

Agreements Act and the Uruguay Round Agreement on Textiles and Clothing, but are designed to assist only in the implementation of certain of their provisions.

D. Michael Hutchinson,

Acting Chairman, Committee for the Implementation of Textile Agreements.

Committee for the Implementation of Textile Agreements

October 11, 1995.

Commissioner of Customs,

Department of the Treasury, Washington, DC 20229.

Dear Commissioner: This directive amends, but does not cancel, the directive issued to you on January 24, 1995, by the Chairman, Committee for the Implementation of Textile Agreements. That directive concerns imports of certain cotton, man-made fiber, silk blend and other vegetable fiber textiles and textile products, produced or manufactured in Bangladesh and exported during the twelve-month period which began on January 1, 1995 and extends through December 31, 1995.

Effective on October 11, 1995, you are directed to amend further the January 24, 1995 directive to increase the limit for Categories 645/646 to 239,418 dozen¹, as provided for under the Uruguay Round Agreements Act and the Uruguay Round Agreement on Textiles and Clothing.

The Committee for the Implementation of Textile Agreements has determined that this action falls within the foreign affairs exception to the rulemaking provisions of 5 U.S.C.553(a)(1).

Sincerely,

D. Michael Hutchinson,

Acting Chairman, Committee for the Implementation of Textile Agreements.

[FR Doc.95-25750 Filed 10-16-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-DR-F

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

Office of the Secretary

Defense Science Board

AGENCY: Change in date of Advisory Committee Meeting Notice.

SUMMARY: The meeting of the Defense Science Board scheduled for October 25-26, 1995, as published in the Federal Register (Vol. 60, No. 13, Page 4150, Friday, January 20, 1995, FR Doc. 95-1365) will be held on October 31 and November 1, 1995. In all other respects the original notice remains unchanged.

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

Dated: October 11, 1995.

L.M. Bynum,

Alternate OSD Federal Register Liaison Officer, Department of Defense.

[FR Doc. 95-25616 Filed 10-16-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 5000-04-M

Department of the Army, Corps of Engineers

Coastal Engineering Research Board (CERB)

AGENCY: Corps of Engineers.

ACTION: Notice of open meeting.

SUMMARY: In accordance with Section 10(a)(2) of the Federal Advisory Committee Act (P.L. 92-463), announcement is made of the following committee meeting:

Name of Committee: Coastal Engineering Research Board (CERB).

Date of Meeting: October 25, 1995.

Place: Fort Lauderdale Airport Hilton, Fort Lauderdale, Florida.

Time: 8:00 a.m. to 5:45 p.m.

Proposed Agenda: The morning session will consist of presentations on the following topics: New policies; Coast of Florida Study, GIS; Dredging Research Program and technology transfer activities; aragonite studies; turtle deflector, Coastal Inlet Research Program; and dredged material disposal (Miami). The afternoon session is devoted to old CERB business; benefits of the Coastal Engineering Education Program, and presentations dealing with various Division and District activities. These include: a South Atlantic Division overview, risk based analysis of coastal projects; Folly Beach, Tybee Island, economics of beach-fill projects, and POD/Caribbean Island partnering.

This meeting is open to the public; participation by the public is scheduled for 11:55 a.m. on October 25.

The entire meeting is open to the public subject to the following:

1. Since seating capacity of the meeting room is limited, advance notice of intent to attend, although not required, is requested in order to assure adequate arrangements.

2. Oral participation by public attendees is encouraged during the time scheduled on the agenda; written statements may be submitted prior to the meeting or up to 30 days after the meeting.

Inquiries and notice of intent to attend the meeting may be addressed to Colonel Bruce K. Howard, Executive Secretary, Coastal Engineering Research Board, U.S. Army Engineer Waterways Experimentation Station, 3909 Halls Ferry Road, Vicksburg, Mississippi 39180-6199.

Bruce K. Howard,

Corps of Engineers Executive Secretary.

[FR Doc. 95-25666 Filed 10-16-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3710-92-M

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

Direct Grant Programs and Fellowship Programs: 84.129T Distance Learning Through Telecommunications; 84.129U-I Parent Information and Training Programs; 84.129U-3 Parent Information and Training Programs—Technical Assistance

AGENCY: Department of Education.

ACTION: Notice inviting applications for new awards for fiscal year 1996; correction.

SUMMARY: This notice provides material inadvertently omitted from the combined application notice (CAN) inviting new awards for fiscal year (FY) 1996 under many of the Department's programs and competitions, as published in the issue of Thursday, August 10, 1995 (60 FR 40956). The Secretary publishes this material under the Education Department General Administrative Regulations (EDGAR). The material is useful to potential applicants in applying for awards under the affected programs and competitions.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: A number of the discretionary grant programs and competitions included in the CAN for FY 1996—especially those for which the Department has not issued program-specific regulations—use the selection criteria in EDGAR (specifically 34 CFR 75.210) for their selection criteria. Paragraph (c) of § 75.210 provides that the Secretary distributes an additional 15 points among the criteria listed in paragraph (b) of that section and that the Secretary indicates in the application notice for the program how the 15 points are distributed.

Among the programs or competitions included in the CAN that use EDGAR for their selection criteria are three from which the reference to the EDGAR selection criteria and the distribution of the additional 15 points were inadvertently omitted. All three of these programs or competitions are under the Rehabilitation Services Administration of the Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services. They are: CFDA No.84.129T, Distance Learning through Telecommunications; CFDA No. 84.129U-I, Parent Information and Training Programs; and CFDA No. 84.129U-3, Parent Information and Training Programs—Technical Assistance.

The correct references to the EDGAR selection criteria and the distribution of the additional points are as follows:

Corrections

84.129T Distance Learning Through Telecommunications

Selection Criteria: In evaluating applications for grants under this program, the Secretary uses the selection criteria in 34 CFR 75.210.

The regulations in 34 CFR 75.210 provide that the Secretary may award up to 100 points for the selection criteria, including a reserved 15 points. For this competition the Secretary distributes the 15 points as follows:

Plan of operation (34 CFR 75.210(b)(3)). Fifteen points are added to this criterion for a possible total of 30 points.

84.129U-1 Parent Information and Training Programs

Selection Criteria: In evaluating applications for grants under this program, the Secretary uses the selection criteria in 34 CFR 75.210.

The regulations in 34 CFR 75.210 provide that the Secretary may award up to 100 points for the selection criteria, including a reserved 15 points. For this competition the Secretary distributes the 15 points as follows:

Plan of operation (34 CFR 75.210(b)(3)). Fifteen points are added to this criterion for a possible total of 30 points.

84.129U-3 Parent Information and Training Programs—Technical Assistance

Selection Criteria: In evaluating applications for grants under this program, the Secretary uses the selection criteria in 34 CFR 75.210.

The regulations in 34 CFR 75.210 provide that the Secretary may award up to 100 points for the selection criteria, including a reserved 15 points. For this competition the Secretary distributes the 15 points as follows:

Plan of operation (34 CFR 75.210(b)(3)). Fifteen points are added to this criterion for a possible total of 30 points.

Dated: October 12, 1995.

Judith A. Winston,

General Counsel.

[FR Doc. 95-25720 Filed 10-16-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4000-01-P

Arbitration Panel Decision Under the Randolph-Sheppard Act

AGENCY: Department of Education.

ACTION: Notice of arbitration panel decision under the Randolph-Sheppard Act.

SUMMARY: Notice is hereby given that on August 6, 1994, an arbitration panel rendered a decision in the matter of *Lue Atha Dixie v. Tennessee Department of Human Services* (Docket No. R-S/92-10). This panel was convened by the Secretary of the U.S. Department of Education pursuant to 20 U.S.C. 107d-2 upon receipt of a complaint by petitioner Lue Atha Dixie.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: A copy of the full text of the arbitration panel decision may be obtained from George F. Arnow, U.S. Department of Education, 600 Independence Avenue, S.W., Room 3230, Switzer Building, Washington, D.C. 20202-2738. Telephone: (202) 205-9317. Individuals who use a telecommunications device for the deaf (TDD) may call the TDD number at (202) 205-8298.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: Pursuant to the Randolph-Sheppard Act (20 U.S.C. 107d-2(c)), the Secretary publishes a synopsis of arbitration panel decisions affecting the administration of vending facilities on Federal and other property.

Background

Ms. Lue Atha Dixie began her career as a vending facility manager in the Tennessee Business Enterprise Program in 1980. The program is operated by the Tennessee Department of Human Services (TDHS), the State licensing agency (SLA), in conformance with the requirements of the Randolph-Sheppard Act (the Act), 20 U.S.C 107 *et seq.*, and implementing regulations in 34 CFR Part 395.

Ms. Dixie was removed from the Business Enterprise Program on October 31, 1990, when her license as a facility manager was revoked on the grounds that her visual acuity exceeded the standard established by the Act. However, pending the outcome of the Federal arbitration hearing, Ms. Dixie continued to manage the facility pursuant to an arrangement with the SLA.

The question of visual acuity was raised when she underwent a periodic eye examination that was required of all managers in the TDHS program following a 1989 amendment to the Tennessee State Rules, 1240-6-2.03. Prior to this amendment, there had been no requirement of periodic examinations of vending facility managers. In the course of the eye examination conducted after the passage of the new rule, Ms. Dixie's level of visual acuity disqualified her from the program based on the visual acuity standard found in the regulations in 34 CFR 395.1(c).

Consequently, in compliance with revised State Rule 1240-6-2.03, which provided for the revocation of the license of any manager whose vision did not qualify him or her under the regulations in 34 CFR 395.1(c), Ms. Dixie's license was terminated. The ophthalmologist who conducted the initial examination of Ms. Dixie's eyes concluded that her vision did not fall within the eligibility guidelines. Subsequently, at Ms. Dixie's request, she was examined by another ophthalmologist, whose examination largely confirmed the previous doctor's assessment.

In March 1991, after her license was terminated, Ms. Dixie was examined by a third ophthalmologist. Using specialized contrast sensitivity acuity testing procedures, which measure acuity over a broader range of light and color than traditional methods, the doctor's report was favorable to Ms. Dixie.

However, during the time the foregoing examinations were taking place, the SLA discovered in its records two eye examinations of Ms. Dixie in 1978 and 1980 indicating that her visual acuity did not meet the eligibility requirements of the Randolph-Sheppard program.

Following her October 1990 license termination, Ms. Dixie requested and received a State fair hearing, which was conducted on March 15, 1991. On July 2, 1991 a hearing officer upheld the SLA's decision terminating Ms. Dixie's license, and on July 15, 1991 the SLA adopted the hearing officer's decision as final agency action.

Subsequently, Ms. Dixie filed a request with the Secretary of the U.S. Department of Education to convene an arbitration panel to hear this dispute. A panel was convened, and this complaint was heard on February 21, 1994.

Arbitration Panel Decision

The arbitration panel concluded that Ms. Dixie's functional visual acuity satisfied the applicable regulations in 34 CFR 395.1(c) and that she was improperly removed from the Tennessee Business Enterprise Program. The panel reasoned that, if the report of the contrast acuity examination had been available to the SLA prior to Ms. Dixie's removal from the vending facility program, her removal might well have been avoided.

The panel concluded that the contrast sensitivity testing for visual acuity is probably the most comprehensive way to measure functional vision. The panel further stated that while the definition of blindness contained in 34 CFR 395.1(c) uses the Snelling Acuity Chart