instrument or at the time of receipt of application by the U.S. Customs Service.

Frank W. Creel,

Director, Statutory Import Programs Staff.

[FR Doc. 96–26217 Filed 10–10–96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–DS–P

University of Arizona, et al.; Notice of Consolidated Decision on Applications for Duty-Free Entry of Scientific Instruments

This is a decision consolidated pursuant to Section 6(c) of the Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Materials Importation Act of 1966 (Pub. L. 89–651, 80 Stat. 897; 15 CFR part 301). Related records can be viewed between 8:30 A.M. and 5:00 P.M. in Room 4211, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th and Constitution Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C.

Comments: None received. *Decision:* Approved. No instrument of equivalent scientific value to the foreign instruments described below, for such purposes as each is intended to be used, is being manufactured in the United States.

Docket Number: 96–079. *Applicant:* University of Arizona, Tucson, AZ 85721. *Instrument:* Mass Spectrometer, Model Sector 54. *Manufacturer:* Micromass, United Kingdom. *Intended Use:* See notice at 61 FR 42589, August 16, 1996. *Reasons:* The foreign instrument provides: (1) an abundance sensitivity of 10ppb at mass U^{237}, (2) an ion-counting Daly type detector with a detection efficiency >90% and (3) motorized computer-controlled multiple collectors.

Docket Number: 96–080. *Applicant:* Berkeley Geochronology Center, Berkeley, CA 94709. *Instrument:* Mass Spectrometer, Model Sector 54. *Manufacturer:* Micromass, United Kingdom. *Intended Use:* See notice at 61 FR 42589, August 16, 1996. *Reasons:* The foreign instrument provides: (1) an abundance sensitivity of $2x10^{8}$, (2) a peak flat specification of 0.01% and (3) a precision of 15 ppm for analysis of $^{87}Sr/^{86}Sr$.

The capabilities of each of the foreign instruments described above are pertinent to each applicant's intended purposes. We know of no instrument or apparatus being manufactured in the United States which is of equivalent scientific value to either of the foreign instruments.

Frank W. Creel,

Director, Statutory Import Programs Staff.

[FR Doc. 96–26216 Filed 10–10–96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–DS–P

University of California; Notice of Decision on Application for Duty-Free Entry of Scientific Instrument

This decision is made pursuant to Section 6(c) of the Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Materials Importation Act of 1966 (Pub. L. 89–651, 80 Stat. 897; 15 CFR part 301). Related records can be viewed between 8:30 A.M. and 5:00 P.M. in Room 4211, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th and Constitution Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C.

Docket Number: 96–073. *Applicant:* University of California, Berkeley, CA 94720. *Instrument:* High Pressure Freezing Machine, Model HPM 010. *Manufacturer:* Bal-Tec, Inc. Liechtenstein. *Intended Use:* See notice at 61 FR 41773, August 12, 1996.

Comments: None received. *Decision:* Approved. No instrument of equivalent scientific value to the foreign instrument, for such purposes as it is intended to be used, is being manufactured in the United States. *Reasons:* The foreign instrument provides cryogenic sample preparation of biological tissues down to −80 °C at 30 000 lbs/sq. in. in pressure and within 20–50 milliseconds. The National Institutes of Health advises in its memorandum dated July 24, 1996 that (1) this capability is pertinent to the applicant's intended purpose and (2) it knows of no domestic instrument or apparatus of equivalent scientific value to the foreign instrument for the applicant's intended use.

We know of no other instrument or apparatus of equivalent scientific value to the foreign instrument which is being manufactured in the United States.

Frank W. Creel,

Director, Statutory Import Programs Staff.

[FR Doc. 96–26218 Filed 10–10–96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–DS–P

Woods Hole Oceanographic Institution; Notice of Decision on Application for Duty-Free Entry of Scientific Instrument

This decision is made pursuant to Section 6(c) of the Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Materials Importation Act of 1966 (Pub. L. 89–651, 80 Stat. 897; 15 CFR part 301). Related records can be viewed between 8:30 A.M. and 5:00 P.M. in Room 4211, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th and Constitution Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C.

Docket Number: 96–067. *Applicant:* Woods Hole Oceanographic Institution, Woods Hole, MA 02543. *Instrument:* 5 Window Beta Detector with Anticoincidence, Model GM–25–5. *Manufacturer:* Riso National Laboratory, Denmark. *Intended Use:* See notice at 61 FR 39948, July 31, 1996.

Comments: None received. *Decision:* Approved. No instrument of equivalent scientific value to the foreign instrument, for such purposes as it is intended to be used, is being manufactured in the United States. *Reasons:* The foreign instrument provides: (1) robust design and portability for shipboard operation, (2) one-inch detector windows and (3) a background of 0.178 ± 0.003 counts per minute. Several domestic manufacturers of similar equipment advise that (1) these capabilities are pertinent to the applicant's intended purpose and (2) they know of no domestic instrument or apparatus of equivalent scientific value to the foreign instrument for the applicant's intended use.

We know of no other instrument or apparatus of equivalent scientific value to the foreign instrument which is being manufactured in the United States.

Frank W. Creel,

Director, Statutory Import Programs Staff.

[FR Doc. 96–26219 Filed 10–10–96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–DS–P

[C–508–605]

Industrial Phosphoric Acid From Israel; Final Results of Countervailing Duty Administrative Review

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

ACTION: Notice of final results of countervailing duty administrative review.

SUMMARY: On June 6, 1996, the Department of Commerce (''the Department'') published in the Federal Register its preliminary results of administrative review of the countervailing duty order on industrial phosphoric acid (IPA) from Israel for the period January 1, 1994 through December 31, 1994 (61 FR 28845). The Department has now completed this administrative review in accordance with section 751(a) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended. For information on the net subsidy for each reviewed company, and for all non-reviewed companies, please see the *Final Results of Review* section of this notice. We will instruct the U.S. Customs Service to assess countervailing duties as detailed in the *Final Results of Review* section of this notice.

EFFECTIVE DATE: October 11, 1996.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Cameron Cardozo or Brian Albright, Office of CVD/AD Enforcement VI, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20230; telephone: (202) 482–2786.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

Pursuant to section 355.22(a) of the Department's Interim Regulations, this review covers only those producers or exporters of the subject merchandise for which a review was specifically requested. See Antidumping and Countervailing Duties: Interim regulations; request for comments, 60 FR 25130, 25137 (May 11, 1995) (''Interim Regulations''). Accordingly, this review covers Rotem Amfert Negev Ltd. (Rotem). This review also covers the period January 1, 1994 through December 31, 1994, and nine programs.

We invited interested parties to comment on the preliminary results. Since the publication of the preliminary results on June 6, 1996, the following events have occurred. On July 8, 1996, case briefs were submitted by the Government of Israel (GOI) and Rotem, a producer of the subject merchandise which exported industrial phosphoric acid to the United States during the review period (respondents). On July 12, 1996, rebuttal briefs were submitted by FMC Corporation and Monsanto Company (petitioners).

Applicable Statute and Regulations

Unless otherwise indicated, all citations to the statute are references to the provisions of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended by the Uruguay Round Agreements Act (''URAA'') effective January 1, 1995 (''the Act''). References to the Countervailing Duties; Notice of Proposed Rulemaking and Request for Public Comments, 54 FR 23366 (May 31, 1989) (''Proposed Regulations''), are provided solely for further explanation of the Department's countervailing duty practice. Although the Department has withdrawn the particular rulemaking proceeding pursuant to which the Proposed Regulations were issued, the subject matter of these regulations is being considered in connection with an ongoing rulemaking proceeding which, among other things, is intended to conform the Department's regulations to the URAA. See Advance Notice of Proposed Rulemaking and Request for Public Comments, 60 FR 80 (January 3, 1995).

Scope of the Review

Imports covered by this review are shipments of industrial phosphoric acid (IPA) from Israel. Such merchandise is classifiable under item number 2809.20.00 of the Harmonized Tariff Schedule (HTS). The HTS item number is provided for convenience and Customs purposes. The written description remains dispositive.

Privatization

Previously, we have found that a private party purchasing all or part of a government-owned company can repay prior non-recurring subsidies on behalf of the company as part or all of the sales price. Accordingly, in the preliminary results, we calculated a ratio representing the amount of subsidies remaining with Rotem after each partial privatization in 1992 and 1993. To calculate the benefit provided to Rotem in the POR (1994), we multiplied the benefit calculated for Encouragement of Capital Investment Law grants (the only non-recurring allocable subsidies) by the ratio representing the amount of subsidies remaining with Rotem after the partial privatizations.

Analysis of Programs

Based upon our analysis of the questionnaire responses and written comments from the interested parties, we determine the following:

I. Programs Conferring Subsidies

1. Encouragement of Capital Investments Law (ECIL) Grants

In the preliminary results, we found that this program conferred countervailable benefits on the subject merchandise. Our analysis of the comments submitted by the interested parties, summarized below, has led us to change our findings from the preliminary results. For ECIL grants that were tied to IPA production, we have divided the benefit by Rotem's sales of IPA during the POR. For ECIL grants that were not tied specifically to IPA production but were tied to the production of products that can be used as inputs in the production of IPA, we have divided the benefit by Rotem's total sales of all products during the POR. On this basis, the net subsidy for this program is 8.00 percent *ad valorem* for 1994.

2. Long-term Industrial Development Loans

In the preliminary results, we found that this program conferred countervailable benefits on the subject merchandise. We received no comments on our preliminary results and our findings remain unchanged in these final results. On this basis, the net subsidy for this program is less than 0.005 percent *ad valorem* for 1994.

3. Encouragement of Industrial Research and Development Grants (EIRD)

In the preliminary results, we found that this program conferred countervailable benefits on the subject merchandise. Our analysis of the comments submitted by the interested parties, summarized below, has not led us to change our findings from the preliminary results. On this basis, the net subsidy for this program is 0.06 percent *ad valorem* for 1994.

II. Programs Found Not To Be Used

In the preliminary results, we found that Rotem did not apply for or receive benefits under the following programs:

A. Exchange Rate Risk Insurance Scheme;

B. Reduced Tax Rates under ECIL;

C. ECIL Section 24 Loans;

D. Labor Training Grants;

E. Dividends and Interest Tax Benefits under Section 46 of the ECIL; and

F. ECIL Preferential Accelerated Depreciation.

Our analysis of the comments submitted by the interested parties, summarized below, has not led us to change our findings from the preliminary results.

Analysis of Comments

Comment 1: Respondents argue that ECIL grants for Project 14 should not be considered subsidies bestowed on the subject merchandise, which is IPA sold as IPA, because the grants were intended to increase production of IPA for use in downstream products. Respondents take issue with the Department's application of section 355.47 of the Proposed Regulations, which the Department cited in its memorandum addressing the treatment of Project 14. (See, Memorandum to File from Team on April 15, 1996, available in the public file of the Central Records Unit, Room B–099, Department of Commerce). According to respondents, section 355.47 does not support the Department's preliminary decision to countervail Project 14 grants that were used in the ''production'' of IPA. While the regulation does speak in terms of ''production,'' respondents argue that this does not contemplate production of a product for use in value-added downstream products that are outside the scope of the order. Rather, the provision contemplates production of the product for sale as the product itself; that is, as the subject merchandise.

Respondents further argue that the Department's treatment of Project 14 is at odds with its treatment of other ECIL grants. Respondents point out that the Department allocated a portion of the grants for Rotem's green acid facility, Project 9, to its calculation of the subsidy on IPA because a portion of green acid was fed to IPA production. IPA was thus, to a certain degree, a downstream product of green acid. According to the Department's analysis, argue respondents, the Project 9 grants, since the grants were for the production of green acid and not downstream IPA, should have been fully allocated to the production of green acid and not IPA.

Finally, respondents question the Department's citations to four earlier determinations which support the ''practice of tying benefits to specific products.'' In doing so, respondents maintain that Project 14 grants should not be ''tied'' to IPA when the sole purpose of the grants was to benefit products other than IPA. Thus, respondents conclude, while the four cited cases do stand for the ''established tenet'' of tying benefits, they are not relevant to the issue of how to treat grants for the ultimate production of downstream products.

In rebuttal, petitioners argue that the Department correctly included Project 14 grants in its calculation of the net subsidy. According to petitioner, the statute makes clear that when a countervailable subsidy is provided with respect to the manufacture or production of a class or kind of merchandise imported into the United States, and the requisite injury determination is made, a duty shall be imposed equal to the amount of the net countervailable subsidy. It is undisputed that the grants made available to Rotem under Project 14 were for the ''manufacture'' or ''production'' of industrial phosphoric acid. Moreover, state petitioners, as a matter of law, the Department has also determined that the grants provided under Project 14 do constitute ''countervailable subsidies.'' Under these circumstances, the Department had no alternative but to include the amount of this countervailable subsidy in its calculation of the net subsidy amount.

Petitioners further maintain that there are several flaws in respondents' argument that the grants are not intended to benefit IPA as subject merchandise. First, it does not square with the language of the statute, which mentions no requirement for any sale, much less a requirement that a sale be for a particular purpose. In addition, state petitioners, respondents' argument would require a finding by the Department that the grants provided to Rotem actually benefited Rotem's sales of IPA in the United States, a so-called competitive-benefits-conferred interpretation of the statute that has been soundly rejected by the Department and the Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit in the privatization context. According to petitioners, the only relevant legal test has been met in this case, *i.e.,* that the grants received in connection with Project 14 were provided for the production of IPA. What Rotem subsequently did with the production and whether it used the grants to obtain a competitive advantage for its sales of IPA in the United States are legally irrelevant matters.

Department's Position: We disagree with respondents. Where the Department determines that a countervailable benefit is tied to the production or sale of a product or products, as set forth in section 355.47 of the Proposed Regulations, the benefit is attributable to sales of that product or products made during the period of review. As respondents have themselves pointed out, Project 14 grants are clearly tied directly to the production of IPA, the subject merchandise. Contrary to respondents assertion that it is clear that section 355.47 does not contemplate production of an input for use in value-added downstream products, section 355.47 does not address the ''use'' of the product in question in determining whether a benefit is tied to subject merchandise. Rather, as outlined in section 355.47, the Department may countervail a benefit that is tied to production or sale of the subject merchandise.

While respondents have stated that during the POR their capacity to produce IPA expanded in some measure as a result of the Project 14 grant, respondents' submission merely indicated a future intent to manufacture products that can use IPA as an input. See April 15, 1996 submission to the Department from respondents regarding New Factual Information at 5–8. They have submitted no evidence that any increased production of IPA during the POR (1994), which resulted from expansion of capacity from Project 14, was used as an input in the production of downstream products manufactured by Rotem. Moreover, respondents' April 15, 1996 submission indicates that the expansion intended to increase production of IPA ''has not yet come fully on stream.'' If, in future reviews, Rotem increases its production of IPA and record evidence establishes that some portion of Rotem's IPA is used as an input for downstream products manufactured by Rotem, we will then examine how the benefits from Project 14 grants on IPA, whether sold or captively consumed, should be treated for the purpose of calculating the subsidy rate. In this review, however, the information on the record indicates that during the POR Rotem only produced IPA that is sold as IPA.

Respondents have also mistakenly analogized the Department's treatment of Project 14 grants with its treatment of other ECIL grants that were not directly tied to IPA production. In those projects, grants were provided to expand the production of materials (e.g., phosphate rock, green acid) that were either sold or used captively during the POR to produce IPA. Accordingly, consistent with our approach in prior reviews, the Department is allocating benefits from those grants to IPA, (See, e.g., Industrial Phosphoric Acid from Israel; Final Results of Countervailing Duty Administrative Reviews, 61 FR 28841 (June 6, 1996), although utilizing a different allocation methodology (See Department's Position on *Comment 2*). In contrast, the Project 14 grants were provided for the purpose of expanding production of IPA, and are therefore tied directly to the production of the subject merchandise.

Respondents correctly recognize that the four cases cited by the Department stand for the ''established tenet'' of tying benefits and that they are not relevant to the issue of how to treat grants for the ultimate production of downstream products. Project 14 grants were provided to increase production of IPA. Although respondents claim that the ''sole purpose'' of the Project 14 grants was to benefit products other than IPA, record evidence indicates that during the POR, IPA produced was sold as IPA. Therefore, we continue to treat the Project 14 grants as subsidies bestowed directly on the production of the subject merchandise during the 1994 POR and allocate the benefit over sales of IPA during the review period.

Comment 2: Rotem argues that the Department should not have found that three EIRD grants conferred benefits on IPA during the review period, since Rotem stated in its questionnaire response that these grants were not related to IPA production. Two grants benefited a research project concerning green acid, and one grant benefited a research project concerning phosphate. Accordingly, for the final results, Rotem argues that the Department should find that the EIRD grants were not countervailable subsidies to IPA during the period of review. Alternatively, if the Department refuses to accept

Rotem's statements, then the Department must allocate the EIRD grants in the same manner as the ECIL grants that related to the green acid facility.

Petitioners respond that the countervailing duty law does not require that a subsidy directly benefit the subject merchandise. Instead, the statute is quite clear that countervailable subsidies may be provided either directly or indirectly. Both the phosphate raw material and the green acid, which were the direct targets of these grants, are important inputs in the production of IPA. As a result, IPA benefits indirectly from these grants.

Finally, petitioners argue that the Department has dealt previously with this issue in the 1987 administrative review. In that review, respondent advanced a similar argument that a grant provided for research on phosphate rock did not benefit IPA. The Department rejected that argument because rock phosphates are a main input in the production of IPA. This reasoning, argue petitioners, is equally applicable to the EIRD grants at issue in the instant review. To the extent the production of green acid and phosphate is improved by the research made possible through the EIRD grants, IPA will also benefit. Therefore, the Department acted properly in including these EIRD grants in its calculation of the net subsidy rate for IPA.

Department's Position: The statute gives the Department clear authority to countervail benefits that are provided directly or indirectly to the production of the subject merchandise. *See* 19 U.S.C. § 1671(a). To the extent that green acid and phosphate produced by Rotem are inputs in the production of IPA produced by Rotem, the EIRD grants benefit IPA. In making this determination, we are being consistent with our past practice with regard to EIRD grants. The respondent received an EIRD grant for a research project on rock phosphate during the 1990 administrative review. We found this grant countervailable because the research would ''benefit the gathering of raw materials (inputs) required to produce IPA.'' Industrial Phosphoric Acid from Israel; Preliminary Results of Countervailing Duty Administrative Review, 57 FR 21958, 21960 (May 26, 1992) and Final Results of Countervailing Duty Administrative Review, 57 FR 39391 (August 31, 1992). The method used by the Department to calculate the benefit under these grants is therefore reasonable and consistent with our practice in prior reviews.

In consideration of respondents' comment, specifically respondents' argument that EIRD grants should be allocated in the same manner as ECIL grants, we have reexamined our calculation methodology with respect to EIRD and ECIL grants. We have determined that the proper grant allocation methodology to follow is the one that the Department has used to determine the benefit for the EIRD grants. This methodology is consistent with the Department's approach in Final Affirmative Countervailing Duty Determination: Certain Pasta from Italy, 61 FR 30288, 30289 (June 14, 1996) (Certain Pasta). As the Department stated in Certain Pasta, in cases where an input product and the subject merchandise are produced within a single corporate entity, the Department has found that subsidies to the input product benefit total sales of the corporation, including sales of the subject merchandise. See also Final Affirmative Countervailing Duty Determination: Certain Softwood Lumber Products from Canada, 57 FR 22570 (May 28, 1992). Therefore, we are taking the entire amount of grants provided to the production of products that are inputs to IPA and dividing the benefit by Rotem's total sales. As discussed above (*Comment 1*), for grants that are directly tied to IPA production, we will continue to allocate the entire amount of the grant to Rotem's sales of IPA.

Final Results of Review

In accordance with section 355.22(c)(4)(ii) of the Department's Interim Regulations, we calculated an individual subsidy rate for each producer/exporter subject to this administrative review. For the period January 1, 1994 through December 31, 1994, we determine the net subsidy for Rotem to be 8.06 percent *ad valorem*.

Net subsidies—producer/exporter	Net subsidy rate (percent)
Rotem Amfert Negev Ltd.	8.06

We will instruct the U.S. Customs Service (''Customs'') to assess countervailing duties as indicated above. The Department will also instruct Customs to collect cash deposits of estimated countervailing duties in the percentages detailed above of the f.o.b. invoice price on all shipments of the subject merchandise from reviewed companies, entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption on or after the date of publication of the final results of this review.

Because the URAA replaced the general rule in favor of a country-wide rate with a general rule in favor of individual rates for investigated and reviewed companies, the procedures for establishing countervailing duty rates, including those for non-reviewed companies, are now essentially the same as those in antidumping cases, except as provided for in section 777A(e)(2)(B) of the Act. The requested review will normally cover only those companies specifically named. See section 355.22(a) of the Interim Regulations. Pursuant to 19 C.F.R. 355.22(g), for all companies for which a review was not requested, duties must be assessed at the cash deposit rate, and cash deposits must continue to be collected, at the rate previously ordered. As such, the countervailing duty cash deposit rate applicable to a company can no longer change, except pursuant to a request for a review of that company. See *Federal-Mogul Corporation and The Torrington Company* v. *United States,* 822 F.Supp. 782 (CIT 1993) and *Floral Trade Council* v. *United States,* 822 F.Supp. 766 (CIT 1993) (interpreting 19 C.F.R. 353.22(e), the antidumping regulation on automatic assessment, which is identical to 19 C.F.R. 355.22(g)). Therefore, the cash deposit rates for all companies except those covered by this review will be unchanged by the results of this review.

We will instruct Customs to continue to collect cash deposits for non-reviewed companies at the most recent company-specific or country-wide rate applicable to the company. Accordingly, the cash deposit rates that will be applied to non-reviewed companies covered by this order are those established in the most recently completed administrative proceeding. See Industrial Phosphoric Acid from Israel; Final Results of Countervailing Duty Administrative Reviews, 61 FR 28841 (June 6, 1996). These rates shall apply to all non-reviewed companies until a review of a company assigned these rates is requested. In addition, for the period January 1, 1994 through December 31, 1994, the assessment rates applicable to all non-reviewed companies covered by this order are the cash deposit rates in effect at the time of entry.

This notice serves as a reminder to parties subject to administrative protective order (APO) of their responsibility concerning the disposition of proprietary information disclosed under APO in accordance with 19 C.F.R. 355.34(d). Timely written notification of return/destruction of

APO materials or conversion to judicial protective order is hereby requested. Failure to comply with the regulations and the terms of an APO is a sanctionable violation.

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

Dated: October 4, 1996.

Robert S. LaRussa,

Acting Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.

[FR Doc. 96–26220 Filed 10–10–96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–DS–P

National Institute of Standards and Technology

National Database for Weights and Measures; Proposed Data Collection; Comment Request

SUMMARY: The Department of Commerce, as part of its continuing effort to reduce paperwork and respondent burden, invites the general public and other Federal agencies to take this opportunity to comment on proposed and/or continuing information collections, as required by the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, Public Law 104–13 (44 U.S.C.3506(c)(2)(A)).

DATES: Written comments must be submitted on or before December 10, 1996.

ADDRESSES: Direct all written comments to Linda Engelmeier, Departmental Forms Clearance Officer, Department of Commerce, Room 5327, 14th and Constitution Avenue, NW, Washington, DC, 20230.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Requests for additional information on the information collection instrument(s) and instructions should be directed to Deborah McGann Ripley, Office of Weights and Measures, National Institute of Standards and Technology, Bldg. 820, Mail Stop 223, Gaithersburg, MD 20899, telephone (301) 975–4406, fax (301) 926–4026, E-mail dripley@nist.gov.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

I. Abstract

NIST, in conjunction with The National Conference on Weights and Measures (NCWM), seeks to establish a standard core of data to be collected which would be used to assess the effectiveness of weights and measures programs, the economic impacts of its joint program with the state weights and measures agencies, and to share information and data thus enabling jurisdictions to make marketplace and cost-benefit analysis. The respondents will be State Weights and Measures Inspectors. The results will be used by NCWM and state weights and measures agencies for program evaluation purposes.

II. Method of Collection

State inspectors will enter their inspection data into a database residing on a server at NIST either by direct access to the database through the Internet, by mailing in a disk or using e-mail to transmit the data to NIST to append to database.

III. Data

OMB Number: None.

Form Number: None.

Type of Review: New Collection.

Affected Public: State Employees.

Estimated Number of Respondents: 40.

Estimated Time Per Response: 2 Hours.

Estimated Total Annual Cost: $8,000. (80 × $100 per hour fully burdened cost of a senior level technical manager.)

IV. Requests for Comments

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 shall have practical utility; (b) the accuracy of the agency's estimate of the burden (including hours and cost) of the proposed collection of information: (c) ways to enhance the quality, utility, and clarity of the information to be collected; and (d) ways to minimize the burden of the collection of information on respondents, including the use of automated collection techniques or other forms of information technology.

Comments submitted in response to this notice will be summarized and/or included in the request for OMB approval of this information collection: they will also become a matter of public record.

Dated: September 25, 1996.

Linda Engelmeier,

Acting Departmental Forms Clearance Officer, Office of Management and Organization.

[FR Doc. 96–26142 Filed 10–10–96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–13–P

National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration

[Docket No. 960910251–6251–01]

RIN 0648–ZA24

Announcement of Graduate Research Fellowships in the National Estuarine Research Reserve System for Fiscal Year 1997

AGENCY: Sanctuaries and Reserves Division (SRD), Office of Ocean and Coastal Resource Management (OCRM), National Ocean Service (NOS), National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA), Department of Commerce (DOC).

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: The Sanctuaries and Reserves Division of the Office of Ocean and Coastal Resource Management is soliciting applications for graduate fellowship funding within the National Estuarine Research Reserve System. This notice sets forth funding priorities, selection criteria, and application procedures.

The National Estuarine Research Reserve System (NERRS) of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) announces a new program of Graduate Research Fellowships. A maximum of 42 Graduate Research Fellowships will be competitively awarded to qualified graduate students whose research occurs within the boundaries of at least on Reserve. Fellowships will start no earlier than June 1, 1997.

DATES: All applications must be postmarked no later than November 29, 1996. Notification regarding the awarding of fellowships will be issued on or about March 1, 1997.

ADDRESSES: Dr. Dwight Trueblood, Science Coordinator, NOAA/Sanctuaries and Reserves Division, 1305 East-West Highway, N/ORM2, SSMC4, 12th Floor, Silver Spring, MD 20910, Attn: FY97 NERRS Research. Phone: 301–713–3145 ext. 174 Fax: 301–713–4362, internet: dtruebloodocean.nos.noaa.gov. See Appendix I for National Estuarine Research Reserve addresses.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: For further information on research opportunities under the National Estuarine Research Reserve System, contact the on-site personnel listed in Appendix I. For application information, contact the Science Coordinator of the Sanctuaries and Reserves Division (see Addresses above).