

LIST OF CASES RECEIVED BY THE OFFICE OF HEARINGS AND APPEALS—Continued

(Week of Mar. 8 through Mar. 15, 1985)

Date	Name and location of applicant	Case No.	Type of submission
Mar. 14, 1985	Rollins Truck Leasing, Wilmington, DE	HEE-0130	Exception to the reporting requirements. If granted: Rollins Truck Leasing would not be required to file Form EIA-782B "Reseller/Retailers' Monthly Petroleum Product Sales Report."
Mar. 15, 1985	Cranston Oil Service Co., Newport, RI	HRX-0116	Supplemental order. If granted: Pursuant to the May 19, 1981 Decision and Order (Case No. BEX-0209) the trustee of the Cranston Oil Service Company escrow account would be directed to remit monies to the DOE for disbursement under Subpart V.
Do	Jade Petroleum Co., Branson, MO	HEE-0131	Exception to the reporting requirements. If granted: Jade Petroleum Company would not be required to file Form EIA-782B "Reseller/Retailers' Monthly Petroleum Product Sales Report."

REFUND APPLICATIONS RECEIVED

(Week of Mar. 8 through Mar. 15, 1985)

Date	Name of refund proceeding/ name of refund applicant	Case No.
03/11/85	Wallor/Department of Navy	RF78-6
03/11/85	Union Texas Petroleum/ Lowrey Tims Co.	RF109-1
03/11/85	Amoco/Schneider Oil Co.	RF21-12385
03/11/85	MAPCO/Delta Propane Co., Inc.	RF106-3
03/11/85	MAPCO/Small's LP Gas Co.	RF108-4
03/11/85	MAPCO/Farmland Industries, Inc.	RF108-5
03/11/85	U.S. Oil/Gramco, Ltd.	RF110-1
03/12/85	Hertz/Harcourt Brace Jovan- ovich	RF76-105
03/13/85	Wallace & Wallace/Al Jones Oil	RF69-2
03/13/85	Van Gas/Lawrence P. Soares, Jr.	RF68-20
03/13/85	Amoco/Robert Kristensen	RF21-12389
03/14/85	Van Gas/Herman Wagen- leitner	RF68-21
03/14/85	Hertz/Dow Chemical, USA	RF76/106
03/14/85	Aztec/Kenneth L. Nipper	RF73-12
03/14/85	Seminole/Waverly Minerals	RF111-1
03/15/85	APCO/Kelly Gasoline Co.	RF83-6
03/11/85 through 03/15/85	Gulf Refund Applications	RF40-1819 through RF40-1893

[FR Doc. 85-9415 Filed 4-17-85; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6450-01-M

Objection to Proposed Remedial Orders Filed; Period of February 18 Through March 22, 1985

During the period of February 18 through March 22, 1985, the notices of objection to proposed remedial orders listed in the Appendix to this Notice were filed with the Office of Hearings and Appeals of the Department of Energy.

Any person who wishes to participate in the proceeding the Department of Energy will conduct concerning the proposed remedial orders described in the Appendix to this Notice must file a request to participate pursuant to 10 CFR 205.194 within 20 days after publication of this Notice. The Office of Hearings and Appeals will then determine those persons who may participate on an active basis in the proceeding and will prepare an official service list, which it will mail to all persons who filed requests to participate. Persons may also be placed

on the official service list as non-participants for good cause shown.

All requests to participate in these proceedings should be filed with the Office of Hearings and Appeals, Department of Energy, Washington, D.C. 20585.

George B. Breznay,
Director, Office of Hearings and Appeals.
April 5, 1985.

Shell Oil Co., Houston, TX; HRO-0271, Crude oil

On March 20, 1985, Shell Oil Company, P.O. Box 576, Houston Texas 77001 filed a Notice of Objection to a Proposed Remedial Order which the DOE Economic Regulatory Administration issued to the firm on November 8, 1984. In the PRO, the ERA found that during September 1, 1973, through May 31, 1979, Shell's prices in first sales of crude oil which it produced and sold in the United States were in excess of the lawful ceiling prices as provided in the DOE's regulations. According to the PRO the violation resulted in \$190,559,081.84 of overcharges.

Texaco, Inc., White Plains, NY; HRO-0272, refined products

On March 20, 1985, Texaco, Inc., 2000 Westchester Ave., White Plains, N.Y. 10650 filed a Notice of Objection to a Proposed Remedial Order which the DOE Economic Regulatory Administration issued to the firm on February 7, 1985. In the PRO, the ERA found that during August 19, 1973 through January 28, 1981, Texaco calculated and used excessive May 15, 1973 prices in computing its maximum lawful selling prices with respect to sales of motor gasoline, middle distillates, kerosene, and other covered products to identified and unidentified customers which had purchased those products from Texaco's Atlanta, Houston and Los Angeles sales regions and from its Paragon Oil Division on or before May 15, 1973 pursuant to written variable priced contracts. According to the PRO, one of three restitutionary methodologies should be adopted.

Texaco, Inc., White Plains, NY; HRO-0273, motor gasoline, middle distillates

On March 20, 1985, Texaco, Inc., 2000 Westchester Ave., White Plains, N.Y. 10650 filed a Notice of Objection to a Proposed Remedial Order which the DOE Economic Regulatory Administration issued to the firm on February 7, 1985. In the PRO, the ERA found that during August 19, 1973 through January 28, 1981, Texaco calculated and

applied excessive May 15, 1973 prices in computing maximum lawful selling prices with respect to its sales of motor gasoline and middle distillates from Texaco's Atlanta, Houston and Los Angeles sales regions to identified and unidentified consumers, retailers, and distributors which had purchased such products on or before May 15, 1973, pursuant to written contracts. According to the PRO, one of three restitutionary methodologies should be adopted.

Texaco, Inc., White Plains, NY; HRO-0274, middle distillates kerosene

On March 20, 1985, Texaco, Inc., 2000 Westchester Ave., White Plains, N.Y. 10650 filed a Notice of Objection to a Proposed Remedial Order which the DOE Economic Regulatory Administration issued to the firm on February 7, 1985. In the PRO, the ERA found that during September 1973 through June 1976, Texaco calculated and used excessive May 15, 1973 selling prices in computing its maximum lawful selling prices with respect to its sales of middle distillates and kerosene to identified wholesale customers in Philadelphia. According to the PRO, one of three restitutionary measures should be adopted.

Texaco, Inc., White Plains, NY; HRO-0275, propane

On March 20, 1985, Texaco, Inc., 2000 Westchester Ave., White Plains, N.Y. 10650 filed a Notice of Objection to a Proposed Remedial Order which the DOE Economic Regulatory Administration issued to the firm on February 7, 1985. In the PRO, the ERA found that during August 1973 through December 1980, Texaco calculated and used excessive May 15, 1973 prices in computing its maximum lawful selling prices with respect to its sales of propane to identified and unidentified customers which purchased propane before May 15, 1973 pursuant to written variable priced contracts. According to the PRO, one of three restitutionary methodologies should be adopted.

Texaco, Inc., White Plains, NY; HRO-0276, propane

On March 20, 1985, Texaco, Inc., 2000 Westchester Ave., White Plains, N.Y. 10650 filed a Notice of Objection to a Proposed Remedial Order which the DOE Economic Regulatory Administration issued to the firm on February 7, 1985. In the PRO, the ERA found that during November 1, 1973 through December 1980, Texaco calculated and used excessive May 15, 1973 prices in computing

its maximum lawful selling prices with respect to its sales of propane to Dow Chemical Company and Enterprise Products Company. According to the PRO, one of three restitutionary methodologies should be adopted.

[FR Doc. 85-9414 Filed 4-17-85; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6450-01-M

Southwestern Power Administration

Proposed New Rate Schedule P-4B and Opportunity for Public Review and Comment

AGENCY: Southwestern Power Administration, DOE.

ACTION: Notice of proposed new Rate Schedule P-4B for power and energy sold to certain SWPA customers which desire to change their service arrangements and opportunity for public review and comment.

SUMMARY: The Administrator, Southwestern Power Administration (SWPA), has determined that a new Rate Schedule P-4B is required for certain SWPA customers which desire a change from their present firm service arrangements with load center delivery from SWPA under Rate Schedule F-4B and pursuant to contractual arrangements between SWPA and the Public Service Company of Oklahoma (PSO) and Oklahoma Gas and Electric Company (OG&E). These SWPA customers now desire peaking service arrangements with load center delivery from SWPA pursuant to other contractual arrangements between SWPA, PSO, OG&E, and/or the Oklahoma Municipal Power Authority (OMPA). The proposed Rate Schedule P-4B will have the same rates and terms for load center deliveries as the existing Rate Schedule F-4B, but will recognize the peaking service arrangements between SWPA and the affected SWPA customers, which provide for direct purchase by the affected SWPA customers of non-federally generated energy from PSO, OG&E, and/or OMPA. Since the same rates that apply under Rate Schedule F-4B (except for revenues and expenses associated with non-federally generated energy) will also apply under the proposed rate schedule, the net repayment results of the 1983 Power Repayment Study (the basis for present rate levels) will not be altered. However, the amount that SWPA must budget and receive Congressional appropriations for purchased power each year will be reduced, thereby reducing the overall annual Federal Budget. An opportunity is presented for interested parties to submit written

comments on the proposed rate schedule. Following review of written comments, the Administrator will submit the proposed rate schedule to the Deputy Secretary of Energy for confirmation, approval, and placement in effect on an interim basis and also submit it to the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC) for confirmation and approval on a final basis.

DATES: Written Comments on the proposed Rate Schedule P-4B are due on or before May 3, 1985.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION

CONTACT: Francis R. Gajan, director, Power Marketing, Southwestern Power Administration, Department of Energy, P.O. Box 1619, Tulsa, Oklahoma 74101, (918)581-7529.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: SWPA's proposed new Rate Schedule P-4B is merely a modified version of the existing Rate Schedule F-4B to recognize the change in service arrangements desired by a certain group of SWPA customers now served through PSO and OG&E under Rate Schedule F-4B. The implementation of the proposed Rate Schedule P-4B will not affect the rate levels under other SWPA rate schedules and will produce a rate level which will be identical to that for service under either Rate Schedule F-4B with elimination of the purchase cost pass-through element, or Rate Schedule P-4 with load center delivery. Furthermore, participation in the new service arrangements and, hence, the proposed Rate Schedule P-4B, is purely voluntary. The Administrator has, therefore, determined that written comments will provide adequate opportunity for public participation in the development of the proposed rate schedule and that a shortened comment period is reasonable. Consequently, written comments are due on or before fifteen (15) days following publication of the notice in the Federal Register.

Ten copies of written comments should be submitted to the Administrator, Southwestern Power Administration, U.S. Department of Energy, P.O. Box 1619, Tulsa, Oklahoma 74101. Following review of the written comments, the Administrator will develop the proposed rate schedule which will be submitted to the Deputy Secretary of Energy for approval on an interim basis and to FERC for approval on a final basis.

Issued in Tulsa, Oklahoma, April 9, 1985.
Ronald H. Wilkerson,
Administrator, Southwestern Power Administration.

[FR Doc. 85-9419 Filed 4-17-85; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6450-01-M

FEDERAL EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT AGENCY

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

Memorandum of Understanding Between Federal Emergency Management Agency and Nuclear Regulatory Commission

The Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) and the Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) have entered into a new Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) Relating To Radiological Emergency Planning and Preparedness. This supersedes a memorandum entered into November 4, 1980 (Published December 16, 1980, 45 FR 82713). The substantive changes in the new MOU deal principally with the FEMA handling of NRC requests for findings and determinations concerning offsite planning and preparedness. The basis and conditions for interim findings in support of licensing are defined, as well as provisions for status reports when plans are not complete. The text of the MOU is set out below except that an attachment is not included. This attachment concerns membership on a steering committee.

Memorandum of Understanding Between NRC and FEMA Relating to Radiological Emergency Planning and Preparedness

I. Background and Purpose

This memorandum of Understanding (MOU) establishes a framework of cooperation between the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) and the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) in radiological emergency response planning matters, so that their mutual efforts will be directed toward more effective plans and related preparedness measures at and in the vicinity of nuclear reactors and fuel cycle facilities which are subject to 10 CFR Part 50, Appendix E, and certain other fuel cycle and materials licensees which have potential for significant accidental offsite radiological releases. The memorandum is responsive to the President's decision of December 7, 1979, that FEMA will take the lead in offsite planning and response, his request that NRC assist FEMA in carrying out this role, and the NRC's continuing statutory responsibility for the radiological health and safety of the public.

On January 14, 1980, the two agencies entered into a "Memorandum of Understanding Between NRC and FEMA to Accomplish a Prompt Improvement in

Radiological Emergency Preparedness" that was responsive to the President's December 7, 1979, statement. A revised and updated memorandum of understanding became effective November 1, 1980. This MOU is a further revision to reflect the evolving relationship between NRC and FEMA and the experience gained in carrying out the provisions of the January and November 1980 MOU's. This MOU supersedes these two earlier versions of the MOU.

The general principles, agreed to in the previous MOU's and reaffirmed in this MOU, are as follows: FEMA coordinates all Federal planning for the offsite impact of radiological emergencies and takes the lead for assessing offsite radiological emergency response plans¹ and preparedness, makes findings and determinations as to the adequacy and capability of implementing offsite plans, and communicates those findings and determinations to the NRC. The NRC reviews those FEMA findings and determinations in conjunction with the NRC onsite findings for the purpose of making determinations on the overall state of emergency preparedness. These overall findings and determinations are used by NRC to make radiological health and safety decisions in the issuance of licenses and the continued operation of licensed plants to include taking enforcement actions as notices of violations, civil penalties, orders, or shutdown of operating reactors. This delineation of responsibilities avoids duplicative efforts by the NRC staff in offsite preparedness matters.

A separate MOU dated October 22, 1980, deals with NRC/FEMA cooperation and responsibilities in response to an actual or potential radiological emergency. Operations Response Procedures have been developed that implement the provisions of the Incident Response MOU. These documents are intended to be consistent with the Federal Radiological Emergency Response Plan which describes the relationships, role, and responsibilities of Federal agencies for responding to accidents involving peacetime nuclear emergencies.

II. Authorities and Responsibilities

FEMA—Executive Order 12148 charges the Director, FEMA, with the responsibility to "... establish Federal

policies for, and coordinate, all civil defense and civil emergency planning, management, mitigation, and assistance functions of Executive agencies" (Section 2-101) and "... represent the President in working with State and local governments and the private sector to stimulate vigorous participation in civil emergency preparedness, mitigation, response, and recovery programs." (Section 2-104.)

On December 7, 1979, the President, in response to the recommendations of the Kemeny Commission on the Accident at Three Mile Island, directed that FEMA assume lead responsibility for all offsite nuclear emergency planning and response.

Specifically, the FEMA responsibilities with respect to radiological emergency preparedness as they relate to NRC are:

1. To take the lead in offsite emergency planning and to review and assess offsite emergency plans and preparedness for adequacy.
2. To make findings and determinations as to whether offsite emergency plans are adequate and can be implemented (e.g., adequacy and maintenance of procedures, training, resources, staffing levels and qualifications, and equipment adequacy). Notwithstanding the procedures which are set forth in 44 CFR 350 for requesting and reaching a FEMA administrative approval of State and local plans, findings, and determinations on the current status of emergency planning and preparedness around particular sites, referred to as interim findings, will be provided by FEMA for use as needed in the NRC licensing process. Such findings will be provided by FEMA on mutually agreed to schedules or on specific NRC request. The request and findings will normally be by written communications between the co-chairs of the NRC/FEMA Steering Committee. An interim finding provided under this arrangement will be an extension of FEMA's procedures for review and approval of offsite radiological emergency plans and preparedness set forth in 44 CFR 350. It will be based on the review of currently available plans and, if appropriate, joint exercise results related to a specific nuclear power plant site.

An interim finding based only on the review of currently available offsite plans will include an assessment as to whether these plans are adequate when measured against the standards and criteria of NUREG-0654/FEMA-REP-1, and, pending a demonstration through an exercise, whether there is reasonable assurance that the plans can be

implemented. The finding will indicate one of the following conditions: (1) Plans are adequate and there is reasonable assurance that they can be implemented with only limited or no corrections needed; (2) plans are adequate, but before a determination can be made as to whether they can be implemented, corrections must be made to the plans or supporting measures must be demonstrated (e.g., adequacy and maintenance of procedures, training, resources, staffing levels and qualifications, and equipment adequacy); or (3) plans are adequate and cannot be implemented until they are revised to correct deficiencies noted in the Federal review.

If in FEMA's view the plans that are available are not completed or are not ready for review, FEMA will provide NRC with a status report delineating milestones for preparation of the plan by the offsite authorities as well as FEMA's actions to assist in timely development and review of the plans.

An interim finding on preparedness will be based on review of currently available plans and joint exercise results and will include an assessment as to (1) whether offsite emergency plans are adequate as measured against the standards and criteria of NUREG-0654/FEMA-REP-1, and (2) whether the exercise(s) demonstrated that there is reasonable assurance that the plans can be implemented.

An interim finding on preparedness will indicate one of the following conditions: (1) There is reasonable assurance that the plans are adequate and can be implemented as demonstrated in an exercise; (2) there are deficiencies that may adversely affect public health and safety that must be corrected in order to provide reasonable assurance that the plans can be implemented; or (3) FEMA is undecided and will provide a schedule of actions leading to a decision.

3. To assume responsibility, as a supplement to State, local, and utility efforts, for radiological emergency preparedness training of State and local officials.

4. To develop and issue an updated series of interagency assignments which delineate respective agency capabilities and responsibilities and define procedures for coordination and direction for emergency planning and response. [Current assignments are in 44 CFR 351, March 11, 1982. (47 FR 10758)].

NRC—The Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, requires that the NRC grant licenses only if the health and safety of the public is adequately protected. While the Atomic Energy Act does not

¹Assessments of offsite plans may be based on State and local government plans submitted to FEMA under its rule (44 CFR Part 350), and as noted in 44 CFR 350.3(f), may also be based on plans currently available to FEMA or furnished to FEMA through the NRC/FEMA Steering Committee.

specifically require emergency plans and related preparedness measures, the NRC requires consideration of overall emergency preparedness as a part of the licensing process. The NRC rules (10 CFR 50.33, 50.34, 50.47, 50.54, and Appendix E to 10 CFR Part 50) include requirements for the licensee's emergency plans.

Specifically, the NRC responsibilities for radiological emergency preparedness are:

1. To assess licensee emergency plans for adequacy. This review will include organizations with whom licensees have written agreements to provide onsite support services under emergency conditions.

To verify that licensee emergency plans are adequately implemented (e.g., adequacy and maintenance of procedures, training, resources, staffing levels and qualifications, and equipment).

3. To review the FEMA findings and determinations as to whether offsite plans are adequate and can be implemented.

4. To make radiological health and safety decisions with regard to the overall state of emergency preparedness (i.e., integration of emergency preparedness onsite as determined by the NRC and offsite as determined by FEMA and reviewed by NRC) such as assurance for continued operation, for issuance of operating licenses, or for taking enforcement actions, such as notices of violations, civil penalties, orders, or shutdown of operating reactors.

III. Areas of Cooperation

A. NRC Licensing Reviews. FEMA will provide support to the NRC for licensing reviews related to reactors, fuel facilities, and materials licensees with regard to the assessment of the adequacy of offsite radiological emergency response plans and preparedness. This will include timely submittal of an evaluation suitable for inclusion in NRC safety evaluation reports.

Substantially prior to the time that a FEMA evaluation is required with regard to fuel facility or materials license review, NRC will identify those fuel and materials licensees with potential for significant accidental offsite radiological releases and transmit a request for review to FEMA as the emergency plans are completed.

FEMA routine support will include providing assessments, findings and determinations (interim and final) on offsite plans and preparedness related to reactor license reviews. To support its findings and determinations, FEMA will

make expert witnesses available before the Commission, the NRC Advisory Committee on Reactor Safeguards, NRC hearing boards and administrative law judges, for any court actions, and during any related discovery proceedings.

FEMA will appear in NRC licensing proceedings as part of the presentation of the NRC staff. FEMA counsel will normally present FEMA witnesses and be permitted, at the discretion of the NRC licensing board, to cross-examine the witnesses of parties, other than the NRC witnesses, on matters involving FEMA findings and determinations, policies, or operations; however, FEMA will not be asked to testify on status reports. FEMA is not a party to NRC proceedings and, therefore, is not subject to formal discovery requirements placed upon parties to NRC proceedings. Consistent with available resources, however, FEMA will respond informally to discovery requests by parties. Specific assignment of professional responsibilities between NRC and FEMA counsel will be primarily the responsibility of the attorneys assigned to a particular case. In situations where questions of professional responsibility cannot be resolved by the attorneys assigned, resolution of any differences will be made by the General Counsel of FEMA and the Executive Legal Director of the NRC or their designees. NRC will request the presiding Board to place FEMA on the service list for all litigation in which it is expected to participate.

Nothing in this document shall be construed in any way to diminish NRC's responsibility for protecting the radiological health and safety of the public.

B. FEMA Review of Offsite Plans and Preparedness. NRC will assist in the development and review of offsite plans and preparedness through its membership on the Regional Assistance Committees (RAC). FEMA will chair the Regional Assistance Committees. Consistent with NRC's statutory responsibility, NRC will recognize FEMA as the interface with State and local governments for interpreting offsite radiological emergency planning and preparedness criteria as they affect those governments and for reporting to those governments the results of any evaluation of their radiological emergency plans and preparedness.

Where questions arise concerning the interpretation of the criteria, such questions will continue to be referred to FEMA Headquarters, and when appropriate, to the NRC/FEMA Steering Committee to assure uniform interpretation.

C. Preparation for and Evaluation of Joint Exercises. FEMA and NRC will cooperate in determining exercise requirements for licensees, State and local governments. They will also jointly observe and evaluate exercises. NRC and FEMA will institute procedures to enhance the review of the objectives and scenarios for joint exercises. This review is to assure that both the onsite considerations of NRC and the offsite considerations of FEMA are adequately addressed and integrated in a manner that will provide for a technically sound exercise upon which an assessment of preparedness capabilities can be based. The NRC/FEMA procedures will provide for the availability of exercise objectives and scenarios sufficiently in advance of scheduled exercises to allow enough time for adequate review by NRC and FEMA and correction of any deficiencies by the licensee. The failure of a licensee to develop a scenario that adequately addresses both onsite and offsite considerations may result in NRC taking enforcement actions.

The FEMA reports will be a part of an interim finding on emergency preparedness; or will be the result of an exercise conducted pursuant to FEMA's review and approval procedures under 44 CFR Part 350. Exercise evaluations will identify one of the following conditions: (1) There is reasonable assurance that the plans are adequate and can be implemented as demonstrated in the exercise; (2) there are deficiencies that may adversely impact public health and safety that must be corrected by the affected State and local governments in order to provide reasonable assurance that the plan can be implemented; or (3) FEMA is undecided and will provide a schedule of actions leading to a decision. Within 30 days of the exercise, a draft exercise report will be sent to the State, with a copy to the Regional Assistance Committee, requesting comments and a schedule of corrective actions, as appropriate, from the State in 30 days. Where there are deficiencies of the types noted in 2 above, and when there is a potential for a remedial exercise, FEMA Headquarters will promptly discuss these with NRC Headquarters. Within 90 days of the exercise, the FEMA report will be forwarded to the NRC Headquarters. Within 15 days of receipt of the FEMA report, NRC will notify FEMA in writing of action taken with the licensee relative to FEMA initiatives with State and local governments to correct deficiencies identified in the exercise.

D. Emergency Planning and Preparedness Guidance. NRC has lead

responsibility for the development of emergency planning and preparedness guidance for licensees. FEMA has lead responsibility for the development of radiological emergency planning and preparedness guidance for State and local agencies. NRC and FEMA recognize the need for an integrated, coordinated approach to radiological emergency planning and preparedness by NRC licensees and State and local governments. NRC and FEMA will each, therefore, provide opportunity for the other agency to review and comment on such guidance (including interpretations of agreed joint guidance) prior to adoption as formal agency guidance.

E. Support for Document Management System. FEMA and NRC will each provide the other with continued access to those automatic data processing support systems which contain relevant emergency preparedness data.

At NRC, this includes Document Management System support to the extent that it does not affect duplication or records retention. At FEMA, this includes technical support to the Radiological Emergency Preparedness Management Information System. This agreement is not intended to include the automated information retrieval support for the national level emergency response facilities.

F. Ongoing NRC Research and Development Programs. Ongoing NRC and FEMA research and development programs that are related to State and local radiological emergency planning and preparedness will be coordinated. NRC and FEMA will each provide opportunity for the other agency to review and comment on relevant research and development programs prior to implementing them.

G. Public Information and Education Programs. DEMA will take the lead in developing public information and education programs. NRC will assist FEMA by reviewing for accuracy educational materials concerning radiation and its hazards and information regarding appropriate actions to be taken by the general public in the event of an accident involving radioactive materials.

IV. NRC/FEMA Steering Committee

The NRC/FEMA Steering Committee on Emergency Preparedness will continue to be the focal point for coordination of emergency planning, preparedness, and response activities between the two agencies. The Steering Committee will consist of an equal number of members to represent each agency with one vote per agency. When the Steering Committee cannot agree on the resolution of an issue, the issue will

be referred to NRC and FEMA management. The NRC members will have lead responsibility for licensee planning and preparedness and the FEMA members will have lead responsibility for offsite planning and preparedness. The Steering Committee will assure coordination of plans and preparedness evaluation activities and revise, as necessary, acceptance criteria for licensee, State, and local radiological emergency planning and preparedness. NRC and FEMA will then consider and adopt criteria, as appropriate, in their respective jurisdictions. (See Attachment 1.)

V. Working Arrangements

A. The normal point of contact for implementation of the points in this MOU will be the NRC/FEMA Steering Committee.

B. The Steering Committee will establish the day-to-day procedures for assuring that the arrangements of this MOU are carried out.

VI. Memorandum of Understanding

A. This MOU shall be effective as of date of signature and shall continue in effect unless terminated by either party upon 30 days notice in writing.

B. Amendments or modifications to this MOU may be made upon written agreement by both parties.

Approved for the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

Dated: April 3, 1985.

William J. Dircks,

Executive Director for Operations.

Approved for the Federal Emergency Management Agency.

Dated: April 9, 1985.

Samuel W. Speck,

Associate Director, State and Local Programs and Support.

[FR Doc. 85-9308 Filed 4-17-85; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6718-01-M

FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANK BOARD

State Savings and Loan Association; Salt Lake City, UT; Appointment of Receiver

Notice is hereby given that pursuant to the authority contained in section 406(c)(1)(B)(i)(I) of the National Housing Act, 12 U.S.C. 1729(c)(1)(B)(i)(I) (1982), the Federal Home Loan Bank Board duly appointed the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation as sole receiver for State Savings and Loan Association, Salt Lake City, Utah, on April 12, 1985.

Dated: April 15, 1985.

Jeff Sconyers,

Secretary.

[FR Doc. 85-9362 Filed 4-17-85; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6720-01-M

FEDERAL RESERVE SYSTEM

Citicorp, et al.; Applications To Engage de Novo in Permissible Nonbanking Activities; Correction

This notice corrects a previous Federal Register document (FR Doc. No. 85-6785), published at page 11561 of the issue for Friday, March 22, 1985, specifying a period for public comment concerning an application by Citicorp, New York, New York, to engage in data processing and data transmission activities. Citicorp proposes to engage in these activities world-wide. Comments on this application must be received at the Federal Reserve Bank of New York, not later than May 2, 1985.

Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, April 15, 1985.

James McAfee,

Associate Secretary of the Board.

[FR Doc. 85-9317 Filed 4-17-85; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6210-01-M

Applications To Engage de Novo in Permissible Nonbanking Activities; the Marine Corp., et al.

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