

will develop and begin to implement its work plan for carrying out its assigned responsibilities. All meetings are open to the public and time will be provided at each meeting for the public to address the Task Force, as follows: November 11, 1:30 to 3:00 p.m.; December 16, 1:30 to 3:00 p.m., and January 16, 1:30 to 3:00 p.m.; however, discussion is limited to Task Force members and Forest Service personnel. Persons who wish to bring water rights matters to the attention of the Task Force may also file written statements with the Forest Service liaison at the address listed earlier in this notice either before or after each meeting.

Notice of the establishment of the Water Rights Task Force was published in the Federal Register on September 11, 1996 (61 FR 47858). The Task Force terminates either in August of 1997 or upon submission of a final report.

Dated: October 15, 1996.

Mark A. Reimers,

*Acting Chief.*

[FR Doc. 96-26900 Filed 10-18-96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3410-11-M

### **Timber Sale Contracts; Change in Stumpage Rate Adjustment Procedure**

**AGENCY:** Forest Service, USDA.

**ACTION:** Notice; reopening of public comment period.

**SUMMARY:** On August 7, 1996, the Forest Service published in the Federal Register a proposed policy to eliminate the stumpage rate adjustment procedure used to adjust timber sale contract tentative rates (bid rates) on most timber sales. The agency requested public comment on the proposed policy (61 FR 41124), with the comment period closing October 7, 1996. The comment period is now being reopened for 90 days to allow consideration of this proposal concurrently with consideration of a proposed rule published elsewhere in this issue of the Federal Register to change the procedures for market-related contract term addition. All comments received between August 7, 1996, and the reopening of the comment period will be considered; therefore respondents do not need to resubmit comments previously submitted.

**DATES:** The additional comment period will end on January 21, 1997.

**ADDRESSES:** Send written comments to Director, Timber Management Staff, MAIL STOP 1105, Forest Service, USDA, P.O. Box 96090, Washington, DC 20090-6090.

Dated: October 8, 1996.

J. Kenneth Myers,

*Acting Chief.*

[FR Doc. 96-26756 Filed 10-18-96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3410-11-M

### **ARCHITECTURAL AND TRANSPORTATION BARRIERS COMPLIANCE BOARD**

#### **Telecommunications Access Advisory Committee; Meeting**

**AGENCY:** Architectural and Transportation Barriers Compliance Board.

**ACTION:** Notice of meeting.

**SUMMARY:** The Architectural and Transportation Barriers Compliance Board (Access Board) gives notice of the dates and location of the meetings of the Telecommunications Access Advisory Committee.

**DATES:** The Telecommunications Access Advisory Committee will meet on November 6, 7, and 8, 1996 beginning at 9:30 a.m. each day.

**ADDRESSES:** The meetings will be held at the American Speech-Language and Hearing Association offices, 10801 Rockville Pike, Rockville, MD 20852.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** For further information regarding the meetings, please contact Dennis Cannon, Office of Technical and Information Services, Architectural and Transportation Barriers Compliance Board, 1331 F Street, NW., suite 1000, Washington, D.C. 20004-1111. Telephone number (202) 272-5434 extension 35 (voice); (202) 272-5449 (TTY). Electronic mail address: cannon@access-board.gov. This document is available in alternate formats (cassette tape, braille, large print, or computer disk) upon request.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** On May 24, 1996, the Access Board published a notice appointing members to its Telecommunications Access Advisory Committee (Committee). 61 FR 26155 (May 24, 1996). The Committee will make recommendations to the Access Board on accessibility guidelines for telecommunications equipment and customer premises equipment. These recommendations will be used by the Access Board to develop accessibility guidelines in conjunction with the Federal Communications Commission (FCC) under section 255 (e) of the Telecommunications Act of 1996. The Committee is composed of representatives of manufacturers of telecommunications equipment and customer premises equipment;

organizations representing the access needs of individuals with disabilities; telecommunications providers and carriers; and other persons affected by the guidelines.

At its first meeting on June 12-14, 1996, the Committee took the following actions:

- The statutory definitions of telecommunications, telecommunications equipment and customer premises equipment are to be construed broadly.
- Providing access is not a "change in form" of information within the meaning of the statute's definition of telecommunications and, therefore, not excluded.
- A listserv was created through the Trace Center: taac-l@trace.wisc.edu. To subscribe, send e-mail to listproc@trace.wisc.edu with the message subscribe taac-l <firstname lastname>.

At its second meeting on August 14-16, 1996, the Committee agreed on the following points:

- In customer premises equipment (CPE), it is not always possible to separate the effects of software from hardware and one manufacturer may choose to perform the same function with one or the other. Therefore, the guidelines must cover both.
- It is not always possible to determine whether a particular function resides with the CPE, the telecommunications carrier, or the source material. Therefore, the guidelines will be developed with the assumption that the function resides in the CPE and urge the FCC to apply the same guidelines to entities and services under its jurisdiction.

- The Committee also agreed that the existing definitions of CPE and telecommunications equipment are sufficient.

- While the definition of "readily achievable" in the Telecommunications Act is the same as in the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA), the term is applied differently. In the ADA, the term applies to barrier removal in existing facilities whereas the Telecommunications Act applies the term to the manufacture of new equipment. An ad hoc task group was formed to develop criteria to assess "readily achievable" in this new context.

- Subcommittees on Compliance Assessment and Guidelines content were created. Discussions will be conducted primarily by e-mail. To participate in a subcommittee, send e-mail to cannon@access-board.gov.

At its third meeting on September 25–27, 1996, the Committee took the following actions:

- Accepted the application of Microsoft to join the Committee.
- The subcommittee on Compliance Assessment reviewed and revised a draft list of criteria for an effective conformity assessment model, then developed consensus around fifteen of these criteria, with another five criteria needing further clarification or discussion. The subcommittee divided into two work groups: Consumer Information/Verification and Coordination Point/Practitioners' Qualifications.
- The subcommittee on Guidelines Content divided into two work groups: Process Guidelines, and Performance and Design Guidelines. Each work group developed a set of principles and criteria for further discussion. Draft products are posted on a Trace-sponsored Web site. Discussion will be by e-mail (via the main TAAC–L listserv) and by teleconference call. The URL for the Web site is <http://trace.wisc.edu/taac/workdoc.htm>.

The Committee will meet on the dates and at the location announced in this notice. The meetings are open to the public. There will be a public comment period each day for persons interested in presenting their views to the Committee. Persons attending the meetings are strongly encouraged to use public transportation since parking is extremely limited. The American Speech-Language and Hearing Association offices are located north of the Grosvenor Metro subway station. Persons who must drive should call Dennis Cannon at the Access Board. The facility is accessible to individuals with disabilities. Sign language interpreters, assistive listening systems and real time transcription will be available.

The Committee will meet again on December 16–18, 1996 and January 14–15, 1997. Subsequent meetings will be held at locations to be announced.

Lawrence W. Roffee,  
Executive Director.

[FR Doc. 96–26920 Filed 10–18–96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 8150–01–P

## DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

### International Trade Administration [A–412–602]

#### **Certain Forged Steel Crankshafts From the United Kingdom; Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review**

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

**ACTION:** Notice of Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review.

**SUMMARY:** On June 18, 1996, the Department of Commerce (the Department) published the preliminary results of its administrative review of the antidumping duty order on certain forged steel crankshafts from the United Kingdom (61 FR 30854). The review covers one producer/exporter of this merchandise to the United States for the review period September 1, 1993 through August 31, 1994.

We gave interested parties an opportunity to comment on our preliminary results. Based on our analysis of the comments and rebuttal comments received, we have corrected certain clerical errors in the margin calculations. The final weighted-average dumping margin for the reviewed firm is listed below in the section entitled “Final Results of the Review.”

**EFFECTIVE DATE:** October 21, 1996.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** J. David Dirstine or Lyn Johnson, Office of Antidumping Compliance, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20230; telephone (202) 482–4733.

**APPLICABLE STATUTE AND REGULATIONS:** Unless otherwise indicated, all citations to the statute and to the Department's regulations are references to the provisions as they existed on December 31, 1994.

#### **SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:**

##### **Background**

On June 18, 1996, the Department published the preliminary results of administrative review of the antidumping duty order on certain forged steel crankshafts from the United Kingdom (61 FR 30854). We gave interested parties an opportunity to comment on the preliminary results. There was no request for a hearing. The Department has now conducted this review in accordance with section 751 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (the Tariff Act).

##### **Scope of Review**

Imports covered by this review are certain forged steel crankshafts. 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. These products are currently classifiable under item numbers 8483.10.10.10, 8483.10.10.30, 8483.10.30.10, and 8483.10.30.50 of the Harmonized Tariff Schedule (HTS). Neither cast crankshafts nor forged crankshafts with shipping weights of less than 40 pounds or more than 750 pounds are subject to this review. The HTS item numbers are provided for convenience and Customs purposes. The written description remains dispositive.

##### **Analysis of Comments Received**

We gave interested parties an opportunity to comment on the preliminary results. On July 18, and 25, 1996, we received case and rebuttal briefs from the petitioner, the Krupp Gerlach Company (KGC), and the respondent, UES Ltd.—Forgings Division (UEF).

##### **Issues Raised by KGC**

*Comment 1:* KGC argues that the Department improperly used the cost of production (COP) of UEF's sister company, UES Steels, for the steel input cost in the calculation of CV. KGC asserts that it was improper to use UES's COP as a measure of UEF's raw material input costs without first obtaining the transfer prices charged to UEF by UES to determine whether they were greater than UES's COP. KGC further claims that the Department failed to follow its own hierarchy as established in Import Administration Policy Bulletin Number 94.4 of March 25, 1994 (PB 94.4) for measuring raw material costs supplied by a related party when performing a CV analysis. KGC argues that, in accordance with this hierarchy, the Department may use the related party's COP “only” if it determines that the related party transfer price was below cost. KGC further argues that, if raw material inputs were supplied at transfer prices that exceeded the supplier's COP then, in accordance with PB 94.4, the Department should use those transfer prices, in the absence of any better measure of the market value of those inputs, e.g., arm's length prices to unrelated parties. KGC states that this is consistent with numerous determinations including *Oil Country Tubular Goods From Austria*, 60 FR 33551 (June 28, 1995), *Certain Cold-Rolled Carbon Steel Flat Products from*