

Ordered, that the Settlement Agreement and Order be and hereby is accepted, as indicated below; and it is

Further ordered, that Respondent pay to the United States Treasury a civil penalty of one hundred fifty thousand dollars (\$150,000.00) within twenty (20) days after service upon Respondent of the Final Order.

Provisionally accepted and Provisional Order issued on the 29th day of January 1998.

By order of the Commission,  
Sadye E. Dunn,

Secretary, Consumer Product Safety  
Commission.

[FR Doc. 98-2753 Filed 2-3-98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6355-01-M

## DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

### [OMB Control Number 0704-0332]

#### Information Collection Requirements; DoD Pilot Mentor-Protégé Program

**AGENCY:** Department of Defense (DoD).

**ACTION:** Notice and request for comments regarding a proposed extension of an approved information collection requirement.

**SUMMARY:** In compliance with Section 3506(c)(2)(A) of the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (44 U.S.C. Chapter 35), DoD announces the proposed extension of a public information collection and seeks public comment on the provisions thereof. Comments are invited on: (a) Whether the proposed collection of information is necessary for the proper performance of the functions of DoD, including whether the information will have practical utility; (b) the accuracy of the estimate of the burden of the proposed information collection; (c) ways to enhance the quality, utility, and clarity of the information to be collected; and (d) ways to minimize the burden of the information collection on respondents, including the use of automated collection techniques or other forms of information technology. This information collection requirement is currently approved by the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) for use through July 31, 1998, under OMB Control Number 0704-0332. DoD proposes that OMB extend its approval for use through July 31, 2001.

**DATES:** Consideration will be given to all comments received by April 6, 1998.

**ADDRESSES:** Written comments and recommendations on the proposed information collection should be sent to: Defense Acquisition Regulations Council, Attn: Mrs. Susan L. Schneider, PDUSD(A&T) DP(DAR), IMD 3D139,

3062 Defense Pentagon, Washington, D.C. 20301-3062. Telefax number (703) 602-0350. E-mail comments submitted over the Internet should be addressed to: dfars@acq.osd.mil. Please cite OMB Control Number 0704-0332 in all correspondence related to this issue. E-mail comments should cite OMB Control Number 0704-0332 in the subject line.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Mrs. Susan L. Schnieder, (703) 602-0131. A copy of the information collection requirement is available electronically via the Internet at: <http://www.dtic.mil/dfars/>. Paper copies of the information collection requirement may be obtained from Mrs. Susan L. Schnieder, PDUSD (A&T) DP(DAR), IMD 3D129, 3062 Defense Pentagon, Washington, D.C. 20301-3062.

#### SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

*Title, Associated Forms, and Associated OMB Control Number:* Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement (DFARS) Appendix I, Department of Defense Pilot Mentor-Protégé Program; OMB Control Number 0704-0332.

*Needs and Uses:* In order to evaluate whether the purposes of the DoD Pilot Mentor-Protégé Program (established under Section 831 of Public Law 101-510, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1991, as amended) have been attained, Appendix I of the DFARS requires that companies participating in the Program, as mentors, keep records and report on progress in achieving the developmental assistance objectives under each mentor-protégé agreement. Participation in the Program is voluntary and is open to companies with at least one active subcontracting plan negotiated with DoD or another Federal agency. The report is used by the Government to assess whether the purposes of the Program have been attained.

*Affected Public:* Businesses or other for-profit organizations.

*Annual Burden Hours:* 496 (Includes 248 recordkeeping hours).

*Number of Respondents:* 124.

*Responses Per Respondent:* 2.

*Annual Responses:* 248.

*Average Burden per Response:* 1 hour response; 2 hours recordkeeping.

*Frequency:* Semiannually.

#### Summary of Information Collection

The information collection includes requirements related to evaluation of the DoD Pilot Mentor-Protégé Program. DFARS Appendix I-III, Reporting requirements and program reviews, prescribes how mentor firms shall report on the progress made under

active mentor-protégé agreements. It requires mentor firms to report semiannually by attaching to their SF 295, Summary Subcontract Report—

a. A statement that includes the number of active mentor-protégé agreements in effect and the progress in achieving development assistance objectives under each agreement; and

b. A copy of the SF 294, Subcontracting Report for Individual Contracts, for each contract where developmental assistance was credited, with a statement identifying the amount of dollars credited to the small disadvantaged business subcontract goal as a result of developmental assistance; an explanation as to the relationship between the developmental assistance provided the protégé firm(s) under the Program and the activities under the contract covered by the SF 294(s); and the number and dollar value of subcontracts awarded to the protégé firms(s).

**Michele P. Peterson,**

Executive Editor, Defense Acquisition  
Regulations Council.

[FR Doc. 98-2648 Filed 2-3-98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 5000-04-M

## DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

### Department of the Army

#### Environmental Assessment and Finding of No Significant Impact for the Disposal and Reuse of the Manhattan Beach Stand Alone Housing Complex, New York City, New York

**AGENCY:** Department of the Army, DoD.

**ACTION:** Notice of availability.

**SUMMARY:** In compliance with the National Environmental Policy Act and its implementing regulations promulgated by the President's Council on Environmental Quality, the Army has prepared a Finding of No Significant Impact (FNSI) pertaining to the Environmental Assessment (EA) for disposal and reuse of the Manhattan Beach Stand Alone Housing Complex, New York City, New York. In the FNSI, the Army states its intention to dispose of excess property resulting from the closure of the Manhattan Beach Stand Alone Housing Complex.

In accordance with the Defense Authorization Amendments and Base Closure and Realignment Act of October 1988, Pub. L. 100-526, as amended, the Secretary of Defense's Commission on Base Realignment and Closure required the closure of 53 stand alone family housing installations, including the Manhattan Beach Stand Alone Housing Complex.

A 1990 EA identified, documented, and evaluated the environmental and socioeconomic effects of closure of the 53 stand alone housing installations.

This EA supplements the 1990 EA and analyzes the disposal and reuse of the Manhattan Beach Housing Complex.

The EA examines potential impacts of the proposed action, the disposal and reuse of the property, on 13 resource areas and areas of environmental concern: land use, air quality, noise, water resources, geology, infrastructure, hazardous and toxic materials, biological resources and ecosystems, cultural resources, the socioeconomic environment, environment justice, economic development, and quality of life. Additionally, the EA analyzed the potential impacts of the no action alternative—retaining the property in caretaker status.

Based on the analysis found in the EA it has been determined that no significant or cumulatively significant impacts on the quality of the natural or human environment are anticipated from the disposal of the Manhattan Beach Stand Alone Housing Complex.

Consistent with the President's Five-Point Initiative to Revitalize Base Closure Communities, which is intended to foster economic development and job creation, the Army intends to transfer the excess property to Kingsborough Community College via a public benefit conveyance for use as an educational center.

**DATES:** Comments must be submitted on or before March 6, 1998.

**ADDRESSES:** Copies of the EA and FNSI can be obtained by contacting the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Mobile District, ATTN: CESAM-PD-ED (Mr. Doug Nester), P.O. Box 2288, Mobile, Alabama 36628-0001 or by telephone at (334) 694-3854.

Dated: January 28, 1998.

**Denzel L. Fisher,**

*Acting Deputy Assistant Secretary of the Army, (Environment, Safety and Occupational Health), OASA(I,L&E).*

[FR Doc. 98-2685 Filed 2-3-98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3710-08-M

## DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

### Department of the Army

#### All-Terrain Lifter, Army System (ATLAS)

**AGENCY:** U.S. Army Tank-automotive and Armaments Command, DoD.

**ACTION:** Notice of intent.

**SUMMARY:** The Product Manager, Construction Equipment/Material

Handling Equipment (PM CE/MHE) has prepared a Life-Cycle Environmental Assessment (LCEA) which examines the potential impacts to the natural and human environment from the life cycle activities of the All-Terrain Lifter, Army System (ATLAS). Based on the LCEA, PM CE/MHE has determined that the proposed action is not a major Federal action significantly affecting the quality of the human environment, within the meaning of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) of 1969. Therefore, the preparation of an environmental impact statement is not required and the Army is issuing this Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI).

**ADDRESSES:** Written comments should be sent to, U.S. Army Tank-automotive and Armaments Command (TACOM), ATTN: AMSTA-DSA-TA-CE (ATLAS), Warren, MI 48397-5000.

#### FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

For further information, or to obtain a copy of the ATLAS Life-Cycle Environmental Assessment contact Mr. John Syers, Assistant Product Manager (810) 574-8869.

#### SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

##### a. Proposed Action

This LCEA examines the potential impacts to the natural and human environment from the procurement of the ATLAS to satisfy the Army's need for an improved all-terrain forklift for Combat Service (CS) and Combat Service Support (CSS) units, based on the issue 13.9 (Lack of MHE Capability) of the Total Distribution Action Plan and identified in task B-11 of the Army Strategic Mobility Program. A major change was made to the ATLAS Operational Requirements Document (ORD) in November 1993 reducing the forklift's maximum speed of 45 mph, reducing its cross-country mobility, and eliminating the ATLAS requirement to handle Multiple Launch Rocket System (MLRS) pods. The ORD changes also deleted the requirement for replacement of the 4,000 lb Rough Terrain Fork Lift (RTFL) and 6,000 lb Variable Reach Rough Terrain Fork Lift (VRRTFL) with the ATLAS. In January 1995, an additional ORD change deleted the requirement for the ATLAS to be NBC contamination survivable IAW AR 70-71. The revised requirement resulted in the adoption of an NDI acquisition approach to satisfy the revised ATLAS requirements. A market investigation supported the June 1994 special IPR approving the ATLAS program as a Non-Developmental Item (NDI) Component Integration acquisition.

##### b. Environmental Impacts

The ATLAS life-cycle includes the transport of vehicles to test sites, testing, vehicle production, deployment and operation of production vehicles and their eventual demilitarization. Potential environmental impacts of these life-cycle stages may include Air Quality, Noise, Water, Soil and Groundwater, Hazardous Materials and Hazardous Wastes, and Flora, Fauna and Threatened or Endangered Species at each of these life-cycle phases.

##### c. Additional Findings

Impacts from the proposed action would be minimal and not significant for the following reasons:

(1) The ATLAS will be used in its intended environment. This intended environment includes vehicle production and some testing at the Contractor's facility, and the remainder of life-cycle activities at Army installations and facilities.

(2) The ATLAS is very similar to vehicles produced commercially and vehicles already in the Army inventory. It is being produced in low to moderate quantities and will not significantly increase the vehicle population at Army installations and facilities.

(3) The overall environmental risk associated with the ATLAS is low. It does not introduce any new technologies or processes. Vehicle life cycle activities do not introduce any potential environmental impacts that are not already currently mitigated by Army policy and procedures.

(4) The ATLAS Product Manager has ensured that the Contractor producing the vehicle is environmentally compliant, has no permit violations, and has commercial practices for Hazardous Material Management and Pollution Prevention in production of the ATLAS.

(5) The ATLAS Product Manager recognizes that Army installations and facilities have environmental plans and measures in place to address vehicle life cycle activities very similar to that of the ATLAS to prevent, mitigate and remediate environmental damage caused by vehicle operation. Vehicle operations at these Army installations and facilities are in conjunction with normal activities that are already addressed in their site specific environmental impact statements.

##### d. Determination

It is therefore concluded that this program:

(1) Is not a major federal action significantly affecting the quality of human environment.

(2) Will not have a significant impact on the environment.