Indonesian company, carried a unique Indonesian trademark and had a gradually-increasing percentage of local content over the next three years. The system was last modified in June of 1996, when the ''national car'' policy was modified to permit the ''national car'' to be produced outside Indonesia.

The USTR believes that these acts, policies and practices are inconsistent with certain aspects of the GATT 1994, the TRIMs Agreement, the SCM Agreement and the TRIPS Agreement. In particular, the program appears to be inconsistent with the most-favored-nation treatment and national treatment provisions found in Articles I and III of the GATT 1994; the prohibition in Article 2 of the TRIMs Agreement on investment measures that are inconsistent with the national treatment and quantitative restriction provisions in the GATT 1994; the prohibition on certain subsidies in Articles 3, 6, and 28.2 of the SCM Agreement; and the national treatment provision and prohibition on unjustifiable encumbrances on the use of trademarks found in Articles 3, 20, and 65.5 of the TRIPs Agreement. The United States has reserved the right to raise additional factual claims and legal matters during the course of the consultations.

Investigation and Consultations

As required in section 303(a) of the Trade Act, the USTR has requested consultations with the Government of Indonesia regarding the issues under investigation. The request was made pursuant to Articles 1 and 4 of the Understanding on Rules and Procedures Governing the Settlement of Disputes (DSU), Article XXII:1 of the GATT 1994, Article 8 of the TRIMs Agreement, Articles 7 and 30 of the SCM Agreement, and Article 64 of the TRIPS Agreement. If the consultations do not result in a satisfactory resolution of the matter, the USTR will request the establishment of a panel pursuant to Article 6 of the DSU.

Under section 304 of the Trade Act, the USTR must determine within 18 months after the date on which this investigation was initiated, or within 30 days after the conclusion of WTO dispute settlement procedures, whichever is earlier, whether any act, policy, or practice or denial of trade agreement rights described in section 301 of the Trade Act exists and, if that determination is affirmative, the USTR must determine what action, if any, to take under section 301 of the Trade Act.

Public Comment: Requirements for Submissions

Interested persons are invited to submit written comments concerning the acts, policies and practices of Indonesia which are the subject of this investigation, the amount of burden or restriction on U.S. commerce caused by these acts, policies and practices, and the determinations required under section 304 of the Trade Act. Comments must be filed in accordance with the requirements set forth in 15 CFR 2006.8(b) (55 FR 20593) and must be filed on or before noon on Friday, November 15, 1996. Comments must be in English and provided in twenty copies to: Sybia Harrison, Staff Assistant to the Section 301 Committee, Room 223, Office of the U.S. Trade Representative, 600 17th Street, N.W., Washington, DC 20508.

Comments will be placed in a file (Docket 301–109) open to public inspection pursuant to 15 CFR 2006.13, except confidential business information exempt from public inspection in accordance with 15 CFR 2006.15. Confidential business information submitted in accordance with 15 CFR 2006.15 must be clearly marked ''BUSINESS CONFIDENTIAL'' in a contrasting color ink at the top of each page on each of 20 copies, and must be accompanied by a nonconfidential summary of the confidential information. The nonconfidential summary shall be placed in the file that is open to public inspection. An appointment to review the docket (Docket No. 301–109) may be made by calling Brenda Webb (202) 395–6186. The USTR Reading Room is open to the public from 10:00 a.m. to 12 noon and 1:00 p.m. to 4:00 p.m., Monday through Friday, and is located in Room 101.

Irving A. Williamson,

Chairman, Section 301 Committee.

[FR Doc. 96–26592 Filed 10–16–96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3190–01–M

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Federal Aviation Administration

FAA Approval of the Noise Compatibility Program for Chico Municipal Airport (CIC), Chico, CA

AGENCY: Federal Aviation Administration, DOT.

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: The Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) announces its findings on the Noise Compatibility Program submitted by City of Chico, California under the provisions of Title I of the Aviation Safety and Noise Abatement Act of 1979 (Public Law 96–193) and 14 CFR Part 150. These findings are made in recognition of the description of Federal and nonfederal responsibilities in Senate Report No. 96–52 (1980). On April 23, 1993 the FAA determined that the Noise Exposure Maps submitted by City of Chico under Part 150 were in compliance with applicable requirements. On September 18, 1996, the Associate Administrator for Airports approved the Noise Compatibility Program.

EFFECTIVE DATE: The effective date of the FAA's approval of the Noise Compatibility Program is September 18, 1996.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: John L. Pfeifer, Manager, Airports District Office, SFO–600, 831 Mitten Road, Burlingame, California 94010, Telephone: (415) 876–2778. Documents reflecting this FAA action may be reviewed at this same location.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: This notice announces that the FAA has given its overall approval to the Noise Compatibility Program for Chico Municipal Airport, effective September 18, 1996. Under Section 104(a) of the Aviation Safety and Noise Abatement Act of 1979 (hereinafter referred to as ''the Act''), an airport operator who has previously submitted a Noise Exposure Map may submit to the FAA a Noise Compatibility Program which sets forth the measures taken or proposed by the airport operator for the reduction of existing noncompatible land uses and prevention of additional noncompatible land uses within the area covered by the Noise Exposure Maps. The Act requires such programs to be developed in consultation with interested and affected parties including local communities, government agencies, airport users, and FAA personnel.

Each airport Noise Compatibility Program developed in accordance with Federal Aviation Regulations (FAR) Part 150 is a local program, not a Federal program. The FAA does not substitute its judgment for that of the airport proprietor with respect to which measures should be recommended for action. The FAA's approval or disapproval of FAR Part 150 program recommendations is measured according to the standards expressed in Part 150 and the Act and is limited to the following determinations:

a. The Noise Compatibility Program was developed in accordance with the provisions and procedures of FAR Part 150;

b. Program measures are reasonably consistent with achieving the goals of reducing existing noncompatible land uses around the airport and preventing the introduction of additional noncompatible land uses;

c. Program measures would not create an undue burden on interstate or foreign commerce, unjustly discriminate against types or classes of aeronautical uses, violate the terms of airport grant agreements, or intrude into areas preempted by the Federal Government; and

d. Program measures relating to the use of flight procedures can be implemented within the period covered by the program without derogating safety, adversely affecting the efficient use and management of the navigable airspace and air traffic control systems, or adversely affecting other powers and responsibilities of the Administrator prescribed by law. Specific limitations with respect to the FAA's approval of an airport Noise Compatibility Program are delineated in FAR Part 150, Section 150.5. Approval is not a determination concerning the acceptability of land uses under Federal, state, or local law. Approval does not by itself constitute an FAA implementing action. A request for Federal action or approval to implement specific noise compatibility measures may be required, and an FAA decision on the request may require an environmental assessment of the proposed action. Approval does not constitute a commitment by the FAA to financially assist in the implementation of the program nor a determination that all measures covered by the program are eligible for grant-in-aid funding from the FAA. Where federal funding is sought, requests for project grants must be submitted to the FAA Airports District Office in Burlingame, California.

The City of Chico, California submitted to the FAA on December 16, 1992 the Noise Exposure Maps, descriptions, and other documentation produced during the Noise Compatibility Planning study conducted from August 1991 through March 1995. The Noise Exposure Maps were determined by the FAA to be in compliance with applicable requirements on April 23, 1993. Notice of this determination was published in the Federal Register on May 3, 1993. The study contains a proposed Notice Compatibility Program comprised of actions designed for phased implementation by airport management and adjacent jurisdictions form the date of study completion and beyond the year 1996. It was requested that the FAA evaluate and approve this material as a Noise Compatibility Program as described in Section 104(b) of the Act. The FAA began its review of the program on March 22, 1996 and was required by a provision of the Act to approve or disapprove the program within 180 days (other than the use of new flight procedures for noise control). Failure to approve or disapprove such program within the 180-day period shall be deemed to be an approval of such program.

The submitted program contained 15 proposed actions for noise mitigation on and off the airport. The FAA completed its review and determined that the procedural and substantive requirements of the Act and FAR Part 150 have been satisfied. The overall program, therefore, was approved by the Associate Administrator for Airports effective September 18, 1996. Outright approval was granted for 13 of the specific program elements: Retention of existing altitude requirements; Existing posted directional signs; Existing planning and zoning consideration of noise; Existing requirement of avigation easements; Periodic noise exposure map updates; Overflight protection zone; Easement dedication; Notice of airport noise; Requirement for acoustical studies within the areas of CNEL 55dB and above; Preferential approach and departure flight tracks; Establish interagency coordination procedures/maintain public information; Post informational signs at takeoff end of runways; Noise abatement advisories; Flight training/compliance; Increased pilot awareness. One (1) element was disapproved for the purposes of Part 150 upon the finding that it is more properly categorized under Part 77. The other measure, a suggested modification to the VOR approach to Runway 31R was disapproved pending submission of adequate information to make the informed analysis concerning the effectiveness of this measure.

These determinations are set forth in detail in a Record of Approval endorsed by the Associate Administrator for Airports on September 18, 1996. The Record of Approval, as well as other evaluation materials and the documents comprising the submittal, are available for review at the FAA office listed above and at the administrative offices of the Chico Municipal Airport, Chico, California.

Issued in Hawthorne, California on October 4, 1996.

Herman C. Bliss,

Manager, Airports Division, Western-Pacific Region.

[FR Doc. 96–26662 Filed 10–16–96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–13–M

[Docket No. 28611]

Finding of No Significant Impact

AGENCY: Federal Aviation Administration (FAA), DOT.

ACTION: Finding of no significant impact.

SUMMARY: The FAA prepared an Environmental Assessment (EA) to evaluate the Alaska Aerospace Development Corporation's (AADC) proposal to construct and operate a launch site at Narrow Cape on Kodiak Island, Alaska, and issued a proposed Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI) for public comment on June 25, 1996, for 30 days. After reviewing and analyzing currently available data and information on existing conditions, project impacts, and measures to mitigate those impacts, and after considering public comments, the Office of the Associate Administrator for Commercial Space Transportation (AST) has determined that licensing the operation of the proposed launch site is not a major Federal action that would significantly affect the quality of the human environment within the meaning of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) of 1969. Therefore the preparation of an environmental impact statement is not required and AST is issuing a Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI).

FOR A COPY OF THE KODIAK LAUNCH COMPLEX ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT CONTACT: Mr. Nikos Himaras, Office of the Associate Administrator for Commercial Space Transportation, Licensing and Safety Division, 400 Seventh Street, SW., Washington, D.C. 20590; phone (202) 366–2455; or refer to the following Internet address: http://www.dot.gov/dotinfo/faa/cst/cst.html.

DATES: The FAA made its proposed FONSI available for public comment on June 25, 1996, for 30 days.

Proposed Action

The FAA licenses the operation of non-Federal launch sites in the United States, such as AADC's proposed construction and operation of Kodiak Launch Complex (KLC), a commercial space launch site on Kodiak Island, Alaska, pursuant to 49 U.S.C. 70101–70119, formerly the Commercial Space Launch Act. Licensing the operation of a launch site is a proposed Federal action requiring environmental analysis by the FAA in accordance with the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969, 42 U.S.C. 4321 *et seq.* Upon receipt of a complete application, the Associate Administrator for Commercial Space Transportation must determine