status of these limits, refer to the Quota Status Reports posted on the bulletin boards of of each Customs port or call (202) 927–6717. 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 reduced for carryforward used in 1995.

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 62396, 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 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.

Donald R. Foote,

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

Committee for the Implementation of Textile Agreements

May 30, 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, Committee for the Implementation of Textile Agreements. That directive concerns imports of certain cotton, wool, man-made fiber, silk blend and other vegetable fiber textiles and textile products, produced or manufactured in Thailand and exported during the twelve-month period which began on January 1, 1996 and extends through December 31, 1996.

Effective on June 3, 1996, 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 [1] |
|---|---|
| Levels in Group I | |
| 200 | 969,718 kilograms. |
| 363 | 17,432,536 numbers. |
| 604 | 626,078 kilograms. |
| 619 | 6,012,391 square meters. |
| Sublevels in Group II | |
| 338/339 | 1,625,470 dozen. |
| 442 | 19,197 dozen. |
| 638/639 | 1,938,066 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,

Donald R. Foote,

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

[FR Doc.96–13977 Filed 6–3–96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–DR–F

## CORPORATION FOR NATIONAL AND COMMUNITY SERVICE

### Information Collection Activities; Proposed Revision of National Senior Service Corps' Project Progress Report

**AGENCY:** Corporation for National and Community Service.

**ACTION:** Notice of 60-Day Review and Comment Period on Project Progress Report (PPR).

**SUMMARY:** The National Senior Service Corps announces a 60-day review and comment period during which project sponsors and the public are encouraged to submit comments on suggested revisions to the NSSC Project Progress Report (A–1020). The PPR is used by project sponsors funded under the Retired and Senior Volunteer Program (RSVP), Foster Grandparent Program (FGP), and Senior Companion Program (SCP), collectively known as the National Senior Service Corps, to report progress made toward workplan accomplishment, problems encountered, resources generated and budget variances. Established projects normally report twice annually. First-year projects, new components, demonstrations, and projects experiencing problems or substantial project revision will report quarterly, as identified in the Notice of Grant Award (NGA).

Comments are invited on (1) whether the existing PPR appropriately meets project oversight and operational management, planning and reporting needs of the Senior Corps programs; (2) ways to enhance the quality, utility and clarity of the PPR; (3) accuracy of agency estimates of reporting burden; and (4) ways to further reduce burden on respondents.

**DATES:** The National Senior Service Corps will consider written comments on the Project Progress Report and recordkeeping requirements received by August 5, 1996.

**ADDRESS TO SEND COMMENTS:** Janice Forney Fisher, National Senior Service Corps (NSSC), Corporation for National Service, 1201 New York Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20525.

**ESTABLISHED ANNUAL REPORTING OR DISCLOSURE BURDEN:** 30,932 hours.

*This document will be made available in alternate format upon request. TDD (202) 606–5000 ext. 164.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION PLEASE CONTACT:** Janice Forney Fisher (202) 606–5000 ext. 275.

**REGULATORY AUTHORITY:** National Service Trust Act of 1993.

Dated: May 22, 1996.

Thomas E. Endres,

*Deputy Director, National Senior Service Corps.*

[FR Doc. 96–13917 Filed 6–3–96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6050–28–M

### Sunshine Act Meeting

Pursuant to the provisions of the Government in the Sunshine Act (5 U.S.C. § 552(b)), notice is hereby given of the following meeting of the Board of Directors of the Corporation for National and Community Service:

**DATE AND TIME:** Sunday, June 9, 1996, 2:00–6:00 p.m.

**PLACE:** Corintia Room, Parc Fifty Five Crowne Plaza Hotel, 5 Cyril Magnin, San Francisco, CA.

**STATUS:** Open.

**MATTERS TO BE CONSIDERED:**

Agenda

I. Opening Remarks by the Acting Chair.
II. Opening Remarks and Report of the Chief Executive Officer.
III. Approval of Minutes from the February 1996 Board Meeting.
IV. Committee Reports
A. Executive Committee
B. Management and Budget
1. Introduction of the Chief Financial Officer-designate
2. Status of management's response to auditability study
3. Staffing changes
C. Communications
1. Reauthorization
2. Hearings
3. Recruitment
D. Planning and Evaluation
1. Learn & Serve Implementation Plan
2. Briefing on New Initiatives
a. President's School and College Initiatives

b. D.C. Public School Initiative
c. Education Award Only Programs
d. Forums
3. 1997 AmeriCorps Changes
4. Grant Renewal Update
5. Evaluation Update
V. Report on Special Projects
A. First National Senior Service Corps Training Conference and National Leadership Forum on Senior Service
B. Presidents' Summit for Community Volunteering and National Service
C. Olympics and Paralympics—AmeriCorps Team for the Games
D. National Volunteer Week
VI. Ethic of Service Discussion
VII. Future Board Meetings
A. Locations
B. Dates (October 3 and 4, 1996)
VIII. Public Comment
Adjournment

**ACCOMMODATIONS:** Those needing interpreters or other accommodations should notify the Corporation by June 6, 1996.

**CONTACT PERSON FOR FURTHER INFORMATION:** Rhonda Taylor, Associate Director of Special Projects and Initiatives, Corporation for National Service, 8th Floor, Room 8619, 1201 New York Avenue NW, Washington, D.C. 20525. Phone (202) 606–5000 ext. 282. Fax (202) 565–2794. TDD: (202) 565–2799.

Dated: May 31, 1996.

Terry Russell,

*General Counsel.*

[FR Doc. 96–14085 Filed 5–31–96; 2:46 pm]

**BILLING CODE 6050–28–P**

## DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

### Department of the Navy

### Record of Decision for the Disposal and Reuse of Naval Air Station Glenview, IL

The Department of the Navy (Navy), pursuant to Section 102(2)(c) of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (NEPA), 42 U.S.C. § 4321 *et seq.*, and the regulations of the Council on Environmental Quality that implement NEPA procedures, 40 CFR Parts 1500–1508, hereby announces its decision to dispose of Naval Air Station (NAS) Glenview, Illinois.

Navy intends to dispose of the property in a manner that is consistent with the Glenview Naval Air Station Consensus Reuse Plan submitted by the Village of Glenview, the Local Redevelopment Authority (LRA) for NAS Glenview, described in the Final Environmental Impact Statement (FEIS) as the preferred alternative. The Consensus Reuse Plan proposed a mixed use approach of commercial, residential, recreational, public service, and open space land uses.

In deciding to dispose of NAS Glenview in a manner consistent with the Consensus Reuse Plan, Navy has determined that mixed land use will meet the goals of local economic redevelopment and creation of new jobs, while also maintaining the Village of Glenview's character and fiscal integrity, minimizing adverse environmental impacts, and ensuring land uses that are compatible with surrounding properties. This Record Of Decision does not mandate a specific mix of land uses. Rather, it leaves selection of the particular means to achieve the mixed use redevelopment to the acquiring entity and the local zoning authority.

Background

The 1993 Defense Base Closure and Realignment Commission recommended closure of NAS Glenview. This recommendation was then approved by President Clinton and accepted by the One Hundred Third Congress in 1993. Operations at NAS Glenview ceased on September 9, 1995, and the property has been in caretake status since that date.

NAS Glenview is located entirely within the Village of Glenview and consists of 1,121 acres of fee-owned land with 110 buildings that contain 1,332,138 square feet of office and storage space. Navy has reserved 78 acres containing military family housing and open space for use as family housing that will serve the Naval Training Center at Great Lakes, Illinois. The remaining property is surplus to the needs of the Federal Government and can be conveyed.

Navy published a Notice of Intent in the Federal Register on February 3, 1994, announcing that Navy would prepare an Environmental Impact Statement that would analyze the impacts of disposal and reuse of the land, buildings, and infrastructure at NAS Glenview. A 30-day public scoping period was established, and a scoping meeting was held on February 17, 1994, in the Village of Glenview.

On July 14, 1995, Navy distributed a Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) to Federal, State, and local agencies, elected officials, special interest groups, and interested persons. Navy held a public hearing on August 17, 1995, in the Village of Glenview. Federal agencies, Illinois State agencies, local governments, and the general public commented on the DEIS. These comments and Navy's responses were incorporated in the Final Environmental Impact Statement (FEIS) which was distributed to the public on December 1, 1995, for a review that concluded on January 2, 1996. Navy did not receive any comments on the FEIS.

Alternatives

NEPA requires Navy to evaluate a reasonable range of alternatives for disposal and reuse of this Federal property. In the NEPA process, Navy analyzed the environmental impacts of various proposed land uses that could result from disposal of the Air Station property. As the basis for this analysis, Navy relied upon the reuse and redevelopment alternatives identified by The Glenview Community Reuse Planning Group, an organization created by the Village of Glenview in its capacity as the LRA. The Community Reuse Planning Group analyzed various redevelopment scenarios and land uses and prepared the Glenview Naval Air Station Consensus Reuse Plan which was presented to the Department of the Navy on June 21, 1995.

The Community Reuse Planning Group initially considered ten preliminary scenarios for redevelopment that it described as: (1) General Aviation, which based reuse on continued use of the Air Station as a general aviation airport with compatible industrial, office, and warehouse uses; (2) Inherent Land Use Suitability, which based reuse on a variety of physical characteristics such as accessibility, area requirements, adjacent land use, site attractiveness, and environmental constraints; (3) Core Area Prominence, which based reuse on maximizing adaptive reuse of the core area buildings and related development of other areas; (4) Residential Neighborhood Focus, which based reuse on the establishment of new neighborhoods and the introduction of other uses compatible with the residential neighborhoods; (5) Open Space Focus, which dedicated half of the Air Station to open space and recreation; (6) Public Use Focus, which based reuse on recreational, cultural, educational, and public service facilities; (7) Major Institution Focus, which based reuse on the presence of a major institution such as a university campus, regional government center, or medical facility; (8) Commercial/Industrial Focus, which based reuse on revenue-generating activities that would create jobs, maximize revenue flow, and minimize government costs; (9) Sports/Leisure Complex Focus, which based reuse on the development of private and public sports and recreational facilities of regional interest; and (10) A Comprehensive Plan, which based reuse on the Village of Glenview's 1990 Comprehensive Plan that emphasized