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).

Background

On December 10, 1996, the Department published in the Federal Register the preliminary results of its 1995–1996 administrative review of the antidumping duty order on shop towels from Bangladesh (61 FR 65025). We gave interested parties an opportunity to comment on our preliminary results. We did not receive any comments. There was no request for a hearing. The Department has conducted this review in accordance with section 751 of the Act.

Scope of Review

The product covered by this administrative review is shop towels. Shop towels are absorbent industrial wiping cloths made from a loosely woven fabric. The fabric may be either 100-percent cotton or a blend of materials. Shop towels are currently classifiable under item numbers 6307.10.2005 and 6307.10.2015 of the *Harmonized Tariff Schedules* (HTS). Although HTS subheadings are provided for convenience and customs purposes, our written description of the scope of this proceeding remains dispositive.

Final Results of Review

We determine that the following percentage weighted-average margins exist for the period March 1, 1995, through February 29, 1996:

Manufacturer/exporter	Margin (percent)
Greyfab (Bangladesh) Ltd	0.00
Hashem International	0.00
Khaled Textile Mills Ltd	0.00
Shabnam Textiles	0.00

The Department shall determine, and the Customs Service shall assess, antidumping duties on all appropriate entries. The Department will issue appraisement instructions on each exporter directly to the Customs Service.

Furthermore, the following deposit requirements will be effective for all shipments of the subject merchandise entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption on or after the publication date of these final results of this administrative review, as provided by section 751(a)(1) of the Act: (1) the cash deposit rates for the reviewed companies will be those rates established above; (2) for previously reviewed or investigated companies not listed above, the cash deposit rate will continue to be the company-specific rate published for the most recent period; (3) if the exporter is not a firm covered in this review, a prior review, or the original less-than-fair-value investigation (LTFV), but the manufacturer is, the cash deposit rate will be the rate established for the most recent period for the manufacturer of the merchandise; and (4) if neither the exporter nor the manufacturer is a firm covered in this or any previous review or the original investigation, the cash deposit rate will be 4.60 percent, the ''All Others'' rate established in the *LTFV Final Determination* (57 FR 3996). These deposit requirements shall remain in effect until publication of the final results of the next administrative review.

This notice also serves as a final reminder to importers of their responsibility under 19 CFR 353.26 to file a certificate regarding the reimbursement of antidumping duties prior to liquidation of the relevant entries during this review period. Failure to comply with this requirement could result in the Secretary's presumption that reimbursement of antidumping duties occurred and the subsequent assessment of double antidumping duties.

This notice also serves as a reminder to parties subject to administrative protective orders (APOs) of their responsibility concerning the disposition of proprietary information disclosed under APO in accordance with 19 CFR 353.34(d)(1). Timely written notification of the 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 Tariff Act (19 U.S.C. 1675(a)(1)) and 19 CFR 353.22.

Dated: February 27, 1997.

Robert S. LaRussa,

Acting Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.

[FR Doc. 97–6548 Filed 3–14–97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–DS–P

NATIONAL OCEANIC AND ATMOSPHERIC ADMINISTRATION

Department of Interior

Fish and Wildlife Service

[I.D. 021497A]

Development of the Commencement Bay Natural Resource Damage Assessment Restoration Plan, Pierce County, WA

AGENCY: National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS), National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA), Commerce; and Fish and Wildlife Service (FWS), Interior.

ACTION: Notice of availability of a Restoration Plan and Final Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement (RP/FEIS).

SUMMARY: This notice advises the public that the Restoration Plan and Final Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement (RP/FEIS) for the Commencement Bay Natural Resource Damage Assessment (CB/NRDA) restoration planning process is available for public review.

DATES: Written comments are requested by April 16, 1997.

ADDRESSES: Written comments on the RP/FEIS, requests for inclusion on the RP/FEIS mailing list, and requests for copies of any documents associated with the RP/FEIS should be directed to: Judy Lantor, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, 3704 Griffin Lane SE., Suite 102, Olympia, WA 98501–2192, phone (360) 753–6056/9440, or Dr. Robert Clark Jr., NOAA/NMFS Restoration Center NW, 7600 Sand Point Way NE., Seattle, WA 98115–0070, phone (206) 526–4338.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Judy Lantor, FWS, phone (360) 753–6056/9440, or Dr. Robert Clark Jr., NOAA/NMFS, phone (206) 526–4338.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: A notice of availability (NOA) will be mailed to all agencies, organizations, and individuals who participated in the scoping process or were identified during the RP/EIS process. Copies of the RP/FEIS have been sent to all participants who have already requested copies.

A. Background

A Notice of Intent (NOI) to prepare the RP/EIS was published in the Federal Register (59 FR 44711–2, August 30, 1994). Formal and informal scoping meetings were held to provide the

public with an early opportunity to engage in discussions regarding the RP/EIS and to provide oral and written comments. The NOA of the draft RP/EIS was published in the Federal Register (61 FR 41383–41384, August 8, 1996) with the comment period ending on October 8, 1996. Based on comments received, modifications were made to the documents and a RP/FEIS was prepared. The final RP will become part of the Record of Decision. The background and rationale for this action were discussed in the NOA and are not repeated here.

B. RP/FEIS

The purpose of preparing the RP/EIS is to coordinate and implement restoration projects under the CB/NRDA. Since this is a programmatic EIS, the management alternatives reflect general approaches to the restoration of natural resources and services injured as a result of releases of hazardous substances and discharges of oil in the Commencement Bay environment. The five alternatives subjected to detailed analysis were: (1) No action; (2) species-specific; (3) habitat function; (4) acquisition of equivalent natural resources and services; and, (5) integrated approach. The integrated approach, which is a comprehensive plan based on the habitat function alternative, but supplemented with the best features of the other alternatives, is the FWS and NMFS/NOAA's preferred alternative. This alternative best meets the needs of the CB/NRDA restoration goals and principles by maximizing ecological benefits to a wider range of natural resources and their associated services.

Dated: February 24, 1997.

Thomas J. Dwyer,

Acting Regional Director, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service.

Dated: March 4, 1997.

Nancy Foster,

Deputy Assistant Administrator for Fisheries, National Marine Fisheries Service.

[FR Doc. 97–6543 Filed 3–14–97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–22–F

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration

[I.D. 021097A]

Gulf of Maine Aquaculture-Pinniped Interaction Task Force

AGENCY: National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS), National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA), Commerce.

ACTION: Notice of availability; request for comments.

SUMMARY: In accordance with the Marine Mammal Protection Act (MMPA), the Gulf of Maine Aquaculture-Pinniped Interaction Task Force (Task Force) was established to advise NMFS of issues and problems regarding pinnipeds interacting in a dangerous or damaging manner with aquaculture resources in the Gulf of Maine. The Task Force's final report to NMFS was made available for public review and comment on February 20, 1996. A summary of the comments received on the final report of the Task Force and NMFS' response to those comments is provided in this notice.

The MMPA requires that NMFS consider recommendations from the Task Force and prepare a report to Congress recommending alternatives to mitigate the effects of aquaculture-pinniped interactions. NMFS has completed a draft report to Congress, and it is available to the public upon request for review and comment (see **ADDRESSES**).

DATES: Comments on the draft report to Congress must be submitted on or before April 16, 1997.

ADDRESSES: Copies of the report are available from, and written comments should be sent to, Chief, Marine Mammal Division, Office of Protected Resources, NMFS, 1315 East-West Highway, Silver Spring, MD 20910.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: LTJG. Daniel Morris (508) 281–9388, or Dr. Thomas Eagle (301) 713–2322.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

The salmon aquaculture industry in the northeastern United States has grown substantially in the last decade, as have regional populations of harbor seals (*Phoca vitulina*) and gray seals (*Halichoerus grypus*). The industry claims that losses caused by seals attacking the salmon pens are substantial and that the frequency of attacks has increased in recent years. Seals are protected under the MMPA, and the actions that salmon growers can take to protect their pens from seals are limited to non-lethal deterrence measures by the MMPA.

Pursuant to section 120(h) of the MMPA, a Task Force was established by NMFS to examine the issues and problems associated with pinniped-aquaculture interactions in the Gulf of Maine. Task Force members were selected from the aquaculture industry, state government, the scientific community, and conservation organizations. The Task Force convened three times for multi-day meetings, visited pen-sites, conducted public hearings, met with salmon growers, conducted surveys, and reviewed literature related to the issue, prior to completion of its report. The report contained Task Force recommendations to mitigate the seal predation, all of which represent the consensus of the Task Force. NMFS is required to consider recommendations of the Task Force's and draft a report to Congress recommending options available to mitigate the interaction. After opportunity for public review and comment of the draft report, NMFS must submit its recommendations to Congress.

Comments Received by NMFS on the Task Force Report

NMFS received six letters from the public regarding the Task Force report. All of these comments supported generally the Task Force findings and recommendations. The Task Force recommended against lethal deterrence measures.In general, NMFS expects to concur with that recommendation; however, NMFS is considering recommending that Congress reexamine the prohibition on intentional lethal taking of pinnipeds that was enacted in the MMPA Amendments of 1994 so that NMFS could authorize intentional lethal methods on a case-by-case basis, including the limited purpose of removing pinnipeds that are inside net-pens.

Comment: Is there anything known about the age, sex, and health of the seals that attack pens? Would lethal removal of that population segment have an adverse effect on the population at large?

Response: Little is know about the biology of seals that attack pens. The impacts of lethal removal on affected stocks, if the MMPA were amended for such authority, would have to be considered in granting an authorization.

Comment: In the typical attack scenario, growers claim, ''A seal would not be caught in the act of attacking but would be targeted as it approached the vicinity of a previously attacked pen.'' Identification of individual animals in the wild is especially difficult, and it is doubtful that the perpetrator of an attack can be distinguished from others.

Response: Identifying animals for lethal removal would be one of the issues that would have to be addressed if such an authority were included in the MMPA.