

constitutes terminating action for the requirements of paragraph A., above.

C. An alternate means of compliance or adjustment of the compliance time, which provides an acceptable level of safety, may be used when approved by the Manager, Standardization Branch, ANM-113, FAA, Northwest Mountain Region.

Note.—The request should be forwarded through an FAA Principal Maintenance Inspector (PMI), who will either concur or comment and then send it to the Manager, Standardization Branch, ANM-113.

D. Special flight permits may be issued in accordance with FAR 21.197 and 21.199 to operate airplanes to a base in order to comply with the requirements of this AD.

All persons affected by this directive who have not already received the appropriate service documents from the manufacturer, may obtain copies upon request to Garrett Auxiliary Power Division, 2739 East Washington Square, P.O. Box 5227, Phoenix, Arizona 85010. These documents may be examined at the FAA, Northwest Mountain Region, Transport Airplane Directorate, 17900 Pacific Highway South, Seattle, Washington, or the Standardization Branch, 9010 East Marginal Way South, Seattle, Washington.

This amendment revises telegraphic AD T90-11-51, issued May 18, 1990.

This amendment becomes effective July 2, 1990.

Portions of this amendment were effective earlier to all recipients of telegraphic AD 90-11-51, dated May 18, 1990.

Issued in Seattle, Washington, on June 5, 1990.

Leroy A. Keith, Manager,

Transport Airplane Directorate, Aircraft Certification Service.

[FR Doc. 90-13766 Filed 6-13-90; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910-13-M

DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT

Office of the Assistant Secretary for Housing—Federal Housing Commissioner

24 CFR Parts 201, 203, and 234

[Docket No. N-90-3089; FR-2829-N-1]

Mortgage Insurance; Changes to Maximum Mortgage Limits for Single Family Residences, Condominiums and Manufactured Homes and Lots; and Corrections

AGENCY: Office of the Assistant Secretary for Housing—Federal Housing Commissioner, HUD.

ACTION: Notice of revisions to FHA maximum mortgage limits for high-cost areas and corrections.

SUMMARY: This Notice amends the list of areas eligible for "high-cost" mortgage limits under certain of HUD's insuring authorities under the National Housing Act by increasing the mortgage limits in Chittenden and Addison Counties, Vermont; Belknap County, New Hampshire; St. Thomas, U.S. Virgin Islands; St. Mary's County, Maryland; Montgomery, Fauquier, King George, Frederick Counties, Virginia and the City of Winchester, Virginia; Henderson County, North Carolina; the Elkhart-Goshen, IN MSA; Allen County, Indiana; and Clackamas and Washington Counties, Oregon; and adding "high-cost" mortgage limits for Sullivan County, New Hampshire; Lamoille County, Vermont; St. John, U.S. Virgin Islands; the State College, PA MSA; the Jackson, TN MSA; DeKalb County, Illinois; Ector County, Texas; the Las Cruces, NM MSA; and Santa Cruz and Yavapai Counties, Arizona. Mortgage limits are adjusted in an area when the Secretary determines that middle- and moderate-income persons have limited housing opportunities because of high prevailing housing sales prices.

This notice will also correct several typographical errors found in the March 8, 1990, (55 FR 8464) correction notice.

EFFECTIVE DATE: June 14, 1990.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: For single family: Morris Carter, Director, Single Family Development Division, Room 9272; telephone (202) 708-2700. For manufactured homes: Robert J. Coyle, Director, Title I Insurance Division, Room 9160; telephone (202) 708-2880; 451 Seventh Street SW., Washington, DC 20410. (These are not toll-free numbers.)

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

The National Housing Act (NHA), 12 U.S.C. (1710-1749), authorizes HUD to insure mortgages for single family residences (from one- to four-family structures), condominiums, manufactured homes, manufactured home lots, and combination manufactured homes and lots. The NHA, as amended by the Housing and Community Development Amendments of 1980 and the Housing and Community Development Amendments of 1981, permits HUD to increase the maximum mortgage limits under most of these programs to reflect regional differences in the cost of housing. In addition, sections 2(b) and 214 of the NHA provide for special high-cost limits for

insured mortgages in Alaska, Guam and Hawaii.

The last comprehensive list of high-cost areas was published on January 12, 1990 (55 FR 1312) listing all areas eligible for "high-cost" mortgage limits under certain of HUD's insuring authorities under the National Housing Act, and the applicable limits for each area.

Currently, the National Housing Act provides that HUD can grant mortgage insurance for a one-family dwelling in a high-cost area up to a maximum of \$101,250 (150% of the medium one-family dwelling mortgage limit). The basic Law remains unchanged. For fiscal year 1990, the Departments of Veterans Affairs and Housing and Urban Development Appropriation Act (Pub. L. 101-144) has permitted HUD to insure high-cost area mortgages up to 185% of the base statutory mortgage insurance limits provided for in the NHA (\$124,875 in the case of a one-family dwelling). Hence, published limits in this Notice in excess of 150% of the statutory limits will not be effective after September 30, 1990 unless the Congress extends the fiscal year 1990 increase, except for mortgages insured under Title II of the NHA:

- (1) Pursuant to a conditional commitment or master conditional commitment issued by HUD on or before September 30, 1990; or
- (2) Pursuant to an appraisal report or master appraisal report signed by a Direct Endorsement underwriter on or before September 30, 1990; or
- (3) Pursuant to a certificate of reasonable value or master certificate of reasonable value issued by the Department of Veterans Affairs on or before September 30, 1990.

For Title I loans, the published limits in this Notice will not apply to any loans and advances of credit, or purchases of obligations and advances of credit, made after September 30, 1990.

Since the statutory change is temporary in nature, HUD will not amend its regulations to conform them to the increase to 185% of the basic mortgage limit in high-cost areas for fiscal year 1990. The current regulations, which limit insurance coverage to 150% of the base amount in high-cost areas, will be waived in those areas listed in this Notice, where local cost data supports a limit in excess of 150%.

This Document

Today's document increases high-cost mortgage amounts for Chittenden and Addison Counties, Vermont; Belknap County, New Hampshire; St. Thomas, U.S. Virgin Islands; St. Mary's County, Maryland; Montgomery, Fauquier, King George, Frederick Counties, Virginia

and the City of Winchester, Virginia; Henderson County, North Carolina; the Elkhart-Goshen, IN MSA; Allen County, Indiana; and Clackamas and Washington Counties, Oregon; and adds "high-cost" mortgage limits for Sullivan County, New Hampshire; Lamoille County, Vermont; St. John, U.S. Virgin Islands; the State College, PA MSA; the Jackson, TN MSA; DeKalb County, Illinois; Ector County, Texas; the Las Cruces, NM MSA; and Santa Cruz and Yavapai Counties, Arizona. Mortgage limits are adjusted in an area when the Secretary determines that middle- and moderate-income persons have limited housing opportunities because of high prevailing housing sales prices.

This document also corrects several typographical errors found in the March 8, 1990 (55 FR 8464) publication. Specifically, the mortgage limits for a one-family dwelling for York County, VA should be \$113,000 instead of \$13,000, and it should be Moore County, NC instead of Monroe County, NC.

These amendments appear in two parts. Part I explains high-cost limits for mortgages insured under Title I of the National Housing Act. Part II lists each high-cost area, with applicable limits for single family residences (including condominiums) insured under section

203(b), 234(c) and 214 of the National Housing Act.

List of Subjects

24 CFR Part 201

Health facilities, Historic preservation, Home improvement, Loan programs—housing and community development, Manufactured homes, Reporting and recordkeeping requirements.

24 CFR Part 203

Hawaiian natives, Indians: lands, Home improvement, Loan programs—housing and community development, Mortgage insurance, Reporting and recordkeeping requirements, Solar energy.

24 CFR Part 234

Condominiums, Mortgage insurance, Reporting and recordkeeping requirements.

Accordingly, the Department publishes the revised dollar limitations as follows:

National Housing Act High Cost Mortgage Limits

I. Title I: Method of Computing Limits

A. Section 2(b)(1)(D). Combination manufactured home and lot (excluding Alaska, Guam and Hawaii): To

determine the high-cost limit for a combination manufactured home and lot loan, multiply the dollar amount in the "one family" column of part II of this list by .80. For example, Sullivan County, NH, has a one-family limit of \$87,850. The combination home and lot loan limit is $\$87,850 \times .80$, or \$70,280.

B. Section 2(b)(1)(E): Lot only (excluding Alaska, Guam and Hawaii): To determine the high-cost limit for a lot loan, multiply the dollar amount in the "one-family" column of part II of this list by .20. For example, Sullivan County, NH, has a one-family limit of \$87,850. The lot-only loan limit for Sullivan County, NH is $\$87,850 \times .20$, or \$17,570.

C. Section 2(b)(2). Alaska, Guam and Hawaii limits: The maximum dollar limits for Alaska, Guam and Hawaii may be 140% of the statutory loan limits set out in section 2(b)(1).

Accordingly, the dollar limits for Alaska, Guam and Hawaii are as follows:

1. For manufactured homes: \$56,700. ($\$40,500 \times 140\%$).
2. For combination manufactured homes and lots: \$75,600. ($\$54,000 \times 140\%$).
3. For lots only: \$18,900. ($\$13,500 \times 140\%$).

II. Title II: Updating of FHA Sections 203(b), 234(c) and 214 Area Wide Mortgage Limits

REGION I—HUD FIELD OFFICE—MANCHESTER OFFICE

Market area designation and local jurisdictions	1-family and condo unit	2-family	3-family	4-family
Sullivan County, NH	\$87,850	\$98,950	\$120,250	\$138,750
Belknap County	104,500	117,700	143,000	165,000

HUD FIELD OFFICE—BURLINGTON OFFICE

Market area designation and local jurisdictions	1-family and condo unit	2-family	3-family	4-family
Addison County, VT	\$89,200	\$100,450	\$122,050	\$140,850
Chittenden County	120,650	135,850	165,100	190,500
Lamoille County	80,750	90,950	110,500	127,500

REGION III—HUD FIELD OFFICE—PHILADELPHIA OFFICE

Market area designation and local jurisdictions	1-family and condo unit	2-family	3-family	4-family
State College, PA MSA Centre County	\$87,850	\$98,950	\$120,250	\$138,750

HUD FIELD OFFICE—BALTIMORE OFFICE

Market area designation and local jurisdictions	1-family and condo unit	2-family	3-family	4-family
St. Mary's County, MD	\$104,500	\$117,700	\$143,000	\$165,000

HUD FIELD OFFICE—RICHMOND OFFICE

Market area designation and local jurisdictions	1-family and condo unit	2-family	3-family	4-family
Frederick County/Winchester City, VA.....	\$92,150	\$103,750	\$126,100	\$145,500
Fauquier County.....	124,875	140,600	170,200	197,950
King George County.....	89,300	100,550	122,200	141,000
Montgomery County.....	74,550	83,950	102,050	117,750
York County.....	113,050	127,300	154,700	178,500

REGION IV.—HUD FIELD OFFICE—GREENSBORO OFFICE

Market area designation and local jurisdictions	1-family and condo unit	2-family	3-family	4-family
Henderson, County, NC.....	\$80,750	\$90,950	\$110,500	\$127,500
Moore County.....	93,100	104,850	127,400	147,000

HUD FIELD OFFICE—CARIBBEAN OFFICE

Market area designation and local jurisdictions	1-family and condo unit	2-family	3-family	4-family
St. Thomas, US VI.....	\$124,875	\$140,600	\$170,200	\$197,950
St. John, US VI.....				

HUD FIELD OFFICE—MEMPHIS OFFICE

Market area designation and local jurisdictions	1-family and condo unit	2-family	3-family	4-family
Jackson, TN MSA Madison County.....	\$77,750	\$87,600	\$106,400	\$122,800

REGION V—HUD FIELD OFFICE—CHICAGO OFFICE

Market area designation and local jurisdictions	1-family and condo unit	2-family	3-family	4-family
De Kalb County, IL.....	\$77,400	\$87,200	\$105,950	\$122,250

HUD FIELD OFFICE—INDIANAPOLIS OFFICE

Market area designation and local jurisdictions	1-family and condo unit	2-family	3-family	4-family
Elkhart-Goshen, IN—MSA: Elkhart County.....	\$80,250	\$90,400	\$109,850	\$126,750
Allen County, IN.....	79,650	89,700	109,000	125,750

REGION VI—HUD FIELD OFFICE—LUBBOCK OFFICE

Market area designation and local jurisdictions	1-family and condo unit	2-family	3-family	4-family
Ector County, TX.....	\$71,450	\$80,500	\$97,800	\$112,850

HUD FIELD OFFICE—ALBUQUERQUE

Market area designation and local jurisdictions	1-family and condo unit	2-family	3-family	4-family
Las Cruces, NM—MSA: Dona Ana County.....	\$74,200	\$83,600	\$101,550	\$117,200

REGION IX—HUD FIELD OFFICE—PHOENIX

Market area designation and local jurisdictions	1-family and condo unit	2-family	3-family	4-family
Yavapai County, AZ.....	\$87,400	\$98,400	\$119,600	\$138,000

HUD FIELD OFFICE—TUCSON

Market area designation and local jurisdictions	1-family and condo unit	2-family	3-family	4-family
Santa Cruz County, AZ.....	\$69,350	\$78,100	\$94,900	\$109,500

REGION X—HUD FIELD OFFICE—PORTLAND

Market area designation and local jurisdictions	1-family and condo unit	2-family	3-family	4-family
Clackamas County, OR.....	\$113,050	\$127,300	\$154,700	\$178,500
Washington County.....	106,600	120,050	145,850	168,300

Dated: June 6, 1990.

James E. Schoenberger,

Associate General, Deputy Assistant
Secretary for Housing—Federal Housing
Commissioner.

[FR Doc. 90-13844 Filed 6-13-90; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4210-27-M

EQUAL EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY COMMISSION

29 CFR Part 1627

Congressional Action Concerning the Commission's Final Rule Allowing for Non-EEOC Supervised Waivers Under the Age Discrimination in Employment Act (ADEA)

AGENCY: Equal Employment Opportunity
Commission.

SUMMARY: On July 30, 1987 the Equal
Employment Opportunity Commission
voted to approve a final rule creating a
legislative regulation and administrative
exemption allowing for non-EEOC
supervised waivers of private rights
under the Age Discrimination in
Employment Act (under section 9 of the
ADEA and 29 CFR 1627.15). This final
rule was published in the *Federal
Register* of Thursday, August 27, 1987
(52 FR 32293).

On November 21, 1989 the President
signed Public Law 101-162
(appropriations for fiscal year 1990)
which includes the following language:

Provided, That the final rule regarding
unsupervised waivers under the Age
Discrimination in Employment Act, issued by
the Commission on August 27, 1987 (29 CFR
1627.16(c) (1)-(3)), shall not have effect during
fiscal year 1990; Provided further, That none
of the funds may be obligated or expended by
the Commission to give effect to any policy or

practice pertaining to unsupervised waivers
under the Age Discrimination in Employment
Act, except that this proviso shall not
preclude the Commission from investigating
or processing claims of age discrimination,
and pursuing appropriate relief in Federal
court, regardless of whether an unsupervised
waiver of rights has been sought or signed.

EFFECTIVE DATE: November 21, 1989.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:
John K. Light, Attorney-Advisor, ADEA
Division, Coordination and Guidance
Services, Office of Legal Counsel, Equal
Employment Opportunity Commission,
1801 L Street, NW., Washington, DC,
20507, (202) 663-4690.

Signed this 5th day of May 1990 at
Washington, DC

For the Commission.

Evan J. Kemp, Jr.,

Chairman, Equal Employment Opportunity
Commission.

[FR Doc. 90-13813 Filed 6-13-90; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6570-06-M

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Coast Guard

33 CFR Part 100

[CGD 05-90-28]

Special Local Regulations for Marine Events; National Flag Day Fireworks Display; Fort McHenry, Baltimore, MD

AGENCY: Coast Guard, DOT.

ACTION: Final rule.

SUMMARY: Special local regulations are
being adopted for the National Flag Day
fireworks display. The fireworks will be
launched from a barge anchored
approximately 120 yards northeast of

Fort McHenry Range Front Light (LLNR
7550), Patapsco River, East Channel,
Baltimore, Maryland. These regulations
are necessary to control spectator craft
and to provide for the safety of life and
property on navigable waters during the
event.

EFFECTIVE DATE: These regulations are
effective from 6 p.m. to 11:30 p.m., June
14, 1990.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:
Mr. Stephen L. Phillips, Chief, Boating
Affairs Branch, Boating Safety Division,
Fifth Coast Guard District, 431 Crawford
Street, Portsmouth, Virginia 23704-5004,
(804) 398-6204.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: In
accordance with 5 U.S.C. 553, a notice of
proposed rulemaking has not been
published for these regulations and good
cause exists for making them effective in
less than 30 days from the date of
publication. Adherence to normal
rulemaking procedures would not have
been possible. Specifically, the
sponsor's application to hold the event
was not received until May 30, 1990,
leaving insufficient time to publish a
notice of proposed rulemaking in
advance of the event.

Drafting Information

The drafters of this notice are QM1
Kevin R. Connors, project officer,
Boating Affairs Branch, Fifth Coast
Guard District, and Captain Michael K.
Cain, project attorney, Fifth Coast
Guard District Legal Staff.

Discussion of Regulations

The National Flag Day Foundation,
Inc. submitted an application dated May
9, 1990 to hold a fireworks display on
June 14, 1990. The fireworks will be

launched from a barge anchored approximately 120 yards northeast of Fort McHenry Range Front Light (LLNR 7550), Patapsco River, East Channel, Baltimore, Maryland. These regulations are necessary to control spectator craft and to provide for the safety of life and property on navigable waters during the event. A portion of the East Channel will be closed during the fireworks displays. Since the main shipping channel will not be closed for an extended period, commercial traffic should not be severely disrupted.

Economic Assessment and Certification

These regulations are not considered either major under Executive Order 12291 on Federal Regulation or significant under Department of Transportation regulatory policies and procedures (44 FR 11034; February 26, 1979). The economic impact is expected to be so minimal that a full regulatory evaluation is unnecessary. Because of this minimal impact, the Coast Guard certifies that these regulations will not have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities.

Federalism Assessment

This action has been analyzed in accordance with the principles and criteria contained in Executive Order 12612, and it has been determined that the final rule does not raise sufficient federalism implications to warrant the preparation of a Federalism Assessment.

Environmental Impact

This final rule has been thoroughly reviewed by the Coast Guard and has been determined to be categorically excluded from further environmental documentation in accordance with section 2.B.2.c of Commandant Instruction M16475.1B. A Categorical Exclusion Determination statement has been prepared and has been placed in permanent regulations 33 CFR 100.515 rulemaking docket.

List of Subjects in 33 CFR Part 100

Marine safety, Navigation (water).

Final Regulations

In consideration of the foregoing, part 100 of title 33, Code of Federal Regulations is amended as follows:

1. The authority citation for part 100 continues to read as follows:

Authority: 33 U.S.C. 1233; 49 CFR 1.46 and 33 CFR 100.35.

2. A temporary § 100.35-0528 is added to read as follows:

§ 100.35-0528 Patapsco River, East Channel, Fort McHenry, Baltimore, Maryland.

(a) *Definitions.*—(1) *Regulated area.* The waters of the Patapsco River bounded by the arc of a circle with a radius of 600 feet and with its center located at latitude 30°15'52.0" North, longitude 76°34'36.0" West.

(2) *Coast Guard Patrol Commander.* The Coast Guard Patrol Commander is a commissioned, warrant, or petty officer who has been designated by the Commander, Coast Guard Group Baltimore.

(b) *Special Local Regulations.* (1) Except for persons or vessels authorized by the Coast Guard Patrol Commander, no person or vessel may enter or remain in the regulated area.

(2) The operator of any vessel in the immediate vicinity of this area shall:

(i) Stop the vessel immediately when directed to do so by any commissioned, warrant, or petty officer on board a vessel displaying a Coast Guard ensign.

(ii) Proceed as directed by any commissioned, warrant or petty officer on board a vessel displaying a Coast Guard ensign.

(3) Any spectator vessel may anchor outside of the regulated area specified in paragraph (a)(1) of these regulations, but may not block a navigable channel.

(c) *Effective Dates:* These regulations are effective from 6 p.m. to 11:30 p.m., June 14, 1990.

Dated: June 8, 1990.

P.A. Welling,

Rear Admiral, U.S. Coast Guard, Commander, Fifth Coast Guard District.

[FR Doc. 90-13850 Filed 6-13-90; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910-14-M

33 CFR Part 100

[CGD 05-90-27]

Special Local Regulations for Marine Events; Independence Day Celebration, Delaware River, Marcus Hook, Pennsylvania

AGENCY: Coast Guard, DOT.

ACTION: Final rule.

SUMMARY: Special local regulations are being adopted for a fireworks display on the Delaware River, Marcus Hook, Pennsylvania. The display will be launched from a barge moored at the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers Pier on July 3, 1990. These special local regulations are necessary to control spectator craft and to provide for the safety of life and property on the navigable waters during the event.

EFFECTIVE DATE: These regulations are effective from 8 p.m. to 11:45 p.m., July 3, 1990. If inclement weather causes the postponement of the event, the regulations are effective from 8 p.m. to 11:45 p.m. July 5, 1990.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Mr. Stephen L. Phillips, Chief, Boating Affairs Branch, Boating Safety Division, Fifth Coast Guard District, 431 Crawford Street, Portsmouth, Virginia 23704-5004 (804) 398-6204.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: In accordance with 5 U.S.C. 553, a notice of proposed rulemaking has not been published for these regulations and good cause exists for making them effective in less than 30 days from the date of publication. Adherence to normal rulemaking procedures would not have been possible. Specifically, the sponsor's application to hold the event was not received in the district office until May 22, 1990, leaving insufficient time to publish a notice of proposed rulemaking in advance of the event.

Drafting Information

The drafters of this notice are QM1 Kevin R. Connors, project officer, Boating Affairs Branch, Fifth Coast Guard District, and Captain Michael K. Cain, project attorney, Fifth Coast Guard District Legal Staff.

Discussion of Regulations

The Borough of Marcus Hook, Marcus Hook, Pennsylvania has submitted an application to launch a fireworks display from a barge moored to the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers Pier, Delaware River, Marcus Hook, Pennsylvania. A portion of the Delaware River between the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers Pier and Marcus Hook Range Lighted Buoy 9M will be closed to waterborne traffic during the display.

Economic Assessment and Certification

These regulations are not considered major under Executive Order 12291 on Federal Regulation nor significant under Department of Transportation regulatory policies and procedures (44 FR 11034; February 26, 1979). The economic impact is expected to be so minimal that a full regulatory evaluation is unnecessary. Because of this minimal impact, the Coast Guard certifies that these regulations will not have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities.

Federalism Assessment

This Action has been analyzed in accordance with the principles and criteria contained in Executive Order 12612, and it has been determined that