determination by the Commission (a) of any liability or wrongdoing by L.L. Bean; (b) that L.L. Bean knowingly or otherwise violated any law or regulation; (c) that the AC25 and W695 Child Carriers are defective or create a substantial product hazard, or are unreasonably dangerous; (d) that either of the Child Carriers or L.L. Bean has caused any injuries; (e) of the truth of any claims or other matters alleged or otherwise stated by the Commission or any other person either against L.L. Bean or with respect to the Child Carrier. Nothing contained in this Settlement Agreement and Order precludes L.L. Bean from raising any defense in my future litigation not arising out of the terms of this Settlement Agreement and Order.

31. Compliance by L.L. Bean with the Final Settlement and Order in the above-captioned case fully resolves and settles the allegations of violations of section 15(b) of the CPSA set out above.

32. The Commission's Order in this matter is issued under the provisions of the CPSA, 15 U.S.C. 2051 *et seq.,* and a violation of this Order may subject L.L. Bean to appropriate legal action.

33. This Settlement Agreement and Order is binding upon L.L. Bean and the assigns or successors of L.L. Bean.

34. Agreements, understandings, representations, or interpretations made outside this Settlement Agreement and Order may not be used to vary or to contradict its terms.

L.L. Bean, Inc.,

Dated: August 24, 2000.

Christopher J. McCormick,

Senior Vice President, Chief Marketing Officer.

The U.S. Consumer Product Safety Commission.

Alan H. Schoem,

Assostamt Executive Director, Office of Compliance.

Eric L. Stone,

Director, Legal Division, Office of Compliance.

Dated: August 25, 2000.

Anthony Murawski,

Attorney, Legal Division, Office of Compliance.

Order

Upon consideration of the Settlement Agreement entered into between L.L. Bean, Inc., a corporation, and the staff of the U.S. Consumer Produce Safety Commission; and the Commission having jurisdiction over the subject matter and L.L. Bean, Inc., and it appearing that the Settlement Agreement and Order is in the public interest, it is

Ordered, that the Settlement Agreement be, and hereby is, accepted, and it is

Further Ordered, that, upon final acceptance of the Settlement Agreement and Order, L.L. Bean, Inc. shall pay the Commission a civil penalty in the amount of seven hundred fifty thousand dollars ($750,000) within ten (10) calendar days after service of this Final Order upon L.L. Bean, Inc.

Provisionally accepted and Provisional Order issued on the 29th day of August, 2000.

By Order of the Commission.

Sadye E. Dunn,

Secretary, U.S. Consumer Product Safety Commission.

[FR Doc. 00–22471 Filed 8–31–00; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6355–01–M

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

Office of the Secretary

TRICARE; Civilian Health and Medical Program of the Uniformed Services (CHAMPUS); Defense and Veterans Head Injury Program (DVHIP) Demonstration Project.

AGENCY: Office of the Secretary, Department of Defense (DoD).

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: This notice is to advise interested parties of an extension of a demonstration project in which the DoD is participating in the Defense and Veterans Head Injury Program (DVHIP) Protocol II *Traumatic Brain Injury (TBI) Rehabilitation: A Controlled, Rendomized Multicenter Study of Two Interdisciplinary Programs with Adjuvant Pharmacotherapy.* Under the demonstration, DoD will participate in a controlled trial of cognitive therapy for TBI at four participating Department of Veterans Affairs medical facilities. Participation in these clinical trials will provide access to cognitive rehabilitation for TRICARE/CHAMPUS beneficiaries when their conditions meet the study protocol eligibility criteria. The extension of the demonstration project will assist in meeting clinical trial goals and arrival at conclusions regarding the safety and efficacy of cognitive rehabilitation in the treatment of TBI. This demonstration project is under the authority of Title 10, United States Code (U.S.C.), Chapter 55, Section 1092.

EFFECTIVE DATE: August 1, 2000.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Mr. Tariq Shahid, Medical Benefits and Reimbursement Systems, TRICARE Management Activity, Aurora, CO, 80045–6900, telephone (303) 676–3801.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

A. Background

On July 29, 1997, the Department provided notice in the **Federal Register** (62 FR 40506) regarding the DVHIP demonstration. The demonstration purpose is to compare traditional and cognitive rehabilitation for patients with Traumatic Brain Injury (TBI) under DVHIP Protocol II TBI Rehabilitation: A Controlled Randomized Multicenter Study of Two Interdisciplinary Programs with Adjuvant Pharmacotherapy.

TBI is the principal cause of death and disability for young Americans, at an estimated cost of over $39 billion per year. Important advances have been made in prevention and acute care, yet the costs of TBI rehabilitation have been growing exponentially. This is in spite of the fact that few, if any, TBI rehabilitation modalities have been subjected to the degree of scientific scrutiny for efficacy and cost efficiency that is usually applied to other medical treatments. The escalating economic burden that TBI places on individual families, as well as on society, is unlikely to be controlled until this issue is resolved.

The Conference Report on the Defense Appropriations Act for Fiscal Year 1992 (House Report 102–328) supported the Department of Defense (DoD) to start an initiative for DoD victims of head injuries. The DVHIP was established in February 1992, and funded in part by direct appropriations to DoD (Health Affairs) from Congress. The DVHIP represents a unique collaboration among the DoD, Department of Veterans Affairs (DVA), and the Brain Injury Association. DVHIP objectives ensure that all DVA-eligible TBI patients receive TBI-specific evaluation and follow-up, while at the same time collecting patient outcome data that will allow the DVHIP to compare the relative efficacy and cost of various TBI treatment and rehabilitation strategies, and to help define optimal care for victims of TBI.

There are four DVA facilities participating in the DVHIP study. These are located in Palo Alto, California; Minneapolis, Minnesota; Richmond, Virginia; and, Tampa, Florida. The DVHIP would provide services at its DVA facilities only for those patients who are eligible for care within the DVA system. This excluded TRICARE/CHAMPUS patients from participation in the DVHIP. The demonstration project provided access to cognitive rehabilitation for TRICARE/CHAMPUS

patients between the ages of 17–55 years.

Cognitive rehabilitation is a generic term lacking a standard definition. The term is used to describe varied systems of multidisciplinary services intended to remedy related cognitive, daily living and psychosocial ability impairments which are secondary to organic brain damage.

The current state of the medical literature does not allow for a TRICARE/CHAMPUS benefit for cognitive rehabilitation in the treatment of TBI patients. The DVHIP is conducting a randomized, prospective trial that would hasten the answers to the current questions of the contribution(s), if any, of cognitive rehabilitation. The study will address the efficacy of cognitive rehabilitation versus traditional rehabilitation of beneficiaries with TBI (moderate to severe closed head injury) in prospective randomized clinical trials.

B. TRICARE/CHAMPUS Policy

TRICARE/CHAMPUS cost shares TBI rehabilitative services such as speech therapy, physical therapy and occupational therapy. However, cognitive rehabilitation therapy, which is frequently provided as a component of TBI care, is considered unproven for brain injury under TRICARE/CHAMPUS.

TRICARE/CHAMPUS, by regulation, does not approve payment for unproven procedures. Any change in the unproven status of cognitive rehabilitation in the treatment of TBI logically awaits the findings from well-controlled studies of clinically meaningful endpoints such as the DVHIP Demonstration Project.

Because CHAMPUS relies upon outcome-based medical literature in the formulation of its coverage policy regarding cognitive rehabilitation, the DoD should assist with research protocols that will directly contribute to the body of science regarding cognitive rehabilitation. Extension of the demonstration project will assist in meeting clinical trial goals of the DVHIP study and arrival at conclusions regarding the safety and efficacy of cognitive rehabilitation in treatment of TBI.

C. Operation of the Demonstration

The Extension of the Demonstration is projected to last for no more than two years. Under the Demonstration, DoD reimburses the four participating DVA facilities at a negotiated rate which covers all professional and institutional services associated with the inpatient bed days required for the initial evaluation, rehabilitation and subsequent re-evaluations of TRICARE/CHAMPUS patients. The beneficiary cost-shares applicable under TRICARE/CHAMPUS apply under the Demonstration Project.

The TRICARE Management Activity provides for demonstration claim processing via specific contractual arrangement with a contractor. The contractors are not involved in clinical issues but direct patients to the nearest participating DVA facility for evaluation.

Dated: August 28, 2000.

L.M. Bynum,

Alternate OSD Federal Register Liaison Officer Department of Defense.

[FR Doc. 00–22407 Filed 8–31–00; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 5001–10–M

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

Department of the Air Force

Proposed Collection; Comment Request

AGENCY: Department of the Air Force, DoD.

ACTION: Notice.

In compliance with section 3506(c)(2)(A) of the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, the Office of Admissions announces the proposed reinstatement 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 the agency, including whether the information shall have practical utility; (b) the accuracy of the agency's 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.

DATES: Consideration will be given to all comments received by October 31, 2000.

ADDRESSES: Written comments and recommendations on the proposed information collection should be sent to United States Air Force Academy, Office of Admissions, 2304 Cadet Drive, Suite 236, USAFA, CO 80840.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: To request more information on this proposed information collection or to obtain a copy of the proposed and associated collection instruments, please write to the above address, or call United States Air Force Academy, Office of Admissions, (719) 333–7291.

Title, Associated Form, and OMB Number: Air Force Academy Candidate Personal Data Record, USAFA Form 146, OMB Number 0701–0064.

Needs and Uses: The information collection requirement is necessary to obtain data on candidate's background and aptitude in determining eligibility and selection to the Air Force Academy.

Affected Public: Individuals or households.

Annual Burden Hours: 3,617.

Number of Respondents: 7,233.

Responses per Respondent: 1.

Average Burden per Response: 30 Minutes.

Frequency: 1.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Summary of Information Collection

The information collected on this form is required by 10 U.S.C. 9346. The respondents are students who are applying for admission to the United States Air Force Academy. Each student's background and aptitude is reviewed to determine eligibility. If the information on this form is not collected, the individual cannot be considered for admittance to the Air Force Academy.

Janet A. Long,

Air Force Federal Register Liaison Officer.

[FR Doc. 00–22408 Filed 8–31–00; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 5001–05–P

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

Notice of Proposed Information Collection Requests

AGENCY: Department of Education.

SUMMARY: The Leader, Regulatory Information Management Group, Office of the Chief Information Officer, invites comments on the proposed information collection requests as required by the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995.

DATES: Interested persons are invited to submit comments on or before October 31, 2000.

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