

Firm name	Address	Date petition accepted	Product
Gilbert & Nash Company, Inc	1100 Prospect Lane, Kaukauna, WI 54130.	08/14/98	Guiding and tensioning equipment for endless fabrics.

The petitions were submitted pursuant to Section 251 of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2341). Consequently, the United States Department of Commerce has initiated separate investigations to determine whether increased imports into the United States of articles like or directly competitive with those produced by each firm contributed importantly to total or partial separation of the firm's workers, or threat thereof, and to a decrease in sales or production of each petitioning firm.

Any party having a substantial interest in the proceedings may request a public hearing on the matter. A request for a hearing must be received by Trade Adjustment Assistance, Room 7315, Economic Development Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, Washington, DC 20230, no later than the close of business of the tenth calendar day following the publication of this notice.

The Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance official program number and title of the program under which these petitions are submitted is 11.313, Trade Adjustment Assistance.

Dated: August 19, 1998.

Anthony J. Meyer,

Coordinator, Trade Adjustment and Technical Assistance.

[FR Doc. 98-22859 Filed 8-25-98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-24-M

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

National Institute of Standards and Technology

Announcement of an Opportunity To Join a Cooperative Research and Development Consortium for Single-Crystal Reference Materials

AGENCY: National Institute of Standards and Technology.

ACTION: Notice of public meeting.

SUMMARY: The National Institute of Standards and Technology invites interested parties to attend a meeting on September 15, 1998, in the Santa Clara, CA area or on September 29, 1998 in the Gaithersburg, MD area to discuss setting up a cooperative research consortium. The goal of the consortium is to achieve commercially available reference standards to support CD-metrology

below 0.25 microns. Parties participating in the consortium will be loaned a pre-measured prototype sample for evaluation.

The program will be within the scope and confines of The Federal Technology Transfer Act of 1986 (Pub. L. 99-502, 15 U.S.C. 3710a), which provides federal laboratories including NIST with the authority to enter into cooperative research agreements with qualified parties. Under this law, NIST may contribute personnel, equipment, and facilities—but no funds—to the cooperative research program.

Members will be expected to make a contribution to the consortium's efforts in the form of personnel and funds to cover operating expenses. This is not a grant program. Interested parties should contact NIST at least one week prior to the meeting to confirm their interest at the address, telephone number, or FAX number shown below.

DATES: The meeting will take place on September 15, 1998, in the Santa Clara, CA area or on September 29, 1998 in the Gaithersburg, MD area. Interested parties should contact NIST to confirm their interest at the address, telephone number or FAX number shown below.

ADDRESSES: The meeting in the Santa Clara area on September 15, 1998, will be held at the Hotel Sofitel, San Francisco Bay, 223 Twin Dolphin Drive, Redwood City, California 94065-1514. The meeting in Gaithersburg on September 29, 1998, will be held at the National Institute of Standards and Technology (NIST), Technology Building (225) Room A-362, Gaithersburg, MD, 20899.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Dr. Michael W. Cresswell, Building 225, Room B360, National Institute of Standards and Technology, Gaithersburg, MD 20899-0001, Telephone: 301-975-2052, FAX: 301-948-4081, Email: consortium@pipers.eeel.nist.gov.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: NIST and Sandia National Laboratories, with assistance from SEMATECH, have successfully fabricated and tested prototypes of a new class of reference materials to support CD-metrology below 0.25 microns with eventual application to 0.10 microns. This work has the long-term goal of the commercial availability of certified physical standards traceable to NIST. As

a result of the multiple requests for sample prototypes for evaluative purposes that they have received, NIST and Sandia management have proposed a consortium to maximize the benefits of exchanging measurement results made independently by a diverse group of participants, each of whom will be loaned a pre-measured prototype sample for evaluation. This consortium is an extension of a previously organized consortium in which test samples fabricated by a Separation by the Implantation of Oxygen (SIMOX) technique were evaluated. The proposed consortium will utilize test samples fabricated by the Bond and Etch-back Silicon-On-Insulator (BESOI) technique which are expected to yield superior results. The purpose of the above meeting is to describe the chip layout and reference-feature construction, to review the CD-measurement results already extracted from previous test chips by NIST and Sandia, and to explain the CRADA (Cooperative Research and Development Agreement) rules which will apply to the consortium. Each participating organization will be requested to make an illustrated presentation of its CD-measurement results at a closed meeting to be held at an agreed-upon meeting location and time.

Organizations will be asked to contribute a nominal fee in order to participate.

Dated: August 20, 1998.

Robert E. Hebner,

Acting Deputy Director.

[FR Doc. 98-22881 Filed 8-25-98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-13-M

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

Department of the Navy

Record of Decision for the Disposal and Reuse of Naval Medical Center Oakland, CA

Summary: The Department of the Navy (Navy), pursuant to Section 102(2)(C) of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (NEPA), 42 U.S.C. 4332(2)(C), and the regulations of the Council on Environmental Quality that implement NEPA procedures, 40 CFR Parts 1500-1508, hereby announces its decision to dispose of Naval Medical Center (NMC) Oakland, California.

Navy and the City of Oakland analyzed the impacts of disposal and reuse of the NMC Oakland property in a Joint Environmental Impact Statement/Environmental Impact Report (EIS/EIR), as required by NEPA and the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), Cal. Pub. Res. Code, section 21000, *et seq.*, as amended. The City of Oakland is responsible for compliance with CEQA. In the EIS/EIR process, Navy analyzed four reuse alternatives and identified the Maximum Capacity Alternative as the Preferred Alternative.

Navy intends to dispose of the property in a manner that is consistent with the Preferred Alternative. The Preferred Alternative proposed a mix of land uses composed of residential structures, community meeting facilities, retail businesses, active recreational areas with a nine-hole golf course and driving range, athletic fields, and open space.

The Oakland Base Reuse Authority (OBRA) is the Local Redevelopment Authority (LRA) for NMC Oakland and was responsible for planning reuse of the Naval facilities. During its development of alternatives, OBRA asked Navy and the City of Oakland to evaluate the Maximum Capacity Alternative. This alternative proposed a more intensive reuse of the NMC Oakland property than OBRA ultimately adopted in its Final Reuse Plan that was published in August 1996.

In deciding to dispose of NMC Oakland in a manner consistent with the Preferred Alternative, Navy has determined that a mixed land use will meet the local economic redevelopment goals of providing housing and recreational resources while also limiting adverse environmental impacts and ensuring land uses that are compatible with adjacent property. This Record of Decision does not mandate a specific mix of land uses. Rather, it leaves selection of the particular means to achieve the proposed redevelopment to the acquiring entity and the local zoning authority.

Background: Naval Medical Center Oakland, known as Oak Knoll Naval Hospital, is located in the City of Oakland, California, about 17 miles east of the City of San Francisco and about nine miles southeast of Oakland's central business district. This 183-acre property has about 135 acres of developed land on which the main hospital building, five concrete buildings, 20 wood buildings, 25 miscellaneous structures, and 38 family housing structures are situated. There are about 48 acres of undeveloped open space. Much of the NMC property consists of hilly terrain, and about 70

percent of the site contains slopes steeper than 15 percent.

Under the authority of the Defense Base Closure and Realignment Act of 1990, Public Law 101-510, 10 U.S.C. 2687 note, the 1993 Defense Base Closure and Realignment Commission recommended closure of the Naval Hospital at Oakland, California. This recommendation was approved by President Clinton and accepted by the One Hundred Third Congress in 1993. Navy closed NMC Oakland on September 30, 1996.

During the Federal screening process for NMC Oakland, two Federal agencies within the United States Department of Justice, the Federal Bureau of Prisons and the Immigration and Naturalization Service, expressed interest in base closure property at NMC Oakland but subsequently withdrew their requests. Navy declared the NMC Oakland property surplus to the needs of the Federal Government on March 13, 1995.

Navy published a Notice of Intent in the **Federal Register** on September 12, 1995, announcing that Navy and the City of Oakland would prepare a Joint EIS/EIR to analyze the impacts of disposal and reuse of the land, buildings, and infrastructure at NMC Oakland. A public scoping meeting was held at NMC Oakland on September 27, 1995, and the scoping process concluded on October 12, 1995.

On October 11, 1996, Navy and the City of Oakland distributed a Draft EIS/EIR to Federal, State, and local agencies, interested parties, and the general public. On November 13, 1996, Navy and the City of Oakland held a public hearing concerning the Draft EIS/EIR at Oakland City Hall. During the 45-day review period following publication of the Draft EIS/EIR, Federal, State, and local agencies, community groups and associations, and the general public submitted oral and written comments concerning the Draft EIS/EIR. These comments and Navy's responses were incorporated in the Final EIS/EIR that was distributed to the public on May 1, 1998, for a 30-day review period that concluded on June 1, 1998. Navy received three letters concerning the Final EIS/EIR.

Alternatives: NEPA requires Navy to evaluate a reasonable range of alternatives for the disposal and reuse of this surplus Federal property. In the NEPA process, Navy analyzed the environmental impacts of four "action" alternatives. Navy also evaluated a "No action" alternative that would leave the property in a caretaker status with Navy maintaining the physical condition of the property, providing a security force, and making repairs essential to safety.

In November 1993, the Oakland City Council established the Oakland Base Closure/Conversion Task Force. On March 21, 1995, the City of Oakland, the Redevelopment Agency of the City of Oakland, and the County of Alameda entered into a Joint Powers Agreement that established the Oakland Base Reuse Authority to plan reuse of the Naval Hospital, and OBRA was designated as the Local Redevelopment Authority for NMC Oakland. The City of Oakland is the zoning authority for the property.

In August 1995, OBRA submitted the Oak Knoll Reuse Plan Preliminary Alternatives report that proposed four alternatives: the Mixed Use Village Alternative, the Single Use Campus Alternative, the Residential Alternative and the Seniors/Community Alternative which OBRA later eliminated. By way of a letter dated December 18, 1995, OBRA informed Navy that it had added another alternative designated as the Maximum Capacity Alternative. The LRA identified the Maximum Capacity Alternative as the preliminary Preferred Alternative and asked Navy to evaluate this alternative in the EIS/EIR.

In August 1996, the Oakland Base Reuse Authority published the Final Reuse Plan for the Naval Medical Center, Oakland. The Final Reuse Plan proposed the same mix of land uses as the Maximum Capacity Alternative, but decreased the amount of housing and commercial development on the NMC property. Navy and the City of Oakland analyzed the Maximum Capacity Alternative, the Mixed Use Village Alternative, the Single Use Campus Alternative, and the Residential Alternative in the EIS/EIR process.

The first "action" alternative, the Maximum Capacity Alternative, was designated in the Final EIS/EIR as the Preferred Alternative and proposed more housing and commercial development than OBRA ultimately adopted in the Final Reuse Plan. The Preferred Alternative proposed a mix of land uses including residential structures, community meeting facilities, retail businesses, active recreational areas with a nine-hole golf course and driving range, athletic fields, and open space.

The western part of the property covers about 40 acres. In the Maximum Capacity Alternative, residential structures, retail businesses, and corporate offices would occupy 25 acres. Three hundred apartment units would be built on 15 of those 25 acres. Educational and cultural facilities would be situated on the remaining 15 acres in the western section of NMC Oakland.

The center of the property, separated from the western part by Rifle Range Creek, covers about 86 acres and would contain houses and the nine-hole golf course. Two hundred and fifty houses, consisting of single family houses and townhouses, would be built on 32 of the 86 acres. A public nine-hole golf course would be built on the remaining 54 acres.

While OBRA's December 1995 Maximum Capacity Alternative proposed to build sixteen single family homes on about five acres in the northeastern part of the property along the ridgeline at Keller Avenue, OBRA removed this proposal from the Final Reuse Plan and replaced it with open space. Nevertheless, Navy evaluated this potential residential use in the EIS/EIR to assess its impact on the environment.

The southern end of the NMC Oakland property, covering about 20 acres, would contain active recreational resources and houses. The former Club Knoll dining and meeting facility, a swimming pool, tennis courts, baseball and soccer fields, a picnic area, a driving range, and a clubhouse would occupy 15 acres at the site. Eighteen single family houses would be built on the remaining five acres in the southeastern part of the property.

Open space uses such as recreational trails, woodlands, wildlife habitat, and parkland would be distributed along the boundaries of the property and would cover 32 acres of land under the Maximum Capacity Alternative. Largely because of the terrain, it would not be possible to build structures on about 39 acres of NMC property under this alternative.

The second "action" alternative, described in the Final EIS/EIR as the Mixed Use Village Alternative, proposed a different mix of residential, community, commercial, active recreational, and open space areas from that advanced in the Preferred Alternative.

The Mixed Use Village Alternative would provide 23 acres for use as a mixed use redevelopment composed of townhouses, other housing units, a health and social services facility, and professional offices. About 12 acres would be used for research and development offices, laboratories, and meeting areas. Five acres would be used for a cultural or meeting facility such as a library, museum, or conference center. Five acres would be used for neighborhood commercial activities such as a supermarket, restaurants, and small shops. About 86 acres would be used for open space, and about eight acres would be used for active recreational activities. Largely because

of the terrain, it would not be possible to build structures on 44 acres of NMC property in this alternative.

The third "action" alternative, the Single Use Campus Alternative, proposed that a single large organization would occupy most of the developed areas of the NMC Oakland property. The Single Use Campus Alternative would provide 35 acres for use as an educational campus, conference facility or research headquarters. One acre would be used for neighborhood commercial activities such as restaurants and small shops. Active recreational areas would occupy 12 acres, and 101 acres would be reserved as open space. Largely because of the terrain, it would not be possible to build structures on 34 acres of NMC property in this alternative.

The fourth "action" alternative, the Residential Alternative, proposed to build single family houses similar to those in the surrounding residential neighborhood and to use the remaining property for retail businesses, active recreational areas, and open space. This alternative contained two options. Option 1, the low density option, proposed to construct 357 single family houses on 82 acres. Option 2, the high density option, proposed to construct 600 single family houses on 82 acres. Neighborhood commercial activities such as restaurants and small shops would occupy about two acres. About 14 acres would be used for active recreational activities, and 46 acres would be reserved as open space. Largely because of the terrain, it would not be possible to build structures on 39 acres of NMC property in this alternative.

Environmental Impacts: Navy analyzed the direct, indirect, and cumulative impacts from disposal of this Federal property on land use, socioeconomic, public services, cultural resources, aesthetics and scenic resources, biological resources, water resources, geology and soils, traffic and circulation, air quality, noise, utilities, and hazardous materials and waste.

The direct environmental impacts are those associated with Navy's proposed disposal of the NMC Oakland property and with the "No action" alternative. The indirect impacts are those associated with reuse of the NMC property. The cumulative impacts are those associated with other projects on other property in the immediate area. No significant direct impacts will result from Navy's proposed disposal of NMC Oakland. This Record of Decision focuses on the impacts that would likely result from implementing the Preferred Alternative.

The preferred Alternative would not cause any significant impact on land use. The proposed uses would not disturb existing land uses and would not introduce uses that are incompatible with either the NMC property or the surrounding area.

The Preferred Alternative would have an impact on Oakland Unified School District schools because it would generate an enrollment increase of about eight percent in the three public schools that serve the NMC Oakland area. This is a significant impact, because most schools in the District are presently operating at or near capacity.

The Preferred Alternative would have beneficial socioeconomic impacts. It would enhance the area's housing resources and provide additional recreational facilities and areas for the public such as the golf course, swimming pool, tennis courts, athletic fields and parkland as well as generate some additional jobs.

The Preferred Alternative would not require additional police facilities or increase emergency response times. It would, however, increase the demand for police services and create the need for additional police. This is a significant impact.

The Preferred Alternative would not have any impact on cultural resources listed on or eligible for listing on the National Register of Historic Places, because there are no historic properties at NMC Oakland. In letters dated May 31, 1994 and January 10, 1996, the California State Historic Preservation Officer concurred with Navy's determination that implementation of the Preferred Alternative would not have an effect on cultural resources. Additionally, as a result of the extensive grading and development that has taken place at NMC Oakland over the last 75 years, it is unlikely that subsurface cultural resources will be discovered during redevelopment.

The Preferred Alternative would have a significant impact on aesthetic and scenic resources. The construction of houses and associated grading on the ridgeline in the northeastern part of the property with the resultant loss of trees would have had a significant impact on existing views of this area. However, as discussed earlier, OBRA removed this housing from the August 1996 Final Reuse Plan and left the area as open space, eliminating this impact.

The Preferred Alternative would have a significant impact on biological resources. In order to build the nine-hole golf course, it would be necessary to remove some native vegetation such as oaks and other trees, shrubs, and ground cover along Rifle Range Creek.

There are no threatened or endangered species present at NMC Oakland. Thus, the Preferred Alternative would not have any impact on such species.

The Preferred Alternative would not have any significant impact on water resources. It would not cause substantial flooding, erosion, or other adverse effects on water quality.

The Preferred Alternative could have a significant impact on geology and soils. It is possible that redevelopment of the NMC Oakland property could result in slope failures. Limiting the redevelopment of existing slopes to 20 percent or flatter and requiring the use of geotechnical measures during design and construction would reduce the risk of slope failure to an insignificant level.

The Preferred Alternative would have significant impacts on traffic and circulation. The proposed reuse of this property would generate about 13,090 average daily trips, compared with the 4,804 average daily trips that were associated with Navy's use of the NMC Oakland property. This increased traffic would generate a substantial increase in congestion at five local intersections during the morning and evening periods of peak traffic volume. These impacts can be mitigated by installing additional traffic signals and modifying traffic lanes.

The Preferred Alternative would not have any significant adverse impact on Federal air quality standards in the San Francisco Bay Area. However, the Preferred Alternative would have significant and unmitigable traffic-related emission impacts on regional Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD) standards, because the air pollutant emissions would exceed BAAQMD standards. The proposed redevelopment of this property would generate more motor vehicle traffic than when Navy operated NMC Oakland. As a result, vehicle emissions associated with this traffic would exceed the BAAQMD significance thresholds for both ozone precursor emissions (reactive organic compounds and nitrogen oxides) and inhalable particulate matter (PM₁₀).

Demolition, renovation, and construction activities on the property would generate dust that would also have an impact on air quality. Implementing standard dust control measures during demolition, renovation, and construction would reduce this impact to an insignificant level.

Section 176 of the Clean Air Act, 42 U.S.C. 7506, as amended, requires Federal agencies to review their activities to ensure that they do not

hamper local efforts to control air pollution. This statute prevents Federal agencies from conducting activities that do not conform to an approved implementation plan, but recognizes certain categorically exempt activities. The Conveyance of real property, regardless of the method, is such a categorically exempt activity. Accordingly, disposal of the NMC Oakland property does not require Navy to conduct a conformity analysis.

The Preferred Alternative would have significant but mitigable temporary noise impacts on adjacent property arising out of demolition, renovation, and construction activities at the NMC Oakland site. The acquiring entity will reduce these potential noise impacts to an insignificant level by limiting demolition and construction to normal daytime hours.

The existing traffic on Interstate Highway 580 adjacent to the western side of NMC Oakland produces high noise levels. Under the Preferred Alternative, residents of this area would be exposed to 24-hour average noise levels that would exceed the 65-decibel average level generally considered compatible with residential development. This is a significant impact.

With the exception of the potable water supply, the Preferred Alternative would not have a significant impact on utilities. This alternative would, however, increase the demand for water by 112 percent as a result of the increased number of people residing on the property and golf course maintenance requirements. The acquiring entity will mitigate this impact to an insignificant level by coordinating with water suppliers in the conservation and consumption of water.

No significant impacts would be caused by the hazardous materials and hazardous waste that may be used and generated in the Preferred Alternative. These materials will be regulated under the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act of 1976 (RCRA), 42 U.S.C. 6901, *et seq.*

Navy also analyzed the impacts on low-income and minority populations pursuant to Executive Order 12898, Federal Actions to Address Environmental Justice in Minority Populations and Low-Income Populations, reprinted in 42 U.S.C. 4321 note. There would be no disproportionately high and adverse human health or environmental effects on minority and low-income populations. Indeed, the Preferred Alternative would increase the amount of housing available in the City, provide additional recreational facilities and

areas for local residents, and generate some additional jobs.

Mitigation: Implementation of the decision to dispose of NMC Oakland does not require Navy to perform any mitigation measures. The Final EIS/EIR identified and discussed those actions that will be necessary to mitigate impacts associated with the reuse of NMC Oakland. The acquiring entity, under the direction of Federal, State, and local agencies with regulatory authority over protected resources, will be responsible for implementing all necessary mitigation measures.

Comments Received on the FEIS: Navy received comments on the Final EIS/EIR from the United States Environmental Protection Agency, the Alameda County Congestion Management Agency, and the Oakland Unified School District. All of the substantive comments concerned issues already discussed in the Final EIS/EIR. Those comments that require clarification are addressed below.

The Alameda County Congestion Management Agency commented that the standard it applies to ascertain significant environmental impacts from traffic congestion permits longer traffic delays than the stricter standard applied by the City of Oakland and used by Navy in its traffic analysis. Navy's use of the more restrictive standard ensured that both standards would be met or exceeded. The EIS/EIR discussed mitigation measures such as additional traffic signals and lane modifications that would reduce these environmental impacts to an insignificant level even applying the stricter City of Oakland traffic congestion standard.

The Alameda County Congestion Management Agency also asked Navy to analyze traffic congestion on freeways for the years 2000 and 2010 and to identify measures that would reduce traffic congestion, irrespective of whether such congestion was significant. Navy analyzed traffic congestion on freeways for both years and concluded that any traffic congestion would be insignificant. Consequently, there was no need further to discuss mitigation measures.

The Oakland Unified School District reiterated its comment on the Draft EIS/EIR that since the reuse of NMC Oakland would increase school enrollment, any redevelopment plan should also provide funding for building additional school facilities. As explained in response to the School District's comments on the Draft EIS/EIR, Navy's disposal of the NMC Oakland property would not cause any environmental impacts that would require Navy to fund the construction of

new school facilities. The Final EIS/EIR discussed mitigation measures that would reduce school overcrowding to an insignificant level. The acquiring entity and the Oakland Unified School District will be responsible for implementing appropriate mitigation measures.

Regulations Governing the Disposal Decision: Since the proposed action contemplates disposal under the Defense Base Closure and Realignment Act of 1990 (DBCRA), Public Law 101-510, 10 U.S.C. 2687 note, Navy's decision was based upon the environmental analysis in the Final EIS/EIR and application of the standards set forth in DBCRA, the Federal Property Management Regulations (FPMR), 41 CFR Part 101-47, and the Department of Defense Rule on Revitalizing Base Closure Communities and Community Assistance (DoD Rule), 32 CFR Parts 174 and 175.

Section 101-47.303-1 of the FPMR requires that the disposal of Federal property benefit the Federal government and constitute the "highest and best use" of the property. Section 101-47.4909 of the FPMR defines the "highest and best use" as that use to which a property can be put that produces the highest monetary return from the property, promotes its maximum value, or serves a public or institutional purpose. The "highest and best use" determination must be based upon the property's economic potential, qualitative values inherent in the property, and utilization factors affecting land use such as zoning, physical characteristics, other private and public uses in the vicinity, neighboring improvements, utility services, access, roads, location, and environmental and historical considerations.

After Federal property has been conveyed to non-Federal entities, the property is subject to local land use regulations, including zoning and subdivision regulations and building codes. Unless expressly authorized by statute, the disposing Federal agency cannot restrict the future use of surplus Government property. As a result, the local community exercises substantial control over future use of the property. For this reason, local land use plans and zoning affect determination of the highest and best use of surplus Government property.

The DBCRA directed the Administrator of the General Services Administration (GSA) to delegate to the Secretary of Defense authority to transfer and dispose of base closure property. Section 2905(b) of DBCRA directs the Secretary of Defense to

exercise this authority in accordance with GSA's property disposal regulations, set forth at Sections 101-47.1 through 101-47.8 of the FPMR. By letter dated December 20, 1991, the Secretary of Defense delegated the authority to transfer and dispose of base closure property closed under DBCRA to the Secretaries of the Military Departments. Under this delegation of authority, the Secretary of the Navy must follow FPMR procedures for screening and disposing of real property when implementing base closures. Only where Congress has expressly provided additional authority for disposing of base closure property, e.g., the economic development conveyance authority established in 1993 by Section 2905(b)(4) of DBCRA, may Navy apply disposal procedures other than the FPMR's prescriptions.

In Section 2901 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1994, Public Law 103-160, Congress recognized the economic hardship occasioned by base closures, the Federal interest in facilitating economic recovery of base closure communities, and the need to identify and implement reuse and redevelopment of property at closing installations. In Section 2903(c) of Public Law 103-160, Congress directed the Military Departments to consider each base closure community's economic needs and priorities in the property disposal process. Under Section 2905(b)(2)(E) of DBCRA, Navy must consult with local communities before it disposes of base closure property and must consider local plans developed for reuse and redevelopment of the surplus Federal property.

The Department of Defense's goal, as set forth in Section 174.4 of the DoD Rule, is to help base closure communities achieve rapid economic recovery through expeditious reuse and redevelopment of the assets at closing bases, taking into consideration local market conditions and locally developed reuse plans. Thus, the Department has adopted a consultative approach with each community to ensure that property disposal decisions consider the Local Redevelopment Authority's reuse plan and encourage job creation. As a part of this cooperative approach, the base closure community's interests, e.g., reflected in its zoning for the area, play a significant role in determining the range of alternatives considered in the environmental analysis for property disposal. Furthermore, Section 175.7(d)(3) of the DoD Rule provides that the Local Redevelopment Authority's plan generally will be used

as the basis for the proposed disposal action.

The Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, 40 U.S.C. 484, as implemented by the FPMR, identifies several mechanisms for disposing of surplus base closure property: by public benefit conveyance (FPMR Sec. 104-47.303-2); by negotiated sale (FPMR Sec. 101-47.304-9); and by competitive sale (FPMR 101-47.304-7). Additionally, in Section 2905(b)(4), the DBCRA established economic development conveyances as a means of disposing of surplus base closure property.

The selection of any particular method of conveyance merely implements the Federal agency's decision to dispose of the property. Decisions concerning whether to undertake a public benefit conveyance or an economic development conveyance, or to sell property by negotiation or by competitive bid are committed by law to agency discretion. Selecting a method of disposal implicates a broad range of factors and rests solely within the Secretary of the Navy's discretion.

Conclusion: The Oakland Base Reuse Authority's proposed reuse of the NMC Oakland property, reflected in the August 1996 Final Reuse Plan for the Naval Medical Center, Oakland and substantially embodied in the Preferred Alternative, is consistent with the prescriptions of the FPMR and Section 174.4 of the DoD Rule. The Reuse Authority has determined in its Maximum Capacity Alternative that the property should be used for several purposes, including residential, community, commercial, recreational, and open space. The property's location, physical characteristics and existing infrastructure as well as the current uses of adjacent property make it appropriate for the proposed uses.

Although the "No action" alternative has less potential for causing adverse environmental impacts, this alternative would not take advantage of the property's location, physical characteristics and infrastructure or the current uses of adjacent property. Additionally, it would not foster local redevelopment of the NMC Oakland property.

Accordingly, Navy will dispose of Naval Medical Center Oakland in a manner that is consistent with the Oakland Base Reuse Authority's Final Reuse Plan for the property.

Dated: August 17, 1998.

William J. Cassidy, Jr.,

*Deputy Assistant Secretary of the Navy
(Conversion and Redevelopment).*

[FR Doc. 98-22938 Filed 8-25-98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3810-FF-M

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

Department of the Navy

Notice of Public Scoping Meeting for the Marine Corps Heritage Center

AGENCY: Department of the Navy, DOD.

ACTION: Notice of meeting.

SUMMARY: The Department of the Navy announces that it will hold a public scoping meeting to solicit comments on its preparation of an environmental impact statement for the Marine Corps Heritage Center at or adjacent to Marine Corps Base Quantico, Virginia. Agencies and the public are invited to provide written comments.

DATES: The public scoping meeting will be on September 17, 1998, from 7:00 pm to 9:00 pm. All written comments must be received no later than October 5, 1998.

ADDRESSES: The meeting will be held at the Ramada Inn, Grill Room, 16304 Route 1, Triangle, Virginia. Written comments, statements and/or questions regarding scoping issues should be addressed to: Commanding General, Marine Corps Base, (B 046), 3040 McCawley Avenue, Suite 2, Quantico, Virginia, 22134-5053 (Attention: Mr. Jeff Shrum).

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Mr. Jeff Shrum (703) 784-5383 ext 225, fax (703) 784-5809, email shrumj@quantico.usmc.mil.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: Pursuant to the National Environmental Policy Act as implemented by the Council on Environmental Quality regulations (40 CFR Parts 1500-1508), the U.S. Marine Corps published a notice of intent to prepare an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) in the **Federal Register** on July 7, 1998, to evaluate the environmental effects of constructing and operating a Heritage Center complex at or adjacent to Marine Corps Base (MCB) Quantico for Marine Corps personnel, their families and the general public. This Center would consolidate existing interpretive and curatorial functions that are located at MCB Quantico, VA, and the Washington Navy Yard, Washington, DC.

The Marine Corps Air Ground Museum, located at MCB Quantico, holds many of the items in the Marine Corps collections and also provides

items to other DOD museums, the Smithsonian Museum, and other civilian museums. The proposed Heritage Center would facilitate and enhance the presentation of Marine Corps artifacts and history, promote professional military educational opportunities and accommodate unique military events and conferences. Currently, the dispersed locations used to protect the heritage of the Marine Corps do not have adequate facilities for preservation of artifacts or adequate space for displays and historic interpretation presentations.

Locations that meet requirements for siting the Heritage Center will be evaluated in the EIS. The siting criteria includes sufficient size and suitability in order to accommodate facilities (e.g., buildings, parking, roads), and provide visual and noise buffers; proximity to Interstate 95 and/or U.S. Route 1 in order to facilitate traffic to/from the site; and proximity to MCB Quantico in order to support educational requirements of the Base and obtain educational and facility support from the Base.

Environmental issues to be addressed in the EIS include: geological resources, biological resources, water resources, noise, air quality, land use compatibility, cultural resources, socioeconomic, environmental justice, public health and safety, transportation/circulation, aesthetics, utilities, hazardous materials, and solid waste.

Dated: August 21, 1998.

Ralph W. Corey,

LCDR, JAGC, USN, Federal Register Liaison Officer.

[FR Doc. 98-22884 Filed 8-25-98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3810-FF-P

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

Submission for OMB Review; Comment Request

AGENCY: Department of Education.

ACTION: Submission for OMB review; comment request.

SUMMARY: The Acting Deputy Chief Information Officer, Office of the Chief Information Officer, invites comments on the submission for OMB review as required by the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995.

DATES: Interested persons are invited to submit comments on or before September 25, 1998.

ADDRESSES: Written comments should be addressed to the Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs, Attention: Danny Werfel, Desk Officer, Department of Education, Office of

Management and Budget, 725 17th Street, NW., Room 10235, New Executive Office Building, Washington, DC 20503. Requests for copies of the proposed information collection requests should be addressed to Patrick J. Sherrill, Department of Education, 600 Independence Avenue, SW., Room 5624, Regional Office Building 3, Washington, DC 20202-4651.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Patrick J. Sherrill (202) 708-8196.

Individuals who use a telecommunications device for the deaf (TDD) may call the Federal Information Relay Service (FIRS) at 1-800-877-8339 between 8 a.m. and 8 p.m., Eastern time, Monday through Friday.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: Section 3506 of the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (44 U.S.C. Chapter 35) requires that the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) provide interested Federal agencies and the public an early opportunity to comment on information collection requests. OMB may amend or waive the requirement for public consultation to the extent that public participation in the approval process would defeat the purpose of the information collection, violate State or Federal law, or substantially interfere with any agency's ability to perform its statutory obligations. The Acting Deputy Chief Information Officer, Office of the Chief Information Officer, publishes this notice containing proposed information collection requests prior to submission of these requests to OMB. Each proposed information collection, grouped by office, contains the following: (1) Type of review requested, e.g., new, revision, extension, existing or reinstatement; (2) Title; (3) Summary of the collection; (4) Description of the need for, and proposed use of, the information; (5) Respondents and frequency of collection; and (6) Reporting and/or Recordkeeping burden. OMB invites public comment at the address specified above. Copies of the requests are available from Patrick J. Sherrill at the address specified above.

Dated: August 20, 1998.

Hazel Fiers,

*Acting Deputy Chief Information Officer,
Office of the Chief Information Officer.*

Office of Management

Type of Review: Revision.

Title: Waiver Guidance for Waivers Available Under Goals 2000, Elementary and Secondary Education Act and School-to-Work.

Frequency: One time.

Affected Public: State, local or Tribal Gov't; SEAs or LEAs.