the COS adjustment. The petitioners assert that the various interest rates charged to Borusan during the POR vary widely, and suggest that, due to the high inflation in Turkey, it would be unfair to calculate interest expense on an average basis. Further, the petitioners add, it is the Department's practice to calculate costs on a monthly basis, citing *Pipe and Tube from Mexico* at 37016.

The petitioners argue in the alternative that, if the Department does make the COS adjustment requested by Borusan, imputed home market credit expenses must be based on a proper calculation of Borusan's net prices. Specifically, the petitioners argue, Borusan's calculation of net price does not include a deduction for the quantity rebate granted to certain customers by Borusan, thereby overstating the net price to which the credit expense is applied.

DOC Position: Pursuant to section 773(a)(8) of the Act, a COS adjustment for home market imputed credit expenses should be made when CV is the basis for normal value. We use imputed credit expenses to measure the effect of a specific respondent's selling practices in the United States and in the comparison market. Because Borusan's U.S. sales were export price sales, the adjustment entails adding U.S. imputed credit to the CV, and subtracting home market imputed credit from the CV. Although we added the U.S. imputed credit for the preliminary results, we neglected to deduct the home market imputed credit. We have made this correction for the final results.

We disagree with the petitioners' assertion that, because Borusan did not calculate its home market credit expense using monthly interest rates, we should disallow this adjustment. Borusan calculated this expense on a weighted-average basis, *i.e.*, the total principle times the number of days utilized for each short-term loan. This methodology is consistent with that used in calculating interest for both the 1993–94 and the 1994–95 reviews of this proceeding, and we did not request that Borusan recalculate this expense using monthly interest rates. Under these facts, it would be inappropriate to deny this adjustment.

We also disagree that a deduction for the quantity rebate, as proposed by the petitioners, is appropriate, because the quantity rebate is not part of the opportunity cost of the use of money in each sale. Instead, the quantity rebate is given after payment has been made by Borusan's customer.

Final Results of Review

As a result of our review, we determine that the following margin exists for the period May 1, 1996, through April 30, 1997:

Manufacturer/exporter	Margin (percent)
The Borusan Group	0.02

The Department shall determine, and Customs shall assess, antidumping duties on all appropriate entries. As discussed above, because the number of transactions involved in this review and other simplification methods prevent entry-by-entry assessments, we have calculated importer-specific assessment rates. We divided the total dumping margins for the reviewed sales by the total entered value of those reviewed sales. We will direct Customs to assess the resulting percentage margin against the entered customs values for the subject merchandise on each of that importer's entries under the relevant order during the review period.[6] While the Department is aware that the entered value of the reviewed sales is not necessarily equal to the entered value of entries during the POR, use of entered value of sales as the basis of the assessment rate permits the Department to collect a reasonable approximation of the antidumping duties which would have been determined if the Department had reviewed those sales of merchandise actually entered during the POR.

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 administrative review, as provided by section 751(a) of the Act: (1) the cash deposit rate for Borusan will be zero; (2) for merchandise exported by manufacturers or exporters not covered in this review but covered in a previous segment of this proceeding, the cash deposit rate will continue to be the company-specific rate published in the most recent final results in which that manufacturer or exporter participated; (3) if the exporter is not a firm covered in this review or in any previous segment of this proceeding, but the manufacturer is, the cash deposit rate will be that established for the manufacturer of the merchandise in these final results of review or in the most recent final results in which that manufacturer participated; and (4) if neither the exporter nor the manufacturer is a firm covered in this review or in any previous segment of this proceeding, the cash deposit rate will be 14.74 percent, the all others rate established in the less-than-fair-value investigation. These deposit requirements shall remain in effect until publication of the final results of the next administrative review.

This notice also serves as final reminder to importers of their responsibility 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 in the subsequent assessment of double antidumping duties.

This notice also is the only reminder to parties subject to administrative protective order (APO) of their responsibility concerning the return or destruction of proprietary information disclosed under APO in accordance with 19 CFR 353.34(d). Failure to comply is a violation of the APO.

This determination is issued and published in accordance with sections 751(a)(1) and 777(i)(1) of the Act.

Dated: June 18, 1998.

Richard W. Moreland,

Acting Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.

[FR Doc. 98–17250 Filed 6–26–98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–DS–P

[6] We note that, in the preliminary results, we erroneously indicated that if the assessment rates that we calculated for the final results were *de minimis*, we would not instruct Customs to assess duties. However, section 353.6 (b) of our regulations requires the assessment of duties for any importer-specific assessment rates greater than zero. Accordingly, we have not disregarded *de minimis* rates for assessment purposes.

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration

National Estuarine Research Reserve System

AGENCY: Office of Ocean and Coastal Resource Management (OCRM), National Ocean Service (NOS), National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, Department of Commerce.

ACTION: Notice of proposed boundary expansion for the Padilla Bay National Estuarine Research Reserve.

SUMMARY: The Sanctuaries and Reserves Division of OCRM is considering a requesting by the Washington State Department of Ecology to include the 92

acre Hat Island adjacent to the boundary of the Padilla Bay National Estuarine Research Reserve (PBNERR) within the PBNERR boundary. Hat Island, currently in state ownership, contains primarily forested upland, rocky cliffs, rocky shores, and intertidal seagrass habitats. The island supports old growth forests dating back to the 1600's, active nesting and perching habitat for state and federally threatened and endangered bird species, and unique vegetative communities including the ''Idaho bunchgrass'' recommended for protection by the Washington State Natural Heritage Program. It provides ideal research and education opportunities for the PBNERR.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Terry Stevens, Reserve Manager, Padilla Bay National Estuarine Research Reserve, Breazeale-Padilla Bay Interpretive Center, 1043 Bay View-Edison Road, Mount Vernon, Washington 98273; Phone (360) 428–1558 or Nina Garfield, Sanctuaries and Reserves Division, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, SSMC4, 11th Floor, Silver Spring, MD 20910; Phone (301) 713–3141, ext. 171.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The Padilla Bay National Estuarine Research Reserve (PBNERR) was designated in 1980 pursuant to section 315 of the Coastal Zone Management Act of 1972, as amended, 16 U.S.C. 1461. The PBNERR includes more than 10,000 acres within its administrative boundary comprising eelgrass, subtidal sand and mud habitats, and an upland farm area.

Washington State requested NOAA approval to amend the PBNERR boundary to include the state-owned Hat Island adjacent to the current boundary. For several years Hat Island has been discussed for possible inclusion into the PBNERR boundary. During original boundary planning efforts by the Governor's Steering Committee for the Reserve in 1979–80, Hat Island was recognized as a valuable asset for inclusion, but due to its private ownership and extreme high cost, it was decided to leave it outside the boundary and only include the two islands (Saddlebag and Dot) to the north which were already owned by the State. Interest in including Hat Island at a future date was noted in the management plan for future consideration. In the early 1990's, Hat Island was purchased by the Nature Conservancy, and then by the State with funds appropriated for the Washington Wildlife and Recreation Program, with interim management responsibility granted to the Washington Department of Natural Resources (WDNR). Discussions between the Washington Department of Ecology (the PBNERR's managing authority) and the WDNR have concluded that the island is best suited for inclusion in the PBNERR.

The inclusion of Hat Island into the PBNERR will enhance opportunities for research, monitoring, education, and management of Puget Sound's unique estuarine resources.

The expansion proposes inclusion of the 92 acres Hat Island on the western boundary of the PBNERR. This island is dominated by forested uplands, including old growth stands of Douglas fir, steep rocky cliffs, unique vegetative communities, and rocky shoreline, and intertidal and subtidal seagrass communities.

Any person wishing to comment on the proposed boundary expansion may forward written comments to Ms. Nina Garfield, Sanctuaries and Reserves Division, Office of Ocean and Coastal Resource Management, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, 1305 East-West Highway, SSMC4, 11th Floor, Silver Spring, MD 20910. Comments must be submitted no later than thirty (30) calendar days from issuance of this notice.

(Federal Domestic Assistance Catalog Number 11.420 (Coastal Zone Management) Research Reserves.)

Dated: June 22, 1998.

Nancy Foster,

Asssistant Administrator, Ocean Services and Coastal Zone Management.

[FR Doc. 98–17260 Filed 6–26–98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–08–M

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

Office of the Secretary

Submission for OMB Review; Comment Request

ACTION: Notice.

The Department of Defense has submitted to OMB for clearance, the following proposal for collection of information under the provisions of the Paperwork Reduction Act (44 U.S.C., Chapter 35).

Title, Associated Form, and OMB Number: Customer Service Survey—Regulatory Program, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers; ENG 5065; OMB Number 0710—[To Be Determined].

Type of Request: New Collection.

Number of Respondents: 60,000.

Responses Per Respondent: 1.

Annual Responses: 60,000.

Average Burden Per Response: 15 minutes.

Annual Burden Hours: 15,000.

Needs And Uses: The survey form will be provided to the public when they receive a regulatory product, primarily a permit decision or wetland determination. The information collected will be used to determine what areas of the program can be improved and to consider policy areas which may need revision to improve customer satisfaction. Without this customer survey, we could not comply with Executive Order 12862, ''Setting Customer Service Standards,'' and would have to rely on more informal and less structured, and therefore less effective, methods of obtaining public input.

Affected Public: Individuals or Households; Business or Other For-Profit; Not-For-Profit Institutions; Farms; State, Local or Tribal Government.

Frequency: On occasion.

Respondent's Obligation: Voluntary.

OMB Desk Officer: Mr. James A. Laity.

Written comments and recommendations on the proposed information collection should be sent to Mr. Laity at the Office of Management and Budget, Desk Officer for U.S. Army COE, Room 10202, New Executive Office Building, Washington, DC 20503.

DOD Clearance Officer: Mr. Robert Cushing.

Written requests for copies of the information collection proposal should be sent to Mr. Cushing WHS/DIOR, 1215 Jefferson Davis Highway, Suite 1204, Arlington, VA 22202–4302.

Dated: June 22, 1998.

Patricia L. Toppings,

Alternate OSD Federal Register Liaison Officer, Department of Defense.

[FR Doc. 98–17160 Filed 6–26–98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 5000–04–M

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

Office of the Secretary

Submission for OMB Review; Comment Request

ACTION: Notice.

The Department of Defense has submitted to OMB for clearance, the following proposal for collection of information under the provisions of the Paperwork Reduction Act (44 U.S.C. Chapter 35).

Title and OMB Number: Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement (DFARS) Part 205, Publicizing Contract Actions, and DFARS 252.205–7000, Provision of Information to Cooperative Agreement Holders; OMB Number 0704–0286.