All proposals should explain in as precise detail as is practicable how the hydropower resource would be developed on the Uncompahgre Project. Factors which the proposal should consider and address include but are not limited to the following:

a. Title to the rights of way and to the facilities must be vested in the United States.

b. Qualifications of the party, subcontractors, and key personnel. Include any significant experience in similar development activities.

c. A management plan of such activities as planning, National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) compliance, design, construction, operation, and maintenance. Prepare schedules of these activities as is applicable. Describe what studies are necessary to accomplish the hydropower development and how the studies would be implemented.

d. Provide locations and describe principal structures and other important features of the project including roads and transmission lines. Estimate capacity of the power facilities and average annual energy output to be generated by the project.

e. Concepts for power sales and contractual arrangements, utilization of the power, involved parties, the proposed approach to wheeling if required, and any cost associated therewith.

f. Acquiring title to or the right to occupy and use lands necessary for project development.

g. Water rights applicable to the proper operation of the proposed project and how these rights will be acquired or perfected.

h. Proposed operation of the project during times of low, normal, and flood flows, and any anticipated impacts on the Reclamation project and the Gunnison and Uncompahgre River systems. Explain studies necessary to adequately define the impacts and the approach for determining corrective measures. Explain to the extent possible any proposed use of the project for conservation and utilization in the public interest of the available water resources.

i. To the extent practicable, describe any significant environmental issues and the approach for gathering data and handling the environmental issues. The Bureau of Reclamation would be the lead Federal agency for NEPA compliance.

j. Financial ability to fund all studies necessary for compliance of NEPA and to fully develop the project together with a statement of explanation of the proposed method of financing the project. Include cost estimates for all aspects of the project. Describe and illustrate project financing and repayment. Provide an economic analysis that includes all development costs; annual expenses for power production, including a share of the Association's annual expenses for rehabilitation, betterment, operation, maintenance, and replacement of water delivery facilities; return on the investment to the party; and monies available to the United States.

k. Monies received by the United States will be used for such purposes as directed by Federal Reclamation law.

5. All proposals will be reviewed and evaluated on the basis of the following criteria:

a. Extent to which the above factors have been addressed.

b. Optimization of the hydropower resource.

c. Reasonableness of return on investment to the party, and monies available to the United States.

d. Integration of hydroelectric development with existing irrigation project facilities and operation; i.e., anticipated impacts on the Reclamation project and the Gunnison and Uncompahgre River systems.

6. All project study and development costs, including advance of monies to Reclamation for funding of activities associated with environmental compliance, will be at the expense of the party selected to finance the studies and to develop the project. Project development will proceed only if the results of the studies are favorable.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Mr. Arlo H. Allen, Regional Supervisor of Power, Upper Colorado Region, Bureau of Reclamation, P.O. Box 11568, Salt Lake City, Utah 84147, (801) 524-5299.

Dated: December 4, 1985.

Richard Atwater,

Acting Commissioner.

[FR Doc. 85-29143 Filed 12-6-85; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4310-09-M

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Immigration and Naturalization Service

Direct Mail of Applications and Petitions to the Regional Adjudication Center in St. Albans, VT

AGENCY: Immigration and Naturalization Service, Justice.

ACTION: Notice of Direct Mail Initiative.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

For General Information: Loretta Shogren, Director, Policy Directives and Instructions, 425 I Street, NW., Washington, DC 20536, Telephone: 202-633-3048.

For Specific Information: Lloyd Sutherland, Immigration Examiner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, 425 I Street, NW., Washington, DC 20536, Telephone: (202) 633-3946.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The Immigration and Naturalization Service has four regional adjudication centers (RACs). These centers have been adjudicating various petitions and applications in the name of district directors. However, on October 15, 1985, Title 8 of the Code of Federal Regulations was amended to give signature authority to the directors of the four RACs (8 CFR 103.1). Consequently, it now appears to be more efficient to file petitions and applications directly with the RACs rather than file at the districts and send (remote) these cases to the RACs. It generally takes ten (10) days for districts to receipt the applications or petitions and forward them on to the RACs. Direct mail will eliminate this ten day wait and provide faster service for all petitioner's. Direct mail of petitions to RACs will also allow districts to devote more resources to adjustment of status cases, and applications for asylum or naturalization.

In order to gather data on the feasibility of direct mail to RACs, a test program has been devised involving the districts of New York, Washington, D.C. and the Regional Adjudication Center in St. Albans, Vt.

The following three petitions or applications will be filed by mail at the St. Albans Regional Adjudication Center beginning January 6, 1986. These cases would ordinarily be filed either at the New York or Washington, DC district.

I-129B—Temporary Worker Petition

I-506—Application to Change Nonimmigrants Status (When changing to H or L)

I-539—Application for Extension of Stay (When filed with an I-129B petition)

This direct mail test will continue until June 30, 1986. The correct mailing address of the RAC is:

Eastern Adjudication Center, P.O. Box 1270, St. Albans, Vt. 05478

This notice constitutes authority for regional adjudication center directors to accept fees and to process these cases. Petitioners will be notified of the results of this test and any adjustments in filing procedures. All available experience indicates this direct mail initiative will benefit petitioners by giving faster service and allowing them to file initially with the adjudicating office rather than having their cases remote to a second location.

Dated: December 4, 1985.

Richard E. Norton,

Associate Commissioner, Examinations, Immigration and Naturalization Service.

[FR Doc. 85-29095 Filed 12-6-85; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4410-10-M

NATIONAL TRANSPORTATION SAFETY BOARD

Availability of Reports

Reports Issued

Railroad Accident Report—Vinyl Chloride Monomer Release from a Railroad Tank Car and Fire, Formosa Plastics Corporation Plant, Baton Rouge, Louisiana, July 30, 1983 (NTSB/RAR–85/08) (NTIS Order No. PB85–916308).

Railroad Accident Report—Rear End Collision of Two Chicago Transit Authority Trains Near The Montrose Avenue Station, Chicago, Illinois, August 17, 1984 (NTSB/RAR–85/11) (NTIS Order No. PB85–916311).

Railroad/Highway Accident Report—Grade Crossing Collision of a Florida East Coast Railway Company Freight Train and an Indian River Academy Schoolbus, Port St. Lucie, Florida, September 27, 1984 (NTSB/RHR–85/01) (NTIS Order No. PB85–917007).

Highway Accident Report—Fatigue-Related Commercial Vehicle Accidents: Cheyenne, Wyoming, July 18, 1984, and Junction City, Arkansas, October 19, 1984 (NTSB/HAR–85/04) (NTIS Order No. PB85–916205).

Pipeline Accident Report—Arizona Public Service Company Natural Gas Explosion and Fire, Phoenix, Arizona, September 25, 1984 (NTSB/PAR–85/01) NTIS Order No. PB85–916501).

Hazardous Materials Special Investigation Report—Release of Oleum During Wreckage-Clearing Following Derailment of Seaboard Railroad Train Extra 8294 North, Clay, Kentucky, February 5, 1984 (NTSB/SIR–85/01) (NTIS Order No. PB85–917004).

Marine Accident Report—Loss of the U.S. Fishing Vessel AMAZING GRACE about 80 Nautical Miles East of Cape Henlopen, Delaware, about November 14, 1984 (NTSB/MAR–85/07) (NTIS Order No. PB85–916407).

Marine Accident Report—Loss by Fire of the U.S. Passenger Vessel M/V FANTASY ISLANDER in Charlotte Harbor, Florida, September 8, 1984 (NTSB/MAR–85/09) (NTIS Order No. PB85–916409).

Marine Accident/Incident Summary Report—Anaheim Bay, California, October 28, 1984 (NTSB/MAR–85/01/SUM) (NTIS Order No. PB85–916410).

Aircraft Accident Reports—Brief Format, U.S. Civil and Foreign Aviation, Issue Number 6 of 1983 Accidents (NTSB/AAB–85/07) (NTIS Order No. PB85–916907).

Aircraft Accident Reports—Brief Format, U.S. Civil and Foreign Aviation, Issue Number 7 of 1983 Accidents (NTSB/AAB–85/08) (NTIS Order No. PB85–916908).

Aircraft Accident Reports—Brief Format, U.S. Civil and Foreign Aviation, Issue Number 8 of 1983 Accidents (NTSB/AAB–85/09) (NTIS Order No. PB85–916909).

Aircraft Accident Reports—Brief Format, U.S. Civil and Foreign Aviation, Issue Number 9 of 1983 Accidents (NTSB/AAB–85/10) (NTIS Order No. PB85–916910).

Aircraft Accident Reports—Brief Format, U.S. Civil and Foreign Aviation, Issue Number 10 of 1983 Accidents (NTSB/AAB–85/11) (NTIS Order No. PB85–916911).

Aircraft Accident Reports—Brief Format, U.S. Civil and Foreign Aviation, Issue Number 11 of 1983 Accidents (NTSB/AAB–85/12) (NTIS Order No. PB85–916912).

Aircraft Accident Reports—Brief Format, U.S. Civil and Foreign Aviation, Issue Number 12 of 1983 Accidents (NTSB/AAB–85/13) (NTIS Order No. PB85–916913).

Aircraft Accident Reports—Brief Format, U.S. Civil and Foreign Aviation, Issue Number 13 of 1983 Accidents (NTSB/AAB–85/14) (NTIS Order No. PB85–916914).

Aircraft Accident Reports—Brief Format, U.S. Civil and Foreign Aviation, Issue Number 14 of 1983 Accidents (NTSB/AAB–85/15) (NTIS Order No. PB85–916915).

Aircraft Accident Reports—Brief Format, U.S. Civil and Foreign Aviation, Issue Number 15 of 1983 Accidents (NTSB/AAB–85/16) (NTIS Order No. PB85–916916).

Aircraft Accident Reports—Brief Format, U.S. Civil and Foreign Aviation, Issue Number 16 of 1983 Accidents (NTSB/AAB–85/17) (NTIS Order No. PB85–916917).

Aircraft Accident Reports—Brief Format, U.S. Civil and Foreign Aviation, Issue Number 18 of 1983 Accidents (NTSB/AAB–85/19) (NTIS Order No. PB85–916919).

Aircraft Accident Reports—Brief Format, U.S. Civil and Foreign Aviation, Issue Number 1 of 1984 Accidents (NTSB/AAB–85/20) (NTIS Order No.PB85–916920).

Aircraft Accident Reports—Brief Format, U.S. Civil and Foreign Aviation, Issue Number 1 of 1984 Accidents (NTSB/AAB–85/21) (NTIS Order No. PB85–916921).

Briefs of U.S. Air Carrier Accidents—Calendar Year 1980 (NTSB/ARC–85/02) (NTIS Order No. PB85–224855).

Briefs of U.S. Air Carrier Accidents—Calendar Year 1981 (NTSB/ARC–85/03) (NTIS Order No. PB85–224863).

Reports may be ordered from the National Technical Information Service, 5285 Port Royal Road, Springfield, Virginia 22161, for a fee covering the cost of printing, mailing, handling, and maintenance. For information on reports call 703–487–4650 and to order subscriptions to report call 703–487–4630.

Ray Smith,

Federal Register Liaison Officer.

December 2, 1985.

[FR Doc. 85-29085 Filed 12-6-85; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7533-01-M

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

Regulatory Guides; Issuance and Availability

The Nuclear Regulatory Commission has issued a revision to a guide in its Regulatory Guide Series. This series has been developed to describe and make available to the public methods acceptable to the NRC staff of implementing specific parts of the Commission's regulations and, in some cases, to delineate techniques used by the staff in evaluating specific problems or postulated accidents and to provide guidance to applicants concerning certain of the information needed by the staff in its review of applications for permits and licenses.

Revision 1 of Regulatory Guide Guide 1.82, "Water Sources for Long-Term Recirculation Cooling Following Loss-of-Coolant Accident," is a part of the NRC staff's resolution of Unresolved Safety Issue (USI) A–43, "Containment Emergency Sump Performance." This guide provides a method acceptable to the staff for implementing the Commission's requirements with respect to the sumps and pools that serve as emergency water sources during a loss-of-coolant accident. The resolution of USI A–43 was noticed in the Federal Register on November 6, 1985 (50 FR 46228).

Comments and suggestions in connection with: (1) Items for inclusion in guide currently being developed or (2) improvements in all published guides are encouraged at any time. Written comments may be submitted to the Rules and Procedures Branch, Division of Rules and Records, Office of Administration, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC 20555.

Regulatory guides are available for inspection at the Commission's Public Document Room, 1717 H Street NW., Washington, DC. Copies of active guides may be purchased at the current Government Printing Office price. A subscription service for future guides in specific divisions is available through the Government Printing Office. Information on the subscription service and current prices may be obtained by writing to the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Post Office Box 37082, Washington, DC 20013-7082.

(5 U.S.C. 552(a))

Dated at Silver Spring, Maryland this 2nd day of December 1985.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

Robert B. Minogue,

Director, Office of Nuclear Regulatory Research.

[FR Doc. 85-29141 Filed 12-6-85; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590-01-M

Adoption of Size Standards

AGENCY: Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

ACTION: Notice of adoption of size standards.

SUMMARY: The Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) is adopting size standards that will be appropriate to use in determining which of the NRC's licensees are small entities. Current NRC practice is to review regulations in accordance with the procedures set out in the Regulatory Flexibility Act of 1980, which requires all Federal agencies to consider the impact of their regulations on small entities. This proposal sets forth the size determination standards that NRC intends to use to identify more accurately the regulations subject to the regulatory flexibility analysis required by the Act.

EFFECTIVE DATE: December 9, 1985.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: John Philips, Chief, Rules and Procedures Branch, Division of Rules and Records, Office of Administration, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC 20555, Telephone 301-492-7086 or Toll Free 800-368-5642.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

On May 21, 1985, the NRC published a notice inviting public comment on its proposed definition of small entities (50 FR 20913). At that time, the NRC proposed a single size standard of $1 million which was to be applied to all of the NRC's approximately 7,000 licensees who hold over 9,000 licenses. These licenses permit the holders to perform numerous activities involving the use of nuclear material.

Several letters of comment were received. The following is a discussion of the comments and the NRC responses to them.

One commenter recommended that the NRC survey its licensees to determine the quantities of nuclear materials they have in their possession and suggested that the NRC tailor its size standard according to the specific amounts which might be possessed by each licensee.

For most materials licensees, no specific amounts of material are indicated in the license. The NRC has adopted a more flexibile approach which allows the licensees to possess certain ranges of specified material. In instances where the licensee uses devices containing various types of radio-nuclides, the NRC does not specify a single device the licensee must use, but indicates a number of devices (manufactured by various companies) from which the licensee may choose. Any deviation from these choices must be cleared with the NRC in the form of a license amendment. Because of the flexibility of the NRC approach to licensing, it is not possible to evaluate the licensee or to design a size standard based on specific amounts of source, special nuclear, or byproduct material in the licensee's possession.

An educator at a midwestern college suggested that all undergraduate institutions should be considered small entities because their primary usage of nuclear material is for teaching purposes.

As a routine practice, the NRC does not charge fees to certain licensees, chief among whom are educational institutions engaged in teaching, training, or medical activities, and ranging in size from small school districts to large universities. This exemption from fees was extended to educational institutions because it is in the public interest to promote the educational process. The exemption from fees, however, does not relieve each licensee from observing the rules and regulations of the agency, which are designed to protect the public health and safety from any types of hazards that would be associated with the use of nuclear materials. The NRC has distinguished educational institutions from the other materials licensees by providing them with a size standard based upon number of employees rather than annual receipts.

Several commenters recommended that the NRC create a size standard that is based solely on receipts resulting from licensed activity.

The NRC is not able to consider this alternative as a size standard. Section 3 of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 632) defines a small business as any concern "which is independently owned and operated and which is not dominant in its field of operation." While this definition does not define "annual receipts," the Small Business Administration Size Standards do. In 13 CFR 121.2(c)(1), "annual receipts" are defined as those which include "revenues from sales of products and services, interest, rent, fees, commissions and/or whatever sources derived." Thus, it is not possible for the NRC to base a size standard on only one component of a licensee's activities or in the case of educational institutions, based on the use of source, special nuclear, or byproduct material by a single department with an institution.

Several commenters expressed the opinion that the NRC's size standard of $1 million is too restrictive.

After a careful analysis of the comment letters and the recognition that the purpose of the Regulatory Flexibility Act is to have Federal agencies placing greater emphasis on a broad and liberal construction of the term "small business," the NRC has revised its size standard to include a broader spectrum of NRC licensees within the classification of a small entity.

Changes in NRC Standard Definitions

When the NRC designed the questionnaire in 1983, there were 12 categories of annual receipts from which the licensees could choose the one which most closely approximated their organization's receipts. These categories were: (a) Less than $250,000, (b) $250,000-$500,000, (c) $500,000-$750,000, (d) $750,000-$1,000,000, (e) $1,000,000-$7,000,000, (f) $7,000,000-$13,000,000 (g) $13,000,000-$19,000,000, (h) $19,000,000-$25,000,000, (i) $25,000,000-$50,000,000 (j) $50,000,000-$75,000,000, (k) $75,000,000—$100,000,000 and (l) More than $100,000,000. During the analysis of the data the NRC received in response to the questionnaire, the SBA published its final size standards in which the two most frequently used size standards are 500 employees or $3.5 million in annual receipts. If the 500-employee standard were applied to all NRC licensees, over 64 percent of the licensees would fall below the standard. The NRC decided not to use the 500-employee standard, except for educational institutions, because it correlated roughly to the NRC annual receipts category (i) of between $25 million and $50 million, far above the SBA's most frequently used dollar figure of $3.5 million. At that time, and because of the annual receipts categories, the NRC was not able to apply the $3.5 million standard to its licensees. Therefore, the NRC concluded that a $1 million size standard would be its most appropriate choice.

During the interim, the NRC has adopted a new form for applicants for materials licenses to use. This form, NRC-313, requests, on a voluntary basis, four pieces of economic information. The ranges of annual receipts requested on the new form have been prepared to include a category which corresponds to the SBA's $3.5 million size standard.

Therefore, the NRC is revising its size standard for all groups of licensees, except for private practice physicians and educational institutions, to $3.5 million. The NRC believes that this revision reflects a more liberal figure, and the percentage of licensees who will be considered small entities under the Regulatory Flexibility Act has grown from 25 percent to nearly 35 percent.

The reason for leaving the size standard at $1 million for private practice physicians is based on analysis of the data received from the licensees who responded to the questionnaire. Almost 90 percent of the responding licensees reported annual receipts of $1 million or less. Thus, the $1 million figure is considered to be a liberal size standard to apply to private practice physicians.

The NRC has divided educational institutions into two categories: State/publicly supported (by jurisdictions of over 50,000 population) institutions and the remainder of the educational institution licensees. By virtue of their State or public support by jurisdictions of over 50,000 population, those institutions are defined by the Regulatory Flexibility Act of 1980 (5 U.S.C. 601(4)), as large entities. For the remainder of educational institutions who are not State or publicly supported, the NRC has decided to use a size standard of 500 employees. The employee figure is believed to be less subject to change than the tution costs and student admissions. By applying these standards, approximately one-third of the education institution licensees will be considered small entities.

The NRC will use the figures stated in this notice beginning immediately in conjunction with its rulemaking reviews. If, at some future date, it appears that the figures adopted by the NRC should be revised, the NRC will reassess its size standards. The NRC would welcome any comments affected licensees might have regarding these size standard figures. Comments may be submitted to the address found in the FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT section of this notice.

Dated at Bethesda, Maryland, this 4th day of December 1985.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

William J. Dircks,

Executive Director for Operations.

[FR Doc. 85-29142 Filed 12-6-85; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590-01-M

SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

Forms Under Review by Office of Management and Budget

Agency Clearance Office: Kenneth A. Fogash, (202) 272-2142.

Upon Written Request Copy Available from: Securities and Exchange Commission, Office of Consumer Affairs, Washington, DC 20549.

Revision

Rule 17f-1(b), File No. 270-28.

Rule 17f-1(c), File No. 270-29.

Notice is hereby given that pursuant to the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1980 (44 U.S.C. 3501 *et seq.*), the Securities and Exchange Commission has submitted for OMB approval proposed amendments to Rules 17f-1(b) (17 CFR 240.17f-1(b)) and 17f-1(c) (17 CFR 240.17f-1(c)) under the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (15 U.S.C. 78 *et seq.*), which require reporting institutions to register with the Commission or its designee to participate in the Lost and Stolen Securities Program (Rule 17f-1(b)) and to report lost, stolen, missing and counterfeit securities to a centralized data base and to inquire of that data base about securities that come into their possession (Rule 17f-1(c)).

Submit comments to OMB Desk Officer: Ms. Sheri Fox, (202) 395-3785, Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs, Room 3235 NEOB, Washington, DC 20508.

Dated: November 29, 1985.

John Wheeler,

Secretary.

[FR Doc. 85-29092 Filed 12-6-85; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 8010-01-M

[Release No. IC-14823 (File No. 812-6125)]

Application and Opportunity for Hearing; Kleinwort, Benson Ltd.

December 3, 1985.

Notice is hereby given that Kleinwort, Benson Limited ("KB Ltd.") and Kleinwort Benson U.S. Finance Incorporated ("KB Finance") (collectively, "Applicants"), c/o Allen I. Isaacson, P.C., Fried, Frank, Harris, Shriver & Jacobson, One New York Plaza, New York, New York 10004, filed an application on May 29, 1985, and an amendment on October 31, 1985, for an order of the Commission pursuant to section 6(c) of the Investment Company Act of 1940 (the "Act") exempting Applicants from all provisions of the Act. All interested persons are referred to the application on file with the Commission for a statement of the representations made therein, which are summarized below, and to the Act for the text of the relevant provisions thereof.

Applicants state that KB Ltd. is an English merchant bank, registered as a company limited by shares under the United Kingdom Companies Act of 1948 (the "Companies Act"). KB Ltd. is wholly-owned directly by, and the principal operating subsidiary of, Kleinwort, Benson, Lonsdale, plc ("KB Lonsdale"), a publicly quoted English holding company. KB Lonsdale was registered in 1961 as a public company under the Companies Act and then acquired the whole of the issued share capital of the holding companies of Kleinwort, Sons & Co. Limited and Robert Benson, Lonsdale & Co. Limited ("RBL"). These two banking institutions merged in 1961 to establish KB Ltd. The application states that all of the outstanding capital stock of KB Finance, a Delaware corporation, is owned directly by KB Ltd. The Kleinwort Benson Group of companies is represented to be engaged in a full range of commercial banking, investment, capital market and treasury activities.

The application states that as of December 31, 1984, KB Ltd., which is the largest English merchant bank, had total consolidated assets of approximately U.S. $5.398 billion, of which no less than 85 percent was related to loans to customers, certificates of deposit held and similar assets, and income attributable to interest on such assets accounted for no less than 85 percent of total income. On that date, total consolidated liabilities equalled approximately U.S. $5.398 billion, of which no less than 80 percent was represented by deposits and