administrative review of the antidumping duty order on welded pipe and tube from Turkey. We received timely allegations of ministerial errors from Borusan and Cayirova. In its comments dated December 9, 2005, Borusan alleged that the Department erred in that it did not include certain U.S. sales in the margin program. In its comments dated December 12, 2005, Cayirova alleged that the Department erred in the revised credit calculation in the home market (CREDITH). Petitioner did not comment on the ministerial errors alleged by respondents. We agree with respondents that these errors are ministerial errors and have amended the final results to correct the errors referenced herein. For a full explanation of changes made by the Department, please see the Memorandum from Melissa G. Skinner to Stephen J. Claey.

Amended Final Results of Review

As a result of the correction of ministerial errors, the following weighted-average percentage margins exist for the period May 1, 2003, through April 30, 2004:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Manufacturer/Exporter</th>
<th>Margin (percent)</th>
<th>Amended Margin (percent)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Borusan</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>0.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cayirova</td>
<td>3.52</td>
<td>3.28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Department shall determine, and the U.S. Customs and Border Protection (“CBP”) shall assess, antidumping duties on all appropriate entries. In accordance with section 351.212(b)(1) of the Department’s regulations, we have calculated importer-specific assessment rates by dividing the dumping margin found on the subject merchandise examined by the entered value of such merchandise. Where the importer-specific assessment rate is above de minimis, we will instruct CBP to assess antidumping duties on that importer’s entries of subject merchandise. The Department will issue appropriate assessment instructions directly to CBP within 15 days of publication of these amended final results of review.

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the following deposit requirements will be effective for all shipments of the subject merchandise entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption on or after the publication date of these amended final results of administrative review, as provided by section 751(a) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (“the Act”): (1) For the companies named above, the cash deposit rate will be the rate listed above; (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 segment of the proceeding 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.

We are issuing and publishing this determination and notice in accordance with sections 751(a)(1) and 777(i)(1) of the Act.


David M. Spooner, 
Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.

BILLING CODE 3510–05–S

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

Department of the Air Force

Notice of Intent To Perform an Environmental Assessment for Increased Depleted Uranium Use at Nevada Test and Training Range, Nevada

AGENCY: Department of the Air Force (AF), Air Combat Command (ACC).

ACTION: Notice of intent to prepare an Environmental Assessment (EA) for the Increased Depleted Uranium (DU) Use at Nevada Test and Training Range (NTTR).

SUMMARY: The United States Air Force is issuing this Notice of Intent (NOI) to announce that it is conducting an environmental assessment for the proposed action for increasing the annual number of depleted uranium (DU) rounds fired by A–10 aircraft using the 30-millimeter GAU–8 Gatling gun at the Nevada Test and Training Range (NTTR), Range 63, Target 63–10. This NOI describes the Air Force’s proposed scoping process and identifies the Air Force’s point of contact. Target 63–10 is the Air Force’s only air-to-ground target for testing and training with DU rounds.

The proposed assessment will be prepared in compliance with the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321–4347), the Council on Environmental Quality NEPA regulations (40 CFR parts 1500–1508), and Air Force’s Environmental Impact Analysis Process (EIAP) (Air Force Instruction 32–7061 as promulgated at 32 CFR part 989) to determine the potential environmental effects of increasing DU rounds at the NTTR.

As part of the proposal, the Air Force will analyze three alternatives: A, B, and C. Alternative A (proposed action) would increase the annual use of 30-mm DU rounds in a combat mix (CM) from an existing 9,500 to 22,800 annually. CM contains armor-piercing incendiary (API) DU rounds mixed with high explosive incendiary (HEI) rounds in a 5 to 1 ratio. Alternative A would increase the annual use of DU rounds from 7,900 to 19,000 (and HEI rounds from 1,600 to 3,800) to provide the 422 Test and Evaluation Squadron (TES) and the 66 Weapons Squadron (WPS) graduates with sufficient DU rounds to accomplish essential testing and training requirements. Alternative B would enhance testing by increasing the use of CM to a total of 31,680 rounds (26,400 DU and 5,280 HEI) at Target 63–10. This alternative would meet test and training requirements and also allow additional testing by Tactics Development & Evaluation (TD&E) and Tactics Improvement Proposals (TIP). Alternative C (no-action) would reflect no change in current operations associated with Target 63–10 whereby 9,500 CM rounds (7,900 DU and 1,600 HEI) are deployed for test and training. This number (9,500) does not provide enough rounds for effective TES testing and WPS training.

DATES: The Air Force will conduct two scoping meetings to receive public input on alternatives, concerns, and issues to be addressed in the EA and solicit public input concerning the scope of the proposed action and alternatives. The
Public comments are particularly invited on: Whether this collection of information is necessary for the proper performance of functions of the FAR, and whether it will have practical utility; whether our estimate of the public burden of this collection of information is accurate, and based on valid assumptions and methodology; ways to enhance the quality, utility, and clarity of the information to be collected; and ways in which we can minimize the burden of the collection of information on those who are to respond, through the use of appropriate technological collection techniques or other forms of information technology.

DATES: Submit comments on or before March 27, 2006.

ADDRESSES: Submit comments regarding this burden estimate or any other aspect of the collection of information, including suggestions for reducing this burden to the General Services Administration, Regulatory Secretariat (VIR), 1800 F Street, NW, Room 4035, Washington, DC 20405.


SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

A. Purpose

Under the Free Trade Agreements Acts of 1979, unless specifically exempted by statute or regulation, agencies are required to evaluate offers over a certain dollar limitation to supply an eligible product without regard to the restrictions of the Buy American Act or the Balance of Payments program. Offerors identify excluded end products and FTA end products on this certificate.

The contracting officer uses the information to identify the offered items which are domestic and FTA country end products so as to give these products a preference during the evaluation of offers. Items having components of unknown origin are considered to have been mined, produced, or manufactured outside the United States.

B. Annual Reporting Burden

Respondents: 1,140.
Responses Per Respondent: 5.
Annual Responses: 5,700.
Hours Per Response: .167.
Total Burden Hours: 666.


Gerald Zafios, Director, Contract Policy Division.

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

Submission for OMB Review; Comment Request

AGENCY: Department of Education

SUMMARY: The IC Clearance Official, Regulatory Information Management Services, Office of the Chief Information Officer invites comments on the submission for OMB review as required by the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995.

DATES: Interested persons are invited to submit comments on or before February 23, 2006.

ADDRESSES: Written comments should be addressed to the Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs, Attention: Rachel Potter, Desk Officer, Department of Education, Office of Management and Budget, 725 17th Street, NW., Room 10222, New Executive Office Building, Washington, DC 20503 or faxed to (202) 395–6974.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: Section 3506 of the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (44 U.S.C. Chapter 35) requires that the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) provide interested Federal agencies and the public an early opportunity to comment on information collection requests. OMB may amend or waive the requirement for public consultation to the extent that public participation in the approval process would defeat the purpose of the information collection, violate State or Federal law, or substantially interfere with any agency’s ability to perform its statutory obligations. The IC Clearance Official, Regulatory Information Management Services, Office of the Chief Information Officer, publishes that notice containing proposed information collection requests prior to submission of these requests to OMB. Each proposed information collection, grouped by office, contains the following: (1) Type of review requested, e.g. new, revision, extension, existing or reinstatement; (2) Title; (3) Summary of the collection; (4) Description of the need for, and proposed use of, the information; (5) Respondents and frequency of collection; and (6)