

estimated annual operating cost disclosures must be based on the 1995 DOE cost figures published in this notice. The labels must also disclose, under the secondary estimated annual operating cost disclosure, the fact that the estimated annual operating cost is based on the appropriate 1995 DOE energy cost figure. Manufacturers of the above-mentioned products must make these disclosures on the labels required by the amendments and in catalogs beginning ninety days after the Commission publishes new energy consumption ranges of comparability based on the 1995 submissions required by § 305.8. They must continue to use the 1995 DOE cost figures in the manner just described until the Commission publishes new ranges of comparability based on future annual submissions of estimated annual energy consumption data. At that time, these manufacturers

must use the then-current DOE energy cost figures when they prepare new labels in response to the new energy consumption ranges of comparability. When such new ranges are published, the effective date for labeling new products will be ninety days after publication of the ranges in the **Federal Register**. As in the past, products that have been properly labeled prior to the effective date of any range modification need not be relabeled.

**For Energy Cost Representations Respecting Products Covered by EPCA but Not by the Commission's Rule**

Manufacturers of products covered by section 323(c) of EPCA, but not by the Appliance Labeling Rule (clothes dryers, television sets, kitchen ranges and ovens, and space heaters) must use the 1995 representative average unit

costs for energy in all operating cost representations beginning May 18, 1995.

**List of Subjects in 16 CFR Part 305**

Advertising, Energy conservation, Household appliances, Labeling, Reporting and recordkeeping requirements.

**PART 305—[AMENDED]**

Accordingly, 16 CFR Part 305 is amended as follows:

1. The authority citation for part 305 continues to read as follows:

**Authority:** 42 U.S.C. 6294.

2. Section 305.9(a) is revised to read as follows:

**§ 305.9 Representative average unit energy costs.**

(a) Table 1, below, contains the representative unit energy costs to be utilized for all requirements of this part.

TABLE 1.—REPRESENTATIVE AVERAGE UNIT COSTS OF ENERGY FOR FIVE RESIDENTIAL ENERGY SOURCES (1995)

Type of energy	In common terms	As required by DOE test procedure	Dollars per million Btu <sup>1</sup>
Electricity .....	8.67¢/kWh <sup>2,3</sup> .....	\$0.0867/kWh .....	\$25.41
Natural Gas .....	63.0¢/therm <sup>4</sup> or \$6.49/ MCF <sup>5,6</sup> .....	0.00000630/Btu .....	6.30
No. 2 heating oil .....	1.008/gallon <sup>7</sup> .....	0.00000727/Btu .....	7.27
Propane .....	0.985/gallon <sup>8</sup> .....	0.00001079/Btu .....	10.79
Kerosene .....	1.094/gallon <sup>9</sup> .....	0.00000810/Btu .....	8.10

<sup>1</sup> Btu stands for British thermal unit.  
<sup>2</sup> kWh stands for kilowatt hour.  
<sup>3</sup> 1 kWh=3,412 Btu.  
<sup>4</sup> 1 therm=100,000 Btu. Natural gas prices include taxes.  
<sup>5</sup> MCF stands for 1,000 cubic feet.  
<sup>6</sup> For the purposes of this table, 1 cubic foot of natural gas has an energy equivalence of 1,030 Btu.  
<sup>7</sup> For the purposes of this table, 1 gallon of No. 2 heating oil has an energy equivalence of 138,690 Btu.  
<sup>8</sup> For the purposes of this table, 1 gallon of liquid propane has an energy equivalence of 91,333 Btu.  
<sup>9</sup> For the purposes of this table, 1 gallon of kerosene has an energy equivalence of 135,000 Btu.

\* \* \* \* \*

**Donald S. Clark,**  
 Secretary.  
 [FR Doc. 95-4010 Filed 2-16-95; 8:45 am]  
 BILLING CODE 6750-01-M

**DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES**

**Food and Drug Administration**  
**21 CFR Part 14**

**Advisory Committees; Amendments**

**AGENCY:** Food and Drug Administration, HHS.

**ACTION:** Final rule.

**SUMMARY:** The Food and Drug Administration (FDA) is amending the standing advisory committees' regulations to change the function of the Anti-Infective Drugs Advisory Committee and to change the name and

the function of the Dermatologic Drugs Advisory Committee. This action is being taken due to an administrative transfer of functions for the committees in the review of human drug products for use in the treatment of ophthalmic disorders.

**EFFECTIVE DATE:** February 17, 1995.  
**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Donna M. Combs, Committee Management Office (HFA-306), Food and Drug Administration, 5600 Fishers Lane, Rockville, MD 20857, 301-443-2765.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:**  
 FDA is revising § 14.100(c)(2) (21 CFR 14.100(c)(2)) to remove the review of human drug products for use in the treatment of ophthalmic disorders from the function of the Anti-Infective Drugs Advisory Committee. The review of human drug products for use in the treatment of ophthalmic disorders has been transferred to the Dermatologic

and Ophthalmic Drugs Advisory Committee (formerly the Dermatologic Drugs Advisory Committee). The function of the Anti-Infective Drugs Advisory Committee was revised in the charter renewal dated October 3, 1994. In this document, FDA is formally changing the function of the committee.

FDA is also revising § 14.100(c)(6) to change the name and the function of the Dermatologic Drugs Advisory Committee. The function of the committee has been amended to include the review of human drug products for use in the treatment of ophthalmic disorders. The name was changed to reflect the committee's revised function. In the **Federal Register** of December 6, 1994 (59 FR 62734), FDA published a notice of charter renewals dated October 3, 1994, for the Anti-Infective Drugs Advisory Committee and the Dermatologic and Ophthalmic Drugs Advisory Committee. In that notice, the

agency stated that the name of the Dermatologic Drugs Advisory Committee had been changed to the Dermatologic and Ophthalmic Drugs Advisory Committee. In this document, FDA is formally changing the name and the function of the committee.

Under the Administrative Procedure Act (5 U.S.C. 553(b)(3) and (d)) and under 21 CFR 10.40(c)(4), (d), and (e), notice and public procedure and delayed effective date on this regulation are unnecessary and not in the public interest. The regulation relates to agency organization and procedure. Furthermore, the agency finds good cause to proceed to an immediately effective rule. It would be contrary to the public interest to delay notice to the public and embodiment in the regulations of the administrative change regarding review of information on ophthalmic disorders by the appropriately constituted advisory committee.

**List of Subjects in 21 CFR Part 14**

Administrative practice and procedure, Advisory committees, Color additives, Drugs, Radiation protection.

Therefore, under the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act and under authority delegated to the Commissioner of Food and Drugs, 21 CFR part 14 is amended as follows:

**PART 14—PUBLIC HEARING BEFORE A PUBLIC ADVISORY COMMITTEE**

1. The authority citation for 21 CFR part 14 continues to read as follows:

**Authority:** Secs. 201–903 of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. 321–394; 21 U.S.C. 41–50, 141–149, 467f, 679, 821, 1034; secs. 2, 351, 354, 361 of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 201, 262, 263b, 264); secs. 2–12 of the Fair Packaging and Labeling Act (15 U.S.C. 1451–1461); 5 U.S.C. App. 2; 28 U.S.C. 2112.

2. Section 14.100 is amended by revising paragraph (c)(2)(ii), the heading of paragraph (c)(6), and paragraph (c)(6)(ii) to read as follows:

**§ 14.100 List of standing advisory committees.**

\* \* \* \* \*

(c) \* \* \*  
(2) \* \* \*

(ii) Function: Reviews and evaluates available data concerning the safety and effectiveness of marketed and investigational human drug products for use in the treatment of infectious diseases and disorders.

\* \* \* \* \*

(6) *Dermatologic and Ophthalmic Drugs Advisory Committee.*

\* \* \* \* \*

(ii) Function: Reviews and evaluates available data concerning the safety and effectiveness of marketed and investigational human drug products for use in the treatment of dermatologic and ophthalmic disorders.

\* \* \* \* \*

Dated: February 14, 1995.

**Linda A. Suydam,**  
*Interim Deputy Commissioner for Operations.*  
[FR Doc. 95–4196 Filed 2–16–95; 8:45 am]  
BILLING CODE 4160–01–F

**DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT**

**Office of the Assistant Secretary for Housing-Federal Housing Commissioner**

**24 CFR Parts 207, 213, 221, and 236**

[Docket No. R–95–1660; FR–3342–F–03]

RIN 2502–AG04

**Deletion of Value Criterion in Section 223(a)(7) Refinancing**

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

**ACTION:** Final rule.

**SUMMARY:** Section 223(a)(7) of the National Housing Act authorizes HUD to insure mortgages given to refinance existing HUD-insured mortgages. In the past, HUD’s implementing regulations have prohibited the refinanced mortgage amount from exceeding a stated percentage of the value of the property. This value criterion precluded some troubled projects from lowering their debt service payments and gaining a more sound financial footing. On October 26, 1993, HUD published an interim rule in the **Federal Register** deleting the value criterion from the HUD regulations implementing Section 223(a)(7), which was extended by a notice published on October 26, 1994. This rule makes final the policies contained in the October 26, 1993, interim rule.

**EFFECTIVE DATE:** March 20, 1995.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Jane Luton, Acting Director, Policies and Procedures Division, Department of Housing and Urban Development, 451 Seventh Street, SW., Room 6142, Washington, DC 20410. Telephone number (202) 708–2556; and TDD (202) 708–4594. (These are not toll-free numbers.)

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:**

**Background**

Section 223(a)(7) of the National Housing Act (12 U.S.C. 1715n(a)(7)) (the

Act) authorizes HUD to insure mortgages given to refinance existing HUD-insured mortgages under any section or title of the Act. Due to requirements of the Act, the HUD regulations implementing Section 223(a)(7) limit the principal amount of the refinanced mortgage to the amount of the original insured mortgage. Additionally, HUD’s implementing regulations had prohibited the refinanced mortgage amount from exceeding a stated percentage of the Federal Housing Commissioner’s estimate of value of the project after completion of any repairs or improvements to the property. Unlike the original-value limitation noted above, this value criterion was not a statutory requirement.

The value criterion precluded many troubled projects from refinancing their HUD-insured mortgages, thus preventing them from lowering their debt service payments and gaining a sounder financial footing. Because Section 223(a)(7) mortgages are already limited by the amount of the original insured mortgage, HUD felt the public interest and HUD’s Insurance Fund would be better served by allowing these loans to be refinanced to take advantage of lower interest rates.

Therefore, on October 26, 1993, HUD published an interim rule (58 FR 57558) removing the value criterion from its regulations implementing Section 223(a)(7). The effect of the interim rule was extended by a notice published on October 26, 1994 (59 FR 53731). This rule makes final the policies contained in the October 26, 1993, interim rule.

**Comments on the October 26, 1993, Interim Rule**

By the expiration of the comment period on the October 26, 1993, interim rule, HUD had received only two comments, both from the same commenter.

The first comment addressed the backlog of applications languishing in some HUD offices and requested that HUD Field Offices be notified that Section 223(a)(7) refinancing applications already in process should be given priority over those received after the effective date of the interim rule. The preamble to the interim rule established processing priorities, in order to better manage the increased workload anticipated as a result of the rule change. Supplemental instructions were provided to HUD Field Office staff and mortgagees through issuance of HUD Notice H93–89 and Mortgagee Letter 93–39, both dated November 24, 1993, addressing processing priorities and other issues. Inasmuch as the