

Representatives, Secretary of Commerce William M. Daley stated that the Advanced Technology Program is critically important and provides enormous benefits to the United States' long-term economic prosperity. He noted that ATP projects planned, co-funded, and carried out by industry will play a special role in enabling technological developments that have long-term payoffs and widespread benefits for the economy.

Secretary Daley has instructed the Department of Commerce to review certain current policies and procedures of the ATP to determine if, after the six years of experience with the program, there are modifications that could further strengthen the program. In undertaking this review, the Department intends to consult with experts and interested parties, and to gather and analyze industry's experiences with the ATP. The outcome of this review will be incorporated in the Department's recommendations to the Secretary on possible modifications of the program which would increase its effectiveness.

#### Request for Public Comment

The Technology Administration has identified the following topics on which it requests public comments:

##### 1. Company Participation

Companies, both large and small, participate in the program in ways that offer broad based benefits as well as specific technology developments. The program pays only direct costs of single applicants while any indirect costs are borne by the company. Awards to single applicants are currently limited to a maximum of two million dollars and a three year period. Single applicant proposals often involve teaming arrangements, including subcontractors and business alliances, that in many ways resemble joint ventures.

Joint ventures currently require the participation of two or more for-profit organizations which contribute to both the R&D and the cost share. Participants in joint ventures contribute at least half of the total costs and are allowed to apply for projects of up to five years duration and with no limit on funding. The appropriateness of the budget is one of the elements examined in determining the score of applicants.

The program currently solicits proposals in both general competitions, open to all areas of technology, and in focused programs. The ATP develops focused programs by a process which identifies where a coordinated set of public-private technology partnerships could solve a major technology

challenge lending to economic benefits to the U.S.

Issues for comment include:

- Should large companies only participate as members of joint ventures or in other teaming arrangements?
- Should large companies who are single applicants be required to contribute a monetary cost share where current rules require them to pay only their indirect costs?
- Should the program simplify the rules by paying direct costs for both single applicants and joint ventures?
- Should teaming arrangements which do not meet the ATP requirements for joint venture funding but which apply as single applicants be allowed the same flexibility as joint ventures in the size and duration of their projects?
- Are there models for teaming arrangements other than these joint ventures that would work effectively for the ATP?
- Are there other advantages of the team building process involved in developing focused programs that are seen by industry as separate from the benefits of the specific ATP projects?
- What are the appropriate criteria to judge whether greater benefit would accrue by extending an existing focused program or by initiating a new one?
- Should participation in focused programs be limited to one competition after which further proposals would be evaluated as part of general competitions?

##### 2. Private Capital Markets

ATP projects are directed to high risk, enabling research and development that are typically conducted five to ten years before product commercialization. Such projects would not normally be able to secure private financing because of the long term nature of the work, the high risk, and the inability of any single investor to capture the wide range of potential technology uses from the early stage R&D.

- What are the possible sources of private funding available for such projects and how could those sources be made available to potential program applicants?

##### 3. Regional Distribution of Awards

Awards from the program are currently made on the basis of business and technical merit without regard to the geographic location of the participants. Some regions of the country have not received significant assistance from the program because they lack large numbers of R&D intensive companies.

- Are there mechanisms that the Department should explore to foster high quality proposals from companies in States that lack large numbers of R&D intensive companies?
- Should a separate program be set up specifically to aid States that are under-represented in the ATP and should it also apply to under-represented States in other Federal R&D programs?

##### 4. Other Assistance to Applicants

The program holds conferences and workshops to explain the goals and requirements of the program to potential applicants. Proposal requirements are kept to a minimum but larger, more experienced companies may be able to write effective proposals more easily.

- What additional information could ATP provide to potential applicants, particularly smaller companies, that would assist them in developing proposals?
- Should the ATP provide information to unsuccessful applicants about other possible sources of financial assistance to pursue R&D that is judged meritorious?

Dated: March 31, 1997.

**Mary L. Good,**

*Under Secretary for Technology.*

[FR Doc. 97-8608 Filed 4-3-97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-13-M

---

## DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

### Office of the Secretary

#### Submission for OMB Review; Comment Request

**ACTION:** Notice.

The Department of Defense has submitted to OMB for clearance, the following proposal for collection of information under the provisions of the Paperwork Reduction Act (44 U.S.C. Chapter 35).

*Title and Associated Form:* Defense Export Loan Guarantee (DELG) Program Application, DD Form 2747, OMB Number 0704-0391.

*Type of Request:* Extension.

*Number of Respondents:* 20.

*Responses Per Respondent:* 1.

*Annual Responses:* 20.

*Average Burden Per Response:* 1 hour.

*Annual Burden Hours:* 20.

*Needs and Uses:* This collection of information is necessary to review and process applications for loan guarantees issued under 10 U.S.C. 2540 for defense exports. Respondents are defense suppliers of exporters, lenders, or nations, who are requesting a DoD

guarantee of a private sector loan in support of the sale or loan terms lease, to certain eligible countries, of U.S. defense articles, services, or design and construction services. The completed form will enable the department to determine whether the proposed transaction meets statutory guidance for program implementation.

*Affected Public:* Business or Other For-Profit.

*Frequency:* On occasion.

*Respondent's Obligation:* Required to obtain or retain benefits.

*OMB Desk Officer:* Mr. Peter N. Weiss.

Written comments and recommendations on the proposed information collection should be sent to Mr. Weiss at the Office of Management and Budget, Desk Officer for DoD, Room 10236, New Executive Office Building, Washington, DC 20503.

*DOD Clearance Officer:* Mr. Robert Cushing.

Written requests for copies of the information collection proposal should be sent to Mr. Cushing, WHS/DIOR, 1215 Jefferson Davis Highway, Suite 1204, Arlington, VA 22202-4302.

Dated: March 31, 1997.

**Patricia L. Toppings,**

*Alternate OSD Federal Register, Liaison Officer, Department of Defense.*

[FR Doc. 97-8563 Filed 4-3-97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 5000-04-M

### **Defense Science Board Task Force Advanced Modeling and Simulation for Analyzing Combat Concepts in the 21st Century**

**ACTION:** Notice of advisory committee meetings.

**SUMMARY:** The Defense Science Board Task Force on Advanced Modeling and Simulation for Analyzing Combat Concepts in the 21st Century will meet in closed session on April 21-22, 1997 at USACOM, JTASC, 116 Lakeview Parkway, Suffolk, Virginia.

The mission of the Defense Science Board is to advise the Secretary of Defense through the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition and Technology on scientific and technical matters as they affect the perceived needs of the Department of Defense. At this meeting the Task Force will address modeling and simulation capabilities required for analyzing concepts for 21st century military combat operations. These capabilities should encompass the breadth of warfare from strategic to individuals fighting afoot for all phases of military operations (Air, Land, Sea, Information, Communications).

In accordance with Section 10(d) of the Federal Advisory Committee Act, P.L. No. 92-463, as amended (5 U.S.C. App. II, (1994)), it has been determined that this DSB Task Force meeting concerns matters listed in 5 U.S.C. § 552b(c) (1) (1994), and that accordingly this meeting will be closed to the public.

Dated: April 1, 1997.

**L.M. Bynum,**

*Alternate OSD Federal Register Liaison Officer, Department of Defense.*

[FR Doc. 97-8609 Filed 4-3-97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 5000-4-M

### **Department of the Army**

#### **Final Environmental Impact Statement (FEIS) for the Relocation of the U.S. Army Military Police School and the U.S. Army Chemical School to Fort Leonard Wood, Missouri**

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

**ACTION:** Notice of availability.

**SUMMARY:** In compliance with the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (NEPA) and the President's Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ), the Army has prepared an FEIS for the directed relocation of the U.S. Army Chemical School and U.S. Army Military Police School from Fort McClellan, Alabama, to Fort Leonard Wood, Missouri. The relocation is part of the approved 1995 Base Closure and Realignment actions mandated by the Base Closure and Realignment Act of 1990 (Pub. L. 101-510), and subsequent actions in compliance with this law. Therefore, the FEIS focuses on alternative methods of implementing these BRAC actions at Fort Leonard Wood. The FEIS describes the proposed action which involves the relocation of military mission activities, construction of support facilities, and relocation of personnel to Fort Leonard Wood.

Alternatives considered for realignment of the BRAC training missions include the: No. Action Alternative; Relocate Current Practice (RCP) Alternative; Optimum Training Method (OPTM) Alternative; and the Environmentally Preferred Training Method (EPTM) Alternative. Alternatives considered for providing required support facilities include the No Action Alternative, and three land use and facility siting implementation alternatives. The final element of the planned action, realignment of associated personnel, is considered in the context of a: No Action Alternative; and Total Early, Total Late, and Phased Move Alternatives. The Army has

identified their Preferred Action in the FEIS which includes implementation of the OPTM Alternative for realigning training missions, the Combined Headquarters and Instruction Land Use and Facility Plan Alternative to provide required support facilities, and the Phased Move Alternative to relocate personnel from Fort McClellan.

Based on the analysis included in this FEIS, adverse impacts that would occur as a result of implementing the Army's proposed BRAC actions at Fort Leonard Wood include: A reduction of air quality as a result of fog oil obscuring training; training activities and tree clearing that result in a "may effect" finding to Federally listed threatened and endangered species; the potential for loss of soil resources and accelerated erosion resulting from BRAC construction projects; the release of unburned fuel that could impact soil and water resources at the expedient flame range; and human health risks for trainers and military students involved with obscure training. Beneficial impacts include increased operational efficiency and training effectiveness associated with the collocation of the Engineer School, the Military Police School and the Chemical School; short-term economic gains associated with BRAC construction activities; and long-term economic gains associated with the transfer of the Chemical School and Military Police School missions to Fort Leonard Wood.

#### **FEIS Distribution and Waiting Period**

Copies of the FEIS have been forwarded to Federal, State and local agencies; organizations; and individuals who provided substantive comments on the Draft EIS, or who previously requested a copy of the FEIS. These copies were distributed prior to, or simultaneously with, the filing of this Notice of Availability for the FEIS with the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. Copies of the FEIS are available for review at the following public and other libraries: Kinderhook Regional Library, Lebanon, Missouri; Kinderhook Regional Library, Waynesville, Missouri; Rolla Public Library, Rolla, Missouri; Kansas City Public Library, Kansas City, Missouri; St. Louis County Library, Main Branch, St. Louis, Missouri; Clarke Engineer School Library, Fort Leonard Wood, Missouri; Texas County Library, Houston, Missouri; Daniel Boone Regional Library, Columbia, Missouri; Missouri River Regional Library, Jefferson City, Missouri; Springfield-Greene County Library, Springfield, Missouri; and Fisher Library, Fort McClellan, Alabama. Following a 30-day post-filing