airspace and air traffic control systems, or adversely affecting other powers and responsibilities of the Administrator prescribed by law.

Specific limitations with respect to 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 Federal Aviation Administration, Texas Airport Development Office, 2601 Meacham Boulevard, Fort Worth, Texas 76193–0650.

The city of Fort Worth submitted to the FAA on February 3, 1994, the noise exposure maps, descriptions, and other documentation produced during the noise compatibility planning study conducted from November 1991 through January 1995. The Fort Worth Spinks Airport noise exposure maps were determined by FAA to be in compliance with applicable requirements on February 13, 1995. Notice of this determination was published in the **Federal Register** on March 6, 1995.

The Fort Worth Spinks Airport study contains a proposed noise compatibility program comprised of actions designed for phased implementation by airport management and adjacent jurisdictions from the date of study completion beyond the year 1998. 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 February 13, 1995, 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 seven 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 Administrator effective August 11, 1995.

Outright approval was granted for all of the specific program elements. The following is a listing of the approved actions on and off the airport:

a. Modify arrival and departure flight tracks (approved as voluntary);

b. Voluntary use of noise abatement departure and arrival procedures for aircraft weighing over 12,500 Pounds (approved as voluntary);

c. Maintain current zoning ordinance;

d. Amend and expand the land use plan for noise compatibility;

e. Assign a noise abatement officer for noise program management for all three city of Fort Worth airports;

f. Continue public involvement program;

g. Conduct noise review and update as required.

These determinations are set forth in detail in a Record of Approval endorsed by the Administrator on August 11, 1995. 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 Fort Worth Department of Aviation Offices.

Issued in Fort Worth, Texas on August 22, 1995.

Otis T. Welch,

Manager, Texas Airport Development Office.

[FR Doc. 95–22070 Filed 9–5–95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–13–M

DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY

Customs Service

[T.D. (95–67)]

Crystallinity of Ceramic Tile

AGENCY: Customs Service, Department of the Treasury.

ACTION: Request for comments on the percent of crystallinity necessary to satisfy the Harmonized Tariff Schedules of the United States criteria that a ''*ceramic article*'' be a shaped product ''of crystalline or substantially crystalline structure.''

SUMMARY: Customs is attempting to identify the amount of crystallinity necessary to satisfy the aforementioned phrase ''substantially crystalline'' as it applies to ceramic floor and wall tile. Ceramic articles of this nature are normally imported under Subheading numbers covered by U.S. Note 1 to Chapter 69 of the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States (HTSUS).

DATES: Comments must be received on or before October 1, 1995.

COMMENTS: Written comments (preferably in triplicate) may be addressed to and inspected at the offices of Laboratories and Scientific Services, room 7113, 1301 Constitution Ave., NW, Washington, DC 20229.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Mr. Robert L. Zimmerman, Jr., Office of Laboratories & Scientific Services, (202) 927–1060.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

U.S. Note 1 to Chapter 69 reads in pertinent part ''For the purposes of this chapter, a ''*ceramic article*'' is a shaped article having a glazed or unglazed body of crystalline or substantially crystalline structure * * *''. The U.S. Customs Service wishes to define the concept of ''substantially crystalline'' in scientific terms based on state-of-the-art ceramic technology. In this request for comments, Customs is limiting the scope in defining the phrase to floor and wall tile. For this purpose Customs is soliciting comments from any interested party.

In a recent study of nearly 300 floor and wall tiles, Customs has found that the percent crystallinity for this group of tiles was never less than 30 percent as determined by x-ray diffraction. Furthermore, over 90 percent of the tiles studied demonstrated a crystallinity in the range of 50 to 90 percent.

The scientific literature indicates that the degree of crystallinity a ceramic attains is critically dependent on the raw materials used to make the tile and the heat treatment to which these materials are subjected. Often ceramic materials are engineered to meet the physical requirements for an intended use. Again in the case at hand, Customs is interested in ceramic floor and wall tiles. Two issues that Customs would consider in making the final determination of the degree of crystallinity include: the percent crystallinity necessary to impart resiliency to the tile for its intended use; the percent crystallinity at which a ceramic becomes a glass or a glass-ceramic. Customs does not wish to limit discussions to these two issues. All information provided will be given full consideration.

A.W. Tennant,

Director, Laboratories and Scientific Services.

[FR Doc. 95–22078 Filed 9–5–95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4820–02–P

OFFICE OF THE UNITED STATES TRADE REPRESENTATIVE

1995–96 Allocation of the Tariff-rate Quota for Raw Cane Sugar

AGENCY: Office of the United States Trade Representative; 600 17th Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20508.

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: The Office of the United States Trade Representative (USTR) is providing notice of the country-by-country allocation of the in-quota quantity of the tariff-rate quota for imported raw cane sugar for the period that begins October 1, 1995, and ends September 30, 1996.

EFFECTIVE DATE: October 1, 1995.

ADDRESSES: Inquiries may be mailed or delivered to Tom Perkins, Senior Economist, Office of Agricultural Affairs (Room 421), Office of the United States Trade Representative, 600 17th Street, NW., Washington, DC 20508.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Tom Perkins, Office of Agricultural Affairs, 202–395–6127.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: Pursuant to Additional U.S. Note 5 to chapter 17 of the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States (HTS), the United States maintains a tariff-rate quota for imports of raw sugar. The in-quota quantity of the tariff-rate quota for the period October 1, 1995-September 30, 1996, has been established by the Secretary of Agriculture at 1,117,195 metric tons, raw value (1,231,496 short tons).

Section 404(d)(3) of the Uruguay Round Agreements Act (19 U.S.C. 3601(d)(3)) authorizes the President to allocate the in-quota quantity of a tariff-rate quota for any agricultural product among supplying countries or customs areas. The President delegated this authority to the United States Trade Representative under paragraph (3) of Presidential Proclamation No. 6763 (60 FR 1007).

Accordingly, the 1,117,195 metric tons for raw cane sugar are being allocated to the following countries in metric tons, raw value:

Country	FY 1996 allocation
Argentina	45,281
Australia	87,402
Barbados	7,371
Belize	11,583
Bolivia	8,424
Brazil	152,691
Colombia	25,273
Congo	7,258
Cote d'Ivoire	7,258
Costa Rica	15,796
Dominican Republic	185,335
Eucador	11,583
El Salvador	27,379
Fiji	9,477
Gabon	7,258
Guatemala	50,546
Guyana	12,636
Haiti	7,258
Honduras	10,530
India	8,424
Jamaica	11,583
Madagascar	7,258
Malawi	10,530
Mauritius	12,636
Mexico	7,258
Mozambique	13,690
Nicaragua	22,114
Panama	30,538
Papua New Guinea	7,258
Paraguay	7,258
Peru	43,175
Philippines	142,160
South Africa	24,220
St. Kitts & Nevis	7,258
Swaziland	16,849
Taiwan	12,636
Thailand	14,743
Trinidad-Tobago	7,371
Uruguay	7,258
Zimbabwe	12,636
Total	1,117,195

The allocation includes the following minimum quota-holding countries: Congo, Cote d'Ivoire, Gabon, Haiti, Madagascar, Mexico, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, St. Kitts & Nevis, and Uruguay.

Michael Kantor,

United States Trade Representative.

[FR Doc. 95–22031 Filed 9–5–95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3190–01–M