## Hearing Process Information

Those wishing to speak at the hearing may make advance request by writing or calling Mr. Tad Berkebile, Sacramento County Water Agency, 827 Seventh Street, Room 301, Sacramento, CA 95814, telephone (916) 440–6851. Speakers will be called upon to present their comments in the order in which their requests were received. Requests to speak may also be made at the hearing; these speakers will be called after the advance requests. Oral comments/presentations will be limited to 10 minutes per individual.

The hearing facilities have disabled access, but there are no facilities for the deaf. A telephone device for the hearing impaired (TDD) is available at (916) 875–7105.

Dated: June 27, 1997.

**Roger K. Patterson,**

*Regional Director.*

[FR Doc. 97–17449 Filed 7–3–97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4310–94–P

## INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION

### Heavy Forged Handtools From the People's Republic of China; Dismissal of Request for Institution of a Section 751(b) Review Investigation

**AGENCY:** International Trade Commission.

**ACTION:** Dismissal of a request to institute a section 751(b) investigation concerning the Commission's affirmative determinations in investigation No. 731–TA–457 (Final), *Heavy Forged Handtools from the People's Republic of China.*

**SUMMARY:** The Commission determines, pursuant to section 751(b) of the Tariff Act of 1930 (the Act) (19 U.S.C. 1675(b)) and Commission rule 207.45 (19 CFR 207.45), that the subject request does not show changed circumstances sufficient to warrant institution of an investigation to review the Commission's affirmative determinations in investigation No. 731–TA–457 (Final), *Heavy Forged Handtools from the People's Republic of China,* in particular the determination concerning picks and mattocks. Picks and mattocks are provided for in subheading 8201.30.00 of the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Jonathan Seiger (202–205–3183) or Vera Libeau (202–205–3176), Office of Investigations, U.S. International Trade Commission, 500 E Street SW., Washington, DC 20436. Hearing-impaired persons can obtain information on this matter by contacting the Commission's TDD terminal on 202–205–1810. Persons with mobility impairments who will need special assistance in gaining access to the Commission should contact the Office of the Secretary at 202–205–2000. General information concerning the Commission may also be obtained by accessing its internet server (http://www.usitc.gov or ftp://ftp.usitc.gov).

### Background Information

On April 16, 1997, the Commission received a request to review its affirmative determination with respect to picks and mattocks in light of changed circumstances (the request), pursuant to section 751(b) of the Act (19 U.S.C. 1675(b)). The request was filed by counsel on behalf of Olympia Industrial, Inc. (Olympia), a major importer and distributor of heavy forged handtools, including picks and mattocks.

Pursuant to § 207.45(b) of the Commission's rules of practice and procedure (19 CFR 207.45(b)), the Commission published a notice in the **Federal Register** on April 30, 1997 (62 FR 23484) requesting comments as to whether the alleged changed circumstances warranted the institution of a review investigation. The Commission received comments in opposition to the request from counsel on behalf of Woodings-Verona, a domestic producer of picks and mattocks.

### Analysis

In considering whether to institute a review investigation under section 751(b), the Commission will not institute such an investigation unless it is persuaded there is sufficient information demonstrating:

(1) That there are significant changed circumstances from those in existence at the time of the original investigation;

(2) That those changed circumstances are not the natural and direct result of the imposition of the antidumping order, and;

(3) That the changed circumstances, allegedly indicating that revocation of the order would not be likely to lead to continuation or recurrence of material injury to the domestic industry, warrant a full investigation.

*See* 19 U.S.C. 1675(b)(2)(A); *Certain Cold-Rolled Carbon Steel Flat Products from Germany and the Netherlands,* 61 FR 17319, 17320 (April 19, 1996); *A. Hirsh, Inc.* v. *United States,* 737 F. Supp. 1186 (CIT 1990); *Avesta AB* v. *United States,* 724 F. Supp. 974 (CIT 1989), *aff'd* 914 F.2d 232 (Fed Cir. 1990), *cert. denied,* 111 S. Ct. 1308 (1991). In the URAA, Congress changed the substantive standard applicable to changed circumstances reviews from whether the domestic industry would be materially injured or threatened with material injury if the order were revoked to whether revocation of the order is likely to lead to the continuation or recurrence of material injury to the domestic industry. 19 U.S.C. 1675(b)(2)(A).

After consideration of the request for review and the response to the notice inviting comments, the Commission has determined, pursuant to section 751(b) of the Act (19 U.S.C. 1675(b)) and Commission rule 207.45 (19 CFR 207.45), that the information of record, including the request and the comments received in response to the notice, does not show changed circumstances sufficient to warrant institution of an investigation to review the Commission's affirmative determination regarding picks and mattocks in investigation No. 731–TA–457 (Final).

The request alleged four changed circumstances warranting review: (1) Lack of production for commercial markets in the United States; (2) lack of competition between imports and U.S.-made picks and mattocks; (3) the argument that any production decline in the United States since imposition of the antidumping order is not the ''natural and direct result'' of the order, and; (4) the argument that prices of imports of picks and mattocks from nonsubject countries, such as Mexico, Poland, and India, are lower than prices of imports of picks and mattocks from China. The information available on the record does not persuade us that a full investigation is warranted for any of these allegations.[1]

First, the request argues that there is currently no known production of picks and mattocks for sale in so-called ''commercial markets'' in the United States. Based on information currently available, however, the Commission concludes that U.S. production of picks and mattocks for commercial markets has not ceased, but, on the contrary,

[1] The second and third alleged changed circumstances are very closely related to the first, namely, the alleged cessation of production for commercial markets in the United States. In particular, the argument that the alleged cessation in domestic production for commercial markets is not the ''natural and direct result'' of the order is not a changed circumstance in and of itself, but rather an argument that the alleged cessation of production is a changed circumstance. Similarly, the allegation that there is no competition between imports and domestically-produced picks and mattocks is not a changed circumstance in and of itself, but rather a result of the alleged changed circumstance of the cessation in domestic production for commercial markets.

commercial sales of U.S. production of picks and mattocks are still significant. There is no evidence of the complete, or virtually complete, cessation of production that the Commission has, in the past, considered to be a changed circumstance warranting institution of a review investigation.

Second, the request argues that prices of picks and mattocks from China are currently higher, and quantities lower, than prices and quantities of picks and mattocks from countries not subject to the order. Replacement of subject imports by nonsubject imports alone, however, does not necessarily constitute a changed circumstance. Moreover, changes in volumes of subject versus non-subject imports, and any associated changes in relative prices, may in fact be attributable to the effects of the order. Further, to the extent that the transfer of market share from subject to nonsubject imports could be a changed circumstance warranting review, there is no evidence that this has occurred in the picks and mattocks industry.

In light of the above analysis, the Commission determines that institution of a review investigation under section 751(b) of the Act concerning the Commission's affirmative determination regarding picks and mattocks in investigation No. 731–TA–457 (Final), is not warranted.

Issued: June 30, 1997.

By order of the Commission.

**Donna R. Koehnke,**

*Secretary.*

[FR Doc. 97–17581 Filed 7–3–97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7020–02–P

## DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

### Drug Enforcement Administration

### Agency Information Collection Activities: Revision of a Currently Approved Collection; Comment Request

**ACTION:** Notice of information collection under review; Application for Registration (DEA Form 225) and Application for Registration Renewal (DEA Form 225a).

The information collection is published to obtain comments from the public and affected agencies. Comments are encouraged and will be accepted until September 5, 1997.

We are requesting written comments and suggestions from the public and affected agencies concerning the collection of information. Your comments should address one or more of the following four points:

1. Evaluate 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;

2. Evaluate the accuracy of the agencies estimate of the burden of the collection of information, including the validity of the methodology and assumptions used;

3. Enhance the quality, utility, and clarity of the information to be collected; and

4. Minimize the burden of the collection of information on those who are to respond, including through the use of appropriate automated, electronic, mechanical, or other technological collection techniques or other forms of information technology, e.g., permitting electronic submission of responses.

Comments and/or suggestions regarding the item(s) contained in this notice, especially regarding the estimated public burden and associated response time should be directed to Mr. James M. Sheehan, 202–307–7250, Chief, Registration Unit, Drug Operations Section, Office of Diversion Control, Drug Enforcement Administration Washington, DC 20537. If you have additional comments suggestions, or need a copy of the information collection instrument with instructions, or additional information, please contact Mr. James M. Sheehan.

Additionally, comments may also be submitted to the Department of Justice (DOJ), Justice Management Division, Information Management and Security Staff, Attention: Department Clearance Officer, Suite 850, Washington Center, 1001 G Street, NW, Washington, DC 20530. Additional comments may be submitted to DOJ via facsimile at 202–514–1490.

Overview of this information collection:

*1. Type of Information Collection:* Revision of a currently approved collection.

*2. Title of the Form/Collection:* Application for Registration (DEA Form 225) and Application for Registration Renewal (DEA Form 225a).

*3. Agency form number:* DEA Form 225, DEA Form 225a; *Applicable component of the Department of Justice sponsoring the collection:* Office of Diversion Control, Drug Enforcement Administration, Department of Justice.

*4. Affected public who will be asked or required to respond, as well as a brief abstract:* Primary: Business or other for-profit, Other: individuals or households, Not-for-profit institutions and State, Local or Tribal Government.

The Controlled Substances Act requires all firms and individuals who manufacture, distribute, import, export, conduct research or dispense controlled substances to register with DEA. Registration provides a closed system of distribution to control the flow of controlled substances through the distribution chain.

These revisions of the forms will not add any burden to the affected public. The subject forms are being revised to provide the ability to use an Optical Character Reader (OCR) for form processing and to provide for registrants Social Security Number and/or Tax Identification Number. The OCR will enable DEA to increase efficiency and accelerate processing of registrant applications. Social Security Number and/or Tax Identification Number are requested to correctly identify registrants, to expedite application processing, database integration and telephone system upgrades.

1. An estimate of the total number of respondents and the amount of time estimated for an average respondent to respond: 10,000 respondents at 1 response per year at 30 minutes per response.

2. An estimate of the total public burden (in hours) associated with the collection: 5,000 annual burden hours.

Public comment on this proposed information collection is strongly encouraged.

Dated: July 1, 1997.

**Robert B. Briggs,**

*Department Clearance Officer, United States Department of Justice.*

[FR Doc. 97–17557 Filed 7–3–97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4410–09–M

## DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

### Drug Enforcement Administration

### Agency Information Collection Activities: Revision of a Currently Approved Collection; Comment Request

**ACTION:** Notice of information collection under review; Application for Registration (DEA Form 363) and Application for Registration Renewal (DEA Form 363a).

The information collection is published to obtain comments from the public and affected agencies. Comments are encouraged and will be accepted until September 5, 1997.

We are requesting written comments and suggestions from the public and affected agencies concerning the collection of information. Your