Vermont Yankee Nuclear Power Corp. v. *NRDC,* 435 U.S. 519, 553 (1978). Also, environmental objections that could be raised at the draft EIS stage, but that are not raised until after completion of the final EIS may be waived or dismissed by the courts. *City of Angoon* v. *Hodel,* 803 F. 2d 1016, 1022 (9th Cir. 1986) and *Wisconsin Heritages, Inc.* v. *Harris,* 490 F. Supp. 1334, 1338 (E.D. Wis. 1980). Because of these court rulings, it is very important that those interested in this proposed action participate by the close of the comment period so that substantive comments and objections are made available to the Forest Service at a time when it can meaningfully consider them and respond to them in the final EIS.

To assist the Forest Service in identifying and considering issues and concerns on the proposed action, comments on the draft EIS should be as specific as possible. It is also helpful if comments refer to specific pages or chapters of the draft EIS. Comments may also address the adequacy of the draft EIS 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.

The final EIS is scheduled to be completed by March 1998. In the final EIS, the Forest Service is required to respond to comments and responses received during the comment period that pertain to the environmental consequences discussed in the draft EIS and applicable laws, regulations and policies considered in making the decision regarding this proposal. Sonny J. O'Neal, Forest Supervisor, Wenatchee National Forest is the responsible official. As the responsible official he will document the decision and reasons for the decision in the Record of Decision. That decision will be subject to Forest Service appeal regulation (36 CFR part 215).

Dated: May 4, 1997.

G. Elton Thomas,

Natural Resources Group Leader.

[FR Doc. 97–5958 Filed 3–11–97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3410–11–M

Canyons Forest Health Project, Tahoe National Forest, Sierra and Nevada Counties, CA

AGENCY: Forest Service, USDA.

ACTION: Notice; intent to prepare environmental impact statement.

SUMMARY: The USDA Forest Service will prepare an environmental impact statement for harvesting in densely stocked timber stands exhibiting insect-related mortality and reduced health. The harvesting is proposed on approximately 2,500 acres within an 8,000-acre analysis area. The salvage, sanitation, and thinning of the stands is proposed to improve the forest health and remove some of the dead material contributing to the fuel loading in the area. Also being proposed are fuels treatments, site preparation, reforestation, timber stand improvement, and road construction, reconstruction, and decommissioning.

These actions were recently analyzed and decided within a larger project analysis area called the Worn Mill Environmental Assessment/Biological Evaluation (EA/BE) (September, 1996). Only about half of the area analyzed under the Worn Mill EA/BE document was put under contract (Toucan Timber Sale) in December 1996 prior to expiration of the Rescissions Act, Pub. L. 104–19. Since the decision on the Worn Mill EA/BE has also subsequently expired, the second half of the Worn Mill analysis area that was identified as needing forest health treatment will now be re-analyzed under the Canyons Environmental Impact Statement (EIS).

The agency invites comments and suggestions on the scope of the analysis. In addition, the agency gives notice of the full environmental analysis and decision-making process that will occur on the proposal so that interested and affected people are aware of how they may participate and contribute to the final decision.

DATES: Comments concerning the analysis should be received in writing by April 1, 1997.

ADDRESSES: Send written comments to Caryn Huntt, Project Leader, Truckee Ranger District, 10342 Highway 89 N, Truckee, CA 96161.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Caryn Huntt, Project Leader, Natural Resources Department, Truckee Ranger District, (916) 587–3558.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: A draft environmental impact statement is expected to be available for agency and public review by April, 1997. A 45-day comment period will follow the publication of the notice of availability of the draft EIS in the Federal Register. Al comments will be analyzed and a final EIS and accompanying record of decision (ROD) will be issued. The final EIS should be available by June, 1997.

Written comments from the public should be submitted as indicated at the beginning of this notice. Comments would be most useful if sent by the date specified and if they clearly address the issues and alternatives related to the proposed action.

The proposed action being considered includes salvage, sanitation, and thinning of the timber stands to address forest health concerns east of Boca and Stampede reservoirs and on the adjacent flats and slopes near Truckee, California.

Preliminary issues connected with the proposal include forest health, water quality, wildlife habitat, and wildfire/fuels concerns.

The Forest Service believes, at this early stage, it is important to give reviewers notice of several court rulings related to public participation in the environmental review process. First, reviewers of draft environmental impact statements must structure their participation in the environmental review of the proposal so that it is meaningful and alerts an agency to the reviewer's position and contentions. *Vermont Yankee Nuclear Power Corp.* v. *NRDC,* 435 U.S. 519, 553 (1978). Also, environmental objections that could be raised at the draft environmental impact statement stage but that are not raised until after completion of the final environmental impact statement may be waived or dismissed by the courts. *City of Angoon* v. *Hodel,* 803 F.2d 1016, 1022 (9th Cir. 1986) and *Wisconsin Heritages, Inc.* v. *Harris,* 490 F. Supp. 1334, 1338 (E.D. Wis. 1980). Because of these court rulings, it is very important that those interested in this proposed action participate by the close of the 45-day comment period so that substantive comments and objections are made available to the Forest Service at a time when it can meaningfully consider them and respond to them in the final environmental impact statement.

To assist the Forest Service in identifying and considering issues and concerns on the proposed action, comments on 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 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. The responsible official for this environmental impact statement and decision is John H. Skinner, Forest Supervisor, Tahoe National Forest, 631

Coyote Street, P.O. Box 6003, Nevada City, CA 95959.

Dated: March 3, 1997.

John H. Skinner,

Forest Supervisor, Tahoe National Forest.

[FR Doc. 97–5920 Filed 3–10–97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3410–11–M

COMMISSION ON CIVIL RIGHTS

Agenda and Notice of Public Meeting of the Indiana 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 Indiana Advisory Committee to the Commission will convene at 1:00 p.m. and adjourn at 5:00 p.m. on Thursday, March 27, 1997, at the South Bend Public Library, 304 South Main Street, South Bend, Indiana 44601. The purpose of the meeting is to discuss civil rights issues of interest and plan future activities.

Persons desiring additional information, or planning a presentation to the Committee, should contact Committee Chairperson Paul Chase, 317–920–3190, or Constance Davis, Director of the Midwestern Regional Office, 312–353–8311 (TDD 312–353–8362). Hearing-impaired persons who will attend the meeting and require the services of a sign language interpreter should contact the Regional Office at least five (5) working days before the scheduled date of the meeting.

The meeting will be conducted pursuant to the provisions of the rules and regulations of the Commission.

Dated at Washington, DC, March 3, 1997.

Carol-Lee Hurley,

Chief, Regional Programs Coordination Unit.

[FR Doc. 97–5970 Filed 3–10–97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6335–01–P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

[A–427–812]

Calcium Aluminate Flux From France; Preliminary Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review

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

ACTION: Notice of Preliminary Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review.

SUMMARY: In response to a request from one respondent, Lafarge Aluminates (LA), and its U.S. subsidiary, Lafarge Calcium Aluminates, Inc. (LCA) (collectively, Lafarge), the Department of Commerce (the Department) is conducting an administrative review of the antidumping duty order on calcium aluminate (CA) flux from France. This review covers one manufacturer/exporter of the subject merchandise to the United States, Lafarge, for the period June 1, 1995 through May 31, 1996.

We have preliminarily determined that U.S. sales have been made below normal value (NV). If these preliminary results are adopted in our final results of administrative review, we will instruct the U.S. Customs Service (Customs) to assess antidumping duties equal to the differences between the United States Price (USP) and NV.

Interested parties are invited to comment on these preliminary results. Parties who submit arguments in this proceeding are requested to submit with the argument (1) a statement of the issues, and (2) a brief summary of the argument.

EFFECTIVE DATE: March 11, 1997.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Maureen McPhillips or Linda Ludwig, AD/CVD Enforcement Group III, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, NW., Washington, DC 20230, telephone: (202) 482–3019.

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 Round Agreements Act (URAA). In addition, unless otherwise indicated, all citations to the Department's regulations are to the current regulations, as amended by the interim regulations published in the Federal Register on May 11, 1995 (60 FR 25130).

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

On June 13, 1994, the Department published in the Federal Register (59 FR 30337) the antidumping duty order on CA flux from France. On June 6, 1996 (61 FR 28840), the Department published in the Federal Register a notice of opportunity to request an administrative review of the antidumping duty order on CA flux from France. In accordance with 19 CFR 353.22(a)(1)(1995), we received a timely request for review from a respondent, Lafarge. We published a notice of initiation of this antidumping duty administrative review on August 8, 1996 (61 FR 41373), for the period June 1, 1995 through May 31, 1996.

The Department is now conducting this administrative review in accordance with section 751 of the Act.

Scope of the Review

Imports covered by this review are shipments of CA flux, other than white, high purity CA flux. This product contains by weight more than 32 percent but less than 65 percent alumina and more than one percent each of iron and silica.

CA flux is currently classifiable under the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States (HTSUS) subheading 2523.10.0000. The HTSUS subheading is provided for convenience and U.S. Customs' purposes only. The written description of the scope of this order remains dispositive.

Constructed Export Price

In calculating Lafarge's USP, the Department treated respondent's sales as constructed export price (CEP) sales, as defined in section 772(b) of the Act, because the subject merchandise was sold to the first unaffiliated purchaser after importation into the United States.

We calculated CEP based on packed or bulk, ex-U.S. warehouse or delivered prices to unaffiliated customers in the United States. We made deductions from the gross unit price, where appropriate, for the following movement charges: loading material at the Fos plant in France, foreign inland freight from plant to port, foreign brokerage and handling costs, international freight, marine insurance, U.S. brokerage and handling, inland freight from port to U.S. warehouse, unloading charges, inland freight to processors, demurrage and stop-off charges, and U.S. freight from the warehouse to the customer, in accordance with section 772(c)(2)(A) of the Act. Pursuant to section 772(d)(1)(B), we also deducted credit expenses, product liability insurance, and travel expenses for technical services. Pursuant to section 772(d)(1)(D), we deducted U.S. indirect selling expenses, and inventory carrying costs incurred in the United States. We did not deduct indirect selling expenses (*i.e.*, administrative expenses, inventory carrying costs, personnel costs for technicians) incurred by LA in France because these expenses were for commercial activity taking place outside the United States. We also deducted commissions in accordance with section 772(d)(1)(A) of the Act.

We also deducted an amount for profit in accordance with section 772 (d)(3) of the Act.