

motorcyclists and horseback riders, or snowshoers and snowmobilers.

General operation dates may be designated to avoid conflicts between motorcycle and snowmobile use. A period between each season may be designated as well to provide park staff enough time to prepare for the next season. The regulation also allows for designation of other conditions or restrictions in the future that may prove necessary for appropriate operation of the ORV area.

National Park Service general regulations (36 CFR 2.12) prohibit the operation of a motor vehicle, which includes motorcycles, that exceeds a noise level of 60 decibels measured on an A-weighted scale at 50 feet. The ambient noise level of the off-road vehicle use area presently exceeds this standard due to Interstate highway traffic noise and this standard would preclude the operation of most motorcycles. The Society of Automotive Engineers recommends use of 86 decibels at 50 feet, and this standard is adopted.

Public Participation

The policy of the National Park Service is, whenever practicable, to afford the public an opportunity to participate in the rulemaking process. Accordingly, interested persons may submit written comments regarding this proposed rule to the address noted at the beginning of this rulemaking.

Drafting Information

The primary authors of this rulemaking are Brian McHugh, Chief, Resource Management and Visitor Protection, Garree Williamson, Resource Management Specialist, and Gary A. Pace, North District Ranger, all of Cuyahoga Valley National Recreation Area.

Paperwork Reduction Act

This rulemaking does not contain information collection requirements that require approval by the Office of Management and Budget under 44 U.S.C. 3501 *et seq.*

Compliance with Other Laws

The Department of the Interior has determined that this document is not a major rule under Executive Order 12291, and certifies that this document will not have a significant economic effect on a substantial number of small entities under the Regulatory Flexibility Act (5 U.S.C. 601 *et seq.*).

This conclusion is based on the fact that off road vehicle use (snowmobiling and motorcycling) is a minor recreational use in the area and users

will be primarily persons who presently own off-road vehicles. While the proposed rule may contribute in some small way to the local tourism, this additional recreational use will be minimal.

Pursuant to the National Environmental Policy Act (42 U.S.C. 4332), the Service prepared an environmental assessment for the General Management Plan for Cuyahoga Valley National Recreation Area which addressed the proposed off road vehicle use. Copies of these documents are available for review at the address noted at the beginning of this rulemaking.

List of Subjects in 36 CFR Part 7

National Parks, Reporting and recordkeeping requirements.

In consideration of the foregoing, it is proposed to amend 36 CFR Chapter I as follows:

PART 7—SPECIAL REGULATIONS, AREAS OF THE NATIONAL PARK SYSTEM

1. The authority citation continues to read as follows:

Authority: 16 U.S.C. 1, 3, 9a, 462(k); § 7.96 also issued under D.C. Code 8-137 (1981) and D.C. Code 40-721 (1981).

2. By adding a new paragraph (b) to § 7.17 to read as follows:

§ 7.17 Cuyahoga Valley National Recreation Area.

* * * * *

(b) *Snowmobiles and motorcycles.* (1) All Federally owned land located south of Interstate 271, north of Interstate 80, and west of Riverview Road is generally designated as an offroad vehicle (ORV) area, with specific routes for the operation of snowmobiles and motorcycles further designated by the posting of appropriate signs and markers. Operating a snowmobile or a motorcycle within the ORV area is prohibited except on a route designated for such use.

(2) The superintendent may establish conditions or restrictions, in accordance with the criteria and procedures of §§ 1.5 and 1.7 of this chapter, pertaining to the use of the ORV area, including, but not limited to, seasons and periods of time during which snowmobiles or motorcycles may be operated within the ORV area. Violating a condition or restriction established by the superintendent is prohibited.

(3) The superintendent may designate portions of the ORV area that are available for snowmobile or motorcycle use only and that are closed to other forms of public use. Violating a closure

imposed by the superintendent is prohibited.

(4) Operating a motorcycle in the ORV area that exceeds a noise level of 86 decibels measured on the A-weighted scale measured at 50 feet (or an equivalent method, such as the Society of Automotive Engineers procedure for measuring 99 decibels at 20 inches) is prohibited.

Dated: May 6, 1987.

Susan Recce,

Acting Assistant Secretary for Fish and Wildlife and Parks.

[FR Doc. 87-13581 Filed 6-12-87; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4310-70-M

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

48 CFR Part 225

Department of Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement; Foreign Acquisition; Extension of Comment Period

AGENCY: Department of Defense.

ACTION: Proposed rule; notice of extension of comment period.

SUMMARY: The Defense Acquisition Regulatory Council issued a proposed rule in the *Federal Register* on April 16, 1987 (52 FR 12440) to change DFARS 225.105(S-75), with a 60-day comment period to end June 15, 1987. The purpose of this document is to extend the comment period for an additional 60 days.

DATE: Comments on the proposed revisions should be submitted in writing to the Executive Secretary, DAR Council at the address shown below, on or before August 15, 1987, to be considered in the formulation of the final rule. Please cite DAR Case 86-144 in all correspondence related to this issue.

ADDRESS: Interested parties should submit written comments to: Defense Acquisition Regulatory Council, ATTN: Mr. Charles W. Lloyd, Executive Secretary, ODASD(P)/DARS, c/o OUSD(A) Mill Room, Room 3D139, The Pentagon, Washington, DC 20301-3062.

Note.—If commenters choose to hand-carry comments to the DAR Council Office at 1211 South Fern Street, Arlington, VA, arrangements for hand-carried comments must be made with the DAR Council Staff Members. Security Guards at this location are not permitted to accept or sign for hand-delivered comments of any kind.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Mr. Charles W. Lloyd, Executive Secretary, DAR Council, telephone (202) 697-7266.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The DAR Council issued proposed changes to DFARS 225.105(S-75) to clarify that the 50% evaluation factor of the Balance of Payments Program shall not apply to any offer submitted in response to a solicitation for a civil works project, funded by civil works appropriations. Comments were to be submitted within 60 days, ending June 15, 1987. The DAR Council has determined that, because of the complexity of the issue, the comment period should be extended for an additional 60 days, ending August 15, 1987.

Owen L. Green III.

Acting Executive Secretary, Defense Acquisition Regulatory Council.

[FR Doc. 87-13569 Filed 6-12-87; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3810-01-M

Notices

Federal Register

Vol. 52, No. 114

Monday, June 15, 1987

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.

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

(Case No. OEE-3-86)

Bollinger GmbH et al.; Order Renewing Temporary Denial of Export Privileges

In the matter of: Bollinger GmbH, Roseggergasse 34, 1160 Vienna, Austria; Leopold Hrobsky, Donaufelderstrasse 38, Stg. 4, Apt. 4, 1210 Vienna, Austria; Dietmar Ulrichshofer with addresses at Kirchenstrasse 1, 3061 Ollersbach, Austria; and c/o Bollinger GmbH, Roseggergasse 34, 1160 Vienna, Austria and Vrablicz and Company, Steinergasse 11, 1170 Vienna, Austria, Respondents.

The Office of Export Enforcement, International Trade Administration, United States Department of Commerce (Department), pursuant to the provisions of § 388.19 of the Export Administration Regulations, 15 CFR Parts 368 through 399 (1986) (the Regulations), issued pursuant to the Export Administration Act of 1979, 50 U.S.C. app. sections 2401 through 2420 (1982), as amended by the Export Administration Amendments Act of 1985, Pub. L. 99-64, 99 Stat. 120 (July 12, 1985) (the Act), has asked the Deputy Assistant Secretary for Export Enforcement to renew an order temporarily denying all United States export privileges to Dietmar Ulrichshofer; Bollinger GmbH, which is owned by Dietmar Ulrichshofer; Leopold Hrobsky; and, Vrablicz and Company (hereinafter collectively referred to as respondents). Ulrichshofer, who is subject to an outstanding indictment in the U.S. District Court for the Central District of California for conspiracy to violate U.S. export controls and is a fugitive from U.S. justice, resides in Ollersbach, Austria; all of the other respondents reside in Vienna, Austria.¹

The initial order was issued on August 12, 1986 (51 FR 29509, August 18, 1986) and renewed on October 11, 1986 (51 FR 37210, October 20, 1986), December 10, 1986 (51 FR 44655, December 11, 1986) February 8, 1987 (52 FR 4632, February 13, 1987) and April 9, 1987 (52 FR 12576, April 17, 1987).

In its renewal request dated May 19, 1987, the Department states that, as a result of an ongoing investigation, it has reason to believe that respondents have conspired and acted in concert to violate the Act and the Regulations. The Department has reason to believe that the purpose of the conspiracy is to obtain U.S.-origin goods from third countries for ultimate destination in proscribed countries, without obtaining the required authorization from the Department for such shipments. The Department has reason to believe that respondents have participated in the unauthorized reexport of U.S.-origin commodities, including computer equipment and peripherals, from Austria to proscribed destinations, without authorization from the Department. Indeed, the Department previously provided a statement by the U.S. Customs Attache in Austria that his aspect of the investigation has revealed that respondent Vrablicz, on August 5, 1986, reexported such commodities to Czechoslovakia, which commodities were "owned" by respondent Bollinger. The Department further has shown that a statement given by the Customs Attache indicates that respondents currently have in their possession and control in Vienna, Austria, additional U.S.-origin equipment which requires authorization from the Department to permit its reexport from Austria. The Department has shown that there is a presumption of denial for any request seeking authorization to reexport this U.S.-origin equipment to proscribed destinations and states that, in any event, no such authorization has been requested. Nevertheless, the Department has reason to believe that respondents may attempt to reexport these U.S.-origin goods to proscribed destinations.

The Department states that the investigation gives it reason to believe that the violations under investigation were deliberate and covert. The

Department has shown that respondents Ulrichshofer and Hrobsky directed sales of commodities covered by the investigation to the Soviet Bloc. The Department has also shown that Ulrichshofer is involved with other parties in reexporting U.S. origin commodities from Austria to proscribed destinations without authorization from the Department. Further, since the respondents currently have possession and control of U.S.-origin goods subject to the Act and the Regulations, the Department states that violations are likely to occur again. The Department submits that renewal of the temporary denial order naming respondents is necessary for the purpose of giving notice to companies in the United States and abroad to cease dealing with respondents in goods and technical data subject to the Act and the Regulations in order to reduce the likelihood that respondents will continue to engage in activities which are in violation of the Act and the Regulations.

Respondent Vrablicz submitted to the Deputy Assistant Secretary a letter dated May 27, 1987, contesting the Department's request for renewal of the order. This letter was received in a timely manner and a copy was provided to the Department. This submission argues that, despite statements by the Department to the contrary, Vrablicz has attempted to be responsive to the inquiries of the Customs Attache. Chief among the claims made by Vrablicz is that it did not "own" the goods in question and, indeed, could not have owned them since, in Austria, freight forwarders cannot own or dispose of the goods they forward. This claim was doubted by the Customs Attache apparently because of a statement by Vrablicz, in earlier correspondence, which suggested that another freight forwarder "not only owned, but was 'responsible' for" subsequent movements of the subject goods from Vienna.² In its May 27 submission, Vrablicz states that the receipt of goods by the other freight forwarder "does not mean anyway that [the company] has ever been the owner of the goods."

The question of ownership of and "responsibility" for the goods in question appears to be central to the

¹ Werner Bruchhausen, a co-defendant named in the indictment along with Ulrichshofer, was recently convicted and sentenced in May 1987 to a substantial term of imprisonment, by the U.S.

District Court, Los Angeles, California in connection with some of the export control violation activities underlying the Ulrichshofer indictment.

² According to Customs Attache, Robert Urbansky as quoted from cable Vienna 6017, 10 April, 1987. Also, Government Exhibit #1.

Department's case against this respondent. At this stage, the investigation is obviously on-going, and the question of ownership remains unclear. I continue to join with the Department in finding reason to believe there is imminent threat of diversion based on the assumption that Vrablicz, as owner, re-directed the goods. This being the case, this order will be renewed with respect to Vrablicz. If Vrablicz were to make a direct showing to the Deputy Assistant Secretary that it did not own, or could not have owned, the subject goods, nor was it responsible for the disposition thereof, the question of imminent threat would have to be reassessed.

Respondent Hrobsky sent a letter, dated May 18, 1987 to the Administrative Law Judges (ALJ) of the Department of Commerce requesting the "repeal" of the order against him. The ALJ determined that this correspondence would not be treated as an appeal, and forwarded it to me for my consideration. I have three comments concerning this submission. First, this letter does not present opposition to renewal and, therefore, will not be considered as such. Second, the correspondence does not contain any explicit argument relating to the outstanding temporary denial order, but rather reports on communications between the respondent and the Customs Attache. Finally, Hrobsky has apparently attempted to be responsive to the questions posed by the Customs Attache in his April 2, 1987 letter. I cannot independently judge whether these responses are satisfactory. However, if it were the case that these responses are considered adequate by the Customs Attache, I would entertain a request by him to terminate this renewal with request to Hrobsky. If Hrobsky's replies are deficient, I would also expect the Customs Attache to so state and specifically explain before further claim of non-cooperation is relied on as a basis for any future TDO renewal request pertaining to this respondent.

No opposition was received from any other respondent. Therefore, based on the showing by the Department, I find that renewal of the order temporarily denying export privileges to respondents is necessary in the public interest to prevent an imminent violation of the Act and the Regulations and to give notice to companies in the United States and abroad to cease dealing with respondents in goods and technical data subject to the Act and the Regulations in

order to reduce the substantial likelihood that respondents will continue to engage in activities which are in violation of the Act and the Regulations.

Accordingly, it is hereby *Ordered*:

I. All outstanding validated export licenses in which any respondent appears or participates, in any manner or capacity, are hereby revoked and shall be returned forthwith to the Office of Export Licensing for cancellation.

II. The respondents, their successors or assignees, officer, partners, representatives, agents, and employees hereby are denied all privileges of participating, directly or indirectly, in any manner or capacity, in any transaction involving commodities or technical data exported or to be exported from the United States in whole or in part, or that are otherwise subject to the Regulations. Without limiting the generality of the foregoing participation, either in the United States or abroad, shall include participating, directly or indirectly, in any manner or capacity: (a) As a party or as a representative of a party to any export license application submitted to the Department, (b) in preparing or filing with the Department any export license application or reexport authorization, or any document to be submitted therewith, (c) in obtaining or using any validated or general export license or other export control document, (d) in carrying on negotiations with respect to, or in receiving, ordering, buying, selling, delivering, storing, using, or disposing of, in whole or in part, any commodities or technical data exported from the United States, or to be exported, and (e) in financing, forwarding, transporting, or other servicing of such commodities or technical data. Such denial of export privileges shall extend only to those commodities and technical data which are subject to the Act and the Regulations.

III. After notice and opportunity for comment, such denial may be made applicable to any person, firm, corporation, or business organization with which any respondent is now or hereafter may be related by affiliation, ownership, control, position of responsibility, or other connection in the conduct of trade or related services.

IV. No person, firm, corporation, partnership or other business organization, whether in the United States or elsewhere, without prior disclosure to and specific authorization from the Office of Export Licensing

shall, with respect to U.S.-origin commodities and technical data, do any of the following acts, directly or indirectly, or carry on negotiations with respect thereto, in any manner or capacity, on behalf of or on in any association with any respondent or any related party, or whereby any respondent or any related party may obtain any benefit therefrom or have any interest or participation therein, directly or indirectly: (a) Apply for, obtain, transfer, or use any license, Shipper's Export Declaration, bill of lading, or other export control document relating to any export, reexport, transshipment, or diversion of any commodity or technical data exported in whole or in part, or to be exported by, to, or for any respondent or any related party denied export privileges; or (b) order, buy, receive, use, sell, deliver, store, dispose of, forward, transport, finance, or otherwise service or participate in any export, reexport, transshipment, or diversion of any commodity or technical data exported or to be exported from the United States.

V. In accordance with the provisions of § 388.19(e) of the Regulations, any respondent may, at any time, appeal this order by filing with the Office of the Administrative Law Judges, U.S. Department of Commerce, Room H-6717, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, NW., Washington, DC 20230, a full written statement in support of the appeal.

VI. This order is effective June 8, 1987, and shall remain in effect for 60 days.

VII. In accordance with the provisions of § 388.19(d) of the Regulations, the Department may seek renewal of this temporary denial order by filing a written request not later than 20 days before an expiration date. Any respondent may oppose any request to renew this temporary denial order by filing a written submission with the Deputy Assistant Secretary for Export Enforcement, which must be received not later than seven days before the expiration date of this order.

A copy of this order shall be served upon each respondent and published in the **Federal Register**.

Dated: June 8, 1987.

Theodore W. Wu,

Deputy Assistant Secretary for Export Enforcement.

[FR Doc. 87-13553 Filed 6-12-87 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-25-M

[A-570-601]

Antidumping Duty Order; Tapered Roller Bearings and Parts Thereof, Finished or Unfinished, From the People's Republic of China

AGENCY: International Trade Administration, Import Administration, Department of Commerce.

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: In an investigation concerning tapered roller bearings from the People's Republic of China (PRC), the United States Department of Commerce (the Department) and the United States International Trade Commission (the ITC) have determined that tapered roller bearings from the PRC are being sold at less than fair value and that imports of tapered roller bearings from the PRC are materially injuring a United States industry.

EFFECTIVE DATE: June 15, 1987.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Michael Ready or Mary S. Clapp, Office of Investigations, International Trade Administration, United States Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Ave., NW., Washington, DC 20230; telephone: (202) 377-2613 or 377-1769, respectively.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The products covered by this investigation are tapered roller bearings and parts thereof, currently classified in *Tariff Schedules of the United States (TSUS)* item numbers 680.30 and 680.39; flange, take up cartridge, and hanger units incorporating tapered roller bearings, currently classified in TSUS item 681.10; and tapered roller housings (except pillow blocks) incorporating tapered rollers, with or without spindles, whether or not automotive use, currently classified in TSUS item number 692.32 or elsewhere in the TSUS.

On May 20, 1987, the Department made its final determination that this merchandise was being sold at less than fair value (52 FR 19748, May 27, 1987).

On June 5, 1987, in accordance with section 735(d) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, (the Act) (19 U.S.C. 1673d(d)), the ITC notified the Department that such importations materially injure a United States industry.

Therefore, in accordance with sections 736 and 751 of the Act (19 U.S.C. 1563e and 1675), the Department directs United States Customs officers to assess, upon further advice by the administering authority pursuant to section 736(a)(1) of the Act (19 U.S.C. 1673e (a)(1)), antidumping duties equal to the amount by which the foreign market value of the merchandise subject

to the order exceeds the United States price for all entries of such merchandise from the PRC. These antidumping duties will be assessed on all unliquidated entries of such merchandise entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption on or after February 6, 1987, the date on which the Department published its "Preliminary Determination" notice in the *Federal Register*. All entries or withdrawals of merchandise exported by the China National Machinery & Equipment Import & Export Corporation are excluded from this order.

On and after date of publication of this notice, United States Customs officers must require at the same time as importers would normally deposit estimated duties on this merchandise, a cash deposit to the estimated weighted-average antidumping duty margin as noted below:

Manufacturers/Producers/Exporters	Weighted-average percent
Premier Bearing and Equipment Ltd.	0.97
All Others (Except China National Machinery and Equipment Import and Export Corporation, which is excluded)	0.87

This determination constitutes an antidumping duty order with respect to tapered roller bearings from the PRC, pursuant to section 736 of the Act (19 U.S.C. 1673e) and 19 CFR 353.48. We have deleted from the Commerce Regulations, Annex I of 19 CFR Part 353, which listed antidumping findings and orders currently in effect. Instead, interested parties may contact the Central Records Unit Room B-099 of Import Administration for copies of the updated list of orders currently in effect.

This notice is published in accordance with section 736 of the Act (19 U.S.C. 1673e) and 19 CFR 353.48.

Gilbert B. Kaplan,

Deputy Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.

[FR Doc. 87-13613 Filed 6-12-87; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-DS-M

National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration**Public Hearing on the Proposed Great Bay National Estuarine Research Reserve—Draft Environmental Impact Statement and Draft Management Plan**

AGENCY: Division of Marine and Estuarine Management, Office of Ocean and Coastal Resource Management, National Ocean Service, National Oceanic and Atmospheric

Administration, Department of Commerce.

ACTION: Public hearing notice.

SUMMARY: Notice is hereby given that the Division of Marine and Estuarine Management, of the Office of Ocean and Coastal Resource Management (OCRM), National Ocean Service (NOS), National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA), U.S. Department of Commerce, will hold a public hearing for the purpose of receiving comments on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement and Draft Management Plan (DEIS/DMP) prepared on the proposed designation of the Great Bay National Estuarine Research Reserve.

The hearing will be held on Wednesday, July 1, 1987 at 7:00 pm at the University of New Hampshire, John S. Elliott Alumni Center, The 1925 Room, Durham, New Hampshire.

The views of interested persons and organizations on the adequacy of the DEIS/DMP are solicited, and may be expressed orally and/or in written statements. Presentations will be scheduled on a first-come, first-heard basis, and may be limited to a maximum of five (5) minutes. The time allotment may be extended before the hearing when the number of speakers can be determined. All comments received at the hearing will be considered in the preparation of the Final Environmental Impact Statement and Draft Management Plan.

The comment period for the DEIS/DMP will end on Monday, July 13, 1987. All written comments received by this deadline will be included in the FEIS. Copies of the DEIS/DMP may be obtained from the Division of Marine and Estuarine Management, Office of Ocean and Coastal Resource Management, NOAA, 1825 Connecticut Avenue, NW., Washington, DC 20235 (Telephone: 202/673-5122). Federal Domestic Assistance Catalog Number 11.420 Coastal Zone Management Estuarine Sanctuaries

Dated: June 9, 1987.

James P. Blizzard,

Acting Director, Office of Ocean and Coastal Resource Management.

[FR Doc. 87-13537 Filed 6-12-87; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-08-M

Mid-Atlantic Fishery Management Council; Public Meeting

AGENCY: National Marine Fisheries Service, NOAA, Commerce.

The Mid-Atlantic Fishery Management Council will convene a

public meeting, June 24-25, 1987, at the Ramada Inn, 76 Industrial Highway, Essington, PA (Telephone: 215-521-9600), to discuss the Summer Flounder Fishery Management Plan; Title 50 of the Code of Federal Regulations, Part 601; domestic observer policy, and discuss other fishery management and administrative matters. The public meeting may be lengthened or shortened depending upon progress on agenda items. The Council also may convene a closed session (not open to the public) to discuss personnel and/or national security matters.

For further information, contact John C. Bryson, Executive Director, Mid-Atlantic Fishery Management Council, Federal Building, 300 South New Street, Room 2115, Dover, DE 19901; Telephone: (302) 674-2331.

Dated: June 10, 1987.

Dr. Nancy Foster,

Director, Office of Protected Resources and Habitat Programs, National Marine Fisheries Service.

[FR Doc. 87-13620 Filed 6-12-87; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-22-M

COMMITTEE FOR THE IMPLEMENTATION OF TEXTILE AGREEMENTS

Establishing an Import Limit for Certain Man-Made Fiber Textile Products Produced or Manufactured in Bangladesh

June 10, 1987.

The Chairman of the Committee for the Implementation of Textile Agreements (CITA), under the authority contained in E.O. 11651 of March 3, 1972, as amended, has issued the directive published below to the Commissioner of Customs to be effective on June 16, 1987. For further information contact Kim Pham, International Trade Specialist, Office of Textiles and Apparel, U.S. Department of Commerce, (202) 377-4212. For information on the quota status of this limit, please refer to the Quota Status Reports which are posted on the bulletin boards of each Customs port. For information on embargoes and quota re-openings, please call (202) 377-3715.

Background

On December 3, 1986 a notice was published in the *Federal Register* (51 FR 43653) which announced that the United States Government, under Article 3 of the Arrangement Regarding International Trade in Textiles, done at Geneva on December 20, 1973, and as extended by protocols on December 5,

1977, December 22, 1981 and July 31, 1986, had requested the Government of Bangladesh to enter into consultations concerning exports to the United States of man-made fiber sweaters in Category 645/646.

The United States has decided, inasmuch as recent consultations with the Government of Bangladesh did not result in a mutually satisfactory solution concerning this category, to control imports of man-made fiber textile products in Category 645/646, produced or manufactured in Bangladesh and exported during the twelve-month period which began on October 30, 1986 and extends through October 29, 1987.

Accordingly, in the letter published below, the Chairman of the Committee for the Implementation of Textile Agreements directs the Commissioner of Customs to prohibit entry into the United States for consumption, or withdrawal from warehouse for consumption, of man-made fiber textile products in Category 645/646, in excess of the designated restraint level.

The United States remains committed to finding a solution concerning this category. Should such a solution be reached in consultations with the Government of Bangladesh, further notice will be published in the *Federal Register*.

A description of the textile categories in terms of T.S.U.S.A. numbers was published in the *Federal Register* on December 13, 1982 (47 FR 55709), as amended on April 7, 1983 (48 FR 15175), May 3, 1983 (48 FR 19924), December 14, 1983, (48 FR 55607), December 30, 1983 (48 FR 57584), April 4, 1984 (49 FR 13397), June 28, 1984 (49 FR 26622), July 16, 1984 (49 FR 28754), November 9, 1984 (49 FR 44782), July 14, 1986 (51 FR 25386), July 29, 1986 (51 FR 27068) and in Statistical Headnote 5, Schedule 3 of the Tariff Schedules of the United States Annotated (1987).

Ronald I. Levin,

Acting Chairman, Committee for the Implementation of Textile Agreements.

Committee for the Implementation of Textile Agreements

June 10, 1987.

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

Dear Mr. Commissioner: Under the terms of section 204 of the Agricultural Act of 1956, as amended (7 U.S.C. 1854), and the Arrangement Regarding International Trade in Textiles done at Geneva on December 20, 1973, as further extended on July 31, 1986; and in accordance with the provisions of Executive Order 11651 of March 3, 1972, as amended, you are directed to prohibit, effective on June 16, 1987, entry into the United States for consumption and

withdrawal from warehouse for consumption of certain man-made fiber textile products in Category 645/646, produced or manufactured in Bangladesh and exported during the twelve-month period which began on October 30, 1986 and extends through October 29, 1987, in excess of 98,379 dozen.¹

Textile products in Category 645/646 which have been exported to the United States prior to October 30, 1986 shall not be subject to this directive.

Textile products in Category 645/646 which have been released from the custody of the U.S. Customs Service under the provisions of 19 U.S.C. 1448(b) or 1484(a)(1)(A) prior to the effective date of this directive shall not be denied entry under this directive.

Also effective on June 16, 1987, you are directed to charge the following amounts to the restraint limit established in this directive for Category 645/646. These charges are for the import period October 30, 1986 through March 31, 1987.

Category	Amount to be charged
645.....	13,188 dozen.
646.....	21,409 dozen.

A description of the textile categories in terms of T.S.U.S.A. numbers was published in the *Federal Register* on December 13, 1982 (47 FR 55709), as amended on April 7, 1983 (48 FR 15175), May 3, 1983 (48 FR 19924), December 14, 1983, (48 FR 55607), December 30, 1983 (48 FR 57584), April 4, 1984 (49 FR 13397), June 28, 1984 (49 FR 26622), July 16, 1984 (49 FR 28754), November 9, 1984 (49 FR 44782), July 14, 1986 (51 FR 25386), July 29, 1986 (51 FR 27068) and in Statistical Headnote 5, Schedule 3 of the Tariff Schedules of the United States Annotated (1987).

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 to the rulemaking provisions of U.S.C. 553(a)(1).

Sincerely,

Ronald I. Levin,

Acting Chairman, Committee for the Implementation of Textile Agreements.

[FR Doc. 87-13612 Filed 6-12-87; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-DR-M

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

Office of the Secretary

Department of Defense Wage Committee; Closed Meetings

Pursuant to the provisions of section 10 of Pub. L. 92-463, the Federal Advisory Committee Act, notice is

¹ The limit has not been adjusted to account for any imports exported after October 29, 1987.