

Research Grants; 93.121, Scientist Development Awards; 93.282, Mental Health Research Service Awards for Research Training)

Dated: July 25, 1995.

Margery G. Grubb,

Senior Committee Management Specialist, NIH.

[FR Doc. 95-18853 Filed 7-28-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4140-01-M

DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT

Office of the Assistant Secretary for Housing—Federal Housing Commissioner

[Docket No. FR-3911-N-02]

Mortgagee Review Board Administrative Actions

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

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: In compliance with Section 202(c) of the National Housing Act, notice is hereby given of the cause and description of administrative actions taken by HUD's Mortgagee Review Board against HUD-approved mortgagees.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: William Heyman, Director, Office of Lender Activities and Land Sales Registration, 451 Seventh Street, S.W., Washington, D.C. 20410, telephone (202) 708-1515. The Telecommunication Device for the Deaf (TDD) number is (202) 708-4594. (These are not toll-free numbers).

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: Section 202(c)(5) of the National Housing Act (added by Section 142 of the Department of Housing and Urban Development Reform Act of 1989 (Pub. L. 101-235), approved December 15, 1989, requires that HUD "publish in the *Federal Register* a description of and the cause for administrative action against a HUD-approved mortgagee" by the Department's Mortgagee Review Board. In compliance with the requirements of Section 202(c)(5), notice is hereby given of administrative actions that have been taken by the Mortgagee Review Board from April 1, 1995 through June 30, 1995.

1. Community Lending Corporation, College Park, Maryland

Action: Probation and proposed civil money penalty in the amount of \$5,000.

Cause: Failure by the company to remit to the Department mortgage

insurance premiums collected from borrowers in connection with five HUD-FHA insured mortgage transactions; and failure to timely submit loans to HUD-FHA for mortgage insurance endorsement.

2. World Wide Credit Corporation, San Diego, California

Action: Proposed Settlement Agreement of a civil money penalty in the amount of \$1,500; indemnification for any claim losses in connection with 10 improperly originated Title I loans; and implementation of a Quality Control Plan.

Cause: A HUD monitoring review that disclosed violations of HUD-FHA Title I program requirements that included: failure to document borrower's source of funds required for loan fees and closing costs; advising borrowers that loan fees may be deducted from loan proceeds; improperly advising borrowers to obtain gift letters; and omitting the loan disbursement date on the Note.

3. Greystone Servicing Corporation, Inc., New York, New York

Action: Settlement Agreement that includes a payment to the Department in the amount of \$228,000 and assurance by the company of compliance with the requirements of the Government National Mortgage Association (GNMA).

Cause: Violation of GNMA requirements resulting from the improper termination of 57 GNMA mortgage-backed securities pools.

4. Whitehall Funding, Inc., Davenport, Iowa

Action: Settlement Agreement that includes a payment to the Department in the amount of \$75,000 and assurance by the company of compliance with the requirements of the Government National Mortgage Association (GNMA).

Cause: Violation of GNMA requirements resulting from the improper termination of 13 GNMA mortgage-backed securities pools.

5. Washington Credit Union, Lynwood, Washington

Action: Probation and proposed civil money penalty in the amount of \$10,000.

Cause: A HUD monitoring review that disclosed violations of HUD-FHA Title I property improvement loan program requirements that included: failure to comply with HUD-FHA reporting requirements under the Home Mortgage Disclosure Act (HMDA); failure to comply with dealer approval requirements; failure to report to HUD-FHA borrowers' uncompleted property

improvements; failure to resolve a borrower complaint against a dealer; failure to verify a borrower's source of funds for the required initial payment; and inaccurate completion certificates.

6. Carl I Brown & Company, Kansas City, Missouri

Action: Proposed Settlement Agreement that includes payment to the Department of \$75,000; payment of a civil money penalty in the amount of \$30,000; and corrective action by the company to assure compliance with HUD-FHA requirements.

Cause: Review by HUD's contractor of the company's single family mortgage insurance claims submissions and loan servicing procedures that disclosed violations of HUD-FHA requirements. The violations included: overpayment by HUD of expenses paid; payment for preservation and protection work not performed; overpayment for tax refunds; improperly prepared claims submissions; inadequate quality control; improper dispositions of mortgagor escrow surpluses; and inadequate servicing of defaulted loans.

7. PNC Mortgage Corp. of America, Vernon Hills, Illinois

Action: Proposed Settlement Agreement that includes payment to the Department in the amount of \$84,375, and if determined to be appropriate, reimbursement for marketing losses resulting from untimely submitted insurance claims.

Cause: Review by HUD's contractor of the company's single family mortgage insurance claims submissions citing violations of HUD-FHA requirements that included: untimely submission of insurance claims; and incorrect dates on claim forms.

8. Charter Mortgage Corporation, Fort Lauderdale, Florida

Action: Probation

Cause: A HUD monitoring review that disclosed violations of HUD-FHA requirements that included: failure to comply with HUD-FHA reporting requirements under the Home Mortgage Disclosure Act (HMDA); failure to maintain an adequate Quality Control Plan; permitting improperly secured secondary financing to close HUD-FHA insured mortgages; failure to remit to HUD-FHA Up-Front Mortgage Insurance Premiums (UFMIPs) and late charges; submission of erroneous HUD-1 Settlement Statements; and failure to retain complete loan origination files.

9. The Professional Investment & Financial Group, San Gabriel, California

Action: Proposed Settlement Agreement that includes payment to the Department of a civil money penalty in the amount of \$1,000; and revision of the advertising used by the company in its HUD-FHA Title I program activities.

Cause: Use of misleading advertising by the company in connection with the Title I property improvement loan program.

10. Magna Financial Corporation, Irvine, California

Action: Settlement Agreement that includes indemnification to the Department for any claim losses in connection with five improperly originated Title I loans; payment to the Department of a civil money penalty in the amount of \$1,000; and corrective action to assure compliance with HUD-FHA requirements.

Cause: A HUD monitoring review that disclosed violations by the company of HUD-FHA Title I property improvement loan program requirements that included: failure to verify borrowers' source of funds required for initial payment; failure to properly verify borrower's income; requiring a minimum loan amount; failure to meet program requirements for the promissory note; failure to ensure that detailed descriptions of improvements were provided by borrowers; and failure to comply with HUD-FHA reporting requirements under the Home Mortgage Disclosure Act (HMDA).

11. Randall Mortgage, Inc., Maitland, Florida

Action: Settlement Agreement that includes: indemnification to the Department in the amount of \$87,657 for its claim loss in connection with an improperly originated HUD-FHA insured mortgage; indemnification for any future claim losses in connection with seven improperly originated mortgages; payment to the Department of a civil money penalty in the amount of \$2,500; and corrective action to assure compliance with HUD-FHA requirements.

Cause: A HUD monitoring review that disclosed violations of HUD-FHA requirements that included: failure to maintain an adequate Quality Control Plan for the origination of HUD-FHA insured mortgages; failure to verify borrowers' source of funds used for downpayment; failure to ensure that borrowers made the minimum required investment in the property; requiring a borrower to deposit excess escrow funds

at closing; inadequate or lack of face-to-face interviews with borrowers; and failure to properly complete HUD Form 92900 Applications.

Dated: July 20, 1995.

Jeanne K. Engel,

General Deputy Assistant Secretary for Housing—Federal Housing Commissioner.

[FR Doc. 95-18727 Filed 7-28-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4210-27-P

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Bureau of Land Management

[ID-942-1110-00]

Idaho: Filing of Plats of Survey; Idaho

The plat of the following described land was officially filed in the Idaho State Office, Bureau of Land Management, Boise, Idaho, effective 9:00 a.m., July 21, 1995.

The plat representing the dependent resurvey of portions of the subdivisional lines, the 1962-1969 fixed and limiting boundary, the 1962-1969 meander lines of the right and left banks of Henrys Fork, of certain islands, and of lot 22 in section 16, the subdivision of section 15, and the survey of portions of the meander lines of the 1993-1994 right and left banks of Henrys Fork, of lot 13 in section 16, and of a partition line in section 15, T. 7 N., R. 40 E., Boise Meridian, Idaho, Group No. 816, was accepted, July 18, 1995.

This survey was executed to meet certain administrative needs of the Bureau of Land Management.

All inquiries concerning the survey of the above described land must be sent to the Chief, Branch of Cadastral Survey, Idaho State Office, Bureau of Land Management, 3380 Americana Terrace, Boise, Idaho 83706.

Dated: July 21, 1995.

Duane E. Olsen,

Chief Cadastral Surveyor for Idaho.

[FR Doc. 95-18673 Filed 7-28-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4310-GG-M

[ID-942-1640-00]

Idaho: Filing of Plats of Survey; Idaho

The plat, in 2 sheets of the following described land was officially filed in the Idaho State Office, Bureau of Land Management, Boise, Idaho, effective 9:00 a.m., July 21, 1995.

The plat, in 2 sheets, representing the corrective dependent resurvey of a portion of the subdivisional lines and the dependent resurvey of portions of the west boundary, subdivisional lines,

and the boundaries of certain segregation and mineral surveys, the subdivision of certain sections, and the survey of lot 18 in section 17, T. 48 N., R. 2 E., Boise Meridian, Idaho, Group No. 859, was accepted, July 18, 1995.

This survey was executed to meet certain administrative needs of the Bureau of Land Management.

All inquiries concerning the survey of the above described land must be sent to the Chief, Branch of Cadastral Survey, Idaho State Office, Bureau of Land Management, 3380 Americana Terrace, Boise, Idaho, 83706.

Dated: July 21, 1995.

Duane E. Olsen,

Chief Cadastral Surveyor for Idaho.

[FR Doc. 95-18672 Filed 7-28-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4310-GG-M

National Park Service

Petroglyph National Monument, Draft General Management Plan/ Development Concept Plan/ Environmental Impact Statement

AGENCY: National Park Service, Interior.

ACTION: Notice of availability of the Draft General Management Plan/ Development Concept Plan/ Environmental Impact Statement for Petroglyph National Monument, Bernalillo County, New Mexico.

SUMMARY: Pursuant to Section 102(2)(c) of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 and Public Law 101-313 (the legislation that established the monument) the National Park Service announces the availability of the Draft General Management Plan/Development Concept Plan/Environmental Impact Statement (GMP/DCP/EIS) for Petroglyph National Monument. This notice also announces public meetings for the purpose of receiving public comment on the Draft GMP/DCP/EIS.

The Draft GMP/DCP/EIS has been prepared in cooperation with the City of Albuquerque, the State of New Mexico, and the Federal Aviation Administration. The purpose of this Draft GMP/DCP/EIS is to set forth the basic management philosophy of the monument and the overall approaches to resource management, visitor use, and facility development that would be implemented over the next 10-15 years.

Petroglyph National Monument, encompassing 7,244 acres, was established in June 1990 as a new unit of the National Park System to preserve the more than 15,000 prehistoric and historic petroglyphs and other significant natural and cultural resources that are on the west side of