

Notices

This section of the FEDERAL REGISTER contains documents other than rules or proposed rules that are applicable to the public. Notices of hearings and investigations, committee meetings, agency decisions and rulings, delegations of authority, filing of petitions and applications and agency statements of organization and functions are examples of documents appearing in this section.

COMMITTEE FOR THE IMPLEMENTATION OF TEXTILE AGREEMENTS

Announcement of Import Restraint Limits for Certain Cotton, Man-Made Fiber, Silk Blend and Other Vegetable Fiber Textiles and Textile Products Produced or Manufactured in India

February 9, 1995.

AGENCY: Committee for the Implementation of Textile Agreements (CITA).

ACTION: Issuing a directive to the Commissioner of Customs establishing limits for the new agreement year.

EFFECTIVE DATE: February 16, 1995.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Jennifer Tallarico, International Trade Specialist, Office of Textiles and Apparel, U.S. Department of Commerce, (202) 482-4212. For information on the quota status of these limits, refer to the Quota Status Reports posted on the bulletin boards of each Customs port or call (202) 927-6705. For information on embargoes and quota re-openings, call (202) 482-3715.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Authority: Executive Order 11651 of March 3, 1972, as amended; section 204 of the Agricultural Act of 1956, as amended (7 U.S.C. 1854).

Pursuant to the Uruguay Round Agreement on Textiles and Clothing (URATC), the Bilateral Cotton, Wool, Man-Made Fiber, Silk Blend and Other Vegetable Fiber Textile Agreement of February 6, 1987, as amended and extended, and a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) dated December 31, 1994 between the Governments of the United States and India, establish limits for the period beginning on January 1, 1995 and extending through December 31, 1995.

A description of the textile and apparel categories in terms of HTS numbers is available in the

CORRELATION: Textile and Apparel Categories with the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States (see **Federal Register** notice 59 FR 65531, published on December 20, 1994).

The letter to the Commissioner of Customs and the actions taken pursuant to it are not designed to implement all of the provisions of the bilateral agreement and the MOU dated December 31, 1994, but are designed to assist only in the implementation of certain of their provisions.

Rita D. Hayes,

Chairman, Committee for the Implementation of Textile Agreements.

Committee for the Implementation of Textile Agreements

February 9, 1995.

Commissioner of Customs,
Department of the Treasury, Washington, DC 20229.

Dear Commissioner: Under the terms of section 204 of the Agricultural Act of 1956, as amended (7 U.S.C. 1854), the Uruguay Round Act, and the Uruguay Round Agreement on Textiles and Clothing (URATC); pursuant to the Bilateral Cotton, Wool, Man-Made Fiber, Silk Blend and Other Vegetable Fiber Textile Agreement of February 6, 1987, as amended and extended, and the Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) dated December 31, 1994 between the Governments of the United States and India; and in accordance with the provisions of Executive Order 11651 of March 3, 1972, as amended, you are directed to prohibit, effective on February 16, 1995, entry into the United States for consumption and withdrawal from warehouse for consumption of cotton, man-made fiber, silk blend and other vegetable fiber textiles and textile products in the following categories, produced or manufactured in India and exported during the twelve-month period beginning on January 1, 1995 and extending through December 31, 1995, in excess of the following levels of restraint:

Category	Twelve-month restraint limit ¹
334/634	113,378 dozen.
335/635	504,757 dozen.
336/636	695,255 dozen.
338/339	3,400,800 dozen.
340/640	1,662,185 dozen.
341	3,650,191 dozen of which not more than 2,190,114 dozen shall be in Category 341-Y ² .
342/642	1,022,133 dozen.
345	148,544 dozen.
347/348	477,913 dozen.
351/651	216,059 dozen.
363	34,723,417 numbers.
369-D ³	1,057,586 kilograms.
369-S ⁴	576,865 kilograms.
641	1,190,025 dozen.
647/648	691,037 dozen.
Group II	
200, 201, 220-229, 237, 239, 300, 301, 330-333, 349, 350, 352, 359-362, 600-607, 611-629, 630-633, 638, 639, 643-646, 649, 650, 652, 659, 665-O ⁵ , 666, 669, 670, and 831-859, as a group.	90,820,800 square meters equivalent.

¹ The limits have not been adjusted to account for any imports exported after December 31, 1994.

² Category 341-Y: only HTS numbers 6204.22.3060, 6206.30.3010, 6206.30.3030 and 6211.42.0054.

³ Category 369-D: only HTS numbers 6302.60.0010, 6302.91.0005 and 6302.91.0045.

⁴ Category 369-S: only HTS number 6307.10.2005.

⁵ Category 665-O: all HTS numbers except 5702.10.9030, 5702.42.2020, 5702.92.0010 and 5703.20.1000 (rugs exempt from the bilateral agreement).

Category	Twelve-month restraint limit ¹
Levels in Group I	
218	11,111,304 square meters.
219	53,281,729 square meters.
313	29,729,737 square meters.
314	6,343,063 square meters.
315	10,653,804 square meters.
317	34,531,200 square meters.
326	7,848,000 square meters.

Imports charged to these category limits for the period January 1, 1994 through December 31, 1994 shall be charged against those levels of restraint to the extent of any unfilled balances. In the event the limits established for that period have been exhausted by previous entries, such goods shall be subject to the levels set forth in this directive.

The limits set forth above are subject to adjustment in the future pursuant to the provisions of the URATC and any administrative arrangements notified to the Textiles Monitoring Body.

In carrying out the above directions, the Commissioner of Customs should construe entry into the United States for consumption to include entry for consumption into the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico.

The Committee for the Implementation of Textile Agreements has determined that these actions fall within the foreign affairs exception of the rulemaking provisions of 5 U.S.C. 553(a)(1).

Sincerely,
Rita D. Hayes,

Chairman, Committee for the Implementation of Textile Agreements.

[FR Doc. 95-3625 Filed 2-13-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-DR-F

Installation	Cost comparison study
Hill AFB, Utah Bolling AFB, Washington, DC.	Child Care Center. Military Family Housing Maintenance.

Patsy J. Conner,

Air Force Federal Register Liaison Officer.

[FR Doc. 95-3654 Filed 2-13-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3910-01-M

Dated: February 3, 1995.

Lewis D. Walker,

Deputy Assistant Secretary of the Army, (Environment, Safety and Occupational Health) OASA (IL&E).

[FR Doc. 95-3592 Filed 2-13-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3710-08-M

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

Department of the Air Force

Cost Comparison Studies

The Air Force is conducting the following cost comparison studies in accordance with OMB Circular A-76, Performance of Commercial Activities.

Installation	Cost comparison study
Maxwell AFB, Alabama Maxwell AFB, Alabama	Fuels Management. Grounds Maintenance.
Maxwell AFB, Alabama Little Rock AFB, Arkansas.	Refuse Collection. Transient Aircraft Maintenance.
Davis Monthan AFB, Arizona.	Military Family Housing Maintenance.
Tyndall AFB, Florida	Grounds Maintenance.
Tyndall AFB, Florida	Multi-Function Study: Base Operating Support & Backshop Aircraft Maintenance.
Moody AFB, Georgia ...	Military Family Housing Maintenance.
Andersen AFB, Guam ..	Grounds Maintenance.
Andersen AFB, Guam ..	Military Family Housing Maintenance.
Andersen AFB, Guam ..	Mess Attendants.
Andersen AFB, Guam ..	Refuse Collection.
Columbus AFB, Mississippi.	Base Operating Support.
Keesler AFB, Mississippi.	Grounds Maintenance.
Nellis AFB, Nevada	Military Family Housing Maintenance.
Wright Patterson AFB, Ohio.	Audiovisual.
Altus AFB, Oklahoma ...	Aircraft Maintenance.
Tinker AFB, Oklahoma .	Grounds Maintenance.
Lackland AFB, Texas ...	Trainer Fabrication.
Laughlin AFB, Texas	Base Operating Support.
Reese AFB, Texas	Base Operating Support.

Department of the Army

Availability of the Record of Decision (ROD) for the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for Closure and Disposal of Sacramento Army Depot, California

AGENCY: Department of the Army, DOD.

ACTION: Notice of availability.

SUMMARY: In accordance with Public Law 101-510, the Defense Base Closure and Realignment Act of 1990, the 1991 Defense Base Closure and Realignment Commission recommended the closure of Sacramento Army Depot and transfer of depot missions to other installations/agencies. Maintenance missions would be competed to determine location of transfer. In accordance with the Act, the Secretary of Defense must implement all recommendations for closure or realignment. The EIS focuses on the environmental and socioeconomic impacts and mitigations associated with the disposal and reuse of Sacramento Army Depot.

No long-term adverse ecological or environmental health effects are expected due to this action. The increase in population anticipated by the reuse and disposal activities is expected to have a net positive impact on the local economy. The preferred alternative, prepared with the cooperation of the local community, is not expected to significantly impact environmental resources.

DATES: Written public comments and suggestions can be submitted on or before March 16, 1995 to the address shown below.

ADDRESSES: Copies of the ROD can be obtained by writing to the United States Army Corps of Engineers, Sacramento District, ATTN: CESP-K-ED-M (ISS), 1325 J Street, Sacramento, California 95814-2922.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Mr. Wandell Carlton (916) 557-7424.

Department of the Navy

Notice of Public Hearings for the Draft Environmental Impact Statement for Disposal and Reuse of Naval Hospital Long Beach, Long Beach, CA.

Pursuant to Council on Environmental Quality regulations (40 CFR Parts 1500-1508) implementing procedural provisions of the National Environmental Policy Act, the Department of the Navy has prepared and filed with the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency a Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) for disposal and reuse of Naval Hospital Long Beach.

In accordance with legislative requirements in the 1990 Base Closure and Realignment Act (Public Law 101-510) and the results of the 1991 Defense Base Closure and Realignment process, Naval Hospital Long Beach, California was directed to be closed and made available for reuse. Navy has analyzed the environmental effects of reasonably foreseeable reuse alternatives of existing buildings and for redevelopment of the site. Five alternatives for potential reuse have been identified by the City of Long Beach and through an extensive scoping process: (1) The Los Angeles County Office of Education (LACOE); (2) a Senior Health Care facility; (3) an industrial park; (4) retail use; and (5) residential use. Alternatives (1) and (2) would rehabilitate existing structures and facilities; alternatives (3) (4) and (5) would require demolition of existing structures and subsequent site redevelopment.

The DEIS has been distributed to various federal, state, and local agencies, elected officials, and special interest groups. Copies of the DEIS have also been placed in local libraries. A limited number of copies are available at the address listed at the end of this notice.

No implementation of the proposed action will occur until the National Environmental Policy Act process has been completed and the Navy releases a Record of Decision.

The Department of the Navy will hold two public hearings to inform the public of the DEIS findings and to solicit comments. The first meeting will be held on Wednesday, March 1, 1995