

those instances where a shipment is diverted from its intended destination.

In accordance with the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1980 (44 U.S.C. 3507), the information collection requirements included in this rule have been approved by the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) under OMB No. 0581-0069.

Based on the above, the Administrator of AMS has determined that this action will not have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities.

A proposal inviting comments on this action was published in the **Federal Register** on September 8, 1988 (53 FR 34764). Interested persons had until September 19, 1988, to file written comments. None were filed.

After consideration of the information and recommendation submitted by the committee, and other available information, it is hereby found that the rule was hereinafter set forth will tend to effectuate the declared policy of the Act.

Pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 553, it is further found that good cause exists for not postponing the effective date of this action until 30 days after publication in the **Federal Register** in that: (1) Shipments of potatoes from the production area have begun and this rule should cover as many current-season shipments as possible to be of maximum benefit, (2) this rule imposes no special requirements on handlers that cannot be accomplished by the effective date, and (3) all production area handlers were made aware of the action which was proposed at an open meeting of producers and handlers and were given opportunity to comment.

List of Subjects in 7 CFR Part 945

Marketing agreements and orders, Potatoes, Idaho, Oregon.

For the reasons set forth in the preamble, 7 CFR Part 945 is hereby amended as follows:

Note: This section will appear in the Code of Federal Regulations.

PART 945—IRISH POTATOES GROWN IN CERTAIN DESIGNATED COUNTIES IN IDAHO, AND MALHEUR COUNTY, OREGON

1. The authority citation for 7 CFR Part 945 continues to read as follows:

Authority: Secs. 1-19, 48 Stat. 31, as amended; 7 U.S.C. 601-674.

2. Section 945.341 is amended by adding a new paragraph (d)(4) to read as follows:

§ 945.341 Handling regulation.

* * * * *

(d) * * * * *

* * * * *

(4) Handlers shall provide the committee with the destination zip codes of all potatoes handled by permitting the Federal-State Inspection Service to review the bills of lading upon inspection to determine the destination zip codes. The zip codes shall be included on the inspection certificates. Whenever potatoes are diverted to a different destination, the handler shall notify the committee of the new destination zip code orally or in writing as soon as practicable.

* * * * *

Dated: November 28, 1988.

Robert C. Keeney,

Deputy Director, Fruit and Vegetable Division.

[FR Doc. 88-27759 Filed 12-1-88; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3410-02-M

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES

Food and Drug Administration

21 CFR Part 520

Oral Dosage Form New Animal Drugs Not Subject to Certification; Piperazine Adipate Capsules

AGENCY: Food and Drug Administration.

ACTION: Final rule.

SUMMARY: The Food and Drug Administration (FDA) is amending the animal drug regulations to remove that portion of the regulations reflecting approval of a new animal drug application (NADA) held by Carson Chemicals, Inc. The NADA provides for the use of a piperazine adipate in capsules as a canine and feline wormer. Elsewhere in this issue of the **Federal Register**, FDA is withdrawing approval of the NADA.

EFFECTIVE DATE: December 12, 1988.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Mohammad I. Sharar, Center for Veterinary Medicine (HFV-216), Food and Drug Administration, 5600 Fishers Lane, Rockville, MD 20857, 301-443-3183.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: In a notice published elsewhere in this issue of the **Federal Register**, FDA is withdrawing approval of Carson Chemicals, Inc.'s NADA 118-508, as requested by the sponsor. This final rule removes that portion of the regulations reflecting approval of the NADA.

List of Subjects in 21 CFR 520

Animal drugs.

Therefore, under the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act and under authority delegated to the Commissioner of Food and Drugs and redelegated to the Center for Veterinary Medicine, Part 520 is amended as follows:

PART 520—ORAL DOSAGE FORM NEW ANIMAL DRUGS NOT SUBJECT TO CERTIFICATION

1. The authority citation for 21 CFR Part 520 continues to read as follows:

Authority: Sec. 512(i), 82 Stat. 347 (21 U.S.C. 360(i)); 21 CFR 5.10 and 5.83.

§ 520.1801b [Removed]

2. Section 520.1801b *Piperazine adipate capsules* is removed.

Dated: November 28, 1988.

Gerald B. Guest,

Director, Center for Veterinary Medicine.

[FR Doc. 88-27756 Filed 12-1-88; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4160-01-M

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Federal Highway Administration

23 CFR Part 658

[FHWA Docket No. 86-8, Notice No. 3]

RIN 2125-AB55

Truck Size and Weight; Specialized Equipment Boat Transporters

AGENCY: Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), DOT.

ACTION: Final rule.

SUMMARY: In response to petitions, the FHWA is revising certain provisions established by the final rule on truck size and weight published at 49 FR 23302 on June 5, 1984. This rule establishes: (1) A definition of boat transporters, (2) the same lengths and overhang for boat transporters as that provided the automobile transporters, and (3) a definition and a minimum length limit of 65 feet for a truck-trailer boat transporter.

EFFECTIVE DATE: December 2, 1988.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Mr. Phillip W. Blow, Office of Motor Carrier Transportation, (202) 366-4036 or Mr. David C. Oliver, Office of the Chief Counsel, (202) 366-1354, Federal Highway Administration, 400 Seventh Street, SW., Washington, DC 20590. Office hours are from 7:45 a.m. to 4:15 p.m., e.t., Monday through Friday, except legal holidays.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: A rule implementing the truck size and weight provisions of the Surface Transportation Assistance Act of 1982 (STAA) Pub. L. 97-424, 96 Stat. 2097, was published in the *Federal Register* on June 5, 1984 (49 FR 23302). This document represented the culmination of major efforts by the FHWA to implement the truck size and weight provisions of the STAA and in part determined that auto transporters constituted specialized equipment and were not subject to the provisions of 23 CFR 658.13 (a) through (c). Section 658.13(d) provided final requirements for automobile transporters relative to overall length and allowable overhang.

Subsequently, the National Marine Manufacturers Association and Celebrity Boats, Inc., of Benton, Illinois, have petitioned that FHWA classify "boat haulers" as specialized equipment within the meaning of section 411(d) of the STAA, 49 U.S.C. 2311(d). In summary, that request sought treatment similar to the rules pertaining to automobile transporters. The petitioners indicate that the needs of the boat transporter industry are analogous to the needs of the automobile industry which was afforded "specialized equipment" status as part of the 1982 STAA.

The petitioners also claim that vehicles used to transport boats operate in a manner similar to the operation of vehicles used for automobile transport. The granting of "specialized equipment" designation for boat transporters and treatment analogous to that afforded to automobile transporters would entail the establishment of Federal minimum length specifications that would preclude States from imposing length maximums that are less than the Federal limit on the National Network established by 23 CFR 658.9; grant boat transporters the ability to carry cargo on the power unit of a truck combination; and grant front and rear allowances for overhang. The advantages of "specialized equipment" designation include a greater cargo-carrying capacity and more economical use of boat transporter equipment.

FHWA initiated an advanced notice of proposed rulemaking (ANPRM) Docket 86-8 issued March 25, 1986 at 51 FR 10234.

In consideration of the fifty-four responses to the ANPRM, Docket 86-8, Notice No. 2, a notice of proposed rulemaking (NPRM) was published January 29, 1988, at 53 FR 2602. Comments were requested on the proposed rule which (1) Set out a definition of a boat transporter, (2) extended to boat transporters the same length limits and overhang afforded

automobile transporters and, (3) provided a definition and a minimum length limit of 65 feet for a truck-trailer boat transporter.

Thirty-eight responses were received in reply to the January 29 NPRM (Docket No. 86-8). The respondents are generally categorized as State agencies and the District of Columbia—3; trucking companies—3; Associations—2; manufacturers—28 and Congress—2. Most of the manufacturers also operate equipment transporting their products.

Essentially, all of the commenters endorsed the proposed rule. The Kentucky Transportation Cabinet objected to the specialized equipment being designated by commodity transported rather than unique equipment. Other commenters referred to the logic of the specialized equipment designation because the boat transporters equipment was so configured as to limit any type of back haul. The Maine DOT objected to "stinger-steered vehicles which may operate with a pintle-hook arrangement rather than a fifth-wheel arrangement as in the 75 foot auto transporter regulations." This was a misunderstanding as the stinger-steered combination definition stipulates only a fifth-wheel connection. The District of Columbia in its comments, did condition its "no objection" to "when operated on the national network."

The boat manufacturers and transporters endorsed and urged finalization of the proposed rule, noting the similarity of their loadings and equipment to that of the auto transporters. Six of the boat transporters commented on their safety record using the equipment allowed by the proposed rule. Seven commenters specifically endorsed the inclusion and definition of the truck-trailer combination. Two of these commenters referred to their experiences with the truck-trailer combination, i.e., 6 million accident-free miles since 1979, 15,000 boats delivered annually with 12 truck-trailer combinations, no ball and socket failures, better maneuvering, less load damage.

Subsequent to the NPRM it was noted that the stinger-steered definition applied only to automobile transporters. As a result of this oversight we are modifying the definition to refer to all combinations with the fifth wheel located behind and below the rearmost axle of the power unit. This allows the definition to apply to both automobile and boat transporters.

Congressional action since the start of this rulemaking has reinforced the basis for following through with this rule. Section 133(a)(7) at the Federal-Aid

Highway Act of 1987 (Pub. L. 100-17, 101 Stat. 132) enacted April 2, 1987 amends section 411(d) at the STAA of 1982 where "boat transporters" is added as an example of specialized equipment.

Therefore, based upon full consideration of public comments received and a further review by FHWA, 23 CFR 658.5 and 658.13 are amended as described. Two paragraphs are being added to § 658.5 to define boat transporter and to define truck-trailer boat transporter. Section 658.13(d) is being revised to add boat transporters as specialized equipment and to provide length and overhang limits.

Regulatory Impact

The FHWA has considered the impacts of this proposal and has determined that it is not a major rulemaking action within the meaning of E.O. 12291. However, pursuant to E.O. 12498, this rulemaking action has been included in the Regulatory Program for significant rulemaking actions. These determinations by the agency are based on the nature of the rulemaking. The FHWA has determined that this rulemaking proposes to technically amend the June 5, 1985, final rule by clarifying and further defining certain issues contained therein. The impacts of the provisions addressed in this proposed rulemaking have already been considered by the impact documentation prepared for the June 5 final rule. Any changes to the NPRM would not appreciably affect the impact documentation initially prepared. The Regulatory Impact Analysis prepared for the June 5 rulemaking (FHWA Docket 83-14) is available for inspection in the headquarters office of FHWA, 400 Seventh Street SW., Washington, DC.

For the same reason and under the criteria of the Regulatory Flexibility Act, FHWA hereby certifies that this section will not have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities.

(Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance Program Number 20.205, Highway, Planning and Construction. The regulations implementing Executive Order 12372 regarding intergovernmental consultation on Federal programs and activities apply to this program).

A regulatory information number (RIN) is assigned to each regulatory action listed in the Unified Agenda of Federal Regulations. The Regulatory Information Service Center publishes the Unified Agenda in April and October of each year. The RIN number contained in the heading of this document can be used to cross reference this action with the Unified Agenda.

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 have sufficient federalism implications to warrant the preparation of a Federalism Assessment.

List of Subjects in 23 CFR Part 658

Grant programs—transportation, Highways and roads, Motor carriers—size and weight.

Issued on November 28, 1988.

Robert E. Farris,

Federal Highway Administrator.

In consideration of the foregoing, the FHWA amends Part 658, Chapter 1 of Title 23, Code of Federal Regulations, as set forth below.

PART 658—TRUCK SIZE AND WEIGHT; ROUTE DESIGNATION—LENGTH, WIDTH AND WEIGHT LIMITATIONS

1. The authority citation for 23 CFR Part 658 continues to read as follows:

Authority: Secs. 133, 411, 412, 413, and 416 of Pub. L. 97-424, 96 Stat. 2097 (23 U.S.C. 127; 49 U.S.C. 2311, 2312, 2313 and App. 2316), as amended by Pub. L. 98-17, 97 Stat. 59, and Pub. L. 98-554, 98 Stat. 2829; 23 U.S.C. 315; and 49 CFR 1.48.

2. Section 658.5 is amended by revising paragraph (n) and adding paragraph (p) and (q) as follows:

§ 658.5 Definitions.

(n) *Stinger-steered combination.* A truck tractor semitrailer wherein the fifth wheel is located on a drop frame located behind and below the rear-most axle of the power unit.

(p) *Boat transporters.* Any vehicle combination designed and used specifically to transport assembled boats and boat hulls. Boats may be partially disassembled to facilitate transporting.

(q) *Truck-trailer boat transporter.* A boat transporter combination consisting of a straight truck towing a trailer using typically a ball and socket connection. The trailer axle(s) is located substantially at the trailer center of gravity (rather than the rear of the trailer) but so as to maintain a downward force on the trailer tongue.

3. Section 658.13 is amended by adding paragraph (d)(2) to read as follows:

§ 658.13 Length.

(d) * * *

(2) *Boat transporters.* (i) Boat transporters are considered to be specialized equipment. As provided for automobile transporters in § 658.5(k), boat transporters may carry boats on the power unit so long as the length and width restrictions of the vehicles and load are not exceeded. No State shall impose an overall length limitation of less than 65 feet on traditional boat transporters (fifth wheel located on tractor frame over rear axle(s), including "low boys," or less than 75 feet on stinger-steered boat transporters. In addition, no State shall impose an overall length limitation of less than 65 feet on truck-trailer boat transporters. Paragraph (c) of this section requires the States to allow operation of vehicles with the dimensions that were legal in the State on December 1, 1982.

(ii) All length provisions regarding boat transporters are exclusive of front and rear overhang. Further, no State shall impose a front overhang limitation of less than three (3) feet nor a rearmost overhang limitation of less than four (4) feet.

* * * * *
[FR Doc. 88-27773 Filed 12-1-88; 8:45 am]
BILLING CODE 4910-22-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-88-1882; FR-2577]

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

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.

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 "high-cost" mortgage limits for Albany and Rensselaer Counties, New York; Carroll County, Maryland; the City of Fredericksburg and Spotsylvania County, Virginia; Jefferson County, Kentucky; the Albuquerque, New Mexico MSA; Denton and Collin Counties, Texas; and Douglas County, Nevada; and adding "high-cost" mortgage limits for Franklin

County, Massachusetts; Hall County, Georgia; Indian River County, Florida; and Allen County, Indiana. 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.

EFFECTIVE DATE: December 2, 1988.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

For single family: Morris Carter, Director, Single Family Development Division, Room 9270; telephone (202) 755-6720. For manufactured homes: Robert J. Coyle, Director, Title I Insurance Division, Room 9160; telephone (202) 755-6880; 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.

On March 3, 1988 (53 FR 6922), the Department published its most recent annual complete listing of areas eligible for "high-cost" mortgage limits under certain of HUD's insuring authorities under the National Housing Act, and their applicable limits for each area. (See also April 12, 1988, 53 FR 11997.) Amendments to the annual listing were published March 28, 1988 (53 FR 9869), April 25, 1988 (53 FR 13405), June 1, 1988 (53 FR 19897), August 1 1988 (53 FR 28871), and September 20, 1988 (53 FR 36448).

This Document

Today's document increases high-cost mortgage amounts for Albany and Rensselaer Counties, New York; Carroll County, Maryland; the City of Fredericksburg and Spotsylvania County, Virginia; Jefferson County, Kentucky; the Albuquerque, New Mexico MSA; Denton and Collin Counties, Texas; and Douglas County,

Nevada; and adds "high-cost" mortgage limits for Franklin County, Massachusetts; Hall County, Georgia; Indian River County, Florida; and Allen County, Indiana.

These amendments to the high-cost areas appear in two parts. Part I explains high-cost limits for mortgages insured under Title I of the National Housing Act. Part II lists changes for single family residences insured under section 203(b) or 234(c) of the National Housing Act.

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, Franklin County, Massachusetts has a one-family limit of \$101,250. The combination home and lot loan limit for Franklin County is \$101,250 x .80, or \$81,000.

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, Franklin County, Massachusetts has a one-family limit of \$101,250. The lot-only loan limit for Franklin County is \$101,250 x .20, or \$20,250.

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

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

Market area designation and local	1-family and condo unit	2-family	3-family	4-family
REGION I				
HUD Field Office—Boston Office				
Franklin County, MA.....	\$101,250	\$114,000	\$138,000	\$160,500
REGION II				
HUD Field Office—Albany Office				
Albany County, NY.....	101,250	114,000	138,000	160,500
Rensselaer County, NY.....	84,550	95,200	115,700	133,500
REGION III				
HUD Field Office—Richmond Office				
Spotsylvania County/Fredericksburg City, VA.....	80,750	90,950	110,500	127,500
HUD Field Office—Baltimore Office				
Carroll County, MD.....	99,650	112,200	136,350	157,350
REGION V				
HUD Field Office—Atlanta Office				
Hall County, GA.....	75,500	85,050	103,350	119,250
REGION IV				
HUD Field Office—Louisville Office				
Jefferson County, KY.....	91,650	103,200	125,400	144,700
HUD Field Office—Orlando Office				
Indian River County, FL.....	69,800	78,600	95,550	110,250
REGION V				
HUD Field Office—Indianapolis Office				
Allen County, IN.....	76,000	85,600	104,050	120,050
REGION II				
HUD Field Office—Dallas Office				
Collin County, TX.....	101,250	114,000	138,000	160,500
Denton County, TX.....	100,700	113,400	137,800	159,000

Market area designation and local	1-family and condo unit	2-family	3-family	4-family
REGION VI HUD Field Office—Albuquerque Office				
Albuquerque, NM MSA Bernalillo County.....	101,250	114,000	138,000	160,500
REGION IX HUD Field Office—Reno Office				
Douglas County, NV.....	82,650	93,050	113,100	130,500

Date: November 28, 1988.

James E. Schoenberger,

General Deputy Assistant Secretary for
Housing-Federal Housing Commissioner.

[FR Doc. 88-27832 Filed 12-1-88; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4210-27-M

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

24 CFR Part 596

[Docket No. R-88-1392; FR-1913]

Enterprise Zone Development

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

ACTION: Final rule.

SUMMARY: This document:

1. Amends the final rule published on August 16, 1988 (53 FR 30944), captioned as above, by revising the text of two sections of that rule; and

2. Announces that the effective date of the August 16, 1988, rule, as revised in this final rule, is December 2, 1988. The purpose of this document is to implement statutory amendments to Title VII (Enterprise Zone Development) of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1987 that were contained in the recently adopted Stewart B. McKinney Homeless Assistance Amendments of 1988. The effect of the revisions is to alter, in accordance with revised statutory directions, the method of determining the rank order of distress among competing nominees for designation as enterprise zones.

DATES: Effective date: December 2, 1988. Deadline date for submission of nominations: January 17, 1989.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Michael T. Savage, Deputy Director, Office of Block Grant Assistance, Room 7280, Department of Housing and Urban Development, 451 Seventh Street SW., Washington, DC 20410, telephone (202)

755-6588. (This is not a toll-free telephone number.)

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: On August 16, 1988, the Department published its final rule to implement Title VII of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1987 (Pub. L. 100-242, approved February 5, 1988). That rule provided instructions to potential applicants seeking designation as Federal enterprise zones. Among other things, the rule provided, in §§ 596.302 and 596.303, a description of the method HUD would employ in making competing nominees for designation as enterprise zones.

HUD's rule did not take effect on publication, but instead was required, under section 7(o) of the Department of Housing and Urban Development Act (42 U.S.C. 3535(o)), to await a period of thirty session days of the Congress before it could be announced for effect. The 30-day period on October 6, 1988, but HUD did not announce the effective date of the August 16 rule at that time because there was under consideration in the Congress a statutory amendment that would affect the selection procedure described in HUD's rule. That amendment was adopted as section 1090 of the Stewart B. McKinney Homeless Assistance Act (Pub. L. 100-628, approved November 7, 1988) (1988 Act). The 1988 Act provided clarifying language concerning the method of ranking competing enterprise zone nominees. The clarifying amendment requires changes in HUD's August 16 final rule. Section 1090 also provided for revision of HUD's previously published final rule to effect the statutory change, and for making the revised rule effective immediately.

In a Federal Register Notice published on September 22, 1988 (53 FR 36899), the Department advised potential nominees that the deadline date for submitting nominations for enterprise zone designation would be 45 days from the effective date of the final rule. The September 22, 1988, notice indicated HUD's expectation at that time that the rule would be made effective in early October. In light of the delay in

announcing the effective date of this final rule caused by the statutory change, the deadline date for submitting nominations will now be January 17, 1989. Any nominating State or local government whose application has already been submitted based on the September 22, 1988, notice is invited to amend the application as necessary in light of the changes contained in this rule.

The following process will be used to rank order, separately, urban and rural enterprise zones.

1. Unique ranks will be assigned to each zone for each of the four criteria on the basis of the degree to which the zone exceeds the threshold for that criterion. A "highest" rank of "1" will be assigned to the zone that exceeds the threshold by the greatest amount.

2. If two or more zones have data with the same value (to the nearest tenth of a percentage point) on a given criterion, each such zone will be assigned the "highest" rank for the group with records of identical value. For example, if three zones are initially assigned ranks 10, 11, and 12, but if the data used to establish the ranks are equal to the same value, then the two "lower" ranks (i.e., 11 and 12) will be revised to share the ranking of 10.

3. Each zone will receive an overall rank based on its urban or rural designation. For urban zones the overall rank will be the average of the unemployment rank, the poverty rank, and the higher of the rankings received for low income and for population loss. For rural zones, a zone's overall ranking will equal the highest of the four that the zone received.

4. Urban and rural zones will be ranked separately, based on overall rank. If zones are tied in overall rank, they will be further ordered on the basis of the criteria as they appear in the statute. Thus, if zones have the same overall ranking, they will be sequenced, based on, first, unemployment, then poverty, low income, and finally, population loss. (Except for purposes of this "tie breaking" procedure, each of