Program Specialist, Compliance and Production Adjustment Division, USDA/ FSA/CPAD STOP 0517, 1400 Independence Avenue, SW, Washington, D.C. 20250–0517; telephone (202) 720–7602.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Title: Provisions Applicable to Multiple Programs, Farm Reconstitutions.

OMB Number: 0560–0025.

Expiration Date: August 31, 1997.

Type of Request: Extension of a currently approved information collection.

Abstract: The information collected under Office of Management and Budget (OMB) Number 0560–0025, as identified above, is needed to enable the FSA to effectively administer the programs relating to reconstitution of farms, allotments, quotas, and acreages governed by regulations at 7 CFR part 718.

Form FSA–155 is used as a request for farm reconstitution initiated by the producer who wishes to combine a farm with another farm or divide a farm into multiple farming operations. The reconstitution process is a required procedure when a producer wishes to increase acreage attributed to the farm from leases or change farm acreage records as a result of a sale of any part of a farm. The FSA county committee must act on all proposed farm reconstitutions and issue their approval or disapproval on FSA–155. It is necessary to collect the information recorded on FSA–155 to determine farmland, cropland, agricultural use land, and changes to contract acreages resulting from combination or division of the farming operation.

Respondents: Farm owners and operators.

Estimated Number of Respondents: 359,921.

Estimated Number of Reports Filed per person: 1.

Estimated Average Time to Respond: 15 minutes.

Estimated Total Burden Hours: 89,980 hours.

Proposed topics for comments include: (a) whether the collection of information is necessary for the proper performance of the functions of the agency, including whether the information will have practical utility; (b) the accuracy of the agency's estimate of burden including the validity of the methodology and assumptions used; (c) ways to enhance the quality, utility and clarity of the information to be collected; or (d) ways to minimize the burden of the collection of information on those who are to respond, including through the use of appropriate automated, electric, mechanical, or other technological collection techniques or other forms of information technology. Comments should be sent to Desk Officer for Agriculture, Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs, Office of Management and Budget, Washington, D. C. 20503 and to Loretta Baxa, Agricultural Program Specialist, Compliance and Production Adjustment Division, USDA/FSA/CPAD STOP 0517, 1400 Independence Avenue, SW, Washington, D.C. 20250–0517; telephone (202) 720–7602.

Signed at Washington, DC, on May 12, 1997.

Bruce R. Weber,

Acting Administrator, Farm Service Agency.

[FR Doc. 97–12998 Filed 5–16–97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3410–05–P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Bureau of the Census

[Docket No. 970501104–7104–01]

Census County Division (CCD) Program for Census 2000—Proposed Criteria

AGENCY: Bureau of the Census, Commerce.

ACTION: Notice of proposed program revision and request for comments.

SUMMARY: Census county divisions (CCDs) are geographic statistical entities established cooperatively by the Census Bureau and officials of state and local governments in 21 states where minor civil divisions (MCDs) either do not exist or are unsatisfactory for reporting decennial census data. The primary goal of the CCD program is to establish and maintain a set of subcounty units that have stable boundaries and recognizable names. A CCD usually represents one or more communities, trading centers, or, in some instances, major land uses. It usually consists of a single geographic piece that is relatively compact in shape. The geographic ''building blocks'' of CCDs are census tracts, and many CCDs are groupings of several contiguous census tracts.

Since the 1950s, the Census Bureau has worked with state and local officials to create subcounty areas for the collection, presentation, and analysis of census statistics in states where MCDs do not exist, are not well-known locally, or are subject to frequent change. By 1990, 21 states had shifted to CCDs: Alabama, Arizona, California, Colorado, Delaware, Florida, Georgia, Hawaii, Idaho, Kentucky, Montana, Nevada, New Mexico, Oklahoma, Oregon, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas, Utah, Washington, and Wyoming. Once a state has replaced its MCDs with CCDs, it usually keeps them throughout subsequent decennial censuses. For Census 2000, all of the above 21 states will retain their CCDs.

To maintain and update the boundaries and names of CCDs for Census 2000, the Census Bureau offers a program for state and local officials to review and update their 1990 CCDs according to criteria developed and promulgated by the Census Bureau. The Census Bureau then reviews their CCD plans for conformance to these criteria.

As the first step in this process, the Census Bureau is requesting comments on the CCD criteria proposed for Census 2000. These criteria will apply only to states with CCDs. The Census Bureau may modify and, if necessary, reject any CCD changes that do not meet its criteria.

Besides the proposed criteria, this notice includes a description of the changes from the criteria used for the 1990 census and a list of definitions of key terms used in the criteria.

DATES: Any suggestions or recommendations concerning the proposed criteria should be submitted in writing by June 18, 1997.

ADDRESSES: Director, Bureau of the Census, Washington, DC 20233–0001.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Dr. Joel Morrison, Chief, Geography Division, Bureau of the Census, Washington, DC 20233–7400, telephone (301) 457–1132, or e-mail (jmorrison@geo.census.gov).

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The CCD criteria have evolved in response to decennial census practices and the preferences of state and local participants and data users. After each decennial census, the Census Bureau, in consultation with program participants and data users, reviews and revises these criteria. Then, before the next decennial census, the Census Bureau offers participants and data users an opportunity to correct, update, and otherwise improve their CCDs.

In July and August 1995, the Census Bureau issued invitations to state and local groups and agencies to participate in the delineation of statistical geographic areas for Census 2000. These included state and regional planning agencies, councils of governments, and county planning agencies.

In 1997, the Census Bureau will provide materials and detailed guidelines to program participants for the review and delineation of CCDs for Census 2000.

A. Criteria for Delineating CCDs for Census 2000

The Census Bureau requires that CCDs: (1) Have community orientation, (2) have visible, stable boundaries, (3) conform to groupings of census tracts, and (4) have recognizable names.

1. Community Orientation

Each CCD should focus on one or more communities or places and take in the additional surrounding territory that is served by these in some fashion. The definition of community should take into account factors such as production, marketing, consumption, and the integrating factor of local institutions.

The community on which a CCD is centered usually is an incorporated place or a census designated place (CDP). In some cases, the CCD may be centered on a major area of significantly different land use or ownership, such as a large military base or American Indian reservation (AIR). In other situations, a CCD can represent an area that is physiographically different from the rest of the county. A CCD should always consist of a single geographic piece that is relatively compact in shape.

2. Visible, Stable Boundaries

A CCD should have easily locatable boundaries that seldom change. These should be readily discernible in the field and easy to depict on maps. This provision makes the location of boundaries less ambiguous and easier for data users to locate. The following features are acceptable:

- County boundaries (always a CCD boundary).
- Census tract boundaries, which usually follow visible, perennial natural and cultural features such as roads, rivers, canals, railroads, above-ground high-tension power lines, and so forth.
- AIR boundaries.
- Conjoint city limits (in certain situations).

When the above types of features are not available for selection, the Census Bureau may, at its discretion, approve nonstandard visible features such as ridge lines, pipelines, intermittent streams, fence lines, and so forth. The Census Bureau also may accept, on a case-by-case basis, the boundaries of selected nonstandard and potentially nonvisible features such as the boundaries of national parks and forests, cemeteries, or other special land-use properties, the straight-line extensions of visible features, and other lines of sight.

3. Groupings of Census Tracts, CCD Population Size

A CCD should almost always consist of one census tract or a combination of contiguous census tracts. Therefore, CCD boundaries should conform to census tract boundaries. In counties that had block numbering areas (BNAs) in 1990, program participants will be converting the BNAs to census tracts. For these counties, the Census Bureau strongly recommends adjusting the CCDs to conform to groupings of census tracts. As an alternative, program participants may use the CCD framework as a basis for establishing some or all of their census tracts. It is permissible to use both approaches.

In a few exceptional situations, some CCD boundaries may not need to follow census tract boundaries, and there may be two or more 1990 CCDs within one census tract. Usually, such situations are limited to very sparsely populated counties with a large land area.

Population size is not as important a consideration with CCDs as it is with census tracts. Historically, CCDs have ranged from a few hundred people (in selected situations) to more than one million. However, insofar as possible, CCDs that are new for Census 2000 should have a population of at least 1,500 people, the recommended minimum for a census tract.

4. Name Identification

A CCD usually should be named after the largest population center or place within it (Los Angeles). Sometimes a CCD name may represent the two largest centers; for example, Bayard-Santa Rita. In some situations, a CCD may be named after a prominent physical feature (Castle Rock, Lake Mono, Pikes Peak) or a distinctive region within the county (Death Valley, Everglades, Lower Keys, Tellico Plains). In other cases, a CCD name may consist of the county name and a compass direction to indicate the portion of the county in the CCD, or a place name and a compass direction to give the CCD location relative to the place. The directional indicator usually precedes a county name, as in Northwest Union. If a place name is used, the directional indicator follows it; for example, Smithville North. In all cases, the objective is to identify clearly the extent of the CCD by means of an area name; CCD names always should be meaningful to data users.

5. Revisions to Existing CCDs

Some 1990 CCD boundaries have errors. Most of these involve small areas where the CCD boundaries and census tract boundaries were supposed to be conjoint but were not. The Census Bureau will bring these specific situations to the attention of local participants and request that they submit corrections.

The Census Bureau does not encourage state and local officials to make major revisions to their CCDs since the goal of the program is to maintain a set of stable subcounty entities that allows data comparability from census-to-census. However, updates and revisions may be necessary in some instances, such as where there have been county boundary changes, revisions to census tract boundaries, or as part of the initial delineation of census tracts. Additionally, revisions to CCD names may be necessary due to population changes within CCDs.

6. Final Approval of CCDs

The Census Bureau reserves the right to approve all CCD proposals for Census 2000. The Census Bureau will make an effort to reach agreement with local participants, but cannot approve the CCDs submitted if the changes are unwarranted or do not meet Census 2000 criteria. If necessary, the Census Bureau will revise CCDs that do not meet its requirements.

B. Changes to the Criteria for Census 2000

Most provisions of the CCD criteria remain unchanged from those used in conjunction with the 1990 census. The only major change is the shift to census tracts in all counties that had BNAs and the need to adjust the CCDs in those counties to the boundaries of census tracts.

Definitions of Key Terms

American Indian reservation (AIR)—A Federally recognized American Indian entity with boundaries established by treaty, statute, and/or executive or court order and over which American Indians have governmental jurisdiction. Along with reservation, designations such as colonies, communities, pueblos, rancherias, and reserves apply to AIRs.

Block numbering area (BNA)—A small-area, statistical geographic division of a county or statistically equivalent area delineated in 1990 instead of and generally geographically equivalent to a census tract. For Census 2000, the Census Bureau is merging the BNA program with the census tract program and converting all BNAs to census tracts.

Census block—The smallest geographic entity for which the Census Bureau collects and tabulates decennial

census information, bounded on all sides by visible and nonvisible features identified by the Census Bureau in computer files and on maps.

Census designated place (CDP)—A locally recognized, closely settled population center identified by name. The Census Bureau uses CDPs to present data for localities that otherwise would not be identified as places in its data products.

Census tract—A small, relatively permanent statistical geographic subdivision of a county or statistically equivalent area defined for the tabulation of data. For Census 2000, the Census Bureau is replacing BNAs with census tracts.

Conjoint—A description of a boundary shared by two adjacent geographic areas.

Contiguous—A description of geographic areas that are adjacent to one another, sharing either a common boundary or point.

Incorporated place—A type of governmental unit, sanctioned by state law as a city, town (except in New England, New York, and Wisconsin), village, or borough (except in Alaska and New York) having legally prescribed limits, powers, and functions.

Minor civil division (MCD)—The primary governmental or administrative division of a county in 28 States, Puerto Rico, and the Island Areas having legal boundaries, names, and descriptions. MCDs represent many different types of legal entities with a wide variety of characteristics, powers, and functions depending on the State and type of MCD. In some States, some or all of the incorporated places also constitute MCDs.

Nonvisible feature—A map feature that is not visible on the ground such as a city or county boundary through space, a property line, a short line-of-sight extension of a road, or a point-to-point line of sight.

Special place—A specific location requiring special enumeration because the location includes people not in households or the area includes special land use. Special places include facilities with resident population, such as correctional institutions, military installations, college campuses, workers' dormitories, hospitals, nursing homes and group homes and land-use areas such as national parks. A special place includes the entire facility, including nonresidential areas and staff housing units as well as all group quarters population.

Visible feature—A map feature that one can see on the ground such as a road, railroad track, above-ground transmission line, stream, shoreline, fence, sharply defined mountain ridge, or cliff. A nonstandard visible feature is a feature that may not be clearly defined on the ground (such as a ridge), may be seasonal (such as an intermittent stream), or may be relatively impermanent (such as a fence). The Census Bureau generally requests verification that nonstandard features are easily locatable.

Dated: May 1, 1997.

Martha Farnsworth Riche,

Director, Bureau of the Census.

[FR Doc. 97–13051 Filed 5–16–97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–07–P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

[A–201–601]

Certain Fresh Cut Flowers From Mexico; 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 January 9, 1997, the Department of Commerce (the Department) published the preliminary results of its administrative review of the antidumping duty order on certain fresh cut flowers from Mexico. The review covers one manufacturer/exporter and the period April 1, 1995 through March 31, 1996.

We gave interested parties an opportunity to comment on our preliminary results. Based on our analysis of the comments received, we have not changed the results from those presented in the preliminary results of this review.

EFFECTIVE DATE: May 19, 1997.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: G. Leon McNeill or Maureen Flannery, 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

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 January 9, 1997, the Department published in the **Federal Register** (62 FR 1318) the preliminary results of its administrative review of the antidumping duty order on fresh cut flowers from Mexico, 52 FR 13491 (April 23, 1987). The Department has now completed this administrative review in accordance with section 751 of the Act.

Scope of Review

The products covered by this review are certain fresh cut flowers, defined as standard carnations, standard chrysanthemums, and pompon chrysanthemums. During the period of review, such merchandise was classifiable under *Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States* (HTSUS) items 0603.10.7010 (pompon chrysanthemums), 0603.10.7020 (standard chrysanthemums), and 0603.10.7030 (standard carnations). The HTSUS item numbers are provided for convenience and U.S. Customs (Customs) purposes only. The written description of the scope of the order remains dispositive.

This review covers one manufacturer/exporter of fresh cut flowers from Mexico, Rancho Del Pacifico (Pacifico), and the period April 1, 1995 through March 31, 1996.

Duty Absorption

As part of this review, we are considering, in accordance with section 751(a)(4) of the Act, whether Pacifico absorbed antidumping duties. See the preliminary results of this review. For these final results of review, we determine that there is no dumping margin on any of Pacifico's sales during the period of review and, therefore, find that antidumping duties have not been absorbed by Pacifico on its U.S. sales.

Analysis of the Comments Received

We gave interested parties an opportunity to comment on the preliminary results of review. We received a case brief from the petitioner, The Floral Trade Council.

Comment 1: Petitioner argues that the Department should revise its cash deposit instructions to Customs from those issued in prior reviews. Petitioner suggests that, in order to discourage circumvention of the antidumping duty