

end, regional policies and infrastructures play a large role in determining both where companies locate and their ability to be competitive in a global marketplace.

Commerce Department research shows that firms that adopt advanced technologies create more jobs at higher wages than those that do not. Furthermore, regions that boast concentrations of high-tech industries enjoy high growth rates and standards of living. Regions thus compete to attract federal research facilities, private investment, and skilled labor. Recent research suggests that a region's technological infrastructure is among the most important factors that businesses consider when making location decisions. Accordingly, regions are searching for strategies to attract and retain high-tech firms and the jobs that they bring. These strategies may involve building on existing strengths at research universities, providing extension services to local businesses, or integrating existing business assistance resources, but ultimately their success is contingent upon an institutional capacity to support technology-based economic development.

In the Federal government's efforts to foster competitiveness, it must ensure that all regions of the nation develop the necessary infrastructure to support indigenous technology development. Most less populated states, whose manufacturers tend to be small- and medium-sized, are at a competitive disadvantage because there is generally no research base on which local businesses can build. The EPSCoT seeks to remedy this disadvantage.

The EPSCoT seeks to build on the NSF's successful Experimental Program to Stimulate Competitive Research (EPSCoR) which was established in 1979 to stimulate sustainable improvements in the quality of the academic science and technology infrastructure of states that traditionally have been under represented in receiving federal R&D funds. Within these states, the EPSCoR's primary emphasis is on improving the competitive performance of major research universities. By focusing on building the science base of these regions, primarily in universities, the EPSCoR has successfully strengthened the research capacity of universities in these states; yet, there remains a technology "gap."

Improving the competitive performance of universities, which is an essential component of a successful technology-based economy, is often not sufficient to establish new companies,

develop new job opportunities or raise the standard of living.

That is why the Department of Commerce proposes to create an EPSCoT—the technology counterpart to the EPSCoR. EPSCoT would help to bridge the gap between university research and the local economy. It would develop essential economic development tools to foster regional technology-based economic growth. The program would stimulate the development of indigenous technological infrastructure and institutional capabilities of states through a variety of means, including outreach activities, technology development and deployment, technology transfer, education and training, and better linking universities, firms, and state and local governments.

Dated: June 2, 1997.

**Gary Bachula,**

*Deputy Under Secretary for Technology.*

[FR Doc. 97-14990 Filed 6-6-97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-18-M

## COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

### Notice of Meeting

The Commission of Fine Arts' next meeting is scheduled for 19 June 1997 at 10:00 a.m. in the Commission's offices in the Pension Building, Suite 312, Judiciary Square, 441 F Street, NW, Washington, DC 20001 to discuss various projects affecting the appearance of Washington, DC including buildings, memorials, parks, etc.; also matters of design referred by other agencies of the government.

Inquiries regarding the agenda and requests to submit written or oral statements should be addressed to Charles H. Atherton, Secretary, Commission of Fine Arts, at the above address or call 202-504-2200.

Dated in Washington, D.C., 2 June 1997.

**Charles H. Atherton,**

*Secretary.*

[FR Doc. 97-14932 Filed 6-6-97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6330-01-M

## COMMITTEE FOR THE IMPLEMENTATION OF TEXTILE AGREEMENTS

### Adjustment of Import Limits for Certain Cotton, Man-Made Fiber, Silk Blend and Other Vegetable Fiber Textile Products Produced or Manufactured in Bangladesh

June 3, 1997.

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

**ACTION:** Issuing a directive to the Commissioner of Customs adjusting limits.

**EFFECTIVE DATE:** June 10, 1997.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Ross Arnold, 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) 927-5850. 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); Uruguay Round Agreements Act.

The current limits for certain categories are being adjusted, variously, for swing, special shift and carryforward.

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 61 FR 66263, published on December 17, 1996). Also see 61 FR 68241, published on December 27, 1996.

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 Uruguay Round 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**

June 3, 1997.

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 December 20, 1996, 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, 1997 and extends through December 31, 1997.

Effective on June 10, 1997, you are directed to adjust the limits for the following categories, as provided for under the Uruguay Round Agreements Act and the Uruguay Round Agreement on Textiles and Clothing:

Category	Adjusted twelve-month limit <sup>1</sup>
338/339 .....	1,344,461 dozen.
341 .....	2,161,374 dozen.
347/348 .....	2,582,282 dozen.
641 .....	937,712 dozen.
847 .....	358,966 dozen.

<sup>1</sup> The limits have not been adjusted to account for any imports exported after December 31, 1996.

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,

D. Michael Hutchinson,

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

[FR Doc. 97-14995 Filed 6-6-97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-DR-F

## COMMITTEE FOR THE IMPLEMENTATION OF TEXTILE AGREEMENTS

### Adjustment of Import Limits for Certain Cotton, Wool and Man-Made Fiber Textile Products Produced or Manufactured in Costa Rica

June 3, 1997.

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

**ACTION:** Issuing a directive to the Commissioner of Customs adjusting limits.

**EFFECTIVE DATE:** June 10, 1997.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Naomi Freeman, International Trade Specialist, Office of Textiles and Apparel, U.S. Department of Commerce, (202) 482-4212. For information on the quota status of these levels, refer to the 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); Uruguay Round Agreements Act.

The current limits for certain categories are being adjusted, variously, for carryover and swing.

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 62 FR 66263, published on December 17, 1996). Also see 61 FR 69081, published on December 31, 1996.

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 Uruguay Round 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

June 3, 1997.

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 December 24, 1996, by the Chairman, Committee for the Implementation of Textile Agreements. That directive concerns imports of certain cotton, wool and man-made fiber textile products, produced or manufactured in Costa Rica and exported during the twelve-month period which began on January 1, 1997 and extends through December 31, 1997.

Effective on June 10, 1997, you are directed to adjust the limits for the following categories, as provided for under the Uruguay Round Agreements Act and the Uruguay Round Agreement on Textiles and Clothing (ATC):

Category	Adjusted twelve-month limit <sup>1</sup>
340/640 .....	1,061,072 dozen.
342/642 .....	390,897 dozen.
347/348 .....	1,788,141 dozen.
443 .....	235,060 numbers.
447 .....	13,473 dozen.

<sup>1</sup> the limits have not been adjusted to account for any imports exported after December 31, 1996.

The guaranteed access levels for the foregoing categories remain unchanged.

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,

D. Michael Hutchinson,

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

[FR Doc. 97-14992 Filed 6-6-97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-DR-F

## COMMITTEE FOR THE IMPLEMENTATION OF TEXTILE AGREEMENTS

### Adjustment of an Import Limit for Certain Man-Made Fiber Textile Products Produced or Manufactured in Korea

June 3, 1997.

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

**ACTION:** Issuing a directive to the Commissioner of Customs reducing a limit.

**EFFECTIVE DATE:** June 11, 1997.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Ross Arnold, International Trade Specialist, Office of Textiles and Apparel, U.S. Department of Commerce, (202) 482-4212. For information on the quota status of this limit, refer to the 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); Uruguay Round Agreements Act.

The current limit for Categories 619/620 is being reduced for carryforward used in 1996.

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 61 FR 66263, published on December 17, 1996). Also see 61 FR 59087, published on November 20, 1996.

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 Uruguay Round Agreements Act and the Uruguay Round Agreement on Textiles and Clothing, but are designed to assist only in the