Quota Status Reports posted on the bulletin boards of each Customs port or call (202) 927–5850. 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).

The current limit for Categories 336/636 is being increased by application of swing, reducing the limit for Category 341 to account for the increase.

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 60 FR 65299, published on December 19, 1995). Also see 60 FR 62410, published on December 6, 1995.

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, but are designed to assist only in the implementation of certain of its provisions.

Troy H. Cribb,

*Chairman, Committee for the Implementation of Textile Agreements.*

Committee for the Implementation of Textile Agreements

September 4, 1996.

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 November 29, 1995, by the Chairman of CITA. That directive concerns imports of certain cotton and man-made fiber textile products, produced or manufactured in Nepal and exported during the twelve-month period which began on January 1, 1996 and extends through December 31, 1996.

Effective on September 9, 1996, you are directed to adjust the limits for the following categories, as provided for in the agreement dated December 2, 1993 and July 22, 1994, as amended and extended, between the Governments of the United States and the Kingdom of Nepal:

| Category | Twelve-month limit [1] |
|---|---|
| 336/636 ..... | 233,638 dozen. |
| 341 ..... | 832,587 dozen. |

[1] The limits have not been adjusted to account for any imports exported after December 31, 1995.

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

Sincerely,

Troy H. Cribb,

*Chairman, Committee for the Implementation of Textile Agreements.*

[FR Doc. 96–23024 Filed 9–9–96; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 3510–DR–F**

## DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

### Draft Hanford Remedial Action; Environmental Impact Statement and Comprehensive Land-Use Plan, Richland, WA

**AGENCY:** U.S. Department of Energy (DOE).

**ACTION:** Notice of availability (NOA).

**SUMMARY:** DOE announces the availability of the Draft Hanford Remedial Action Environmental Impact Statement and Comprehensive Land-Use Plan (HRA–EIS). The Draft EIS addresses DOE's proposed alternatives for establishing future land-use objectives for the Hanford Site. Decisions resulting from the assessment of the environmental impacts associated with these alternatives, in consultation with stakeholders and regulators, will establish a desired future land use for a given area. The scope of the HRA–EIS is based on the Hanford Future Site Uses Working Group (Working Group) recommendations which were developed by stakeholders representing a diverse combination of interests that worked for a number of years to identify future use options for the Hanford Site. The HRA–EIS addresses potential remediation impacts for four of the six Hanford geographic areas identified by the Working Group; (1) The Columbia River (Hanford Reach), (2) Reactors on the River (100 Areas), (3) the Central Plateau (200 Areas), and (4) All Other Areas (300, 400, 600, 1100, and 3000 Areas). Remediation of all Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act (CERCLA) operable units and Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA) past-practice waste site as defined under the Tri-Party Agreement located within these geographic areas are included in the scope of this EIS. Decommissioning of selected surplus facilities is also addressed, along with RCRA waste treatment, storage, and disposal (TSD) units located in or near past-practice waste units. The Fitzner-Eberhardt Arid Lands Ecology Reserve and the area north of the Columbia River (North Slope) have been remediated and are considered available for unrestricted uses, and therefore have not been analyzed as part of this EIS. However, potential future land uses for these two areas are addressed in the Comprehensive Land-Use Plan portion of the Draft HRA–EIS. The alternatives presented in this EIS were developed by applying different levels-of-access scenarios (i.e., restricted use, unrestricted use, and exclusive use) to the different geographic areas identified by the Working Group.

**DATES:** DOE invites all interested parties to submit written comments concerning the Draft EIS during the comment period ending November 1, 1996. Comments postmarked after that date will be considered to the extent practicable. A public hearing will be conducted on October 17, 1996.

**ADDRESSES:** Requests for copies of the Draft EIS, further information on the Draft EIS, and/or written comments on the Draft EIS should be directed to Mr. Thomas W. Ferns, DOE National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) Document Manager, U.S. Department of Energy, Richland Operations Office, P.O. Box 550, MSIN HO–12, Richland, Washington 99352–0550. Requests for copies of the Draft EIS or comments on the Draft EIS can also be made through (1) the Internet at Thomas__W__Ferns@rl.gov, (2) by calling 1–800–786–2018, or (3) by FAX at (509) 376–4360. Locations of Public Reading Rooms and information repositories where the Draft EIS will be available for review are listed in this notice under ''**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION**.'' The Draft EIS is also available on the DOE Hanford Internet Home Page at http://www.hanford.gov/eis/hraeis/hraeis.htm.

Information on the DOE NEPA process may be obtained from Ms. Carol Borgstrom, Director, Office of NEPA Policy and Assistance, U.S. Department of Energy, 1000 Independence Avenue SW, MSIN EH–42, Washington, D.C. 20585. Ms. Borgstrom may be contacted by telephone at (202) 586–4600 or by leaving a message at 1–800–472–2756.

The public is also invited to attend a hearing in which oral and written comments will be received on the Draft EIS. Oral and written comments will be considered equally in preparation of the Final EIS. The public hearing will be held on the date and at the location listed below:

*Dates:* October 17, 1996.
*Time: 6:30 p.m.*
*Location: Shilo Inn.*
*Addresses:* 50 Comstock Street, Ballroom # 1, Richland, WA 99352.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:**

Background

On August 21, 1992, DOE published a Notice of Intent (NOI) to prepare the HRA–EIS in the Federal Register (57 FR 37959). The scoping period for the HRA–EIS was scheduled to run from August 21, 1992, to November 25, 1992, but was extended, at the public's request, to January 15, 1993. A notice of this extension was printed on November 25, 1992 (57 FR 55517). During the public scoping period, four scoping meetings were held in the Northwest: Spokane, Washington, on September 29, 1992; Pasco, Washington, on October 1, 1992; Seattle, Washington, on October 5, 1992; and Portland, Oregon, on October 8, 1992. Public comments received during the scoping period were considered by DOE in developing the Draft HRA–EIS. Some comments resulted in modifications of the scope and content of the EIS as set forth in the original NOI. Comments from the public scoping process and the DOE responses to those comments can be found in the Implementation Plan for the HRA–EIS, issued in June 1995 (DOE/RL–93–66).

Recently, DOE issued a policy requiring land and facility-use planning at large multi-function DOE sites (this policy has been incorporated into DOE Order 430.1, ''Life-Cycle Asset Management''). To satisfy the requirements of this Order, DOE began development of the Hanford Site Comprehensive Land-Use Plan (Comprehensive Plan). The purpose of the Comprehensive Plan is to guide land and facility-use decisions through the integration of natural, cultural, and socioeconomic factors and to designate existing and future land uses that are appropriate for the Hanford Site, including an evaluation of DOE's responsibilities, authorities, and applicable requirements. In addition, the land-use analysis considers values expressed by other federal agencies; state and local governments; the Tribal Nations; businesses, labor, environmental, and other groups and organizations; and members of the public concerned with or affected by the Hanford Site. These values, taken in conjunction with specific characteristics of the natural and built landscape within the Hanford Site, are used to identify areas of the Hanford Site which could be designated for various future uses.

Copies of the Draft HRA–EIS have been distributed to federal, state, and local officials; Tribal Nations; and agencies, organizations, and individuals who may be interested or affected by the proposed action. The document number for this EIS is DOE/EIS–0222D. This EIS has been prepared in accordance with NEPA; the Council on Environmental Quality's NEPA regulations, 40 CFR Parts 1500–1508; and the DOE NEPA Implementing Procedures, 10 CFR Part 1021. DOE plans to issue the Final EIS in February of 1996, with a Record of Decision issued no sooner than 30 days after issuance of the Final EIS. The Draft EIS and key supporting technical documentation can be found in the DOE reading rooms and designated information repositories identified at the end of this notice.

Alternatives Considered

Future land-use alternatives discussed in detail in the HRA–EIS are:

- ''No-Action''—conduct a long-term monitoring and maintenance program instead of continuing the current program of TSD unit closures, past-practice waste site remedial actions, and surplus facility decommissioning actions (the No-Action Alternative is common to all of the geographic areas, but the specific monitoring and maintenance activities would vary depending on the types of waste sites and facilities found in each area);
- ''Columbia River Unrestricted Future Land-Use Alternative''—unrestricted use of the Columbia River geographic area would be achieved through excavation and removal of contaminated riverbank, riverbottom, and island sediments, in conjunction with removal of the river discharge pipelines. This alternative would result in residual contamination levels that would not preclude any human uses within the Columbia River geographic area;
- ''Columbia River Restricted Future Land-Use Alternative''—restricted use would be achieved through the removal of physical hazards and contaminants combined with engineering and/or institutional controls. This alternative would result in residual contaminant levels that require some continuing restrictions on human use of the Columbia River geographic area;
- ''Reactors on the River Unrestricted Future Land-Use Alternative''—unrestricted use of the Reactors on the River geographic area would be achieved through excavation of contaminated soil and remediation of past-practice waste sites and ground water in conjunction with closure of TSD units and decommissioning of surplus contaminated and uncontaminated facilities associated with the reactors. This alternative would include ground-water remediation to address existing contaminant plumes located in, or potentially entering into, the Reactors on the River geographic area. Under this alternative, the Reactors on the River geographic area would be remediated to levels that do not preclude any human use. However, access or certain uses might continue to be controlled for other reasons (i.e., the presence of physical hazards or to protect cultural resources and/or sensitive wildlife habitat);
- ''Reactors on the River Restricted Future Land-Use Alternative''—restricted future land use for the Reactors on the River geographic area would be achieved through a combination of remedial activities, including excavation and disposal of contaminated soil, remediation of past-practice waste sites, closure of TSD units, site reclamation, decommissioning of surplus facilities, and/or use of engineering and institutional controls. In addition to these potential remediation activities, a ground-water remediation strategy would be employed for the Reactors on the River geographic area. The EIS assesses two primary options for achieving a Restricted Future Land-Use for the Reactors on the River geographic area. The first option (R1) would emphasize removal and disposal of waste and contaminated materials, ground-water remediation, and continuing access restrictions. The second option (R2) would emphasize the placement of engineered caps, or barriers, over waste sites, in addition to ground-water remediation;
- ''Central Plateau Exclusive Future Land-Use Alternative''—exclusive future land use of the Central Plateau geographic area would be achieved primarily through engineering and institutional controls, ground-water remediation, and capping of past-practice waste sites and TSD units. Potential health risks due to residual contamination would require strict controls on access. Use of the area would be limited to management of radioactive and hazardous waste, and similar compatible uses;
- '' All Other Areas Restricted Future Land-Use Alternative''—restricted future land use in the All Other Areas geographic area could be achieved through a variety of remediation activities, including excavation and disposal of contaminated soil, remediation of past-practice waste sites, closure of TSD units, site reclamation, decommissioning of surplus facilities, and/or use of engineering and institutional controls. In addition to these potential remediation activities, a ground-water remediation strategy would be developed and employed for

the All Other Areas geographic area. The EIS assesses two primary options for achieving a restricted future land use for the All Other Areas geographic area. The first option (R1) would emphasize removal and disposal of waste and contaminated materials, ground-water remediation, and continuing access restrictions. The second option (R2) would emphasize the placement of engineered caps, or barriers, over waste sites, in addition to ground-water remediation.

Preferred Alternative

DOE has not selected a preferred alternative at this time. Following public comment on the Draft EIS, DOE will develop a preferred alternative to be presented in the Final EIS.

Invitation to Comment

DOE has completed the general distribution of the EIS and has filed the document with the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, which will publish a separate Notice of Availability elsewhere in the Federal Register. The Draft EIS also is available to the public in the DOE reading rooms and designated information repository locations identified in this notice.

Persons interested in speaking at the hearing (see address at the beginning of this notice) may register at the hearing and will be called on to speak on a first-come, first-served basis. Written comments will also be accepted at the hearing, and speakers are encouraged to provide written versions of their oral comments for the record. Oral and written comments will be considered equally in preparing the Final EIS.

The Summary of the HRA-EIS is available for review for those who do not wish to receive the entire Draft EIS. When requesting copies of the HRA-EIS, please specify whether you wish to receive only the Summary (38 pages) or the entire Draft EIS including associated appendices (4 volumes).

DOE Public Reading Rooms and Information Repositories

Suzzallo Library, University of Washington, Government Publications Room, Seattle, Washington 98159, (206) 543–4664

Foley Center, Gonzaga University, E. 502 Boone, Spokane, Washington 99258, (509) 328–4220, Ext. 3125

DOE Public Reading Room, Washington State University, Tri-Cities Campus, 100 Sprout Road, Room 130, Richland, Washington 99352, (509) 376–8583

Branford Price Millar Library, Science and Engineering Floor, Portland State University, SW Harrison and Park, Portland, Oregon 97207, (503) 725–3690

DOE Freedom of Information Reading Room, Forrestal Building, 1000 Independence Avenue, SW, Washington, DC 20585, (202) 586–5955

Issued this 3rd day of September 1996.

James M. Owendoff,

*Deputy Assistant Secretary for Environmental Restoration.*

[FR Doc. 96–23046 Filed 9–9–96; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 6450–01–P**

## Oak Ridge Operations Office; Notice of Program Interest—Diesel Engine Technologies for Light Trucks

**AGENCY:** Transportation Technologies, DOE.

**ACTION:** Amendment to extend the application due date to September 30, 1996 for Notice of Program Interest—Diesel Engine Technologies for Light Trucks.

**SUMMARY:** The Department of Energy is extending the due date for receipt of applications in response to the Notice of Program Interest for support of the cooperative development of technologies for a high efficiency, very low emission, diesel engine for light trucks, specifically pickups and sport utility vehicles to September 30, 1996. All other information publicized in the original Notice of Program Interest on August 5, 1996, (61 FR 40629) is unchanged.

Issued in Oak Ridge, Tennessee on September 3, 1996.

Peter D. Dayton,

*Director, Procurement and Contracts Division, Oak Ridge Operations Office.*

[FR Doc. 96–23047 Filed 9–9–96; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 6450–01–P**

## Office of Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy

## Energy Conservation Program for Consumer Products: Granting of the Application for Interim Waiver and Publishing of the Petition for Waiver of Vermont Castings, Inc. From the DOE Vented Home Heating Equipment Test Procedure (Case No. DH–006)

**AGENCY:** Office of Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy, Department of Energy.

**ACTION:** Notice.

**SUMMARY:** Today's notice grants an Interim Waiver to Vermont Castings, Inc. (Vermont Castings) from the existing Department of Energy (DOE or Department) test procedure regarding pilot light energy consumption and weighted average steady-state efficiency for its manually controlled vented heater, model DV40 (Gas Fired Built In Direct Vent Fireplace).

Today's notice also publishes a ''Petition for Waiver'' from Vermont Castings. Vermont Castings' Petition for Waiver requests DOE to grant relief from the DOE vented home heating equipment test procedure relating to the use of pilot light energy consumption in calculating the Annual Fuel Utilization Efficiency (AFUE) and the calculation of weighted average steady state efficiency of its model DV20 vented heater. Vermont Castings seeks to delete the required pilot light measurement (Qp) in the calculation of AFUE when the pilot is off, and to test at a minimum fuel input rate of two-thirds instead of the specified ± 5 percent of 50 percent of the maximum fuel input rate in the calculation of AFUE. The Department is soliciting comments, data, and information respecting the Petition for Waiver.

**DATES:** DOE will accept comments, data, and information not later than October 10, 1996.

**ADDRESSES:** Written comments and statements shall be sent to: Department of Energy, Office of Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy, Case No. DH–006, Mail Stop EE–43, Room 1J–018, Forrestal Building, 1000 Independence Avenue, SW, Washington, DC 20585–0121, (202) 586–7140.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:**

William W. Hui, U.S. Department of Energy, Office of Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy, Mail Station EE–431, Forrestal Building, 1000 Independence Avenue, SW, Washington, D.C. 20585–0121, (202) 586–9145.

Eugene Margolis, Esq., U.S. Department of Energy, Office of General Counsel, Mail Station GC–72, Forrestal Building, 1000 Independence Avenue, SW, Washington, DC 20585–0103, (202) 586–9507.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** The Energy Conservation Program for Consumer Products (other than automobiles) was established pursuant to the Energy Policy and Conservation Act, as amended (EPCA), which requires DOE to prescribe standardized test procedures to measure the energy consumption of certain consumer products, including vented home heating equipment. The intent of the test procedures is to provide a comparable measure of energy consumption that will assist consumers in making informed purchasing