

(v) This paragraph (h)(2) expires on September 23, 1996, unless a **Federal Register** notice extending its effectiveness is published prior to this expiration date.

\* \* \* \* \*

Dated: December 27, 1994.

**Nicolas P. Retsinas,**  
*Assistant Secretary for Housing—Federal Housing Commissioner.*  
 [FR Doc. 95-4366 Filed 2-22-95; 8:45 am]  
 BILLING CODE 4210-27-P

**Office of the Assistant Secretary for Community Planning and Development**

**24 CFR Part 597**

[Docket No. R-95-1702; FR-3580-N-06]

RIN 2506-AB65

**Notice of Designation of Empowerment Zones and Enterprise Communities**

**AGENCY:** Office of the Assistant Secretary for Community Planning and Development, HUD.

**ACTION:** Notice of designation of Empowerment Zones and Enterprise Communities.

**SUMMARY:** On January 18, 1994, HUD published an interim rule that implemented that portion of Subchapter C, Part I (Empowerment Zones, Enterprise Communities and Rural Development Investment Areas) of Title XIII of the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1993 dealing with the designation of urban Empowerment Zones and Enterprise Communities. On January 18, 1994, HUD also published a notice inviting applications for designation of Empowerment Zones and Enterprise Communities.

This notice announces the jurisdictions that were designated urban Empowerment Zones and Enterprise Communities by HUD. This notice also announces the designation of two Supplemental Empowerment Zones and four Enhanced Enterprise Communities.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Michael T. Savage, Deputy Director, Office of Economic Development, Room 7136, Department of Housing and Urban Development, 451 Seventh Street SW., Washington, DC 20410, telephone (202) 708-2290; TDD (202) 708-2565. (These are not toll-free numbers.)

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** On January 18, 1994 (59 FR 2790), HUD published an interim rule that implemented that portion of Subchapter C, Part I (Empowerment Zones, Enterprise Communities and Rural Development Investment Areas) of Title

XIII of the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1993 which addresses the designation of urban Empowerment Zones and Enterprise Communities. This interim rule was made final by a final rule published on January 12, 1995 (60 FR 3034).

Title XIII also provides for the designation of rural Empowerment Zones and Enterprise Communities. As noted in the January 18, 1994 interim rule, the urban part of the program is administered by HUD as a Federal-State-local partnership. The rural part of the program is administered by the Department of Agriculture, which also published an interim rule on January 18, 1994 (59 FR 2686).

On January 18, 1994 (59 FR 2711), in addition to publication of the interim rule, HUD published a notice inviting applications from States and local governments for nomination of urban areas as Empowerment Zones and Enterprise Communities. The January 18, 1994 notice provided for an application deadline of June 30, 1994. HUD carefully considered all applications, and on December 21, 1994, President Clinton announced the urban areas that were designated by HUD as Empowerment Zones and Enterprise Communities, and the rural areas that were designated by the Department of Agriculture as rural Empowerment Zones and Enterprise Communities.

On that date, President Clinton announced the designation of two Supplemental Empowerment Zones and four Enhanced Enterprise Communities that will receive HUD economic development grants. The Supplemental Empowerment Zone and Enhanced Enterprise Community grants are provided under HUD's economic development initiative (EDI), which enables communities to provide financing for economic development, housing rehabilitation, and essential development projects.

Appendix A to this notice announces the urban areas that were designated urban Empowerment Zones and Enterprise Communities by HUD. Appendix A to this notice also announces the two Supplemental Empowerment Zones and the four Enhanced Enterprise Communities.

Dated: February 10, 1995.

**Andrew Cuomo,**  
*Assistant Secretary for Community Planning and Development.*

**EMPOWERMENT ZONE, SUPPLEMENTAL EMPOWERMENT ZONE, ENHANCED ENTERPRISE COMMUNITY AND ENTERPRISE COMMUNITY DESIGNEES**

State	City
Alabama EC .....	Birmingham.
Arizona EC .....	Phoenix.
Arkansas EC .....	Pulaski County.
California SEZ .....	Los Angeles City & County.
California EEC .....	Oakland.
California EC .....	Los Angeles/Huntington Park.
Do .....	San Diego.
Do .....	San Francisco/Bayview/Hunters Point.
Colorado EC .....	Denver City & County.
Connecticut EC .....	Bridgeport.
Do .....	New Haven.
Delaware EC .....	Wilmington, New Castle Co.
District EC .....	District of Columbia.
Florida EC .....	Dade County, Miami.
Do .....	Tampa.
Georgia EZ .....	Atlanta.
Georgia EC .....	Albany.
Illinois EZ .....	Chicago.
Illinois EC .....	East St. Louis.
Do .....	Springfield.
Indiana EC .....	Indianapolis.
Iowa EC .....	Des Moines.
Kentucky EC .....	Louisville.
Louisiana EC .....	New Orleans.
Do .....	Ouachita Parish.
Maryland EZ .....	Baltimore.
Massachusetts EEC ..	Boston.
Massachusetts EC ...	Lowell.
Do .....	Springfield.
Michigan EZ .....	Detroit.
Michigan EC .....	Flint.
Do .....	Muskegon.
Minnesota EC .....	Minneapolis.
Do .....	St. Paul.
Mississippi EC .....	Jackson.
Missouri EEC .....	Kansas City (Mo and Kans).
Missouri EC .....	St. Louis, St. Louis County, Wellston.
Nebraska EC .....	Omaha.
Nevada EC .....	Clarke County/Las Vegas.
New Hampshire EC ..	Manchester.
New Jersey EC .....	Newark.
New Mexico EC .....	Albuquerque.
New York EZ .....	New York, Bronx County.
New York EC .....	Albany.
Do .....	Buffalo.
Do .....	Newburgh/Kingston.
Do .....	Rochester.
No. Carolina EC .....	Charlotte.
Ohio SEZ .....	Cleveland.
Ohio EC .....	Akron.
Do .....	Columbus.
Oklahoma EC .....	Oklahoma City.
Oregon EC .....	Portland.

EMPOWERMENT ZONE, SUPPLEMENTAL EMPOWERMENT ZONE, ENHANCED ENTERPRISE COMMUNITY AND ENTERPRISE COMMUNITY DESIGNEES—Continued

State	City
Pennsylvania EZ .....	Philadelphia, Camden N.J.
Pennsylvania EC .....	Harrisburg.
Do .....	Pittsburgh & Allegheny Co.
Rhode Island EC .....	Providence.
So. Carolina EC .....	Charleston.
Tennessee EC .....	Memphis.
Do .....	Nashville.
Texas EEC .....	Houston.
Texas EC .....	Dallas.
Do .....	El Paso.
Do .....	San Antonio.
Do .....	Waco.
Utah EC .....	Ogden.
Vermont EC .....	Burlington.
Virginia EC .....	Norfolk.
Washington EC .....	Seattle.
Do .....	Tacoma.
West Virginia EC .....	Huntington.
Wisconsin EC .....	Milwaukee.

[FR Doc. 95-4365 Filed 2-22-95; 8:45 am] BILLING CODE 4210-29-P

DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY

Fiscal Service

31 CFR Part 351

Offering of United States Savings Bonds, Series EE

CFR Correction

In title 31 of the Code of Federal Regulations, part 200 to end, revised as of July 1, 1994, on page 265, § 351.2 (e)(1) is corrected to read as follows:

§ 351.2 Description of bonds.

\* \* \* \* \*

(e) \* \* \*

(1) *Guaranteed minimum investment yield.* The guaranteed minimum investment yield of a bond from its issue date to each semiannual interest accrual date occurring on or after 5 years from issue up to original maturity will be 7.5 percent per annum, compounded semiannually, for a bond bearing an issue date of November 1, 1982, through October 1, 1986, and 6 percent per annum, compounded semiannually, for a bond bearing an issue date of November 1, 1986, through February 1, 1993; and, 4 percent per annum, compounded semiannually, for a bond bearing an issue date of March 1, 1993, or thereafter. Interest that accrues on a Series EE bond becomes

part of its redemption value and is paid, as set out in § 351.2 (h).

BILLING CODE 1505-01-D

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Coast Guard

33 CFR Part 110

[CGD05-94-088]

RIN 2115-AA98

Anchorage Regulations Anchorage 7 off Marcus Hook; Delaware River, Southeast Side of the Channel Along Marcus Hook Range

AGENCY: Coast Guard, DOT.

ACTION: Final rule.

**SUMMARY:** This rule amends the boundaries of Anchorage 7 off Marcus Hook on the southeast side of the channel along the Marcus Hook Range of the Delaware River. It corrects the published coordinates to reflect those coordinates of the Army Corps of Engineers maintained anchorage, and clearly designates an area large enough to accommodate modern, large vessels requiring examination by public health, customs or immigration authorities.

**EFFECTIVE DATE:** March 27, 1995.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** LCDR Tom Flynn, Assistant Chief, Planning and Waterways Management Section, Fifth Coast Guard District, 431 Crawford Street, Portsmouth, VA 23704-5004, (804) 398-6285.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Drafting Information

The drafters of this notice are LCDR Tom Flynn, project officer, Aids to Navigation and Waterways Management Branch, Fifth Coast Guard District and LT Andy Norris, project attorney, Fifth Coast Guard District Legal Staff.

Regulatory History

On November 8, 1994, the Coast Guard published a notice of proposed rulemaking entitled Anchorage Regulations; Anchorage Grounds: Anchorage 7 off Marcus Hook; Delaware River, Southeast Side of the Channel Along Marcus Hook Range in the **Federal Register** (59 FR 55598). The comment period expired on January 9, 1995. The Coast Guard received no letters commenting on the proposal. A public hearing was not requested and one was not held.

Background and Purpose

Section 7 of the Act of March 4, 1915, as amended (33 U.S.C. 471), authorizes

the establishment of anchorage grounds for vessels in the navigable waters of the United States whenever it is apparent that such grounds are required by the maritime or commercial interests of the United States for safe navigation. A Coast Guard initiated Waterways Analysis and Management System Study (WAMS) of the Delaware River, conducted in 1989, determined that a discrepancy existed between the charted anchorage, the Army Corps of Engineers maintained anchorage, and the anchorage coordinates published in 33 CFR 110.157(a)(8). WAMS was developed to serve as the basis for a systematic analysis and management of the aids to navigation in our nation's waterways. WAMS is intended to identify the navigational needs of the users of a particular waterway, the present adequacy of the aids system in terms of those needs, and what is required in those cases where the users' needs are not being met. The WAMS process also looks into the resources—physical, financial, and personnel—needed to carry out the Aids to Navigation program responsibilities. The analyses of each waterway and the attendant resources are then integrated to provide documentation for both day to day management and future planning within the Aids to Navigation program. Anchorage 7, off Marcus Hook, as defined in 33 CFR 110.157(a)(8), does not correctly delineate the anchorage as currently maintained by the Army Corps of Engineers nor as charted by the National Ocean Service. The preferential area in this anchorage designated for the use of vessels awaiting quarantine inspection is vaguely defined and may not provide adequate room for modern, large vessels. This rule will correct those discrepancies.

Discussion of Comments and Changes

No comments were received concerning the notice of proposed rulemaking. There are no substantive differences between the proposed rule and this final rule.

Regulatory Evaluation

This final rule is not a significant regulatory action under section 3(f) of Executive Order 12866 and does not require an assessment of potential costs and benefits under section 6(a)(3) of that order. It has been exempted from review by the Office of Management and Budget under that order. It is not significant under the regulatory policies and procedures of the Department of Transportation (DOT) (44 FR 11040; February 26, 1979). The Coast Guard expects the economic impact of this