owners Group and approved by the NRC. The proposed changes to the RTS and ESFAS instrumentation are based upon WCAP-10271, its supplements, and the NRC's safety evaluation reports.

Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination: As required by 10 CFR 50.91(a), the licensee has provided its analysis of the issue of no significant hazards consideration, which is presented below:

Criterion 1 - Operation of McGuire in accordance with the proposed license amendment[s] [do] not involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated.

The determination that the results of the proposed changes are within all acceptable criteria was established in the SERs prepared for WCAP-10271, WCAP-10271 Supplement 1, WCAP-10271 Supplement 2, and WCAP-10271 Supplement 2, Revision 1 issued by letters dated February 21, 1985, February 22, 1989, and April 30, 1990. Implementation of the proposed changes is expected to result in an acceptable increase in total RTS yearly unavailability. This increase, which is primarily due to less frequent surveillance, results in an increase of similar magnitude in the probability of an Anticipated Transient Without Scram (ATWS) and in the probability of core melt resulting from an ATWS and also results in a small increase in core damage frequency (CDF) due to ESFAS unavailability.

Implementation of the proposed changes is expected to result in a significant reduction in the probability of core melt from inadvertent reactor trips. This is a result of a reduction in the number of inadvertent reactor trips (0.5 fewer inadvertent reactor trips per unit per year) occurring during testing of RTS instrumentation. This reduction is primarily attributable to testing in bypass and less frequent surveillance.

The reduction in core melt frequency from inadvertent reactor trips is sufficiently large to counter the increase in ATWS core melt probability resulting in an overall reduction in total core melt probability.

The values determined by the WOG and presented in the WCAP for the increase in CDF were verified by Brookhaven National Laboratory (BNL) as part of an audit and sensitivity analysis for the NRC staff. Based on the small value of the increase compared to the range of uncertainty in the CDF, the increase is considered acceptable.

Changes to surveillance test frequencies for the RTS [reactor trip system] interlocks do not represent a significant reduction in testing. The currently specified test interval for interlock channels allows the surveillance requirement to be satisfied by verifying that the permissive logic is in its required state using the permissive annunciator window. The surveillance as currently required only verifies the status of the permissive logic and does not address verification of channel setpoint or operability. The setpoint verification and channel operability are verified after a refueling shutdown. The definition of the channel check includes comparison of the channel status with other channels for the same parameter. The requirement to routinely verify permissive status is a different consideration than the availability of trip or actuation channels which are required to change state on the occurrence of an event and for which the function availability is more dependent on the surveillance interval. The change in surveillance requirement to at least once every refueling does not therefore represent a significant change in channel surveillance and does not involve a significant increase in unavailability of the RTS.The proposed changes do not result in an increase in the severity or consequences of an accident previously evaluated. Implementation of the proposed changes affects the probability of failure of the RTS but does not alter the manner in which protection is afforded nor the manner in which limiting criteria are established.

Criterion 2 - The proposed license amendment[s] [do] not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated.

The proposed changes do not result in a change in the manner in which the RTS provides plant protection. No change is being made which alters the functioning of the RTS (other than in a test mode). Rather, the likelihood or probability of the RTS functioning properly is affected as described above. Therefore, the proposed changes do not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident.

The proposed changes do not involve hardware changes except those necessary to implement testing in bypass. Some existing instrumentation is designed to be tested in bypass and current Technical Specifications allow testing in bypass. Testing in bypass is also recognized by IEEE standards. Therefore, testing in bypass has been previously approved and implementation of the proposed changes for testing in bypass does not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any previously evaluated. Furthermore, since the other proposed changes do not alter the functioning of the RTS, the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any previously evaluated has not been created.

Criterion 3 - The proposed license amendment[s] [do] not involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety.

The proposed changes do not alter the manner in which safety limits, limiting safety

system setpoints, or limiting conditions for operation are determined. The impact of reduced testing other than as addressed above is to allow a longer time interval over which instrument uncertainties (e.g., drift) may act. Experience has shown that the initial uncertainty assumptions are valid for reduced testing.

Implementation of the proposed changes is expected to result in an overall improvement in safety by:

1) Less frequent testing will result in fewer inadvertent reactor trips and actuation of Engineered Safety Features Actuation System components.

2) Higher quality repairs leading to improved equipment reliability due to longer allowable repair times.

3) Improvements in the effectiveness of the operating staff in monitoring and controlling plant operation. This is due to less frequent distraction of the operator and shift supervisor to attend to instrumentation testing.

The foregoing analysis demonstrates that the proposed amendment[s] to McGuire's Technical Specifications [do] not involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of a previously evaluated accident, [do] not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident, and [do] not involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety.

Based upon the preceding analysis, Duke Power Company concludes that the proposed amendment[s] [do] not involve a significant hazards consideration.

The NRC staff has reviewed the licensee's analysis and, based on this review, it appears that the three standards of 10 CFR 50.92(c) are satisfied. Therefore, the NRC staff proposes to determine that the amendment request involves no significant hazards consideration.

Local Public Document Room location: Atkins Library, University of North Carolina, Charlotte (UNCC Station), North Carolina 28223

Attorney for licensee: Mr. Albert Carr, Duke Power Company, 422 South Church Street, Charlotte, North Carolina 28242

NRC Project Director: Herbert N. Berkow

Duke Power Company, Docket Nos. 50-269, 50-270 and 50-287, Oconee Nuclear Station, Units 1, 2 and 3, Oconee County, South Carolina

Date of amendment request: January 12, 1995

Description of amendment request: The proposed amendments would revise and clarify portions of Technical Specification (TS) Section 6.0, ''Administrative Controls,'' for the McGuire, Catawba, and Oconee nuclear stations. The licensee submitted a combined amendment request covering the three Duke Power nuclear stations. The proposed changes are described below.

1. Remove the specific assignment of responsibilities for the review, distribution, and approval activities contained in the Technical Review and Control Section of each station's TS. The proposed specifications state that these activities will be performed by a knowledgeable individual/organization. Approval of the affected documents is to be at the appropriate manager/superintendent level as specified in Duke administrative controls.

2. Move the requirement for the review of proposed changes in the stations' TS and Operating Licenses by the Duke Nuclear Safety Review Board (NSRB) to Duke administrative procedures (Selected Licensee Commitments documents) and change the wording of the requirements covering NSRB meeting frequency. The Oconee TS covering the NSRB are being rewritten to be consistent with McGuire and Catawba.

3. Add Technical Review and Control Program implementation and Plant Operations Review Committee (PORC) implementation to the list of required procedures and programs for each nuclear station.

4. Change or clarify certain TS administrative requirements covering technical review and control activities or records retention requirements.

5. For Oconee only, under ''Station Operating Procedures,'' revise the TS requirements covering the review and approval of station procedures and temporary procedure changes such that these are now consistent with the corresponding requirements for McGuire and Catawba.

Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination: As required by 10 CFR 50.91(a), the licensee has provided its analysis of the issue of no significant hazards consideration, which is presented below:

(It should be noted that the licensee submitted a combined analysis that covers McGuire, Catawba, and Oconee nuclear stations.)

Standard 1. The proposed amendments will not involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated.

The provisions of these proposed amendments concern administrative changes in the stations' Technical Specifications involving the Technical Review and Control, Procedures and Programs/Station Operating Procedures, and Records Retention/Station Operating Records portions of the Administrative Controls Section. The requested changes primarily affect review and control activities, but also include other administrative changes affecting the approval of station procedures (Oconee only), records retention, and definition of the term ODCM [offsite dose calculation manual] (McGuire and [Catawba]). The provisions of the proposed amendment primarily involve the relocation of existing Technical Specifications review, distribution, or approval requirements to internal Duke administrative controls. However, implementation of the proposed amendment does involve changes to several review/distribution activities. These review/distribution activities are primarily for: 1) Proposed changes to the stations' Technical Specifications, 2) Proposed tests and experiments which affect nuclear safety and are not addressed in the stations' FSAR [Final Safety Analysis Report] or Technical Specifications, 3) Environmental radiological procedures, 4) Reportable events documentation and reports of violations of Technical Specifications, 5) Reports of special reviews and investigations, and 6) Reports of unplanned onsite releases of radiological material to the environs. Planned implementation of the proposed Technical Specifications amendments utilizing Selected Licensee Commitments will result in the above items being reviewed/received by a different organizational unit in the future. The organizational unit is to be either the recently initiated Plant Operations Review Committee (PORC) or the General Manager, Environmental Services. Personnel serving on the PORC, and the General Manager, Environmental Services will be qualified based upon education and experience to review the operational and technical considerations involved with the applicable items listed above. No required reviews are being eliminated by the requested amendments, only the organizational units responsible for performing the reviews will be changed. Future reviews of these items under the auspices of the PORC or the General Manager, Environmental Services will maintain a quality level equivalent to that being currently achieved by Duke's Qualified Reviewer Program, the Station Managers, or the Duke Nuclear Safety Review Board as applicable. Consequently, merely changing the organizational units performing future reviews, or making the additional administrative changes described above, results in no increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated because the review function will continue to be conducted in an equivalent manner.

The implementing SLC will also permit proposed amendments to the stations' Technical Specifications and Operating Licenses to be approved for the Station Manager by a designee. However, this individual will occupy a position equivalent to, or higher, in the Duke organization as the Station Manager.

Additionally, the proposed changes do not directly impact the design or operation of any plant systems or components any more so than the review and approval processes currently being conducted in accordance with existing approved Technical Specifications.

Standard 2. The proposed amendments will not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any previously evaluated.

The proposed changes are administrative in nature and primarily cover the review,

distribution, and/or approval function performed for items identified in existing Technical Specifications. The quality level of the future reviews will not decrease and the ability of Duke to identify the possibility for the occurrence of new or different kinds of accidents prior to implementation will be maintained. Of specific interest in the consideration of Standard ι2 is the review of proposed tests and experiments which affect station nuclear safety and are not addressed in the FSAR or Technical Specifications. The Technical Specifications required reviews of these tests and experiments are not being proposed for removal by these requested amendments. Only the organizational unit conducting the review of proposed tests and experiments is being changed by the requested amendments. The PORC, instead of the Station Manager, is being assigned the responsibility for conducting the reviews of proposed tests and experiments in the future. It is believed that the combined expertise of the PORC membership will enhance Duke's ability to identify potential situations which could possibly involve a new, or different, kind of accident.

Standard ι3. The proposed amendments will not involve a significant reduction in any margin of safety.

The changes contained in the requested amendments are administrative in nature and do not impact the design capabilities or operation of any plant structures, systems, or components. There will be no reduction in margin of safety as a result of implementing these requested amendments. Impact upon margin of safety is a consideration primarily included in the 10 CFR 50.59 evaluation process conducted for station procedures, procedure changes, and nuclear station modifications. The 10 CFR 50.59 evaluation process is conducted under the auspices of the Duke Qualified Reviewer Program and is not affected by these requested amendments. The impact on margin of safety for future Technical Specifications and Operating License changes will be reviewed by the PORC, but these reviews will be equivalent in quality to the reviews presently conducted by the Qualified Reviewers.

The NRC staff has reviewed the licensee's analysis and, based on this review, it appears that the three standards of 10 CFR 50.92(c) are satisfied. Therefore, the NRC staff proposes to determine that the amendment request involves no significant hazards consideration.

Local Public Document Room location: Oconee County Library, 501 West South Broad Street, Walhalla, South Carolina 29691

Attorney for licensee: J. Michael McGarry, III, Winston and Strawn, 1200 17th Street, NW., Washington, DC 20036

NRC Project Director: Herbert N. Berkow

Entergy Operations Inc., Docket No. 50-382, Waterford Steam ElectricStation, Unit 3, St. Charles Parish, Louisiana

Date of amendment request: January 27, 1995

Description of amendment request: The requested change would modify Section 5.3.1, Fuel Assemblies, of the Waterford 3 technical specifications. The requested change increases the maximum enrichment for the spent fuel pool and containment temporary storage rack from 4.1 to 4.9 weight percent U-235 when fuel assemblies contain fixed poisons. Waterford 3 plans to use higher enriched fuel in the next fuel cycle (Cycle 8) to meet the energy plans and maintain a reload batch size similar to that used in Cycles 6 and 7.

Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination: As required by 10 CFR 50.91(a), the licensee has provided its analysis of the issue of no significant hazards consideration, which is presented below:

The proposed change will increase the fuel enrichment limit in order to meetthe cycle energy requirements while maintaining fuel batch sizes consistent with previous cycle designs. The calculated k-effective, including uncertainties, demonstrate substantial margin to criticality in the storage racks for both normal and accident conditions. No changes to the facility are required. No new modes of operating the fuel storage or transfer systems are required, except a restriction to limit the use of the new fuel vault to fuel with a maximum enrichment of 4.1 weight percent U-235. This restriction will be implemented by administrative controls. Since the plant equipment and operation are essentially the same, there is no significant increase in the probability of a criticality accident. Since a criticality event is demonstrated to be unfeasible, there are no increased adverse consequences for such a postulated event.

As previously discussed, the proposed change will not result in a physical change to the facility nor will it result in a significant change to the operation of the facility; therefore, it does not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated.

The proposed change has been analyzed to establish a k-effective, including uncertainties, at or below the NRC criticality acceptance criteria of k-effective below 0.95 including uncertainties at the 95/95 probability/confidence level; therefore, there is no reduction in the margin of safety.

The NRC staff has reviewed the licensee's analysis and, based on this review, it appears that the three standards of 10 CFR 50.92(c) are satisfied. Therefore, the NRC staff proposes to determine that the amendment request involves no significant hazards consideration.

Local Public Document Room location: University of New Orleans Library, Louisiana Collection, Lakefront, New Orleans, Louisiana 70122

Attorney for licensee: N.S. Reynolds, Esq., Winston & Strawn 1400 L Street N.W., Washington, D.C. 20005-3502

NRC Project Director: William D. Beckner

GPU Nuclear Corporation, et al., Docket No. 50-289, Three Mile Island Nuclear Station, Unit No. 1, Dauphin County, Pennsylvania

Date of amendment request: January 16, 1995

Description of amendment request: The proposed amendment would revise the TMI-1 Technical Specifications (TS) to incorporate certain improvements from the Revised Standard Technical Specifications (TS) for Babcock & Wilcox nuclear power plants (NUREG-1430). The amendment would also change the bases incorporating the results of analyses to support allowance for drift of the pressurizer code safety valve setpoint. One of the proposed STS improvements involves a change to Chapter 6, Administrative Controls, affecting both TMI-1 and TMI-2 TSs. A separate notice of consideration of issuance of amendment to facility operating license is being issued for the proposed TMI-2 TSs Change.

Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination: As required by 10 CFR 50.91(a), the licensee has provided its analysis of the issue of no significant hazards consideration, which is presented below:

1. Operation of the facility in accordance with the proposed amendment would not involve a significant increase in the probability of occurrence or the consequences of an accident previously evaluated.

The proposed amendments involve a) an administrative change to both the TMI-1 and TMI-2 Technical Specifications which is consistent with the B&W Standard Technical Specifications (STS), NUREG-1430, and b) changes to the TMI-1 Technical Specifications which are consistent with the STS. This change does not involve any change to system or equipment configuration. The proposed amendment revises certain surveillance requirements, extends certain surveillance intervals as evaluated above, or involves changes that are purely

administrative. The reliability of systems and components relied upon to prevent or mitigate the consequences of accidents previously evaluated is not degraded by the proposed changes. Assurance of system and equipment availability is maintained. Therefore, this change does not increase the probability of occurrence or the consequences of an accident previously evaluated.

2. Operation of the facility in accordance with the proposed amendment would not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated. The changes only involve changes to surveillance requirements that are consistent with STS and with the ASME Code. No new failure modes are created and thus the changes are bounded by accidents previously evaluated.

3. Operation of the facility in accordance with the proposed amendment would not

involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety. Each of these changes is compatible with the STS and has been evaluated to preserve the level of safety assured by the current TS.

The NRC staff has reviewed the licensee's analysis and, based on this review, it appears that the three standards of 10 CFR 50.92(c) are satisfied. Therefore, the NRC staff proposes to determine that the amendment request involves no significant hazards consideration.

Local Public Document Room location: Government Publications Section, State Library of Pennsylvania, Walnut Street and Commonwealth Avenue, Box 1601, Harrisburg, PA 17105.

Attorney for licensee: Ernest L. Blake, Jr., Esquire, Shaw, Pittman, Potts & Trowbridge, 2300 N Street, NW., Washington, DC 20037.

NRC Project Director: Phillip F. McKee

Gulf States Utilities Company, Cajun Electric Power Cooperative, and Entergy Operations, Inc., Docket No. 50-458, River Bend Station, Unit 1, West Feliciana Parish, Louisiana

Date of amendment request: January 20, 1995

Description of amendment request: The proposed amendment would revise the fire hazards analysis for the River Bend Station (RBS) by allowing a deviation from 10 CFR 50, Appendix R, Section III.G.3 with respect to the requirement for a fixed fire suppression system in fire area C-17. This area houses the control building heating, ventilation and air conditioning (HVAC) systems and the loss due to a fire could cause the loss of main control room habitability. C-17 does not have a fixed fire suppression system but depends upon the use of the existing remote shutdown system as described in the updated safety analysis report (USAR).

Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination: As required by 10 CFR 50.91(a), the licensee has provided its analysis of the issue of no significant hazards consideration, which is presented below:

1) The request does not involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of accident previously evaluated.

The event of concern is a fire in fire area C-17. The low fire loading and sparse concentration of exposed combustible material in fire area C-17 would limit fire spread. However, for this scenario all equipment in fire area C-17 will be assumed lost. Fire area C-17 contains the air handling units for the main control room envelope. The loss of both air handling units would cause the control building chillers to stop running due to a logic tie requiring air flow through the air handling equipment for the chilled water system to operate during normal operation. The loss of the HVAC system in the control building would cause the main control room and the equipment rooms to begin heating up if exposed to design summer conditions. Operator actions can be accomplished to minimize the heat up rates for the rooms prior to the areas reaching equipment temperature limits. This would allow the operators to begin the shutdown process from the main control room. If the main control room continued to heat up, the operators could accomplish the shutdown using the remote shutdown system. HVAC for the remote shutdown panel is located in fire area C-4 and would not be damaged by a fire in fire area C-17. Operation of the control building HVAC system from the remote shutdown panel bypasses the logic between the chilled water system and the air handling system. This would allow restart of the HVAC system for all areas except the main control room. The scenario would conclude in a manner similar to that described in RBS USAR Appendix 15A, Event 52, ''Reactor Shutdown From Outside Main Control Room.''

In summary, the probability of a fire occurring in fire area C-17 is not increased. However, if a fire were to occur in fire area C-17 which caused the loss of main control room HVAC, the remote shutdown system would provide an acceptable method of shutdown. The low fire loading and sparse concentration of exposed combustible material in fire area C-17 would limit fire spread. Therefore, this request does not involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated.

2) The request does not create the possibility of occurrence of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated.

The event of concern is a fire in fire area C-17. Fire area C-17 does not have a fixed suppression system as required by 10 CFR 50, Appendix R, Section III.G.3. Fire suppression systems are generally used to limit fire spread, once the heat of the fire opens thermally sensitive sprinklers. The low fire loading and sparse concentration of exposed combustible material in fire area C-17 would limit fire spread. However, for the purpose of event analysis, all equipment in fire area C-17 is assumed lost. Thus a fire in fire area C-17 is bounded by the same analysis with or

without a fixed suppression system in terms of equipment availability.

The proposed method of shutdown for a fire in fire area C-17 will be changed in that the remote shutdown system will be credited. Use of the remote shutdown system is bounded by RBS USAR Appendix 15A, Event 52, ''Reactor Shutdown From Outside Main Control Room.'' The HVAC for the remote shutdown panel is located in fire area C-4 and would be undamaged by a fire in fire area C-17. Operation of the control building HVAC system from the remote shutdown panel bypasses the logic between the chilled water system and the air handling system. This would allow restart of the HVAC system for all areas except the main control room.

In summary, if a fire were to occur in fire area C-17 which caused the loss of main control room HVAC, the remote shutdown system would provide an acceptable method of shutdown. Since, for the purpose of event analysis, all equipment in fire area C-17 is assumed lost, a fire in fire area C-17 is bounded by the same analysis with or without a fixed suppression system in terms of equipment availability. Therefore, this request does not create the possibility of occurrence of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated.

3) The request does not involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety.

In this case, the margin of safety is implicit rather than being explicitly expressed as a numerical value. An implicit margin of safety involves conditions for NRC acceptance. Since the RBS Technical Specification Bases do not specifically address a margin of safety for fire protection, the SAR, the NRC's Safety Evaluation Report (SER), and appropriate other licensing basis documents were reviewed to determine if the proposed change would result in a reduction in a margin of safety. As stated, in part, in Attachment 4 to NPF-47:

EOI shall implement and maintain in effect all provisions of the approved fire protection program as described in the Final Safety Analysis Report for the facility through Amendment 22 and as approved in the SER dated May 1984 and Supplement 3 dated August 1985 subject to provisions 2 and 3....

As discussed in the Reason for Request, SSER 3 dated August 1985 states, in part:

On the basis of its evaluation the staff finds that the applicant's fire protection program with approved deviations is in conformance with the guidelines of BTP CMEB 9.5-1, sections III.G, III.J, and III.O of Appendix R to 10CFR50, and GDC 3, and is, therefore, acceptable.

Thus, the margin of safety in this case can be defined as conformance with the specified fire protection guidelines. 10 CFR 50, Appendix R, Section III.G.3, requires, in part, that alternative shutdown capability be provided for areas where adequate separation of redundant safe shutdown components cannot be provided. In addition, fire detection and a fixed fire suppression system must be installed in the area, room, or zone under consideration. Since fire area C-17 does not have a fixed suppression system, use of the remote shutdown system for a fire in this fire area would deviate from the requirements of 10 CFR 50, Appendix R, Section III.G.3. However, as discussed previously, the low fire loading and sparse amount of exposed combustibles compensate for the lack of a fixed fire suppression system. There is no adverse impact on the ability to achieve and maintain safe shutdown. Therefore, this request does not involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety.

The NRC staff has reviewed the licensee's analysis and, based on this review, it appears that the three standards of 10 CFR 50.92(c) are satisfied. Therefore, the NRC staff proposes to determine that the

amendment request involves no significant hazards consideration.

Local Public Document Room location: Government Documents Department, Louisiana State University, Baton Rouge, Louisiana 70803

Attorney for licensee: Mark Wetterhahn, Esq., Winston & Strawn, 1400 L Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20005

NRC Project Director: William D. Beckner

Northeast Nuclear Energy Company (NNECO), Docket No. 50-245, Millstone Nuclear Power Station, Unit 1, New London County, Connecticut

Date of amendment request: July 28, 1994

Description of amendment request: The proposed amendment would add a footnote to Technical Specifcaiton 3.5.C. The footnote would state that the operability of the feedwater coolant injection (FWCI) system be independent of its seismic capability.

Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination: As required by 10 CFR 50.91(a), the licensee has provided its analysis of the issue of no significant hazards consideration, which is presented below:

NNECO has reviewed the proposed change in accordance with 10CFR50.92 and concluded that the change does not involve a significant hazards consideration (SHC). The basis for this conclusion is that the three criteria of 10CFR50.92(c) are not compromised. The proposed change does not involve an SHC because the change would not:

1. Involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously analyzed.

Any postulated failure in the non-seismic portion of the FWCI subsystem may result in a loss of feedwater flow transient. However comparing the probability of occurrence of a seismic event, any increase in the probability of occurrence of a loss of feedwater event would be small. The proposed change would have no impact on the probability of occurrence of any other accident, including LOCAs [loss of coolant accidents].

The FWCI subsystem will continue to be maintained as QA Category 1 (except for the seismic attribute). Therefore, it will remain available for accident mitigation for most scenarios. Nevertheless, LOCA analyses have been reevaluated to demonstrate that FWCI is not necessary to show compliance with 10CFR50.46. Potentially limiting LOCA scenarios have been analyzed without the FWCI subsystem using an approved LOCA methodology. An active single failure was postulated in addition to not taking credit for the FWCI subsystem. Based on the results of these analyses, the current design basis large and small break LOCAs remain bounding. Moreover, FWCI is not credited in mitigating any of the non-LOCA transients/accidents.

Safe shutdown following a seismic event can be achieved using the LPCI [low pressure coolant injection] and ESW [emergency service water] systems, and the SRVs [safety relief valves], which are all seismically qualified. Therefore, the FWCI system is not required to mitigate a seismic event.

2. Create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any previously analyzed.

Seismic reclassification of portions of FWCI does not create the possibility of a new kind of an accident. The portion of the piping up to the second isolation valve (from the RPV [reactor pressure vessel]), is seismically qualified and will remain classified as seismic. This ensures that a postulated failure in the non-seismic portion of piping or components does not degrade containment integrity or result in a blowdown of the RPV. Consequential and environmental effects of a FW [feedwater] piping failure have been analyzed in the HELB [high energy line break] program and have been found to be acceptable.

3. Involve a significant reduction in the margin of safety.

All accidents, including LOCAs, can be mitigated without using FWCI. FWCI is also not necessary for safe shutdown following a seismic event. The intended function of the FWCI subsystem is to reduce the likelihood of core uncovery during the lifetime of the plant. The CS [core spray] and LPCI subsystems provide redundant and diverse means of injecting water to the RPV. The FWCI subsystem provides an additional diverse means to inject water. Since FWCI will be maintained QA Category 1 (except for the seismic attribute), it will continue to provide the additional diversity to the injection systems. Considering the intended function of the subsystem and the credit taken in the accident analysis, reclassifying FWCI to be non-seismic does not significantly reduce the margin of safety.

The NRC staff has reviewed the licensee's analysis and, based on this review, it appears that the three standards of 10 CFR 50.92(c) are satisfied. Therefore, the NRC staff proposes to determine that the amendment request involves no significant hazards consideration.

Local Public Document Room location: Learning Resource Center, Three Rivers Community-Technical College, Thames Valley Campus, 574 New London Turnpike, Norwich, CT 06360.

Attorney for licensee: Ms. L. M. Cuoco, Senior Nuclear Counsel, Northeast Utilities Service Company, Post Office Box 270, Hartford, CT 06141-0270.

NRC Project Director: Phillip F. McKee

Northern States Power Company, Docket Nos. 50-282 and 50-306, Prairie Island Nuclear Generating Plant, Unit Nos. 1 and 2, Goodhue County, Minnesota

Date of amendment requests: January 9, 1995, as supplemented February 7, 1995

Description of amendment requests: The proposed amendments would revise Prairie Island Nuclear Generating Plant Technical Specification (TS) 4.12, ''Steam Generator Tube Surveillance,'' to incorporate revised acceptance criteria for steam generator tubes with degradation in the tubesheet roll expansion region. These criteria for steam generator tube acceptance were developed by Westinghouse Electric Corporation and are known as F* (≥F-Star'') and L* (≥L-Star''). These criteria would be utilized to avoid unnecessary plugging and sleeving of steam generator tubes.

Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination: As required by 10 CFR 50.91(a), the licensee has provided its analysis of the issue of no significant hazards consideration, which is presented below:

1. The proposed amendment[s] will not involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated.

F Steam Generator Tube Repair Criteria*

The supporting technical and safety evaluations of the subject criterion demonstrate that the presence of the tubesheet will enhance the tube integrity in the region of the hardroll by precluding tube deformation beyond its initial expanded outside diameter. The resistance to both tube rupture and tube collapse is strengthened by the presence of the tubesheet in that region. The results of hardrolling of the tube into the tubesheet is an interference fit between the tube and the tubesheet. Tube rupture cannot occur because the contact between the tube and tubesheet does not permit sufficient movement of tube material. The radial preload developed by the rolling process will secure a postulated separated tube end within the tubesheet during all plant conditions. In a similar manner, the tubesheet does not permit sufficient movement of tube material to permit buckling collapse of the tube during postulated LOCA [loss-of-coolant accident] loadings.

The F* length of roll expansion is sufficient to preclude tube pullout from tube degradation located below the F* distance, regardless of the extent of the tube degradation. The existing Technical Specification leakage rate requirements and accident analysis assumptions remain unchanged in the unlikely event that significant leakage from this region does occur. As noted above, tube rupture and pullout is not expected for tubes using the F* criterion. Any leakage out of the tube from

within the tubesheet at any elevation in the tubesheet is fully bounded by the existing steam generator tube rupture analysis included in the Prairie Island Plant USAR [Updated Safety Analysis Report]. For plants with partial depth roll expansion like Prairie Island, a postulated tube separation within the tube near the top of the roll expansion (with subsequent limited tube axial displacement) would not be expected to result in coolant release rates equal to those assumed in the USAR for a steam generator tube rupture event due to the limited gap between the tube and tubesheet. The proposed plugging criterion does not adversely impact any other previously evaluated design basis accident.

Leakage testing of roll expanded tubes indicates that for roll lengths approximately equal to the F* distance, any postulated faulted condition primary to secondary leakage from F* tubes would be insignificant.

L Steam Generator Tube Repair Criteria*

The presence of the tubesheet enhances steam generator tube integrity in the region of the hardroll by precluding tube deformation beyond its initial expanded outside diameter. The resistance to both tube rupture and tube collapse is strengthened by the presence of the tubesheet in that region. The result of the hardroll of the tube into the tubesheet is an interference fit between the tube and the tubesheet. Tube rupture cannot occur because the contact between the tube and tubesheet does not permit sufficient movement of tube materials. In a similar manner, the tubesheet does not permit sufficient movement of tube material to permit buckling collapse of the tube during postulated LOCA loadings.

The type of degradation for which the L* criteria has been developed (cracking with an axial or near axial orientation) has been found not to significantly reduce the axial strength of a tube. An evaluation including analysis and testing has been done to determine the strength reduction for the axial loads with simulated axial and near axial cracks. This evaluation provided the basis for the acceptance criteria for tube degradation subject to the L* criteria.

The length of roll expansion above L* is sufficient to preclude significant leakage from tube degradation located below the L* distance. The existing Technical Specification leakage rate requirements and accident analysis assumptions remain unchanged in the unlikely event that significant leakage from this region does occur. As noted above, tube rupture and pullout is not expected for tubes using the alternate plugging criteria.

Any leakage out of the tube from within the tubesheet at any elevation in the tubesheet is fully bounded by the existing steam generator tube rupture analysis included in the Prairie Island Updated Safety Analysis Report. The proposed alternate plugging criteria do not adversely impact any other previously evaluated design basis accident.

2. The proposed amendment[s] will not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously analyzed.

*F**

Implementation of the proposed F* criterion does not introduce any significant changes to the plant design basis. Use of the criterion does not provide a mechanism to initiate an accident outside of the region of the expanded portion of the tube. Any hypothetical accident as a result of any tube degradation in the expanded portion of the tube would be bounded by the existing tube rupture accident analysis. Tube bundle structural integrity will be maintained. Tube bundle leaktightness will be maintained such that any postulated accident leakage from F* tubes will be negligible with regards to offsite doses.

*L**

Implementation of the proposed alternate tubesheet tube plugging criteria does not introduce changes to the plant design basis. Use of the criteria does not provide a mechanism to result in an accident outside of the region of the tubesheet expansion. Any hypothetical accident as a result of any tube degradation in the expanded portion of the tube would be bounded by the existing tube rupture accident analysis.

3. The proposed amendment[s] will not involve a significant reduction in the margin of safety.

*F**

The use of the F* criterion has been demonstrated to maintain the integrity of the tube bundle commensurate with the requirements of Reg Guide 1.121 [≥Bases for Plugging Degraded PWR Steam Generator Tubes≥] (intended for indications in the free span of tubes) and the primary to secondary pressure boundary under normal and postulated accident conditions. Acceptable tube degradation for the F* criterion is any degradation indication in the tubesheet region, more than the F* distance below the bottom of the transition between the roll expansion and the unexpanded tube. The safety factors used in the verification of the strength of the degraded tube are consistent with the safety factors in the ASME Boiler and Pressure Vessel Code used in steam generator design. The F* distance has been verified by testing to be greater than the length of roll expansion required to preclude both tube pullout and significant leakage during normal and postulated accident conditions. Resistance to tube pullout is based upon the primary to secondary pressure differential as it acts on the surface area of the tube, which includes the tube wall cross-section, in addition to the inner diameter based area of the tube. The leak testing acceptance criteria are based on the primary to secondary leakage limit in the Technical Specifications and the leakage assumptions used in the USAR accident analysis.

Implementation of the tubesheet plugging criterion will decrease the number of tubes which must be taken out of service with tube plugs or repaired with sleeves. Both plugs and sleeves reduce the RCS (reactor coolant system) flow margin; thus, implementation of the F* criterion will maintain the margin of flow that would otherwise be reduced in the event of increased plugging or sleeving.

Based on the above, it is concluded that the proposed change does not result in a significant reduction in margin with respect to plant safety as defined in the USAR or the Technical Specification Bases.

*L**

The use of the alternate tubesheet plugging criteria has been demonstrated to maintain the integrity of the tube bundle commensurate with the requirements of Reg. Guide 1.121 for indications in the free span of tubes and the primary to secondary pressure boundary under normal and postulated accident conditions. Acceptable tube degradation for the L* criteria is any degradation indication with axial or nearly axial cracking in the tubesheet region, more than the L* distance below the bottom of the transition between the roll expansion and the unexpended tube. For tubes with axial or nearly axial cracks the strength of the tube relative to an axial load would not be reduced below the strength required to resist potential axial loads. The safety factors used in the verification of the strength of the degraded tube are consistent with the safety factors in the ASME Boiler and Pressure Vessel Code used in steam generator design. The L* distance has been verified by testing to be greater than the length of roll expansion required to preclude significant leakage during normal and postulated accident conditions. The leak testing acceptance criteria are based on the primary to secondary leakage limit in the Technical Specifications and the leakage assumptions used in the USAR accident analyses.

Implementation of the proposed tubesheet plugging criteria will decrease the number of tubes which must be taken out of service with tube plugs or repaired with sleeves. Both plugs and sleeves reduce the RCS flow margin, thus implementation of the alternate plugging criteria will maintain the margin of flow that would otherwise be reduced in the event of increased plugging or sleeving.

Based on the above, it is concluded that the proposed change does not result in a significant reduction in margin with respect to plant safety as defined in the Updated Safety Analysis Report or the bases of the Technical Specifications.

The NRC staff has reviewed the licensee's analysis and, based on this review, it appears that the three standards of 10 CFR 50.92(c) are satisfied. Therefore, the NRC staff proposes to determine that the amendment requests involve no significant hazards consideration. This notice supersedes the staff's previous notice which was published in the **Federal Register** February 1, 1995 (60 FR 6307).

Local Public Document Room location: Minneapolis Public Library, Technology and Science Department, 300 Nicollet Mall, Minneapolis, Minnesota 55401

Attorney for licensee: Jay Silberg, Esq., Shaw, Pittman, Potts, and Trowbridge, 2300 N Street, NW, Washington, DC 20037

NRC Project Director: Cynthia Carpenter, Acting

Northern States Power Company, Docket Nos. 50-282 and 50-306, Prairie Island Nuclear Generating Plant, Unit Nos. 1 and 2, Goodhue County, Minnesota

Date of amendment requests: February 23, 1995

Description of amendment requests: The proposed amendments would revise the wording in the Prairie Island technical specifications to allow implementation of exemptions to the schedule requirements of 10 CFR Part 50, Appendix J. A related exemption request would grant temporary relief from the requirements of 10 CFR Part 50, Appendix J, Section III.D.1.(a) which requires Prairie Island Unit 2 to perform a Type A test in the May 1995 refueling outage.

Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination: As required by 10 CFR 50.91(a), the licensee has provided its analysis of the issue of no significant hazards consideration, which is presented below:

1. The proposed amendment[s] will not involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated.

The proposed amendment is an administrative change which allows implementation of approved exemptions to the regulations and by itself does not change any retest schedules.

Therefore, the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated are not affected by the proposed amendment.

2. The proposed amendment[s] will not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously analyzed.

The proposed amendment is an administrative change which allows implementation of approved exemptions to the regulations and by itself does not change any retest schedules.

Therefore, the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated would not be created by the proposed amendment.

3. The proposed amendment[s] will not involve a significant reduction in the margin of safety

The proposed amendment is an administrative change which allows implementation of approved exemptions to the regulations and by itself does not change any retest schedules.

Therefore, a significant reduction in the margin of safety would not be involved with the proposed amendment.

The NRC staff has reviewed the licensee's analysis and, based on this review, it appears that the three standards of 10 CFR 50.92(c) are satisfied. Therefore, the NRC staff proposes to determine that the amendment requests involve no significant hazards consideration.

Local Public Document Room location: Minneapolis Public Library, Technology and Science Department, 300 Nicollet Mall, Minneapolis, Minnesota 55401

Attorney for licensee: Jay Silberg, Esq., Shaw, Pittman, Potts, and Trowbridge, 2300 N Street, NW, Washington, DC 20037

NRC Project Director: Cynthia Carpenter, Acting

Omaha Public Power District, Docket No. 50-285, Fort Calhoun Station,Unit No. 1, Washington County, Nebraska

Date of amendment request: February 10, 1995

Description of amendment request: The proposed amendment to the technical specifications (TSs) would relocate the requirements for the incore instrumentation (ICI) system from the TS to the Updated Safety Analysis Report (USAR).

Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination: As required by 10 CFR 50.91(a), the licensee has provided its analysis of the issue of no significant hazards consideration, which is presented below:

(1) The proposed changes do not involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated.

The Incore Instrumentation (ICI) System is used to measure core power distribution for the purpose of Limiting Conditions for Operation (LCO) monitoring of Technical Specification (TS) limits on linear heat rate, unrodded planer radial peaking factor, unrodded integrated radial peaking factor, and azimuthal power tilt. The ICI System has no safety purpose itself; it measures parameters which have safety significance. No change to the monitored parameters is proposed. The proposed changes will relocate requirements on the number and distribution of incore detectors used by the ICI System when measuring these parameters from the TS to the Updated Safety Analysis Report (USAR). Changes to the requirements can be made without NRC approval when the changes meet the criteria of 10 CFR 50.59. Changes to the ICI System requirements that do not meet the criteria of 10 CFR 50.59 must be approved by the NRC by license amendment.

Relocation of the requirements on the ICI System from the TS to the USAR does not increase the probability or consequences of any accident previously analyzed because the ICI System is neither a precursor nor a mitigator for any analyzed accident. The ICI System is used to ensure that operation within the LCOs for linear heat rate, unrodded planer radial peaking factor, unrodded integrated radial peaking factor, and azimuthal power tilt is maintained. However, its operation serves no mitigation function associated with any USAR Section 14 accident analysis. The parameters measured by the ICI System are important parameters in many accident analyses; however, this proposed change does not remove or revise the limits on these parameters.

Additionally, it is proposed to revise TS 2.10.4(1)(b) to clarify its requirements. Currently TS 2.10.4(1) part (b) applies while operating under the provisions of part (a) if the plant computer incore detector alarms become inoperable. This is incorrect in that part (a) applies when the linear heat rate is being monitored by the ICI System and the linear heat rate is exceeding its limits as indicated by valid detector alarms. Part (b) of this specification should apply only if the linear heat rate is being monitored by the ICI System, is within its limits, and the plant computer incore detector alarms are inoperable.

Administrative changes are also proposed which correct grammar and renumber/relocate portions of the TS and bases to other TS, to correspond to the proposed change to relocate ICI System requirements.

Therefore, the proposed change does not involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated.

(2) The proposed changes do not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any previously evaluated.

The ICI System will continue to be used to monitor TS limits on core power distribution. There will be no physical alterations to the plant configuration, changes to setpoint values, or changes to the implementation of setpoints or limits as a result of this proposed change.

The proposed change to TS 2.10.4(1)(b) only clarifies its requirements. The proposed change is more restrictive in that TS 2.10.4(1)(b), as currently written, could be interpreted to allow continued operation for up to seven days with the linear heat rate exceeding its limits. The proposed change clarifies this specification to ensure that TS 2.10.4(1)(a) is applied if the linear heat rate is exceeded while being monitored by the ICI System. TS 2.10.4(1)(a) requires that the linear heat rate be restored within one hour or a plant shutdown initiated.

Therefore, the proposed change does not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any previously evaluated.

(3) The proposed changes do not involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety.

The ICI System is used to measure core power distribution parameters which are a direct measure of the margin of safety. The limits on these parameters are not changed. Therefore, the proposed change (i.e., relocation of the ICI System operability requirements to the USAR and/or plant procedures) does not involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety.

The proposed change to TS 2.10.4(1)(b) helps ensure that the margin of safety is maintained by clarifying when the TS is applicable. This clarification ensures that the more restrictive actions of TS 2.10.4(1)(a) are taken if the linear heat rate is exceeded while being monitored by the ICI System. Therefore, the proposed change does not involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety.

The NRC staff has reviewed the licensee's analysis and, based on this review, it appears that the three standards of 10 CFR 50.92(c) are satisfied. Therefore, the NRC staff proposes to determine that the amendment request involves no significant hazards consideration.

Local Public Document Room location: W. Dale Clark Library, 215 South 15th Street, Omaha, Nebraska 68102

Attorney for licensee: LeBoeuf, Lamb, Leiby, and MacRae, 1875 Connecticut Avenue, NW., Washington, DC 20009-5728

NRC Project Director: Theodore R. Quay

Pacific Gas and Electric Company, Docket Nos. 50-275 and 50-323, DiabloCanyon Nuclear Power Plant, Unit Nos. 1 and 2, San Luis Obispo County, California

Date of amendment requests: December 30, 1994 (Reference LAR 94-12)

Description of amendment requests: The proposed amendments would revise the combined Technical Specifications (TS) for the Diablo Canyon Nuclear Power Plant, Unit Nos. 1 and 2, to revise TS 2.2, 3/4.3.1, 3/4.3.2, 3/4.3.3, 3/4.4.4, 3/4.4.9, 3/4.5.2, 3/4.8.1, 3/4.8.2, 3/4.9.2, 3/4.9.9, and 3/4.10.3. The specific TS changes proposed are as follows:

(1) The TS issued in License Amendments (LAs) 84/83 would be changed to (a) revise the value of the overpower Delta-temperature (OPDT) constant K6 in TS 2.2.1, Table 2.2-1, Note 3; (b) revise the reactor coolant system (RCS) loop Delta-T function; and (c) make editorial corrections for clarification and consistency to TS 2.2.1 (and TS 2.2.1 Bases), TS 3/4.3.1, and TS 3/4.3.2.

In revising the RCS loop Delta-T function, the licensee would (a) incorporate the 0.99 multiplying factor listed in TS 2.2.1, Table 2.2-1, Note 5, and TS 3/4.3.2, Table 3.3-4, Note 2, into constants B1 through B4; (b) change ''Steam Generator (SG) Water Level Low-Low'' in TS 3/4.3.2, Table 3.3-3 and Table 4.3-2, Functional Unit 6.c, ''Auxiliary Feedwater'' (AFW), by deleting the Mode 3 applicability of the RCS loop Delta-T function and by adding a footnote to the Mode 3 applicability of the SG water level low-low function requiring that the trip time delay (TTD) associated with the SG water level low-low channel be less than or equal to 464.1 seconds; (c) change TS 3/4.3.1, Table 3.3-1, Action 27, and TS 3/4.3.2, Table 3.3-3, Action 29, by allowing up to four RCS loop Delta-T channels to be inoperable with the TTD threshold power level for zero seconds time adjusted to 0-percent rated thermal power (RTP) and by allowing the affected SG water level low-low channels to be placed in the tripped condition, with one inoperable RCS loop Delta-T channel; and (d) change the Table 3.3-1 and Table 3.3-3 ''Channels to Trip'' and ''Minimum Channels Operable'' columns to not applicable (N.A.).

(2) The TS issued in LAs 70/69 would be changed to (a) delete references to the plant vent noble gas activity monitors (RM-14A and RM-14B) and footnote references to applicability of the containment ventilation exhaust radiation monitors (RM-44A and RM-44B) in TS Tables 3.3-3, 3.3-4, 3.3-5, 3.3-6, 4.3-2, and 4.3-3 and TS 4.9.9; and (b) revise the ''Trip Setpoint and Allowable Values'' column in TS Table 3.3-4, Functional Unit 3.c.4), to reference the offsite dose calculation procedure (ODCP).

(3) Cycle-specific information in TS 4.3.2.1, TS 3.3.3.6, TS 4.4.4.1, TS 4.5.2, TS 3.8.1.1, TS 3.8.2.1, and TS 3.8.2.2 that is no longer necessary would be deleted.

(4) The word ''analog'' would be deleted from TS 4.4.9.3.1, TS 4.9.2, and TS 4.10.3.2.

Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination: As required by 10 CFR 50.91(a), the licensee has provided its analysis of the issue of no significant hazards consideration, which is presented below:

a. Does the change involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated?

The proposed change to the OPDT constant K6 is conservative and will not cause any design or analysis acceptance criteria to be exceeded. There is no effect on the structural and functional integrity of any plant system. The OPDT function is part of the accident mitigation response and is not itself an initiator for any transient. This change does not affect the integrity of the fission product barriers for mitigation of radiological dose consequences as a result of an accident.

The proposed change to incorporate the 0.99 multiplier into the TTD constants is an administrative change and has no effect on plant operation. The proposed change to delete Mode 3 applicability of the RCS Loop Delta-T function does not affect any design or analysis results. Allowing up to 4 RCS Loop Delta-T channels to be inoperable with the TTD threshold power level for zero seconds time delay adjusted to 0% RTP is conservative with respect to ESFs [engineered safety features] and reactor trip actuation time. Allowing the SG [steam generator] water level low-low channels affected by the inoperable RCS Loop Delta-T channels to be placed in the tripped condition is also conservative with respect to reactor trip and AFW pumps start. The change to the Channels to Trip and Minimum Channels Operable columns is a clarifying change to reflect the proposed changes to the action statements and identifies that the RCS Loop Delta-T does not provide a reactor trip function. Therefore, the proposed changes to the RCS Loop Delta-T function do not affect any of the accident analysis results.

The proposed changes to revise Table 3.3-4, Functional Unit 3.c.4), and to delete cycle-specific TS, TS references to RM-14A and RM-14B, and the word ''analog'' from the analog channel operation test are administrative and have no effect on plant operation.

Therefore, the proposed changes do not involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated.

b. Does the change create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated?

The proposed change to the OPDT constant K6 does not affect the assumed accident initiation sequences. No new operating configuration is being imposed by the change to K6 that would create a new failure scenario. No new failure modes are being created for any plant equipment.

The proposed changes to the RCS Loop Delta-T function do not involve any physical modification to any plant system or change the methodology by which any safety-related system performs its function.

1The proposed changes to revise Table 3.3-4, Functional Unit 3.c.4), and to delete cycle-specific TS, TS references to RM-14A and RM-14B, and the word ''analog'' from the analog channel operation test are administrative, would not result in any physical alteration to any plant system, and would not be a change in the method by which any safety-related system performs its function.

Therefore, the proposed changes do not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated.

c. Does the change involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety?

The proposed change to the OPDT constant K6 will not affect any accident analysis assumptions, initial conditions, or results.

The proposed changes to the RCS Loop Delta-T function do not affect any accident analysis assumptions, initial conditions, or results.

The proposed changes to revise Table 3.3-4, Functional Unit 3.c.4), and to delete cycle-specific TS, TS references to RM-14A and RM-14B, and the word ''analog'' from the analog channel operation test are administrative and clarify the TS. These proposed changes have no effect on current operating methodologies or actions that govern plant performance.

Therefore, the proposed changes do not involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety.

The NRC staff has reviewed the licensee's analysis and, based on this review, it appears that the three standards of 50.92(c) are satisfied. Therefore, the NRC staff proposes to determine that the amendment requests

involve no significant hazards consideration.

Local Public Document Room location: California Polytechnic State University, Robert E. Kennedy Library, Government Documents and Maps Department, San Luis Obispo, California 93407

Attorney for licensee: Christopher J. Warner, Esq., Pacific Gas and Electric Company, P.O. Box 7442, San Francisco, California 94120

NRC Project Director: Theodore R. Quay

Philadelphia Electric Company, Public Service Electric and Gas Company,Delmarva Power and Light Company, and Atlantic City Electric Company,Dockets Nos. 50-277 and 50-278, Peach Bottom Atomic Power Station,Units Nos. 2 and 3, York County, Pennsylvania

Date of application for amendments: September 26, 1994

Description of amendment request: The proposed TS changes extend surveillance test intervals and allowable out-of-service times for the testing and/or repair of instrumentation that actuate the Reactor Protection System, Primary Containment Isolation, Core and Containment Cooling systems, Control Rod Blocks, Radiation Monitoring systems, and Alternate Rod Insertion/Recirculation Pump Trip.

Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination: As required by 10 CFR 50.91(a), the licensee has provided its analysis of the issue of no significant hazards consideration, which is presented below:

1. The proposed changes do not involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated.

The proposed TS changes increase the STIs and AOTs for actuation instrumentation based on analyses described and justified in Licensing Topical Reports (References 2 through 8) [see licensee's September 26, 1994 application for reference information] which have been evaluated in associated Safety Evaluation Reports. These changes were incorporated into PBAPS Technical Specifications consistent with NUREG-1433. TS requirements that govern Operability or routine testing of plant instruments are not assumed to be initiators of any analyzed event because these instruments are intended to prevent, detect or mitigate accidents. Therefore, these changes will not involve an increase in the probability of occurrence of an accident previously evaluated. Additionally, these changes will not increase the consequences of an accident previously evaluated because the proposed change will not involve any physical changes to plant systems, structures, or components (SSC), or the manner in which these SSC are operated, maintained, modified, or inspected. The changes will not alter the operation of equipment assumed to be available for the mitigation of accidents or transients by the plant safety analysis or licensing basis. As justified in References 1 through 8, the proposed changes establish or maintain adequate assurance that components are operable when necessary for the prevention or mitigation of accidents or transients and that plant variables are maintained within limits necessary to satisfy the assumptions for initial conditions in the safety analyses. These changes establish or modify time limits allowed for operation with inoperable instrument channels based on the analyses in References 1 through 8 and will not allow continuous plant operation with plant conditions such that a single failure will result in a loss of any safety function. Therefore, these changes will not increase the consequences of an accident previously evaluated.

2) The proposed changes do not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated.

These proposed changes will not involve any physical changes to SSC, or the manner in which these SSC are operated, maintained, modified, tested, or inspected. Therefore, these changes will not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated. The changes in methods governing normal plant operation are consistent with the current safety analysis assumptions. Therefore, these changes will not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated.

3) The proposed changes do not involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety.

The proposed TS changes increase the STIs and AOTs for actuation instrumentation based on analyses described and justified in Licensing Topical Reports (References 2 through 8) which have been evaluated in associated Safety Evaluation Reports. These changes were incorporated into PBAPS Technical Specifications consistent with NUREG-1433. These changes can be classified into one of the following three categories:

a. Changes to the minimum STIs and AOTs for the testing and/or repair of instrumentation based on the results of generic analyses in References 1 through 8;

b. Changes to conditions, required actions, and completion times needed to make PBAPS TS requirements consistent with the assumptions used in the analyses in References 1 through 8; and,

c. Changes that reformat, renumber, and/or reword existing requirements to incorporate the changes above.

All of the proposed changes will be incorporated into the PBAPS custom Technical Specifications using the same approach and specific requirements used in Reference 12.

There is no significant reduction in the margin of safety resulting from changes to the STIs and AOTs for the testing and/or repair of instrumentation based on the results of the analyses in References 1 through 8. These analyses determined that there is no significant change in the availability and/or reliability of instrumentation as a result of this change in STIs and AOTs. PECO Energy performed reviews that confirmed these analyses are applicable to PBAPS and that there would be no effect on the identification of excessive instrument setpoint drift as a result of increasing from monthly to quarterly the minimum interval between instrument functional tests. The proposed required actions ensure that actions to mitigate loss of single failure tolerance is initiated within 24 hours (12 hours for RPS) in accordance with the results of the analyses in References 1 through 8 and action to mitigate a loss of instrument function is initiated within 1 hour.

The proposed changes which replace the shutdown actions associated with inoperable instrumentation with actions to declare the supported system inoperable does not involve a reduction in a margin of safety. The proposed changes ensure that appropriate compensatory measures are taken commensurate with approved TS Actions for the affected systems and the safety analyses. In addition, the proposed changes provide the benefit of avoiding an unnecessary shutdown transient when appropriate measures are available to compensate for the inoperable instrumentation.

There is no significant reduction in the margin of safety resulting from changes that reformat, renumber, and/or reword existing requirements to incorporate the changes above.

The NRC staff has reviewed the licensee's analysis and, based on this review, it appears that the three standards of 10 CFR 50.92(c) are satisfied. Therefore, the NRC staff proposes to determine that the amendment request involves no significant hazards consideration.

Local Public Document Room location: Government Publications Section, State Library of Pennsylvania, (REGIONAL DEPOSITORY) Education Building, Walnut Street and Commonwealth Avenue, Box 1601, Harrisburg, Pennsylvania 17105.

Attorney for licensee: J. W. Durham, Sr., Esquire, Sr. V. P. and General Counsel, Philadelphia Electric Company, 2301 Market Street, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19101

NRC Project Director: John F. Stolz

Philadelphia Electric Company, Public Service Electric and Gas Company,Delmarva Power and Light Company, and Atlantic City Electric Company,Dockets Nos. 50-277 and 50-278, Peach Bottom Atomic Power Station,Units Nos. 2 and 3, York County, Pennsylvania

Date of application for amendments: November 17, 1994

Description of amendment request: The proposed changes to the Technical Specifications (TS) are being requested to support modifications 5384 and 5386 which upgrade the Main Stack and Vent Stack Radiation Monitoring Systems.

Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination: As required by 10 CFR 50.91(a), the licensee has provided its analysis of the issue of no significant hazards consideration, which is presented below:

1. The proposed changes do not involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated.

Neither the Main Stack nor the Vent Stack Radiation Monitoring Systems serve as an initiator or contributor to any accidents previously evaluated. The systems provide indication and detection of radioactivity and effluent release in the main and vent stacks. The new systems perform the same function as the old, and have equal or better performance characteristics. Installation and operation of the new radiation monitoring systems do not degrade any active or passive equipment that responds to an accident.

The proposed increase in the surveillance test interval of the subject radiation monitoring systems from 12 to 18 months is consistent with vendor recommendations, and is based on operating experience with instrumentation of a similar design.

Therefore, the proposed changes do not involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated.

2. The proposed changes do not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any previously evaluated.

Both modifications replace obsolete radiation monitoring equipment and have the same failure modes as the existing equipment. The upgraded systems are considered enhancements to the existing systems and are considered neither a contributor nor initiator of any accidents previously evaluated.

Based on the above, the proposed changes do not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any previously evaluated.

3. The proposed changes do not involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety.

Neither the accuracy nor the responsiveness of the existing radiation monitoring equipment will be degraded as a result of the installation of modifications 5384 and 5386. Revisions to the calibration and surveillance frequencies are based on vendor information and experience with instrumentation of similar design. The changes associated with setpoints and the lower limit of detection are in the conservative direction. The upgraded main stack system continues to provide a non-safety related trip signal to Group III isolation valves during purging of the containment through the SBGTS [standby gas treatment system]. The revisions to parameter descriptions and instrument designation are considered administrative.

Therefore, based on the above, the proposed changes do not involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety.

The NRC staff has reviewed the licensee's analysis and, based on this review, it appears that the three standards of 10 CFR 50.92(c) are satisfied. Therefore, the NRC staff proposes to determine that the amendment request involves no significant hazards consideration.

Local Public Document Room location: Government Publications Section, State Library of Pennsylvania, (REGIONAL DEPOSITORY) Education Building, Walnut Street and Commonwealth Avenue, Box 1601, Harrisburg, Pennsylvania 17105.

Attorney for licensee: J. W. Durham, Sr., Esquire, Sr. V. P. and General Counsel, Philadelphia Electric Company, 2301 Market Street, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19101

NRC Project Director: John F. Stolz

Public Service Electric & Gas Company, Docket No. 50-311, Salem Nuclear Generating Station, Unit No. 2, Salem County, New Jersey

Date of amendment request: February 3, 1994, supplemented September 19, 1994, and November 23, 1994

Description of amendment request: The proposed amendment revises the Technical Specifications to reflect a reduction in the Reactor Coolant System flow.

Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination: As required by 10 CFR 50.91(a), the licensee has provided its analysis of the issue of no significant hazards consideration, which is presented below:

1. Involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously analyzed.

No component modification, system realignment, or change in operations will occur which could affect the probability of any accident or transient. The proposed reduction in RCS loop and total flow rates will not change the probability of a challenge to any Engineered Safeguard Feature or other device. The consequences of previously analyzed accidents have been found to remain within acceptable licensing basis limits when the reduced flow rates are assumed. The system transient response is not affected by the initial RCS flow assumption, unless the initial assumption is so low as to impair the steady-state core cooling capability or steam generator heat transfer capability. This is clearly not the case with a 1% reduction in RCS flow. The proposed change to the wording of the parameter title on Table 3.2-1 is editorial for clarity. Therefore, the proposed changes do not involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously analyzed.

2. Create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident.

No component modification, system realignment, or change in operating procedure will occur which could create the possibility of a new event not previously considered. The proposed reduction in RCS loop and total flow rates will not initiate any new events. Therefore, the proposed changes would not create the possibility of a different or new kind of accident.

3. Involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety.

The proposed decrease in RCS loop and total flow rates has been analyzed and found to have an insignificant effect on the applicable transient analyses found in the FSAR. The proposed change to the wording of the parameter title on Table 3.2-1 is editorial for clarity. Therefore, the proposed changes would not involve a significant reduction in any margin of safety.

Therefore, based on the information presented above, PSE&G has concluded there is no significant hazards consideration.

The NRC staff has reviewed the licensee's analysis and, based on this review, it appears that the three standards of 10 CFR 50.92(c) are satisfied. Therefore, the NRC staff proposes to determine that the amendment request involves no significant hazards consideration.

Local Public Document Room location: Salem Free Public library, 112 West Broadway, Salem, New Jersey 08079

Attorney for licensee: Mark J. Wetterhahn, Esquire, Winston and Strawn, 1400 L Street, NW, Washington, DC 20005-3502

NRC Project Director: John F. Stolz

Toledo Edison Company, Centerior Service Company, and The Cleveland Electric Illuminating Company, Docket No. 50-346, Davis-Besse Nuclear Power Station, Unit No. 1, Ottawa County, Ohio

Date of amendment request: January 30, 1995

Description of amendment request: The proposed amendment would revise Technical Specification (TS) 4.6.1.2.a and associated Bases for 3/4.6.1.2 to state that Type A tests for overall integrated containment leakage rate shall be conducted in accordance with the requirements specified in Appendix J of 10 CFR 50, as modified by NRC-approved exemptions. Additionally, TS 4.6.1.2.b would be revised to eliminate the reference to the schedule contained in TS 4.6.1.2.a.

Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination: As required by 10 CFR 50.91(a), the licensee has provided its analysis of the issue of no significant hazards consideration, which is presented below:

Toledo Edison has reviewed the proposed change and determined that a significant hazards consideration does not exist because operation of the Davis-Besse Nuclear Power Station, Unit No. 1, in accordance with these changes would:

1a. Not involve a significant increase in the probability of an accident previously evaluated because no accident initiators,

conditions or assumptions are significantly affected by the proposed changes.

The proposed change would revise Technical Specification (TS) Surveillance Requirement (SR) 4.6.1.2.a to allow overall integrated containment leakage rate (Type A) testing to be scheduled in accordance with 10 CFR 50 Appendix J, as modified by approved exemptions, and would make associated administrative changes to TS SR 4.6.1.2.b and to TS Bases 3/4.6.1.2. As stated above, none of these proposed changes involve accident initiators, conditions, or assumptions.

1b. Not involve a significant increase in the consequences of an accident previously evaluated because no accident conditions or assumptions are affected by the proposed changes.

The results of the previous Type A testing demonstrate a high degree of containment integrity. The Type B and C testing performed since the last Type A test provides confidence that the high degree of containment integrity will be maintained during the interval to the next Type A test. Therefore, the proposed changes do not alter the source term, containment isolation, or allowable releases, and will not increase the radiological consequences of a previously evaluated accident.

2. Not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated because no new or different accident initiators or assumptions are introduced by the proposed changes. The proposed changes do not affect the design or operation of any plant system, structure, or component. The proposed changes do not affect any accident initiators and are not initiators themselves. The proposed changes do not alter any accident scenarios.

3. Not involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety. The initial conditions and methodologies used in the accident analyses remain unchanged. As described above, the proposed changes do not significantly reduce or adversely affect the confidence that the present high degree of containment integrity will be maintained.

The NRC staff has reviewed the licensee's analysis and, based on this review, it appears that the three standards of 10 CFR 50.92(c) are satisfied. Therefore, the NRC staff proposes to determine that the amendment request involves no significant hazards consideration.

Local Public Document Room location: University of Toledo Library, Documents Department, 2801 Bancroft Avenue, Toledo, Ohio 43606.

Attorney for licensee: Jay E. Silberg, Esquire, Shaw, Pittman, Potts and Trowbridge, 2300 N Street, N.W., Washington, DC 20037.

NRC Project Director: Leif J. Norrholm

Toledo Edison Company, Centerior Service Company, and The Cleveland Electric Illuminating Company, Docket No. 50-346, Davis-Besse Nuclear Power Station, Unit No. 1, Ottawa County, Ohio

Date of amendment request: January 30, 1995

Description of amendment request: The proposed amendment would provide new Reactor Coolant Pressure Boundary (RCPB) pressure-temperature limit curves that are applicable up to 21 effective full power years (EFPY).

Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination: As required by 10 CFR 50.91(a), the licensee has provided its analysis of the issue of no significant hazards consideration, which is presented below:

Toledo Edison had reviewed the proposed change and determined that a significant hazards consideration does not exist because operation of Davis-Besse Nuclear Power Station, Unit 1, in accordance with this change would:

1a. Not involve a significant increase in the probability of an accident previously evaluated because: (1) revision of the pressure-temperature curves and the extended applicability of the pressurizer level/RCS pressure limit curves for periods when relief valve DH4849 is inoperable will continue to provide the same level of protection of the RCPB as was previously evaluated, and (2) the revision to License Condition 2.C(3)(d) is administrative to reflect the validity of the present analyses to 21 EFPY and (3) the revision to the Technical Specification Bases

to reflect the extension to 21 EFPY is administrative and does not affect any previously analyzed accidents.

1b. Not involve a significant increase in the consequences of an accident previously evaluated because: (1) revision of the pressure-temperature curves and the extended applicability of the pressurizer level/RCS pressure limit curves for periods when relief valve DH4849 is inoperable will continue to provide the same level of protection of the RCPB as was previously evaluated, and (2) the revision to License Condition 2.C(3)(d) is administrative to reflect the validity of the present analyses to 21 EFPY and (3) the revision to the Technical Specification Bases to reflect the extension to 21 EFPY is administrative and does not affect any previously analyzed accidents.

2. Not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated because: (1) revision of the pressure-temperature curves and the extended applicability of the pressurizer level/RCS pressure limit curves will continue to provide protection against reactor vessel failure due to brittle fracture concerns under all postulated circumstances, and (2) the revision to License Condition 2.C(3)(d) is administrative to reflect the validity of the present analyses to 21 EFPY and (3) the revision to the Technical Specification Bases to reflect the extension to 21 EFPY is an administrative change and does not affect any activities or equipment in plant operation.

3. Not involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety because: (1) revision of the pressure-temperature curves and the extended applicability of the pressurizer level/RCS pressure limit curves maintains the present margin of safety from reactor vessel brittle fracture as required by 10 CFR 50, Appendix G, and (2) the revision to License Condition 2.C(3)(d) and the Bases revision are administrative and do not affect any analyses which provide the basis for the Technical Specifications.

The NRC staff has reviewed the licensee's analysis and, based on this review, it appears that the three standards of 10 CFR 50.92(c) are satisfied. Therefore, the NRC staff proposes to determine that the amendment request involves no significant hazards consideration.

Local Public Document Room location: University of Toledo Library, Documents Department, 2801 Bancroft Avenue, Toledo, Ohio 43606.

Attorney for licensee: Jay E. Silberg, Esquire, Shaw, Pittman, Potts and Trowbridge, 2300 N Street, N.W., Washington, DC 20037.

NRC Project Director: Leif J. Norrholm

Virginia Electric and Power Company, Docket Nos. 50-280 and 50-281, Surry Power Station, Unit Nos. 1 and 2, Surry County, Virginia

Date of amendment request: February 14, 1995

Description of amendment request: The proposed change revises Technical Specification 4.4.D to reference the testing requirements of 10 CFR Part 50, Appendix J, and to state that the Nuclear Regulatory Commission-approved exemptions to the applicable regulatory requirements are permitted.

Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination: As required by 10 CFR 50.91(a), the licensee has provided its analysis of the issue of no significant hazards consideration, which is presented below:

Virginia Electric and Power Company has performed an evaluation of ... the proposed administrative Technical Specification change, in accordance with 10 CFR 50.91(a)(1) regarding no significant hazards considerations using the standards in 10 CFR 50.92(c). A discussion of these standards as they relate to this ... amendment request follows.

Criterion 1 - Does Not Involve a Significant Increase in the Probability or Consequences of an Accident Previously Evaluated.

The proposed change ... revises Technical Specification 4.4.D to reference the testing frequency requirements of 10 CFR 50 Appendix J and to state that NRC approved exemptions to the applicable regulatory

requirements are permitted. The current Technical Specification requires retests in accordance with Section III.D.1(a) of Appendix J. The proposed administrative change simply includes the statement ''as modified by NRC approved exemptions.'' No new requirements are added, nor are any existing requirements deleted. Any specific changes to the requirements of Section III.D.1(a) will require a submittal from Virginia Electric and Power Company under 10 CFR 50.12 and subsequent review and approval by the NRC prior to implementation. The proposed change is stated generically to avoid the need for further Technical Specification changes if different exemptions are approved in the future.

The proposed change, in itself, does not affect reactor operations or accident analyses and has no radiological consequences. The change provides clarification so that future Technical Specifications changes will not be necessary to correspond to applicable NRC approved exemptions from the requirements of Appendix J.

Therefore, this proposed change does not involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of any accident previously evaluated.

Criterion 2 - Does Not Create the Possibility of a New or Different Kind of Accident from any Previously Evaluated.

The proposed Technical Specification amendment provides clarification to a specification that paraphrases a codified requirement.

Since the proposed change would not change the design, configuration or method of operation of the plant, it would not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any previously evaluated.

Criterion 3 - Does Not Involve a Significant Reduction in the Margin of Safety.

The proposed Technical Specification change is administrative and clarifies the relationship between the requirements of TS 4.4.D, Appendix J, and any approved exemptions to Appendix J. It does not, in itself, change a safety limit or [a] Limiting Condition for Operation. The NRC will directly approve any proposed change or exemption to III.D.1(a) of Appendix J prior to implementation.

Therefore, this change does not involve a significant reduction in the margin of safety.

The NRC staff has reviewed the licensee's analysis and, based on this review, it appears that the three standards of 50.92(c) are satisfied. Therefore, the NRC staff proposes to determine that the amendment request involves no significant hazards consideration.

Local Public Document Room location: Swem Library, College of William and Mary, Williamsburg, Virginia 23185.

Attorney for licensee: Michael W. Maupin, Esq., Hunton and Williams, Riverfront Plaza, 951 E. Byrd Street, Richmond, Virginia 23219.

NRC Project Director: David B. Matthews

Previously Published Notices Of Consideration Of Issuance Of Amendments To Facility Operating Licenses, Proposed No Significant Hazards Consideration Determination, And Opportunity For A Hearing

The following notices were previously published as separate individual notices. The notice content was the same as above. They were published as individual notices either because time did not allow the Commission to wait for this biweekly notice or because the action involved exigent circumstances. They are repeated here because the biweekly notice lists all amendments issued or proposed to be issued involving no significant hazards consideration.

For details, see the individual notice in the **Federal Register** on the day and page cited. This notice does not extend the notice period of the original notice.

Illinois Power Company and Soyland Power Cooperative, Inc., Docket No. 50-461, Clinton Power Station, Unit No. 1, DeWitt County, Illinois

Date of amendment request: February 14, 1995

Brief description of amendment request: The amendment request proposes changes to Technical Specification 3.8.2, ''AC Sources-Shutdown;'' 3.8.5, ''DC Sources-Shutdown;'' and 3.8.8, ''Inverters-Shutdown.'' The proposed changes would revise the operability requirements for the Division 3 diesel generator and the Division 3 and 4 batteries, battery chargers, and inverters to apply only when the high pressure core spray system is required to be operable.Date of publication of individual notice in **Federal Register:** February 17, 1995 (60 FR 9412).

Expiration date of individual notice: March 20, 1995

Local Public Document Room location: Vespasian Warner Public Library, 120 West Johnson Street, Clinton, Illinois 61727.

Union Electric Company, Docket No. 50-483, Callaway Plant, Unit 1, Callaway County, Missouri

Date of amendment request: September 8, 1994

Brief description of amendment request: The amendment request proposes changes to Technical Specification Section 3/4.9.1 to establish administrative controls to address a possible boron dilution event directly from the reactor makeup water system.

Date of publication of individual notice in **Federal Register:** March 1, 1995 (60 FR 11151).

Expiration date of individual notice: March 31, 1995

Local Public Document Room location: Callaway County Public Library, 710 Court Street, Fulton, Missouri 65251.

Notice Of Issuance Of Amendments To Facility Operating Licenses

During the period since publication of the last biweekly notice, the Commission has issued the following amendments. The Commission has determined for each of these amendments that the application complies with the standards and requirements of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended (the Act), and the Commission's rules and regulations. The Commission has made appropriate findings as required by the Act and the Commission's rules and regulations in 10 CFR Chapter I, which are set forth in the license amendment.

Notice of Consideration of Issuance of Amendment to Facility Operating License, Proposed No Significant Hazards Consideration Determination, and Opportunity for A Hearing in connection with these actions was published in the **Federal Register** as indicated.

Unless otherwise indicated, the Commission has determined that these amendments satisfy the criteria for categorical exclusion in accordance with 10 CFR 51.22. Therefore, pursuant to 10 CFR 51.22(b), no environmental impact statement or environmental assessment need be prepared for these amendments. If the Commission has prepared an environmental assessment under the special circumstances provision in 10 CFR 51.12(b) and has made a determination based on that assessment, it is so indicated.

For further details with respect to the action see (1) the applications for amendment, (2) the amendment, and (3) the Commission's related letter, Safety Evaluation and/or Environmental Assessment as indicated. All of these items are available for public inspection at the Commission's Public Document Room, the Gelman Building, 2120 L Street, NW., Washington, DC, and at the local public document rooms for the particular facilities involved.

Arizona Public Service Company, et al., Docket No. STN 50-529, Palo Verde Nuclear Generating Station, Unit 2, Maricopa County, Arizona

Date of application for amendment: November 30, 1994, as supplemented by letter dated January 27, 1995

Brief description of amendment: The amendment changed the pressurizer code safety valve lift setting from 2500

psia to 2475 psia. The lift setting is being changed to permit Unit 2 to operate with up to 1500 plugged tubes in each steam generator.

Date of issuance: March 1, 1995

Effective date: March 1, 1995

Amendment No.: 78

Facility Operating License No. NPF-74: The amendment revised the Technical Specifications.

Date of initial notice in **Federal Register:** January 4, 1995 (60 FR 496) The additional information contained in the January 27, 1995, supplemental letter was clarifying in nature and thus within the scope of the initial notice and did not affect the NRC staff's proposed no significant hazards consideration determination. The Commission's related evaluation of the amendment is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated March 1, 1995.No significant hazards consideration comments received: No.

Local Public Document Room location: Phoenix Public Library, 12 East McDowell Road, Phoenix, Arizona 85004

Boston Edison Company, Docket No. 50-293, Pilgrim Nuclear Power Station,Plymouth County, Massachusetts

Date of application for amendment: September 6, 1994

Brief description of amendment: The proposed amendment relocates the alarms for the drywell to suppression chamber vacuum breaker to a different annunicator panel.

Date of issuance: February 16, 1995 Effective date: To be implemented prior to startup from refueling outage ι10.

Amendment No.: 158

Facility Operating License No. DPR-35: Amendment revised the Technical Specifications.

Date of initial notice in **Federal Register:** October 26, 1994 (59 FR 53839) The Commission's related evaluation of the amendment is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated No significant hazards consideration comments received: No

Local Public Document Room location: Plymouth Public Library, 11 North Street, Plymouth, Massachusetts 02360.

Commonwealth Edison Company, Docket Nos. STN 50-456 and STN 50-457, Braidwood Station, Unit Nos. 1 and 2, Will County, Illinois

Date of application for amendments: January 5, 1994, as supplemented by letters dated April 26, 1994, September 30, 1994, and January 12, 1995.

Brief description of amendments: The amendments change the Braidwood Technical Specifications to remove the requirement to verify, every 18 months, that the control room ventilation can be manually isolated.

Date of issuance: February 28, 1995

Effective date: February 28, 1995

Amendment Nos.: 60 and 60

Facility Operating License Nos. NPF-72 and NPF-77: The amendments revised the Technical Specifications.

Date of initial notice in **Federal Register:** January 25, 1995 (60 FR 4930). The Commission's related evaluation of the amendments is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated February 28, 1995. No significant hazards consideration comments received: No

Local Public Document Room location: Wilmington Township Public Library, 201 S. Kankakee Street, Wilmington, Illinois 60481.

Commonwealth Edison Company, Docket Nos. STN 50-454 and STN 50-455, Byron Station, Unit Nos. 1 and 2, Ogle County, IllinoisDocket Nos. STN 50-456 and STN 50-457, Braidwood Station, Unit Nos. 1 and 2, Will County, Illinois

Date of application for amendments: August 31, 1993, as supplemented July 19, 1994.

Brief description of amendments: The amendments revise the technical specifications by increasing the allowed outage time for an inoperable chiller only in MODES 1 through 4, adding an optional ACTION statement in MODES 5 and 6, and adding a surveillance requirement for the control room ventilation system.

Date of issuance: March 2, 1995

Effective date: March 2, 1995

Amendment Nos.: 70, 70, 61 and 61

Facility Operating License Nos. NPF-37, NPF-66, NPF-72 and NPF-77: The amendments revised the Technical Specifications.

Date of initial notice in **Federal Register:** January 25, 1995 (60 FR 4932). The Commission's related evaluation of the amendments is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated March 2, 1995.No significant hazards consideration comments received: No

Local Public Document Room location: For Byron, the Byron Public Library, 109 N. Franklin, P.O. Box 434, Byron, Illinois 61010; for Braidwood, the Wilmington Township Public Library, 201 S. Kankakee Street, Wilmington, Illinois 60481.Commonwealth Edison Company, Docket Nos. 50-237 and 50-249, Dresden Nuclear Power Station, Units 2 and 3, Grundy County, Illinois; Docket Nos. 50-254 and 50-265, Quad Cities Nuclear Power Station, Units 1 and 2, Rock Island County, IllinoisDate of application for amendments: July 29, 1992, as supplemented January 14, 1993, and February 16, 1993

Brief description of amendments: Dresden and Quad Cities Technical Specification Upgrade Program. Date of issuance: February 16, 1995Effective date: Immediately, to be implemented by December 31, 1995.

Amendment Nos.: 131, 125, 152, and 148

Facility Operating License Nos. DPR-19, DPR-25, DPR-29 and DPR-30. The amendments revised the Technical Specifications.

Date of initial notice in **Federal Register:** June 23, 1993 (58 FR 34071) The Commission's related evaluation of the amendments is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated February 16, 1995. No significant hazards consideration comments received: No

Local Public Document Room location: For Dresden, The Morris Public Library, 604 Liberty Street, Morris, Illinois 60450; For Quad Cities, The Dixon Public Library, 221 Hennepin Avenue, Dixon, Illinois 61021.

Commonwealth Edison Company, Docket Nos. 50-237 and 50-249, Dresden Nuclear Power Station, Units 2 and 3, Grundy County, Illinois

Date of application for amendments: July 29, 1992, as supplemented January 14, 1993, February 16, 1993 and January 27, 1995

Brief description of amendments: The July 29, 1992, application, is one of twelve applications which have been submitted by Commonwealth Edison Company (ComEd) in an effort to upgrade the existing custom Technical Specifications (TS) to the Boiling Water Reactor (BWR) Standard Technical Specifications (STS). Dresden has recently rescheduled the Unit 2 refueling outage from March 4, 1995, until June 1995. Currently, the surveillance frequency for certain Inservice Testing (IST) requirements expires on February 21, 1995. The current TSs do not make provisions for a grace period for surveillance frequencies of the IST program. In accordance with BWR STS guidance, the TSs regarding IST proposed in the July 29, 1992, application, allow the flexibility to perform these tests appropriately during refueling outages (where applicable) by providing a 25 percent extension to IST surveillance intervals. The January 27, 1995, supplement requested the staff to review and approve just that portion of the July 29, 1992, application dealing with the implementation of the IST program in Section 3.0/4.0 of the proposed TS.

Date of issuance: February 22, 1995Effective date: February 22, 1995

Amendment Nos.: 132 and 126

Facility Operating License Nos. DPR-19 and DPR-25: The amendments revised the Technical Specifications.

Date of initial notice in **Federal Register:** June 23, 1993 (58 FR 34071) The January 27, 1995, letter did not change the initial proposed no significant hazards consideration determination. The Commission's related evaluation of the amendments is contained in a Safety Evaluation datedFebruary 22, 1995.No significant hazards consideration comments received: No

Local Public Document Room location: Morris Public Library, 604 Liberty Street, Morris, Illinois 60450.

Connecticut Yankee Atomic Power Company and Northeast Nuclear Energy Company, Docket Nos. 50-213 and 50-245, Haddam Neck Plant and Millstone Nuclear Power Station, Unit 1, Middlesex County and New London County, Connecticut

Date of application for amendments: October 31, 1994, as supplemented February 14, 1995.

Brief description of amendments: The amendments renew the existing license conditions for both plants to implement and maintain Integrated Implementation Schedule Program Plans (the Program Plans). The Program Plans provide a methodology to be followed for scheduling plant modifications and engineering evaluations.

Date of issuance: February 23, 1995

Effective date: February 23, 1995

Amendment Nos.: 183 for Haddam Neck, 80 for Millstone 1

Facility Operating License Nos. DPR-61 and DPR-21. Amendments revise the Licenses.

Date of initial notice in **Federal Register:** December 7, 1994 (59 FR 63117)The February 14, 1995, letter provided clarifying information that did not change the initial proposed no significant hazards consideration determination. The Commission's related evaluation of the amendments is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated February 23, 1995.No significant hazards consideration comments received: No.

Local Public Document Room locations: Russell Library, 123 Broad Street, Middletown, CT 06457, for the Haddam Neck Plant, and the Learning Resource Center, Three Rivers Community-Technical College, Thames Valley Campus, 574 New London Turnpike, Norwich, CT 06360, for Millstone Unit 1.

Consumers Power Company, Docket No. 50-255, Palisades Plant, Van Buren County, Michigan

Date of application for amendment: October 5, 1994, as supplemented February 10, 20, and 22, 1995.

Brief description of amendment: The amendment revises primary coolant system (PCS) pressure-temperature limits, power-operated relief valve setting limits, and primary coolant pump starting limits to accommodate reactor vessel fluence for an additional 4 effective full power years. The amendment also revises the emergency core cooling system technical specifications to render two high-pressure safety injection pumps incapable of injecting into the PCS when the PCS is below 300°F rather than rendering both inoperable below 260°F. In addition, it revises the pressurizer heatup to achieve consistency between design assumptions and technical specifications limits.

Date of issuance: March 2, 1995

Effective date: March 2, 1995

Amendment No.: 163

Facility Operating License No. DPR-20. Amendment revised the Technical Specifications.

Date of initial notice in **Federal Register:** January 4, 1995 (60 FR 501) The February 10, 20, and 22, 1995, submittals provided clarifyinginformation which was within the scope of the initial application and did not affect the staff's initial proposed no significant hazards consideration findings. The Commission's related evaluation of the amendment is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated March 2, 1995.No significant hazards consideration comments received: No.

Local Public Document Room location: Van Wylen Library, Hope College, Holland, Michigan 49423.

Duke Power Company, et al., Docket Nos. 50-413 and 50-414, Catawba Nuclear Station, Units 1 and 2, York County, South Carolina

Date of application for amendments: January 10, 1994, as supplemented March 21 and September 15, 1994, and January 5, 1995

Brief description of amendments: The amendments revised Technical Specification Table 2.2-1 and TS 4.2.5 to allow a change in the method for measuring reactor coolant system (RCS) flow rate from the calorimetric heat balance method to a method based on a one-time calibration of the RCS cold leg elbow differential pressure taps.

Date of issuance: February 17, 1995

Effective date: To be implemented within 30 days from the date of issuance

Amendment Nos.: 128 and 122

Facility Operating License Nos. NPF-35 and NPF-52: Amendments revised the Technical Specifications.

Date of initial notice in **Federal Register:** January 26, 1994 (59 FR 3743) for Unit 1; and March 1, 1994 (59 FR 9785) for Unit 2

The March 21 and September 15, 1994, and January 5, 1995, letters provided additional information that did not change the initial scope of the January 10, 1994, application and the initial proposed no significant hazards consideration determination.

The Commission's related evaluation of the amendments is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated February 17, 1995. No significant hazards consideration comments received: No

Local Public Document Room location: York County Library, 138 East Black Street, Rock Hill, South Carolina 29730

Entergy Operations, Inc., Docket No. 50-313, Arkansas Nuclear One,Unit No. 1, Pope County, Arkansas

Date of amendment request: August 30, 1994

Brief description of amendment: The amendment revised the Technical Specifications to address the installation of two battery chargers on each 125 vdc power train in lieu of the ''swing'' battery charger that is currently used.

Date of issuance: February 17, 1995

Effective date: February 17, 1995

Amendment No.: 176

Facility Operating License No. DPR-51. Amendment revised the Technical Specifications.

Date of initial notice in **Federal Register:** January 17, 1995 (60 FR 3439) The Commission's related evaluation of the amendment is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated February 17, 1995.No significant hazards consideration comments received: No.

Local Public Document Room location: Tomlinson Library, Arkansas Tech University, Russellville, Arkansas 72801

Entergy Operations, Inc., Docket No. 50-313, Arkansas Nuclear One,Unit No. 1, Pope County, Arkansas

Date of amendment request: June 22, 1994.

Brief description of amendment: The amendment extends the allowable outage time for one inoperable train of emergency feedwater from 36 hours to 72 hours, clarifies the specifications and their associated bases, and relocates information within the specifications.

Date of issuance: March 1, 1995

Effective date: 30 days following the date of issuance.

Amendment No.: 177

Facility Operating License No. DPR-51. Amendment revised the Technical Specifications.

Date of initial notice in **Federal Register:** August 17, 1994, (59 FR 42339) The Commission's related evaluation of the amendment is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated March 1, 1995.No significant hazards consideration comments received: No.

Local Public Document Room location: Tomlinson Library, Arkansas Tech University, Russellville, Arkansas 72801

Entergy Operations, Inc., Docket No. 50-382, Waterford Steam ElectricStation, Unit 3, St. Charles Parish, Louisiana

Date of amendment request: January 19, 1995

Brief description of amendment: The amendment changed the Appendix A technical specifications (TSs) by adding TS 3.0.5 and its associated Bases. This new specification will allow equipment removed from service or declared inoperable to comply with ACTIONS to be returned to service under administrative controls soley to perform testing required to demonstrate its OPERABILITY or the OPERABILITY of other equipment.

Date of issuance: March 1, 1995

Effective date: March 1, 1995

Amendment No.: 101

Facility Operating License No. NPF-38. Amendment revised the Technical Specifications.

Date of initial notice in **Federal Register:** January 27, 1995 (60 FR 5441) The Commission's related evaluation of the amendment is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated March 1, 1995.No significant hazards consideration comments received: No.

Local Public Document Room location: University of New Orleans Library, Louisiana Collection, Lakefront, New Orleans, Louisiana 70122.

Entergy Operations, Inc., Docket No. 50-382, Waterford Steam ElectricStation, Unit 3, St. Charles Parish, Louisiana

Date of amendment request: August 11, 1994, as supplemented by letter dated December 2, 1994.

Brief description of amendment: The amendment revised the Technical Specifications for the Waterford Steam Electric Station, Unit 3, by modifying the specifications having cycle-specific parameter limits by replacing the values of those limits with a reference to a core operating limits report for the values of those limits. These changes are in accordance with the requirements of Generic Letter 88-16.

Date of issuance: March 1, 1995

Effective date: March 1, 1995

Amendment No.: 102

Facility Operating License No. NPF-38. Amendment revised the Technical Specifications.

Date of initial notice in **Federal Register:** December 21, 1994 (59 FR 65812) The Commission's related evaluation of the amendment is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated March 1, 1995.No significant hazards consideration comments received: No.

Local Public Document Room location: University of New Orleans Library, Louisiana Collection, Lakefront, New Orleans, Louisiana 70122.

Entergy Operations, Inc., Docket No. 50-382, Waterford Steam ElectricStation, Unit 3, St. Charles Parish, Louisiana

Date of amendment request: August 19, 1994, as supplemented by letter dated October 14, 1994.

Brief description of amendment: The amendment changed the Appendix A technical specification (TSs) by removing the Limiting Condition For Operation (LCO) 3/4.3.4, the associated surveillance requirements, and Bases information from the TSs. This information and requirements will be incorporated into the Waterford 3 Updated Final Safety Analysis Report (UFSAR) and maintained under the provisions of 10 CFR 50.59.

Date of issuance: March 2, 1995

Effective date: March 2, 1995

Amendment No.: 103

Facility Operating License No. NPF-38. Amendment revised the Technical Specifications.

Date of initial notice in **Federal Register:** August 31, 1994 (59 FR 45023) The additional information contained in the supplemental letter dated October 14, 1994, was clarifying in nature and thus, within the scope of the initial notice and did not affect the staff's proposed no significant hazards consideration determination. The Commission's related evaluation of the amendment is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated March 2, 1995.No significant hazards consideration comments received: No.

Local Public Document Room location: University of New Orleans Library, Louisiana Collection, Lakefront, New Orleans, Louisiana 70122.

Entergy Operations, Inc., System Energy Resources, Inc., South Mississippi Electric Power Association, and Mississippi Power & Light Company,Docket No. 50-416, Grand Gulf Nuclear Station, Unit 1, Claiborne County, Mississippi

Date of application for amendment: April 21, 1993

Brief description of amendment: The amendment revised the requirement for control rod testing to increase the ''notch testing'' surveillance interval for partially withdrawn control rods from once per 7 days to once per 31 days. The change is consistent with the format and content of the Improved Standard Technical Specifications (NUREG-1434, Revision 0).

Date of issuance: February 16, 1995

Effective date: February 16, 1995

Amendment No: 115

Facility Operating License No. NPF-29. Amendment revises the Technical Specifications.

Date of initial notice in **Federal Register:** May 12, 1993 (58 FR 28055) The Commission's related evaluation of the amendment is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated February 16, 1995. No significant hazards consideration comments received: No

Local Public Document Room location: Judge George W. Armstrong Library, 220 S. Commerce Street, Natchez, Mississippi 39120.

Entergy Operations, Inc., System Energy Resources, Inc., South Mississippi Electric Power Association, and Mississippi Power & Light Company,Docket No. 50-416, Grand Gulf Nuclear Station, Unit 1, Claiborne County, Mississippi

Date of application for amendment: July 14, 1993

Brief description of amendment: The amendment revised technical specification requirements for the hydrogen ignition system (HIS). The amendment also removed several tables related to the HIS in accordance with guidance contained in Generic Letter 91-08, ''Removal of Component Lists From Technical Specifications.''

Date of issuance: February 16, 1995

Effective date: February 16, 1995

Amendment No: 116

Facility Operating License No. NPF-29. Amendment revises the Technical Specifications.

Date of initial notice in **Federal Register:** September 1, 1993 (58 FR 46232) The Commission's related evaluation of the amendment is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated February 16, 1995. No significant hazards consideration comments received: No

Local Public Document Room location: Judge George W. Armstrong Library, 220 S. Commerce at Washington, Natchez, Mississippi 39120.

Entergy Operations, Inc., System Energy Resources, Inc., South Mississippi Electric Power Association, and Mississippi Power & Light Company,Docket No. 50-416, Grand Gulf Nuclear Station, Unit 1, Claiborne County, Mississippi

Date of application for amendment: August 11, 1993

Brief description of amendment: The amendment deleted the requirements of Limiting Condition for Operation (LCO) 3.3.3.9 and Surveillance Requirement 4.3.3.9 related to loose-part detection instrumentation. The deleted requirements will be relocated to documents that are controlled by the licensee under the provisions of 10 CFR 50.59. The change is consistent with the format and content of the Improved Standard Technical Specifications (NUREG-1434, Revision 0).

Date of issuance: February 16, 1995

Effective date: February 16, 1995

Amendment No: 117

Facility Operating License No. NPF-29. Amendment revises the Technical Specifications.

Date of initial notice in **Federal Register:** September 1, 1993 (58 FR 46232) The Commission's related evaluation of the amendment is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated February 16, 1995. No significant hazards consideration comments received: No

Local Public Document Room location: Judge George W. Armstrong Library, 220 S. Commerce Street, Natchez, Mississippi 39120.

Entergy Operations, Inc., System Energy Resources, Inc., South Mississippi Electric Power Association, and Mississippi Power & Light Company,Docket No. 50-416, Grand Gulf Nuclear Station, Unit 1, Claiborne County, Mississippi

Date of application for amendment: August 11, 1993

Brief description of amendment: The amendment deleted certain accident monitoring instruments from Technical Specification Table 3.3.7.5-1 ''Accident Monitoring Instrumentation'' and deleted the corresponding Surveillance Requirements from Table 4.3.7.5-1, ''Accident Monitoring Instrumentation Surveillance Requirements.'' The deleted requirements will be relocated to documents that are controlled by the licensee under the provisions of 10 CFR 50.59. The change is consistent with the format and content of the Improved Standard Technical Specifications (NUREG-1434, Revision 0).

Date of issuance: February 16, 1995

Effective date: February 16, 1995

Amendment No: 118

Facility Operating License No. NPF-29. Amendment revises the Technical Specifications.

Date of initial notice in **Federal Register:** September 1, 1993 (58 FR 46234) The Commission's related evaluation of the amendment is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated February 16, 1995.No significant hazards consideration comments received: No

Local Public Document Room location: Judge George W. Armstrong Library, 220 S. Commerce Street, Natchez, Mississippi 39120.

Entergy Operations, Inc., System Energy Resources, Inc., South Mississippi Electric Power Association, and Mississippi Power & Light Company, Docket No. 50-416, Grand Gulf Nuclear Station, Unit 1, Claiborne County, Mississippi

Date of application for amendment: October 22, 1993, as supplemented by letters dated February 10, and 14, 1995.

Brief description of amendment: The amendment modified the testing frequencies for the drywell bypass test and the airlock test, relocated certain drywell airlock tests from the technical specifications to administrative procedures, and incorporates various improvements from the Improved Standard Technical Specifications (NUREG-1434, Revision 0).

Date of issuance: February 16, 1995

Effective date: February 16, 1995

Amendment No: 119

Facility Operating License No. NPF-29. Amendment revises the Technical Specifications.

Date of initial notice in **Federal Register:** December 8, 1993 (58 FR 64607) The Commission's related evaluation of the amendment is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated February 16, 1995. No significant hazards consideration comments received: No

Local Public Document Room location: Judge George W. Armstrong Library, 220 S. Commerce Street, Natchez, Mississippi 39120.

GPU Nuclear Corporation, et al., Docket No. 50-289, Three Mile Island Nuclear Station, Unit No. 1, Dauphin County, Pennsylvania

Date of application for amendment: May 17, 1993, as supplemented on December 23, 1994

Brief description of amendment: The amendment changes the action statement for inoperable degraded grid and loss of voltage relays and their associated auxiliary relays and timers.

Date of issuance: January 31, 1995

Effective date: January 31, 1995

Amendment No.: 193

Facility Operating License No. DPR-50. Amendment revised the Technical Specifications.

Date of initial notice in **Federal Register:** November 10, 1993 (58 FR 59750). The December 23, 1994, letter provided additional information that did not change the initial proposed no significant hazards consideration determination. The Commission's related evaluation of this amendment is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated January 31, 1995. No significant hazards consideration comments received: No.

Local Public Document Room location: Government Publications Section, State Library of Pennsylvania, Walnut Street and Commonwealth Avenue, Box 1601, Harrisburg, PA 17105. The above Notice was to be published in the **Federal Register** of February 15, 1995. The notice that was inadvertently published at 60 FR 8762 relates to a licensing action which has not been completed.

Houston Lighting & Power Company, City Public Service Board of San Antonio, Central Power and Light Company, City of Austin, Texas, Docket Nos. 50-498 and 50-499, South Texas Project, Units 1 and 2, Matagorda County, Texas

Date of amendment request: November 7, 1994, as supplemented by letters dated December 20, 1994, and January 23, 1995.

Brief description of amendments: The amendments changed the number of standby diesel generators (SDGs) (emergency power source) required to be operable during Mode 6 with greater than or equal to 23 feet of water above the reactor vessel flange, from two to one. The amendment also allows limited substitution of an alternate onsite emergency power source for one of the two required SDGs, in Mode 5, and in Mode 6 with less than 23 feet of water. In addition, certain system specifications that are affected by the changes for the emergency power source were also changed.

Date of issuance: February 14, 1995

Effective date: February 14, 1995, to be implemented within 31 days of issuance.

Amendment Nos.: Unit 1 - Amendment No. 34; Unit 2 - Amendment No. 20

Facility Operating License Nos. NPF-76 and NPF-80. The amendments revised the Technical

Specifications.Public comments requested as to proposed no significant hazards consideration: Yes (60 FR 5739, dated January 30, 1995). The notice provided an opportunity to submit comments on the Commission's proposed no significant hazards consideration determination. No comments have been received. The notice also provided for an opportunity to request a hearing by March 1, 1995, but stated that, if the Commission makes a final no significant hazards consideration determination, any such hearing would take place after issuance of the amendments.

The Commission's related evaluation of the amendments, finding of exigent circumstances, and final determination of no significant hazards consideration is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated February 14, 1995.

Local Public Document Room location: Wharton County Junior College, J. M. Hodges Learning Center, 911 Boling Highway, Wharton, Texas 77488

IES Utilities Inc., Docket No. 50-331, Duane Arnold Energy Center, Linn County, Iowa

Date of application for amendment: August 15, 1994, as supplemented on December 21, 1994, and January 20, 1995. The licensee's submittals of December 21, 1994, and January 20, 1995, provided clarification and did not change the original no significant hazards consideration.

Brief description of amendment: The proposed amendment would revise the Technical Specifications by increasing the allowable main steam isolation valve (MSIV) leakage and deleting the requirements applicable to the MSIV leakage control system.

Date of issuance: February 22, 1995

Effective date: February 22, 1995 and to be implemented within 90 days.

Amendment No.: 207

Facility Operating License No. DPR-49. Amendment revised the Technical Specifications.

Date of initial notice in **Federal Register:** September 14, 1994 (59 FR 47169) The Commission's related evaluation of the amendment is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated February 22, 1995.No significant hazards consideration comments received: No.

Local Public Document Room location: Cedar Rapids Public Library, 500 First Street, S. E., Cedar Rapids, Iowa 52401.

Illinois Power Company and Soyland Power Cooperative, Inc., Docket No. 50-461, Clinton Power Station, Unit No. 1, DeWitt County, Illinois

Date of application for amendment: August 12, 1994, as supplemented on October 14, 1994 and February 6, 1995.

Brief description of amendment: The amendment modifies Clinton Power Station Technical Specification 3.6.5.1, ''Drywell,'' to permit a one-time only change to forego performance of the drywell bypass leakage rate test during the fifth refueling outage scheduled to begin in March 1995.

Date of issuance: March 1, 1995

Effective date: March 1, 1995

Amendment No.: 96

Facility Operating License No. NPF-62. The amendment revised the Technical Specifications.

Date of initial notice in **Federal Register:** September 28, 1994 (59 FR 49427). The October 14, 1994, and February 6, 1995, submittals consisted of revisions and clarifications which did not change the staff's initial proposed no significant hazards consideration determination or expand the scope of the original notice.The Commission's related evaluation of the amendment is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated March 1, 1995. No significant hazards consideration comments received: No

Local Public Document Room location: The Vespasian Warner Public Library, 120 West Johnson Street, Clinton, Illinois 61727.

Indiana Michigan Power Company, Docket Nos. 50-315 and 50-316, Donald C. Cook Nuclear Plant, Unit Nos. 1 and 2, Berrien County, Michigan

Date of application for amendments: November 18, 1994

Brief description of amendments: The amendments revise Technical Specification 4.0.5 to delete the wording ''except where specific written relief has been granted by the Commission pursuant to 10 CFR 50, Section 50.55a(g)(6)(i).'' This change allows the licensee to implement certain 10 CFR 50.55a relief requests while the relief requests are being reviewed by the NRC at the beginning of an updated interval.

Date of issuance: February 23, 1995

Effective date: February 23, 1995

Amendment Nos.: 190/176

Facility Operating License Nos. DPR-58 and DPR-74. Amendments revised the Technical Specifications.

Date of initial notice in **Federal Register:** December 21, 1994 (59 FR 65817) The Commission's related evaluation of the amendments is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated February 23, 1995. No significant hazards consideration comments received: No.

Local Public Document Room location: Maud Preston Palenske Memorial Library, 500 Market Street, St. Joseph, Michigan 49085.

Northeast Nuclear Energy Company, et al., Docket No. 50-423, MillstoneNuclear Power Station, Unit No. 3, New London County, Connecticut

Date of application for amendment: May 18, 1994

Brief description of amendment: The amendment modifies the operability requirements for the fuel building exhaust filter system. The amendment will result in modifications to the applicability, surveillance requirement, and bases sections of Technical Specification 3/4.9.12, ''Fuel Building Exhaust Filter System.''

Date of issuance: February 22, 1995

Effective date: As of the date of issuance to be implemented within30 days.

Amendment No.: 105

Facility Operating License No. NPF-49. Amendment revised the Technical Specifications.

Date of initial notice in **Federal Register:** June 22, 1994 (59 FR 32234) The Commission's related evaluation of the amendment is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated February 22, 1995.No significant hazards consideration comments received: No.

Local Public Document Room location: Learning Resources Center, Three Rivers Community-Technical College, Thames Valley Campus, 574 New London Turnpike, Norwich, CT 06360.

Pacific Gas and Electric Company, Docket Nos. 50-275 and 50-323, DiabloCanyon Nuclear Power Plant, Unit Nos. 1 and 2, San Luis Obispo County,California

Date of application for amendments: July 9, 1992

Brief description of amendments: The amendments extend the operating licenses for the Diablo Canyon Nuclear Power Plant, Units 1 and 2 to recover or recapture the construction period of the reactors. Specifically, the amendments extend the expiration date of the Unit 1 license from April 23, 2008, to September 22, 2021, and the expiration date of the Unit 2 license from December 9, 2010, to April 26, 2025.

Date of issuance: March 1, 1995

Effective date: March 1, 1995

Amendment Nos.: 97 and 96

Facility Operating License Nos. DPR-80 and DPR-82: The amendments revised the license.

Date of initial notice in **Federal Register:** July 22, 1992 (57 FR 32575)

The Commission's related evaluation of the amendments is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated March 1, 1995.No significant hazards consideration comments received: Yes. Comments from the San Luis Obispo Mothers for Peace (MFP) and their contentions were admitted into this proceeding. These contentions concern the adequacy of the licensee's maintenance and surveillance program and interim corrective actions in lieu of Thermo-Lag. The Atomic Safety and Licensing Board, in its initial decision dated November 4, 1994 (LBP-94-35), authorized the staff to extend the DCPP operating license expiration dates. Because a hearing was held prior to license issuance, the staff does not need to make a final no significant hazards consideration determination.

Local Public Document Room location: California Polytechnic State University, Robert E. Kennedy Library, Government Documents and Maps Department, San Luis Obispo, California 93407

Pennsylvania Power and Light Company, Docket No. 50-387, Susquehanna Steam Electric Station, Unit 1, Luzerne County, Pennsylvania

Date of application for amendment: July 27, 1994, as supplemented October 27, 1994 and February 3, 1995

Brief description of amendment: The amendment raises the authorized Power Level from 3293 MWt to a new limit of 3441 MWt.

Date of issuance: February 22, 1995

Effective date: As of date of issuance and is to be implemented prior to startup in Cycle 9, currently scheduled to occur in May 1995.

Amendment No.: 143

Facility Operating License No. NPF-14: This amendment revised the Technical Specifications and license.

Date of initial notice in **Federal Register:** September 14, 1994 (59 FR 47171) The Commission's related evaluation of the amendment is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated February 22, 1995.No significant hazards consideration comments received: No

Local Public Document Room location: Osterhout Free Library, Reference Department, 71 South Franklin Street, Wilkes-Barre, Pennsylvania 18701.

Pennsylvania Power and Light Company, Docket Nos. 50-387 and 50-388 Susquehanna Steam Electric Station, Units 1 and 2, Luzerne County, Pennsylvania

Date of application for amendments: June 23, 1994

Brief description of amendments: The amendment revises Technical Specification 4.0.5, which provides the requirements for inservice inspection and testing of ASME Code components, to conform to Standard Technical Specifications (NUREG-1433).

Date of issuance: February 28, 1995

Effective date: February 28, 1995

Amendment Nos.: 144 and 113

Facility Operating License Nos. NPF-14 and NPF-22. The amendments revised the Technical Specifications.

Date of initial notice in **Federal Register:** August 3, 1994 (59 FR 39595) The Commission's related evaluation of the amendments is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated February 28, 1995.No significant hazards consideration comments received: No

Local Public Document Room location: Osterhout Free Library, Reference Department, 71 South Franklin Street, Wilkes-Barre, Pennsylvania 18701.

Pennsylvania Power and Light Company, Docket Nos. 50-387 and 50-388 Susquehanna Steam Electric Station, Units 1 and 2, Luzerne County, Pennsylvania

Date of application for amendments: October 28, 1994, and supplemented by letter dated December 29, 1994

Brief description of amendments: These amendments change the Technical Specifications (TS) for the two units by adding reference ι20 (Unit 1) and reference ι18 (Unit 2) to Section 6.9.3.2 as ''PL-NF-90-001, Supplement 1, 'Application of Reactor Analysis Methods for BWR Design and Analysis: Loss of Feedwater Heating Changes and Use of RETRAN MOD 5.1,' September 1994.'' These additions reflect changes to the methodology that the licensee is using to perform its nuclear fuel reload analysis for the two units.

Date of issuance: February 28, 1995

Effective date: February 28, 1995

Amendment Nos.: 145 and 114

Facility Operating License Nos. NPF-14 and NPF-22. The amendments revised the Technical Specifications.

Date of initial notice in **Federal Register:** December 21, 1994 (59 FR 65819) The Commission's related evaluation of the amendments is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated February 28, 1995.No significant hazards consideration comments received: No

Local Public Document Room location: Osterhout Free Library, Reference Department, 71 South Franklin Street, Wilkes-Barre, Pennsylvania 18701.

Philadelphia Electric Company, Docket Nos. 50-352 and 50-353, Limerick Generating Station, Units 1 and 2, Montgomery County, Pennsylvania

Date of application for amendments: August 31, 1994

Brief description of amendments: These amendments address Section 5, ''Remove Temperature Requirement for Operational Condition 5 (TSCR 94-44-0), by revising TS Table 1.2 and TS Bases 3/4.9.11 to remove the average reactor coolant temperature requirement in Operational Condition (OPCON) 5, Refueling.

Date of issuance: January 27, 1995

Effective date: January 27, 1995Amendment Nos. 88 and 50

Facility Operating License Nos. NPF-39 and NPF-85. The amendments revised the Technical Specifications.

Date of initial notice in **Federal Register:** November 9, 1994 (59 FR 55884) The Commission's related evaluation of the amendments is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated January 27, 1995.No significant hazards consideration comments received: No

Local Public Document Room location: Pottstown Public Library, 500 High Street, Pottstown, Pennsylvania 19464.

Power Authority of The State of New York, Docket No. 50-286, Indian Point Nuclear Generating Unit No. 3, Westchester County, New York

Date of application for amendment: November 16, 1994

Brief description of amendment: The amendment revises Technical Specifications Section 3.10.8 and the associated Bases, to reduce the maximum allowable control rod drop time from 2.4 to 1.8 seconds.

Date of issuance: February 21, 1995

Effective date: As of the date of issuance to be implemented within 30 days.

Amendment No.: 160

Facility Operating License No. DPR-64: Amendment revised the Technical Specifications.

Date of initial notice in **Federal Register:** January 20, 1995 (60 FR 4203) The Commission's related evaluation of the amendment is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated February 21, 1995.No significant hazards consideration comments received: No

Local Public Document Room location: White Plains Public Library, 100 Martine Avenue, White Plains, New York 10610.

Saxton Nuclear Experimental Corporation, Docket No. 50-146, Saxton Nuclear Reactor Facility

Date of application for amendment: August 8, 1994, as supplemented on October 28, 1994, and January 12, 1995.

Brief description of amendment: The amendment adds characterization as an authorized activity at Saxton and improves the wording of the technical specifications.

Date of issuance: February 22, 1995

Effective date: February 22, 1995

Amendment No.: 12Amended Facility License No. DPR-4: Amendment changed the Technical Specifications

Date of initial notice in **Federal Register:** November 9, 1994. The Commission's related evaluation of the amendment is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated February 22, 1995.No significant hazards consideration comments received: No

Local Public Document Room location: Saxton Community Library, 911 Church Street, Saxton, Pennsylvania 16678

Southern California Edison Company, et al., Docket Nos. 50-361 and 50-362, San Onofre Nuclear Generating Station, Unit Nos. 2 and 3, San Diego County, California

Date of application for amendments: December 30, 1993, as supplemented by letters dated June 3, 1994, August 25, 1994, and January 3, 19, and 30, 1995.

Brief description of amendments: These amendments revise TS 3.9.4, ''Containment Building Penetrations,'' and the associated bases to allow both doors of the containment personnel airlock to be open at the same time during refueling operations provided certain conditions are met.

Date of issuance: February 28, 1995

Effective date: February 28, 1995

Amendment Nos.: 117 and 106

Facility Operating License Nos. NPF-10 and NPF-15: The amendments revised the Technical Specifications.

Date of initial notice in **Federal Register:** September 28, 1994 (59 FR 49434). The additional information contained in the January 3, 19, and 30, 1995, letters were clarifying in nature, within the scope of the initial notice and did not affect the NRC staff's proposed no significant hazards consideration determination. The Commission's related evaluation of the amendments is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated February 28, 1995.No significant hazards consideration comments received: No.

Local Public Document Room location: Main Library, University of California, P. O. Box 19557, Irvine, California 92713

Southern Nuclear Operating Company, Inc., Docket Nos. 50-348 and 50-364, Joseph M. Farley Nuclear Plant, Units 1 and 2, Houston County, Alabama.

Date of amendments request: December 19, 1994

Brief description of amendments: The amendments to Technical Specifications include: (1) a revision in Table 3.7-3 to the main steam safety valve (MSSV) setpoint tolerance from plus or minus 1 percent to plus or minus 3 percent, (2) modification of the bases to 3/4.7.1.1 to increase the relieving capacity of the MSSVs to at least 12,984,660 pounds per hour which corresponds to approximately 112 percent of total secondary steam flow at 100 percent rated thermal power, (3) modifications to Table 3.7-1 to reduce the allowable power range neutron flux high setpoints for multiple inoperable steam generator safety valves, and (4) an editorial correction to Bases 3/4.7.1.2 to indicate required auxiliary feedwater flow at ''1133 psia'' rather than ''1133 psig.''

Date of issuance March 1, 1995

Effective date: March 1, 1995

Amendment Nos.: 112 and 103

Facility Operating License Nos. NPF-2 and NPF-8. Amendments revise the Technical Specifications.

Date of initial notice in **Federal Register:** January 4, 1995 (60 FR 505) The Commission's related evaluation of the amendments is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated March 1, 1995No significant hazards consideration comments received: No

Local Public Document Room location: Houston-Love Memorial Library, 212 W. Burdeshaw Street, Post Office Box 1369, Dothan, Alabama 36302The Commission's related evaluation of the amendments is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated March 1, 1995No significant hazards consideration comments received: No

Tennessee Valley Authority, Docket Nos. 50-259, 50-260, and 50-296, Browns Ferry Nuclear Plant, Units 1, 2, and 3, Limestone County, Alabama

Date of application for amendments: September 29, 1993

Brief description of amendment: The proposed changes increase the amount of boron required in the standby liquid control system.

Date of issuance: February 28, 1995

Effective date: February 28, 1995

Amendment Nos.: 217, 233 and 191

Facility Operating License Nos. DPR-33, DPR-52 and DPR-68: Amendments revised the Technical Specifications.

Date of initial notice in **Federal Register:** June 8, 1994 (59 FR 29635) The Commission's related evaluation of the amendment is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated February 28, 1995.No significant hazards consideration comments received: None

Local Public Document Room location: Athens Public library, South Street, Athens, Alabama 35611

Tennessee Valley Authority, Docket Nos. 50-259, 50-260 and 50-296, Browns Ferry Nuclear Plant, Units 1, 2, and 3, Limestone County, Alabama

Date of application for amendments: September 30, 1993 (TS 336)

Brief description of amendment: The proposed changes revise and clarify the spent fuel pool water level, temperature, sampling, and analysis surveillance requirements.

Date of issuance: March 2, 1995

Effective date: March 2, 1995

Amendment Nos.: 218, 334 and 192

Facility Operating License Nos. DPR-33, DPR-52 and DPR-68: Amendments revised the Technical Specifications.

Date of initial notice in **Federal Register:** December 22, 1993 (58 FR 67862) The Commission's related evaluation of the amendment is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated March 2, 1995.No significant hazards consideration comments received: None

Local Public Document Room location: Athens Public library, South Street, Athens, Alabama 35611

Tennessee Valley Authority, Docket Nos. 50-259, 50-260, and 50-296, Browns Ferry Nuclear Plant, Units 1, 2, and 3, Limestone County, Alabama

Date of application for amendments: March 31, 1994

Brief description of amendment: For Browns Ferry Units 1 and 3, the proposed changes provide for operation in the extended load line limit region and revised rod block monitor operability requirements. For all three Browns Ferry units, the changes delete a obsolete value for rated loop recirculation flow rate, relocate cycle-specific equations to the Core Operating Limits report, and provide other miscellaneous changes.

Date of issuance: February 24, 1995

Effective date: February 24, 1995

Amendment Nos.: 216, 232, 190

Facility Operating License Nos. DPR-33, DPR-52 and DPR-68: Amendments revised the Technical Specifications.

Date of initial notice in **Federal Register:** September 28, 1994 (59 FR 49437) The Commission's related evaluation of the amendment is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated February 24, 1995.No significant hazards consideration comments received: None

Local Public Document Room location: Athens Public library, South Street, Athens, Alabama 35611

Toledo Edison Company, Centerior Service Company, and The Cleveland Electric Illuminating Company, Docket No. 50-346, Davis-Besse Nuclear Power Station, Unit No. 1, Ottawa County, Ohio

Date of application for amendment: October 7, 1994

Brief description of amendment: Eliminates redundancy in system leakage test requirements by revising TS 3/4.5.2 and its associated basis for the Emergency Core Cooling System and TS 3/4.6.2 and its associated basis for the Containment Spray System.

Date of issuance: February 27, 1995

Effective date: February 27, 1995 and to be implemented within 90 days.

Amendment No. 195

Facility Operating License No. NPF-3. Amendment revised the Technical Specifications.

Date of initial notice in **Federal Register:** November 9, 1994 (59 FR 55893) The Commission's related evaluation of the amendment is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated February 27, 1995.No significant hazards consideration comments received: No

Local Public Document Room location: University of Toledo Library, Documents Department, 2801 Bancroft Avenue, Toledo, Ohio 43606.

TU Electric Company, Docket Nos. 50-445 and 50-446, Comanche Peak Steam Electric Station, Unit Nos. 1 and 2, Somervell County, Texas

Date of amendment request: November 18, 1994 (published in Federal Register as November 11, 1994)

Brief description of amendments: The proposed amendments would provide for cycle-specific allowances to account for increases in the Heat Flux Hot Channel Factor between monthly surveillances.

Date of issuance: March 1, 1995

Effective date: March 1, 1995, to be implemented within 30 days of issuance.

Amendment Nos.: Unit 1 - Amendment No. 34; Unit 2 - Amendment No. 20

Facility Operating License Nos. NPF-87 and NPF-89. The amendments revised the Technical Specifications.

Date of initial notice in **Federal Register:** December 7, 1994 (59 FR 63127) The Commission's related evaluation of the amendments is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated March 1, 1995.No significant hazards consideration comments received: No.

Local Public Document Room location: University of Texas at Arlington Library, Government Publications/Maps, 702 College, P.O. Box 19497, Arlington, Texas 76019.

Washington Public Power Supply System, Docket No. 50-397, Nuclear Project No. 2, Benton County, Washington

Date of application for amendment: October 31, 1994

Brief description of amendment: The amendment modifies the Techical Specifications (TS) to (1) add two action statements that would provide allowed outage times for either one or both of the scram discharge volume (SDV) vent or drain valves less stringent than the current requirements of TS 3.0.3., and (2) change the surveillance requirements for the SDV vent and drain valves to conduct the testing during shutdown conditions rather than at power as currently required.

Date of issuance: February 27, 1995

Effective date: February 27, 1995

Amendment No.: 134

Facility Operating License No. NPF-21: The amendment revised the Technical Specifications.

Date of initial notice in **Federal Register:** December 21, 1994 (59 FR 65828) The Commission's related evaluation of the amendment is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated February 27, 1995.No significant hazards consideration comments received: No

Local Public Document Room location: Richland Public Library, 955 Northgate Street, Richland, Washington 99352

Wisconsin Public Service Corporation, Docket No. 50-305, Kewaunee NuclearPower Plant, Kewaunee County, Wisconsin

Date of application for amendment: February 23, 1994

Brief description of amendment: The amendment revises Kewaunee Nuclear Power Plant (KNPP) Technical Specification (TS) 6.8.c by removing the requirement to conduct a biennial review of plant procedures in accordance with American National Standards Institute (ANSI) N18.7-1976, Section 5.2.15. Alternate programs that are described in the KNPP Operational Quality Assurance Program Description (OQAPD) will be used to ensure that procedures are reviewed and maintained current.

Date of issuance: February 23, 1995

Effective date: February 23, 1995 and to be implemented within 30 days.

Amendment No.: 115

Facility Operating License No. DPR-43. Amendment revised the Technical Specifications.

Date of initial notice in **Federal Register:** March 30, 1994 (59 FR 14903) The Commission's related evaluation of the amendment is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated February 23, 1995.No significant hazards consideration comments received: None.

Local Public Document Room location: University of Wisconsin Library Learning Center, 2420 Nicolet Drive, Green Bay, Wisconsin 54301.

Notice Of Issuance Of Amendments To Facility Operating Licenses And Final Determination Of No Significant Hazards Consideration And Opportunity For A Hearing (Exigent Public Announcement Or Emergency Circumstances)

During the period since publication of the last biweekly notice, the Commission has issued the following amendments. The Commission has determined for each of these amendments that the application for the amendment complies with the standards and requirements of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended (the Act), and the Commission's rules and regulations. The Commission has made appropriate findings as required by the Act and the Commission's rules and regulations in 10 CFR Chapter I, which are set forth in the license amendment.

Because of exigent or emergency circumstances associated with the date the amendment was needed, there was not time for the Commission to publish, for public comment before issuance, its usual 30-day Notice of Consideration of Issuance of Amendment, Proposed No Significant Hazards Consideration Determination, and Opportunity for a Hearing.

For exigent circumstances, the Commission has either issued a **Federal Register** notice providing opportunity for public comment or has used local media to provide notice to the public in the area surrounding a licensee's facility of the licensee's application and of the Commission's proposed determination of no significant hazards consideration. The Commission has provided a reasonable opportunity for the public to comment, using its best efforts to make available to the public means of communication for the public to respond quickly, and in the case of telephone comments, the comments have been recorded or transcribed as appropriate and the licensee has been informed of the public comments.

In circumstances where failure to act in a timely way would have resulted, for

example, in derating or shutdown of a nuclear power plant or in prevention of either resumption of operation or of increase in power output up to the plant's licensed power level, the Commission may not have had an opportunity to provide for public comment on its no significant hazards consideration determination. In such case, the license amendment has been issued without opportunity for comment. If there has been some time for public comment but less than 30 days, the Commission may provide an opportunity for public comment. If comments have been requested, it is so stated. In either event, the State has been consulted by telephone whenever possible.

Under its regulations, the Commission may issue and make an amendment immediately effective, notwithstanding the pendency before it of a request for a hearing from any person, in advance of the holding and completion of any required hearing, where it has determined that no significant hazards consideration is involved.

The Commission has applied the standards of 10 CFR 50.92 and has made a final determination that the amendment involves no significant hazards consideration. The basis for this determination is contained in the documents related to this action. Accordingly, the amendments have been issued and made effective as indicated.

Unless otherwise indicated, the Commission has determined that these amendments satisfy the criteria for categorical exclusion in accordance with 10 CFR 51.22. Therefore, pursuant to 10 CFR 51.22(b), no environmental impact statement or environmental assessment need be prepared for these amendments. If the Commission has prepared an environmental assessment under the special circumstances provision in 10 CFR 51.12(b) and has made a determination based on that assessment, it is so indicated.

For further details with respect to the action see (1) the application for amendment, (2) the amendment to Facility Operating License, and (3) the Commission's related letter, Safety Evaluation and/or Environmental Assessment, as indicated. All of these items are available for public inspection at the Commission's Public Document Room, the Gelman Building, 2120 L Street, NW., Washington, DC, and at the local public document room for the particular facility involved.

The Commission is also offering an opportunity for a hearing with respect to the issuance of the amendment. By April 14, 1995, the licensee may file a request for a hearing with respect to issuance of the amendment to the subject facility operating license and any person whose interest may be affected by this proceeding and who wishes to participate as a party in the proceeding must file a written request for a hearing and a petition for leave to intervene. Requests for a hearing and a petition for leave to intervene shall be filed in accordance with the Commission's ''Rules of Practice for Domestic Licensing Proceedings'' in 10 CFR Part 2. Interested persons should consult a current copy of 10 CFR 2.714 which is available at the Commission's Public Document Room, the Gelman Building, 2120 L Street, NW., Washington, DC and at the local public document room for the particular facility involved. If a request for a hearing or petition for leave to intervene is filed by the above date, the Commission or an Atomic Safety and Licensing Board, designated by the Commission or by the Chairman of the Atomic Safety and Licensing Board Panel, will rule on the request and/or petition; and the Secretary or the designated Atomic Safety and Licensing Board will issue a notice of a hearing or an appropriate order.

As required by 10 CFR 2.714, a petition for leave to intervene shall set forth with particularity the interest of the petitioner in the proceeding, and how that interest may be affected by the results of the proceeding. The petition should specifically explain the reasons why intervention should be permitted with particular reference to the following factors: (1) the nature of the petitioner's right under the Act to be made a party to the proceeding; (2) the nature and extent of the petitioner's property, financial, or other interest in the proceeding; and (3) the possible effect of any order which may be entered in the proceeding on the petitioner's interest. The petition should also identify the specific aspect(s) of the subject matter of the proceeding as to which petitioner wishes to intervene. Any person who has filed a petition for leave to intervene or who has been admitted as a party may amend the petition without requesting leave of the Board up to 15 days prior to the first prehearing conference scheduled in the proceeding, but such an amended petition must satisfy the specificity requirements described above.

Not later than 15 days prior to the first prehearing conference scheduled in the proceeding, a petitioner shall file a supplement to the petition to intervene which must include a list of the contentions which are sought to be litigated in the matter. Each contention must consist of a specific statement of the issue of law or fact to be raised or controverted. In addition, the petitioner shall provide a brief explanation of the bases of the contention and a concise statement of the alleged facts or expert opinion which support the contention and on which the petitioner intends to rely in proving the contention at the hearing. The petitioner must also provide references to those specific sources and documents of which the petitioner is aware and on which the petitioner intends to rely to establish those facts or expert opinion. Petitioner must provide sufficient information to show that a genuine dispute exists with the applicant on a material issue of law or fact. Contentions shall be limited to matters within the scope of the amendment under consideration. The contention must be one which, if proven, would entitle the petitioner to relief. A petitioner who fails to file such a supplement which satisfies these requirements with respect to at least one contention will not be permitted to participate as a party.

Those permitted to intervene become parties to the proceeding, subject to any limitations in the order granting leave to intervene, and have the opportunity to participate fully in the conduct of the hearing, including the opportunity to present evidence and cross-examine witnesses. Since the Commission has made a final determination that the amendment involves no significant hazards consideration, if a hearing is requested, it will not stay the effectiveness of the amendment. Any hearing held would take place while the amendment is in effect.

A request for a hearing or a petition for leave to intervene must be filed with the Secretary of the Commission, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC 20555, Attention: Docketing and Services Branch, or may be delivered to the Commission's Public Document Room, the Gelman Building, 2120 L Street, NW., Washington, DC, by the above date. Where petitions are filed during the last 10 days of the notice period, it is requested that the petitioner promptly so inform the Commission by a toll-free telephone call to Western Union at 1-(800) 248-5100 (in Missouri 1-(800) 342-6700). The Western Union operator should be given Datagram Identification Number N1023 and the following message addressed to **(Project Director)**: petitioner's name and telephone number, date petition was mailed, plant name, and publication date and page number of this **Federal Register** notice. A copy of the petition should also be sent to the Office of the General Counsel, U.S. Nuclear

Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC 20555, and to the attorney for the licensee.

Nontimely filings of petitions for leave to intervene, amended petitions, supplemental petitions and/or requests for a hearing will not be entertained absent a determination by the Commission, the presiding officer or the Atomic Safety and Licensing Board that the petition and/or request should be granted based upon a balancing of the factors specified in 10 CFR 2.714(a)(1)(i)-(v) and 2.714(d).

Pennsylvania Power and Light Company, Docket No. 50-388, SusquehannaSteam Electric Station, Unit 2, Luzerne County, Pennsylvania

Date of application for amendment: February 7, 1995

Brief description of amendment: The amendment changed the Technical Specifications to allow continued operation with one neutron flux monitor system channel (≥B'' channel) inoperable and should the remaining channel become inoperable to allow continued plant operation for 7 days to restore one of the two inoperable channels.

Date of issuance: March 1, 1995

Effective date: March 1, 1995

Amendment No.: 115

Facility Operating License No. NPF-22: Amendment revised the Technical Specifications. Public comments requested as to proposed no significant hazards consideration: No. On February 8, 1995, the staff issued a Notice of Enforcement Discretion, which was immediately effective and remained in effect until this amendment was issued.

The Commission's related evaluation of the amendments, finding of emergency circumstances, consultation with the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and final no significant hazards considerations determination are contained in a Safety Evaluation dated March 1, 1995.

Attorney for licensee: Jay Silberg, Esq., Shaw, Pittman, Potts & Trowbridge 2300 N Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20037

Local Public Document Room location: Osterhout Free Library, Reference Department, 71 South Franklin Street, Wilkes-Barre, Pennsylvania 18071.

NRC Project Director: John F. Stolz

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 8th day of March 1995.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission

Elinor G. Adensam,

Acting Director, Division of Reactor Projects - III/IV, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

[Doc. 95-6207 Filed 3-14-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590-01-F

[Docket No. 50–346]

Toledo Edison Company, et al.; Notice of Withdrawal of Applications for Amendments to Facility Operating License

The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (the Commission) has granted the request of the Toledo Edison Company, Centerior Service Company, and the Cleveland Electric Illuminating Company (the licensees) to withdraw its March 13, 1992, September 11, 1992, and February 17, 1993, applications for proposed amendments to Facility Operating License No. NPF–3 for the Davis-Besse Nuclear Power Station, Unit No. 1, located in Ottawa County, Ohio.

The proposed amendments would have revised the facility technical specifications by changing the venting requirements for the Reactor Coolant System, deleting figures in Section 5.1, ''Design Features—Site,'' and revising the Safety Features Actuation System and Steam and Feedwater Rupture Control System Instrumentation Setpoints.

The Commission had previously issued Notice of Consideration of Issuance of Amendment published in the **Federal Register** on March 23, 1992 (57 FR 10050), for the March 13, 1992, application; January 6, 1993 (58 FR 600) for the September 11, 1992, application, and June 23, 1993 (58 FR 34096), for the February 23, 1993, application. However, by letter dated February 10, 1995, the licensee withdrew the proposed changes.

For further details with respect to this action, see the applications for amendment dated March 13, 1992, September 11, 1992, and February 17, 1993, and the licensee's letter dated February 10, 1995, which withdrew the applications for license amendments. The above documents are available for public inspection at the Commission's Public Document Room, the Gelman Building, 2120 L Street, NW., Washington, DC, and at the local public document room located at the University of Toledo Library, Documents Department, 2801 Bancroft Avenue, Toledo, Ohio 43606.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 9th day of March, 1995.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

Jon B. Hopkins,

Senior Project Manager, Project Directorate III–3, Division of Reactor Projects III/IV, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation.

[FR Doc. 95–6340 Filed 3–14–95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590–01–M

OFFICE OF THE UNITED STATES TRADE REPRESENTATIVE

Notice of Meeting of the Industry Policy Advisory Committee

AGENCY: Office of the United States Trade Representative.

AGENCY: Notice that the March 22, 1995 meeting of the Industry Policy Advisory Committee will be held from 9:30 a.m. to 2:30 p.m. The meeting will be closed to the public from 9:30 to 1:00 p.m. The meeting will be open to the public from 1:00 p.m. to 2:30 p.m.

SUMMARY: The Industry Policy Advisory Committee will hold a meeting on March 22, 1995 from 9:30 a.m. to 2:30 p.m. The meeting will be closed to the public from 9:30 to 1:00 p.m. The meeting will include a review and discussion of current issues which influence U.S. trade policy. Pursuant to Section 2155(f)(2) of Title 19 of the United States Code, I have determined that this portion of the meeting will be concerned with matters the disclosure of which would seriously compromise the development by the United States Government of trade policy, priorities, negotiating objectives or bargaining positions with respect to the operation of any trade agreement and other matters arising in connection with the development, implementation and administration of the trade policy of the United States. The meeting will be open to the public and press from 1:00 p.m. to 2:30 p.m. when trade policy issues will be discussed. Attendance during this part of the meeting is for observation only. Individuals who are not members of the committee will not be invited to comment.

DATES: The meeting is scheduled for March 22, 1995, unless otherwise notified.

ADDRESSES The meeting will be held at the Madison Hotel, located at 15th and M streets, NW., Washington, DC., unless otherwise notified.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Michaelle Burstin, Director of Public Liaison, Office of the United States Trade Representative, (202) 395–6120.

Michael Kantor,

United States Trade Representatives.

[FR Doc. 95–6316 Filed 3–14–95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3190–01–M

POSTAL RATE COMMISSION

Notice of Facility Visit

March 10, 1995.

Members of the Commission and its advisory staff will visit the offices of

WEFA in Bala Cynwyd, Pennsylvania on Thursday, March 16, 1995. WEFA officials will explain the process of preparation of the economic model of direct response advertising it developed for the Direct Marketing Association. A report of the visit will be on file in the Docket Room of the Commission.

Margaret P. Crenshaw,

Secretary.

[FR Doc. 95–6344 Filed 3–14–95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7710–FW–P

SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

Under Review by Office of Management and Budget

Acting Agency Clearance Officer: David T. Copenhafer, (202) 942–8800

Upon written request copy available from: Securities and Exchange Commission, Office of Filings and Information Services, Washington, D.C. 20549

Extensions:

Form SE—File No. 270–289
Form ID—File No. 270–291
Form ET—File No. 270–290
Form TH—File No. 270–377

Notice is hereby given pursuant to the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1980 (44 U.S.C. 3501 *et seq.*), that the Securities and Exchange Commission (''Commission'') has requested extension of Forms SE, ID, ET, and TH. These forms are used by persons filing information with the Commission electronically on the EDGAR system.

Form SE is used by electronic filers to submit exhibits in paper format. An estimated 2,000 filings on Form SE are made annually at an estimated .10 burden hours per response.

Form ID is used to apply for EDGAR access codes. An estimated 7,000 filings on Form ID are made annually at an estimated .15 burden hours per response.

Form ET is used to transmit electronic format documents. An estimated 120 filings on Form ET are made annually at an estimated .25 burden hours per response.

Form TH is used to provide notification of a filer's reliance on a temporary hardship exemption. An estimated 200 filings on Form ET are made annually at an estimated .33 burden hours per response.

Direct general comments to the Clearance Officer for the Securities and Exchange Commission at the address below. Direct any comments concerning the accuracy of the estimated average burden hours for compliance with SEC rules and forms to David T. Copenhafer, Acting Director, Office of Information Technology, Securities and Exchange Commission, 450 Fifth Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20549, and SEC Clearance Office, Office of Management and Budget, Paperwork Reduction Project (3235–0327, 3235–0328, 3235–0329, and 3235–0425), Room 3208, New Executive Office Building, Washington, D.C. 20543.

Dated: March 7, 1995.

Margaret H. McFarland,

Deputy Secretary.

[FR Doc. 95–6355 Filed 3–14–95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 8010–01–M

[Release No. 34–35462; File No. SR–BSE–95–1]

Self-Regulatory Organizations; Notice of Filing and Immediate Effectiveness of Proposed Rule Change by the Boston Stock Exchange, Inc., Relating to the Value Charges on Intermarket Trading System Trades

March 8, 1995.

Pursuant to Section 19(b)(1) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (''Act''), 15 U.S.C. 78s(b)(1), notice is hereby given that on February 3, 1995, the Boston Stock Exchange, Inc. (''BSE'' or ''Exchange'') filed with the Securities and Exchange Commission (''Commission'') the proposed rule change as described in Items I, II, and III below, which Items have been prepared by the self-regulatory organization. The Commission is publishing this notice to solicit comments on the proposed rule change from interested persons.

I. Self-Regulatory Organization's Statement of the Terms of Substance of the Proposed Rule Change

The Exchange seeks to make permanent the portion of its fee schedule pertaining to value charges on non-specialist Intermarket Trading System (''ITS'') trades and the waiver of ITS user fees. By a filing, which the Commission noticed on November 24, 1992, the Exchange amended its fee schedule to provide for a $.003 per share user fee on *net* outbound specialist trades, value charges of $.002 per share for BSE executions up to and including 2,000 shares, and a range of value charges per $1,000 contract values for all BSE executions over 2,000 shares.[1]

Moreover, the Exchange amended its fee schedule to provide for value charges, and waive user fees, on all non-specialist ITS trades for a one-year period.[2]

By a filing, which the Commission noticed on November 10, 1993, the Exchange extended the value charges on non-specialist ITS trades and the waiver of the non-specialist ITS user fees for a six-month period.[3] The Exchange now proposes to amend permanently its fee schedule to impose value charges, and waive user fees, on all non-specialist ITS trades as follows:

Value Charges

First $10 million per month—$.16 per $1,000 contract value
Next $40 million per month—$.13 per $1,000 contract value
Next $50 million per month—$.10 per $1,000 contract value
Next $100 million per month—$.08 per $1,000 contract value
Next $300 million per month—$.05 per $1,000 contract value
$500.1 + million per month—$.01 per $1,000 contract value
Maximum charge per side (non-cross) $100.00
Maximum charge per side (cross) $75.00
I.T.S. User Fee—No charge for non-specialist firms

II. Self-Regulatory Organization's Statement of the Purpose of, and Statutory Basis for, the Proposed Rule Change

In its filing with the Commission, the self-regulatory organization included statements concerning the purpose of and basis for the proposed rule change and discussed any comments it received on the proposed rule change. The text of these statements may be examined at the places specified in Item IV below. The self-regulatory organization has prepared summaries, set forth in Sections A, B, and C below, of the most significant aspects of such statements.

A. Self-Regulatory Organization's Statement of the Purpose of, and Statutory Basis for, the Proposed Rule Change

1. Purpose

The purpose of the proposed rule change is to amend permanently the Exchange's fee schedule regarding certain ITS fees. At the request of the Commisson, the Exchange had temporarily amended a portion of its proposed rule filing SR–BSE–92–9

[1] *See* Securities Exchange Act Release No. 31515 (Nov. 24, 1992), 57 FR 56937 (notice of immediate effectiveness of File No. SR–BSE–92–9).

[2] The portion of the proposed rule change that was amended for a one-year period was intended to replace the ITS user fee of $.003 per share on ''outbound trades only.''

[3] *See* Securities Exchange Act Release No. 33184 (Nov. 10, 1993), 58 FR 60709 (notice of immediate effectiveness of File No. SR–BSE–93–22).

regarding certain ITS transactions. The Exchange temporarily amended these fees in 1992 for a one-year period and extended these fees in 1993 for a six-month period, pending the outcome of the Market 2000 Study.[4] The affected fees are comprised of the value charges instituted on all nonspecialist outbond ITS trades, which replaces the ITS User Fee of $.003 per share on all outbound trades incurred by non-specialist firms.

2. Statutory Basis

The statutory basis for this proposal is Section 6(b)(4) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934.

B. Self-Regulatory Organization's Statement on Burden on Competition

The fee change will impose no burden on competition.

C. Self-Regulatory Organization's Statement on Comments on the Proposed Rule Change Received from Members, Participants or Others

No written comments were solicited or received with respect to the fee change.[5]

III. Date of Effectiveness of the Proposed Rule Change and Timing for Commission Action

The foregoing rule change establishes or changes a due, fee, or other charge imposed by the Exchange and, therefore, has become effective pursuant to Section 19(b)(3)(A) of the Act and subparagraph (e) of Rule 19b–4 thereunder. At any time within 60 days of the filing of such proposed rule change, the Commission may summarily abrogate such rule change if it appears to the Commission that such action is necessary or appropriate in the public interest, for the protection of investors, or otherwise in furtherance of the purposes of the Act.

IV. Solicitation of Comments

Interested persons are invited to submit written data, views, and arguments concerning the foregoing. Persons making written submissions should file six copies thereof with the Secretary, Securities and Exchange Commission, 450 Fifth Street NW., Washington, DC 20549. Copies of the submission, all subsequent amendments, all written statements with respect to the proposed rule change that are filed with the Commission, and all written communications relating to the proposed rule change between the Commission and any person, other than those that may be withheld from the public in accordance with the provisions of 5 U.S.C. 552, will be available for inspection and copying at the Commission's Public Reference Section, 450 Fifth Street NW., Washington, DC 20549. Copies of such filing will also be available for inspection and copying at the principal office of the Exchange. All submissions should refer to File No. SR–BSE–95–1 and should be submitted by April 5, 1995.

For the Commission, by the Division of Market Regulation, pursuant to delegated authority.

Margaret H. McFarland,

Deputy Secretary.

[FR Doc. 95–6353 Filed 3–14–95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 8010–01–M

[4] The six-month extension expired in May 1994. BSE did not seek another extension until this filing.

[5] At the time of the original filing in 1992, the Exchange solicited comments from the Fee Committee of the Board of Governors, comprised of representatives of dealer-specialist, retail, and institutional firms, the Executive Committee, which serves as the Board of Governors of the Clearing Corporation, and the Board of Governors of the Exchange. *See* Securities Exchange Act Release No. 31515 (Nov. 24, 1992), 57 FR 56937 (notice of immediate effectiveness of File No. SR–BSE–92–9).

[Release No. 34–35463; International Series Release No. 790; File No. SR–CBOE–95–12]

Self-Regulatory Organizations; Notice of Filing of Amendment No. 1 to Proposed Rule Change by the Chicago Board Options Exchange, Inc., Relating to Margin Levels for Currency Warrants Based on the Value of the U.S. Dollar in Relation to the Mexican Peso

March 9, 1995.

Pursuant to Section 19(b)(1) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (''Act''),[1] and rule 19b–4 thereunder,[2] notice is hereby given that on March 6, 1995, the Chicago Board Options Exchange, Inc. (''CBOE'' or ''Exchange'') filed with the Securities and Exchange Commission (''Commission'') Amendment No. 1 to the proposed rule change as described in Items I, II, and III below, which Items have been prepared by the Exchange. The Exchange filed the original proposal with the Commission on January 27, 1995. Notice of the proposed rule change appeared in the **Federal Register** on February 8, 1995.[3] The Commission is publishing this notice to solicit comments on Amendment No. 1 to the proposed rule change from interested persons.

I. Self-Regulatory Organization's Statement of the Terms of Substance of the Proposed Rule Change

The CBOE proposes margin levels for warrants traded on the Exchange that are based upon the value of the U.S. dollar in relation to the Mexican peso (''Mexican Peso Warrants''). The text of Amendment No. 1 to the proposed rule change is available at the Office of the Secretary, CBOE, and at the Commission.

II. Self-Regulatory Organization's Statement of the Purpose of, and Statutory Basis for, the Proposed Rule Change

In its filing with the Commission, the Exchange included statements concerning the purpose of and basis for Amendment No. 1 to the proposed rule change and discussed any comments it received on the amendment. The text of these statements may be examined at the places specified in Item IV below. The CBOE has prepared summaries, set forth in Sections (A), (B), and (C) below, of the most significant aspects of such statements.

(A) Self-Regulatory Organization's Statement of the Purpose of, and Statutory Basis for, the Proposed Rule Change

In the Exchange's proposal to list and trade Mexican Peso Warrants, the CBOE represented that ''Exchange will require that customer positions in Mexican Peso Warrants be subject to the margin requirements applicable to foreign currency options.''[4] The Exchange is now amending that proposal to specify objective margin levels that will be applicable to Mexican Peso Warrants trading on the Exchange.

The Exchange represents that it has calculated frequency distributions reflecting U.S. dollar/Mexican peso returns for all one, seven, and 21 day periods for the period from January 2, 1992, through January 25, 1995 (''three year period''), and for the period from January 3, 1994, through January 25, 1995 (''one year period''). The Exchange further represents that these distributions demonstrate that 97.5% of all seven day returns for the three year period would have been covered by 4.5% of the underlying peso value and that 95% of all seven day returns for the one year period would have been covered by approximately 10% of the underlying peso value. Based upon these results, the Exchange is proposing

[1] 15 U.S.C. 78s(b)(1) (1988).

[2] 17 CFR 240.19b–4 (1991).

[3] *See* Securities Exchange Act Release No. 35324 (February 2, 1995), 60 FR 7599 (February 8, 1995).

[4] *Id.*

to set the margin ''add-on'' percentage for Mexican Peso Warrants at 12% for both initial and maintenance margin, with a minimum add-on for out-of-the-money warrants of 8%. If, as a result of the Exchange's routine monitoring of margin adequacy, the CBOE determines that a different percentage would be appropriate, the Exchange will file a proposal with the Commission pursuant to section 19(b) of the Act to modify the margin add-on percentages applicable to Mexican Peso Warrants.

The Exchange believes that Amendment No. 1 to the proposed rule change is consistent with section 6 of the Act, in general, and furthers the objectives of section 6(b)(5) oft he Act,[5] in particular, in that the proposal will promote just and equitable principles of trade and will contribute to the protection of investors and the public interest.

(B) Self-Regulatory Organization's Statement on Burden on Competition

The Exchange does not believe that Amendment No. 1 to the proposed rule change will impose any inappropriate burden on competition.

(c) Self-Regulatory Organization's Statement on Comments on the Proposed Rule Change Received From Members, Participants, or Others

Written comments on Amendment No. 1 to the proposed rule change were neither solicited nor received.

III. Date of Effectiveness of the Proposed Rule Change and Timing for Commission Action

Within 35 days of the date of publication of this notice in the **Federal Register** or within such longer period (i) as the Commission may designate up to 90 days of such date if it finds such longer period to be appropriate and publishes its reasons for so finding or (ii) as to which the Exchange consents, the Commission will:

(a) By order approve such proposed rule change, as amended, or

(b) Institute proceedings to determine whether the proposed rule change, as amended, should be disapproved.

IV. Solicitation of Comments

Interested persons are invited to submit written data, views and arguments concerning Amendment No. 1 to the proposed rule change. Persons making written submissions should file six copies thereof with the Secretary, Securities and Exchange Commission, 450 Fifth Street NW., Washington, DC 20549. Copies of the submission, all subsequent amendments, all written statements with respect to the proposed rule change, as amended, that are filed with the Commission, and all written communications relating to the proposed rule change, as amended, between the Commission and any person, other than those that may be withheld from the public in accordance with the provisions of 5 U.S.C. 552, will be available for inspection and copying in the Commission's Public Reference Section, 450 Fifth Street NW., Washington, DC. Copies of such filing will also be available for inspection and copying at the principal office of the CBOE. All submissions should refer to File No. SR–CBOE–95–12 and should be submitted by April 5, 1995.

For the Commission, by the Division of Market Regulation, pursuant to delegated authority.[6]

Margaret H. McFarland,

Deputy Secretary.

[FR Doc. 95–6351 Filed 3–14–95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 8010–01–M

[5] 15 U.S.C. 78f(b)(5) (1988).

[6] 17 CFR 200.30–3(a)(12) (1994).

[Release No. 34–35464; International Series Release No. 791; File No. SR–Phlx–95–03]

Self-Regulatory Organizations; Order Approving a Proposed Rule Change by the Philadelphia Stock Exchange, Inc., Relating to Customized Foreign Currency Options Transaction Size

March 9, 1995.

On January 17, 1995, the Philadelphia Stock Exchange, Inc. (''Phlx'' or ''Exchange'') filed with the Securities and Exchange Commission (''Commission''), pursuant to Section 19(b)(1) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (''Act''), [1] and Rule 19b–4 thereunder, [2] a proposed rule change to reduce the minimum transaction size for customized foreign currency options (''Customized FCOs'') from 300 to 200 contracts. Notice of the proposed rule change appeared in the **Federal Register** on January 30, 1995. [3] No comment letters were received on the proposed rule change. This order approves the Exchange's proposal.

On November 1, 1994, the Commission approved the Exchange's proposal to trade Customized FCOs. [4] Presently, Phlx Rule 1069(a)(6) imposes a 300 contract minimum for opening Customized FCO transactions. The Exchange represents that a number of midsized corporations and institutions have told the Exchange that the current minimum contract value is too large for their purposes. The Exchange, therefore, proposed to reduce the minimum opening transaction size for Customized FCO transactions to 200 contracts.[5]

The Commission finds that the proposed rule change is consistent with the requirements of the Act and the rules and regulations thereunder applicable to a national securities exchange, and, in particular, the requirements of Section 6(b)(5) [6] in that the proposal is designed to promote just and equitable principles of trade, to prevent fraudulent and manipulative acts and practices, and to protect investors and the public interest. Specifically, the Commission believes that the proposed rule change is designed to make the Customized FCO market accessible to smaller corporate FCO users while maintaining the focus of this market towards institutional investors. As a result, the Commission believes that the proposal may serve to add liquidity to this market which would benefit all users of Customized FCO's.

Moreover, even with lowering the minimum opening transaction size to 200 contracts, the average value of an opening Customized FCO transaction will be approximately $10 million.[7] The Commission believes that this level is sufficient to ensure that Customized FCO market continues to be used almost exclusively by institutional investors. The Commission also notes that this dollar value is equivalent to the minimum opening transaction size that the Commission required in approving proposals by the American Stock Exchange,[8] the Chicago Board Options Exchange,[9] and the Pacific Stock Exchange[10] for trading flexible exchange options (''FLEX Options''). As a result, the Commission believes that this proposal does not raise any regulatory concerns that were not adequately addressed by the Exchange when the

[1] 15 U.S.C. 78s(b)(1) (1988).

[2] 17 CFR 240.19b–4 (1992).

[3] *See* Securities Exchange Act Release No. 35261 (January 23, 1995), 60 FR 5745 (January 30, 1995).

[4] *See* Securities Exchange Act Release No. 34925 (November 1, 1994), 59 FR 55720 (November 8, 1994) (''Exchange Act Release No. 34925'').

[5] The Exchange represents that the average value of a 300 contract Customized FCO transaction, at prevailing exchange rates, is approximately $15 million. Reducing the minimum opening transaction size to 200 contracts would still result in an average minimum transaction value of approximately $10 million.

[6] 15 U.S.C. 78(b)(5) (1988).

[7] *See supra* note 5.

[8] *See* Securities Exchange Act Release No. 32781 (August 20, 1993), 58 FR 45360 (August 27, 1993).

[9] *See* Securities Exchange Act Release Nos. 32694 (July 29, 1993), 58 FR 41814 (August 5, 1993), and 31920 (February 24, 1993), 58 FR 12280 (March 3, 1993).

[10] *See* Securities Exchange Act Release No. 34364 (July 13, 1994), 59 FR 36813 (July 19, 1994).

Commission approved the trading of Customized FCOs.[11]

It is therefore ordered, pursuant to Section 19(b)(2) of the Act,[12] that the proposed rule change (SR–Phlx–95–03) is hereby approved.

For the Commission, by the Division of Market Regulation, pursuant to delegated authority.[13]

Margaret H. McFarland,

Deputy Secretary.

[FR Doc. 95–6352 Filed 3–14–95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 8010–01–M

[Rel. No. IC–20948; No. 812–9074]

Aetna Insurance Company of America, et al.

March 9, 1995.

AGENCY: Securities and Exchange Commission (''Commission'' or ''SEC'').

ACTION: Notice of application for an order under the Investment Company Act of 1940 (''1940 Act'').

APPLICANTS: Aetna Insurance Company of America (''Aetna''); Variable Annuity Account I of Aetna (''Account I''), Variable Annuity Account II of Aetna (''Account II''), and any other Separate Accounts established in the future by Aetna (''Future Accounts,'' and together with Accounts I and II, ''Separate Accounts'') to support certain group and individual deferred variable annuity contracts (''Contracts'') or other variable annuity contracts that are substantially similar in all material respects to the Contracts (''Other Contracts'') and that may be issued in the future by Aetna;[1] Aetna Life Insurance and Annuity Company (''ALIAC''), the principal underwriter of the Contracts; and Any Member Broker-Dealer of the National Association of Securities Dealers, Inc. (''NASD'') That May In The Future Serve As Principal Underwriter For The Contracts (''Future Underwriters'').

RELEVANT 1940 ACT SECTIONS: Order requested under Section 6(c) of the 1940 Act granting exemptions from the provisions of Sections 26(a)(2)(C) and 27(c)(2) of the 1940 Act.

SUMMARY OF APPLICATION: Applicants seeking an order permitting the deduction of a mortality and expense risk change from the assets of the Separate Accounts in connection with the issuance and sale of the Contracts or Other Contracts.

FILING DATE: The application was filed on June 24, 1994, and amended on December 23, 1994 and February 23, 1995.

HEARING OR NOTIFICATION OF HEARING: An order granting the application will be issued unless the Commission orders a hearing. Interested persons may request a hearing by writing to the Commission's Secretary and serving the Applicants with a copy of the request, personally or by mail. Hearing requests should be received by the Commission by 5:30 p.m. on April 3, 1995, and should be accompanied by proof of service on Applicants in the form of an affidavit or, for lawyers, a certificate of service. Hearing requests should state the nature of the writer's interest, the reason for the request, and the issues contested. Persons may request notification of a hearing by writing to the Commission's Secretary.

ADDRESSES: Secretary, SEC, 450 5th Street NW., Washington, DC 20549. Applicants, c/o Aetna Insurance Company of America, 151 Farmington Avenue, Hartford, Connecticut 06156.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Yvonne M. Hunold, Assistant Special Counsel, or Wendy F. Friedlander, Deputy Chief, at (202) 942–0670, Office of Insurance Products (Division of Investment Management).

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: Following is a summary of the application; the complete application is available for a fee from the Commission's Public Reference Branch.

Applicants' Representations

1. Aetna, a stock life insurance company, is a wholly-owned subsidiary of Aetna Life Insurance and Annuity Company (''ALIAC''), which is, in turn, a wholly-owned subsidiary of Aetna Life and Casualty Company. Aetna is in the process of qualifying to do business and obtaining licenses to sell insurance in all jurisdictions except New York.

2. The Separate Accounts are or will be established by Aetna for the purpose of funding variable annuity contracts. The Separate Accounts are or will be registered under the 1940 Act as unit investment trusts. Assets of the Separate Accounts will be allocated among the shares of one or more registered open-end investment companies (''Funds''), some of which may be managed by ALIAC or its affiliates.

3. ALIAC is the principal underwriter of the Contracts and may act as investment adviser to some of the Funds. ALIAC is registered as a broker-dealer under the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 and as an investment adviser under the Investment Advisers Act of 1940. ALIAC is a member of NASD.

4. Non-tax qualified Contracts are funded through Account I and Contracts purchased and used in connection with retirement plans under Sections 401(a) or 403(b) of the Internal Revenue Code, as amended (''Code'') are funded through Account II. Individual Contracts qualifying for favorable federal income tax treatment under Section 408 of the Code and Contracts purchased by deferred compensation plans under Section 457 of the Code may be funded through either Account I or Account II.

5. The Contracts may provide for, among other things single or installment premium payments, or a combination of the two, and deferred or immediate annuity payments on a fixed or variable basis beginning on a date elected by the Contract owners and in no event later than certain contractually established dates (''Retirement Date''). Additionally, Contract owners may allocate premium payments to: (a) One or more of the Funds available under a Contract; (b) in some Contracts to a fixed Interest Option, which is part of Aetna's general account; and (c) in some Contracts to a Credited Interest Option, with or without a market value adjustment upon redemption prior to the end of a guaranteed term, and assets attributable to such an option may be held in Aetna's general account or in a non-insulated, none-utilized separate account of Aetna.[2]

6. The Contracts provide for the payment of a standard death benefit equal to the greater of (i) the cash value of the Contract account, or (ii) the sum of purchase payments less any withdrawals, or (iii) the contract holder's account value at the most recent seventh year anniversary of the Contract adjusted for purchase payments, withdrawals and amounts applied to an annuity option. The Contracts also provide for the payment of an enhanced death benefit equal to the greater of (i) the cash value of the Contract account, or (ii) during the first year of the Contract, the amount of premiums paid (adjusted for any withdrawals and any amount paid to an annuity option), or (iii) during subsequent years of the Contract, an

---

[11] *See* Exchange Act Release No. 34925, *supra* note 4.

[12] 15 U.S.C. 78s(b)(2) (1988).

[13] 17 CFR 200.30–3(a)(12) (1994).

[1] Applicants have undertaken to amend their application during the Notice Period to include the representation that Future Contracts will be substantially similar ''in all material respects'' to the Contract.

[2] Applicants are not requesting Commission review of whether the Fixed Interest Option or any other Credited Interest Option under the Contracts are securities required to be registered under the 1933 Act. Applicants will not consider any order issued as a result of this application to be an expression of any view by the Commission on this issue.

amount determined by increasing premiums paid in prior years by a contractually-determined factor (adjusted for any withdrawals or any amounts paid for an annuity option), or (iv) cash value on the most recent seventh year anniversary of the Contract, adjusted for purchase payments, withdrawals and amounts applied to an annuity option.[3]

7. Various fees and charges are deducted under the Contracts. Aetna may impose a maximum annual maintenance charge of $35 under the Contracts for administrative services provided to Contract holders. Aetna currently deducts a $30 annual maintenance charge from Cash Value on the Contract date, on each Contract Anniversary prior to the Retirement Date, and upon termination of the Contract. In addition, Aetna reserves the right to deduct a daily administrative expense charge of up to 0.25%, on an annual basis, of the net asset value of the Separate Accounts, to cover its administrative expenses during the accumulation period and the annuity period. Of the 0.25% maximum administrative expense charge, Aetna currently deducts 0.15% annually of the average daily net assets of the Separate Accounts during the accumulation period. An administrative charge currently is not imposed during the annuity period.

8. No charge currently is made for transfers of cash values among the Funds or from a Fund to a Fixed or Credited Interest Option during the accumulation period. Aetna reserves the right to establish a minimum amount for transfers and to impose a transfer charge of up to $10 for each transfer request after the first twelve requests in each Contract year to reimburse Aetna for its transfer administrative costs during the accumulation period. No transfer fees are charged during the annuity period.

9. No profit is anticipated from the maintenance charge, transfer fee and administrative expense charges, which will not be greater than Aetna's average expected cost of the services to be provided, defined in accordance with Rule 26a–1 under the 1940 Act. Applicants intend to rely on Rules 26a–1 and 6c–8(c) under the 1940 Act for the necessary exemptive relief to permit imposition of these fees. Aetna represents that it will monitor its administrative expenses and the proceeds of these charges on at least an annual basis to ensure compliance with Rule 26a–1 under the 1940 Act.

10. No charge currently is deducted for premium taxes. Aetna reserves the right, however, to deduct such taxes from cash value under the Contracts at the time such taxes are payable. Aetna reserves the right to offer Other Contracts that permit the deduction of premium taxes from cash values or purchase payments. No charges currently are made for federal, state or local taxes, other than premium taxes, that Aetna incurs or that may be attributable to a Separate Account or the Contracts. Aetna reserves the right to deduct such taxes in the future for any such tax or economic burden from any sales load payable to Aetna with respect to the Contracts. Aetna will not deduct any such taxes from the assets of the Separate Accounts unless it has been specifically authorized to do so by the Commission. Applicants intend to rely on Rule 26a–2(d) under the 1940 Act to permit the deduction of taxes from the assets of a Separate Account.

11. No sales charge is deducted from premium payments. Aetna reserves the right to deduct a contingent deferred sales charge (''CDSC'') of up to 9% of the amount withdrawn, on partial or full Contract surrenders and withdrawals of Account Value, and upon election of certain annuity payment options, to compensate Aetna for its distribution expenses. The CDSC is applied to purchase payments and not to any increases in Account Value. The maximum CDSC currently is 7%, decreasing by up to 1% per year after payment of a purchase payment until it reaches zero after seven years. The aggregate CDSC is guaranteed never to exceed 8.5% of aggregate premium payments. The CDSC may be waived under certain specified circumstances. Amounts attributable to purchase payments are considered withdrawn before amounts attributable to income, and the oldest purchase payments are considered withdrawn first when determining the amount of CDSC that should be applied.

12. Aetna anticipates that the CDSC will not generate revenues that will be sufficient to pay all its distribution costs. Excess distribution costs, thus, would be paid out of Aetna's general assets, which may include profits derived from the mortality and expense risk charge assessed under the Contracts. Applicants will rely on Rule 6c–8 under the 1940 Act to deduct the CDSC.

13. A daily charge will be deducted from the net assets of the Separate Accounts to compensate Aetna for assuming certain mortality and expense risks. Aetna currently charges 0.35% for the expense risk, 0.75% for standard mortality risks, and 0.15% for the enhanced death benefit, or a current total charge of 1.25%. Aetna reserves the right to charge up to .90% on an annual basis for standard mortality risks, in which event the charge for mortality and expense risks would be at a maximum annual rate of 1.40% of net assets.

14. The mortality risk arises from Aetna's contractual obligation to make annuity payments (in accordance with the annuity tables and other provisions in the Contracts) regardless of how long any individual annuitant or all annuitants may live. The mortality risk is that an annuitant will live longer than predicted by Aetna's actuarial projections, thereby resulting in higher than expected annuity payments. This undertaking assures that neither an annuitant's own longevity, nor an improvement in general life expectancy, will adversely affect the monthly annuity payments that the annuitant will receive under the Contracts. Aetna also assumes a mortality risk in that Aetna may be obligated to pay either a standard death benefit or an enhanced death benefit in excess of a contract holder's account value.

15. The expense risk assumed by Aetna is the risk that charges for administration expenses, which are guaranteed not to increase for the life of the Contracts, may be insufficient to cover the actual costs of issuing and administering the Contracts or Other Contracts.

16. Aetna currently anticipates that, under ordinary circumstances, the mortality and expense risk charge will be more than sufficient to cover its costs. Accordingly, any excess will be profit to Aetna and may be available to pay distribution costs for the Contracts that are not covered by funds derived from the CDSC.

Applicants' Legal Analysis

1. Applicants request exemptions under Section 6(c) from Sections 26(a)(2)(C) and 27(c)(2) of the 1940 Act to the extent necessary to permit the deduction of a mortality and expense risk charge from the assets of the Separate Accounts in connection with funding the Contracts and Other Contracts. Applicants further request that such exemptive relief be extended

[3] The death benefit calculations in (iii) under the standard death benefit and in (ii), (iii) and (iv) under the enhanced death benefit apply until the Certificate Holder or annuitant reaches the death benefit maximum age shown in the Contract. Thereafter, the death benefit is only adjusted for purchase payments, withdrawals and amounts applied to annuity options. Currently, there is no limitation on the maximum death benefit payable under the standard death benefit or the enhanced death benefit; however, Aetna reserves the right in the future to impose a limitation on the maximum allowable death benefit under (iii) under the standard and under (ii), (iii) and (iv) under the enhanced death benefit.

to ALIAC as principal underwriter for the Aetna Contracts and to Future Underwriters, a class consisting of broker-dealers who may, in the future, act as principal underwriters of the Contracts. Applicants submit that the requested exemptions are necessary and appropriate in the public interest and consistent with the protection of investors and the purposes fairly intended by the policy and provisions of the 1940 Act.

2. Applicants state that the terms of the relief requested with respect to any Other Contracts funded by the Separate Accounts or distributed by any Future Underwriter are consistent with the standards set forth in Section 6(c) of the 1940 Act. Without the requested relief, exemptive relief would have to be requested for each new separate account established to fund the Other Contracts or for each Future Underwriter. Such additional requests for exemptive relief would present no issues under the 1940 Act not already addressed in this application. The requested relief would eliminate the need for the filing of redundant exemptive applications, thereby reducing administrative expenses, maximizing efficient use of resources and, thus, promoting competitiveness in the variable annuity market. Both the delay and the expense of repeatedly seeking exemptive relief would, Applicants assert, impair Aetna's ability to effectively take advantage of business opportunities as they arise. If Aetna were repeatedly to seek exemptive relief with respect to the same issues addressed in this application, investors would not receive additional protection or benefit and could be disadvantaged by Aetna's increased overhead. Applicants submit, therefore, that the requested relief is appropriate in the public interest and consistent with the protection of investors and the purposes fairly intended by the policy and provisions of the 1940 Act.

3. Section 6(c) of the 1940 Act authorizes the Commission to grant an exemption from any provision, rule or regulation of the 1940 Act to the extent that it is necessary or appropriate in the public interest and consistent with the protection of investors and the purposes fairly intended by the policy and provisions of the 1940 Act.

4. Sections 26(a)(2)(C) and 27(c)(2) of the 1940 Act, in relevant part, prohibit a registered unit investment trust, its depositor or principal underwriter, from selling periodic payment plan certificates unless the proceeds of all payments, other than sales loads, are deposited with a qualified bank and held under arrangements which prohibit any payment to the depositor or principal underwriter except a reasonable fee, as the Commission may prescribe, for performing bookkeeping and other administrative duties normally performed by the bank itself.

5. Applicants submit that Aetna is entitled to reasonable compensation for its assumption of mortality and expense risks. Applicants represent that the mortality and expense risk charge under the Contracts with the standard death benefit is a reasonable and proper insurance charge to compensate Aetna for assuming certain risks under the Contracts, including the risk that: (a) annuitants under the Contracts will live longer as a group than has been anticipated in setting the annuity rates guaranteed in the Contracts; (b) the cash value will be less than the death benefit; and (c) administrative expenses will be greater than amounts derived from the administrative charges. Thus, Applicants assert that this charge is consistent with the protection of investors.

6. Aetna represents that the annual charge of 1.25% of net assets for mortality and expense risks (.90% and .35%, respectively) assumed by it in connection with the standard death benefit is within the range of industry practice for comparable annuity contracts. This representation is based upon Aetna's analysis of publicly available information about similar industry products, taking into consideration such factors as current charge levels, the existence of charge level guarantees, and guaranteed annuity rates. Applicants represent that Aetna will maintain at its principal offices, available to the Commission, a memorandum setting forth in detail the products analyzed in the course of, and the methodology and results of, its comparative survey.[4]

7. Applicants further represent that the additional mortality risk charge of 0.15% for the enhanced death benefit is reasonable in relation to the risks assumed under the Contracts. Based on an actuarial analysis of the cost of providing an enhanced death benefit, it was determined that the additional mortality risk charge of up to 0.15% was a reasonable charge for providing the enhanced death benefit in relation to the risks assumed by Aetna under the Contracts. Aetna will maintain at its principal offices,[5] available to the Commission, upon request, a memorandum setting forth in detail the methodology used in determining that the additional risk charge of up to 0.15% for the enhanced death benefit is reasonable in relation to the risks assumed by Aetna under the Contracts.

8. Similarly, prior to making available any Other Contracts through the Separate Accounts, Applicants represent that the mortality and expense risk charges under such Other Contracts will be within the range of industry practice for comparable contracts. Aetna undertakes to maintain at its principal offices, available to the Commission upon request, memoranda setting forth in detail the products analyzed in the course of, and the methodology and results of, of its comparative surveys and analyses in reaching these determinations.

9. Applicants acknowledge that, if a profit is realized from the mortality and expense risk charge, all or a portion of such profit may be available to pay distribution expenses not reimbursed by the CDSC deducted under the Contracts. Aetna has concluded that there is a reasonable likelihood that the proposed distribution financing arrangements will benefit the Separate Accounts and the Contract holders. The basis for that conclusion is set forth in a memorandum which will be maintained by Aetna at its administrative offices and will be available to the Commission.

10. Applicants represent that Other Contracts will be offered only if Aetna concludes that the proposed distribution financing arrangement will benefit such Other Contracts and the Separate Accounts established in connection with their issuance and the Contract owners. The basis for such conclusion will be set forth in a memorandum which will be maintained by Aetna at its administrative offices and will be made available to the Commission, upon request.[6]

11. Accordingly, Applicants assert that the deduction for the assumption of mortality and expense risks is necessary and appropriate in the public interest and consistent with the protection of investors and the purposes fairly intended by the policy and provisions of the 1940 Act.

12. Aetna also represents that the Separate Accounts will only invest in management investment companies which undertake, in the event they should adopt a plan under Rule 12b–1 to finance distribution expenses, to have a board of directors or trustees, a

[4] Applicants have undertaken to amend their application during the Notice Period to include this representation.

[5] Applicants have undertaken to amend their application during the Notice Period to include this representation.

[6] Applicants have undertaken to amend their application during the Notice Period to include these representations.

majority of whom are not ''interested persons'' of the company, formulate and approve any such plan in accordance with Rule 12b–1.

Conclusion

For the reasons set forth above, Applicants represent that the exemptions requested to permit the daily deduction from the assets of the Separate Accounts of the charge for assumption of mortality and expense risks, including an enhanced death benefit, at a maximum annual rate of 1.40% of net assets, are necessary and appropriate in the public interest and consistent with the protection of investors and the purposes fairly intended by the policy and provisions of the 1940 Act.

For the Commission, by the Division of Investment Management, pursuant to delegated authority.

Margaret H. McFarland,

Deputy Secretary.

[FR Doc. 95–6354 Filed 3–14–95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 8010–01–M

[Release No. IC–20946; 812–9318]

The First Trust Special Situations Trust, et al.; Notice of Application

March 8, 1995.

AGENCY: Securities and Exchange Commission (''SEC'').

ACTION: Notice of application for exemption under the Investment Company Act of 1940 (the ''Act'').

APPLICANTS: The First Trust Special Situations Trust, Target Equity Trust, Value Ten Series 1 and subsequent series, and Nike Securities L.P. (''Nike'').

RELEVANT ACT SECTIONS: Order requested under sections 6(c) and 17(b) from section 17(a).

SUMMARY OF APPLICATION: Applicants request an order to permit a terminating series of a unit investment trust to sell portfolio securities to a new series of the trust.

FILING DATE: The application was filed on November 3, 1994, and was amended on March 3, 1995.

HEARING OR NOTIFICATION OF HEARING: An order granting the application will be issued unless the SEC orders a hearing. Interested persons may request a hearing by writing to the SEC's Secretary and serving applicants with a copy of the request, personally or by mail. Hearing requests should be received by the SEC by 5:30 p.m. on April 3, 1995 and should be accompanied by proof of service on applicants, in the form of an affidavit or, for lawyers, a certificate of service. Hearing requests should state the nature of the writer's request, the reason for the request, and the issues contested. Persons may request notification of a hearing by writing to the SEC's Secretary.

ADDRESSES: Secretary, SEC, 450 Fifth Street NW., Washington, DC 20549. Applicants, c/o Nike Securities L.P., 1001 Warrenville Road, Suite 3000, Lisle, Illinois 60532.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The following is a summary of the application. The complete application may be obtained for a fee at the SEC's Public Reference Branch.

Applicants' Representations

1. The First Trust Special Situations Trust (the ''Trust''), a unit investment trust registered under the Act, consists of a number of series (''Series''), each of which will be similar but separate and designated by a different series number. Target Equity Trust, Value Ten Series 1 is of one of the Series of the Trust. Nike is the sponsor for each Series (the ''Sponsor''). Applicants request that the relief sought herein apply to any future Series that has the characteristics described below and in the application.

2. Each Series will have a portfolio which contains equity securities (''Equity Securities'') which are (i) actively traded (*i.e.*, have had an average daily trading volume in the preceding six months of at least 500 shares equal in value to at least 25,000 United States dollars) on an exchange (an ''Exchange'') which is either (a) a national securities exchange which meets the qualifications of section 6 of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 or (b) a foreign securities exchange that meets the qualifications set out in the proposed amendment to rule 12d3–1(d)(6) under the Act, as proposed by the Commission,[1] and that releases daily closing prices, and (ii) included in a published index (an ''Index'').

3. The investment objective of each Series is to seek a greater total return than the stocks comprising an entire related Index (*e.g.*, the Dow Jones Industrial Average (''DJIA''), the Hang Seng Index, or the Financial Times Industrial Ordinary Share Index). Certain of the Series will acquire approximately equal values of a designated number of stocks in the DJIA having the highest dividend yields as of a specified date and will hold those stocks for a designated period. Other Series will create their portfolios in a similar manner using securities that are included in other Indices. The Sponsor of the Series intends that, as each Series terminates, a new Series (''New Series'') based on the appropriate Index will be offered for the next period.

4. Each Series has or will have a contemplated date (a ''Rollover Date'') on which holders of units in that Series (the ''Rollover Series'') may at their option redeem their units in the Rollover Series and receive in return units of a New Series which is created on or about the Rollover Date.

5. There is normally some overlap from year to year in the stocks having the highest dividend yields in an Index and, therefore, between the portfolios of each Rollover Series and the corresponding New Series. For example, of the ten securities selected for inclusion in Value Ten Series 5 on September 7, 1994, eight were still among the top ten dividend yielding stocks in the DJIA as of the date of the amended application.

6. In connection with its termination, each Rollover Series sells all of its portfolio securities on an Exchange as quickly as practicable, but over a period of time so as to minimize any adverse impact on the market price. Similarly, a New Series acquires its portfolio securities in purchase transactions on an Exchange. This procedure creates brokerage commissions on portfolio securities of the same issue that are borne by the holders of units of both the Rollover Series and the New Series. Applicants, therefore, request an exemptive order to permit any Rollover Series to sell portfolio securities to a New Series and a New Series to purchase those securities.

7. In order to minimize overreaching, the Sponsor will certify to the trustee of the Rollover Series and the New Series, within five days of each sale from a Rollover Series to a New Series, (a) that the transaction is consistent with the policy of both the Rollover Series and the New Series, as recited in their respective registration statements and reports filed under the Act, (b) the date of such transaction, and (c) the closing sales price on the Exchange for the sale date of the securities subject to such sale. The trustee will then countersign the certificate, unless, in the unlikely event that the trustee disagrees with the closing sales price listed on the certificate, the trustee immediately informs the Sponsor orally of any such disagreement and returns the certificate within five days to the Sponsor with corrections duly noted. Upon the Sponsor's receipt of a corrected certificate, if the Sponsor can verify the

[1] Investment Company Act Release No. 17096 (Aug. 3, 1989) (proposing amendments to rule 12d3–1).

correct price by reference to an independently published list of closing sales prices for the date of the transaction, the Sponsor will ensure that the price of units of the New Series, and distributions to holders of the Rollover Series with regard to redemption of their units or termination of the Rollover Series, accurately reflect the corrected price. To the extent that the Sponsor disagrees with the trustee's corrected price, the Sponsor and the trustee will jointly determine the correct sales price by reference to a mutually agreeable, independently published list of closing sales prices for the date of the transaction.

Applicants' Legal Analysis

1. Section 17(a) of the Act makes it unlawful for an affiliated person of a registered investment company to sell securities to, or purchase securities from, the company. Investment companies under common control may be considered affiliates of one another. Each Series will have an identical or common Sponsor, Nike. Since the Sponsor of each Series may be considered to control each Series, it is likely that each Series would be considered an affiliate of the others.

2. Section 17(b) provides that the SEC shall exempt a proposed transaction from section 17(a) if evidence establishes that: (a) the terms of the proposed transaction are reasonable and fair and do not involve overreaching; (b) the proposed transaction is consistent with the policies of the registered investment company involved; and (c) the proposed transaction is consistent with the general provisions of the Act. Under section 6(c), the SEC may exempt classes of transactions if, and to the extent that, such exemption is necessary or appropriate in the public interest, and consistent with the protection of investors and the purposes fairly intended by the policy and provisions of the Act. Applicants believe that the proposed transactions satisfy the requirements of sections 6(c) and 17(b).

3. Rule 17a–7 under the Act permits registered investment companies that might be deemed affiliates solely by reason of common investment advisers, directors, and/or officers, to purchase securities from, or sell securities, one another at an independently determined price, provided certain conditions are met. Paragraph (e) of the rule requires an investment company's board of directors to adopt and monitor the procedures for these transactions to assure compliance with the rule. A unit investment trust does not have a board of directors and, therefore, may not rely on the rule. Applicants represent that they will comply with all of the provisions of rule 17a–7, other than paragraph (e).

4. Applicants represent that purchases and sales between Series will be consistent with the policy of each Series, as only securities that otherwise would be brought and sold on the open market pursuant to the policy of each Series will be involved in the proposed transactions. Applicants further believe that the current practice of buying and selling on the open market leads to unnecessary brokerage fees and is therefore contrary to the general purposes of the Act.

Applicants' Conditions

Applicants agree that the order granting the requested relief shall be subject to the following conditions:

1. Each sale of Equity Securities by a Rollover Series to a New Series will be affected at the closing price of the securities sold on the applicable Exchange on the sale date, without any brokerage charges or other remuneration except customary transfer fees, if any.

2. The nature and conditions of such transactions will be fully disclosed to investors in the appropriate prospectus of each future Rollover Series and New Series.

3. The trustee of each Rollover Series and New Series will (a) review the procedures discussed in the application relating to the sale of securities from a Rollover Series to a New Series and (b) make such changes to the procedures as the trustee deems necessary that are reasonably designed to comply with paragraphs (a) through (d) of rule 17a–7.

4. A written copy of these procedures and a written record of each transaction pursuant to this order will be maintained as provided in rule 17a–7(f).

For the Commission, by the Division of Investment Management, under delegated authority.

Margaret H. McFarland,

Deputy Secretary.

[FR Doc. 95–6357 Filed 3–14–95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 8010–01–M

[Release No. IC–20949; 812–9442]

ML Venture Partners II, L.P. et al.; Notice of Application

March 9, 1995.

AGENCY: Securities and Exchange Commission (the ''SEC'').

ACTION: Notice of application for an order under the Investment Company Act of 1940 (the ''Act'').

APPLICANTS: ML Venture Partners II, L.P. (''MLCP II''), Merrill Lynch, Pierce, Fenner & Smith Incorporated (''Merrill Lynch''), and Donaldson, Lufkin & Jenrette Securities Corporation (''DLJ'').

RELEVANT ACT SECTIONS: Order requested under section 57(c) from section 57(a)(2).

SUMMARY OF APPLICATION: Applicants request an order relating to the sale of shares of common stock of Corporate Express, Inc. by MLVP II in an underwriting in which Merrill Lynch and/or DLJ are members of the underwriting syndicate.

FILING DATE: The application was filed on January 20, 1995. Applicants have agreed to file an amendment during the notice period, the substance of which is incorporated herein.

HEARING OR NOTIFICATION OF HEARING: An order granting the application will be issued unless the SEC orders a hearing. Interested persons may request a hearing by writing to the SEC's Secretary and serving applicants with a copy of the request, personally or by mail. Hearing requests should be received by the SEC by 5:30 p.m. on April 3, 1995, and should be accompanied by proof of service on the applicants, in the form of an affidavit or, for lawyers, a certificate of service. Hearing requests should state the nature of the writer's interest, the reasons for the request, and the issues contested. Persons who wish to be notified of a hearing may request such notification by writing to the SEC's Secretary.

ADDRESSES: Secretary, SEC, 450 Fifth Street NW., Washington, DC 20549. MLCP II and Merrill Lynch, North Tower, World Financial Center, New York, New York 10281.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Fran Pollack-Matz, Senior Attorney, (202) 942–0570, or Robert A. Robertson, Branch Chief, (202) 942–0560 (Division of Investment Management, Office of Investment Company Regulation).

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The following is a summary of the application. The complete application may be obtained for a fee from the SEC's Public Reference Branch.

Applicants' Representations

1. MLVP II, a Delaware limited partnership, is a business development company under the Act. The investment objective of MLVP II is to seek long-term capital appreciation by making venture capital investments. MLVP II has five general partners, consisting of four individuals (the ''MLVP II Individual General Partners'') and one managing general partner, MLVP II Co. L.P. (the

''MLVP II Managing General Partner''). The MLVP II Individual General Partners include three MLVP II Independent General Partners (defined to be individuals who are not ''interested persons'' of MLVP II) and one general partner who is an individual and who is an affiliated person of the MLVP II Managing General Partner. The MLVP II Managing General Partner, is a limited partnership controlled by its general partner, Merrill Lynch Venture Capital Inc. (the ''Management Company''). The Management Company, an indirect subsidiary of Merrill Lynch & Co., Inc. (''ML & Co.''), performs, or arranges for the performance of, the management and administrative services necessary for the operation of MLVP II. On May 23, 1991, MLVP II, the MLVP II Managing General Partner, and the Management Company retained DLJ Capital Management Corporation (the ''Sub-Manager''), an indirect wholly-owned subsidiary of Donaldson, Lufkin & Jenrette, Inc., to provide management services in connection with the venture capital investments of MLVP II pursuant to a Sub-Management Agreement (the ''Sub-Management Agreement''). Under the Sub-Management Agreement, the Sub-Manager is primarily responsible for the venture capital investments of MLVP II. The agreement provides that the Sub-Manager shall, subject to the overall supervision of the MLVP II Individual General Partner, ''make all decisions regarding Venture Capital Investments and, among other things, find evaluate, structure, monitor and liquidate such investments.''

2. Merrill Lynch, a Delaware corporation, is the principal subsidiary of ML & Co. ML & Co., a Delaware corporation, is a diversified financial services holding company which, through its subsidiaries, provides investment and financing, insurance, real estate, and related services.

3. DLJ, a Delaware corporation, is a wholly-owned subsidiary of Donaldson, Lufkin & Jenrette, Inc., a holding company which through its subsidiaries engages in investment banking, merchant banking, public finance, trading, distribution, and research. Donaldson, Lufkin & Jenrette, Inc. is a subsidiary of The Equitable Companies Incorporated.

4. Corporate Express is a distributor of office supplies and products that it sells directly to large corporate customers. Corporate Express has expanded its operations significantly over the past three years and currently has annualized revenues in excess of $600 million.

5. MLVP II made an initial investment in Corporate Express in May, 1992. At that time, MLVP II acquired 442,136 shares of common stock and 760,800 shares of Series A Convertible Preferred Stock for $1,392,838 ($0.22 per common share and $1.70 per Series A Preferred Share). MLVP II acquired these shares from the Management Company pursuant to the terms and conditions contained in an SEC exemptive order dated May 11, 1992 (the ''Blanket Exemptive Order'') permitting co-investments between MLVP II and certain entities managed by DLJ Capital Corporation. In April, 1993, MLVP II acquired 153,450 shares of Series B Convertible Preferred Stock for $537,075 ($3.50 per share) in a follow-on investment in Corporate Express. MLVP II's follow-on investment in Corporate Express was made in accordance with the terms and conditions of the Blanket Exemptive Order.

6. On September 23, 1994, 7,500,000 shares of common stock of Corporate Express were offered to the public in an underwritten offering in which DLJ acted as a managing underwriter and Merrill Lynch acted as an underwriter. In connection with that offering, MLVP II exchanged its 914,250 Class A and B Preferred Shares for 914,250 shares of common stock of Corporate Express. At the same time, Corporate Express effected a one-for-two reverse split of its common stock. As a result of that split, MLVP II exchanged its 1,356,386 shares of common stock of Corporate Express for 678,193 shares of common stock. Since the initial public offering, the common stock of Corporate Express has traded in the NASDAQ National Market System (''NASDAQ''). In addition to the purchasers in the public offering and in subsequent secondary market transfers, the stockholders of Corporate Express include certain affiliates of DLJ, members of management and other employees of Corporate Express, and other institutional investors.

7. As of December 31, 1994, MLVP II owned 696,234 shares, or approximately 2.7%, of the outstanding common stock of Corporate Express. At such date, affiliates of DLJ (excluding MLVP II) owned 2,168,471 shares, or approximately 8.4%.

8. Although MLVP II has made no determination as to the time at which it would like to sell its investment in Corporate Express, MLVP II is now considering alternative methods of disposing of such investment.

Applicants' Legal Analysis

1. Applicants request an order under section 57(c) exempting from section 57(a)(2) sales of shares of common stock of Corporate Express by MLVP II in underwritings in which Merrill Lynch and/or DLJ are members of the underwriting syndicate.[1]

2. Section 57(a)(2) prohibits certain affiliates of a business development company from purchasing any security or other property on a principal basis from the business development company or from any company controlled by the business development company, except securities of which the seller is the issuer. Section 57(b) provides, in part, that the affiliates affected by section 57(a) include any ''person directly or indirectly either controlling, controlled by or under common control with'' the business development company. Section 57(c) provides that a person may file an application with the SEC for an order exempting a proposed transaction from one or more provisions of section 57(a)(1) through (3), and that the SEC shall issue an order if evidence establishes that: (a) the terms of the proposed transaction, including the consideration to be paid or received, are reasonable and fair and do not involve overreaching of the business development company or its shareholders or partners on the part of any person concerned; (b) the proposed transaction is consistent with the policy of the business development company as recited in the filings made by such company with the SEC under the Securities Act of 1933, its registration statement and reports filed under the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, and its report to shareholders or partners; and (c) the proposed transaction is consistent with the general purposes of the Act.

3. Applicants believe that the Management Company is controlled by ML & Co. and that ML & Co. might be deemed to exercise and controlling influence over MLVP II and Merrill Lynch. Likewise, applicants believe that the Sub-Manager is controlled by Donaldson, Lufkin & Jenrette, Inc. and that Donaldson, Lufkin & Jenrette, Inc. might be deemed to exercise a controlling influence over MLVP II and DLJ. As a result of these affiliations, sales of securities on a principal basis by MLVP II to Merrill Lynch and/or DLJ are prohibited by section 57(a) and cannot be effected unless an order is issued under section 57(c).

[1] Applicants do not believe that the proposed transactions would constitute joint transactions under section 57(a)(4) and rule 17d–1 and therefore have not requested that the order include relief under that section and rule. Applicants recognize that the Commission expresses no opinion on this issue.

4. Applicants believe that the statutory standards set forth above will be satisfied with respect to the relief requested. In this connection, applicants believe that the structure of the proposed transaction has been designed to insure that the terms of the transaction will be fair and reasonable, will not involve overreaching on the part of any person concerned, and will eliminate the possibility of abuses of the potential conflict of interest. The terms of the proposed transaction provide that MLVP II will only sell shares in an underwritten offering in which Merrill Lynch and/or DLJ are members of the underwriting syndicate if certain conditions are met. The Sub-Manager for MLVP II must initially evaluate the proposed transaction and determine to recommend the sale of the investments.

5. The abuses that section 57(a)(2) is designed to deter are limited with respect to the proposed transactions. The shares of Corporate Express are traded on NASDAQ and the price to be paid for shares in an underwritten offering will approximate the trading price of such shares on NASDAQ less an underwriting discount. The underwriting terms with respect to MLVP II's sale of shares must be on the same terms applicable to any selling shareholder participating in the offering, including terms applicable to affiliates of ML & Co. and/or DLJ. The underwriting terms and arrangements, including the underwriting discount, will be reviewed and passed upon by the Individual General Partners, and separately by the Independent General Partners.

6. Liquidity in portfolio investments is becoming increasingly important as MLVP II approaches the ninth year of its ten year term. The ability to sell shares in an underwritten offering in which Merrill Lynch and/or DLJ are acting as underwriters may provide liquidity not otherwise available to MLVP II. Due to its affiliation with Corporate Express through Merrill Lynch, sales by MLVP II in the public market of shares of Corporate Express are subject to the volume limitations contained in rule 144 under the Securities Act of 1933. In addition, because DLJ acted as managing underwriter for Corporate Express in its initial public offering, it is likely that DLJ will be the managing underwriter or otherwise a member of the underwriting syndicate in future offerings of such company's securities. Thus, in the absence of the requested relief, MLVP II will be at a substantial disadvantage because it will be unable to liquidate its holdings at a time when other institutional investors in Corporate Express are selling shares in an underwritten offering for which Merrill Lynch and/or DLJ are members of the underwriting syndicate.

7. MLVP II believes that the relief requested is consistent with its purpose, its stated policies and the disclosure made to its prospective investors. Applicants also believe that the proposed transactions are in the best interests of MLVP II to the extent that such transactions permit MLVP II to liquidate portfolio securities on favorable terms and in a more expedited manner than would otherwise be available.

Applicants' Conditions

Applicants agree that the order granting the requested relief shall be subject to the following conditions:

1. If MLVP II is offered the opportunity to sell shares of common stock of Corporate Express in an underwritten offering in which Merrill Lynch and/or DLJ is a member of the underwriting syndicate, the Sub-Manager will review the terms of the proposed offering. The Sub-Manager will provide a written report to the independent General Partners which will set forth the Sub-Manager's recommendation as to whether MLVP II should sell shares in such underwritten offering based on the Sub-Manager's analysis of all factors it deems relevant, including the terms of the proposed underwritten offering.

2. MLVP II will be given the opportunity to sell shares in such underwritten offering on at least a proportionate basis with affiliates of DLJ and ML & Co. (if any), and on the same terms applicable to any selling shareholders participating in the offering, including terms applicable to affiliates of DLJ and ML & Co. (if any) selling shares in such offering. In this regard, the underwriting discount with respect to such offering will be no larger than the customary underwriting discount charged by underwriters for equity securities in similar transactions.

3. MLVP II will only participate in such underwritten offering if the shares to be sold continue to be traded on NASDAQ or are listed on a national securities exchange, as of the date of the offering and if the offering price is determined by reference to, and approximates, the price of the shares on NASDAQ, or a national securities exchange, at the time the offering price is determined.

4. The underwriting terms and arrangements with respect to the proposed transaction must be determined by the Individual General Partners, and a majority of the Independent General Partners, to be fair and reasonable.

5. If the Sub-Manager, on the basis of its evaluation described above, recommends that MLVP II sell shares in such underwritten offering, the Individual General Partners shall then determine whether, in their view, it is in the best interests of MLVP II to sell shares in such underwritten offering. MLVP II shall only sell shares in such underwritten offering if the Individual General Partners, including a majority of the Independent General Partners, determine that:

(i) the terms of the proposed transaction, including the consideration to be paid to MLVP II, are reasonable and fair and do not involve overreaching of MLVP II or its partners on the part of any person concerned;

(ii) the proposed transaction is consistent with the policies of MLVP II as indicated in its filings under the Securities Act of 1933 and the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, and its reports to its partners; and

(iii) participation by MLVP II in the proposed transaction is in the best interests of the partners of MLVP II.

6. MLVP II will maintain the records required by section 57(f)(3) of the Act as if each of the transactions permitted under these conditions were approved by the Independent General Partners under section 57(f) of the Act.

For the SEC, by the Division of Investment Management, under delegated authority.

Margaret H. McFarland,

Deputy Secretary.

[FR Doc. 95–6356 Filed 3–14–95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 8010–01–M

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Office of the Secretary

Notice of Public Meeting and Request for Information on the Centralization and Computerization of DOT Dockets

AGENCIES: The Office of the Secretary (OST), the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA), the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), the Federal Railroad Administration (FRA), the Federal Transit Administration (FTA), the Maritime Administration (MARAD), the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration (NHTSA), the Research and Special Programs Administration (RSPA), and the United States Coast Guard (USCG), DOT.

ACTION: Notice of public meeting.

SUMMARY: DOT is consolidating its nine separate docket facilities into a single, central office, and initiating a transition

from a paper-based system to use of an optical ''imaging'' technology for more efficient storage, management, and retrieval of docketed information. This change also will address increasing space limitations, provide better security, and provide a platform for eventual electronic filing and on-line public access to the docket. The ultimate objective is to make records accessible from outside Washington, not just at DOT headquarters. This notice announces the date, time, location, and procedures for a public meeting to discuss this initiative.

DATES: The public meeting is scheduled 1:30 PM to 4:00 PM (local time) for: March 29, 1995; Washington, D.C.

ADDRESSES: The public meeting will be held at: U.S. Department of Transportation, Room 2230, 400 7th Street SW, Washington, D.C. 20590. Individuals interested in attending the meeting should contact Rasheed Tahir at 202–366–9307, no later than March 24, 1995.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Neil Eisner, Assistant General Counsel for Regulation and Enforcement, Office of General Counsel, Department of Transportation, (202) 366–4723, 400 7th Street SW, Washington, DC 20590.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The Secretary of Transportation has directed that the Office of the Secretary (OST) and the DOT operating administrations consolidate their separate paper-based docket facilities into a single, central office and convert to an electronic image-based system. This change will enable the Department to provide better service and access to the public and to government users. Currently, OST and each operating administration has its own separate docket facility and performs many duplicative docketing functions. Substantial building space is inefficiently allocated for public access to the dockets. On a given day, several facilities may be empty and one jammed, with public users waiting in the hall outside. Increases in the number and complexity of rulemakings and adjudicatory proceedings have generated a growing mountain of paper, which, in turn, has created pressing space and storage problems. The dependence on paper also perpetuates inefficiencies in information processing and dissemination. Voluminous dockets, in particular, make it difficult for users to search for and organize relevant information. Multiple copies of docketed materials must be produced and circulated to responsible offices in the Department. These efforts consume a substantial amount of time and resources. The consolidation will eliminate duplication, improve records management, enhance docket security, and provide easier public access by creating a single point of entry. The affected offices and agencies are working together to develop the consolidated docket facility and to standardize docket procedures to the extent possible.

As part of the consolidation effort, DOT has initiated a phased transition from a paper-based docket system to storage of docket records in an electronic format. This change responds to five different needs: to (1) Store increasing amounts of docketed information; (2) provide users with better, quicker, and easier access to that information: (3) provide more efficient ways to transmit information to and from the dockets; (4) provide users with the ability to perform electronic searches of information in the dockets to increase the efficiency and quality of this review; and (5) provide better security for docketed materials, which now may get lost or misplaced.

To meet the legal requirements that DOT maintain a record of all materials submitted to the dockets and produce certified true copies of docketed information, the new system will store docketed information as images on optical disks. Images are like photographs; when stored on read-only optical disks, they are permanent and unalterable, assuring 100 percent accuracy of the records. The optical disk system will allow more efficient storage and management of docketed information, because a single disk can store hundreds of documents that are easily available through the index. The index will provide users with the capability for rapid retrieval and more sophisticated cross-referencing and searching of docketed information.

The system will have controlled access and security features to maintain its integrity and to protect against viruses and tampering. It will have ''open architecture'' to enable future expansion and incorporation of technological improvements. When finally implemented, it will consist of about 5.5 million imaged records, taking into account the average annual amount of material received and the orderly retirement of records. The agencies plan to backscan dockets that are currently open and a limited amount of necessary historical or precedential material to optical disks that can be indexed for research purposes. Suggestions on what information would be useful to include in the system are welcome, bearing in mind that all existing paper dockets cannot be scanned. The remainder of the paper dockets will be sent to the Federal Records Center consistent with standard operating procedures.

The Department's Docket Management Facility initially will accept only ''hard'' copy filings. However, to facilitate review and processing now, the formal paper filing can be accompanied by floppy disks for the action offices. The Department is considering providing Optical Character Recognition (OCR) capability in the docket system as soon as it is feasible. The Department's priority, however, is to optimize the document flow into, within, and from the Department through electronic transmission. When the new system and its staff have the capability to handle the change, electronic filing will be encouraged. Electronically-filed documents will not need OCR translation. The Department is considering adding future capabilities to the system where possible, including: (1) Use of government-approved electronic signature; (2) electronic transfer of documents to the **Federal Register** and to the Federal Records Center; (3) multi-media capability to enable access by visually and hearing impaired individuals; and (4) automatic billing of public users (through credit cards/bills) for filing fees and copying services. The timing of the transition to electronic transmission, OCR and the availability of the future capabilities will depend upon the readiness of the new system to handle them and upon budgetary constraints.

The Department plans a phased transition to the new, centralized facility. The Office of the Secretary's (OST) docket office has already been relocated. During the transfer of OST's docket to the imaging system and the internal connection of Department staff to the dockets on-line, hard copies will be maintained in the docket office until the new system works smoothly. Computer work stations in the new docket office will be available to access the information that is electronically stored. These will have an easy-to-use interface and docket staff will be available to help users. The docket offices of the other DOT agencies will be sequentially consolidated into the new facility. As part of this process, the docket facility will eventually be ''networked'' to Department offices.

Ultimately, the public will have on-line access to the docket from outside of DOT's docket office. The system will support both Macintosh and IBM compatible equipment and provide an easy-to-use interface with pull-down menus. The architecture of the network will enable real-time response for accessing images, but acceptable speed (comparable to turning the pages of a

document) will require the use of at least a 486DX2–66 machine or Macintosh equivalent.

Not only should this effort result in a much more efficient use of space, personnel, equipment, and expertise, but it should save the public and the government time and money in analyzing information submitted to the docket.

Notice of Public Meeting

The Department believes that users will benefit from an opportunity to hear a more detailed description of the new docket management system and to ask questions about it. Therefore, we are holding a public meeting beginning at 1:30 PM and ending no later than 4:00 PM (local time) on March 29, 1995, in Washington, DC. We hope that as people start using the system, they will point out problems and bring us new ideas on how to make the system more responsive to their needs.

Seating will be restricted by available room size and will be made available on a first-come-first-served basis. If time and the number of attendees permit, we may be able to conduct one or more short tours of the new docket facility. If the interest expressed in the tour exceeds the capacity of our docket facility, we will schedule additional tours. Persons interested in attending should contact Rasheed Tahir at 202–366–9307.

Since this meeting is intended to inform the public about and to solicit public views and questions on the new docket management system, we will conduct it in an informal manner.

Issued in Washington, D. C. on March 13, 1995.

Stephen H. Kaplan,

General Counsel.

[FR Doc. 95–6512 Filed 3–14–95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–62–P

Federal Aviation Administration

[Summary Notice No. PE–9521]

Petitions for Exemption; Summary of Petitions Received; Dispositions of Petitions Issued

AGENCY: Federal Aviation Administration (FAA), DOT.

ACTION: Notice of petitions for exemption received and of dispositions of prior petitions.

SUMMARY: Pursuant to FAA's rulemaking provisions governing the application, processing, and disposition of petitions for exemption (14 CFR Part 11), this notice contains a summary of certain petitions seeking relief from specified requirements of the Federal Aviation Regulations (14 CFR Chapter I), dispositions of certain petitions previously received, and corrections. The purpose of this notice is to improve the public's awareness of, and participation in, this aspect of FAA's regulatory activities. Neither publication of this notice nor the inclusion or omission of information in the summary is intended to affect the legal status of any petition or its final disposition.

DATES: Comments on petitions received must identify the petition docket number involved and must be received on or before April 4, 1995.

ADDRESSES: Send comments on any petition in triplicate to: Federal Aviation Administration, Office of the Chief Counsel, Attn: Rule Docket (AGC–200), Petition Docket No. _____, 800 Independence Avenue, SW., Washington, DC 20591.

The petition, any comments received, and a copy of any final disposition are filed in the assigned regulatory docket and are available for examination in the Rules Docket (AGC–200), Room 915G, FAA Headquarters Building (FOB 10A), 800 Independence Avenue SW., Washington, DC 20591; telephone (202) 267–3132.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Mr. D. Michael Smith, Office of Rulemaking (ARM–1), Federal Aviation Administration, 800 Indpendence Avenue, SW., Washington, DC 20591; telephone (202) 267–7470.

This notice is published pursuant to paragraphs (c), (e), and (g) of § 11.27 of Part 11 of the Federal Aviation Regulations (14 CFR Part 11).

Issued in Washington, DC, on March 9, 1995.

Donald P. Byrne,

Assistant Chief Counsel for Regulations.

Petitions for Exemption

Docket No.: 27956
Petitioner: Air Line Pilots Association
Sections of the FAR Affected: 14 CFR appendices I and J, part 121
Corrective Action: To withdraw the notice of this petition published in the **Federal Register** on February 17, 1995. Due to an inadvertent administrative error, on January 31, 1995, the FAA responded to already denied petitions and published this response for comments.

Dispositions of Petitions

Docket No.: 24052
Petitioner: The Blue Angels
Sections of the FAR Affected: 14 CFR 91.117(a) and (b), 91.119(c), and 91.303(c) and (d)
Description of Relief Sought/ Disposition: To extend Exemption No. 4504, as amended, which permits the Blue Angels pilots to conduct airshow rehearsals involving low-level, high-speed, and aerobatic flight subject to certain conditions and limitations. *GRANT, February 23, 1995, Exemption No. 4504D*

Docket No.: 25390
Petitioner: Airbus Industrie
Sections of the FAR Affected: 14 CFR 145.35
Description of Relief Sought/ Disposition: To permit the production units and associated partners of Airbus to be collectively certificated under Airbus as a U.S. foreign repair station to support the operation of U.S.-registered A300, A310, A320, A321, A330, and A340 aircraft. *GRANT, February 15, 1995, Exemption No. 6029*

Docket No.: 26976
Petitioner: United States Coast Guard
Sections of the FAR Affected: 14 CFR 91.119(c)
Description of Relief Sought/ Disposition: To extend Exemption No. 5614, which permits the Coast Guard to operate over other than congested areas at an altitude of less than 500 feet and, in the case of operations over open water or sparsely populated areas, at a distance closer than 500 feet to any person, vessel, vehicle, or structure for the purpose of rescuing and aiding persons and protecting and saving property. *GRANT, February 23, 1995, Exemption No. 5614A*

Docket No.: 27086
Petitioner: Bombardier, Inc.
Sections of the FAR Affected: 14 CFR 61.55(b)(2); 61.56(c)(1); 61.57(c) and (d); 61.58(c)(1) and (d); 61.63(c)(2) and (d)(2) and (3); 61.65(c), (e)(2) and (3), and (g); 61.67(d)(2); 61.157(d)(1) and (2) and (e)(1) and (2); 61.191(c); and appendix A, part 61
Description of Relief Sought/ Disposition: To extend Exemption No. 5617, which permits Bombardier to use FAA-approved simulators to meet certain flight experience requirements of part 61 of the FAR. *GRANT, February 16, 1995, Exemption No. 5617A*

Docket No.: 27951
Petitioner: Corning Incorporated
Sections of the FAR Affected: 14 CFR 25.562(b) and (c)
Description of Relief Sought/ Disposition: To allow Corning Incorporated exemption from performing the emergency landing dynamic tests required by §§ 25.562(b) and (c), for seating on Corning's Dornier 328–100 aircraft.

DENIAL, February 16, 1995, Exemption No. 6028

Docket No.: 28077

Petitioner: Evan Joseph Farrow (through his mother, Mrs. Pamela Farrow)

Sections of the FAR Affected: 14 CFR 121.311(b)

Description of Relief Sought/ Disposition: To permit Evan to be held on his caregiver's lap, rather than being secured in an approved child restraint device or in an individual seat with a seatbelt, while aboard an aircraft even though he has reached his second birthday. *GRANT, February 14, 1995, Exemption No. 6027*

Docket No.: 28099

Petitioner: Delta Air Lines, Inc.

Sections of the FAR Affected: 14 CFR 25.791(a) and 121.317(a)

Description of Relief Sought/ Disposition: To allow Delta to operate MD–90 aircraft with the ''No Smoking'' signs hardwired in the ON position. *GRANT, March 1, 1995, Exemption No. 6034*

[FR Doc. 95–6401 Filed 3–14–95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–13–M

National Highway Traffic Safety Administration

[Docket No. 95–17; Notice 1]

Notice of Receipt of Petition for Decision That Nonconforming 1985 Dobson Horse Trailers Are Eligible for Importation

AGENCY: National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, DOT

ACTION: Notice of receipt of petition for decision that nonconforming 1985 Dobson horse trailers are eligible for importation.

SUMMARY: This notice announces receipt by the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration (NHTSA) of a petition for a decision that a 1985 Dobson horse trailer that was not originally manufactured to comply with all applicable Federal motor vehicle safety standards is eligible for importation into the United States because it has safety features that comply with, or are capable of being altered to comply with, all such standards.

DATE: The closing date for comments on the petition is April 14, 1995.

ADDRESS: Comments should refer to the docket number and notice number, and be submitted to: Docket Section, Room 5109, National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, 400 Seventh Street SW., Washington, DC 20590. (Docket hours are from 9:30 a.m. to 4 p.m.)

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Ted Bayler, Office of Vehicle Safety Compliance, NHTSA (202–366–5306).

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

Under 49 U.S.C. 30141(a)(1)(A) (formerly section 108(c)(3)(A)(i)(I) of the National Traffic and Motor Vehicle Safety Act (the Act)), a motor vehicle that was not originally manufactured to conform to all applicable Federal motor vehicle safety standards shall be refused admission into the United States unless NHTSA has decided that the motor vehicle is substantially similar to a motor vehicle originally manufactured for importation into and sale in the United States, certified under 49 U.S.C. 30115 (formerly section 114 of the Act), and of the same model year as the model of the motor vehicle to be compared, and is capable of being readily altered to conform to all applicable Federal motor vehicle safety standards. Where there is no substantially similar U.S.-certified motor vehicle, 49 U.S.C. 30141(a)(1)(B) (formerly section 108(c)(3)(A)(i)(II) of the Act, 15 U.S.C. 1397(c)(3)(A)(i)(II)) permits a nonconforming motor vehicle to be admitted into the United States if its safety features comply with, or are capable or being altered to comply with, all applicable Federal motor vehicle safety standards based on destructive test data of such other evidence as NHTSA decides to be adequate.

Petitions for eligibility decisions may be submitted by either manufacturers or importers who have registered with NHTSA pursuant to 49 CFR part 592. As specified in 49 CFR 593.7, NHTSA publishes notice in the **Federal Register** of each petition that it receives, and affords interested an opportunity to comment on the petition. At the cost of the period, NHTSA decides, on the basis of the petition and any comments that it has received, whether the vehicle is eligible for importation. The agency then publishes this decision in the **Federal Register**.

G&K Automotive Conversion, Inc. of Santa Ana, California (Registered Importer R–90–007) has petitioned NHTSA to decide whether 1985 Dobson horse trailers are eligible for importation into the United States. The petitioner contends that this vehicle is eligible for importation under 49 U.S.C. 30141(a)(1)(B) because it has safety features that comply with, or are capable of being altered to comply with, all applicable Federal motor vehicle safety standards.

Specifically, the petitioner claims that the 1985 Dobson horse trailer complies with Standard No. 119 New Pneumatic Tires for Vehicles other than Passenger Cars. Additionally, the petitioner claims that the vehicle complies with Standard No. 121 Air Brake Systems in that it ''has drum style brakes at each wheel set, of a size and capacity sufficient to meet the standard.''

The petitioner further contends that the vehicle is capable of being readily altered to the meet the following standards, in the manner indicated:

Standard No. 106 Brake Hoses: Replacement of all existing brake hose linings from the front connection to the pressure modulators and from the pressure modulators to the wheel brake assemblies with hose lining that bear DOT markings and have crimped end fittings.

Standard No. 108 Lamps, Reflective Devices, and Associated Equipment: (a) installation of two yellow illuminated markers on each side of the vehicle and on its from end; (b) installation of one yellow reflector on each side of the vehicle; (c) installation of one red illuminated marker on each side of the vehicle and five red illuminated markers on its rear end; (d) installation of one red reflector marker on each side of the vehicle and two red reflector markers on its rear end; (e) installation of one strip of 50mm (Grade DOT–C2) white/red retroreflective sheeting on each side of the vehicle and on its rear end; (f) installation of two strips of 50mm (Grade DOT–C2) white retroreflective sheeting on the vehicle's rear end; (g) installation of one white license plate lamp on the vehicle's rear and: (h) installation of two red taillamp/ stoplamp/turn indicators on the vehicle's rear end.

Standard No. 115 Vehicle Identification Number: Installation of a VIN plate.

Standard No. 120 Tire Selection and Rims for Motor Vehicles other than Passenger Cars: Installation of a tire information placard.

Interested person are invited to submit comments on the petition described above. Comments should refer to the docket number and be submitted to: Docket Section, National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, Room 5109, 400 Seventh Street SW., Washington, DC 20590. It is requested but not required that 10 copies be submitted.

All comments received before the close of business on the closing date indicated above will be considered, and will be available for examination in the docket at the above address both before and after that date. To the extent possible, comments filed after the closing date will also be considered.

Notice of final action on the petition will be published in the **Federal Register** pursuant to the authority indicated below.

Authority: 49 U.S.C. 30141 (a)(1)(B) and (b)(1); 49 CFR 593.8; delegations of authority at 49 CFR 1.50 and 501.8.

Issued on March 9, 1995.

Harry Thompson,

Acting Director, Office of Vehicle Safety Compliance.

[FR Doc. 95–6362 Filed 3–14–95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–59–M

UNITED STATES SENTENCING COMMISSION

Sentencing Guidelines for United States Courts

AGENCY: United States Sentencing Commission.

ACTION: Notice and request for public comment regarding proposed amendments to sentencing guidelines, policy statements, and commentary.

SUMMARY: The Commission is considering promulgating amendments to the sentencing guidelines, policy statements, and commentary. A synopsis of issues to be addressed is set forth below. The Commission may report amendments to the Congress on or before May 1, 1995. Comment is sought on all proposals, alternative proposals, and any other aspect of the sentencing guidelines, policy statements, and commentary relating to the issues below.

DATES: Public comment should be received by the Commission no later than April 10, 1995, to be considered by the Commission in the promulgation of amendments due to the Congress by May 1, 1995.

ADDRESSES: Public comment should be sent to: United States Sentencing Commission, One Columbus Circle, NE., Suite 2–500, South Lobby, Washington, DC 20002–8002, Attention: Public Information.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Michael Courlander, Public Information Specialist, Telephone: (202) 273–4590.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The United States Sentencing Commission is an independent agency in the judicial branch of the United States Government. The Commission is empowered under 28 U.S.C. 994(a) to promulgate sentencing guidelines and policy statements for federal sentencing courts. The statute further directs the Commission to review and revise periodically guidelines previously promulgated and authorizes it to submit guideline amendments to the Congress no later than the first day of May each year. See 28 U.S.C. 994 (o), (p).

Ordinarily, the Administrative Procedure Act rulemaking requirements are inapplicable to judicial agencies; however, 28 U.S.C. 994(x) makes the Administrative Procedure Act rule-making provisions of 5 U.S.C. 553 applicable to the promulgation of sentencing guidelines by the Commission.

Section 1B1.10 of the United States Sentencing Commission Guidelines Manual sets forth the Commission's policy statement regarding retroactivity of amended guideline ranges. Comment is requested as to whether any of the proposed amendments should be made retroactive under this policy statement.

With the exception of proposed amendment and issue for comment 4, the issues below are derived specifically from the Commission's Special Report to Congress: Cocaine and Federal Sentencing Policy, submitted to Congress on February 28, 1995. In addition to requesting comment on these issues, the Commission invites suggestions for specific amendment language. Publication of an issue for comment reflects only the Commission's determination that the issue is worthy of public comment by interested groups and individuals. Publication should not be regarded as an indication that the Commission or any individual Commissioner has formed a view on the merits of the issue.

Authority. 28 U.S.C. 994 (a), (o), (p), (x).

Richard P. Conaboy,

Chairman.

1. Issue for Comment

On February 28, 1995, the Commission issued a special report to Congress on cocaine and federal sentencing policy. The report recommended that changes be made to the current cocaine sentencing guidelines, including changes to the 100-to-1 quantity ratio between powder cocaine and crack cocaine used in determining sentences. The report indicated that the Commission will investigate the feasibility of creating new guideline enhancements and amending current enhancements to address more fully and fairly the harms associated with cocaine offenses generally and, specifically, the added harms associated with crack cocaine offenses. Based on these new enhancements, the Commission intends to make appropriate adjustments in the guideline quantity ratio.

The Commission requests comment regarding implementation of the recommendations in the report. Specifically, the Commission requests comment on the appropriateness of adding specific offense characteristics to § 2D1.1 to enhance sentences for violence and other harms associated with some crack and powder cocaine offenses as well as some other drug offenses. In addition, the Commission seeks comment on the usefulness of adding or amending commentary and policy statements regarding possible departures to take account of the increased harms associated with some cocaine offenses. For example, how should the social harm associated with ''crack houses'' or other establishments where drugs are sold and consumed be taken into account? The Commission previously has requested commentary on what quantity ratio should be substituted for the current 100-to-1 ratio.

In addition, the Commission seeks comment on the timing and scope of guideline amendments for cocaine offenses. For example, if the Commission proceeds with guideline amendments for cocaine offenses in this amendment cycle, should the amendments apply to drug offenses generally or only to cocaine offenses? If new enhancements (e.g., for use of a firearm and victim injury) are made generally applicable to drug offenses, are other changes in the drug guidelines necessary (e.g., in the relative emphasis on drug quantity)? Should any of these changes be made retroactive to cases previously sentenced, and if so, how might this process best be accomplished?

A number of amendment proposals and issues for comment relating to drug sentencing policy were set forth in the **Federal Register** of January 9, 1995. See 60 FR 2430. Additional issues for comment raised by the Special Report on Cocaine Sentencing are set forth below.

2. Issue for Comment

In light of the Commission's report to Congress on cocaine and federal sentencing policy and its recommendations regarding sentences for those convicted of simple possession of crack cocaine, the Commission requests comment on whether and how it should amend § 2D2.1 for offenses involving the simple possession of crack cocaine.

3. Issue for Comment

The Commission invites comment as to whether the enhancements for drug offenses involving underage or pregnant individuals, which are now included in

§ 2D1.2, should instead be made specific offense characteristics under § 2D1.1.

Inclusion in § 2D1.1 would make these enhancements applicable to all drug defendants whose relevant conduct involved juveniles or pregnant individuals, regardless of whether the defendant was convicted of the particular statutes now indexed to § 2D1.2 (21 U.S.C. 859, 860, and 861). The circuits appear to be split regarding whether conviction under one of these statutes is a prerequisite for application of the § 2D1.2 enhancements. (Compare United States v. Oppedahl, 998 F.2d 584 (8th Cir. 1993), with United States v. Locklear, 24 F.3d 641 (4th Cir. 1994), cert. denied, 115 S. Ct. 278, 457 (1994).)

4. Synopsis of Proposed Amendment

This amendment inserts additional background commentary explaining the Commission's rationale and authority for § 4B1.1 (Career Offender). The amendment responds to a decision by the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit in United States v. Price, 990 F.2d 1367 (D.C. Cir. 1993). In Price, the court invalidated application of the career offender guideline to a defendant convicted of a drug conspiracy because 28 U.S.C. 994(h), which the Commission cites as the mandating authority for the career offender guideline, does not expressly refer to inchoate offenses. The court indicated that it did not foreclose Commission authority to include conspiracy offenses under the career offender guideline by drawing upon its broader guideline promulgation authority in 28 U.S.C. 994(a). See also United States v. Mendoza-Figueroa, 28 F.3d 766 (8th Cir. 1994), vacated (Sept. 2, 1994); United States v. Bellazerius, 24 F.3d 698 (5th Cir.) cert. denied, 115 S. Ct. 375 (1994). Other circuits have rejected the Price analysis and upheld the Commission's definition of ''controlled substance offense.'' The Ninth Circuit considered the legislative history to section 994(h) and determined that the Senate Report clearly indicated that section 994(h) was not the sole enabling statute for the career offender guidelines. United States v. Heim, 15 F.3d 830 (9th Cir.) cert. denied, 115 S. Ct. 445 (1994). See also United States v. Hightower, 25 F.3d 182 (3d Cir.), cert. denied, 115 S. Ct. 370 (1994). United States v. Damerville, 27 F.3d 254 (7th Cir), cert. denied, 115 S. Ct. 55 (1994).

Proposed Amendment

Application Note 1 of the Commentary to § 4B1.2 is repromulgated without change.

The Commentary to § 4B1.1 captioned ''Background'' is amended to read as follows:

Background

28 U.S.C. 994(h) mandates that the Commission assure that certain ''career'' offenders receive a sentence of imprisonment ''at or near the maximum term authorized.'' Section 4B1.1 implements this directive, with the definition of a career offender tracking in large part the criteria set forth in 28 U.S.C. 994(h). However, in accord with its general guideline promulgation authority under 28 U.S.C. 994(a)-(f) and its amendment authority under 28 U.S.C. 994(o) and (p), the Commission has modified this definition in several respects to focus more precisely on the class of recidivist offenders for whom a lengthy term of imprisonment is appropriate and avoid ''unwarranted sentencing disparities among defendants with similar records who have been found guilty of similar criminal conduct * * * .'' 28 U.S.C. 991(b)(1)(B). The Commission's refinement of this definition over time is consistent with Congress's choice of a directive to the Commission rather than a mandatory minimum sentencing statute (''The [Senate Judiciary] Committee believes that such a directive to the Commission will be more effective; the guidelines development process can assure consistent and rational implementation for the Committee's view that substantial prison terms should be imposed on repeat violent offenders and repeat drug traffickers.'' S. Rep. No. 225, 98th Cong., 1st Sess. 175 (1983)).

The legislative history of this provision suggests that the phrase ''maximum term authorized'' should be construed as the maximum term authorized by statute. See S. Rep. No. 225, 98th Cong., 1st Sess. 175 (1983), 128 Cong. Rec. 26,511–12 (1982) (text of ''Career Criminals'' amendment by Senator Kennedy), id. at 26,515 (brief summary of amendment), id. at 26,517–18 (statement of Senator Kennedy).''.

Additional Issue for Comment

The Commission invites comment on whether, as an alternative to, or in addition to, the proposed amendment to § 4B1.1, Chapter I, Part A of the Guidelines Manual should be amended to state that in its promulgation of specific guidelines, the Commission intends in all cases to rely on its general authority under 28 U.S.C. 994(a) as well as any other more specific grant of statutory authority.

[FR Doc. 95–6330 Filed 3–14–95; 8:45 am]
BILLING CODE 2210–40–P

DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS

Information Collection Under OMB Review: VA MATIC Change, VA Form 29–0165

AGENCY: Department of Veterans Affairs.

ACTION: Notice.

The Department of Veterans Affairs has submitted to OMB the following proposal for the collection of information under the provisions of the Paperwork Reduction Act (44 U.S.C. Chapter 35). This document lists the following information: (1) The title of the information collection, and the Department form number(s), if applicable; (2) a description of the need and its use; (3) who will be required or asked to respond; (4) an estimate of the total annual reporting hours, and recordkeeping burden, if applicable; (5) the estimated average burden hours per respondent; (6) the frequency of response; and (7) an estimated number of respondents.

ADDRESSES: Copies of the proposed information collection and supporting documents may be obtained from Trish Fineran, Veterans Benefits Administration (20M30), Department of Veterans Affairs, 810 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, DC 20420, (202) 273–6886.

Comments and questions about the items on the list should be directed to VA's OMB Desk Officer, Joseph Lackey, NEOB, Room 10102, Washington, DC 20503, (202) 395–7316. Do not send requests for benefits to this address.

DATES: Comments on the information collection should be directed to the OMB Desk Officer on or before April 14, 1995.

Dated: March 8, 1995.

By direction of the Secretary.

Donald L. Neilson,

Director, Information Management Service.

Reinstatement

1. VA MATIC Change, VA Form 29–0165
2. The form is used by the insured to request VA to change the account number and/or financial institution from which a VA MATIC deduction was previously authorized.
3. Individuals or households
4. 1,250 hours
5. 15 minutes

6. On occasion
7. 5,000 respondents.

[FR Doc. 95–6365 Filed 3–14–95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 8320–01–M

Privacy Act of 1974; Report of Amended Matching Program

AGENCY: Department of Veterans Affairs.

ACTION: Notice.

Notice is hereby given that the Department of Veterans Affairs (VA) intends to conduct a recurring computer matching program matching Social Security Administration (SSA) benefit recipient records with VA pension and parents' dependency and indemnity compensation records.

The goal of this match is to compare income status as reported to VA with benefit records maintained by SSA.

The Department of Veterans Affairs (VA) plans to match records of veterans and surviving spouses and children who receive pension and parents who receive dependency and indemnity compensation (DIC) from VA with Social Security Administration benefit records maintained by SSA. The match with SSA will provide VA with data from the SSA Master Beneficiary Record. VA will use the data to update the master records of VA beneficiaries receiving income dependent benefits and to adjust VA benefit payments as prescribed by law. Otherwise, information about a VA beneficiary's receipt of SSA benefits is obtained from reporting by the beneficiary. The proposed matching program will enable VA to ensure accurate reporting of income.

RECORDS TO BE MATCHED: The VA records involved in the match are the VA system of records, Compensation, Pension, Education and Rehabilitation Records—VA (58 VA 21/22) contained in the Privacy Act Issuances, 1991 compilation, Volume II, pages 967–971 as amended. The SSA records consist of information from the SSA Master Beneficiary Record 09–60–0090 published at 58 FR 35302, June 30, 1993.

In accordance with Title 5 U.S.C. subsection 552a(o)(2) and (r), copies of the agreement are being sent to both Houses of Congress and to the Office of Management and Budget.

This notice is provided in accordance with the provisions of the Privacy Act of 1974 as amended by Public Law 100–503.

The match is estimated to start April 1, 1995, but will start no sooner than 40 days after publication of this Notice in the **Federal Register**, or 40 days after copies of this Notice and the agreement of the parties are submitted to Congress and the Office of Management and Budget, whichever is later, and end not more than 18 months after the agreement is properly implemented by the parties. The involved agencies' Data Integrity Boards (DIB) may extend this match for 12 months provided the agencies certify to their DIBs, within three months of the ending date of the original match, that the matching program will be conducted without change and that the matching program has been conducted in compliance with the original matching program.

ADDRESSES: Interested individuals may comment on the proposed matches by writing to the Director, Compensation and Pension Service (21), Department of Veterans Affairs, 810 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, DC 20420.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: David G. Spivey (213B), (202) 273–7258.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: This information is required by Title 5 U.S.C. subsection 552a(e)(12), the Privacy Act of 1974. A copy of this notice has been provided to both Houses of Congress and the Office of Management and Budget.

Approved: March 2, 1995.

Jesse Brown,

Secretary of Veterans Affairs.

[FR Doc. 95–6364 Filed 3–14–95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 8320–01–M

Sunshine Act Meetings

Federal Register

Vol. 60. No. 50

Wednesday, March 15, 1995

This section of the FEDERAL REGISTER contains notices of meetings published under the "Government in the Sunshine Act" (Pub. L. 94-409) 5 U.S.C. 552b(e)(3).

BOARD OF GOVERNORS OF THE FEDERAL RESERVE SYSTEM

TIME AND DATE: 11:00 a.m., Monday, March 20, 1995.

PLACE: Marriner S. Eccles Federal Reserve Board Building, C Street entrance between 20th and 2lst Streets, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20551.

STATUS: Closed.

MATTERS TO BE CONSIDERED:

1. Personnel actions (appointments, promotions, assignments, reassignments, and salary actions) involving individual Federal Reserve System employees.
2. Any items carried forward from a previously announced meeting.

CONTACT PERSON FOR MORE INFORMATION: Mr. Joseph R. Coyne, Assistant to the Board; (202) 452–3204. You may call (202) 452–3207, beginning at approximately 5 p.m. two business days before this meeting, for a recorded announcement of bank and bank holding company applications scheduled for the meeting.

Dated: March 10, 1995.

Jennifer J. Johnson,

Deputy Secretary of the Board.

[FR Doc. 95–6474 Filed 3–13–95; 10:23 am]

BILLING CODE 6210–01–P

NATIONAL CREDIT UNION ADMINISTRATION

Notice of Change in Time and Place of Meeting

The National Credit Union Administration Board determined that its business requires the previously announced open meeting (Federal Register, Vol. 60, page 13514, Monday, March 13, 1995) scheduled for 10:00 a.m., Monday, March 13, 1995 at the Doubletree Hotel, Salon III of the Ballroom, 201 Marquette NW, Albuquerque, New Mexico is changed as follows:

TIME AND DATE: 6:00 p.m., M.S.T., Monday, March 13, 1995.

PLACE: Hyatt Regency Albuquerque Hotel, Pavilion Room, 330 Tijeras NW, Albuquerque, New Mexico 87102, (505) 842–1234.

The previously announced matters to be considered are:

1. Final Interpretive Ruling and Policy Statement (IRPS) 95–1, Supervisory Review Committee.
2. Establishment of the Position of Ombudsman.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Becky Baker, Secretary of the Board, Telephone (703) 518–6304.

Becky Baker,

Secretary of the Board.

[FR Doc. 95–6547 Filed 3–13–95; 3:29 pm]

BILLING CODE 7535–01–M

OVERSEAS PRIVATE INVESTMENT CORPORATION

Board of Directors Meeting

TIME AND DATE: Tuesday, March 28, 1:00 p.m. (Open Portion), 1:30 p.m. (Closed Portion).

PLACE: Offices of the Corporation, Twelfth Floor Board Room, 1100 New York Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C.

STATUS: Meeting Open to the Public from 1:00 p.m. to 1:30 p.m. Closed portion will commence at 1:30 p.m. (approx.)

MATTERS TO BE CONSIDERED:

1. President's Report
2. Approval of 12/06/94 Minutes (Open Portion)
3. Meeting schedule through September 1995

FURTHER MATTERS TO BE CONSIDERED: (Closed to the Public 1:30 p.m.).

1. Insurance Project in Kyrgyzstan
2. Insurance Project in the Philippines
3. Insurance Project in the Philippines
4. Finance Project in Argentina
5. Finance Project in Jamaica
6. Insurance Project in Argentina
7. Finance Project in South America
8. Pending Major Projects
9. Approval of the 12/06/94 Minutes (Closed Portion)

CONTACT PERSON FOR INFORMATION: Information on the meeting may be obtained from Jane Chalmers at (202) 336–8421.

Dated: March 13, 1995.

Jane H. Chalmers,

Deputy General Counsel.

[FR Doc. 95–6577 Filed 3–13–95; 3:55 pm]

BILLING CODE 3210–01–M

Corrections

Federal Register

Vol. 60, No. 50

Wednesday, March 15, 1995

This section of the FEDERAL REGISTER contains editorial corrections of previously published Presidential, Rule, Proposed Rule, and Notice documents. These corrections are prepared by the Office of the Federal Register. Agency prepared corrections are issued as signed documents and appear in the appropriate document categories elsewhere in the issue.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Food and Consumer Service

Child Nutrition Programs; Income Eligibility Guidelines

Correction

In notice document 95–5633 beginning on page 12732, in the issue of Wednesday, March 8, 1995, make the following correction:

On page 12733, in the second column, in the table entitled ''Income Eligibility Guidelines'', under the heading entitled ''Alaska'', in the fifth column, in the fourth line, ''2,910'' should read ''2,920''.

BILLING CODE 1505–01–D

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Drug Enforcement Administration

William W. Malone, M.D.; Revocation of Registration

Correction

In notice document 95–5455 appearing on page 12572 in the issue of Tuesday, March 7, 1995, make the following correction:

On page 15272, in the first column, in the eighth line ''AM546789'' should read ''AM5467849''.

BILLING CODE 1505–01–D

federal register

Wednesday
March 15, 1995

Part II

Department of Health and Human Services

Health Resources and Services Administration

Health Education Assistance Loan Program: List of Defaulted Borrowers; Notice

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES

Health Resources and Services Administration

Health Education Assistance Loan Program: List of Defaulted Borrowers

AGENCY: Health Resources and Services Administration, HHS.

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: The Health Resources and Services Administration (HRSA) is publishing this notice of Health Education Assistance Loan (HEAL) borrowers who are in default, as required by section 709(c)(1) of the PHS Act (the Act), as amended by the Health Professions Education Extension Amendments of 1992.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Director, Division of Student Assistance, Bureau of Health Professions, Health Resources and Services Administration, Parklawn Building, Room 8–48, 5600 Fishers Lane, Rockville, Maryland 20857 (written requests only). All media inquiries should be directed to the HRSA Office of Communications at (301) 443–3376. Borrower-specific account information, beyond that included in the notice, will not be released to any person other than the borrower, without the written consent of the borrower.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: Section 709(c)(1) of the Act (42 U.S.C. 292h(c)(1)) requires the Agency to compile and publish in the **Federal Register** a list of HEAL borrowers who are in default. All borrowers who have defaulted on HEAL loans and for whom claims have been paid by the Department of Health and Human Services (DHHS), from the beginning of the program through March 31, 1994, are subject to inclusion in this notice.

Defaulted loans for which claims have been paid are serviced by DHHS or the Department of Justice (DOJ). HEAL borrowers in a satisfactory status with DHHS or DOJ in the following categories have been excluded from this listing: (1) Those who have paid their loans in full subsequent to their default; (2) those who received HEAL loan cancellation due to death or permanent and total disability; (3) those whose loans have been repurchased from DHHS or DOJ by a HEAL school, lender, or holder; (4) those who have been approved by DHHS for deferment or forbearance; (5) those in bankruptcy who have confirmed plans which provide for the HEAL loan(s) (and have provided written evidence to DHHS or DOJ of such); and (6) those who have made six scheduled payments or the equivalent from July 1, 1994 through December 31, 1994. Borrowers who fall into any of the above categories are viewed by DHHS and DOJ, at the present time, as having made satisfactory arrangements to resolve the default, and have therefore been excluded from this publication.

The list that follows presents: the defaulter's name, latest known City and State of residence, the total amount of the HEAL debt, the school last attended for which a HEAL loan was received, practice discipline, and estimated school separation date. This information is listed by State of residence for practice discipline.

Section 709(c)(2) of the Act directs that the information included in this notice be made available to relevant Federal agencies and to schools, school associations, professional and specialty associations, State licensing boards, hospitals with which listed borrowers may be associated, and other relevant organizations. In accordance with this section of the Act, DHHS will provide to these entities, upon written request, the information included in the **Federal Register** notice along with Social Security Account Numbers and last known street addresses of the borrowers listed. Written requests should be submitted to the Director, Division of Student Assistance, at the address indicated above.

List of Defaulters

Alabama

Allopathic Medicine

Cox, Jerral W., Birmingham, AL, $3,360.79, Univ of Alabama Birmingham, Birmingham, AL, Allopathic Medicine, June 1991

Kiser, Curtis, Mt Meigs, AL, $130,360.44, Morehouse School of Medicine, Atlanta, GA, Allopathic Medicine, June 1985

Martin, Timothy L., Sheffield, AL, $73,696.92, East Tennessee State University, Johnson City, TN, Allopathic Medicine, May 1984

Murphy, Stephen, Birmingham, AL, $11,535.34, Univ of Alabama Birmingham, Birmingham, AL, Allopathic Medicine, June 1991

Rodgers, Joseph K., Mobile, AL, $60,087.08, Univ of South Alabama, Mobile, AL, Allopathic Medicine, June 1989

Tull II, David A., Tuskegee, AL, $18,541.26, Univ of South Alabama, Mobile, AL, Allopathic Medicine, June 1989

Villaverde, John T., Huntsville, AL, $9,208.23, Univ of Miami, Miami, FL, Allopathic Medicine, June 1982

Chiropractic

Bond, William W., Tuscaloosa, AL, $106,283.27, Life College, Marietta, GA, Chiropractic, June 1983

Bush, Kerry L., Mobile, AL, $105,479.31, Palmer College of Chiropractic, Davenport, IA, Chiropractic, October 1986

Clay, Mark D., Birmingham, AL, $13,359.62, Life College, Marietta, GA, Chiropractic, December 1982

Gardner, Lester, Vernon, AL, $33,492.27, Palmer College of Chiropractic, Davenport, IA, Chiropractic, June 1987

Hembree, David W., Foley, AL, $41,004.20, Life College, Marietta, GA, Chiropractic, December 1989

Hembree, Gloria, Fairhope, AL, $32,843.11, Life College, Marietta, GA, Chiropractic, March 1990

Johnson, Albert, Cullman, AL, $130,980.56, Life College, Marietta, GA, Chiropractic, September 1987

McKenzie, Janell, Vincent, AL, $101,639.09, Life College, Marietta, GA, Chiropractic, March 1986

Quinley, Timothy E., Foley, AL, $21,395.05, Palmer College of Chiropractic, Davenport, IA, Chiropractic, December 1988

Randolph, Jon J., Guin, AL, $31,079.96, Life College, Marietta, GA, Chiropractic, January 1985

Randolph, Kenneth J., Guin, AL, $31,990.92, Life College, Marietta, GA, Chiropractic, September 1984

Rizzuto, Richard W., Birmingham, AL, $18,266.02, Life College, Marietta, GA, Chiropractic, March 1991

Swigert, Mark E., Foley, AL, $36,297.62, Palmer College of Chiropractic, Davenport, IA, Chiropractic, June 1985

Dentistry

Alexander, Jesse, Auburn, AL, $61,612.73, Georgetown University, Washington, DC, Dentistry, May 1988

Brooks, Sheldon J., Birmingham, AL, $46,035.06, Loma Linda University, Loma Linda, CA, Dentistry, June 1983

Chandler, Charles H., Anniston, AL, $83,975.35, Univ of Alabama Birmingham, Birmingham, AL, Dentistry, June 1986

Elliott III, Eugene L., Birmingham, AL, $19,658.57, Univ of Alabama Birmingham, Birmingham, AL, Dentistry, June 1989

Milledge, Darryl D K, Montgomery, AL, $22,081.99, Univ of Alabama Birmingham, Birmingham, AL, Dentistry, June 1990

Richardson, Dewayne, Jasper, AL, $6,117.00, Howard University, Washington, DC, Dentistry, May 1990

West, Marvin, Montgomery, AL, $8,600.69, Meharry Medical College, Nashville, TN, Dentistry, May 1982
Williamson, Maria E., Huntsville, AL, $22,941.75, Loyola University Chicago, Chicago, IL, Dentistry, May 1985

Osteopathy

Kiser, Galen, Haleyville, AL, $149,163.22, Univ of Health Sciences, Kansas City, MO, Osteopathy, May 1986

Pharmacy

Bean, Rhonda, Birmingham, AL, $4,987.67, Xavier University of Louisiana, New Orleans, LA, Pharmacy, May 1988
Reid, Billy F., Huntsville, AL, $25,853.41, Mercer University, Atlanta, GA, Pharmacy, June 1981

Podiatry

Beverly, Carmen, Auburn, AL, $10,803.80, Pennsylvania Col of Podiatric Medicine, Philadelphia, PA, Podiatry, June 1980

Veterinary Medicine

Butler, Brian, Opelika, AL, $5,132.82, Tuskegee University, Tuskegee, AL, Veterinary Medicine, May 1990
Gardner, Kurt J., Huntsville, AL, $48,035.72, Tuskegee University, Tuskegee, AL, Veterinary Medicine, May 1983
Guy, Pamela D., Tuskegee, AL, $73,951.75, Tuskegee University, Tuskegee, AL, Veterinary Medicine, May 1984
Malone, Glen G., Montgomery, AL, $15,391.48, Tuskegee University, Tuskegee, AL, Veterinary Medicine, May 1979

Alaska

Allopathic Medicine

Richards, Cynthia J., Juno, AK, $13,663.91, Univ of South Dakota, Sioux Falls, SD, Allopathic Medicine, May 1989

Chiropractic

Koob, Michael D., Kenai, AK, $8,859.61, Northwestern College of Chiropractic, Bloomington, MN, Chiropractic, August 1986
Lamagdeleine, Michael K., Anchorage, AK, $72,739.44, Palmer College of Chiropractic, Davenport, IA, Chiropractic, June 1987

Clinical Psychology

Valenzuela, Debbie L., Anchorage, AK, $67,083.26, California Sch of Prof Psych, Alhambra, CA, Clinical Psychology, July 1987

Dentistry

Lien, Douglas D., Anchorage, AK, $173,021.69, New York University, New York, NY, Dentistry, June 1985

Osteopathy

Bigelow, Loy, Anchorage, AK, $191,083.46, College of Osteo Med of the Pacific, Pomona, CA, Osteopathy, June 1986
King, Ruth A., Kenai, AK, $185,005.35, College of Osteo Med of the Pacific, Pomona, CA, Osteopathy, June 1987

Arizona

Allopathic Medicine

Cata, Elena, Mesa, AZ, $11,772.64, Univ of Illinois Medical Center, Chicago, IL, Allopathic Medicine, June 1989
Harris, Brian W., Scottsdale, AZ, $57,335.99, Wayne State University, Detroit, MI, Allopathic Medicine, June 1987
Koenen, Howard, Tucson, AZ, $28,670.50, Univ of California San Diego, La Jolla, CA, Allopathic Medicine, June 1988
Martin, Leona M., Yuma, AZ, $154,973.09, Meharry Medical College, Nashville, TN, Allopathic Medicine, May 1985
Palmer, Glen L., Tucson, AZ, $16,815.74, Univ of Kansas Medical Center, Kansas City, KS, Allopathic Medicine, May 1990
Pruitt, Christopher, Phoenix, AZ, $28,911.97, Medical College of Ohio, Toledo, OH, Allopathic Medicine, June 1991
Silberstein, Brigitta, Fountain Hills, AZ, $83,868.94, New York Medical College, Valhalla, NY, Allopathic Medicine, June 1985

Chiropractic

Allen Jr, Ben R., Mesa, AZ, $73,902.24, Life College, Marietta, GA, Chiropractic, September 1983
Arkfield, Ted, Phoenix, AZ, $22,822.56, Northwestern College of Chiropractic, Bloomington, MN, Chiropractic, April 1988
Baker, Debora K., Glendale, AZ, $8,720.83, Cleveland Chiropractic College, Kansas City, MO, Chiropractic, January 1983
Berger, Karl, Mesa, AZ, $61,414.78, Palmer College of Chiropractic West, San Jose, CA, Chiropractic, June 1987
Brantner, Ray J., Phoenix, AZ, $40,896.73, Palmer College of Chiropractic, Davenport, IA, Chiropractic, June 1985
Buchwald, Bonnie, Tucson, AZ, $32,857.16, Life College, Marietta, GA, Chiropractic, September 1985
Budd, Carlinda L., Tucson, AZ, $84,194.78, Logan College of Chiropractic, Chesterfield, MO, Chiropractic, April 1986
Corser, Lester J., Phoenix, AZ, $6,363.04, Los Angeles College of Chiropractic, Whittier, CA, Chiropractic, December 1982
Crider, Walter D., Scottsdale, AZ, $86,238.38, Western States Chiropractic College, Portland, OR, Chiropractic, August 1988
Crooks, Joan, Sedona, AZ, $63,537.56, Western States Chiropractic College, Portland, OR, Chiropractic, June 1985
Davis, Jacqueline S., Apache Junction, AZ, $5,174.82, Palmer College of Chiropractic, Davenport, IA, Chiropractic, March 1986
Dazell-Reed, Linda, Tucson, AZ, $23,643.98, Texas Chiropractic College Foundation, Pasadena, TX, Chiropractic, April 1987
De Rosa, Arthur, Scottsdale, AZ, $29,365.43, Life Chiropractic College-West, San Lorenzo, CA, Chiropractic, December 1988
Depamphilis, Greg, Tempe, AZ, $43,603.63, Life College, Marietta, GA, Chiropractic, September 1986
Faber, Dana A., Chino Valley, AZ, $37,068.69, Parker College of Chiropractic, Dallas, TX, Chiropractic, August 1987
Faber, Robert H., Chino Valley, AZ, $54,897.01, Parker College of Chiropractic, Dallas, TX, Chiropractic, April 1987
Failor, Richard I., Mesa, AZ, $10,383.79, Palmer College of Chiropractic, Davenport, IA, Chiropractic, March 1985
Hendricks, Richard L., Mesa, AZ, $42,273.67, Palmer College of Chiropractic, Davenport, IA, Chiropractic, December 1983
Hodson, Philip A., Phoenix, AZ, $39,102.13, Palmer College of Chiropractic, Davenport, IA, Chiropractic, March 1985
Hornyak, John, Tucson, AZ, $29,583.80, Life College, Marietta, GA, Chiropractic, September 1988
Jones, Richard, Camp Verde, AZ, $71,140.85, Cleveland Chiropractic College, Kansas City, MO, Chiropractic, May 1985
Kelley, Gary L., Tucson, AZ, $52,360.99, Palmer College of Chiropractic, Davenport, IA, Chiropractic, March 1986
Kolb, Maryann, Tempe, AZ, $89,867.16, Life College, Marietta, GA, Chiropractic, September 1986
Lay, William G., Tucson, AZ, $96,928.34, Logan College of Chiropractic, Chesterfield, MO, Chiropractic, April 1985
Legate, Andre, Winslow, AZ, $13,564.50, Palmer College of Chiropractic West, San Jose, CA, Chiropractic, September 1989

Manos, Greg C., Tucson, AZ, $75,872.98, Palmer College of Chiropractic, Davenport, IA, Chiropractic, October 1987
Mason-Downing, Marlene, Glendale, AZ, $44,824.68, Cleveland Chiropractic College, Kansas City, MO, Chiropractic, May 1985
Oberstein, Bruce M., Mesa, AZ, $40,883.80, Life College, Marietta, GA, Chiropractic, December 1982
Reeves, Gary, Glendale, AZ, $4,544.27, Cleveland Chiropractic College, Kansas City, MO, Chiropractic, January 1983
Rich, Kenneth C., Mesa, AZ, $104,584.96, Los Angeles College of Chiropractic, Whittier, CA, Chiropractic, April 1988
Saunders, Edward M., Phoenix, AZ, $74,580.66, Life College, Marietta, GA, Chiropractic, September 1986
Shellman, Joan J., Mesa, AZ, $136,498.40, Life College, Marietta, GA, Chiropractic, September 1984
Shobe Jr, Ted E., Gilbert, AZ, $30,301.14, Palmer College of Chiropractic, Davenport, IA, Chiropractic, June 1983
Smith, Sandra M., Phoenix, AZ, $26,982.63, Palmer College of Chiropractic, Davenport, IA, Chiropractic, September 1984
Tagg, Lyndon R., Mesa, AZ, $114,357.99, Palmer College of Chiropractic, Davenport, IA, Chiropractic, September 1985
White, Howard D., Phoenix, AZ, $54,942.09, Southern Calif CLG of Chiropractic, Pico Rivera, CA, Chiropractic, April 1989
Wickstrom, Todd S., Phoenix, AZ, $46,648.48, Cleveland Chiropractic College, Kansas City, MO, Chiropractic, May 1988
Zalak-Goldwater, Edward G., Mesa, AZ, $85,591.58, Southern Calif CLG of Chiropractic, Pico Rivera, CA, Chiropractic, February 1987

Dentistry

Chase, Mark, Phoenix, AZ, $60,282.90, Univ of The Pacific, San Francisco, CA, Dentistry, June 1984
Dobrota, Jerry G., Village of Oak Creek, AZ, $94,464.51, Loma Linda University, Loma Linda, CA, Dentistry, June 1985
Keith, Rosalyn D., Tempe, AZ, $32,193.03, Georgetown University, Washington, DC, Dentistry, May 1987
Leavey, Brett, Mesa, AZ, $75,872.17, Marquette University, Milwaukee, WI, Dentistry, May 1988
Park, Youngmi, Sierra Vista, AZ, $53,046.95, Marquette University, Milwaukee, WI, Dentistry, May 1989
Ransdell, Kerry L., Tempe, AZ, $91,506.28, Washington University, St Louis, MO, Dentistry, May 1985
Rima, Russell A., Phoenix, AZ, $192,348.51, Loma Linda University, Loma Linda, CA, Dentistry, June 1984
Rogers, Steven J., Scottsdale, AZ, $150,463.83, Loma Linda University, Loma Linda, CA, Dentistry, March 1982
Sinnard, Mark S., Prescott, AZ, $3,959.17, Univ of Nebraska Medical Center, Omaha, NE, Dentistry, May 1989
Smith, Catherine J., Phoenix, AZ, $108,754.15, Washington University, St Louis, MO, Dentistry, May 1989
Wainwright, Clayton, Peoria, AZ, $34,785.30, Univ of The Pacific, San Francisco, CA, Dentistry, June 1986

Optometry

Stoutsenberger, Jeffrey, Mesa, AZ, $1,937.23, Southern College of Optometry, Memphis, TN, Optometry, May 1990

Osteopathy

Dewilde, Steven, Tucson, AZ, $22,732.82, College of Osteo Med of the Pacific, Pomona, CA, Osteopathy, June 1986
Gladwell, Irene, Phoenix, AZ, $94,513.88, West Virginia School of Osteopathic Med, Lewisburg, WV, Osteopathy, May 1983
Smith, Susan M., Scottsdale, AZ, $72,915.91, Univ of Osteo Medical & Health Science, Des Moines, IA, Osteopathy, June 1985

Podiatry

Balch, David D., Tucson, AZ, $122,375.59, California College of Podiatric Medicine, San Francisco, CA, Podiatry, May 1981
Henry, William E., Gilbert, AZ, $50,774.16, Dr William Scholl Col of Podiatric Med, Chicago, IL, Podiatry, May 1984
Nagy, Ronald A., Mesa, AZ, $6,108.13, New York College of Podiatric Medicine, New York, NY, Podiatry, June 1983
Scinta, Mark C., Phoenix, AZ, $25,785.28, New York College of Podiatric Medicine, New York, NY, Podiatry, June 1983

Arkansas

Allopathic Medicine

Campbell, Reginald R., Little Rock, AR, $14,258.34, Univ of Arkansas Medical Center, Little Rock, AR, Allopathic Medicine, May 1984
Hewgley, Joseph C., Rogers, AR, $9,490.88, Univ of Arkansas Medical Center, Little Rock, AR, Allopathic Medicine, May 1991
Jewell, Eldin C., Little Rock, AR, $93,098.00, Meharry Medical College, Nashville, TN, Allopathic Medicine, May 1985
Stannard, Janet H., Roland, AR, $57.30, Univ of Arkansas Medical Center, Little Rock, AR, Allopathic Medicine, May 1985

Chiropractic

Adcox, David W., Newport, AR, $17,871.42, Logan College of Chiropractic, Chesterfield, MO, Chiropractic, December 1989
Barnett, Terry L., Jonesboro, AR, $104,323.13, Life College, Marietta, GA, Chiropractic, March 1986
Basco, Dennis G., Corning, AR, $98,005.77, Life College, Marietta, GA, Chiropractic, December 1988
Brown, Helen, Biggers, AR, $71,787.58, Logan College of Chiropractic, Chesterfield, MO, Chiropractic, December 1986
Clark, Mary I., Kingston, AR, $20,128.26, Northwestern College of Chiropractic, Bloomington, MN, Chiropractic, August 1984
Ennis, James R., Clinton, AR, $95,919.70, Los Angeles College of Chiropractic, Whittier, CA, Chiropractic, April 1988
Johnson, Robert L., Eureka Springs, AR, $13,412.34, Cleveland Chiropractic College, Kansas City, MO, Chiropractic, January 1983
Kirklin, Kenton K., Trumann, AR, $136,069.29, Life College, Marietta, GA, Chiropractic, June 1986
Mathews, Daniel G., Little Rock, AR, $17,143.45, Cleveland Chiropractic College, Kansas City, MO, Chiropractic, May 1982
Meskill, Richard, Fort Smith, AR, $19,688.75, Life College, Marietta, GA, Chiropractic, September 1983
Reynolds III, Augustus M., Little Rock, AR, $26,507.88, Cleveland Chiropractic College, Kansas City, MO, Chiropractic, September 1989
Somerville, Laurie A., Blytheville, AR, $7,308.96, Los Angeles College of Chiropractic, Whittier, CA, Chiropractic, December 1988
Swilley, Mark, Osceola, AR, $40,604.83, Logan College of Chiropractic, Chesterfield, MO, Chiropractic, December 1989
Wyly, Travis L., Little Rock, AR, $26,687.20, Texas Chiropractic College Foundation, Pasadena, TX, Chiropractic, May 1982

Dentistry

Calvin, Rosetta, Pine Bluff, AR, $57,378.92, Univ of Louisville, Louisville, KY, Dentistry, May 1987
Goodman, William D., Magnolia, AR, $13,357.36, Univ of Tennessee Memphis, Memphis, TN, Dentistry, June 1986

Kouri, Gary B., Fort Smith, AR, $114,228.04, Univ of Missouri Kansas City, Kansas City, MO, Dentistry, May 1987
Layman, Kevin W., Alma, AR, $103,786.59, Univ of Missouri Kansas City, Kansas City, MO, Dentistry, April 1985
Mathis, Keith A., Little Rock, AR, $17,706.44, Univ of Texas, Houston, TX, Dentistry, June 1988
Sherrill, Edward E., Little Rock, AR, $26,302.72, Univ of Missouri Kansas City, Kansas City, MO, Dentistry, May 1988

Optometry

Freeman, Gregory G., Little Rock, AR, $56,493.15, Southern Calif College of Optometry, Fullerton, CA, Optometry, May 1986
Gunn, Nanette Q., Little Rock, AR, $210,323.75, Southern College of Optometry, Memphis, TN, Optometry, June 1986

Osteopathy

Burnette, David B., Mountain View, AR, $101,869.47, West Virginia School of Osteopathic Med, Lewisburg, WV, Osteopathy, May 1985

Pharmacy

Caldwell, Eric J., Lewisville, AR, $16,280.18, Texas Southern University, Houston, TX, Pharmacy, May 1990

California

Allopathic Medicine

Adams, Alfred E., Inglewood, CA, $30,471.84, Meharry Medical College, Nashville, TN, Allopathic Medicine, May 1981
Alexander, Marsha, Rio Vista, CA, $37,447.49, East Tennessee State University, Johnson City, TN, Allopathic Medicine, May 1984
Anderson, Angela, Los Angeles, CA, $36,439.48, Creighton University, Omaha, NE, Allopathic Medicine, December 1985
Anderson, Laura M., Los Angeles, CA, $48,216.23, Tulane University, New Orleans, LA, Allopathic Medicine, January 1986
Anderson, Paul, La Jolla, CA, $4,719.28, George Washington University, Washington, DC, Allopathic Medicine, May 1988
Arias, Caleb, Riverbank, CA, $3,503.34, Univ of California San Diego, La Jolla, CA, Allopathic Medicine, June 1989
Avelar, Susana, San Francisco, CA, $104,160.78, Medical College of Wisconsin, Milwaukee, WI, Allopathic Medicine, May 1990
Ayodele, Emmanuel A., Compton, CA, $14,845.07, Meharry Medical College, Nashville, TN, Allopathic Medicine, May 1982
Balyeat, Lisa E., South Pasadena, CA, $7,103.57, Univ of Texas Medical Branch Galveston, Galveston, TX, Allopathic Medicine, June 1988
Becker, Donna R., Glendale, CA, $30,829.44, Harvard Medical School, Boston, MA, Allopathic Medicine, June 1984
Belzberg, Gary, Long Beach, CA, $35,005.60, Medical College of Wisconsin, Milwaukee, WI, Allopathic Medicine, May 1984
Bernardez, Jorge, Gardena, CA, $9,657.20, Univ of California Los Angeles, Los Angeles, CA, Allopathic Medicine, June 1987
Bledsoe, Ralph C., Carson, CA, $20,712.19, Brown University, Providence, RI, Allopathic Medicine, May 1988
Blum, Brian B., San Francisco, CA, $10,049.85, Univ of Texas Southwestern Medical Cntr, Dallas, TX, Allopathic Medicine, June 1987
Cafaro, Virginia, San Francisco, CA, $51,118.93, Virginia Commonwealth University, Richmond, VA, Allopathic Medicine, May 1986
Carrillo, Javier N., Oxnard, CA, $6,363.91, Univ of Med & Dent of New Jersey, Newark, NJ, Allopathic Medicine, June 1985
Carter, Eugene J., Panorama City, CA, $24,510.86, Univ of California Irvine, Irvine, CA, Allopathic Medicine, May 1988
Channel, Ollie V., Inglewood, CA, $25,616.38, Univ of California Los Angeles, Los Angeles, CA, Allopathic Medicine, January 1987
Checco, James, Redwood City, CA, $31,408.63, Cornell University Medical College, New York, NY, Allopathic Medicine, May 1985
Chretien, Paul P., Sacramento, CA, $2,154.19, Univ of Massachusetts Worcester, Worcester, MA, Allopathic Medicine, June 1983
Collins, Rodney, Salinas, CA, $10,009.37, Howard University, Washington, DC, Allopathic Medicine, May 1983
Cooke, Lawrence, Laguna Niguel, CA, $86,180.80, Columbia University, New York, NY, Allopathic Medicine, May 1987
Cosio, Jose A., Los Angeles, CA, $193,912.81, Medical College of Wisconsin, Milwaukee, WI, Allopathic Medicine, May 1985
Coyle, Douglas O., Temple City, CA, $12,926.86, Univ of California San Francisco, San Francisco, CA, Allopathic Medicine, June 1983
Curry, Charles M., Fresno, CA, $13,850.09, Meharry Medical College, Nashville, TN, Allopathic Medicine, May 1984
Dela-Johnson, Roy, Los Angeles, CA, $13,892.87, Universidad Central Del Caribe, Bayamon, PR, Allopathic Medicine, May 1988
Diaz-Gomez, Mario A., Riverside, CA, $51,521.17, Creighton University, Omaha, NE, Allopathic Medicine, May 1984
Dickens, Charles L., Los Angeles, CA, $107,990.49, Meharry Medical College, Nashville, TN, Allopathic Medicine, May 1989
Douglas, Clifford C., Redlands, CA, $37,750.79, Loma Linda University, Loma Linda, CA, Allopathic Medicine, June 1989
Drennan, Michael D., Cardiff by the Sea, CA, $4,694.17, Univ of California San Diego, La Jolla, CA, Allopathic Medicine, June 1985
Duarte, David A., Long Beach, CA, $79,354.97, Harvard Medical School, Boston, MA, Allopathic Medicine, June 1985
Duncan, Monique M., Los Angeles, CA, $8,618.16, Case Western Reserve University, Cleveland, OH, Allopathic Medicine, August 1985
Essey, Robert J., Los Angeles, CA, $74,437.96, Temple University, Philadelphia, PA, Allopathic Medicine, May 1984
Fletcher, Leonard, Santa Ana, CA, $69,140.78, Univ of Texas Hlth Sci Cntr San Antonio, San Antonio, TX, Allopathic Medicine, May 1986
Foote, Ronald H., Hanford, CA, $25,781.71, Howard University, Washington, DC, Allopathic Medicine, May 1985
Garcia, Gregory, Ventura, CA, $27,221.09, Univ of Illinois Medical Center, Chicago, IL, Allopathic Medicine, June 1989
Garner, Tim G., Los Angeles, CA, $13,452.01, Howard University, Washington, DC, Allopathic Medicine, May 1985
Goldfarb, Georgia, Venice, CA, $55,518.30, Medical College of Wisconsin, Milwaukee, WI, Allopathic Medicine, May 1982
Haider, Wais I., Corona, CA, $29,045.56, Univ of Colorado Health Science Center, Denver, CO, Allopathic Medicine, May 1989
Hamilton, Clarence, Alta Loma, CA, $129,582.40, Meharry Medical College, Nashville, TN, Allopathic Medicine, May 1984
Harding, Robert E., Palo Alto, CA, $5,716.52, Rush University, Chicago, IL, Allopathic Medicine, June 1987
Harris, Arthur, Woodland Hills, CA, $36,548.98, Wayne State University, Detroit, MI, Allopathic Medicine, June 1980
Harris, Henry D., Los Angeles, CA, $54,562.46, Meharry Medical College,

Nashville, TN, Allopathic Medicine, May 1980
Hayden, Royce D., San Diego, CA, $6,549.64, Meharry Medical College, Nashville, TN, Allopathic Medicine, May 1984
Henry, Camille, San Diego, CA, $83,462.67, Georgetown University, Washington, DC, Allopathic Medicine, May 1984
Hibbert, Harold H., Stanford, CA, $8,035.96, Stanford University, Stanford, CA, Allopathic Medicine, June 1987
Hill, Melvin N., Woodland Hills, CA, $66,557.99, Univ of Med & Dent of New Jersey, Newark, NJ, Allopathic Medicine, May 1986
Hines, Berta, Los Angeles, CA, $88,512.93, Meharry Medical College, Nashville, TN, Allopathic Medicine, May 1982
Irvine, David, Loma Linda, CA, $39,146.14, Loma Linda University, Loma Linda, CA, Allopathic Medicine, June 1990
Johnsen, James H., Cupertino, CA, $163,917.78, Finch University of Health Sciences, North Chicago, IL, Allopathic Medicine, June 1987
Julian, Virginia, Belvedere Tiburon, CA, $118,644.28, Univ of California San Diego, La Jolla, CA, Allopathic Medicine, June 1983
Kamel, Luca, Beverly Hills, CA, $72,942.86, Univ of Miami, Miami, FL, Allopathic Medicine, May 1988
Kelly, Edward L., Blue Jay, CA, $5,388.58, Loma Linda University, Loma Linda, CA, Allopathic Medicine, June 1984
Kelly, Ronald K., Dixon, CA, $17,953.11, Univ of California Irvine, Irvine, CA, Allopathic Medicine, June 1983
Kunihira, Dale Y., San Bernardino, CA, $44,240.58, Loma Linda University, Loma Linda, CA, Allopathic Medicine, June 1985
Lamotte, Angela, Culver City, CA, $94,764.51, Univ of California Los Angeles, Los Angeles, CA, Allopathic Medicine, June 1989
Lawton, Michael, Yorba Linda, CA, $60,926.09, Univ of Iowa, Iowa City, IA, Allopathic Medicine, May 1983
Li, Patrick P., San Gabriel, CA, $132,365.47, Finch University of Health Sciences, North Chicago, IL, Allopathic Medicine, June 1987
Lofton, Julie, Yorba Linda, CA, $86,897.81, Hahnemann University, Philadelphia, PA, Allopathic Medicine, June 1986
Lopez, Stephen H., Los Angeles, CA, $4,218.70, Univ of California Irvine, Irvine, CA, Allopathic Medicine, June 1983
Lui, Suk Ching J., Union City, CA, $37,374.35, St Louis University, St Louis, MO, Allopathic Medicine, May 1990
Matalon, Ofer, Santa Rosa, CA, $54,246.34, Univ of Illinois Medical Center, Chicago, IL, Allopathic Medicine, June 1986
May, James W., Beverly Hills, CA, $4,008.56, Indiana University Indianapolis, Bloomington, IN, Allopathic Medicine, August 1984
Mays, Archie, Long Beach, CA, $114,073.89, Meharry Medical College, Nashville, TN, Allopathic Medicine, May 1985
McCormack, Faith J., Modesto, CA, $129,652.07, George Washington University, Washington, DC, Allopathic Medicine, May 1989
McManus, Michael, Stockton, CA, $12,343.26, Univ of California Irvine, Irvine, CA, Allopathic Medicine, June 1983
Meyer, James P., Long Beach, CA, $95,653.53, Georgetown University, Washington, DC, Allopathic Medicine, May 1987
Miller, Bradley, Beverly Hills, CA, $42,671.11, Univ of Southern California, Los Angeles, CA, Allopathic Medicine, June 1988
Moini, Kian, Emeryville, CA, $4,213.96, Baylor College of Medicine, Houston, TX, Allopathic Medicine, May 1988
Mora, Francisco J., Canoga Park, CA, $65,422.68, Tufts University, Boston, MA, Allopathic Medicine, June 1983
Moreno, Daniel, Los Angeles, CA, $35,356.87, Tufts University, Boston, MA, Allopathic Medicine, May 1988
Morkin, Patrick P., South Pasadena, CA, $24,644.26, Univ of Texas Hlth Sci Cntr San Antonio, San Antonio, TX, Allopathic Medicine, May 1989
Mouton, Marsha, Oakland, CA, $38,393.97, Univ of Texas, Houston, TX, Allopathic Medicine, June 1986
Murphy, Monica J., Los Angeles, CA, $14,540.66, Morehouse School of Medicine, Atlanta, GA, Allopathic Medicine, May 1985
Nwobi, Veronica, Santa Monica, CA, $15,077.95, Suny Buffalo, Buffalo, NY, Allopathic Medicine, June 1984
Olson, Robert, Sierra Madre, CA, $210,609.30, Univ of Southern California, Los Angeles, CA, Allopathic Medicine, June 1984
Patterson, Joseph M., Alhambra, CA, $7,695.54, Univ of South Alabama, Mobile, AL, Allopathic Medicine, June 1987
Patton, Marvin C., Oakland, CA, $35,400.42, Harvard Medical School, Boston, MA, Allopathic Medicine, June 1990
Payne, David, Playa del Rey, CA, $10,098.83, Wayne State University, Detroit, MI, Allopathic Medicine, June 1985
Pena, Mary M., Sacramento, CA, $33,144.97, Univ of California San Diego, La Jolla, CA, Allopathic Medicine, June 1986
Perrault, Mark D., Culver City, CA, $30,403.04, Michigan State University, East Lansing, MI, Allopathic Medicine, March 1984
Perry, Keith O., Los Angeles, CA, $90,358.44, Finch University of Health Sciences, North Chicago, IL, Allopathic Medicine, June 1983
Peterson-Lipscomb, Anna J., Irvine, CA, $37,473.84, Wright State University, Dayton, OH, Allopathic Medicine, August 1984
Phillips, Jeffrey L., Vallejo, CA, $7,377.89, Finch University of Health Sciences, North Chicago, IL, Allopathic Medicine, June 1985
Pote III, William H.W., Loma Linda, CA, $119,441.44, Loma Linda University, Loma Linda, CA, Allopathic Medicine, June 1986
Powers, Arnold A., Los Angeles, CA, $9,278.39, Brown University, Providence, RI, Allopathic Medicine, June 1985
Razavi, Mahmood K., Los Angeles, CA, $32,488.14, Univ of Washington, Seattle, WA, Allopathic Medicine, June 1988
Riley, Calvin C., Irvine, CA, $71,986.23, Univ of California Irvine, Irvine, CA, Allopathic Medicine, June 1985
Robinson, Paul, Long Beach, CA, $14,827.24, Univ of California Davis, Davis, CA, Allopathic Medicine, June 1990
Rose, Sharon R., Northridge, CA, $11,616.92, Univ of California Irvine, Irvine, CA, Allopathic Medicine, June 1987
Salinas, Rafael E., Monrovia, CA, $168,558.24, Univ of California Irvine, Irvine, CA, Allopathic Medicine, December 1986
Schlater, Theodore L., Long Beach, CA, $13,160.39, Univ of California Irvine, Irvine, CA, Allopathic Medicine, June 1988
Scott, Barbara T., Northridge, CA, $65,056.78, Texas Tech University Health Sci Center, Lubbock, TX, Allopathic Medicine, June 1989
Scott, Cheryl L., Los Angeles, CA, $10,247.54, Boston University Medical Center, Boston, MA, Allopathic Medicine, June 1984
Shahin, Samir, Los Angeles, CA, $34,894.66, Univ of Southern California, Los Angeles, CA, Allopathic Medicine, June 1983
Shaw, Michael G., Inglewood, CA, $38,837.49, Meharry Medical College, Nashville, TN, Allopathic Medicine, May 1985
Siqueiros, Rafael O., Santa Cruz, CA, $22,806.39, Univ of California San

Diego, La Jolla, CA, Allopathic Medicine, June 1988
Smith, Diana D., Santa Barbara, CA, $14,741.62, Univ of California San Francisco, San Francisco, CA, Allopathic Medicine, June 1983
Smith, Robert E., San Juan Capistrano, CA, $70,768.12, Hahnemann University, Philadelphia, PA, Allopathic Medicine, June 1982
Stafford, Novarro, Culver City, CA, $22,099.78, Meharry Medical College, Nashville, TN, Allopathic Medicine, May 1985
Strachan, Alexander, San Francisco, CA, $1,726.96, Columbia University, New York, NY, Allopathic Medicine, May 1985
Swartz, Elena F., Riverside, CA, $74,986.45, Univ of Southern California, Los Angeles, CA, Allopathic Medicine, June 1990
Szubin, Richard A., San Diego, CA, $137,414.17, Case Western Reserve University, Cleveland, OH, Allopathic Medicine, May 1987
Tarver, Donald, San Francisco, CA, $23,176.54, Univ of Cincinnati, Cincinnati, OH, Allopathic Medicine, June 1987
Washington, Patricia, Los Angeles, CA, $75,643.99, Georgetown University, Washington, DC, Allopathic Medicine, May 1984
Watts-Hurtado, Monica V., Newhall, CA, $5,835.10, Univ of California Los Angeles, Los Angeles, CA, Allopathic Medicine, June 1989
Webber, Barry, Burbank, CA, $70,831.24, Georgetown University, Washington, DC, Allopathic Medicine, May 1982
Weil, Mitchell A., San Clemente, CA, $15,043.51, Univ of California Los Angeles, Los Angeles, CA, Allopathic Medicine, June 1980
Williams, Gary T., Perris, CA, $121,120.00, Meharry Medical College, Nashville, TN, Allopathic Medicine, May 1984
Williams, Joanne, Sherman Oaks, CA, $7,421.18, Univ of California Irvine, Irvine, CA, Allopathic Medicine, June 1982
Williams, William E., Ontario, CA, $20,506.07, Univ of Southern California, Los Angeles, CA, Allopathic Medicine, June 1981
Wilson, Larry J., Palo Alto, CA, $127,449.83, Univ of Pittsburgh, Pittsburgh, PA, Allopathic Medicine, June 1985
Wilson, Michael G., San Pedro, CA, $10,764.95, Univ of Med & Dent of New Jersey, Newark, NJ, Allopathic Medicine, June 1985
Winkler, Christopher C., Oakland, CA, $70,838.25, St Louis University, St Louis, MO, Allopathic Medicine, May 1987
Wolfrey, Wayne T., Los Angeles, CA, $2,560.66, Univ of Nebraska Medical Center, Omaha, NE, Allopathic Medicine, May 1988
Worstell, Craig, Sunnyvale, CA, $93,489.70, Loma Linda University, Loma Linda, CA, Allopathic Medicine, May 1987
Zink, Mark T., San Bernardino, CA, $20,545.34, Univ of Miami, Miami, FL, Allopathic Medicine, May 1987

Chiropractic

Abboud, William H., Moreno Valley, CA, $1,447.93, Los Angeles College of Chiropractic, Whittier, CA, Chiropractic, December 1987
Alegria, Albert J., South Pasadena, CA, $85,534.77, Southern Calif Clg of Chiropractic, Pico Rivera, CA, Chiropractic, January 1987
Allen, Lawrence, Temecula, CA, $105,465.16, Southern Calif Clg of Chiropractic, Pico Rivera, CA, Chiropractic, January 1987
Alvarado, Mario, Gilroy, CA, $51,263.21, Palmer College of Chiropractic, Davenport, IA, Chiropractic, March 1985
Anaim, Jamal, La Mirada, CA, $15,960.35, Los Angeles College of Chiropractic, Whittier, CA, Chiropractic, April 1992
Anderson, Douglas W., Santa Ana, CA, $129,597.35, Los Angeles College of Chiropractic, Whittier, CA, Chiropractic, April 1986
Anderson, Michael M., Los Angeles, CA, $60,770.83, Los Angeles College of Chiropractic, Whittier, CA, Chiropractic, December 1986
Archuleta, Philip, San Marcos, CA, $98,606.98, Los Angeles College of Chiropractic, Whittier, CA, Chiropractic, December 1988
Arishin, Michael, Los Gatos, CA, $35,899.74, Palmer College of Chiropractic West, San Jose, CA, Chiropractic, September 1985
Badorek, Jack D., Costa Mesa, CA, $1,479.48, Cleveland Chiropractic College, Los Angeles, CA, Chiropractic, September 1983
Bai, Chung, Glendale, CA, $5,582.43, Southern Calif Clg of Chiropractic, Pico Rivera, CA, Chiropractic, May 1988
Bain, Lee R., West Covina, CA, $113,951.87, Life College, Marietta, GA, Chiropractic, December 1987
Baldry, James S., North Hollywood, CA, $6,215.96, Cleveland Chiropractic College, Los Angeles, CA, Chiropractic, April 1985
Baldwin, Richard C., San Francisco, CA, $29,570.04, Palmer College of Chiropractic, Davenport, IA, Chiropractic, October 1986
Barrack, Steven, Carlsbad, CA, $45,398.20, Cleveland Chiropractic College, Los Angeles, CA, Chiropractic, December 1983
Barrett, Elizabeth L., Temple City, CA, $109,143.56, Los Angeles College of Chiropractic, Whittier, CA, Chiropractic, December 1986
Beam, David, Colton, CA, $92,240.02, Los Angeles College of Chiropractic, Whittier, CA, Chiropractic, June 1985
Beaver, Richard D., Downieville, CA, $95,021.99, Texas Chiropractic College Foundation, Pasadena, TX, Chiropractic, April 1986
Becchett, Sondra, Belmont, CA, $55,971.92, Palmer College of Chiropractic West, San Jose, CA, Chiropractic, March 1987
Benedict, Susan, Malibu, CA, $81,420.04, National College of Chiropractic, Lombard, IL, Chiropractic, June 1989
Benkula, Jan, San Lorenzo, CA, $20,104.61, Life Chiropractic College—West, San Lorenzo, CA, Chiropractic, March 1987
Berg, Troy L., Artesia, CA, $38,417.78, Los Angeles College of Chiropractic, Whittier, CA, Chiropractic, December 1986
Berry-lowy, Christie L., Glendora, CA, $32,726.13, Cleveland Chiropractic College, Los Angeles, CA, Chiropractic, December 1988
Bixby, Charles K., Petaluma, CA, $40,966.37, Life Chiropractic College-West, San Lorenzo, CA, Chiropractic, March 1989
Boron, Steven, Guerneville, CA, $38,071.92, Palmer College of Chiropractic West, San Jose, CA, Chiropractic, June 1991
Brodsky, Barbara B., San Francisco, CA, $6,727.44, Life Chiropractic College-West, San Lorenzo, CA, Chiropractic, December 1984
Brooke, Daniel J., Antioch, CA, $18,202.83, Palmer College of Chiropractic West, San Jose, CA, Chiropractic, September 1990
Brooks, Steve F., Salinas, CA, $28,930.62, Logan College of Chiropractic, Chesterfield, MO, Chiropractic, December 1986
Brown, Vincent L., Castro Valley, CA, $33,808.84, Life Chiropractic College-West, San Lorenzo, CA, Chiropractic, June 1989
Brunstein, Angela, Fullerton, CA, $60,951.33, Los Angeles College of Chiropractic, Whittier, CA, Chiropractic, April 1990
Bunzeluk, Nancy J., Marina, CA, $40,228.51, Life College, Marietta, GA, Chiropractic, December 1983
Burch, Gregory D., Norco, CA, $42,462.81, Western States Chiropractic College, Portland, OR, Chiropractic, June 1984
Burdman, Darin L., Long Beach, CA, $7,229.17, Los Angeles College of

Chiropractic, Whittier, CA, Chiropractic, December 1985
Burkhardt, Pamela K., San Fransisco, CA, $52,029.32, NorthWestern College of Chiropractic, Bloomington, MN, Chiropractic, April 1989
Burkley, Anton Z., Oakland, CA, $78,144.52, Life Chiropractic College-West, San Lorenzo, CA, Chiropractic, June 1988
Burt, Thomas T., Walnut Creek, CA, $58,837.76, Life Chiropractic College-West, San Lorenzo, CA, Chiropractic, March 1984
Butterfield, Cathy L., San Jose, CA, $30,312.86, Palmer College of Chiropractic West, San Jose, CA, Chiropractic, June 1987
Butterfield, James B., San Jose, CA, $13,631.52, Palmer College of Chiropractic West, San Jose, CA, Chiropractic, March 1991
Buvarp, Oystein, Aptos, CA, $7,648.59, Palmer College of Chiropractic West, San Jose, CA, Chiropractic, June 1992
Byington, Brad A., South Lake Tahoe, CA, $77,888.65, Southern Calif Clg of Chiropractic, Pico Rivera, CA, Chiropractic, April 1989
Caballero, Jorge R., Los Angeles, CA, $80,103.07, Los Angeles College of Chiropractic, Whittier, CA, Chiropractic, April 1987
Cappa, Claude L., San Mateo, CA, $39,452.12, Palmer College of Chiropractic, Davenport, IA, Chiropractic, June 1984
Cardwell-Lejeune, Jodi J., Sacramento, CA, $6,282.40, Palmer College of Chiropractic West, San Jose, CA, Chiropractic, June 1987
Carr, Wayne S., Healdsburg, CA, $77,998.74, Western States Chiropractic College, Portland, OR, Chiropractic, August 1988
Casey, Daniel P., Huntington Beach, CA, $56,512.80, Cleveland Chiropractic College, Los Angeles, CA, Chiropractic, September 1985
Castillo, Joella M., San Francisco, CA, $70,229.05, Palmer College of Chiropractic West, San Jose, CA, Chiropractic, June 1986
Castro, Hector M., Santa Ana, CA, $49,601.88, Life Chiropractic College-West, San Lorenzo, CA, Chiropractic, December 1986
Cates, Stephen, Laguna Hills, CA, $28,531.43, Los Angeles College of Chiropractic, Whittier, CA, Chiropractic, December 1983
Cheney, Julian L., Reseda, CA, $2,328.41, Cleveland Chiropractic College, Los Angeles, CA, Chiropractic, August 1983
Christensen, Casey, Whittier, CA, $82,868.28, Los Angeles College of Chiropractic, Whittier, CA, Chiropractic, December 1986
Clifford, Fred W., Palm Desert, CA, $75,974.13, Palmer College of Chiropractic, Davenport, IA, Chiropractic, December 1985
Conger, Ronald E., North Hollywood, CA, $13,937.63, Cleveland Chiropractic College, Los Angeles, CA, Chiropractic, August 1988
Cook, Karen, Los Gatos, CA, $99,180.74, Palmer College of Chiropractic West, San Jose, CA, Chiropractic, March 1985
Cook-Holmes, Peggy P., Manteca, CA, $94,900.32, Cleveland Chiropractic College, Kansas City, MO, Chiropractic, September 1984
Cooksley, Michelle, Laguna Beach, CA, $1,345.79, Cleveland Chiropractic College, Los Angeles, CA, Chiropractic, July 1984
Cory, Jon G., Irvine, CA, $44,905.98, Los Angeles College of Chiropractic, Whittier, CA, Chiropractic, April 1988
Cory, Robert G., Irvine, CA, $63,514.53, Cleveland Chiropractic College, Los Angeles, CA, Chiropractic, August 1986
Cresswell, Diana, Whittier, CA, $41,993.42, Los Angeles College of Chiropractic, Whittier, CA, Chiropractic, April 1990
Crocevera, Carolyn A., Pacific Grove, CA, $13,073.74, Cleveland Chiropractic College, Los Angeles, CA, Chiropractic, August 1986
Curran, Douglas, Fresno, CA, $59,675.67, Logan College of Chiropractic, Chesterfield, MO, Chiropractic, April 1986
Curtin, Michael M., Fairfax, CA, $12,495.43, National College of Chiropractic, Lombard, IL, Chiropractic, August 1988
Curtis, Diane, Costa Mesa, CA, $9,694.68, Cleveland Chiropractic College, Kansas City, MO, Chiropractic, May 1982
Danison, Robert L., South Lake Tahoe, CA, $38,126.80, Palmer College of Chiropractic, Davenport, IA, Chiropractic, March 1985
Davidson, James A., Boyes Hot Springs, CA, $34,900.81, Life Chiropractic College-West, San Lorenzo, CA, Chiropractic, June 1986
Delallo, Joseph D., South Lake Tahoe, CA, $54,588.36, Los Angeles College of Chiropractic, Whittier, CA, Chiropractic, April 1986
Desantis, Lynn M., Ramona, CA, $5,505.78, Southern Calif Clg of Chiropractic, Pico Rivera, CA, Chiropractic, December 1989
Desantis, Nicholas, El Cajon, CA, $74,556.16, Southern Calif Clg of Chiropractic, Pico Rivera, CA, Chiropractic, December 1987
Dewees, Randel K., San Jose, CA, $69,454.76, Palmer College of Chiropractic West, San Jose, CA, Chiropractic, September 1989
Diedrich, Curtis E., Fremont, CA, $18,254.39, Palmer College of Chiropractic West, San Jose, CA, Chiropractic, March 1984
Dieter, Lawrence A., Los Osos, CA, $91,891.67, Los Angeles College of Chiropractic, Whittier, CA, Chiropractic, April 1989
Difiore, William, Fountain Valley, CA, $29,587.48, Southern Calif Clg of Chiropractic, Pico Rivera, CA, Chiropractic, August 1986
Diquattro, Scott, Cathedral City, CA, $66,255.36, Los Angeles College of Chiropractic, Whittier, CA, Chiropractic, December 1984
Dodenhoff, Bradley, Bakersfield, CA, $15,225.26, Los Angeles College of Chiropractic, Whittier, CA, Chiropractic, August 1984
Dorman, Patrick, San Diego, CA, $20,333.19, Texas Chiropractic College Foundation, Pasadena, TX, Chiropractic, December 1985
Dunbar, Charles, Poway, CA, $118,527.97, Palmer College of Chiropractic West, San Jose, CA, Chiropractic, December 1988
Dvorsky, Jay, Los Angeles, CA, $122,775.88, Los Angeles College of Chiropractic, Whittier, CA, Chiropractic, December 1986
Dwelly, Bruce E., Fair Oaks, CA, $17,022.97, Palmer College of Chiropractic West, San Jose, CA, Chiropractic, December 1988
Earth-Child, Erin I., Berkeley, CA, $10,278.59, Life Chiropractic College-West, San Lorenzo, CA, Chiropractic, December 1986
Eckel, David, Lancaster, CA, $76,495.98, Cleveland Chiropractic College, Los Angeles, CA, Chiropractic, August 1986
Eli, Desiree, Aptos, CA, $28,693.03, Life Chiropractic College-West, San Lorenzo, CA, Chiropractic, September 1989
Ellis, Carl, Escondido, CA, $101,838.48, Palmer College of Chiropractic West, San Jose, CA, Chiropractic, December 1989
Elsea, Steven S., Stockton, CA, $6,403.30, Life Chiropractic College-West, San Lorenzo, CA, Chiropractic, December 1985
Ely, Stephen, Fresno, CA, $33,985.11, Western States Chiropractic College, Portland, OR, Chiropractic, March 1985
Ervin, Laurie M., Soquel, CA, $16,830.51, Life Chiropractic College-West, San Lorenzo, CA, Chiropractic, March 1986
Etcheverry, John C., Pinole, CA, $11,290.37, Los Angeles College of Chiropractic, Whittier, CA, Chiropractic, December 1988

Evans, Gary, Stockton, CA, $79,179.93, Logan College of Chiropractic, Chesterfield, MO, Chiropractic, April 1986
Famalaro, John J., El Toro, CA, $80,941.98, Cleveland Chiropractic College, Los Angeles, CA, Chiropractic, December 1983
Fawcett III, Joe J., Fresno, CA, $57,323.73, Palmer College of Chiropractic, Davenport, IA, Chiropractic, March 1984
Fickel, Theodore, Montecito, CA, $59,578.28, Los Angeles College of Chiropractic, Whittier, CA, Chiropractic, December 1982
Fifield, Fred, Modesto, CA, $62,015.15, Life Chiropractic College-West, San Lorenzo, CA, Chiropractic, December 1986
Fishkin, William, San Francisco, CA, $10,269.78, Life Chiropractic College-West, San Lorenzo, CA, Chiropractic, March 1987
Fitzpatrick, Patrick J., Hesperia, CA, $66,026.74, Los Angeles College of Chiropractic, Whittier, CA, Chiropractic, December 1987
Flores, Otto, Santa Ana, CA, $48,090.96, Southern Calif Clg of Chiropractic, Pico Rivera, CA, Chiropractic, August 1988
Flynn, Timothy G., Palo Alto, CA, $1,439.36, Palmer College of Chiropractic West, San Jose, CA, Chiropractic, September 1989
Forsting, Ruth A., San Francisco, CA, $5,941.18, Palmer College of Chiropractic, Davenport, IA, Chiropractic, June 1984
Fridrick, Timothy P., Sepulveda, CA, $39,503.11, Southern Calif Clg of Chiropractic, Pico Rivera, CA, Chiropractic, April 1988
Frye, Dan A., Oceanside, CA, $3,406.04, Life Chiropractic College-West, San Lorenzo, CA, Chiropractic, September 1990
Galba-Machuca, Debra M., Visalia, CA, $36,873.12, Palmer College of Chiropractic West, San Jose, CA, Chiropractic, June 1986
Gallager, Tamara T., Chino, CA, $29,704.46, Los Angeles College of Chiropractic, Whittier, CA, Chiropractic, December 1984
Gallagher, David B., Los Angeles, CA, $6,463.63, Cleveland Chiropractic College, Los Angeles, CA, Chiropractic, December 1983
Garza, Rudy, Cathedral City, CA, $52,331.91, Life Chiropractic College-West, San Lorenzo, CA, Chiropractic, December 1985
Gates, Thom A., Los Angeles, CA, $11,819.11, Cleveland Chiropractic College, Los Angeles, CA, Chiropractic, April 1987
Gidowski, Frank, Rosemead, CA, $52,363.52, Southern Calif Clg of Chiropractic, Pico Rivera, CA, Chiropractic, December 1988
Gilberti, Benedict, La Costa, CA, $12,015.86, Cleveland Chiropractic College, Kansas City, MO, Chiropractic, January 1987
Given, Vaughn, Mission Viejo, CA, $30,445.61, Southern Calif Clg of Chiropractic, Pico Rivera, CA, Chiropractic, October 1985
Glickman, Alex, Petaluma, CA, $24,655.40, Cleveland Chiropractic College, Los Angeles, CA, Chiropractic, July 1985
Glum, Gary, El Segundo, CA, $103,440.00, Los Angeles College of Chiropractic, Whittier, CA, Chiropractic, April 1984
Golden, Mary C., Fremont, CA, $11,530.67, Life Chiropractic College-West, San Lorenzo, CA, Chiropractic, October 1986
Good-Mays, Kathryn M., Reseda, CA, $63,381.14, Parker College of Chiropractic, Dallas, TX, Chiropractic, May 1988
Green, Sheldon S., Goleta, CA, $46,812.51, Cleveland Chiropractic College, Los Angeles, CA, Chiropractic, December 1985
Gregory, Todd A., Santa Maria, CA, $21,752.74, Life Chiropractic College-West, San Lorenzo, CA, Chiropractic, September 1989
Gross, Dale M., Reseda, CA, $5,673.54, Cleveland Chiropractic College, Los Angeles, CA, Chiropractic, December 1983
Gutierrez, John J., Stockton, CA, $38,083.40, Life Chiropractic College-West, San Lorenzo, CA, Chiropractic, December 1985
Habbart, Joseph L., Mountain View, CA, $30,209.89, Palmer College of Chiropractic West, San Jose, CA, Chiropractic, June 1986
Hahn, Peter, Northridge, CA, $13,412.56, Los Angeles College of Chiropractic, Whittier, CA, Chiropractic, December 1989
Haines, Donna J., Mckinleyville, CA, $42,717.86, National College of Chiropractic, Lombard, IL, Chiropractic, August 1988
Halle, Thomas C., Los Angeles, CA, $50,640.15, Cleveland Chiropractic College, Los Angeles, CA, Chiropractic, December 1986
Hamby, Bobby J., Walnut, CA, $11,365.63, Life College, Marietta, GA, Chiropractic, March 1986
Hamilton, Aaron J., Fountain Valley, CA, $16,473.08, Cleveland Chiropractic College, Los Angeles, CA, Chiropractic, December 1982
Harness, William E., San Diego, CA, $19,263.24, Cleveland Chiropractic College, Kansas City, MO, Chiropractic, May 1985
Harper, Nicholas N., Long Beach, CA, $42,809.31, Los Angeles College of Chiropractic, Whittier, CA, Chiropractic, April 1984
Hatfield, Brian, Santa Monica, CA, $29,087.12, Life Chiropractic College-West, San Lorenzo, CA, Chiropractic, March 1988
Hawley, John, Santa Barbara, CA, $50,693.31, Cleveland Chiropractic College, Los Angeles, CA, Chiropractic, December 1986
Hayes, Douglas, Santa Monica, CA, $118,854.12, Life College, Marietta, GA, Chiropractic, September 1984
Hempsey, William, Sherman Oaks, CA, $19,625.65, Cleveland Chiropractic College, Los Angeles, CA, Chiropractic, August 1983
Henry, Scott, La Mesa, CA, $26,472.83, Palmer College of Chiropractic, Davenport, IA, Chiropractic, March 1984
Hermosillo, Francisco J., Tarzana, CA, $92,003.54, Southern Calif. Clg. of Chiropractic, Pico Rivera, CA, Chiropractic, April 1987
Hernandez, Orestes M., Los Angeles, CA, $39,161.76, Cleveland Chiropractic College, Los Angeles, CA, Chiropractic, December 1988
Hetherington, Jane, San Rafael, CA, $53,852.05, Life Chiropractic College-West, San Lorenzo, CA, Chiropractic, September 1987
Hicks, Randall, Castro Valley, CA, $100,799.22, Life Chiropractic College-West, San Lorenzo, CA, Chiropractic, March 1987
Hileman, Kent, Hollister, CA, $22,547.14, Cleveland Chiropractic College, Los Angeles, CA, Chiropractic, August 1986
Hines, John, Buena Park, CA, $4,966.16, Palmer College of Chiropractic, Davenport, IA, Chiropractic, June 1983
Hinkey, Stephen, Culver City, CA, $19,829.23, Los Angeles College of Chiropractic, Whittier, CA, Chiropractic, April 1986
Hockersmith, Kevin W., Sanger, CA, $99,612.46, Cleveland Chiropractic College, Kansas City, MO, Chiropractic, May 1989
Hoffman, Stuart, Santa Monica, CA, $6,524.47, Cleveland Chiropractic College, Los Angeles, CA, Chiropractic, April 1986
Holmes, Bobby B., Manteca, CA, $131,368.40, Cleveland Chiropractic College, Kansas City, MO, Chiropractic, September 1985
Holsinger, Matthew W., San Mateo, CA, $62,112.08, Life Chiropractic College-West, San Lorenzo, CA, Chiropractic, June 1990
Holst, Stephen S., Carmel, CA, $57,749.78, Life Chiropractic College-

West, San Lorenzo, CA, Chiropractic, March 1986
Holt, Kenneth, Canyon Lake, CA, $50,934.40, Southern Calif. Clg. of Chiropractic, Pico Rivera, CA, Chiropractic, December 1988
Hopkins, Mitch, Brea, CA, $59,980.43, Los Angeles College of Chiropractic, Whittier, CA, Chiropractic, April 1988
Hopstock, Richard, La Puente, CA, $54,302.07, Los Angeles College of Chiropractic, Whittier, CA, Chiropractic, December 1985
Hoskin, Jerry, Watsonville, CA, $49,470.80, Life Chiropractic College-West, San Lorenzo, CA, Chiropractic, June 1986
Hosler, John J., Hollister, CA, $27,409.59, Palmer College of Chiropractic West, San Jose, CA, Chiropractic, December 1984
Howard, Marty B., Hayward, CA, $15,777.23, Life Chiropractic College-West, San Lorenzo, CA, Chiropractic, December 1986
Huff, Arthur R., Pasadena, CA, $88,185.50, Southern Calif. Clg. of Chiropractic, Pico Rivera, CA, Chiropractic, April 1988
Huff, Guy L., Torrance, CA, $90,955.97, Cleveland Chiropractic College, Los Angeles, CA, Chiropractic, December 1986
Hunt, Celia, Citrus Heights, CA, $21,462.56, Life Chiropractic College-West, San Lorenzo, CA, Chiropractic, September 1989
Imboden, Shannon L., Los Angeles, CA, $12,386.36, Cleveland Chiropractic College, Los Angeles, CA, Chiropractic, December 1987
Inskeep, Norman D., San Jose, CA, $103,481.62, Palmer College of Chiropractic West, San Jose, CA, Chiropractic, September 1986
Jasper, Chuck, San Rafael, CA, $6,067.82, Palmer College of Chiropractic West, San Jose, CA, Chiropractic, March 1984
Jeffcoat, Lori M., Alameda, CA, $13,339.98, Los Angeles College of Chiropractic, Whittier, CA, Chiropractic, December 1990
Jette, Steven A., Petaluma, CA, $8,715.66, Western States Chiropractic College, Portland, OR, Chiropractic, December 1983
Johnson, Eric, Victorville, CA, $86,833.48, Palmer College of Chiropractic West, San Jose, CA, Chiropractic, March 1990
Johnson, Kevin A., Costa Mesa, CA, $38,933.66, Cleveland Chiropractic College, Los Angeles, CA, Chiropractic, August 1990
Johnson, Randall R., Los Angeles, CA, $80,046.73, Cleveland Chiropractic College, Los Angeles, CA, Chiropractic, December 1986
Johnson, Shelia, Los Angeles, CA, $93,110.08, Cleveland Chiropractic College, Los Angeles, CA, Chiropractic, April 1986
Kahan, Robert M., Mission Viejo, CA, $20,760.16, Los Angeles College of Chiropractic, Whittier, CA, Chiropractic, April 1984
Kahanek, Carol A., Santa Cruz, CA, $38,899.12, Western States Chiropractic College, Portland, OR, Chiropractic, December 1983
Kaye, Lafe M., Newbury Park, CA, $35,825.53, Los Angeles College of Chiropractic, Whittier, CA, Chiropractic, December 1987
Kelly, Mark S., Chino, CA, $21,355.78, Cleveland Chiropractic College, Los Angeles, CA, Chiropractic, April 1986
Klee, Mark A., Lancaster, CA, $15,327.97, Los Angeles College of Chiropractic, Whittier, CA, Chiropractic, July 1987
Kosak, Jerome E., Fairfield, CA, $24,435.97, Cleveland Chiropractic College, Los Angeles, CA, Chiropractic, August 1982
Kotsch, Simone P., Huntington Beach, CA, $38,050.42, Los Angeles College of Chiropractic, Whittier, CA, Chiropractic, December 1985
Kowalski, Brian A., Newport Beach, CA, $8,131.83, Life College, Marietta, GA, Chiropractic, October 1982
Kraetzer, Nicholas, San Pedro, CA, $4,473.92, Southern Calif Clg of Chiropractic, Pico Rivera, CA, Chiropractic, December 1987
Kullrich, Regan T., Oakhurst, CA, $12,394.97, Cleveland Chiropractic College, Los Angeles, CA, Chiropractic, May 1986
Lamb, Robert, Sebastopol, CA, $28,678.41, Los Angeles College of Chiropractic, Whittier, CA, Chiropractic, April 1989
Lampman, Chuck D., Sylmar, CA, $105,598.36, Cleveland Chiropractic College, Los Angeles, CA, Chiropractic, August 1986
Landemare, Henry M., Moss Beach, CA, $91,251.18, Life Chiropractic College-West, San Lorenzo, CA, Chiropractic, June 1985
Lanzarotta, Suzette, Grass Valley, CA, $5,745.54, Palmer College of Chiropractic, Davenport, IA, Chiropractic, December 1982
Laughter, James, San Diego, CA, $41,963.88, Western States Chiropractic College, Portland, OR, Chiropractic, March 1985
Lesko, Andrew, La Habra Heights, CA, $38,172.68, Los Angeles College of Chiropractic, Whittier, CA, Chiropractic, April 1987
Levay, Mariann, Sacramento, CA, $64,653.56, Cleveland Chiropractic College, Kansas City, MO, Chiropractic, June 1987
Levernier, Laura A., Costa Mesa, CA, $43,191.41, Life Chiropractic College-West, San Lorenzo, CA, Chiropractic, June 1986
Levesque, Gary, Huntington Beach, CA, $8,421.15, Los Angeles College of Chiropractic, Whittier, CA, Chiropractic, April 1982
Lewis, Edward, Auburn, CA, $96,506.97, Palmer College of Chiropractic West, San Jose, CA, Chiropractic, June 1989
Lima, Thomas, Oakland, CA, $1,814.37, Life Chiropractic College-West, San Lorenzo, CA, Chiropractic, October 1985
Lin, Ho Shiong, San Lorenzo, CA, $21,806.75, Life Chiropractic College-West, San Lorenzo, CA, Chiropractic, September 1987
Locke, Peggy J., Santa Barbara, CA, $88,366.54, Cleveland Chiropractic College, Los Angeles, CA, Chiropractic, April 1989
Lodwig, Michael, Walnut Creek, CA, $15,819.65, Palmer College of Chiropractic West, San Jose, CA, Chiropractic, October 1989
Lopez, Luis L., Canyon Lake, CA, $79,677.62, Los Angeles College of Chiropractic, Whittier, CA, Chiropractic, April 1985
Louis, Kathryn S., Santa Monica, CA, $12,984.22, Los Angeles College of Chiropractic, Whittier, CA, Chiropractic, April 1986
Lowe, Dane E., Poway, CA, $4,090.78, Palmer College of Chiropractic West, San Jose, CA, Chiropractic, December 1983
Lunceford, Glenn, Norco, CA, $13,310.48, Life Chiropractic College-West, San Lorenzo, CA, Chiropractic, June 1986
Lyons, Dorothy A., Coulterville, CA, $27,241.79, Cleveland Chiropractic College, Los Angeles, CA, Chiropractic, April 1989
Maclaren, Stacy L., Ventura, CA, $20,079.05, Life Chiropractic College-West, San Lorenzo, CA, Chiropractic, October 1985
Mahan, Michael, El Cajon, CA, $16,668.32, Life Chiropractic College-West, San Lorenzo, CA, Chiropractic, April 1988
Mahar, Deborah L., Santa Ana, CA, $14,699.17, Palmer College of Chiropractic West, San Jose, CA, Chiropractic, June 1984
Mairet, Alain A., Menlo Park, CA, $51,833.99, Life Chiropractic College-West, San Lorenzo, CA, Chiropractic, June 1987
Mallary, Peter, Santa Cruz, CA, $39,427.19, Palmer College of Chiropractic West, San Jose, CA, Chiropractic, September 1988
Mannino-Siegel, Holly L., Whittier, CA, $20,213.68, Los Angeles College of

Chiropractic, Whittier, CA, Chiropractic, April 1986
Mark, Jeffrey, San Francisco, CA, $83,834.42, Los Angeles College of Chiropractic, Whittier, CA, Chiropractic, April 1987
Marquez, Evelyn W., South Pasadena, CA, $57,937.92, Los Angeles College of Chiropractic, Whittier, CA, Chiropractic, July 1986
Martello, Daniel M., San Francisco, CA, $2,209.78, Northwestern College of Chiropractic, Bloomington, MN, Chiropractic, April 1986
Martin, Diana, Los Gatos, CA, $21,286.06, Palmer College of Chiropractic West, San Jose, CA, Chiropractic, March 1986
Matsumae, Dean, Huntington Beach, CA, $14,402.78, Los Angeles College of Chiropractic, Whittier, CA, Chiropractic, August 1989
Maynard, Jennifer E., Glendora, CA, $56,259.54, Southern Calif Clg of Chiropractic, Pico Rivera, CA, Chiropractic, December 1988
McGee, Billie J., Simi Valley, CA, $29,043.12, Cleveland Chiropractic College, Los Angeles, CA, Chiropractic, April 1984
McGinn, Thomas, San Jose, CA, $124,236.17, Palmer College of Chiropractic West, San Jose, CA, Chiropractic, March 1987
McKinlay, George A., Orange, CA, $23,266.37, Cleveland Chiropractic College, Los Angeles, CA, Chiropractic, August 1988
McLaughlin, Robert, Sacramento, CA, $39,905.80, Palmer College of Chiropractic West, San Jose, CA, Chiropractic, December 1989
McLean, Lila E., San Lorenzo, CA, $49,153.66, Palmer College of Chiropractic, Davenport, IA, Chiropractic, June 1987
Melville, Carl, Crestline, CA, $89,807.54, Los Angeles College of Chiropractic, Whittier, CA, Chiropractic, December 1989
Meriott, Robert B., San Juan Capistrano, CA, $13,818.59, Los Angeles College of Chiropractic, Whittier, CA, Chiropractic, April 1983
Miller, Brad T., Santa Ana, CA, $16,491.61, Cleveland Chiropractic College, Los Angeles, CA, Chiropractic, August 1990
Miller, David, Concord, CA, $25,525.00, Life Chiropractic College-West, San Lorenzo, CA, Chiropractic, December 1989
Miller, Marilyn E., San Francisco, CA, $6,091.62, Life Chiropractic College-West, San Lorenzo, CA, Chiropractic, June 1986
Mitchell, Gregory W., Los Angeles, CA, $103,353.04, Southern Calif. Clg. of Chiropractic, Pico Rivera, CA, Chiropractic, May 1988
Molina, Robert, West Covina, CA, $48,100.20, Cleveland Chiropractic College, Los Angeles, CA, Chiropractic, August 1987
Monahan, Michael L., Carlsbad, CA, $43,364.32, Los Angeles College of Chiropractic, Whittier, CA, Chiropractic, December 1986
Montgomery, Rita M., Los Angeles, CA, $57,724.69, Cleveland Chiropractic College, Los Angeles, CA, Chiropractic, August 1986
Moore, Dennis J., Long Beach, CA, $108,626.04, Los Angeles College of Chiropractic, Whittier, CA, Chiropractic, April 1986
Moore, Wesley B., San Jose, CA, $37,707.76, Life Chiropractic College-West, San Lorenzo, CA, Chiropractic, December 1984
Moroney, Sharon, Santa Clara, CA, $16,660.48, National College of Chiropractic, Lombard, IL, Chiropractic, August 1986
Moroney, William, San Mateo, CA, $21,750.44, Palmer College of Chiropractic West, San Jose, CA, Chiropractic, September 1986
Mullins, Marilyn E., Placentia, CA, $48,602.31, Los Angeles College of Chiropractic, Whittier, CA, Chiropractic, April 1984
Murphy, Debbie C., Ojai, CA, $35,502.40, Los Angeles College of Chiropractic, Whittier, CA, Chiropractic, August 1986
Nahai, John, Concord, CA, $113,476.45, Life Chiropractic College-West, San Lorenzo, CA, Chiropractic, December 1985
Navai, Mehdi N., Alhambra, CA, $58,876.59, Cleveland Chiropractic College, Los Angeles, CA, Chiropractic, August 1988
Nedelcove, Deborah E., La Quinta, CA, $20,200.35, Cleveland Chiropractic College, Los Angeles, CA, Chiropractic, December 1987
Nelson, Robert, Palm Desert, CA, $64,863.74, Cleveland Chiropractic College, Los Angeles, CA, Chiropractic, April 1988
O'Connor, Thomas J., Corte Madera, CA, $7,500.84, Life Chiropractic College-West, San Lorenzo, CA, Chiropractic, June 1984
Oberstein, Lawrence, Santa Rosa, CA, $27,306.83, Life Chiropractic College-West, San Lorenzo, CA, Chiropractic, December 1984
Oranen, David J., Sacramento, CA, $52,790.80, Los Angeles College of Chiropractic, Whittier, CA, Chiropractic, December 1984
Overman, Kathleen N., Canoga Park, CA, $22,818.60, New York Chiropractic College, Seneca Falls, NY, Chiropractic, December 1984
Owens, Robert B., San Fransciso, CA, $9,141.46, Palmer College of Chiropractic West, San Jose, CA, Chiropractic, September 1983
Pacheco, Mark A., Stockton, CA, $38,441.45, Cleveland Chiropractic College, Los Angeles, CA, Chiropractic, April 1985
Pallas, James J., Temecula, CA, $64,714.41, Los Angeles College of Chiropractic, Whittier, CA, Chiropractic, April 1986
Palumo, Frank N., North Hills, CA, $20,261.32, Cleveland Chiropractic College, Los Angeles, CA, Chiropractic, August 1988
Pankey, John, Alameda, CA, $28,206.23, Palmer College of Chiropractic West, San Jose, CA, Chiropractic, December 1988
Panza, Ernest, Chula Vista, CA, $14,906.92, Life College, Marietta, GA, Chiropractic, March 1991
Parker, Brian T., Simi Valley, CA, $24,751.49, Cleveland Chiropractic College, Los Angeles, CA, Chiropractic, December 1988
Parnell, Aaron L., San Mateo, CA, $36,543.46, Life Chiropractic College-West, San Lorenzo, CA, Chiropractic, October 1986
Pascal, David S., Santa Cruz, CA, $3,566.52, Cleveland Chiropractic College, Los Angeles, CA, Chiropractic, January 1986
Pellerin, Stephen P., Ahwahnee, CA, $61,528.62, Southern Calif. Clg. of Chiropractic, Pico Rivera, CA, Chiropractic, April 1986
Penney, Karen, San Bernardino, CA, $14,446.48, Los Angeles College of Chiropractic, Whittier, CA, Chiropractic, December 1993
Perez, Jesus V., Pomona, CA, $75,117.87, Cleveland Chiropractic College, Los Angeles, CA, Chiropractic, July 1984
Peters, Deborah, Palo Alto, CA, $33,515.65, Palmer College of Chiropractic West, San Jose, CA, Chiropractic, September 1990
Pfeiffer, Arlene, Huntington Beach, CA, $7,107.92, Los Angeles College of Chiropractic, Whittier, CA, Chiropractic, April 1983
Pham, Greg N., Fountain Valley, CA, $57,420.15, Southern Calif. Clg. of Chiropractic, Pico Rivera, CA, Chiropractic, December 1989
Pilkington, Charles, San Bernardino, CA, $19,225.29, Los Angeles College of Chiropractic, Whittier, CA, Chiropractic, December 1985
Pinkerman, James, Temecula, CA, $107,376.29, Los Angeles College of Chiropractic, Whittier, CA, Chiropractic, December 1987
Podry, Robert J., La Canada, CA, $59,357.00, Southern Calif. Clg. of Chiropractic, Pico Rivera, CA, Chiropractic, August 1986

Pollock, Thomas G., Santa Barbara, CA, $75,668.99, Cleveland Chiropractic College, Los Angeles, CA, Chiropractic, April 1987
Portillo, Carlos, San Jose, CA, $15,107.79, Palmer College of Chiropractic West, San Jose, CA, Chiropractic, June 1986
Portugal, Gilbert M., El Toro, CA, $2,192.43, Los Angeles College of Chiropractic, Whittier, CA, Chiropractic, April 1986
Postulka, Perry D., La Mesa, CA, $20,974.60, Los Angeles College of Chiropractic, Whittier, CA, Chiropractic, December 1986
Pride, Marcus O., Carson, CA, $82,973.73, Southern Calif. Clg. of Chiropractic, Pico Rivera, CA, Chiropractic, August 1987
Radetic, Pete, Pleasant Hill, CA, $38,211.22, Life Chiropractic College-West, San Lorenzo, CA, Chiropractic, June 1986
Rahn, Roger S., Agoura, CA, $78,491.03, Los Angeles College of Chiropractic, Whittier, CA, Chiropractic, April 1988
Rains, Emory S., Balboa, CA, $29,499.71, Los Angeles College of Chiropractic, Whittier, CA, Chiropractic, April 1983
Ramsey, Debora A., Saugus, CA, $31,124.97, Cleveland Chiropractic College, Los Angeles, CA, Chiropractic, December 1985
Ratliff, Cynthia, Santa Cruz, CA, $49,076.95, Palmer College of Chiropractic West, San Jose, CA, Chiropractic, December 1987
Rayas-Felix, Magdalena, Los Angeles, CA, $16,845.25, Los Angeles College of Chiropractic, Whittier, CA, Chiropractic, April 1988
Reason, Richard, Goleta, CA, $120,199.63, Southern Calif CLG of Chiropractic, Pico Rivera, CA, Chiropractic, April 1987
Redd, Timothy J., San Dimas, CA, $122,091.69, Southern Calif CLG of Chiropractic, Pico Rivera, CA, Chiropractic, April 1987
Reed, Robert W., San Bernardino, CA, $50,726.47, Southern Calif CLG of Chiropractic, Pico Rivera, CA, Chiropractic, December 1986
Reilly, Ann M., Richmond, CA, $24,092.06, Life Chiropractic College-West, San Lorenzo, CA, Chiropractic, December 1986
Reynolds, Bob, Bakersfield, CA, $44,649.43, Cleveland Chiropractic College, Los Angeles, CA, Chiropractic, August 1986
Richardson, Justin W., Canoga Park, CA, $10,379.04, Cleveland Chiropractic College, Los Angeles, CA, Chiropractic, December 1983
Richins, Craig H., Fresno, CA, $69,537.63, Palmer College of Chiropractic, Davenport, IA, Chiropractic, September 1984
Rios, Emanuel J., San Gabriel, CA, $45,323.33, Southern Calif CLG of Chiropractic, Pico Rivera, CA, Chiropractic, August 1988
Rockmael, Allan, San Francisco, CA, $84,289.21, Life Chiropractic College-West, San Lorenzo, CA, Chiropractic, September 1988
Rodriguez, Consuelo A., San Gabriel, CA, $34,195.24, Cleveland Chiropractic College, Los Angeles, CA, Chiropractic, September 1984
Rodriguez, Humberto J., La Mirada, CA, $66,279.62, Los Angeles College of Chiropractic, Whittier, CA, Chiropractic, April 1987
Rogers, Guy A., Bakersfield, CA, $61,955.31, Southern Calif CLG of Chiropractic, Pico Rivera, CA, Chiropractic, April 1990
Roloff, Robin, Lakewood, CA, $12,820.84, Cleveland Chiropractic College, Los Angeles, CA, Chiropractic, April 1988
Rolon, Zandra, Santa Cruz, CA, $18,887.16, Cleveland Chiropractic College, Los Angeles, CA, Chiropractic, April 1989
Romer, Cheryl C., Fresno, CA, $57,171.30, Cleveland Chiropractic College, Los Angeles, CA, Chiropractic, December 1983
Romo, Glen A., Walnut, CA, $5,816.38, Cleveland Chiropractic College, Los Angeles, CA, Chiropractic, August 1988
Rosenfeld, Jeffre B., Santa Monica, CA, $40,151.56, Cleveland Chiropractic College, Los Angeles, CA, Chiropractic, April 1986
Rothenberg-Aisenberg, Mary Ellen B., Chula Vista, CA, $107,111.88, Los Angeles College of Chiropractic, Whittier, CA, Chiropractic, August 1985
Rude, Kirby K., Pasadena, CA, $36,104.38, Southern Calif CLG of Chiropractic, Pico Rivera, CA, Chiropractic, December 1987
Ruiz, Henry S., Los Angeles, CA, $114,613.71, Southern Calif CLG of Chiropractic, Pico Rivera, CA, Chiropractic, August 1986
Sakalis, Gregory G., Glendale, CA, $362.40, Southern Calif CLG of Chiropractic, Pico Rivera, CA, Chiropractic, August 1987
Sargent, John F., Los Angeles, CA, $70,616.79, Southern Calif CLG of Chiropractic, Pico Rivera, CA, Chiropractic, August 1986
Schear, Darrell, Laguna Hills, CA, $132,229.72, Cleveland Chiropractic College, Los Angeles, CA, Chiropractic, December 1984
Schluter, Kathleen K., Ukiah, CA, $24,906.36, Life Chiropractic College-West, San Lorenzo, CA, Chiropractic, December 1985
Schluter, Lyle C., Sonoma, CA, $34,705.62, Palmer College of Chiropractic West, San Jose, CA, Chiropractic, December 1983
Schow, Kenneth M., Glendale, CA, $32,084.08, Los Angeles College of Chiropractic, Whittier, CA, Chiropractic, December 1982
Scott, John, Modesto, CA, $123,349.96, Palmer College of Chiropractic West, San Jose, CA, Chiropractic, September 1985
Sellers, Lon E., San Diego, CA, $24,739.35, Cleveland Chiropractic College, Los Angeles, CA, Chiropractic, August 1983
Shanesfelter, Charles, Saratoga, CA, $23,251.19, Southern Calif CLG of Chiropractic, Pico Rivera, CA, Chiropractic, December 1989
Shapiro, Michael S., Valencia, CA, $51,149.97, Los Angeles College of Chiropractic, Whittier, CA, Chiropractic, April 1985
Sharkey, Vincent J., San Francisco, CA, $4,737.17, Life Chiropractic College-West, San Lorenzo, CA, Chiropractic, September 1986
Shouka, Mohammed, Yorba Linda, CA, $22,218.59, Los Angeles College of Chiropractic, Whittier, CA, Chiropractic, December 1988
Sibley, Jane E., Tustin, CA, $63,545.24, Los Angeles College of Chiropractic, Whittier, CA, Chiropractic, April 1988
Simovich, Paul, Huntington Beach, CA, $26,054.25, Los Angeles College of Chiropractic, Whittier, CA, Chiropractic, April 1988
Smith Jr, Carl A., Garden Grove, CA, $118,950.11, Los Angeles College of Chiropractic, Whittier, CA, Chiropractic, December 1987
Smith, Steven K., Venice, CA, $54,960.32, Western States Chiropractic College, Portland, OR, Chiropractic, June 1988
Snavely, Danny H., Laguna Niguel, CA, $71,492.53, Los Angeles College of Chiropractic, Whittier, CA, Chiropractic, April 1986
Souza, Robert R., Costa Mesa, CA, $109,847.09, Los Angeles College of Chiropractic, Whittier, CA, Chiropractic, April 1984
Spatrisano, Bonnie, Los Banos, CA, $81,622.18, Cleveland Chiropractic College, Los Angeles, CA, Chiropractic, August 1985
Spencer, Johnnie J., Baker, CA, $83,735.55, Life College, Marietta, GA, Chiropractic, December 1985
Stevens, Don M., Sacramento, CA, $138,840.25, Los Angeles College of Chiropractic, Whittier, CA, Chiropractic, December 1985
Stevens, Michael N., Los Gatos, CA, $44,650.24, Palmer College of

Chiropractic West, San Jose, CA, Chiropractic, December 1985
Stevens, Milton W., Pittsburg, CA, $118,833.98, Life Chiropractic College-West, San Lorenzo, CA, Chiropractic, March 1985
Stevens, Tamara S., Hayward, CA, $99,699.44, Life Chiropractic College-West, San Lorenzo, CA, Chiropractic, March 1987
Stewart, Jeannie, Costa Mesa, CA, $16,077.80, Los Angeles College of Chiropractic, Whittier, CA, Chiropractic, April 1984
Stiga, John P., Santa Cruz, CA, $8,062.12, Life College, Marietta, GA, Chiropractic, March 1982
Stone, Steven, Piedmont, CA, $12,522.59, Life Chiropractic College-west, San Lorenzo, CA, Chiropractic, December 1990
Studer, Jonathan B., San Jose, CA, $41,001.05, Palmer College of Chiropractic West, San Jose, CA, Chiropractic, December 1986
Sturgeon, Margaret M., Oakland, CA, $33,727.88, Life Chiropractic College-West, San Lorenzo, CA, Chiropractic, December 1985
Styler, Richard, Fair Oaks, CA, $9,948.57, Palmer College of Chiropractic West, San Jose, CA, Chiropractic, September 1989
Sullivan, Joseph, Burbank, CA, $57,148.42, Los Angeles College of Chiropractic, Whittier, CA, Chiropractic, December 1986
Super, Douglas D J, Hayward, CA, $58,323.18, Life Chiropractic College-West, San Lorenzo, CA, Chiropractic, December 1990
Sutton, Brian, Denuba, CA, $53,319.27, Southern Calif Clg of Chiropractic, Pico Rivera, CA, Chiropractic, April 1986
Tamimi, Musa A., Panorama City, CA, $12,153.20, Cleveland Chiropractic College, Los Angeles, CA, Chiropractic, December 1987
Taylor, Brett, Mission Viejo, CA, $48,654.87, Southern Calif Clg of Chiropractic, Pico Rivera, CA, Chiropractic, September 1986
Taylor, John E., Placentia, CA, $9,857.99, Los Angeles College of Chiropractic, Whittier, CA, Chiropractic, April 1982
Taylor, Julie A., Glendale, CA, $28,694.67, Cleveland Chiropractic College, Los Angeles, CA, Chiropractic, April 1984
Terry, William H., Fallbrook, CA, $61,472.73, Los Angeles College of Chiropractic, Whittier, CA, Chiropractic, April 1984
Teter, Steven S., San Leandro, CA, $3,276.49, Western States Chiropractic College, Portland, OR, Chiropractic, March 1983
Theobald, Richard C., San Diego, CA, $35,618.60, Palmer College of Chiropractic, Davenport, IA, Chiropractic, October 1988
Thompson, Donald D., Novato, CA, $7,811.91, Life Chiropractic College-West, San Lorenzo, CA, Chiropractic, June 1989
Thompson, James D., Fair Oaks, CA, $112,683.06, Palmer College of Chiropractic West, San Jose, CA, Chiropractic, March 1987
Thornton, James G., Nevada City, CA, $3,792.89, Logan College of Chiropractic, Chesterfield, MO, Chiropractic, January 1983
Turner, Nancy N., Costa Mesa, CA, $16,116.67, Life Chiropractic College-West, San Lorenzo, CA, Chiropractic, December 1985
Vail, Warren, Encinitas, CA, $10,551.69, Life Chiropractic College-West, San Lorenzo, CA, Chiropractic, March 1989
Van Gorder, Kurt F., Temecula, CA, $55,817.80, Los Angeles College of Chiropractic, Whittier, CA, Chiropractic, April 1989
Vardanian, Michael A., Fullerton, CA, $47,094.43, Los Angeles College of Chiropractic, Whittier, CA, Chiropractic, April 1985
Vareles, Richard, Sherman Oaks, CA, $53,917.31, Los Angeles College of Chiropractic, Whittier, CA, Chiropractic, December 1985
Vega, Javier J., Montclair, CA, $11,714.02, Southern Calif Clg of Chiropractic, Pico Rivera, CA, Chiropractic, December 1987
Vessels, Steven, Loma Linda, CA, $51,382.77, Los Angeles College of Chiropractic, Whittier, CA, Chiropractic, April 1983
Viloria, Jenifer A., Los Angeles, CA, $75,132.17, Southern Calif Clg of Chiropractic, Pico Rivera, CA, Chiropractic, August 1987
Vlaskovich Jr, William, Santa Clara, CA, $96,662.24, Palmer College of Chiropractic West, San Jose, CA, Chiropractic, June 1987
Walls-Fenwick, Jan D., San Bernardino, CA, $84,133.46, Southern Calif Clg of Chiropractic, Pico Rivera, CA, Chiropractic, April 1988
Walsh, Richard J., Los Angeles, CA, $22,308.80, Life Chiropractic College-West, San Lorenzo, CA, Chiropractic, December 1986
Wanke, Glenn P., Fullerton, CA, $92,975.05, Los Angeles College of Chiropractic, Whittier, CA, Chiropractic, April 1987
Ward, Michael L., Mountain View, CA, $41,031.58, Palmer College of Chiropractic West, San Jose, CA, Chiropractic, October 1984
Wedmeyer, Ron A., Bakersfield, CA, $8,648.75, Southern Calif Clg of Chiropractic, Pico Rivera, CA, Chiropractic, April 1990
Weiss, Gwenn M., Cupertino, CA, $26,660.74, Palmer College of Chiropractic West, San Jose, CA, Chiropractic, September 1986
Westing, Denise, Alameda, CA, $29,320.09, Life Chiropractic College-West, San Lorenzo, CA, Chiropractic, December 1987
White, Judith U., Newport Beach, CA, $18,740.49, Southern Calif Clg of Chiropractic, Pico Rivera, CA, Chiropractic, January 1985
Whittlesey, James B., Novato, CA, $24,516.74, Life Chiropractic College-West, San Lorenzo, CA, Chiropractic, September 1986
Willard, Teresa D., Long Beach, CA, $8,205.72, Cleveland Chiropractic College, Los Angeles, CA, Chiropractic, December 1988
Williams, Duane D., Livermore, CA, $46,332.67, Palmer College of Chiropractic, Davenport, IA, Chiropractic, September 1984
Williams, Joseph, San Diego, CA, $15,802.40, Palmer College of Chiropractic West, San Jose, CA, Chiropractic, December 1984
Wymore, Patrick J., Van Nuys, CA, $70,380.64, Los Angeles College of Chiropractic, Whittier, CA, Chiropractic, September 1986
Yarchover, Richard, Sylmar, CA, $19,230.07, Los Angeles College of Chiropractic, Whittier, CA, Chiropractic, April 1987
Yniguez, Alma B., San Francisco, CA, $83,078.54, Palmer College of Chiropractic West, San Jose, CA, Chiropractic, May 1989
Yniguez, Ramon, Sunnyvale, CA, $18,849.52, Palmer College of Chiropractic West, San Jose, CA, Chiropractic, December 1985
Zachary, John K., Los Angeles, CA, $37,152.10, Southern Calif Clg of Chiropractic, Pico Rivera, CA, Chiropractic, August 1988
Zewde, Worku, Marina Del Rey, CA, $38,981.14, Cleveland Chiropractic College, Los Angeles, CA, Chiropractic, April 1989
Zoodsma, Kenneth, Del Mar, CA, $38,013.48, National College of Chiropractic, Lombard, IL, Chiropractic, August 1986
Zydervelt, Hannah H W, Pacific Grove, CA, $37,319.51, Palmer College of Chiropractic, Davenport, IA, Chiropractic, March 1984

Clinical Psychology

Armstrong, Phyllis, Los Angeles, CA, $21,288.72, California Sch of Prof Psych, Alhambra, CA, Clinical Psychology, May 1990
Behman, Patricia, Studio City, CA, $46,587.40, California Sch of Prof

Psych, Alhambra, CA, Clinical Psychology, September 1986.
Block, Robbyn K., Encino, CA, $76,935.34, California Sch of Prof Psych, Alhambra, CA, Clinical Psychology, July 1988.
Blomeley, Robert R., Foothill Farms, CA, $8,628.14, California Sch of Prof Psych San Diego, San Diego, CA, Clinical Psychology, June 1983.
Boulware, Susan S., Sausalito, CA, $58,430.73, California Sch of Prof Psych, Alameda, CA, Clinical Psychology, July 1986.
Cadavid-Hannon, Ester, Culver City, CA, $41,425.36, California Sch of Prof Psych, Alhambra, CA, Clinical Psychology, July 1988.
Cappelletty, Gordon G., Fresno, CA, $7,513.31, California Sch of Prof Psych Fresno, Fresno, CA, Clinical Psychology, August 1986.
Carleton, Raymond, San Diego, CA, $6,283.83, California Sch of Prof Psych San Diego, San Diego, CA, Clinical Psychology, May 1990.
Chalgujian, Hilda, Palm Desert, CA, $63,970.43, California Sch of Prof Psych Fresno, Fresno, CA, Clinical Psychology, June 1989.
Chun, John H., San Diego, CA, $44,811.60, California Sch of Prof Psych San Diego, San Diego, CA, Clinical Psychology, May 1989.
Clark, Minola, San Diego, CA, $92,623.19, California Sch of Prof Psych San Diego, San Diego, CA, Clinical Psychology, May 1991.
Corwin, Mary, Modesta, CA, $21,787.75, California Sch of Prof Psych Fresno, Fresno, CA, Clinical Psychology, August 1986.
Cox, Charles, Palm Springs, CA, $25,026.92, Yeshiva University, New York, NY, Clinical Psychology, June 1988.
Davis, Clarie L., Calipatria, CA, $22,172.78, California Sch of Prof Psych, Alhambra, CA, Clinical Psychology, July 1985.
Esenten, Teri A., Palos Verdes, CA, $52,495.98, California Sch of Prof Psych San Diego, San Diego, CA, Clinical Psychology, June 1986.
Gaston, Patricia S., Dana Point, CA, $138,085.68, California Sch of Prof Psych San Diego, San Diego, CA, Clinical Psychology, June 1986.
Gonzalez, Maria, Clovis, CA, $2,537.34, California Sch of Prof Psych Fresno, Fresno, CA, Clinical Psychology, June 1990.
Gonzalez, Rocio R., Los Angeles, CA, $45,163.78, California Sch of Prof Psych, Alhambra, CA, Clinical Psychology, July 1987.
Gullotta, Geraldine P., Escondido, CA, $49,944.96, California Sch of Prof Psych San Diego, San Diego, CA, Clinical Psychology, June 1983.
Harris, Carole I., San Diego, CA, $20,884.14, California Sch of Prof Psych San Diego, San Diego, CA, Clinical Psychology, June 1985.
Herrington, Robert L., San Diego, CA, $21,450.56, California Sch of Prof Psych San Diego, San Diego, CA, Clinical Psychology, May 1992.
Howell, Nicole, Thousand Oaks, CA, $108,002.25, California Sch of Prof Psych, Alhambra, CA, Clinical Psychology, July 1987.
Inesi, Gino E., San Francisco, CA, $12,375.78, Pacific Graduate School of Psychology, Palo Alto, CA, Clinical Psychology, April 1990.
Jackson, Cynthia, Laguna Beach, CA, $63,980.68, Fuller Theological Seminary, Pasadena, CA, Clinical Psychology, June 1989.
Jacobs, Delores A., San Diego, CA, $66,000.13, California Sch of Prof Psych San Diego, San Diego, CA, Clinical Psychology, May 1989.
Jacobson, Todd, San Diego, CA, $106,465.41, California Sch of Prof Psych San Diego, San Diego, CA, Clinical Psychology, May 1989.
King, Gloria, San Leandro, CA, $14,966.37, California Sch of Prof Psych, Alameda, CA, Clinical Psychology, June 1990.
Lafitte, William, Newport Beach, CA, $54,822.84, California Sch of Prof Psych San Diego, San Diego, CA, Clinical Psychology, May 1987.
Lataille, Edward, San Diego, CA, $113,499.98, California Sch of Prof Psych San Diego, San Diego, CA, Clinical Psychology, May 1987.
Lender, Joyce A., Anaheim, CA, $132,750.69, California Sch of Prof Psych, Alhambra, CA, Clinical Psychology, July 1987.
Lin, Sherri, West Hollywood, CA, $17,367.21, California Sch of Prof Psych, Alhambra, CA, Clinical Psychology, May 1990.
Loranger, Paul G., Sunset Beach, CA, $51,717.73, California Sch of Prof Psych, Alhambra, CA, Clinical Psychology, May 1990.
Lyons, Lawrence, Del Mar, CA, $19,545.63, California Sch of Prof Psych San Diego, San Diego, CA, Clinical Psychology, July 1983.
Mackabee, La Mildred, Los Angeles, CA, $52,461.72, California Sch of Prof Psych, Alhambra, CA, Clinical Psychology, May 1989.
McCaul, Brad J., Red Bluff, CA, $54,558.78, California Sch of Prof Psych San Diego, San Diego, CA, Clinical Psychology, June 1984.
McCarter, Michele A., San Diego, CA, $76,864.18, California Sch of Prof Psych San Diego, San Diego, CA, Clinical Psychology, May 1987.
McDiarmid, Jim, Merced, CA, $5,148.76, California Sch of Prof Psych Fresno, Fresno, CA, Clinical Psychology, August 1986.
McGregor, Floyd, Inglewood, CA, $38,619.36, California Sch of Prof Psych, Alhambra, CA, Clinical Psychology, July 1987.
McMahon, Kathleen, El Monte, CA, $25,048.44, California Sch of Prof Psych, Alhambra, CA, Clinical Psychology, May 1990.
Moya, Eva, Los Angeles, CA, $29,351.20, Univ of Denver, Denver, CO, Clinical Psychology, August 1983.
Musquiz, Elizabeth E., Murrieta, CA, $6,137.45, California Sch of Prof Psych, Alhambra, CA, Clinical Psychology, June 1987.
Pete, Patricia, San Diego, CA, $46,037.48, California Sch of Prof Psych Fresno, Fresno, CA, Clinical Psychology, June 1988.
Perez, Mary Ellen, Burbank, CA, $25,547.14, Fuller Theological Seminary, Pasadena, CA, Clinical Psychology, June 1988.
Phillips, Constance, Oakland, CA, $16,942.90, California Sch of Prof Psych, Alhambra, CA, Clinical Psychology, May 1989.
Phillips, John, Oakhurst, CA, $58,742.17, California Sch of Prof Psych Fresno, Fresno, CA, Clinical Psychology, August 1986.
Pust, Keith W., Lake Elsinore, CA, $35,899.87, Biola University, La Mirada, CA, Clinical Psychology, May 1986.
Quigley, Michael, San Mateo, CA, $28,792.95, Pacific Graduate School of Psychology, Palo Alto, CA, Clinical Psychology, June 1992.
Richardson, Katherine, Los Angeles, CA, $70,163.04, Biola University, La Mirada, CA, Clinical Psychology, June 1988
Rivas, Mary L., Artesia, CA, $9,737.70, Finch University of Health Sciences, North Chicago, IL, Clinical Psychology, June 1989
Shields, Judith, San Diego, CA, $82,694.39, California Sch of Prof Psych San Diego, San Diego, CA, Clinical Psychology, May 1989
Smukler, Evie L., Sherman Oaks, CA, $18,818.46, California Sch of Prof Psych, Alhambra, CA, Clinical Psychology, July 1987
Spenser, Angela C., Oceanside, CA, $107,447.10, California Sch of Prof Psych San Diego, San Diego, CA, Clinical Psychology, May 1988
Stanford, Jeannie, Santa Monica, CA, $12,009.06, California Sch of Prof Psych, Alhambra, CA, Clinical Psychology, July 1987
Steder, Sandra, San Francisco, CA, $33,541.19, California Sch of Prof Psych, Alameda, CA, Clinical Psychology, July 1988

Stevenson, Teresa M., Los Angeles, CA, $14,976.51, California Sch of Prof Psych, Alhambra, CA, Clinical Psychology, July 1987
Veliquette, John J., Laguna Niguel, CA, $141,541.72, California Sch of Prof Psych San Diego, San Diego, CA, Clinical Psychology, May 1987
Venners, Angela, Signal Hill, CA, $6,590.63, California Sch of Prof Psych, Alhambra, CA, Clinical Psychology, July 1988
Wolter, Carl, Pasadena, CA, $43,534.91, Fuller Theological Seminary, Pasadena, CA, Clinical Psychology, June 1985
Wood, Carol, Santa Monica, CA, $82,501.86, California Sch of Prof Psych, Alhambra, CA, Clinical Psychology, December 1987
Yurkovich, Mark, Hollywood, CA, $34,853.10, California Sch of Prof Psych Fresno, Fresno, CA, Clinical Psychology, August 1986

Dentistry

Benavidez, Charles, Elk Grove, CA, $123,928.79, Univ of Southern California, Los Angeles, CA, Dentistry, May 1991
Berry, Scott T., West Lake Village, CA, $127,737.32, Washington University, St Louis, MO, Dentistry, May 1984
Borden, Mark G., Modesto, CA, $151,645.81, Loyola University Chicago, Chicago, IL, Dentistry, May 1982
Broschinsky, Clifford, Walnut Creek, CA, $59,254.52, Univ of Missouri Kansas City, Kansas City, MO, Dentistry, May 1989
Calloway, Vollie A., Stockton, CA, $149,214.86, Meharry Medical College, Nashville, TN, Dentistry, May 1985
Chun, Denise, San Mateo, CA, $33,525.54, Univ of The Pacific, San Francisco, CA, Dentistry, June 1991
Clifford, Lawrence K., Santa Rosa, CA, $36,576.84, Loma Linda University, Loma Linda, CA, Dentistry, September 1980
Comer, Michael J., Elk Grove, CA, $34,903.81, Washington University, St Louis, MO, Dentistry, May 1989
Cutts, David P., Temecula, CA, $44,583.15, Loma Linda University, Loma Linda, CA, Dentistry, June 1983
Dangerfield, Alan N., Santa Clara, CA, $132,484.16, Georgetown University, Washington, DC, Dentistry, May 1983
Daniels, William W., Roseville, CA, $12,444.04, Tufts University, Boston, MA, Dentistry, June 1982
Delappe, Elizabeth, San Jose, CA, $21,313.16, Univ of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, PA, Dentistry, January 1985
Done, Byron, Anaheim, CA, $126,319.95, Univ of Southern California, Los Angeles, CA, Dentistry, May 1987
Edwards, Gregory C., Los Angeles, CA, $27,256.32, Howard University, Washington, DC, Dentistry, May 1983
Eslao, Caesar, Lomita, CA, $63,873.62, Univ of Southern California, Los Angeles, CA, Dentistry, May 1990
Formaker, James, West Hollywood, CA, $35,702.22, Univ of Southern California, Los Angeles, CA, Dentistry, May 1986
Foroutanzad, John, Los Angeles, CA, $227,211.75, Univ of The Pacific, San Francisco, CA, Dentistry, June 1984
Frybarger, Francis, Lemon Grove, CA, $16,642.64, Washington University, St Louis, MO, Dentistry, May 1991
Garcia, Gilberto, Long Beach, CA, $115,048.02, Univ of The Pacific, San Francisco, CA, Dentistry, June 1989
Georgeson, Ronald M., Kerman, CA, $21,618.90, Loma Linda University, Loma Linda, CA, Dentistry, August 1984
Ghamary, Ghafoor G., San Diego, CA, $5,556.44, Georgetown University, Washington, DC, Dentistry, May 1984
Goldman, Morton H., San Diego, CA, $13,011.13, West Virginia University, Morgantown, WV, Dentistry, July 1985
Gomes, Marshall E., Canyon Lake, CA, $131,626.75, Loma Linda University, Loma Linda, CA, Dentistry, June 1985
Gonzales, Edward J., Los Angeles, CA, $181,161.54, Boston University Medical Center, Boston, MA, Dentistry, May 1988
Gray, Scott, Hemet, CA, $52,686.64, Univ of The Pacific, San Francisco, CA, Dentistry, June 1988
Greene, David A., Loma Linda, CA, $201,950.89, Loma Linda University, Loma Linda, CA, Dentistry, June 1983
Gyaami, Opanin, Grand Terrace, CA, $225,231.56, Loma Linda University, Loma Linda, CA, Dentistry, June 1983
Hall, David, Capitola, CA, $58,330.81, Univ of California San Francisco, San Francisco, CA, Dentistry, June 1982
Harrison, Rodney B., Montclair, CA, $116,942.48, Meharry Medical College, Nashville, TN, Dentistry, May 1983
Hempel, Jeffrey D., Acton, CA, $28,677.01, Loma Linda University, Loma Linda, CA, Dentistry, June 1980
Henken, Edmond H., San Clemente, CA, $56,826.96, Loma Linda University, Loma Linda, CA, Dentistry, June 1984
Hill, David, San Jose, CA, $36,254.79, Tufts University, Boston, MA, Dentistry, June 1986
Hnyla, Celestine A., San Diego, CA, $147,042.18, Case Western Reserve University, Cleveland, OH, Dentistry, May 1987
Hoehn, James D., Newbury Park, CA, $84,687.68, Loma Linda University, Loma Linda, CA, Dentistry, June 1985
Honnlee, Michael, Rowland Heights, CA, $3,554.29, Loyola University Chicago, Chicago, IL, Dentistry, December 1990
Hurley, Ronnie L., Carlsbad, CA, $130,686.00, Washington University, St Louis, MO, Dentistry, May 1985
Husbands, Michael, Chino Hills, CA, $163,482.98, Loma Linda University, Loma Linda, CA, Dentistry, September 1983
Johnson, Frederic, Los Angeles, CA, $40,703.62, Temple University, Philadelphia, PA, Dentistry, May 1992
Jones, Roger A., Santa Cruz, CA, $107,178.83, Meharry Medical College, Nashville, TN, Dentistry, May 1985
Kelly, Andrew, Los Angeles, CA, $44,395.24, Howard University, Washington, DC, Dentistry, May 1983
Kent, Donald, San Francisco, CA, $146,716.15, Univ of Southern California, Los Angeles, CA, Dentistry, May 1985
Kerstetter, Gary A., Vista, CA, $105,593.88, Loma Linda University, Loma Linda, CA, Dentistry, September 1983
Kim, Kwang-Jim, Glendale, CA, $60,481.42, Univ of Southern California, Los Angeles, CA, Dentistry, May 1984
Kim, Sung O., Los Angeles, CA, $72,198.40, Univ of Southern California, Los Angeles, CA, Dentistry, May 1985
Klim, David D., Redlands, CA, $95,539.21, Loma Linda University, Loma Linda, CA, Dentistry, June 1984
Kurts, Tedd R., Mountain View, CA, $34,961.73, Loma Linda University, Loma Linda, CA, Dentistry, June 1986
Landis, Charles, Chico, CA, $4,359.21, Loma Linda University, Loma Linda, CA, Dentistry, June 1983
Lemelle-Love, Shelia A., Poway, CA, $88,230.71, Univ of Southern California, Los Angeles, CA, Dentistry, May 1987
Lim, Jhang H., Los Angeles, CA, $101,689.04, Univ of Southern California, Los Angeles, CA, Dentistry, May 1984
Luckey, John M., San Diego, CA, $88,633.08, Loma Linda University, Loma Linda, CA, Dentistry, June 1981
Mann, Walter, Murrieta, CA, $5,368.29, Univ of The Pacific, San Francisco, CA, Dentistry, June 1982
Marshall, Dauna, Los Angeles, CA, $74,131.34, Howard University, Washington, DC, Dentistry, May 1985
Marth, Tedie, San Marino, CA, $12,155.38, Univ of Southern California, Los Angeles, CA, Dentistry, June 1982

McFee, Donald, Fontana, CA, $29,188.00, Univ of Alabama Birmingham, Birmingham, AL, Dentistry, June 1990
McLaughlin, Harry L., San Diego, CA, $12,422.16, Univ of Southern California, Los Angeles, CA, Dentistry, June 1984
Medina, Jacqueline J., Los Angeles, CA, $16,320.07, Univ of California San Francisco, San Francisco, CA, Dentistry, June 1981
Memmott, Dana B., Signal Hill, CA, $11,308.99, Univ of Southern California, Los Angeles, CA, Dentistry, May 1984
Miller, Guy M., Wrightwood, CA, $194,037.15, Loma Linda University, Loma Linda, CA, Dentistry, December 1982
Miller, William, Los Angeles, CA, $36,162.74, Univ of Texas Hlth Sci Cntr San Antonio, San Antonio, TX, Dentistry, May 1984
Miner, Michael W., Irvine, CA, $150,459.67, Tufts University, Boston, MA, Dentistry, June 1986
Moore, Derek D., Santa Ana, CA, $11,471.41, Fairleigh Dickinson University, Teaneck, NJ, Dentistry, May 1986
Nguyen, Kien-Trinh T., San Jose, CA, $9,795.90, Virginia Commonwealth University, Richmond, VA, Dentistry, May 1987
Nichols, Marcus, Culver City, CA, $42,215.07, Case Western Reserve University, Cleveland, OH, Dentistry, May 1984
Nowry, Remond, Valley Village, CA, $96,421.15, Univ of Southern California, Los Angeles, CA, Dentistry, May 1991
Pattendien, Sharon J., San Francisco, CA, $137,101.24, Fairleigh Dickinson University, Teaneck, NJ, Dentistry, May 1987
Penn, Dennis, Carlsbad, CA, $6,148.61, Tufts University, Boston, MA, Dentistry, June 1980
Peterson, Kirk J., Long Beach, CA, $66,882.10, Tufts University, Boston, MA, Dentistry, May 1987
Pierce, John, San Diego, CA, $2,525.07, Univ of Missouri Kansas City, Kansas City, MO, Dentistry, April 1982
Portales, Ramon, San Pedro, CA, $8,038.15, Ohio State University, Columbus, OH, Dentistry, June 1985
Price, Steve V., Los Angeles, CA, $3,558.06, Univ of California Los Angeles, Los Angeles, CA, Dentistry, June 1984
Pryor III, Cornelius M., Los Angeles, CA, $10,727.05, Howard University, Washington, DC, Dentistry, May 1982
Rahmati, Behnam, Laguna Hills, CA, $123,041.59, Univ of Southern California, Los Angeles, CA, Dentistry, May 1987
Ramirez, Ralph, El Monte, CA, $14,017.88, Univ of Southern California, Los Angeles, CA, Dentistry, May 1985
Richards, Richard, Alameda, CA, $7,043.93, Univ of Southern California, Los Angeles, CA, Dentistry, May 1983
Riveroy, Isaac, Walnut, CA, $117,282.24, Boston University Medical Center, Boston, MA, Dentistry, May 1989
Roberts, Martha E., San Rafael, CA, $32,332.04, Univ of California San Francisco, San Francisco, CA, Dentistry, June 1982
Rucker, David D., San Mateo, CA, $240,754.38, Univ of The Pacific, San Francisco, CA, Dentistry, June 1985
Ruffner, Timothy E., Ventura, CA, $155,878.56, Loma Linda University, Loma Linda, CA, Dentistry, June 1985
Saliano, David D., North Hollywood, CA, $143,327.11, Univ of Southern California, Los Angeles, CA, Dentistry, May 1984
Sanchez-Spitzer, Alice, Los Angeles, CA, $54,626.78, Univ of California Los Angeles, Los Angeles, CA, Dentistry, June 1982
Santucci, Gerald, Walnut Creek, CA, $28,303.06, Univ of Southern California, Los Angeles, CA, Dentistry, May 1983
Schneider, Harry, Palm Desert, CA, $250,248.83, Loma Linda University, Loma Linda, CA, Dentistry, March 1985
Sevilla, Dana, Hayward, CA, $8,572.69, Univ of California San Francisco, San Francisco, CA, Dentistry, June 1988
Sevrean, Joseph J., Pomona, CA, $2,794.31, Creighton University, Omaha, NE, Dentistry, May 1989
Shaw, Michael P., Fremont, CA, $111,810.71, Marquette University, Milwaukee, WI, Dentistry, May 1983
Sheppard, Gordon L., Ceres, CA, $67,094.01, Univ of Southern California, Los Angeles, CA, Dentistry, May 1988
Shervin, Amir H., Los Angeles, CA, $54,233.75, Univ of Southern California, Los Angeles, CA, Dentistry, May 1985
Shin, Hui-Yong, Los Angeles, CA, $58,739.09, Univ of Southern California, Los Angeles, CA, Dentistry, May 1989
Shinsato, Wade A., Sun Valley, CA, $66,847.27, Univ of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, PA, Dentistry, June 1987
Silva, Bradley K., Dana Point, CA, $74,272.64, New York University, New York, NY, Dentistry, June 1984
Snipes, Steven, San Marcos, CA, $9,111.74, Univ of Southern California, Los Angeles, CA, Dentistry, June 1981
Spencer, Durwood, Bakersfield, CA, $57,940.28, Univ of The Pacific, San Francisco, CA, Dentistry, June 1989
Stewart, John R., Orange, CA, $3,247.36, Univ of The Pacific, San Francisco, CA, Dentistry, June 1985
Sullivan, John K., Tulare, CA, $128,377.72, Univ of The Pacific, San Francisco, CA, Dentistry, September 1984
Swen, John J., Orangevale, CA, $40,108.20, Loma Linda University, Loma Linda, CA, Dentistry, June 1986
Taylor, Tamra, San Clemente, CA, $38,583.46, Loma Linda University, Loma Linda, CA, Dentistry, June 1984
Tracy, James M., San Jose, CA, $46,458.62, Georgetown University, Washington, DC, Dentistry, May 1979
Turner, Portia D., Inglewood, CA, $5,432.54, Howard University, Washington, DC, Dentistry, May 1986
Valenton, Francisco D., Sacramento, CA, $17,723.01, Univ of California San Francisco, San Francisco, CA, Dentistry, June 1984
Vazagov, Zachial, Arcadia, CA, $178,596.77, Tufts University, Boston, MA, Dentistry, May 1988
Vergara, Steven D., Loma Linda, CA, $83,568.10, Loma Linda University, Loma Linda, CA, Dentistry, June 1984
Wainwright, Mark, Oakland, CA, $18,042.93, Univ of Missouri Kansas City, Kansas City, MO, Dentistry, June 1989
Warner, Arthur, Fremont, CA, $49,210.60, Case Western Reserve University, Cleveland, OH, Dentistry, May 1984
Weems, John, Visalia, CA, $78,939.85, Emory University, Atlanta, GA, Dentistry, May 1986
Wheadon, Scott, San Jose, CA, $54,194.47, Univ of Southern California, Los Angeles, CA, Dentistry, May 1986
Wright, Ronald L., Los Angeles, CA, $2,567.86, Meharry Medical College, Nashville, TN, Dentistry, May 1990
Yauman, Charles C., Mountain View, CA, $11,101.31, Univ of California Los Angeles, Los Angeles, CA, Dentistry, June 1983
Zachary, Floyd E., Live Oak, CA, $29,692.02, Loma Linda University, Loma Linda, CA, Dentistry, June 1981
Zangeneh Dane, Zahra, Encino, CA, $72,534.13, Fairleigh Dickinson University, Teaneck, NJ, Dentistry, May 1989

Health Administration

Fleming, Joseph J., Hayward, CA, $43,037.98, Trinity University, San Antonio, TX, Health Administration, June 1987
Martin, David D.C., San Diego, CA, $27,617.33, Washington University, St

Louis, MO, Health Administration, May 1985

Optometry

Crandon, David, Los Alamitos, CA, $55,338.92, Southern Calif College of Optometry, Fullerton, CA, Optometry, May 1988
Davidek, Rosali, Alta Loma, CA, $127,426.37, Southern Calif College of Optometry, Fullerton, CA, Optometry, May 1988
Falletti-Borell, Giovanni, San Diego, CA, $76,230.65, Inter American Univ of PR, San Juan, PR, Optometry, June 1984
Litten, Laura L., Orange, CA, $99,280.87, Southern Calif College of Optometry, Fullerton, CA, Optometry, May 1989
Mast, Barry, Camarillo, CA, $34,347.18, Southern College of Optometry, Memphis, TN, Optometry, June 1984
Mayfield, Sheryl A., Redwood City, CA, $25,777.94, Southern Calif College of Optometry, Fullerton, CA, Optometry, June 1983
McWhinnie Jr., Clarence E., Los Angeles, CA, $9,103.34, Southern Calif College of Optometry, Fullerton, CA, Optometry, June 1983
Powell, Reed M., Hesperia, CA, $11,727.39, Illinois College of Optometry, Chicago, IL, Optometry, June 1980
Schamel, Lisa E., Los Angeles, CA, $14,651.42, Illinois College of Optometry, Chicago, IL, Optometry, May 1987
Steinberg, Craig, Van Nuys, CA, $5,868.43, Univ of Missouri St Louis, St Louis, MO, Optometry, May 1984.
Utnehmer, Patrick P., Temecula, CA, $9,290.06, Southern Calif College of Optometry, Fullerton, CA, Optometry, June 1984.

Osteopathy

Carter, Merv D., Moreno Valley, CA, $59,948.58, Michigan State University, East Lansing, MI, Osteopathy, June 1987.
Cline, Sherri L., Glendale, CA, $5,933.04, Univ of North Texas Health Science Ctr, Fort Worth, TX, Osteopathy, May 1988.
Conger, Michelle, Pasadena, CA, $168,624.42, Univ of Health Sciences, Kansas City, MO, Osteopathy, May 1986.
Crosby, Daniel W., Upland, CA, $5,939.26, College of Osteo Med of the Pacific, Pomona, CA, Osteopathy, June 1986.
Hoang Xaun, Tuan A., Apo—San Francisco, CA, $12,624.15, College of Osteo Med of the Pacific, Pomona, CA, Osteopathy, June 1991.
Lane, Richard R., Monrovia, CA, $44,858.43, College of Osteo Med of the Pacific, Pomona, CA, Osteopathy, June 1989.
Marshall, William E., Newbury Park, CA, $148,618.99, College of Osteo Med of the Pacific, Pomona, CA, Osteopathy, June 1987.
Maynard, Charles D., El Cajon, CA, $13,207.69, College of Osteo Med of the Pacific, Pomona, CA, Osteopathy, June 1983.
Mendelson, Sol, Alta Loma, CA, $31,081.37, College of Osteo Med of the Pacific, Pomona, CA, Osteopathy, June 1982.
Mitchell, Ralph, Alta Loma, CA, $74,089.12, College of Osteo Med of the Pacific, Pomona, CA, Osteopathy, June 1991.
Patel, Harikrushna S., Inglewood, CA, $38,746.27, Univ of Osteo Medical & Health Science, Des Moines, IA, Osteopathy, June 1989.
Rudolph, Paul, Chino, CA, $229,993.26, Univ of Health Sciences, Kansas City, MO, Osteopathy, May 1984.
Smythe, Gerald, Cypress, CA, $1,184.09, College of Osteo Med of the Pacific, Pomona, CA, Osteopathy, May 1991.
Urbach, Mark J., Culver City, CA, $123,098.93, Michigan State University, East Lansing, MI, Osteopathy, June 1985.

Pharmacy

Abe, Gregory, Tujunga, CA, $24,116.19, Univ of Southern California, Los Angeles, CA, Pharmacy, May 1988.
Coan, Bernard, Sunnyvale, CA, $6,515.14, Massachusetts College of Pharmacy, Boston, MA, Pharmacy, June 1988.
Daneshrad-Farnoosh, Angela, North Hollywood, CA, $5,509.16, Univ of Southern California, Los Angeles, CA, Pharmacy, May 1989.
Degroot, Ruth, San Francisco, CA, $8,973.52, Univ of The Pacific, Stockton, CA, Pharmacy, April 1991.
Duarma, Geetha, Los Angeles, CA, $20,729.72, Univ of Southern California, Los Angeles, CA, Pharmacy, May 1990.
Frick, Deborah, Santa Ana, CA, $23,368.96, Univ of Southern California, Los Angeles, CA, Pharmacy, May 1989.
Gonzales, Carol C., Glendale, CA, $4,583.45, Univ of Southern California, Los Angeles, CA, Pharmacy, May 1986.
Hedlund, Bonnie L., Fullerton, CA, $107,363.87, Univ of Southern California, Los Angeles, CA, Pharmacy, May 1986.
Olivier, Ralph, Canyon Country, CA, $19,167.33, Univ of Southern California, Los Angeles, CA, Pharmacy, May 1987.
Omoregie, Samuel I., Los Angeles, CA, $45,617.94, Univ of Southern California, Los Angeles, CA, Pharmacy, May 1988.
Osayamen, Matthew, San Diego, CA, $57,934.64, Univ of Southern California, Los Angeles, CA, Pharmacy, May 1987.
Ramos, Juliana J., San Pedro, CA, $40,018.53, Massachusetts College of Pharmacy, Boston, MA, Pharmacy, May 1983.
Taylor, Roger R., Foster City, CA, $46,060.25, Massachusetts College of Pharmacy, Boston, MA, Pharmacy, June 1985.
Tran, Ba, Milpitas, CA, $5,439.97, Temple University, Philadelphia, PA, Pharmacy, June 1987.
Williams, Patricia, Los Angeles, CA, $9,136.72, Drake University, Des Moines, IA, Pharmacy, December 1979.
Zalez, Carol M., Encino, CA, $15,290.30, Univ of The Pacific, Stockton, CA, Pharmacy, April 1987.

Podiatry

Allen, Karen, San Francisco, CA, $122,029.02, California College of Podiatric Medicine, San Francisco, CA, Podiatry, May 1985.
Burleigh, Sharon, Oakland, CA, $61,408.19, California College of Podiatric Medicine, San Francisco, CA, Podiatry, May 1985
Cammall, David B., San Diego, CA, $28,307.04, California College of Podiatric Medicine, San Francisco, CA, Podiatry, May 1986
Case, Jeffrey A., Santa Ana, CA, $117,728.41, California College of Podiatric Medicine, San Francisco, CA, Podiatry, May 1985
Chaffin, Dwight, Modesto, CA, $205,099.97, California College of Podiatric Medicine, San Francisco, CA, Podiatry, May 1982
Dakis, Stephen S., La Jolla, CA, $23,228.61, Ohio College of Podiatric Medicine, Cleveland, OH, Podiatry, May 1987
Featherstone, John, San Bruno, CA, $36,320.34, California College of Podiatric Medicine, San Francisco, CA, Podiatry, May 1993
Fednard, Anne Marie A., Oakland, CA, $73,440.62, California College of Podiatric Medicine, San Francisco, CA, Podiatry, June 1986
Gandy, Paul P., San Bernardino, CA, $65,867.72, Ohio College of Podiatric Medicine, Cleveland, OH, Podiatry, May 1982
Gray, David M., San Francisco, CA, $29,130.73, California College of Podiatric Medicine, San Francisco, CA, Podiatry, May 1986
Harman, Jeffery M., Beverly Hills, CA, $7,486.94, California College of Podiatric Medicine, San Francisco, CA, Podiatry, May 1983

Hartman, Gregory D., Burbank, CA, $43,530.03, California College of Podiatric Medicine, San Francisco, CA, Podiatry, May 1982
Hitchcock, Philip R., Highland, CA, $101,888.34, California College of Podiatric Medicine, San Francisco, CA, Podiatry, May 1981
Landrum, Keith, Palos Verdes, CA, $52,618.22, Dr William Scholl Col of Podiatric Med, Chicago, IL, Podiatry, May 1981
Lee, Chul G., Upland, CA, $54,089.38, Ohio College of Podiatric Medicine, Cleveland, OH, Podiatry, May 1989
Lentell, Brian M., Fresno, CA, $38,754.11, California College of Podiatric Medicine, San Francisco, CA, Podiatry, May 1984
Lillie, Richard W., Mission Viejo, CA, $83,643.35, California College of Podiatric Medicine, San Francisco, CA, Podiatry, May 1981
Loggins, L, Oakland, CA, $210,397.48, California College of Podiatric Medicine, San Francisco, CA, Podiatry, June 1986
London, Eliyahu, Crestline, CA, $211,734.09, California College of Podiatric Medicine, San Francisco, CA, Podiatry, June 1986
Medina, Edwin R., Berkeley, CA, $91,217.72, California College of Podiatric Medicine, San Francisco, CA, Podiatry, May 1987
Pineda, Joseph J., Santa Barbara, CA, $190,998.76, California College of Podiatric Medicine, San Francisco, CA, Podiatry, May 1984
Pisarski, Marshall M W, San Francisco, CA, $37,435.27, California College of Podiatric Medicine, San Francisco, CA, Podiatry, May 1985
Pope, David, Downey, CA, $145,930.30, California College of Podiatric Medicine, San Francisco, CA, Podiatry, May 1985
Sass, Michael D., Upland, CA, $123,211.40, California College of Podiatric Medicine, San Francisco, CA, Podiatry, May 1988
Scoffield, Mark H., Fresno, CA, $68,494.77, Dr William Scholl Col of Podiatric Med, Chicago, IL, Podiatry, May 1982
Scott, Thomas, Oakland, CA, $48,663.02, California College of Podiatric Medicine, San Francisco, CA, Podiatry, May 1987
Seymour, Stephen J., Thousand Oaks, CA, $53,244.63, California College of Podiatric Medicine, San Francisco, CA, Podiatry, June 1980
Shaber, Sydney S., San Francisco, CA, $38,418.83, California College of Podiatric Medicine, San Francisco, CA, Podiatry, June 1979
Spaulding, Karla K., San Francisco, CA, $20,261.79, California College of Podiatric Medicine, San Francisco, CA, Podiatry, May 1989
Sullivan-Sabo, Denise D., Sacramento, CA, $59,374.28, California College of Podiatric Medicine, San Francisco, CA, Podiatry, May 1984
Waller, Marilyn J., Castro Valley, CA, $130,896.29, California College of Podiatric Medicine, San Francisco, CA, Podiatry, May 1990
Warford, Mark, Roseville, CA, $94,766.66, California College of Podiatric Medicine, San Francisco, CA, Podiatry, May 1987
Wells, Kenneth, Chula Vista, CA, $189,769.11, California College of Podiatric Medicine, San Francisco, CA, Podiatry, June 1986
Zolfaghri, Behrooz, Danville, CA, $46,518.31, California College of Podiatric Medicine, San Francisco, CA, Podiatry, May 1986
Zorilla, Orlando, San Gabriel, CA, $167,735.57, California College of Podiatric Medicine, San Francisco, CA, Podiatry, June 1986

Public Health

Adler, Eric M., La Jolla, CA, $9,797.25, Yale University, New Haven, CT, Public Health, May 1987
Bernard, Cheryle, Martinez, CA, $121,687.49, Tulane University, New Orleans, LA, Public Health, May 1986
Howell, Reynold R., San Francisco, CA, $58,540.71, Loma Linda University, Loma Linda, CA, Public Health, December 1981
Lemkin, Peter R., Solana Beach, CA, $6,159.37, Yale University, New Haven, CT, Public Health, May 1984
Nebedum, Archibald, Los Angeles, CA, $10,665.37, Univ of California Los Angeles, Los Angeles, CA, Public Health, June 1985
Velez, Janet, Moreno Valley, CA, $1,147.22, Yale University, New Haven, CT, Public Health, May 1988
Williams, Pamela A., Carson, CA, $4,646.86, Loma Linda University, Loma Linda, CA, Public Health, June 1983

Veterinary Medicine

Anderson-Coleman, Joy R., Los Angeles, CA, $7,740.34, Tuskegee University, Tuskegee, AL, Veterinary Medicine, May 1990
Coleman, Keith B., Los Angeles, CA, $4,110.66, Tuskegee University, Tuskegee, AL, Veterinary Medicine, May 1989
Hurdle II, Clarence, Sacramento, CA, $65,596.45, Tuskegee University, Tuskegee, AL, Veterinary Medicine, May 1986
Pattio, Nolton, Monrovia, CA, $21,618.72, Univ of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, PA, Veterinary Medicine, May 1983

Colorado

Allopathic Medicine

Bennett, Yvonne E., Littleton, CO, $24,015.20, Univ of Colorado Health Science Center, Denver, CO, Allopathic Medicine, May 1986
Busse, David D., Wheat Ridge, CO, $150,711.89, George Washington University, Washington, DC, Allopathic Medicine, May 1987
Ferguson, Rebecca R., Snowmass, CO, $36,263.80, Univ of Texas Southwestern Medical Cntr, Dallas, TX, Allopathic Medicine, June 1986
Flaherty, Matthew, Denver, CO, $17,442.87, Univ of Colorado Health Science Center, Denver, CO, Allopathic Medicine, May 1990
McEwen, Christopher C., Winter Park, CO, $6,445.73, Univ of Cincinnati, Cincinnati, OH, Allopathic Medicine, June 1984
Roberts, Charles C., Aurora, CO, $76,587.79, Univ of Colorado Health Science Center, Denver, CO, Allopathic Medicine, May 1985
Wells, Victor V., Denver, CO, $31,992.84, Creighton University, Omaha, NE, Allopathic Medicine, May 1984

Chiropractic

Baker, Geoffrey B., Lakewood, CO, $2,460.12, Palmer College of Chiropractic, Davenport, IA, Chiropractic, October 1989
Bammer, Phillip L., Broomfield, CO, $48,364.92, Cleveland Chiropractic College, Kansas City, MO, Chiropractic, December 1983
Burbridge, David H., Thornton, CO, $41,684.38, Palmer College of Chiropractic, Davenport, IA, Chiropractic, October 1988
Clarke, Debbie F., Louisville, CO, $6,949.31, Life College, Marietta, GA, Chiropractic, June 1984
Cline, Doyle, Broomfield, CO, $27,304.24, Palmer College of Chiropractic, Davenport, IA, Chiropractic, October 1985
Colby, Susan E., Colorado Springs, CO, $39,571.95, Palmer College of Chiropractic, Davenport, IA, Chiropractic, March 1986
Crow, Joe, Cheraw, CO, $14,612.08, Parker College of Chiropractic, Dallas, TX, Chiropractic, January 1990
Cunningham, Marvin D., Colorado Springs, CO, $20,067.11, Palmer College of Chiropractic West, San Jose, CA, Chiropractic, June 1986
Day, Donald D., Thornton, CO, $55,260.64, Cleveland Chiropractic College, Kansas City, MO, Chiropractic, December 1983
Dunevitz, Benjamin S., Denver, CO, $78,306.24, Logan College of

Chiropractic, Chesterfield, MO, Chiropractic, January 1986
Foster, Valeria, Greeley, CO, $5,558.07, Life College, Marietta, GA, Chiropractic, March 1983
Garcia, Sylvester, Platteville, CO, $56,341.78, Los Angeles College of Chiropractic, Whittier, CA, Chiropractic, December 1988
Hendler, Michael J., Lakewood, CO, $77,828.22, Los Angeles College of Chiropractic, Whittier, CA, Chiropractic, April 1988
Jordan, James, Castle Rock, CO, $100,898.10, Logan College of Chiropractic, Chesterfield, MO, Chiropractic, April 1986
Krebill, Michael, Colorado Springs, CO, $85,989.49, Logan College of Chiropractic, Chesterfield, MO, Chiropractic, August 1988
Langolf, Daniel L., Lakewood, CO, $46,259.40, Palmer College of Chiropractic, Davenport, IA, Chiropractic, June 1986
Martin, Kathleen L., Englewood, CO, $18,380.47, Palmer College of Chiropractic, Davenport, IA, Chiropractic, June 1989
McClain, Van A., Golden, CO, $11,150.55, Palmer College of Chiropractic, Davenport, IA, Chiropractic, June 1987
McClure, Lance L., Littleton, CO, $46,745.58, Los Angeles College of Chiropractic, Whittier, CA, Chiropractic, April 1984
Michals, Robert, Aurora, CO, $40,532.58, Palmer College of Chiropractic, Davenport, IA, Chiropractic, September 1984
Morgan, Pamela, Denver, CO, $881.94, Logan College of Chiropractic, Chesterfield, MO, Chiropractic, April 1983
Ohrdorf, Ronald T., Colorado Springs, CO, $111,425.96, Cleveland Chiropractic College, Kansas City, MO, Chiropractic, May 1988
Orr, William, Canon City, CO, $94,237.15, Palmer College of Chiropractic, Davenport, IA, Chiropractic, October 1988
Rowland, Brian, Denver, CO, $1,632.00, Life Chiropractic College-West, San Lorenzo, CA, Chiropractic, December 1989
Schmidt, Jeffrey J., Woody Creek, CO, $34,595.66, Western States Chiropractic College, Portland, OR, Chiropractic, December 1988
Sensenig, Barry W., Boulder, CO, $5,290.94, Western States Chiropractic College, Portland, OR, Chiropractic, June 1983
Skinner, Keith, Denver, CO, $37,799.18, Texas Chiropractic College Foundation, Pasadena, TX, Chiropractic, December 1990
Stjernholn, Darwin, Denver, CO, $74,361.82, Los Angeles College of Chiropractic, Whittier, CA, Chiropractic, December 1988
Stokka, Wayne M., Littleton, CO, $15,490.46, Northwestern College of Chiropractic, Bloomington, MN, Chiropractic, April 1989
Strapko, Steven W., Lakewood, CO, $56,181.02, Northwestern College of Chiropractic, Bloomington, MN, Chiropractic, April 1988
Taylor, Kenneth, Colorado Springs, CO, $46,149.64, Life College, Marietta, GA, Chiropractic, September 1984
Trainer, Anita J., Denver, CO, $46,002.06, Logan College of Chiropractic, Chesterfield, MO, Chiropractic, August 1987
Wheeler, Edward, Arvada, CO, $25,231.80, Palmer College of Chiropractic, Davenport, IA, Chiropractic, October 1985
Williams, Danny C., Parker, CO, $4,770.65, Palmer College of Chiropractic, Davenport, IA, Chiropractic, March 1990
Williams, Patsy, Greeley, CO, $5,471.42, Palmer College of Chiropractic, Davenport, IA, Chiropractic, December 1989
Withem, Stewart, Grand Junction, CO, $64,829.08, Cleveland Chiropractic College, Los Angeles, CA, Chiropractic, December 1986
Young, Larry N., Pueblo, CO, $29,430.25, Cleveland Chiropractic College, Kansas City, MO, Chiropractic, May 1985

Clinical Psychology

Evans, Roberta, Denver, CO, $16,904.66, California Sch. of Prof. Psych., San Diego, San Diego, CA, Clinical Psychology, June 1983
Szczypka, Denis, Denver, CO, $3,837.97, Wright State University, Dayton, OH, Clinical Psychology, August 1986

Dentistry

Burkart, John D., Aurora, CO, $39,491.34, Marquette University, Milwaukee, WI, Dentistry, May 1983
Hansen, Daryl G., Denver, CO, $15,026.94, Univ of Colorado Health Science Center, Denver, CO, Dentistry, August 1989
Haviland, Philip F., Denver, CO, $19,006.64, Oral Roberts University, Tulsa, OK, Dentistry, May 1987
Lack, Ray, Arvada, CO, $57,353.28, Univ of Colorado Health Science Center, Denver, CO, Dentistry, May 1986
Tabor, Carl, Denver, CO, $70,284.90, Tufts University, Boston, MA, Dentistry, June 1983
Thompson, Jerrold A., Lakewood, CO, $13,206.10, Univ of Colorado Health Science Center, Denver, CO, Dentistry, May 1983
Webb, David M., Colorado Springs, CO, $18,807.19, Creighton University, Omaha, NE, Dentistry, May 1987

Optometry

Carrico, Gerri P., Denver, CO, $37,507.84, Southern Calif College of Optometry, Fullerton, CA, Optometry, May 1988
Cooley, Stephen L., Fort Collins, CO, $19,313.97, Pacific University, Forest Grove, OR, Optometry, May 1984
Russell, Karen M., Parker, CO, $111,330.29, Illinois College of Optometry, Chicago, IL, Optometry, December 1985

Pharmacy

Espinosa, Sylvia, Colorado Springs, CO, $9,936.23, Univ of Southern California, Los Angeles, CA, Pharmacy, May 1989

Podiatry

Heser, Robert J., Denver, CO, $42,524.82, Dr William Scholl Col of Podiatric Med, Chicago, IL, Podiatry, May 1984
Nicklas, Lisa A., Pueblo, CO, $18,136.29, Ohio College of Podiatric Medicine, Cleveland, OH, Podiatry, June 1987
Otteman, Timothy, Lakewood, CO, $81,572.34, Dr William Scholl Col of Podiatric Med, Chicago, IL, Podiatry, May 1983

Connecticut

Allopathic Medicine

Cartwright, Nadine, Huntington, CT, $86,876.70, Brown University, Providence, RI, Allopathic Medicine, June 1985
Franco, Wayne, Wethersfield, CT, $87,632.56, Georgetown University, Washington, DC, Allopathic Medicine, May 1980
Hayden, Gina M., Westport, CT, $30,979.26, Univ of Med & Dent of New Jersey, Newark, NJ, Allopathic Medicine, May 1987
Hume, Forest, Woodbury, CT, $9,714.43, Univ of Kentucky, Lexington, KY, Allopathic Medicine, May 1990
Jackson, Garland C., Hamden, CT, $230,246.71, Finch University of Health Sciences, North Chicago, IL, Allopathic Medicine, June 1984
Jensen, Peter, Norwalk, CT, $3,048.84, Dartmouth Medical School, Hanover, NH, Allopathic Medicine, June 1992
Lowe, Paul R., Huntington, CT, $46,771.84, Boston University Medical Center, Boston, MA, Allopathic Medicine, May 1986

Meckler, Laurie, New Haven, CT, $40,877.32, Cornell University Medical College, New York, NY, Allopathic Medicine, May 1988
Pavlis, Maria C., Greenwich, CT, $54,893.07, Univ of Miami, Miami, FL, Allopathic Medicine, May 1991
Yang, Chun, Branford, CT, $3,153.27, Brown University, Providence, RI, Allopathic Medicine, May 1991

Chiropractic

Anderson, Mark, Monroe, CT, $64,335.74, Life College, Marietta, GA, Chiropractic, June 1986
Barone, Alice, Trumbull, CT, $15,421.34, New York Chiropractic College, Seneca Falls, NY, Chiropractic, April 1989
Dancer, Gena A., Greenwich, CT, $72,393.61, Cleveland Chiropractic College, Los Angeles, CA, Chiropractic, December 1986
Helenek, Anthony, Essex, CT, $25,891.96, Life College, Marietta, GA, Chiropractic, September 1985
Heppe, Cherie, Hartford, CT, $4,674.00, Los Angeles College of Chiropractic, Whittier, CA, Chiropractic, April 1993
Hudson, Donald, Hartford, CT, $78,328.25, Palmer College of Chiropractic, Davenport, IA, Chiropractic, December 1988
Trebing, William P., Greenwich, CT, $6,313.78, New York Chiropractic College, Seneca Falls, NY, Chiropractic, April 1984

Clinical Psychology

Rivera, Nelson, Hartford, CT, $105,277.31, California Sch of Prof Psych, Alhambra, CA, Clinical Psychology, July 1987
Wakeman, Edward A., Guilford, CT, $16,523.18, California Sch of Prof Psych Fresno, Fresno, CA, Clinical Psychology, June 1986

Dentistry

Johnson, John M., Waterford, CT, $5,638.67, Georgetown University, Washington, DC, Dentistry, May 1985
Mason, Kyle K., Guilford, CT, $4,835.94, Univ of Oklahoma Health Sciences Center, Oklahoma City, OK, Dentistry, December 1986
Resendiz, Mario, Danbury, CT, $21,723.26, Univ of Illinois Medical Center, Chicago, IL, Dentistry, June 1986
Robinson, Robyn C., New Haven, CT, $8,614.59, Univ of Med & Dent of New Jersey, Newark, NJ, Dentistry, May 1988
Seib, Kenneth C., Branford, CT, $22,759.48, Univ of Florida, Gainesville, FL, Dentistry, December 1987

Pharmacy

Poplis, Richard A., Waterbury, CT, $12,596.07, Massachusetts College of Pharmacy, Boston, MA, Pharmacy, June 1985

Podiatry

Church, Steven, Meriden, CT, $52,210.67, New York College of Podiatric Medicine, New York, NY, Podiatry, June 1984
Irrera, Stephen A., West Haven, CT, $17,419.57, Ohio College of Podiatric Medicine, Cleveland, OH, Podiatry, May 1979

Public Health

Carter, Deborah L., New Britain, CT, $2,832.49, Yale University, New Haven, CT, Public Health, May 1990
Winfield, Allison S., New Haven, CT, $3,309.99, Yale University, New Haven, CT, Public Health, May 1990

Veterinary Medicine

Smith, Robin, Quaker Hill, CT, $51,642.85, Ohio State University, Columbus, OH, Veterinary Medicine, June 1987

Delaware

Allopathic Medicine

Trader, Stephanie L., Wilmington, DE, $128,028.36, Univ of Pittsburgh, Pittsburgh, PA, Allopathic Medicine, June 1990

Chiropractic

De La Cuesta, Imant, Wilmington, DE, $35,367.82, Life Chiropractic College-west, San Lorenzo, CA, Chiropractic, September 1990

Pharmacy

Pressley, Laura, Newark, DE, $34,430.04, Temple University, Philadelphia, PA, Pharmacy, May 1988

District of Columbia

Allopathic Medicine

Anyasodo, Patrick P U, Washington, DC, $137,297.48, Georgetown University, Washington, DC, Allopathic Medicine, May 1985
Baker, Daryl, Washington, DC, $1,586.54, Howard University, Washington, DC, Allopathic Medicine, May 1991
Bartee, Dyrel P., Washington, DC, $26,037.67, Howard University, Washington, DC, Allopathic Medicine, May 1988
Burt, Hugh A., Washington, DC, $63,335.86, Georgetown University, Washington, DC, Allopathic Medicine, May 1990
Clark, Charles H., Washington, DC, $14,593.47, Howard University, Washington, DC, Allopathic Medicine, May 1982
Clark, Jeannine A., Washington, DC, $15,660.16, Georgetown University, Washington, DC, Allopathic Medicine, May 1981
Clark, John J., Washington, DC, $39,571.69, George Washington University, Washington, DC, Allopathic Medicine, May 1981
Cuffy, Lewis, Washington, DC, $54,746.88, Georgetown University, Washington, DC, Allopathic Medicine, May 1990
Greaves, Jeanette J., Washington, DC, $54,784.29, Georgetown University, Washington, DC, Allopathic Medicine, May 1985
Johnson, Gavia E., Washington, DC, $7,628.19, Howard University, Washington, DC, Allopathic Medicine, May 1991
McAllister, Amazair, Washington, DC, $3,817.55, Howard University, Washington, DC, Allopathic Medicine, May 1983
Owino, Stephen S., Washington, DC, $2,244.18, Howard University, Washington, DC, Allopathic Medicine, May 1987
Pressley, Deborah L., Washington, DC, $9,045.79, Univ of Colorado Health Science Center, Denver, CO, Allopathic Medicine, August 1979
Spencer, Silvano A., Washington, DC, $7,210.75, Howard University, Washington, DC, Allopathic Medicine, May 1986
Taylor, David, Washington, DC, $1,804.14, Howard University, Washington, DC, Allopathic Medicine, May 1991
Wiggins, Denise D., Washington, DC, $80,810.75, Georgetown University, Washington, DC, Allopathic Medicine, May 1985

Chiropractic

Darawshi, Jaber M., Washington, DC, $6,345.16, Cleveland Chiropractic College, Kansas City, MO, Chiropractic, May 1985

Dentistry

Adedara, Isaac O., Washington, DC, $65,897.72, Howard University, Washington, DC, Dentistry, May 1990
Cheek Jr, Albert A., Washington, DC, $22,023.11, Howard University, Washington, DC, Dentistry, May 1988
Cruz, James J., Washington, DC, $17,534.82, Georgetown University, Washington, DC, Dentistry, May 1988
Elfter, George N., Washington, DC, $23,997.15, Columbia University, New York, NY, Dentistry, May 1989
Gross, Shepherd, Washington, DC, $108,581.56, Howard University, Washington, DC, Dentistry, May 1986

Hailstock, Marshelle, Washington, DC, $9,252.98, Howard University, Washington, DC, Dentistry, May 1985
Harris, Conrad W., Washington, DC, $78,560.55, Howard University, Washington, DC, Dentistry, May 1985
Jacobson, Douglas N., Washington, DC, $25,043.27, Washington University, St Louis, MO, Dentistry, May 1987
Jones, Sherman, Washington, DC, $88,638.27, Howard University, Washington, DC, Dentistry, May 1989
Kelly Jr, Johnie, Washington, DC, $19,894.00, Georgetown University, Washington, DC, Dentistry, May 1988
King, James H., Washington, DC, $26,142.95, Howard University, Washington, DC, Dentistry, May 1990
Labate, Cathleen A., Washington, DC, $22,407.57, Ohio State University, Columbus, OH, Dentistry, June 1986
Mack, Stephanie, Washington, DC, $13,909.17, Howard University, Washington, DC, Dentistry, May 1991
Markham, Robert R., Washington, DC, $15,720.45, Howard University, Washington, DC, Dentistry, May 1988
Perry-Dodson, Elizabeth, Washington, DC, $14,743.55, Howard University, Washington, DC, Dentistry, December 1987
Pettaway, Reginald, Washington, DC, $36,447.16, Howard University, Washington, DC, Dentistry, May 1989
Ruffin, Wayne A., Washington, DC, $36,907.50, Howard University, Washington, DC, Dentistry, May 1987
Sims, Michael A., Washington, DC, $27,757.67, Georgetown University, Washington, DC, Dentistry, May 1983
Smith, Daniel, Washington, DC, $11,597.92, Howard University, Washington, DC, Dentistry, May 1984
Smith, Ellison B., Washington, DC, $26,696.55, Howard University, Washington, DC, Dentistry, May 1990
Smith, Vasco A., Washington, DC, $139,562.47, Meharry Medical College, Nashville, TN, Dentistry, May 1984
Tucker, Lawrence, Washington, DC, $16,576.71, Georgetown University, Washington, DC, Dentistry, May 1989
Whitaker, Aaron T., Washington, DC, $42,109.72, Howard University, Washington, DC, Dentistry, May 1984
Wilson, Tanya R., Washington, DC, $6,181.45, Ohio State University, Columbus, OH, Dentistry, June 1987

Optometry

Howard, Veryl E., Washington, DC, $17,491.94, Pennsylvania College of Optometry, Philadelphia, PA, Optometry, May 1988

Osteopathy

Carter-Miller, Loretta L., Washington, DC, $2,610.55, Michigan State University, East Lansing, MI, Osteopathy, June 1987
Hopkins, Garland W., Washington, DC, $67,368.50, Philadelphia Col of Osteopathic Medicine, Philadelphia, PA, Osteopathy, June 1985

Pharmacy

Carter, Kevin, Washington, DC, $19,610.24, Howard University, Washington, DC, Pharmacy, May 1987
Martin Jr, Samuel, Washington, DC, $63,465.22, Howard University, Washington, DC, Pharmacy, May 1986
Ross, Tanya, Washington, DC, $33,531.87, Temple University, Philadelphia, PA, Pharmacy, June 1986

Podiatry

Chatmon, Deirdre, Washington, DC, $44,168.82, New York College of Podiatric Medicine, New York, NY, Podiatry, June 1989
Rucker, Gail M., Washington, DC, $146,417.44, New York College of Podiatric Medicine, New York, NY, Podiatry, June 1985
Travis, Andrew F., Washington, DC, $152,894.37, New York College of Podiatric Medicine, New York, NY, Podiatry, June 1987

Veterinary Medicine

Reid-Quinn, Cheri A., Washington, DC, $44,504.08, Tuskegee University, Tuskegee, AL, Veterinary Medicine, May 1983

Florida

Allopathic Medicine

Alexander, Zandrina, Brandon, FL, $18,979.64, Univ of Connecticut Health Center, Farmington, CT, Allopathic Medicine, May 1983
Burks, Teman, Tampa, FL, $184,136.54, Georgetown University, Washington, DC, Allopathic Medicine, May 1984
Cadrecha, Cheryl, Gainesville, FL, $13,785.23, Univ of Florida, Gainesville, FL, Allopathic Medicine, June 1990
Carazo, Andres, Miami, FL, $58,066.59, Tulane University, New Orleans, LA, Allopathic Medicine, June 1987
Collins, Matthew C., Altamonte Springs, FL, $16,639.18, Mayo Medical School, Rochester, MN, Allopathic Medicine, May 1987
Cooper, Charles R., Jacksonville, FL, $17,507.64, Univ of Miami, Miami, FL, Allopathic Medicine, June 1983
Darrisaw, Brian R., Daytona Beach, FL, $5,882.70, Cornell University Medical College, New York, NY, Allopathic Medicine, May 1987
Dreier, Yolanda J., Tampa, FL, $8,464.30, Indiana University Indianapolis, Bloomington, IN, Allopathic Medicine, May 1986
Ellis, Stanley B., Orlando, FL, $57,045.66, Loma Linda University, Loma Linda, CA, Allopathic Medicine, May 1987
Ellison, Dennard W., Jacksonville, FL, $12,677.76, Univ of Florida, Gainesville, FL, Allopathic Medicine, May 1986
Gelbard, Steven D., Fort Lauderdale, FL, $177,534.06, Tufts University, Boston, MA, Allopathic Medicine, June 1983
Koesterman, Charley F., Miami, FL, $60,094.84, Univ of North Dakota, Grand Forks, ND, Allopathic Medicine, May 1987
Kunen, Frederick J., Miami, FL, $52,236.45, Univ of Miami, Miami, FL, Allopathic Medicine, June 1982
Lloyd, Antoinette L., Orange Park, FL, $12,781.00, Yale University, New Haven, CT, Allopathic Medicine, May 1985
Mowrey, James V., Pensacola, FL, $17,567.60, Univ of Miami, Miami, FL, Allopathic Medicine, June 1986
Parks, Gregory G., St Petersburg, FL, $4,905.23, Morehouse School of Medicine, Atlanta, GA, Allopathic Medicine, May 1989
Pinkston, Garvey R., Silver Springs, FL, $67,524.82, Univ of Miami, Miami, FL, Allopathic Medicine, June 1981
Pittman, Kenneth R., Fort Lauderdale, FL, $11,706.77, Mercer University, Macon, GA, Allopathic Medicine, June 1986
Reddick, David J., Royal Palm Beach, FL, $38,557.49, Boston University Medical Center, Boston, MA, Allopathic Medicine, May 1985
Rhodes, Thomas, Beverly Hills, FL, $12,976.91, Univ of South Florida, Tampa, FL, Allopathic Medicine, June 1989
Rose, Stefan, Miami, FL, $60,461.83, Univ of Miami, Miami, FL, Allopathic Medicine, May 1985
Sanchez, Wilfredo, Miami, FL, $9,876.94, Rush University, Chicago, IL, Allopathic Medicine, June 1987
Scott, Clarence, Sanford, FL, $214,240.57, Georgetown University, Washington, DC, Allopathic Medicine, May 1986
Smith, Barbara B., Coral Springs, FL, $22,095.95, Albert Einstein Med Col of Yeshiva Univ, Bronx, NY, Allopathic Medicine, June 1982
Smith, George, Tampa, FL, $178,643.81, Hahnemann University, Philadelphia, PA, Allopathic Medicine, June 1984
Smith, Willielyra, Miami, FL, $7,693.65, Wright State University, Dayton, OH, Allopathic Medicine, June 1989
Wade, Larren, Boca Raton, FL, $20,550.57, Univ of Miami, Miami, FL, Allopathic Medicine, May 1990

Chiropractic

Anderson, Barry, Tampa, FL, $1,907.90, Northwestern College of Chiropractic, Bloomington, MN, Chiropractic, December 1982
Bailey, Darrell E., Lynn Haven, FL, $20,097.83, Life College, Marietta, GA, Chiropractic, March 1989
Baker III, James W., Jacksonville, FL, $60,198.00, Life College, Marietta, GA, Chiropractic, December 1986
Barner, Russell, Tampa, FL, $141,142.76, Life College, Marietta, GA, Chiropractic, December 1986
Bartnett, Edmond E., North Miami Beach, FL, $63,097.87, Life College, Marietta, GA, Chiropractic, March 1985
Bennett, David, Ormond Beach, FL, $9,283.00, Life College, Marietta, GA, Chiropractic, September 1985
Bennett, Regina V., Clearwater, FL, $135,472.06, Life College, Marietta, GA, Chiropractic, March 1986
Berry, Virgil, Starke, FL, $97,315.69, Cleveland Chiropractic College, Kansas City, MO, Chiropractic, May 1986
Blackman, Gregory D., Port St Lucie, FL, $14,507.85, Life College, Marietta, GA, Chiropractic, June 1982
Boley, Glenn E., Coral Springs, FL, $45,336.23, National College of Chiropractic, Lombard, IL, Chiropractic, April 1988
Born, Kenice A., Clearwater, FL, $58,990.31, National College of Chiropractic, Lombard, IL, Chiropractic, August 1986
Boshes, Perri D., Boca Raton, FL, $17,784.77, Life College, Marietta, GA, Chiropractic, December 1984
Boyer, Glenn, Hollywood, FL, $8,461.32, Life College, Marietta, GA, Chiropractic, December 1984
Brimm, Willard, Tampa, FL, $54,633.70, Cleveland Chiropractic College, Kansas City, MO, Chiropractic, September 1985
Brousseau, Wayne, Casselberry, FL, $15,724.32, Life College, Marietta, GA, Chiropractic, June 1983
Brown, Michael L., Fort Pierce, FL, $64,106.15, Life College, Marietta, GA, Chiropractic, September 1989
Buskirk, Dayna E., Gainesville, FL, $48,384.10, Life College, Marietta, GA, Chiropractic, March 1987
Calrissian, Lando, Milton, FL, $15,992.32, Life College, Marietta, GA, Chiropractic, March 1990
Campanale, Paul R., Jacksonville, FL, $25,744.65, New York Chiropractic College, Seneca Falls, NY, Chiropractic, April 1984
Campo, John I., Tampa, FL, $97,552.31, National College of Chiropractic, Lombard, IL, Chiropractic, August 1986
Carageorge, Dawn C., Tampa, FL, $33,663.98, Life College, Marietta, GA, Chiropractic, June 1989
Carpenter, Richard, Tampa, FL, $81,001.41, Life College, Marietta, GA, Chiropractic, March 1986
Carrancejie, Monica, Tampa, FL, $76,529.78, Life College, Marietta, GA, Chiropractic, December 1986
Caudill, Curtis, St. Petersburg, FL, $14,279.76, Life College, Marietta, GA, Chiropractic, September 1983
Cohen, Scott, Hollywood, FL, $31,984.16, Life College, Marietta, GA, Chiropractic, December 1990
Constantinoff, Karen, Cape Coral, FL, $6,641.63, Life College, Marietta, GA, Chiropractic, June 1983
Dejesus, Jose A., Miami, FL, $17,498.26, Logan College of Chiropractic, Chesterfield, MO, Chiropractic, January 1984
Dejesus-Kock, Iris M., Miami, FL, $10,580.81, Logan College of Chiropractic, Chesterfield, MO, Chiropractic, April 1983
Densmore, Robert D., Tampa, FL, $24,570.45, Texas Chiropractic College Foundation, Pasadena, TX, Chiropractic, December 1984
Diesen, James D., Orange Park, FL, $62,100.84, Logan College of Chiropractic, Chesterfield, MO, Chiropractic, April 1988
Dinofer, Jeffrey, Miami, FL, $44,998.67, Life College, Marietta, GA, Chiropractic, March 1989
Douglas, Bonnie J., Largo, FL, $49,264.97, Life College, Marietta, GA, Chiropractic, September 1984
Draluck, Dean, Margate, FL, $17,906.76, Life College, Marietta, GA, Chiropractic, September 1989
Dungan, Kim V., Sunrise, FL, $57,656.57, Life College, Marietta, GA, Chiropractic, June 1984
Erickson, Brock T., Delray Beach, FL, $8,079.35, Life College, Marietta, GA, Chiropractic, September 1990
Etienne, Ivan, Miami, FL, $14,515.69, National College of Chiropractic, Lombard, IL, Chiropractic, May 1983
Fabricant, Michael M., Davie, FL, $59,596.34, Cleveland Chiropractic College, Kansas City, MO, Chiropractic, May 1984
Falowski, Frances, Fort Lauderdale, FL, $145,583.72, Life College, Marietta, GA, Chiropractic, September 1985
Fine, Mitchell L., Laurel Hill, FL, $14,939.02, Life College, Marietta, GA, Chiropractic, December 1983
Fountain, Rodney E., Fort Myers, FL, $116,071.13, Texas Chiropractic College Foundation, Pasadena, TX, Chiropractic, May 1984
Garone, Joseph J., Miramar, FL, $45,980.89, Palmer College of Chiropractic, Davenport, IA, Chiropractic, December 1984
Garver, Gordon B., St Augustine, FL, $29,258.35, Life College, Marietta, GA, Chiropractic, June 1982
Giallanzo, Tom, Dania, FL, $111,750.07, Palmer College of Chiropractic West, San Jose, CA, Chiropractic, December 1985
Glasgow, James, Stuart, FL, $24,960.39, Northwestern College of Chiropractic, Bloomington, MN, Chiropractic, April 1984
Glogower, Audie, West Palm Beach, FL, $60,907.51, New York Chiropractic College, Seneca Falls, NY, Chiropractic, August 1986
Goforth, James, Jackson, FL, $39,853.74, Palmer College of Chiropractic, Davenport, IA, Chiropractic, October 1986
Gordon, Gay L., Sebastian, FL, $14,815.33, Life College, Marietta, GA, Chiropractic, December 1983
Guy, Geoffrey C., Englewood, FL, $17,731.59, Life College, Marietta, GA, Chiropractic, June 1983
Hall, Patricia, Homestead, FL, $23,413.33, New York Chiropractic College, Seneca Falls, NY, Chiropractic, December 1984
Halley, James E., Port Richey, FL, $46,723.93, Cleveland Chiropractic College, Kansas City, MO, Chiropractic, August 1987
Hardwick, James F., Altamonte Springs, FL, $106,957.67, Life College, Marietta, GA, Chiropractic, December 1986
Haut, Ruth A., Kissimmee, FL, $60,562.87, Texas Chiropractic College Foundation, Pasadena, TX, Chiropractic, May 1984
Holzer, Richard R., Hollywood, FL, $49,211.88, Life College, Marietta, GA, Chiropractic, December 1984
Hundley, Kenneth L., Panama City, FL, $141,318.26, Life College, Marietta, GA, Chiropractic, September 1985
Jennings, Peggy P., Gainesville, FL, $39,931.35, Texas Chiropractic College Foundation, Pasadena, TX, Chiropractic, May 1984
Kern, Mark S., Fort Myers, FL, $25,027.40, Life College, Marietta, GA, Chiropractic, June 1983
Kincy, Gary, Key West, FL, $34,947.24, Texas Chiropractic College Foundation, Pasadena, TX, Chiropractic, April 1989
Klejnot, Timothy A., Palm Harbor, FL, $80,624.39, Life College, Marietta, GA, Chiropractic, June 1989
Kolarik, Thomas T., Temple Terrace, FL, $65,723.88, Life College, Marietta, GA, Chiropractic, September 1984
Kornacki, Kerry E., Jacksonville, FL, $34,284.38, Cleveland Chiropractic College, Kansas City, MO, Chiropractic, September 1986

Krista, Geraldine M., Orange City, FL, $114,446.82, Life College, Marietta, GA, Chiropractic, September 1985
Lada, Richard, Citrus Springs, FL, $43,681.06, Life College, Marietta, GA, Chiropractic, March 1990
Langheier, David D., Clearwater, FL, $32,350.98, Life College, Marietta, GA, Chiropractic, September 1983
Levin, Nancy, Palm Beach Gardens, FL, $48,531.59, Life College, Marietta, GA, Chiropractic, September 1984
Levine, Jeffrey D., Orlando, FL, $42,254.46, Life College, Marietta, GA, Chiropractic, September 1985
Liebman, Jay M., Hallandale, FL, $128,451.86, Life College, Marietta, GA, Chiropractic, March 1985
Machara, Katherine, Deltona, FL, $120,619.14, Life College, Marietta, GA, Chiropractic, December 1986
Mane, Walter, Miami, FL, $103,936.80, Logan College of Chiropractic, Chesterfield, MO, Chiropractic, April 1985
Marcus, Alex, Orlando, FL, $16,157.47, Life College, Marietta, GA, Chiropractic, June 1984
Marsh, Garth, Treasure Island, FL, $11,104.21, Life College, Marietta, GA, Chiropractic, June 1991
McElhinney, Thomas E., St Augustine, FL, $75,973.19, Life College, Marietta, GA, Chiropractic, March 1989
McLerren, Todd, Jacksonville, FL, $35,513.89, Palmer College of Chiropractic, Davenport, IA, Chiropractic, June 1989
Meunier, Edward J., Fort Lauderdale, FL, $142,718.85, Life College, Marietta, GA, Chiropractic, August 1985
Morris Jr, David O., Tampa, FL, $106,686.63, Life College, Marietta, GA, Chiropractic, December 1988
Moses, Robert, Jacksonville, FL, $57,790.81, Life College, Marietta, GA, Chiropractic, December 1984
Pena, Fred, Winter Park, FL, $23,482.51, Palmer College of Chiropractic, Davenport, IA, Chiropractic, June 1988
Price, Douglas A., Tampa, FL, $67,494.01, Life College, Marietta, GA, Chiropractic, June 1983
Robinson, Bruce, Cocoa Beach, FL, $89,188.45, Life College, Marietta, GA, Chiropractic, June 1986
Robitaille, Richard R., Apopka, FL, $93,389.19, Life College, Marietta, GA, Chiropractic, December 1984
Rodriguez, Frank, Longwood, FL, $87,417.70, Los Angeles College of Chiropractic, Whittier, CA, Chiropractic, December 1985
Rodriguez, Marlene, Miami, FL, $25,503.87, Life College, Marietta, GA, Chiropractic, March 1988
Rodriguez, Pedro P., Miami, FL, $10,506.33, Cleveland Chiropractic College, Kansas City, MO, Chiropractic, September 1983
Rosemont, Joann L., Jensen Beach, FL, $6,996.07, Palmer College of Chiropractic, Davenport, IA, Chiropractic, June 1984
Ross, Lawrence, Fort Pierce, FL, $57,171.69, Life College, Marietta, GA, Chiropractic, December 1984
Rossrucker, Kenneth S., Altamonte Springs, FL, $52,444.75, Life College, Marietta, GA, Chiropractic, December 1982
Santa Cruz, Matthew E., Tampa, FL, $40,632.55, Texas Chiropractic College Foundation, Pasadena, TX, Chiropractic, May 1983
Schlapper, Gary, Deland, FL, $65,369.07, Cleveland Chiropractic College, Kansas City, MO, Chiropractic, May 1984
Schnell, Donald, Sarasota, FL, $12,089.68, Palmer College of Chiropractic, Davenport, IA, Chiropractic, June 1992
Shapiro, Abe, Pompano Beach, FL, $7,259.95, Northwestern College of Chiropractic, Bloomington, MN, Chiropractic, September 1990
Siverling, Gerald G., Brandon, FL, $40,127.84, Texas Chiropractic College Foundation, Pasadena, TX, Chiropractic, May 1983
Smith, Mark A., Cape Coral, FL, $18,896.78, National College of Chiropractic, Lombard, IL, Chiropractic, April 1985
Smith, Richard, Pembroke Pines, FL, $38,409.97, Life College, Marietta, GA, Chiropractic, September 1989
South, Steve C., Fort Myers Beach, FL, $24,616.48, Cleveland Chiropractic College, Kansas City, MO, Chiropractic, September 1984
Stallings, Spichael L., Panama City, FL, $43,432.21, Life College, Marietta, GA, Chiropractic, December 1983
Tepperberg, Phillip S., Tavernier, FL, $40,109.61, Los Angeles College of Chiropractic, Whittier, CA, Chiropractic, April 1983
Thiel, Margaret A., St Petersburg, FL, $60,807.76, Life College, Marietta, GA, Chiropractic, September 1988
Thomas, Bruce L., St Petersburg, FL, $96,317.24, Life College, Marietta, GA, Chiropractic, March 1989
Thompson, Rubin, Miami, FL, $6,947.91, Palmer College of Chiropractic, Davenport, IA, Chiropractic, October 1982.
Thornton, Loren, Fruitland Park, FL, $121,833.60, Life College, Marietta, GA, Chiropractic, March 1986.
Vitow, Barry, Boca Raton, FL, $70,235.88, Life College, Marietta, GA, Chiropractic, June 1984.
Walburn, Keith J., Tampa, FL, $42,531.06, Life College, Marietta, GA, Chiropractic, December 1983.
Walker, Duane, Jacksonville, FL, $64,592.90, Life College, Marietta, GA, Chiropractic, September 1986.
Walters, Clark C., Dunedin, FL, $51,381.77, Life College, Marietta, GA, Chiropractic, June 1985.
Whipkey, Douglas G., Jensen Beach, FL, $39,386.63, Cleveland Chiropractic College, Kansas City, MO, Chiropractic, May 1989.
Wieland, David M., St Petersburg, FL, $53,036.90, National College of Chiropractic, Lombard, IL, Chiropractic, August 1983.
Wilkins Jr, Ellison W., Palm Beach, FL, $38,324.29, Los Angeles College of Chiropractic, Whittier, CA, Chiropractic, August 1984.
Wynne, Conrad, Deltona, FL, $21,782.36, Cleveland Chiropractic College, Kansas City, MO, Chiropractic, January 1990.
Yenzer Jr, James, New Smyrna Beach, FL, $150,535.66, Life College, Marietta, GA, Chiropractic, December 1985.
Zulovitz, Mark J., Vero Beach, FL, $69,201.82, Life College, Marietta, GA, Chiropractic, December 1986.

Clinical Psychology

Aufderheide, Dean H., Fort Walton, FL, $16,549.14, Fuller Theological Seminary, Pasadena, CA, Clinical Psychology, June 1988.
Don-pedro, Eric G., Orlando, FL, $42,362.31, American Sch of Professional Psychology, Chicago, IL, Clinical Psychology, November 1984.
Gomez, Gabriella, North Miami Beach, FL, $11,745.90, Nova Southeastern University, Ft Lauderdale, FL, Clinical Psychology, May 1988.
Hall, Pamela A., Fort Lauderdale, FL, $92,744.78, Florida Institute of Technology, Melbourne, FL, Clinical Psychology, June 1987.
Klein, Jean, North Miami Beach, FL, $27,422.28, Nova Southeastern University, Ft Lauderdale, FL, Clinical Psychology, December 1985.
Lamboi, Sangoi, Tampa, FL, $41,300.39, Univ of Florida, Gainesville, FL, Clinical Psychology, December 1987.
Mims, Debbie, Melbourne, FL, $44,930.14, Florida Institute of Technology, Melbourne, FL, Clinical Psychology, June 1988.
Noel, Sheldon S., Miami Beach, FL, $37,002.60, American Sch of Professional Psychology, Chicago, IL, Clinical Psychology, November 1985.

Dentistry

Blehl, Thomas, Orlando, FL, $15,949.39, Boston University Medical Center, Boston, MA, Dentistry, June 1981.
Bruyning, Edwin F., Miami, FL, $100,847.74, Tufts University, Boston, MA, Dentistry, June 1989.

Christopoulos, Steve, St Petersburg, FL, $10,154.89, Boston University Medical Center, Boston, MA, Dentistry, June 1986.
Coello, Carlos A., Boca Raton, FL, $154,055.13, Washington University, St Louis, MO, Dentistry, May 1989.
Concepcion, Jorge L., Miami, FL, $74,965.37, Boston University Medical Center, Boston, MA, Dentistry, May 1989.
Dacosta, Michael P., Miami, FL, $13,475.59, Univ of The Pacific, San Francisco, CA, Dentistry, June 1983.
Gerlecz, Steven, Lynn Haven, FL, $35,347.73, Univ of Missouri Kansas City, Kansas City, MO, Dentistry, April 1985.
Hammonds, Michael, Port Charlotte, FL, $140,561.63, Univ of Louisville, Louisville, KY, Dentistry, August 1984.
Ho, Tram B., St Petersburg, FL, $8,841.04, Virginia Commonwealth University, Richmond, VA, Dentistry, May 1993.
Johnson, Eric, Vero Beach, FL, $24,483.15, Univ of Detroit Mercy, Detroit, MI, Dentistry, May 1989.
Koshman, Brent D., Key West, FL, $58,839.37, Univ of The Pacific, San Francisco, CA, Dentistry, August 1982.
Luis, Jacqueline, Miami, FL, $4,082.98, Univ of Florida, Gainesville, FL, Dentistry, May 1990
Mandracchia, Philip A., Hollywood, FL, $18,269.85, New York University, New York, NY, Dentistry, June 1982
McClure, Brian C., Jupiter, FL, $8,268.97, Univ of Florida, Gainesville, FL, Dentistry, May 1989
Moore, Kimberly, Orlando, FL, $49,675.06, Univ of Missouri Kansas City, Kansas City, MO, Dentistry, May 1985
Mora, Alfred, Port St. Lucie, FL, $149,019.04, Marquette University, Milwaukee, WI, Dentistry, May 1987
Olah, Dian M., St. Petersburg, FL, $50,680.17, Univ of Florida, Gainesville, FL, Dentistry, May 1985
Oppenheimer, John H., St. Petersburg, FL, $163,366.54, Marquette University, Milwaukee, WI, Dentistry, May 1989
Perlman, Bruce C., West Palm Beach, FL, $28,442.05, Emory University, Atlanta, GA, Dentistry, June 1982
Redmon, Maria I., Pensacola, FL, $42,386.01, Marquette University, Milwaukee, WI, Dentistry, May 1988
Rojas, Eduardo, Orlando, FL, $111,211.71, Marquette University, Milwaukee, WI, Dentistry, May 1990
Setien, Anna M., Miami, FL, $32,203.28, Washington University, St. Louis, MO, Dentistry, May 1992
Thomas, Robert, Mary Esther, FL, $158,463.90, Meharry Medical College, Nashville, TN, Dentistry, May 1982
Urban, Curt K., Barefoot Bay, FL, $99,079.93, Marquette University, Milwaukee, WI, Dentistry, May 1983
Ward, Rodney R., Apopka, FL, $12,232.07, Loma Linda University, Loma Linda, CA, Dentistry, September 1983
Wiggins, Kenneth, Hialeah, FL, $4,322.51, Meharry Medical College, Nashville, TN, Dentistry, May 1993
Wilson, Edward R., Clearwater, FL, $112,686.61, Indiana University Indianapolis, Bloomington, IN, Dentistry, July 1986

Optometry

Cummings, Michael A., Tampa, FL, $23,990.29, New England College of Optometry, Boston, MA, Optometry, March 1985
Gardner, Edmond, Cooper City, FL, $164,570.52, Illinois College of Optometry, Chicago, IL, Optometry, May 1983
Kostantinov, Peter, Clearwater, FL, $7,469.80, New England College of Optometry, Boston, MA, Optometry, May 1992
Neal, Terry L., Melbourne, FL, $2,944.41, Southern College of Optometry, Memphis, TN, Optometry, June 1984
Williams, Gary, Jacksonville, FL, $67,637.53, Southern College of Optometry, Memphis, TN, Optometry, May 1989

Osteopathy

Agre, Norman, Fort Lauderdale, FL, $101,089.89, Univ of Health Sciences, Kansas City, MO, Osteopathy, May 1985
Austin, Jerry, Dania, FL, $74,850.17, Nova Southeastern University, North Miami Beach, FL, Osteopathy, June 1989
Baker, Betty J., Miami, FL, $224,850.16, Nova Southeastern University, North Miami Beach, FL, Osteopathy, June 1988
Beers, Richard H., Winter Park, FL, $11,963.64, Univ of Health Sciences, Kansas City, MO, Osteopathy, May 1985
Crutcher, Timothy T., Sarasota, FL, $47,256.71, Nova Southeastern University, North Miami Beach, FL, Osteopathy, June 1987
Hannum III, Robert J., Tampa, FL, $9,337.84, Philadelphia Col of Osteopathic Medicine, Philadelphia, PA, Osteopathy, June 1987
Heisler, Hope J., Cape Coral, FL, $18,291.85, Oklahoma State University, Tulsa, OK, Osteopathy, May 1989
Lyons, Glynnis J., Tampa, FL, $6,983.17, West Virginia School of Osteopathic Med, Lewisburg, WV, Osteopathy, June 1981
Majauskas, Retrantas, West Palm Beach, FL, $225,442.61, Univ of Health Sciences, Kansas City, MO, Osteopathy, May 1985
Morris, Dareld, Fort Myers, FL, $107,787.39, Nova Southeastern University, North Miami Beach, FL, Osteopathy, June 1991
Perrotti, Anthony, Penbroke Pines, FL, $139,805.86, Nova Southeastern University, North Miami Beach, FL, Osteopathy, June 1987
Stephenson, Brenda, Hallandale, FL, $158,789.95, Kirksville Col of Osteopathic Medicine, Kirksville, MO, Osteopathy, June 1986
Tooker, Bruce, Panama City, FL, $122,159.47, Nova Southeastern University, North Miami Beach, FL, Osteopathy, June 1987
Webb, Paul, Dania, FL, $168,025.98, Nova Southeastern University, North Miami Beach, FL, Osteopathy, June 1986
Williams, Edward, Sunrise, FL, $256,451.10, Nova Southeastern University, North Miami Beach, FL, Osteopathy, June 1985

Pharmacy

Butler, Eddie J., Terra Cela, FL, $69,597.81, Mercer University, Atlanta, GA, Pharmacy, June 1981
Copeland-Collier, Kathryn K., St Petersburg, FL, $19,529.79, Univ of Florida, Gainesville, FL, Pharmacy, March 1980
Grice, Arnitta J., Havana, FL, $2,859.73, Texas Southern University, Houston, TX, Pharmacy, May 1989
Spogen, Frederick C., Cocoa Beach, FL, $8,328.92, Massachusetts College of Pharmacy, Boston, MA, Pharmacy, June 1982

Podiatry

Amanambu, Eugene, Hialeah, FL, $98,430.92, Barry University—Podiatric Med, Miami Shores, FL, Podiatry, May 1990
Benitez-Negron, Enrique, Miami, FL, $134,779.25, Univ of Osteo Medical & Health Science, Des Moines, IA, Podiatry, June 1989
Bolanio, Maritza, Miami, FL, $100,387.66, Ohio College of Podiatric Medicine, Cleveland, OH, Podiatry, May 1989
Costanzo, Anthony, St Petersburg, FL, $124,027.46, New York College of Podiatric Medicine, New York, NY, Podiatry, June 1986
Delgado, Jorge, Miami, FL, $36,474.82, Barry University—Podiatric Med, Miami Shores, FL, Podiatry, December 1990
Fine, David D., Oakland Park, FL, $88,320.65, Ohio College of Podiatric

Medicine, Cleveland, OH, Podiatry, May 1984
Gennett, Gregory, Naples, FL, $57,422.35, New York College of Podiatric Medicine, New York, NY, Podiatry, June 1987
Imani, Ibn, Miami, FL, $98,650.10, Barry University—Podiatric Med, Miami Shores, FL, Podiatry, May 1991
Peiss, Stuart, Tequesta, FL, $24,909.23, Dr William Scholl Col of Podiatric Med, Chicago, IL, Podiatry, May 1984
Reed, Bruce, Tampa, FL, $130,223.03, Dr William Scholl Col of Podiatric Med, Chicago, IL, Podiatry, May 1987
Samuels, Petrona P., Fort Lauderdale, FL, $156,695.69, New York College of Podiatric Medicine, New York, NY, Podiatry, June 1986
Smith, Larry L., Tallahassee, FL, $39,439.77, Dr William Scholl Col of Podiatric Med, Chicago, IL, Podiatry, May 1988
Wright, Victor, Valrico, FL, $14,725.63, Dr William Scholl Col of Podiatric Med, Chicago, IL, Podiatry, May 1983

Public Health

Butler, David, Land O Lakes, FL, $7,287.98, Univ of Oklahoma Health Sciences Center, Oklahoma City, OK, Public Health, December 1991
Montgomery, John M., Orange Park, FL, $8,160.18, Yale University, New Haven, CT, Public Health, May 1984
Papillon, Frank H., North Miami, FL, $9,282.58, Univ of Illinois At Chicago, Chicago, IL, Public Health, August 1986

Veterinary Medicine

Howard, Susan, Gainesville, FL, $79,155.40, Univ of Florida, Gainesville, FL, Veterinary Medicine, May 1988

Georgia

Allopathic Medicine

Barnes, William T., Macon, GA, $18,201.69, Mercer University, Macon, GA, Allopathic Medicine, June 1990
Beasley, Mary, Atlanta, GA, $87,421.01, Emory University, Atlanta, GA, Allopathic Medicine, May 1987
Bennett, John G., Marietta, GA, $35,592.64, Medical College of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, PA, Allopathic Medicine, June 1980
Bowen-Hay, Winston B., Norcross, GA, $99,987.80, Morehouse School of Medicine, Atlanta, GA, Allopathic Medicine, May 1991
Brown, Darren W., Doraville, GA, $3,979.43, Wright State University, Dayton, OH, Allopathic Medicine, June 1986
Burrowes, Celio, Atlanta, GA, $83,969.84, Meharry Medical College, Nashville, TN, Allopathic Medicine, May 1982
Cain, Alicia A., Jonesboro, GA, $1,131.41, Meharry Medical College, Nashville, TN, Allopathic Medicine, May 1980
Carroll, Otto, Atlanta, GA, $164,278.44, Oral Roberts University, Tulsa, OK, Allopathic Medicine, May 1986
Chappell, Daniel, Fort Oglethorpe, GA, $79,780.70, Univ of Miami, Miami, FL, Allopathic Medicine, May 1984
Cockrell, Gail Y., Lithonia, GA, $2,818.73, Univ of Cincinnati, Cincinnati, OH, Allopathic Medicine, June 1983
Grant, Patricia, Decatur, GA, $17,116.95, Morehouse School of Medicine, Atlanta, GA, Allopathic Medicine, May 1992
Harper, Jennifer, Atlanta, GA, $220,348.55, Morehouse School of Medicine, Atlanta, GA, Allopathic Medicine, June 1985
Horne, Hilton M., Quitman, GA, $41,594.16, Meharry Medical College, Nashville, TN, Allopathic Medicine, May 1979
Isaacs, Rolin W., Atlanta, GA, $58,301.40, Morehouse School of Medicine, Atlanta, GA, Allopathic Medicine, June 1985
Majeed, Ishaq I., Atlanta, GA, $87,790.34, Morehouse School of Medicine, Atlanta, GA, Allopathic Medicine, May 1987
Maynard, Lawrence, Atlanta, GA, $3,131.97, Univ of Massachusetts Worcester, Worcester, MA, Allopathic Medicine, June 1986
Mcghee, James E., Stone Mountain, GA, $4,019.93, Emory University, Atlanta, GA, Allopathic Medicine, May 1988
Meyer, Richard, Marietta, GA, $53,944.30, Loma Linda University, Loma Linda, CA, Allopathic Medicine, June 1985
Millon, Jeffrey, Lithonia, GA, $40,927.85, Meharry Medical College, Nashville, TN, Allopathic Medicine, August 1985
Nelson, Robert, Gray, GA, $4,599.29, Meharry Medical College, Nashville, TN, Allopathic Medicine, May 1979
Patterson, Lea T., Atlanta, GA, $8,975.57, Morehouse School of Medicine, Atlanta, GA, Allopathic Medicine, May 1990
Rachel, Everett D., Stone Mountain, GA, $4,997.84, Univ of Alabama Birmingham, Birmingham, AL, Allopathic Medicine, June 1989
Salimonu, Olidele K., Decatur, GA, $53,427.85, Univ of Illinois Medical Center, Chicago, IL, Allopathic Medicine, June 1987
Samarasinghe, Ajit, Atlanta, GA, $5,236.68, Meharry Medical College, Nashville, TN, Allopathic Medicine, May 1990
Smith, Charles, St Marys, GA, $40,507.75, Tufts University, Boston, MA, Allopathic Medicine, May 1988
Staples Horne, Michelle J., Decatur, GA, $7,076.10, Morehouse School of Medicine, Atlanta, GA, Allopathic Medicine, May 1990
Stull, Tina, Stone Mountain, GA, $8,575.81, Emory University, Atlanta, GA, Allopathic Medicine, May 1988
Watson Jr, Henry, Atlanta, GA, $26,906.09, Meharry Medical College, Nashville, TN, Allopathic Medicine, May 1980
Woody, Edith K., Atlanta, GA, $26,178.08, Ohio State University, Columbus, OH, Allopathic Medicine, December 1982
Yarde, William L., Jonesboro, GA, $110,299.19, Morehouse School of Medicine, Atlanta, GA, Allopathic Medicine, May 1985

Chiropractic

Ackermann, Anne E., Marietta, GA, $52,432.65, Life College, Marietta, GA, Chiropractic, September 1984
Ackermann, Brian J., Marietta, GA, $51,164.74, Life College, Marietta, GA, Chiropractic, September 1984
Agee, Mark, Marietta, GA, $53,453.96, Life College, Marietta, GA, Chiropractic, December 1984
Ali, Abdirazak A., College Park, GA, $23,433.71, Life College, Marietta, GA, Chiropractic, June 1990
Ash, Carla L., Marietta, GA, $86,481.47, Life College, Marietta, GA, Chiropractic, September 1986
Bakels, James E., Marietta, GA, $22,268.49, Life College, Marietta, GA, Chiropractic, September 1990
Barner, Robert, Marietta, GA, $52,577.49, Life College, Marietta, GA, Chiropractic, December 1983
Bell, Clayton, Riverdale, GA, $123,028.36, Life College, Marietta, GA, Chiropractic, September 1987
Berman, David H., Marietta, GA, $123,052.47, Life College, Marietta, GA, Chiropractic, March 1987
Bernius, Gregory L., Peachtree City, GA, $68,828.41, Palmer College of Chiropractic, Davenport, IA, Chiropractic, June 1988
Billstrom, Richard, Marietta, GA, $88,395.30, Life College, Marietta, GA, Chiropractic, December 1986
Bishop Jr., William B., Cartersville, GA, $22,807.28, Life College, Marietta, GA, Chiropractic, June 1988
Blake, Lisa M., Decatur, GA, $82,369.91, New York Chiropractic College, Seneca Falls, NY, Chiropractic, April 1988
Bleyaert, Lamont L., Woodstock, GA, $55,550.76, Life College, Marietta, GA, Chiropractic, September 1985

Bohr, Corinne E., Alpharetta, GA, $63,426.80, Life College, Marietta, GA, Chiropractic, June 1986
Breazeale, Michael, Marietta, GA, $120,675.42, Life College, Marietta, GA, Chiropractic, March 1987
Brooks, William, Decatur, GA, $62,942.69, Life College, Marietta, GA, Chiropractic, March 1984
Brown, George A., Smyrna, GA, $8,504.68, Cleveland Chiropractic College, Kansas City, MO, Chiropractic, September 1990
Brown, Wilbur E., Dunwoody, GA, $11,705.31, Palmer College of Chiropractic, Davenport, IA, Chiropractic, June 1984
Burleson, David A., Marietta, GA, $22,930.00, Life College, Marietta, GA, Chiropractic, September 1984
Burnett, Diane G., Atlanta, GA, $10,807.37, Life College, Marietta, GA, Chiropractic, December 1986
Byrd, Ricardau R., Atlanta, GA, $27,852.19, Life College, Marietta, GA, Chiropractic, September 1982
Caporaso, Nicholas, Lawrenceville, GA, $30,301.38, Life College, Marietta, GA, Chiropractic, June 1988
Carpenter, Jacob O., Decatur, GA, $17,467.79, Life College, Marietta, GA, Chiropractic, September 1985
Cassan, Steven S., Canton, GA, $29,388.54, Life College, Marietta, GA, Chiropractic, March 1985
Catalfo, Tim, Roswell, GA, $78,574.44, Life College, Marietta, GA, Chiropractic, September 1988
Cavaliere, Frances F., Marietta, GA, $80,763.65, Life College, Marietta, GA, Chiropractic, September 1984
Chochla, Thomas N., Marietta, GA, $74,734.10, Life College, Marietta, GA, Chiropractic, September 1988
Cicala, Carmine J., Marietta, GA, $82,903.90, Life College, Marietta, GA, Chiropractic, March 1987
Cirou, Barbara L., Athens, GA, $8,647.06, Life College, Marietta, GA, Chiropractic, March 1982
Clark, Richard, Folkston, GA, $95,929.42, Life College, Marietta, GA, Chiropractic, March 1985
Clay, Cassius C., Atlanta, GA, $29,308.66, Life College, Marietta, GA, Chiropractic, June 1983
Collins Jr., Cecil E., Canton, GA, $60,016.38, Life College, Marietta, GA, Chiropractic, June 1985
Conard, Arden M., Marietta, GA, $20,509.28, Life College, Marietta, GA, Chiropractic, June 1984
Cook, Robert, Tennille, GA, $68,134.49, Palmer College of Chiropractic, Davenport, IA, Chiropractic, March 1985
Cooper, Robert N., Marietta, GA, $8,168.66, Life College, Marietta, GA, Chiropractic, December 1990
Cosmelli, Patricia, Marietta, GA, $3,975.80, Life College, Marietta, GA, Chiropractic, December 1986
Cox, Harold D., Marietta, GA, $131,801.29, Palmer College of Chiropractic West, San Jose, CA, Chiropractic, March 1987
Crawford, Franklin R., Marietta, GA, $58,193.86, Life College, Marietta, GA, Chiropractic, December 1984
Crimes, Patricia T., Duluth, GA, $71,673.34, Life College, Marietta, GA, Chiropractic, December 1986
Crosswhite, Larry K., Oakwood, GA, $123,588.33, Life College, Marietta, GA, Chiropractic, September 1986
Culver, Toni Y., Atlanta, GA, $58,363.47, Life College, Marietta, GA, Chiropractic, June 1985
Day, Philip P., Savannah, GA, $68,183.27, Life College, Marietta, GA, Chiropractic, December 1986
Deopp, William N., Marietta, GA, $46,453.37, Life College, Marietta, GA, Chiropractic, June 1985
Downes, John, Kennesaw, GA, $110,800.07, Life College, Marietta, GA, Chiropractic, September 1986
Duker, John, Conyers, GA, $115,424.31, Life College, Marietta, GA, Chiropractic, March 1987
Earley, Kenneth S., Lawrenceville, GA, $62,727.19, Life College, Marietta, GA, Chiropractic, December 1987
Elkins, Richard, Marietta, GA, $31,284.51, Life College, Marietta, GA, Chiropractic, June 1989
Farley, James J., Marietta, GA, $50,333.80, Life College, Marietta, GA, Chiropractic, September 1986
Farmer, Henry C., Cedartown, GA, $38,202.64, Life College, Marietta, GA, Chiropractic, March 1985
Ficco, David S., Duluth, GA, $70,723.83, Life College, Marietta, GA, Chiropractic, December 1986
Fisher, Michael, Marietta, GA, $30,007.17, Life College, Marietta, GA, Chiropractic, March 1989
Fordiani, Thomas R., Marietta, GA, $143,069.48, Life College, Marietta, GA, Chiropractic, September 1986
Francis, Michael J., Jonesboro, GA, $50,955.58, Life College, Marietta, GA, Chiropractic, June 1986
Galzarano, Carole, Marietta, GA, $68,862.92, Life College, Marietta, GA, Chiropractic, June 1987
Gay, Warner, Marietta, GA, $31,512.73, Life College, Marietta, GA, Chiropractic, March 1983
Gill, Joseph, Fayetteville, GA, $130,252.66, Life College, Marietta, GA, Chiropractic, March 1987
Gotkin, Stuart S., Marietta, GA, $57,556.55, Life College, Marietta, GA, Chiropractic, December 1985
Green, Stephen, Kennesaw, GA, $70,668.31, Life College, Marietta, GA, Chiropractic, December 1985
Greene, Silas R., Macon, GA, $32,484.23, Life College, Marietta, GA, Chiropractic, June 1984
Gross, Thomas, Cartersville, GA, $65,548.58, Life College, Marietta, GA, Chiropractic, December 1983
Hall, John L., Cartersville, GA, $122,359.54, Life College, Marietta, GA, Chiropractic, June 1987
Hejeij, Wassim H., Morrow, GA, $11,159.69, Life College, Marietta, GA, Chiropractic, December 1991
Holewinski, Kenneth, Marietta, GA, $34,945.40, Life College, Marietta, GA, Chiropractic, September 1984
Horsley, Ronald G., Kennewaw, GA, $37,049.52, Life College, Marietta, GA, Chiropractic, June 1985
Hoyt, John A., Atlanta, GA, $7,551.32, Life College, Marietta, GA, Chiropractic, March 1988
Hush, George G., Smyrna, GA, $47,967.55, Life College, Marietta, GA, Chiropractic, December 1986
Iraci, Cynthia L., Waleska, GA, $101,241.61, Life College, Marietta, GA, Chiropractic, June 1986
Jackson, Jerry, Marietta, GA, $46,898.80, Life College, Marietta, GA, Chiropractic, December 1988
Judd, Ronald K., Jasper, GA, $49,301.73, Life College, Marietta, GA, Chiropractic, March 1984
Justice, James, Lawrenceville, GA, $139,398.22, Life College, Marietta, GA, Chiropractic, June 1985
Kay, Alicia E., Atlanta, GA, $42,821.23, Life College, Marietta, GA, Chiropractic, June 1984
King, David, Smyrna, GA, $32,963.99, Life College, Marietta, GA, Chiropractic, September 1985
Klubenspies, John, Lilburn, GA, $84,756.79, Life College, Marietta, GA, Chiropractic, September 1986
Kowalske, Philip P., Marietta, GA, $123,017.60, Life College, Marietta, GA, Chiropractic, December 1986
Kozel, Noreen V., Powder Springs, GA, $4,927.18, Life College, Marietta, GA, Chiropractic, June 1990
Kyle, George, Lawrenceville, GA, $53,570.41, Life College, Marietta, GA, Chiropractic, March 1983
Lambert-Kemlage, Sharon A., Marietta, GA, $98,288.54, Life College, Marietta, GA, Chiropractic, March 1986
Lee, Carole, Acworth, GA, $24,527.34, Life College, Marietta, GA, Chiropractic, December 1983
Lister, Rufus G., Marietta, GA, $44,094.15, Life College, Marietta, GA, Chiropractic, June 1988
Lowman, John R., Marietta, GA, $66,264.05, Life College, Marietta, GA, Chiropractic, June 1986
Lubnewski, Peter P., Smyrna, GA, $99,032.18, Life College, Marietta, GA, Chiropractic, September 1983

Mahar, Dale, Marietta, GA, $41,201.85, Life College, Marietta, GA, Chiropractic, March 1984
Marcum, Craig, Morrow, GA, $4,918.53, Life College, Marietta, GA, Chiropractic, June 1991
Marsh, Jeffrey C., Marietta, GA, $99,684.55, Life College, Marietta, GA, Chiropractic, June 1989
Martin Jr, John W., Canton, GA, $78,107.88, Life College, Marietta, GA, Chiropractic, September 1986
Martin, Craig S., Dublin, GA, $57,081.04, Life College, Marietta, GA, Chiropractic, June 1989
Mason, George G M, Decatur, GA, $16,411.08, Logan College of Chiropractic, Chesterfield, MO, Chiropractic, April 1989
Massengale, Gregory L., Marietta, GA, $94,865.89, Life College, Marietta, GA, Chiropractic, March 1986
Mayles, Sandra, Dalton, GA, $68,591.79, Life College, Marietta, GA, Chiropractic, December 1983
McCormick, Robert J., Marietta, GA, $31,757.80, Life College, Marietta, GA, Chiropractic, June 1986
McMahon, Joseph A., Marietta, GA, $8,462.79, Life College, Marietta, GA, Chiropractic, April 1991
McQuaig, John, Stone Mountain, GA, $3,016.75, Logan College of Chiropractic, Chesterfield, MO, Chiropractic, September 1983
Mercks, James L., Marietta, GA, $133,318.65, Life College, Marietta, GA, Chiropractic, March 1986
Merrit, Marvin, Lawrenceville, GA, $22,153.87, Life College, Marietta, GA, Chiropractic, March 1985
Moeckel, Timothy, Atlanta, GA, $57,225.88, Life College, Marietta, GA, Chiropractic, September 1985
Monical, William, Marietta, GA, $49,252.25, Life College, Marietta, GA, Chiropractic, September 1988
Morgan, Charles C., Marietta, GA, $92,653.35, Life College, Marietta, GA, Chiropractic, June 1986
Moritz, Gregory M., Powder Springs, GA, $83,140.08, Life College, Marietta, GA, Chiropractic, December 1984
Mosley, James, Columbus, GA, $44,527.07, Northwestern College of Chiropractic, Bloomington, MN, Chiropractic, August 1985
Mueller, William J., Dunwoody, GA, $59,443.34, Life College, Marietta, GA, Chiropractic, September 1983
Nadel, Glenn R., Marietta, GA, $18,050.99, Life College, Marietta, GA, Chiropractic, April 1989
Nappi, Neil A., Marietta, GA, $47,489.94, Life College, Marietta, GA, Chiropractic, June 1984
Nicholson Jr, James E., Marietta, GA, $106,426.57, Life College, Marietta, GA, Chiropractic, April 1985
Noble, Craig J., Kennesaw, GA, $120,782.80, Life College, Marietta, GA, Chiropractic, September 1986
Ogbuchi, Sampson N., Doraville, GA, $7,621.88, Life College, Marietta, GA, Chiropractic, March 1991
Owens, James R., Atlanta, GA, $12,377.54, Life College, Marietta, GA, Chiropractic, March 1992
Palffy, Victor T., Atlanta, GA, $139,572.98, Life College, Marietta, GA, Chiropractic, March 1986
Palmer, Albert A A, Marietta, GA, $15,710.16, Cleveland Chiropractic College, Kansas City, MO, Chiropractic, May 1989
Palmer, Becky A., Marietta, GA, $71,097.66, Life College, Marietta, GA, Chiropractic, March 1986
Patterson, Jerry E., Smyrna, GA, $24,010.68, Life College, Marietta, GA, Chiropractic, September 1984
Patterson, Mark A., Marietta, GA, $99,652.08, Life College, Marietta, GA, Chiropractic, December 1987
Paul, Roger W., Stone Mountain, GA, $115,762.89, Life College, Marietta, GA, Chiropractic, September 1985
Pavkov, Gary G., Kennesaw, GA, $48,401.75, Life College, Marietta, GA, Chiropractic, March 1987
Penn Jr, Paul P., Atlanta, GA, $60,331.14, Life College, Marietta, GA, Chiropractic, June 1984
Perrier, Debra D., Cedartown, GA, $21,428.03, Life College, Marietta, GA, Chiropractic, June 1985
Polishuk, Andre A., Smyrna, GA, $113,795.46, Life College, Marietta, GA, Chiropractic, January 1984
Pristash, Michael R., Marietta, GA, $93,260.29, Life College, Marietta, GA, Chiropractic, September 1984
Rawlins, Joel J., Smyrna, GA, $116,025.23, Life College, Marietta, GA, Chiropractic, September 1986
Reymann, William M., Marietta, GA, $7,164.80, Life College, Marietta, GA, Chiropractic, March 1986
Rivera, Antonio, Atlanta, GA, $21,651.43, Life College, Marietta, GA, Chiropractic, June 1983
Robideau, Robert R., Roswell, GA, $56,937.22, Life College, Marietta, GA, Chiropractic, September 1985
Rowland, Jimmy H., Warner Robins, GA, $64,614.07, Life College, Marietta, GA, Chiropractic, December 1986
Rutkowski, Morris E., Marietta, GA, $90,654.73, Life College, Marietta, GA, Chiropractic, December 1985
Sarabadan, Davood, Atlanta, GA, $52,941.33, Life College, Marietta, GA, Chiropractic, September 1986
Scala, Timothy T., Marietta, GA, $30,937.21, Life College, Marietta, GA, Chiropractic, September 1984
Scampole, James, Kernsaw, GA, $59,875.02, Life College, Marietta, GA, Chiropractic, September 1985
Schreffler, Keith, Marietta, GA, $21,547.52, Life College, Marietta, GA, Chiropractic, June 1991
Seabolt, Alan A., Marietta, GA, $117,537.17, Life College, Marietta, GA, Chiropractic, October 1986
Seigle, Marcus, Atlanta, GA, $26,013.41, Life College, Marietta, GA, Chiropractic, December 1986
Severson, Charles, Marietta, GA, $37,317.94, Life College, Marietta, GA, Chiropractic, December 1982
Sheick, Steven A., Smyrna, GA, $106,497.54, Life College, Marietta, GA, Chiropractic, September 1986
Siegle, Raymond J., Atlanta, GA, $3,082.21, Life College, Marietta, GA, Chiropractic, June 1991
Sieradzki, Rex A., Atlanta, GA, $64,931.45, Life College, Marietta, GA, Chiropractic, September 1986
Siminski, Larry T., Atlanta, GA, $109,738.59, Life College, Marietta, GA, Chiropractic, June 1988
Small, Tammie, Smyrna, GA, $68,373.48, Life College, Marietta, GA, Chiropractic, September 1989
Snyder, Richard K., Acworth, GA, $31,942.31, Life College, Marietta, GA, Chiropractic, December 1983
Spears, George, Marietta, GA, $82,729.26, Life College, Marietta, GA, Chiropractic, December 1985
Spears, Roseann N., Kennesaw, GA, $130,880.58, Life College, Marietta, GA, Chiropractic, September 1986
Spiva, Walter E., Blairsville, GA, $125,008.76, Life College, Marietta, GA, Chiropractic, September 1986
Spivey, Douglas D., Doraville, GA, $58,753.35, Life College, Marietta, GA, Chiropractic, December 1986
Thomas, Gordon A., Atlanta, GA, $66,429.63, Life College, Marietta, GA, Chiropractic, September 1985
Traff, Randall, Marietta, GA, $4,349.56, Life College, Marietta, GA, Chiropractic, March 1991
Troutman Jr, William D., Atlanta, GA, $51,880.23, Life College, Marietta, GA, Chiropractic, October 1983
Troutman, William W., Atlanta, GA, $28,837.12, Life College, Marietta, GA, Chiropractic, January 1983
Tucker, Ron, Atlanta, GA, $23,157.86, Life Chiropractic College-West, San Lorenzo, CA, Chiropractic, June 1987
Tutt, Gwendolyn M., Roswell, GA, $66,216.68, Life College, Marietta, GA, Chiropractic, June 1983
Vescuso, John A., Marietta, GA, $101,985.23, Life College, Marietta, GA, Chiropractic, September 1986
Vlahos, James G., Norcross, GA, $102,374.81, Life College, Marietta, GA, Chiropractic, September 1985

Walker, James E., Marietta, GA, $153,831.59, Life College, Marietta, GA, Chiropractic, September 1985
Wallace, Mark R., Mableton, GA, $51,389.78, Life College, Marietta, GA, Chiropractic, December 1986
Warrick, Wayne D., Kennesaw, GA, $59,436.56, Life College, Marietta, GA, Chiropractic, March 1987
Weatherly, William, Atlanta, GA, $46,040.69, Life College, Marietta, GA, Chiropractic, June 1983
Wellman, Fred, Smyrna, GA, $16,874.21, Life College, Marietta, GA, Chiropractic, December 1983
Williams, D'oyen A., Stone Mountain, GA, $111,719.83, Life College, Marietta, GA, Chiropractic, December 1984
Yarian, Eldon L., Dunwoody, GA, $13,833.03, Life College, Marietta, GA, Chiropractic, March 1984
Zakrzewski, David, Marietta, GA, $29,972.56, Life College, Marietta, GA, Chiropractic, August 1988
Zonder, Stuart S., Acworth, GA, $79,282.57, Life College, Marietta, GA, Chiropractic, December 1985

Clinical Psychology

Daniels, Gregory C., Atlanta, GA, $59,879.93, Georgia State University, Atlanta, GA, Clinical Psychology, June 1987
Kroupa, Carol, Roswell, GA, $54,362.41, California Sch of Prof Psych Fresno, Fresno, CA, Clinical Psychology, June 1989

Dentistry

Allred, Robert, Lithonia, GA, $188,777.17, Emory University, Atlanta, GA, Dentistry, May 1987
Bowers-Phillips, Donna M., Savannah, GA, $51,913.87, Howard University, Washington, DC, Dentistry, May 1984
Brown, Geoffrey C., Atlanta, GA, $9,414.98, Meharry Medical College, Nashville, TN, Dentistry, May 1985
Carter, James E., Alpharetta, GA, $10,135.39, Medical College of Georgia, Augusta, GA, Dentistry, June 1987
Comer, Barry B., Decatur, GA, $105,941.01, Emory University, Atlanta, GA, Dentistry, May 1984
Comer, Julia R., Decatur, GA, $134,713.74, Emory University, Atlanta, GA, Dentistry, May 1986
Fortson Jr, Henry D., Thomasville, GA, $192,821.78, Meharry Medical College, Nashville, TN, Dentistry, May 1984
Gold, Robert S., Atlanta, GA, $171,294.03, Boston University Medical Center, Boston, MA, Dentistry, May 1988
Hall, John E., Atlanta, GA, $77,596.16, Meharry Medical College, Nashville, TN, Dentistry, May 1982
Hammock, Mark M., Decatur, GA, $40,807.66, Howard University, Washington, DC, Dentistry, May 1989
Holiday, Harry, Statesboro, GA, $91,149.20, Meharry Medical College, Nashville, TN, Dentistry, May 1985
Jackson, Lester, Savannah, GA, $56,263.93, Meharry Medical College, Nashville, TN, Dentistry, May 1985
Kuhlmay, Klaus, Atlanta, GA, $12,120.37, Emory University, Atlanta, GA, Dentistry, May 1987
Lester, Jack, Lithonia, GA, $124,269.89, Meharry Medical College, Nashville, TN, Dentistry, May 1986
Mcdonald, Kenneth, Atlanta, GA, $10,619.02, Virginia Commonwealth University, Richmond, VA, Dentistry, May 1991
Mosley, Nicholas A., Redan, GA, $119,738.19, Meharry Medical College, Nashville, TN, Dentistry, May 1983
Scott, Renee R., Atlanta, GA, $130,280.50, Meharry Medical College, Nashville, TN, Dentistry, May 1986

Osteopathy

Celestin, Alexander J., Savannah, GA, $123,083.66, New York College of Osteopathic Medicine, Old Westbury, NY, Osteopathy, June 1987

Pharmacy

Adu-Agyei, Yaw, Atlanta, GA, $10,631.90, Mercer University, Atlanta, GA, Pharmacy, June 1985
Afrane, Barima B., Decatur, GA, $9,421.55, Univ of Southern California, Los Angeles, CA, Pharmacy, May 1986
Clancy-Knierien, Kimberely A., Marietta, GA, $1,422.83, Mercer University, Atlanta, GA, Pharmacy, June 1987
Edeh, Onyemaechi A., Atlanta, GA, $56,209.89, Mercer University, Atlanta, GA, Pharmacy, June 1983
Felton, Norman N., Decatur, GA, $32,667.74, Mercer University, Atlanta, GA, Pharmacy, June 1983
Hailesalassie, Hapte H., College Park, GA, $41,698.36, Mercer University, Atlanta, GA, Pharmacy, June 1987
Hall, Carolyn, Doraville, GA, $16,056.93, Mercer University, Atlanta, GA, Pharmacy, June 1989
Hanson, Aubrey M., Decatur, GA, $42,432.87, Mercer University, Atlanta, GA, Pharmacy, June 1982
Jackson, Lenell R., College Park, GA, $24,995.07, Mercer University, Atlanta, GA, Pharmacy, August 1987
Lawrence, Doris, Austell, GA, $24,977.44, Mercer University, Atlanta, GA, Pharmacy, May 1985
Lowe, Stephanie, Decatur, GA, $28,077.46, Mercer University, Atlanta, GA, Pharmacy, June 1989
Okosun, Edobor M., College Park, GA, $64,189.81, Mercer University, Atlanta, GA, Pharmacy, August 1984
Osakue, Stephen O., Atlanta, GA, $38,045.26, Mercer University, Atlanta, GA, Pharmacy, June 1986
Sciple, Charles, Atlanta, GA, $68,891.16, Mercer University, Atlanta, GA, Pharmacy, June 1987
Washington, Gwendlyn A., Decatur, GA, $33,714.42, Mercer University, Atlanta, GA, Pharmacy, June 1988
Wiggins III, William, Marietta, GA, $19,193.33, Mercer University, Atlanta, GA, Pharmacy, June 1982
Wingate, Ronald, Atlanta, GA, $5,701.65, Mercer University, Atlanta, GA, Pharmacy, May 1989

Podiatry

Kalali, Saeed, Marietta, GA, $3,808.48, New York College of Podiatric Medicine, New York, NY, Podiatry, June 1990
Kustich, Susan, Augusta, GA, $98,332.42, New York College of Podiatric Medicine, New York, NY, Podiatry, June 1989
Orji, John E., Atlanta, GA, $64,990.96, Univ of Osteo Medical & Health Science, Des moines, IA, Podiatry, June 1991
Storm, Mark, Cumming, GA, $65,177.94, Ohio College of Podiatric Medicine, Cleveland, OH, Podiatry, May 1990

Public Health

Cox, Robert M., Atlanta, GA, $109,926.96, Loma Linda University, Loma Linda, CA, Public Health, September 1981

Veterinary Medicine

Brown, Mazola H., Atlanta, GA, $35,208.37, Tuskegee University, Tuskegee, AL, Veterinary Medicine, May 1983
Friedlander, Michael A., Roswell, GA, $25,861.26, Tuskegee University, Tuskegee, AL, Veterinary Medicine, May 1990
Mcfield, Gizele, Bethlehem, GA, $83,843.02, Tuskegee University, Tuskegee, AL, Veterinary Medicine, May 1982
Slaughter, Edwin L., Atlanta, GA, $22,353.15, Tuskegee University, Tuskegee, AL, Veterinary Medicine, May 1982
Waller, Walton, Marietta, GA, $13,658.28, Tuskegee University, Tuskegee, AL, Veterinary Medicine, May 1990

Hawaii

Allopathic Medicine

Battaglia, Joseph, Kihei, HI, $18,854.59, Univ of Illinois Medical Center,

Chicago, IL, Allopathic Medicine, June 1987
Baum, Kenneth J., Honolulu, HI, $79,639.34, Univ of Med & Dent of New Jersey, Newark, NJ, Allopathic Medicine, May 1985
Gluck, Daniel S., Haleiwa, HI, $208,007.99, Tufts University, Boston, MA, Allopathic Medicine, May 1982
Zasi, Alan, Lihue, HI, $75,948.52, Washington University, St Louis, MO, Allopathic Medicine, May 1987.

Chiropractic

Bennett, Hugh, Honolulu, HI, $5,503.39, Cleveland Chiropractic College, Kansas City, MO, Chiropractic, May 1989
Corn, Byron K., Waianae, HI, $36,102.00, Palmer College of Chiropractic, Davenport, IA, Chiropractic, March 1984
Ferguson, Gary, Honolulu, HI, $58,064.78, Northwestern College of Chiropractic, Bloomington, MN, Chiropractic, August 1988
Johanning, Jeanine J M, Kihei, HI, $43,787.31, Logan College of Chiropractic, Chesterfield, MO, Chiropractic, August 1986
Rider, Ward E., Kailua, HI, $8,744.54, Cleveland Chiropractic College, Los Angeles, CA, Chiropractic, December 1983
Wallace, Owen, Honolulu, HI, $13,188.59, Life College, Marietta, GA, Chiropractic, September 1984

Dentistry

Knickelbine, Mark T., Honolulu, HI, $31,662.78, Marquette University, Milwaukee, WI, Dentistry, May 1982
Riter, Cecil, Honolulu, HI, $18,529.10, Loma Linda University, Loma Linda, CA, Dentistry, June 1985

Optometry

Stine, Gordon J., Lihue, HI, $34,432.64, Pacific University, Forest Grove, OR, Optometry, May 1990

Osteopathy

Denney, Teresa, Honolulu, HI, $132,945.82, College of Osteo Med of the Pacific, Pomona, CA, Osteopathy, June 1983
Reppy, Robert R., Kailua, HI, $181,816.82, College of Osteo Med of the Pacific, Pomona, CA, Osteopathy, June 1986

Idaho

Chiropractic

Buckles, Bobby R., Boise, ID, $57,549.52, Western States Chiropractic College, Portland, OR, Chiropractic, June 1987
Gott, George, Boise, ID, $73,018.54, Palmer College of Chiropractic, Davenport, IA, Chiropractic, September 1984
Herem, Larry A., Burley, ID, $72,796.95, Palmer College of Chiropractic, Davenport, IA, Chiropractic, June 1985
Holmes, Clarence J., Rathdrum, ID, $19,566.50, Life Chiropractic College-West, San Lorenzo, CA, Chiropractic, December 1984
Young, Kerry V., Idaho Falls, ID, $55,562.32, Logan College of Chiropractic, Chesterfield, MO, Chiropractic, December 1987

Clinical Psychology

Furgason, Margaret A., St Maries, ID, $52,756.92, California Sch of Prof Psych San Diego, San Diego, CA, Clinical Psychology, June 1984

Optometry

Murray, Richard, Boise, ID, $52,383.51, Pacific University, Forest Grove, OR, Optometry, May 1987

Illinois

Allopathic Medicine

Armetta, Karen A., Naperville, IL, $24,804.90, Rush University, Chicago, IL, Allopathic Medicine, October 1985
Bacon, Cutia W., Chicago, IL, $5,534.90, Univ of Illinois Medical Center, Chicago, IL, Allopathic Medicine, June 1991
Beckett, James E., Des Plaines, IL, $59,779.25, Hahnemann University, Philadelphia, PA, Allopathic Medicine, June 1981
Burns, Peter, Chicago, IL, $4,135.92, Rush University, Chicago, IL, Allopathic Medicine, June 1990
Cherry, Nanci S., Chicago, IL, $96,694.82, Michigan State University, East Lansing, MI, Allopathic Medicine, December 1987
Cooper, April D., Hazel Crest, IL, $69,837.77, Univ of Illinois Medical Center, Chicago, IL, Allopathic Medicine, June 1989
Dehn, Roger, Crystal Lake, IL, $10,664.30, Univ of Illinois Medical Center, Chicago, IL, Allopathic Medicine, June 1989
Falater, Laura L., Chicago, IL, $68,722.79, Finch University of Health Sciences, North Chicago, IL, Allopathic Medicine, June 1987
Fields, Jessie J., Chicago, IL, $24,456.27, Medical College of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, PA, Allopathic Medicine, June 1982
Forde, Daron D., Westmont, IL, $90,773.34, Univ of Illinois Medical Center, Chicago, IL, Allopathic Medicine, June 1988
Friedman, Rochelle, Chicago, IL, $53,316.53, Finch University of Health Sciences, North Chicago, IL, Allopathic Medicine, June 1987
Garibay, Carlos, Homewood, IL, $34,923.76, Rush University, Chicago, IL, Allopathic Medicine, June 1982
Gebo, Paul D., Arlington Heights, IL, $16,688.36, Univ of Illinois Medical Center, Chicago, IL, Allopathic Medicine, June 1987
Glenn, Byron, Carbondale, IL, $120,189.55, Univ of Illinois Medical Center, Chicago, IL, Allopathic Medicine, August 1987
Griffin-Berry, Carol L., Chicago, IL, $6,375.28, Univ of Illinois Medical Center, Chicago, IL, Allopathic Medicine, June 1989
Hashemi, Kamran, Chicago, IL, $153,696.64, Northwestern University, Chicago, IL, Allopathic Medicine, June 1987
Hernandez, Jose J., Chicago, IL, $43,132.46, Univ of Illinois Medical Center, Chicago, IL, Allopathic Medicine, June 1984
Keyes, Kemmes, Chicago, IL, $44,403.16, Wright State University, Dayton, OH, Allopathic Medicine, June 1983
Kizaire, Danielle C., Chicago, IL, $13,863.25, Loyola University Chicago, Maywood, IL, Allopathic Medicine, June 1984
Kushner, Brad D., Waukegan, IL, $124,692.19, Finch University of Health Sciences, North Chicago, IL, Allopathic Medicine, October 1987
Lessin, Barry D., Chicago, IL, $63,421.38, Univ of Wisconsin Madison, Madison, WI, Allopathic Medicine, May 1983
Little, Carlton, Chicago, IL, $84,914.56, Medical College of Ohio, Toledo, OH, Allopathic Medicine, June 1989
Martin, Noelle, Chicago, IL, $68,335.48, Medical College of Ohio, Toledo, OH, Allopathic Medicine, June 1991
Mitchell, Kevin A., Chicago, IL, $26,576.98, Southern Illinois Univ, Springfield, IL, Allopathic Medicine, May 1987
OH, Kyu, Chicago, IL, $32,233.61, Univ of Illinois Medical Center, Chicago, IL, Allopathic Medicine, June 1991
Pate, Michael D., Des Plaines, IL, $38,759.66, Indiana University Indianapolis, Bloomington, IN, Allopathic Medicine, May 1985
Patterson-Jones, Sharon B., Chicago, IL, $43,764.29, Univ of Illinois Medical Center, Chicago, IL, Allopathic Medicine, June 1983
Phillips, Richard O., Chicago, IL, $148,824.91, Univ of Illinois Medical Center, Chicago, IL, Allopathic Medicine, June 1988
Popoola, Freddie M., Chicago, IL, $171,027.76, Medical College of Wisconsin, Milwaukee, WI, Allopathic Medicine, December 1983

Pursell, Susan, Chicago, IL, $14,588.76, Boston University Medical Center, Boston, MA, Allopathic Medicine, May 1990
Reese, Elaine Thurmond, Dixmoor, IL, $35,019.14, Univ of Illinois Medical Center, Chicago, IL, Allopathic Medicine, June 1984
Salomom, Alix, Chicago, IL, $62,645.77, Meharry Medical College, Nashville, TN, Allopathic Medicine, May 1988
Singleton, Edward L., Olympia Fields, IL, $2,264.74, Univ of Illinois Medical Center, Chicago, IL, Allopathic Medicine, June 1981
Somerville, Phillip P., Palatine, IL, $20,379.31, Univ of Illinois Medical Center, Chicago, IL, Allopathic Medicine, June 1986
Thompson, Anthony W., Chicago, IL, $58,180.24, Rush University, Chicago, IL, Allopathic Medicine, January 1986
Troxler, Harold B., Chicago, IL, $136,060.47, Meharry Medical College, Nashville, TN, Allopathic Medicine, May 1984
West, Clifton B., Chicago, IL, $231,200.88, Meharry Medical College, Nashville, TN, Allopathic Medicine, May 1985
Whittington, Darryll, Vernon Hills, IL, $5,926.96, Univ of Arkansas Medical Center, Little Rock, AR, Allopathic Medicine, May 1990
Williams, Johnnie, Chicago, IL, $27,809.57, Univ of Illinois Medical Center, Chicago, IL, Allopathic Medicine, June 1985
Williams, Karol, Chicago, IL, $119,991.50, Finch University of Health Sciences, North Chicago, IL, Allopathic Medicine, June 1981
Wilson, Evelyn, Chicago, IL, $72,211.26, Morehouse School of Medicine, Atlanta, GA, Allopathic Medicine, June 1985
Woodridge, Charles, Maywood, IL, $137,577.27, Finch University of Health Sciences, North Chicago, IL, Allopathic Medicine, June 1984.
Wuertz, Christopher, Western Springs, IL, $12,191.57, Univ of Illinois Medical Center, Chicago, IL, Allopathic Medicine, June 1984.

Chiropractic

Cienkus, Regina M., Berwyn, IL, $15,050.53, National College of Chiropractic, Lombard, IL, Chiropractic, August 1986.
Cully Jr, Milton A., Cary, IL, $49,171.13, Palmer College of Chiropractic, Davenport, IA, Chiropractic, June 1987.
Darnell, Kevin R., Mt Vernon, IL, $35,264.68, Logan College of Chiropractic, Chesterfield, MO, Chiropractic, December 1986.
Davis, Keith A., Chicago, IL, $58,997.27, National College of Chiropractic, Lombard, IL, Chiropractic, April 1987.
Dehn, Donald C., Rockford, IL, $29,157.63, National College of Chiropractic, Lombard, IL, Chiropractic, May 1983.
Denetry, Donald J., Forest Park, IL, $19,012.62, National College of Chiropractic, Lombard, IL, Chiropractic, April 1982.
Eicke, Christine, Chicago, IL, $22,236.86, National College of Chiropractic, Lombard, IL, Chiropractic, April 1988.
Floriez, Anita D., Moline, IL, $14,993.36, Palmer College of Chiropractic, Davenport, IA, Chiropractic, October 1985.
Gauthier III, George W., Wheaton, IL, $19,441.20, National College of Chiropractic, Lombard, IL, Chiropractic, August 1989.
Hansen, Michael, Park Forest, IL, $43,127.57, Logan College of Chiropractic, Chesterfield, MO, Chiropractic, April 1985.
Johnson, John F., Rock Island, IL, $8,772.38, Palmer College of Chiropractic, Davenport, IA, Chiropractic, October 1989.
Jordan, James R., Calumet City, IL, $56,567.74, National College of Chiropractic, Lombard, IL, Chiropractic, August 1983.
Kaminsky, Arthur, Arlington Heights, IL, $62,704.62, Cleveland Chiropractic College, Kansas City, MO, Chiropractic, May 1990.
King-Duarte, Doreen I., Carol Stream, IL, $15,834.88, National College of Chiropractic, Lombard, IL, Chiropractic, August 1986.
Mash, Harold J., Chicago, IL, $138,698.43, Palmer College of Chiropractic, Davenport, IA, Chiropractic, October 1987.
Mccarthy, Thomas, Moline, IL, $16,512.27, Palmer College of Chiropractic, Davenport, IA, Chiropractic, December 1988.
Moffett, Douglas A., Homewood, IL, $11,377.18, National College of Chiropractic, Lombard, IL, Chiropractic, December 1987.
Moreno, Florencio, Aurora, IL, $18,064.03, Palmer College of Chiropractic, Davenport, IA, Chiropractic, September 1989.
Mullinax, Jeffrey S., Schaumburg, IL, $9,425.87, Logan College of Chiropractic, Chesterfield, MO, Chiropractic, September 1982.
Naddaf, Jamileh K., Newton, IL, $109,165.23, Cleveland Chiropractic College, Kansas City, MO, Chiropractic, May 1988.
Oslay, Russell C., Ashton, IL, $14,489.01, Palmer College of Chiropractic, Davenport, IA, Chiropractic, March 1987.
Patterson, Farris, Maywood, IL, $26,381.39, National College of Chiropractic, Lombard, IL, Chiropractic, April 1984.
Penze, Robert, Arlington Heights, IL, $24,643.45, National College of Chiropractic, Lombard, IL, Chiropractic, April 1988.
Pettit, David C., Moline, IL, $66,689.39, Palmer College of Chiropractic, Davenport, IA, Chiropractic, October 1989.
Reynolds, Betty, Jacksonville, IL, $3,254.24, Logan College of Chiropractic, Chesterfield, MO, Chiropractic, December 1992.
Rieck-Rosecrans, Cathy, Wheaton, IL, $27,289.56, National College of Chiropractic, Lombard, IL, Chiropractic, August 1985.
Sandburg, Donald D., Barrington, IL, $86,325.92, National College of Chiropractic, Lombard, IL, Chiropractic, April 1987.
Sayre, Bruce, Chicago, IL, $16,745.90, Palmer College of Chiropractic, Davenport, IA, Chiropractic, October 1985.
Sierra, Caroline, East Moline, IL, $46,590.96, Palmer College of Chiropractic, Davenport, IA, Chiropractic, March 1986.
Skonie, Roger, Aurora, IL, $15,401.68, National College of Chiropractic, Lombard, IL, Chiropractic, April 1991.
Slavin, Mark B., Schaumburg, IL, $15,199.04, National College of Chiropractic, Lombard, IL, Chiropractic, August 1986.
Smith, Gary D., Gurnee, IL, $94,813.13, Logan College of Chiropractic, Chesterfield, MO, Chiropractic, August 1985
Smith, Myra B., Niles, IL, $68,442.32, National College of Chiropractic, Lombard, IL, Chiropractic, August 1985
Smith-Burton, Cythia C W, Chicago, IL, $74,971.83, Cleveland Chiropractic College, Kansas City, MO, Chiropractic, September 1985
Soares, Luiz, Chicago, IL, $106,370.75, Palmer College of Chiropractic, Davenport, IA, Chiropractic, March 1988
Stratton, Mark W., Du Quoin, IL, $56,029.98, Logan College of Chiropractic, Chesterfield, MO, Chiropractic, December 1985
Stuart Jr, William E., Chicago, IL, $45,746.53, Palmer College of Chiropractic, Davenport, IA, Chiropractic, June 1986
Sutanto, Sugeng, Downers Grove, IL, $70,880.17, Cleveland Chiropractic College, Kansas City, MO, Chiropractic, May 1988

Thurston, Gregory G., Algonquin, IL, $87,815.96, Texas Chiropractic College Foundation, Pasadena, TX, Chiropractic, December 1984
Valvo, Nila L., Glen Ellyn, IL, $4,546.58, National College of Chiropractic, Lombard, IL, Chiropractic, December 1982
Vernon, Earl, Waukegan, IL, $6,868.39, Palmer College of Chiropractic, Davenport, IA, Chiropractic, June 1991
Wheeler, Cynthia L., Belleville, IL, $65,231.86, Logan College of Chiropractic, Chesterfield, MO, Chiropractic, August 1988
Willey, Karyn L., Woodridge, IL, $2,060.25, National College of Chiropractic, Lombard, IL, Chiropractic, December 1985
Yoos, Deborah D., Grayville, IL, $35,140.94, Palmer College of Chiropractic, Davenport, IA, Chiropractic, March 1986

Clinical Psychology

Angevine, Jeffrey L., Chicago, IL, $3,599.05, Illinois Institute of Technology, Chicago, IL, Clinical Psychology, May 1987
Bass, Michael E., Chicago, IL, $34,178.37, American Sch of Professional Psychology, Chicago, IL, Clinical Psychology, June 1993
Ozols, Valdis V., Lisle, IL, $34,347.97, Univ of Tennessee, Knoxville, TN, Clinical Psychology, June 1989

Dentistry

Alexander, Jada, Chicago, IL, $74,011.52, Meharry Medical College, Nashville, TN, Dentistry, May 1984
Azarpira, Mohammad H., Chicago, IL, $125,418.25, Loyola University Chicago, Chicago, IL, Dentistry, May 1987
Baldare, David R., Chicago, IL, $67,181.30, Loyola University Chicago, Chicago, IL, Dentistry, May 1988
Bellucci, Joan, Vernon Hills, IL, $102,847.60, Marquette University, Milwaukee, WI, Dentistry, May 1989
Berman, Daniel, Chicago, IL, $73,049.29, Temple University, Philadelphia, PA, Dentistry, June 1987
Broussard, Mark, Palatine, IL, $12,903.09, Louisiana St Univ Med Ctr, New Orleans, LA, Dentistry, May 1986
Buggs, Keith K., Rockford, IL, $4,899.08, Meharry Medical College, Nashville, TN, Dentistry, May 1986
Burnett, Doralia A., Richton Park, IL, $124,350.37, Marquette University, Milwaukee, WI, Dentistry, May 1990
Bybee, William D., East Moline, IL, $12,092.76, Univ of Texas, Houston, TX, Dentistry, May 1988
Covek, Robert J., Grayslake, IL, $3,800.73, Loyola University Chicago, Chicago, IL, Dentistry, May 1986
Cox, Kerwin C., Chicago, IL, $118,979.53, Univ of Oklahoma Health Sciences Center, Oklahoma City, OK, Dentistry, April 1989
Dwyer, Grace, Chicago, IL, $11,373.98, Univ of Illinois Medical Center, Chicago, IL, Dentistry, June 1987
Eubanks-Green, Paula J., Chicago, IL, $23,245.13, Loyola University Chicago, Chicago, IL, Dentistry, May 1982
Exum, Clyde J R, Chicago, IL, $2,957.36, Howard University, Washington, DC, Dentistry, May 1983
Foote, Frederick, Chicago, IL, $219,059.33, Meharry Medical College, Nashville, TN, Dentistry, July 1983
Gladden, Benjamin, Rockford, IL, $18,318.26, Univ of Illinois Medical Center, Chicago, IL, Dentistry, August 1988
Gover, Bryan K., Skokie, IL, $112,622.59, Marquette University, Milwaukee, WI, Dentistry, May 1989
Hansen, Kathy M., Hanover Park, IL, $3,644.05, Loyola University Chicago, Chicago, IL, Dentistry, May 1984
Harris, Carl M., Chicago, IL, $45,847.67, Univ of Illinois Medical Center, Chicago, IL, Dentistry, June 1980
Herron, Devere, Chicago, IL, $76,824.09, Howard University, Washington, DC, Dentistry, May 1985
Howlett, Brian K., Chicago, IL, $4,184.06, Howard University, Washington, DC, Dentistry, May 1992
Jennings, Lenora, Chicago, IL, $2,705.25, Univ of Illinois Medical Center, Chicago, IL, Dentistry, June 1985
Jimerson, Ruthie M., Burnham, IL, $192,868.55, Meharry Medical College, Nashville, TN, Dentistry, May 1987
Johnson, Quincy L., Maywood, IL, $66,616.32, Univ of Illinois Medical Center, Chicago, IL, Dentistry, May 1989
Jones, Perkins S., Springfield, IL, $89,346.00, Howard University, Washington, DC, Dentistry, May 1983
Kashani, Mortaza, Hillside, IL, $37,617.75, Marquette University, Milwaukee, WI, Dentistry, May 1991
Kinell, Carl S., Blue Island, IL, $117,022.57, Marquette University, Milwaukee, WI, Dentistry, May 1986
Kraut, Donald A., Chicago, IL, $27,129.04, Northwestern University, Chicago, IL, Dentistry, June 1985
Pina, Linda, Cicero, IL, $1,151.38, Univ of Illinois Medical Center, Chicago, IL, Dentistry, June 1985
Pumilia, Cathryn A., Rockford, IL, $130,785.64, Marquette University, Milwaukee, WI, Dentistry, May 1990
Pumilia, Pacita M., Rockford, IL, $103,548.25, Marquette University, Milwaukee, WI, Dentistry, May 1989
Sagall, Alfred D., Highland Park, IL, $192,341.44, Marquette University, Milwaukee, WI, Dentistry, May 1986
Salmon, Kevin, Palos Heights, IL, $21,134.96, Loyola University Chicago, Chicago, IL, Dentistry, May 1991
Tucker, Darold, Chicago, IL, $78,415.95, Howard University, Washington, DC, Dentistry, May 1983
Vitello, Thomas B., Chicago, IL, $59,614.10, Loyola University Chicago, Chicago, IL, Dentistry, May 1984
Walton, David D., Chicago, IL, $10,221.69, Univ of Illinois Medical Center, Chicago, IL, Dentistry, August 1985
Ware, Rita, Calumet City, IL, $34,127.56, Southern Illinois Univ Edwardsville, Edwardsville, IL, Dentistry, June 1989
Wells, Christopher C., Chicago, IL, $5,482.89, Univ of Illinois Medical Center, Chicago, IL, Dentistry, June 1983
White, Bernadine R., Godfrey, IL, $5,162.94, Southern Illinois Univ Edwardsville, Edwardsville, IL, Dentistry, June 1989
Whitfield, Glen A., Edgemont, IL, $41,295.40, Georgetown University, Washington, DC, Dentistry, May 1988
Yuen, Ka W., Chicago, IL, $6,637.68, Univ of Illinois Medical Center, Chicago, IL, Dentistry, June 1990
Zackey, Tyson, Chicago, IL, $8,949.97, Northwestern Univ, Chicago, IL, Dentistry, May 1987

Optometry

Bourboukas, Nick, Chicago, IL, $6,121.68, Illinois College of Optometry, Chicago, IL, Optometry, May 1987
Keeler-Dwyer, Cynthia L., Chicago, IL, $46,066.34, Illinois College of Optometry, Chicago, IL, Optometry, May 1990
Lielzuika, Kaija, Chicago, IL, $34,914.05, Illinois College of Optometry, Chicago, IL, Optometry, May 1989
Nath, Kailash, Clarendon Hills, IL, $78,565.57, New England College of Optometry, Boston, MA, Optometry, May 1987

Osteopathy

Bruton, Joseph, Oak Park, IL, $83,192.83, Univ of Osteo Medical & Health Science, Des Moines, IA, Osteopathy, June 1990
Chaudhuri, Suyro, Bloomington, IL, $41,849.10, Univ of Health Sciences, Kansas City, MO, Osteopathy, May 1988

Johnson, Randall, Lake Forest, IL, $16,720.45, Univ of Osteo Medical & Health Science, Des Moines, IA, Osteopathy, June 1989
Superson-Malachinski, Wynne, Bolingbrook, IL, $16,041.39, Midwestern University, Downers Grove, IL, Osteopathy, June 1980

Pharmacy

Grimmette, Ronald D., Chicago, IL, $8,558.63, Xavier University of Louisiana, New Orleans, LA, Pharmacy, May 1989
Ohaeri, Christiana, South Holland, IL, $3,607.87, Drake University, Des Moines, IA, Pharmacy, May 1989
Powell, Alexander, Chicago, IL, $53,913.67, Univ of Illinois Medical Center, Chicago, IL, Pharmacy, June 1985
Wright, Jonathan W., Chicago, IL, $10,864.00, Drake University, Des Moines, IA, Pharmacy, December 1985

Podiatry

Amudoaghan, Walnette C., Chicago, IL, $161,021.25, Ohio College of Podiatric Medicine, Cleveland, OH, Podiatry, May 1985
Beaver, Bart, Chicago, IL, $75,659.87, Dr William Scholl Col of Podiatric Med, Chicago, IL, Podiatry, May 1990
Beck III, Welby S., Chicago, IL, $172,955.95, Dr William Scholl Col of Podiatric Med, Chicago, IL, Podiatry, May 1986
Brown, Stephen H., Chicago, IL, $80,602.69, Dr William Scholl Col of Podiatric Med, Chicago, IL, Podiatry, May 1988
Collins, Henry L., Chicago, IL, $99,405.62, Dr William Scholl Col of Podiatric Med, Chicago, IL, Podiatry, May 1987
Crawford, James, Chicago, IL, $164,076.03, Dr William Scholl Col of Podiatric Med, Chicago, IL, Podiatry, May 1982
Dixon, David A., Chicago, IL, $115,687.34, Dr William Scholl Col of Podiatric Med, Chicago, IL, Podiatry, May 1989
Flanagan, John, Chicago, IL, $88,961.93, Dr William Scholl Col of Podiatric Med, Chicago, IL, Podiatry, May 1987
Foster, Terri L., Matteson, IL, $156,277.61, Univ of Osteo Medical & Health Science, Des Moines, IA, Podiatry, June 1987
Green, Gregory N., Chicago, IL, $29,319.34, Dr William Scholl Col of Podiatric Med, Chicago, IL, Podiatry, May 1983
Hall, Michael G., Westchester, IL, $77,914.40, Dr William Scholl Col of Podiatric Med, Chicago, IL, Podiatry, May 1986
Handy, Myra, Evanston, IL, $131,449.04, Dr William Scholl Col of Podiatric Med, Chicago, IL, Podiatry, May 1986
Harcus, James M., Chicago, IL, $37,480.49, Dr William Scholl Col of Podiatric Med, Chicago, IL, Podiatry, May 1981
Hochman, Daryl D., Chicago, IL, $2,703.68, Dr William Scholl Col of Podiatric Med, Chicago, IL, Podiatry, May 1986
Hrywnak, Severko, Chicago, IL, $29,940.05, Dr William Scholl Col of Podiatric Med, Chicago, IL, Podiatry, May 1982
Jacobson, Ronald, Spring Grove, IL, $33,438.16, Dr William Scholl Col of Podiatric Med, Chicago, IL, Podiatry, May 1983
Jenkins, Jondelle B., Chicago, IL, $121,782.03, Dr William Scholl Col of Podiatric Med, Chicago, IL, Podiatry, May 1983
Lemoine, Hannelore, Chicago, IL, $61,069.48, Dr William Scholl Col of Podiatric Med, Chicago, IL, Podiatry, May 1980
Mikos, Ronald A., Skokie, IL, $14,364.77, Dr William Scholl Col of Podiatric Med, Chicago, IL, Podiatry, May 1982
Miller, Ellis A., Winthrop Harbor, IL, $6,013.03, Ohio College of Podiatric Medicine, Cleveland, OH, Podiatry, May 1985
Murphy, Stephen J., Chicago, IL, $129,398.89, Dr William Scholl Col of Podiatric Med, Chicago, IL, Podiatry, May 1982
Nau, Edgard, Chicago, IL, $111,754.67, Dr William Scholl Col of Podiatric Med, Chicago, IL, Podiatry, May 1986
O'Lleary, James J., La Grange, IL, $15,339.49, Dr William Scholl Col of Podiatric Med, Chicago, IL, Podiatry, May 1984
Porada, Stanley L., Tinley Park, IL, $65,468.77, Dr William Scholl Col of Podiatric Med, Chicago, IL, Podiatry, May 1989
Shaw, Michael, Rogers Park, IL, $58,637.89, Dr William Scholl Col of Podiatric Med, Chicago, IL, Podiatry, May 1988
Stevenson, Robert, Chicago, IL, $61,024.92, Univ of Osteo Medical & Health Science, Des Moines, IA, Podiatry, May 1991
Tucker, Carol, Chicago, IL, $144,939.53, Dr William Scholl Col of Podiatric Med, Chicago, IL, Podiatry, May 1988
Whitfield, Carolyn, Homewood, IL, $108,307.10, Dr William Scholl Col of Podiatric Med, Chicago, IL, Podiatry, May 1986

Public Health

Biosah, Ada, Chicago, IL, $24,485.22, Univ of Texas, Houston, TX, Public Health, May 1990
Lewin, Karen S., Chicago, IL, $13,268.23, Yale University, New Haven, CT, Public Health, May 1983

Veterinary Medicine

Kahn, Mark D., Richton Park, IL, $7,150.55, Tuskegee University, Tuskegee, AL, Veterinary Medicine, May 1987
Storslee, Barbara, Orland Park, IL, $10,610.18, Iowa State University, Ames, IA, Veterinary Medicine, May 1989

Indiana

Allopathic Medicine

Bell, Charles, Munster, IN, $20,627.73, Meharry Medical College, Nashville, TN, Allopathic Medicine, May 1982
Cezar, Mahdi, Indianapolis, IN, $18,150.53, Meharry Medical College, Nashville, TN, Allopathic Medicine, May 1990
Donathan, Robert, Brazil, IN, $8,388.41, Creighton University, Omaha, NE, Allopathic Medicine, May 1990
Lewis, George M., Indianapolis, IN, $70,595.07, Univ of Massachusetts Worcester, Worcester, MA, Allopathic Medicine, June 1982
Rodman, Karen D., Indianapolis, IN, $13,967.55, Univ of Pittsburgh, Pittsburgh, PA, Allopathic Medicine, June 1986
Williams, David L., Indianapolis, IN, $164,702.31, Meharry Medical College, Nashville, TN, Allopathic Medicine, May 1984

Chiropractic

Maxfield-Brown, Bobbi, Evansville, IN, $91,130.76, Logan College of Chiropractic, Chesterfield, MO, Chiropractic, December 1986
Meeks, Dana E., Newburgh, IN, $35,286.32, Palmer College of Chiropractic, Davenport, IA, Chiropractic, September 1983
Reed, Nelson, Fort Wayne, IN, $71,197.54, Logan College of Chiropractic, Chesterfield, MO, Chiropractic, August 1987
Refkin, Joseph J P, Indianapolis, IN, $16,490.27, National College of Chiropractic, Lombard, IL, Chiropractic, August 1987
Vandenburgh, Peggy S., Indianapolis, IN, $73,504.13, Palmer College of Chiropractic, Davenport, IA, Chiropractic, December 1985
Wykoff, Richard A., Lawrenceburg, IN, $123,632.88, Life College, Marietta, GA, Chiropractic, June 1985

Dentistry

Arch, Joseph A., Indianapolis, IN, $6,153.80, Indiana University Indianapolis, Bloomington, IN, Dentistry, May 1985

Arnett, Shannon L., Kendallville, IN, $18,207.70, Indiana University Indianapolis, Bloomington, IN, Dentistry, May 1989
Baker, Michael, Indianapolis, IN, $11,997.33, Univ of Missouri Kansas City, Kansas City, MO, Dentistry, May 1991
Kirk, James E., Portage, IN, $35,037.17, Loyola University Chicago, Chicago, IL, Dentistry, May 1985
Price, David G., Valparaiso, IN, $102,803.59, Loyola University Chicago, Chicago, IL, Dentistry, May 1990
Stojkovich, Lou, St John, IN, $74,886.71, Marquette University, Milwaukee, WI, Dentistry, May 1990

Osteopathy

French, Talmas T., Cedar Lake, IN, $216,483.22, Midwestern University, Downers Grove, IL, Osteopathy, June 1986

Podiatry

Beatty, Deborah, Indianapolis, IN, $25,082.49, Dr William Scholl Col of Podiatric Med, Chicago, IL, Podiatry, May 1993
Fair, Benny, Fort Wayne, IN, $120,738.64, Dr William Scholl Col of Podiatric Med, Chicago, IL, Podiatry, May 1990
Marlatt, Stephanie, Michigan City, IN, $81,311.15, Dr William Scholl Col of Podiatric Med, Chicago, IL, Podiatry, May 1987
Rogers, Laurence C., Rochester, IN, $29,927.21, Dr William Scholl Col of Podiatric Med, Chicago, IL, Podiatry, May 1980
Smith, Jonathan, Decatur, IN, $24,297.00, Dr William Scholl Col of Podiatric Med, Chicago, IL, Podiatry, May 1988
Williams, David L., Indianapolis, IN, $30,395.43, Dr William Scholl Col of Podiatric Med, Chicago, IL, Podiatry, May 1984
Wojnaroski, Joseph P., Lake Station, IN, $11,135.57, Dr William Scholl Col of Podiatric Med, Chicago, IL, Podiatry, May 1982

Iowa

Allopathic Medicine

Pierson, Ronald R., Coralville, IA, $33,600.02, Univ of Southern California, Los Angeles, CA, Allopathic Medicine, May 1986
Schaus, Scott S., Ames, IA, $21,762.50, Northeastern Ohio Universities, Rootstown, OH, Allopathic Medicine, May 1988

Chiropractic

Bockstedt-Middleton, Louise M., Davenport, IA, $22,077.83, Palmer College of Chiropractic, Davenport, IA, Chiropractic, October 1986
Crawford, James, Dubuque, IA, $49,614.09, Cleveland Chiropractic College, Los Angeles, CA, Chiropractic, August 1987
Giroush, Gamal G., Davenport, IA, $37,677.73, Palmer College of Chiropractic, Davenport, IA, Chiropractic, March 1987
Heer, Joel M., Dubuque, IA, $11,597.12, Palmer College of Chiropractic, Davenport, IA, Chiropractic, October 1983
Heese, Kit L., West Des Moines, IA, $20,517.02, Logan College of Chiropractic, Chesterfield, MO, Chiropractic, December 1986
Heyl, Susan J., Bettendorf, IA, $12,324.79, Palmer College of Chiropractic, Davenport, IA, Chiropractic, December 1989
Hicks, Timothy G., Orange City, IA, $27,639.33, Palmer College of Chiropractic, Davenport, IA, Chiropractic, June 1989
Hobbins, Jennifer J., Davenport, IA, $1,833.41, Palmer College of Chiropractic, Davenport, IA, Chiropractic, March 1987
Holford, Joe E., Council Bluffs, IA, $80,012.57, Cleveland Chiropractic College, Kansas City, MO, Chiropractic, May 1986
LeBlanc, Michael M., Davenport, IA, $30,998.04, Palmer College of Chiropractic, Davenport, IA, Chiropractic, June 1984
McDonald, James, Davenport, IA, $2,211.41, Logan College of Chiropractic, Chesterfield, MO, Chiropractic, September 1982
Meike, Alan, Davenport, IA, $694.24, Palmer College of Chiropractic, Davenport, IA, Chiropractic, October 1993
Moore, Douglas B., Davenport, IA, $30,201.37, Palmer College of Chiropractic, Davenport, IA, Chiropractic, October 1987
Paper, Nicole N., Davenport, IA, $17,908.15, Palmer College of Chiropractic, Davenport, IA, Chiropractic, June 1988
Schaeffer, Wally, Coralville, IA, $21,977.82, Palmer College of Chiropractic, Davenport, IA, Chiropractic, September 1984
Schaeuble, Gary S., Cedar Rapids, IA, $15,941.23, Palmer College of Chiropractic, Davenport, IA, Chiropractic, October 1986
Sigh, Edward R., Davenport, IA, $57,032.72, Cleveland Chiropractic College, Kansas City, MO, Chiropractic, May 1984
Szekely, Kevin, State Center, Australia, $40,797.95, Palmer College of Chiropractic, Davenport, IA, Chiropractic, March 1985
Volk, Anthony, Davenport, IA, $19,932.76, Palmer College of Chiropractic, Davenport, IA, Chiropractic, October 1985
Walters, Brian D., Davenport, IA, $69,021.87, Palmer College of Chiropractic, Davenport, IA, Chiropractic, December 1986
Woiwood, David V., Carlisle, IA, $71,869.71, Palmer College of Chiropractic, Davenport, IA, Chiropractic, June 1985

Dentistry

Dye, Ralph M., Des Moines, IA, $109,125.92, Loma Linda University, Loma Linda, CA, Dentistry, June 1986
Kempema, Pamela, Prairie City, IA, $9,012.79, Univ of Michigan, Ann Arbor, MI, Dentistry, May 1988

Osteopathy

Jacobson, Steve, West Des Moines, IA, $131,634.91, Univ of Osteo Medical & Health Science, Des Moines, IA, Osteopathy, May 1991
Spector, Mark, Des Moines, IA, $144,323.02, Univ of Osteo Medical & Health Science, Des Moines, IA, Osteopathy, June 1988
Van Patten, Merri, Sioux City, IA, $41,813.06, Univ of Osteo Medical & Health Science, Des Moines, IA, Osteopathy, June 1990

Pharmacy

Benson, Thersa L., Des Moines, IA, $10,504.28, Drake University, Des Moines, IA, Pharmacy, May 1990
Moss, Edward G., Des Moines, IA, $74,854.95, Drake University, Des Moines, IA, Pharmacy, May 1989

Podiatry

Davis, Anthony D., Des Moines, IA, $127,896.83, Ohio College of Podiatric Medicine, Cleveland, OH, Podiatry, May 1989
Del Prado, Rick, Waterloo, IA, $111,532.64, Univ of Osteo Medical & Health Science, Des Moines, IA, Podiatry, June 1990
Gardner, Sandra M., Des Moines, IA, $166,452.97, Ohio College of Podiatric Medicine, Cleveland, OH, Podiatry, May 1987
Pryharski, Laureen A., Jefferson, IA, $166,258.68, Univ of Osteo Medical & Health Science, Des Moines, IA, Podiatry, June 1989

Veterinary Medicine

Wilson, Arach J., Ames, IA, $8,995.29, Tuskegee University, Tuskegee, AL, Veterinary Medicine, May 1979

Kansas

Allopathic Medicine

Atlas, William, Overland Park, KS, $58,707.00, Univ of Texas Hlth Sci

Cntr San Antonio, San Antonio, TX, Allopathic Medicine, May 1989
Ayika, Paul B., Lawrence, KS, $18,489.02, Univ of Texas Hlth Sci Cntr San Antonio, San Antonio, TX, Allopathic Medicine, May 1989
Hudgins, Mark, Lenexa, KS, $28,440.31, Univ of Kansas Medical Center, Kansas City, KS, Allopathic Medicine, May 1990
Richmond, Joseph J., Kansas City, KS, $63,628.76, Finch University of Health Sciences, North Chicago, IL, Allopathic Medicine, June 1983
Schaper, David, Cherryvale, KS, $37,616.91, Univ of Kansas Medical Center, Kansas City, KS, Allopathic Medicine, May 1990
Williams, Teri L., Shawnee Mission, KS, $7,709.89, Univ of Kansas Medical Center, Kansas City, KS, Allopathic Medicine, May 1990

Chiropractic

Amon, Julie A., Netawaka, KS, $18,611.54, Cleveland Chiropractic College, Kansas City, MO, Chiropractic, May 1984
Bond, James R., Derby, KS, $114,652.04, Cleveland Chiropractic College, Kansas City, MO, Chiropractic, May 1987
Breese, Audrey, Lenexa, KS, $91,681.56, Cleveland Chiropractic College, Kansas City, MO, Chiropractic, January 1987
Buck, Larry A., Wichita, KS, $94,342.15, Cleveland Chiropractic College, Kansas City, MO, Chiropractic, September 1986
Capilli, Michael, Kansas City, KS, $25,993.81, Cleveland Chiropractic College, Kansas City, MO, Chiropractic, May 1987
Cody, Ronald J., Valley Center, KS, $123,616.42, Cleveland Chiropractic College, Kansas City, MO, Chiropractic, December 1986
Coffland, Robert, Iola, KS, $56,530.23, Cleveland Chiropractic College, Kansas City, MO, Chiropractic, May 1985
Corley, Gary E., Eskridge, KS, $52,035.73, Cleveland Chiropractic College, Kansas City, MO, Chiropractic, September 1988
Gay, Mark, Clearwater, KS, $60,686.97, Cleveland Chiropractic College, Kansas City, MO, Chiropractic, January 1990
Gieschen, John, Overland Park, KS, $17,216.58, Cleveland Chiropractic College, Kansas City, MO, Chiropractic, May 1983
Hoss, Angela, Sharon Springs, KS, $22,216.23, Parker College of Chiropractic, Dallas, TX, Chiropractic, December 1986
Hoyt, Ruth R., Overland Park, KS, $40,000.70, Cleveland Chiropractic College, Kansas City, MO, Chiropractic, August 1983
Jay, Doyle W., Lebo, KS, $86,779.59, Palmer College of Chiropractic, Davenport, IA, Chiropractic, June 1986
Mathiesen, Douglas A., Shawnee Mission, KS, $135,732.35, Cleveland Chiropractic College, Kansas City, MO, Chiropractic, September 1985
Neely, Timothy W., Topeka, KS, $37,021.70, Cleveland Chiropractic College, Kansas City, MO, Chiropractic, January 1990
O'leary, Molly M., Prairie Village, KS, $84,783.99, Cleveland Chiropractic College, Kansas City, MO, Chiropractic, December 1987
Rahman-Setayesh, Ali, Topeka, KS, $68,263.31, Logan College of Chiropractic, Chesterfield, MO, Chiropractic, December 1989
Schellenger, Yvonne Y., Newton, KS, $84,688.10, Cleveland Chiropractic College, Kansas City, MO, Chiropractic, September 1984
Schinstock, Julia A., Hoisington, KS, $67,248.62, Cleveland Chiropractic College, Kansas City, MO, Chiropractic, September 1986
Strozier, Mark, Shawnee Mission, KS, $91,086.50, Cleveland Chiropractic College, Kansas City, MO, Chiropractic, May 1989
Wagner, John P., Newton, KS, $41,128.20, Palmer College of Chiropractic, Davenport, IA, Chiropractic, December 1985
Weatherhed, Karl D., Concordia, KS, $41,852.60, Cleveland Chiropractic College, Kansas City, MO, Chiropractic, August 1985
Wharran, David, Liberal, KS, $11,074.55, Cleveland Chiropractic College, Kansas City, MO, Chiropractic, December 1983
Wheeler, Randy, Haysville, KS, $100,942.03, Cleveland Chiropractic College, Kansas City, MO, Chiropractic, May 1986
Wheeler, Samuel, Maize, KS, $112,872.52, Cleveland Chiropractic College, Kansas City, MO, Chiropractic, May 1987
Wilson, Eileen, Prarrie Village, KS, $56,091.29, Cleveland Chiropractic College, Kansas City, MO, Chiropractic, May 1986
Wilson, Jeff A., Topeka, KS, $42,184.01, Cleveland Chiropractic College, Kansas City, MO, Chiropractic, May 1990
Woody, Larry L., Olathe, KS, $14,220.69, Cleveland Chiropractic College, Kansas City, MO, Chiropractic, August 1983
Ziemba, Mitchell B., Lenexa, KS, $62,178.40, Cleveland Chiropractic College, Kansas City, MO, Chiropractic, September 1988

Dentistry

Fobbs, Michel M., Atchison, KS, $6,331.00, Howard University, Washington, DC, Dentistry, May 1984
Morris, Lynda, Overland Park, KS, $75,573.60, Washington University, St Louis, MO, Dentistry, September 1989
Rieck, Paul G., Olathe, KS, $11,330.53, Univ of Missouri Kansas City, Kansas City, MO, Dentistry, April 1983

Osteopathy

Fields, Allen, Overland Park, KS, $13,386.41, Univ of Health Sciences, Kansas City, MO, Osteopathy, May 1992

Kentucky

Allopathic Medicine

Ardul-Majid, Razia S., Covington, KY, $3,424.87, Univ of Louisville, Louisville, KY, Allopathic Medicine, May 1990
Bedford, Phillip, Covington, KY, $41,701.78, Univ of Louisville, Louisville, KY, Allopathic Medicine, October 1984
Brown, Henry H., Louisville, KY, $6,852.62, Univ of Louisville, Louisville, KY, Allopathic Medicine, May 1987
Burns, Mark V., Louisville, KY, $2,283.70, Univ of Louisville, Louisville, KY, Allopathic Medicine, May 1988
Collins, Jennifer, Catlettsburg, KY, $20,484.88, Univ of Miami, Miami, FL, Allopathic Medicine, May 1986
Frierson, Leonard, Louisville, KY, $28,603.66, Univ of Louisville, Louisville, KY, Allopathic Medicine, May 1989
Hagan, Elizabeth A., Louisville, KY, $15,902.45, Univ of Louisville, Louisville, KY, Allopathic Medicine, May 1989
Kerr, Bryant B., Louisville, KY, $6,113.85, Univ of Louisville, Louisville, KY, Allopathic Medicine, May 1986
Peasley, Ken, Columbia, KY, $62,918.41, Ponce School of Medicine, Ponce, PR, Allopathic Medicine, June 1984

Chiropractic

Aromola, Joseph J., Hebron, KY, $31,493.44, Palmer College of Chiropractic, Davenport, IA, Chiropractic, June 1986
Humphrey, Cheryl K., York, KY, $7,141.13, Los Angeles College of Chiropractic, Whittier, CA, Chiropractic, April 1988
Jewett, Charles, Versailles, KY, $54,289.37, Palmer College of Chiropractic, Davenport, IA, Chiropractic, December 1989

Phillips, Brian, Louisville, KY, $105,109.20, Life College, Marietta, GA, Chiropractic, December 1987

Dentistry

Bentley, Bobetta, Neon, KY, $4,555.92, Univ of Louisville, Louisville, KY, Dentistry, May 1988
Emnett, William P., Lexington, KY, $26,686.13, Univ of Kentucky, Lexington, KY, Dentistry, May 1980
Faison, Willie R., Louisville, KY, $205,044.01, Meharry Medical College, Nashville, TN, Dentistry, December 1985
Ford, Patricia J., Louisville, KY, $257.35, Univ of Louisville, Louisville, KY, Dentistry, May 1985
Green, Judith G., Louisville, KY, $129,926.29, Univ of Louisville, Louisville, KY, Dentistry, May 1987
Holman, Stanley, Louisville, KY, $27,403.08, Meharry Medical College, Nashville, TN, Dentistry, May 1985
Labordeaux, Herbert W., Louisville, KY, $2,421.94, Univ of Louisville, Louisville, KY, Dentistry, May 1990
Preston, Michael R., Hagerhill, KY, $88,160.37, Univ of Kentucky, Lexington, KY, Dentistry, May 1987
Turnbow, Thomas P., Hickman, KY, $53,317.33, Univ of Tennessee Memphis, Memphis, TN, Dentistry, June 1989

Health Administration

Gazall, Victor J., Louisville, KY, $41,748.60, St Louis University, St Louis, MO, Health Administration, May 1986

Optometry

Watkins, Thomas W., Campbellsville, KY, $53,409.97, Southern College of Optometry, Memphis, TN, Optometry, May 1990

Osteopathy

Fiorella-Holder, Michelle, Louisville, KY, $212,329.21, Univ of Osteo Medical & Health Science, Des Moines, IA, Osteopathy, June 1987

Podiatry

Hedden, Dianne, Owensboro, KY, $32,111.18, Ohio College of Podiatric Medicine, Cleveland, OH, Podiatry, May 1990

Louisiana

Allopathic Medicine

Burt, Eric S., Monroe, LA, $5,177.56, Louisiana St Univ Med Ctr Shreveport, Shreveport, LA, Allopathic Medicine, May 1989
Coleman, James, Shreveport, LA, $19,438.66, Univ of California Davis, Davis, CA, Allopathic Medicine, June 1980
Dixon, Armand, New Orleans, LA, $44,863.77, Meharry Medical College, Nashville, TN, Allopathic Medicine, May 1993
Fedoroff, Ivan I., New Orleans, LA, $2,197.77, Louisiana St Univ Med Ctr New Orleans, New Orleans, LA, Allopathic Medicine, May 1985
Geary, David M., Lafayette, LA, $93,886.29, Creighton University, Omaha, NE, Allopathic Medicine, May 1985
Ishmael, Francis J., Baton Rouge, LA, $3,461.13, Louisiana St Univ Med Ctr New Orleans, New Orleans, LA, Allopathic Medicine, May 1986
Mahner, John P., Dequincy, LA, $17,186.10, Louisiana St Univ Med Ctr New Orleans, New Orleans, LA, Allopathic Medicine, May 1992
Molden, Gregory L., New Orleans, LA, $109,304.96, Medical College of Ohio, Toledo, OH, Allopathic Medicine, June 1984
Orsulak, Joseph, Bossier City, LA, $8,040.42, Louisiana St Univ Med Ctr Shreveport, Shreveport, LA, Allopathic Medicine, May 1988
Redmann, Greg A., Metairie, LA, $6,635.41, Univ of Texas Hlth Sci Cntr San Antonio, San Antonio, TX, Allopathic Medicine, May 1987
Saloy, Melanie, New Orleans, LA, $126,417.05, Meharry Medical College, Nashville, TN, Allopathic Medicine, May 1987
Seyfarth Jr, Huey A., Baton Rouge, LA, $19,994.57, Univ of Oklahoma Health Sciences Center, Oklahoma City, OK, Allopathic Medicine, June 1986
Spears, Clifton, Alexandria, LA, $89,782.61, Meharry Medical College, Nashville, TN, Allopathic Medicine, May 1987
Watford, Eric E., Gonzales, LA, $113,032.65, Meharry Medical College, Nashville, TN, Allopathic Medicine, May 1984
Weist, Gregory J., Baton Rouge, LA, $15,200.89, Louisiana St Univ Med Ctr New Orleans, New Orleans, LA, Allopathic Medicine, May 1985

Chiropractic

Carter, Ronald M., St Rose, LA, $38,119.13, Palmer College of Chiropractic, Davenport, IA, Chiropractic, December 1985
Duff, Robert, New Orleans, LA, $88,583.37, Parker College of Chiropractic, Dallas, TX, Chiropractic, January 1990
Guillory, Laura, Chalmette, LA, $48,870.11, Life College, Marietta, GA, Chiropractic, June 1984
Kritko, Anthony, Metairie, LA, $15,147.75, Life College, Marietta, GA, Chiropractic, September 1983
Lafleur, Allen R., Kenner, LA, $119,343.69, Life College, Marietta, GA, Chiropractic, December 1983
Miller, Kevin, Baton Rouge, LA, $78,483.76, Western States Chiropractic College, Portland, OR, Chiropractic, December 1988
Moran, Kevin A., Metairie, LA, $17,259.35, Palmer College of Chiropractic, Davenport, IA, Chiropractic, March 1984
Salczenko, Jeffrey G., Bossier City, LA, $51,971.41, Palmer College of Chiropractic, Davenport, IA, Chiropractic, December 1987
Schwaiger, Mark, Gretna, LA, $7,508.33, Life College, Marietta, GA, Chiropractic, April 1983

Dentistry

Baranco, Patricia, Baton Rouge, LA, $244,269.86, Meharry Medical College, Nashville, TN, Dentistry, May 1985
Byrd, Daryl, New Orleans, LA, $132,832.68, Meharry Medical College, Nashville, TN, Dentistry, May 1986
Hill, William, New Orleans, LA, $17,353.62, Louisiana St Univ Med Ctr, New Orleans, LA, Dentistry, May 1989
Langford, Cynthia M., Rosepine, LA, $224,403.61, Marquette University, Milwaukee, WI, Dentistry, May 1988
Reed, David, Algeria, LA, $136,506.11, Meharry Medical College, Nashville, TN, Dentistry, May 1985

Osteopathy

Floyd, James P., Shreveport, LA, $124,504.16, Nova Southeastern University, North Miami Beach, FL, Osteopathy, June 1989
Newton, Steven R., Baton Rouge, LA, $14,059.48, Univ of Med & Dent of New Jersey, Newark, NJ, Osteopathy, May 1983

Pharmacy

Aruna, Augustine S., New Orleans, LA, $1,506.62, Creighton University, Omaha, NE, Pharmacy, December 1988
Smith, Darryl, New Orleans, LA, $6,306.09, Xavier University of Louisiana, New Orleans, LA, Pharmacy, May 1983

Podiatry

Bourque, Lawles J., Lafayette, LA, $7,671.10, Ohio College of Podiatric Medicine, Cleveland, OH, Podiatry, May 1992
Goodrow, Andrew J., New Orleans, LA, $167,936.88, California College of Podiatric Medicine, San Francisco, CA, Podiatry, June 1986
Jordan, Joyce M., New Orleans, LA, $192,098.59, Ohio College of Podiatric

Medicine, Cleveland, OH, Podiatry, May 1983
Morreale, Angelo, Natchitoches, LA, $55,934.46, Ohio College of Podiatric Medicine, Cleveland, OH, Podiatry, May 1984

Public Health

Branton, Marilyn S., Pearl River, LA, $47,431.14, Tulane University, New Orleans, LA, Public Health, May 1986
Gex, Michelle, New Orleans, LA, $6,289.63, Tulane University, New Orleans, LA, Public Health, May 1984
Metoyer, Elisha J., New Orleans, LA, $3,017.76, Tulane University, New Orleans, LA, Public Health, May 1989
Roohani, Maurine, New Orleans, LA, $37,912.64, Tulane University, New Orleans, LA, Public Health, May 1988

Maine

Allopathic Medicine

Benjamin, James, Presque Isle, ME, $35,000.00, Howard University, Washington, DC, Allopathic Medicine, May 1983
McChesney, Guy H., Bangor, ME, $4,689.21, Yale University, New Haven, CT, Allopathic Medicine, May 1989

Chiropractic

Alexander-Kirton, Stephen, Calais, ME, $52,659.08, Cleveland Chiropractic College, Kansas City, MO, Chiropractic, September 1983
Lovell, Stephen, Bangor, ME, $22,269.35, Logan College of Chiropractic, Chesterfield, MO, Chiropractic, April 1986
Williamson, Tim, Portland, ME, $93,778.18, Life College, Marietta, GA, Chiropractic, June 1987
Winkler, Stephen D., Bangor, ME, $57,206.78, Logan College of Chiropractic, Chesterfield, MO, Chiropractic, April 1986

Dentistry

Dentremont, Franklin, Bangor, ME, $12,860.49, Tufts University, Boston, MA, Dentistry, June 1980
Pick, Charles E., Waterville, ME, $11,082.76, Case Western Reserve University, Cleveland, OH, Dentistry, May 1985

Veterinary Medicine

Raiten-Kasoff, Joan K., Bangor, ME, $27,851.36, Univ of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, PA, Veterinary Medicine, May 1986

Maryland

Allopathic Medicine

Barber, Steven, Silver Spring, MD, $40,010.48, Howard University, Washington, DC, Allopathic Medicine, May 1988
Briley, Michele D., Suitland, MD, $13,008.64, Howard University, Washington, DC, Allopathic Medicine, May 1985
Buahin, Kwame, Baltimore, MD, $17,560.87, Columbia University, New York, NY, Allopathic Medicine, May 1989
Cooper Jr, John D., Rockville, MD, $2,012.72, Suny Buffalo, Buffalo, NY, Allopathic Medicine, June 1988
Crarey, Patrick E., Upper Marlboro, MD, $63,920.87, Georgetown University, Washington, DC, Allopathic Medicine, May 1983
Daniels Iii, Fernando, Upper Marlboro, MD, $29,873.24, Meharry Medical College, Nashville, TN, Allopathic Medicine, May 1987
Eudaric, Philippe M., Baltimore, MD, $34,465.15, Univ of Texas Hlth Sci Cntr San Antonio, San Antonio, TX, Allopathic Medicine, May 1988
Franklin, Janet L., Rockville, MD, $10,299.08, Georgetown University, Washington, DC, Allopathic Medicine, May 1984
Hill, Leo D., Cheverly, MD, $16,239.20, Temple University, Philadelphia, PA, Allopathic Medicine, June 1989
Hogan, John W., Fort Washington, MD, $539.74, Howard University, Washington, DC, Allopathic Medicine, May 1982
Kennedy, Grace, Baltimore, MD, $65,501.43, Medical College of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, PA, Allopathic Medicine, June 1985
Lent, Michael, Hyattsville, MD, $10,772.06, Univ of California San Francisco, San Francisco, CA, Allopathic Medicine, June 1982
Lynch, Ray A., Columbia, MD, $25,415.94, Howard University, Washington, DC, Allopathic Medicine, May 1989
Marshall, John T., Hillcrest Heights, MD, $84,864.65, Marshall University, Huntington, WV, Allopathic Medicine, June 1986
McKinney Jr, Thornton, Bladensburg, MD, $68,044.16, Georgetown University, Washington, DC, Allopathic Medicine, May 1990
Miles, Robert L., Elk Ridge, MD, $159,709.49, Meharry Medical College, Nashville, TN, Allopathic Medicine, May 1985
Mines, Sakilba C., Silver Spring, MD, $46,438.59, Hahnemann University, Philadelphia, PA, Allopathic Medicine, June 1983
Mosely, Victoria, Baltimore, MD, $135,335.97, Tufts University, Boston, MA, Allopathic Medicine, May 1984
Park, Won S., Baltimore, MD, $12,999.29, Univ of Maryland Baltimore, Baltimore, MD, Allopathic Medicine, May 1990
Patrick, George V., Columbia, MD, $26,909.53, Medical College of Ohio, Toledo, OH, Allopathic Medicine, June 1990
Ramos, Lydia I., Gaithersburg, MD, $31,728.32, Georgetown University, Washington, DC, Allopathic Medicine, May 1986
Sears, Terri A., Greenbelt, MD, $15,422.68, Howard University, Washington, DC, Allopathic Medicine, May 1984
Shelby, Gloria D., Capitol Heights, MD, $18,147.61, Howard University, Washington, DC, Allopathic Medicine, May 1984
Tedford, William, Silver Spring, MD, $14,034.51, Michigan State University, East Lansing, MI, Allopathic Medicine, June 1988
Turner, Sherri A., Silver Spring, MD, $30,777.75, Tufts University, Boston, MA, Allopathic Medicine, May 1980
Wagner, Robert J., Baltimore, MD, $59,523.08, Albany Medical College, Albany, NY, Allopathic Medicine, May 1989
West, Denise G., Baltimore, MD, $20,839.58, Univ of Maryland Baltimore, Baltimore, MD, Allopathic Medicine, May 1987
Wheeler, Jacquelyn L., Baltimore, MD, $185,533.20, Meharry Medical College, Nashville, TN, Allopathic Medicine, May 1986
Whittingham, Wayne L., Riverdale, MD, $9,920.21, Howard University, Washington, DC, Allopathic Medicine, May 1988
Wilder, Deborah, Silver Spring, MD, $98,315.48, Georgetown University, Washington, DC, Allopathic Medicine, May 1989
Williams, Lorraine, Silver Spring, MD, $5,232.08, Howard University, Washington, DC, Allopathic Medicine, May 1989
Young, Howard, Baltimore, MD, $96,210.16, Albany Medical College, Albany, NY, Allopathic Medicine, May 1989

Chiropractic

Faurote, Pamella R., Wheaton, MD, $12,609.74, Cleveland Chiropractic College, Los Angeles, CA, Chiropractic, December 1983
Gordon, Robert K., Snow Hill, MD, $86,381.68, Cleveland Chiropractic College, Kansas City, MO, Chiropractic, May 1987
Hughes, Charles, Baltimore, MD, $143,298.00, Life College, Marietta, GA, Chiropractic, March 1987
McCracken, Rosalind A., Chevy Chase, MD, $17,879.05, Life Chiropractic College-West, San Lorenzo, CA, Chiropractic, March 1988

Smith, Rusty A., City Unknown, MD, $3,829.88, Palmer College of Chiropractic West, San Jose, CA, Chiropractic, March 1988

Dentistry

Brantley, Carl C., Mt Rainier, MD, $12,916.11, Howard University, Washington, DC, Dentistry, May 1989
Brown, Irene E., Silver Spring, MD, $130,911.64, Meharry Medical College, Nashville, TN, Dentistry, May 1987
Coleman, Michele, Lanham, MD, $11,169.01, Howard University, Washington, DC, Dentistry, May 1985
Cummins, David D., Gaithersburg, MD, $42,310.53, Howard University, Washington, DC, Dentistry, May 1985
Delacruz, Maureen, Bethesda, MD, $103,123.11, Georgetown University, Washington, DC, Dentistry, May 1984
Garcia, Anthony, Baltimore, MD, $17,655.25, Univ of Maryland Baltimore, Baltimore, MD, Dentistry, June 1989
Gordon, Vernon, Columbia, MD, $46,306.94, Univ of Maryland Baltimore, Baltimore, MD, Dentistry, May 1985
Harris, Michael, Upper Marlboro, MD, $54,101.35, Howard University, Washington, DC, Dentistry, June 1988
Johnson, Leardrew L., Takoma Park, MD, $11,630.74, Howard University, Washington, DC, Dentistry, May 1988
Jones, Winifred M., Baltimore, MD, $175,370.00, Meharry Medical College, Nashville, TN, Dentistry, May 1987
Leach, Kevin, Landover, MD, $33,058.12, Marquette University, Milwaukee, WI, Dentistry, May 1990
Lindsey, Glenda G., Brooklandville, MD, $51,228.98, Howard University, Washington, DC, Dentistry, May 1986
McKee, Commelita, Silver Spring, MD, $18,901.90, Howard University, Washington, DC, Dentistry, May 1990
Palou, Ana M., Silver Spring, MD, $49,090.67, Georgetown University, Washington, DC, Dentistry, May 1989
Press, Zachary D., Randallstown, MD, $66,469.27, Univ of Maryland Baltimore, Columbia, SC, Dentistry, May 1985
Richardson, Joseph J., Silver Spring, MD, $180,389.24, Howard University, Washington, DC, Dentistry, May 1987
Saffold, Michael D., Hyattsville, MD, $12,859.83, Univ of Maryland Baltimore, Baltimore, MD, Dentistry, May 1987
Smith, Dezrie, Clinton, MD, $19,201.91, Georgetown University, Washington, DC, Dentistry, May 1989
Thomas, Lindwall, Silver Spring, MD, $13,385.34, Howard University, Washington, DC, Dentistry, May 1991
Van Story-Lewis, Patricia E., Adelphi, MD, $31,706.47, Howard University, Washington, DC, Dentistry, May 1981
Williams, Laura A., Temple Hills, MD, $40,272.46, Howard University, Washington, DC, Dentistry, May 1987
Wilson, Debra D., Baltimore, MD, $57,109.98, Univ of Maryland Baltimore, Baltimore, MD, Dentistry, May 1984

Osteopathy

Poljan, Mary K., Frostburg, MD, $9,372.14, Michigan State University, East Lansing, MI, Osteopathy, June 1989

Pharmacy

Clark, Timothy J., Baltimore, MD, $10,015.37, Ohio State University, Columbus, OH, Pharmacy, June 1987
Conerly, Rex A., Greenbelt, MD, $29,648.83, Howard University, Washington, DC, Pharmacy, May 1986
Onyekwere, Lawrence, Randallstown, MD, $4,905.37, Creighton University, Omaha, NE, Pharmacy, August 1983

Podiatry

Boyce, Jesse M., Bowie, MD, $143,504.40, New York College of Podiatric Medicine, New York, NY, Podiatry, June 1987
Doyle, Anthony A., Silver Spring, MD, $47,904.41, California College of Podiatric Medicine, San Francisco, CA, Podiatry, May 1989
Gatling, Joycelyn J., Largo, MD, $117,605.95, Ohio College of Podiatric Medicine, Cleveland, OH, Podiatry, May 1982
Hudyman, Andrew, Baltimore, MD, $9,948.59, Ohio College of Podiatric Medicine, Cleveland, OH, Podiatry, June 1990
Jacobs, Steven, Baltimore, MD, $12,010.59, Pennsylvania Col of Podiatric Medicine, Philadelphia, PA, Podiatry, June 1987
Miles Jr, Robert, Wheaton, MD, $124,969.46, Dr William Scholl Col of Podiatric Med, Chicago, IL, Podiatry, May 1988
Rosenberg, Robert, Gaithersburg, MD, $141,266.92, Barry University—Podiatric Med, Miami Shores, FL, Podiatry, May 1989
Sachs, Jody, Derwood, MD, $149,292.76, Ohio College of Podiatric Medicine, Cleveland, OH, Podiatry, May 1987
Young, Pamela, Bowie, MD, $76,879.20, Ohio College of Podiatric Medicine, Cleveland, OH, Podiatry, May 1988

Public Health

Henderson, Melford J., Rockville, MD, $4,487.78, Yale University, New Haven, CT, Public Health, May 1984
Mathews, Elizabeth A., Baltimore, MD, $14,535.47, Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, MD, Public Health, January 1991
Pieh, Michael, Rockville, MD, $16,074.54, Tulane University, New Orleans, LA, Public Health, May 1988

Veterinary Medicine

Barksdale, Daryl L., Frederick, MD, $4,903.57, Tuskegee University, Tuskegee, AL, Veterinary Medicine, May 1987
Kidd, Nettie J., Silver Spring, MD, $8,210.97, Tuskegee University, Tuskegee, AL, Veterinary Medicine, May 1988
Slaughter, John, Baltimore, MD, $89,529.29, Tuskegee University, Tuskegee, AL, Veterinary Medicine, May 1985

Massachusetts

Allopathic Medicine

Bergus, Boris, Dighton, MA, $2,845.91, Harvard Medical School, Boston, MA, Allopathic Medicine, June 1988
Charles, Jean B., Bedford, MA, $64,929.81, Boston University Medical Center, Boston, MA, Allopathic Medicine, May 1985
Cyrus, Pamela A., Arlington, MA, $19,319.81, Marshall University, Huntington, WV, Allopathic Medicine, May 1988
Daley, William L., Boston, MA, $77,026.05, Boston University Medical Center, Boston, MA, Allopathic Medicine, June 1983
Davis, Rudy, Boston, MA, $46,204.47, Boston University Medical Center, Boston, MA, Allopathic Medicine, May 1990
Gelwan, Eliot M., Brookline, MA, $9,495.79, Yale University, New Haven, CT, Allopathic Medicine, May 1983
Healey, Christine, Winthrop, MA, $30,742.36, Univ of Rochester, Rochester, NY, Allopathic Medicine, May 1987
Holt, Todd N., Provincetown, MA, $65,399.20, Univ of Arkansas Medical Center, Little Rock, AR, Allopathic Medicine, May 1986
Joyce, Benjamin, Cataumet, MA, $16,273.27, Tufts University, Boston, MA, Allopathic Medicine, May 1985
Ling, Judith, Springfield, MA, $32,265.78, Stanford University, Stanford, CA, Allopathic Medicine, June 1981
Mendes, Antonio C., Dorchester, MA, $13,361.75, Univ of Massachusetts Worcester, Worcester, MA, Allopathic Medicine, May 1990
Murphy, Michael P., Brookline, MA, $11,902.61, Suny Stony Brook, Stony Brook, NY, Allopathic Medicine, June 1989

O'Connor, Brian, Boston, MA, $41,576.15, Georgetown University, Washington, DC, Allopathic Medicine, May 1985
Obi Tabot, Eliot T., Framingham, MA, $8,188.96, Univ of Missouri Columbia, Columbia, MO, Allopathic Medicine, May 1989
Rivers, Samuel, Randolph, MA, $14,096.35, Brown University, Providence, RI, Allopathic Medicine, June 1984
Rucks, Andrew A., Springfield, MA, $175,915.66, Meharry Medical College, Nashville, TN, Allopathic Medicine, May 1985
Saintlouis, Josephus, West Roxbury, MA, $97,155.19, Univ of Minnesota, Minneapolis, MN, Allopathic Medicine, June 1987
Simpson, Ashley, Allston, MA, $27,570.60, Tufts University, Boston, MA, Allopathic Medicine, May 1989
Swinford, Rita, Boston, MA, $15,613.85, SUNY Stony Brook, Stony Brook, NY, Allopathic Medicine, June 1990
Thompson, John, East Bridgewater, MA, $23,523.84, Medical College of Wisconsin, Milwaukee, WI, Allopathic Medicine, May 1989
Tucker, Lori B., Nahant, MA, $20,605.93, Tufts University, Boston, MA, Allopathic Medicine, June 1983
Urkevic, Jan, Brookline, MA, $63,761.18, Georgetown University, Washington, DC, Allopathic Medicine, May 1988
Weaver, Rebecca, Boston, MA, $168,973.42, Tufts University, Boston, MA, Allopathic Medicine, May 1987
Whitt, Beverly S., Brockton, MA, $118,513.19, Univ of California Irvine, Irvine, CA, Allopathic Medicine, June 1988

Chiropractic

Angelo, Kathie L., Hull, MA, $59,797.42, Life College, Marietta, GA, Chiropractic, December 1984
Boyden, David, South Deerfield, MA, $2,564.00, Palmer College of Chiropractic, Davenport, IA, Chiropractic, October 1992
Brault, Peter, Westminster, MA, $31,420.40, New York Chiropractic College, Seneca Falls, NY, Chiropractic, April 1983
Bruce, Ronald, Peabody, MA, $10,014.40, Los Angeles College of Chiropractic, Whittier, CA, Chiropractic, August 1987
Cotter, Paul, Newton, MA, $33,418.61, Palmer College of Chiropractic, Davenport, IA, Chiropractic, June 1988
Dehamer-Howard, Heleen H., South Hamilton, MA, $65,437.32, Life College, Marietta, GA, Chiropractic, June 1983
Doherty, Edward (chip) E., Westwood, MA, $17,049.75, Palmer College of Chiropractic, Davenport, IA, Chiropractic, June 1984
Doonan, Greg, Peabody, MA, $22,359.21, Palmer College of Chiropractic, Davenport, IA, Chiropractic, March 1984
Falkinburg, Rory, Williamsburg, MA, $49,566.42, Los Angeles College of Chiropractic, Whittier, CA, Chiropractic, April 1989
Garcia, Frank J., Boston, MA, $1,694.10, Life College, Marietta, GA, Chiropractic, October 1986
Hughes, Allen D., Worchester, MA, $92,550.78, Palmer College of Chiropractic, Davenport, IA, Chiropractic, March 1989
Leconte, Isabelle I., Cambridge, MA, $36,645.55, Los Angeles College of Chiropractic, Whittier, CA, Chiropractic, August 1986
Miller, Harry, Sandwich, MA, $10,247.66, Life College, Marietta, GA, Chiropractic, September 1990
Morman, Diane, Jamaica Plain, MA, $48,727.12, Life College, Marietta, GA, Chiropractic, March 1983
Powell, Michael, Somerset, MA, $73,413.85, Palmer College of Chiropractic, Davenport, IA, Chiropractic, June 1986
Rines, Susan B., Westwood, MA, $3,922.48, Life College, Marietta, GA, Chiropractic, December 1990

Clinical Psychology

Webster, Thomas, North Hampton, MA, $75,912.21, New School For Social Research, New York, NY, Clinical Psychology, May 1989

Dentistry

Bissanti, Michael A., Braintree, MA, $36,505.58, Boston University Medical Center, Boston, MA, Dentistry, June 1983
Brown, David, Belchertown, MA, $113,324.01, Univ of Southern California, Los Angeles, CA, Dentistry, May 1990
Butler, Hubert, Boston, MA, $103,208.24, Temple University, Philadelphia, PA, Dentistry, June 1987
Cale, Scott, Watertown, MA, $114,096.45, Tufts University, Boston, MA, Dentistry, June 1990
Calhoun, Mary, West Bridgewater, MA, $32,736.40, Case Western Reserve University, Cleveland, OH, Dentistry, December 1985
Capua, Joseph, Dorchester, MA, $87,558.88, Boston University Medical Center, Boston, MA, Dentistry, May 1990
Christopoulos, George, Saugus, MA, $123,902.65, Boston University Medical Center, Boston, MA, Dentistry, May 1987
Cohen, Ronald, Rockland, MA, $177,541.19, Tufts University, Boston, MA, Dentistry, February 1987
Culbertson, William, Wollaston, MA, $25,273.64, Boston University Medical Center, Boston, MA, Dentistry, May 1982
Dooley, Paul J., Hyde Park, MA, $25,031.70, Boston University Medical Center, Boston, MA, Dentistry, May 1990
Down, Majorie E., Wrentham, MA, $4,109.16, Boston University Medical Center, Boston, MA, Dentistry, June 1984
Gabriel, Tony D., Watertown, MA, $62,101.17, Marquette University, Milwaukee, WI, Dentistry, May 1984
Gallery, Melissa, Nahant, MA, $129,070.22, Tufts University, Boston, MA, Dentistry, May 1987
Gearin, Timothy, Chicope, MA, $114,945.44, Tufts University, Boston, MA, Dentistry, February 1988
George, Gail G., Quincy, MA, $120,233.28, Boston University Medical Center, Boston, MA, Dentistry, May 1987
Hardy, Mary, Lowell, MA, $145,046.31, Tufts University, Boston, MA, Dentistry, June 1990
Jones, Margaret K., Pembroke, MA, $173,621.56, Boston University Medical Center, Boston, MA, Dentistry, May 1986
Lawrence, Herbert, Roxbury, MA, $20,216.90, Boston University Medical Center, Boston, MA, Dentistry, May 1985
Lebourdais, Stephen, Pittsfield, MA, $395.71, Univ of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, PA, Dentistry, May 1981
Lynch, William, Milford, MA, $43,184.98, Boston University Medical Center, Boston, MA, Dentistry, May 1990
Martinez, Hannah A., Medford, MA, $38,741.67, Tufts University, Boston, MA, Dentistry, June 1989
Matkoski, Jane L., Dorchester, MA, $103,226.49, Boston University Medical Center, Boston, MA, Dentistry, May 1988
Nosack, John E., Watertown, MA, $163,310.12, Tufts University, Boston, MA, Dentistry, June 1986
Savas, Christy W., Worchester, MA, $1,566.15, Georgetown University, Washington, DC, Dentistry, May 1982
Sedovsky, Jeffrey, Framingham, MA, $172,430.12, Boston University Medical Center, Boston, MA, Dentistry, May 1989
Smith, Rickey, Mattapan, MA, $152,901.35, Marquette University, Milwaukee, WI, Dentistry, May 1988

Snow, Brian B., Harwich, MA, $40,095.96, Georgetown University, Washington, DC, Dentistry, May 1985
Solimini Jr, Anthony G., Boston, MA, $40,101.59, Boston University Medical Center, Boston, MA, Dentistry, June 1988
Thompson, Florian, Boston, MA, $199,852.28, Boston University Medical Center, Boston, MA, Dentistry, May 1988
Weake, Jeffrey R., North Weymouth, MA, $214,973.31, Tufts University, Boston, MA, Dentistry, June 1985
Woodrick, William R., Waltham, MA, $39,354.25, Univ of Pittsburgh, Pittsburgh, PA, Dentistry, June 1989

Optometry

Garcia, Miguel A., Danvers, MA, $27,908.76, New England College of Optometry, Boston, MA, Optometry, May 1988
Soque, James, Falmouth, MA, $4,244.00, New England College of Optometry, Boston, MA, Optometry, May 1991

Osteopathy

Berry, Linda, Seekonk, MA, $179,026.77, Univ of New England, Biddeford, ME, Osteopathy, June 1986
Leaver, Janet M., Stoughton, MA, $209,267.49, Univ of New England, Biddeford, ME, Osteopathy, December 1986
Parks, Norman G., Brookline, MA, $17,169.16, Michigan State University, East Lansing, MI, Osteopathy, June 1987

Pharmacy

Amah, Ezem, Boston, MA, $7,410.56, Massachusetts College of Pharmacy, Boston, MA, Pharmacy, June 1988
Culba, Frantisek, Quincy, MA, $4,646.27, Massachusetts College of Pharmacy, Boston, MA, Pharmacy, June 1992
Gibbs, David P., Boston, MA, $27,134.93, Massachusetts College of Pharmacy, Boston, MA, Pharmacy, June 1984
Johnson, Benjamin B., North Hampton, MA, $11,378.43, Massachusetts College of Pharmacy, Boston, MA, Pharmacy, June 1987
Karbalaei, Esfandiar, Cambridge, MA, $7,751.32, Massachusetts College of Pharmacy, Boston, MA, Pharmacy, June 1992
Tkejiani, Azubeze A C, Mattapan, MA, $58,185.48, Massachusetts College of Pharmacy, Boston, MA, Pharmacy, June 1988
Watt, Sharyn, Brockton, MA, $58,988.79, Massachusetts College of Pharmacy, Boston, MA, Pharmacy, June 1986

Podiatry

Coby, Michael, Amherst, MA, $21,131.98, Pennsylvania Col of Podiatric Medicine, Philadelphia, PA, Podiatry, June 1987
Tachibana, James, Stockbridge, MA, $104,791.48, New York College of Podiatric Medicine, New York, NY, Podiatry, June 1982

Public Health

Burnside, Susan, Marblehead, MA, $13,891.83, Boston University Medical Center, Boston, MA, Public Health, May 1985
Caraballo-Wesley, Elizabeth, Mattapan, MA, $13,914.83, Boston University Medical Center, Boston, MA, Public Health, May 1985
Cronin, Denis, Medford, MA, $21,136.94, Columbia University Health Sciences, New York, NY, Public Health, May 1986
Dorsinville, Mona M., Boston, MA, $22,574.60, Harvard University, Boston, MA, Public Health, June 1987
Dumser, James B., Malden, MA, $26,370.74, Harvard University, Boston, MA, Public Health, June 1987
Kattan, Yehuda Y., Springfield, MA, $17,599.99, Tulane University, New Orleans, LA, Public Health, December 1985
Mercier-Pierre, Hermide, Brockton, MA, $18,440.62, Boston University Medical Center, Boston, MA, Public Health, May 1987
Michaud, Unique, Needham, MA, $8,711.25, Harvard University, Boston, MA, Public Health, June 1987
Mikols, Ann M., Boston, MA, $31,892.78, Boston University Medical Center, Boston, MA, Public Health, May 1985
Munroe, Alelia, Boston, MA, $15,231.73, Boston University Medical Center, Boston, MA, Public Health, January 1983

Veterinary Medicine

Canavan, Robert T., Wayland, MA, $54,167.02, Tufts University, Boston, MA, Veterinary Medicine, May 1989
Ernst, Harry B., Falmouth, MA, $106,645.40, Tufts University, Boston, MA, Veterinary Medicine, May 1987
Hepburn, Bradley J., Somerville, MA, $28,317.98, Tufts University, Boston, MA, Veterinary Medicine, May 1985
Thompson, Ashiaa, Canton, MA, $60,011.24, Tuskegee University, Tuskegee, AL, Veterinary Medicine, May 1984
Weber, Merle H., Andover, MA, $84,847.96, Tufts University, Boston, MA, Veterinary Medicine, May 1987

Michigan

Allopathic Medicine

Anderson, Denise, Detroit, MI, $120,337.40, Meharry Medical College, Nashville, TN, Allopathic Medicine, May 1988
Arrington, Dexter E., Detroit, MI, $1,547.88, Washington University, St Louis, MO, Allopathic Medicine, May 1990
Berry, Aphonso, Troy, MI, $5,067.88, Howard University, Washington, DC, Allopathic Medicine, May 1988
Burton, Ann Y., Detroit, MI, $144,433.06, Medical College of Ohio, Toledo, OH, Allopathic Medicine, June 1986
Coalman, Perry G., Kalamazoo, MI, $25,453.97, Medical College of Wisconsin, Milwaukee, WI, Allopathic Medicine, May 1984
Criss, David, Southfield, MI, $7,794.19, Michigan State University, East Lansing, MI, Allopathic Medicine, June 1990
Crittenden Jr, William, Detroit, MI, $86,214.91, Meharry Medical College, Nashville, TN, Allopathic Medicine, May 1986
Daniel, Felton J., Farmington, MI, $24,462.39, Medical College of Georgia, Augusta, GA, Allopathic Medicine, June 1983
Eichler, John A., Ypsilanti, MI, $106,052.29, Univ of Pittsburgh, Pittsburgh, PA, Allopathic Medicine, June 1987
Eiland, Gazandra J., East Lansing, MI, $4,720.38, Univ of Michigan, Ann Arbor, MI, Allopathic Medicine, May 1991
Ennis, Michael C., Lansing, MI, $25,126.76, Michigan State University, East Lansing, MI, Allopathic Medicine, June 1989
George, Eric R., Grand Rapids, MI, $7,106.28, Marshall University, Huntington, WV, Allopathic Medicine, May 1989
Hatter, Marcus, Lansing, MI, $84,352.00, Michigan State University, East Lansing, MI, Allopathic Medicine, June 1989
Johnson, Anthony, Detroit, MI, $31,658.04, Meharry Medical College, Nashville, TN, Allopathic Medicine, May 1989
Lucas, Joann, Detroit, MI, $135,929.11, Meharry Medical College, Nashville, TN, Allopathic Medicine, May 1987
Marang, Boitshoko P., Detroit, MI, $103,787.13, Southern Illinois Univ Springfield, IL, Allopathic Medicine, November 1984
McAllister, William, Detroit, MI, $32,927.98, Michigan State University, East Lansing, MI, Allopathic Medicine, June 1982

Mial, Richard, Ann Arbor, MI, $3,727.52, Creighton University, Omaha, NE, Allopathic Medicine, May 1985
Moore, Charzetta, West Bloomfield, MI, $129,991.72, Meharry Medical College, Nashville, TN, Allopathic Medicine, May 1987
Motley, Rebecca K., Detroit, MI, $104,269.76, Univ of Michigan, Ann Arbor, MI, Allopathic Medicine, May 1986
Neitzel, Shelly, Ann Arbor, MI, $12,759.30, Univ of Michigan, Ann Arbor, MI, Allopathic Medicine, May 1988
Pavlou, Bill, West Bloomfield, MI, $119,004.90, Hahnemann University, Philadelphia, PA, Allopathic Medicine, June 1982
Polak, Timothy, Ann Arbor, MI, $12,853.27, Wayne State University, Detroit, MI, Allopathic Medicine, June 1991
Polk, Norris, Detroit, MI, $1,682.88, Meharry Medical College, Nashville, TN, Allopathic Medicine, May 1982
Rizzo, Michael J., Southfield, MI, $26,106.24, St. Louis University, St. Louis, MO, Allopathic Medicine, May 1985
Segesta, Michael, East Detroit, MI, $23,547.46, Mayo Medical School, Rochester, MN, Allopathic Medicine, May 1988
Sigismund, Gordon, Farmington Hills, MI, $95,868.81, Meharry Medical College, Nashville, TN, Allopathic Medicine, May 1988
Sparrow Jr, Cleveland C., Birmingham, MI, $76,352.92, Georgetown University, Washington, DC, Allopathic Medicine, May 1988
Tanwi, Lyndon, Southfield, MI, $61,190.34, Univ of Texas Hlth Sci Cntr San Antonio, San Antonio, TX, Allopathic Medicine, June 1986
Walker, Yvette R., Harper Woods, MI, $34,557.26, Meharry Medical College, Nashville, TN, Allopathic Medicine, May 1990
Ware, Cynthia R., Detroit, MI, $20,593.70, Wright State University, Dayton, OH, Allopathic Medicine, June 1990
West, Woodrow W., Southfield, MI, $8,591.50, Univ of Michigan, Ann Arbor, MI, Allopathic Medicine, May 1984

Chiropractic

Aamodt, Wayne G., Grand Rapids, MI, $6,780.74, Palmer College of Chiropractic, Davenport, IA, Chiropractic, December 1982
Adray, Allie, Dearborn, MI, $117,294.25, Life College, Marietta, GA, Chiropractic, March 1987
Allen, David F., Madison Heights, MI, $45,152.03, National College of Chiropractic, Lombard, IL, Chiropractic, December 1985
Beller, Bryan, Wyandotte, MI, $118,057.79, Life College, Marietta, GA, Chiropractic, March 1987
Calzetta, Gregory A., St. Clair Shores, MI, $49,304.46, Life College, Marietta, GA, Chiropractic, October 1985
Chapman, Michelle, Auburn Hills, MI, $34,046.57, Palmer College of Chiropractic, Davenport, IA, Chiropractic, October 1987
Clark, Daniel S., Rochester Hills, MI, $34,236.42, Palmer College of Chiropractic, Davenport, IA, Chiropractic, June 1985
Clark, Gary C., Inkster, MI, $13,722.20, Palmer College of Chiropractic, Davenport, IA, Chiropractic, March 1989
Cordes, John, West Bloomfield, MI, $48,169.55, Logan College of Chiropractic, Chesterfield, MO, Chiropractic, August 1985
Dunn, Karen K, Dearborn, MI, $30,326.81, Palmer College of Chiropractic, Davenport, IA, Chiropractic, June 1985
Flateau, Jacqueline, Taylor, MI, $27,431.82, Life College, Marietta, GA, Chiropractic, June 1989
Forte-Thottakath, Sandra L, Detroit, MI, $17,698.14, National College of Chiropractic, Lombard, IL, Chiropractic, August 1985
Graham Jr, Robert L, Byron Center, MI, $12,784.31, Life College, Marietta, GA, Chiropractic, December 1985
Gress, Raymond, Sparta, MI, $9,275.23, Life College, Marietta, GA, Chiropractic, September 1983
Hassinger, Royann, Ortonville, MI, $35,353.23, National College of Chiropractic, Lombard, IL, Chiropractic, December 1985
Humphrey, Terry J, Lansing, MI, $15,834.59, Life College, Marietta, GA, Chiropractic, September 1983
Hunsberger, Mark, Lake Orion, MI, $13,741.48, Palmer College of Chiropractic, Davenport, IA, Chiropractic, December 1982
Jackson, William, Lakeville, MI, $27,691.13, Cleveland Chiropractic College, Kansas City, MO, Chiropractic, September 1983
Kay, John, Westland, MI, $73,790.02, Life College, Marietta, GA, Chiropractic, June 1986
Knol, Jennifer JS, Holland, MI, $46,844.71, Life College, Marietta, GA, Chiropractic, June 1986
Koffeman, John N, Ann Arbor, MI, $38,951.24, National College of Chiropractic, Lombard, IL, Chiropractic, December 1983
Laing, Jean D, Detroit, MI, $39,941.89, Palmer College of Chiropractic, Davenport, IA, Chiropractic, March 1984
Lavengood, Daniel J, Wyoming, MI, $124,518.18, Life College, Marietta, GA, Chiropractic, March 1987
Lavengood, Todd D, Marshall, MI, $50,588.00, Palmer College of Chiropractic, Davenport, IA, Chiropractic, December 1986
McShan, Ophelia O, Kalamazoo, MI, $55,955.83, Life College, Marietta, GA, Chiropractic, December 1984
Migdalewicz, Alan, Ferndale, MI, $29,484.74, Palmer College of Chiropractic, Davenport, IA, Chiropractic, December 1987
Monterosso, Karen, Allen Park, MI, $18,766.75, Life College, Marietta, GA, Chiropractic, March 1983
Nelson, Roger, Waterford, MI, $31,775.60, Palmer College of Chiropractic, Davenport, IA, Chiropractic, December 1986
O'Dell, Craig, Lake, MI, $149,037.89, Life College, Marietta, GA, Chiropractic, June 1984
Pierce, Douglas E, Grand Rapids, MI, $10,699.84, Parker College of Chiropractic, Dallas, TX, Chiropractic, April 1986
Richardson, Neil N, Cedar Springs, MI, $39,021.83, Palmer College of Chiropractic, Davenport, IA, Chiropractic, March 1987
Rosemond, Luther, Detroit, MI, $89,841.36, Life College, Marietta, GA, Chiropractic, December 1985
Roshy, Gary, Ludington, MI, $133,887.58, Palmer College of Chiropractic, Davenport, IA, Chiropractic, October 1986
Sanborn, Brian, Mt Pleasant, MI, $132,714.79, Life College, Marietta, GA, Chiropractic, March 1987
Scafidi, Scott J, Pontiac, MI, $23,653.89, Life College, Marietta, GA, Chiropractic, March 1986
Schwarz, Bernard B, Center Line, MI, $19,051.95, Palmer College of Chiropractic, Davenport, IA, Chiropractic, December 1983
Smith, Dale, Battle Creek, MI, $88,322.81, Life Chiropractic College-West, San Lorenzo, CA, Chiropractic, June 1987
Truax, Christopher J, Algonac, MI, $2,796.87, National College of Chiropractic, Lombard, IL, Chiropractic, August 1984
Vergote, Steven S, Warren, MI, $32,715.46, Palmer College of Chiropractic, Davenport, IA, Chiropractic, September 1985
Vernon, David W, Clarkston, MI, $7,287.15, Cleveland Chiropractic College, Los Angeles, CA, Chiropractic, December 1982
Vettraino, Mark, Orion, MI, $82,083.21, Life College, Marietta, GA, Chiropractic, June 1984
Williams, Ronald G, Grand Rapids, MI, $48,065.89, National College of

Chiropractic, Lombard, IL, Chiropractic, December 1987
Wilson, Soni, Detroit, MI, $54,458.43, Logan College of Chiropractic, Chesterfield, MO, Chiropractic, August 1988
Wolgat, Gregory J., Southfield, MI, $13,927.87, Life College, Marietta, GA, Chiropractic, December 1983

Clinical Psychology

Wright, Richard R., Detroit, MI, $105,850.24, California Sch of Prof Psych San Diego, San Diego, CA, Clinical Psychology, June 1987

Dentistry

Anderson, Mary L., Birmingham, MI, $177,252.76, Univ of Detroit Mercy, Detroit, MI, Dentistry, April 1982
Baumstark, James M., Livonia, MI, $147,998.08, Marquette University, Milwaukee, WI, Dentistry, May 1988
Branham, Jerome R., Pontiac, MI, $33,379.39, Meharry Medical College, Nashville, TN, Dentistry, May 1981
Burnett, Kevin M., Detroit, MI, $57,843.82, Univ of Detroit Mercy, Detroit, MI, Dentistry, May 1983
Chapman, William, Westland, MI, $150,602.48, Univ of Detroit Mercy, Detroit, MI, Dentistry, December 1986
Dawidowski, Douglas M., Rochester, MI, $57,449.94, Univ of Detroit Mercy, Detroit, MI, Dentistry, April 1981
George, Achukutty T., Detroit, MI, $14,631.84, Univ of Michigan, Ann Arbor, MI, Dentistry, May 1990
Hamlin, Calvin, Detroit, MI, $49,296.91, Howard University, Washington, DC, Dentistry, May 1987
Holyway, Craig T., Southfield, MI, $92,841.85, Washington University, St Louis, MO, Dentistry, May 1991
Hysni, Eddie K., Orchard Lake, MI, $23,364.11, Univ of Detroit Mercy, Detroit, MI, Dentistry, May 1987
Khouri, Louie, Ferndale, MI, $7,705.97, Univ of Michigan, Ann Arbor, MI, Dentistry, August 1989
Munson, Kevin D., Huntington Woods, MI, $11,604.02, Univ of Maryland Baltimore, Baltimore, MD, Dentistry, May 1988
Murphy, Kevin K., Fraser, MI, $43,673.38, Univ of Detroit Mercy, Detroit, MI, Dentistry, April 1981
Rashid, Paul, East Lansing, MI, $120,311.44, Boston University Medical Center, Boston, MA, Dentistry, May 1989
Rodgers-McDougall, Shawn E., Ann Arbor, MI, $35,893.84, Univ of Detroit Mercy, Detroit, MI, Dentistry, May 1989
Russell, Bobby D., Stevensville, MI, $60,317.42, Loyola University Chicago, Chicago, IL, Dentistry, May 1988
Schaefer, Mary L., Flint, MI, $39,372.48, Meharry Medical College, Nashville, TN, Dentistry, May 1981
Senior, Duane A., Detroit, MI, $166,391.33, Meharry Medical College, Nashville, TN, Dentistry, May 1985
Snyder, Steven H., Southfield, MI, $46,515.75, Univ of Detroit Mercy, Detroit, MI, Dentistry, April 1981
Taylor, Harold L., Detroit, MI, $179,802.38, Meharry Medical College, Nashville, TN, Dentistry, May 1984

Optometry

Wells, Marcy A., Detroit, MI, $19,152.33, Illinois College of Optometry, Chicago, IL, Optometry, May 1989

Osteopathy

Barnett, Ruth D., Southfield, MI, $78,575.65, Michigan State University, East Lansing, MI, Osteopathy, June 1985
Barr, John T., Bay City, MI, $18,984.11, Univ of Health Sciences, Kansas City, MO, Osteopathy, March 1991
Benjamin, Roxanne R., Rose City, MI, $58,677.88, Michigan State University, East Lansing, MI, Osteopathy, June 1985
Bilyeu, Stuart, Ann Arbor, MI, $16,735.02, Michigan State University, East Lansing, MI, Osteopathy, June 1988
Breedlove, David L., Detroit, MI, $9,843.87, Michigan State University, East Lansing, MI, Osteopathy, June 1983
Brent, Gloria G J, East Lansing, MI, $41,188.63, Michigan State University, East Lansing, MI, Osteopathy, June 1986
Cohn, Mitchell A., Birmingham, MI, $183,722.78, Univ of Osteo Medical & Health Science, Des Moines, IA, Osteopathy, June 1986
Frei, Julia, Marquette, MI, $8,593.93, Michigan State University, East Lansing, MI, Osteopathy, June 1989
Green, Linda, Detroit, MI, $30,284.87, Michigan State University, East Lansing, MI, Osteopathy, June 1985
Kreuzer, Craig, Grand Rapids, MI, $15,954.01, College of Osteo Med of the Pacific, Pomona, CA, Osteopathy, June 1991
Posey, Willie L., Detroit, MI, $176,628.71, Midwestern University, Downers Grove, IL, Osteopathy, June 1988
Racicot, Terry A., Troy, MI, $11,079.61, Oklahoma State University, Tulsa, OK, Osteopathy, May 1989
Ross, Guy, Ferndale, MI, $16,613.81, Michigan State University, East Lansing, MI, Osteopathy, June 1990
Snyder, Richard R., West Bloomfield, MI, $80,794.94, Univ of Health Sciences, Kansas City, MO, Osteopathy, May 1985
Swan, Charles, Pontiac, MI, $7,107.12, Michigan State University, East Lansing, MI, Osteopathy, June 1988
Torosian, Michael P., Novi, MI, $126,378.86, Univ of Health Sciences, Kansas City, MO, Osteopathy, May 1990
Toth, Robert L., Detroit, MI, $27,404.12, Michigan State University, East Lansing, MI, Osteopathy, June 1981

Pharmacy

Lemmons, Yvonne Y., Detroit, MI, $32,856.10, Mercer University, Atlanta, GA, Pharmacy, June 1983

Podiatry

Ball Jr, Thomas, Detroit, MI, $31,217.90, Ohio College of Podiatric Medicine, Cleveland, OH, Podiatry, May 1980
Baptist, Mazel, Detroit, MI, $11,652.22, New York College of Podiatric Medicine, New York, NY, Podiatry, June 1989
Berk, Richard I., Ann Arbor, MI, $135,455.45, Ohio College of Podiatric Medicine, Cleveland, OH, Podiatry, May 1981
Cesar, Gary L., Lansing, MI, $129,846.33, Ohio College of Podiatric Medicine, Cleveland, OH, Podiatry, May 1985
Hofner, Mark L., Dearborn, MI, $158,126.77, Univ of Osteo Medical & Health Science, Des Moines, IA, Podiatry, June 1988
Horne-Atkins, Jerilyn, Southfield, MI, $35,634.19, Ohio College of Podiatric Medicine, Cleveland, OH, Podiatry, May 1980
Jackson, Thomas C., Detroit, MI, $24,563.69, Ohio College of Podiatric Medicine, Cleveland, OH, Podiatry, May 1985
Johnson, Ervin, Grosse Pointe Farms, MI, $193,156.33, Univ of Osteo Medical & Health Science, Des Moines, IA, Podiatry, May 1990
Moore, Jackie, Detroit, MI, $41,895.23, Univ of Osteo Medical & Health Science, Des Moines, IA, Podiatry, June 1990
Thomas, Valerie, Detroit, MI, $77,145.46, Ohio College of Podiatric Medicine, Cleveland, OH, Podiatry, May 1989
Wilson, Ronald, Detroit, MI, $98,846.07, Ohio College of Podiatric Medicine, Cleveland, OH, Podiatry, May 1985

Public Health

Paveza, Gregory L., Ypsilanti, MI, $154,416.62, Univ of Illinois at Chicago, Chicago, IL, Public Health, June 1985

Veterinary Medicine

Stewart, Kevin R., Utica, MI, $48,040.62, Michigan State University, East Lansing, MI, Veterinary Medicine, June 1987

Minnesota

Allopathic Medicine

Azzarello, James, Minneapolis, MN, $91,916.64, Albany Medical College, Albany, NY, Allopathic Medicine, May 1987

Baker, Jeffrey, Minneapolis, MN, $18,313.91, Univ of Minnesota, Minneapolis, MN, Allopathic Medicine, June 1986

Faragounis, Vasilios, Rochester, MN, $24,805.49, Boston University Medical Center, Boston, MA, Allopathic Medicine, May 1988

Hoskins-Akale, Denise, Cottage Grove, MN, $225,269.64, Medical College of Wisconsin, Milwaukee, WI, Allopathic Medicine, February 1985

Johnson, Richard, Minneapolis, MN, $32,010.22, Univ of Louisville, Louisville, KY, Allopathic Medicine, May 1987

Osei-Tutu, Ernest O., Minneapolis, MN, $16,346.62, Thomas Jefferson University, Philadelphia, PA, Allopathic Medicine, June 1987

Chiropractic

Bauwens, David M., St Paul, MN, $49,679.39, Palmer College of Chiropractic, Davenport, IA, Chiropractic, December 1986

Blish, Jon J., Mound, MN, $19,531.19, Northwestern College of Chiropractic, Bloomington, MN, Chiropractic, December 1988

Bruns, Faylene, Lakeville, MN, $41,813.42, Northwestern College of Chiropractic, Bloomington, MN, Chiropractic, April 1986

Carson, Timothy T., Minneapolis, MN, $4,860.13, Northwestern College of Chiropractic, Bloomington, MN, Chiropractic, August 1987

Chmelik, Gregory J., Rushford, MN, $5,135.29, Northwestern College of Chiropractic, Bloomington, MN, Chiropractic, December 1990

Clancey, Michael, Fairmont, MN, $60,603.99, Palmer College of Chiropractic, Davenport, IA, Chiropractic, October 1986

Denker, Beth A., Blaine, MN, $66,433.71, Northwestern College of Chiropractic, Bloomington, MN, Chiropractic, April 1989

Driessen, Todd, Faribault, MN, $36,891.23, Palmer College of Chiropractic, Davenport, IA, Chiropractic, December 1984

Dudley, Diann M., Chanhassen, MN, $9,937.81, Northwestern College of Chiropractic, Bloomington, MN, Chiropractic, December 1989

Fagan, Barbara, Bloomington, MN, $73,049.57, Northwestern College of Chiropractic, Bloomington, MN, Chiropractic, April 1991

Fairchild, Alima C., Minneapolis, MN, $39,865.93, Northwestern College of Chiropractic, Bloomington, MN, Chiropractic, December 1986

Hendrickson, Raymond D., Clear Lake, MN, $4,838.75, Northwestern College of Chiropractic, Bloomington, MN, Chiropractic, April 1984

Hoklin, Barbara U., Excelsior, MN, $40,831.38, Northwestern College of Chiropractic, Bloomington, MN, Chiropractic, December 1987

Hoklin, John, Excelsior, MN, $30,061.60, Northwestern College of Chiropractic, Bloomington, MN, Chiropractic, August 1987

Juetten, Herbert, Pierz, MN, $102,211.07, Logan College of Chiropractic, Chesterfield, MO, Chiropractic, April 1986

Kronbeck, Gary M., Little Falls, MN, $7,844.86, Northwestern College of Chiropractic, Bloomington, MN, Chiropractic, April 1989

Lawson, Mary E., Grand Marais, MN, $16,342.27, Northwestern College of Chiropractic, Bloomington, MN, Chiropractic, April 1985

Lowe, James J., St Paul, MN, $39,229.16, Northwestern College of Chiropractic, Bloomington, MN, Chiropractic, April 1990

Lyso, Mark, Chaska, MN, $26,822.78, Northwestern College of Chiropractic, Bloomington, MN, Chiropractic, August 1983

McRoy, David, St Paul, MN, $21,479.21, Northwestern College of Chiropractic, Bloomington, MN, Chiropractic, December 1988

Miller, Mark, Minnetonka, MN, $52,840.46, Parker College of Chiropractic, Dallas, TX, Chiropractic, December 1987

Mittet, David, Delworth, MN, $40,060.53, Northwestern College of Chiropractic, Bloomington, MN, Chiropractic, December 1988

Pena, Francisco, St Cloud, MN, $4,456.32, Northwestern College of Chiropractic, Bloomington, MN, Chiropractic, August 1990

Post, Margaret, Minneapolis, MN, $5,894.89, Northwestern College of Chiropractic, Bloomington, MN, Chiropractic, April 1984

Quast, Sean, White Bear Lake, MN, $31,077.17, Northwestern College of Chiropractic, Bloomington, MN, Chiropractic, April 1988

Rothman, Jerry, Eagan, MN, $26,662.52, Northwestern College of Chiropractic, Bloomington, MN, Chiropractic, April 1990

Smith, Edward, Edina, MN, $13,544.11, Northwestern College of Chiropractic, Bloomington, MN, Chiropractic, April 1992

Sogaard, James E., Maple Lake, MN, $22,422.30, Northwestern College of Chiropractic, Bloomington, MN, Chiropractic, December 1983

Steffi, David L., Worthington, MN, $12,582.71, Northwestern College of Chiropractic, Bloomington, MN, Chiropractic, April 1989

Triden, Thomas A., Maple Grove, MN, $37,372.29, Northwestern College of Chiropractic, Bloomington, MN, Chiropractic, August 1986

Wahl, David, Montgomery, MN, $71,894.02, Northwestern College of Chiropractic, Bloomington, MN, Chiropractic, December 1988

Weigel, Mark, Minneapolis, MN, $20,772.86, Northwestern College of Chiropractic, Bloomington, MN, Chiropractic, April 1989

Wibbels, Keith, Eagan, MN, $7,627.52, Northwestern College of Chiropractic, Bloomington, MN, Chiropractic, April 1984

Dentistry

Doan, Tung T., Minneapolis, MN, $28,036.43, Univ of Alabama Birmingham, Birmingham, AL, Dentistry, June 1987

Saran, Richard, Bloomington, MN, $68,908.56, Loyola University Chicago, Chicago, IL, Dentistry, May 1987

Wilbur, Raymond, Northfield, MN, $133,833.17, Marquette University, Milwaukee, WI, Dentistry, May 1987

Podiatry

Wahman, Stephen B., St Paul, MN, $7,226.05, Dr William Scholl Col of Podiatric Med, Chicago, IL, Podiatry, May 1982

Mississippi

Allopathic Medicine

Chenier, Lawrence L., Vicksburg, MS, $15,313.45, Meharry Medical College, Nashville, TN, Allopathic Medicine, May 1980

Coleman, Larry L., Pinola, MS, $71,460.61, Meharry Medical College, Nashville, TN, Allopathic Medicine, May 1984

Harper, Tracy, Gulfport, MS, $27,008.75, Meharry Medical College, Nashville, TN, Allopathic Medicine, May 1992

Herron, Woodie, Aberdeen, MS, $37,345.11, Meharry Medical College, Nashville, TN, Allopathic Medicine, May 1983

Miller, James J., Moss Point, MS, $12,855.25, Howard University,

Washington, DC, Allopathic Medicine, May 1987
Smith, Deborah Anne, Jackson, MS, $9,599.85, Univ of Mississippi Medical Center, Jackson, MS, Allopathic Medicine, May 1983
Taylor, Brenda G., Vicksburg, MS, $24,721.95, Univ of Mississippi Medical Center, Jackson, MS, Allopathic Medicine, May 1984

Chiropractic

Armstrong, Robert J., Jackson, MS, $109,962.88, Life College, Marietta, GA, Chiropractic, September 1986
Durdin, James M., Tupelo, MS, $143,940.54, Life College, Marietta, GA, Chiropractic, June 1986
Fontenette, Vernie F., Gulfport, MS, $53,294.20, Life College, Marietta, GA, Chiropractic, March 1988
Foxworth, Raymond A., Jackson, MS, $76,167.64, Cleveland Chiropractic College, Kansas City, MO, Chiropractic, January 1985
Gratta, James J., Hattiesburg, MS, $11,005.97, Cleveland Chiropractic College, Kansas City, MO, Chiropractic, May 1988
Matthews, Paul E., Natchez, MS, $64,367.62, Cleveland Chiropractic College, Kansas City, MO, Chiropractic, August 1983
McNair, Lawrence L., Gulfport, MS, $80,882.06, Life College, Marietta, GA, Chiropractic, June 1986
Stone, John L., Bay Springs, MS, $36,409.45, Life College, Marietta, GA, Chiropractic, March 1984
Taylor, Gregory P., Corinth, MS, $74,646.36, Logan College of Chiropractic, Chesterfield, MO, Chiropractic, December 1988
Veal, Paul E., Sledge, MS, $13,167.86, Life College, Marietta, GA, Chiropractic, June 1986
Winborn, David D., Moss Point, MS, $30,203.82, National College of Chiropractic, Lombard, IL, Chiropractic, May 1985

Dentistry

Burks, Osborne D., Lorman, MS, $36,580.79, Meharry Medical College, Nashville, TN, Dentistry, May 1983
Chatham, Charles B., Jackson, MS, $33,867.19, Univ of Mississippi Medical Center, Jackson, MS, Dentistry, May 1985
Coleman, James T., Pearl, MS, $27,067.98, Univ of Mississippi Medical Center, Jackson, MS, Dentistry, May 1984
Long, Robert E., Clarksdale, MS, $3,221.65, Meharry Medical College, Nashville, TN, Dentistry, August 1979
Magro, Steven V., Madison, MS, $45,117.45, Univ of Mississippi Medical Center, Jackson, MS, Dentistry, May 1987
Ocampo, Buddy, Soso, MS, $40,282.05, Univ of Mississippi Medical Center, Jackson, MS, Dentistry, June 1985

Osteopathy

Mitchell, Jerry, Pascagoula, MS, $38,432.27, Univ of North Texas Health Science Ctr., Fort Worth, TX, Osteopathy, May 1986

Pharmacy

Ratliff II, James H., Hattiesburg, MS, $3,752.65, Xavier University of Louisiana, New Orleans, LA, Pharmacy, May 1983

Podiatry

Mingo, Robert, Lexington, MS, $11,238.84, Ohio College of Podiatric Medicine, Cleveland, OH, Podiatry, May 1986

Veterinary Medicine

Roney, Stephen, Lexington, MS, $25,500.10, Tuskegee University, Tuskegee, AL, Veterinary Medicine, May 1989

Missouri

Allopathic Medicine

Barnes, Mark R., Kansas City, MO, $21,809.09, Univ of Missouri Kansas City, Kansas City, MO, Allopathic Medicine, December 1986
Bond, Kelvin, Florissant, MO, $18,474.89, Washington University, St Louis, MO, Allopathic Medicine, May 1989
Chapman, Astra, Kansas City, MO, $16,597.23, Univ of Missouri Kansas City, Kansas City, MO, Allopathic Medicine, May 1986
Chavis, Dion, Columbia, MO, $5,482.49, Univ of Missouri Columbia, Columbia, MO, Allopathic Medicine, May 1988
Jones, Larry, Kansas City, MO, $3,313.99, Howard University, Washington, DC, Allopathic Medicine, May 1987
King Jr., Edgar E., Hayti, MO, $104,120.28, Univ of Missouri Columbia, Columbia, MO, Allopathic Medicine, November 1986
Martin, Kurt, St. Louis, MO, $1,564.79, Southern Illinois Univ, Springfield, IL, Allopathic Medicine, May 1991
McCullough, Eddie, Kansas City, MO, $35,509.99, Univ of Missouri Kansas City, Kansas City, MO, Allopathic Medicine, May 1991
Reed, Arlington, Louisburg, MO, $185,013.78, Georgetown University, Washington, DC, Allopathic Medicine, May 1984
Sanders, Thomas, Kansas City, MO, $97,805.71, Meharry Medical College, Nashville, TN, Allopathic Medicine, May 1989

Chiropractic

Barr, Timothy G., St Joseph, MO, $91,164.86, Cleveland Chiropractic College, Kansas City, MO, Chiropractic, September 1989
Bartholomew, Brian K., St. Peters, MO, $2,926.76, Cleveland Chiropractic College, Kansas City, MO, Chiropractic, December 1990
Bateman, Michael, Imperial, MO, $25,132.97, Logan College of Chiropractic, Chesterfield, MO, Chiropractic, April 1990
Belhouari, Jelloul, Kansas City, MO, $35,854.39, Texas Chiropractic College Foundation, Pasadena, TX, Chiropractic, May 1991
Bement, Stephen A., Webster Groves, MO, $37,224.11, Logan College of Chiropractic, Chesterfield, MO, Chiropractic, August 1987
Berger, Keith, Chesterfield, MO, $17,710.77, Logan College of Chiropractic, Chesterfield, MO, Chiropractic, April 1983
Bezzic, Aleta M., Kansas City, MO, $69,652.65, Cleveland Chiropractic College, Kansas City, MO, Chiropractic, May 1989
Borst, Mitchell, Ballwin, MO, $11,725.15, Logan College of Chiropractic, Chesterfield, MO, Chiropractic, December 1988
Bottorff, Douglas, Kansas City, MO, $111,479.71, Cleveland Chiropractic College, Kansas City, MO, Chiropractic, May 1987
Boyer, Arthur G., Festus, MO, $44,726.29, Logan College of Chiropractic, Chesterfield, MO, Chiropractic, April 1983
Bright, Gale, Kansas City, MO, $64,356.53, Cleveland Chiropractic College, Kansas City, MO, Chiropractic, January 1989
Brown, Harry, Kansas City, MO, $49,188.33, Cleveland Chiropractic College, Kansas City, MO, Chiropractic, September 1985
Caplan, Richard A., Kansas City, MO, $21,545.51, Cleveland Chiropractic College, Kansas City, MO, Chiropractic, May 1989
Carr, Elizabeth A., Kansas City, MO, $74,905.63, Cleveland Chiropractic College, Kansas City, MO, Chiropractic, May 1990
Cheatwood, Richard, Affton, MO, $27,965.17, Logan College of Chiropractic, Chesterfield, MO, Chiropractic, April 1987
Colley, Rodney E., Kansas City, MO, $59,828.69, Cleveland Chiropractic College, Kansas City, MO, Chiropractic, January 1987
Dailey, Charles, St Joseph, MO, $77,417.88, Cleveland Chiropractic College, Kansas City, MO, Chiropractic, May 1985

Dareing, Mark, Houston, MO, $23,904.64, Cleveland Chiropractic College, Kansas City, MO, Chiropractic, April 1982
Davis, Floyd Jerome, Kansas City, MO, $51,869.26, Cleveland Chiropractic College, Kansas City, MO, Chiropractic, September 1987
Deiter, Cary T., Gladstone, MO, $85,201.69, Cleveland Chiropractic College, Kansas City, MO, Chiropractic, January 1984
Elliott, Joseph E., Macon, MO, $75,248.22, Logan College of Chiropractic, Chesterfield, MO, Chiropractic, April 1984
Erwin, Herbert F., St Louis, MO, $85,944.77, Logan College of Chiropractic, Chesterfield, MO, Chiropractic, April 1986
Fulkerson, Marc A., Liberty, MO, $75,635.61, Life College, Marietta, GA, Chiropractic, December 1986
Giarranto, David, Jefferson City, MO, $64,399.05, Cleveland Chiropractic College, Kansas City, MO, Chiropractic, January 1986
Gibson, Stephen S., Cape Girardeau, MO, $27,163.61, Logan College of Chiropractic, Chesterfield, MO, Chiropractic, September 1984
Gulla, Kevin M., Lees Summit, MO, $10,806.35, Cleveland Chiropractic College, Kansas City, MO, Chiropractic, May 1989
Hartley, Michael A., Kansas City, MO, $76,970.31, Cleveland Chiropractic College, Kansas City, MO, Chiropractic, August 1983
Herbst, Stephen H., Winona, MO, $74,438.97, Logan College of Chiropractic, Chesterfield, MO, Chiropractic, April 1986
Hollimon, Tracy, Fair Grove, MO, $25,411.61, Cleveland Chiropractic College, Kansas City, MO, Chiropractic, September 1989
Hotz, Michael K., Kansas City, MO, $121,116.76, Cleveland Chiropractic College, Kansas City, MO, Chiropractic, September 1985
Johnston, John D., Grandview, MO, $81,457.27, Cleveland Chiropractic College, Kansas City, MO, Chiropractic, May 1988
Jordan, Jeffrey E., Kearney, MO, $44,579.34, Cleveland Chiropractic College, Kansas City, MO, Chiropractic, January 1990
Kessinger, Andrew J., Seymour, MO, $55,559.97, Logan College of Chiropractic, Chesterfield, MO, Chiropractic, July 1986
Krasowsky, George G., Columbia, MO, $15,783.93, Logan College of Chiropractic, Chesterfield, MO, Chiropractic, April 1986
Marvin, Allen, Kansas City, MO, $36,494.63, Cleveland Chiropractic College, Kansas City, MO, Chiropractic, January 1989
McCoy, Michael T., St Louis, MO, $17,972.53, Cleveland Chiropractic College, Kansas City, MO, Chiropractic, January 1984
Miller, Mimi, St Louis, MO, $46,982.00, Logan College of Chiropractic, Chesterfield, MO, Chiropractic, December 1989
Peters, Ronald S., Chesterfield, MO, $1,323.16, Logan College of Chiropractic, Chesterfield, MO, Chiropractic, December 1990
Peterson, Michael S., Kansas City, MO, $5,988.32, Logan College of Chiropractic, Chesterfield, MO, Chiropractic, April 1986
Pinkham, Scott B., Lake St Louis, MO, $114,738.88, Logan College of Chiropractic, Chesterfield, MO, Chiropractic, April 1987
Porter, Robert A., Des Peres, MO, $37,812.04, Logan College of Chiropractic, Chesterfield, MO, Chiropractic, April 1986
Price, Arthur, Kansas City, MO, $132,720.79, Cleveland Chiropractic College, Kansas City, MO, Chiropractic, December 1985
Rice, Sterling S., Kansas City, MO, $87,388.83, Cleveland Chiropractic College, Kansas City, MO, Chiropractic, May 1985
Robertson, Dana D., Columbia, MO, $3,489.19, Logan College of Chiropractic, Chesterfield, MO, Chiropractic, January 1983
Samvat, Mohammad R., St Louis, MO, $5,409.63, Logan College of Chiropractic, Chesterfield, MO, Chiropractic, April 1991
Sheraden, Timothy H., Ballwin, MO, $16,974.71, Life College, Marietta, GA, Chiropractic, June 1985
Simmons, Thomas T., Kansas City, MO, $71,215.17, Cleveland Chiropractic College, Kansas City, MO, Chiropractic, January 1987
Sirois Jr, Bernard, St Peters, MO, $16,584.54, Logan College of Chiropractic, Chesterfield, MO, Chiropractic, April 1988
Smith, Charles A., Kansas City, MO, $56,853.80, Cleveland Chiropractic College, Kansas City, MO, Chiropractic, January 1987
Smith, Rhonda, Kansas City, MO, $94,745.04, Cleveland Chiropractic College, Kansas City, MO, Chiropractic, January 1987
Steuber, Virgil V., Springfield, MO, $76,575.84, Cleveland Chiropractic College, Kansas City, MO, Chiropractic, May 1986
Swope, Karl A., Rolla, MO, $102,325.74, Los Angeles College of Chiropractic, Whittier, CA, Chiropractic, April 1985
Talley, Michael S., Belton, MO, $36,643.50, Cleveland Chiropractic College, Kansas City, MO, Chiropractic, May 1983
Taylor, David G., Blue Springs, MO, $18,786.18, Cleveland Chiropractic College, Kansas City, MO, Chiropractic, September 1987
Taylor, Linda L., Kansas City, MO, $75,476.95, Cleveland Chiropractic College, Kansas City, MO, Chiropractic, September 1986
Thompson, Gary L., St Louis, MO, $28,127.39, Palmer College of Chiropractic, Davenport, IA, Chiropractic, June 1983
Tibbetts, Mila A., Independence, MO, $42,752.09, Cleveland Chiropractic College, Kansas City, MO, Chiropractic, September 1989
Towers, Timothy, St Louis, MO, $12,880.13, Logan College of Chiropractic, Chesterfield, MO, Chiropractic, September 1985
Vannucci, Milo, Kansas City, MO, $56,276.77, Cleveland Chiropractic College, Kansas City, MO, Chiropractic, December 1983
Warner, Nathan G., Houston, MO, $40,443.03, Cleveland Chiropractic College, Kansas City, MO, Chiropractic, January 1990
Washington, Joseph D., St Louis, MO, $35,442.62, Cleveland Chiropractic College, Kansas City, MO, Chiropractic, September 1988
Weed, Jimmy, St Louis, MO, $7,147.34, Logan College of Chiropractic, Chesterfield, MO, Chiropractic, January 1984
Wene, Gregory L., Joplin, MO, $53,786.93, Life College, Marietta, GA, Chiropractic, June 1983
White, Michael M., Kansas City, MO, $22,399.64, Cleveland Chiropractic College, Kansas City, MO, Chiropractic, April 1982
Wills, Lawrence J., Kansas City, MO, $116,452.05, Cleveland Chiropractic College, Kansas City, MO, Chiropractic, May 1987
Wright, Lynnea L., Kansas City, MO, $50,666.87, Cleveland Chiropractic College, Kansas City, MO, Chiropractic, September 1986
Zorad, Christine, Independence, MO, $51,129.32, Cleveland Chiropractic College, Kansas City, MO, Chiropractic, January 1986

Dentistry

Baker, Charles F., St Louis, MO, $17,699.62, Washington University, St Louis, MO, Dentistry, May 1982
Brockington, Phillip M., Kansas City, MO, $61,410.66, Howard University, Washington, DC, Dentistry, May 1985
Cannon, Fred C., Columbia, MO, $112,740.29, Univ of Missouri Kansas City, Kansas City, MO, Dentistry, May 1988

Clark, Evelyn B., Kansas City, MO, $78,540.47, Univ of Missouri Kansas City, Kansas City, MO, Dentistry, May 1988
Crawford, Oran L., Kansas City, MO, $62,032.54, Univ of Missouri Kansas City, Kansas City, MO, Dentistry, April 1985
Eimers, Jerry, Maryville, MO, $43,294.01, Univ of Missouri Kansas City, Kansas City, MO, Dentistry, May 1983
Engel, Gene G., Kansas City, MO, $53,415.50, Univ of Missouri Kansas City, Kansas City, MO, Dentistry, May 1984
French, Robert, St Louis, MO, $7,670.11, Washington University, St Louis, MO, Dentistry, May 1989
Fuller, Marilyn M., St Louis, MO, $26,221.04, Howard University, Washington, DC, Dentistry, May 1985
Fulton, Alma, Ballwin, MO, $83,823.68, Washington University, St Louis, MO, Dentistry, May 1989
Furlong, Dennis, Kansas City, MO, $62,357.49, Univ of Illinois Medical Center, Chicago, IL, Dentistry, June 1987
Nelson, Howard D., Kansas City, MO, $80,394.21, Univ of Missouri Kansas City, Kansas City, MO, Dentistry, April 1986
Nickell, Scott, Fenton, MO, $154,360.90, Washington University, St Louis, MO, Dentistry, May 1989
Peterson, Alan A., St Louis, MO, $103,323.92, Washington University, St Louis, MO, Dentistry, May 1984
Scialfa, August, St Louis, MO, $737.51, Univ of Missouri Kansas City, Kansas City, MO, Dentistry, April 1982
Sladek, Martin J., Farmington, MO, $198,084.38, Washington University, St Louis, MO, Dentistry, May 1987
Somlar, Steven, Florissant, MO, $48,616.36, Loyola University Chicago, Chicago, IL, Dentistry, April 1990
Vorbeck, Teresa, Florissant, MO, $134,588.83, Washington University, St Louis, MO, Dentistry, May 1988
Zinke, Alan G., Nixa, MO, $34,231.23, Marquette University, Milwaukee, WI, Dentistry, May 1985

Health Administration

Cipriano, Anthony A., St Louis, MO, $40,066.94, St Louis University, St Louis, MO, Health Administration, May 1985

Optometry

Allen, Faye F., St Louis, MO, $113,342.25, Univ of Missouri St Louis, St Louis, MO, Optometry, May 1986
Harris, Alexander, Florissant, MO, $61,920.81, Univ of Missouri St Louis, St Louis, MO, Optometry, May 1986
Joyner, Walter F., Jefferson City, MO, $35,751.46, Southern Calif College of Optometry, Fullerton, CA, Optometry, June 1981

Osteopathy

Bell, Barbara, Joplin, MO, $79,297.80, Kirksville Col of Osteopathic Medicine, Kirksville, MO, Osteopathy, June 1983
Catron, Mark, Carthage, MO, $133,858.45, Univ of Health Sciences, Kansas City, MO, Osteopathy, June 1984
Early, Gary M., Kirksville, MO, $13,675.23, Kirksville Col of Osteopathic Medicine, Kirksville, MO, Osteopathy, June 1980
Glynn, Paul, Miller, MO, $9,647.06, Univ of Health Sciences, Kansas City, MO, Osteopathy, May 1983
McCrary-Smith, Gina M., St Louis, MO, $149,949.31, Univ of Health Sciences, Kansas City, MO, Osteopathy, May 1985
Seedorff, Linda, Lawson, MO, $72,389.83, Univ of Health Sciences, Kansas City, MO, Osteopathy, May 1988
Seitz, Joyce, Kansas City, MO, $30,507.20, Univ of Health Sciences, Kansas City, MO, Osteopathy, May 1990
Sengstacken, Mark A., Marshall, MO, $246,268.78, Univ of Health Sciences, Kansas City, MO, Osteopathy, May 1987
Turner, Garry L., Independence, MO, $97,393.32, Univ of Health Sciences, Kansas City, MO, Osteopathy, May 1985
Whinery, Ramona, Kansas City, MO, $191,399.94, Univ of Health Sciences, Kansas City, MO, Osteopathy, May 1986

Pharmacy

Dudley, Raynold R., Columbia, MO, $29,000.16, Creighton University, Omaha, NE, Pharmacy, August 1984
Griffin, Terrill T., St Louis, MO, $15,922.33, Drake University, Des Moines, IA, Pharmacy, December 1987
Oris, Gregory R., Sedalia, MO, $10,600.00, St Louis College of Pharmacy, St Louis, MO, Pharmacy, May 1987
Ratliff, Wayne, University City, MO, $12,981.57, St Louis College of Pharmacy, St Louis, MO, Pharmacy, May 1988

Podiatry

Dailey, John M., Rolla, MO, $145,290.61, Ohio College of Podiatric Medicine, Cleveland, OH, Podiatry, May 1983
Jackson, Howard, St Louis, MO, $174,421.20, Ohio College of Podiatric Medicine, Cleveland, OH, Podiatry, May 1983
Moore, Robert M., St Louis, MO, $53,084.15, Dr William Scholl Col of Podiatric Med, Chicago, IL, Podiatry, May 1982

Public Health

Greenwood, Michael M., Kirksville, MO, $5,576.84, Univ of Oklahoma Health Sciences Center, Oklahoma City, OK, Public Health, August 1988

Montana

Chiropractic

Kaiser, Robert, Thompson Falls, MT, $56,261.13, Cleveland Chiropractic College, Kansas City, MO, Chiropractic, April 1984
Landes, David A., Deer Lodge, MT, $68,843.69, Life Chiropractic College-West, San Lorenzo, CA, Chiropractic, September 1987
Lavender, Anthony G., Joliet, MT, $99,010.78, Logan College of Chiropractic, Chesterfield, MO, Chiropractic, August 1986
Marschall, Skye K., Big Fork, MT, $92,932.55, Texas Chiropractic College Foundation, Pasadena, TX, Chiropractic, December 1983
Owczarek, Keith V., Missoula, MT, $44,185.68, Northwestern College of Chiropractic, Bloomington, MN, Chiropractic, April 1985

Podiatry

Daniels, Jerry G., Butte, MT, $167,854.14, California College of Podiatric Medicine, San Francisco, CA, Podiatry, June 1986
Huppert, Gregory, Billings, MT, $15,857.02, California College of Podiatric Medicine, San Francisco, CA, Podiatry, May 1986

Veterinary Medicine

Dierking, Douglas C., Alberton, MT, $26,310.52, Univ of Minnesota, Minneapolis, MN, Veterinary Medicine, June 1984

Nebraska

Allopathic Medicine

Jackson, Robyn A., Omaha, NE, $4,876.63, Creighton University, Omaha, NE, Allopathic Medicine, May 1990

Chiropractic

Hinds, Thomas, South Sioux City, NE, $61,180.61, Logan College of Chiropractic, Chesterfield, MO, Chiropractic, December 1986
McCabe, Laura, Lincoln, NE, $84,777.26, Life College, Marietta, GA, Chiropractic, January 1988
O'Mara, William I., Arthur, NE, $19,118.65, Texas Chiropractic

College Foundation, Pasadena, TX, Chiropractic, April 1984
Theobald, Patrick, Nebraska City, NE, $32,980.66, Texas Chiropractic College Foundation, Pasadena, TX, Chiropractic, December 1987

Dentistry

Carson, Brad W., Papillion, NE, $18,318.95, Creighton University, Omaha, NE, Dentistry, May 1989
Rensch, Michael A., Omaha, NE, $22,584.22, Creighton University, Omaha, NE, Dentistry, May 1987
Schobert, Scott A., Omaha, NE, $112,278.75, Marquette University, Milwaukee, WI, Dentistry, May 1989

Optometry

Weeks, Brad A., Omaha, NE, $62,932.19, Univ of Missouri St Louis, St Louis, MO, Optometry, May 1987

Podiatry

Dyer, William D., Lincoln, NE, $111,238.01, Dr William Scholl Col of Podiatric Med, Chicago, IL, Podiatry, May 1985
Meinhold, Steven, Omaha, NE, $44,373.08, Dr William Scholl Col of Podiatric Med, Chicago, IL, Podiatry, May 1984
Thornton, Martha F., Lincoln, NE, $125,843.37, Univ of Osteo Medical & Health Science, Des Moines, IA, Podiatry, June 1987

Nevada

Allopathic Medicine

Bradley, Bruce, Las Vegas, NV, $20,101.62, Wright State University, Dayton, OH, Allopathic Medicine, June 1987
Degernes, Daniel J., Sparks, NV, $17,504.27, Univ of Nevada Reno, Reno, NV, Allopathic Medicine, June 1989
Rucker, Elleston C., Las Vegas, NV, $21,894.39, Vanderbilt University, Nashville, TN, Allopathic Medicine, May 1982

Chiropractic

Akin, Kathy L., Las Vegas, NV, $24,712.53, National College of Chiropractic, Lombard, IL, Chiropractic, August 1986
Foster, Misha, Reno, NV, $73,375.14, Cleveland Chiropractic College, Kansas City, MO, Chiropractic, January 1989
Hawkins, Budweiser, Las Vegas, NV, $87,199.75, Los Angeles College of Chiropractic, Whittier, CA, Chiropractic, May 1987
Henderson, Donald L., Mesquite, NV, $27,975.74, Palmer College of Chiropractic, Davenport, IA, Chiropractic, March 1986
Hults, Ivagene P., Las Vegas, NV, $68,191.32, Los Angeles College of Chiropractic, Whittier, CA, Chiropractic, December 1986
Lamb, Michael W., Henderson, NV, $7,740.95, Palmer College of Chiropractic, Davenport, IA, Chiropractic, February 1991
Murphy, Richard T., Henderson, NV, $55,696.99, Palmer College of Chiropractic, Davenport, IA, Chiropractic, October 1987
Nugent, Richard E., Las Vegas, NV, $113,562.06, Cleveland Chiropractic College, Kansas City, MO, Chiropractic, August 1985

Clinical Psychology

Weir, Dianna, Las Vegas, NV, $70,826.45, California Sch of Prof Psych Fresno, Fresno, CA, Clinical Psychology, June 1987

Dentistry

Frier, James W., Stateline, NV, $21,024.84, Georgetown University, Washington, DC, Dentistry, May 1983
Goodrich, Allyn P., Ely, NV, $7,395.31, Baylor College of Dentistry, Dallas, TX, Dentistry, June 1984
Osley, Robert C., Las Vegas, NV, $4,095.93, Univ of Colorado Health Science Center, Denver, CO, Dentistry, August 1990

Osteopathy

Oksenholt, Lorrie M., Sparks, NV, $28,621.08, Univ of Health Sciences, Kansas City, MO, Osteopathy, May 1983

Podiatry

Borgia, Anthony, Boulder City, NV, $9,079.22, Pennsylvania Col of Podiatric Medicine, Philadelphia, PA, Podiatry, June 1985
Shields, Thomas, Las Vegas, NV, $125,574.16, Ohio College of Podiatric Medicine, Cleveland, OH, Podiatry, May 1986
Thurston, Glen D., Carson City, NV, $5,350.14, California College of Podiatric Medicine, San Francisco, CA, Podiatry, May 1991

New Hampshire

Allopathic Medicine

Percival, Marjorie C., Concord, NH, $4,013.84, Dartmouth Medical School, Hanover, NH, Allopathic Medicine, June 1986

Chiropractic

Pratt, Edward P., Bristol, NH, $52,739.14, Palmer College of Chiropractic, Davenport, IA, Chiropractic, June 1986

Dentistry

Barrows, Joni, Newmarket, NH, $219,116.49, Marquette University, Milwaukee, WI, Dentistry, May 1987

Pharmacy

Brunelle, Louise L., Manchester, NH, $26,687.48, Massachusetts College of Pharmacy, Boston, MA, Pharmacy, May 1982

New Jersey

Allopathic Medicine

Blum, Karl, Roseland, NJ, $12,250.50, Univ of Med & Dent of New Jersey, Newark, NJ, Allopathic Medicine, May 1990
Bocage, Jean P., Piscataway, NJ, $11,238.48, Univ of Med & Dent of New Jersey, Newark, NJ, Allopathic Medicine, May 1984
Brown, James E., East Orange, NJ, $35,202.16, Univ of Med & Dent of New Jersey, Newark, NJ, Allopathic Medicine, May 1989
Chusid, Eugene, Fair Lawn, NJ, $117,620.03, Albany Medical College, Albany, NY, Allopathic Medicine, May 1987
Davis, Kuyann, Manalapan, NJ, $21,931.63, Meharry Medical College, Nashville, TN, Allopathic Medicine, May 1984
Devastey, Gerard, East Orange, NJ, $9,830.58, Univ of Med & Dent of New Jersey, Newark, NJ, Allopathic Medicine, May 1987
Frazier, Judith A., Montclair, NJ, $7,242.32, Univ of Med & Dent of New Jersey, Newark, NJ, Allopathic Medicine, May 1989
Glenn, John, South Plainfield, NJ, $105,283.55, Univ of Med & Dent of New Jersey, Newark, NJ, Allopathic Medicine, May 1986
Goodman, Ira, Summit, NJ, $2,744.56, Rush University, Chicago, IL, Allopathic Medicine, June 1983
Halls, Lydia, Jersey City, NJ, $9,617.36, Wake Forest University, Winston-Salem, NC, Allopathic Medicine, May 1985
Harris, Hazel, Irvington, NJ, $4,960.53, Univ of Med & Dent of New Jersey, Newark, NJ, Allopathic Medicine, June 1981
Hasselman, Martin, Sewell, NJ, $12,367.88, Hahnemann University, Philadelphia, PA, Allopathic Medicine, June 1984
Laflore, John E., Randolph, NJ, $87,492.29, Rush University, Chicago, IL, Allopathic Medicine, June 1981
Lerner, David, Highland Park, NJ, $193,965.90, George Washington University, Washington, DC, Allopathic Medicine, May 1988
Lucombe, Linda P., Plainsboro, NJ, $2,532.94, Univ of Med & Dent of

New Jersey, Newark, NJ, Allopathic Medicine, May 1991
Schimandle, Jeff J., Kendall Park, NJ, $3,727.73, Univ of Med & Dent of New Jersey, Newark, NJ, Allopathic Medicine, May 1984
Smalls, Linda Y., East Orange, NJ, $10,716.55, Univ of Med & Dent of New Jersey, Newark, NJ, Allopathic Medicine, June 1983

Chiropractic

Allen, Richard L., Morristown, NJ, $96,394.74, Life College, Marietta, GA, Chiropractic, March 1986
Bernstein, David T., Colonia, NJ, $14,034.04, Life College, Marietta, GA, Chiropractic, September 1985
Bolinger, Mark A., Westmont, NJ, $83,079.24, National College of Chiropractic, Lombard, IL, Chiropractic, April 1986
Bornstein, Mark L., Edison, NJ, $97,510.82, Life College, Marietta, GA, Chiropractic, September 1983
Conley, John, Middletown, NJ, $28,535.11, Palmer College of Chiropractic, Davenport, IA, Chiropractic, March 1984
Cornely, Michael P., Merchantville, NJ, $63,037.16, Palmer College of Chiropractic, Davenport, IA, Chiropractic, December 1987
Edmunds, John D., Manahawkin, NJ, $127,277.03, Life College, Marietta, GA, Chiropractic, March 1986
Escamilla, Kerry, Bergenfield, NJ, $18,047.80, Palmer College of Chiropractic, Davenport, IA, Chiropractic, March 1986
Feathers, Kathryn D., Maplewood, NJ, $32,224.37, Southern Calif Clg of Chiropractic, Pico Rivera, CA, Chiropractic, December 1989
Gearity, Katherine A., North Bergen, NJ, $59,718.80, New York Chiropractic College, Seneca Falls, NY, Chiropractic, April 1987
Gloshinski, Laura L., High Bridge, NJ, $51,048.74, Life College, Marietta, GA, Chiropractic, March 1986
Harrigan, David, Absecon, NJ, $27,973.77, Life College, Marietta, GA, Chiropractic, March 1987
Hassiotti, Leone L., East Orange, NJ, $59,073.10, New York Chiropractic College, Seneca Falls, NY, Chiropractic, December 1986
Hermida, Mario D., Bergenfield, NJ, $28,576.54, Palmer College of Chiropractic, Davenport, IA, Chiropractic, March 1990
Hoffman, Wayne A., East Rutherford, NJ, $28,080.96, Life College, Marietta, GA, Chiropractic, March 1988
Howe, John B., Pompton Lakes, NJ, $20,169.45, New York Chiropractic College, Seneca Falls, NY, Chiropractic, April 1987
Iacobino, Matthew J., Highland Lake, NJ, $97,047.88, Palmer College of Chiropractic, Davenport, IA, Chiropractic, December 1985
Ittner, William, Seaside Park, NJ, $42,819.21, Life College, Marietta, GA, Chiropractic, June 1986
Jacob, Elizabeth, Newton, NJ, $26,077.90, Cleveland Chiropractic College, Los Angeles, CA, Chiropractic, December 1988
Jones, Scott, Mt Laurel, NJ, $30,848.46, New York Chiropractic College, Seneca Falls, NY, Chiropractic, December 1988
Kane, Richard R., Somerset, NJ, $121,900.91, New York Chiropractic College, Seneca Falls, NY, Chiropractic, April 1985
Luongo, Mary Ann, Bayonne, NJ, $13,913.82, New York Chiropractic College, Seneca Falls, NY, Chiropractic, December 1984
Lynch, Mark, Forked River, NJ, $39,069.75, New York Chiropractic College, Seneca Falls, NY, Chiropractic, April 1987
Manzoni, Janet M., Morganville, NJ, $37,065.10, New York Chiropractic College, Seneca Falls, NY, Chiropractic, December 1986
Maskell, Gary G., Whiting, NJ, $103,172.99, Life College, Marietta, GA, Chiropractic, December 1986
Morrow, Lu A., Marlton, NJ, $42,489.87, New York Chiropractic College, Seneca Falls, NY, Chiropractic, April 1988
O'Brien, Robert, Maple Shade, NJ, $16,469.15, Life College, Marietta, GA, Chiropractic, June 1991
Romanski, Michael M., Wall, NJ, $27,412.62, Life College, Marietta, GA, Chiropractic, March 1989
Ruane, Joseph J., West Long Branch, NJ, $30,498.17, Life College, Marietta, GA, Chiropractic, December 1982
Rushing, Gary, Red Bank, NJ, $69,458.45, Life College, Marietta, GA, Chiropractic, June 1986
Russell, Robert, Blackwood, NJ, $6,561.32, Life College, Marietta, GA, Chiropractic, March 1989
Ruta, Eugenio, Livingston, NJ, $29,206.40, Life College, Marietta, GA, Chiropractic, June 1988
Siegel, Roy F., Somerville, NJ, $72,274.32, Logan College of Chiropractic, Chesterfield, MO, Chiropractic, August 1986
Signore, Joseph, Forked River, NJ, $96,618.04, Life College, Marietta, GA, Chiropractic, April 1989
Stafford, Orie V., Hackensack, NJ, $63,335.76, Los Angeles College of Chiropractic, Whittier, CA, Chiropractic, December 1984
Tumas, John J., Brick, NJ, $42,305.04, Life College, Marietta, GA, Chiropractic, December 1985
Tumas, Mary D., Brielle, NJ, $69,489.97, Life College, Marietta, GA, Chiropractic, June 1986
Verbaro, Dennis, Chester, NJ, $85,108.07, New York Chiropractic College, Seneca Falls, NY, Chiropractic, April 1987
Viggiano, Christopher, Long Valley, NJ, $67,561.31, Palmer College of Chiropractic, Davenport, IA, Chiropractic, September 1988
Weimmer, Federick F., Lakehurst, NJ, $23,391.30, Palmer College of Chiropractic, Davenport, IA, Chiropractic, March 1985
Werrell, Sandra M., Mt Laurel, NJ, $33,316.53, National College of Chiropractic, Lombard, IL, Chiropractic, August 1985
Woods, Dolores, Orange, NJ, $14,473.05, Life College, Marietta, GA, Chiropractic, June 1991
Zimmel, Douglas, Colts Neck, NJ, $81,230.84, Life College, Marietta, GA, Chiropractic, June 1986
Zulovitz-Cunninghan, Lori, Towaco, NJ, $78,831.88, Life College, Marietta, GA, Chiropractic, December 1986

Clinical Psychology

Helm, Susan D., Westfield, NJ, $7,873.66, New School for Social Research, New York, NY, Clinical Psychology, December 1986
Jones, Patricia T., Teaneck, NJ, $20,925.05, Yeshiva University, New York, NY, Clinical Psychology, June 1988

Dentistry

Adams, Rick, Glen Rock, NJ, $29,864.40, New York University, New York, NY, Dentistry, June 1989
Caruso, Edmund, Branchville, NJ, $41,193.08, Univ of Med & Dent of New Jersey, Newark, NJ, Dentistry, May 1986
Castillo, Steven, Union City, NJ, $148,652.79, New York University, New York, NY, Dentistry, June 1987
Correa, Louisa F., Paramus, NJ, $5,899.74, Georgetown University, Washington, DC, Dentistry, May 1990
Creecy, Ronald R., Moorestown, NJ, $16,203.86, Howard University, Washington, DC, Dentistry, May 1983
Dull, John N., Bloomfield, NJ, $18,990.12, Georgetown University, Washington, DC, Dentistry, May 1984
Ernst, David, East Brunswick, NJ, $16,085.59, New York University, New York, NY, Dentistry, June 1983
Johnson, Kevin D., Hackensack, NJ, $40,576.01, Howard University, Washington, DC, Dentistry, May 1989
Kulikowski, Karen, Bayonne, NJ, $4,424.15, Univ of Med & Dent of New Jersey, Newark, NJ, Dentistry, May 1992

Mayers-Ellison, June L., Laurel, NJ, $47,861.97, Meharry Medical College, Nashville, TN, Dentistry, May 1980
McDonough, Lawrence L., Rumson, NJ, $101,468.06, New York University, New York, NY, Dentistry, June 1986
McTernan, Roy J., Clifton, NJ, $63,618.11, Fairleigh Dickinson University, Teaneck, NJ, Dentistry, May 1985
Mirrone, John, Sewell, NJ, $105,006.57, Fairleigh Dickinson University, Teaneck, NJ, Dentistry, May 1988
Monaco, Joan, Nutley, NJ, $35,635.40, Univ of Med & Dent of New Jersey, Newark, NJ, Dentistry, May 1991
Newman, Michael, Sayreville, NJ, $16,165.78, Fairleigh Dickinson University, Teaneck, NJ, Dentistry, May 1983
Newsome, Dorita, Orange, NJ, $34,448.18, Univ of Med & Dent of New Jersey, Newark, NJ, Dentistry, June 1983
Oakes, Craig, Budd Lake, NJ, $48,639.86, Tufts University, Boston, MA, Dentistry, May 1990
Ramirez, Nydia, New Milford, NJ, $124,370.33, Fairleigh Dickinson University, Teaneck, NJ, Dentistry, May 1987
Rojowski, Ravenna, Teaneck, NJ, $66,521.56, Fairleigh Dickinson University, Teaneck, NJ, Dentistry, May 1984
Sarno, Mark M., Brick, NJ, $39,243.19, Fairleigh Dickinson University, Teaneck, NJ, Dentistry, May 1985
Scarpa Jr, Peter P., Stanhope, NJ, $7,342.45, Georgetown University, Washington, DC, Dentistry, May 1988
Seides, Richard R., Montclair, NJ, $25,101.25, Univ of Maryland Baltimore, Baltimore, MD, Dentistry, June 1985
Sherzai, Roshana, Lodi, NJ, $2,857.61, Georgetown University, Washington, DC, Dentistry, May 1989
Stern, Jeffrey L., Marlton, NJ, $157,806.23, Boston University Medical Center, Boston, MA, Dentistry, June 1986
Stradford, Terry, Old Bridge, NJ, $55,878.01, Howard University, Washington, DC, Dentistry, May 1987
Stuart, William J., New Milford, NJ, $36,158.58, Univ of Med & Dent of New Jersey, Newark, NJ, Dentistry, May 1986
Turpen, Marina, Margate City, NJ, $55,906.94, Tufts University, Boston, MA, Dentistry, May 1988
Ugwuneri, Zephaniah N., Somerset, NJ, $5,943.31, Baylor College of Dentistry, Dallas, TX, Dentistry, June 1990
Velu, Gita, Jersey City, NJ, $73,581.48, Univ of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, PA, Dentistry, May 1992
Wassef, Michael, Tinton Falls, NJ, $3,321.31, Georgetown University, Washington, DC, Dentistry, May 1990
Wilson, Orin M., Orange, NJ, $13,773.90, Univ of Med & Dent of New Jersey, Newark, NJ, Dentistry, June 1984
Zouak, Larbi, Tenafly, NJ, $90,753.98, Fairleigh Dickinson University, Teaneck, NJ, Dentistry, May 1987

Optometry

Moosavi, Syed M., Toms River, NJ, $16,912.74, Northeastern State University, Tahlequah, OK, Optometry, August 1988

Osteopathy

Claire, James F., Voorhees, NJ, $183,428.69, Univ of Med & Dent of New Jersey, Newark, NJ, Osteopathy, May 1986
Crecca, Joseph F., Tuckertown, NJ, $121,943.71, Univ of Osteo Medical & Health Science, Des Moines, IA, Osteopathy, June 1984
Goldstein, Bruce, Voorhees, NJ, $25,973.14, Univ of Med & Dent of New Jersey, Newark, NJ, Osteopathy, July 1987
Goldstein, David W., Cherry Hill, NJ, $149,557.36, Univ of Health Sciences, Kansas City, MO, Osteopathy, May 1989
Kelly, Robert B., Old Bridge, NJ, $56,501.44, Univ of Med & Dent of New Jersey, Newark, NJ, Osteopathy, May 1986
Neff, Ronald J., Turnersville, NJ, $143,215.25, Philadelphia Col of Osteopathic Medicine, Philadelphia, PA, Osteopathy, June 1985
Rogers, James J., Cherry Hill, NJ, $9,805.63, Univ of Med & Dent of New Jersey, Newark, NJ, Osteopathy, May 1988

Pharmacy

Ahmed, Azza F., Bloomfield, NJ, $13,246.28, Long Island University, Brookville, NY, Pharmacy, October 1988
Aly, Nevein, Bloomfield, NJ, $12,107.39, Long Island University, Brookville, NY, Pharmacy, February 1987
Bennett, Elizabeth C., Teaneck, NJ, $15,036.22, Mercer University, Atlanta, GA, Pharmacy, June 1986
Eruchie, Anthonia O., East Orange, NJ, $24,891.00, Long Island University, Brookville, NY, Pharmacy, June 1986
Jacob, Robert S., Bayonne, NJ, $14,852.51, Long Island University, Brookville, NY, Pharmacy, February 1985
Milligan, Patricia, Forked River, NJ, $12,148.59, Drake University, Des Moines, IA, Pharmacy, December 1982
Onyekaba, Ebere E., Newark, NJ, $23,703.34, Long Island University, Brookville, NY, Pharmacy, June 1986

Podiatry

Benson, David M., Edison, NJ, $63,175.49, California College of Podiatric Medicine, San Francisco, CA, Podiatry, May 1988
Chapel, Charles, Bricktown, NJ, $90,553.94, Pennsylvania College of Podiatric Medicine, Philadelphia, PA, Podiatry, June 1984
Forman, Steven, Clementon, NJ, $157,032.73, Ohio College of Podiatric Medicine, Cleveland, OH, Podiatry, May 1984
Geary, Robert J., Bayonne, NJ, $95,929.50, New York College of Podiatric Medicine, New York, NY, Podiatry, June 1984
Hegarty, James E., Cliffside Park, NJ, $94,769.06, Dr William Scholl College of Podiatric Medicine, Chicago, IL, Podiatry, May 1980
Khaladj, Morteza, Iselin, NJ, $148,555.02, New York College of Podiatric Medicine, New York, NY, Podiatry, June 1986
McAllister, Joseph F., Hoboken, NJ, $173,319.37, New York College of Podiatric Medicine, New York, NY, Podiatry, June 1988
Oliver, John A., Linden, NJ, $157,144.41, New York College of Podiatric Medicine, New York, NY, Podiatry, June 1988
Tortoriello, Michael J., Montclair, NJ, $26,135.16, New York College of Podiatric Medicine, New York, NY, Podiatry, June 1983
Turner, Demi M., Newark, NJ, $145,948.26, New York College of Podiatric Medicine, New York, NY, Podiatry, June 1985
Urbanek, Michelle, Flemington, NJ, $54,970.23, Pennsylvania College of Podiatric Medicine, Philadelphia, PA, Podiatry, June 1984

Veterinary Medicine

Hassey, Marianne, Clifton, NJ, $24,022.34, Univ of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, PA, Veterinary Medicine, May 1989
Meadows, Quentin O., Pleasantville, NJ, $36,341.65, Tuskegee University, Tuskegee, AL, Veterinary Medicine, May 1985
Porter, Gina M., Orange, NJ, $60,470.65, Tuskegee University, Tuskegee, AL, Veterinary Medicine, May 1985
Smith, Marsha, Rumson, NJ, $27,107.00, Tufts University, Boston, MA, Veterinary Medicine, May 1987

New Mexico

Allopathic Medicine

Sanchez, Ishmael B., La Luz, NM, $39,359.30, University of New Mexico, Albuquerque, NM, Allopathic Medicine, May 1984

Chiropractic

Blow, James R., Silver City, NM, $19,423.61, Parker College of Chiropractic, Dallas, TX, Chiropractic, March 1986
Elkins, Kelly, Dona Ana, NM, $20,139.03, Parker College of Chiropractic, Dallas, TX, Chiropractic, April 1986
McNeil, Diane J., Las Cruces, NM, $4,892.30, Palmer College of Chiropractic, Davenport, IA, Chiropractic, December 1989
Mitchell, Donald R., Alamogordo, NM, $98,906.15, Life College, Marietta, GA, Chiropractic, September 1986
Neira, Alejandro, Albuquerque, NM, $52,845.17, Palmer College of Chiropractic, Davenport, IA, Chiropractic, October 1986
Nelson, Christopher G., Albuquerque, NM, $120,773.10, Life College, Marietta, GA, Chiropractic, March 1987
Sacristan, Juan, Santa Fe, NM, $18,425.28, Palmer College of Chiropractic West, San Jose, CA, Chiropractic, June 1985
Schoos, Robert J., Belen, NM, $24,658.02, Texas Chiropractic College Foundation, Pasadena, TX, Chiropractic, May 1982
Sturgeon, Jeffrey, Albuquerque, NM, $36,499.98, Cleveland Chiropractic College, Kansas City, MO, Chiropractic, May 1990

Dentistry

Kunz, Frederick W., Ruidoso, NM, $9,225.75, Louisiana St Univ Med Ctr, New Orleans, LA, Dentistry, May 1985
Moye, David M., Socorro, NM, $6,739.50, Univ of Missouri Kansas City, Kansas City, MO, Dentistry, May 1991
Neumann, Barry A., Albuquerque, NM, $15,989.51, Marquette University, Milwaukee, WI, Dentistry, December 1982

Health Administration

Jones, Terence T., Albuquerque, NM, $52,954.81, Univ of Southern California, Los Angeles, CA, Health Administration, May 1986

Optometry

Wogksch, David C., Santa Fe, NM, $19,053.56, Pennsylvania College of Optometry, Philadelphia, PA, Optometry, May 1980

Osteopathy

Connelly, Chris F., Albuquerque, NM, $2,750.41, Philadelphia Col of Osteopathic Medicine, Philadelphia, PA, Osteopathy, June 1981
Rico, David, Socorro, NM, $93,553.74, Oklahoma State University, Tulsa, OK, Osteopathy, May 1986

Podiatry

Hughes, Marilyn G., Albuquerque, NM, $74,977.40, Ohio College of Podiatric Medicine, Cleveland, OH, Podiatry, May 1982
Roth, Jeffrey, Alamogordo, NM, $192,791.17, Univ of Osteo Medical & Health Science, Des Moines, IA, Podiatry, June 1987

New York

Allopathic Medicine

Abbott, Brian, Nyack, NY, $103,842.30, New York Medical College, Valhalla, NY, Allopathic Medicine, June 1989
Allen, Mark D., New York, NY, $135,222.88, Meharry Medical College, Nashville, TN, Allopathic Medicine, May 1986
Austin, Scott M., Freeport, NY, $11,642.78, Creighton University, Omaha, NE, Allopathic Medicine, May 1990
Brooks, Delroy C., Brooklyn, NY, $88,950.17, Meharry Medical College, Nashville, TN, Allopathic Medicine, May 1984
Burrowes, Wayne R., Brooklyn, NY, $7,825.03, SUNY Health Science Center Brooklyn, Syracuse, NY, Allopathic Medicine, May 1988
Cama, Cristoforo, Flushing, NY, $82,594.57, Finch University of Health Sciences, North Chicago, IL, Allopathic Medicine, June 1991
Cohen, Steven, Belle Harbor, NY, $119,492.00, New York Medical College, Valhalla, NY, Allopathic Medicine, June 1990
Condiotti, Jay, Bronx, NY, $2,611.43, SUNY Health Science Center Brooklyn, Brooklyn, NY, Allopathic Medicine, May 1991
Czegledy, Ferenc, Long Island City, NY, $55,341.34, Brown University, Providence, RI, Allopathic Medicine, May 1988
D'Amico, James M., Hicksville, NY, $106,763.56, Washington University, St Louis, MO, Allopathic Medicine, May 1988
Dean, Gregory E., New York, NY, $59,101.05, Columbia University, New York, NY, Allopathic Medicine, May 1988
Diaz, Fred F., Bronx, NY, $41,374.26, Albert Einstein Med Col of Yeshiva Univ, Bronx, NY, Allopathic Medicine, June 1982
Edelman, Martha, Manhasset, NY, $74,615.83, Albert Einstein Med Col of Yeshiva Univ, Bronx, NY, Allopathic Medicine, June 1988
Edgar, John, New York, NY, $41,257.64, Texas Tech University Health Sci Center, Lubbock, TX, Allopathic Medicine, May 1990
Elzey, Leonard D., Mt Vernon, NY, $145,262.28, Meharry Medical College, Nashville, TN, Allopathic Medicine, May 1986
Finney, Deirdre, New York, NY, $147,576.16, East Tennessee State University, Johnson City, TN, Allopathic Medicine, May 1985
Flores, Cathryn, Bronx, NY, $20,507.88, Albert Einstein Med Col of Yeshiva Univ, Bronx, NY, Allopathic Medicine, June 1987
Fogarty, Janine, Rochester, NY, $6,196.78, SUNY Health Science Center Brooklyn, Syracuse, NY, Allopathic Medicine, May 1989
Fucigna, Robert, New York, NY, $9,445.37, Univ of Med & Dent of New Jersey, Newark, NJ, Allopathic Medicine, May 1991
Gallagher, James, Hicksville, NY, $1,067.21, SUNY Health Science Center Brooklyn, Syracuse, NY, Allopathic Medicine, May 1992
Gamble, Oliver W., Bronx, NY, $26,043.12, Hahnemann University, Philadelphia, PA, Allopathic Medicine, June 1987
Gordon, Marcus, New York, NY, $11,971.09, Albert Einstein Med Col of Yeshiva Univ, Bronx, NY, Allopathic Medicine, June 1985
Halbert, Cyril F., Bronx, NY, $87,032.06, Georgetown University, Washington, DC, Allopathic Medicine, May 1984
Hunt, Leonard A., St Albans, NY, $56,951.75, Meharry Medical College, Nashville, TN, Allopathic Medicine, May 1987
Jacoby, Avi, Rego Park, NY, $163,885.06, Hahnemann University, Philadelphia, PA, Allopathic Medicine, June 1984
Johnson, Christopher L., New York, NY, $5,603.33, Harvard Medical School, Boston, MA, Allopathic Medicine, June 1989
Kellman, Raphael, New York, NY, $21,269.86, Albert Einstein Med Col of Yeshiva Univ, Bronx, NY, Allopathic Medicine, June 1987
Kindler, Hedy L., New York, NY, $3,578.15, Suny Buffalo, Buffalo, NY, Allopathic Medicine, June 1989
Lentol, Lawrence A., Elmont, NY, $174,468.17, Ponce School of Medicine, Ponce, PR, Allopathic Medicine, June 1986
Levy-Jones, Maureen, Rockaway, NY, $61,865.05, Univ of Med & Dent of New Jersey, Newark, NJ, Allopathic Medicine, May 1985

Long, Kimlyn, Manhasset, NY, $662.27, Howard University, Washington, DC, Allopathic Medicine, May 1990
Lopez, Raymond, Nanuet, NY, $56,177.05, Ponce School of Medicine, Ponce, PR, Allopathic Medicine, May 1982
Martinez, Jose, Brooklyn, NY, $162,790.85, Universidad Central Del Caribe, Bayamon, PR, Allopathic Medicine, May 1986
McDaniel, Ronnie L., New York, NY, $87,978.80, Univ of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, PA, Allopathic Medicine, June 1987
McGilvery, James W., New York, NY, $43,637.03, Univ of Cincinnati, Cincinnati, OH, Allopathic Medicine, June 1987
Mcnulty, John, Middletown, NY, $81,195.56, Albany Medical College, Albany, NY, Allopathic Medicine, May 1991
Monk, Melcher, New York, NY, $5,846.47, Univ of Illinois Medical Center, Chicago, IL, Allopathic Medicine, June 1989
Nicholson, Charolette M., Bronx, NY, $29,600.03, Univ of Med & Dent of New Jersey, Newark, NJ, Allopathic Medicine, August 1986
Normann, Peter, New Windsor, NY, $21,481.30, Univ of Vermont, Burlington, VT, Allopathic Medicine, June 1989
Orellana, Jose J., Bronx, NY, $3,865.95, Suny Health Science Center Brooklyn, Syracuse, NY, Allopathic Medicine, May 1986
Petit, Felix R., Jamaica, NY, $4,546.12, Suny Buffalo, Buffalo, NY, Allopathic Medicine, June 1990
Pikoris, Bernadette, Brooklyn, NY, $45,506.38, New York Medical College, Valhalla, NY, Allopathic Medicine, June 1990
Powell, Craig, Delmar, NY, $81,091.31, Wright State University, Dayton, OH, Allopathic Medicine, November 1985
Prescod, Glenn, Jamaica, NY, $41,178.49, Dartmouth Medical School, Hanover, NH, Allopathic Medicine, June 1988
Ramos, Carmen, East Meadow, NY, $19,304.46, Ponce School of Medicine, Ponce, PR, Allopathic Medicine, May 1991
Ramos-Ayala, Joel, Flushing, NY, $141,138.04, Universidad Central Del Caribe, Bayamon, PR, Allopathic Medicine, May 1987
Rashduni, David H., Clifton, NY, $4,657.70, Univ of Med & Dent of New Jersey, Newark, NJ, Allopathic Medicine, June 1984
Rector, Joel M., New York, NY, $7,794.97, Cuny Mount Sinai School of Medicine, New York, NY, Allopathic Medicine, April 1989
Reynolds, Barbara, Bronx, NY, $29,302.73, Hahnemann University, Philadelphia, PA, Allopathic Medicine, June 1988
Reynolds, Howard P., New York, NY, $9,633.54, Cornell University Medical College, New York, NY, Allopathic Medicine, May 1987
Rivera, Pedro P., New York, NY, $80,016.33, Universidad Central Del Caribe, Bayamon, PR, Allopathic Medicine, May 1988
Robinson, Edward E., Bronx, NY, $71,838.08, Meharry Medical College, Nashville, TN, Allopathic Medicine, May 1983
Sablon, Dimitri, Brooklyn, NY, $5,961.09, Suny Health Science Center Brooklyn, Syracuse, NY, Allopathic Medicine, May 1990
Sanders, Shirley C., Apo—New York, NY, $28,754.15, Mayo Medical School, Rochester, MN, Allopathic Medicine, May 1985
Santiago, Jose J A, New York, NY, $95,682.83, Temple University, Philadelphia, PA, Allopathic Medicine, June 1986
Saunders, Maurice, Port Washington, NY, $120,004.73, Albany Medical College, Albany, NY, Allopathic Medicine, May 1986
Scaccia, Marcella, Brooklyn, NY, $4,601.41, New York Medical College, Valhalla, NY, Allopathic Medicine, June 1989
Scarfo, Dan J., New York, NY, $23,461.30, Suny Health Science Center Brooklyn, Brooklyn, NY, Allopathic Medicine, June 1987
Shaw, Gary, New York, NY, $21,023.77, Cornell University Medical College, New York, NY, Allopathic Medicine, May 1985
Shell, Valerie A., Pomona, NY, $51,875.04, Hahnemann University, Philadelphia, PA, Allopathic Medicine, June 1984
Soto, Lucy, Throggs Neck, NY, $114,494.90, Medical College of Wisconsin, Milwaukee, WI, Allopathic Medicine, May 1986
Sparman, Alfred, Brooklyn, NY, $110,493.06, New York Medical College, Valhalla, NY, Allopathic Medicine, June 1990
Stone, Brian A., Bronx, NY, $62,587.05, Univ of Alabama Birmingham, Birmingham, AL, Allopathic Medicine, June 1985
Sweeny, Mark A., Buffalo, NY, $3,001.36, Suny Buffalo, Buffalo, NY, Allopathic Medicine, July 1987
Thornton, Kenneth, Brooklyn, NY, $9,305.14, Howard University, Washington, DC, Allopathic Medicine, May 1990
Valentine, David, Mt Vernon, NY, $58,697.18, Univ of Pittsburgh, Pittsburgh, PA, Allopathic Medicine, June 1986
Villeta, Javier J., South Richmond Hill, NY, $91,674.43, Ponce School of Medicine, Ponce, PR, Allopathic Medicine, June 1984
Vivot-Welber, Norma C., New York, NY, $108,173.88, Wayne State University, Detroit, MI, Allopathic Medicine, June 1987
Walker, Claude A., Wyandanch, NY, $2,133.11, Suny Health Science Center Brooklyn, Brooklyn, NY, Allopathic Medicine, June 1989
Walters, Joseph, Bronx, NY, $47,887.07, Hahnemann University, Philadelphia, PA, Allopathic Medicine, June 1981
Weinberger, Andre, Brooklyn, NY, $141,682.49, Hahnemann University, Philadelphia, PA, Allopathic Medicine, June 1983
Whyte, Brian W., Flushing, NY, $7,915.35, Temple University, Philadelphia, PA, Allopathic Medicine, June 1987
Williams III, Rolland R., North Tonawanda, NY, $253,944.09, Meharry Medical College, Nashville, TN, Allopathic Medicine, May 1986
Wimbley, Timothy T., New York, NY, $38,034.33, Wright State University, Dayton, OH, Allopathic Medicine, June 1985

Chiropractic

Alston, Patricia, New York, NY, $67,485.89, New York Chiropractic College, Seneca Falls, NY, Chiropractic, April 1988
Amato, Vincent, Brooklyn, NY, $35,555.33, National College of Chiropractic, Lombard, IL, Chiropractic, August 1988
Ambrosio, Joseph A., Great Neck, NY, $6,492.91, New York Chiropractic College, Seneca Falls, NY, Chiropractic, April 1984
Bee, Christopher R., Holbrook, NY, $32,385.53, New York Chiropractic College, Seneca Falls, NY, Chiropractic, April 1987
Bitet, Scott, Jamaica, NY, $22,124.95, Life College, Marietta, GA, Chiropractic, June 1986
Brea, Anthony, Little Neck, NY, $30,841.95, New York Chiropractic College, Seneca Falls, NY, Chiropractic, December 1982
Bucher, Gilles, Bayville, NY, $40,137.77, New York Chiropractic College, Seneca Falls, NY, Chiropractic, August 1988
Capovilla, Craig, Highland Falls, NY, $5,229.77, Life College, Marietta, GA, Chiropractic, September 1985
Cascone, Michelle M., Huntington, NY, $24,918.16, New York Chiropractic College, Seneca Falls, NY, Chiropractic, April 1984

Casella, Angela, Bronx, NY, $16,497.82, New York Chiropractic College, Seneca Falls, NY, Chiropractic, December 1989
Chavez, Patricia, New York, NY, $15,406.77, Cleveland Chiropractic College, Los Angeles, CA, Chiropractic, December 1983
Emerson, Edwin, Selden, NY, $96,568.40, New York Chiropractic College, Seneca Falls, NY, Chiropractic, April 1988
Farewell, Howard, Garnerville, NY, $12,560.15, New York Chiropractic College, Seneca Falls, NY, Chiropractic, April 1984
Farkas, Carl, Brooklyn, NY, $28,724.69, New York Chiropractic College, Seneca Falls, NY, Chiropractic, December 1991
Ferguson, Christopher D., Brooklyn, NY, $9,647.62, Life College, Marietta, GA, Chiropractic, March 1987
Fiore, Dominick, Waterloo, NY, $90,058.16, New York Chiropractic College, Seneca Falls, NY, Chiropractic, December 1986
Flood, Lori A., Buffalo, NY, $17,330.10, National College of Chiropractic, Lombard, IL, Chiropractic, December 1986
Frankel, Tali R., Far Rockaway, NY, $11,364.45, New York Chiropractic College, Seneca Falls, NY, Chiropractic, April 1987
Ghigna, Mary L., Bayshore, NY, $53,394.87, New York Chiropractic College, Seneca Falls, NY, Chiropractic, April 1984
Gray, A L., Woodmere, NY, $9,194.65, New York Chiropractic College, Seneca Falls, NY, Chiropractic, December 1990
Greenwald, Lewis A., Staten Island, NY, $6,897.42, Life College, Marietta, GA, Chiropractic, June 1990
Gurwitz, Alan, Rochester, NY, $62,857.70, New York Chiropractic College, Seneca Falls, NY, Chiropractic, April 1990
Hogan, Dennis, Thiells, NY, $12,279.27, Logan College of Chiropractic, Chesterfield, MO, Chiropractic, August 1989
Horn, Carl, Syosset, NY, $25,854.30, Palmer College of Chiropractic, Davenport, IA, Chiropractic, March 1989
Hughes, Jill, Rocky Point, NY, $10,400.92, Logan College of Chiropractic, Chesterfield, MO, Chiropractic, August 1988
Humbert, Marti, Massapequa, NY, $54,988.02, New York Chiropractic College, Seneca Falls, NY, Chiropractic, April 1988
Jackson, Jo Ann, Brooklyn, NY, $13,156.67, Life College, Marietta, GA, Chiropractic, December 1983
Joergens, Donald, Staten Island, NY, $14,826.55, New York Chiropractic College, Seneca Falls, NY, Chiropractic, December 1989
Johnson, Timothy H., Buffalo, NY, $18,287.07, Life College, Marietta, GA, Chiropractic, September 1983
Johnston, Mary, Baldwin, NY, $75,642.63, New York Chiropractic College, Seneca Falls, NY, Chiropractic, April 1988
Keller, William D., Tivoli, NY, $91,485.11, Northwestern College of Chiropractic, Bloomington, MN, Chiropractic, December 1988
Kern, Arnold E., Livingston Manor, NY, $13,488.12, New York Chiropractic College, Seneca Falls, NY, Chiropractic, April 1984
Kiss, Kathleen M., Shirley, NY, $71,733.57, New York Chiropractic College, Seneca Falls, NY, Chiropractic, April 1987
Kle, James P., Glen Head, NY, $56,910.10, Life College, Marietta, GA, Chiropractic, December 1984
Konigsberg, Paul, Cross River, NY, $9,370.81, Logan College of Chiropractic, Chesterfield, MO, Chiropractic, September 1983
Koultukis, Chris, New York, NY, $3,088.08, New York Chiropractic College, Seneca Falls, NY, Chiropractic, April 1985
Lentini, Salvatore, Brooklyn, NY, $7,065.09, Palmer College of Chiropractic West, San Jose, CA, Chiropractic, September 1984
Leung, Leo S., Flushing, NY, $41,513.46, New York Chiropractic College, Seneca Falls, NY, Chiropractic, April 1990
Lisjak, Craig F., Eden, NY, $24,092.71, Life College, Marietta, GA, Chiropractic, December 1989
Luca, Robert P., Brooklyn, NY, $72,644.77, Life College, Marietta, GA, Chiropractic, December 1986
Margas, Lillian E., Hicksville, NY, $35,493.30, New York Chiropractic College, Seneca Falls, NY, Chiropractic, December 1990
McCabe, Peter T., Carmel, NY, $32,660.54, Life College, Marietta, GA, Chiropractic, September 1984
McCormack, Wayne, Liberty, NY, $40,335.10, New York Chiropractic College, Seneca Falls, NY, Chiropractic, April 1985
McGowan, Grace, Blauvelt, NY, $2,596.85, Palmer College of Chiropractic, Davenport, IA, Chiropractic, December 1987
Medori, John, Garden City, NY, $28,499.61, New York Chiropractic College, Seneca Falls, NY, Chiropractic, December 1986
Moretti, Jeffrey, Poughkeepsie, NY, $94,016.00, New York Chiropractic College, Seneca Falls, NY, Chiropractic, April 1989
Musso, Deborah G., New York, NY, $2,038.22, New York Chiropractic College, Seneca Falls, NY, Chiropractic, April 1987
Nestler, Kenneth, New Paltz, NY, $31,440.88, Life College, Marietta, GA, Chiropractic, June 1987
Obadia, Eric, Greenlawn, NY, $50,775.18, New York Chiropractic College, Seneca Falls, NY, Chiropractic, April 1986
Patterson, Arthur, Staten Island, NY, $11,826.68, Life College, Marietta, GA, Chiropractic, March 1983
Pehush, Marie, Pelham, NY, $43,736.71, New York Chiropractic College, Seneca Falls, NY, Chiropractic, April 1985
Penke, Christopher P., Tonawanda, NY, $35,629.99, National College of Chiropractic, Lombard, IL, Chiropractic, December 1982
Pepe-Kerr, Celeste C., Port Washington, NY, $58,189.20, Los Angeles College of Chiropractic, Whittier, CA, Chiropractic, December 1983
Perez, Dayse, New York, NY, $96,189.59, Life College, Marietta, GA, Chiropractic, March 1988
Petrillo, James A., Rochester, NY, $45,771.89, New York Chiropractic College, Seneca Falls, NY, Chiropractic, December 1984
Pukancik, Susan S., Vestal, NY, $6,603.93, Life College, Marietta, GA, Chiropractic, July 1984
Renz, Howard W., Brooklyn, NY, $20,757.69, Cleveland Chiropractic College, Kansas City, MO, Chiropractic, January 1983
Renzulli, Diane, Massapequa Park, NY, $2,253.35, New York Chiropractic College, Seneca Falls, NY, Chiropractic, April 1985
Rheault, Robert M., Moravia, NY, $72,598.21, Western States Chiropractic College, Portland, OR, Chiropractic, December 1987
Roesler-Sirlin, Christine, Plainview, NY, $71,679.22, New York Chiropractic College, Seneca Falls, NY, Chiropractic, April 1988
Rosner, Jeffrey S., East Patchoque, NY, $584.84, New York Chiropractic College, Seneca Falls, NY, Chiropractic, April 1984
Ross, Kimberly A., Woodstock, NY, $86,053.41, New York Chiropractic College, Seneca Falls, NY, Chiropractic, April 1987
Ryan Burdett, Denis D., Riverdale, NY, $117,334.25, Life College, Marietta, GA, Chiropractic, March 1986
Sandler, Ellen B., Glen Cove, NY, $54,621.52, Life College, Marietta, GA, Chiropractic, March 1985
Schack, Richard N., Jamaica, NY, $100,417.20, New York Chiropractic

College, Seneca Falls, NY, Chiropractic, December 1987
Schecher, Valerie, East Meadow, NY, $72,687.88, New York Chiropractic College, Seneca Falls, NY, Chiropractic, April 1990
Seymour, Gary S., Walden, NY, $27,102.51, Life College, Marietta, GA, Chiropractic, June 1983
Shaw, Donald H., East Hampton, NY, $76,766.96, Western States Chiropractic College, Portland, OR, Chiropractic, December 1985
Silverstein, Michael, New York, NY, $28,159.46, Life Chiropractic College-West, San Lorenzo, CA, Chiropractic, September 1986
Slator, Mary, Sheds, NY, $21,378.78, Palmer College of Chiropractic, Davenport, IA, Chiropractic, October 1986
Smith, Donna, Portville, NY, $26,083.35, Logan College of Chiropractic, Chesterfield, MO, Chiropractic, August 1988
Smith, Gertrude M., New York, NY, $79,243.44, Life College, Marietta, GA, Chiropractic, December 1984
Snipe, Teresa G., Jamaica, NY, $46,913.04, Life College, Marietta, GA, Chiropractic, March 1984
Spanakos, Michael, Greenvale, NY, $1,341.15, Life College, Marietta, GA, Chiropractic, March 1985
Staurides, Angela E., Flushing, NY, $27,988.54, New York Chiropractic College, Seneca Falls, NY, Chiropractic, April 1986
Stein, Richard E., Highland, NY, $25,733.49, New York Chiropractic College, Seneca Falls, NY, Chiropractic, April 1989
Streit, Allan, Bronx, NY, $12,324.07, National College of Chiropractic, Lombard, IL, Chiropractic, April 1984
Sundin, Doreen A., East Islip, NY, $35,993.50, Palmer College of Chiropractic, Davenport, IA, Chiropractic, June 1984
Valvo, Carl L., Yonkers, NY, $99,252.65, National College of Chiropractic, Lombard, IL, Chiropractic, August 1985
Viladesau, Raymond L., Massapequa, NY, $13,899.42, Life College, Marietta, GA, Chiropractic, October 1982
Weber, Richard L., Staten Island, NY, $18,148.42, Life College, Marietta, GA, Chiropractic, March 1988
Wheatley, William J., Highland Mills, NY, $46,450.01, New York Chiropractic College, Seneca Falls, NY, Chiropractic, December 1988
Wilson, Anthony, Westbury, NY, $13,839.27, New York Chiropractic College, Seneca Falls, NY, Chiropractic, December 1991
Zilker, Wayne, New Rochelle, NY, $56,617.72, Palmer College of Chiropractic West, San Jose, CA, Chiropractic, September 1987

Clinical Psychology

Bernard, Theresa, Ossining, NY, $75,051.10, Univ of Denver, Denver, CO, Clinical Psychology, August 1987
Creelman, Monica L., Brooklyn, NY, $4,228.31, Adelphi University, Garden City, NY, Clinical Psychology, May 1991
Kaplan, Perry, Mamaroneck, NY, $18,651.09, Teachers College Columbia University, New York, NY, Clinical Psychology, May 1989
Knight, Patricia A., Sayville, NY, $41,322.12, Adelphi University, Garden City, NY, Clinical Psychology, May 1989
Romeo, Allen, New York, NY, $39,195.57, California Sch. of Prof. Psych., Alameda, CA, Clinical Psychology, June 1989
Talarico, Richard, New York, NY, $85,731.65, California Sch. of Prof. Psych., Alhambra, CA, Clinical Psychology, September 1985

Dentistry

Agata, Richard C., Brooklyn, NY, $111,332.80, Temple University, Philadelphia, PA, Dentistry, May 1984
Alli-Graham, William R., New York, NY, $1,870.52, Fairleigh Dickinson University, Teaneck, NJ, Dentistry, May 1984
Bentley, David J., Wellsville, NY, $17,355.15, Virginia Commonwealth University, Richmond, VA, Dentistry, August 1988
Betelman, Genady, Brooklyn, NY, $105,062.16, Washington University, St. Louis, MO, Dentistry, May 1990
Boldt, Harrison, Brooklyn, NY, $182,501.32, New York University, New York, NY, Dentistry, June 1987
Butler, Marilyn, Suffern, NY, $106,397.31, New York University, New York, NY, Dentistry, June 1986
Caldwell, Robert J., Jamaica, NY, $10,676.13, Howard University, Washington, DC, Dentistry, May 1986
Carja, Sylvia, Flushing, NY, $7,278.04, New York University, New York, NY, Dentistry, June 1992
Chen, Ronnie, New York, NY, $2,971.03, New York University, New York, NY, Dentistry, June 1986
Chibambo Smith, Gadi M., Haverstraw, NY, $58,778.75, Howard University, Washington, DC, Dentistry, May 1987
Curtis, Charles R., Flushing, NY, $102,415.92, Georgetown University, Washington, DC, Dentistry, May 1985
Derosa, Alan A., New Paltz, NY, $190,566.80, Emory University, Atlanta, GA, Dentistry, May 1985
Dibenedetto, Mauro, Massapequa, NY, $110,795.79, Tufts University, Boston, MA, Dentistry, May 1991
Farkas, Edward, Brooklyn, NY, $63,329.48, New York University, New York, NY, Dentistry, June 1985
Foster, Grady, Cambria Heights, NY, $32,768.55, Howard University, Washington, DC, Dentistry, May 1983
Glassman, Martin J., Briarcliff Manor, NY, $12,000.49, Univ of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, PA, Dentistry, May 1983
Glicksberg, Jerome, Brooklyn, NY, $1,583.93, Univ of Detroit Mercy, Detroit, MI, Dentistry, May 1987
Han, Sok, Woodside, NY, $93,016.83, Univ of Southern California, Los Angeles, CA, Dentistry, May 1986
Jacobson, Robert, Ossining, NY, $133,541.82, Marquette University, Milwaukee, WI, Dentistry, May 1990
Joseph, Leslie, Queens, NY, $119,330.90, New York University, New York, NY, Dentistry, June 1987
Kadoch, David D., Milbasin, NY, $39,345.68, New York University, New York, NY, Dentistry, June 1987
Kline, Kurt, Olattsburgh, NY, $138,949.19, Boston University Medical Center, Boston, MA, Dentistry, May 1990
Kronengold, Jack, Forest Hills, NY, $151,634.75, New York University, New York, NY, Dentistry, June 1987
Kupetz, Scott, Hopewell Junction, NY, $122,997.21, Fairleigh Dickinson University, Teaneck, NJ, Dentistry, May 1988
Onguner, Yasemin, Brooklyn, NY, $34,170.68, New York University, New York, NY, Dentistry, May 1992
Perez, Hector, Bronx, NY, $63,561.98, New York University, New York, NY, Dentistry, October 1991
Perez, Nelson, Brooklyn, NY, $13,562.10, New York University, New York, NY, Dentistry, June 1986
Picker, Tad T., Bronx, NY, $90,373.98, New York University, New York, NY, Dentistry, June 1986
Pollack, Douglas F., New York, NY, $7,916.90, New York University, New York, NY, Dentistry, June 1982
Popa, Dragos D B, New York, NY, $137,485.24, New York University, New York, NY, Dentistry, June 1985
Resnansky, Alexander, Melville, NY, $13,476.14, SUNY Stony Brook, Stony Brook, NY, Dentistry, June 1991
Schroder, Anthony M., Middletown, NY, $31,639.57, New York University, New York, NY, Dentistry, June 1984
Schwartz, Eric, Long Beach, NY, $122,493.36, Boston University Medical Center, Boston, MA, Dentistry, June 1989
Sherman, Lynn P., Beach Haven, NY, $153,325.51, Univ of The Pacific, San Francisco, CA, Dentistry, September 1983
Stone, Grace G., Roosevelt, NY, $189,072.17, Meharry Medical

College, Nashville, TN, Dentistry, May 1985
Stukes, Susan D., New Rochelle, NY, $2,194.64, Howard University, Washington, DC, Dentistry, May 1985
Thompson, Fannye F., Brooklyn, NY, $27,740.48, Univ of Med & Dent of New Jersey, Newark, NJ, Dentistry, May 1983
Wiggins, Christopher, New York, NY, $66,362.94, New York University, New York, NY, Dentistry, June 1989
Williams, Miriam, Bronx, NY, $35,921.34, Howard University, Washington, DC, Dentistry, May 1982
Wood, Kevin C., Amherst, NY, $49,277.84, Howard University, Washington, DC, Dentistry, May 1983
Woods, Daemon S., Watertown, NY, $35,706.71, Fairleigh Dickinson University, Teaneck, NJ, Dentistry, May 1990
Yeates, Terrance C., Brooklyn, NY, $45,575.52, Howard University, Washington, DC, Dentistry, May 1985

Health Administration

Jansson, Susanne E., Westhampton Beach, NY, $25,949.09, Washington University, St Louis, MO, Health Administration, May 1986

Optometry

Pasarell, Alan, Washingtonville, NY, $8,250.46, SUNY State College of Optometry, New York, NY, Optometry, July 1982
Placide, Frantz, Rochester, NY, $4,969.98, SUNY State College of Optometry, New York, NY, Optometry, June 1991
Richland, Warren A., Brooklyn, NY, $9,176.05, New England College of Optometry, Boston, MA, Optometry, June 1985
Rolinski, Douglas, Elmhurst, NY, $9,330.81, SUNY State College of Optometry, New York, NY, Optometry, June 1984
Tran, Nguyen C., New York, NY, $26,031.45, SUNY State College of Optometry, New York, NY, Optometry, June 1986

Osteopathy

Adler, Richard, New York, NY, $41,708.12, Univ of Osteo Medical & Health Science, Des Moines, IA, Osteopathy, June 1984
Anthony, Melvin E., New York, NY, $34,526.94, Oklahoma State University, Tulsa, OK, Osteopathy, May 1990
Baltazar, Rodney, Jamaica, NY, $128,071.54, Univ of Osteo Medical & Health Science, Des Moines, IA, Osteopathy, May 1991
Bennett-Bennett, Bonnie A., Point Lookout, NY, $207,267.63, College of Osteo Med of the Pacific, Pomona, CA, Osteopathy, June 1986
Driscoll, William, Mineola, NY, $76,758.25, New York College of Osteopathic Medicine, Old Westbury, NY, Osteopathy, June 1990
Durojaye, Ojebode, Bronx, NY, $26,580.21, New York College of Osteopathic Medicine, Old Westbury, NY, Osteopathy, June 1993
Gordon, Barbara, Spring Valley, NY, $135,068.81, New York College of Osteopathic Medicine, Old Westbury, NY, Osteopathy, June 1989
Gotlin, Douglas, Brooklyn, NY, $114,036.72, Nova Southeastern University, North Miami Beach, FL, Osteopathy, June 1990
Horner, Deborah, Bronx, NY, $43,643.63, New York College of Osteopathic Medicine, Old Westbury, NY, Osteopathy, June 1991
Kelly, James, Port Jefferson, NY, $107,795.19, Philadelphia Col of Osteopathic Medicine, Philadelphia, PA, Osteopathy, June 1984
Kendrick, Deborah A., Brooklyn, NY, $628.01, New York College of Osteopathic Medicine, Old Westbury, NY, Osteopathy, June 1988
Mihalkis, Georgia, Bronx, NY, $97,918.40, Univ of Osteo Medical & Health Science, Des Moines, IA, Osteopathy, June 1985
Steinke, Charles T., Belle Harbor, NY, $200,885.56, Univ of Health Sciences, Kansas City, MO, Osteopathy, May 1986
Walfield, Brad, Kings Park, NY, $101,446.21, Univ of Med & Dent of New Jersey, Newark, NJ, Osteopathy, August 1988

Pharmacy

Glover, Cheryl M., Brooklyn, NY, $44,310.62, Long Island University, Brookville, NY, Pharmacy, June 1987
Haynes, Robert, Brooklyn, NY, $17,044.98, Long Island University, Brookville, NY, Pharmacy, June 1987
Ibeh, Fidelas A., Brooklyn, NY, $14,378.42, Long Island University, Brookville, NY, Pharmacy, January 1989
Jusu, Thomas T., Brooklyn, NY, $12,296.77, Mercer University, Atlanta, GA, Pharmacy, June 1987
Katz-Bierenbaum, Gail B., New York, NY, $4,194.08, Long Island University, Brookville, NY, Pharmacy, June 1990
Licciardello, Alfred A., Brooklyn, NY, $8,716.01, Long Island University, Brookville, NY, Pharmacy, June 1986
Ngoka, Regina N., Brooklyn, NY, $3,498.63, Long Island University, Brookville, NY, Pharmacy, June 1984
Romero, Gerardo, Brooklyn, NY, $9,354.17, Long Island University, Brookville, NY, Pharmacy, October 1986
Terp, Marie A., New York, NY, $17,469.25, Long Island University, Brookville, NY, Pharmacy, June 1987

Podiatry

Aiello, Lisa A., Lake Carmel, NY, $62,513.47, New York College of Podiatric Medicine, New York, NY, Podiatry, June 1989
Barry, Patrick, Flushing, NY, $3,787.31, New York College of Podiatric Medicine, New York, NY, Podiatry, June 1983
Becker, Russell P., Queens Village, NY, $33,661.05, Barry University-Podiatric Med, Miami Shores, FL, Podiatry, May 1989
Bernstein, Jeffrey S., New York, NY, $47,693.23, New York College of Podiatric Medicine, New York, NY, Podiatry, June 1986
Berquist, Andrew O., Taberg, NY, $116,589.43, California College of Podiatric Medicine, San Francisco, CA, Podiatry, May 1986
Birnstill, Albert, Wappingers Falls, NY, $77,012.14, Univ of Osteo Medical & Health Science, Des Moines, IA, Podiatry, May 1992
Brown, Kenneth L., Brooklyn, NY, $60,169.46, California College of Podiatric Medicine, San Francisco, CA, Podiatry, May 1987
Davidson, Jon J., Plainview, NY, $185,363.10, New York College of Podiatric Medicine, New York, NY, Podiatry, June 1986
Di Napoli, James J., Lynbrook, NY, $46,436.91, Dr. William Scholl Col of Podiatric Med, Chicago, IL, Podiatry, May 1984
Downes, Robert R., Commack, NY, $169,330.60, New York College of Podiatric Medicine, New York, NY, Podiatry, June 1986
Earle, John, Jamaica, NY, $32,285.70, New York College of Podiatric Medicine, New York, NY, Podiatry, June 1992
Fanizzi, Thomas, Bayshore, NY, $137,594.97, New York College of Podiatric Medicine, New York, NY, Podiatry, June 1986
Fink, Robert C, New York, NY, $64,043.88, Ohio College of Podiatric Medicine, Cleveland, OH, Podiatry, May 1982
Grant, Albert V., New York, NY, $108,068.13, New York College of Podiatric Medicine, New York, NY, Podiatry, June 1986
Griffin, Carlotta, Rochester, NY, $123,600.66, New York College of Podiatric Medicine, New York, NY, Podiatry, June 1988
Hertz, Zeev, Brooklyn, NY, $73,968.12, New York College of Podiatric

Medicine, New York, NY, Podiatry, June 1990
Herzlich, Douglas B., Bronx, NY, $91,825.30, New York College of Podiatric Medicine, New York, NY, Podiatry, June 1984
Kane, Shalva, Forest Hills, NY, $42,919.08, New York College of Podiatric Medicine, New York, NY, Podiatry, June 1991
Kantro, Scott R., Forest Hills, NY, $48,833.89, California College of Podiatric Medicine, San Francisco, CA, Podiatry, June 1979
Katz, Alan, Pomona, NY, $63,738.13, New York College of Podiatric Medicine, New York, NY, Podiatry, June 1986
Kelly-Soluri, Laura, Farmingdale, NY, $65,861.57, New York College of Podiatric Medicine, New York, NY, Podiatry, June 1989
Kirk, Marshall, Lake Carmel, NY, $80,979.38, New York College of Podiatric Medicine, New York, NY, Podiatry, June 1989
Kleinman, Abraham, Far Rockaway, NY, $20,550.12, New York College of Podiatric Medicine, New York, NY, Podiatry, June 1990
Layton, Stephen, Wantagh, NY, $33,726.52, New York College of Podiatric Medicine, New York, NY, Podiatry, June 1989
Ledino, John, Syracuse, NY, $42,603.89, Ohio College of Podiatric Medicine, Cleveland, OH, Podiatry, May 1983
Lieman-Mathews, Theodora S., Staten Island, NY, $126,273.57, New York College of Podiatric Medicine, New York, NY, Podiatry, June 1985
Llewellyn, Allan, Brooklyn, NY, $35,565.87, New York College of Podiatric Medicine, New York, NY, Podiatry, June 1984
Lloyd, Jay, New York, NY, $24,739.87, New York College of Podiatric Medicine, New York, NY, Podiatry, June 1986
Mackey, Oliver G., Flushing, NY, $165,460.83, New York College of Podiatric Medicine, New York, NY, Podiatry, June 1988
Melendez, Angelina, Bronx, NY, $161,533.68, New York College of Podiatric Medicine, New York, NY, Podiatry, June 1989
Mitchell, Kenneth, New York, NY, $30,437.27, New York College of Podiatric Medicine, New York, NY, Podiatry, June 1982
Moy, John, New York, NY, $90,739.89, New York College of Podiatric Medicine, New York, NY, Podiatry, June 1986
Nash, John J., Albany, NY, $3,376.49, New York College of Podiatric Medicine, New York, NY, Podiatry, June 1985
Nelson, Mark, Yonkers, NY, $155,697.55, New York College of Podiatric Medicine, New York, NY, Podiatry, June 1985
Paul, Fitzpatrick, New York, NY, $86,967.29, New York College of Podiatric Medicine, New York, NY, Podiatry, June 1985
Perkins, Terence M., Bronx, NY, $106,280.16, New York College of Podiatric Medicine, New York, NY, Podiatry, June 1989
Pinnace, Jeanette, Bronx, NY, $140,207.97, New York College of Podiatric Medicine, New York, NY, Podiatry, June 1989
Rogers, Natalie, Bronx, NY, $24,409.70, Ohio College of Podiatric Medicine, Cleveland, OH, Podiatry, May 1989
Sheahan, Michael D., Staten Island, NY, $43,041.43, New York College of Podiatric Medicine, New York, NY, Podiatry, June 1982
Shelto, Donna, Jamaica, NY, $96,987.21, New York College of Podiatric Medicine, New York, NY, Podiatry, June 1990
Soleye, Babatunde, Hartsdale, NY, $8,175.32, New York College of Podiatric Medicine, New York, NY, Podiatry, June 1980
Teusink, Scott H., Staten Island, NY, $180,205.10, New York College of Podiatric Medicine, New York, NY, Podiatry, June 1988
Zawada, Stanley J., Bayside, NY, $113,862.91, New York College of Podiatric Medicine, New York, NY, Podiatry, June 1984

Public Health

Altheim, Joy, Nesconset, NY, $10,366.62, Boston University Medical Center, Boston, MA, Public Health, January 1991
Amu-Nnadi, Sam, Jamaica, NY, $27,070.34, Univ of Pittsburgh, Pittsburgh, PA, Public Health, August 1987
Paskilas, Alexander, New Rochelle, NY, $37,970.89, Yale University, New Haven, CT, Public Health, May 1987

Veterinary Medicine

Lane, Mark J., Monroe, NY, $7,854.93, Univ of Florida, Gainesville, FL, Veterinary Medicine, May 1987
Weiskopf, Joan, Port Chester, NY, $35,726.78, Tufts University, Boston, MA, Veterinary Medicine, May 1989

North Carolina

Allopathic Medicine

Battle, Gordon J., Greensboro, NC, $6,226.50, Michigan State University, East Lansing, MI, Allopathic Medicine, June 1990
Bourne, Jeanette L., Winterville, NC, $2,389.38, Univ of Massachusetts Worcester, Worcester, MA, Allopathic Medicine, June 1987
Bunch III, John D., Matthews, NC, $9,635.60, Medical University of South Carolina, Charleston, SC, Allopathic Medicine, May 1982
Cutler, Kenneth A., Durham, NC, $24,933.78, Eastern Virginia Medical School, Norfolk, VA, Allopathic Medicine, June 1984
Douthit, Jeffrey K., Winston Salem, NC, $23,676.08, Wake Forest University, Winston-Salem, NC, Allopathic Medicine, May 1987
Hunter, Lorenzo, Greenville, NC, $194,528.84, Meharry Medical College, Nashville, TN, Allopathic Medicine, May 1986
Perry, Wade W., Durham, NC, $19,340.64, Hahnemann University, Philadelphia, PA, Allopathic Medicine, June 1985
Stovall, Vicki M., Winston Salem, NC, $62,648.85, Wake Forest University, Winston-Salem, NC, Allopathic Medicine, May 1987
Williams, Valjeanne, Durham, NC, $12,992.59, Univ of Med & Dent of New Jersey, Newark, NJ, Allopathic Medicine, May 1986

Chiropractic

Austin Jr, Donald E., Sanford, NC, $10,447.15, Life College, Marietta, GA, Chiropractic, December 1986
Collins, William W., Hendersonville, NC, $33,646.95, Life College, Marietta, GA, Chiropractic, December 1982
Coronado, Rudolph, Pembroke, NC, $53,159.71, Parker College of Chiropractic, Dallas, TX, Chiropractic, January 1989
Cox, Janet L., Tyron, NC, $86,044.23, Los Angeles College of Chiropractic, Whittier, CA, Chiropractic, April 1988
Davies, Bruce, Dunn, NC, $85,782.06, Cleveland Chiropractic College, Kansas City, MO, Chiropractic, January 1989
Dawson, Glenda J., Shelby, NC, $119,375.32, Life College, Marietta, GA, Chiropractic, September 1986
Hall, Scott W., Winston Salem, NC, $109,441.36, Cleveland Chiropractic College, Kansas City, MO, Chiropractic, September 1986
Kerr, Thomas, Charlotte, NC, $38,456.64, Palmer College of Chiropractic, Davenport, IA, Chiropractic, December 1984
Mercer, Lloyd D., Black Mountain, NC, $85,744.90, Cleveland Chiropractic College, Kansas City, MO, Chiropractic, January 1989
Nickels, Steven M., Charlotte, NC, $128,882.12, Life College, Marietta, GA, Chiropractic, March 1986
Reischman, Grace A., Matthews, NC, $18,296.78, Logan College of

Chiropractic, Chesterfield, MO, Chiropractic, January 1986

Reischman, Timothy T., Matthews, NC, $8,798.21, Logan College of Chiropractic, Chesterfield, MO, Chiropractic, August 1985

Williams, Betty Dale F., Roxboro, NC, $98,528.54, Life College, Marietta, GA, Chiropractic, September 1985

Williams, James, Andrews, NC, $110,790.59, Palmer College of Chiropractic, Davenport, IA, Chiropractic, December 1985

Dentistry

Cates, Sanford M., Randleman, NC, $69,924.97, Creighton University, Omaha, NE, Dentistry, May 1984

Optometry

Oxendine, Tony, Red Springs, NC, $14,934.41, Pennsylvania College of Optometry, Philadelphia, PA, Optometry, May 1988

Stephens Jr, Ronald, Denver, NC, $32,984.41, Southern College of Optometry, Memphis, TN, Optometry, June 1988

Pharmacy

Thornton, Douglas E., Lucama, NC, $10,960.94, St Louis College of Pharmacy, St Louis, MO, Pharmacy, May 1987

Williams, Kenneth M., Durham, NC, $7,069.68, Long Island University, Brookville, NY, Pharmacy, June 1990

Podiatry

Bolovc, David, Greensboro, NC, $125,114.19, New York College of Podiatric Medicine, New York, NY, Podiatry, June 1988

Neumunz, Gregory, Hampstead, NC, $38,359.66, New York College of Podiatric Medicine, New York, NY, Podiatry, June 1987

Quirke, Clement, Charlotte, NC, $36,977.09, New York College of Podiatric Medicine, New York, NY, Podiatry, June 1985

Public Health

Eloi, Emmanuel E., Charlotte, NC, $11,353.94, Boston University Medical Center, Boston, MA, Public Health, May 1986

Veterinary Medicine

Hayes, Alphonse, Greensboro, NC, $19,239.16, Tuskegee University, Tuskegee, AL, Veterinary Medicine, May 1989

Herring, Mollie E., Pittsboro, NC, $24,702.05, Univ of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, PA, Veterinary Medicine, December 1983

North Dakota

Chiropractic

Trauger, Gary G., Watford City, ND, $61,418.38, Palmer College of Chiropractic, Davenport, IA, Chiropractic, June 1984

Ohio

Allopathic Medicine

Anyaji, George, Toledo, OH, $144,659.63, Medical College of Ohio, Toledo, OH, Allopathic Medicine, June 1987

Bartnett, Bruce B., Twinsburg, OH, $49,189.76, Case Western Reserve University, Cleveland, OH, Allopathic Medicine, August 1985

Berry, Rush, Westervillle, OH, $21,533.07, Univ of Illinois Medical Center, Chicago, IL, Allopathic Medicine, June 1990

Blackshere-Richardson, Eloise C., Cincinnati, OH, $13,795.40, Wright State University, Dayton, OH, Allopathic Medicine, November 1985

Blissenbach, David A., Gahanna, OH, $8,290.35, Wright State University, Dayton, OH, Allopathic Medicine, June 1982

Clark-Cook, Susan, Fairborn, OH, $4,245.14, Wright State University, Dayton, OH, Allopathic Medicine, August 1990

Ellis, Brenda J., Dayton, OH, $109,891.90, Meharry Medical College, Nashville, TN, Allopathic Medicine, May 1985

Evans, Catherine L., Columbus, OH, $42,738.81, Medical College of Ohio, Toledo, OH, Allopathic Medicine, June 1989

Flood, Wanda, Massillon, OH, $35,921.75, Howard University, Washington, DC, Allopathic Medicine, May 1986

Griffin, Marcus, Cincinnati, OH, $79,675.17, Wright State University, Dayton, OH, Allopathic Medicine, June 1990

Harley, Carolyn, Columbus, OH, $79,864.04, Wright State University, Dayton, OH, Allopathic Medicine, June 1987

Heintzelman, Kurt, Columbus, OH, $81,096.94, Ohio State University, Columbus, OH, Allopathic Medicine, June 1988

Heuring, Richard R., Columbus, OH, $16,420.24, Univ of Cincinnati, Cincinnati, OH, Allopathic Medicine, June 1987

Ho-a-Lim, Fredrick, Cleveland, OH, $51,486.94, Meharry Medical College, Nashville, TN, Allopathic Medicine, May 1983

Howard, Anthony, Cuyahoga Falls, OH, $181,836.15, Meharry Medical College, Nashville, TN, Allopathic Medicine, May 1986

Jackson, Steven S., Columbus, OH, $12,926.90, Ohio State University, Columbus, OH, Allopathic Medicine, June 1984

Katsaros, Demetrios, Cleveland, OH, $70,579.13, Finch University of Health Sciences, North Chicago, IL, Allopathic Medicine, June 1990

Mays, Dewey O., Dayton, OH, $16,602.28, Meharry Medical College, Nashville, TN, Allopathic Medicine, May 1981

McAnallen, Curtis, Gahanna, OH, $26,453.81, Marshall University, Huntington, WV, Allopathic Medicine, May 1990

McKnight, Timothy J., Akron, OH, $6,256.54, Tufts University, Boston, MA, Allopathic Medicine, June 1989

McSurdy, Bruce J., North Ridgeville, OH, $72,432.99, Univ of Cincinnati, Cincinnati, OH, Allopathic Medicine, June 1990

Mundy-Washington, Deidria V., Dayton, OH, $10,598.00, Wright State University, Dayton, OH, Allopathic Medicine, June 1988

Needham, Brett B., Cincinnati, OH, $31,070.89, Ohio State University, Columbus, OH, Allopathic Medicine, June 1984

Nemore Jr, George, Dayton, OH, $28,511.58, Wright State University, Dayton, OH, Allopathic Medicine, September 1985

Parks, Derrick D., Dayton, OH, $6,004.63, Wright State University, Dayton, OH, Allopathic Medicine, September 1985

Passalacqua, Paul, Maumee, OH, $12,660.78, Medical College of Ohio, Toledo, OH, Allopathic Medicine, June 1986

Pate-Glover, Valerie J., Cleveland, OH, $80,176.28, Wright State University, Dayton, OH, Allopathic Medicine, June 1984

Perry, Victor, Toledo, OH, $181,579.49, Medical College of Ohio, Toledo, OH, Allopathic Medicine, June 1986

Peterson, Frank R., Cleveland Heights, OH, $71,638.08, Wright State University, Dayton, OH, Allopathic Medicine, June 1988

Putzi, Judith L., Cincinnati, OH, $107,048.11, Wright State University, Dayton, OH, Allopathic Medicine, June 1984

Rozier, Frederick, Columbus, OH, $47,530.41, Medical College of Wisconsin, Milwaukee, WI, Allopathic Medicine, August 1982

Shook, Scott, Columbus, OH, $64,976.44, Wright State University, Dayton, OH, Allopathic Medicine, June 1988

Shuman, Ralph W., Toledo, OH, $47,255.85, Medical College of Ohio,

Toledo, OH, Allopathic Medicine, June 1984
Silas, Charles G., Dayton, OH, $137,686.86, Wright State University, Dayton, OH, Allopathic Medicine, June 1987
Tonwe, Tutse D., Cleveland, OH, $227,047.31, Wright State University, Dayton, OH, Allopathic Medicine, May 1985
Torres, Jose A., Cleveland, OH, $125,471.38, Universidad Central Del Caribe, Bayamon, PR, Allopathic Medicine, May 1986
Uhlinger, Donald, Cincinnati, OH, $5,336.65, Wright State University, Dayton, OH, Allopathic Medicine, June 1992
Venable, Walter, Beavercreek, OH, $33,751.58, Wright State University, Dayton, OH, Allopathic Medicine, June 1983
White, Linda Lee Samso, Marion, OH, $51,102.76, East Tennessee State University, Johnson City, TN, Allopathic Medicine, May 1984
Yates, James E., Jackson, OH, $106,556.87, Wright State University, Dayton, OH, Allopathic Medicine, June 1986

Chiropractic

Adams, Stephen C., Portsmouth, OH, $84,742.67, Palmer College of Chiropractic, Davenport, IA, Chiropractic, June 1989
Akinpelu, Enoch A., Mason, OH, $12,425.96, Life College, Marietta, GA, Chiropractic, September 1984
Beltakis, David, Cleveland, OH, $24,963.85, Palmer College of Chiropractic West, San Jose, CA, Chiropractic, March 1991
Bowers, Thomas, Toledo, OH, $76,728.50, National College of Chiropractic, Lombard, IL, Chiropractic, December 1986
Burke-Evanoff, Anne, Westerville, OH, $22,111.54, Northwestern College of Chiropractic, Bloomington, MN, Chiropractic, August 1985
Burke-Evanoff, James M., Westerville, OH, $4,283.95, Northwestern College of Chiropractic, Bloomington, MN, Chiropractic, December 1984
Campana, Thomas M., Cleveland, OH, $57,611.40, Palmer College of Chiropractic, Davenport, IA, Chiropractic, September 1985
Drotar, Christopher J., Toledo, OH, $75,436.18, Palmer College of Chiropractic, Davenport, IA, Chiropractic, March 1985
Fenstermaker-Easley, Sarah, West Union, OH, $12,876.43, Palmer College of Chiropractic, Davenport, IA, Chiropractic, September 1983
Howard Jr, Daniel L., Milford, OH, $31,385.76, Cleveland Chiropractic College, Kansas City, MO, Chiropractic, January 1990
Hunter, Donald E., Fairborn, OH, $46,171.31, Palmer College of Chiropractic, Davenport, IA, Chiropractic, September 1984
Kinney, Lue B., Dayton, OH, $66,938.73, Cleveland Chiropractic College, Kansas City, MO, Chiropractic, May 1985
Lorts, Deanna I., Cincinnati, OH, $58,709.59, Cleveland Chiropractic College, Kansas City, MO, Chiropractic, September 1986
McClain, Donald W., Cleveland, OH, $30,585.33, Logan College of Chiropractic, Chesterfield, MO, Chiropractic, December 1988
Monbarren, John W., Lakewood, OH, $19,724.56, Life College, Marietta, GA, Chiropractic, June 1990
Nagode, Dale, Middleburg, OH, $3,179.14, Life Chiropractic College-West, San Lorenzo, CA, Chiropractic, June 1985
Oetzel, Stephen L., Wilmington, OH, $38,132.03, Palmer College of Chiropractic, Davenport, IA, Chiropractic, June 1986
Parigros, John, Sylvania, OH, $61,952.09, Cleveland Chiropractic College, Kansas City, MO, Chiropractic, January 1987
Scanlon, Mark, Cincinnati, OH, $4,981.51, Palmer College of Chiropractic, Davenport, IA, Chiropractic, February 1991
Schone, Jerry O., Reynoldsburg, OH, $3,817.86, Palmer College of Chiropractic, Davenport, IA, Chiropractic, October 1986
Schumacher, Douglass E., Dayton, OH, $79,081.21, Life College, Marietta, GA, Chiropractic, December 1986
Schwan, Douglas A., Toledo, OH, $2,208.06, Palmer College of Chiropractic, Davenport, IA, Chiropractic, December 1982
Shihadeh, Ahmad, Columbus, OH, $8,011.54, Life College, Marietta, GA, Chiropractic, March 1991

Clinical Psychology

Daugherty, Paula G., Trotwood, OH, $1,004.46, Wright State University, Dayton, OH, Clinical Psychology, August 1989
Howard, Kimberly S., Springfield, OH, $16,172.90, Wright State University, Dayton, OH, Clinical Psychology, August 1989
Turner, Hugh, Elyria, OH, $20,197.53, Florida Institute of Technology, Melbourne, FL, Clinical Psychology, August 1984

Dentistry

Ajandeh, Abba, Cleveland, OH, $103,561.68, Case Western Reserve University, Cleveland, OH, Dentistry, May 1990
Allen, Sherman, Cleveland, OH, $66,051.78, Howard University, Washington, DC, Dentistry, May 1988
Ball, John, Cleveland, OH, $8,588.35, Case Western Reserve University, Cleveland, OH, Dentistry, May 1985
Bohonek, Stanislav, Cleveland, OH, $69,918.52, Case Western Reserve University, Cleveland, OH, Dentistry, May 1987
Brightman, Brenda, Cleveland, OH, $70,010.24, Case Western Reserve University, Cleveland, OH, Dentistry, May 1988
Butler, Tracey A., Cincinnati, OH, $10,131.50, Univ of Louisville, Louisville, KY, Dentistry, May 1991
Costaras, Bill, Westlake, OH, $24,012.89, Case Western Reserve University, Cleveland, OH, Dentistry, May 1987
Denham, Audrey, Columbus, OH, $12,127.09, Ohio State University, Columbus, OH, Dentistry, June 1984
Easley, Wayland, Shaker Heights, OH, $86,791.48, Case Western Reserve University, Cleveland, OH, Dentistry, May 1990
Falkenhain, Scott, Westerville, OH, $3,891.99, Univ of Missouri Kansas City, Kansas City, MO, Dentistry, May 1989
Fellner, Thomas G., Galion, OH, $2,852.05, Case Western Reserve University, Cleveland, OH, Dentistry, May 1989
Gross, Bonnie B., Columbus, OH, $34,330.35, Case Western Reserve University, Cleveland, OH, Dentistry, May 1986
Holiday, Tanya, Columbus, OH, $126,535.15, Meharry Medical College, Nashville, TN, Dentistry, May 1988
Jeffreys, Carl E., Cincinnati, OH, $95,871.35, Washington University, St Louis, MO, Dentistry, May 1989
Jones, Pedro R., Cleveland, OH, $184,282.74, Meharry Medical College, Nashville, TN, Dentistry, May 1983
Jordan, Martin E., Cleveland, OH, $5,541.42, Howard University, Washington, DC, Dentistry, May 1990
Kollat, Dana G., Columbus, OH, $40,226.13, Ohio State University, Columbus, OH, Dentistry, June 1989
Lancour, Michelle M., Gahanna, OH, $2,389.85, Ohio State University, Columbus, OH, Dentistry, June 1991
Lesinski, Mary C., Cleveland, OH, $13,462.71, Case Western Reserve University, Cleveland, OH, Dentistry, May 1985
Mack Jr, William, Brookfield, OH, $177,635.02, Case Western Reserve University, Cleveland, OH, Dentistry, May 1987

Marburger, Garth, Lake Milton, OH, $6,651.59, Ohio State University, Columbus, OH, Dentistry, June 1989
Massengale Jr, Lendell, Cincinnati, OH, $76,156.12, Meharry Medical College, Nashville, TN, Dentistry, May 1982
Mattson, Kenneth, Bluffton, OH, $125,399.65, Loma Linda University, Loma Linda, CA, Dentistry, June 1983
Mays, Ealy E., Dayton, OH, $95,348.15, Meharry Medical College, Nashville, TN, Dentistry, May 1987
McCune, Thomas S., Cleveland, OH, $115,394.28, Case Western Reserve University, Cleveland, OH, Dentistry, May 1988
Meade, Madeline, Parma, OH, $20,104.76, Case Western Reserve University, Cleveland, OH, Dentistry, May 1988
Obester, David A., Columbus, OH, $128,950.46, Ohio State University, Columbus, OH, Dentistry, June 1986
Riemenschneider, Kurt, Worthington, OH, $28,543.30, Case Western Reserve University, Cleveland, OH, Dentistry, May 1990
Slack, Craig, Columbus, OH, $19,309.23, Ohio State University, Columbus, OH, Dentistry, June 1987
Stanfar, Anthony, North Royalton, OH, $7,038.86, Case Western Reserve University, Cleveland, OH, Dentistry, May 1988
Stiggers, Donald, Shaker Heights, OH, $4,474.03, Case Western Reserve University, Cleveland, OH, Dentistry, May 1990
Taylor, Michael S., Columbus, OH, $48,639.99, Tufts University, Boston, MA, Dentistry, June 1989
Villaire, Matthew J., Cleveland Heights, OH, $175,452.54, Case Western Reserve University, Cleveland, OH, Dentistry, May 1986
Zaun, Timothy M., Lakewood, OH, $57,182.63, Case Western Reserve University, Cleveland, OH, Dentistry, December 1986

Health Administration

Chowdhry, Raja R., Cincinnati, OH, $88,566.11, Xavier University, Cincinnati, OH, Health Administration, August 1983
Daniels, Quincy C., Cincinnati, OH, $9,571.15, Xavier University, Cincinnati, OH, Health Administration, December 1988
Dickerson, Gayle, Cincinnati, OH, $16,146.15, Xavier University, Cincinnati, OH, Health Administration, May 1986
Jackson, Cynthia E., Cincinnati, OH, $5,852.87, Xavier University, Cincinnati, OH, Health Administration, December 1987

Optometry

Delisio, Mario, Willoughby, OH, $3,509.25, New England College of Optometry, Boston, MA, Optometry, June 1987

Osteopathy

Basedow, William, St Marys, OH, $134,800.98, Univ of Osteo Medical & Health Science, Des Moines, IA, Osteopathy, June 1985
Brody, Francee A., Youngstown, OH, $121,380.50, Univ of Health Sciences, Kansas City, MO, Osteopathy, May 1987
Carter, Larry E., Youngstown, OH, $16,827.61, Univ of Osteo Medical & Health Science, Des Moines, IA, Osteopathy, May 1993
Fifer, Shirley S., Mariemont, OH, $175,873.34, Univ of Osteo Medical & Health Science, Des Moines, IA, Osteopathy, June 1985
Greene, Larry J., Portsmouth, OH, $22,100.20, Oklahoma State University, Tulsa, OK, Osteopathy, May 1993
Smilek, Martin, Cuyahoga Falls, OH, $28,086.29, Ohio University, Athens, OH, Osteopathy, June 1991

Pharmacy

Cognetti, Richard A., Elida, OH, $8,557.67, Ohio Northern University, Ada, OH, Pharmacy, May 1989
Gary, Mark, Cincinnati, OH, $12,065.96, Massachusetts College of Pharmacy, Boston, MA, Pharmacy, June 1987
Howard, Willard W., Dayton, OH, $30,277.72, Howard University, Washington, DC, Pharmacy, May 1985
Okunbor, Friday, Cleveland, OH, $10,593.19, Creighton University, Omaha, NE, Pharmacy, August 1987

Podiatry

Anda, Peter M., Twinsburg, OH, $25,331.60, Ohio College of Podiatric Medicine, Cleveland, OH, Podiatry, May 1989
Chestang, Leo A., Cleveland, OH, $155,823.24, Ohio College of Podiatric Medicine, Cleveland, OH, Podiatry, May 1984
Coffey, Patrick, Troy, OH, $101,974.16, Ohio College of Podiatric Medicine, Cleveland, OH, Podiatry, May 1982
Day, Clara Ruth E., Shaker Heights, OH, $125,471.76, Ohio College of Podiatric Medicine, Cleveland, OH, Podiatry, May 1988
Erkard Jr, James T., Kent, OH, $33,493.97, Ohio College of Podiatric Medicine, Cleveland, OH, Podiatry, May 1982
Friday, Steve M., Youngstown, OH, $6,090.20, Ohio College of Podiatric Medicine, Cleveland, OH, Podiatry, June 1987
Glover, Geraldine, Cleveland, OH, $116,623.46, Ohio College of Podiatric Medicine, Cleveland, OH, Podiatry, May 1986
Gorisse, Guy R., Richmond Heights, OH, $168,037.31, Ohio College of Podiatric Medicine, Cleveland, OH, Podiatry, May 1986
Grad, Bennet, Cincinnati, OH, $34,313.36, Ohio College of Podiatric Medicine, Cleveland, OH, Podiatry, May 1983
Harris, Lawrence J., Shaker Heights, OH, $125,127.30, Ohio College of Podiatric Medicine, Cleveland, OH, Podiatry, May 1986
Minton, Wayne E., Cleveland, OH, $194,688.64, Ohio College of Podiatric Medicine, Cleveland, OH, Podiatry, June 1988
Otto, David E., Willoughby, OH, $210,486.25, Ohio College of Podiatric Medicine, Cleveland, OH, Podiatry, May 1985
Perry, Valerie J., Cleveland Heights, OH, $12,413.84, Ohio College of Podiatric Medicine, Cleveland, OH, Podiatry, May 1991
Rodgers, Larry A., Cleveland, OH, $190,397.51, Ohio College of Podiatric Medicine, Cleveland, OH, Podiatry, May 1986
Salem, Atiyeh A., Cleveland, OH, $72,287.57, Ohio College of Podiatric Medicine, Cleveland, OH, Podiatry, May 1981
Serrano, Nydia, Lorain, OH, $122,412.16, Ohio College of Podiatric Medicine, Cleveland, OH, Podiatry, May 1988
Shonkwiler, Walter S., Columbus, OH, $10,612.11, Ohio College of Podiatric Medicine, Cleveland, OH, Podiatry, May 1983
Siggers, Ralph A., Berea, OH, $175,085.37, Ohio College of Podiatric Medicine, Cleveland, OH, Podiatry, June 1987
Taylor, Elton, Cleveland, OH, $71,208.65, Dr William Scholl Col of Podiatric Med, Chicago, IL, Podiatry, May 1990
Villier, Carlton, Cincinnati, OH, $212,021.37, Ohio College of Podiatric Medicine, Cleveland, OH, Podiatry, May 1984
Vinegar, Barbara, Cleveland, OH, $67,710.15, Ohio College of Podiatric Medicine, Cleveland, OH, Podiatry, May 1991
Winters, Mark I., University Heights, OH, $95,570.58, Ohio College of Podiatric Medicine, Cleveland, OH, Podiatry, May 1985

Public Health

Jones, Donald A., Cleveland Heights, OH, $24,825.59, Loma Linda University, Loma Linda, CA, Public Health, June 1983

Veterinary Medicine

Emans, Susan M., Columbus, OH, $3,718.62, Ohio State University, Columbus, OH, Veterinary Medicine, June 1987

Oklahoma

Allopathic Medicine

Berney, Joseph P., Oklahoma City, OK, $31,131.42, Univ of Texas Hlth Sci Cntr San Antonio, San Antonio, TX, Allopathic Medicine, May 1983
Boschee, Pamela, Tulsa, OK, $7,712.46, Univ of North Dakota, Grand Forks, ND, Allopathic Medicine, May 1988
Bowlan, Timothy, Edmond, OK, $18,725.98, Univ of Oklahoma Health Sciences Center, Oklahoma City, OK, Allopathic Medicine, July 1984
Brown, Douglas, Claremore, OK, $23,655.68, Univ of Oklahoma Health Sciences Center, Oklahoma City, OK, Allopathic Medicine, June 1985
Fincher, Mark L., Duncan, OK, $21,239.38, Univ of Oklahoma Health Sciences Center, Oklahoma City, OK, Allopathic Medicine, June 1983

Chiropractic

Atwell, Sandra L., Shawnee, OK, $123,653.87, Life College, Marietta, GA, Chiropractic, March 1986
Billingmeier, Arthur A., Bethany, OK, $135,937.34, Cleveland Chiropractic College, Kansas City, MO, Chiropractic, April 1986
Bundrick, Doyle, Edmond, OK, $22,871.47, Cleveland Chiropractic College, Kansas City, MO, Chiropractic, May 1989
Cooper Jr, Robert C., Tulsa, OK, $77,141.81, Cleveland Chiropractic College, Kansas City, MO, Chiropractic, September 1986
Cothran, Lonnie A., Poteau, OK, $66,687.90, Texas Chiropractic College Foundation, Pasadena, TX, Chiropractic, April 1987
Guinn, Michael, Ponca City, OK, $96,918.32, Cleveland Chiropractic College, Kansas City, MO, Chiropractic, January 1986
Harms, Eugene G., Skiatook, OK, $49,835.38, Life College, Marietta, GA, Chiropractic, October 1982
Henderson, Raymond, Edmond, OK, $73,410.04, Cleveland Chiropractic College, Kansas City, MO, Chiropractic, August 1986
Jones, James, Wynnewood, OK, $5,242.15, Texas Chiropractic College Foundation, Pasadena, TX, Chiropractic, August 1991
Lockhart, Barry, Tulsa, OK, $68,279.68, Parker College of Chiropractic, Dallas, TX, Chiropractic, September 1988
Maker, James A., Oklahoma City, OK, $18,208.59, Cleveland Chiropractic College, Kansas City, MO, Chiropractic, September 1984
Owens, Gregory, Claremore, OK, $62,270.74, Cleveland Chiropractic College, Kansas City, MO, Chiropractic, December 1986
Shuey, Stephen C., Claremore, OK, $1,203.61, Palmer College of Chiropractic, Davenport, IA, Chiropractic, March 1986
Wynn, Leo H., Henryetta, OK, $60,416.98, Cleveland Chiropractic College, Kansas City, MO, Chiropractic, September 1984

Dentistry

Howell, Richard R., Oklahoma City, OK, $10,568.92, Univ of Oklahoma Health Sciences Center, Oklahoma City, OK, Dentistry, December 1983
Johnson, Todd, Choctaw, OK, $27,006.18, Univ of Oklahoma Health Sciences Center, Oklahoma City, OK, Dentistry, June 1986
McGee, Arnie A., Gore, OK, $39,175.15, Univ of Oklahoma Health Sciences Center, Oklahoma City, OK, Dentistry, June 1986
McKeel, Wade, Tulsa, OK, $8,379.78, Univ of Oklahoma Health Sciences Center, Oklahoma City, OK, Dentistry, June 1988
Shoeleh, Hossein M., Washington, OK, $38,496.21, Univ of Oklahoma Health Sciences Center, Oklahoma City, OK, Dentistry, June 1991
Shoeleh, Vicki P., Washington, OK, $97,870.89, Oral Roberts University, Tulsa, OK, Dentistry, June 1989
Smith, Curtis, Midwest City, OK, $9,411.34, Univ of Oklahoma Health Sciences Center, Oklahoma City, OK, Dentistry, June 1987
Streight, John A., Ponca City, OK, $68,153.12, Univ of Oklahoma Health Sciences Center, Oklahoma City, OK, Dentistry, June 1985

Optometry

Mahoney, Robert, Tulsa, OK, $159,010.68, Illinois College of Optometry, Chicago, IL, Optometry, May 1987
Thompson-Venable, Kristie L., Edmond, OK, $38,104.11, Northeastern State University, Tahlequah, OK, Optometry, May 1986

Osteopathy

Almack, Richard C., Tulsa, OK, $32,582.70, Oklahoma State University, Tulsa, OK, Osteopathy, May 1986
Auxter, Thomas M., Kelleyville, OK, $206,257.22, Kirksville Col of Osteopathic Medicine, Kirksville, MO, Osteopathy, June 1986
Laughlin, Sidney C., Shawnee, OK, $67,469.64, Oklahoma State University, Tulsa, OK, Osteopathy, June 1981
Mackey, Cynthia K., Oklahoma City, OK, $220,564.53, Oklahoma State University, Tulsa, OK, Osteopathy, June 1984
Manning, Ralph E., Tulsa, OK, $24,743.51, Kirksville Col of Osteopathic Medicine, Kirksville, MO, Osteopathy, June 1991
Miller, Susan M., Tulsa, OK, $50,985.40, Oklahoma State University, Tulsa, OK, Osteopathy, May 1985
Ott, Margie, Tulsa, OK, $21,527.74, Oklahoma State University, Tulsa, OK, Osteopathy, May 1990
Woods, Billy J., Oklahoma City, OK, $116,061.51, Oklahoma State University, Tulsa, OK, Osteopathy, February 1983
Zahasky Jr, James J., Oklahoma City, OK, $44,517.82, Oklahoma State University, Tulsa, OK, Osteopathy, May 1986

Public Health

Dibie, Cyril N., Oklahoma City, OK, $1,441.38, Univ of Oklahoma Health Sciences Center, Oklahoma City, OK, Public Health, December 1989
Ihekona, Augustine E., Oklahoma City, OK, $21,084.61, Univ of Oklahoma Health Sciences Center, Oklahoma City, OK, Public Health, May 1985
Nnokam, Kennedy I., Oklahoma City, OK, $16,371.68, Univ of Oklahoma Health Sciences Center, Oklahoma City, OK, Public Health, May 1988

Oregon

Allopathic Medicine

Alcox, Gordon, Portland, OR, $52,920.07, Univ of Oklahoma Health Sciences Center, Oklahoma City, OK, Allopathic Medicine, June 1987
Durham, Maureen M., Milwaukie, OR, $54,461.95, Univ of Connecticut Health Center, Farmington, CT, Allopathic Medicine, May 1982
Stirgus, Kent L., Portland, OR, $36,857.01, Univ of Colorado Health Science Center, Denver, CO, Allopathic Medicine, May 1988
Zeme, Mark I., Ashland, OR, $6,195.41, Univ of Michigan, Ann Arbor, MI, Allopathic Medicine, May 1987

Chiropractic

Boyd, Patrick J., Eugene, OR, $108,271.25, Life College, Marietta, GA, Chiropractic, March 1986
Brown, Lorin J., Aloha, OR, $88,320.82, Los Angeles College of Chiropractic, Whittier, CA, Chiropractic, December 1987
Burns, Charles C., Gresham, OR, $50,097.29, Western States Chiropractic College, Portland, OR, Chiropractic, June 1986

Butcher, William C., Forest Grove, OR, $10,395.37, Western States Chiropractic College, Portland, OR, Chiropractic, June 1992
Campbell, Dennis L., Salem, OR, $55,837.97, Western States Chiropractic College, Portland, OR, Chiropractic, June 1986
Cather, Robert D., Portland, OR, $44,050.48, Western States Chiropractic College, Portland, OR, Chiropractic, June 1984
Clark, Dorothy, Aumsville, OR, $29,046.64, Western States Chiropractic College, Portland, OR, Chiropractic, June 1989
Coburn, Sarah H., Portland, OR, $39,857.32, Western States Chiropractic College, Portland, OR, Chiropractic, August 1985
Cooper, Steven M., Gresham, OR, $36,239.66, Western States Chiropractic College, Portland, OR, Chiropractic, December 1992
Crandell, Robyn G., Portland, OR, $22,826.60, Northwestern College of Chiropractic, Bloomington, MN, Chiropractic, June 1991
Drabik, Stephen, Ashland, OR, $24,011.42, Palmer College of Chiropractic West, San Jose, CA, Chiropractic, March 1988
Edson, Lysanji A., Portland, OR, $10,889.26, Palmer College of Chiropractic West, San Jose, CA, Chiropractic, September 1989
Falk, Harold S., Eugene, OR, $94,987.53, Los Angeles College of Chiropractic, Whittier, CA, Chiropractic, April 1986
Hempstead, Kenneth, Portland, OR, $72,326.60, Western States Chiropractic College, Portland, OR, Chiropractic, June 1987
Hicks, Brent M., Portland, OR, $16,426.31, Logan College of Chiropractic, Chesterfield, MO, Chiropractic, August 1986
Hundagen, Joyce M., Portland, OR, $32,866.64, Western States Chiropractic College, Portland, OR, Chiropractic, June 1987
Huntley, Norbert E., Portland, OR, $90,686.08, Los Angeles College of Chiropractic, Whittier, CA, Chiropractic, December 1987
Jones, Christine, Beaverton, OR, $51,461.73, Western States Chiropractic College, Portland, OR, Chiropractic, September 1988
King, Douglas R., Corbett, OR, $37,057.09, Western States Chiropractic College, Portland, OR, Chiropractic, June 1989
Martin, Thomas W., Portland, OR, $35,450.31, Western States Chiropractic College, Portland, OR, Chiropractic, December 1983
Matthews, Thalia P., Portland, OR, $22,164.81, Parker College of Chiropractic, Dallas, TX, Chiropractic, April 1986
Muhr, Frank F., Eugene, OR, $3,517.59, Los Angeles College of Chiropractic, Whittier, CA, Chiropractic, April 1988
Murphy, Shelia, Portland, OR, $52,947.32, Western States Chiropractic College, Portland, OR, Chiropractic, December 1987
Palmblad, Michael K., Hermiston, OR, $59,036.64, Western States Chiropractic College, Portland, OR, Chiropractic, December 1984
Platt, Caroline, Portland, OR, $30,547.57, Logan College of Chiropractic, Chesterfield, MO, Chiropractic, April 1988
Reehl, Michelle, Grants Pass, OR, $7,599.11, Palmer College of Chiropractic, Davenport, IA, Chiropractic, June 1982
Rolland, Steven B., Corvallis, OR, $129,040.75, Western States Chiropractic College, Portland, OR, Chiropractic, June 1986
Scofield, Leslie A., Eugene, OR, $3,471.88, Palmer College of Chiropractic, Davenport, IA, Chiropractic, June 1986
Sprauer, Vincent C., Milwaukie, OR, $6,377.63, Western States Chiropractic College, Portland, OR, Chiropractic, June 1986
Stoltz, William D., Grants Pass, OR, $48,561.95, Western States Chiropractic College, Portland, OR, Chiropractic, December 1984
Tarnasky, Gideon M., Salem, OR, $19,757.34, Western States Chiropractic College, Portland, OR, Chiropractic, December 1982
Templeton, Joel A., Portland, OR, $58,660.34, Western States Chiropractic College, Portland, OR, Chiropractic, June 1985
Warner, Brent B., Portland, OR, $60,205.23, Western States Chiropractic College, Portland, OR, Chiropractic, June 1985
West, Weldon, Portland, OR, $74,306.76, Western States Chiropractic College, Portland, OR, Chiropractic, June 1986
Wheeler, Trev, Ontario, OR, $103,642.69, Western States Chiropractic College, Portland, OR, Chiropractic, December 1988

Dentistry

Cooney, Carey, Beaverton, OR, $42,033.04, Oregon Health Science University, Portland, OR, Dentistry, June 1990
Tilson, Charles E., Lake Oswego, OR, $37,675.07, Washington University, St Louis, MO, Dentistry, May 1985

Podiatry

Alderson, James J., Boring, OR, $215,994.25, Ohio College of Podiatric Medicine, Cleveland, OH, Podiatry, May 1986
Bailey, Brian K., North Bend, OR, $153,857.15, California College of Podiatric Medicine, San Francisco, CA, Podiatry, May 1987
Belknap, John, Sandy, OR, $109,655.34, California College of Podiatric Medicine, San Francisco, CA, Podiatry, May 1988
Caproitti, Dale D., West Linn, OR, $157,963.76, Ohio College of Podiatric Medicine, Cleveland, OH, Podiatry, May 1982
Rizzi, Raymond, Portland, OR, $87,256.26, California College of Podiatric Medicine, San Francisco, CA, Podiatry, May 1991
Zook, Gerald P., Eugene, OR, $29,242.48, California College of Podiatric Medicine, San Francisco, CA, Podiatry, May 1983

Pennsylvania

Allopathic Medicine

Allison, Toni, Philadelphia, PA, $13,395.28, Temple University, Philadelphia, PA, Allopathic Medicine, June 1982
Auerbach-Heller, Barbara W., Philadelphia, PA, $91,391.42, Univ of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, PA, Allopathic Medicine, May 1983
Baumgarten, Miriam, Bala Cynwyd, PA, $11,550.96, Suny Stony Brook, Stony Brook, NY, Allopathic Medicine, June 1991
Bearden, Frank L., Pittsburgh, PA, $37,157.71, Rush University, Chicago, IL, Allopathic Medicine, December 1980
Benson, Glen N., Chester, PA, $23,753.32, Penn State University, Hershey, PA, Allopathic Medicine, May 1985
Davenport, Lorenzo, Philadelphia, PA, $75,942.05, Temple University, Philadelphia, PA, Allopathic Medicine, May 1985
Difrancesco, Eileen, Dunmore, PA, $90,728.35, Temple University, Philadelphia, PA, Allopathic Medicine, May 1989
Fisher, George E., Philadelphia, PA, $146,793.55, Thomas Jefferson University, Philadelphia, PA, Allopathic Medicine, June 1987
Garcia, Richard, Philadelphia, PA, $2,221.78, Univ of Med & Dent of New Jersey, Newark, NJ, Allopathic Medicine, May 1992
Gilroy, Anne F., Ardmore, PA, $128,201.95, Medical College of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, PA, Allopathic Medicine, June 1985
Guidotti, Janice L., Philadelphia, PA, $49,698.17, Hahnemann University, Philadelphia, PA, Allopathic Medicine, June 1986

Harris, John, Philadelphia, PA, $14,407.49, Hahnemann University, Philadelphia, PA, Allopathic Medicine, June 1988
Hawkins, William N., Philadelphia, PA, $81,344.55, Meharry Medical College, Nashville, TN, Allopathic Medicine, May 1989
Hicks, Eric, Philadelphia, PA, $16,196.32, Univ of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, PA, Allopathic Medicine, May 1987
Hill, James, Philadelphia, PA, $127,739.61, Meharry Medical College, Nashville, TN, Allopathic Medicine, May 1988
Howard, Leslie A., Philadelphia, PA, $60,583.01, Temple University, Philadelphia, PA, Allopathic Medicine, June 1988
Johnson, Howard D., Bridgeville, PA, $9,198.85, Penn State University, Hershey, PA, Allopathic Medicine, May 1990
Jones, Ronald M., Philadelphia, PA, $21,468.35, SUNY Buffalo, Buffalo, NY, Allopathic Medicine, June 1988
Kozikowski, Joseph, Media, PA, $9,473.19, Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, MD, Allopathic Medicine, May 1990
Lansky, Philip S., Philadelphia, PA, $43,955.58, Univ of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, PA, Allopathic Medicine, May 1982
Lott, Jacquecola, Philadelphia, PA, $178,267.42, Meharry Medical College, Nashville, TN, Allopathic Medicine, May 1986
Mamby, Audley, Philadelphia, PA, $158,381.67, Univ of Wisconsin Madison, Madison, WI, Allopathic Medicine, May 1986
McCormick, Timothy P., Pittsburgh, PA, $168,191.72, Hahnemann University, Philadelphia, PA, Allopathic Medicine, June 1985
Mills, Randell, Cochranville, PA, $64,142.15, Harvard Medical School, Boston, MA, Allopathic Medicine, June 1986
Mobley, Derrick, Philadelphia, PA, $100,800.35, Medical College of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, PA, Allopathic Medicine, May 1986
Mumie, Lawrence, Hazelton, PA, $23,837.94, Hahnemann University, Philadelphia, PA, Allopathic Medicine, June 1982
Peterson, Kirby K., Philadelphia, PA, $52,941.29, Univ of Illinois Medical Center, Chicago, IL, Allopathic Medicine, June 1989
Poleon, Mercedes L., Philadelphia, PA, $95,450.35, Hahnemann University, Philadelphia, PA, Allopathic Medicine, June 1986
Shepherd, Stuart J., Philadelphia, PA, $19,393.82, Stanford University, Stanford, CA, Allopathic Medicine, June 1989
Smith, Horatio L., Pittsburgh, PA, $9,591.91, Morehouse School of Medicine, Atlanta, GA, Allopathic Medicine, May 1990
Smith, Paulette M., Philadelphia, PA, $77,196.86, Medical College of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, PA, Allopathic Medicine, June 1989
Turnberg, Martha A., Stroudsburg, PA, $15,083.26, Medical College of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, PA, Allopathic Medicine, June 1982
Ward, Stephanie A., Philadelphia, PA, $5,901.39, Penn State University, Hershey, PA, Allopathic Medicine, May 1980

Chiropractic

Balan, William J., Bensalem, PA, $82,590.79, Texas Chiropractic College Foundation, Pasadena, TX, Chiropractic, May 1983
Bompiani, Cataldo, Dallastown, PA, $941.48, Palmer College of Chiropractic, Davenport, IA, Chiropractic, June 1984
Dinardo, Anthony A., Philadelphia, PA, $26,108.44, National College of Chiropractic, Lombard, IL, Chiropractic, April 1984
Failla, Robert R., Hazelton, PA, $22,547.58, New York Chiropractic College, Seneca Falls, NY, Chiropractic, December 1983
Goleburn, Joel, Pittsburgh, PA, $12,974.15, Los Angeles College of Chiropractic, Whittier, CA, Chiropractic, December 1983
Hanes, Robert B., King of Prussia, PA, $10,117.91, Palmer College of Chiropractic, Davenport, IA, Chiropractic, March 1984
Horne, Patricia A., Philadelphia, PA, $68,429.54, Cleveland Chiropractic College, Kansas City, MO, Chiropractic, May 1987
Labarre, Scott D., Bethleham, PA, $10,244.91, Palmer College of Chiropractic, Davenport, IA, Chiropractic, June 1986
MacDonald, Frank, Allentown, PA, $84,348.66, Life College, Marietta, GA, Chiropractic, December 1988
Mazero, Robert, Duncannon, PA, $98,347.96, Logan College of Chiropractic, Chesterfield, MO, Chiropractic, April 1984
Miller, John, Pittsburgh, PA, $32,281.70, Cleveland Chiropractic College, Kansas City, MO, Chiropractic, May 1987
Mistretta, John P., Hermitage, PA, $45,718.67, Palmer College of Chiropractic, Davenport, IA, Chiropractic, March 1988
Noll, Michael D., Chambersburg, PA, $50,915.94, Palmer College of Chiropractic, Davenport, IA, Chiropractic, December 1988
Norpel Jr, Joseph W., North Wales, PA, $71,471.01, Life College, Marietta, GA, Chiropractic, December 1985
Ragan, Howard W., Drexel Hill, PA, $6,638.60, Logan College of Chiropractic, Chesterfield, MO, Chiropractic, April 1986
Roebuck, James N., North Wales, PA, $62,369.63, Logan College of Chiropractic, Chesterfield, MO, Chiropractic, August 1985
Ross, Roger R., Wallingford, PA, $46,822.37, Logan College of Chiropractic, Chesterfield, MO, Chiropractic, August 1985
Saunders, James P., Wallingford, PA, $69,387.16, National College of Chiropractic, Lombard, IL, Chiropractic, May 1983
Savelli, Christine A., Bethleham, PA, $40,687.25, Life College, Marietta, GA, Chiropractic, December 1988
Solomon, Joy S., Pittsburgh, PA, $18,726.56, Life College, Marietta, GA, Chiropractic, March 1992
Stasko, Edward G., Pittsburgh, PA, $30,200.29, Palmer College of Chiropractic, Davenport, IA, Chiropractic, June 1984
Storer, John J., Camp Hill, PA, $45,714.28, Logan College of Chiropractic, Chesterfield, MO, Chiropractic, April 1986
Trodden, Scott, New Castle, PA, $25,195.31, Parker College of Chiropractic, Dallas, TX, Chiropractic, September 1991
Wachter, John P., Pittsburgh, PA, $64,762.43, Palmer College of Chiropractic, Davenport, IA, Chiropractic, September 1984
Waite, William C., Mcmurry, PA, $27,052.95, Texas Chiropractic College Foundation, Pasadena, TX, Chiropractic, May 1982
Wakefield, William C., Pittsburgh, PA, $3,103.59, Palmer College of Chiropractic, Davenport, IA, Chiropractic, June 1985
Waldman, Andrew D., Pittsburgh, PA, $28,255.10, Palmer College of Chiropractic, Davenport, IA, Chiropractic, March 1988
Warrick, Dennis, Ligonier, PA, $72,108.19, Life College, Marietta, GA, Chiropractic, September 1985
Wiegand, Paul J., Danville, PA, $29,507.74, Los Angeles College of Chiropractic, Whittier, CA, Chiropractic, April 1984

Clinical Psychology

Brando, Nora, Feasterville, PA, $80,417.61, Hahnemann University, Philadelphia, PA, Clinical Psychology, June 1990
Morris, Russell D., Philadelphia, PA, $35,511.18, Adelphi University,

Garden City, NY, Clinical Psychology, May 1988
Mouzon, Laquetta O., Philadelphia, PA, $15,520.19, Hahnemann University, Philadelphia, PA, Clinical Psychology, June 1988
Penny, Patricia, Perkasie, PA, $39,468.16, Yeshiva University, New York, NY, Clinical Psychology, June 1989

Dentistry

Alston-Davis, Diedra D., Pine Forge, PA, $81,553.60, Meharry Medical College, Nashville, TN, Dentistry, May 1983
Barnhart, Jerome, Pittsburgh, PA, $65,661.96, Univ of Pittsburgh, Pittsburgh, PA, Dentistry, June 1988
Baron, Lawrence, Philadelphia, PA, $71,426.41, Temple University, Philadelphia, PA, Dentistry, April 1990
Bartolazo, Arvin K., Philadelphia, PA, $118,267.17, Temple University, Philadelphia, PA, Dentistry, January 1989
Berger, David L., Wampum, PA, $37,979.79, Univ of Pittsburgh, Pittsburgh, PA, Dentistry, June 1988
Bigdeli, Javad, Penn Valley, PA, $20,366.13, Columbia University, New York, NY, Dentistry, May 1984
Browning, Lois E., Peach Bottom, PA, $38,779.86, Temple University, Philadelphia, PA, Dentistry, June 1985
Burne Jr, James P., Scranton, PA, $7,219.88, Georgetown University, Washington, DC, Dentistry, May 1989
Chacker, Laurence G., Philadelphia, PA, $32,516.82, Univ of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, PA, Dentistry, May 1985
Cieslik, Charles R., Millersburg, PA, $17,002.22, Temple University, Philadelphia, PA, Dentistry, June 1981
Gallucci, Don A., Scranton, PA, $52,141.03, Tufts University, Boston, MA, Dentistry, June 1986
Gordon, Wanda, Philadelphia, PA, $41,190.10, Univ of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, PA, Dentistry, May 1986
Harrison, Carl, Pittsburgh, PA, $21,552.78, Howard University, Washington, DC, Dentistry, May 1988
Henry, Randy S., Indiana, PA, $131,662.79, Univ of Pittsburgh, Pittsburgh, PA, Dentistry, June 1987
Hoppes, Elaine M., Philadelphia, PA, $66,676.09, Temple University, Philadelphia, PA, Dentistry, December 1986
Jackson, Pamela, Philadelphia, PA, $8,740.69, Virginia Commonwealth University, Richmond, VA, Dentistry, May 1984
Jeffries, Christian T., Elizabethtown, PA, $89,718.60, Case Western Reserve University, Cleveland, OH, Dentistry, May 1986
Koch, Robert E., Mars, PA, $91,810.83, Temple University, Philadelphia, PA, Dentistry, June 1988
Loughead, Thomas, Pittsburgh, PA, $88,800.51, Univ of Pittsburgh, Pittsburgh, PA, Dentistry, July 1989
McGettigan, Brian, Philadelphia, PA, $29,004.43, Temple University, Philadelphia, PA, Dentistry, June 1988
Meehan, Maureen T., Slatington, PA, $82,115.28, Temple University, Philadelphia, PA, Dentistry, June 1989
Miller, Alan A., Monroeville, PA, $6,577.68, Temple University, Philadelphia, PA, Dentistry, May 1982
Mitchell, Albert B., Philadelphia, PA, $59,143.75, Howard University, Washington, DC, Dentistry, May 1987
Mosley, Joan, Philadelphia, PA, $60,836.71, Howard University, Washington, DC, Dentistry, May 1988
Nuhfer-Dempsey, Dina L., Erie, PA, $33,038.19, Univ of Pittsburgh, Pittsburgh, PA, Dentistry, July 1986
Pacey, David, Enhaut, PA, $63,576.47, Univ of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, PA, Dentistry, June 1989
Patterson, Gregory A., Keisterville, PA, $17,259.55, Temple University, Philadelphia, PA, Dentistry, June 1987
Patterson, Grgory A., Kesterville, PA, $8,142.18, Temple University, Philadelphia, PA, Dentistry, June 1987
Pluto, Eugene, Greensburg, PA, $61,981.09, Univ of Pittsburgh, Pittsburgh, PA, Dentistry, August 1985
Powell, Carlton F., Cheltenham, PA, $39,827.66, Meharry Medical College, Nashville, TN, Dentistry, May 1988
Province, Susan L., Somerset, PA, $8,787.42, Univ of Pittsburgh, Pittsburgh, PA, Dentistry, June 1986
Schott, Alan J., Philadelphia, PA, $45,860.80, Temple University, Philadelphia, PA, Dentistry, December 1987
Semelsberger, Richard J., Philadelphia, PA, $19,584.86, Temple University, Philadelphia, PA, Dentistry, June 1983
Shaw, Linda J., Gladwyne, PA, $11,520.31, Temple University, Philadelphia, PA, Dentistry, May 1987
Tanski-Yudichak, Connie, Wilkes Barre, PA, $100,675.25, Temple University, Philadelphia, PA, Dentistry, June 1989
Terasavage, William, Pittsburgh, PA, $11,885.43, Univ of Pittsburgh, Pittsburgh, PA, Dentistry, August 1986
Toncini, Mark G., Freeport, PA, $41,391.97, Temple University, Philadelphia, PA, Dentistry, December 1981
Wasilko, Thomas J., Elizabeth, PA, $12,443.65, Georgetown University, Washington, DC, Dentistry, May 1982
Yudichak, John, Larkoville, PA, $119,111.73, Temple University, Philadelphia, PA, Dentistry, December 1987

Optometry

Barron, Timothy S., Erie, PA, $14,686.12, Pennsylvania College of Optometry, Philadelphia, PA, Optometry, May 1981

Osteopathy

Beitchman, Perry E., Philadelphia, PA, $26,398.91, Univ of Health Sciences, Kansas City, MO, Osteopathy, May 1988
Brenneis, Gerard, Sharon, PA, $27,347.69, Kirksville Col of Osteopathic Medicine, Kirksville, MO, Osteopathy, June 1987
Dubiel, Henry J., Feasterville, PA, $28,419.75, Philadelphia Col of Osteopathic Medicine, Philadelphia, PA, Osteopathy, June 1981
Hadley, Pamela, Philadelphia, PA, $25,108.41, Philadelphia Col of Osteopathic Medicine, Philadelphia, PA, Osteopathy, June 1985
Johnson, Lucinda, Philadelphia, PA, $13,769.62, Philadelphia Col of Osteopathic Medicine, Philadelphia, PA, Osteopathy, June 1990
Justofin, Chris D., West Hazleton, PA, $129,664.45, Univ of Health Sciences, Kansas City, MO, Osteopathy, May 1989

Pharmacy

Abanzukwe, Joy, Philadelphia, PA, $18,248.48, Philadelphia College Pharmacy & Science, Philadelphia, PA, Pharmacy, September 1987
Angel, Marilyn W., Greensburg, PA, $22,292.43, Univ of Pittsburgh, Pittsburgh, PA, Pharmacy, May 1987
Daniels, Ronald W, Philadelphia, PA, $10,902.97, Temple University, Philadelphia, PA, Pharmacy, June 1985
Dommermuth, Timothy, Erie, PA, $1,290.11, Philadelphia College Pharmacy & Science, Philadelphia, PA, Pharmacy, May 1981
Eichinger, Rosemarie R., Ridley Park, PA, $7,348.40, Philadelphia College Pharmacy & Science, Philadelphia, PA, Pharmacy, May 1984
Godwin, Lisa, Philadelphia, PA, $10,106.00, Philadelphia College Pharmacy & Science, Philadelphia, PA, Pharmacy, May 1987
Golock, Donna, Pittsburgh, PA, $9,019.13, Duquesne University, Pittsburgh, PA, Pharmacy, May 1986
Mras, Michael M., Northumberland, PA, $9,381.35, Idaho State University, Pocatello, ID, Pharmacy, May 1988

Nock, Thomas R., Philadelphia, PA, $83,916.70, Temple University, Philadelphia, PA, Pharmacy, June 1986
Rivers, Constance L., Philadelphia, PA, $4,144.39, Temple University, Philadelphia, PA, Pharmacy, May 1988
Shuda, Michael R., Bala Cynwyd, PA, $13,973.44, Temple University, Philadelphia, PA, Pharmacy, May 1988
Stanley, Carolyn, Philadelphia, PA, $63,514.02, Temple University, Philadelphia, PA, Pharmacy, June 1986
Vogel, Joseph, Enon Valley, PA, $44,832.11, Duquesne University, Pittsburgh, PA, Pharmacy, May 1987

Podiatry

Acello, Robert L., Philadelphia, PA, $54,827.02, Ohio College of Podiatric Medicine, Cleveland, OH, Podiatry, May 1986
Anderson, Gwendolyn, Philadelphia, PA, $21,850.28, Pennsylvania Col of Podiatric Medicine, Philadelphia, PA, Podiatry, June 1987
Bailey, Cynthia, Philadelphia, PA, $135,025.53, New York College of Podiatric Medicine, New York, NY, Podiatry, June 1989
Cooperman, Bruce, Philadelphia, PA, $131,466.82, Univ of Osteo Medical & Health Science, Des Moines, IA, Podiatry, June 1989
Danczak, Michael, Pottstown, PA, $33,323.29, Ohio College of Podiatric Medicine, Cleveland, OH, Podiatry, May 1984
Daniels, Patricia A., Philadelphia, PA, $107,230.22, Pennsylvania Col of Podiatric Medicine, Philadelphia, PA, Podiatry, June 1986
Frazier, Kathalyn G., Pittsburgh, PA, $168,042.93, Ohio College of Podiatric Medicine, Cleveland, OH, Podiatry, May 1986
Fusco, John, Bellefonte, PA, $55,624.62, Pennsylvania Col of Podiatric Medicine, Philadelphia, PA, Podiatry, June 1987
Ghaly, Wagih, Philadelphia, PA, $40,093.65, Pennsylvania Col of Podiatric Medicine, Philadelphia, PA, Podiatry, May 1990
Goldberg, Sheldon, Philadelphia, PA, $68,951.49, Pennsylvania Col of Podiatric Medicine, Philadelphia, PA, Podiatry, June 1981
Johnson, Lucille E., Dingmans Ferry, PA, $19,836.19, California College of Podiatric Medicine, San Francisco, CA, Podiatry, May 1992
Lauer, Richard L., York, PA, $290,322.60, California College of Podiatric Medicine, San Francisco, CA, Podiatry, June 1986
Lindley, Frank A., Philadelphia, PA, $16,348.72, Pennsylvania Col of Podiatric Medicine, Philadelphia, PA, Podiatry, June 1987
Ly, Hung Van H., Philadelphia, PA, $63,693.23, Pennsylvania Col of Podiatric Medicine, Philadelphia, PA, Podiatry, June 1985
Rosolowicz, Catherine, Pottstown, PA, $8,513.39, Ohio College of Podiatric Medicine, Cleveland, OH, Podiatry, May 1984
Rusnak, JeanMarie, Newtown, PA, $50,965.11, Pennsylvania Col of Podiatric Medicine, Philadelphia, PA, Podiatry, June 1986
Slome, Mark A., Philadelphia, PA, $7,351.39, New York College of Podiatric Medicine, New York, NY, Podiatry, June 1986
Ward, William F., Norristown, PA, $6,706.60, Pennsylvania Col of Podiatric Medicine, Philadelphia, PA, Podiatry, June 1989
Weitzen, Julie, Norristown, PA, $71.30, Pennsylvania Col of Podiatric Medicine, Philadelphia, PA, Podiatry, June 1987
Wildes, Ellen K., Dallas, PA, $80,759.61, California College of Podiatric Medicine, San Francisco, CA, Podiatry, August 1985

Public Health

Ditommaso, Richard, Pittsburgh, PA, $4,840.71, Univ of Pittsburgh, Pittsburgh, PA, Public Health, April 1986
Jeanbaptiste, Henriot, Pittsburgh, PA, $4,628.71, Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, MD, Public Health, June 1986
Lamothe, Lissa, Philadelphia, PA, $17,422.69, Tulane University, New Orleans, LA, Public Health, August 1989
Lee, Margaret, Pittsburgh, PA, $6,706.17, Yale University, New Haven, CT, Public Health, May 1990

Veterinary Medicine

Giles, Beverly, Philadelphia, PA, $8,958.69, Univ of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, PA, Veterinary Medicine, May 1988
Graf Ii, William R., Philadelphia, PA, $40,680.83, Univ of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, PA, Veterinary Medicine, May 1987
Henderson, Bernard, Philadelphia, PA, $6,301.92, Tuskegee University, Tuskegee, AL, Veterinary Medicine, May 1990

Puerto Rico

Allopathic Medicine

Caro, Joseph, Utuado, PR, $60,388.91, Medical College of Wisconsin, Milwaukee, WI, Allopathic Medicine, September 1984
Gutman, Jose E., Ponce, PR, $36,389.61, Universidad Central Del Caribe, Bayamon, PR, Allopathic Medicine, May 1988
Mercado, Brenda, Carolina, PR, $67,373.15, Universidad Central Del Caribe, Bayamon, PR, Allopathic Medicine, December 1988
Solivan Reyes, Samuel, Bayamon, PR, $78,268.93, Universidad Central Del Caribe, Bayamon, PR, Allopathic Medicine, December 1983
Vargas-Bird, Irma M., Bayamon, PR, $72,611.39, Universidad Central Del Caribe, Bayamon, PR, Allopathic Medicine, May 1988
Zabala, Armando, Rio Piedras, PR, $77,169.01, Univ of Illinois Medical Center, Chicago, IL, Allopathic Medicine, June 1985

Chiropractic

Nellen, Beatrice B., Ciudad Guatamal, PR, $87,910.43, Life College, Marietta, GA, Chiropractic, March 1985

Dentistry

Abreu-sirald, Carlos, Isabela, PR, $135,264.65, Boston University Medical Center, Boston, MA, Dentistry, May 1989
Claudio Vazquez, Jose, Caquao, PR, $12,123.81, Univ of Puerto Rico, San Juan, PR, Dentistry, May 1980
Colon-honda, Rafael E., Caguas, PR, $32,938.64, Univ of Puerto Rico, San Juan, PR, Dentistry, May 1983
Estrada-Escalona, Valerie R., San Juan, PR, $21,472.31, New York University, New York, NY, Dentistry, June 1993
Martinez, Gustavo, Guaynabo, PR, $6,346.43, Georgetown University, Washington, DC, Dentistry, May 1990
Martinez, Juan, Santa Isabel, PR, $27,152.01, Univ of Puerto Rico, San Juan, PR, Dentistry, June 1989
Medina-Pellicer, Norberto N., Rio Piedras, PR, $28,342.06, Univ of Puerto Rico, San Juan, PR, Dentistry, May 1982
Mullen, Francis D., Guaynabo, PR, $132,549.07, Univ of Puerto Rico, San Juan, PR, Dentistry, May 1982
Rogers, Larry B., Rincon, PR, $22,093.61, Univ of Mississippi Medical Center, Jackson, MS, Dentistry, May 1984
Rosario, Graciela, Cayey, PR, $10,007.74, Univ of Puerto Rico, San Juan, PR, Dentistry, May 1982
Sanchez, Francisco F. R., Los Lomas, PR, $9,674.24, Univ of Puerto Rico, San Juan, PR, Dentistry, May 1981
Vega-Godoy, Arlos A., Hato Rey, PR, $15,105.77, Univ of Puerto Rico, San Juan, PR, Dentistry, May 1980

Optometry

De Jesus, Jose M., San Juan, PR, $19,464.25, Inter American Univ of PR, San Juan, PR, Optometry, May 1987
Latorre, Victor L., Guayama, PR, $30,519.68, Inter American Univ of PR, San Juan, PR, Optometry, May 1987
Lopez-Aleman, Miguel, Truillo Alto, PR, $77,952.29, Inter American Univ of PR, San Juan, PR, Optometry, May 1989
Morales, Oscar, Valle Verde Bay, PR, $126,916.96, Inter American Univ of PR, San Juan, PR, Optometry, May 1987
Moreno, Fernando O., Catano, PR, $36,912.81, Inter American Univ of PR, San Juan, PR, Optometry, June 1985
Rivera, Axel E., Rio Piedras, PR, $62,618.07, Inter American Univ of PR, San Juan, PR, Optometry, May 1989
Rivera, Luis F., Rio Piedras, PR, $36,411.97, Inter American Univ of PR, San Juan, PR, Optometry, May 1988
Rivera, Olga, Guayama, PR, $47,575.19, Inter American Univ of PR, San Juan, PR, Optometry, June 1990
Rodriguez, Maria J., Mayaguez, PR, $33,946.60, Inter American Univ of PR, San Juan, PR, Optometry, May 1989
Soto-Medina, Barry D., Guaynabo, PR, $98,711.45, Inter American Univ of PR, San Juan, PR, Optometry, May 1985
Vanbrackle, Ismael I., Santurce, PR, $28,435.01, Inter American Univ of PR, San Juan, PR, Optometry, June 1985

Pharmacy

Oliver, Sonia, Coto Laurel, PR, $4,275.41, Long Island University, Brookville, NY, Pharmacy, June 1990

Podiatry

Rosado, Hector, Vista Alegre, PR, $36,498.54, Pennsylvania Col of Podiatric Medicine, Philadelphia, PA, Podiatry, June 1990

Public Health

Flores, Luis A., Coguaes, PR, $31,327.67, Univ of Pittsburgh, Pittsburgh, PA, Public Health, August 1983
Landron-Colberg, Eva, Rio Piedras, PR, $13,733.12, Univ of Puerto Rico, San Juan, PR, Public Health, May 1980

Veterinary Medicine

Carbo, Sandra, Canovanas, PR, $24,086.85, Tuskegee University, Tuskegee, AL, Veterinary Medicine, May 1986
Iriarte, Celestino M., Canovanas, PR, $83,563.79, Tuskegee University, Tuskegee, AL, Veterinary Medicine, May 1982

Rhode Island

Allopathic Medicine

Jones, Wendell, Providence, RI, $39,752.78, Univ of Med & Dent of New Jersey, Newark, NJ, Allopathic Medicine, May 1986

Health Administration

Tiemo, Vincent D., Providence, RI, $9,702.11, Xavier University, Cincinnati, OH, Health Administration, May 1988

Optometry

Estrada, Rolando, Providence, RI, $13,346.19, New England College of Optometry, Boston, MA, Optometry, May 1989

Pharmacy

Handren, Michelle S., Bristol, RI, $5,810.86, Massachusetts College of Pharmacy, Boston, MA, Pharmacy, June 1988

Veterinary Medicine

Ballou, Sarah, Providence, RI, $24,930.77, Univ of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, PA, Veterinary Medicine, May 1983

South Carolina

Allopathic Medicine

Burt, Joseph M., Myrtle Beach, SC, $36,476.30, Michigan State University, East Lansing, MI, Allopathic Medicine, June 1983
Caldwell, Judith, Summerville, SC, $82,009.97, Meharry Medical College, Nashville, TN, Allopathic Medicine, May 1985
Nobles, Patrick, Spartanburg, SC, $11,528.89, East Tennessee State University, Johnson City, TN, Allopathic Medicine, May 1983

Chiropractic

Badia, Raymond, Spartanburg, SC, $90,146.45, Life College, Marietta, GA, Chiropractic, June 1984
Barwick-Barnica, Janet M., Longs, SC, $3,124.62, Life College, Marietta, GA, Chiropractic, March 1991
Cuddington, Timothy J., Orangeburg, SC, $26,993.66, Life College, Marietta, GA, Chiropractic, December 1985
Garrett, Alex C., Mauldin, SC, $61,507.62, Life College, Marietta, GA, Chiropractic, March 1987
Heinen, Joseph E., Columbia, SC, $67,564.88, Life College, Marietta, GA, Chiropractic, June 1984
Shay, Robert J., Prosperity, SC, $135,052.58, Life College, Marietta, GA, Chiropractic, September 1986
Simon, Larry, Myrtle Beach, SC, $93,366.71, Life College, Marietta, GA, Chiropractic, December 1986
Taber, Stuart, Columbia, SC, $77,351.11, Life College, Marietta, GA, Chiropractic, December 1984
Woodward, Merre, Beaufort, SC, $22,158.08, Life College, Marietta, GA, Chiropractic, March 1991

Dentistry

Bailey, Angela, Florence, SC, $25,283.16, Univ of Louisville, Louisville, KY, Dentistry, May 1987
Dixson, David R., Columbia, SC, $212,781.51, Meharry Medical College, Nashville, TN, Dentistry, May 1986
Funderburk Jr, William A., Myrtle Beach, SC, $56,937.31, Medical University of South Carolina, Charleston, SC, Dentistry, May 1985
Mahon-Samuels, Brenda Y., Columbia, SC, $29,505.71, Howard University, Washington, DC, Dentistry, May 1982
Odom, James E., Sharon, SC, $39,627.64, Medical University of South Carolina, Charleston, SC, Dentistry, May 1981
Pelzer Jr, Lucious, Elloree, SC, $52,768.03, Meharry Medical College, Nashville, TN, Dentistry, May 1983
Thomas, Robert L., Spartanburg, SC, $34,169.47, Medical University of South Carolina, Charleston, SC, Dentistry, May 1990

Osteopathy

Brown, Kevin T., Fairfax, SC, $185,332.75, Univ of Health Sciences, Kansas City, MO, Osteopathy, May 1984

Podiatry

Bracey, Gale, Columbia, SC, $156,963.98, Ohio College of Podiatric Medicine, Cleveland, OH, Podiatry, May 1984
Foster, Martha E., Greenville, SC, $229,424.33, Univ of Osteo Medical & Health Science, Des Moines, IA, Podiatry, June 1987
Katalinich, Gery B., Myrtle Beach, SC, $118,056.87, California College of Podiatric Medicine, San Francisco, CA, Podiatry, May 1985
Salley, Hezekiah, Smoaks, SC, $127,683.35, Ohio College of Podiatric Medicine, Cleveland, OH, Podiatry, May 1983

Veterinary Medicine

Higgins, Leonard, Charleston, SC, $14,146.56, Tuskegee University, Tuskegee, AL, Veterinary Medicine, May 1986

South Dakota

Chiropractic

Adams, Nancy, Sioux Falls, SD, $29,046.61, Northwestern College of Chiropractic, Bloomington, MN, Chiropractic, April 1987

Gorsuch, Garry, Rapid City, SD, $32,041.16, Life Chiropractic College-West, San Lorenzo, CA, Chiropractic, September 1990

Health Administration

Lund, Peggy P., Sioux Falls, SD, $13,462.64, St Louis University, St Louis, MO, Health Administration, May 1985

Tennessee

Allopathic Medicine

Bogus, Britt, Knoxville, TN, $103,521.16, Meharry Medical College, Nashville, TN, Allopathic Medicine, May 1988

Braswell, James, Nashville, TN, $151,230.68, Meharry Medical College, Nashville, TN, Allopathic Medicine, May 1988

Chatman, David D., Antioch, TN, $51,175.14, Univ of Med & Dent of New Jersey, Newark, NJ, Allopathic Medicine, May 1983

Chevalier, Jovita A., Memphis, TN, $23,677.02, Meharry Medical College, Nashville, TN, Allopathic Medicine, May 1992

Collins, James E., Nashville, TN, $127,956.34, Meharry Medical College, Nashville, TN, Allopathic Medicine, May 1987

Conner, Shavetta D., Antioch, TN, $1,044.01, Meharry Medical College, Nashville, TN, Allopathic Medicine, May 1989

Davidson, Clifford M., Knoxville, TN, $47,409.29, Univ of Alabama Birmingham, Birmingham, AL, Allopathic Medicine, June 1986

Davis, Clarence, Nashville, TN, $30,034.74, Meharry Medical College, Nashville, TN, Allopathic Medicine, May 1989

Davis, Helen H M, Nashville, TN, $134,858.65, Meharry Medical College, Nashville, TN, Allopathic Medicine, May 1986

Duncan, Michael, Nashville, TN, $107,634.58, Meharry Medical College, Nashville, TN, Allopathic Medicine, May 1988

Dungee, Steven A., Nashville, TN, $4,251.59, Meharry Medical College, Nashville, TN, Allopathic Medicine, May 1990

Gaither, Thomas T., Nashville, TN, $172,073.92, Meharry Medical College, Nashville, TN, Allopathic Medicine, May 1986

Johnson, James, Nashville, TN, $153,109.93, Meharry Medical College, Nashville, TN, Allopathic Medicine, May 1986

Johnson-Jenkins, Yvonne M., Nashville, TN, $130,945.66, Meharry Medical College, Nashville, TN, Allopathic Medicine, May 1986

Jubert, Angela, Nashville, TN, $30,829.50, Meharry Medical College, Nashville, TN, Allopathic Medicine, May 1990

Latimer, Harvey L., Nashville, TN, $146,854.76, Meharry Medical College, Nashville, TN, Allopathic Medicine, May 1986

Morales, Orlando, Smyrna, TN, $126,650.88, Meharry Medical College, Nashville, TN, Allopathic Medicine, May 1987

Nicks, Robbin M., Hermitage, TN, $167,202.49, Meharry Medical College, Nashville, TN, Allopathic Medicine, May 1986

Pettigrew, Francis, Chattanooga, TN, $6,442.81, Univ of Tennessee Memphis, Memphis, TN, Allopathic Medicine, June 1987

Pratt, Ninette R., Bolivar, TN, $132,777.00, Meharry Medical College, Nashville, TN, Allopathic Medicine, May 1986

Saunders, Robert D., Kingsport, TN, $9,160.08, East Tennessee State University, Johnson City, TN, Allopathic Medicine, May 1989

See, Tahnya D., Antioch, TN, $51,995.68, Case Western Reserve University, Cleveland, OH, Allopathic Medicine, June 1982

Shannon, Joan H., Nashville, TN, $1,952.88, Tufts University, Boston, MA, Allopathic Medicine, May 1983

Smith, Larry W., Antioch, TN, $97,192.99, Meharry Medical College, Nashville, TN, Allopathic Medicine, May 1986

Sparrow, Alj F., Nashville, TN, $110,184.70, Meharry Medical College, Nashville, TN, Allopathic Medicine, May 1987

Stewart, Barry A., Knoxville, TN, $9,627.05, Univ of Tennessee Memphis, Memphis, TN, Allopathic Medicine, June 1987

Walker, Brian E., Nashville, TN, $3,051.55, Meharry Medical College, Nashville, TN, Allopathic Medicine, May 1990

Williams, Pamela C., Antioch, TN, $89,303.31, Meharry Medical College, Nashville, TN, Allopathic Medicine, May 1981

Wimbish, Ronald P., Nashville, TN, $169,163.06, Meharry Medical College, Nashville, TN, Allopathic Medicine, May 1987

Woodard, Deborah A., McKenzie, TN, $233,709.80, Meharry Medical College, Nashville, TN, Allopathic Medicine, May 1986

Chiropractic

Carter, Karen L., Nashville, TN, $34,364.40, Logan College of Chiropractic, Chesterfield, MO, Chiropractic, September 1985

Consiglio, Joseph S., Fairfield, TN, $48,001.22, Life College, Marietta, GA, Chiropractic, June 1990

Crislip, David F., Johnson City, TN, $102,849.67, Palmer College of Chiropractic, Davenport, IA, Chiropractic, October 1986

Haley, Jane E., Fayetteville, TN, $15,647.38, Life College, Marietta, GA, Chiropractic, March 1988

Hill, Cecil, Knoxville, TN, $3,773.72, Life College, Marietta, GA, Chiropractic, March 1991

Johnson, Steven R., Eva, TN, $41,984.43, Palmer College of Chiropractic, Davenport, IA, Chiropractic, March 1985

Lowe, Joseph L., Cleveland, TN, $44,392.90, Life College, Marietta, GA, Chiropractic, June 1983

Moore, Charles, Adamsville, TN, $64,925.44, Parker College of Chiropractic, Dallas, TX, Chiropractic, December 1987

Nelson, Michael W., Sparta, TN, $61,247.22, Palmer College of Chiropractic, Davenport, IA, Chiropractic, June 1985

Patterson, Larry D., Oak Ridge, TN, $12,265.61, Logan College of Chiropractic, Chesterfield, MO, Chiropractic, September 1985

Reid, Henry, Dayton, TN, $55,470.64, Life College, Marietta, GA, Chiropractic, June 1988

Shafer Jr, Joseph E., Goodlettsville, TN, $15,407.15, Life College, Marietta, GA, Chiropractic, September 1985

Williams Jr, Samuel L., Cleveland, TN, $108,113.04, Life College, Marietta, GA, Chiropractic, September 1984

Yates, Jay M., Nashville, TN, $95,337.29, Palmer College of Chiropractic West, San Jose, CA, Chiropractic, September 1986

Clinical Psychology

Keck, Julie N., Nashville, TN, $88,277.68, California Sch of Prof Psych San Diego, San Diego, CA, Clinical Psychology, May 1989

King, Wanda W., Bolivar, TN, $46,688.39, Wright State University, Dayton, OH, Clinical Psychology, August 1986

Dentistry

Black, Jacquese O., Antioch, TN, $70,180.61, Meharry Medical College, Nashville, TN, Dentistry, May 1991

Branch, Joerald D., Memphis, TN, $2,972.42, Meharry Medical College, Nashville, TN, Dentistry, May 1989
Coggins, Cheryl, Antioch, TN, $103,348.53, Meharry Medical College, Nashville, TN, Dentistry, May 1987
Cowan, Walter O., Antioch, TN, $203,127.75, Meharry Medical College, Nashville, TN, Dentistry, May 1986
Davis, Edward E., Memphis, TN, $6,344.60, Meharry Medical College, Nashville, TN, Dentistry, May 1983
Dickinson-Branch, Phyllis A., Bartlett, TN, $68,889.89, Meharry Medical College, Nashville, TN, Dentistry, May 1986
Felder, Harry, Hendersonville, TN, $188,762.29, Meharry Medical College, Nashville, TN, Dentistry, May 1985
Flint, Bryan A., Jonesborough, TN, $19,485.01, Univ of Tennessee Memphis, Memphis, TN, Dentistry, June 1984
Franklin, Gilbert L., Memphis, TN, $40,154.14, Meharry Medical College, Nashville, TN, Dentistry, May 1980
Gilliam III, Ira H., Nashville, TN, $52,606.80, Meharry Medical College, Nashville, TN, Dentistry, May 1983
Gipson, Samuel D., Memphis, TN, $34,852.48, Meharry Medical College, Nashville, TN, Dentistry, May 1980
Jones, Vincent, Knoxville, TN, $88,048.27, Meharry Medical College, Nashville, TN, Dentistry, May 1982
Lemorrocco, Belinda, Memphis, TN, $8,217.41, Univ of Tennessee Memphis, Memphis, TN, Dentistry, June 1987
Little, Deider Tanner, Nashville, TN, $204,410.26, Meharry Medical College, Nashville, TN, Dentistry, May 1984
Long, Larry L., Murfreesboro, TN, $16,889.30, Univ of Tennessee Memphis, Memphis, TN, Dentistry, June 1988
Mulhollen, Kelli, Memphis, TN, $27,991.50, Univ of Tennessee Memphis, Memphis, TN, Dentistry, June 1991
Parks, Anita, Nashville, TN, $8,996.77, Meharry Medical College, Nashville, TN, Dentistry, December 1991
Ray, Timothy H., Cleveland, TN, $9,515.20, West Virginia University, Morgantown, WV, Dentistry, August 1985
Rudder, David P., Knoxville, TN, $44,868.88, Univ of Tennessee Memphis, Memphis, TN, Dentistry, June 1985
Westbrook, Fred, Nashville, TN, $52,749.88, Meharry Medical College, Nashville, TN, Dentistry, May 1986
Winfrey, Willie, Nashville, TN, $70,982.69, Meharry Medical College, Nashville, TN, Dentistry, May 1980

Optometry

Venanzio, David, Memphis, TN, $65,053.15, Southern College of Optometry, Memphis, TN, Optometry, May 1991

Pharmacy

Hamby, Michael L., Murfreesboro, TN, $3,417.54, Univ of Tennessee Memphis, Memphis, TN, Pharmacy, June 1988

Podiatry

Baggett, Larry D., Memphis, TN, $108,505.90, Dr William Scholl Col of Podiatric Med, Chicago, IL, Podiatry, May 1983
Huff, Gregory E., Nashville, TN, $26,071.40, Dr William Scholl Col of Podiatric Med, Chicago, IL, Podiatry, May 1990

Veterinary Medicine

Edward, James, Millington, TN, $6,389.96, Mississippi State University, Mississippi State, MS, Veterinary Medicine, May 1988

Texas

Allopathic Medicine

Adams, Gerald F., Houston, TX, $4,976.70, Univ of Texas, Houston, TX, Allopathic Medicine, June 1989
Allen, David B., Texarkana, TX, $22,816.06, Univ of Texas Hlth Sci Cntr San Antonio, San Antonio, TX, Allopathic Medicine, May 1984
Baker, Donnie W., League City, TX, $102,066.41, Meharry Medical College, Nashville, TN, Allopathic Medicine, May 1988
Barrera, Adrian, Laredo, TX, $11,495.31, Univ of Texas Southwestern Medical Cntr, Dallas, TX, Allopathic Medicine, May 1991
Behringer, George M., Houston, TX, $8,235.77, Univ of Texas, Houston, TX, Allopathic Medicine, May 1991
Berry, James E., Galveston, TX, $19,093.08, Univ of Texas Medical Branch Galveston, Galveston, TX, Allopathic Medicine, May 1986
Brauer, Bodo, Beaumont, TX, $18,188.45, Univ of Texas Medical Branch Galveston, Galveston, TX, Allopathic Medicine, May 1986
Brown, Lisa L., Houston, TX, $7,136.17, Univ of Illinois Medical Center, Chicago, IL, Allopathic Medicine, June 1991
Brown, William, Houston, TX, $6,723.88, Univ of Texas Southwestern Medical Cntr, Dallas, TX, Allopathic Medicine, June 1987
Bryant, Edith, Houston, TX, $12,895.06, Univ of Texas Southwestern Medical Cntr, Dallas, TX, Allopathic Medicine, May 1991
Byrd, Bruce, Amarillo, TX, $4,502.73, Univ of Texas Southwestern Medical Cntr, Dallas, TX, Allopathic Medicine, June 1988
Choi, Yun S., College Station, TX, $9,458.43, Louisiana St Univ Med Ctr New Orleans, New Orleans, LA, Allopathic Medicine, May 1990
Compass, Sairwaa T., Austin, TX, $9,625.89, Univ of Texas Southwestern Medical Cntr, Dallas, TX, Allopathic Medicine, June 1989
Davis, Kenneth A., Austin, TX, $44,597.00, Univ of Texas Hlth Sci Cntr San Antonio, San Antonio, TX, Allopathic Medicine, May 1990
Douglas Jr, Hermon H., De Soto, TX, $97,783.67, Meharry Medical College, Nashville, TN, Allopathic Medicine, May 1982
Edwards, Mary M., Arlington, TX, $35,533.11, Univ of Pittsburgh, Pittsburgh, PA, Allopathic Medicine, June 1986
Ellis, Cynthia, Austin, TX, $119,702.07, Meharry Medical College, Nashville, TN, Allopathic Medicine, May 1985
Emerson, Timothy J., San Angelo, TX, $65,488.39, Univ of Texas Medical Branch Galveston, Galveston, TX, Allopathic Medicine, May 1984
Foster, Roderic W., Dallas, TX, $9,571.99, Univ of Texas Southwestern Medical Cntr, Dallas, TX, Allopathic Medicine, June 1983
Fuller, Michael A., Galveston, TX, $84,512.05, Univ of Texas Medical Branch Galveston, Galveston, TX, Allopathic Medicine, May 1984
Green Jr, Kenneth W., Hurst, TX, $54,449.08, Univ of Texas Medical Branch Galveston, Galveston, TX, Allopathic Medicine, May 1986
Gutierrez, Oscar V., Laredo, TX, $12,542.20, Univ of Texas Southwestern Medical Cntr, Dallas, TX, Allopathic Medicine, June 1987
Guzman, Johnny E., Burleson, TX, $69,035.72, Medical College of Wisconsin, Milwaukee, WI, Allopathic Medicine, February 1986
Harding, Phyllis D., Wichita Falls, TX, $66,182.77, Univ of Cincinnati, Cincinnati, OH, Allopathic Medicine, June 1984
Heindel, Terry J., Houston, TX, $3,050.49, Univ of Mississippi Medical Center, Jackson, MS, Allopathic Medicine, June 1991
Hicks, Gilbert, Austin, TX, $37,260.32, Univ of Texas Medical Branch Galveston, Galveston, TX, Allopathic Medicine, May 1988
King, Lewis, Dallas, TX, $16,913.90, Univ of Arkansas Medical Center,

Little Rock, AR, Allopathic Medicine, May 1990
Lewis, Michael, Houston, TX, $69,857.41, Univ of Texas Medical Branch Galveston, Galveston, TX, Allopathic Medicine, May 1989
Liegel, Joyce, Houston, TX, $30,104.39, Univ of Texas, Houston, TX, Allopathic Medicine, June 1985
Luu, Kham N., Houston, TX, $6,167.94, Univ of Texas Medical Branch Galveston, Galveston, TX, Allopathic Medicine, May 1989
Mannino, Troy, Katy, TX, $9,596.74, Univ of Texas, Houston, TX, Allopathic Medicine, May 1988
Marek, Michael, Cedar Park, TX, $58,155.72, Univ of Texas, Houston, TX, Allopathic Medicine, May 1988
Mayorgo, Gilbert, Houston, TX, $128,658.70, Univ of Texas Medical Branch Galveston, Galveston, TX, Allopathic Medicine, June 1987
Metcalf, Edmund, Medina, TX, $25,998.19, Univ of Texas Hlth Sci Cntr San Antonio, San Antonio, TX, Allopathic Medicine, May 1991
Moseley, Clarence D., Houston, TX, $26,702.85, Univ of Texas Medical Branch Galveston, Galveston, TX, Allopathic Medicine, May 1987
Novetsky, Jerry J., Plano, TX, $34,710.44, Wayne State University, Detroit, MI, Allopathic Medicine, June 1985
Ortiz, Tomas, Houston, TX, $38,919.48, Universidad Central Del Caribe, Bayamon, PR, Allopathic Medicine, December 1987
Parkin, Dianne, Houston, TX, $14,304.64, Univ of Texas Hlth Sci Cntr San Antonio, San Antonio, TX, Allopathic Medicine, May 1993
Penick, Larry, Houston, TX, $2,401.03, Loyola University Chicago, Maywood, IL, Allopathic Medicine, June 1983
Petty, Jay, Longview, TX, $10,628.32, Univ of Arkansas Medical Center, Little Rock, AR, Allopathic Medicine, May 1988
Pickett, Jan J., Farmers Branch, TX, $6,177.41, Univ of Texas Southwestern Medical Cntr, Dallas, TX, Allopathic Medicine, June 1986
Porras, Jose, El Paso, TX, $169,647.49, Medical College of Wisconsin, Milwaukee, WI, Allopathic Medicine, May 1984
Reddix-Norman, Irance E., Missouri City, TX, $28,655.42, Howard University, Washington, DC, Allopathic Medicine, May 1986
Rollins, John, Amarillo, TX, $13,289.97, Texas Tech University Health Sci Center, Lubbock, TX, Allopathic Medicine, May 1982
Rosales, Anna M., Hondo, TX, $58,382.63, Univ of Texas Medical Branch Galveston, Galveston, TX, Allopathic Medicine, May 1988
Schulz, Eric, The Woodlands, TX, $4,822.54, Univ of Texas, Houston, TX, Allopathic Medicine, June 1988
Starnes, Willis L., Irving, TX, $22,995.36, Univ of Texas Medical Branch Galveston, Galveston, TX, Allopathic Medicine, June 1982
Tessmer, John, Brownwood, TX, $68,208.35, Univ of Texas Medical Branch Galveston, Galveston, TX, Allopathic Medicine, May 1983
Tihfon, Pierre M., Houston, TX, $23,569.06, Univ of Oklahoma Health Sciences Center, Oklahoma City, OK, Allopathic Medicine, May 1987
Tran, Truc V., Houston, TX, $1,893.43, Univ of Texas Medical Branch Galveston, Galveston, TX, Allopathic Medicine, May 1989
Uri, John J., Bellaire, TX, $10,532.87, Univ of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, PA, Allopathic Medicine, May 1987
Victorianne, Albert A., Houston, TX, $43,501.44, Tulane University, New Orleans, LA, Allopathic Medicine, June 1983
Wilson, Alan K., Houston, TX, $2,036.06, Univ of Texas Medical Branch Galveston, Galveston, TX, Allopathic Medicine, May 1989
Wolf, Philip L., San Antonio, TX, $21,937.83, Univ of Texas Medical Branch Galveston, Galveston, TX, Allopathic Medicine, June 1985
Woodhouse, Juanita, De Soto, TX, $15,146.32, Univ of Oklahoma Health Sciences Center, Oklahoma City, OK, Allopathic Medicine, June 1990
Wright, Billy, Tyler, TX, $25,554.02, Univ of South Dakota, Sioux Falls, SD, Allopathic Medicine, July 1980
Zavala, Alfonso G., Houston, TX, $191,704.14, Meharry Medical College, Nashville, TN, Allopathic Medicine, May 1987

Chiropractic

Adams, Stephen, Friendswood, TX, $71,726.56, Texas Chiropractic College Foundation, Pasadena, TX, Chiropractic, April 1989
Allison, Dwaine M., Fort Worth, TX, $2,566.83, Texas Chiropractic College Foundation, Pasadena, TX, Chiropractic, December 1985
Alshouse, Luanne, Terrell, TX, $51,828.65, Cleveland Chiropractic College, Kansas City, MO, Chiropractic, January 1986
Amma-Lesrine, Vashti, Crosby, TX, $31,050.94, Texas Chiropractic College Foundation, Pasadena, TX, Chiropractic, August 1988
Augustus, Michael, La Marque, TX, $50,185.73, Texas Chiropractic College Foundation, Pasadena, TX, Chiropractic, March 1986
Bailey, John L., Channelview, TX, $68,567.44, Texas Chiropractic College Foundation, Pasadena, TX, Chiropractic, December 1989
Barnett, Brian D., Webster, TX, $91,469.86, Texas Chiropractic College Foundation, Pasadena, TX, Chiropractic, April 1987
Benton, Craig R., Lampasas, TX, $43,830.51, Texas Chiropractic College Foundation, Pasadena, TX, Chiropractic, December 1985
Beyer, Floyd E., Port Arthur, TX, $72,515.68, Cleveland Chiropractic College, Kansas City, MO, Chiropractic, January 1989
Blount, Steve A., De Soto, TX, $8,319.16, Palmer College of Chiropractic, Davenport, IA, Chiropractic, February 1991
Bonner, Michael, Houston, TX, $58,738.33, Texas Chiropractic College Foundation, Pasadena, TX, Chiropractic, April 1991
Borst, Brenda J., Arlington, TX, $6,757.31, Parker College of Chiropractic, Dallas, TX, Chiropractic, April 1986
Brand, Rodney, Fort Worth, TX, $23,173.36, Texas Chiropractic College Foundation, Pasadena, TX, Chiropractic, May 1983
Brittain, Jeffrey D., Houston, TX, $78,801.96, Texas Chiropractic College Foundation, Pasadena, TX, Chiropractic, December 1987
Broadwell, Teri A., Irving, TX, $103,319.39, Parker College of Chiropractic, Dallas, TX, Chiropractic, May 1989
Brown, Darla, Highlands, TX, $45,653.19, Texas Chiropractic College Foundation, Pasadena, TX, Chiropractic, December 1990
Broze, Rory, Austin, TX, $64,027.09, Texas Chiropractic College Foundation, Pasadena, TX, Chiropractic, May 1984
Bryant, Clifford, Greenville, TX, $59,873.60, Life College, Marietta, GA, Chiropractic, March 1987
Calhoun, Lynn, Austin, TX, $19,824.55, Palmer College of Chiropractic, Davenport, IA, Chiropractic, December 1984
Calixto, Flavio, Irving, TX, $95,752.59, Cleveland Chiropractic College, Kansas City, MO, Chiropractic, January 1988
Cannon, Dennis, Lewisville, TX, $42,369.29, Cleveland Chiropractic College, Kansas City, MO, Chiropractic, January 1986
Carlin, Susan, San Antonio, TX, $113,918.33, Cleveland Chiropractic College, Kansas City, MO, Chiropractic, May 1986
Cathcart, Richard, Pasadena, TX, $31,250.31, Texas Chiropractic College Foundation, Pasadena, TX, Chiropractic, December 1985

Centola, Robert, Richardson, TX, $45,982.44, New York Chiropractic College, Seneca Falls, NY, Chiropractic, April 1989
Cleere, Carrol E., Red Oak, TX, $67,990.67, Palmer College of Chiropractic, Davenport, IA, Chiropractic, June 1985
Daniell, Larry L., Houston, TX, $108,014.81, Los Angeles College of Chiropractic, Whittier, CA, Chiropractic, April 1984
Davis, George G., Dallas, TX, $20,234.66, Texas Chiropractic College Foundation, Pasadena, TX, Chiropractic, May 1983
Dean, J C, Dickinson, TX, $60,555.57, Texas Chiropractic College Foundation, Pasadena, TX, Chiropractic, December 1986
Delay, Patricia A., Houston, TX, $17,061.24, Texas Chiropractic College Foundation, Pasadena, TX, Chiropractic, December 1989
Dickey, Jerry, Richardson, TX, $80,426.55, Parker College of Chiropractic, Dallas, TX, Chiropractic, September 1988
Dodd, Daniel J., Missouri City, TX, $17,974.88, Texas Chiropractic College Foundation, Pasadena, TX, Chiropractic, May 1982
Dodson, Mason, Tyler, TX, $106,003.70, Texas Chiropractic College Foundation, Pasadena, TX, Chiropractic, April 1989
Durham, Ricky R., Houston, TX, $123,548.00, Texas Chiropractic College Foundation, Pasadena, TX, Chiropractic, August 1986
Duvall, Dalace, Houston, TX, $31,250.94, Parker College of Chiropractic, Dallas, TX, Chiropractic, January 1992
Dyess, Stephen J., Deer Park, TX, $113,487.29, Texas Chiropractic College Foundation, Pasadena, TX, Chiropractic, April 1987
Eastman, Donald W., Mesquite, TX, $61,422.48, Texas Chiropractic College Foundation, Pasadena, TX, Chiropractic, April 1988
Eaves, Donald G., Houston, TX, $99,705.97, Texas Chiropractic College Foundation, Pasadena, TX, Chiropractic, December 1987
Ellis, Robert, Terrell, TX, $52,296.34, Cleveland Chiropractic College, Kansas City, MO, Chiropractic, January 1986
Fagan, Darrell, Seabrook, TX, $60,614.09, Texas Chiropractic College Foundation, Pasadena, TX, Chiropractic, December 1987
Ferguson, James D., Cedar Park, TX, $94,787.78, Palmer College of Chiropractic, Davenport, IA, Chiropractic, March 1984
Font, David, Lubbock, TX, $70,199.10, Palmer College of Chiropractic, Davenport, IA, Chiropractic, October 1989
Fridman, Olga O., Houston, TX, $16,272.94, Texas Chiropractic College Foundation, Pasadena, TX, Chiropractic, April 1988
German, John V., Houston, TX, $44,903.14, Texas Chiropractic College Foundation, Pasadena, TX, Chiropractic, May 1985
Glenn, Michael, Duncanville, TX, $119,246.15, Texas Chiropractic College Foundation, Pasadena, TX, Chiropractic, April 1988
Goebel, Michale L., Houston, TX, $62,272.05, Texas Chiropractic College Foundation, Pasadena, TX, Chiropractic, April 1988
Gutierrez, Celso, Houston, TX, $10,085.36, Texas Chiropractic College Foundation, Pasadena, TX, Chiropractic, August 1993
Haney, Sylvia, Orange, TX, $37,339.35, Cleveland Chiropractic College, Kansas City, MO, Chiropractic, January 1985
Harding, James, Dripping Springs, TX, $20,101.22, Western States Chiropractic College, Portland, OR, Chiropractic, March 1989
Harris, Scott, Dallas, TX, $40,500.74, Parker College of Chiropractic, Dallas, TX, Chiropractic, May 1989
Harvey, Robert L., Bridgeport, TX, $80,339.95, Parker College of Chiropractic, Dallas, TX, Chiropractic, April 1988
Hendricks, Craig C., Dallas, TX, $30,212.13, Palmer College of Chiropractic, Davenport, IA, Chiropractic, March 1985
Herrington, Tommy L., Pasadena, TX, $36,825.14, Texas Chiropractic College Foundation, Pasadena, TX, Chiropractic, April 1988
Hetzel, Williams A., Itasca, TX, $136,353.57, Cleveland Chiropractic College, Kansas City, MO, Chiropractic, January 1986
Hill, Michael J., Pasadena, TX, $23,429.87, Texas Chiropractic College Foundation, Pasadena, TX, Chiropractic, April 1984
Kennedy, Michael, Conroe, TX, $104,157.65, Texas Chiropractic College Foundation, Pasadena, TX, Chiropractic, December 1987
Kirk Sr, Jack H., Dickinson, TX, $42,718.89, Texas Chiropractic College Foundation, Pasadena, TX, Chiropractic, May 1984
Lall, Len L., Rockwall, TX, $52,201.46, Texas Chiropractic College Foundation, Pasadena, TX, Chiropractic, May 1984
Landsiedel, Randy J., Irving, TX, $100,264.70, Western States Chiropractic College, Portland, OR, Chiropractic, May 1988
Mackin, Cheryl L., Austin, TX, $54,558.54, Texas Chiropractic College Foundation, Pasadena, TX, Chiropractic, December 1988
Manning-Pinotti, Katherine W., Houston, TX, $112,597.46, Texas Chiropractic College Foundation, Pasadena, TX, Chiropractic, December 1986
Maples II, John L., Fort Worth, TX, $88,934.87, Cleveland Chiropractic College, Kansas City, MO, Chiropractic, May 1986
Maples, Thomas J., Mesquite, TX, $36,430.55, Logan College of Chiropractic, Chesterfield, MO, Chiropractic, September 1985
Martin, David, Floydada, TX, $95,947.43, Life College, Marietta, GA, Chiropractic, December 1986
McAdams, Glen R., Conroe, TX, $30,042.10, Texas Chiropractic College Foundation, Pasadena, TX, Chiropractic, April 1990
McCuan, Kathy A, Austin, TX, $910.62, Logan College of Chiropractic, Chesterfield, MO, Chiropractic, April 1983
McLain, Burton B., Hempstead, TX, $27,678.14, Texas Chiropractic College Foundation, Pasadena, TX, Chiropractic, May 1985
McLain, Marilyn, Hempstead, TX, $33,929.20, Texas Chiropractic College Foundation, Pasadena, TX, Chiropractic, May 1985
Metcalf, Roy L., Fort Worth, TX, $115,684.62, Life College, Marietta, GA, Chiropractic, December 1987
Montanari, Arthur M., La Porte, TX, $102,563.70, Texas Chiropractic College Foundation, Pasadena, TX, Chiropractic, April 1988
Morgan, Glenn R., Arlington, TX, $66,529.18, Parker College of Chiropractic, Dallas, TX, Chiropractic, September 1989
Morgan, Shirley, Houston, TX, $3,911.16, Texas Chiropractic College Foundation, Pasadena, TX, Chiropractic, December 1988
Moses, Michael J., Kingwood, TX, $50,019.26, Texas Chiropractic College Foundation, Pasadena, TX, Chiropractic, December 1985
Munson, Herbert, Houston, TX, $45,034.37, Texas Chiropractic College Foundation, Pasadena, TX, Chiropractic, December 1986
Nguyen, Ho H., Houston, TX, $35,615.38, Texas Chiropractic College Foundation, Pasadena, TX, Chiropractic, December 1990
Oliver, Monte, Lindale, TX, $41,005.47, Parker College of Chiropractic, Dallas, TX, Chiropractic, August 1987
Owen, Gary, Lubbock, TX, $39,563.63, Logan College of Chiropractic, Chesterfield, MO, Chiropractic, December 1986

Parry, William A., Houston, TX, $17,127.67, Texas Chiropractic College Foundation, Pasadena, TX, Chiropractic, June 1984
Pinotti, Jeffrey, Houston, TX, $82,916.58, Texas Chiropractic College Foundation, Pasadena, TX, Chiropractic, August 1986
Plaster, Michael, Fort Worth, TX, $37,633.63, Parker College of Chiropractic, Dallas, TX, Chiropractic, December 1987
Pouralis, Behzad M., Pasadena, TX, $47,936.40, Texas Chiropractic College Foundation, Pasadena, TX, Chiropractic, December 1989
Primeaux, Chrstopher, Texarkana, TX, $86,701.28, Texas Chiropractic College Foundation, Pasadena, TX, Chiropractic, December 1988
Quadlander, Michael E., Houston, TX, $63,143.44, Texas Chiropractic College Foundation, Pasadena, TX, Chiropractic, April 1988
Real, Vernon D., Pasadena, TX, $107,159.72, Texas Chiropractic College Foundation, Pasadena, TX, Chiropractic, December 1988
Reaume, David G., Odessa, TX, $92,068.07, Texas Chiropractic College Foundation, Pasadena, TX, Chiropractic, April 1986
Reece, Deward F., Corpus Christi, TX, $22,608.30, Texas Chiropractic College Foundation, Pasadena, TX, Chiropractic, May 1982
Reynolds, Charlotte M., Houston, TX, $94,241.50, Texas Chiropractic College Foundation, Pasadena, TX, Chiropractic, April 1986
Rhine, Cecil T., Cleveland, TX, $75,791.74, Texas Chiropractic College Foundation, Pasadena, TX, Chiropractic, April 1988
Riley, Rock, Canton, TX, $29,422.45, Texas Chiropractic College Foundation, Pasadena, TX, Chiropractic, May 1982
Roberson, Harvey L., Houston, TX, $35,761.82, Texas Chiropractic College Foundation, Pasadena, TX, Chiropractic, December 1989
Robinson, Glenn R., Garland, TX, $77,916.94, Cleveland Chiropractic College, Kansas City, MO, Chiropractic, September 1988
Rodriquez, Jesus A., El Paso, TX, $120,512.32, Texas Chiropractic College Foundation, Pasadena, TX, Chiropractic, April 1986
Romeieh-romay, Barbara C., Bedford, TX, $87,289.28, Cleveland Chiropractic College, Kansas City, MO, Chiropractic, May 1985
Rosenbaum, Allan J., Lubbock, TX, $82,774.37, Texas Chiropractic College Foundation, Pasadena, TX, Chiropractic, December 1985
Rublee, William, Nacogdoches, TX, $50,118.15, Texas Chiropractic College Foundation, Pasadena, TX, Chiropractic, May 1984
Sanchez, Gerald G., Houston, TX, $45,001.88, Texas Chiropractic College Foundation, Pasadena, TX, Chiropractic, April 1988
Schade, Cynthia J., Austin, TX, $40,434.25, Palmer College of Chiropractic, Davenport, IA, Chiropractic, September 1985
Schalk, Ronald R., San Antonio, TX, $20,676.09, Texas Chiropractic College Foundation, Pasadena, TX, Chiropractic, May 1982
Sedlacek, Jay, Irving, TX, $21,767.48, Parker College of Chiropractic, Dallas, TX, Chiropractic, September 1993
Shaver, Dennis D., Kerrville, TX, $27,560.72, Texas Chiropractic College Foundation, Pasadena, TX, Chiropractic, December 1985
Shukri, Shafiq, Wichita Falls, TX, $13,366.25, Parker College of Chiropractic, Dallas, TX, Chiropractic, September 1986
Skidmore, Clyde E., Stafford, TX, $57,630.53, Life College, Marietta, GA, Chiropractic, December 1983
Smith, Cecil P., Garland, TX, $21,434.91, Parker College of Chiropractic, Dallas, TX, Chiropractic, April 1986
Smith, Timothy, San Antonio, TX, $99,566.13, Texas Chiropractic College Foundation, Pasadena, TX, Chiropractic, April 1986
Snell, Day Lee, Houston, TX, $32,670.44, Texas Chiropractic College Foundation, Pasadena, TX, Chiropractic, May 1984
Sprecher, Kyle O., Webster, TX, $73,985.74, Texas Chiropractic College Foundation, Pasadena, TX, Chiropractic, December 1986
Stalker, James, Round Rock, TX, $18,534.02, Logan College of Chiropractic, Chesterfield, MO, Chiropractic, May 1983
Sykes, Steven G., Killeen, TX, $37,529.90, Texas Chiropractic College Foundation, Pasadena, TX, Chiropractic, June 1987
Taparauskas, Anne M., Houston, TX, $47,546.30, Texas Chiropractic College Foundation, Pasadena, TX, Chiropractic, April 1986
Taylor, Danny, Irving, TX, $35,797.18, Parker College of Chiropractic, Dallas, TX, Chiropractic, December 1987
Thompson, Roy E., Austin, TX, $34,460.59, Texas Chiropractic College Foundation, Pasadena, TX, Chiropractic, May 1983
Todd-Ferguson, Linda K., Cedar Park, TX, $52,911.02, Palmer College of Chiropractic, Davenport, IA, Chiropractic, June 1985
Tretheway-Koenig, Joan L., Pearland, TX, $16,435.47, Western States Chiropractic College, Portland, OR, Chiropractic, June 1990
Truong, Thao, Houston, TX, $11,929.67, Texas Chiropractic College Foundation, Pasadena, TX, Chiropractic, December 1988
Tucker, James, Arlington, TX, $10,232.91, Cleveland Chiropractic College, Kansas City, MO, Chiropractic, September 1983
Twigg, Jonathan, Alpine, TX, $102,776.21, Cleveland Chiropractic College, Kansas City, MO, Chiropractic, May 1988
Unruh, Steve L., Baytown, TX, $86,852.91, Life College, Marietta, GA, Chiropractic, December 1987
Van Nice, Dennis, Midland, TX, $53,606.86, Cleveland Chiropractic College, Kansas City, MO, Chiropractic, January 1987
Van Parys, Leslie R., Waco, TX, $9,428.84, Northwestern College of Chiropractic, Bloomington, MN, Chiropractic, April 1987
Walter, Jonathan J., Austin, TX, $19,100.97, Life Chiropractic College-West, San Lorenzo, CA, Chiropractic, September 1988
Wardle, Jenice, Port Arthur, TX, $95,385.96, Life Chiropractic College-West, San Lorenzo, CA, Chiropractic, June 1987
Wellington, James G., Pasadena, TX, $30,943.02, Texas Chiropractic College Foundation, Pasadena, TX, Chiropractic, May 1982
Wheeler, Wesley D., Houston, TX, $67,383.48, Texas Chiropractic College Foundation, Pasadena, TX, Chiropractic, December 1988
Whigham, Gwendolyn E., Houston, TX, $34,540.89, Parker College of Chiropractic, Dallas, TX, Chiropractic, April 1987
Whitaker, Gary W., San Antonio, TX, $21,536.47, Texas Chiropractic College Foundation, Pasadena, TX, Chiropractic, May 1982
Williams, Dewayne, Brownsville, TX, $88,232.15, Cleveland Chiropractic College, Kansas City, MO, Chiropractic, December 1988
Wirt-Sealy, Rita J., Groveton, TX, $12,431.33, Texas Chiropractic College Foundation, Pasadena, TX, Chiropractic, May 1985
Woywood, Roger, Dallas, TX, $39,194.08, Parker College of Chiropractic, Dallas, TX, Chiropractic, September 1989

Dentistry

Anderson, Madeline J., Austin, TX, $2,012.14, Univ of Texas Hlth Sci Cntr San Antonio, San Antonio, TX, Dentistry, May 1989
Baird, John, Richardson, TX, $28,284.30, Baylor College of

Dentistry, Dallas, TX, Dentistry, June 1992
Bartley, Emily, Houston, TX, $29,165.88, Meharry Medical College, Nashville, TN, Dentistry, May 1991
Beckett, Timothy W., Dallas, TX, $67,093.66, Meharry Medical College, Nashville, TN, Dentistry, May 1981
Beers, Wayne D., San Antonio, TX, $21,596.07, Univ of Texas Hlth Sci Cntr San Antonio, San Antonio, TX, Dentistry, May 1989
Bonin, Mark, Spring, TX, $10,989.21, Univ of Texas, Houston, TX, Dentistry, May 1987
Broadus, Reginald H., Fort Worth, TX, $60,247.40, Meharry Medical College, Nashville, TN, Dentistry, May 1985
Burke, Andrea A., Houston, TX, $121,870.47, Meharry Medical College, Nashville, TN, Dentistry, May 1985
Canady, Keith, Lewisville, TX, $42,861.88, Baylor College of Dentistry, Dallas, TX, Dentistry, June 1990
Chung, Kwang, Lewisville, TX, $4,050.39, Univ of Texas Hlth Sci Cntr San Antonio, San Antonio, TX, Dentistry, May 1992
Collier, George R., San Antonio, TX, $50,629.25, Georgetown University, Washington, DC, Dentistry, May 1983
Cortez, Eddie, San Antonio, TX, $105,041.14, Marquette University, Milwaukee, WI, Dentistry, May 1988
Courtney, Barbara, Dallas, TX, $22,588.30, Boston University Medical Center, Boston, MA, Dentistry, May 1991
Currington, Tony, Houston, TX, $63,534.03, Washington University, St Louis, MO, Dentistry, May 1991
Daniels II, John T., San Antonio, TX, $63,079.03, Howard University, Washington, DC, Dentistry, May 1983
Douglas, Agnes A., De Soto, TX, $52,719.20, Meharry Medical College, Nashville, TN, Dentistry, May 1985
Dudley, Donald, Arp, TX, $25,161.10, Baylor College of Dentistry, Dallas, TX, Dentistry, June 1988
Garcia, Leticia, Beaumont, TX, $23,165.72, Univ of Texas Hlth Sci Cntr San Antonio, San Antonio, TX, Dentistry, June 1983
Glosson, Romus, Houston, TX, $6,320.64, Univ of Texas, Houston, TX, Dentistry, May 1989
Green Jr, Henry, San Antonio, TX, $153,414.86, Baylor College of Dentistry, Dallas, TX, Dentistry, June 1984
Hatten II, John H., OdFessa, TX, $27,055.69, Univ of Texas Hlth Sci Cntr San Antonio, San Antonio, TX, Dentistry, June 1983
Hickman, Carl, Houston, TX, $9,197.62, Univ of Texas Hlth Sci Cntr San Antonio, San Antonio, TX, Dentistry, May 1982
Hicks, Philip, Houston, TX, $44,360.40, Univ of Texas, Houston, TX, Dentistry, June 1985
Hooda, Farid K., Arlington, TX, $8,662.04, Baylor College of Dentistry, Dallas, TX, Dentistry, June 1991
Hurd, Michael, Houston, TX, $5,310.36, Univ of Texas, Houston, TX, Dentistry, May 1991
Jacome Jr, Robert R A, Plano, TX, $193,150.68, Univ of Oklahoma Health Sciences Center, Oklahoma City, OK, Dentistry, June 1988
Johnson, Cleverick D., Houston, TX, $2,959.65, Univ of Texas, Houston, TX, Dentistry, June 1986
Kariem, James J., Amarillo, TX, $160,881.40, Meharry Medical College, Nashville, TN, Dentistry, May 1984
Maedgen, Alan, Dallas, TX, $12,843.70, Univ of Texas Hlth Sci Cntr San Antonio, San Antonio, TX, Dentistry, May 1987
Mason, Samuel S., Houston, TX, $143,627.42, Meharry Medical College, Nashville, TN, Dentistry, May 1984
Morgan, John D., Beeville, TX, $928.97, Baylor College of Dentistry, Dallas, TX, Dentistry, June 1985
Mosely Jr, Lee, Houston, TX, $41,511.61, Meharry Medical College, Nashville, TN, Dentistry, May 1984
Obrien, Francis, Euless, TX, $4,522.54, Univ of Texas, Houston, TX, Dentistry, June 1984
Perry, Maurice A., Houston, TX, $41,266.42, Meharry Medical College, Nashville, TN, Dentistry, May 1987
Ramos Jr, Rodolfo G., San Antonio, TX, $3,208.46, Univ of Texas, Houston, TX, Dentistry, May 1990
Ramos, Gisella Y., Austin, TX, $3,656.83, Univ of Louisville, Louisville, KY, Dentistry, May 1993
Rapanotti, Mario C., San Antonio, TX, $14,097.13, Univ of Texas Hlth Sci Cntr San Antonio, San Antonio, TX, Dentistry, June 1983
Rodriguez, Annette, San Antonio, TX, $17,570.45, Univ of Texas Hlth Sci Cntr San Antonio, San Antonio, TX, Dentistry, May 1993
Steele, David D., Texarkana, TX, $21,217.19, Univ of Texas, Houston, TX, Dentistry, June 1986
Summers, Eddie, League City, TX, $9,475.13, Univ of Texas, Houston, TX, Dentistry, June 1987
Tootoonchi, Mohammod, Houston, TX, $2,925.62, Univ of Texas, Houston, TX, Dentistry, May 1990
Trammel, Henry, Tyler, TX, $34,294.24, Univ of Texas Hlth Sci Cntr San Antonio, San Antonio, TX, Dentistry, May 1989
Trice, Robert, Grand Prairie, TX, $39,287.33, Baylor College of Dentistry, Dallas, TX, Dentistry, May 1989
Underhill, Luke, Corpus Christi, TX, $52,661.71, Univ of Missouri Kansas City, Kansas City, MO, Dentistry, April 1985
Venable, James R., Fort Worth, TX, $7,858.24, Univ of Oklahoma Health Sciences Center, Oklahoma City, OK, Dentistry, June 1990
Wade, Eric, Tyler, TX, $28,348.13, Univ of Texas Hlth Sci Cntr San Antonio, San Antonio, TX, Dentistry, May 1984
West, Paul, Fort Worth, TX, $21,326.14, Baylor College of Dentistry, Dallas, TX, Dentistry, June 1991
Wood, Cecil C., Duncanville, TX, $120,218.01, Univ of Oklahoma Health Sciences Center, Oklahoma City, OK, Dentistry, June 1983
Wright-Coleman, Debra D., Bedford, TX, $19,329.29, Meharry Medical College, Nashville, TN, Dentistry, May 1983

Health Administration

Miranda Jr, Leandro, San Antonio, TX, $24,426.39, Trinity University, San Antonio, TX, Health Administration, December 1989
Simeone, William J., Houston, TX, $15,104.20, St. Louis University, St. Louis, MO, Health Administration, May 1985
White, Kevin G., Dallas, TX, $7,918.46, St. Louis University, St. Louis, MO, Health Administration, May 1989

Optometry

Hall, Anita, Arlington, TX, $26,552.73, Southern College of Optometry, Memphis, TN, Optometry, May 1989
Harrison-Greenfield, Nancy A., Katy, TX, $71,804.43, New England College of Optometry, Boston, MA, Optometry, March 1985
McGregor, Scott D., Carrollton, TX, $103,406.67, Southern College of Optometry, Memphis, TN, Optometry, June 1986

Osteopathy

Abdal-Alim, Khalid, Houston, TX, $28,678.68, Univ of Osteo Medical & Health Science, Des Moines, IA, Osteopathy, June 1991
Alvarado, Leticia D., San Antonio, TX, $1,644.31, Michigan State University, East Lansing, MI, Osteopathy, June 1984
Brooks, Marc E., Austin, TX, $35,061.53, Univ of North Texas Health Science Ctr, Fort Worth, TX, Osteopathy, June 1991
Burks, Chester L., Dallas, TX, $42,682.24, Univ of North Texas Health Science Ctr, Fort Worth, TX, Osteopathy, May 1983

Gross, George G., Arlington, TX, $20,357.34, Kirksville Col of Osteopathic Medicine, Kirksville, MO, Osteopathy, June 1980
Lee, John H., Port Author, TX, $10,920.70, Univ of North Texas Health Science Ctr, Fort Worth, TX, Osteopathy, May 1986
Mayberry, Bobby J., Fort Worth, TX, $2,963.87, Univ of North Texas Health Science Ctr, Fort Worth, TX, Osteopathy, June 1990
Morrill, Thomas R., Mesquite, TX, $61,792.19, Univ of North Texas Health Science Ctr, Fort Worth, TX, Osteopathy, May 1986
Overton, Lora, Fort Worth, TX, $15,283.15, Oklahoma State University, Tulsa, OK, Osteopathy, May 1988
Poplawsky, James, Boerne, TX, $8,189.59, Univ of North Texas Health Science Ctr, Fort Worth, TX, Osteopathy, May 1985

Pharmacy

Boboye, Cyril C., Arlington, TX, $12,823.51, Creighton University, Omaha, NE, Pharmacy, August 1985
Breedlove, Arthur L., Irving, TX, $1,593.05, Texas Southern University, Houston, TX, Pharmacy, December 1987
Jenewari, Elsie N., Houston, TX, $7,877.31, Creighton University, Omaha, NE, Pharmacy, August 1983
Powe, Roderick L., Dallas, TX, $24,637.35, Creighton University, Omaha, NE, Pharmacy, August 1985

Podiatry

Baxendale, Robert, Dallas, TX, $31,340.88, Pennsylvania Col of Podiatric Medicine, Philadelphia, PA, Podiatry, June 1982
Baxter, Bobby C., Houston, TX, $130,612.10, Dr. William Scholl Col of Podiatric Med, Chicago, IL, Podiatry, May 1984
Bethea, Carroll Ruth, Irving, TX, $61,981.55, Ohio College of Podiatric Medicine, Cleveland, OH, Podiatry, May 1985
Dang, Dung D., Channelview, TX, $89,361.00, California College of Podiatric Medicine, San Francisco, CA, Podiatry, May 1989
Edwards, Fanny F., Houston, TX, $24,235.70, New York College of Podiatric Medicine, New York, NY, Podiatry, June 1984
Ellington, James D., Southlake, TX, $27,368.64, Univ of Osteo Medical & Health Science, Des Moines, IA, Podiatry, June 1993
Ezzeh, Mary, Duncanville, TX, $144,649.14, Univ of Osteo Medical & Health Science, Des Moines, IA, Podiatry, June 1989
Gipson, Helen D., Dallas, TX, $64,656.24, Ohio College of Podiatric Medicine, Cleveland, OH, Podiatry, May 1985
Grocoff, Ronald D., Plano, TX, $40,087.01, Ohio College of Podiatric Medicine, Cleveland, OH, Podiatry, May 1980
Knutson, Timothy, San Antonio, TX, $82,446.69, California College of Podiatric Medicine, San Francisco, CA, Podiatry, May 1981
Moss, Stephen, Houston, TX, $92,859.03, Dr. William Scholl Col of Podiatric Med, Chicago, IL, Podiatry, May 1989
Negash, Omer O., Houston, TX, $17,404.31, Barry University-Podiatric Med, Miami Shores, FL, Podiatry, May 1989
Ramirez, Jesus, El Paso, TX, $70,894.77, Ohio College of Podiatric Medicine, Cleveland, OH, Podiatry, May 1983
Rose, Myrtle F., Dallas, TX, $126,464.87, Ohio College of Podiatric Medicine, Cleveland, OH, Podiatry, June 1987
Stillwagoner, Lee W., Sulfur Springs, TX, $28,231.04, Univ of Osteo Medical & Health Science, Des Moines, IA, Podiatry, June 1989
Tanenbaum, Jeffrey C., Houston, TX, $43,179.46, Pennsylvania Col of Podiatric Medicine, Philadelphia, PA, Podiatry, June 1980
Taylor, Emma, Houston, TX, $147,003.96, Univ of Osteo Medical & Health Science, Des Moines, IA, Podiatry, June 1990
Updyke, John G., Austin, TX, $117,010.67, California College of Podiatric Medicine, San Francisco, CA, Podiatry, May 1981

Public Health

Gilbert, Grant D., Houston, TX, $37,258.58, Univ of Illinois At Chicago, Chicago, IL, Public Health, September 1982
Perry, Terry T., Houston, TX, $5,816.20, Tulane University, New Orleans, LA, Public Health, May 1984

Veterinary Medicine

Brinkley, Marty R., Kaufman, TX, $1,719.33, Oklahoma State University, Stillwater, OK, Veterinary Medicine, May 1990

Utah

Allopathic Medicine

Manchester, Kevin K., West Valley City, UT, $21,331.50, Univ of Nevada Reno, Reno, NV, Allopathic Medicine, May 1989

Chiropractic

Bowman, Jeffrey J., Salt Lake City, UT, $12,123.56, Palmer College of Chiropractic, Davenport, IA, Chiropractic, September 1983
Brown, James A., West Jordan, UT, $58,745.08, Palmer College of Chiropractic, Davenport, IA, Chiropractic, October 1986
De Mille, Alan M., Cedar City, UT, $118,340.02, Palmer College of Chiropractic West, San Jose, CA, Chiropractic, March 1987
Howard, Douglas D., Salt Lake City, UT, $27,048.89, Cleveland Chiropractic College, Los Angeles, CA, Chiropractic, August 1986
Madsen, Richard, Salt Lake City, UT, $33,054.87, Palmer College of Chiropractic West, San Jose, CA, Chiropractic, December 1985
Mangum, Donald L., Panguitch, UT, $75,604.57, Palmer College of Chiropractic, Davenport, IA, Chiropractic, December 1988
Martin, Craig J., Salt Lake City, UT, $29,315.37, Life Chiropractic College-west, San Lorenzo, CA, Chiropractic, December 1987
Patton, Daniel R., Salt Lake City, UT, $83,850.01, Palmer College of Chiropractic, Davenport, IA, Chiropractic, October 1987
Robinette, Terry A., Sandy, UT, $61,943.00, Logan College of Chiropractic, Chesterfield, MO, Chiropractic, August 1986
Taylor, Todd R., Bountiful, UT, $2,208.36, Logan College of Chiropractic, Chesterfield, MO, Chiropractic, December 1987

Dentistry

Gifford, Craig P., Salt Lake City, UT, $158,573.27, Case Western Reserve University, Cleveland, OH, Dentistry, May 1987
Troili, Dean C., Salt Lake City, UT, $184,494.00, Marquette University, Milwaukee, WI, Dentistry, May 1986
Tucker, Bret J., Salt Lake City, UT, $65,509.14, Virginia Commonwealth University, Richmond, VA, Dentistry, May 1988
Wigg, Kenneth Y., Price, UT, $2,032.49, Creighton University, Omaha, NE, Dentistry, May 1991

Optometry

Haggard, Joe R., Springville, UT, $6,036.79, Illinois College of Optometry, Chicago, IL, Optometry, May 1987
Mitchell, Mike K., Salt Lake City, UT, $42,751.31, Southern Calif College of Optometry, Fullerton, CA, Optometry, May 1986

Podiatry

Haase, George G., Ogden, UT, $57,141.19, Dr William Scholl Col of Podiatric Med, Chicago, IL, Podiatry, May 1984

Rindlisbacher, Mark C., Payson, UT, $151,673.85, Dr William Scholl Col of Podiatric Med, Chicago, IL, Podiatry, May 1988
Tindall, Michael A., Magna, UT, $77,972.29, California College of Podiatric Medicine, San Francisco, CA, Podiatry, May 1988

Vermont

Chiropractic

Ramirez, Laura A., Burlington, VT, $14,353.92, Los Angeles College of Chiropractic, Whittier, CA, Chiropractic, April 1990
Swett, Robert, Manchester, VT, $31,047.63, Logan College of Chiropractic, Chesterfield, MO, Chiropractic, August 1988

Dentistry

Wiebking, Henry A., Richmond, VT, $95,660.96, Univ of Maryland Baltimore, Baltimore, MD, Dentistry, January 1985

Veterinary Medicine

Ponte, Paula J., Bennington, VT, $192,999.43, Tufts University, Boston, MA, Veterinary Medicine, May 1987

Virgin Islands

Chiropractic

Slotnick, Robin, Kingshill, VI, $68,175.18, Los Angeles College of Chiropractic, Whittier, CA, Chiropractic, December 1989

Virginia

Allopathic Medicine

Asamoah, Nana, Herndon, VA, $11,640.47, George Washington University, Washington, DC, Allopathic Medicine, May 1990
Boschulte, Jualenda, Alexandria, VA, $59,290.15, Georgetown University, Washington, DC, Allopathic Medicine, May 1989
Dempster, Alexandra, Aldie, VA, $26,399.13, Univ of Miami, Miami, FL, Allopathic Medicine, May 1987
Gomez, Mario, Richmond, VA, $29,951.05, Eastern Virginia Medical School, Norfolk, VA, Allopathic Medicine, June 1983
Gong, Pearl, Charlottesville, VA, $9,411.16, Albert Einstein Med Col of Yeshiva Univ, Bronx, NY, Allopathic Medicine, June 1983
Harrington, Baxter C., Midlothian, VA, $47,769.83, Meharry Medical College, Nashville, TN, Allopathic Medicine, May 1985
Kirk Jr, Vernon H., Portsmouth, VA, $46,283.40, Univ of Utah, Salt Lake City, UT, Allopathic Medicine, June 1986
Scott, Rosemary C., Saluda, VA, $135,573.51, Meharry Medical College, Nashville, TN, Allopathic Medicine, May 1987
Thomas, Giovana R., Alexandria, VA, $9,688.29, Univ of Rochester, Rochester, NY, Allopathic Medicine, May 1988
Tolliver, John, Fairfax, VA, $5,536.02, Univ of Med & Dent of New Jersey, Newark, NJ, Allopathic Medicine, May 1984
Wright, Richard O., Virginia Beach, VA, $69,150.99, Meharry Medical College, Nashville, TN, Allopathic Medicine, May 1984

Chiropractic

Clayton, Richard E., Richmond, VA, $75,192.00, Life College, Marietta, GA, Chiropractic, March 1985
Davis, Thomas A., Waynesboro, VA, $85,971.28, Logan College of Chiropractic, Chesterfield, MO, Chiropractic, August 1986
Dotti, John T., Newport News, VA, $90,996.91, Texas Chiropractic College Foundation, Pasadena, TX, Chiropractic, May 1983
Ganther, Timothy, Virginia Beach, VA, $67,187.38, Logan College of Chiropractic, Chesterfield, MO, Chiropractic, August 1986
Headley, Patricia, Roseland, VA, $49,574.63, Palmer College of Chiropractic, Davenport, IA, Chiropractic, October 1986
Jackson, Zona G., Freeman, VA, $23,937.66, Logan College of Chiropractic, Chesterfield, MO, Chiropractic, August 1988
Kessler, Edward, Virginia Beach, VA, $46,052.75, Life College, Marietta, GA, Chiropractic, December 1983
Khalsa, Gururakha, Arlington, VA, $39,429.05, Cleveland Chiropractic College, Kansas City, MO, Chiropractic, May 1989
Kilmer, David, Thaxton, VA, $43,314.89, Los Angeles College of Chiropractic, Whittier, CA, Chiropractic, December 1985
Panza, Tony, Williamsburg, VA, $15,614.15, Life College, Marietta, GA, Chiropractic, March 1990
Seaman, John J., Hayes, VA, $19,778.55, Logan College of Chiropractic, Chesterfield, MO, Chiropractic, September 1985
Streicher, Bruce, Shipman, VA, $73,882.35, Life College, Marietta, GA, Chiropractic, March 1985
Vosburgh, Stephen E., Sterling, VA, $107,022.87, Life College, Marietta, GA, Chiropractic, January 1985
Ziegler, Louis, Alexandria, VA, $44,076.77, Life College, Marietta, GA, Chiropractic, December 1989

Dentistry

Amouhashem, Parvin, Springfield, VA, $8,600.84, Georgetown University, Washington, DC, Dentistry, May 1990
Bukowski, Todd M., Arlington, VA, $26,978.62, Suny Buffalo, Buffalo, NY, Dentistry, June 1989
Bunn, Steven T., Alexandria, VA, $108,123.97, Georgetown University, Washington, DC, Dentistry, May 1983
Freeman Jr, Lenwood, Ladysmith, VA, $11,181.32, Howard University, Washington, DC, Dentistry, May 1988
Gibboney, Dana, Virginia Beach, VA, $56,713.17, Virginia Commonwealth University, Richmond, VA, Dentistry, May 1992
Holley, Elizabeth, Chesapeake, VA, $33,406.36, Meharry Medical College, Nashville, TN, Dentistry, May 1991
Jennings, Kevin K., Chesapeake, VA, $163,955.50, Meharry Medical College, Nashville, TN, Dentistry, May 1983
Jones, Gale F., Richmond, VA, $60,375.64, Howard University, Washington, DC, Dentistry, May 1987
Labrie, Gerald F., Springfield, VA, $20,438.71, Georgetown University, Washington, DC, Dentistry, May 1983
Miller, Jay P., Arlington, VA, $9,153.73, Georgetown University, Washington, DC, Dentistry, May 1990
Nicholas, Robert, Richmond, VA, $24,568.57, Virginia Commonwealth University, Richmond, VA, Dentistry, May 1987
Pearson, Haywood, Richmond, VA, $140,789.11, Meharry Medical College, Nashville, TN, Dentistry, May 1983
Peoples, Douglas B., Petersburg, VA, $21,475.95, Georgetown University, Washington, DC, Dentistry, May 1983
Preston, Richard G., Richmond, VA, $8,079.82, Georgetown University, Washington, DC, Dentistry, May 1985
Ruffin, Wyatt M., Virginia Beach, VA, $198,885.17, Meharry Medical College, Nashville, TN, Dentistry, December 1983
Scott, Annette, Alexandria, VA, $80,864.70, Howard University, Washington, DC, Dentistry, May 1986
Shaffner, Robert, Christiansburg, VA, $205,986.71, Marquette University, Milwaukee, WI, Dentistry, May 1988
Solliday, Michael P., Arlington, VA, $19,295.09, Georgetown University, Washington, DC, Dentistry, May 1987
Willis, Orion W., Portsmouth, VA, $31,868.56, Howard University, Washington, DC, Dentistry, May 1983
Wilson, Sulyn, Vienna, VA, $6,627.94, Georgetown University, Washington, DC, Dentistry, May 1990

Optometry

Pfab, Mary C., Petersburg, VA, $67,336.10, Southern College of

Optometry, Memphis, TN, Optometry, June 1985

Osteopathy

Hobowsky, Martin, Norfolk, VA, $122,775.00, Oklahoma State University, Tulsa, OK, Osteopathy, May 1986

Pharmacy

Habib, Suraia, Alexandria, VA, $2,941.54, Massachusetts College of Pharmacy, Boston, MA, Pharmacy, June 1989

Wright, James, Clifton, VA, $56,286.18, Howard University, Washington, DC, Pharmacy, May 1986

Podiatry

Anderson III, Jesse N., Norfolk, VA, $104,301.36, Ohio College of Podiatric Medicine, Cleveland, OH, Podiatry, May 1984

Dew, John, Norfolk, VA, $76,590.75, Ohio College of Podiatric Medicine, Cleveland, OH, Podiatry, June 1990

McMillion, Jerry, Richmond, VA, $42,750.58, Pennsylvania Col of Podiatric Medicine, Philadelphia, PA, Podiatry, May 1992

Public Health

Talley, Mark D., Richmond, VA, $2,028.36, Univ of North Carolina Chapel Hill, Chapel Hill, NC, Public Health, May 1986

Veterinary Medicine

Griffith, Deborah, Virginia Beach, VA, $21,731.41, Tuskegee University, Tuskegee, AL, Veterinary Medicine, May 1983

Taylor, Christopher, Port Republic, VA, $19,073.29, Michigan State University, East Lansing, MI, Veterinary Medicine, June 1987

Washington

Allopathic Medicine

Haririe, Jim J., Kent, WA, $50,221.24, Medical College of Wisconsin, Milwaukee, WI, Allopathic Medicine, May 1983

Lindsey-Wright, Karen, Seattle, WA, $111,005.95, Meharry Medical College, Nashville, TN, Allopathic Medicine, May 1989

Sahm, Roger, Spokane, WA, $98,927.37, Vanderbilt University, Nashville, TN, Allopathic Medicine, May 1988

Smith Naporn, Atania, Gig Harbor, WA, $75,496.82, Medical College of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, PA, Allopathic Medicine, June 1985

White, Jeffrey, Chattaroy, WA, $62,881.50, Oral Roberts University, Tulsa, OK, Allopathic Medicine, May 1985

White, Leroy C., Tacoma, WA, $27,734.63, Temple University, Philadelphia, PA, Allopathic Medicine, June 1981

Chiropractic

Chinn, Greg, Kirkland, WA, $85,371.47, Life College, Marietta, GA, Chiropractic, December 1989

Collins, Norman E., Renton, WA, $68,117.32, Palmer College of Chiropractic, Davenport, IA, Chiropractic, March 1988

Corley, David L., Tacoma, WA, $43,083.52, Life Chiropractic College-West, San Lorenzo, CA, Chiropractic, December 1984

Corley, Lee, Everett, WA, $83,598.13, Life Chiropractic College-West, San Lorenzo, CA, Chiropractic, June 1989

Craig, Bradley, Vancouver, WA, $99,273.62, Western States Chiropractic College, Portland, OR, Chiropractic, June 1988

Diel, Gary R., Gig Harbor, WA, $100,167.57, Life College, Marietta, GA, Chiropractic, September 1984

Diel-Singleton, Betty Knox B., Tacoma, WA, $51,305.65, Life College, Marietta, GA, Chiropractic, June 1984

Dreyer, Frank J., Spokane, WA, $15,617.22, Palmer College of Chiropractic, Davenport, IA, Chiropractic, September 1984

Eartheart-Grim, Peter A., Mukelteo, WA, $51,076.16, Western States Chiropractic College, Portland, OR, Chiropractic, December 1983

Erkel, Thomas R., Bellevue, WA, $28,394.74, Palmer College of Chiropractic, Davenport, IA, Chiropractic, October 1985

Grubstein, Alan, Tacoma, WA, $98,691.93, Cleveland Chiropractic College, Kansas City, MO, Chiropractic, September 1987

Hamilton, Charles A., Seattle, WA, $19,369.37, Life College, Marietta, GA, Chiropractic, March 1989

Hartley, William, Seattle, WA, $36,848.24, Western States Chiropractic College, Portland, OR, Chiropractic, December 1990

Katz, Gary S., Edmonds, WA, $24,237.31, Northwestern College of Chiropractic, Bloomington, MN, Chiropractic, April 1983

Kronlund, Douglas G., Puyallup, WA, $31,405.41, Life Chiropractic College-West, San Lorenzo, CA, Chiropractic, March 1990

McCord, Allan R., Renton, WA, $13,914.18, Palmer College of Chiropractic, Davenport, IA, Chiropractic, June 1983

McKilligan, Terrance, Woodland, WA, $14,188.44, Palmer College of Chiropractic, Davenport, IA, Chiropractic, October 1985

Nicholes, David L., Woodinville, WA, $18,072.71, Palmer College of Chiropractic, Davenport, IA, Chiropractic, March 1989

Olson, Lee E., Redmond, WA, $8,284.29, Western States Chiropractic College, Portland, OR, Chiropractic, March 1984

Phelps, Carl C., Issaquah, WA, $28,272.78, Palmer College of Chiropractic, Davenport, IA, Chiropractic, June 1985

Pittman, Joanne E., Lake Stevens, WA, $72,951.40, Life College, Marietta, GA, Chiropractic, March 1986

Scheen, Susan, Vashon, WA, $4,439.37, Western States Chiropractic College, Portland, OR, Chiropractic, June 1986

Schwartz, Gerald, Silverdale, WA, $70,356.33, Cleveland Chiropractic College, Los Angeles, CA, Chiropractic, August 1986

Scovel, Michael, Everett, WA, $104,483.70, Palmer College of Chiropractic West, San Jose, CA, Chiropractic, December 1988

Stanton, Lawrence, Seattle, WA, $8,346.16, Los Angeles College of Chiropractic, Whittier, CA, Chiropractic, April 1985

Taylor, Larry D., Wapato, WA, $37,970.59, Palmer College of Chiropractic West, San Jose, CA, Chiropractic, October 1986

Terides, Michael, Bellingham, WA, $80,769.76, Palmer College of Chiropractic West, San Jose, CA, Chiropractic, March 1991

Tyrell, Michael, Spokane, WA, $134,235.03, Life College, Marietta, GA, Chiropractic, June 1986

Walters, Jerome P., Olympia, WA, $35,510.97, Palmer College of Chiropractic, Davenport, IA, Chiropractic, December 1983

Clinical Psychology

Kinney, Lorrin L., Vancouver, WA, $31,637.13, California Sch of Prof Psych Fresno, Fresno, CA, Clinical Psychology, August 1987

Mattila, William, Bremerton, WA, $49,150.43, Fuller Theological Seminary, Pasadena, CA, Clinical Psychology, June 1989

Dentistry

Clark, Russell, Everett, WA, $136,038.02, Univ of The Pacific, San Francisco, CA, Dentistry, June 1990

Robinson, Harold L., Tumwater, WA, $37,145.18, Temple University, Philadelphia, PA, Dentistry, January 1988

Optometry

Splinter, Kenneth W., Aberdeen, WA, $22,671.81, Pacific University, Forest Grove, OR, Optometry, May 1984

Osteopathy

Williams, Robert, Seattle, WA, $178,894.30, Univ of New England, Biddeford, ME, Osteopathy, June 1987

Pharmacy

Day, Harold E., Bremerton, WA, $2,066.22, Long Island University, Brookville, NY, Pharmacy, January 1987

Podiatry

Burgess, Jonathan, Vancouver, WA, $78,662.23, Ohio College of Podiatric Medicine, Cleveland, OH, Podiatry, May 1990

Morrison, John T., Port Orchard, WA, $35,347.95, Ohio College of Podiatric Medicine, Cleveland, OH, Podiatry, May 1983

West Virginia

Allopathic Medicine

Arreola, Rodolfo, Morgantown, WV, $32,250.27, Brown University, Providence, RI, Allopathic Medicine, May 1990

James, Tyshaun, Charlestown, WV, $27,695.30, Marshall University, Huntington, WV, Allopathic Medicine, May 1989

Chiropractic

Calandros, George, Huntington, WV, $1,153.89, Cleveland Chiropractic College, Kansas City, MO, Chiropractic, May 1991

Henshaw, Clifford D., Charlestown, WV, $60,654.19, Life College, Marietta, GA, Chiropractic, March 1988

Dentistry

Chattin, Donald H., Parkersburg, WV, $1,284.04, West Virginia University, Morgantown, WV, Dentistry, May 1980

Freeman, Kenneth K., Charlestown, WV, $32,805.08, Case Western Reserve University, Cleveland, OH, Dentistry, May 1986

Osteopathy

Booth, Christopher R., Alderson, WV, $21,843.02, West Virginia School of Osteopathic Med, Lewisburg, WV, Osteopathy, May 1992

Gant, Allan L., Richwood, WV, $14,923.36, West Virginia School of Osteopathic Med, Lewisburg, WV, Osteopathy, June 1981

Kirkland, Charles K., Elkins, WV, $56,680.87, West Virginia School of Osteopathic Med, Lewisburg, WV, Osteopathy, May 1984

Spanos, George K., Huntington, WV, $9,594.93, West Virginia School of Osteopathic Med, Lewisburg, WV, Osteopathy, May 1982

Wisconsin

Allopathic Medicine

Boyd, Olage O., Milwaukee, WI, $184,296.18, Medical College of Wisconsin, Milwaukee, WI, Allopathic Medicine, May 1984

Erickson, Gregg, Elroy, WI, $29,626.59, Medical College of Wisconsin, Milwaukee, WI, Allopathic Medicine, May 1980

Harris, Ernest H., Madison, WI, $33,490.25, Univ of Illinois Medical Center, Chicago, IL, Allopathic Medicine, June 1983

Lane, Michael, Shorewood, WI, $13,973.76, Creighton University, Omaha, NE, Allopathic Medicine, May 1989

Leisman, Scott, Madison, WI, $9,071.75, Univ of Wisconsin Madison, Madison, WI, Allopathic Medicine, June 1982

Mansur, Sharif S., Menomoee Falls, WI, $13,438.41, Medical College of Ohio, Toledo, OH, Allopathic Medicine, June 1989

Miller, Julie, Milwaukee, WI, $49,311.57, Medical College of Wisconsin, Milwaukee, WI, Allopathic Medicine, August 1987

Onyeneke, Chuka D., Kenosha, WI, $137,608.96, Medical College of Ohio, Toledo, OH, Allopathic Medicine, June 1989

Plater, Daniel H., Madison, WI, $92,691.50, Univ of Southern California, Los Angeles, CA, Allopathic Medicine, June 1988

Pounds, Lawrence M., Hartford, WI, $183,953.00, Medical College of Wisconsin, Milwaukee, WI, Allopathic Medicine, May 1988

Robbins, Lamont C., Milwaukee, WI, $50,226.95, Medical College of Wisconsin, Milwaukee, WI, Allopathic Medicine, May 1980

Salazar, Marielena, Oshkosh, WI, $124,662.00, Tufts University, Boston, MA, Allopathic Medicine, May 1988

Smalley, Katherine, Holmen, WI, $24,832.80, Medical College of Wisconsin, Milwaukee, WI, Allopathic Medicine, May 1991

Tesch, Patrick R., Milwaukee, WI, $32,126.32, Medical College of Wisconsin, Milwaukee, WI, Allopathic Medicine, September 1986

Williamson, Frederick, Milwaukee, WI, $137,419.17, Medical College of Wisconsin, Milwaukee, WI, Allopathic Medicine, May 1990

Chiropractic

Berres, George W., Colfax, WI, $68,528.61, Palmer College of Chiropractic, Davenport, IA, Chiropractic, October 1985

Hansen, Timothy J., Pewaukeee, WI, $18,782.37, Parker College of Chiropractic, Dallas, TX, Chiropractic, December 1986

Hultine, Lynn R., Wauwatosa, WI, $50,649.00, Logan College of Chiropractic, Chesterfield, MO, Chiropractic, August 1990

Kalienbach, Robert, Marshfield, WI, $90,188.06, Parker College of Chiropractic, Dallas, TX, Chiropractic, May 1989

Kleinjan, Mary B., Racine, WI, $58,108.28, Northwestern College of Chiropractic, Bloomington, MN, Chiropractic, August 1990

Mayfield, Gordon, Lodi, WI, $12,369.89, Northwestern College of Chiropractic, Bloomington, MN, Chiropractic, April 1984

Radandt, Mark, Kenosha, WI, $86,909.54, Palmer College of Chiropractic, Davenport, IA, Chiropractic, June 1984

Slusher, Stephen L., Jamesville, WI, $58,956.81, Cleveland Chiropractic College, Los Angeles, CA, Chiropractic, June 1987

Stick, Alex A., West Bend, WI, $7,574.08, Palmer College of Chiropractic, Davenport, IA, Chiropractic, October 1985

Ulbrich, George A., Neenah, WI, $12,790.83, Western States Chiropractic College, Portland, OR, Chiropractic, March 1983

Vance, Julie E., Racine, WI, $33,463.07, Palmer College of Chiropractic, Davenport, IA, Chiropractic, December 1988

Waschbisch, Sue A., Oconto Falls, WI, $12,412.56, Palmer College of Chiropractic, Davenport, IA, Chiropractic, June 1992

Werner, Mary, Seymour, WI, $60,319.96, Cleveland Chiropractic College, Kansas City, MO, Chiropractic, September 1983

Dentistry

Bartelt, Craig, Fond Du Lac, WI, $18,659.96, Marquette University, Milwaukee, WI, Dentistry, May 1984

Bock, Jerome, Milwaukee, WI, $144,572.35, Marquette University, Milwaukee, WI, Dentistry, May 1988

Dove, Edward E., Milwaukee, WI, $17,247.58, Marquette University, Milwaukee, WI, Dentistry, May 1989

Jones, Harold A., Milwaukee, WI, $115,572.54, Marquette University, Milwaukee, WI, Dentistry, May 1989

Karr, Robert A., Milwaukee, WI, $169,785.25, Marquette University, Milwaukee, WI, Dentistry, May 1985

Law, Daniel, Milwaukee, WI, $88,774.00, Marquette University, Milwaukee, WI, Dentistry, May 1986

Mallien, Maria M., Milwaukee, WI, $145,302.81, Marquette University, Milwaukee, WI, Dentistry, December 1985

Morrison, Michael B., West Allis, WI, $161,978.00, Marquette University, Milwaukee, WI, Dentistry, May 1988
Pendleton, Darryl D., Glendale, WI, $6,833.67, Southern Illinois Univ Edwardsville, Edwardsville, IL, Dentistry, December 1986
Reed, John F., Madison, WI, $155,067.14, Marquette University, Milwaukee, WI, Dentistry, May 1986
Sadien, Habib, Milwaukee, WI, $29,109.03, Loyola University Chicago, Chicago, IL, Dentistry, May 1993
Sanderson, Scott F., Stoughton, WI, $151,960.37, Marquette University, Milwaukee, WI, Dentistry, May 1989
Tanski, Thomas A., Grafton, WI, $14,827.53, Marquette University, Milwaukee, WI, Dentistry, May 1982
Volkert, Lawrence, Racine, WI, $85,839.57, Marquette University, Milwaukee, WI, Dentistry, May 1986

Podiatry

Perpich, Thomas T J, Milwaukee, WI, $105,740.73, Univ of Osteo Medical & Health Science, Des Moines, IA, Podiatry, June 1987

Public Health

Rodriquez, Victor, Milwaukee, WI, $3,911.16, Tulane University, New Orleans, LA, Public Health, May 1989

Veterinary Medicine

Nance, Dara, Madison, WI, $34,806.22, Univ of Wisconsin Madison, Madison, WI, Veterinary Medicine, May 1992
Patterson, William H., Oregon, WI, $3,943.28, Michigan State University, East Lansing, MI, Veterinary Medicine, June 1984

Wyoming

Allopathic Medicine

Nelson, Vivian I., Cheyenne, WY, $13,755.81, Univ of North Dakota, Grand Forks, ND, Allopathic Medicine, May 1993

Chiropractic

Kilgore, Charles, Torrington, WY, $75,465.44, Cleveland Chiropractic College, Kansas City, MO, Chiropractic, September 1985

Foreign Countries

Allopathic Medicine

Dotson, Tanya J., Copenhagen, Denmark, $30,172.35, Morehouse School of Medicine, Atlanta, GA, Allopathic Medicine, June 1986
Hawkins, Irene, Florence, Italy, $4,905.56, Cornell University Medical College, New York, NY, Allopathic Medicine, May 1985
Kavadellas, Anastasi, City Unknown, Greece, $12,515.28, Univ of Miami, Miami, FL, Allopathic Medicine, May 1986
Maynez, Miguel A., Nervante, Mexico, $58,946.12, Hahnemann University, Philadelphia, PA, Allopathic Medicine, June 1982
Nelson, Richard, Riyadh, Saudi Arabia, $12,105.37, Loma Linda University, Loma Linda, CA, Allopathic Medicine, June 1991
Palmer-West, Lori J., Toronto, Canada, $70,023.55, Tulane University, New Orleans, LA, Allopathic Medicine, June 1983
Ponder III, Alvin, City Unknown, West Indies, $49,676.06, Howard University, Washington, DC, Allopathic Medicine, May 1987
Roybal-Hazen, Maria E., City Unknown, Mexico, $28,799.21, Michigan State University, East Lansing, MI, Allopathic Medicine, June 1989
Weekes Jr, Noel N., Pecs, Hungary, $101,285.57, George Washington University, Washington, DC, Allopathic Medicine, May 1989

Chiropractic

Abriel, Mark B., Sydney, Australia, $28,906.34, Life College, Marietta, GA, Chiropractic, June 1984
Akins, Jeff, London, England, $67,082.70, Cleveland Chiropractic College, Kansas City, MO, Chiropractic, May 1989
Brunstein, Florian, Rome, Italy, $54,440.56, Los Angeles College of Chiropractic, Whittier, CA, Chiropractic, April 1989
Campbell, Fredrik, City Unknown, Sweden, $9,620.68, Western States Chiropractic College, Portland, OR, Chiropractic, June 1992
Clubb, David A., Queensland, Australia, $118,252.62, Logan College of Chiropractic, Chesterfield, MO, Chiropractic, December 1986
Deboer, Gregory, Vordingborg, Denmark, $30,106.51, Palmer College of Chiropractic, Davenport, IA, Chiropractic, March 1986
Dippie, John M., City Unknown, Australia, $41,041.90, Palmer College of Chiropractic, Davenport, IA, Chiropractic, March 1990
Esser, Clinton, Winnipeg Manitoba, Canada, $18,797.61, Life Chiropractic College-West, San Lorenzo, CA, Chiropractic, December 1989
Etminan-Rad, Monica A., Tehran, Iran, $14,510.29, Palmer College of Chiropractic, Davenport, IA, Chiropractic, March 1985
Maddalone, Dawn M., Barbados, West Indies, $37,037.11, Palmer College of Chiropractic, Davenport, IA, Chiropractic, June 1987
McRoberts, Lynn, Ontario, Canada, $39,316.96, Los Angeles College of Chiropractic, Whittier, CA, Chiropractic, December 1991
Morris, Clifford, Apeldoorn, Netherlands, $46,014.34, National College of Chiropractic, Lombard, IL, Chiropractic, December 1988
Nixon, Jeffrey L., Aylmar Quebec, Canada, $80,274.26, Cleveland Chiropractic College, Kansas City, MO, Chiropractic, May 1987
Omeara, Daniel, Manila, Philippines, $61,129.50, Life Chiropractic College-West, San Lorenzo, CA, Chiropractic, April 1989
Pierre, Claude P., Tromsoe, Norway, $43,057.92, Logan College of Chiropractic, Chesterfield, MO, Chiropractic, April 1989
Pressnall, Lana, Alberta, Canada, $7,245.01, Western States Chiropractic College, Portland, OR, Chiropractic, December 1991
Ridings, Vicki V T, city unknown, England, $20,829.88, Texas Chiropractic College Foundation, Pasadena, TX, Chiropractic, April 1984
Schumacher-Cameron, Tara L., Alberta, Canada, $32,812.47, Palmer College of Chiropractic, Davenport, IA, Chiropractic, December 1988
Thomas, Jack R., Gleenwood Alberta, Canada, $18,100.02, Logan College of Chiropractic, Chesterfield, MO, Chiropractic, August 1986
Torkelson, Scott S., city unknown, Denmark, $33,419.82, Palmer College of Chiropractic, Davenport, IA, Chiropractic, October 1986
Wren, Russell, Jonkoting, Sweden, $69,729.80, Logan College of Chiropractic, Chesterfield, MO, Chiropractic, April 1990

Clinical Psychology

Perris-Myttas, Marina, Barnet Herts, United Kingdom, $6,640.87, Univ of Denver, Denver, CO, Clinical Psychology, August 1988

Dentistry

Akande-Robinson, Deborah A., city unknown, West Indies, $137,779.25, Meharry Medical College, Nashville, TN, Dentistry, July 1982
McWeeney, Vincent, Nassau, Bahamas, $187,887.59, Marquette University, Milwaukee, WI, Dentistry, May 1988
Nielsen, David, Yaound, Cameroun, $131,468.23, Loma Linda University, Loma Linda, CA, Dentistry, June 1989
Shakman, Robert E., Jamaica, West Indies, $138,401.55, Tufts University, Boston, MA, Dentistry, June 1985
Taylor-Hearn, Kathleen, City Unknown, Canada, $8,984.53, Univ of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, PA, Dentistry, May 1985

Optometry

Arenaza, Gilbert, city unknown, Netherlands Antilles, $16,471.47, New England College of Optometry, Boston, MA, Optometry, May 1991

Medlock, Melissa M., Abu-Alanda, Jordon, $18,563.01, Illinois College of Optometry, Chicago, IL, Optometry, May 1989

Pharmacy

Hoffman, Beverley A., Capetown, South Africa, $20,732.99, Univ of Southern California, Los Angeles, CA, Pharmacy, May 1984

Podiatry

Enrico, Julie M., City Unknown, Canada, $94,856.64, California College of Podiatric Medicine, San Francisco, CA, Podiatry, May 1983

Jacobs, Benjamin J., Domingo, Dominican Republic, $9,401.45, California College of Podiatric Medicine, San Francisco, CA, Podiatry, May 1991

Lunetto, James V., Karlsruhe, Germany, $40,632.39, New York College of Podiatric Medicine, New York, NY, Podiatry, June 1984

Mirchoff, William F., Victoria BC, Canada, $15,631.65, California College of Podiatric Medicine, San Francisco, CA, Podiatry, May 1982

Turner, Patrick, Penticton BC, Canada, $78,173.97, Pennsylvania Col of Podiatric Medicine, Philadelphia, PA, Podiatry, June 1984

Wade, Paul W., city unknown, Australia, $25,316.97, California College of Podiatric Medicine, San Francisco, CA, Podiatry, May 1983

Public Health

Okosun, Ikekekhuamhenn, Bauchi, Nigeria, $19,912.87, Univ of Oklahoma Health Sciences Center, Oklahoma City, OK, Public Health, June 1987

Veterinary Medicine

Crossman-McLauchlan, Dorothy, Bulimba Qld, Australia, $45,428.64, Tufts University, Boston, MA, Veterinary Medicine, May 1985

Kennedy, Meredith E., Arusha, Tanzania, $807.16, Michigan State University, East Lansing, MI, Veterinary Medicine, June 1990

Dated: March 6, 1995.

Ciro V. Sumaya,

Administrator

[FR Doc. 95–5784 Filed 3–14–95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4160–15–P

federal register

Wednesday
March 15, 1995

Part III

Department of Labor

Employment and Training Administration

Department of Education

Office of Vocational and Adult Education

Job Training Partnership Act: School-To-Work Opportunities; Indian Program; Application Procedures; Notice

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Employment and Training Administration

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

Office of Vocational and Adult Education

Job Training Partnership Act: School-To-Work Opportunities; Indian Program; Application Procedures

AGENCIES: Employment and Training Administration, Labor. Office of Vocational and Adult Education, Education.

ACTION: Notice of availability of funds and solicitation for grant applications (SGA).

SUMMARY: This Notice contains all of the necessary information and forms needed to apply for grant funding. This notice announces a competition for Indian Program Grants to enable local partnerships to begin development or implementation of School-to-Work Opportunities initiatives that serve Indian youth and involve schools funded by the Bureau of Indian Affairs (BIA). The School-to-Work Opportunities initiatives funded under this competition will offer Indian youth access to School-to-Work Opportunities programs that will prepare them for first jobs in high-skill, high-wage careers and further postsecondary education and training.

DATES: Applications for grant awards will be accepted commencing March 15, 1995. The closing date for receipt of applications is May 15, 1995, at 2 p.m. (Eastern Time) at the address below. Telefacsimile (FAX) applications will not be honored.

ADDRESSES: Applications shall be mailed to: U.S. Department of Labor, Employment and Training Administration, Division of Acquisition and Assistance, Attention: Ms. Laura Cesario, Reference: SGA/DAA 95–002, 200 Constitution Avenue NW, Room S–4203, Washington, D.C. 20210.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Ms. Laura Cesario, Division of Acquisition and Assistance, Telephone: (202) 219–7300 (this is not a toll-free number).

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Section A. Purpose

This competition will award grants to local partnerships for School-to-Work Opportunities initiatives that serve Indian youth and involve Bureau-funded schools. Approximately $500,000 is available for awards under this notice. The Departments expect to award approximately 8 development grants of about $30,000 and up to 5 implementation grants ranging in amount between $50,000 and $100,000 under this notice. Grants under this competition will be financed under Title IV of the Job Training Partnership Act and will be used to implement activities that are consistent with Title II, Subtitle C of the School-to-Work Opportunities Act of 1994.

Local Partnerships may apply for either a development grant, an implementation grant or both. The competitions have been structured to allow those partnerships which have been engaged in planning and development activities to apply for an implementation grant without jeopardizing their opportunities for receiving a development grant. However, local partnerships which intend to apply for consideration under both the development and implementation grant competitions must submit separate applications for each competition. The amount of any award will be based on a number of factors, including the scope, quality, and comprehensiveness of the proposed initiative and the size of the population to be served.

The Departments intend to conduct subsequent competitions for Indian Program Grants, on an annual basis, under the recently enacted School-to-Work Opportunities Act of 1994. A local partnership may receive only one (1) development or implementation grant under this notice, with grant renewals for up to five years to be awarded depending upon fund availability and maintaining satisfactory progress.

Section B. Application Process

1. Eligible Applicants

An entity that meets the definition of ''eligible partnership,'' as defined in section B.7 of this notice, proposes to serve Indian youth, and involves Bureau-funded schools is eligible to apply for an Indian Program Grant for either development or implementation of School-to-Work Opportunities initiatives.

2. Submission of Application

Applicants must submit an original and four (4) copies of the application. The application shall consist of four distinct parts: budget and certifications, abstract, program narrative and appendices. To ensure a comprehensive and expedient review, the Departments strongly suggest that applicants submit an application formatted as seen below:

Table of Contents

I. Budget and Certifications

Part I shall contain the Standard Form (SF) 424, ''Application for Federal Assistance,'' and SF 424A, ''Budget'' (Appendix A). All copies of the 424 Form must have original signatures of the designated fiscal agent and must indicate in item 11 whether the application is to be considered for development or implementation funding. In addition, the budget shall include—on a separate page(s)—a detailed cost break-out of each line item on Budget Form 424A. Assurances and Certifications (Appendix B) shall also be included in this part.

II. Abstract

Part II shall consist of a one page abstract summarizing the essential components and key features of the partnership's plan.

III. Program Narrative

Part III shall contain the program narrative that demonstrates the applicant's plan and capabilities in accordance with the Statement of Work in Section C. The Departments strongly advise applicants to describe their plan in light of each of the Selection Criteria in Section E of this notice. No cost data or reference to price shall be included in this part of the application. The Departments strongly request that applicants limit the program narrative section to no more than 40 double-spaced pages, on one side only.

IV. Appendices

All applicable appendices including letters of support, resumes and organizational charts should be included in this section. The safeguard assurance, as required under Part III, Section D, ''Safeguards'', of this notice, should be included in all applications as Appendix A. The Departments recommend that all appendix entries be cross-referenced back to applicable sections in the program narrative.

3. Late Applications

Any application received after the exact time specified for receipt at the office designated in this notice will not be considered, unless it is received before awards are made and it—

(a) Was sent by registered or certified mail not later than the fifth calendar day before the date specified for receipt of applications (e.g., an application submitted in response to a solicitation requiring receipt of applications by the 20th of the month must have been mailed/post marked by the 15th of that month); or

(b) Was sent by the U.S. Postal Service Express Mail Next Day Service to addressee not later than 5:00 P.M. at the place of mailing two working days prior to the date specified for receipt of applications. The term ''working days'' excludes weekends and Federal holidays.

The term ''post marked'' means a printed, stamped, or otherwise placed impression (exclusive of a postage meter machine impression) that is readily identifiable, without further action, as having been supplied or affixed on the date of mailing by an employee of the U.S. Postal Service.

4. Hand-Delivered Applications

It is preferred that applications be mailed at least five days prior to the closing date. To be considered for funding, hand-delivered applications must be received by 2:00 P.M., Eastern Time, on the closing date. Telegraphed and/or Faxed applications will not be honored. Failure to adhere to the above instructions will be a basis for a determination of nonresponsiveness. Overnight express mail from carriers other than the U.S. Postal Service will be considered hand-delivered applications and must be received by the above specified date and time.

5. Period of Performance

The period of performance will be twelve (12) months from the date of award by the Department of Labor. Since all awards must be made by June 30, 1995 under this competition, the Departments recommend that all applicants use July 1, 1995–June 30, 1996 as both budgetary and project award periods.

6. Option to Extend

These Indian Program Grants may be extended for up to four additional years at the discretion of the Federal Government, based upon the availability of funds and the demonstrated progress of the grantee in implementing a School-to-Work Opportunities initiative.

Consistent with the School-to-Work Opportunities Act, the Departments expect that over time, the amount of federal funds, if any, that are added to this grant, awarded under this notice, will decrease. Funds awarded under this notice are considered ''venture capital'' for the establishment of School-to-Work Opportunities systems serving Indian youth. Likewise, local partnerships will eventually assume responsibility for maintaining School-to-Work Opportunities systems with other Federal, State and local resources.

7. Definitions

As used in this notice—

''All aspects of an industry'' means all aspects of the industry or industry sector a student is preparing to enter, including planning, management, finances, technical and production skills, underlying principles of technology, labor and community issues, health and safety issues, and environmental issues, related to that industry or industry sector;

''Bureau-funded school'' as defined in Section 1139 (3) of the ''Education Amendments of 1978'' means:

(a) A Bureau school—a Bureau of Indian Affairs-operated elementary or secondary day or boarding school or a BIA-operated dormitory for students attending a school other than a Bureau school.

(b) A contract school—an elementary or secondary school or a dormitory that receives financial assistance for its operation under a contract or agreement with the BIA under Section 102, 103 (a), or 208 of the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act.

(c) A school for which assistance is provided under the Tribally Controlled Schools Act of 1988.

''Career guidance and counseling'' means programs—

(a) That pertain to the body of subject matter and related techniques and methods organized for the development in individuals of career awareness, career planning, career decisionmaking, placement skills, and knowledge and understanding of local, State, and national occupational, educational, and labor market needs, trends, and opportunities;

(b) That assist individuals in making and implementing informed educational and occupational choices; and

(c) That aid students to develop career options with attention to surmounting gender, race, ethnic, disability, language, or socioeconomic impediments to career options and encouraging careers in nontraditional employment.

''Career major'' means a coherent sequence of courses or field of study that prepares a student for a first job and that—

(a) Integrates academic and occupational learning, integrates school-based and work-based learning, and establishes linkages between secondary schools and postsecondary educational institutions;

(b) Prepares the student for employment in a broad occupational cluster or industry sector;

(c) Typically includes at least two years of secondary education and at least one or two years of postsecondary education;

(d) Provides the students, to the extent practicable, with strong experience in and understanding of all aspects of the industry the students are planning to enter;

(e) Results in the award of—

(1) a high school diploma or its equivalent, such as:

(A) a general equivalency diploma; or

(B) an alternative diploma or certificate for students with disabilities for whom such alternative diploma or certificate is appropriate;

(2) a certificate or diploma recognizing successful completion of one or two years of postsecondary education (if appropriate), and

(3) a skill certificate; and

(f) May lead to further education and training, such as entry into a registered apprenticeship program, or may lead to admission to a two- or four-year college or university.

''Elementary school'' means a day or residential school that provides elementary education, as determined under State law.

''Employer'' includes both public and private employers, as well as tribal businesses and school-based enterprises where appropriate;

''Eligible partnership'' means an entity responsible for School-to-Work Opportunities programs funded under this competition and that—

(a) Consists of tribal organizations responsible for economic development, employment, job training, and education (such as tribal business councils, local chapters of tribal business councils, tribal departments of education), employers (including tribal businesses or school-based enterprises where applicable), representatives of Bureau-funded schools and local postsecondary educational institutions (including representatives of area vocational education schools and tribal colleges where applicable), local educators (such as teachers, counselors, or administrators), representatives of labor organizations or nonmanagerial employee representatives, students and parents; and

(b) May include other entities, such as—

(1) Employer organizations;

(2) Community-based organizations;

(3) National trade associations working at the local level;

(4) Industrial extension centers;

(5) Rehabilitation agencies and organizations;

(6) Registered apprenticeship agencies;

(7) Local vocational education entities;

(8) Proprietary institutions of higher education (as defined in section 481(b) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1088(b)) that meet the eligibility and certification requirements under Title IV of such Act (20 U.S.C. 1070 et seq.);

(9) Local government agencies;

(10) Parent organizations;

(11) Teacher organizations;

(12) Vocational student organizations;

(13) Private industry councils established under section 402 of the Job Training Partnership Act (29 U.S.C. 1512);

''Postsecondary education institution'' means an institution of higher education (as such term is defined in section 481 of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1088)) which meets the eligibility and certification requirements under Title IV of that Act (20 U.S.C. 1070 et seq.);

''Registered apprenticeship agency'' means the Bureau of Apprenticeship and Training in the Department of Labor or a State apprenticeship agency recognized and approved by the Bureau of Apprenticeship and Training as the appropriate body for State registration or approval of local apprenticeship programs and agreements for Federal purposes;

''Registered apprenticeship program'' means a program registered by a registered apprenticeship agency;

''School dropout'' means a youth who is no longer attending any school and who has not received a secondary school diploma or a certificate from a program of equivalency for such a diploma;

''School site mentor'' means a professional employed at a school who is designated as the advocate for a particular student, and who works in consultation with classroom teachers, counselors, related services personnel, and the employer of the student to design and monitor the progress of the School-to-Work Opportunities program of the student.

''Secondary school'' means—

(a) A nonprofit day or residential school that provides secondary education, as determined under State law, except that it does not include any education provided beyond grade 12; and

(b) A Job Corps center under part B of Title IV of the Job Training Partnership Act (29 U.S.C. 1691 et seq.);

''Skill certificate'' means a portable, industry-recognized credential issued by a School-to-Work Opportunities program under an approved plan, that certifies that a student has mastered skills at levels that are at least as challenging as skill standards endorsed by the National Skill Standards Act of 1994, except that until such skill standards are developed, the term ''skill certificate'' means a credential issued under a process described in the approved School-to-Work plan;

''Workplace mentor'' means an employee or other individual, approved by the employer at a workplace, who possesses the skills and knowledge to be mastered by a student, and who instructs the student, critiques the performance of the student, challenges the student to perform well, and works in consultation with classroom teachers and the employer of the student.

Section C. Statement of Work

Part I. Background

The United States is the only industrialized nation that lacks a comprehensive and coherent system to help its youth acquire the knowledge, skills, abilities, and information about the labor market necessary to make an effective transition from school to career-oriented work. Three-fourths of America's high school students do not attain four-year college degrees. Many of them do not possess the basic academic and occupational skills necessary for entry into high-skill, high-wage careers in the changing workplace or to pursue further education.

The School-to-Work Opportunities Act of 1994 created a national framework for high-quality, statement school-to-work transition systems that enable young Americans to identify and navigate paths to productive and progressively more rewarding roles in the workplace. The funds used for the School-to-Work Indian Program grant competition were requested and appropriated prior to enactment of the School-to-Work Act. However, the Secretaries of Education and Labor have modeled the School-to-Work Opportunities Indian Grant Program on the Act.

Partnerships serving Indian youth face particular challenges in implementing School-to-Work Opportunities initiatives:

1. High unemployment and relatively few high-skill, high-wage employment opportunities often characterize the areas to be served, making it more difficult to secure employer participation, work-based learning opportunities, and career-track jobs for Indian youth who complete a School-to-Work Opportunities program. Therefore, creative strategies must be developed to make full use of the capacity of local institutions to include a variety of alternative work-based learning environments and to support intensive efforts to enhance diverse employer involvement.

2. Dropout rates of schools in Indian communities are often high, and intervention to improve student performance needs to begin in the elementary or middle school years. School-to-Work Opportunities initiatives can offer alternative learning environments, creative approaches to academic and technical subjects and relevant and engaging school-based and work-based activities that can encourage Indian youth to remain in school until completion.

3. Economic and geographic factors may create uneven educational and employment opportunities among Indian youth, thus requiring that careful consideration be given to enhancing both the access and availability of opportunities. In particular, the extremely rural nature of many tribal communities requires innovative efforts in providing high-skill high-wage employment including but not limited to opportunities with tribal businesses, school-based enterprises, and entrepreneurial training.

Under this competition, federal funds will be used as ''venture capital'' to establish School-to-Work Opportunities systems serving Indian youth. Local partnerships applying for development grants should be ready to use funds to involve Bureau-funded schools in establishing cooperative linkages and planning innovative methods of providing School-to-Work services for Indian youth. Local partnerships applying for implementation grants should be ready to implement School-to-Work initiatives involving Bureau-funded schools by building on and enriching existing promising programs such as tech-prep education, career academies, youth apprenticeship, school-based enterprises, job training and previous related efforts funded by the BIA. However, the purpose of funding under the School-to-Work Opportunities initiative is not simply to augment existing programs, but rather to build systems that provide opportunities for all students to achieve the benefits and outcomes of the School-to-Work Opportunities initiative. Building comprehensive systems will likely involve a combination of enhancing existing programs, establishing linkages among them, and developing an effective framework that connects both existing and new programs in a meaningful way. Through involvement in the School-to-Work Indian Program Grants, tribal organizations are expected to build over time the kind of School-to-Work

Opportunities Systems that best meet their needs.

Part II. Program Description

a. Objectives

The School-to-Work Opportunities initiative provides for a substantial degree of State and local flexibility and experimentation, but all State systems, individual local initiatives and Indian Program initiatives will share several common features and basic program components as required by the School-to-Work Opportunities Act of 1994. A School-to-Work Opportunities initiative under this competition must include the following common features and basic program components:

1. The basis of the School-to-Work Opportunities system is—

(a) The integration of school-based learning and work-based learning;

(b) The integration of academic and occupational learning; and

(c) The establishment of effective linkages between secondary and postsecondary education.

2. School-to-Work Opportunities programs will—

(a) Provide participating students with the opportunity to complete career majors;

(b) Incorporate the program components described below (school-based learning, work-based learning, and connecting activities);

(c) Provide participating students, to the extent practicable, with strong experience in and understanding of all aspects of the industry the students are preparing to enter; and

(d) Provide all students with equal access to the full range of such program components (including both school-based and work-based learning components) and related activities, such as recruitment, enrollment, and placement activities, except that nothing in this notice shall be construed to provide any individual with an entitlement to services.

3. School-to-Work Opportunities initiatives must incorporate three basic program components:

(a) School-Based Learning, that includes—

- Career awareness and career exploration and counseling (beginning at the earliest possible age, but not later than the 7th grade) in order to help students who may be interested to identify, and select or reconsider, their interests, goals, and career majors, including those options that may not be traditional for their gender, race, or ethnicity;
- Initial selection by interested students of a career major not later than the beginning of the 11th grade;
- A program of study designed to meet the same academic content standards established for all students, including, where applicable, standards established under the Goals 2000: Educate America Act, and to meet the requirements necessary to prepare a student for postsecondary education and the requirements necessary to earn a skill certificate;
- A program of instruction and curriculum that integrates academic and vocational learning (including applied methodologies and team-teaching strategies), and incorporates instruction, to the extent practicable, in all aspects of an industry, appropriately tied to the career of a participant;
- Regularly scheduled evaluations involving ongoing consultation and problem solving with students and school dropouts to identify their academic strengths and weaknesses, academic progress, workplace knowledge, goals, and the need for additional learning opportunities to master core academic and vocational skills; and
- Procedures to facilitate the entry of students participating in a School-to-Work Opportunities initiative into additional training or postsecondary education programs, as well as to facilitate the transfer of the students between education and training programs.

(b) Work-based learning, that includes—

(1) Mandatory activities—

- Work experience;
- A planned program of job training and work experiences (including training related to pre-employment and employment skills to be mastered at progressively higher levels) that are coordinated with learning in the school-based learning component described above and are relevant to the career majors of students and lead to the award of skill certificates;
- Workplace mentoring;
- Instruction in general workplace competencies, including instruction and activities related to developing positive work attitudes, and employability and participative skills; and
- Broad instruction, to the extent practicable, in all aspects of the industry.

(2) Permissible activities—Such component may include such activities as paid work experience, job shadowing, school-sponsored enterprises, or on-the-job training.

(c) Connecting Activities, that include—

- Matching students with the work-based learning opportunities of employers;
- Providing, with respect to each student, a school site mentor to act as a liaison among the student and the employer, school, teacher, school administrator, and parent of the student, and, if appropriate, other community partners;
- Providing technical assistance and services to employers, including small- and medium-sized businesses, and other parties in—

(A) Designing school-based learning components as described above, work-based learning components as described above, and counseling and case management services; and

(B) Training teachers, workplace mentors, school site mentors, and counselors;

- Providing assistance to schools and employers to integrate school-based and work-based learning and integrate academic and occupational learning into the program;
- Encouraging the active participation of employers, in cooperation with local education officials, in the implementation of local activities described in this Part as school-based learning, work-based learning, or connecting activities;

(A) Providing assistance to participants who have completed the program in finding an appropriate job, continuing their education, or entering into an additional training program; or

(B) Linking the participants with other community services that may be necessary to assure a successful transition from school to work;

- Collecting and analyzing information regarding post-program outcomes of participants in the School-to-Work Opportunities initiative, to the extent practicable and appropriate for Indian programs, on the basis of socioeconomic status, gender, and disability, and on the basis of whether the participants are students with limited-English proficiency, school dropouts, disadvantaged students, or academically talented students; and
- Linking youth development activities under the School-to-Work Opportunities initiative with employer and industry strategies for upgrading the skills of their workers.

b. Examples of Allowable Activities

Funds awarded under this competition to a partnership serving Indian youth and involving Bureau-funded schools may be used only for activities undertaken to develop or implement the local partnership's plan that will provide opportunities for Indian youth to participate successfully in a School-to-Work Opportunities initiative.

Development Grants: Eligible partnerships that have not fully developed a plan for the implementation of a School-to-Work Opportunities system may apply for development grants. These funds may support a wide range of planning and development activities. These grants are designed for situations in which an eligible partnership may not be ready to move forward with implementation of a School-to-Work Opportunities initiative, but intends to compete for implementation grants in future rounds of competition. Eligible partnerships seeking development grants must describe the planning and development activities for the School-to-Work Opportunities initiative that the partnership proposes to undertake during the 12-month grant period. The plan should include activities funded from this grant as well as from other sources. Examples of development activities that may be conducted with funds awarded under an Indian Program Grant are—

1. Initiating a planning process aimed at building a School-to-Work Opportunities initiative;
2. Identifying or establishing an appropriate structure to administer a School-to-Work Opportunities initiative;
3. Further expanding eligible partnerships as defined in this notice to participate in the design, development and administration of the School-to-Work Opportunities initiative;
4. Building consensus among local stakeholders and supporting planning and development activities to provide guidance in creating the School-to-Work Opportunities plan;
5. Initiating pilot projects to test key components of program design such as designing and testing common intake systems for students participating in School-to-Work Opportunities initiatives, and determining methods to integrate program data bases;
6. Analyzing current statutory, regulatory and administrative impediments to the creation of a School-to-Work Opportunities initiative;
7. Assessing staff training and development needs for participation in a School-to-Work Opportunities initiative;
8. Preparing the strategic plan required for submission of a proposal for an implementation grant. The plan should describe the progress expected to be achieved in the planning and development process by the end of the 12-month grant period. This should include expected ''next steps.''

Implementation grants: Eligible partnerships that have developed and are ready to implement a plan for a School-to-Work Opportunities initiative may apply for implementation grants. These funds may be used to support a wide range of activities providing School-to-Work Opportunities for Indian youth. Examples of implementation activities that may be conducted with funds awarded under an Indian Program Grant are:

1. Recruiting and providing assistance to employers, including small- and medium-sized businesses, tribal businesses and school-based enterprises, to provide the work-based learning components in the School-to-Work Opportunities initiative;
2. Establishing consortia of employers, including tribal businesses and school-based enterprises, to support the School-to-Work Opportunities initiative and provide access to jobs related to the career majors of students;
3. Supporting or establishing intermediaries (selected from among the members of the local partnership) to perform the connecting activities described above in Part II. a., ''Objectives,'' and to provide assistance to Indian youth in obtaining jobs and further education and training;
4. Designing or adapting innovative school curricula that can be used to integrate academic, vocational, and occupational learning, school-based and work-based learning, and secondary and postsecondary education for all students in the area served;
5. Providing training to work-based and school-based staff on new curricula, student assessments, student guidance, and feedback to the school regarding student performance in connection with the School-to-Work Opportunities Initiative;
6. Establishing, in schools participating in a School-to-Work Opportunities initiative, a graduation assistance program to assist at-risk students, low-achieving students, and students with disabilities, in graduating from high school, enrolling in postsecondary education or training, and finding or advancing in jobs;
7. Providing career exploration and awareness services, counseling and mentoring services, college awareness and preparation services, and other services (beginning at the earliest possible age, but not later than the 7th grade) to prepare students for the transition from school to work;
8. Providing supplementary and support services, including child care and transportation, when such services are necessary for participation in a local School-to-Work Opportunities initiative;
9. Conducting or obtaining an in-depth analysis of the local labor market and the generic and specific skill needs of employers to identify high-demand, high-wage careers to target;
10. Integrating school-based and work-based learning into existing job training programs for school dropouts;
11. Establishing or expanding school-to-apprenticeship programs in cooperation with registered apprenticeship agencies and apprenticeship sponsors;
12. Assisting participating employers, including small- and medium-sized businesses, tribal businesses and school-based enterprises, to identify and train workplace mentors and to develop work-based learning components;
13. Promoting the formation of partnerships between Bureau-funded schools and other elementary and secondary schools (including middle schools) and local businesses as an investment in future workplace productivity and competitiveness;
14. Designing local strategies to provide adequate planning time and staff development activities for teachers, school counselors, related services personnel, and school site mentors, including opportunities outside the classroom that are at the worksite;
15. Enhancing linkages between after-school, weekend, and summer jobs, career exploration, and school-based learning;
16. Obtaining the assistance of organizations and institutions that have a history of success in working with school dropouts and at-risk and disadvantaged youths in recruiting such Indian youth who are at-risk or school dropouts to participate in a local School-to-Work Opportunities initiative;
17. Conducting outreach to all students in a language and manner that most appropriately and effectively meets their needs and responds to the needs of their community;
18. Experimenting with providing work-based learning opportunities both inside and outside the Indian community;
19. Developing, in conjunction with Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Schools Act or other funds, improvements in the Bureau-funded and other elementary and middle schools that serve the Indian community in order to reduce the long-term dropout rate of Indian youth;
20. Developing and implementing techniques that will increase the college enrollment of Indian youth in the targeted area;
21. Utilizing complementary initiatives within the targeted area such as comprehensive sports and recreation programs, after-school programs, and community development activities;

22. Encouraging Indian youth to design and initiate innovative work-based learning activities operated within a school setting; and

23. Developing and implementing school-based and work-based learning and connecting activities that are related to the tribal organization's economic development plan.

Part III. Application Contents

All eligible applicants for development or implementation grants must submit an application which provides evidence of key descriptive components. Since applicants have been recommended to submit applications which describe their plan in light of the Selection Criteria defined in Section E, the Departments suggest that applicants provide evidence of the following as part of the applicable Selection Criteria addressed in the Program Narrative section of application. Applications must include the following:

a. A description of the composition of the eligible partnership as previously defined in Section B.7 of this announcement. Partnerships applying for either development or implementation grants must identify and provide evidence of the involvement of the members of the local partnership required to make the application eligible for consideration in the Indian Program. Partnerships applying for implementation grants must clearly outline the respective roles of each member of the partnership and how the partnership is organized to successfully implement the planned local School-to-Work Opportunities initiative. Given the particular needs in Indian communities, special efforts should be made to coordinate community services to successfully identify and address the special needs of the Indian youth.

b. A description of the targeted area to be covered, and its relationship to the surrounding labor market. Included in the description should be information on specific employer needs (including those of tribal businesses or school-based enterprises where applicable); industry and occupational growth projections; high-demand, high-wage careers to be targeted and the relationship of these factors to the tribal organization's economic plan (where applicable). The description should include information for the entire labor market area in which the Indian community is located.

c. A description of the short- and long-term goals and performance outcomes that the partnership has established an how the partnership will measure its progress in meeting these goals for developing or implementing a system. In addition to goals related directly to School-to-Work Opportunities outcomes, such goals for Indian Program initiatives might include decreased dropout rates, decreased truancy rates, and increased college entry and entered employment rates. In addition to describing its own goals and outcomes, each local partnership awarded a grant under this notice must commit to assisting the Federal Government in carrying out a national evaluation that will track and assess the progress and effectiveness of the School-to-Work Opportunities initiative.

d. A description of the current and planned coordination between the local partnership's School-to-Work Opportunities initiative in the Indian community and the tribal organization's economic development, workforce development and education reform plans. Areas to be addressed include: the development of skill standards and processes for awarding skill certificates; the establishment of a system-wide evaluation process; the identification of emerging occupations appropriate for career majors; the development of new curricula; strategies for recruiting employers and providing paid work-based learning experiences; and providing professional staff development. Should the tribal organization and the Bureau-funded school not have a plan for developing skill standards and awarding skill certificates, the application should describe the local partnership's proposed activities concerning the investigation and adaptation of existing industry-recognized standards or existing processes for awarding industry-recognized certificates to incorporate the criteria established in the Goals 2000: Educate America Act. States and neighboring partnerships located near the area may serve as a source of information regarding skill standards and skill certificates recognized in the local labor market and in other parts of the State.

e. A timeline outlining the specific tasks to be undertaken related to development or to implementation of a School-to-Work Opportunities plan, with expected completion dates and stated outcomes to be achieved.

f. A designation of a fiscal agent to receive and be accountable for funds awarded under this notice.

Section D. Safeguards

The Departments apply the following safeguards to School-to-Work Opportunities programs funded under this competition:

1. No student in a School-to-Work Opportunities program shall displace any currently employed worker (including a partial displacement, such as a reduction in the hours of non-overtime work, wages, or employment benefits.)

2. No School-to-Work Opportunities program shall impair exiting contracts for services or collective bargaining agreements, and no program under this competition that would be inconsistent with the terms of a collective bargaining agreement shall be undertaken without the written concurrence of the labor organization and employer concerned.

3. No student participating in School-to-Work Opportunities program shall be employed or fill a job—

a. When any other individual is on temporary layoff, with the clear possibility of recall, from the same or any substantially equivalent job with the participating employer; or

b. When the employer has terminated the employment of any regular employee or otherwise reduced its workforce with the intention of filling the vacancy so created with a student.

4. Students shall be provided with adequate and safe equipment and safe and healthful workplaces in conformity with all health and safety requirements of Federal, State, and local law.

5. Nothing in this notice shall be construed so as to modify or affect any Federal or State law prohibiting discrimination on the basis of religion, gender, age, or disability.

6. Funds awarded under this competition shall not be expended for wages of students or workplace mentors participating in School-to-Work Opportunities programs.

7. The grantee shall implement and maintain such other safeguards as the Departments may deem appropriate in order to ensure that School-to-Work Opportunities participants are afforded adequate supervision by skilled adult workers, or to otherwise further the purposes of this program.

An applicant must provide an assurance, in the application appendices, that the foregoing safeguards will be implemented and maintained throughout all program activities.

Section E. Selection Criteria

Under the School-to-Work Opportunities Indian Program Grants competition announced in this notice, a careful evaluation of applications will be made by a panel constructed of (a) peer reviewers and (b) specialists within the Departments of Labor and Education. Each panelist will evaluate the applications against the criteria

listed below, with emphasis on the scope and quality of the proposed plan and with careful consideration of the effectiveness, rather than the presence, of each program component. The panel results are advisory in nature and not binding on the Grants Officer. Final funding decisions will be made based on the results of the panel review process and such other factors as: geographic balance, diversity of programmatic approaches, replicability, sustainability, and innovation. The Government will use the following selection criteria in evaluating applications for *development grants:*

Selection Criteria

Selection Criterion 1: Vision of a local School to Work Opportunities initiative incorporating the elements described in Part II of this notice.

Points: 30.

Considerations: In applying this criterion, reviewers will consider:

* How well does the vision of an integrated delivery system for School-to-Work Opportunities incorporate the common features and basic program components described in Part II of this notice?

* How clearly are the problems and/or inefficiencies of current programs and approaches understood and articulated?

* How clearly does the partnership articulate how it envisions integrating promising existing programs into a comprehensive School-to-Work Opportunities system?

* How well does this vision incorporate realistic strategies to ensure that ''all students'' have opportunities to participate in School-to-Work initiatives?

* How well does the vision address the needs of the labor market within which the targeted area is located, including the tribal economic plan?

* How well does the vision convey the partnership's connection between the proposed School-to-Work Opportunities system and overall education reform?

Selection Criterion 2: Approach to collaboration, planning and development.

Points: 30.

Considerations: In applying this criterion, reviewers will consider:

* Whether the eligible partnership includes all of the required representatives as defined in section E.7 of this notice?

* Whether other appropriate officials and organizations necessary to achieve the objectives of the application are also represented?

* To what extent will employers and representatives of workers participate in the development of the plan?

* Are the roles and responsibilities of each partner well articulated and substantive?

* Is the plan likely to lead to a broad consensus about the design of the School-to-Work Opportunities system?

* Is the proposal clear on who will have the day to day responsibilities for the grant and how major decisions will be made?

Selection Criterion 3: Feasibility and soundness of the development plan.

Points: 25.

Considerations: In applying this criterion, reviewers will consider:

* Are the planned activities likely to prepare the eligible partnership to implement a School-to-Work Opportunities initiative?

* To what extent has progress already been made?

* Are staff development and training needs fully considered?

* Does the development process fully take advantage of technology?

* Whether the approach to identifying and overcoming anticipated barriers to the development of the partnership's School-to-Work plan is feasible?

* Whether the management plan and related timeline of activities included in the application are appropriate to the goals and outcomes to be achieved?

* Are key personnel to be used on the project qualified to undertake proposed activities?

Selection Criterion 4: Commitment to the planning and development effort.

Points: 15.

Considerations: In applying this criterion, reviewers will consider:

* To what extent are Federal or other local resources being utilized to finance planning and development activities towards the development of a comprehensive School-to-Work system?

* To what extent has the partnership provided in-kind support and resources towards the development of the system?

* Whether resources available are adequate to support the activities proposed?

The Government will use the following selection criteria in evaluating applications for implementation grants.

Selection Criteria

Selection Criterion 1: Scope and Quality of the School-to-Work Opportunities Initiative.

Points: 25.

Considerations: In applying this criterion, reviewers will consider:

* Is there an innovative and effective strategy for implementing a School-to-Work Opportunities initiative serving Indian youth and involving Bureau-funded schools that integrates school-based learning and work-based learning, integrates academic and occupational learning, and establishes effective linkages between secondary and postsecondary education?

* Does the application demonstrate an effective strategy for targeting high-demand, high-wage jobs and relate that strategy to the partnership's goals?

* What steps will the local partnership take to generate paid high-qualify, work-based learning experiences?

* How effectively are the common features and basic program components described in Part II., a., of the Statement of Work included in the local School-to-Work Opportunities initiative?

* Have promising existing programs been considered for adaptation?

* Have new directions and approaches been planned to ensure that these programs include the common features and basic program components?

* As the proposed School-to-Work Opportunities initiative becomes established within the targeted area, is there an effective long-range plan for integrating other existing school-to-work programs with the initiative?

* Is the proposed local initiative effectively tied to a plan for educational reform?

Selection Criterion 2: Scope and Effectiveness of Indian Program Local Partnerships.

Points: 25.

Considerations: In applying this criterion, reviewers will consider:

* Does the application demonstrate the strong commitment and support of tribal organizations (such as tribal business councils or local chapters of tribal business councils, tribal departments of education), employers (both within and surrounding the targeted area where applicable and including tribal businesses and school-based enterprises), representatives of local educational agencies and local postsecondary educational institutions (including representatives of area vocational education schools and tribal colleges, where applicable), local educators (such as teachers, counselors, or administrators), representatives of labor organizations or nonmanagerial employee representatives, parents and students and provide for their sustained and specific involvement?

* Given the scope of the proposed School-to-Work Opportunities initiative, does the local partnership include other members appropriate to effective implementation, particularly community-based organizations and

others experienced in dealing with the distinctive needs of Indian youth?

* Are the rolls and responsibilities of the members of the local partnership clearly described, appropriate and likely to produce the desired changes in the way students are prepared for the future?

* Does the local partnership's plan include an effective and convincing strategy for obtaining the active and continued involvement of employers and other interested parties such as locally elected officials, secondary and postsecondary educational institutions (or related agencies), business associations, industrial extension centers, employees, labor organizations or nonmanagerial employees, teachers, related services personnel, students, parents, community-based organizations, rehabilitation agencies and organizations, registered apprenticeship agencies, local vocational educational agencies, vocational student organizations, State or regional cooperative education associations, and human service agencies in the implementation of local program(s)?

Selection Criterion 3: Student Participation.

Points: 20.

Considerations: In applying this criterion, reviewers will consider:

* Applying the definitions contained in Section B (7) of this notice as appropriate for programs serving Indian youth, does the plan propose realistic strategies to ensure that ''all students'' have opportunities to participate in School-to-Work Opportunities initiatives?

* Does the strategy recognize barriers to their participations and propose effective ways of overcoming them so that these students are prepared for high-skill, high-wage jobs, including—for young women—nontraditional employment?

* Does the plan provide for the direct delivery of services to significant numbers of Indian youth or propose an effective model for service provision to Indian youth in remote areas?

* Is there an effective strategy for assessing the academic and human service needs of students and dropouts and making improvements or adjustments as necessary to ensure their successful participation in and completion of School-to-Work Opportunities programs?

• What, if any, provisions are made for the participation of elementary and middle school Indian youth in school-to-work activities, such as career exploration and awareness?

Selection Criterion 4: Comprehensiveness.

Points: 15.

Consideration: In applying this criterion, reviewers will consider:

• To what extent has the local partnership considered the current and future occupational needs of the labor market areas within which the targeted area is located, including the tribal organization's economic plan?

• Does the membership representing employers in the local partnership reflect such current and future occupational needs?

• How is the strategy for implementing the School-to-Work Opportunities initiative likely to produce systemic change, rather than stand-alone program implementation?

• What evidence is provided that such systemic change will have substantial impact on the preparation of Indian youth for a first job in a high-skill, high-wage career and postsecondary education and training?

• Where appropriate, is there existing or planned collaboration among other school districts, States, employers, labor organizations, and community groups that will lead to an increasingly comprehensive local School-to-Work Opportunities system?

• Are related human services programs available within the community included in the partnership's plan for coordination?

• Are strategies in place to coordinate related Federal funding available to the Indian community?

• Does the local partnership's plan exhibit strong potential for maintaining School-to-Work Opportunities initiatives after Federal funding ceases?

Selection Criterion 5: Management plan.

Points: 15.

Considerations: In applying this criterion, reviewers will consider:

• What evidence exists to demonstrate the effectiveness of the local partnership and/or its key members in the delivery of comprehensive vocational programs with successful job placement rates through cooperative activities among local educational agencies, Local businesses, labor organizations, and others?

• Does the entity submitting the application on the part of the local partnership have the capacity to manage the implementation of the local School-to-Work Opportunities initiative?

• Does the management plan anticipate barriers to implementation and include a system for addressing them as they arise?

• Does the applicant limit administrative costs in order to maximize the amounts spent on delivery of services to students enrolled in its School-to-Work Opportunities programs?

• Does the plan include methods for sustaining and expanding the partnership as the initiative expands in scope and size?

• Is there an effective strategy for identifying and utilizing other resources, including private sector resources, to maintain and expand School-to-Work Opportunities initiatives?

• Does the management plan reflect continuous improvement methodologies by building in specific, outcome-based, evaluative checkpoints and the mechanisms necessary to carry out improvements, redesigns, or mid-course corrections along the way?

• Are key personnel under the plan qualified to perform the required activities, including maintaining the essential partnership?

Section F. Reporting Requirements/ Deliverables

The local partnership will be required to provide the following:

1. Quarterly and Final Reports

• Quarterly financial reports as required by the grant award documents;

• Quarterly narrative reports on progress made and problems encountered in implementing the proposed plan and that indicate, where relevant, the corrective action(s) proposed to address implementation problems; and

• Annual reports at year-end on the activities and accomplishments of the local partnership's School-to-Work Opportunities initiative.

2. Deliverables

• At a minimum, preparing an assessment of accomplishments and results at each program year-end suitable for dissemination to other Indian communities and partnerships.

• Acting as a host to outside visitors from other Indian communities or local partnerships interested in developing and implementing School-to-Work Opportunities initiatives in settings with similar characteristics.

Signed at Washington, DC, this 9th day of March 1995.

Doug Ross,

Assistant Secretary for Employment and Training, Department of Labor.

Augusta Souza Kappner,

Assistant Secretary for Vocational and Adult Education, Department of Education.

BILLING CODE 4510–30–M

Appendix A

APPLICATION FOR FEDERAL ASSISTANCE

1. TYPE OF SUBMISSION: *Application* ☐ Construction ☐ Non-Construction; *Preapplication* ☐ Construction ☐ Non-Construction	2. DATE SUBMITTED	Applicant Identifier
	3. DATE RECEIVED BY STATE	State Application Identifier
	4. DATE RECEIVED BY FEDERAL AGENCY	Federal Identifier

5. APPLICANT INFORMATION

Legal Name:	Organizational Unit:
Address *(give city, county, state, and zip code)*:	Name and telephone number of the person to be contacted on matters involving this application *(give area code)*

6. EMPLOYER IDENTIFICATION NUMBER (EIN): ☐☐ – ☐☐☐☐☐☐☐

7. TYPE OF APPLICANT: *(enter appropriate letter in box)* ☐

A. State
B. County
C. Municipal
D. Township
E. Interstate
F. Intermunicipal
G. Special District
H. Independent School Dist.
I. State Controlled Institution of Higher Learning
J. Private University
K. Indian Tribe
L. Individual
M. Profit Organization
N. Other (Specify): _____

8. TYPE OF APPLICATION:

☐ New ☐ Continuation ☐ Revision

If Revision, enter appropriate letter(s) in box(es): ☐ ☐

A. Increase Award B. Decrease Award C. Increase Duration
D. Decrease Duration Other *(specify)*:

_____

9. NAME OF FEDERAL AGENCY:

10. CATALOG OF FEDERAL DOMESTIC ASSISTANCE NUMBER: ☐☐ ☐☐☐

TITLE:

11. DESCRIPTIVE TITLE OF APPLICANT'S PROJECT:

12. AREAS AFFECTED BY PROJECT *(cities, counties, states, etc.)*:

13. PROPOSED PROJECT:		14. CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICTS OF:	
Start Date	Ending Date	a. Applicant	b. Project

15. ESTIMATED FUNDING:	
a. Federal	$ .00
b. Applicant	$ .00
c. State	$ .00
d. Local	$ .00
e. Other	$ .00
f. Program Income	$ .00
g. TOTAL	$ .00

16. IS APPLICATION SUBJECT TO REVIEW BY STATE EXECUTIVE ORDER 12372 PROCESS?

a. YES. THIS PREAPPLICATION/APPLICATION WAS MADE AVAILABLE TO THE STATE EXECUTIVE ORDER 12372 PROCESS FOR REVIEW ON:

DATE_____

b NO. ☐ PROGRAM IS NOT COVERED BY E.O. 12372

☐ OR PROGRAM HAS NOT BEEN SELECTED BY STATE FOR REVIEW

17. IS THE APPLICANT DELINQUENT ON ANY FEDERAL DEBT?

☐ Yes If "Yes," attach an explanation. ☐ No

18. TO THE BEST OF MY KNOWLEDGE AND BELIEF, ALL DATA IN THIS APPLICATION/PREAPPLICATION ARE TRUE AND CORRECT, THE DOCUMENT HAS BEEN DULY AUTHORIZED BY THE GOVERNING BODY OF THE APPLICANT AND THE APPLICANT WILL COMPLY WITH THE ATTACHED ASSURANCES IF THE ASSISTANCE IS AWARDED

a. Typed Name of Authorized Representative	b. Title	c. Telephone number
d. Signature of Authorized Representative		e. Date Signed

Previous Editions Not Usable

Standard Form 424 (REV 4-88)
Prescribed by OMB Circular A-102

Authorized for Local Reproduction

BILLING CODE 4510–30–C

Instructions for the SF 424

This is a standard form used by applicants as a required facesheet for preapplications and applications submitted for Federal assistance. It will be used by Federal agencies to obtain applicant certification that States which have established a review and comment procedure in response to Executive Order 12372 and have selected the program to be included in their process, have been given a opportunity to review the applicant's submission.

Item and Entry

1. Self-explanatory.
2. Date application submitted to Federal agency for State if applicable) & applicant's control number (if applicable).
3. State use only (if applicable).
4. If this application is to continue or revise an existing award, enter present Federal identifier number. If for a new project, leave blank.
5. Legal name of applicant, name of primary organizational unit which will undertake the assistance activity, complete address of the applicant, and name and telephone number of the person to contact on matters related to this application.
6. Enter Employer Identification Number (EIN) as assigned by the Internal Revenue Service.
7. Enter the appropriate letter in the space provided.
8. Check appropriate box and enter appropriate letter(s) in the space(s) provided:

—''New'' means a new assistance award.
—''Continuation'' means an extension for an additional funding/budget period for a project with a projected completion date.
—''Revision'' means any change in the Federal Government's financial obligation or contingent liability from an existing obligation.

9. Name of Federal agency from which assistance is being requested with this application.
10. Use the Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance number and title of the program under which assistance is requested.
11. Enter a brief descriptive title of the project, if more than one program is involved, you should append an explanation on a separate sheet. If appropriate (e.g., construction or real property projects), attach a map showing project location. For preapplications, use a separate sheet to provide a summary description of this project.
12. List only the largest political entities affected (e.g., State, counties, cities).
13. Self-explanatory.
14. List the applicant's Congressional District and any District(s) affected by the program or project.
15. Amount requested or to be contributed during the first funding/budget period by each contributor. Value of in-kind contributions should be included on appropriate lines as applicable. If the action will result in a dollar change to an existing awards, indicate *only* the amount of the change. For decreases, enclose the amounts in parentheses. If both basic and supplemental amounts are included, show breakdown on an attached sheet. For multiple program funding, use totals and show breakdown using same categories as item 15.
16. Applicants should contact the State Single Point of Contact (SPOC) for Federal Executive Order 12372 to determine whether the application is subject to the State intergovernmental review process.
17. This question applies to the applicant organization, not the person who signs as the authorized representative. Categories of debt include delinquent audit disallowances, loans and taxes.
18. To be signed by the authorized representative of the applicant. A copy of the governing body's authorization for you to sign this application as official representative must be on file in the applicant's office. (Certain Federal agencies may require that this authorization be submitted as part of the application.)

BILLING CODE 4510–30–M

PART II - BUDGET INFORMATION

SECTION A - Budget Summary by Categories

	(A)	(B)	(C)
1. Personnel	$		
2. Fringe Benefits (Rate %)			
3. Travel			
4. Equipment			
5. Supplies			
6. Contractual			
7. Other			
8. Total, Direct Cost (Lines 1 through 7)			
9. Indirect Cost (Rate %)			
10. Training Cost/Stipends			
11. TOTAL Funds Requested (Lines 8 through 10)	$		

SECTION B - Cost Sharing/ Match Summary (if appropriate)

	(A)	(B)	(C)
1. Cash Contribution	$		
2. In-Kind Contribution			
3. TOTAL Cost Sharing / Match (Rate %)	$		

NOTE: Use Column A to record funds requested for the initial period of performance (i.e. 12 months, 18 months, etc.); Column B to record changes to Column A (i.e. requests for additional funds or line item changes; and Column C to record the totals (A plus B).

(INSTRUCTIONS ON BACK OF FORM)

BILLING CODE 4510–30–C

Instructions for Part II—Budget Information

Section A—Budget Summary by Categories

1. *Personnel:* Show salaries to be paid for project personnel.

2. *Fringe Benefits:* Indicate the rate and amount of fringe benefits.

3. *Travel:* Indicate the amount requested for staff travel. Include funds to cover at least one trip to Washington, DC for project director or designee.

4. *Equipment:* Indicate the cost of non-expendable personal property that has a useful life of more than one year with a per unit cost of $5,000 or more.

5. *Supplies:* Include the cost of consumable supplies and materials to be used during the project period.

6. *Contractual:* Show the amount to be used for (1) procurement contracts (except those which belong on other lines such as supplies and equipment); and (2) sub-contracts/grants.

7. *Other:* Indicate all direct costs not clearly covered by lines 1 through 6 above, including consultants.

8. *Total, Direct Costs:* Add lines 1 through 7.

9. *Indirect Costs:* Indicate the rate and amount of indirect costs. Please include a copy of your negotiated Indirect Cost Agreement.

10. *Training/Stipend Cost:* (If allowable)

11. *Total Federal Funds Requested:* Show total of lines 8 through 10.

Section B—Cost Sharing/Matching Summary

Indicate the actual rate and amount of cost sharing/matching when there is a cost sharing/matching requirement. Also include percentage of total project cost and indicate source of cost sharing/matching funds, i.e. other Federal source or other Non-Federal source.

Note: Please include a detailed cost analysis of each line item.

Appendix B—Assurances and Certifications

The Department of Labor will not award a grant or agreement where the awardee has failed to accept the Assurances and Certifications contained in this section. By signing the face sheet of this grant or agreement, the awardee is providing the certifications set forth below:

Assurances—Non-Construction Programs
Debarment and Suspension Certification
Certification Regarding Lobbying
Drug Free Workplace Certification
Certification of Non-Delinquency
Non-discrimination and Equal Employment Requirements Under JTPA

1. Assurances—Non-Construction Programs

Note: Certain of these assurances may not be applicable to your project or program. If you have questions, please contact the awarding agency. Further, certain Federal awarding agencies may require applicants to certify to additional assurances. If such is the case, you will be notified.

As the duly authorized representative of the applicant, I certify that the applicant:

(1) Has the legal authority to apply for Federal Assistance, and the institutional managerial and financial capability (including funds sufficient to pay the non-Federal share of project costs) to ensure proper planning, management and completion of the project described in this application.

(2) Will give the awarding agency, the Comptroller General of the United States, and if appropriate, the State, through any authorized representative, access to and the right to examine all records, books, papers, or documents related to the award; and will establish a proper accounting system in accordance with generally accepted accounting standards or agency directives.

(3) Will establish safeguards to prohibit employees from using their positions for a purpose that constitutes or presents the appearance of personal or organizational conflict of interest, or personal gain.

(4) Will initiate and complete the work within the applicable time frame after receipt of approval of the awarding agency.

(5) Will comply with the Intergovernmental Personnel Act of 1970 (42 U.S.C. 4728–4763) relating to prescribed standards for merit systems for programs funded under one of the nineteen statutes or regulations specified in Appendix A of OPM's Standards for a Merit System of Personnel Administration (5 CFR 900, Subpart F).

(6) Will comply with all Federal statutes relating to nondiscrimination. These include but are not limited to: (a) Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (P.L. 88.352) which prohibits discrimination on the basis of race, color or national origin; (b) Title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972, as amended (20 U.S.C. 1681–1683, and 1685–1686), which prohibits discrimination on the basis of handicaps; (d) the Age Discrimination Act of 1975, as amended (42 U.S.C. 6101–6107), which prohibits discrimination on the basis of age; (e) the Drug Abuse Office and Treatment Act of 1972 (P.L. 92.255) as amended, relating to nondiscrimination on the basis of drug abuse; (f) the Comprehensive Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism Prevention, Treatment and Rehabilitation Act of 1970 (P.L. 91.616) as amended, relating to nondiscrimination on the basis of alcohol abuse or alcoholism; (g) 523 and 527 of the Public Health Service Act of 1912 (42 U.S.C. 290 dd.3 and 290 ee.3), as amended, relating to confidentiality of alcohol and drug abuse patient records; (h) Title VIII of the Civil Rights Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 3601 et seq.) as amended, relating to nondiscrimination in the sale, rental or financing of housing; (i) any other nondiscrimination provisions in the specific statute(s) under which application for Federal assistance is being made; and (j) the requirements of any other nondiscrimination statute(s) which may apply to the application.

(7) Will comply, or has already complied, with the requirements of Titles II and III of the Uniformly Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Policies Act of 1970 (P.L. 91.646) which provides for fair and equitable treatment of persons displaced or whose property is acquired as a result of Federal or federally assisted programs. These requirements apply to all interests in real property acquired for project purposes regardless of Federal participation in purchases.

(8) Will comply with the provisions of the Hatch Act (U.S.C. 1501–1508 and 7324–7328) which limit the political activities of employees whose principal employment activities are funded in whole or in part with Federal funds.

(9) Will comply, as applicable, with the provisions of the Davis-Bacon Act (40 U.S.C. 276a to 276a 7), the Copeland Act (40 U.S.C. 276c and 18 U.S.C. 874, and the Contract Work Hours and Safety Standards Act (40.327–333), regarding labor standards for federally assisted construction subagreements.

(10) Will comply, if applicable, with Flood Insurance Purchase Requirements of Section 102(A) of the Flood Disaster Protection Act of 1973 (P.L. 93.234) which requires recipients in a special flood hazard area to participate in the program and to purchase flood insurance if the total cost of insurable construction and acquisition is $10,000 or more.

(11) Will comply with environmental standards which may be prescribed pursuant to the following: (a) institution of environmental quality control measures under the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (P.L. 91.190) and Executive Order (EO) 11514; (b) notification of violating facilities pursuant to EO 11738; (c) protection of wetlands pursuant to EO 11990; (d) evaluation of flood hazards in flood plains in accordance with EO 11988; (e) assurance of project consistency with the approved State management program developed under the Coastal Zone Management Act of 1972 (16 U.S.C. 1451 et seq.); (f) conformity of Federal actions to State (Clear Air) Implementation Plans under Section 176(c) of the Clear Air Act of 1955, as amended (42 U.S.C. 7401 et seq.); (g) protection of underground sources of drinking water under the Safe Drinking Water Act of 1974, as amended, (P.L. 93.523); and (h) protection of endangered species under the Endangered Species Act of 1973, as amended, (P.L. 93.205).

(12) Will comply with the Wide and Scenic Rivers Act of 1988 (16 U.S.C. 1271 et seq.) related to protecting components or potential components of the national wide and scenic rivers system.

(13) Will assist the awarding agency in assuring compliance with Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966, as amended (16 U.S.C. 470), EO 11593 (identification and protection of historic properties), and the Archaeological and Historic Preservation Act of 1974 (16 U.S.C. 469a.1 et seq.).

(14) Will comply with P.L. 93.348 regarding the protection of human subjects involved in research, development, and related activities supported by this award of assistance.

(15) Will comply with the Laboratory Animal Welfare Act of 1966 (P.L.) 89.544, as amended, 7 U.S.C. 2131 et seq.) pertaining to the care, handling, and treatment of warm blooded animals held for research, teaching, or other activities supported by this award of assistance.

(16) Will comply with the Lead-Based Paint Poisoning Prevention Act (42 U.S.C.

4801 et seq.) which prohibits the use of lead based paint in construction or rehabilitation of residence structures.

(17) Will cause to be performed the required financial and compliance audits in accordance with the Single Audit Act of 1984.

(18) Will comply with all applicable requirements of all other Federal laws, executive orders, regulations and policies governing this program.

2. Certification Regarding Debarment, Suspension, and Other Responsibility Matters—Primary Covered Transactions

(1) The prospective primary participant certifies to the best of its knowledge and belief, that it and its principals:

(a) Are not presently debarred, suspended, proposed for debarment, declared ineligible, or voluntarily excluded from covered transactions by any Federal department or agency;

(b) Have not within a three-year period preceding this proposal been convicted or had a civil judgment rendered against them for commission of fraud or a criminal offense in connection with obtaining attempting to obtain, or performing a public (Federal, State, or local) transaction or contract under a public transaction; violation of Federal or State antitrust statutes or commission of embezzlement, theft, forgery, bribery, falsification or destruction of records, making false statements, or receiving stolen property;

(c) Are not presently indicated or otherwise criminally or civilly charged by a government entity (Federal, State or local) with commission of any of the offenses enumerated in paragraph (1)(b) of this certification; and;

(d) Have not a three-year period preceding this application/proposal had one or more public transactions (Federal, State, or local) terminated for cause or default.

(2) Where the prospective primary participant is unable to certify to any of the statements in this certification, such prospective participant shall attach an explanation of this proposal.

3. Certification Regarding Lobbying

Certification for Contracts, Grants, Loans, and Cooperative Agreements

By accepting this grant/agreement, the signee hereby certifies, to the best of his or her knowledge and belief, that:

1. No Federal appropriated funds have been paid or will be paid, by or on behalf of the undersigned, to any person for influencing or attempting to influence an officer or employee of Congress, or an employee of a Member of Congress in connection with the awarding of any Federal contract, the making of any Federal grant, the making of any Federal loan, the entering into of any cooperative agreement, and the extension, continuation, renewal, amendment or modification of any Federal contract, grant, loan or cooperative agreement.

2. If any funds other than Federal appropriated funds have been paid or will be paid to any person for influencing or attempting to influence an officer or employee of any agency, a Member of Congress, an officer or employee of Congress, or an employee of a Member of Congress in Connection with this Federal contract, grant, loan or cooperative agreement, the undersigned shall complete and submit Standard Form—LLL, ''Disclosure Form to Report Lobbying,'' in accordance with its instructions.

Instructions for Completion of SF–LLL, Disclosure of Lobbying Activities

This disclosure form shall be completed by the reporting entity, whether subawardee or prime Federal recipient, at the initiation or receipt of a covered Federal Action, or a material change to a previous filing, pursuant to title 31 U.S.C. section 1352. The filing of a form is required for each payment or agreement to make payment to any lobbying entity for influencing or attempting to influence an officer or employee of any agency, a Member of Congress, an officer or employee of Congress, or an employee of a Member of Congress in connection with a covered Federal action. Use the SF–LLL–A Continuation Sheet for additional information if the space on the form is inadequate. Complete all items that apply for both the initial filing and material change report. Refer to the implementing guidance published by the Office of Management and Budget for additional information.

1. Identify the type of covered Federal action for which lobbying activity is and/or has been secured to influence the outcome of a covered Federal action.

2. Identify the status of the covered Federal action.

3. Identify the appropriate classification of this report. If this is a followup report caused by a material change to the information previously reported, enter the year and quarter in which the change occurred. Enter the date of the last previously submitted report by this reporting entity for this covered Federal action.

4. Enter the full name, address, city, state and zip code of the reporting entity. Include Congressional District, if known. Check the appropriate classification of the reporting entity that designates if it is, or expects to be, a prime or subaward recipient. Identify the tier of the subawardee, e.g., the first subawardee of the prime is the 1st tier. Subawards include but are not limited to subcontracts, subgrants and contract awards under grants.

5. If the organization filing the report in item 4 checks ''Subawardee'', then enter the full name, address, city, state and zip code of the prime Federal recipient. Include Congressional District, if known.

6. Enter the name of the Federal agency making the award or loan commitment. Include at least one organizational level below agency name, if known. For example, Department of Transportation, United States Coast Guard.

7. Enter the Federal program name or description for the covered Federal action (item 1). If known, enter the full Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance (CFDA) number for grants, cooperative agreements, loans, and loan commitments.

8. Enter the most appropriate Federal identifying number available for the Federal action identified in item 1 (e.g., Request for Proposal (RFP) number; Invitation for Bid (IFB) number, grant announcement number, the contract, grant, or loan award number, the application/proposal control number assigned by the Federal agency). Include prefixes, e.g., ''RFP–DE–90–001.''

9. For a covered Federal action where there has been an award or loan commitment by the Federal agency, enter the Federal amount of the award/loan commitment for the prime entity identified in item 4 or 5.

10. (a) Enter the full name, address, city, state and zip code of the lobbying entity engaged by the reporting entity identified in item 4 to influence the covered Federal action.

(b) Enter the full names of the individual(s) performing services, and include full address if different from 10 (a). Enter Last Name, First Name, and Middle Initial (MI).

11. Enter the amount of compensation paid or reasonably expected to be paid by the reporting entity (item 4) to the lobbying entity (item 10). Indicate whether the payment has been made (actual) or will be made (planned). Check all boxes that apply. If this is a material change report, enter the cumulative amount of payment made or planned to be made.

12. Check the appropriate box(es). Check all boxes that apply. If payment is made through an in-kind contribution, specify the nature and value of the in-kind payment.

13. Check the appropriate box(es). Check all boxes that apply. If other, specify nature.

14. Provide a specific and detailed description of the services that the lobbyist has performed, or will be expected to perform, and the date(s) of any services rendered. Include all preparatory and related activity, not just time spent in actual contact with Federal officials. Identify the Federal official(s) or employee(s) contacted or the officer(s), employee(s), or Member(s) of Congress that were contacted.

15. Check whether or not a SF–LLL–A Continuation Sheet(s) is attached.

16. The certifying official shall sign and date the form, print his/her name, title, and telephone number.

Public reporting burden for this collection of information is estimated to average 30 minutes per response, including time for reviewing instructions, searching existing data sources, gathering and maintaining the data needed, and completing and reviewing the collection of information. Send comments regarding the burden estimate or any other aspect of this collection of information, including suggestions for reducing this burden, to the Office of Management and Budget, Paperwork Reduction Project (0348–0046), Washington, DC 20503.

BILLING CODE 4510–30–M

A & C CONTINUE:(6)

DISCLOSURE OF LOBBYING ACTIVITIES CONTINUATION SHEET

Reporting Entity: Page_____ Page _____

Approved by OMB 0348-0046 Authorized for Local Reporduction Standard Form - LLL-A

A & C CONTINUE:(7)

DISCLOSURE OF LOBBYING ACTIVITIES

Complete this form to disclose lobbying activities pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 1352
(see reverse for public burden disclosure)

1. Type of Federal Action: _____ a. contract b. grant c. cooperative agreement d. loan e. loan guarantee f. loan insurance	2. Status of Federal Action: _____ a. bid/offer/application b. initial award c. post-award	3. Report Type: _____ a. initial filing b. material change For Material Change Only: year _____ quarter _____ date of last report _____

4. Name and Address of Reporting Entity: ___ Prime ___ Subawardee Tier _____, if known: Congressional District, if known:	5. If Reporting Entity in No.4 is Subawardee, Enter Name and Address of Prime. Congressional District, if known:
6. Federal Department/Agency:	7. Federal Program Name/Description: CFDA Number, if applicable: _____
8. Federal Action Number, if known:	9. Award Amount, if known: $
10. a. Name and Address of Lobbying Entity (if individual, last name, first name, MI): (Attach Continuation Sheet(s) SF-LLL-A, if necessary)	b. Individuals Performing Services (including address if different from No. 10a) (last name, first name, MI): (Attach Continuation Sheet(s) SF-LLL-A, if necessary)
11. Amount of Payment (check all that apply): _____ actual _____ planned $_____ 12. Form of Payment (check all that apply): _____ a. cash _____ b. in-kind; specify: nature _____ value _____	13. Type of Payment (check all that apply) ___ a. retainer ___ b. one-time fee ___ c. commission ___ d. contingent fee ___ e. deferred ___ f. other, specify: _____

14. Brief Description of Services Performed or to be Performed and Date(s) of Service, including officer(s), employee(s). or Member(s) contacted, for Payment indicated in item 11:

(attach Continuation Sheet(s) SF-LLL-A, if necessary)

15. Continuation Sheet(s) SF-LLL-A attached: _____ YES _____ NO

16. Information requested through this form is authorized by title 31 U.S.C. section 1352. This disclosure of lobbying activities is a material representation of fact upon which reliance was placed by the tier above when this transaction was made or entered into. This disclosure is required pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 1352. This information will be reported to the Congress semi-annually and will be available for public inspection. Any person who fails file the required disclosure shall be subject to a civil penalty of not less than $10,000 and not more than $100,000 for each such failure.	Signature _____ Print Name: _____ Title: _____ Telephone Number: _____ Date: _____

Authorized for Local Reproduction Standard Form - LLL-A

A & C CONTINUE:(8)

3. *The undersigned shall require that the language of this certification be included in the award documents for all subawards at all tiers (including subcontracts, subgrants, and contracts under grants, loans, and cooperative agreements) and that all subrecipients shall certify and disclose accordingly.*

This certification is a material representation of fact upon which reliance was placed when this transaction was made or entered into. Submission of this certification is a prerequisite for making or entering into this transaction imposed by Section 1352, Title 31, U.S. Code. ***Any person who fails to file the required certification shall be subject to a civil penalty of not less than $10,000 and not more than $100,000 for each such failure.***

4. DRUG FREE WORKPLACE:

Awardee certifies that it will provide a drug free workplace by implementing the provisions at 29 CFR 98.630. In accordance with these provisions please provide in the space below, a list of places where performance of work done in connection with this specific grant/agreement will take place. This information ***must be included with this signed document.***

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

5. CERTIFICATION OF NON-DELINQUENCY:

(PLEASE CHECK THE APPROPRIATE STATEMENT):

_____ *Not Delinquent on any Federal Debt*

_____ *Delinquent on any Federal Debt*

BILLING CODE 4510–30–C

Nondiscrimination and Equal Opportunity Requirements of JTPA—29 CFR Part 34—Assurances

(1) As a condition to the award of financial assistance under JTPA from the Department of Labor, the grant applicant assures, with respect to operation of the JTPA-funded program or activity and all agreements or arrangements to carry out the JTPA-funded program or activity, that it will comply fully with the nondiscrimination and equal opportunity provisions of the Job Training Partnership Act of 1982, as amended (JTPA), including the Nontraditional Employment for Women Act of 1991 (where applicable); Title IV of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, as amended; Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, as amended; the Age Discrimination Act of 1975, as amended, and with all applicable requirements imposed by or pursuant to regulations implementing those laws, including but not limited to 29 CFR Part 34. The United States has the right to seek judicial enforcement of this assurance.

(2) The grant applicant certifies that it has developed and will maintain a ''Method of Administration'' pursuant to 29 CFR 34.33. This system must be in place by August 14, 1993.

(3) The grant applicant is attaching information pursuant to 29 CFR 34.24(a)(3)(ii) where applicable, including the name of any Federal agency other than the Department of Labor's Directorate of Civil Rights that conducted a civil rights compliance review or complaint investigation during the two preceding years in which the grant applicant was found to be in noncompliance; and shall identify the parties to, the forum of and case numbers pertaining to, any administrative enforcement actions or lawsuits filed against it during the two years prior to its application which allege discrimination on the ground of race, color, religion, sex, national origin, age, disability, political affiliation or belief, citizenship or participation in JTPA.

Note: _____ No findings of noncompliance in the last two years. _____ See attached information.

Appendix C—Goals 2000: Educate America Act—Legislative Summary

Overview

- The Goals 2000 Act provides resources to states and communities to develop and implement comprehensive education reforms aimed at helping students reach challenging academic and occupational skill standards.

Legislative Review

- On March 23, the House of Representatives approved the final Goals 2000 bill by a bipartisan vote of 306–121. On March 26, the Senate approved Goals 2000 by a bipartisan vote of 63–22.
- The President signed the bill into law March 31, 1994. (Public Law 103–227)

Timetable and Funding

- In 1994, $105 million was appropriated for Goals 2000. First-year funds became available to the states on July 1, 1994. Congress has appropriated $403 million in 1995.
- Funding will be formula-based. For first-year funding, states have been asked to submit an application that will describe how a broad-based citizen panel will develop an action plan to improve their schools. The application will also describe how subgrants will be made for local education improvement and better teacher preservice and professional development programs.
- During the first year, states will use at least 60 percent of their allotted funds to award subgrants to local school districts for the development or implementation of local and individual school improvement efforts, and for better teacher education programs and professional development activities.
- In succeeding years, at least 90 percent of each state's funds will be used to make subgrants for the implementation of the state, local and individual school improvement plans and to support teacher education and professional development.
- During the first year, local districts will use at least 75 percent of the funds they receive to support individual school improvement initiatives. After the first year, districts will pass through at least 85 percent of the funds to schools.

Components of the Goals 2000: Educate America Act

Title I: Setting High Expectations for Our Nation: the National Education Goals

- Formalizes in law the original six National Education Goals. These goals concern: readiness for school; increased school graduation rates; student academic achievement and citizenship; mathematics and science performance; adult literacy; and safe, disciplined, and drug-free schools. The Act adds two new goals that encourage parental participation and better professional development for teachers and principals.

Title II: Public Accountability for Progress Toward the Goals and Development of Challenging Voluntary, Academic Standards

- Establishes in law the bipartisan National Education Goals Panel, which will; report on the nation's progress toward meeting the goals; build public support for taking actions to meet the goals; and review the voluntarily-submitted national standards and the criteria for certification of these standards developed by the National Education Standards and Improvement Council.
- Creates the National Education Standards and Improvement Council, made of a bipartisan, broad base of citizens and educators, to examine and certify voluntary national and state standards submitted on a voluntary basis by states and by organizations working on particular academic subjects.
- Authorizes grants to support the development of voluntary assessment systems aligned to state standards, and for the development of *model* opportunity-to-learn standards.

Title III: Supporting Community and State Efforts to Improve Education

- The central purpose of the Goals 2000 Act is to support, accelerate, and sustain state and local improvement efforts aimed at helping students reach challenging academic and occupational standards.
- Section 318 of the Act specifically prohibits federal mandates, direction and control of education.

Broad-Based Citizen Involvement in State Improvement Efforts

- The Governor and the Chief State School Officer will each appoint half the members of a broad-based panel. This panel will be comprised of teachers, principals, administrators, parents, representatives of business, labor, and higher education, and members of the public, as well as the chair of the state board of education and the chairs of the appropriate authorizing committees of the state legislature.
- States that already have a broad-based panel in place that has made substantial progress in developing a reform plan may request that the Secretary of Education recognize the existing panel.

Comprehensive Improvement Plan Geared to High Standards of Achievement

- The State Planning Panel is responsible for developing a comprehensive reform plan.
- States with reform plan already in place that meet the Act's requirements will not have to develop new plans for Goals 2000. The U.S. Secretary of Education may approve plans, or portions of plans, already adopted by the state.
- In order to receive Goals 2000 funds after the first year, a state has to have an approved plan or have made substantial progress in developing it.
- A peer review process will be used to review the state plans and offer guidance to the State Planning Panel. The U.S. Department of Education also will offer other technical assistance and support by drawing on the expertise of successful educators and leaders from around the nation.

In general, the plans are to address:

- Strategies for the development or adoption of content standards, student performance standards, student assessments, and plans for improving teacher training.
- Strategies to involve parents and the community in helping all students meet challenging state standards and to promote grass-roots, bottom-up involvement in reform.
- Strategies for ensuring that all local educational agencies and schools in the state are involved in developing and implementing needed improvements.
- Strategies for improved management and governance, and for promoting accountability for results, flexibility, site-based management, and other principles of high-performance management.
- Strategies for providing all students an opportunity to learn at high academic levels.
- Strategies for assisting local education agencies and schools to meet the needs of school-age students who have dropped out of school.
- Strategies for bringing technology into the classroom to increase learning.

Funds are also available to states to support the development of a state technology plan, to be integrated with the overall reform plan.

Broad-Based Involvement in Local Education Improvement Efforts

• Each local school district that applies for Goals 2000 funds will be asked to develop a broad consensus regarding a local improvement plan.

• Local districts will encourage and assist school in developing and implementing reforms that best meet the particular needs of the schools. The local plan would include strategies for ensuring that students meet higher academic standards.

Waivers and Flexibility

• State educational agencies may apply to the U.S. Secretary of Education for waivers of certain requirements of Department of Education programs that impede the implementation of the state or local plans. States may also submit waiver requests on behalf of local school districts and schools.

• The Secretary may select up to six states for participation in an education flexibility demonstration program, which allows the Secretary to delegate his waiver authority to State education agencies.

• The Act specifies certain statutory and regulatory programmatic requirements that may not be waived, including parental involvement and civil rights laws.

Title IV. Support for Increased Parental Involvement

• This title creates parental information and resource centers to increase parents knowledge and confidence in child-rearing activities and to strengthen partnerships between parents and professionals in meeting the educational needs of children. Parent resource centers will be funded by the U.S. Department of Education beginning in fiscal year 1995.

Title V. National Skill Standards Board

• This title creates a National Skill Standards Board to stimulate the development and adoption of a voluntary national system of occupational skill standards and certification. This Board will serve as a cornerstone of the national strategy to enhance workforce skills. The Board will be responsible for identifying broad clusters of major occupations in the U.S. and facilitating the establishment of voluntary partnership to develop skill standards for each cluster. The Board will endorse those skill standards submitted by the partnerships that meet certain statutorily prescribed criteria.

Relationship of Goals 2000 to Other Federal Education Programs

• State participation in all apsects of the Goals 2000 Act is voluntary, and is not a precondition for participation in other Federal programs.

• The Goals 2000 Act is a step toward making the Federal government a better partner and a supportive partner in local and state comprehensive improvement efforts aimed at helping all children reach higher standards. The proliferation of many sets of rules and regulations for different federal education programs has often interfered with local school, community or state efforts to improve schools. The Goals 2000 Act is designed to be flexible and supportive of community-based improvements in education.

• Other new and existing education and training programs will fit within the Goals 2000 framework of challenging academic and occupations standards, comprehensive reform, and flexibility at the state and local levels. The aim is to give schools; communities and states the option of coordinating, promoting, and building greater coherence among Federal programs and between Federal programs and state and local education reforms.

• For example, the School-to-Work Opportunities Act will support state and local efforts to build a school-to-work transition system that will help youth acquire the knowledge, skills, abilities, and labor-market information they need to make a smooth transition from school to career-oriented work and to further education and training. Students in these programs could be expected to meet the same academic standards established in states under Goals 2000 and will earn portable, industry-recognized skill certificates that are benchmarked to high-quality standards.

• Similarly, the reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) allows states that have developed their own standards and assessments under Goals 2000 to use them for students participating in ESEA programs, thereby providing one set of standards and assessments for states and schools to use for their own reform needs and, at the same time, to meet Federal requirements.

For more information, contact 1–800–USA–Learn.

Appendix D—Questions and Answers About School-to-Work Indian Program Grants

What is the purpose of the SGA?

The Solicitation for Grant Award (SGA) announces a competition or Indian Program Grants to enable eligible partnerships to begin development or implementation of School-to-Work Opportunities initiatives serving Indian youth and involving schools funded by the Bureau of Indian Affairs.

Are public comments being sought?

No. The SGA was developed in concert with key organizations including the Bureau of Indiana Affairs, the National Advisory Council on Indian Education, and Indian programs within the Departments of Education and Labor. This work group provided input into the development of the SGA. In accordance with DOL procurement policy and the desire to get funds to the field as soon as possible, the SGA was published in the final format.

Why School-to-Work Opportunities?

The United States is the only industrialized Nation that lacks a comprehensive and coherent system to help its youth acquire the knowledge, skills, abilities, and information about the labor market necessary to make an effective transition from school to career-oriented work. The School-to-Work Opportunities Act of 1994 created a national framework for high-quality, school-to-work transition systems that enable young Americans to identify and navigate paths to productive and progressively more rewarding roles in the workplace. School-to-Work Opportunities initiatives funded under this competition will offer Indian youth access to School-too-Work Opportunity programs that will prepare them for first jobs in high-skill, high-wage careers and further post-secondary education and training.

When are applications due?

Applications are due 60 days after the publication of the SGA.

When will awards be made?

All awards must be made by June 30, 1995.

How should I format my application?

The Departments recommend that applications be formatted as suggested in Section B.2 of the SGA. Applications should include: an abstract, budget, program narrative and appendices. Applicants are strongly urged to submit applications that comprehensively address the selection criteria as described in Section E of the SGA.

Who will review my application?

Under this application, a technical review panel consisting of peer reviewers and specialists with the Departments of Labor and Education will review applications for both development and implementation grants.

What will the review of my application be based on?

a. Inclusion of required elements.

All applications must include:

1. Evidence that the applicant meets the definition of an eligible applicant.

2. An assurance that the grantee will abide by the safeguards as stated in the legislation.

3. Evidence of the key descriptive components as required in Part III, *Application Contents*, of the SGA.

b. Quality and comprehensiveness of the program narrative.

Panelists will evaluate all applications against the criteria listed in Section E of the SGA for the development and implementation grant competitions. Emphasis will be placed on the scope and quality of the proposed plan and with careful consideration of the effectiveness, rather than the presence, of each program component. Final funding decisions will be made based on the results of the panel review process and such other factors as: geographic balance, diversity of programmatic approaches, replicability, sustainability, and innovation.

Who may apply for these grants?

A partnership which proposes to serve Indian youth and involves Bureau of Indian Affairs funded schools is qualified under this competition to apply for either a development or implementation grant. To be eligible to apply, a partnership must include:

1. Tribal organizations responsible for economic development, employment and job training, and education (such as tribal business councils, local chapters of tribal business councils, tribal departments of education and tribal school boards).

2. Employers (including tribal businesses or school-based enterprises where applicable).

3. Representatives of Bureau-funded schools and local postsecondary educational institutions (including representatives of area vocational education schools and tribal colleges where applicable).

4. Local educators (such as teachers, counselors or administrators).

5. Representatives of labor organizations or nonmanagerial employee representatives.

6. Students and parents, and may include other appropriate entities. Examples of these entities are contained in section B.7 of the SGA.

What funding is available?

This SGA offers $500,000 in FY94 funds under JTPA Title IV for activities that are consistent with Title II, Subtitle C of the School-to-Work Opportunities Act of 1994. Future year appropriations are authorized under the School-to-Work Opportunities Act. The statute that ½ of 1% of all future appropriations shall be set aside for STWO Indian Program Grants. Based on current budget levels, $1.25 million in FY95 funds will be available for the next competition.

How many grants are anticipated?

The Departments anticipate awarding:

- Approximately 8 development grants of $30,000 each; and
- Up to 5 implementation grants ranging in amount between $50,000 and $100,000.

The final amount of each award will be based on a number of factors, including the scope, quality, and comprehensiveness of the proposed initiative and the size of the population to be served.

How long is the project period?

The award period for this competition will be 12 months. However, grants may be continued for five years based on satisfactory progress and the availability of federal funds.

Can I apply for both a development and implementation grant?

Eligible partnerships may apply for either a development grant, an implementation grant or both. The rationale is to allow those partnerships which have been engaged in planning and development activities to apply for an implementation grant without jeopardizing their opportunities for receiving a development grant. However, partnerships that intend to apply for consideration under both the development and implementation grant competitions must submit separate applications for each competition. A local partnership may receive only one (1) grant under this competition, either a development grant or an implementation grant.

What are the reporting requirements?

Reporting requirements include quarterly financial and narrative reports and an annual report on project accomplishments.

What other grant programs have been implemented under the STWO Act?

The U.S. Departments of Labor and Education are jointly conducting separate competitions for grants to *States* that are prepared to implement statewide School-to-Work Opportunities systems, to *local partnerships* that are prepared to implement local School-to-Work Opportunities initiatives, and to *local partnerships that serve high poverty areas of Urban and Rural constituencies* and that are also prepared to develop and implement local School-to-Work Opportunities initiatives. Planning and development grants have been awarded to all States and Puerto Rico. Development grants will be awarded to the seven U.S. Territories by June 1995.

[FR Doc. 95–6333 Filed 3–14–95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4510–30–M

federal register

Wednesday
March 15, 1995

Part IV

Department of Defense

General Services Administration

National Aeronautics and Space Administration

48 CFR Parts 32 and 52

Federal Acquisition Regulation, Contract Financing; Proposed Rule and Notice

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION

NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION

48 CFR Parts 32 and 52

[FAR Case 94–764]

RIN 9000–AG36

Federal Acquisition Regulation; Contract Financing

AGENCIES: Department of Defense (DOD), General Services Administration (GSA), and National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA).

ACTION: Proposed rule.

SUMMARY: This proposed rule is issued pursuant to the Federal Acquisition Streamlining Act of 1994, Public Law 103–355 (the Act). The Federal Acquisition Regulatory Council is considering amending the Federal Acquisition Regulation (FAR) pertaining to contract financing as a result of changes to 10 U.S.C. 2307 and 41 U.S.C. 255 by Sections 2001 and 2051 of the Act. This regulatory action was subject to Office of Management and Budget review under Executive Order 12866, dated September 30, 1993.

DATES: *Comment Due Date:* Comments should be submitted on or before May 15, 1995 to be considered in the formulation of a final rule.

Public Meeting: A public meeting will be held on April 3, 1995, at 1 p.m.

Oral/Written Statements: Views to be presented at the public meeting should be sent, in writing, to the FAR Secretariat, at the address given below, not later than March 29, 1995.

ADDRESSES: Interested parties should submit written comments to: General Services Administration, FAR Secretariat (VRS), 18th & F Streets NW., Room 4037, Washington, DC 20405, Telephone: (202) 501–4755.

The public meeting will be held at: General Services Administration Auditorium, 18th & F Streets NW., First Floor, Washington, DC 20405.

Please cite FAR case 94–764 in all correspondence related to this case.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Mr. John Galbraith, Contract Financing/Payment Team Leader, at (703) 697–6710 in reference to this FAR case. For general information, contact the FAR Secretariat, Room 4037, GS Building, Washington, DC 20405 (202) 501–4755. Please cite FAR case 94–764.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

A. Background

The Federal Acquisition Streamlining Act of 1994, Pub. L. 103–355, provides authorities that streamline the acquisition process and minimize burdensome government-unique requirements. Major changes that can be expected in the acquisition process as a result of Federal Acquisition Streamlining Act implementation include changes in the areas of Commercial Item Acquisition, Simplified Acquisition Procedures, the Truth in Negotiations Act, and Introduction of the Federal Acquisition Computer Network (FACNET).

This notice announces FAR revisions under FAR case 94–764, Contract Financing. Sections 2001 and 2051 of the Federal Acquisition Streamlining Act of 1994 (Pub. L. 103–355), substantially changed the statutory authorities for Government financing of contracts. Subsections 2001(f) and 2051(e) provide specific authority for Government financing of purchases of commercial items, and subsections 2001(b) and 2051(b) substantially revised the authority for Government financing of purchases of non-commercial items. In order to promptly achieve the benefits of the provisions of the Act, the Government is issuing implementing regulations on an expedited basis. We believe prompt publication of proposed rules provides the public the opportunity to participate more fully in the process of developing regulations.

Subsections 2001(f) and 2051(e) provide specific authority for Government financing of purchases of commercial items. These sections amended 10 U.S.C. 2307 and 41 U.S.C. 255 by adding a new paragraph, Conditions for Payments for Commercial Items, to each. These paragraphs authorize the Government to provide contract financing with certain limitations:

- The financing must be in the best interest of the Government;
- The financing cannot exceed 15 percent until some performance of work under the contract;
- The terms and conditions must be appropriate or customary in the commercial marketplace.

The above statutory provisions also remove from financing of commercial purchases certain restrictions applicable to financing of non-commercial purchases by other provisions of 10 U.S.C. 2307 and 41 U.S.C. 255.

Subsections 2001(b) and 2051(b) amend the authority for Government financing of non-commercial purchases by authorizing financing on the basis of certain classes of measures of performance.

To implement these changes, the DOD, NASA, and GSA propose to amend the FAR by revising Subparts 32.0, 32.1, and 32.5; by adding new Subparts 32.2 and 32.10; and by adding new clauses to 52.232.

The statutory changes create a fundamental distinction between financing of purchases of commercial and non-commercial items. As a result, the subparts of Part 32, Contract Financing, fall into three logical categories:

- Subparts applicable to both commercial and non-commercial financing;
- Subparts applicable to only commercial financing; and
- Subparts applicable to only non-commercial financing.

The specific subparts in each category are identified at 32.002 (Applicability of Subparts).

Subpart Discussion

Subpart 32.0 now contains the general policy and guidance which is applicable to Government contract financing of both commercial and non-commercial items.

Subpart 32.1 (Non-commercial Purchase Financing) now contains the general policy and guidance applicable to non-commercial purchases. The content of this subpart reflects existing policy and guidance that previously appeared in other locations in Part 32. These policies have been moved to Subpart 32.1 to give them general applicability to all forms of financing of non-commercial items.

Subpart 32.2 (Commercial Purchase Financing) contains the policy and guidance applicable to contract financing of commercial purchases. This subpart is wholly new. Current contract financing policy discourages the use of Government contract financing for commercial items (see current FAR 32.502–1(c)), and if financing is provided, it is commonly Progress Payments Based on Cost. The new statute places Government financing of commercial purchases on a different statutory basis than that for non-commercial purchases. As a result, the new subpart provides policy concerning market research about financing, security for the taxpayer's money, and determining the best interest of the United States. The new subpart provides several alternative procedures for establishing contract financing terms for commercial items. The new subpart also provides standard terms for use of contracting officers in establishing

financing in contracts. To assist in considering installment payment financing issues, public comments are sought as to whether or not installment payment financing at 32.206(f) and 52.232–AB should be incorporated into the FAR.

The proposed installment payment clause is intended to permit contracting officers to incorporate financing into contracts for commercial items without any administrative effort beyond incorporation of the clause. It is intended to be an alternative that may be used when the contracting officer determines that the administrative cost of contract financing for a commercial item would otherwise prohibit its use.

The table below shows how the Installment Payments for Commercial Items clause arithmetic would work for a contract which is awarded in January with various deliveries starting in April and ending in September (bolded numbers indicate delivery payments after liquidation of installment payments).

INSTALLMENT PAYMENTS FOR COMMERCIAL ITEMS (EXAMPLE)

[Amounts shown in thousands of dollars ($)]

	Qty	$/Unit	$Total	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	June	July	Aug	Sept	Total
Item 0001	20	20	400	70	70	70	70	120	.....	.....	.....	.....	400
Do	20	20	400	.....	70	70	70	70	120	.....	.....	.....	400
Do	20	20	400	.....	.....	70	70	70	70	120	.....	.....	400
Do	20	20	400	.....	.....	.....	70	70	70	70	120	.....	400
Do	20	20	400	.....	.....	.....	.....	70	70	70	70	120	400
Item 0002	2	15	30	7	7	7	9	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	30
Do	2	15	30	.....	7	7	7	9	.....	.....	.....	.....	30
Do	2	15	30	.....	.....	7	7	7	9	.....	.....	.....	30
Do	2	15	30	.....	.....	.....	7	7	7	9	.....	.....	30
Do	2	15	30	.....	.....	.....	.....	7	7	7	9	.....	30
Iteam 0003	10	40	400	56	56	56	56	56	120	.....	.....	.....	400
Do	10	40	400	.....	56	56	56	56	56	120	.....	.....	400
Do	10	40	400	.....	.....	56	56	56	56	56	120	.....	400
Do	10	40	400	.....	.....	.....	56	56	56	56	56	120	400
Finance payment	.....	.....	.....	133	266	399	525	525	392	259	126	o	2,625
Delivery payment	.....	.....	.....	o	o	o	9	129	249	249	249	240	1,125
Total payment	.....	.....	3,750	133	266	399	534	654	641	508	375	240	3,750

Subpart 32.5 (Progress Payments Based on Costs) has been slightly modified to reflect the separation of commercial from non-commercial items and to reflect the general policy in 32.1 for availability of financing for non-commercial purchases.

Subpart 32.10 (Performance-Based Payments) contains the policy and guidance applicable to contract financing through performance-based payments. This is a wholly new subpart. Under the current FAR, contract financing for non-commercial items is primarily through progress payments based on cost and through other specialized contract financing mechanisms for specific types of procurements (for example percentage-of-completion progress payments for shipbuilding or construction). This new subpart provides the policy and procedures for establishing and administering performance-based payments. Performance-based payments under this subpart are applicable only to non-commercial purchases.

FAR 52.232 is amended to add the additional clauses and solicitation provisions required to implement the new statutory authorities. Under the current FAR, the contracting officer can insert a complete, fully contained progress payment clause in a contract and proceed with the procurement with minimal administrative cost. For performance-based financing and commercial financing (except for installment payments), contracting officers will have to determine the form of contract financing and write individualized contract terms establishing the computation of amounts and certain other contract financing terms.

Public Meeting

The FAR Council is interested in an exchange of ideas and opinions with respect to the regulatory implementation of the Act. For that reason, the FAR Council is conducting a series of public meetings. The public is encouraged to furnish its views; the FAR Council anticipates that public comments will be very helpful in formulating final rules.

The public meeting on this rule (FAR case 94–764) will be held on April 3, 1995, at 1 p.m., to enable the public to present its views on this rule. This meeting will coincide with the meeting on Commercial Items (FAR case 94–790) which is now also scheduled for April 3, 1995. Persons or organizations wishing to make presentations will be allowed 10 minutes each, provided they notify the FAR Secretariat at (202) 501–4755 and submit written statements of the presentation by March 29, 1995. Persons or organizations with similar positions are encouraged to select a common spokesman for presentation of their views. This meeting, in conjunction with the **Federal Register** notice soliciting public comments on the rule, will be the only opportunity for the public to present its views.

B. Regulatory Flexibility Act

This proposed rule is expected to have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities within the meaning of the Regulatory Flexibility Act, 5 U.S.C. 601, *et seq.*, because the proposed implementation of subsection 2001(f) and subsection 2051(e) of the Federal Acquisition Streamlining Act of 1994 (Public Law 103–355) will substantially increase the availability of Government contract financing for purchases of commercial items, thereby benefiting many small entities making commercial sales in markets where customer financing is a market practice; and because the implementation of subsection 2001(b) and subsection 2051(b) of the Federal Acquisition Streamlining Act of 1994 (Public Law 103–355) permits contract financing of purchases of non-commercial items upon the basis of performance, without requiring contractor cost accounting systems for the contract financing, thereby benefiting many small entities who Do not use such systems. An Initial Regulatory Flexibility Analysis has been

performed. Comments from small entities concerning the affected FAR subparts will be considered in accordance with 5 U.S.C. 610 of the Act. Such comments must be submitted separately and should cite 5 U.S.C. 601, *et seq.* (FAR case 94–764), in correspondence.

C. Paperwork Reduction Act

The Paperwork Reduction Act (Pub. L. 96–511) is deemed to apply because the proposed rule contains information collection requirements. Accordingly, a request for approval of a new information collection requirement concerning Contract Financing is being submitted to the Office of Management and Budget under 44 U.S.C. 3501, *et seq.* Public comments concerning this request are invited in a **Federal Register** notice which appears elsewhere in this issue.

List of Subjects in 48 CFR Parts 32 and 52

Government procurement.

Dated: March 8, 1995.

Capt. Barry L. Cohen,

Project Manager for the Implementation of the Federal Acquisition Streamlining Act of 1994.

Therefore, it is proposed that 48 CFR Parts 32 and 52 be amended as set forth below:

PART 32—CONTRACT FINANCING

1. The authority citation for 48 CFR Parts 32 and 52 continues to read as follows:

Authority: 40 U.S.C. 486(c); 10 U.S.C. chapter 137; and 42 U.S.C. 2473(c).

2. Section 32.000 is amended in paragraph (e) by removing the word ''and''; in paragraph (f) by removing the period and inserting a semicolon in its place; and by adding paragraphs (g) and (h) to read as follows:

32.000 Scope of part.

* * * * *

(g) Financing of purchases of commercial items; and

(h) Performance-based payments.

3. Section 32.001 is amended by revising the section heading and adding, in alphabetical order, the definitions *Customary contract financing* and *Unusual contract financing* to read as follows:

32.001 Definitions.

Customary contract financing means that financing deemed by an agency to be available for routine use by contracting officers. Most customary contract financing arrangements should be usable by contracting officers without specific reviews or approvals of the financing arrangement by higher management. It is expected that contracting officers will have the necessary training and resources to routinely arrange and/or administer (including paying) any financing terms the agency deems customary for that agency.

Unusual contract financing means any financing not deemed customary contract financing by the agency. Normally, unusual contract financing is that financing that is legal and proper under applicable laws, but that the agency has not authorized contracting officers to use without specific reviews or approvals of the financing arrangement by higher management. Arranging and/or administering (including paying) unusual contract financing may require more and/or different training or resources than the agency routinely makes available for such operations, or may have greater or different risks than the financing arrangements deemed customary by the agency.

4. Sections 32.002 through 32.005 are added to read as follows:

32.002 Applicability of subparts.

(a) The following subparts of this part are applicable to all purchases subject to part 32:

(1) Subpart 32.0, General.

(2) Subpart 32.3, Loan Guarantees for Defense Production.

(3) Subpart 32.6, Contract Debts.

(4) Subpart 32.7, Contract Funding.

(5) Subpart 32.8, Assignment of Claims.

(6) Subpart 32.9, Prompt Payment.

(b) Subpart 32.2, Commercial Purchase Financing, is applicable only to purchases of commercial items under authority of 48 CFR part 12.

(c) The following subparts of this part are applicable to all purchases made under any authority other than 48 CFR Part 12:

(1) Subpart 32.1, Non-Commercial Purchase Financing.

(2) Subpart 32.4, Advance Payments.

(3) Subpart 32.5, Progress Payments for Supplies or Services.

(4) Subpart 32.10, Performance-Based Payments.

32.003 Simplified acquisition procedures financing.

Unless agency regulations otherwise permit, contract financing shall not be provided for purchases made under the authority of 48 CFR Part 13.

32.004 Contract performance in foreign countries.

The enforceability of contract provisions for security of Government financing in a foreign jurisdiction is dependent upon local law and procedure. Prior to providing contract financing where foreign jurisdictions may become involved, the contracting officer shall ensure the Government's security is enforceable. This may require the provision of additional or different security than that normally provided for in the standard contract clauses.

32.005 Consideration for contract financing.

(a) *Requirement.* When a contract financing clause is included at the inception of a contract, there shall be no separate consideration for the contract financing clause. The worth of the contract financing to the contractor is expected to be reflected in one or both of (1) a bid or negotiated price that will be lower than such price would have been in the absence of the contract financing, or (2) contract terms and conditions, other than price, that are more beneficial to the Government than they would have been in the absence of the contract financing. Adequate new consideration is required for changes to, or addition of, contract financing after award.

(b) *Amount of new consideration.* The contractor may provide new consideration by monetary or nonmonetary means, provided the value is adequate. The fair and reasonable consideration should approximate the amount by which the price would have been less had the contract financing terms been contained in the initial contract. In the absence of definite information on this point, the contracting officer should apply the following criteria in evaluating whether the proposed new consideration is adequate:

(1) The value to the contractor of the anticipated amount and duration of the contract financing at the imputed financial costs of the equivalent working capital.

(2) The estimated profit rate to be earned through contract performance.

(c) *Interest.* Except as provided in Subpart 32.4 (Advance Payments), the contract shall not provide for any other type of specific charges, such as interest, on contract financing.

5. Subpart 32.1 heading and section 32.100 are revised to read as follows:

Subpart 32.1—Non-Commercial Purchase Financing

32.100 Scope of subpart.

This subpart provides policies and procedures applicable generally to contract financing and payment for any purchases other than purchases of commercial items in accordance with 48 CFR Part 12.

32.101 [Amended]

6. Section 32.101 is amended by removing the period at the end of the section and inserting in its place ‘‘, as amended.’’

7. Section 32.102 is amended in the last sentence of paragraph (a) by removing the word ‘‘subadvances’’ and inserting in its place ‘‘advances’’; in paragraph (b)(2) by removing the word ‘‘or’’; in paragraph (b)(3) by removing the period and inserting in its place ‘‘; or’’; and adding paragraphs (b)(4) and (f) to read as follows:

32.102 Description of contract financing methods.

* * * * *

(b) * * *

(4) Performance-based payments.

* * * * *

(f) Performance-based payments are contract financing payments made on the basis of—

(1) Performance measured by objective, quantifiable methods;

(2) Accomplishment of defined events; or

(3) Other quantifiable measures of results.

32.103 Progress payments under construction contracts.

8. Section 32.103 is amended by revising the section heading to read as set forth above; and by removing the word ‘‘the’’ in the second sentence.

9. Section 32.104 is amended by adding paragraphs (c) through (f) to read as follows:

32.104 Providing contract financing.

* * * * *

(c) Subject to specific agency regulations, contract financing may be provided when the contracting officer determines it is in the best interest of the Government. Unless authorized by agency regulation, contract financing shall not be provided for awards expected to be less than the simplified acquisition procedure threshold, and unless the provision of financing is restricted to small businesses, shall not be provided for awards expected to be less than $1 million.

(d) Whenever practical, contracting officers should use performance-based payments (see subpart 32.10).

(e) For competitive awards, the contracting officer shall include the intended contract financing terms in the solicitation, in accordance with this part and any agency regulations. Contract financing shall not be a factor in the evaluation of resulting proposals, and proposals which contain alternative financing terms shall not be accepted (but see subparts 14.2 and 15.6 concerning alternative proposals and amendments of solicitations).

(f) When only one source is solicited, the contracting officer shall include the intended contract financing terms in the solicitation in accordance with this part and any agency regulations. In negotiations of the resulting contract, if the contract financing is to be through performance-based payments in accordance with subpart 32.10, the contracting officer shall ensure that the combination of price and financing is fair and reasonable, all factors, including financing cost to the Treasury, considered.

10. Section 32.106 is amended in the introductory text by inserting after ‘‘Government’s’’ the word ‘‘best’’; and by revising paragraphs (b) and (d) to read as follows:

32.106 Order of preference.

* * * * *

(b) Customary contract financing (see 32.113).

* * * * *

(d) Unusual contract financing (see 32.114).

* * * * *

32.110 [Reserved]

11. Section 32.110 is removed and reserved.

32.111 Contract clauses for non-commercial purchases.

12. The section heading for 32.111 is revised to read as set forth above.

13. Sections 32.113 and 32.114 are added to read as follows:

(**Note to Readers:** The proposed text of 32.112 is contained in FAR case 94–762, which was published for public comment at 60 FR 6602, February 2, 1995. Comments concerning the proposed text for 32.112 should be submitted separately and reference that FAR case 94–762.)

32.113 Customary contract financing.

The following contract financing arrangements are customary contract financing when provided in accordance with this part 32 and agency regulations:

(a) Financing of shipbuilding, or ship conversion, alteration, or repair, when agency regulations provide for progress payments based on a percentage or stage of completion;

(b) Financing of construction or architect-engineer services purchased under the authority of 48 CFR part 36, in accordance with this part;

(c) For small businesses, financing of contracts for supplies or services with a contract price equal to or greater than the simplified acquisition procedure threshold through customary performance-based payments in accordance with subpart 32.10, or customary progress payments in accordance with subpart 32.5 (but not both);

(d) Financing of contracts for supplies or services with a contract price of $1 million or more, through customary performance-based payments in accordance with subpart 32.10, or customary progress payments in accordance with subpart 32.5 (but not both);

(e) Financing of contracts for supplies or services through Advance Payments in accordance with subpart 32.4;

(f) Financing of contracts for supplies or services through Guaranteed Loans in accordance with subpart 32.3; or

(g) Financing of contracts for supplies or services through any appropriate combination of Advance Payments, Guaranteed Loans, and either customary performance-based payments or customary progress payments (but not both) in accordance with their respective subparts.

32.114 Unusual contract financing.

Any contract financing arrangement that deviates from the policy, procedures, terms, or conditions of this part is unusual contract financing. Unusual contract financing shall be authorized only after approval by the head of the agency or as provided for in agency regulations.

14. Subpart 32.2, consisting of sections 32.200 through 32.207, is added to read as follows:

Subpart 32.2—Commercial Purchase Financing

Sec.
32.200 Scope of subpart.
32.201 Statutory authority.
32.202 General.
32.202–1 Policy.
32.202–2 Types of payments for commercial purchases.
32.202–3 Conducting market research about financing terms.
32.202–4 Security for Government financing.
32.203 Procedures for determining contract financing terms.
32.204 Procedures for contracting officer-specified commercial contract financing.
32.205 Procedures for offeror-proposed commercial contract financing.
32.206 Construction of contract clauses.
32.207 Administration and payment of commercial financing payments.

32.200 Scope of subpart.

This subpart provides policies and procedures for commercial financing arrangements under commercial purchases pursuant to 48 CFR part 12. This subpart does not apply to any purchase made under other authority.

32.201 Statutory authority.

10 U.S.C. 2307(f) and 41 U.S.C. 255(f) provide that payment for commercial items may be made under such terms and conditions as the head of the agency determines are appropriate or customary in the commercial marketplace and are in the best interest of the United States.

32.202 General.

32.202–1 Policy.

(a) *Use of financing in contracts.* It is the responsibility of the contractor to provide all resources needed for performance of the contract. Thus, for Government purchases of commercial items, financing of the contract is normally the contractor's responsibility. However, in some markets the provision of financing by the buyer is a commercial practice. In these circumstances, the contracting officer shall include appropriate financing terms in contracts for commercial purchases when doing so will be in the best interest of the Government.

(b) *Authorization.* Commercial interim payments and commercial advance payments may be made under the following circumstances—

(1) The contract item financed is a commercial supply item;

(2) The contracting officer determines that it is customary in the commercial marketplace to make financing payments for the item;

(3) Authorizing this form of contract financing is in the best interest of the Government (see 32.202–1(e));

(4) Adequate security is obtained (see 32.202–4);

(5) Prior to any performance of work under the contract, the aggregate of commercial advance payments shall not exceed 15 percent of the contract price; and

(6) The contract is awarded on the basis of competitive procedures or, if only one offer is solicited, adequate consideration is obtained (based on the time value of financing to be provided) if the financing is expected to be substantially more advantageous to the offeror than the offerors normal method of customer financing.

(c) *Difference from non-commercial financing.* Government financing of commercial purchases under this subpart 32.2 is expected to be different from that used for non-commercial purchases under subpart 32.1 and its related subparts. While the contracting officer may adapt techniques and procedures from the non-commercial subparts for use in implementing commercial contract financing arrangements, the contracting officer must have a full understanding of effects of the differing contract environments and of what is needed to protect the interests of the Government in commercial contract financing.

(d) *Unusual contract financing.* Any contract financing arrangement not in accord with the requirements of agency regulations or 48 CFR part 32 is unusual contract financing and requires advance approval in accordance with agency procedures. If not otherwise specified, such unusual contract financing shall be approved by the head of the contracting activity.

(e) *Best interest of the Government.* (1) The statute does not allow contract financing by the Government where it is not in the best interest of the United States. The contracting officer in deciding for individual procurements whether to use contract financing and, if so, the methods and techniques therefor, shall consider the interests of the United States in accordance with agency regulations. The interests of the United States may include—

(i) The cost to the Government of providing the financing (*e.g.*, Treasury borrowing costs);

(ii) The transaction costs to the Government of establishing and negotiating the financing terms, and administrative costs of administering the financing terms;

(iii) Execution of Executive branch and agency policy;

(iv) Compliance with fiscal and budgetary requirements;

(v) Promotion of competition through new market entrants;

(vi) Acquisition of advanced, state-of-the-art technology; and

(vii) Integration of the industrial bases for defense, commercial, and Governmental markets.

(2) In considering policy to determine whether financing is in the best interest of the Government, the best interests of the Government are usually served by an appropriate trade-off of the transaction costs of the procurement, against the optimizing of the price and financing of the individual purchase. Agencies may find that certain types of procurements, certain types of items, or certain dollar levels of procurements do not justify the transaction costs of financing or do not justify high-cost procedures for determining financing. The specifics of these factors will vary from agency to agency, and, possibly, from office to office or time to time.

32.202–2 Types of payments for commercial purchases.

These definitions reflect distinctions made in the statutory commercial financing authority and the implementation of the Prompt Payment Act.

Commercial advance payment means a payment made before any performance of work under the contract. The aggregate of these payments shall not exceed 15 percent of the contract price. These payments are contract financing payments for prompt payment purposes (*i.e.*, not subject to the interest penalty provisions of the Prompt Payment Act in accordance with subpart 32.9). These payments are not subject to subpart 32.4.

Commercial interim payment means any payment that is not a commercial advance payment or a delivery payment. These payments are contract financing payments for prompt payment purposes (*i.e.*, not subject to the interest penalty provisions of the Prompt Payment Act in accordance with subpart 32.9). The difference between a commercial advance and commercial interim payment for Government contract purposes is whether some performance of the work under the contract has been accomplished.

Delivery payment means a payment for accepted supplies or services, including payments for accepted partial deliveries. Commercial financing payments are liquidated by deduction from these payments. Delivery payments are invoice payments for prompt payment purposes.

32.202–3 Conducting market research about financing terms.

(a) If contract financing is expected to be in the best interest of the Government (see 32.202–1(e) of this subpart), contract financing shall be a subject included in the market research conducted in accordance with 48 CFR part 10 (Market Research). Contracting officers shall determine for commercial purchases in the appropriate market—

(1) The extent to which other buyers provide contract financing for purchases in that market;

(2) The overall level of financing normally provided;

(3) The amount or percentages of any payments equivalent to commercial advance payments (32.202–2);

(4) The basis for any payments equivalent to commercial interim payments (32.202–2), as well as the frequency, and amounts or percentages; and

(5) Any special or unusual payment terms applicable to the equivalent of delivery payments (32.202–2).

(b) When adequate and current information is already available, contract financing market research does not have to be repeated. Similarly, procuring activities making repetitive purchases in specific markets may provide contracting officers with contract financing terms for use in purchases in those markets.

(c) *Customary standard market terms* means those contract financing terms and conditions that are the usual, regular terms offered by a substantial number of sellers to equivalent buyers of the item in that market at that time. Customary standard market terms are not required to be identical for all sellers, but are expected to be similar. Terms may reasonably vary in percentages, or timing, or other terms and still be considered customary standard market terms, so long as they do not significantly differ in the overall impact upon the Government, including the impact upon the integrity of competitive procurements. If the extent of variation in the terms offered by diverse sellers is such that some potential offerors would be significantly advantaged or disadvantaged by a synthesis of the various terms, the contracting officer may find there are no customary standard market terms. The extent of analysis applied in making these determinations should be commensurate with the expected size of the contract and amount of contract financing.

32.202–4 Security for Government financing.

(a) *Policy*. 10 U.S.C. 2307(f) and 41 U.S.C. 255(f) require the Government to obtain adequate security for Government financing. The contracting officer shall determine what security the Government will accept, which shall be specified in the solicitation. If the Government is willing to accept more than one form of security, the offeror shall be required to specify the form of security it will provide. The value of the security must be at least equal to the unliquidated amount of contract financing payments to be made to the contractor. If acceptable to the contracting officer, the resulting contract shall specify the security (see 32.206(b)(1)(iv) and also paragraph (f), Security for Government Financing of the clause at 52.232–AA, Standard Terms for Government Financing of Purchases of Commercial Items, or paragraph (f) of the clause at 52.232–AB, Installment Payments for Commercial Items). The amount of security provided by the contractor may be adjusted from time to time during the period of performance, so long as it is always equal to or greater than the amount of unliquidated financing that is paid to the contractor. Paragraphs (b), (c), and (d) of this section list some (but not all) forms of security that the contracting officer may find acceptable. There is no order of preference in this listing, and a form not listed is of equal acceptability if the contracting officer finds it adequate.

(b) *Paramount lien*. (1) The statutes cited in 32.201 provide that if the Government's security is in the form of a lien, such lien is paramount to all other liens and is effective immediately upon the first payment, without filing, notice, or other action by the United States.

(2) When the Government's security is in the form of a lien, the contract shall specify what the lien is upon, *e.g.*, the work in process, the contractor's plant, the contractor's inventory. Contracting officers may be flexible in the choice of assets, so long as it is adequate. The contract must also give the Government a right to verify the existence and value of the assets.

(3) Provision of Government financing shall be conditioned upon a contractor certification that the assets subject to the lien are free from any prior encumbrances. Prior liens may result from such things as capital equipment loans, installment purchases, working capital loans, various lines of credit, and revolving credit arrangements.

(c) *Other assets as security*. (1) Contracting officers may consider the guidance at 28.203–2, 28.203–3, and 28.204 in determining which types of assets may be acceptable as security. For the purpose of applying the guidance in part 28 to this section, the term *surety* and/or *individual surety* should be interpreted to mean *offeror* and/or *contractor*.

(2) Subject to agency regulations, the contracting officer may also consider the net worth of the offeror in relation to the maximum amount of Government funds at risk. If the contracting officer finds that the unencumbered net worth of the offeror will be significantly in excess of the total unliquidated Government financing (on all Government contracts using this form of security), and the offeror agrees to provide additional security should that net worth become encumbered or materially reduced, the contracting officer may determine the Government has adequate security.

(d) *Other forms of security*. Other acceptable forms of security include—

(1) An irrevocable letter of credit from a federally insured financial institution;

(2) A bond from a surety acceptable in accordance with 48 CFR part 28 (note that the bond must guarantee repayment of the unliquidated contract financing);

(3) A guarantee of repayment from a person or corporation of demonstrated liquid net worth, connected by significant ownership to the contractor; or

(4) Title to identified contractor assets of adequate worth.

32.203 Procedures for determining contract financing terms.

(a) *Selection procedure*. When the criteria in 32.202–1(b) are met:

(1) If market research discloses that contract financing is not customary in the commercial market, the contracting officer shall not provide for financing in the solicitation and contract;

(2) If market research discloses customary standard market terms for commercial financing in a market, the contracting officer shall use the contracting officer-specified financing procedure at 32.204 and specify the customary standard market terms in the solicitation and contract; or

(3) If market research discloses that contract financing is customary in the commercial market but there are no customary standard market terms, the contracting officer shall, in accordance with agency regulations, use the contracting officer-specified procedure at 32.204, the offeror-proposed procedure at 32.205, or other agency specified procedure or technique. If agency regulations do not provide otherwise, the contracting officer shall use the contracting officer-specified procedure at 32.204 for purchases expected to be less than $5 million and may use the offeror-proposed procedure at 32.205 for purchases expected to be $5 million or more.

(b) *Summary of contracting officer-specified financing procedure*. Under the contracting officer-specified procedure at 32.204, the Government specifies the contract financing terms in the solicitation. The contracting officer does not evaluate or adjust prices for financing terms. Contracting officer-specified contract financing terms are designed to allow reasonable contract financing of purchases with minimum transaction costs. Under this procedure, the contract financing for any particular procurement is based upon the financing terms commonly used in the particular market, or the terms the Government finds appropriate to the purchase.

(c) *Summary of offeror-proposed financing procedure*. Under the offeror-proposed procedure at 32.205, offerors are invited to propose contract financing

terms. The contracting officer then evaluates all of the financing terms and prices to determine the evaluated price. The evaluated price is based upon the net cost to the Government of the proposed price and financing terms.

(d) *Front-end loading of financing terms.* In establishing contract financing terms, the contracting officer must be aware of certain risks. While contract financing payments may be made at the beginning and during the early period of a contract, very high amounts of financing early in the contract may unduly increase the risk to the Government. Contracting officers cannot consider various aspects of financing separately; the security and the amounts and timing of financing payments must be analyzed as a whole to determine whether the arrangement will be in the best interest of the Government. Under the contracting-officer specified procedure, large, early, contract financing payments are not prohibited if they are the customary standard market terms and an appropriate quality of security is obtained. Under the offeror-proposed procedure, large, early, contract financing payments are not prohibited if such payments are usual or common in the offeror's sales equivalent to the size and type of the instant Government purchase and an appropriate quality of security is obtained.

(e) *Optional nature of contract financing terms.* (1) A contracting officer determination that contract financing is customary in a commercial market, while establishing the Government's authority to offer or agree to contract financing, does not preclude an offeror from bidding or proposing on the basis of no contract financing. Similarly, the presence of a contract financing clause in a contract does not preclude contractor forbearance in its exercise (see 32.207(f)).

(2) For solicitations under contracting officer-specified procedures, an offer stating that the contracting officer-specified contract financing terms will not be used by the offeror does not alter the evaluation of the offer (see 32.204(b)) nor does it render the offer nonresponsive or otherwise unacceptable. In the event of award to an offeror whose offer declined the proposed contract financing, the contract financing provisions shall not be included in the resulting contract.

(3) For solicitations under offeror-proposed procedures, a proposal containing no contract financing provisions or stating that contract financing is not proposed, shall, in lieu of the computation in 32.205(c), be evaluated as having no additional cost to the United States for providing contract financing.

32.204 Procedures for contracting-officer-specified commercial contract financing.

(a) *Financing terms.* Under this procedure, the solicitation specifies the financing terms that will be used in any resulting contract.

(b) *Determination of contract financing terms.* The contracting officer shall determine the contract financing terms based upon the results of market research and prepare a written rationale for the terms. If the contracting officer determines there is variation between sellers within the customary standard market terms (see 32.202–3(c)), the contract financing terms specified by the contracting officer shall be within those variations. The financing terms shall be incorporated in the solicitation. Contract financing shall not be a factor in evaluation of resulting proposals, and proposals of alternative financing terms shall not be accepted (but see 14.208 and 15.606 concerning amendments of solicitations). Contract financing shall not be a basis for adjusting offerors' proposed prices because the effect of contract financing is reflected in each offeror's proposed prices.

32.205 Procedures for offeror-proposed commercial contract financing.

(a) Under this procedure, each offeror may propose financing terms. The contracting officer must then determine which offer is in the best interest of the United States.

(b) *Solicitations.* The contracting officer shall include in the solicitation the Invitation to Propose Contract Financing Terms at 52.232–AC. The contracting officer shall also—

(1) Specify the effective delivery payment (invoice) dates that will be used in the evaluation of financing proposals; and

(2) Specify the interest rate to be used in the evaluation of financing proposals (see (c)(4) of this section).

(c) *Evaluation of proposals.* (1) When contract financing terms vary between offerors, the contracting officer must adjust each proposed price for evaluation purposes to reflect the cost to the United States of providing the proposed financing in order to determine the total cost to the United States of that particular combination of price and financing.

(2) Contract financing results in the Government making financing payments earlier than it otherwise would as delivery payments. The cost to the Government of providing contract financing is the Government's imputed cost of those earlier-than-otherwise-required payments. In order to determine the cost to the Government for providing financing, the contracting officer must compute that imputed cost of financing and add it to the proposed price to determine the evaluated price for each offeror.

(3) The imputed cost of a single financing payment is the amount of the payment multiplied by the annual interest rate, multiplied by the number of years between the date of payment of the financing payment and the date the amount would have been paid as a delivery payment. The imputed cost of financing is the sum of the imputed costs of each of the financing payments.

(4) The time value of offeror-proposed contract financing arrangements shall be calculated using as the interest rate the Nominal Discount Rate specified in Appendix C of OMB Circular A–94, Benefit-Cost Analysis of Federal Programs; Guidelines and Discounts, appropriate to the period of contract financing. This Appendix is updated yearly and is available from the Office of Economic Policy in the Office of Management and Budget (OMB).

32.206 Construction of contract clauses.

(a) Unless otherwise authorized by agency regulations, the contract shall contain the paragraph entitled Payment of the clause at 52.212–4. If the contract will provide for contract financing, the contracting officer shall construct a solicitation provision and contract clause for any resulting contract. This solicitation provision shall be constructed in accordance with 32.204 or 32.205. If the procedure at 32.205 is used, the solicitation provision Invitation to Propose Financing Terms at 52.232–AC shall be included. The contract clause shall be constructed in accordance with the requirements of this subpart and any agency regulations.

(b) Each contract financing clause shall have the following structure:

(1) One or more paragraphs describing the—

(i) Computation of the financing payment amounts;

(ii) Specific conditions of contractor entitlement to those financing payments;

(iii) Liquidation of those financing payments by delivery payments;

(iv) Specifics of the security under the contract, any terms or conditions specifically applicable thereto; and

(v) Frequency, form, and any additional content of the contractor's request for financing payment (in addition to the requirements of the clause Standard Terms for Government Financing of Purchases of Commercial Items at 52.232–AA), which paragraph

shall limit the frequency of requests to no more than one per month, unless otherwise authorized by agency regulation.

(2) Unless agency regulations authorize alterations, the unaltered text of the clause at 52.232–AA, Standard Terms for Government Financing of Purchases of Commercial Items.

(c) *Computation of amounts, and contractor entitlement provisions.* Contracts shall provide that delivery payments shall be made only for completed goods and services accepted by the Government in accordance with the terms of the contract. Contracts may provide for commercial advance and commercial interim payments based upon a wide variety of bases, including (but not limited to) achievement or occurrence of specified events, the passage of time, or specified times prior to the delivery date(s). The basis for payment must be objectively determinable. It is expected that the basis for payment for customary standard market terms is one that is documented by the records and controls maintained by a prudent business person in the normal course of business in that market. Therefore, in establishing the basis for contract financing payments under the contracting-officer specified procedure, the contracting officer normally should be guided by the customary standard market terms. Under the offeror-proposed procedure, the offeror is responsible for proposing terms it can implement.

(d) *Instructions for multiple appropriations.* If contract financing is to be computed for the contract as a whole, and if there is more than one appropriation account (or subaccount) funding payments under the contract, the contracting officer shall include in the contract instructions for distribution of financing payments to the respective funds accounts.

(e) *Prompt payment for commercial purchase payments.* The provisions of subpart 32.9, Prompt Payment, apply to contract financing and invoice payments for commercial purchases in the same manner they apply to contract financing and invoice payments for non-commercial purchases. The contracting officer, in constructing financing and payment terms for commercial purchases, is responsible for including in the contract all the information necessary to implement prompt payment. In particular, contracting officers must be careful to clearly differentiate in the contract between contract financing and invoice payments and between items having different prompt payment times.

(f) *Installment payment financing for commercial items.* Contracting officers may insert the clause at 52.232–AB, Installment Payments for Commercial Items, in contracts and solicitations in lieu of constructing a specific clause in accordance with paragraphs (b) through (e) of this section when the contracting officer determines that this clause is appropriate and in the best interest of the Government.

(1) *Description.* Installment payment financing is payment by the Government to a contractor of a fixed number of equal interim financing payments prior to delivery and acceptance of a contract item. The installment payment arrangement is designed to reduce administrative costs. However, if a contract will have a large number of deliveries, the administrative costs may increase to the point where installment payments are not in the best interest of the Government.

(2) *Authorized types of installment financing payments and rates.* Installment financing payments may be made using the clause at 52.232–AB, Installment Payments for Commercial Items, either at the 70 percent financing rate cited in the clause or at any other lower rate in accordance with agency procedures.

(3) *Calculating the amount of installment financing payments.* The contracting officer shall identify in the contract schedule those items for which installment financing payments are authorized. Monthly installment financing payment amounts are to be calculated by the contractor pursuant to the instructions in the contract clause only for items authorized to receive installment financing payments.

(4) *Liquidating installment payment financing payments.* If installment financing payments have been made for an item, the amount paid to the contractor upon acceptance of the item by the Government shall be reduced by the amount of installment financing payments made for the item in order to liquidate all installment financing payments previously made for the item. The contractors request for final payment for each item is required to show this calculation.

32.207 Administration and payment of commercial financing payments.

(a) *Responsibility.* The contracting officer responsible for administration of the contract shall be responsible for review and approval of contract financing requests.

(b) *Approval of financing requests.* Unless otherwise provided in agency regulations, or by agreement with the appropriate payment official:

(1) The contracting officer shall be responsible for receiving, approving, and transmitting all contract financing requests to the appropriate payment office; and

(2) Each approval shall specify the amount to be paid, necessary contractual information, and the account(s) (see 32.206(d)) to be charged for the payment.

(c) *Reviews.* Because the basis for payments can vary widely, the contracting officer is responsible for determining what reviews, either pre- or post- payment, are required for protection of the Government's interests. The contracting officer, in approving financing payments, may rely upon contractor certifications and internal management, accounting, and data practices or systems, provided the contracting officer has determined that those practices or systems are reliable and that appropriate reviews are conducted to verify their continued reliability.

(d) *Financial surveillance.* The contracting officer is responsible for monitoring the contractor's overall financial condition. The contract financing provisions, entitled Suspension and Reduction of Financing Payments, and Reports and Government Access, of the clauses at 52.232–AA and 52.232–AB, specifically give the Government rights to information in this area.

(e) *Management of security.* After contract award, the contracting officer responsible for approving requests for financing payments shall be responsible for determining that the security continues to be adequate.

(f) *Limits on Government access.* (1) Unless the contractor requests contract financing under a contract financing clause, the associated Government rights granted by the Records, reports and access provisions of the contract financing clauses (*e.g.*, access to records) are inoperative.

(2) The Government rights granted by the Records, reports, and access provisions of contract financing clauses are for the purpose of ensuring the accuracy and safety of the Government's financing payments and shall not be used for any other purpose.

15. Section 32.501–1 is amended by revising paragraph (d) to read as follows:

32.501–1 Customary progress payment rates.

* * * * *

(d) In accordance with the Defense Procurement Improvement Act of 1986 (Pub. L. 99–145), as amended, and, for civilian agencies, in accordance with 41

U.S.C. 255, as amended, progress payments are limited to 80 percent on work accomplished under undefinitized contract actions. A higher rate is not authorized under unusual progress payments or other customary progress payments for the undefinitized actions.

32.501–4 [Removed]

16. Section 32.501–4 is removed.

17. Section 32.502–1 is amended in paragraph (a) introductory text by removing the phrase ''paragraphs (b) and (c) below,'' and inserting in its place ''paragraph (b) of this section,''; by revising paragraph (b) introductory text and (b)(1); by removing paragraph (c); by redesignating paragraph (d) as paragraph (c); and in newly designated paragraph (c)(1) by removing the phrase ''through (c) above,'' and inserting in its place ''and (b) of this section,''. The revised text reads as follows:

32.502–1 Use of customary progress payments.

* * * * *

(b) To reduce undue administrative effort and expense, unless otherwise provided in agency regulations, the contracting officer shall not provide for progress payments on contracts of less than $1 million unless—

(1) The contractor is a small business concern and the contract will be equal to or greater than the simplified acquisition procedure threshold; or

* * * * *

18. Subpart 32.10, consisting of sections 32.1000 through 32.1011, is added to read as follows:

Subpart 32.10—Performance-Based Payments

Sec.
32.1000 Scope of subpart.
32.1001 Policy.
32.1002 Bases for performance-based payments.
32.1003 Criteria for use.
32.1004 Procedure.
32.1005 Solicitation provisions and contract clause.
32.1006 Agency approvals.
32.1007 Administration of performance-based payments.
32.1008 Suspension or reduction of performance-based payments.
32.1009 Title.
32.1010 Risk of loss.
32.1011 Performance-based payments for events.

32.1000 Scope of subpart.

This subpart provides policy and procedures, and prescribes contract clauses for performance-based payments under non-commercial purchases pursuant to subpart 32.1. This subpart does not apply to—

(a) Payments under cost-reimbursement contracts;

(b) Contracts for architect-engineer services or construction or for shipbuilding or ship conversion, alteration, or repair, when the contracts provide for progress payments based upon a percentage or stage of completion;

(c) Contracts for research or development; or

(d) Contracts awarded through sealed bid procedures.

32.1001 Policy.

(a) Performance-based payments are contract financing payments and, when authorized by the contract, are to be used to pay a contractor on bases which do not involve acceptance by the Government.

(b) Performance-based payments are fully recoverable, in the same manner as progress payments, in the event of default. Except as provided in 32.1003(c), where performance-based payments are used, they shall be the exclusive method of contract financing in the contract in accordance with subpart 32.1.

(c) Contractors shall maintain an appropriate investment in their contract at all times.

(d) For Government accounting purposes, performance-based payments should be treated like progress payments based on costs under subpart 32.5.

(e) Performance-based payments are contract financing payments and, therefore, are not subject to the interest-penalty provisions of prompt payment. However, these payments shall be made in accordance with the agency's policy for contract financing payments.

32.1002 Bases for performance-based payments.

Performance-based payments may be made on any of the following bases:

(a) Performance measured by objective, quantifiable methods,

(b) Accomplishment of defined events, or

(c) Other quantifiable measures of results.

32.1003 Criteria for use.

Performance-based payments shall be used only if the following conditions are met:

(a) The contract meets any criteria established by agency regulations in accordance with subpart 32.1,

(b) The contract is a definitized fixed-price type contract, and

(c) The contract does not provide for other methods of contract financing, except that advance payments in accordance with subpart 32.4, or Guaranteed Loans in accordance with subpart 32.3 may be used.

32.1004 Procedure.

Performance-based financing payments may be made either on a whole contract basis or on a deliverable item basis, unless otherwise prescribed by agency regulations.

(a) *Establishing performance bases.* Each event or performance criteria that will trigger payment of a performance-based finance payment amount shall be an integral and necessary part of contract performance and shall be identified in the contract, along with a description of what constitutes successful performance of the event or attainment of the performance criteria. An event need not be a critical event in order to trigger a payment, but successful performance of each such event or performance criteria shall be readily verifiable. A contractor shall not be paid for an event or performance criteria until previously scheduled events or prior performance criteria have been successfully performed. If payment of performance-based finance amounts is on a deliverable item basis, each event or performance criteria shall be part of the performance necessary for that deliverable item and shall be identified to a specific contract line item or subline item.

(b) *Establishing performance-based finance payment amounts.* The contracting officer responsible for establishing the price of a contract also shall establish a complete, fully defined schedule of performance-based payments when establishing the price of the contract. If a contract action significantly affects the price, or event or performance criteria, the contracting officer responsible for pricing the contract modification shall adjust the performance-based payment schedule appropriately. The payment amounts should be adequate to ensure that the contractor maintains an appropriate investment in work in process inventory and total performance-based finance payments shall not exceed 75 percent of the contract price, if on a whole contract basis, or 75 percent of the delivery item price if on a delivery item basis. Performance-based finance payment amounts may be established on the basis of—

(1) The estimated projected cost of performance of the entire contract, or of specific line items, as of the date of each event;

(2) The estimated projected cost of performance of the entire contract, or of specific line items, as of the date of attainment of each performance criteria;

(3) The estimated projected cost of performance of particular events; or

(4) Any other rational basis determined by the contracting officer or agency procedures.

(c) *Instructions for multiple appropriations.* If the whole contract approach is used and there is more than one appropriation account (or sub account) funding payments under the contract, the contracting officer shall include in the contract instructions for distribution of financing payments to the respective funds accounts.

(d) *Liquidating performance-based finance payments.* Performance-based finance amounts shall be liquidated by deducting a percentage or a designated dollar amount from the delivery payment.

(1) If the performance-based finance payments are on a delivery item basis, the liquidation amount for each such line item shall be the percent of that delivery item price that was previously paid under performance-based finance payments or the designated dollar amount.

(2) If the performance-based finance payments are on a whole contract basis, liquidation shall be by either predesignated liquidation amounts or a liquidation percentage. In order to ensure proper liquidation, performance-based financing payments made after any payment for a deliverable item shall be adjusted to reflect the amount of previous delivery payments. (For example, if $3 million of performance-based financing payments have been made under a $10 million contract, the liquidation percentage would be 30 percent.)

(e) *Late payment penalties.* Performance-based payments are contract financing payments and, therefore, are not subject to the interest-penalty provisions of the Prompt Payment Act in accordance with subpart 32.9. However, these payments shall be made in accordance with the agency's policy for contract financing payments.

32.1005 Solicitation provisions and contract clause.

(a) If performance-based contract financing will be provided, the contracting officer shall insert the clause at 52.232–BD, Performance-Based Payments, with the description of the basis for payment and liquidation as required in 32.1004 in the solicitation and resulting contract.

(b) The contracting officer shall insert the provision at 52.232–BB, Notice of Performance-Based Payments, in requests for proposals that include a Performance-Based Payments clause.

(c) Unless otherwise directed by agency regulations in accordance with 32.104(c), if it is expected that the award will be for less than $1 million, the contracting officer shall insert the provision at 52.232–BC, Notice of Availability of Performance-Based Payments Exclusively for Small Business Concerns, in solicitations that include the Performance-Based Payment clause.

32.1006 Agency approvals.

The contracting officer shall obtain such approvals as are required by agency regulations.

32.1007 Administration of performance-based payments.

(a) *Administration.* The extent of supervision of performance-based payments shall vary inversely with the contractor's experience, performance record, reliability, quality of management, financial strength, and the adequacy of the records, accounts and controls established by the contractor for the administration of the clause. Supervision shall be of a kind and degree sufficient to provide timely knowledge of the need for, and timely opportunity for, any actions necessary to protect the Government's interests.

(b) *Approval of requests.* If the contracting officer has satisfied himself that the contractor's internal records and controls and management arrangements are accurate and reliable for all aspects of administration of performance-based payments, the contracting officer may rely upon those in approving any particular request for payment. In such event, the contracting officer shall determine the degree of risk to the Government's interests, and shall arrange an appropriate schedule of post-payment reviews and verifications. Where the contracting officer is not satisfied, the contracting officer shall require such reviews and verifications before approval for payment, as the contracting officer finds appropriate for the protection of the Government's interests.

32.1008 Suspension or reduction of performance-based payments.

(a) *General.* The Performance-Based Payments clause provides the Government the right to reduce or suspend performance-based payments or to increase the liquidation, under specified conditions. These conditions and actions are discussed in paragraphs (b) through (d) of this section.

(1) The contracting officer shall take these actions only in accordance with the contract terms and never precipitately or arbitrarily. These actions should be taken only after—

(i) Notifying the contractor of the intended action and providing an opportunity for discussion;

(ii) Evaluating the effect of the action on the contractor's operations, based on the contractor's financial condition, projected cash requirements, and the existing or available credit arrangements; and

(iii) Considering the general equities of the particular situation.

(2) The contracting officer shall take immediate unilateral action only if warranted by circumstances such as overpayments or unsatisfactory contract performance.

(3) In all cases, the contracting officer shall (i) act fairly and reasonably, (ii) base decisions on substantial evidence, and (iii) document the contract file. Findings made under paragraph (e) of the Performance-Based Payments clause at 52.232–BD shall be in writing.

(b) *Contractor noncompliance.* (1) The contractor must comply with all material requirements of the contract. This includes the requirement to maintain efficient and reliable records, accounts, and controls adequate for proper administration of the clause. If these are deemed inadequate, performance-based payments shall be suspended (or payments for events for which the records, accounts, or controls are unacceptable shall be suspended) until the necessary changes have been made.

(2) If the contractor fails to comply with the contract without fault or negligence, the contracting officer will not take action permitted by paragraph (e)(1) of the Performance-Based Payment clause at 52.232–BD, other than to correct overpayments and collect amounts due from the contractor (see also 32.1007(c)).

(c) *Unsatisfactory financial condition.* (1) If the contracting officer finds that contract performance (including full liquidation of performance-based payments) is endangered by the contractor's financial condition, or by a failure to make progress, the contracting officer shall require the contractor to make additional operating or financial arrangements adequate for completing the contract without loss to the Government.

(2) If the contracting officer concludes that further performance-based payments would increase the probable loss to the Government, the contracting officer shall suspend performance-based payments and all other payments until the unliquidated balance of performance-based payments is eliminated.

(d) *Delinquency in payment of costs of performance.* If the contracting officer determines the contractor is delinquent in paying the costs of contract performance in the ordinary course of

business, the contracting officer shall evaluate whether the delinquency is caused by an unsatisfactory financial condition and, if so, shall apply the guidance in paragraph (c) of this section. If the contractor's financial condition is satisfactory, the contracting officer shall not deny performance-based payments if the contractor agrees to—

(1) Cure the payment delinquencies;

(2) Avoid further delinquencies; and

(3) Make additional arrangements adequate for completing the contract without loss to the Government.

32.1009 Title.

(a) Since the Performance-Based Payment clause at 52.232–BD gives the Government title to all of the property described in paragraph (f) of the clause, the contracting officer must ensure that the Government title to this property is not compromised by other encumbrances. Ordinarily, the contracting officer, in the absence of reason to believe otherwise, may rely upon the contractor's certification contained in the payment request.

(b) If the contracting officer becomes aware of any arrangement or condition that would impair the Government's title to the property affected by the Performance-Based Payment clause at 52.232–BD, the contracting officer shall require additional protective provisions.

(c) The existence of any such encumbrance is a violation of the contractor's obligations under the contract, and the contracting officer may, if necessary, suspend or reduce payments under the terms of Performance-Based Payments clause covering failure to comply with a material requirement of the contract. In addition, if the contractor fails to disclose an existing encumbrance in the certification, the contracting officer should consult with legal counsel concerning possible violation of 31 U.S.C. 3729, the False Claims Act.

32.1010 Risk of loss.

(a) Under the Performance-Based Payments clause at 52.232–BD, and except for normal spoilage, the contractor bears the risk for loss, theft, destruction, or damage to property affected by the clause, even though title is vested in the Government, unless the Government has expressly assumed this risk. The clauses prescribed in 32.1005 related to performance-based payments, default, and terminations, do not constitute a Government assumption of risk.

(b) If a loss occurs in connection with property for which the contractor bears the risk and the property is part of or needed for performance, the contractor is obligated to repay the Government the performance-based payments related to the property.

(c) The contractor is not obligated to pay for the loss of property for which the Government has assumed the risk of loss. However, a serious loss may impede the satisfactory progress of contract performance, so that the contracting officer may need to act under paragraph (e)(2) of the Performance-Based Payment clause. In addition, while the contractor is not required to repay previous performance-based payments in the event of a loss for which the Government has assumed the risk, such a loss may prevent the contractor from making the certification required by the Performance-Based Payments clause.

32.1011 Performance-based payments for events.

The following policy and procedures apply to the use of performance-based payments based upon specific events (milestones):

(a) The performance-based payment shall be based on a program event, identified to a specific contract line item or subline item, and liquidated by deduction of the performance-based payments from the price of the item in the contract.

(b) Each event for which a performance-based payment is established shall have a description of what constitutes successful performance.

(c) Because performance-based payments are liquidated by deduction from a specific delivery, each event for which a performance-based payment is established shall be part of the performance of a specific deliverable item under the contract.

(d) It is not required that the performance-based payment amount be based on the cost of performing an event; however, there must be a rational basis for the payment amount established.

(e) The contracting officer awarding the contract is responsible for establishing a complete, fully defined schedule of performance-based payments prior to award of the contract.

(f) The performance-based payments shall be set forth in the contract, be reasonably priced, and be based on meaningful program events.

(g) The contracting officer shall not approve a performance-based payment until the contractor has successfully performed the specified event, notwithstanding the contractor's failure to perform is without fault or negligence on the contractor's part. However, if a contracting officer determines that the failure to perform was Government-caused (and it can be established that the contractor would have successfully performed the event otherwise), the effect upon the contractor of the delay in performance payment for the event may be considered if contract adjustment results.

PART 52—SOLICITATION PROVISIONS AND CONTRACT CLAUSES

19. Sections 52.232–AA through 52.232–BD are added to read as follows:

§ 52.232–AA Standard Terms for Government Financing of Purchases of Commercial Items.

In accordance with 32.206(b)(2), insert the following clause:

Standard Terms for Government Financing of Purchases of Commercial Items (Date)

If contract financing will be provided under this contract, the terms and conditions of this clause shall apply, in addition to any other provisions of this contract. If the contract financing terms of this contract resulted from an Invitation to Propose Financing Terms (FAR 52.232–AC), no financing payment shall be made in any greater amount or at any earlier date than specified in the listing contained in the contractor's proposal as accepted by the contracting officer.

(a) *Reduction or suspension of payments.* The Contracting Officer may reduce or suspend financing payments, liquidate financing payments by deduction from any payment for accepted supplies or services under this or any other contract, or take a combination of these actions, after finding upon substantial evidence any of the following conditions—

(1) The Contractor failed to comply with any contract term or condition;

(2) Performance of this contract is endangered by the Contractor's unsatisfactory financial condition; or

(3) The Contractor fails to provide the Government, upon request, a satisfactory assurance of future performance.

(b) *Records, reports, and access.* The Contractor shall maintain records and controls adequate for administration of this clause. For the sole purpose of administering this clause, the Contractor shall promptly furnish reports, certificates, financial statements, and other pertinent information requested by the Contracting Officer, and shall give the Government reasonable opportunity to examine and verify the Contractor's records and controls required for administration of this clause, and to examine and verify the Contractor's performance of this contract.

(c) *Special terms regarding termination for cause.* If this contract is terminated for cause, the Contractor shall, on demand, repay to the Government the amount of unliquidated performance payments. The Government shall be liable for no payment except as provided by the Termination for Cause term of the clause at 52.212–4.

(d) *Reservation of rights.* (1) No payment under this clause shall (i) excuse the Contractor from performance of obligations under this contract, or (ii) constitute a waiver of any of the rights or remedies of the parties under the contract.

(2) The Government's rights and remedies under this clause (i) shall not be exclusive, but rather shall be in addition to any other rights and remedies provided by law or this contract; and (ii) shall not be affected by delayed, partial, or omitted exercise of any right, remedy, power, or privilege, nor shall such exercise or any single exercise preclude or impair any further exercise under this clause or the exercise of any other right, power, or privilege of the Government.

(e) *Contractor certification and acknowledgment of criminal and civil penalties.* As required in the paragraph concerning the content of the Contractor's request for financing payment, the Contractor shall make the following certification in each request for financing payment:

I certify to the best of my knowledge and belief that—

(1) This request for financing payment is true and correct;

(2) All payments requested are properly due in accordance with the contract, and that except as disclosed to the Contracting Officer by written communication dated _____, the deliverable items for which payments are requested will be delivered or performed in accordance with the contract;

(3) There has been no impairment or diminution of the Government's security under this contract (except as reported in writing on _____);

(4) There has been no materially adverse change in the financial condition of the Contractor since the submission by the Contractor to the Government of the most recent written information dated _____; and,

(5) After the making of this requested Financing Payment, the amount of all such payments will not exceed any limitation in the contract, and the amount of all payments under the contract will not exceed any limitation in the contract.

(6) I understand that inaccurate information provided to the Government may subject me and/or others to civil and/or criminal penalties for false claims or false statements pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 3729 and 18 U.S.C. 1001.

(f) *Security for Government financing.* In the event the Contractor fails to provide adequate security, as required in this contract, no financing payment shall be made under this contract. Upon receipt of the adequate security, financing payments shall be made, including all previous payments to which the Contractor is entitled, in accordance with the terms of the provisions for contract financing. If at any time the Contracting Officer determines that the security provided by the Contractor is insufficient, the Contractor shall promptly provide such additional security as the Contracting Officer determines necessary. In the event the Contractor fails to provide such additional security, the Contracting Officer may find the Contractor to have failed to comply with a requirement of the contract as provided in paragraph (a), Reduction or suspension of payments.

(g) *Content of Contractor's request for financing payment term.* The Contractor's request for financing payment shall contain the following:

(1) The name and address of the Contractor;

(2) The date of the request for Financing Payment;

(3) The contract number and/or other identifier of the contract or order under which the request is made;

(4) An appropriately itemized and totaled statement of the financing payments requested and such other information as is necessary for computation of the payment, prepared in accordance with the direction of the Contracting Officer; and

(5) A certification by a Contractor official authorized to bind the Contractor, as specified in paragraph (e), Contractor certification and acknowledgment of criminal and civil penalties.

(End of clause)

§ 52.232–AB Installment Payments for Commercial Items.

As prescribed in 32.206(e), insert the following clause:

Installment Payments for Commercial Items (Date)

Installment financing payments shall be made to the Contractor when requested, as work progresses, but not more frequently than monthly, in amounts approved by the Contracting Officer under the following conditions:

(a) *Computation of amounts.* Installment payment financing shall be paid to the Contractor when requested for each separately priced unit of supply (but not for services) of each contract line item in amounts approved by the Contracting Officer pursuant to this clause.

(1) *Number of installment payments for each contract line item.* Each separately priced unit of each contract line item is authorized a fixed number of monthly installment payments. The number of installment payments authorized for each unit of a contract line item is equal to the number of months from the date of contract award to the date one month before the first delivery of the first separately priced unit of the contract line item. For example, if the first scheduled delivery of any separately priced unit of a contract line item is nine (9) months after award of the contract, all separately priced units of that contract line item are authorized eight (8) installment payments.

(2) *Amount of each installment payment.* The amount of each installment payment for each separately priced unit of each contract line item is equal to 70 percent of the unit price divided by the number of installment payments authorized for that unit.

(3) *Date of each installment payment.* Installment payments for any particular separately priced unit of a contract line item begin the number of months prior to the delivery of that unit that are equal to the number of installment payments authorized for that unit. For example, if eight (8) installment payments are authorized for each separately priced unit of a contract line item, the first installment payment for any particular unit of that contract line item would be eight (8) months before the scheduled delivery date for that unit. The last installment payment is due one (1) month before scheduled delivery of a unit.

(4) *Limitation on Payment.* Prior to the payment for acceptance of a separately priced unit of a contract line item, the sum of all installment payments for that unit shall not exceed 70 percent of the price of that unit.

(b) *Contractor request for installment payment.* The Contractor may submit Requests for Payment of Installment Payments not more frequently than monthly, in a form and manner acceptable to the Contracting Officer. Unless otherwise authorized by the Contracting Officer, all installments in any month for which payment is being requested shall be included in a single request, appropriately itemized and totaled.

(c) *Adequate progress and approval for payment.* An installment payment under this clause is a contract financing payment under the Prompt Payment clause of this contract, and except as provided below, approved requests shall be paid within thirty (30) days of submittal of a proper request for payment. Payment is not required, and the prompt payment period shall not begin, until the Contracting Officer approves the request, if the Contracting Officer—

(1) Requires substantiation of adequate progress;

(2) Inquires into the status of performance;

(3) Inquires into any of the conditions listed in paragraph (e), Reduction or suspension of payments, of this clause; or

(4) Inquires into the Contractor certification.

(d) *Liquidation of installment payments.* (1) Installment payments shall be liquidated by deducting from the invoice payment made upon acceptance of each item the total unliquidated amount of installment payments made for that separately priced unit of that contract line item.

(2) If at any time the amount of payments under this contract exceeds any limitation in this contract, the Contractor shall repay to the Government the excess. Unless otherwise determined by the Contracting Officer, such excess shall be credited as a reduction in the unliquidated installment payment balance(s) for the related deliverable item(s), after adjustment of delivery payments and balances for any retroactive price adjustments.

(3) The liquidation amounts for each unit of each line item shall be clearly delineated in each request for delivery payment submitted by the Contractor.

(e) *Reduction or suspension of installment payments.* The Contracting Officer may reduce or suspend Installment Payments, liquidate Installment Payments by deduction from any payment for accepted supplies or services under this or any other contract, or take a combination of these actions, after finding upon substantial evidence any of the following conditions:

(1) The Contractor failed to comply with any contract term or condition;

(2) Performance of this contract is endangered by the Contractor's unsatisfactory financial condition; or

(3) The Contractor fails to provide the Government, upon request, a satisfactory assurance of future performance.

(f) *Security for installment payment financing.* In the event the Contractor fails to provide adequate security as required in this contract, no financing payment shall be made under this contract. Upon receipt of the adequate security, financing payments shall be made, including all previous payments to which the Contractor is entitled, in accordance with the terms of the provisions for contract financing. If at any time the Contracting Officer determines that the security provided by the Contractor is insufficient, the Contractor shall promptly provide such additional security as the Contracting Officer determines necessary. In the event the Contractor fails to provide such additional security, the Contracting Officer may find the Contractor to have failed to comply with a material requirement of the contract as provided in paragraph (e), Reduction or suspension of installment payments, of this clause.

(g) *Records, reports, and access.* The Contractor shall maintain records and controls adequate for administration of this clause. For the sole purpose of administering this clause, the Contractor shall promptly furnish reports, certificates, financial statements, and other pertinent information requested by the Contracting Officer, and shall give the Government reasonable opportunity to examine and verify the Contractor's records and controls required for administration of this clause, and to examine and verify the Contractor's performance of this contract.

(h) *Special terms regarding termination for cause.* If this contract is terminated for cause, the Contractor shall, on demand, repay to the Government the amount of unliquidated performance payments. The Government shall be liable for no payment except as provided by the Termination for Cause term of the clause at 52.212–4.

(i) *Reservation of rights.* (1) No payment or vesting of title under this clause shall (i) excuse the Contractor from performance of obligations under this contract, or (ii) constitute a waiver of any of the rights or remedies of the parties under the contract.

(2) The Government's rights and remedies under this clause (i) shall not be exclusive, but rather shall be in addition to any other rights and remedies provided by law or this contract, and (ii) shall not be affected by delayed, partial, or omitted exercise of any right, remedy, power, or privilege, nor shall such exercise or any single exercise preclude or impair any further exercise under this clause or the exercise of any other right, power, or privilege of the Government.

(j) *Content of Contractor's request for installment payment.* The Contractor's request for installment payment shall contain the following:

(1) The name and address of the Contractor;

(2) The date of the request for Installment Payment;

(3) The contract number and/or other identifier of the contract or order under which the request is made;

(4) An itemized and totaled statement of the items, related deliverable items, and installment payment(s) being requested for each separately priced unit of each contract line item; and

(5) A certification by a Contractor official authorized to bind the Contractor, as specified in paragraph (k).

(k) *Contractor certification.* As required in paragraph (j)(5) of this clause, the Contractor shall make the following certification in each Request for Installment Payment:

I certify to the best of my knowledge and belief that—

(1) This request for installment payment is true and correct;

(2) All installment payments requested are properly due in accordance with the contract, and that except as disclosed to the Contracting Officer by written communication dated _____, the deliverable items for which Installment Payments are requested will be delivered or performed in accordance with the contract;

(3) There are no encumbrances (except as reported in writing on _____) against the property acquired or produced for, and allocated or properly chargeable to the contract which would affect or impair the Government's security;

(4) There has been no materially adverse change in the financial condition of the Contractor since the submission by the Contractor to the Government of the most recent written information dated _____; and,

(5) After the making of this requested Installment Payment, the amount of all payments for each deliverable item for which Installment Payments have been requested will not exceed any limitation in the contract, and the amount of all payments under the contract will not exceed any limitation in the contract.

(6) I understand that inaccurate information provided to the Government may subject me and/or others to civil and/or criminal penalties for false claims or false statements pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 3729 and 18 U.S.C. 1001.

(End of clause)

52.232–AC Invitation to Propose Financing Terms.

The contracting officer shall include this provision as specified in 32.205(b) and 32.206.

Invitation to Propose Financing Terms (Date)

(a) The offeror is invited to propose terms under which the Government shall make contract financing payments to the contractor during performance of this contract. The financing terms proposed by the offeror shall be a factor in the evaluation of the contractor's proposal. The financing terms of the successful offeror and the clause, Standard Terms for Government Financing of Purchases of Commercial Items, at 52.232–AA, shall be incorporated in any resulting contract.

(b) The offeror agrees that in the event of any conflict between the terms proposed by the offeror and the terms in the clause Standard Terms for Government Financing of Purchases of Commercial Items at 52.232–AA, the terms of the clause Standard Terms for Government Financing of Purchases of Commercial Items at 52.232–AA shall govern.

(c) Because of statutory limitations (10 U.S.C. 2307(f) and 41 U.S.C. 255(f)), the offeror's proposed financing shall not be acceptable if it does not conform to the following limitations:

(1) Delivery payments shall be made only for supplies delivered and accepted, or services rendered and accepted in accordance with the Payment term,

(2) Contract financing payments shall not exceed 15 percent of the contract price in advance of any performance of work under the contract,

(3) The terms and conditions of the contract financing must be appropriate or customary in the commercial marketplace, and

(4) The terms and conditions of the contract financing must be in the best interest of the United States.

(d) The offeror's proposal of financing terms shall include the following:

(1) The proposed contractual language describing the contract financing (see FAR 32.202–3 for appropriate definitions of types of payments),

(2) A listing of the earliest time and greatest amount at which each contract financing payment may be payable and the amount of each delivery payment. Any resulting contract shall provide that no contract financing payment shall be made at any earlier time or in any greater amount than shown in the offeror's listing.

(e) The offeror's proposed prices and financing terms shall be evaluated to determine the cost to the United States of the proposal. This evaluation shall be done using the interest rate and delivery schedule specified elsewhere in this solicitation.

(End of provision)

52.232–BB Notice of Performance-Based Payments.

As prescribed in 32.1005(b), insert the following provision:

Notice of Performance-Based Payments (Date)

The need for customary performance-based payments conforming to the regulations in Subpart 32.10 of the Federal Acquisition Regulation (FAR) will not be considered as a handicap or adverse factor in the award of the contract. The Performance-Based Payments clause included in this solicitation, and the description of the basis for payment and liquidation, will be included in any resulting contract. Even though the clause is included in the contract, the clause shall be inoperative during any time the Contractor's records, accounts, or controls are determined by the Government to be inadequate for administration of this clause.

(End of provision)

52.232–BC Notice of Availability of Performance-Based Payments Exclusively for Small Business Concerns.

As provided in 32.1005(c), insert the following provision:

Notice of Availability of Performance-Based Payments Exclusively for Small Business Concerns (Date)

The Performance-Based Payments clause will be available only to small business concerns. Any bid conditioned upon inclusion of a performance-based payment clause in the resulting contract will be rejected as nonresponsive if the bidder is not a small business concern.

(End of provision)

52.232–BD Performance-Based Payments.

As prescribed in 32.1005(a), insert the following clause:

Performance-Based Payments (Date)

In accordance with the provisions of this clause, and the contract's description of the basis for payment, the Contractor shall be paid contract financing payments based upon performance under the following conditions:

(a) *Amount of payments and limitations on payments.* Subject to such other limitations and conditions as are specified in this contract and this clause, the amount of payments and limitations on payments shall be specified in the contract's description of the basis for payment.

(b) *Contractor request for performance-based payment.* The Contractor may submit Requests for Payment of Performance-Based Payments not more frequently than monthly, in a form and manner acceptable to the Contracting Officer. Unless otherwise authorized by the Contracting Officer, all basis for payment in any period for which payment is being requested shall be included in a single request, appropriately itemized and totaled. The Contractor's request shall contain the information and certification detailed in paragraphs (l) and (m) of this clause.

(c) *Approval and payment of requests.* (1) The Contractor shall not be entitled to payment of a Request for Performance-Based Payment prior to successful accomplishment of the event or performance criteria for which payment is requested. The Contracting Officer shall determine whether the event or performance criteria for which payment is requested has been successfully accomplished in accordance with the terms of the contract. The Contracting Officer may, at any time, require the Contractor to substantiate the event or performance criteria which has been or is represented as being payable.

(2) A payment under this Performance-Based Payment clause is a contract financing payment under the Prompt Payment clause of this contract, and approved requests shall be paid in accordance with the prompt payment period and provisions specified for Contract Financing Payments by that clause provided, however, if the Contracting Officer requires substantiation as provided in paragraph (c)(1) of this clause, or inquires into the status of an event or performance criteria, or into any of the conditions listed in paragraph (e), Reduction or Suspension of Payments, of this clause, or into the contractor certification, payment is not required, and the prompt payment period shall not begin until the Contracting Officer approves the request.

(3) The approval by the Contracting Officer of a Request for Performance-Based Payment does not constitute an acceptance by the Government and does not excuse the Contractor from performance of obligations under this contract.

(d) *Liquidation of performance-based payments.* (1) Performance-based finance amounts paid prior to payment for delivery and acceptance of an item shall be liquidated by deducting a percentage or the designated dollar amount from the delivery payment. If the performance-based finance payments are on a delivery item basis, the liquidation amount for each such line item shall be the percent of that delivery item price that was previously paid under performance-based finance payments or the designated dollar amount. If the performance-based finance payments are on a whole contract basis, liquidation shall be by either predesignated liquidation amounts or a liquidation percentage. If a liquidation percentage is used, the liquidation percentage for each line item shall be the percent of the total contract price that was previously paid under performance-based finance payments. In order to ensure proper liquidation, performance-based financing payments made after any payment for a deliverable item shall be adjusted to reflect the amount of previous delivery payments.

(2) If at any time the amount of payments under this contract exceeds any limitation in this contract, the Contractor shall repay to the Government the excess. Unless otherwise determined by the Contracting Officer, such excess shall be credited as a reduction in the unliquidated performance-based payment balance(s), after adjustment of invoice payments and balances for any retroactive price adjustments.

(e) *Reduction or suspension of performance-based payments.* The Contracting Officer may reduce or suspend performance-based payments, liquidate performance-based payments by deduction from any payment under the contract, or take a combination of these actions after finding upon substantial evidence any of the following conditions:

(1) The Contractor failed to comply with any material requirement of this contract (which includes paragraphs (h) and (i) of this clause).

(2) Performance of this contract is endangered by the Contractor's (i) failure to make progress, or (ii) unsatisfactory financial condition.

(3) The Contractor is delinquent in payment of any subcontractor or supplier under this contract in the ordinary course of business.

(f)(1) *Title.* Title to the property described in this paragraph (f) shall vest in the Government. Vestiture shall be immediately upon the date of the first performance-based payment under this contract, for property acquired or produced before that date. Otherwise, vestiture shall occur when the property is or should have been allocable or properly chargeable to this contract.

(2) *Property,* as used in this clause, includes all of the below-described items acquired or produced by the Contractor that are or should be allocable or properly chargeable to this contract under sound and generally accepted accounting principles and practices:

(i) Parts, materials, inventories, and work in process,

(ii) Special tooling and special test equipment to which the Government is to acquire title under any other clause of this contract,

(iii) Nondurable (*i.e.,* noncapital) tools, jigs, dies, fixtures, molds, patterns, taps, gauges, test equipment and other similar manufacturing aids, title to which would not be obtained as special tooling under subparagraph (f)(2)(ii) of this clause, and

(iv) Drawings and technical data, to the extent the Contractor or subcontractors are required to deliver them to the Government by other clauses of this contract.

(3) Although title to property is in the Government under this clause, other applicable clauses of this contract, (*e.g.,* the termination or special tooling clauses), shall determine the handling and disposition of the property.

(4) The Contractor may sell any scrap resulting from production under this contract, without requesting the Contracting Officer's approval, provided that any significant reduction in the value of the property to which the Government has title under this clause is reported in writing to the Contracting Officer.

(5) In order to acquire for its own use or dispose of property to which title is vested in the Government under this clause, the Contractor must obtain the Contracting Officer's advance approval of the action and the terms. If approved, the basis for payment to which the property is related shall be deemed to be not in compliance with the terms of the contract and not payable (if the property is part of or needed for performance), and the Contractor shall refund the related performance-based payments in accordance with paragraph (d) of this clause.

(g) *Risk of loss.* Before delivery to and acceptance by the Government, the Contractor shall bear the risk of loss for property, the title to which vests in the Government under this clause, except to the extent the Government expressly assumes the risk. If any property is damaged, lost, stolen, or destroyed, the basis of payment to which the property is related shall be deemed to be not in compliance with the terms of the contract and not payable (if the property is part of or needed for performance), and the Contractor shall refund the related performance-based payments in accordance with paragraph (d) of this clause.

(h) *Records and controls.* The Contractor shall maintain records and controls adequate for administration of this clause.

(i) *Reports and Government access.* The Contractor shall promptly furnish reports, certificates, financial statements, and other pertinent information requested by the

Contracting Officer for the administration of this clause and to determine that an event or other criteria prompting a financing payment has been successfully accomplished. The Contractor shall give the Government reasonable opportunity to examine and verify the Contractor's records and to examine and verify the Contractor's performance of this contract for administration of this clause.

(j) *Special terms regarding default.* If this contract is terminated under the Default clause, (1) the Contractor shall, on demand, repay to the Government the amount of unliquidated performance payments, and (2) title shall vest in the Contractor, on full liquidation of all performance-based payments, for all property for which the Government elects not to require delivery under the Default clause of this contract. The Government shall be liable for no payment except as provided by the Default clause.

(k) *Reservation of rights.* (1) No payment or vesting of title under this clause shall (i) excuse the Contractor from performance of obligations under this contract, or (ii) constitute a waiver of any of the rights or remedies of the parties under the contract.

(2) The Government's rights and remedies under this clause (i) shall not be exclusive, but rather shall be in addition to any other rights and remedies provided by law or this contract, and (ii) shall not be affected by delayed, partial, or omitted exercise of any right, remedy, power, or privilege, nor shall such exercise or any single exercise preclude or impair any further exercise under this clause or the exercise of any other right, power, or privilege of the Government.

(l) *Content of Contractor's request for performance-based payment.* The Contractor's Request for Performance-Based Payment shall contain the following:

(1) The name and address of the Contractor,

(2) The date of the request for Performance-Based Payment,

(3) The contract number and/or other identifier of the contract or order under which the request is made,

(4) Such information and documentation as is required by the contract's description of the basis for payment, and

(5) A certification by a Contractor official authorized to bind the Contractor, as specified in paragraph (m).

(m) *Content of Contractor's certification.* As required in paragraph (l)(5) of this clause, the Contractor shall make the following certification in each Request for Performance-Based Payment:

I certify to the best of my knowledge and belief—

(1) That this Request for Performance-Based Payment is true and correct; that this Request (and attachments) has been prepared from the books and records of the Contractor, in accordance with the contract, and the instructions of the Contracting Officer;

(2) That (except as reported in writing on _____), all payments to subcontractors and suppliers under this contract have been paid, or will be paid, currently, when due in the ordinary course of business;

(3) That there are no encumbrances (except as reported in writing on _____) against the property acquired or produced for, and allocated or properly chargeable to the contract which would affect or impair the Government's title;

(4) That there has been no materially adverse change in the financial condition of the Contractor since the submission by the Contractor to the Government of the most recent written information dated _____; and

(5) That after the making of this requested Performance-Based Payment, the amount of all payments for each deliverable item for which Performance-Based Payments have been requested will not exceed any limitation in the contract, and the amount of all payments under the contract will not exceed any limitation in the contract.

(End of clause)

[FR Doc. 95–6294 Filed 3–14–95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6820–34–P

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION

NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION

[FAR Case 94–764]

OMB Clearance Request for Contract Financing

AGENCIES: Department of Defense (DOD), General Services Administration (GSA), and National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA).

ACTION: Notice of new request for OMB clearance.

SUMMARY: Under the provisions of the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1980 (44 U.S.C. 3501), the Federal Acquisition Regulation (FAR) Secretariat has submitted to the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) a request to review and approve a new information collection requirement concerning Contract Financing.

DATES: Comments may be submitted on or before May 15, 1995.

ADDRESSES: Send comments to Mr. Peter Weiss, FAR Desk Officer, OMB, Room 10236, NEOB, Washington, DC 20503.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Beverly Fayson, Office of Federal Acquisition Policy, GSA (202) 501–4755.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

A. Purpose

The Federal Acquisition Streamlining Act of 1994, Pub. L. 103–355, provides authorities that streamline the acquisition process and minimize burdensome government-unique requirements. Sections 2001 and 2051 of the Federal Acquisition Streamlining Act of 1994 substantially changed the statutory authorities for Government financing of contracts. Sections 2001(f) and 2051(e) provide specific authority for Government financing of purchases of commercial items, and sections 2001(b) and 2051(b) substantially revised the authority for Government financing of purchases of non-commercial items.

Sections 2001(f) and 2051(e) provide specific authority for Government financing of purchases of commercial items. These paragraphs authorize the Government to provide contract financing with certain limitations:

- The financing must be in the best interest of the Government,
- The financing cannot exceed 15 percent until some performance of work under the contract,
- The terms and conditions must be appropriate or customary in the commercial marketplace.

The above statutory provisions also remove from financing of commercial purchases certain restrictions applicable to financing of non-commercial purchases by other provisions of 10 U.S.C. 2307 and 41 U.S.C. 255.

Sections 2001(b) and 2051(b) also amend the authority for Government financing of non-commercial purchases by authorizing financing on the basis of certain classes of measures of performance.

To implement these changes, DOD, NASA, and GSA propose to amend the Federal Acquisition Regulation by revising Subparts 32.0, 32.1, and 32.5; by adding new Subparts 32.2 and 32.10; and by adding new clauses to 52.232. The statutory changes create a fundamental distinction between financing of purchases of commercial and non-commercial items. As a result, the subparts of Part 32, Contract Financing, fall into three logical categories:

- Subparts applicable to both commercial and non-commercial financing,
- Subparts applicable to only commercial financing, and
- Subparts applicable to only non-commercial financing.

The proposed rule will enable the Government to provide financing to assist in the performance of contracts for commercial items and provide financing for non-commercial items based on contractor performance.

B. Annual Reporting Burden

Public reporting burden for this collection of information is estimated to average *1* hour per request for commercial financing and *.5* hours per request for performance-based financing, including the time for reviewing instructions, searching existing data sources, gathering and maintaining the data needed, and completing and reviewing the collection of information. Send comments regarding this burden estimate or any other aspect of this collection of information, including suggestions for reducing this burden, to General Services Administration, FAR Secretariat, 18th & F Streets, NW, Room 4037, Washington, DC 20405, and to the FAR Desk Officer, Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs, Office of Management and Budget, Washington, DC 20503.

The annual reporting burden for Commercial Financing is estimated as follows: Respondents, *1,000*; responses per respondent, *5*; total annual responses, *5,000*; preparation hours per response, *1*; and total response burden hours, *5,000*.

The annual reporting burden for Performance-Based Financing is estimated as follows: Respondents, *6,000*; responses per respondent, *32*; total annual responses, *192,000*; preparation hours per response, *.5*; and total response burden hours, *96,000*.

OBTAINING COPIES OF PROPOSALS: Requester may obtain copies of OMB applications or justifications from the General Services Administration, FAR Secretariat (VRS), Room 4037, Washington, DC 20405, telephone (202) 501–4755. Please cite OMB clearance request regarding Contract Financing, FAR case 94–764, in all correspondence.

Dated: March 9, 1995.

Beverly Fayson,

FAR Secretariat.

[FR Doc. 95–6293 Filed 3–14–95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6820–34–P

federal register

Wednesday
March 15, 1995

Part V

Department of Transportation

Federal Transit Administration

49 CFR Part 661

Buy America Requirements: Public Interest Waiver for Micro-Purchases; Final Rule

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Federal Transit Administration

49 CFR Part 661

[Docket No. 94–A]

RIN 2132–AA42

Buy America Requirements

AGENCY: Federal Transit Administration (FTA), DOT.

ACTION: Notice of waiver from Buy America requirements for ''micro-purchases'' by FTA grantees.

SUMMARY: FTA issues an immediate public interest waiver from Buy America requirements for ''micro-purchases''—those purchases with capital and operating assistance where the cost is $2,500 or less.

DATES: Effective date: March 15, 1995. Comment date: Comments must be received by May 15, 1995.

ADDRESSES: Comments should be addressed to: Federal Transit Administration, Office of Chief Counsel, Docket No. 94–A, Room 9316, 400 Seventh Street, SW., Washington, DC 20590. Comments will be available for review by the public at this address from 9 a.m. to 5 p.m., Monday through Friday.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Gregory B. McBride, Deputy Chief Counsel, Office of Chief Counsel, (202) 366–4063.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The Buy American Act of 1933, 41 U.S.C. 10 a–d, established a preference for domestically produced goods in direct federal procurements. The first Buy America legislation applicable to the expenditure of federal funds by recipients under FTA and Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) grant programs was enacted in 1978: section 401 of the Surface Transportation Assistance Act of 1978 (Pub. L. 95–599, 92 Stat. 2689) established a domestic preference for ''articles, materials, supplies mined, produced, or manufactured'' in the United States and costing more than $500,000.

In January 1983, Congress repealed section 401 and substituted section 165 of the Surface Transportation Assistance Act of 1982, Pub. L. No. 97–424, 96 Stat. 2097. This action, among other things, eliminated the $500,000 threshold. Congress prohibited the expenditure of FTA or FHWA funds on steel, cement, and ''manufactured products,'' but as discussed below, included four exceptions permitting the statute to be waived. In 1984, Congress removed cement from section 165, and in 1991 added iron (see section 337 of the Surface Transportation Assistance and Uniform Relocation Act of 1987 (Pub. L. 100–17, 101 Stat. 32) and section 1048 of the Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act of 1991 (Pub. L. 102–204, 105 Stat. 1914)).

Now codified at 49 U.S.C. 5323(j), the Buy America requirement that applies to purchases made with Federal transit and highway funds provides as follows:

(j) BUY AMERICA.—(1) The Secretary of Transportation may obligate an amount that may be appropriated to carry out this chapter for a project only if the steel, iron, and manufactured goods used in the project are produced in the United States.

(2) The Secretary of Transportation may waive paragraph (1) of this subsection if the Secretary finds that—

(A) Applying paragraph (1) would be inconsistent with the public interest;

(B) The steel, iron, and goods produced in the United States are not produced in a sufficient and reasonably available amount or are not of a satisfactory quality;

(C) When procuring rolling stock (including train control, communication, and traction power equipment) under this chapter—

(i) The cost of components and subcomponents produced in the United States is more that 60 percent of the cost of all components of the rolling stock; and

(ii) Final assembly of the rolling stock has occurred in the United States; or

(D) Including domestic material will increase the cost of the overall project by more than 25 percent.

FTA has issued regulations implementing this provision at 49 CFR Part 661. These regulations specify that ''for a manufactured product to be considered produced in the United States: (1) All of the manufacturing processes for the product must take place in the United States; and (2) all items or material used in the product must be of United States origin.'' 49 CFR 661.5(d). This definition is different from the regulation implementing the 1933 Buy American Act which requires that manufactured products contain only a 51 percent domestic content.

In this global economy, it is nearly impossible to find manufactured products that are entirely domestic. Consequently, FTA receives Buy America waiver requests for thousands of items, the great majority for reasons of nonavailability under section (j)(2)(B), with a few based on price differential under section (j)(2)(D). (In Appendix A to 49 CFR 661.7, FTA adopted the waivers granted under the Buy American Act of 1933 (41 U.S.C. 10 a–d) and included public interest waivers under section (j)(2)(A) for microcomputer equipment, certain Chrysler vehicles assembled in Canada, and spare parts when purchased as part of a rolling stock procurement.) As a general rule, most grantees have many more procurements for small items than for large items. Thus, most waivers granted by FTA are based on the nonavailability of items such as office supplies (e.g., pens, paperclips) and maintenance items (e.g., screws, bearings, small vehicle replacement parts, consumables). Many involve purchases of less than $20, with unit prices under one dollar and often less than one cent. These types of things are generally purchased with Federal and local operating assistance funds.

The volume of these waiver requests has resulted in significant delays in grantees' procurement processes. They consume an inordinate amount of grantee staff time, since documentation for each waiver request must be developed and submitted to FTA, where it is reviewed and acted on. Large grantees handle thousands of individual procurements each year. Several grantees state that in order to comply with the FTA Buy America requirements, procurement staffs have been increased.

One mid-sized grantee has written that it processes more than 1,000 purchase orders each month. Such procurements, if subjected to Buy America scrutiny, could theoretically result in the generation of more than 12,000 internal documents annually and an estimated 1,500 requests for waivers. To fully comply with the requirement (for procurements of less than $10,000), this grantee estimated that its purchasing department staff would have to be increased by 2–3 persons, increasing staff costs in excess of $100,000; two fax machines with phone lines would have to be procured, with a one-time cost in excess of $2,000 and annual telephone costs in excess of $1,200; and its computerized stock order system would have to be revised to recognize and track each order to make sure it meets the requirement, at a cost in excess of $10,000. Modifying its purchase procedures to meet the requirement would require reducing the number of purchase orders by ordering larger quantities. However, the grantee explained, good business practice dictates that inventories be kept at the lowest level possible for several reasons, including loss prevention control, minimizing cash in inventory, maintaining purchasing flexibility to take advantage of product changes and improvements, space restrictions for storage, and shelf life. The grantee also noted that buying all items in large quantities also can work against good faith attempts to include disadvantaged

business participation in the bidding process.

Grantees have cited other reasons for their assertion that compliance with FTA's current Buy America rule is unduly difficult and burdensome:

• *Small Purchase Procedures.* Grantees do not routinely accumulate the documentation necessary to justify a waiver of the Buy America requirements when procuring goods in accordance with their small purchase procedures, as allowed by 49 CFR Part 18, Uniform Administrative Requirements for Grants and Cooperative Agreements to State and Local Governments (known as the ''common grant rule''). These small purchase procedures were meant to reduce paperwork and facilitate grantees' effective and efficient procurement of goods. Because documentation needed to request a waiver is usually not required or compatible with such procedures, the requirement to request a waiver is often overlooked. Strict compliance with the FTA rule would necessitate creation of documentation not normally needed for business reasons, preclude the use of oral quotes where normally appropriate, and make the use of purchase orders difficult. Moreover, since the rule precludes granting a waiver until after receipt of bids, grantees are forced to repeat written waiver requests for the same item, even when it is evident that a domestic product will not be offered.

• *State or Local Purchasing Procedures.* Since many small to mid-size transit properties and most states are required to use a local or state purchasing department for purchasing supplies, they have little control over the procedures used. To comply with the FTA Buy America requirements, they must create duplicative local procurement procedures, thereby incurring delays and increasing the cost of their procurements. Ironically, one State has reported that it cannot take advantage of the State Highway Department purchasing office since the State Highway Department complies with the FHWA rule, 23 CFR 635.410, which is inconsistent with the FTA rule.

• *Vendor Problems.* Compliance with the FTA Buy America requirements has also been a problem for vendors who supply the small items grantees need for their routine operations. In many instances, such vendors are distributors and suppliers rather than manufacturers; accordingly, they cannot reasonably be expected to know whether the items being procured are produced in the United States or not. However, under the FTA rule, all vendors must execute a certification of either compliance or noncompliance; for this purpose, some grantees have included a compliance certification on all purchase orders. If a vendor declines to sign the certification, the grantee will not do business with that vendor. This approach protects the grantee, but puts a vendor at risk. Many vendors refuse to certify compliance with the Buy America rule when they do not know the content of the products they are supplying. Some even refuse to deal with the FTA grantee, thus reducing competition. In any case, if the vendor does not certify compliance, the grantee is obliged to consider the product non-domestic and to seek a waiver from FTA for its purchase.

• *Confusion with 1933 Buy American Act.* Grantees also report that some vendors certify compliance with the Buy America requirement believing it to be the same as the 1933 Buy American Act, which requires manufactured products to be 51 percent domestic in content. This is contrary to the FTA regulation, which requires a 100 percent domestic content. Indeed, there are instances where grantees themselves do not know that the FTA regulation requires 100 percent domestic content for a manufactured product to be domestic. Until or unless there is a complaint, the grantee will not look behind the certification to verify that the person who signed it understood the requirement. Thus, one is not always certain that a Buy America certification is correct or that the bids are being judged by the same standard.

Today's action is consistent with and responsive to President Clinton's initiative to reinvent government, known as the National Performance Review, and three recent actions designed to simplify government procedures, especially as to small purchases. The first is Executive Order 12931 of October 13, 1994, Federal Procurement Reform, which requires that Federal agencies review their procurement requirements with a view to streamlining them. The second is the Federal Acquisition Streamlining Act of 1994 (FASA), enacted October 13, 1994, which has as two of its major streamlining features the creation of a Simplified Acquisition Threshold of $100,000 to replace the existing $25,000 small purchase threshold and the exemption of ''micro-purchases'' (purchases valued at $2,500 or less) from the provisions of the 1933 Buy American Act. On December 15, 1994, the Department of Defense, the General Services Administration and the National Aeronautics and Space Administration issued an interim rule implementing FASA (59 FR 64786, December 15, 1994). The third is a proposal by the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) to apply the $100,000 Simplified Acquisition Threshold for direct Federal purchases to purchases by Federal recipients of financial assistance under the common grant rule at 49 CFR Part 18.36 (59 FR 53705, October 5, 1994). FTA also notes that the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), in administering the same statute as FTA, already provides a general waiver if the cost of foreign materials does not exceed $2,500.

Public Interest Waiver

In light of these considerations, FTA believes that application of its Buy America rule to micro-purchases is not consistent with the public interest; accordingly, FTA hereby issues a general public interest waiver under 49 U.S.C. § 5323(j)(2)(A) and 49 CFR 661.7(b) to exempt from its Buy America requirements all purchases made with FTA financial assistance, including capital, planning, and operating assistance, where the cost of the purchase is $2,500 or less. This exemption covers many of the very small purchases made by FTA grantees, including office and janitorial supplies and furnishings, maintenance supplies and equipment, and other small items. The goal of this public interest waiver is to eliminate some of the procurement delays, ''red tape,'' and paperwork from FTA grantees' procurement processes. To further serve these purposes, FTA, elsewhere in today's **Federal Register**, proposes a waiver for small purchases as defined in the common grant rule, 49 CFR 18.36(d), and for purchases with operating assistance.

Request for Comments

FTA welcomes comment on this grant of a general public interest waiver.

List of Subjects in 49 CFR Part 661

Buy America.

For the reasons set out above, FTA amends 49 CFR Part 661 as follows:

PART 661—BUY AMERICA REQUIREMENTS—SURFACE TRANSPORTATION ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1982, AS AMENDED

1. The authority citation for part 661 is revised to read as follows:

Authority: Sec. 165, Pub. L. 97–424, as amended by Sec. 337, Pub. L. 100–17 (49 U.S.C. 5323(j)); 49 CFR 1.51.

2. Appendix A to § 661.7 is amended by adding a new paragraph (e) as follows:

Appendix A to § 661.7—General Waivers

* * * * *

(e) Under the provisions of § 661.7(b) of this part, all purchases where the cost is $2,500 or less are exempt from the requirements of this part.

Issued on: March 10, 1995.

Gordon J. Linton,

Administrator.

[FR Doc. 95–6387 Filed 3–14–95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–57–U

federal register

Wednesday
March 15, 1995

Part VI

Department of Transportation

Federal Transit Administration

49 CFR Part 661

Buy America Requirements; Proposed Rule

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Federal Transit Administration

49 CFR Part 661

[Docket No. 94–A]

RIN 2132–AA42

Buy America Requirements

AGENCY: Federal Transit Administration (FTA), DOT.

ACTION: Notice of proposed waiver from Buy America requirements for small purchases and for purchases with operating assistance.

SUMMARY: FTA proposes to issue a public interest waiver from the Buy America requirements for ''small purchases'' (as defined in the ''common grant rule'') by FTA grantees and made with capital and planning assistance and for all purchases by FTA grantees made with operating assistance.

DATES: Comments must be received by May 15, 1995.

ADDRESSES: Comments should be addressed to: Federal Transit Administration, Office of Chief Counsel, Docket No. 94–A, Room 9316, 400 Seventh Street, S.W., Washington, D.C. 20590. Comments will be available for review by the public at this address from 9:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m., Monday through Friday.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Gregory B. McBride, Deputy Chief Counsel, Office of Chief Counsel, (202) 366–4063.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: Elsewhere in today's **Federal Register**, FTA provides notice of its issuance of a public interest waiver for micro-purchases (i.e., those purchases where the cost is $2,500 or less) by FTA grantees. In this notice, to further serve the same purposes, FTA proposes to issue a public interest waiver from the Buy America requirements for ''small purchases'' (as defined in the ''common grant rule'') by FTA grantees made with capital and planning assistance and for all purchases by FTA grantees made with operating assistance.

The Buy American Act of 1933, 41 U.S.C. 10a–d, established a preference for domestically produced goods in direct federal procurements. The first Buy America legislation applicable to the expenditure of federal funds by recipients under FTA and Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) grant programs was enacted in 1978: section 401 of the Surface Transportation Assistance Act of 1978 (Pub. L. 95–599, 92 Stat. 2689) established a domestic preference for ''articles, materials, supplies mined, produced, or manufactured'' in the United States and costing more than $500,000.

In January 1983, Congress repealed section 401 and substituted section 165 of the Surface Transportation Assistance Act of 1982, Pub. L. No. 97–424, 96 Stat. 2097. This action, among other things, eliminated the $500,000 threshold. Congress prohibited the expenditure of FTA or FHWA funds on steel, cement, and ''manufactured products,'' but as discussed below, included four exceptions permitting the statute to be waived. In 1984, Congress removed cement from section 165, and in 1991 added iron (see section 337 of the Surface Transportation Assistance and Uniform Relocation Act of 1987 (Pub. L. 100–17, 101 Stat. 32) and section 1048 of the Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act of 1991 (Pub. L. 102–204, 105 Stat. 1914)).

Now codified at 49 U.S.C. 5323(j), the Buy America requirement that applies to purchases made with Federal transit and highway funds provides as follows:

(j) BUY AMERICA.—(1) The Secretary of Transportation may obligate an amount that may be appropriated to carry out this chapter for a project only if the steel, iron, and manufactured goods used in the project are produced in the United States.

(2) The Secretary of Transportation may waive paragraph (1) of this subsection if the Secretary finds that—

(A) Applying paragraph (1) would be inconsistent with the public interest;

(B) The steel, iron, and goods produced in the United States are not produced in a sufficient and reasonably available amount or are not of a satisfactory quality;

(C) When procuring rolling stock (including train control, communication, and traction power equipment) under this chapter—

(i) The cost of components and subcomponents produced in the United States is more that 60 percent of the cost of all components of the rolling stock; and

(ii) Final assembly of the rolling stock has occurred in the United States; or

(D) Including domestic material will increase the cost of the overall project by more than 25 percent.

FTA has issued regulations implementing this provision at 49 CFR Part 661. These regulations specify that ''for a manufactured product to be considered produced in the United States: (1) All of the manufacturing processes for the product must take place in the United States; and (2) all items or material used in the product must be of United States origin.'' 49 CFR 661.5(d). This definition is different from the regulation implementing the 1933 Buy American Act which requires that manufactured products contain only a 51 percent domestic content.

In this global economy, it is nearly impossible to find manufactured products that are entirely domestic. Consequently, FTA receives Buy America waiver requests for thousands of items, the great majority for reasons of nonavailability under section (j)(2)(B), with a few based on price differential under section (j)(2)(D). (In Appendix A to 49 CFR 661.7, FTA adopted the waivers granted under the Buy American Act of 1933 (41 U.S.C. 10a–d) and included public interest waivers under section (j)(2)(A) for microcomputer equipment, certain Chrysler vehicles assembled in Canada, and spare parts when purchased as part of a rolling stock procurement.) As a general rule, most grantees have many more procurements for small items than for large items. Thus, most waivers granted by FTA are based on the nonavailability of items such as office supplies (e.g., pens, paperclips) and maintenance items (e.g., screws, bearings, small vehicle replacement parts, consumables). Many involve purchases of less than $20, with unit prices under one dollar and often less than one cent. These types of things are generally purchased with Federal and local operating assistance funds.

The volume of these waiver requests has resulted in significant delays in grantees' procurement processes. They consume an inordinate amount of grantee staff time, since documentation for each waiver request must be developed and submitted to FTA, where it is reviewed and acted on. Large grantees handle thousands of individual procurements each year. Several grantees state that in order to comply with the FTA Buy America requirements, procurement staffs have been increased.

One mid-sized grantee has written that it processes more than 1,000 purchase orders each month. Such procurements, if subjected to Buy America scrutiny, could theoretically result in the generation of more than 12,000 internal documents annually and an estimated 1,500 requests for waivers. To fully comply with the requirement (for procurements of less than $10,000), this grantee estimated that its purchasing department staff would have to be increased by 2–3 persons, increasing staff costs in excess of $100,000; two fax machines with phone lines would have to be procured, with a one-time cost in excess of $2,000 and annual telephone costs in excess of $1,200; and its computerized stock order system would have to be revised to recognize and track each order to make sure it meets the requirement, at a cost in excess of $10,000. Modifying

its purchase procedures to meet the requirement would require reducing the number of purchase orders by ordering larger quantities. However, the grantee explained, good business practice dictates that inventories be kept at the lowest level possible for several reasons, including loss prevention control, minimizing cash in inventory, maintaining purchasing flexibility to take advantage of product changes and improvements, space restrictions for storage, and shelf life. The grantee also noted that buying all items in large quantities also can work against good faith attempts to include disadvantaged business participation in the bidding process.

Grantees have cited other reasons for their assertion that compliance with FTA's current Buy America rule is unduly difficult and burdensome:

• *Small Purchase Procedures.* Grantees do not routinely accumulate the documentation necessary to justify a waiver of the Buy America requirements when procuring goods in accordance with their small purchase procedures, as allowed by 49 CFR Part 18, Uniform Administrative Requirements for Grants and Cooperative Agreements to State and Local Governments (known as the ''common grant rule''). These small purchase procedures were meant to reduce paperwork and facilitate grantees' effective and efficient procurement of goods. Because documentation needed to request a waiver is usually not required or compatible with such procedures, the requirement to request a waiver is often overlooked. Strict compliance with the FTA rule would necessitate creation of documentation not normally needed for business reasons, preclude the use of oral quotes where normally appropriate, and make the use of purchase orders difficult. Moreover, since the rule precludes granting a waiver until after receipt of bids, grantees are forced to repeat written waiver requests for the same item, even when it is evident that a domestic product will not be offered.

• *State or Local Purchasing Procedures.* Since many small to mid-size transit properties and most states are required to use a local or state purchasing department for purchasing supplies, they have little control over the procedures used. To comply with the FTA Buy America requirements, they must create duplicative local procurement procedures, thereby incurring delays and increasing the cost of their procurements. Ironically, one State has reported that it cannot take advantage of the State Highway Department purchasing office since the State Highway Department complies with the FHWA rule, 23 CFR 635.410, which is inconsistent with the FTA rule.

• *Vendor Problems.* Compliance with the FTA Buy America requirements has also been a problem for vendors who supply the small items grantees need for their routine operations. In many instances, such vendors are distributors and suppliers rather than manufacturers; accordingly, they cannot reasonably be expected to know whether the items being procured are produced in the United States or not. However, under the FTA rule, all vendors must execute a certification of either compliance or noncompliance; for this purpose, some grantees have included a compliance certification on all purchase orders. If a vendor declines to sign the certification, the grantee will not do business with that vendor. This approach protects the grantee, but puts a vendor at risk. Many vendors refuse to certify compliance with the Buy America rule when they do not know the content of the products they are supplying. Some even refuse to deal with the FTA grantee, thus reducing competition. In any case, if the vendor does not certify compliance, the grantee is obliged to consider the product non-domestic and to seek a waiver from FTA for its purchase.

• *Confusion with 1933 Buy American Act.* Grantees also report that some vendors certify compliance with the Buy America requirement believing it to be the same as the 1933 Buy American Act, which requires manufactured products to be 51 percent domestic in content. This is contrary to the FTA regulation, which requires a 100 percent domestic content. Indeed, there are instances where grantees themselves do not know that the FTA regulation requires 100 percent domestic content for a manufactured product to be domestic. Until or unless there is a complaint, the grantee will not look behind the certification to verify that the person who signed it understood the requirement. Thus, one is not always certain that a Buy America certification is correct or that the bids are being judged by the same standard.

Today's action is consistent with and responsive to President Clinton's initiative to reinvent government, known as the National Performance Review, and three recent actions designed to simplify government procedures, especially as to small purchases. The first is Executive Order 12931 of October 13, 1994, Federal Procurement Reform, which requires that Federal agencies review their procurement requirements with a view to streamlining them. The second is the Federal Acquisition Streamlining Act of 1994 (FASA), enacted October 13, 1994, which has as two of its major streamlining features the creation of a Simplified Acquisition Threshold of $100,000 to replace the existing $25,000 small purchase threshold and the exemption of ''micro-purchases'' (purchases valued at $2,500 or less) from the provisions of the 1933 Buy American Act. On December 15, 1994, the Department of Defense, the General Services Administration and the National Aeronautics and Space Administration issued an interim rule implementing FASA (59 FR 64786, December 15, 1994). The third is a proposal by the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) to apply the $100,000 Simplified Acquisition Threshold for direct Federal purchases to purchases by Federal recipients of financial assistance under the common grant rule at 49 CFR Part 18.36 (59 FR 53705, October 5, 1994). FTA also notes that the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), in administering the same statute as FTA, already provides a general waiver if the cost of foreign materials does not exceed $2,500.

Public Interest Waiver

In light of these considerations, FTA believes that application of its Buy America rule to small purchases is not consistent with the public interest; accordingly, FTA proposes to issue a general public interest waiver under 49 U.S.C. § 5323(j)(2)(A) and 49 CFR § 661.7(b) to exempt from its Buy America requirements all ''small purchases'' (as defined in the common grant rule, 49 CFR 18.36(d)) made by its grantees with FTA financial assistance, including capital, planning, and operating assistance and all purchases by FTA grantees with operating assistance. This exemption would cover many small purchases made by FTA grantees. The goal of this public interest waiver is to eliminate some of the procurement delays, ''red tape,'' and paperwork from FTA grantees' procurement processes.

Request for Comments

FTA requests comment on this proposal to grant a general public interest waiver. After consideration of all comments, FTA will publish notice in the **Federal Register** of its action.

Issued on: March 10, 1995.

Gordon J. Linton,

Administrator.

[FR Doc. 95–6386 Filed 3–14–95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–57–U

federal register

Wednesday
March 15, 1995

Part VII

Environmental Protection Agency

Paper Products Recovered Materials Advisory; Notice

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

[SWH–FRL–5172–9]

Paper Products Recovered Materials Advisory Notice

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency.

ACTION: Notice of availability.

SUMMARY: The Environmental Protection Agency today is providing notice of the availability of a draft Paper Products Recovered Materials Advisory Notice and ''Draft Paper Products RMAN—Supporting Analyses.'' This action will promote paper recycling by using government procurement to expand markets for recovered paper. Under section 6002 of the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act of 1976, EPA designates items that are or can be made with recovered materials and provides recommendations for government procurement of these items. In 1988, EPA designated the category of paper and paper products and recommended minimum recovered materials content levels for items within this category that are commonly purchased by government agencies. Today, EPA is issuing draft revisions to the 1988 recommendations. EPA also addresses issues raised by paper manufacturers, merchants, and purchasers as they have been implementing the 1988 recommendations.

DATES: EPA will accept public comments on the recommendations contained in the draft Paper Products Recovered Materials Advisory Notice until May 15, 1995. Both written and electronic comments must be submitted on or before this date.

ADDRESSES: Commenters must send an original and two copies of comments, referencing docket F–95–PPRN–FFFFF, to the RCRA Information Center (5305), U.S. EPA, 401 M Street SW., Washington, DC 20460.

Commenters wishing to submit Confidential Business Information (CBI) should submit an original and two copies of the CBI, referencing docket F–95–PPRN–FFFFF, under separate cover to the Document Control Officer (5305), U.S. EPA, 401 M Street SW., Washington, DC 20460.

Comments may also be submitted electronically by sending electronic mail (e-mail) through the Internet System to: RCRA-Docket@epamail.epa.gov. All electronic comments must be submitted as an ASCII file avoiding the use of special characters and any form of encryption. The comments should be identified by docket number F–95–PPRN–FFFFF. Further information on submitting comments electronically is provided below in the section entitled ''Electronic Filing of Comments.''

Public comments and relevant documents are available for viewing in the RCRA Information Center (RIC), located in room M2616, at the EPA address listed above. The RIC is open from 9 am to 4 pm, Monday through Friday, excluding Federal holidays. To review docket materials, the public must make an appointment by calling (202) 260–9327. Materials may be copied for $0.15 per page.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: ''Draft Paper Products RMAN—Supporting Analyses'' is the primary supporting document for the draft Paper Products Recovered Materials Advisory Notice (RMAN). Both the **Federal Register** notice and the supporting document will be available in electronic format on the Internet System through the EPA Public Access Server at gopher.epa.gov. For a paper copy of the **Federal Register** notice or ''Draft Paper Products RMAN—Supporting Analyses,'' please contact the RCRA Hotline at 800–424–9346, or, in the Washington, DC metropolitan area, (703) 412–9810. Paper copies also are available in the RCRA Docket at the address listed in the previous section.

For technical information regarding the recommendations in today's notice, contact Dana Arnold of the Recycling Section in EPA's Office of Solid Waste at (703) 308–7279.

ELECTRONIC FILING OF COMMENTS: As part of an interagency ''streamlining'' initiative, EPA is experimenting with electronic submission of public comments through the Internet, in addition to accepting comments in traditional written form. This notice is one of the actions selected by EPA for this experiment. From the experiment, EPA will learn how electronic commenting works, and any problems that arise can be addressed before EPA adopts electronic commenting more broadly in its rulemaking activities.

Electronic comment through the Internet raises some novel issues. Persons who comment on this document should be aware that this experimental electronic commenting is administered on a completely public system. Therefore, any personal information included in comments and the electronic mail addresses of those who make comments electronically are automatically available to anyone else who views these comments.

Similarly, since all electronic comments are available to all users, commenters should not submit electronically any information which they believe to be Confidential Business Information (CBI). Such information should be submitted only in writing as described above under **ADDRESSES.**

The official record for this action will be kept in paper form. Accordingly, EPA will convert all documents received electronically into printed paper form as they are received and will place the paper copies in the official record, which will also include all comments submitted directly in writing. The official record is the paper record maintained in the RCRA docket (see **ADDRESSES** above). (Comments submitted on paper will not be transferred to electronic format. These comments may be viewed only in the RCRA docket as described above.)

Because the electronic comment process is still experimental, EPA cannot guarantee that all electronic comments can be accurately converted to printed paper form. If EPA becomes aware of any problems with the receipt of the electronic file or with its transfer to paper, the Agency will attempt to contact the commenter to request that the comment be resubmitted in electronic or written form.

Some commenters may choose to submit identical comments in both electronic and written form to ensure accuracy. In these instances, EPA requests that commenters clearly note in both the electronic and written submissions that the comments are duplicated in the other medium. This will assist EPA in processing and filing the comments during the open comment period.

As with written comments, EPA will not attempt to verify the identities of electronic commenters or to review the accuracy of electronic comments. EPA will take such commenters and comments at face value. Electronic and written comments will be placed in the official record without any editing or change by EPA except to the extent changes occur in the process of converting electronic comments to printed paper form.

If it chooses to respond officially to electronic comments on this notice, EPA will do so either in a notice in the **Federal Register** or in a response to comments document placed in the official record for this docket. EPA will not respond to commenters electronically, other than to seek clarification of electronic comments that may be garbled in transmission or conversion to printed paper form. Any communications from EPA employees

to electronic commenters, other than those described in this paragraph, either through Internet or otherwise are not official responses from EPA.

ACCESSING INTERNET:

1. Through Gopher: Go to: gopher.epa.gov

From the main menu, choose ''EPA Offices and Regions''. Next, choose ''Office of Solid Waste and Emergency Response (OSWER)''. Next, choose ''Office of Solid Waste''. Then, choose ''Non-Hazardous Waste—RCRA Subtitle D''. Finally, choose ''Procurement/Paper''.

2. Through FTP: Go to: ftp.epa.gov

Login: anonymous
Password: Your Internet Address
Files are located in directories/pub/gopher. All OSW files are in directories beginning with ''OSW''.

3. Through MOSAIC: Go to: http://www.epa.gov

Choose the EPA Public Access Gopher. From the main (Gopher) menu, choose ''EPA Offices and Regions''. Next, choose ''Office of Solid Waste and Emergency Response (OSWER).'' Next, choose ''Office of Solid Waste''. Then, choose ''Non-Hazardous Waste—RCRA Subtitle D''. Finally, choose ''Procurement/Paper''.

4. Through dial-up access:

Dial 919–558–0335. Choose EPA Public Access Gopher. From the main (Gopher) menu, choose ''EPA Offices and Regions''. Next, choose ''Office of Solid Waste and Emergency Response (OSWER)''. Next, choose ''Office of Solid Waste''. Then, choose ''Non-Hazardous Waste—RCRA Subtitle D''. Finally, choose ''Procurement/Paper''.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Preamble Outline

I. Authority
II. Introduction
A. Objectives
B. The Procurement Guidelines Development Process
C. Approach to Recovered Materials Content Recommendations
1. One-part vs. Two-part Content Levels
2. Broad vs. Narrow Definition of ''Postconsumer Materials''
3. Establishment of Minimum Recovered Materials Content Levels and Ranges
4. EPA's Methodology for Recommending Postconsumer and Recovered Fiber Content Levels
III. Other Issues Addressed in the Draft Paper Products RMAN
A. Measurement of Recovered Fiber Content
B. Clarifications and Revisions to Definitions
C. Revisions to Item Listings
D. Recyclability
E. Use of EPA's Recommendations
III. Request for Comments

I. Authority

The draft Paper Products Recovered Materials Advisory Notice is published under authority of sections 2002(a) and 6002 of the Solid Waste Disposal Act, as amended by the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act of 1976, as amended, 42 U.S.C. 6912(a) and 6962, and Executive Order 12873, ''Federal Acquisition, Recycling, and Waste Prevention'' (58 FR 54911, October 22, 1993).

II. Introduction

Today, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA or the Agency) is publishing a draft Recovered Materials Advisory Notice (RMAN), which contains recommendations for procuring agencies to use when purchasing paper and paper products in accordance with section 6002 of the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act of 1976 (RCRA).

Detailed information supporting EPA's draft recommendations are found in ''Draft Paper Products RMAN—Supporting Analyses.'' This document is available electronically and in paper form. See the section above entitled **FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT** for instructions for obtaining the supporting analyses document in either format.

A. Objectives

In developing the draft recommendations for paper and paper products, EPA considered two objectives. As required by RCRA section 6002, EPA's first objective is to recommend content levels that will maximize the use of postconsumer recovered materials in paper and paper products. EPA's second objective is to promote paper recycling by increasing both the usage of postconsumer recovered materials in paper manufacturing and the availability of competitively-priced paper and paper products containing postconsumer and other recovered materials.

EPA recognizes that while its recommendations are meant primarily for the use of government procuring agencies, EPA's guidance is widely used by private sector purchasers, who represent 95% or more of paper demand. EPA has found that when its recommendations for postconsumer recovered materials content are too high, paper and paper products containing these high percentages are often unavailable to government agencies and private sector purchasers or are not consistently available throughout the U.S. Also, while some paper and paper products containing these high percentages of recovered materials are available, they often are not price-competitive with other paper and paper products offered to government agencies and private sector purchasers. As a result, overall use of postconsumer recovered materials may not be maximized simply by EPA's recommending high postconsumer content levels.

Since designating paper and paper products as procurement items in 1988, EPA has found that increasing demand from both public and private sector purchasers has resulted in greater recycling of postconsumer recovered materials than simply increasing demand from the public sector. Therefore, in establishing today's draft content recommendations, EPA sought to increase the availability to both government and private purchasers of reasonably-priced paper and paper products containing postconsumer recovered materials. EPA strongly believes that this approach will maximize the recycling and use of postconsumer recovered materials.

Therefore, to meet its twin objectives, EPA is adopting a different approach than was used in 1988 to recommend content levels for paper and paper products. As explained in more detail below, EPA is recommending two-part content levels, consisting of a postconsumer fiber component and a recovered fiber component. EPA believes that the two-part recommendations will assure that there is a demand for all recovered materials, including postconsumer recovered materials, as well as those generated during paper converting and printing operations.

Further, EPA is recommending content ranges for each component, whenever appropriate, to encourage increased purchasing of paper and paper products containing postconsumer and recovered fiber throughout the U.S. EPA believes that ranges are appropriate for three reasons. First, Executive Order 12873 directs EPA to recommend ranges. Second, while many agencies will continue to purchase paper products centrally (or from the General Services Administration or the Government Printing Office), local purchases will increase as a result of recent government procurement reform, which increases the small purchase threshold and allows greater local purchasing using credit cards. Currently, the postconsumer and total recovered fiber content of many paper products varies, as does product

availability, across the U.S. Procuring agencies can use the ranges as an information source in establishing standards for local purchases.

Third, although EPA's recommendations are intended for government purchasing agencies and their contractors, the Agency is aware that private sector purchasers refer to EPA's recommendations when purchasing paper products. EPA wants to encourage the continued broad use of its recommendations to foster greater demand for products containing postconsumer and recovered fiber, which, in turn, will lead to increased usage of these materials. However, EPA believes that private sector purchasers may be able to find paper and paper products available only at the lower end of the ranges, because the large quantities of paper that these purchasers need will be manufactured mainly by mills that use only lower levels of postconsumer and recovered fiber.

There currently are insufficient quantities of paper and paper products containing high percentages of postconsumer and recovered fiber to meet the demand of both public and private sector purchasers. By recommending ranges, EPA is acknowledging that some purchasers will be able to buy products that contain high percentages of postconsumer and recovered fiber, while others will find that products are available that contain lower percentages of these materials. Others, while not being able to buy price-competitive products that contain postconsumer and recovered fiber even at the low end of the ranges, will continue to seek such products, increasing overall demand for recycled paper products. EPA anticipates that this increased demand for and purchase of paper and paper products containing postconsumer and recovered fiber, even at the low end of the recommended ranges, will spur pulp and paper mills to make additional capital investments in the equipment and systems needed to use greater percentages of these fibers and to produce them at a competitive price.

Therefore, EPA encourages both public and private sector purchasers to establish their minimum content standards at the highest levels practicable; if a product is not available at a competitive price and at a content level at the high end of the range, purchasers should set their standards at the highest levels available to them that meet their price and performance objectives, using the recommended range as a guide. In this way, EPA's recommended ranges will encourage both public and private sector purchasers to purchase paper products containing the highest levels of postconsumer and recovered fiber practicable.

Finally, by establishing ranges, EPA is taking into account the diversity that exists within the paper industry. The recommendations recognize that, in many grades of paper, larger quantities of paper and paper products are produced at mills that primarily use wood-based fiber than at mills that primarily use recovered and postconsumer fiber. While it is not currently economically feasible for these mills to substitute high percentages of postconsumer fiber for the wood-based fiber, it is technically and economically possible for them to use lower percentages of postconsumer and recovered fiber. EPA believes that ranges will provide an incentive for all paper mills to maximize their usage of postconsumer and recovered fiber. This will lead to greater availability of competitively-priced paper and paper products for both public and private purchasers. In the long run, this approach will lead to greater demand for postconsumer and recovered fiber.

B. The Procurement Guidelines Development Process

EPA's procurement guidelines are required by section 6002 of RCRA and Executive Order 12873. In an April 20, 1994 **Federal Register** notice, EPA explained that under Executive Order 12873, the Agency is required to issue a regulation, known as a Comprehensive Procurement Guideline (CPG), which will designate items that procuring agencies should purchase containing recovered materials. Executive Order 12873 also directed EPA to issue guidance documents, known as Recovered Materials Advisory Notices, which will contain EPA's recommendations for purchasing the designated items. In the April 20, 1994 **Federal Register**, EPA published the first draft RMAN, which established eight product categories corresponding to the categories used in the CPG. One of these categories, Part A, was reserved for recommendations for paper and paper products. See the April 20, 1994 **Federal Register** (59 FR 18852) and ''Draft Paper Products RMAN—Supporting Analyses'' for more detail about the requirements of RCRA section 6002 and the guidelines development process.

In today's notice, EPA is announcing that the draft recommendations for paper and paper products are available for public review and comment. EPA's draft recommendations are found in the Appendix at the end of this **Federal Register** notice. They are arranged in the RMAN format established by the April 20, 1994 **Federal Register** notice. As noted above, detailed information supporting the draft recommendations are found in ''Draft Paper Products RMAN—Supporting Analyses.''

C. Approach to Recovered Materials Content Recommendations

1. One-Part vs. Two-Part Content Levels

As defined in RCRA section 6002(h), the term ''recovered materials'' refers to materials generated after the end of the papermaking process. Recovered materials can be generated by many sources, including paper mills, intermediate paper users such as printers and converters, merchants, retailers, and the intended end user. Recovered materials are sometimes divided into ''preconsumer materials,'' which refers to materials that have not passed through their intended end usage, and ''postconsumer materials,'' which refers to materials that have passed through their intended end usage. Minimum content standards can be expressed as a percentage of postconsumer materials content, a percentage of recovered materials (or total recovered materials) content, or percentages of both. For example, today, a common content standard for printing and writing paper is 50% total recovered materials, including 10% postconsumer materials.

In 1988, EPA recommended postconsumer content levels for newsprint, tissue products, paperboard, and packaging; and ''waste paper'' content levels for most printing and writing papers. As defined in the 1988 paper procurement guideline, ''waste paper'' includes postconsumer materials and certain materials generated after the end of the papermaking process (see 53 FR 23551, June 22, 1988).

In response to a 1990 EPA request for comment (55 FR 40384, October 3, 1990) and an EPA-sponsored 1993 public forum, a group of commenters suggested that the Agency recommend two-part content levels consisting of a ''total recovered materials'' component in addition to a postconsumer recovered materials component. Within this group, some commenters favor a postconsumer materials component that is defined consistently with the postconsumer definition contained in RCRA section 6002(h). Others favor a broader component consisting of postconsumer materials plus certain preconsumer materials that require deinking or cleaning, similar to postconsumer materials, prior to use.

These commenters argue that two-part content levels can achieve two goals: (1) Assure markets for all recovered materials, regardless of source and (2) increase demand for postconsumer materials. Because there is a limited amount of preconsumer recovered materials, commenters argue that pulp and paper mills will need to use greater percentages of postconsumer materials in order to meet total recovered materials requirements in their products. According to one commenter's estimate, the paper industry recovered and used 87% of available preconsumer materials (i.e., materials generated by sources other than the intended end user of a finished product) in 1990.[1] According to the American Forest & Paper Association (AF&PA), an industry association, almost all preconsumer materials are recovered and used when exports are taken into account.

A second group of commenters favored a single, strictly postconsumer standard. These commenters argue that most preconsumer material is already recovered, and that the focus for government procurement should be on postconsumer paper because it is the single largest component of municipal solid waste. They also believe that only a strictly postconsumer standard will stimulate markets for materials collected by municipal recycling programs.

A third group of commenters argue in favor of a single, total recovered materials standard encompassing both preconsumer and postconsumer materials. They believe that because most preconsumer material is already recovered, virtually all additional recovered paper will necessarily come from postconsumer sources.

EPA believes that the two-part approach is preferable to the postconsumer-only and total recovered materials-only approaches because the two-part approach will result in greater usage of postconsumer materials. A single, postconsumer level fails to acknowledge the continuing contribution to solid waste management and the investments made by mills that have been using all recovered materials, regardless of source, that require deinking, cleaning, or processing prior to use. Additionally, EPA believes that, because most preconsumer materials are now being used, total recovered materials content levels will lead to higher use of postconsumer materials as mills seek sufficient materials to meet the total recovered materials content levels.

EPA also believes that a broad, single, total recovered materials content level will not fulfill the statutory requirement that government agencies procure paper products containing the ''highest percentage of postconsumer recovered materials practicable.''

2. Broad vs. Narrow Definition of ''Postconsumer Materials''

Several groups recommended that EPA broaden the postconsumer definition to include certain preconsumer materials that, like postconsumer materials, require deinking or contaminant removal prior to use. These groups state that there is no reason, from a papermaking perspective, to separate these materials. They further state that it is difficult to distinguish postconsumer and preconsumer materials and that tracking of postconsumer materials is not feasible and extremely costly to implement.

It is not the intent of RCRA that pulp and paper mills track every piece of recovered paper or that mills using recovered materials incur unnecessary costs. Under RCRA section 6002, procuring agencies are required to (1) obtain certifications that the product offered to them meets the minimum content level specified in their specifications or solicitation documents and (2) purchase paper products containing the highest levels of postconsumer materials practicable. Procuring agencies are not required to obtain certifications regarding the exact amount of postconsumer or recovered fiber used. For example, if an agency solicits copier paper containing 20% postconsumer fiber, bidders must certify that the product offered contains this minimum percentage. The product may occasionally contain higher levels of postconsumer fiber, but the bidders and the mills supplying them are not required to conduct a detailed analysis in order to determine the exact percentage of postconsumer fiber in the product in excess of the 20% minimum.

Some degree of tracking is needed, however, to identify the postconsumer materials content of paper and paper products offered to government agencies in order (1) to satisfy the RCRA certification requirement and (2) to meet the RCRA requirement that paper and paper products contain the highest levels of postconsumer materials practicable. Although it is difficult, in some instances, to determine whether a material is pre- or postconsumer, manufacturers of deinked market pulp and paper products containing postconsumer materials are making market claims about the postconsumer content of their products. Therefore, EPA believes that the level of information in the market is adequate, and no additional tracking is necessary for mills to certify that their products meet EPA's draft recommendations.

EPA notes that, while several groups also urged the adoption of a broader postconsumer definition for use in Executive Order 12873, the Executive Order contains a postconsumer definition analogous to the statutory definition. EPA believes that its recommendations should be consistent with Executive Order 12873.

As discussed in detail in the supporting analyses document, there have been significant increases in deinking and processing capacity and various technology improvements that make it possible to manufacture virtually all non-food[2] grades of paper and paperboard using some percentage of postconsumer fiber. Thus, EPA believes that it is not necessary to expand the definition of postconsumer materials used in the 1988 procurement guideline. For these reasons, EPA is using the statutory definition of ''postconsumer'' in today's draft RMAN.

EPA also notes that the type of postconsumer ''material'' of concern is fiber. For most products, the fiber is derived from wood, but it also can be derived from textiles or agricultural products. The availability of such fiber is limited and has been used primarily by manufacturers of cotton fiber printing and writing papers, which represented less than 1% of printing and writing papers capacity in 1993. Recognizing this, EPA will refer to ''postconsumer fiber,'' rather than to ''postconsumer material.'' EPA believes that the statutory definition is broad enough to encompass postconsumer fiber derived from textiles and other non-wood sources.

Thus, the two-part content levels recommended in today's draft RMAN will consist of a ''recovered fiber'' component and a ''postconsumer fiber'' component. These terms are discussed in section III.B below.

[1] See the ''Final Report on Recycled Paper Definitions, Standards, Measurement, Labeling Guidelines, and Buy-Recycled Initiative,'' Addendum E, Recycling Advisory Council, February 6, 1992. EPA placed a copy of the report in the docket for the Paper Products RMAN. The report also is available from the National Recycling Coalition.

[2] Manufacturers of food-grade paper and paperboard must be able to certify that their products meet Food and Drug Administration requirements that the items contain no hazardous and deleterious substances that can migrate into the food. While it is technically possible to produce a food-grade product with recovered and/or postconsumer fiber, the material must be carefully selected. Limited availability of suitable material precludes wide-spread use of recovered or postconsumer fiber in food-grade paper products.

As part of this approach, EPA will no longer use the term ''waste paper'' for printing and writing papers. EPA prefers the term ''recovered fiber'' because the name reflects the fact that this material has value. As discussed in section II.B of this preamble, EPA is adapting the 1988 definition of ''waste paper'' to define ''recovered fiber.''

3. Establishment of Minimum Recovered Materials Content Levels and Ranges

a. Content recommendations vs. minimum content standards. RCRA section 6002 requires procuring agencies to purchase paper and paper products containing the ''highest percentages of postconsumer recovered materials practicable.'' EPA stated in the 1988 paper procurement guideline that the use of minimum content levels would satisfy this requirement (see 53 FR 23553, June 22, 1988).

Under RCRA section 6002(i), it is the procuring agencies' responsibility to establish minimum recovered materials content standards, while EPA provides recommendations regarding the levels of recovered materials in the designated items. To make it clear that EPA does not establish the specific minimum content standards used by other agencies, EPA will no longer refer to its recommendations as recovered materials content ''standards,'' as was done in the 1988 paper procurement guideline. Instead, EPA will refer to its recommendations as recovered materials content ''levels,'' consistent with RCRA section 6002(e) and Executive Order 12873.

b. Recommended content ranges. Executive Order 12873 directs EPA to present ''the range of recovered materials content levels within which the designated recycled items are currently available.'' In meeting this provision, EPA will recommend ranges that (1) reflect the best information available to the Agency about the use of postconsumer and other recovered fiber in the manufacture of a designated item and (2) encourage manufacturers to use the maximum amount of postconsumer and recovered fiber without compromising competition or product performance and availability. EPA recommends that procuring agencies use these ranges, in conjunction with their own research into the content of items available to them, to establish their minimum content standards. In some instances, EPA will recommend one level, rather than a range, because the item is universally available at that recommended level. In such cases, EPA recommends that procuring agencies use that level in establishing their minimum content standards.

4. EPA's Methodology for Recommending Postconsumer and Recovered Fiber Content Levels

EPA identified and evaluated pertinent data sources and information regarding the percentages of postconsumer and recovered fiber contained in paper and paper products. Sources included EPA research, responses to the 1990 **Federal Register** request for comment and the 1993 public forum, procuring agency and industry data, manufacturers' information, and other published data. Based on this information and the content levels established in Executive Order 12873, EPA established recommended levels or ranges of levels for paper and paper products.

As previously discussed, whenever feasible, EPA will recommend ranges for both recovered fiber and postconsumer fiber content. The high end of each range will be set at the maximum content currently used in paper and paper products that are available in sufficient quantities, and with adequate competition, to meet procuring agency needs. For many items, this level will be 100% for the recovered fiber component of the two-part content recommendations. The high end of each range will direct procuring agencies toward those levels that will meet the statutory requirement to purchase paper and paper products containing the highest levels of postconsumer fiber practicable. Thus, EPA strongly encourages procuring agencies to specify and seek paper and paper products containing both postconsumer and recovered fiber at levels at or near the high end of the recommended ranges if price and performance meet the procuring agencies' objectives.

The low end of each range will be set at levels that can be met by the simple majority of mills currently producing paper and paper products containing postconsumer and recovered fiber. These levels could also be met by other mills if they decide to purchase or produce pulp made from postconsumer and recovered fiber. For most items, these levels will be higher than the lowest percentage currently in products, in order to provide an incentive for paper mills that now primarily use wood-based fiber or lower levels of postconsumer or recovered fiber to increase their use of postconsumer and recovered fiber in the manufacture of their products. For example, if the majority of mills currently use 20% postconsumer fiber in a writing paper, but a few mills use 10% postconsumer fiber, EPA would recommend 20% as the low end of the range.

In all five major paper and paperboard grades, there are groups of mills that use high levels of postconsumer and recovered fiber and groups of mills that primarily use wood-based fiber, sometimes in conjunction with low percentages of postconsumer and/or recovered fiber. EPA accounted for this diversity in establishing the recommended ranges. As a result, for some items, there is a broad range for postconsumer or recovered fiber content. The high end of these ranges generally reflects the percentages of postconsumer and recovered fiber used by mills that rely on this type of fiber, while the low end of the ranges reflects the percentages of postconsumer and recovered fiber used by mills that rely primarily on wood-based fiber. For many items, the low end of the recovered fiber range is the same percentage as the low end of the postconsumer fiber range. In these instances, all of the recovered fiber used by these mills is postconsumer fiber. This means that the item can contain either all postconsumer fiber (e.g., X% recovered fiber, all of which is postconsumer) or blends of recovered and postconsumer fiber (e.g., 100% recovered fiber, including Y% postconsumer fiber) and still fall within EPA's recommended range.

It is EPA's intention to provide procuring agencies with the best and most current information available to assist them in fulfilling their statutory obligations under RCRA section 6002. To do this, EPA will monitor changes in manufacturing capacity and product content and the progress made by procuring agencies in purchasing paper and paper products with the highest percentages of postconsumer and recovered fiber practicable. EPA will periodically adjust the recommended content ranges to reflect these changes. As larger quantities of paper become available that contain higher levels of postconsumer and recovered fiber, EPA will consider increasing the content levels in its recommendations.

III. Other Issues Addressed in the Draft Paper Products RMAN

A. Measurement of Recovered Fiber Content

As procuring agencies implemented the 1988 designation of paper and paper products, EPA received inquiries about measurement of recovered fiber content. Today, EPA is addressing the two principal inquiries: (1) Whether postconsumer and recovered fiber content should be measured as a

percentage of fiber weight or total sheet weight and (2) whether mill broke generated by a papermaking process that uses postconsumer or recovered fiber can be included in content calculations. In the draft RMAN, EPA recommends that postconsumer and recovered fiber content be measured as a percentage of the weight of the fiber in paper or a paper product. In addition, EPA wishes to clarify that mill broke generated by a papermaking process that uses postconsumer or recovered fiber can be included in content calculations, to the extent that the feedstock contains materials which would qualify as postconsumer or recovered fiber. These issues are discussed in detail in chapter VI.A of ''Draft Paper Products RMAN—Supporting Analyses.''

B. Clarifications and Revisions to Definitions

Today, EPA also addresses definitional issues raised by procuring agencies, mills and other interested parties since the 1988 paper procurement guideline was issued. Specifically, EPA has been asked (1) whether the definition of ''postconsumer'' includes printers' over-runs, converters' scrap, and/or over-issue publications, (2) which definition of ''recovered materials'' applies to the content standards established in Executive Order 12873, and (3) whether a paper product converted from off-specification paper or obsolete inventory contains ''recovered material.''

EPA discusses these questions in detail in chapter VI.B of ''Draft Paper Products RMAN—Supporting Analyses.'' EPA's responses to the inquiries are as follows. (1) The definition of ''postconsumer'' materials in RCRA section 6002(h) does not include printers' over-runs, converters' scrap, and/or over-issue publications. (2) Procuring agencies should use the definition of ''recovered fiber'' in today's draft RMAN when purchasing printing and writing papers in accordance with the content levels established in Executive Order 12873. (3) Because off-specification paper and obsolete inventory that contain no recovered fiber do not meet the statutory definition of ''recovered materials,'' products made from these materials cannot be sold as recycled products. Materials must be repulped, not just recovered, in order to count toward recovered fiber content.

In addition, several commenters suggested that EPA expand the definition of ''mill broke'' and narrow the definition of ''waste paper.'' In today's draft RMAN, EPA has expanded the mill broke definition to include certain materials that are generated after the completion of the papermaking process, including materials generated in finishing operations. These materials are commonly re-pulped, sold to others for pulping, or otherwise used in or converted to paper products. In addition, in developing the definition of ''recovered fiber'' from the 1988 ''waste paper'' definition, EPA has made three significant changes. First, the definition found in section A–7 of the draft RMAN clarifies that materials must be repulped, not just recovered, in order to count toward recovered fiber content. Second, consistent with the revised definition of ''mill broke,'' the definition of ''recovered fiber'' excludes materials such as obsolete inventory or off-specification product generated at mills after the end of the papermaking process. Third, EPA is clarifying that forest residues do not count toward ''recovered fiber'' content. See chapter VI.B of ''Draft Paper Products RMAN—Supporting Analyses'' for a detailed discussion of the draft definitions of ''mill broke'' and ''recovered fiber.''

C. Revisions to Item Listings

The 1988 paper procurement guideline contained 24 recommended minimum content levels. Today's draft RMAN contains 54 recommended minimum content levels. In addition to revised content recommendations, EPA made the following changes:

- The printing and writing paper recommendations are no longer limited to ''high grade bleached'' papers.
- The draft RMAN uses new terminology for uncoated printing and writing papers to better reflect the terminology currently used by paper merchants and mills.
- The draft RMAN incorporates the content levels for uncoated printing and writing papers established by Executive Order 12873.
- The draft RMAN includes separate recommendations for wove and kraft envelopes, rather than lumping them into one envelope listing.
- The draft RMAN includes recommendations for supercalendered paper, safety paper, coated printing papers, and bristols.
- The ''doilies'' listing under the tissue products subcategory has been replaced with a ''tray liners'' listing in a new Miscellaneous Paper Products subcategory.
- The ''Unbleached packaging'' and ''Recycled paperboard'' subcategories have been reorganized into a Paperboard and Packaging subcategory that contains recommendations for corrugated containers, solid fiber boxes, folding cartons, industrial paperboard, miscellaneous paperboard products, carrierboard, and brown papers.

These changes are discussed in detail in ''Draft Paper Products RMAN—Supporting Analyses.''

D. Recyclability

The underlying purpose of RCRA section 6002 is to use the stimulus of governmental purchasing to foster markets for recovered materials. Therefore, EPA encourages materials recovery to conserve valuable natural resources and to provide alternatives to landfilling and incineration. In order to achieve both of these objectives, EPA believes that procuring agencies should consider the impact of their purchases on their recyclable materials collection programs.

Depending on their fiber or other characteristics, some used paper products containing recovered materials may have a wider variety of potential markets and, therefore, may be easier to recycle than others. Certain characteristics can lower the value of collected used paper or limit its reuse as a feedstock for new products. Other characteristics might require adjustments in an agency's recyclables collection program.

For example, ''white office paper'' is a highly valued recovered material. Depending on its market, a ''white office paper'' collection program might exclude other office papers that are colored, coated, or contain groundwood. Thus, if a procuring agency decided to purchase a colored paper or a paper containing groundwood for use in office printers and copiers, the agency should expect that these materials would affect the office paper collection program if they are mixed with the white paper. The agency could find that the used paper is recyclable, but that (1) its value is reduced because it is now ''mixed paper'' rather than ''white office paper,'' or (2) a separate sort is required in order to maintain the value of the white office paper. Alternatively, the agency could find that the mixed paper must be disposed of because there is no market for it in the geographic area in which the agency is located.

Yet other characteristics might make a paper product more recyclable or generate less material because the product is source reduced. For example, manufacturers may be using less packaging or reusable packaging, resulting in less waste.

EPA believes that procuring agencies should consider these impacts prior to purchasing paper products containing recovered materials. Therefore, in section A–6 of today's draft RMAN, EPA

is recommending that procuring agencies consider the effect of their procurement actions on their used paper collection programs by assessing the impact of their decisions on their overall contribution to the solid waste stream.

E. Use of EPA's Recommendations

EPA encourages state and local agencies and private sector purchasers to use the recommendations in today's draft RMAN when purchasing paper and paper products. EPA recommends that purchasers establish their minimum content standards at the highest percentages available to them that achieve their price and performance objectives, even if these standards are above EPA's recommended ranges.

EPA has found that some state agencies have been using the Agency's 1988 content recommendations as a starting point in establishing product labeling requirements. While EPA's recommendations were not intended for use as labeling standards, they can be used as an information source for agencies establishing recycled product labeling programs.

EPA cautions persons using EPA's recommendations, whether to establish purchasing specifications or labeling standards, to use them only for the *specific items* for which they were intended. It is not appropriate to analogize from one item in a paper grade (e.g., printing and writing paper, tissue products, paperboard) to another item that could also fall within that grade, without first researching the use of postconsumer and recovered fiber in the other item. The two items could have different performance requirements necessitating different levels of postconsumer or recovered fiber. In addition, one item could be made primarily by mills that use high percentages of postconsumer or recovered fiber, while the other item could be made primarily by mills that use low or no percentages of this fiber.

IV. Request for Comments

EPA requests comment on the content levels, definitions, and specifications recommendations found in today's draft RMAN. In addition, EPA requests comment or information on the following issues, which are discussed in detail in ''Draft Paper Products RMAN—Supporting Analyses:''

Recommendations for Tissue Products

- Do government agencies or their contractors purchase specialty tissue products?
- Is postconsumer or other recovered fiber used in the manufacture of specialty tissue products and, if so, in what percentages?
- Can manufacturers of consumer paper napkins and consumer facial tissues that primarily use wood-based fiber produce these items using a minimum of 30% and 20% postconsumer fiber, respectively? If not, what levels of postconsumer fiber can be used in these items?
- Can manufacturers of consumer paper napkins and consumer facial tissues use a range of recovered fiber from 30–100% and 20–100%, respectively?
- Are tray liners available containing percentages of recovered fiber, including postconsumer fiber, other than 100% recovered fiber, including 75% postconsumer fiber?
- Can postconsumer fiber be used in tray liners and meet Food and Drug Administration (FDA) restrictions on migration of contaminants into food?

Recommendations for Paperboard and Packaging Products

- Is recovered fiber other than postconsumer fiber used in the manufacture of corrugated containers?
- Are corrugated containers rated at 300 psi or greater available containing more than 30% postconsumer fiber?
- Will the recent increased demand for OCC affect the ability of manufacturers to meet the recommended content levels for corrugated containers?
- Will the imminent availability of additional capacity to make linerboard containing 100% recovered fiber allow manufacturers to exceed the high end of the ranges of recommended content levels for corrugated containers?
- Are there differences in the postconsumer fiber content currently used in coated and uncoated folding cartons?
- Should recommendations for coated and uncoated folding cartons be listed separately because of the differences in their ability to incorporate postconsumer fiber content?
- Will the recent increased demand for OCC affect the availability of folding cartons containing higher percentages of postconsumer fiber?
- Should EPA recommend different content levels for the various industrial paperboard products, based on the specific application(s) for those products?
- Should EPA recommend different postconsumer ranges for coated and uncoated miscellaneous paperboard products, and should there should be different content recommendations based on the specific application(s) of the products?
- Are percentages of postconsumer fiber greater than 15% used in padded mailers? What percentages of recovered fiber other than postconsumer fiber are used in padded mailers?
- Are there different performance characteristics of the two different types of carrierboard (solid unbleached sulfate and recycled paperboard) that would require listing them separately in the final RMAN?
- Is postconsumer or other recovered fiber used in solid bleached sulfate paperboard products, in general, and in food grade items in particular?
- Do procuring agencies purchase solid bleached sulfate paperboard products, either directly or indirectly? If yes, to what extent?
- Should EPA recommend content levels for solid bleached sulfate paperboard products?

Recommendations for Printing and Writing Papers

- Do state agency requirements for the paper used to print state checks differ from federal or commercial check specifications and if so, how? What is the availability of safety paper containing recovered and postconsumer fiber that meets state agency requirements?
- What is the performance and availability of greeting card stock containing higher percentages of postconsumer fiber?

Dated: March 8, 1995.

Elliott P. Laws,

Assistant Administrator, Office of Solid Waste and Emergency Response.

Appendix—Draft Paper Products Recovered Materials Advisory Notice Contents

Part A—Paper and Paper Products
Section A–1—Printing and Writing Papers
Section A–2—Newsprint
Section A–3—Sanitary Tissue Products
Section A–4—Paperboard and Packaging
Section A–5—Miscellaneous Paper Products
Section A–6—Other Recommendations for Paper and Paper Products
Section A–7—Definitions
Appendix A–1.—Example Calculation of Postconsumer Fiber Content of a Corrugated Container

Part A—Paper and Paper Products

Section A–1—Printing and Writing Papers

Preference Program: EPA recommends that procuring agencies establish minimum content standards expressed as a percentage of recovered fiber, including a percentage of postconsumer fiber. EPA recommends that procuring agencies base their minimum content standards for printing and writing papers on the content levels shown in Tables A–1a, A–1b, and A–1c. Percentages are based on the fiber weight of the product.

TABLE A–1A.—RECOMMENDED RECOVERED FIBER CONTENT LEVELS FOR UNCOATED PRINTING AND WRITING PAPERS

Item	Recovered fiber (percent)	Postconsumer fiber (percent)
Reprographic Paper (e.g., mimeo and duplicator paper, high-speed copier paper, and bond paper*)	20	20
Offset Paper (e.g., offset printing paper*, book paper*, bond paper*)	20	20
Tablet Paper (e.g., office paper such as note pads, stationery* and other writing* papers)	20	20
Forms Bond (e.g., forms, computer printout paper, ledger*)	20	20
Envelope Paper:		
Wove	20	20
Kraft:		
White and colored (including manila)	10–20	10–20
Unbleached	10	10
Cotton Fiber Paper (e.g., cotton fiber papers, ledger*, stationery* and matching envelopes, and other writing* papers)	50	20
Text & Cover Paper (e.g., cover stock, book paper*, stationery* and matching envelopes, and other writing* paper)	50	20
Supercalendered	10	10
Check Safety Paper	10	10

*These items can be made from a variety of printing and writing papers, depending on the performance characteristics of the item. Some of the papers are a commodity-type and some are specialty papers. EPA recommends that procuring agencies determine the performance characteristics required of the paper prior to establishing minimum content standards. For example, bond, ledger, or stationery made from cotton fiber paper or a text and cover paper have different characteristics than similar items made from commodity papers.

TABLE A–1b.—RECOMMENDED RECOVERED FIBER CONTENT LEVELS FOR COATED PRINTING AND WRITING PAPERS

Item	Recovered fiber (percent)	Postconsumer fiber (percent)
Coated Printing Paper	10	10
Carbonless	20	20

TABLE A–1c.—RECOMMENDED RECOVERED FIBER CONTENT LEVELS FOR BRISTOLS

Item	Recovered fiber (percent)	Postconsumer fiber (percent)
File Folders (manila and colored)	20	20
Dyed Filing Products	20–50	20
Cards (index, postal, and other, including index sheets)	50	20
Pressboard Report Covers and Binders	50	20
Tags and Tickets	20–50	20

Section A–2—Newsprint

Preference Program: EPA recommends that procuring agencies establish minimum content standards expressed as a percentage of recovered fiber, including a percentage of postconsumer fiber. EPA recommends that procuring agencies base their minimum content standards for newsprint on the content levels shown in Table A–2. Percentages are based on the fiber weight of the product.

TABLE A–2.—RECOMMENDED RECOVERED FIBER CONTENT LEVELS FOR NEWSPRINT

Item	Recovered fiber (percent)	Postconsumer fiber (percent)
Newsprint	40–100	40–85

Section A–3—Tissue Products

Preference Program: EPA recommends that procuring agencies establish minimum content standards expressed as a percentage of recovered fiber, including a percentage of postconsumer fiber. EPA recommends that procuring agencies base their minimum content standards for tissue products on the content levels shown in Table A–3. Percentages are based on the fiber weight of the product.

TABLE A–3.—RECOMMENDED RECOVERED FIBER CONTENT LEVELS FOR TISSUE PRODUCTS

Item	Recovered fiber (percent)	Postconsumer fiber (percent)
Bathroom tissue:		
Commercial/industrial	100	25–60
Consumer	20–100	20–60
Paper towels:		
Commercial/industrial	100	40–60
Consumer	20–100	20–60
Paper napkins:		
Commercial/industrial	100	30–60
Facial tissue:		
Commercial/industrial	100	30
Industrial wipers	40–100	40

Section A–4—Paperboard and Packaging Products

Preference Program: EPA recommends that procuring agencies establish minimum content standards expressed as a percentage of recovered fiber, including a percentage of postconsumer fiber. EPA recommends that procuring agencies base their minimum content standards for paperboard and packaging products on the content levels shown in Table A–4. Percentages are based on the fiber weight of the product.

TABLE A–4.—RECOMMENDED RECOVERED FIBER CONTENT LEVELS FOR PAPERBOARD AND PACKAGING PRODUCTS

Item	Recovered fiber (percent)	Postconsumer fiber (percent)
Corrugated containers:*		
(<300 psi)	40–50	40–50
(300 psi)	30	30
Solid Fiber Boxes	40	40
Folding cartons**	100	40–80
Industrial paperboard (e.g., tubes, cores, drums, and cans)	100	45–100
Miscellaneous (e.g., pad backs, covered binders, book covers, mailing tubes, protective packaging)	90–100	75–100
Padded mailers	5–15	5–15
Carrierboard	25–100	15
Brown papers (e.g., wrapping paper and bags)	5–40	5–20

*The recovered fiber and postconsumer fiber content is calculated from the content of each component relative to the weight each contributes to the total weight of the box. See Appendix I for an example.

**The recommended content ranges are not applicable to all types of paperboard used in folding cartons. Cartons made from solid bleached sulfate or solid unbleached sulfate contain no or small percentages of postconsumer fiber, depending on the paperboard source.

Section A–5—Miscellaneous Paper Products

Preference Program: EPA recommends that procuring agencies establish minimum content standards expressed as a percentage of recovered fiber, including a percentage of postconsumer fiber. EPA recommends that procuring agencies base their minimum content standards for the listed paper products on the content levels shown in Table A–5. Percentages are based on the fiber weight of the product.

TABLE A–5.—RECOMMENDED RECOVERED FIBER CONTENT LEVELS FOR MISCELLANEOUS PAPER PRODUCTS

Item	Recovered fiber (percent)	Postconsumer fiber (percent)
Tray liners	100	75

Section A–6—Other Recommendations for Paper and Paper Products

Measurement: EPA recommends that procuring agencies express their minimum content standards as a percentage of the fiber weight of the paper or paper product. EPA further recommends that procuring agencies specify that mill broke cannot be counted toward postconsumer or recovered fiber content, except that procuring agencies should permit mills to count mill broke generated in a papermaking process using postconsumer and/or recovered fiber as feedstock toward ''postconsumer fiber'' or ''recovered fiber'' content, to the extent that the feedstock contained these materials. In other words, if a mill uses less than 100% postconsumer or recovered fiber, only a proportional amount of broke can be counted towards postconsumer or recovered fiber content.

Specifications: EPA recommends that procuring agencies review specifications provisions pertaining to performance and aesthetics and revise provisions that can impede use of postconsumer and recovered fiber, unless such provisions are related to reasonable performance standards. Agencies should determine whether performance provisions are

unnecessarily stringent for a particular end use. Agencies also should revise aesthetics provisions—such as brightness, dirt count, or shade matching—if appropriate, consistent with the agencies' performance requirements, in order to allow for a higher use of postconsumer and recovered fiber.

EPA recommends that procuring agencies document determinations that paper products containing postconsumer and recovered fiber will not meet the agencies' reasonable performance standards. Any determination should be based on technical performance information related to a specific item, not a grade of paper or type of product.

EPA recommends that procuring agencies watch for changes in the use of postconsumer and recovered fiber in paper and paper products. When a paper or a paper product containing postconsumer and recovered fiber is produced in types and grades not previously available, at a competitive price, procuring agencies should either revise specifications to allow the use of such type or grade, or develop new specifications for such type or grade, consistent with the agencies' performance requirements.

Recyclability: EPA recommends that procuring agencies consider the effect of a procurement of a paper product containing recovered and postconsumer fiber on their paper collection programs by assessing the impact of their decision on their overall contribution to the solid waste stream.

Section A–7—Definitions

For purposes of the recommendations contained in this Part, terms shall have the following meanings:

''Postconsumer fiber'' means:

(1) Paper, paperboard, and fibrous wastes from retail stores, office buildings, homes, and so forth, after they have passed through their end-usage as a consumer item, including: used corrugated boxes; old newspapers; old magazines; mixed waste paper; tabulating cards; and used cordage; and

(2) All paper, paperboard, and fibrous wastes that enter and are collected from municipal solid waste.

Postconsumer fiber does not include fiber derived from printers' over-runs, converters' scrap, and over-issue publications.

''Recovered fiber'' ''Recovered fiber'' means the following materials:

(1) Postconsumer fiber such as:

(A) Paper, paperboard, and fibrous wastes from retail stores, office buildings, homes, and so forth, after they have passed through their end-usage as a consumer item, including: used corrugated boxes; old newspapers; old magazines; mixed waste paper; tabulating cards; and used cordage; and

(B) All paper, paperboard, and fibrous wastes that enter and are collected from municipal solid waste.

(2) Fiber derived from printing and converting operations, excluding any paper generated in a paper mill prior to the completion of the paper manufacturing process. ''Recovered fiber'' includes repulped fiber from dry paper scrap generated after the paper machine reel has been rewound and/or cut into smaller rolls or rough sheets, including but not limited to:

(A) Envelope cuttings, finishing trim, bindery trimmings, and other paper and paperboard resulting from printing, cutting, forming, and other converting operations; and bag, box, and carton manufacturing wastes; and

(B) Repulped finished paper and paperboard from obsolete inventories of paper merchants, wholesalers, dealers, printers, converters, or consumers.

''Mill broke'' means any paper or paperboard scrap generated in a mill prior to completion of the papermaking process and/or specific materials generated during finishing operations that occur after the end of the papermaking process. It includes the following materials, whether generated prior to or after the completion of the papermaking process: paper machine trim, offgrade or off-specification rolls (also referred to as rejected, unused stock), culls, stub rolls, side rolls, end rolls, and obsolete inventories of paper and paperboard. Although mill broke is occasionally sold from one mill to another, such a sale does not alter its classification or exclusion from the definition of ''recovered fiber.''

Appendix A–1.—Example Calculation of Postconsumer Fiber Content of a Corrugated Container

C-flute has a take-up factor of approximately 1.44, which means that for each one foot of combined corrugated board there is 1.44 feet of fluted medium. This factor is used to calculate the weight of paperboard in a given area of combined corrugated board, from which the basis weight of the board is derived. Each linerboard contributes 35% of the basis weight (42/121.4). The medium contributes 30% of the total basis weight (37.4/121.4).

	Board basis weight (lbs/MSF)
Linerboard #1	42×1.00=42.0
Medium	26×1.44=37.4
Linerboard #2	42×1.00=42.0
Combined Board Weight	121.4 lbs/MSF

If the linerboard used has 20% postconsumer fiber and the medium has 80% postconsumer fiber, the resulting total postconsumer fiber content of the containerboard is as follows:

Linerboard: .35×.20=.07×2=.14 (or 14%)

Medium: .30×.80=.24 (or 24%)

Total postconsumer fiber: .14+.24=.38 (or 38%)

[FR Doc. 95–6407 Filed 3–14–95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560–50–P

federal register

Wednesday
March 15, 1995

Part VIII

Department of the Interior

Fish and Wildlife Service

50 CFR Part 20

Migratory Bird Harvest Information Program; Proposed Rule

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Fish and Wildlife Service

50 CFR Part 20

RIN 1018–AD08

Migratory Bird Harvest Information Program

AGENCY: Fish and Wildlife Service, Interior.

ACTION: Proposed rule.

SUMMARY: The Fish and Wildlife Service (hereinafter Service) herein proposes to amend the Migratory Bird Harvest Information Program (hereinafter Program) regulations. The Service plans to add Michigan, Oklahoma, and Oregon (beginning with the 1995–96 hunting season) to the list of participating States, and to implement some additional modifications to the Program. This regulatory action will continue to require all licensed hunters who hunt migratory game birds in participating States to identify themselves as migratory bird hunters to the State licensing authority, and to supply their name, address, and date of birth to the State. Hunters will be required to have evidence of current participation in the Program on their person while hunting migratory game birds in participating States. The quality and extent of information about harvests of migratory game birds must be improved in order to better manage these populations. Hunters' names and addresses are necessary to provide a sample frame for voluntary hunter surveys to improve harvest estimates for all migratory game birds. States will gather migratory bird hunters' names and addresses and the Service will conduct the harvest surveys.

DATES: The written comment period for the proposed rule will end on April 1, 1995.

ADDRESSES: Written comments should be sent to the Chief, Office of Migratory Bird Management, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, 10815 Loblolly Pine Drive, Laurel, Maryland 20708–4028. Comments received will be available for public inspection during normal business hours in Building 158, 10815 Loblolly Pine Drive (Gate 4, Patuxent Environmental Science Center), Laurel, Maryland 20708–4028.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Paul I. Padding, Office of Migratory Bird Management, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, (301) 497–5980, FAX (301) 497–5981.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The purpose of this rule is to expand the Program to include the States of Michigan, Oklahoma, and Oregon beginning in the 1995–96 hunting season, and to make minor modifications to the Program.

Background

The purpose of this cooperative Program is to obtain annually a nationwide sample frame of migratory bird hunters, from which representative samples of hunters will be selected and asked to participate in voluntary harvest surveys. State wildlife agencies will provide the sample frame by annually collecting the name, address, and date of birth of each licensed migratory bird hunter in the State. To reduce survey costs and to identify hunters who hunt less commonly-hunted species, States will also request that each migratory bird hunter provide a brief summary of his or her migratory bird hunting activity for the previous year. States will send this information to the Service, and the Service will sample hunters and conduct national hunter activity and harvest surveys.

A notice of intent to establish the Program was published in the June 24, 1991, **Federal Register** (56 FR 28812). A final rule that established the Program and initiated a 2-year pilot phase in three volunteer States (California, Missouri, and South Dakota) was published in the March 19, 1993, **Federal Register** (58 FR 15093). The pilot phase was completed following the 1993–94 migratory bird hunting seasons in California, Missouri, and South Dakota.

A State/Federal technical group was formed to evaluate Program requirements, the different approaches used by the pilot States, and the Service's survey procedures during the pilot phase. Changes incorporated into the Program as a result of the technical group's evaluation were specified in a final rule, published in the October 21, 1994, **Federal Register** (59 FR 53334), that initiated the implementation phase of the Program.

Currently, all licensed hunters who hunt migratory game birds in participating States are required to have a Program validation, indicating that they have identified themselves as migratory bird hunters and have provided the required information to the State wildlife agency. Hunters must provide the required information to each State in which they hunt migratory birds. Validations are printed on or attached to the annual State hunting license or on a State-specific supplementary permit. The State may charge hunters a small handling fee to compensate agents and to cover the State's administrative costs associated with conducting this Program.

The State/Federal technical group continues to evaluate the Program to determine the adequacy and timeliness of the sample frame and the time burden, cost, and other impacts on hunters, State license agents, State wildlife agencies, and the Service. Emphasis is currently on the time requirement for the sample frame and on alternative survey methods for special groups of unlicensed hunters (e.g., junior and senior hunters).

The Service's current survey design calls for hunting-record forms to be distributed to hunters selected for the survey before they forget the details of their hunts. Because of this design requirement, States have only a short time to obtain hunter names and addresses from license vendors and to provide those names and addresses to the Service. Currently, participating States must send the required information to the Service within 5 business days of issuance of the hunting license or permit (10 business days if the information is provided in electronic form). Several States have expressed concern that they can not meet this time requirement. The Service conducted an experiment during the 1994–95 hunting season to determine whether extending the time requirement would adversely affect the accuracy of survey results. The results and implications of that experiment will be discussed at the next meeting of the State/Federal technical group, prior to publication of a final rule in 1995.

The Service previously stated that additional States will continue to be added until all States participate in 1998. The suggested schedule was included in a final rule published in the October 21, 1994, **Federal Register** (59 FR 53334). Seven States requested changes to the suggested schedule; in response to those requests, four States were moved back in the agenda (Louisiana, Minnesota, Pennsylvania, and Texas) while three States were advanced (Idaho, Michigan, and Ohio).

Several States have subsequently indicated that they may not be able to implement the Program by the year that the current schedule requires them to enter the Program. The States and the Service are presently developing mutually acceptable measures for ensuring that the Program will achieve full implementation on schedule.

Proposed Modifications to the Program

In addition to implementation of the Program in Michigan, Oklahoma, and Oregon, the Service is proposing several other modifications to the Program. One

such modification would increase the time allowed for providing names and addresses to the Service. Results of the Service's experiment (described above) will provide the basis for determining the extent to which the time requirement should be changed.

Another modification being proposed is to require harvest estimates for hunters who are exempted from a permit requirement and those that are also exempted from State licensing requirements. This would include several categories of hunters such as junior hunters, senior hunters, landowners, and other special categories. These exemptions vary on a State-by-State basis. The requirement would likewise vary by State and be incorporated into individual cooperative agreements with the Service.

Excluding those hunters who are not required to obtain an annual State hunting license from the Program also excludes their harvest from the estimates. The importance of their harvest depends on how many hunters are excluded and on the number of birds they bag. Excluding these hunters may result in serious bias. Minimum survey standards are being developed for exempted categories. States may require exempted hunters to obtain permits (e.g., Maryland required exempted hunters to obtain permits upon entry to the Program in 1994).

NEPA Consideration

The establishment of this Harvest Information Program and options have been considered in the ''Environmental Assessment: Migratory Bird Harvest Information Program.'' Copies of this document are available from the Service at the address indicated under the caption **FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT**.

Regulatory Flexibility Act and the Paperwork Reduction Act

On June 14, 1991, the Assistant Secretary for Fish and Wildlife and Parks concluded that the rule would not have a significant effect on a substantial number of small entities under the Regulatory Flexibility Act 5 USC 601 *et seq.* This rule will eventually affect about 3–5 million migratory game bird hunters when it is fully implemented. It will require licensed migratory game bird hunters to identify themselves and to supply their names, addresses, and birth dates to the State licensing authority. Additional information will be requested in order that they can be efficiently sampled for a voluntary national harvest survey. Hunters will be required to have evidence of current participation in the Program on their person while hunting migratory game birds.

The States may require a small handling fee to compensate their hunting-license vendors and to cover their administrative costs. Many of the State hunting-license vendors are small entities, but this rule should not economically impact those vendors. Only migratory game bird hunters, individuals, would be required to provide this information, so this rule should not adversely affect small entities.

The collection of information contained in this rule has been approved by the Office of Management and Budget under 44 U.S.C. 3501 *et seq.* and assigned clearance number 1018–0015. The information is required from licensed hunters to obtain the benefit of hunting migratory game birds.

The public reporting burden for this collection of information is estimated to average 0.015 hours per response, including the time for reviewing instructions, searching existing data sources, gathering and maintaining the data needed, and completing and reviewing the collection of information. Comments regarding the burden estimate or any other aspect of these reporting requirements should be directed to the Service Information Collection Clearance Officer, ms 224—ARLSQ, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, 1849 C Street, NW., Washington, DC 20240, or the Office of Management and Budget, Paperwork Reduction Project 1018–0015, Washington, DC 20503.

Executive Order 12866

This rule was not subject to Office of Management and Budget review under Executive Order 12866.

Executive Order 12612 - Federalism

The regulations do not have significant Federalism effects as provided in Executive Order 12612. Due to the migratory nature of certain species of birds, the Federal Government has been given responsibility over these species by the Migratory Bird Treaty Act. State harvest surveys presently cannot provide adequate national estimates of migratory game bird harvests for the following reasons: (1) some States do not now conduct annual harvest surveys or maintain accessible lists of hunter names and addresses; (2) comparable information is not available from all States because States have different licensing laws regulating who must buy a hunting license and different survey procedures; (3) currently, many State license lists are not available in time to permit distribution of hunter records early in the hunting season; and (4) budget constraints often prevent States from conducting harvest surveys during certain years or could cause some States to eliminate them completely.

These rules do not have a substantial direct effect on fiscal capacity, change the roles or responsibilities of Federal or State Governments, or intrude on State policy or administration. Therefore, these regulations do not have significant Federalism effects and do not have sufficient Federalism implications to warrant the preparation of a Federalism Assessment. In fact, the Service would cooperate with States in providing special surveys to meet mutual management needs, and increased cooperation between Federal and State agencies would reduce duplication of survey efforts.

Executive Order 12360 - Taking of Individual Property Rights

Executive Order 12360 discussed guidelines for the taking of individual property rights. These rules, authorized by the Migratory Bird Treaty Act, do not affect any constitutionally-protected property rights. These rules would not result in the physical occupancy of property, the physical invasion of property, or the regulatory taking of any property.

Authorship

The primary author of this rule is Paul I. Padding, Office of Migratory Bird Management.

List of Subjects in 50 CFR Part 20

Exports, Hunting, Imports, Reporting and recordkeeping requirements, Transportation, Wildlife.

For the reasons set out in the preamble, 50 CFR part 20 is proposed to be amended as set forth below.

PART 20 - MIGRATORY BIRD HUNTING

1. The authority citation for part 20 continues to read as follows:

Authority: The Migratory Bird Treaty Act (July 3, 1918), as amended, (16 U.S.C. 703–711); the Fish and Wildlife Improvement Act of 1978 (November 8, 1978), as amended, (16 U.S.C. 712); and the Fish and Wildlife Act of 1956 (August 8, 1956), as amended, (16 U.S.C. 742 a—d and e—j).

2. Section 20.20 is revised to read as follows:

§ 20.20 Migratory Bird Harvest Information Program.

(a) *Information collection requirements.* The collections of information contained in § 20.20 have been approved by the Office of

Management and Budget under 44 U.S.C. 3501 et seq. and assigned clearance number 1018–0015. The information will be used to provide a sampling frame for the national Migratory Bird Harvest Survey. Response is required from licensed hunters to obtain the benefit of hunting migratory game birds. Public reporting burden for this information is estimated to average 0.015 hours per response, including the time for reviewing instructions, searching existing data sources, gathering and maintaining the data needed, and completing and reviewing the collection of information. Send comments regarding this burden estimate or any other aspect of this collection of information, including suggestions for reducing the burden, to the Service Information Collection Clearance Officer, MS-224 ARLSQ, Fish and Wildlife Service, Washington, DC 20240, or the Office of Management and Budget, Paperwork Reduction Project 1018–0015, Washington, DC 20503.

(b) *General provisions.* Each person hunting migratory game birds in California, Maryland, Michigan, Missouri, Oklahoma, Oregon, and South Dakota shall have identified himself or herself as a migratory bird hunter and given his or her name, address, and date of birth to the respective State hunting licensing authority and shall have on his or her person evidence, provided by that State, of compliance with this requirement.

(c) *Tribal exemptions.* Nothing in paragraph (b) of this section shall apply to hunters on Federal Indian Reservations or to tribal members hunting on ceded lands.

(d) *State exemptions.* Nothing in paragraph (b) of this section shall apply to those hunters who are exempted from State-licensing requirements in the State in which they are hunting.

(e) *Implementation schedule.* The Service is continuing to implement this Program over the next 3-year period from 1996–1998, which will incorporate approximately a half million additional migratory bird hunters each year. It it proposed that the States participate on or before the following schedule:

1996—Alabama, Georgia, Idaho, Illinois, Louisiana, Maine, Minnesota, Mississippi, North Carolina, Pennsylvania, Tennessee, Texas, and Vermont.

1997—Arizona, Arkansas, Colorado, Florida, Kentucky, Ohio, South Carolina, Virginia, and Wisconsin.

1998—Alaska, Connecticut, Delaware, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Massachusetts, Montana, Nebraska, Nevada, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New Mexico, New York, North Dakota, Rhode Island, Utah, Washington, West Virginia, and Wyoming.

Dated: February 27, 1995.

George T. Frampton, Jr.,

Assistant Secretary for Fish and Wildlife and Parks.

[FR Doc. 95–6292 Filed 3–14–95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4310–55–F

federal register

Wednesday
March 15, 1995

Part IX

The President

Executive Order 12956—Israel-United States Binational Industrial Research and Development Foundation

Federal Register
Vol. 60, No. 50
Wednesday, March 15, 1995

Presidential Documents

Title 3—

The President

Executive Order 12956 of March 13, 1995

Israel-United States Binational Industrial Research and Development Foundation

By the authority vested in me as President by the Constitution and the laws of the United States of America, including section 1 of the International Organizations Immunities Act (22 U.S.C. 288), and having found that the Israel-United States Binational Industrial Research and Development Foundation is a public international organization in which the United States participates within the meaning of the International Organizations Immunities Act, I hereby designate the Israel-United States Binational Industrial Research and Development Foundation as a public international organization entitled to enjoy the privileges, exemptions, and immunities conferred by the International Organizations Immunities Act. This designation is not intended to abridge in any respect the privileges, exemptions, or immunities that such organization may have acquired or may acquire by international agreements or by congressional action.



THE WHITE HOUSE,
March 13, 1995.

[FR Doc. 95–6588
Filed 3–14–95; 9:18 am]
Billing code 3195–01–P

Reader Aids

Federal Register

Vol. 60, No. 50

Wednesday, March 15, 1995

INFORMATION AND ASSISTANCE

Federal Register

Index, finding aids & general information	**202–523–5227**
Public inspection announcement line	**523–5215**
Corrections to published documents	**523–5237**
Document drafting information	**523–3187**
Machine readable documents	**523–4534**

Code of Federal Regulations

Index, finding aids & general information	**523–5227**
Printing schedules	**523–3419**

Laws

Public Laws Update Service (numbers, dates, etc.)	**523–6641**
Additional information	**523–5230**

Presidential Documents

Executive orders and proclamations	**523–5230**
Public Papers of the Presidents	**523–5230**
Weekly Compilation of Presidential Documents	**523–5230**

The United States Government Manual

General information	**523–5230**

Other Services

Data base and machine readable specifications	**523–4534**
Guide to Record Retention Requirements	**523–3187**
Legal staff	**523–4534**
Privacy Act Compilation	**523–3187**
Public Laws Update Service (PLUS)	**523–6641**
TDD for the hearing impaired	**523–5229**

ELECTRONIC BULLETIN BOARD

Free **Electronic Bulletin Board** service for Public Law numbers, Federal Register finding aids, and list of documents on public inspection. **202–275–0920**

FAX-ON-DEMAND

You may access our Fax-On-Demand service. You only need a fax machine and there is no charge for the service except for long distance telephone charges the user may incur. The list of documents on public inspection and the daily Federal Register's table of contents are available using this service. The document numbers are 7050-Public Inspection list and 7051-Table of Contents list. The public inspection list will be updated immediately for documents filed on an emergency basis.
NOTE: YOU WILL ONLY GET A LISTING OF DOCUMENTS ON FILE AND NOT THE ACTUAL DOCUMENT. Documents on public inspection may be viewed and copied in our office located at 800 North Capitol Street, N.W., Suite 700. The Fax-On-Demand telephone number is: **301–713–6905**

FEDERAL REGISTER PAGES AND DATES, MARCH

11017–11608.....1
11609–11896.....2
11897–12102.....3
12103–12394.....6
12395–12658.....7
12659–12858.....8
12859–13022.....9
13023–13366.....10
13367–13612.....13
13613–13888.....14
13889–14200.....15

CFR PARTS AFFECTED DURING MARCH

At the end of each month, the Office of the Federal Register publishes separately a List of CFR Sections Affected (LSA), which lists parts and sections affected by documents published since the revision date of each title.

3 CFR

Proclamations:
6772.....11609
6773.....12101
6774.....12657
6775.....13887
6776.....13889

Executive Orders:
November 24, 1916 (Revoked in part by PLO 7121).....12886
12903 (Superseded by EO 12955).....13365
12954.....13023
12955.....13365
12956.....14199

Administrative Orders:
Memorandums:
March 2, 1995 12393
Presidential Determinations:
No. 95–15 of Feb. 28, 1995 12859

5 CFR

Ch. LXXVII.....12396
362.....11017
532.....12395, 12396
582.....13027
731.....13613
843.....13034
1300.....12396
1650.....13604
1653.....13604

Proposed Rules:
Ch. XIV 11057

7 CFR

29 .....12398, 12399, 12400, 13515
51.....11242
56.....12401, 13780
58.....11246
354.....11897
372.....13212
906.....13891
989.....12403
1209.....13613
1210.....13515
1942.....11019

Proposed Rules:
51.....11918, 13926
58 .....11919, 12154, 12156
319.....13382
945.....13080
1099.....12907
1230.....13384
1940.....13650, 13928

9 CFR

2.....13893
77.....11898
91.....13896
92.....13896, 13898
317.....12883
381.....12883

Proposed Rules:
1.....12908
3.....12908
92.....13929
102.....12159, 12162
104.....12159
105.....12159
114.....12162
116.....12159
160.....13084
161.....13084

10 CFR

50.....13615
55.....13615
73.....13615

Proposed Rules:
20.....13385

12 CFR

543.....12103
552.....12103
571.....12103
708a.....12759

Proposed Rules:
7.....11924
31.....11924
543.....13008
552.....13008
571.....13008
722.....13388

13 CFR

Proposed Rules:
120.....11941
122.....11941

14 CFR

11.....12034, 12108
25.....11194
39 .....11020, 11611, 11613, 11615, 11617, 11619, 11621, 11623, 12406, 12407, 12408, 12410, 12411, 12413, 12414, 12663, 12666, 13618, 13620, 13621, 13623, 13624
61.....11254
71 .....11625, 12108, 12667, 13626, 13900
91.....13627
95.....13035
97.....12109, 12110
121.....11194, 12034
135.....11194, 13010
1241.....11022
1262.....12668

Proposed Rules:
33.....12360

39 .....11635, 11637, 11942, 11944, 11945, 12714,
71.....11057, 13931
121.....13008, 13862
125.....13862
135.....13862

15 CFR

925.....12592
Proposed Rules:
905.....11947

16 CFR

Proposed Rules:
1700.....12165

17 CFR

1.....13901
239.....11876
270.....11876, 11887
274.....11876
400.....11022
401.....11022
402.....11022, 12825
403.....11022
404.....11022
405.....11022
450.....11022
Proposed Rules:
239.....11890
270.....11890
274.....11890

18 CFR

Proposed Rules:
154.....13651
158.....13651
201.....13651
250.....13651
284.....13651

19 CFR

12.....13352

20 CFR

Proposed Rules:
200.....11639
404.....12166
416.....12166

21 CFR

173.....11899
179.....12669
328.....13590
450.....11026
510.....11027
558.....11027, 11028
Proposed Rules:
310.....13014
314.....13014

24 CFR

15.....11901
25.....13834
58.....13518
92.....13348
201.....13834, 13854
202.....13834
243.....11828
290.....11844
760.....11828
813.....11626
886.....11844
888.....12594
889.....11828
890.....11836, 13515
905.....11626
908.....11626
913.....11626
3500.....11194
Proposed Rules:
100.....13840
888.....11870

26 CFR

1 .....11028, 11906, 12415
Proposed Rules:
1 .....11059, 11060, 11195, 11950, 12034, 13213, 13393

28 CFR

0.....11906
31.....13330
40.....13902

29 CFR

1910.....11194, 13782
1915.....11194, 13782
1917.....13782
1918.....13782
1926.....11194
1952.....12416, 12417
2509.....12328
2619.....13904
2676.....13904
Proposed Rules:
1952.....12488

30 CFR

914.....13038
936.....13040
944.....13367
Proposed Rules:
Ch. VII.....13858
254.....13652
756.....13086
773.....13087
925.....11640
926.....13932
944.....13935

31 CFR

356.....13906
500.....12885

32 CFR

199.....12419
1636.....13907
Proposed Rules:
199.....12717
209.....11642
311.....13936

33 CFR

100.....11629
117.....13629
143.....13550
155.....13318
157.....13318
165.....12112
Proposed Rules:
117 .....12178, 13393, 13395, 13653
320.....13654
325.....13654
333.....13654
402.....11643

34 CFR

3.....11907
75.....12096, 12648

36 CFR

7.....13629
1230.....13908
Proposed Rules:
7.....13662

38 CFR

3.....12886

39 CFR

3001.....12113, 12116
Proposed Rules:
111.....12490

40 CFR

9.....12670
52 .....12121, 12123, 12125, 12438, 12442, 12446, 12451, 12453, 12459, 12685, 12688, 12691, 12695, 12700, 13042, 13631, 13634, 13908
58.....11907
61.....13912
63 .....11029, 12670, 13045
70 .....12128, 12478, 13046
81 .....12453, 12459, 13368, 13634
180 .....11029, 11032, 12702, 12703, 12704, 12705, 12707, 13914
281.....12630, 12709
282.....12630
372.....13047
721.....11033
Proposed Rules:
50.....13663
51.....12492
52 .....12180, 12184, 12185, 12519, 12520, 12721, 12722, 13937
53.....13663
58.....12492
60.....13937
61.....13938
63 .....12723, 13088, 13664
68.....13526
70 .....12521, 13088, 13683
81.....12520
85.....12185
148.....11702
180 .....13938, 13939, 13941
194.....11060
261.....12525
266.....11702
268.....11702
271.....11702, 12525
300.....13944
302.....12525
761.....13095

42 CFR

485.....11632
486.....11632
Proposed Rules:
65a.....12525

43 CFR

2720.....12710
Public Land Orders:
7100.....12592
7117.....11045
7118.....11046
7119.....11633
7120.....11633
7121.....12886
7122.....12887
7123.....12887
7124.....13915

44 CFR

65.....13049
67.....13050
152.....11236
Proposed Rules:
61.....13945
67.....13096
206.....13945

45 CFR

2543.....13055
Proposed Rules:
1180.....12186

46 CFR

2.....13550
30.....13318
32.....13318
70.....13318
90.....13318
172.....13318
Proposed Rules:
10.....13570
12.....13570
67.....12188

47 CFR

1.....13636
2.....13071
5.....13636
15.....13071
24.....13915
32.....12137
36.....12137
61.....13637
65.....12137
73 .....11909, 11910, 11911, 13918
Proposed Rules:
Ch. I.....13102
1.....13396
2.....11644, 13687
63.....11644
64.....12529
73 .....12530, 12724, 12725, 13947

48 CFR

Ch. 99.....12711
2 .....12366, 12384, 13397
3.....12366, 13397
4.....12366, 12384
5 .....12366, 12384, 13397
6.....12366, 13397
7.....12384, 13397
8.....12366, 12384
9 .....12366, 12384, 13397
10.....13397
11.....13397
12.....12384, 13397
13.....12366, 13397
14.....12384, 13397
15 .....12366, 12384, 13397
16 .....12366, 12384, 13397
22.....12366, 13397
23.....12366, 13397
25.....12366
27.....12366
28.....12366

29 12366
32 ....12366, 12384
36 ....12366, 13397
41 12366
42 ....12366, 13397
43 12366
44 ....12366, 13397
45 ....12366, 12384
46 ....12366, 13397
47 ....12366, 13397
49 ....12366, 13397
52 ....12366, 12384, 13397
53 ....12366, 12384, 13397
209 13073
219 13074
223 13075
235 13076
252 ....13073, 13075
701 ....11911, 12825
703 ....11911, 12825
715 ....11911, 12825
724 11911
731 ....11911, 12825
752 ....11911, 12825
927 11812
952 11812
970 11812
1517 12712
1837 11634

Proposed Rules:

Ch. I 11198
32 14156
45 12530
52 ....12530, 14156
933 11646
970 11646
9904 12725

49 CFR

1 ....11046, 13639
107 12139
218 11047
382 13369
391 13369
393 12146
571 ....11913, 13216, 13286, 13297, 13639
575 11913
653 12296
654 ....12296, 12298
661 14174
1312 13077
1314 13077

Proposed Rules:

234 11649
393 13306
571 ....12192, 13688
661 14178
800 13948
830 13948
831 13948

50 CFR

17 ....12483, 12887
204 11050
611 13780
646 12592
651 13078
654 13918
663 13377
675 13780
676 13780
681 13380
672 ....11915, 12149, 12152, 13079
673 ....11054, 12825
675 ....11915, 12149, 12487
676 ....11916, 12152

Proposed Rules:

17 ....11768, 12531, 12728, 12730, 13105, 13397, 13950
20 14194
222 11951
663 11062
672 13106
675 13106