

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.

Troy H. Cribb,

Chairman, Committee for the Implementation of Textile Agreements.

Committee for the Implementation of Textile Agreements

August 5, 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 November 4, 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 Guatemala and exported during the twelve-month period which began on January 1, 1997 and extends through December 31, 1997.

Effective on August 12, 1997, you are directed to increase the Guaranteed Access Level for Categories 342/642 to 150,000 dozen.

The Committee for the Implementation of Textile Agreements has determined that this action falls within the foreign affairs exception of 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. 97-21084 Filed 8-8-97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-DR-F

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

Office of the Secretary

Proposed Collection; Comment Request

AGENCY: Defense Technical Information Center, DOD.

ACTION: Notice.

In compliance with Section 3506(c)(2)(A) of the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, the Defense Technical Information Center (DTIC) announces the initiation of a public information collection of its registered users and seeks public comment on the provisions thereof. Comments are invited on: (a) Whether the proposed collection of information is necessary for the proper performance of the functions of the agency, including whether the information will have practical utility; (b) the accuracy of the agency's estimate of the burden of the proposed information collection; (c)

ways to enhance the quality, utility, and clarity of the information to be collected; and (d) ways to minimize the burden of the information collection on respondents, including the use of automated collection techniques or other forms of information technology.

DATES: Consideration will be given to all comments received by October 10, 1997.

ADDRESSES: Written comments and recommendations on the proposed information collection should be sent to: ATTN: DTIC-BCP, Defense Technical Information Center, 8725 John J. Kingman Road, Suite 0944, Fort Belvoir, VA 22060-6218.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

To request more information on this proposed information collection or to obtain a copy of the proposal and associated collection instruments, please write to the above address or call (703) 767-8267/DSN 427-8267.

Title, Associated Form, and OMB Number

Needs and Uses: The information collection is necessary to provide DTIC with satisfaction data about the timeliness, use, and quality of its products and services in order to establish a customer satisfaction baseline; assist in determining appropriate modifications to current products and services; and contribute to DTIC's product development efforts. It will allow DTIC to compile customer data which does not currently exist. Information gathered from discussions with customers is maintained in various nondigital formats but is not considered to be quantifiable in terms of customer satisfaction factors because of its anecdotal nature. Because DTIC offers 23 products and services to approximately 3,500 registered users, no cheaper method exists to collect this data other than a survey instrument. This survey is required to implement Executive Order 12862, 11 Sep 93, Setting Customer Service Standards, and the memorandum of the Secretary of Defense, 7 Jan 94, which directs the application of the principles of the Executive Order to all customers of the directors of all defense agencies; the Government Performance and Results Act (GPRA); and the DTIC Strategic Plan mandate to measure customer satisfaction of government-produced products and services.

Affected Public: All DTIC registered users who are Department of Defense (DoD) contractors and potential contractors; U.S. Government organizations and their contractors; and participants in the Small Business Innovation Research/Small Business,

Technology Transfer, Historically Black Colleges and Universities, and University Research Support programs.

Annual Burden Hours: 20 hours (based on a 20% return rate).

Number of Respondents:

Approximately 1,500.

Responses per Respondent: 1.

Average Burden per Respondent: 3 minutes.

Frequency: Annually, after baseline is established.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: This survey is required to implement Executive Order 12862, 11 Sep 93, Setting Customer Service Standards; the memorandum of the Secretary of Defense, 7 Jan 94, which directs the application of the principles of the Executive Order to all customers of the directors of all defense agencies; the GPRA; and the DTIC Strategic Plan mandate to measure customer satisfaction of government-produced products and services.

The Executive Order 12862, 11 Sep 93, Setting Customer Service Standards, the memorandum of the Secretary of Defense, 7 Jan 94, and the GPRA of 1993, have as their purposes to improve the efficiency and effectiveness of Federal programs by requiring Government agencies to establish a system to set goals and measure program performance and program results. DTIC does not presently have a system established to gather data to measure program performance or program results in quantifiable terms against customer standards. Each agency is required to publish a customer service plan and make use of customer survey information to promote the principles and objectives of the executive order.

Under the GPRA, DTIC must set program goals and then publicly report on their progress toward achieving those goals in three stages:

a. By September 30, 1997, a five-year strategic plan for DTIC's programs. DTIC has developed such a plan. According to the GPRA, it will be submitted every 3 years, include a mission statement covering major functions and operations of the agency and general goals and objectives of the agency; the approach and necessary resources to be used in achieving those goals and objectives; any "key external factors" that might have a significant affect on DTIC's ability to achieve the general goals and objectives; and any program evaluations used in establishing or revising the goals and objectives (including plans for future evaluations).

b. By October 1, 1997, DTIC will be required to prepare an annual performance plan. The first plan will be

for Fiscal Year 1999. As with the pilot projects, these plans will cover each program activity in DTIC's budget and establish performance goals and define the performance level to be achieved by a program activity. The goal will be expressed in an objective, quantifiable, and measurable form. Performance indicators will be used to measure the relevant outputs, outcomes, and/or service levels for each program activity. The performance plans will also describe the operational processes and resources needed to meet the performance goals and will establish a procedure for comparing actual program results with the performance goals.

c. By March 31, 2000, and every year thereafter, DTIC will be required to publish annual program performance reports. (These reports will be due 6 months after the end of the fiscal year on which they are based.) The reports will compare the performance indicators that were established in the performance plan and the actual program performance achieved with the performance goals. These reports will also discuss the agency's success in achieving the performance goals and describe and explain those cases in which performance goals have not been met.

Dated: August 5, 1997.

L.M. Bynum,

Alternate OSD Federal Register Liaison Officer, Department of Defense.

[FR Doc. 97-21089 Filed 8-8-97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 5000-04-M

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

Department of the Army

Final Environmental Impact Statement (FEIS) for the Proposed Construction of a Rail Connector at Fort Campbell, Kentucky

AGENCY: Department of the Army, DoD.

ACTION: Notice of Availability.

SUMMARY: In compliance with the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 and the Council on Environmental Quality and Army regulations, the Army has prepared an FEIS for the proposed construction of a rail connector for Fort Campbell, Kentucky. The primary Army action analyzed in the FEIS is the construction of a rail connector between the government-owned line and the CSX line in Christian County, Kentucky. The rail connector is needed so that the 101st Airborne Division, stationed at Fort Campbell, can deploy rapidly during an emergency.

Five alternatives including the No-Action Alternative, have been evaluated:

1. The No-Action Alternative would not change the existing configuration or operation of the rail lines, or construct any new ones. Trains from Fort Campbell would continue current operations, using the Hopkinsville Belt Line and Interchange, to switch five cars at a time to the CSX main line.

2. The Hopkinsville Interchange Upgrade Alternative (Alternative 1) would upgrade the existing connection between the government-owned branch line with the CSX main line track and also involves construction of two relatively short rail connectors within the city limits of Hopkinsville and a 2.2-mile siding track parallel to the existing branch line south of Hopkinsville. However, because Alternative 1 resulted in excessive cycle times resulting from having only one (northbound) entrance to the CSX main line, a modified Alternative 1 was also reviewed. The modified Alternative 1 included a southbound entrance to the CSX main line and alignment adjustments to lessen the proposed curvature and grade. Due to the high real estate acquisition costs, potential residential and commercial displacement impacts, numerous grade crossings, and the requirement for additional bridges and tunnels, the alternative was found not to be reasonable.

3. The Hopkinsville Bypass North Alternative (Alternative 2N) would connect the branch line directly to the CSX main line south of Hopkinsville and north of the Hopkinsville Bypass (KY 8546) with approximately 2.7 miles of new rail, and incorporate a 2.2-mile siding track parallel to the existing branch line south of Hopkinsville.

4. The Hopkinsville Bypass South Alternative (Alternative 2S) would connect the branch line directly to the CSX main line south of Hopkinsville and south of the Hopkinsville Bypass (KY 8546) with approximately 2.8 miles of new rail, and incorporate a 2.2-mile siding track parallel to the existing branch line south of Hopkinsville.

5. The Masonville-Casky Alternative (Alternative 3) would connect the branch line directly to the CSX main line approximately 6 miles south of Hopkinsville with approximately 5.5 miles of new rail. A 2.2-mile siding track for Alternative 3 is included in the alignment corridor.

The FEIS has identified Alternative 2S as the preferred alternative, due to the following: it meets mission requirements, allowing the 101st Airborne Division to meet its rapid deployment requirements; is less

disruptive to City and total community land use and planning; requires few or no relocations; has fewer grade crossings; and has less public opposition than Alternatives 2N and 3. No, significant adverse environmental impacts are anticipated as a result of this Army action.

DISTRIBUTION AND WAITING PERIOD: The FEIS on the proposed construction of a rail connector for Fort Campbell, Kentucky, was distributed to interested agencies and the public prior to, or simultaneously with, filing of the Notice of Availability for the FEIS with the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. Following a 30 day post-filing waiting period, the Department of the Army will prepare a Record of Decision.

QUESTIONS OR REQUEST FOR FEIS:

Questions regarding the FEIS, or a request for copies of the document may be directed to Mr. William Ray Haynes, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Louisville District, PO Box 59, Louisville, Kentucky 40201-6475, or call (502) 582-6475.

Dated: August 5, 1997.

Richard E. Newsome,

Acting Deputy Assistant Secretary of the Army (Environment, Safety and Occupational Health), OASA (1, L&E).

[FR Doc. 97-21041 Filed 8-8-97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3710-08-M

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

Federal Energy Regulatory Commission

[Docket No. RP96-403-004]

ANR Pipeline Company; Notice of Refund Report

August 5, 1997.

Take notice that on August 1, 1997, ANR Pipeline Company (ANR) tendered for filing a report of refunds paid to eligible customers in compliance with the Commissioner's Order on Reconciliation Filing and Directing Refunds issued on June 13, 1997, in the referenced proceeding.

On July 1, 1997, ANR states that it paid to eligible customers refunds of the costs of upstream pipeline capacity of Viking Gas Transmission Corporation of \$8,483,256, consisting of principal amounts totaling \$7,740,793 and interest of \$742,463.

Any person desiring to protest this filing should file a protest with the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, 888 First Street, NE., Washington, DC 20426, in accordance with Section 385.211 of the Commission's Rules and Regulations. All such protests must be