

costs are classified by budget category. The FY2000 totals are expected to be readily available in computer files from which they can be extracted and sent in by e-mail or by mail on either computer-readable diskette or a few pages of computer printout. Sponsor characteristics are expected to be known by State agency staff or easily extracted from files and will be reportable on a form provided to each State office that may be completed electronically or by hand. Burden is minimized by collecting sponsoring organization information from the State agencies rather than from each of the 1,138 individual sponsoring organizations.

*Estimate of Burden:* We estimate the burden to each State agency to be as follows:

Retrieval, compilation, and sending of electronic information on all its sponsoring organizations—2 hours.

Clerical time to locate, copy, compile, and send information on each sponsoring organization that is not electronically available—30 minutes for each sponsor file.

*Respondents:* Respondents include staff of State agencies that administer the CACFP.

*Estimated Number of Respondents:* 53 agencies in total; including 49 State agencies, the Mid-Atlantic FNS Regional Office that administers the CACFP in Virginia, and the CACFP agencies in the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, and Guam.

*Estimated Total Annual Burden on Respondents:* Total of 675 hours.

*Comments:* Comments are invited on (a) whether the proposed 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 the burden of the proposed collection of information, including the validity of the methodology and the assumptions used; (c) ways to enhance the quality, utility, and clarity of the information to be collected; and (d) ways to minimize the burden of the collection of information on those who are to respond, including the use of appropriate automated, electronic, mechanical, or other technology. Comments should be sent to the address stated in the preamble. All responses to this notice will be summarized and included in the request for Office of Management and Budget (OMB) approval. All comments will also become a matter of public record.

Dated: March 16, 2001.

**Susan E. Offutt,**

*Administrator, Economic Research Service.*

[FR Doc. 01-7396 Filed 3-23-01; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 3410-18-P**

## DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

### Grain Inspection, Packers and Stockyards Administration

#### Proposed Posting of Stockyards

The Grain Inspection, Packers and Stockyards Administration, United States Department of Agriculture, has information that the livestock markets named below are stockyards as defined in Section 302 of the Packers and Stockyards Act (7 U.S.C. 202), and should be made subject to the provisions of the Packers and Stockyards Act, 1921, as amended (7 U.S.C. 181 *et seq.*).

CA-189

Dinuba Sales Yard, Cutler, California

IN-166

United Producers, Inc., Little York, Indiana

Pursuant to the authority under Section 302 of the Packers and Stockyards Act, notice is hereby given that it is proposed to designate the stockyards named above as posted stockyards subject to the provisions of said Act.

Any person who wishes to submit written data, views or arguments concerning the proposed designation may do so by filing them with the Director, Office of Policy/Litigation Support, Packers and Stockyards Programs, Grain Inspection, Packers and Stockyards Administration, U.S. Department of Agriculture, Room 1521 South Building, 1400 Independence Avenue, SW, Washington, D.C. 20250, by April 10, 2001.

All written submissions made pursuant to this notice will be made available for public inspection in the office of the Director of the Office of Policy/Litigation Support during normal business hours.

Done at Washington, DC, this 13th day of March 2001.

**David R. Shipman,**

*Acting Administrator, Grain Inspection, Packers and Stockyards Administration.*

[FR Doc. 01-7333 Filed 3-23-01; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 3410-EN-P**

## DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

### Bureau of Export Administration

#### Action Affecting Export Privileges; Optical Associates, Inc.

In the Matter of: Optical Associates, Inc.,  
1425 McCandless Drive, Milpitas,  
California 95035, Respondent

#### Order

The Office of Export Enforcement, Bureau of Export Administration, United States Department of Commerce (BXA), having notified Optical Associates, Inc. (OAI) of its intention to initiate an administrative proceeding against it pursuant to section 13(c) of the Export Administration Act of 1979, as amended (50 U.S.C.A. app. §§ 2401-2420 (1991 & Supp. 2000)) (the Act),<sup>1</sup> and the Export Administration Regulations (currently codified at 15 CFR Parts 730-774 (2000)) (the Regulations),<sup>2</sup> based on allegations that, on or about December 2, 1998, OAI exported a U.S.-origin Mask Aligner and parts from the United States to Bhaba Atomic Research Center (BARC), an entity on the Department of Commerce Entity List, Supplement No. 4 to Part 744 of the Regulations, without obtaining a Department of Commerce license as required by section 744.11 of the Regulations, in violation of section 764.2(a) of the Regulations, and;

BXA and OAI having entered into a Settlement Agreement pursuant to Section 766.18(a) of the Regulations whereby they agreed to settle this matter in accordance with the terms and conditions set forth therein, and the terms of the Settlement Agreement having been approved by me;

#### *It Is Therefore Ordered*

First, that, for a period of three years from the date of this Order, Optical, Associates, Inc., 1425 McCandless Drive, Milpitas, California, 95035, and all of its successors or assigns, officers, representatives, agents, and employees, may not participate, directly or indirectly, in any way in any transaction involving any commodity, software, or

<sup>1</sup> The Act expired on August 20, 1994. Executive Order 12924 (3 CFR, 1994 Comp. 917 (1995)), which has been extended by successive Presidential Notices, the most recent being that of August 3, 2000 (64 FR 48347, August 8, 2000), continued the Regulations in effect under the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C.A. §§ 1701-1706 (1991 & Supp. 2000)). The Act was reauthorized on November 13, 2000. See Pub. L. No. 106-508.

<sup>2</sup> The violation at issue occurred in 1998. The Regulations governing the violation at issue are codified at 15 CFR Parts 730-744 (1998), and to the degree to which they pertain to this matter, are substantially the same as the 2000 version of the Regulations.

technology (hereinafter collectively referred to as "item") that is subject to the Regulations and that is exported or to be exported from the United States to India, or in any other activity subject to the Regulations that involves India, including, but not limited to:

A. Applying for, obtaining, or using any license, License Exception, or export control document;

B. Carrying on negotiations concerning, or ordering, buying, receiving, using, selling, delivering, storing, disposing of, forwarding, transporting, financing, or otherwise servicing in any way, any transaction involving any item that is subject to the Regulations and that is exported or to be exported from the United States to India, or in any other activity subject to the Regulations that involves India; or

C. Benefiting in any way from any transaction involving any item exported or to be exported from the United States to India that is subject to the Regulations, or in any other activity subject to the Regulations that involves India.

*Second*, that no person may, directly or indirectly, do any of the following:

A. Export or reexport to or on behalf of the denied person any item subject to the Regulations to India;

B. Take any action that facilitates the acquisition or attempted acquisition by the denied person of the ownership, possession, or control of any item subject to the Regulations that has been or will be exported from the United States to India, including financing or other support activities related to a transaction whereby the denied person acquires or attempts to acquire such ownership, possession or control;

C. Take any action to acquire from or to facilitate the acquisition or attempted acquisition from the denied person of any item subject to the Regulations that has been exported from the United States to India;

D. Obtain from the denied person in the United States any item subject to the Regulations with knowledge or reason to know that the item will be, or is intended to be, exported from the United States to India; or

E. Engage in any transaction to service any item subject to the Regulations that has been or will be exported from the United States to India, and which is owned, possessed or controlled by the denied person, or service any item, of whatever origin, that is owned, possessed or controlled by the denied person if such service involves the use of any item subject to the Regulations that has been or will be exported from the United States to India. For purposes of this paragraph, servicing means

installation, maintenance, repair, modification or testing.

*Third*, that, after notice and opportunity for comment as provided in Section 766.23 of the Regulations, any person, firm, corporation, or business organization related to the denied person by affiliation, ownership, control, or position of responsibility in the conduct of trade or related services may also be made subject to the provisions of this Order.

*Fourth*, that this Order does not prohibit any export, reexport, or other transaction subject to the Regulations where the only items involved that are subject to the Regulations are the foreign-produced direct product of U.S.-origin technology.

*Fifth*, that the proposed Charging Letter, the Settlement Agreement, and this Order shall be made available to the public.

This Order, which constitutes the final agency action in this matter, is effective immediately.

Entered this 15th day of March, 2001.

**Lisa A. Prager,**

*Acting Assistant Secretary for Export Enforcement.*

[FR Doc. 01-7387 Filed 3-23-01; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 3510-DT-M**

## DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

### International Trade Administration

[A-588-806]

#### Electrolytic Manganese Dioxide From Japan: 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 10, 2001, the Department of Commerce published the preliminary results of administrative review of the antidumping duty order on electrolytic manganese dioxide from Japan. The review covers one producer/exporter, Tosoh Corporation, during the period of review April 1, 1999, through December 31, 1999.

We gave interested parties an opportunity to comment on the preliminary results. We did not receive any comments. The review indicates the existence of no dumping margins for Tosoh Corporation during this period.

**EFFECTIVE DATE:** March 26, 2001.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Karin Ryerson or Richard Rimlinger,

Office of AD/CVD Enforcement 3, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, Washington, DC 20230; telephone: (202) 482-3174 or (202) 482-4477, respectively.

#### SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

#### The Applicable Statute and Regulations

Unless otherwise indicated, all citations to the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (the Act) are references to the provisions effective January 1, 1995, the effective date of the amendments made to the Act, by the Uruguay Round Agreements Act (URAA). In addition, unless otherwise indicated, all citations to the Department of Commerce's (the Department's) regulations are to 19 CFR part 351 (2000).

#### Background

On January 10, 2001, the Department published in the **Federal Register** the preliminary results of the administrative review of the antidumping duty order on electrolytic manganese dioxide (EMD) from Japan. See *Preliminary Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review: Electrolytic Manganese Dioxide from Japan*, 66 FR 1948 (January 10, 2001) (Preliminary Results).

#### Scope of Review

Imports covered by this review are shipments of EMD from Japan. EMD is manganese dioxide (MnO<sub>2</sub>) that has been refined in an electrolysis process. The subject merchandise is an intermediate product used in the production of dry-cell batteries. EMD is sold in three physical forms (powder, chip, or plate) and two grades (alkaline and zinc chloride). EMD in all three forms and both grades is included in the scope of the order. This merchandise is currently classifiable under item number 2820.10.0000 of the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States (HTSUS). The HTSUS number is provided for convenience and customs purposes. It is not determinative of the products subject to the order. The written product description remains dispositive.

#### Analysis of Comments Received

We received no comments from interested parties as a result of our preliminary results of review. Therefore, we are adopting those preliminary results as the final results of this review.

#### Sunset Revocation

On April 20, 2000, the International Trade Commission (ITC), pursuant to section 751(c) of the Act, determined that revocation of the antidumping duty