

to a State for carrying out the Forest Legacy Program. The purpose of the Federal grant is to provide funding to States electing this option to help in the acquisition of environmentally important private lands and interests in lands with title vested in the State or a unit of State or local government. Under section 6 of the Act of March 1, 1911, (16 U.S.C. 515), and section 11(a) of the Department of Agriculture Organic Act of 1956 (7 U.S.C. 428(a)), the Secretary of Agriculture continues to have authority to acquire, from willing landowners, environmentally important forest lands and interests therein for Federal acquisition, including conservation easements and rights of public access, with title vested in the U.S. Government.

The revised Forest Legacy Program guidelines are divided into three parts:

Part 1—General Program Guidelines: Program direction applicable to all aspects of the Forest Legacy Program.

Part 2—Federal Acquisition Program Guidelines: Program direction applicable to States and Forest Service units selecting the Federal acquisition and ownership process, where ownership of lands or interests in lands is vested in the United States.

Part 3—State Grant Program Guidelines: This is the new part which provides program direction applicable to States and Forest Service units where the State has elected the new State grant option and title in lands or interests in lands is vested in the State or a unit of State or local government.

Summary of Comments Received

The agency received 32 replies containing over 170 comments in response to a Notice of Availability of the Forest Legacy Program Guidelines changes published in the Federal Register May 21, 1996, (61 FR 25478) and to letters notifying over 300 interested parties. Fourteen responses were received from State government lead agencies. Three responses were received from land trust organizations. The rest of the responses were from conservation organizations, university/extension organizations, citizens, legislative offices, Indian Tribes, and industry.

Of the 170 comments, 25 percent focused on funding, 12 percent on grants administration, 8 percent on cost-sharing, 8 percent on State program administration, 7 percent on Federal program administration, 7 percent on the acquisition process, 5 percent on public involvement, 5 percent on conservation easements, and 11 percent were of a general nature. In addition, other comments related to Assessment

of Need/identification of Forest Legacy Areas (1 percent), land trust participation (2 percent), National Environmental Policy Act (2 percent), the Forest Stewardship Program (2 percent), eligibility criteria (1 percent), cooperative agreements (1 percent), and conversion/disposition of Forest Legacy tracts (3 percent).

All comments were fully considered and the agency adopted a number of changes in the final guidelines in response to comments received. Summarized comments and the agency's response follow:

1. *Comment:* Several respondents felt the fund allocation process was unclear, that funds should not remain at the Forest Service's Washington Office, and that a more predictable process should be established.

Response: Section VIII of Part 1 was rewritten to improve clarity. Funds will remain at the Washington Office until the participating Forest Service field units consult with active States and develop recommendations regarding: base level funding (at least 50 percent of the project funds); the portion of project funds distributed based on considerations, such as equity among States, forested areas in greatest need of protection, and lands that can be effectively protected and managed; and to which Forest Service field unit the funds should be allocated.

All funds are allocated from the Washington Office to Forest Service field units. These units can award grants to States or transfer funds to Forest Service field subunits for Forest Legacy Program implementation. A minimum of 50 percent of project funds are to be distributed in equal shares among all participating States. To allow for maximum flexibility, Forest Service field units consult with States to determine where the other project funds should be allocated.

2. *Comment:* Several respondents raised questions about the grant process and allowable cost-sharing and requested flexibility in the use of funds and cost-share matching.

Response: The guidelines to the States in Section I of Part 3 provide the maximum flexibility possible consistent with grant law and practice. Grants may extend for up to 5 years, but the funds must be used during the first 2 years to ensure that appropriated funds are used in a timely fashion. The remaining grant period may be used to accumulate cost-share matching contributions from non-Federal partners. Also in response to comments, the agency added a definition of eligible cost-sharing and the specific requirements for donations.

3. *Comment:* One respondent sought greater participation in the program by American Indian Tribes.

Response: The final guidelines encourage collaboration between Indian Tribes and States to consider tribal lands and reservations for designation as, or inclusion within, Forest Legacy Areas during the Assessment of Need planning process.

4. *Comment:* Several respondents wanted clarification of the Federal acquisition process and when it would apply.

Response: A definition of Federal acquisition procedures, as they relate to the Forest Legacy Program, were added in Section II of Part 1.

Summary

The Forest Legacy Program Guidelines are used to implement the Forest Legacy Program. The Revised Forest Legacy Program Guidelines were mailed to interested parties, Forest Service field offices, and State Foresters.

Dated: October 1, 1996.

Mark A. Reimers,

Acting Chief.

[FR Doc. 96-26038 Filed 10-9-96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3410-11-P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Bureau of Export Administration

Submission for OMB Review; Comment Request

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 of 1995, Public Law 104-13.

Agency: Bureau of Export Administration.

Title: Offsets in Military Exports.

Agency Number: None.

OMB Control Number: 0694-0084.

Type of Request: Extension of a currently approved collection.

Burden: 1,000 hours.

Number of Respondents: 100.

Avg. Hours Per Response: 10.

Needs and Uses: The Defense Production Act Amendments of 1992 requires U.S. firms to furnish information regarding "offset" agreements exceeding \$5,000,000 in value associated with the sales of weapon systems or defense-related items to foreign countries. The information collected is used to assess the cumulative effect of offset compensation practices of U.S. trade and competitiveness, as required by the statute.

Affected Public: Businesses or other for-profit organizations.

Frequency: Annually.

Respondent's Obligation: Mandatory.

OMB Desk Officer: Victoria Baecher-Wassmer, (202) 395-7340.

Copies of the above information collection proposal can be obtained by calling or writing Linda Engelmeier, Acting DOC Forms Clearance Officer, (202) 482-3272, Department of Commerce, Room 5327, 14th and Constitution Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20230.

Written comments and recommendations for the proposed information collection should be sent to Victoria Baecher-Wassmer, OMB Desk Officer, Room 10202, New Executive Office Building, Washington, D.C. 20503.

Dated: October 3, 1996.

Linda Engelmeier,

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

[FR Doc. 96-26027 Filed 10-9-96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-DT-P

International Trade Administration

[A-570-845, A-570-846]

Notice of Preliminary Determinations of Sales at Less Than Fair Value and Postponement of Final Determinations: Brake Drums and Brake Rotors From the People's Republic of China

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

EFFECTIVE DATE: October 10, 1996.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Brian C. Smith or Michelle A. Frederick, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20230; telephone: (202) 482-1766 or (202) 482-0186, respectively.

The Applicable Statute

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 Rounds Agreements Act (URAA).

Preliminary Determinations

We determine preliminarily that brake drums and brake rotors from the People's Republic of China (PRC) are being, or are likely to be, sold in the United States at less than fair value

(LTFV), as provided in section 733 of the Act. The estimated margins are shown in the "Suspension of Liquidation" section of this notice.

Case History

Since the initiation of these investigations (61 FR 14740, April 3, 1996), the following events have occurred:

On April 4, 1996, the Department sent a survey to the PRC's Ministry of Foreign Trade and Economic Cooperation (MOFTEC) and to the China Chamber of Commerce for Import & Export of Machinery & Electronics Products (China Chamber) requesting the identification of producers and exporters, and information on production and sales of brake drums and brake rotors exported to the United States. We received a facsimile from the China Chamber identifying three brake drum exporters and six brake rotor exporters to the United States on April 25, 1996.

On April 29, 1996, the United States International Trade Commission (ITC) issued affirmative preliminary injury determinations in these cases (see ITC Investigation No. 731-TA-744). The ITC found that there is a reasonable indication that an industry in the United States is threatened with material injury by reason of imports from the PRC of brake drums, and that there is a reasonable indication that an industry is materially injured by reason of imports from the PRC of brake rotors.

The Department issued antidumping questionnaires¹ to the China Chamber and MOFTEC, on May 8, 1996, with instructions to forward the document to all producers/exporters of brake drums and brake rotors and to inform these companies that they must respond by the due dates. We also sent courtesy copies of the antidumping duty questionnaire to all identified companies. In May, June, and July, 1996, 18 PRC companies submitted their section A, C, and D responses.

On June 1, 1996, we postponed both preliminary determinations until not later than October 3, 1996 (61 FR 29073, June 7, 1996) because we determined these investigations to be extraordinarily complicated within the

¹ The questionnaire is divided into four sections. Section A requests general information concerning a company's corporate structure and business practices, the merchandise under investigation that it sells, and the sales of the merchandise in all of its markets. Sections B and C request home market sales listings and U.S. sales listings, respectively (section B does not normally apply in antidumping proceedings involving the PRC). Section D requests information on the factors of production of the subject merchandise.

meaning of section 733(c)(1)(B)(i) of the Act.

On June 7, 1996, we received a fax from Zhejiang Asia-Pacific Machine & Electric Group Co., stating that it did not export brake rotors or brake drums to the United States during the period of these investigations.

On July 15, 1996, the Department requested that interested parties provide published information (PI) for valuing the factors of production and for surrogate country selection. We received comments from the interested parties in August 1996.

After receiving complete questionnaire responses from the 18 PRC companies, we determined that, due to limited resources, we would only be able to analyze the responses of the seven largest brake rotor PRC exporters and the five largest brake drum PRC exporters to the United States (a total of 10 PRC companies, two of which export both brake drums and brake rotors). (See *Respondent Selection* section below.)

In July and August, we issued supplemental questionnaires to the 10 selected respondents only. We received responses to these questionnaires during August and September 1996. On September 18, 1996, less than 20 days before the preliminary determinations, the petitioner alleged that critical circumstances exist with respect to imports of brake drums and brake rotors from the PRC. The Department will make its determination as to whether it finds critical circumstances not later than 30 days after the date of the petitioner's submission in accordance with section 353.16(b)(2)(ii).

Also, on September 13, the petitioner submitted additional PI which we were not able to consider for the preliminary determinations. However, we will consider this information for the final determinations.

On September 18, 1996, counsel for Shenyang/Laizhou submitted additional comments on PI. We have considered Shenyang/Laizhou's submission, and we have rejected the claims made therein for these preliminary determinations.

On September 20, 1996, counsel for Southwest Technical Import & Export Corporation (Southwest) submitted revised sales and factors of production databases, explaining that the only change to its previous databases was what it had reported as a factor amount for plastic tarpaulins. For these preliminary determinations, we have incorporated the most recently submitted factor information Southwest reported for plastic tarpaulins into our analysis but we have not used the databases Southwest most recently