26(a)(1), 26(a)(2) and 27(c)(2), to the extent necessary.

5. Applicants represent that current industry practice calls for unit investment trust separate accounts, such as the Account, to hold shares of management investment companies in uncertificated form. Applicants further represent that holding shares of underlying management investment companies in uncertificated form contributes to efficiency in the operation and sale of such shares by separate accounts, and generally saves costs.

6. Applicants note that, in contrast to the Policies (which are covered by Rule 6e–2), policies covered by Rule 6e–3(T) may rely on Rules 6e–3(T)(b)(13)(iii) (B) and (C) which, in effect, afford the exemptions requested here by the Applicants. The Commission has proposed amendments to Rule 6e–2(b)(13)(iii) to permit life insurers to hold the assets of a separate account without a trust indenture or other such instrument, and to permit a separate account organized as a unit investment trust to hold the securities of any registered investment company that offers its shares to the separate account in uncertificated form. Applicants also note that the Commission has adopted 1940 Act Rule 26a–2 which affords exemptions in connection with variable annuity separate accounts that are essentially similar to those requested here. Accordingly, Applicants presume that the Commission adopted or proposed the foregoing exemptive rules based on a determination that, where state insurance law protects separate account assets and open account arrangements foster administrative efficiency and cost savings, safekeeping of separate account assets does not necessarily depend on the presence of a trustee, custodian or trust indenture, or the issuance of share certificates.

7. Northwestern represents that: it will comply with all other applicable provisions of Section 26 of the 1940 Act as if it were a trustee or custodian for its Account (subject to the other exemptive relief requested in the application); it will file with the insurance regulatory authority of Wisconsin an annual statement of its financial condition in the form prescribed by the National Association of Insurance Commissioners—the most recent such statement indicated that Northwestern has a combined capital and surplus of at least $1 million; it is examined from time to time by the insurance regulatory authority of Wisconsin as to its financial condition and other affairs; and it is subject to supervision and inspection with respect to its separate account operations.

H. Request for Exemptions Relating to Sale of Fund Shares Without an Underwriter

1. Section 12(b) of the 1940 Act provides, in pertinent part, that it shall be unlawful for any registered open-end company to act as a distributor of securities of which it is the issuer, except through an underwriter, in contravention of such rules and regulations as the Commission may prescribe. Rule 12b–1(a)(1) provides, in pertinent part, that, except in compliance with the provisions of that rule, it shall be unlawful for a registered open-end management investment company to act as a distributor of securities of which it is the issuer, except through an underwriter.

2. Applicants request exemption from Section 12(b) and Rule 12b–1(a)(1) to the extent necessary to permit the Fund to sell the shares of its portfolios to the Account without the use of an underwriter, on the condition that Applicants not use the Fund's assets for distribution expenses unless the Fund complies with 1940 Act Rule 12b–1(b).

3. Applicants state that shares of the Fund Portfolios have been and will be sold only to the Account and to other separate accounts of Northwestern, except for the seed money shares purchased by Northwestern itself. The shares will be sold at net asset value without any sales charge or underwriting spread. Applicants represent that the Fund bears no expenses for distribution of its shares.

4. Applicants submit that, in view of the foregoing facts, no useful purpose would be served by requiring the Fund to use an underwriter for the sale of the shares of its portfolios to the Account. Direct sales of these shares to the Account would not expose the Fund to any underwriting risks, since such shares are issued only when requests for their purchase are received from the Account. Nor would the direct sales to the Account create any expenses for the Fund.

Conclusion

Applicants assert that, for the reasons set forth above, the requested exemptions meet the standards of Section 6(c) of the 1940 Act. The requested exemptions are 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.

For the Commission, by the Division of Investment Management, under delegated authority.

Margaret H. McFarland,

Deputy Secretary.

[FR Doc. 95–23016 Filed 9–15–95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 8010–01–M

SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION

Reporting and Recordkeeping Requirements Under OMB Review

ACTION: Notice of Reporting Requirements Submitted for Review.

SUMMARY: Under the provisions of the Paperwork Reduction Act (44 U.S.C. Chapter 35), agencies are required to submit proposed reporting and recordkeeping requirements to OMB for review and approval, and to publish a notice in the Federal Register notifying the public that the agency has made such a submission.

DATES: Comments should be submitted within 30 days of this publication in the Federal Register. If you intend to comment but cannot prepare comments promptly, please advise the OMB Reviewer and the Agency Clearance Officer before the deadline.

COPIES: Request for clearance (OMB 83–1), supporting statement, and other documents submitted to OMB for review may be obtained from the Agency Clearance Officer. Submit comments to the Agency Clearance Officer and the OMB Reviewer.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Agency Clearance Officer: Georgia Greene, Small Business Administration, 409 3rd Street, SW., 5th Floor, Washington, DC 20416, Telephone: (202) 205–6629.

OMB Reviewer: Donald Arbuckle, Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs, Office of Management and Budget, New Executive Office Building, Washington, DC 20503.

Title: Disaster Survey Worksheet.

SBA Form No.: SBA Form 987.

Frequency: On Occasion.

Description of Respondents: Individuals, businesses and public officials within an area requesting a disaster declaration.

Annual Responses: 4,000.

Annual Burden: 333.

Dated: August 21, 1995.

Jackie White,

Acting Chief, Administrative Information Branch.

[FR Doc. 95–23117 Filed 9–15–95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 8025–01–P

Augusta District Advisory Council Public Meeting

The U.S. Small Business Administration Augusta District Advisory Council will hold a public meeting on Tuesday, September 26, 1995 at 10 a.m. at The Woodlands Club, 39 Woods Road, Falmouth, Maine, to discuss matters as may be presented by members, staff of the U.S. Small Business Administration , or others present.

For further information, write or call Mr. Roy Perry, District Director, U.S. Small Business Administration, 40 Western Avenue, Augusta, Maine 04330, (207) 622–8242 x 110.

Dated: September 11, 1995.

Art DeCoursey,

Director, Office of Advisory Council.

[FR Doc. 95–23116 Filed 9–15–95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 8025–01–P

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTAION

Federal Aviation Administration

Receipt of a Noise Compatibility Program Revision and Request for Review; Charlotte/Douglas International Airport, Charlotte, NC

AGENCY: Federal Aviation Administration, DOT.

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: The Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) announces that it is reviewing a proposed revision to the noise compatibility program that was submitted for Charlotte/Douglas International Airport under the provisions of Title I of the Aviation Safety and Noise Act of 1979 (Pub. L. 96–193) (hereinafter referred to as ''the Act'') and 14 CFR Part 150 by the City of Charlotte. This revised program was submitted subsequent to a determination by the FAA that associated noise exposure maps submitted under 14 CFR Part 150 for Charlotte/Douglas International Airport were in compliance with applicable requirements effective July 11, 1989.

Upon acceptance of the Noise Exposure Maps, the FAA received the initial noise compatibility program on November 20, 1989. It was approved May 18, 1990. The proposed revision to the noise compatibility program will be approved or disapproved on or before February 19, 1996.

EFFECTIVE DATE: The effective date of the start of FAA's review is August 23, 1995. The public comment period ends October 22, 1995.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Thomas M. Roberts, Program Manager, Atlanta Airports District Office, Campus Building, 1701 Columbia Avenue, Suite 2–260, College Park, Georgia 30337–2747. Telephone (404) 305–7153. Comments on the revised noise compatibility program should also be submitted to the above office.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: This notice announces that the FAA is reviewing a proposed noise compatibility program revision for Charlotte/Douglas International Airport which will be approved or disapproved on or before February 19, 1996. This notice also announces availability of this program for public review and comment.

This revision will add Churches within the definitions of ''public buildings'' under the approved noise compatibility program Land-Use Corrective Measure No. 2 paragraph entitled ''Soundproofing of Public Buildings.''

An airport operator who has submitted noise exposure maps that are found by FAA to be in compliance with the requirements of Federal Aviation Regulations (FAA) Part 150 promulgated pursuant to Title I of the Act, may submit a noise compatibility program for FAA approval which sets forth the measures the operator has taken or proposes for the prevention of the introduction of additional noncompatible uses.

The FAA has formally received the noise compatibility program revision for Charlotte/Douglas International Airport, effective on August 23, 1995. It was requested that the FAA review this material and that the noise mitigation measures, to be implemented jointly by the airport and surrounding communities, be approved as a noise compatibility program under section 104(b) of the Act. Preliminary review of the submitted material indicates that it conforms to the requirements for submittal of noise compatibility programs, but further review will be necessary prior to approval or disapproval of the program. The formal review period, limited by law to a maximum of 180 days, will be completed on or before February 19, 1996.

The FAA's detailed evaluation will be conducted under the provisions of 14 CFR Part 150, § 150.33. The primary considerations in the evaluation process are whether the proposed measures may reduce the level of aviation safety, create an undue burden on interstate or foreign commerce, or be reasonably consistent with obtaining the goal of reducing existing noncompatible land uses and preventing the introduction of additional noncompatible land uses.

Interested persons are invited to comment on the proposed program revision with specific reference to these factors. All comments, other than those properly addressed to the local land use authorities, will be considered by the FAA to the extent practicable. Copies of the noise maps, the FAA's evaluation of the maps, and the proposed noise compatibility program are available for examination at the following locations:

Federal Aviation Administration, 800 Independence Avenue, SW., Room 617, Washington, DC 30591

Federal Aviation Administration, Atlanta Airports District Office, Campus Building, 1701 Columbia Avenue, Suite 2–260, College Park, Georgia 30337–2747

T.J. Orr, Aviation Director, Charlotte/Douglas International Airport, P.O. Box 19066, Charlotte, North Carolina

Questions may be directed to the individual named above under the heading, **FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT**.

Issued in Atlanta, Georgia, August 23, 1995.

Dell T. Jernigan,

Manager, Atlanta Airports District Office.

[FR Doc. 95–23097 Filed 9–15–95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–13–M

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Federal Aviation Administration

Intent To Prepare an Environmental Impact Statement and To Hold an Environmental Scoping Meeting for Airport Improvements at Manchester Airport, Manchester, New Hampshire

AGENCY: Federal Aviation Administration.

ACTION: Notice of public environmental scoping meeting.

SUMMARY: The Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) is issuing notice to advise the public that an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) will be prepared for airport improvements under consideration by the City of Manchester Department of Aviation for Manchester Airport in the City of Manchester and Town of Londonderry, New Hampshire. To insure that all significant issues related to this planning effort are identified, a public scoping meeting will be held.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: John Silva, Environmental Program Manager, Federal Aviation Administration, New