

concerns on the proposed action, comments on the revised supplement to the draft environmental impact statement should be as specific as possible. It is also helpful if comments refer to specific pages or chapters of the draft statement. Comments may also address the adequacy of the revised supplement to the draft environmental impact statement or the merits of the alternatives formulated and discussed in the statement. Reviewers may wish to refer to the Council on Environmental Quality Regulations for implementing the procedural provisions of the National Environmental Policy Act at 40 CFR 1503.3 in addressing these points.

Dated: April 21, 1995.

**Robert Williams,**

*Acting Regional Forester of the Alaska Region.*

[FR Doc. 95-10940 Filed 5-3-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3410-11-M

### **Snowbird Mineral Withdrawal, Lolo National Forest, Mineral County, MT**

**AGENCY:** Forest Service, USDA.

**ACTION:** Notice.

**SUMMARY:** The U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, proposes to withdraw 160 acres of National Forest System lands for 30 years to allow for public recreational crystal and mineral collection. From the date of the withdrawal, these lands would be closed to location and entry under the mining laws for the next 30 years.

**DATES:** Comments concerning the scope of the analysis should be received in writing by May 15, 1995.

**ADDRESSES:** Send written comments to the Ninemile Ranger District, 20325 Ninemile Road, Huson, MT, 49846.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Lisa Stoeffler, 406-626-5201.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** On March 29, 1993, the U.S. Department of Agriculture filed an application to withdraw the following described National Forest System land from location and mineral entry under the United States mining laws, subject to valid existing rights:

#### **Principle Meridian, Montana**

T. 12 N., 25 W., (Unsurveyed)  
Sec. 19, SW<sup>1</sup>/<sub>4</sub>.

The area described contains 160 acres in Mineral County.

The Forest Service is preparing an Environmental Analysis to in order to

make a recommendation for the withdrawal of these lands for 30 years.

The purpose of the 30 year withdrawal is to provide the opportunity for the public to use the site as a recreational mineral and crystal collecting area. The Forest Service will undertake an analysis to determine the existing and potential demand for the land and its resources.

The public is invited to comment, in writing, on this proposal

Dated: April 3, 1995

**Robert P. Meuchel,**

*Acting Forest Supervisor.*

[FR Doc. 95-10937 Filed 5-3-94; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3410-11-M

### **COMMISSION ON CIVIL RIGHTS**

#### **Notice of Public Meeting Cancellation of the Maine Advisory Committee**

Notice is hereby given, pursuant to the provisions of the rules and regulations of the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, that a meeting of the Maine Advisory Committee to the Commission which was to have convened on Monday, May 8, 1995, at 1:30 p.m. and adjourned at 4:00 p.m., at the Magistrate Court of the U.S. District Court House, Third Floor, 202 Harlow Street, Bangor, Maine 04401, has been canceled.

The original notice for the May 8, 1995, meeting was announced in the **Federal Register** on April 21, 1995, 60 FR 19883.

Persons desiring additional information, or planning a presentation to the Committee, should contact Edward Darden, Acting Director of the Eastern Regional Office, 202-376-7533 (TDD 202-376-8116).

Dated at Washington, DC, May 1, 1995.

**Carol-Lee Hurley,**

*Chief, Regional Programs Coordination Unit.*

[FR Doc. 95-11074 Filed 5-3-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6335-01-P

### **DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE**

#### **Agency Information Collection Under Review by the Office of Management and Budget**

DOC has submitted to the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) for clearance the following proposal for collection of information under the provisions of the Paperwork Reduction Act (44 U.S.C. Chapter 35).

Agency: National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA).  
Title: Southeast Region Dealer/Interview Family of Forms.

Form Number: Agency: NOAA 88-30;  
OMB Number 0648-0013.

Type of Request: Extension of the expiration date.

Burden: 2,268 hours; 9,170 respondents with 15,286 responses; Avg. Hours Per Response varies depending on requirement but ranges between 3 to 40 minutes.

Needs and Uses: Data from dealer reporting are used to monitor mandated fishery quotas. Interviews with fishermen provide detailed catch, effort, and species composition data for stock assessments that support fishery management plans.

Affected Public: Businesses or other for-profit institutions, individuals.

Frequency: Weekly, monthly, on occasion.

Obligation: Mandatory.

OMB Desk Officer: Don Arbuckle, (202) 395-7340.

Copies of the above information collection proposal can be obtained by calling or writing DOC Clearance Officer, Gerald Taché, (202) 482-3271, Department of Commerce, Room 5327, 14th and Constitution Avenue, NW, Washington, DC 20230.

Written comments and recommendations for the proposed information collection should be sent to Don Arbuckle, OMB Desk Officer, Room 10202, New Executive Office Building, Washington, DC 20503.

Dated: April 27, 1995

**Gerald Taché,**

*Department Forms Clearance Officer, Office of Management and Organization.*

[FR Doc. 95-11053 Filed 5-3-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-CW-M

### **International Trade Administration**

[A-412-602]

#### **Notice of Preliminary Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review: Certain Forged Steel Crankshafts From the United Kingdom**

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

**EFFECTIVE DATE:** May 4, 1995.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Brian C. Smith or John Beck, Office of Antidumping Investigations, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. 20230; telephone: (202) 482-1766 or (202) 482-3464, respectively.

## SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

**Background**

On September 7, 1993, the Department of Commerce (the Department) published in the **Federal Register** a notice of "Opportunity to Request an Administrative Review" of the Antidumping Duty Order on Certain Forged Steel Crankshafts from the United Kingdom (52 FR 35467). In accordance with 19 CFR 353.22(a)(2), in September 1993, United Engineering and Forging (UEF) requested an administrative review of the antidumping order covering the period September 1, 1992, through August 31, 1993. We initiated the administrative review on October 18, 1993 (58 FR 53710), and are conducting it in accordance with section 751 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (the Act).

**Scope of the Review**

The products covered in this review are certain forged steel crankshafts (CFSCs). The term "crankshafts," as used in this review, includes forged carbon or alloy steel crankshafts with a shipping weight between 40 and 750 pounds, whether machined or unmachined. The products are currently classifiable under items 8483.10.10.10, 8483.10.10.30, 8483.10.30.10, and 8483.10.30.50 of the *Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States* (HTSUS). Neither cast crankshafts nor forged crankshafts with shipping weights of less than 40 pounds or more than 750 pounds are subject to this review. Although the HTSUS subheadings are provided for convenience and Customs purposes, our written description of the scope of this proceeding is dispositive.

**Applicable Statute and Regulations**

Unless otherwise indicated, all citations to the Statute and to the Department's regulations are in reference to the provisions as they existed on December 31, 1994.

**Such or Similar Merchandise**

In determining similar merchandise comparisons, we considered the following physical characteristics, which appear in order of importance: (1) Twisted vs. untwisted; (2) number of throws; (3) ship weight; (4) forging method; (5) engine type; (6) number of bearings; (7) number of flanges; and, (8) number of counterweights (see the February 4, 1993, model matching methodology memorandum from Louis Apple, Acting Division Director to David L. Binder, Acting Director, Office of Antidumping Investigations; and the April 26, 1995, memorandum from the case analyst to the file).

**United States Price (USP)**

We based USP on purchase price, in accordance with section 772(b) of the Act, because the subject merchandise was sold to an unrelated purchaser before importation into the United States and because exporter's sales price methodology was not otherwise indicated. We based purchase price on the packed, c.i.f. price to the first unrelated purchaser in the United States.

We made deductions from USP, where appropriate, for ocean and foreign inland freight, U.S. duties, harbor maintenance and merchandise processing fees, marine insurance and U.S. brokerage and handling expenses, in accordance with section 772(d)(2) of the Act. For certain sales made by UEF's Shardlow facility, ocean freight, foreign inland freight, U.S. duties, and U.S. brokerage and handling expenses were not reported. Therefore, in accordance with section 776(c) of the Act, we have relied upon the best information available (BIA) in these preliminary results to value these unreported expenses for those sales. As BIA, we applied the largest reported amount to each of Shardlow's unreported expenses. Based on verification, we requested UEF to correct its reported brokerage and handling expenses, and ocean freight expenses identified in the August 23, 1994, verification reports. In addition, we made certain corrections to UEF's reported credit expenses, warranty expenses, U.S. duty expenses, marine insurance expenses and additional corrections to ocean freight and U.S. brokerage and handling expenses identified in the verification reports.

For one crankshaft model, we increased USP to account for tooling and manufacturing costs that were not included in the U.S. sales invoice, but were billed separately to the U.S. customer. Such costs are normally considered a component of USP for that merchandise (see *Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review: Certain Forged Steel Crankshafts from the United Kingdom* (52 FR 5975 (February 14, 1991))).

We also made adjustments to USP, as appropriate, for price and/or quantity changes subsequent to shipment.

Finally, we made an adjustment for taxes paid on comparison sales in the United Kingdom, in accordance with our practice, pursuant to the Court of International Trade (CIT) decision in *Federal-Mogul, et al v. United States*, 834 F. Supp. 1993. See *Preliminary Determination of Sales at Less Than Fair Value: Color Negative Photographic*

*Paper and Chemical Components Thereof from Japan* (59 FR 16177, 16179 (April 6, 1994)), for an explanation of this tax methodology.

**Foreign Market Value**

In order to determine whether there were sufficient sales of CFSCs in the home market to serve as a viable basis for calculating foreign market value (FMV), we compared the volume of the respondent's home market sales to the volume of its third country sales, in accordance with section 773(a)(1)(B) of the Act. Based on this comparison, we determined that the home market is viable, and that it is the most appropriate basis for calculating FMV.

Where home market sales were used for comparisons, we calculated FMV based on packed, ex-factory or delivered prices to customers in the United Kingdom. We made deductions, where appropriate, for discounts. We also made adjustments to FMV, where appropriate, for price and/or quantity changes subsequent to shipment.

In light of the Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit's decision in *Ad Hoc Committee of AZ-NM-TX-FL Producers of Gray Portland Cement v. United States*, 13 F.3d 398 (Fed. Cir. 1994), the Department no longer can deduct home market movement charges from FMV pursuant to its inherent power to fill in gaps in the antidumping statute. Instead, we adjust for those expenses under the circumstance-of-sale (COS) provision of 19 CFR 353.56(a). Accordingly, in the present case, we adjusted for post-sale home market inland freight charges under the COS provision of 19 CFR 353.56(a).

Because all price-to-price comparisons involved purchase price sales, we also made COS adjustments, where appropriate, for differences in credit expenses, warranty expenses, and pre-sale and post-sale warehousing expenses on U.S. sales, in accordance with 19 CFR 353.56(a). We treated the pre-sale warehousing expense as a direct selling expense because UEF has an agreement with its U.S. customer that it will store the subject merchandise in a warehouse before it transfers title of the merchandise to its customer. In accordance with section 773(a)(1) of the Act, we then added U.S. packing costs to all home market prices. We did not deduct home market packing costs because UEF could not report them separately.

Where appropriate, we made adjustments to FMV to account for differences in physical characteristics of the merchandise, in accordance with 19 CFR 353.57.

For two U.S. products, we found no home market products sold in contemporaneous periods which had an adjustment for differences in physical characteristics of merchandise that was less than 20 percent of the cost of manufacture of the U.S. product. For sales of one U.S. product, we deemed it inappropriate to match a twisted with an untwisted crankshaft (see *Final Determination of Sales at Less Than Fair Value: Certain Forged Steel Crankshafts from the United Kingdom* (52 FR 32951, 32953 (September 1, 1987))). For the second U.S. product, there were no contemporaneous sales of comparable home market products. For these products, we based FMV on CV. We calculated CV based on the sum of the respondent's submitted cost of materials, fabrication, general expenses, U.S. packing and profit. In addition, we increased the respondent's submitted general and administrative expenses (G&A) to include certain forging division G&A items (see August 18, 1994, verification report for a further discussion). According to section 773(e)(1)(B) (i) and (ii) of the Act, we included the actual general expenses which exceeded the statutory minimum (ten percent of the cost of manufacturing (COM)). We used the statutory minimum profit, which is eight percent of the sum of COM and general expenses, because the actual profit amount was less than the statutory minimum.

We made adjustments to CV, in accordance with 19 CFR 353.56, for differences in circumstances of sale. These adjustments were made for differences in credit expenses, warranties, and warehousing.

#### Currency Conversion

We made currency conversions in accordance with 19 CFR 353.60(a). All currency conversions were made at the rates certified by the Federal Reserve Bank.

#### Verification

As provided in section 776(b) of the Act, we verified information provided by respondent by using standard verification procedures, including on-site inspection of the manufacturer's facilities, examination of relevant sales and financial records, and selection of original source documentation containing relevant information.

#### Preliminary Results of Review

As a result of our review, we preliminarily determine that the following margin exists for the period September 1, 1992, through August 31, 1993:

Manufacturer/exporter	Review period	Margin (percent)
UEF .....	9/01/92—8/31/93	0.36

Interested parties may request a disclosure within 5 days of publication of this notice and may request a hearing within 10 days of the date of publication. Any hearing, if requested, will be held 44 days after the date of publication, or the first workday thereafter. Interested parties may submit case briefs within 30 days of the date of publication. Rebuttal briefs, limited to issues raised in the case briefs, may be filed not later than 37 days after the date of publication. The Department will publish a notice of the final results of this administrative review, which will include the results of its analysis of issues raised in any such case briefs.

The Department shall determine, and the Customs Service shall assess, antidumping duties on all appropriate entries. Individual differences between USP and FMV may vary from the percentages stated above. The Department will issue appraisal instructions directly to the Customs Service.

Furthermore, the following deposit requirement will be effective for all shipments of CFSCs from the United Kingdom entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption on or after the publication date of the final results of this administrative review, as provided by section 751(a)(1) of the Tariff Act: (1) The cash deposit rate for UEF will be the rate established in the final results of this review, except if the rate is less than 0.50 percent and, therefore, *de minimis*, the cash deposit will be zero; (2) for previously reviewed or investigated companies not listed above, the cash deposit rate will continue to be the company-specific rate published for the most recent period; (3) if the exporter is not a firm covered in this review, a prior review, or the original LTFV investigation, but the manufacturer is, the cash deposit rate will be the rate established for the most recent period for the manufacturer of the merchandise; and (4) if neither the exporter nor the manufacturer is a firm covered in this or any previous review conducted by the Department, the cash deposit rate will be the "all others" rate, as set forth below.

On March 25, 1993, the Court of International Trade (CIT), in *Floral Trade Council v. United States*, 822 F.Supp. 766 (CIT 1993), and *Federal-Mogul Corporation v. United States*, 822 F.Supp. 782 (CIT 1993), decided that

once an "all others" rate is established for a company, it can only be changed through an administrative review. The Department has determined that in order to implement this decision, it is appropriate to reinstate the original "all others" rate from the LTFV investigation (or that rate as amended for correction of clerical errors or as a result of litigation) in proceedings governed by antidumping duty orders. In proceedings governed by antidumping findings, unless we are able to ascertain that "all others" rate from the original investigation, the Department has determined that it is appropriate to adopt the "new shipper" rate established in the first final results of administrative review published by the Department (or that rate as amended for correction of clerical errors or as a result of litigation) as the "all others" rate for the purposes of establishing cash deposits in all current and future administrative reviews. Because this proceeding is governed by an antidumping duty order, the "all others" rate for the purposes of this review will be 14.67 percent, the "all others" rate established in the LTFV investigation.

These cash deposit requirements, when imposed, shall remain in effect until publication of the final results of the next administrative review.

This notice serves as a preliminary reminder to importers of their responsibility under 19 CFR 353.26 to file a certificate regarding the reimbursement of antidumping duties prior to liquidation of the relevant entries during this review period. Failure to comply with this requirement could result in the Secretary's presumption that reimbursement of antidumping duties occurred and the subsequent assessment of double antidumping duties.

This administrative review and notice are in accordance with section 751(a)(1) of the Tariff Act (19 U.S.C. 1675(a)(1)) and 19 CFR 353.22.

Dated: April 27, 1995.

**Susan G. Esserman,**

*Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.*

[FR Doc. 95-11056 Filed 5-3-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-DS-P