

GENERAL ACCOUNTING OFFICE**Federal Accounting Standards Advisory Board****AGENCY:** General Accounting Office.**ACTION:** Request for Comment on Exposure Draft.

SUMMARY: The Federal Accounting Standards Advisory Board (FASAB) has published for comment an exposure draft of a proposed statement of recommended federal accounting standards that would amend Statement of Federal Financial Accounting Standards No. 7, Accounting for Revenue and Other Financing Sources. The exposure draft is titled Deletion of Paragraph 65.2—Material Revenue-Related Transactions Disclosures. The exposure draft explains why the Board believes that this subparagraph should be deleted and presents the alternative view of one Board member. Comments are requested by December 12, 1998. Comments should be directed to Wendy Comes, Executive Director, at the address shown in the exposure draft. Copies of the exposure draft may be obtained by calling FASAB at (202) 512-7350, by faxing a request to (202) 512-7366, or at <http://www.financenet.gov/financenet/fed/fasab/deletion.pdf>.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Robert Bramlett, Assistant Director, 441 G St., NW, Room 3B18, Washington, DC 20548, or call (202) 512-7355.

Authority: Federal Advisory Committee Act, Pub. L. 92-463, sec. 10(a)(2), 86 Stat. 770, 774 (1972) (current version at 5 U.S.C. app. section 10(a)(2) (1988); 41 CFR 101-6.1015 (1990).

Dated: November 18, 1998.

Robert W. Bramlett,

Assistant Director.

[FR Doc. 98-31262 Filed 11-20-98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 1610-01-M

GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION**[OMB Control No. 3090-0235]****Submission for OMB Review; Comment Request Entitled Price Reductions Clause****AGENCY:** Office of Acquisition Policy, GSA.**ACTION:** Notice of request for an extension to a previously approved OMB Clearance (3090-0235).

SUMMARY: Under the provisions of the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (44 U.S.C. Chapter 35), the Office of

Acquisition Policy has submitted to the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) a request to review and approve an extension of a previously approved information collection requirement concerning Price Reductions clause. The information collection was previously published in the **Federal Register** on June 19, 1998 at 63 FR 33667, allowing for a 60-day public comment period. Public comments were received from the Coalition for Government Procurement and the Information Technology Services Council.

Following is a summary of the comments GSA received and GSA's response.

1. The Price Reduction clause is an administrative and financial burden.

The clause was significantly streamlined when modified in 1994. Other administrative requirements were also relaxed or deleted. The clause requires submission of information in only very limited circumstances. The only monitoring required by the clause is for sales to the designated customer or class of customer. No special format or periodic reporting is required. GSA contacted a sampling of potential respondents (small and large business MAS contractors), from various schedules to determine the estimated annual burden. It found the average number of times the information is reported each year is 2 times with an estimated time of 15 hours. Several of the small businesses consulted said the clause was not a burden. The Price Reduction clause is a key safeguard that has been built into the MAS procurement process to protect against loss of taxpayer dollars.

2. The Price Reduction clause is not necessary to ensure price reasonableness on MAS contracts.

The clause simply assures that the government maintains throughout the life of the contract the relative price/discount advantage negotiated in relation to the contractor's commercial customer upon which the contract award is predicated.

The clause provides that if a contractor sells any item covered by a comparable type contract at a price below the negotiated MAS contract price to the identified comparable customer, then the contractor must give the government an equivalent price reduction on all subsequent government orders for the balance of the contract period or until the price is furthered reduced.

Without a mechanism such as the Price Reduction clause to ensure that a balance between government prices and commercial prices is maintained there are no assurances of continued price

reasonableness under the contract. The only reasonable alternative would be to have shorter contracts and negotiate more frequently, imposing a greater burden on the contractor. To eliminate such a clause would be to eliminate an important means by which the government insures that it receives the best pricing. Most MAS contracts are often three to five years in length; price reductions insure that the government is receiving current market prices in response to changes in market demand and technology. The existence of the price reduction clause helps allow MAS contracts to be of longer duration than the more typical one-year supply contract. Absent such a clause, the government would be forced to enter into contracts of shorter duration in order to maintain current pricing. The administrative costs and other burdens associated with more frequent negotiations would be increased for contractors and government alike.

3. The Price Reduction clause is not consistent with commercial practice.

GSA acknowledges that there are differences of opinion with industry with regard to the Price Reductions clause being consistent with commercial practice, however, there are similar type arrangements in private industry. GSA's Office of Inspector General (OIG) has found that price reduction requirements, in fact, are standard commercial practice for many large volume purchasers. The OIG has found commercial agreements that contained provisions by which a seller would commit to giving the buyer the benefit of any decreases in prices for the subject products during the term of the agreement.

DATES: Comment Due Date: December 23, 1998.

ADDRESSES: Additional comments regarding this burden estimate or any other aspect of this collection of information, including suggestions for reducing this burden, should be submitted to: Edward Springer, GSA Desk Officer, Room 3235, NEOB, Washington, DC 20503 and also may be submitted to Marjorie Ashby, General Services Administration (MVP), 1800 F Street NW, Washington, DC 20405.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Al Matera, Office of GSA Acquisition Policy (202) 501-1224.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:**A. Purpose**

The GSA is requesting the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) to review and approve information collection, 3090-0235, concerning the Price Reductions clause. The Price

Reductions clause used in multiple award schedule contracts ensures that the Government maintains its relationship with the contractor's customer or category of customers, upon which the contract is predicated.

B. Annual Reporting Burden

Respondents: 6,862; annual responses: 13,724; average hours per response: 7.5; burden hours: 102,930.

Copy of Proposal: A copy of this proposal may be obtained from the GSA Acquisition Policy Division (MVP), Room 4011, GSA Building, 1800 F Street NW, Washington, DC 20405, or by telephoning (202) 501-3822, or by faxing your request to (202) 501-3341.

Dated: November 17, 1998.

Ida M. Ustad,

Deputy Associate Administrator, Office of Acquisition Policy.

[FR Doc. 98-31264 Filed 11-20-98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6820-61-M

GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION

Public Buildings Service, Region 10; Notice of Intent To Prepare an Environmental Assessment/ Environmental Impact Statement

ACTION: The US General Services Administration (GSA) hereby gives notice that it intends to prepare an Environmental Assessment (EA) or Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) pursuant to the requirements of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) of 1969, and the President's Council on Environmental Quality Regulations (40 CFR parts 1500-1508), for the construction of a new Federal Courthouse in Eugene, Lane County, Oregon.

Procedures: The EA will be prepared at the completion of, and based upon, a scoping report. The EA will evaluate the proposed project, including all reasonable alternatives identified through the scoping process and a no-action alternative. Scoping will be accomplished through direct mailing correspondence to interested persons, agencies, and organizations and through two Public Scoping Meetings. The public scoping meetings will be held on December 14th and 15th, 1998 at the Hilton Hotel, 66 East 6th Ave., Eugene, OR, in the Joplin/Seeger Conference Room at 6:00 pm following an open house beginning at 5:30 pm. GSA will publish a public notice of these meetings in Eugene newspapers approximately two weeks prior to the events.

After the EA is prepared, it will be made available for public review. If significant impacts are not identified in the EA, GSA will issue a Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI).

If, upon completion of the EA, significant impacts to the environment are identified, GSA will prepare an Environmental Impact Statement. Public meetings will be held after the release of the Draft Environmental Impact Statement and GSA will respond to all relevant comments received during the 45-day public comment period in the Final Environmental Impact Statement. After a minimum 30-day period following publication of the Final Environmental Impact Statement GSA will issue a Record of Decision that will identify the site selected.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: GSA, assisted by Herrera Environmental Consultants, is anticipating the preparation of an Environmental Assessment or Environmental Impact Statement to acquire a site, design, and construct a new US Courthouse in Eugene, Oregon. GSA will serve as the lead agency and scoping will be conducted consistent with NEPA regulations and guidelines. GSA invites interested individuals, organizations, and federal, state, and local agencies to participate in defining and identifying any significant impacts and issues to be studied in the EA, including social, economic, or environmental concerns. Scoping should be limited to identifying significant issues to be analyzed in the environmental document and commenting on alternatives and the merit of the proposal.

Project Purpose, Historical Background, and Description

The District Judges, Magistrates, and US Marshals are currently located in the existing US Courthouse. Bankruptcy and other Court related Agencies are located in leased space in downtown Eugene. The existing Courthouse does not currently meet the requirements of the US Court's Design guide. The existing Courthouse/Federal Building complex cannot be adapted to accommodate the required space needs of both the Court and Agency tenants.

Congress has authorized GSA to acquire a site for construction of a new US Courthouse in Eugene. The approximate gross overall square feet planned for the project is 265-290 for all US District Court and Bankruptcy Court activities in Eugene, Oregon.

Alternatives: The EA/EIS will examine the short- and long-term impacts on the natural and physical environment. The impact assessment will include but not be limited to

impacts such as social environment, changes in land use, aesthetics, changes in traffic and parking patterns, economic impacts, and consideration of City planning and zoning requirements.

The EA/EIS will examine measures to mitigate significant adverse impacts resulting from the proposed action. Concurrent with NEPA implementation, GSA will also implement its consultation responsibilities under Section 106 of the National Historical Preservation Act to identify potential impacts to existing historic or cultural resources.

The EA/EIS will consider a no-action alternative and action alternatives. The no-action alternative would continue the occupancy in the existing Courthouse and continue to lease Court space in Eugene. The action alternatives will consist of different sites and configurations for construction of a new building in the delineated area in downtown Eugene. The delineated area includes a portion of the centralized business area. The delineated area includes property that is adjacent to the boundaries of the delineated area. The delineated area is as follows:

Bounded on the north by 5th Avenue, on the east by High Street, on the south by Broadway, and by Olive Street on the west.

ADDRESSES: In addition to the public scoping process, please send your written comments on the scope of alternatives and potential impacts to the following address: Michael D. Levine, Regional Environmental Program Manager, 10PCB, General Services Administration, 400 15th Street SW, Auburn, WA, 98001, or fax: Michael D. Levine at 253-931-7308, or e-mail at Michael.Levine@GSA.GOV. Written comments should be received no later than January 7, 1999.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Nona Diediker at Herrera Environmental Consultants, 2200 Sixth Ave, Suite 601, Seattle, Washington, 98121 or call 206-441-9080; or Michael D. Levine, GSA (253) 931-7263.

Mailing List: If you wished to be placed on the project mailing list to receive further information as the EA process develops, contact Nona Diediker at the address noted above.

Dated: November 13, 1998.

L. Jay Pearson,

Regional Administrator (10A).

[FR Doc. 98-31265 Filed 11-20-98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6820-BR-M