

7. Section 17(d) and rule 17d-1 generally prohibit a registered investment company's joint or joint and several participation with an affiliated person in a transaction in connection with any joint enterprise or other joint arrangement without SEC approval. Under the Plan, participating directors will not receive a benefit that otherwise would inure to a Fund or its shareholders. Deferral of a director's fees in accordance with the Plan would essentially maintain the parties, viewed both separately and in their relationship to one another, in the same position (apart from tax effects) as would occur if the fees were paid on a current basis and then invested by the director directly in Designated Shares.

Applicants' Conditions

Applicants agree that the order granting the requested relief shall be subject to the following conditions:

1. With respect to the requested relief from rule 2a-7, any money market Fund that values its assets by the amortized cost method will buy and hold Designated Shares that determine the performance of Deferral Accounts to achieve an exact match between the liability of such Fund to pay Compensation Deferrals and the assets that offset that liability.

2. If a Fund purchases Designated Shares issued by an affiliated Fund, the Fund will vote such shares in proportion to the votes of all other holders of shares of such affiliated Fund.

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

Margaret H. McFarland,
Deputy Secretary.

[FR Doc. 95-13079 Filed 5-26-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 8010-01-M

SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION

[Declaration of Disaster Loan Area #2775 Amendment #1]

Louisiana; Declaration of Disaster Loan Area

The above-numbered Declaration is hereby amended, effective May 17, 1995, to establish the incident period for this disaster as beginning on May 8, 1995 and continuing through May 16, 1995.

All other information remains the same i.e., the termination date for filing applications for physical damage is July 10, 1995, and for loans for economic injury the deadline is February 12, 1996. (Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance Program Nos. 59002 and 59008.)

Dated: May 22, 1995.

Bernard Kulik,

Associate Administrator for Disaster Assistance.

[FR Doc. 95-13099 Filed 5-26-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 8025-01-M

[Declaration of Disaster Loan Area #2776; Amendment #1]

Mississippi; Declaration of Disaster Loan Area

The above-numbered Declaration is hereby amended, effective May 19, 1995, to include Jackson County, Mississippi as a disaster area due to damages caused by severe storms, tornadoes, and flooding. In addition, effective May 17, 1995, the declaration is amended to establish the incident period for this disaster as beginning on May 8, 1995 and continuing through May 17, 1995.

In addition, applications for economic injury loans from small businesses located in the contiguous counties of George in the State of Mississippi, and Mobile in the State of Alabama may be filed until the specified date at the previously designated location.

All other information remains the same, i.e., termination date for filing applications for physical damage is July 10, 1995, and for loans for economic injury the deadline is February 12, 1996.

The economic injury number for the State of Alabama is 852900.

(Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance Program Nos. 59002 and 59008.)

Dated: May 22, 1995.

Bernard Kulik,

Associate Administrator for Disaster Assistance.

[FR Doc. 95-13098 Filed 5-26-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 8025-01-M

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

[Public Notice 2213]

United States International Telecommunications Advisory Committee (ITAC): Study Group B; Meeting Notice

The Department of State announces that the United States International Telecommunications Advisory Committee (ITAC), Study Group B Group will meet on Thursday, June 22, 1995 at 9:30 a.m., Room 1912 of the Department of State.

The Agenda for Study Group B will include a review of the results of the ITU-T Study Group 11 meeting (May 1995) as well as the results of the June Study Group 9 meeting. Consideration

of contributions to upcoming meetings of ITU-T Study Group 13 in July, 1995 and the ITU-T Study Group 10 meeting, in September of 1995 will also be considered on the agenda of this meeting. Other matters within the purview of Study Group B may be raised at the meeting. Persons presenting contributions to the meeting of Study Group B should bring 35 copies to the meeting.

Members of the General Public may attend the meetings and join in the discussions, subject to the instructions of the chair. Admittance of public members will be limited to the seating available. In this regard, entrance to the Department of State is controlled. If you are not presently named on the mailing list of the Telecommunications Standardization Sector Study Group, and wish to attend please call 202-647-0201 not later than 5 days before the scheduled meetings. Enter from the "C" Street Main Lobby. One of the following valid photo ID's will be required for admittance: U.S. driver's license with picture, U.S. passport, U.S. Government ID (company ID's are no longer accepted by Diplomatic Security).

Dated: May 16, 1995.

Earl S. Barbely,

Chairman, U.S. ITAC for Telecommunication Standardization.

[FR Doc. 95-13058 Filed 5-26-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4710-45-M

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Federal Aviation Administration

Airborne Windshear Warning and Escape Guidance Systems for Transport Airplanes

AGENCY: Federal Aviation Administration, DOD.

ACTION: Notice of availability.

SUMMARY: This notice announces the availability of and requests comments on a proposed technical standard order (TSO) pertaining to airborne windshear warning and escape guidance systems for transport airplanes. The proposed TSO prescribes the minimum performance standards that airborne windshear warning and escape guidance systems for transport airplanes must meet to be identified with the marking "TSO-C117a."

DATES: Comments must identify the TSO file number and be received on or before August 31, 1995.

ADDRESSES: Send all comments on the proposed technical standard order to: Technical Analysis Branch, AIR-120,

Aircraft Engineering Division, Aircraft Certification Service—File No. TSO–C117a, Federal Aviation Administration (FAA), 800 Independence Avenue, SW., Washington, DC 20591. Or deliver comments to: Federal Aviation Administration, Room 804, 800 Independence Avenue, SW., Washington, DC 20591.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Ms. Bobbie J. Smith, Technical Programs and Continued Airworthiness Branch, AIR–120, Aircraft Engineering Division, Aircraft Certification Service, Federal Aviation Administration, 800 Independence Avenue, SW., Washington, DC 20591, Telephone (202) 267–9546.

Comments Invited

Interested persons are invited to comment on the proposed TSO listed in this notice by submitting such written data, views, or arguments as they desire to the above specified address. Comments received on the proposed technical standard order may be examined, before and after the comment closing date, in Room 804, FAA Headquarters Building (FOB–10A), 800 Independence Avenue, SW., Washington, DC 20591, weekdays except Federal holidays, between 8:30 a.m., and 4:30 p.m. All communications received on or before the closing date for comments specified above will be considered by the Director of the Aircraft Certification Service before issuing the final TSO.

Background

Revised TSO–C117a, Airborne Windshear Warning and Escape Guidance Systems for Transport Airplanes, requires the applicant to show by analysis, or other suitable means, that the system threshold is above a point at which nuisance warnings would be objectionable under conditions of severe turbulence, or aircraft change of configuration, i.e. flaps and/or gear retraction. If electronics techniques are used to reduce nuisance warnings by turbulence or aircraft configuration change, it must be shown that the system response to windshear detection is acceptable.

A Douglas DC–9–31 airplane crashed while executing a missed-approach following an instrument landing system approach. The NTSB report identifies the probable contriving factor for the missed-detection of the presence of a wind shear in the flight path was a warning delay designed into the wind shear detection system. This delay of warning was designed to reduce nuisance warnings from severe

turbulence or aircraft configuration change, i.e., change of flap setting. This TSO revision will require test to demonstrate that wind shear detection is within acceptable limits.

How To Obtain Copies

A copy of the proposed TSO–C117a may be obtained by contacting the individual listed under “**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT.**”

Issued in Washington, DC, on May 23, 1995.

John K. McGrath,

Manager, Aircraft Engineering Division, Aircraft Certification Service.

[FR Doc. 95–13132 Filed 5–26–95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–13–M

National Highway Traffic Safety Administration

[Docket No. 95–44; Notice 1]

Receipt of Petition for Decision That Nonconforming 1989 Honda Civic DX Hatchback Passenger Cars Are Eligible for Importation

AGENCY: National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, DOT.

ACTION: Notice of receipt of petition for decision that nonconforming 1989 Honda Civic DX Hatchback passenger cars 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 1989 Honda Civic DX Hatchback that was not originally manufactured to comply with all applicable Federal motor vehicle safety standards is eligible for importation into the United States because (1) it is substantially similar to a vehicle that was originally manufactured for importation into and sale in the United States and that was certified by its manufacturer as complying with the safety standards, and (2) it is capable of being readily altered to conform to the standards.

DATE: The closing date for comments on the petition is June 29, 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 St., SW., Washington, DC 20590. [Docket hours are from 9:30 am to 4 pm]

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: George Entwistle, 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.

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 persons an opportunity to comment on the petition. At the close of the comment 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**.

J.K. Motors of Kingsville, Maryland (“J.K.”) (Registered Importer 90–006) has petitioned NHTSA to decide whether 1989 Honda Civic DX Hatchback passenger cars are eligible for importation into the United States. The vehicle which J.K. believes is substantially similar is the 1989 Honda Civic DX Hatchback that was manufactured for importation into, and sale in, the United States and certified by its manufacturer as conforming to all applicable Federal motor vehicle safety standards.

The petitioner claims that it carefully compared the non-U.S. certified 1989 Honda Civic DX Hatchback to its U.S. certified counterpart, and found the two vehicles to be substantially similar with respect to compliance with most Federal motor vehicle safety standards.

J.K. submitted information with its petition intended to demonstrate that the non-U.S. certified 1989 Honda Civic DX Hatchback, as originally manufactured, conforms to many Federal motor vehicle safety standards in the same manner as its U.S. certified counterpart, or is capable of being