of an environmental assessment or environmental impact statement.

Controlling Paperwork Burdens on the Public

This internal directive does not establish or revise any recordkeeping or reporting requirements or other information collection requirements as defined in 5 CFR part 1320 and, therefore, imposes no paperwork burden on the public. Accordingly, the review provisions of the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (44 U.S.C. 3501 *et seq.*) and implementing regulations at 5 CFR 1320 do not apply.

Regulatory Impact

This notice has been reviewed under USDA procedures pursuant to Executive Order 12866 on Regulatory Planning and Review, and it has been determined that this notice is not significant as defined by the Executive Order.

These directive revisions remove burdensome, unnecessary, and obsolete guidance to Forest Service employees on conducting benchmark analysis in the forest plan revision process. The result is a savings in time and money with no diminution in the quality and usefulness of planning data. Benchmark analysis still must be performed. However, planning teams will now rely directly on the requirements of the planning rule. The net result is to provide planning teams more flexibility to tailor analysis to address issues associated with forest plan revisions in the most cost effective and relevant manner. These revisions to agency planning direction will not have an annual effect on the economy of $100 million nor adversely affect productivity, competition, jobs, the environment, public health or safety, nor State or local governments. This internal agency guidance will not interfere with an action taken or planned by another agency nor raise new legal or policy issues. Finally, this action will not alter the budgetary impact of entitlement, grants, user fees, or loan programs or the rights and obligations of recipients of such programs.

Moreover, this policy has been considered in light of the Regulatory Flexibility Act (5 U.S.C. 601 et. seq.), and it is hereby certified that this action will not have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities as defined by that Act. The effect of this directive is to remove out-of-date and burdensome analytical requirements in land and resource management planning. It has no effect on small entities or their ability to obtain, understand, or respond to planning data.

No Takings Implications

This notice concerns planning activities engaged in by the Forest Service involving National Forest lands and is thus exempt from consideration for takings implications under Section 2(c)(4) of Executive Order 12630 and Section II(B)(4) of the Attorney General's Guidelines for the Evaluation of Risk and Avoidance of Unanticipated Takings.

Unfunded Mandates Reform

Pursuant to Title II of the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act of 1995, which the President signed into law on March 22, 1995, the Department has assessed the effect of this rule on State, local, and tribal governments and the private sector. This policy does not compel the expenditure of $100 million or more by any State, local, or tribal governments or anyone in the private sector. Therefore, a statement under section 202 of the Act is not required.

Dated: October 1, 1996.

Mark A. Reimers,

Acting Chief.

[FR Doc. 96–29211 Filed 11–13–96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3410–11–M

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Membership of the Departmental Performance Review Board

AGENCY: Department of Commerce.

ACTION: Notice of membership of Departmental Performance Review Board.

SUMMARY: In accordance with 5 U.S.C., 4313(c)(4), DOC announces the appointment of persons to serve as members of the Departmental Performance Review Board (DPRB). The DPRB is responsible for reviewing performance appraisals and ratings of Senior Executive Service (SES) members and serves as the higher level review for executives who report to an appointing authority. Such reviews are conducted only at the executive's request. The appointment of these members to the DPRB will be for periods of 24 months.

EFFECTIVE DATE: The effective date of service of appointees to the Departmental Performance Review Board is October 1, 1996.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Deborah Jefferson, Executive Resources Program Manager, Office of Human Resources Management, Office of the Director, 14th and Constitution, Washington, D.C. 20230, (202) 482–8075.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The names, position titles, and type of appointment of the members of the DPRB are set forth below by organization:

General Counsel

Paul L. Joffe, Deputy General Counsel (NC)
Barbara S. Fredericks, Assistant General Counsel for Administration (C)

Economics and Statistics Administration

Paul London, Deputy Under Secretary for Economic Affairs (NC)
James K. White, Executive Director, ESA, (C)
Bryant Benton, Deputy Director, Bureau of the Census (C)
Arnold A. Jackson, Associate Director for Information Technology, Bureau of the Census (C)
Nancy Potok, Comptroller, Bureau of the Census (C)
Betty Barker, Deputy Director, Bureau of Economic Analysis (C)

Technology Administration

James Albus, Chief, Intelligent Systems Division, Manufacturing Engineering Laboratory, NIST (C)
Karl Bell, Deputy Director for Administration, NIST (C)
William Ott, Deputy Director, Physics Laboratory, NIST (C)
Rosalie Ruegg, Director, Economic Assessment Office, Advanced Technology Program, NIST (C)
Henry C. Waters, Director of Strategic Planning and Marketing, NTIS (C)

National Telecommunications and Information Administration

Shirl G. Kinney, Deputy Assistant Secretary for Administration (C)

Economic Development Administration

Awilda R. Marquez, General Counsel (NC)
Charles R. Sawyer, Midwestern Regional Director (C)

International Trade Administration

Barbara Stafford, Deputy Assistant Secretary for Antidumping and Countervailing Enforcement Group I, Import Administration (NC)
Henry Misisco, Director, Office of Automotive Affairs, Trade Development (C)
J. Hayden Boyd, Director, Office of Consumer Goods, Trade Development (C)
Charles M. Ludolph, Director, Office of European Union and Regional Affairs, Market Access and Compliance (C)

Tong S. Chung, Director, Advocacy Center, Trade Development (NC)
W. Dawn Busby, Director, Office of Export Trading Company Affairs, Trade Development (NC)
Dan McLaughlin, Deputy Assistant Secretary for Domestic Operations, U.S. and Foreign Commercial Service (NC)

National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration

Diana H. Josephson, Deputy Under Secretary for Oceans and Atmosphere (NC)
Susan B. Fruchter, Counselor to the Under Secretary, Office of Policy and Strategic Planning (NC)
William B. Wheeler, Director, Office of Legislative Affairs (NC)
Margaret F. Hayes, Assistant General Counsel for Fisheries, Office of the General Counsel (C)
Lois J. Gajdys, Chief, Management and Budget, National Weather Service (C)
Nancy Foster, Deputy Assistant Administrator, National Marine Fisheries Service (C)
Alan R. Thomas, Acting, Assistant Administrator, Office of Oceanic and Atmospheric Research (C)
Stewart S. Remer, Director for Human Resources Management, Office of Finance and Administration (C)

Patent and Trademark Office

Robert M. Anderson, Deputy Assistant Commissioner for Trademarks (C)
Janice A. Howell, Director of Electronic and Optical Systems and Devices (C)

Bureau of Export Administration

Frank W. Deliberti, Deputy Assistant Secretary for Export Enforcement (C)
Robert F. Kugelman, Director of Administration (C)

Dated: November 7, 1996.

Elizabeth W. Stroud,

Executive Secretary, DPRB.

[FR Doc. 96–29197 Filed 11–13–96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–BS–M

International Trade Administration

[A–583–810]

Chrome-Plated Lug Nuts From Taiwan; Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review and Termination in Part

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

ACTION: Notice of final results of antidumping duty administrative review and termination in part.

SUMMARY: On July 8, 1996, the Department of Commerce (the Department) published the preliminary results of administrative review of the antidumping duty order on chrome-plated lug nuts from Taiwan. The review covers 18 manufactures/exporters and the period September 1, 1994, through August 31, 1995. Based on our analysis of the comments received, the dumping margins have changed from those presented in the preliminary results.

EFFECTIVE DATE: November 14, 1996.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Todd Peterson or Thomas Futtner, Office of AD/CVD Enforcement, Import Administration Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20230; telephone (202) 482–4195 or 482–3814, respectively.

Applicable Statute and Regulations

Unless otherwise indicated, all citations to the statute are references to the provisions effective January 1, 1995, the effective date of the amendments made to the Tariff Act of 1930 (the Act), by the Uruguay Round Agreements Act (URAA). In addition, unless otherwise indicated, all citations to the Department's regulations are to be current regulations, as amended by the interim regulations published in the Federal Register on May 11, 1995 (60 FR 25130).

Background

On July 8, 1996, the Department published the preliminary results (61 FR 35724) of its administrative review of the antidumping duty order on chrome-plated lug nuts from Taiwan (September 20, 1991, 56 FR 47737). The Department has now completed this administrative review in accordance with section 751 of the Act.

Scope of the Review

The merchandise covered by this review is one-piece and two-piece chrome-plated lug nuts, finished or unfinished, which are more than 11/16 inches (17.45 millimeters) in height and which have a hexagonal (hex) size of at least ¾ inches (19.05 millimeters) but not over one inch (25.4 millimeters), plus or minus 1/16 of an inch (1.59 mm). The term ''unfinished'' refers to unplated and/or unassembled chrome-plated lug nuts. The subject merchandise is used for securing wheels to cars, vans, trucks, utility vehicles, and trailers. Zinc-plate lug nuts, finished or unfinished, and stainless-steel capped lug nuts are not in the scope of this review. Chrome-plated lock nuts are also not in the scope of this review.

During the period of review, chrome-plated lug nuts were provided for under subheading 7318.16.00.00 of the Harmonized Tariff Schedule (HTS). Although the HTS subheading is provided for convenience and Customs purposes, our written description of the scope of this review is dispositive. This review covers the following firms: Gourmet Equipment (Taiwan) Corporation (Gourmet), Buxton International Corporation (Buxton), Chu Fong Metallic Electric Co., Transcend International, Kuang Hong Industries Inc., San Chien Industrial Works, Ltd, Everspring Plastic Corporation, Anmax Industrial Co., Ltd., Gingen Metal Corp., Golwinate Associates, Inc., Hwen Hsin Enterprises Co., Ltd., Kwan How Enterprises Co., Ltd., Kwan Ta Enterprises Co., Ltd., San Shing Hardware Works Co., Trade Union International Inc./Top Line, Uniauto, Inc., Wing Tang Electrical Manufacturing Company and Multigrand Industries Inc. and the period September 1, 1994, through August 31, 1995. Buxton and Uniauto are related firms and responded as one firm, Buxton/Uniauto.

Analysis of Comments Received

We invited interested parties to comment on the preliminary results. We received timely comments from the petitioner, Consolidated International Automotive, and rebuttal comments from Buxton and Gourmet.

Comment

Petitioner believes that the Department should apply the more adverse facts available (FA) rate of 10.67 percent to Buxton/Uniauto and Gourmet. Petitioner points out that these respondents have failed to provide questionnaire responses that can be reconciled with audited financial statements in prior reviews, and have also failed to do so in this review. Petitioner argues that respondents should not be rewarded for ongoing deficiencies with lower rate, particularly in light of the need for the Department to ensure accurate responses.

Petitioner states that the Department adheres to one of two guidelines when applying facts available to a respondent that substantially cooperates, but fails to provide all the information requested in a timely manner or in the form requested. The Department either applies the highest rate ever applicable to the firm or the highest calculated rate in the review for the same merchandise and country. *See Allied-Aerospace Co.* v. *United States*, 995 F.2d 1185, 1188 (Fed. Cir. 1993) Petitioner states that the