

on the World Wide Web, at "http://www.ftc.gov/os/actions/htm." A paper copy can be obtained from the FTC Public Reference Room, Room H-130, Sixth Street and Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20580, either in person or by calling (202) 326-3627. Public comment is invited. Such comments or views will be considered by the Commission and will be available for inspection and copying at its principal office in accordance with Section 4.9(b)(6)(ii) of the Commission's Rules of Practice (16 CFR 4.9(b)(6)(ii)).

Analysis of Proposed Consent Order to Aid Public Comment

The Federal Trade Commission has accepted an agreement to a proposed consent order from Uno Restaurant Corporation, Pizzeria Uno Corporation, and Uno Restaurants, Inc. The proposed respondents operate the nationwide Pizzeria Uno restaurant chain, where they sell, among other items, a line of thin crust pizzas known as "Thinzettas."

The proposed consent order has been placed on the public record for sixty (60) days for reception of comments by interested persons. Comments received during this period will become part of the public record. After sixty (60) days, the Commission will again review the agreement and the comments received and will decide whether it should withdraw from the agreement and take other appropriate action or make final the agreement's proposed order.

The Commission's complaint charges that the proposed respondents falsely claimed that their Thinzettas line of thin crust pizzas is low in fat. The proposed consent order contains provisions designed to remedy the violations charged and to prevent proposed respondents from engaging in similar acts in the future.

Part I of the proposed order, in connection with pizzas or any other food product containing a baked crust, prohibits the proposed respondents from misrepresenting the existence or amount of total fat or any other nutrient or substance in such product. Part I further provides that if any representation covered by this Part conveys a nutrient content claim defined (for purposes of labeling) by any regulation promulgated by the Food and Drug Administration, compliance with this Part shall be governed by the qualifying amount set forth in that regulation. Part II of the proposed order specifies that nothing in the order prohibits the proposed respondents from making any representation for any product that is specifically permitted in labeling for such product by regulations

promulgated by the Food and Drug Administration pursuant to the Nutrition Labeling and Education Act of 1990.

Part III of the proposed order contains record keeping requirements for materials that substantiate, qualify, or contradict covered claims and requires the proposed respondents to keep and maintain all advertisements and promotional materials containing any representation covered by the proposed order. Part IV requires distribution of a copy of the consent decree to current and future principals, officers, directors, managers, and franchisees, and to certain current and future employees, agents, and representatives.

Part V provides for Commission notification upon any change in the corporate respondents affecting compliance obligations arising under the order. Part VI requires the filing of compliance report(s). Finally, Part VII provides for the termination of the order after twenty years under certain circumstances.

The purpose of this analysis is to facilitate public comment on the proposed order, and it is not intended to constitute an official interpretation of the agreement and proposed order or to modify in any way their terms.

Donald S. Clark,
Secretary.

[FR Doc. 97-2207 Filed 1-28-97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6750-01-P

GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION

Public Buildings Service; Notice of Intent To Prepare an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS)

SUMMARY: The General Services Administration (GSA) hereby gives notice it intends to prepare an Environmental Impact Statement 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), as implemented by GSA's Order PBS P 1095.4B to construct a new Federal Courthouse in downtown Seattle, King County, Washington.

The EIS will evaluate the proposed project, any other reasonable alternatives, and the no-action alternative identified through the scoping process. Scoping will be accomplished through direct mail correspondence to interested persons, parties, and organizations and through a Public Scoping Meeting. GSA will publish a Public Notice of this meeting

and all subsequent public meetings in Seattle newspapers approximately one to two weeks prior to each event.

ADDRESSES: As part of the public scoping process, GSA solicits your written comments on the scope of alternatives and potential impacts at the following address: Ms Donna M. Meyer, Regional Environmental Program Officer (10 PCB), General Services Administration, 400 15th Street SW, Auburn, WA, 98001, or FAX: Ms Donna M. Meyer at 206-931-7308. Written comments should be received no later than February 21, 1997.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Nona Diediker at Herrera Environmental Consultants, 2200 Sixth Avenue, Suite 601, Seattle, Washington 98121, (206) 441-9080, or Donna M. Meyer, GSA, (206) 931-7675.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The GSA, assisted by Herrera Environmental Consultants, is anticipating the preparation of an Environmental Impact Statement on a proposal to acquire a site and design and construct a new Federal Courthouse in downtown Seattle. 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 the reasonable alternatives to be evaluated in the EIS, and in identifying any significant social, economic, or environmental issues related to the alternatives. During scoping, comments should focus on identifying specific impacts to be evaluated and suggesting alternatives that minimize adverse significant impacts while achieving similar objectives. Comments may also identify issues which are not significant or which have been covered by prior environmental review. Scoping should be limited to commenting on alternatives and the merit of the proposal rather than indicating preferences. There will be an opportunity to comment on preferences upon completion of the Draft Environmental Impact Statement.

Mailing List: If you wish to be placed on the project mailing list to receive future or further information as the EIS process develops, contact Herrera at the address noted above.

Project Purpose, Historical Background, and Project: A new Federal Courthouse is needed in downtown Seattle to consolidate existing judicial functions and to accommodate the projected space needs of the Federal Courts and court-related agencies. There have been previous environmental reviews completed for this project. A

new review is necessary because of a change in the delineated area. The existing U.S. Courthouse at 1010 5th Street is listed on the National Register of Historic Places along with its lawn area.

The Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts (AOC) has requested GSA provide a building based on the Long Range Facility Plan for the Western District of Washington. The new Courthouse would provide for 15 courtrooms for use by the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals, the U.S. District Court, and U.S. Magistrate judges. The existing Courthouse would continue to be utilized.

At occupancy, the new facility is expected to house approximately 700 federal employees. Development would involve construction of one building comprising approximately 620,000 square feet of gross floor area and parking for 200 vehicles.

Alternatives: The EIS will examine the short and long term impacts on the natural and built environment of developing and operating a new courthouse in downtown Seattle. Potential impact assessment will include but not be limited to changes in the social environment, changes in land use, aesthetics, changes in traffic and parking patterns, economic impacts, and conformance to City planning and zoning requirements.

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

The EIS would consider a no action alternative and action alternatives. The no-action alternative (no-build) alternative would continue the use of the existing U.S. Courthouse supplemented by the continued use of leased space throughout the downtown Seattle area. The preferred action alternative is construction of a new courthouse building. Currently, three separate site alternatives are being proposed for study. GSA will consider the acquisition of one or two block sites sufficient to meet future expansion needs of the court and within an area delineated as follows:

Bounded on the north by Blanchard Street, on the east by Terry Avenue, on the south by James Street, and by First Avenue on the west.

Due to the unique requirements for courtrooms, chambers, and security considerations, GSA has found it is

impractical to consider the use of an existing building through either purchase or lease in which to meet these needs.

Procedures: The Draft EIS will be prepared at the completion of and based upon a scoping report. The Draft EIS will then be made available for public and agency review and comment with a public hearing being held during this comment period. A final EIS would be prepared following conclusion of the comment period to address issues raised on the Draft EIS.

Dated: January 23, 1997.

L. Jay Pearson,

Regional Administrator (10A).

[FR Doc. 97-2237 Filed 1-28-97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6820-23-M

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES

Office of the Secretary; Statement of Organization, Functions, and Delegation of Authority

Part A (Office of the Secretary), Chapter AE (Office of the Assistant Secretary for Planning and Evaluation (OASPE), of the Statement of Organization, Functions and Delegation of Authority for the Department of Health and Human Services (most recently amended at 61 FR 24499 on May 15, 1996) is amended to establish the Office of Science Policy within OASPE.

I. Chapter AE, add the following as paragraph F:

F. The Office of Science Policy (OSP) is responsible for guiding and coordinating the development of science policy throughout the Department. As directed by the Secretary or the ASPE, OSP establishes and leads broadly representative, multi-office working groups to develop policy initiatives related to complex science and technology issues that cut across the missions of several entities within the Department. The Director, OSP frequently serves as the spokesperson for these working groups in presentations to the Secretary, other senior DHHS staff, to members and/or staff of the Congress, and to others outside DHHS.

OSP is responsible for guiding and coordinating the incorporation of science-policy considerations within regulatory proposals, legislative proposals, Congressional testimony, press releases, and other public documents describing major Departmental initiatives. OSP staff provide critique and advice regarding

the science-policy content of such documents, which typically originate from DHHS Operating Divisions or other units within the Office of the Secretary. In selected instances, OSP initiates and directs the development of such documents.

OSP is responsible for creating and maintaining effective communication with scientific and technical communities outside the Department regarding science-policy issues. This may include liaison with the Office of Science and Technology Policy, Executive Office of the President. It also includes active participation in inter-agency science and technology activities (such as those sponsored by the National Science and Technology Council) and government/private sector collaborations related to science policy (such as those sponsored by the National Academy of Sciences). These duties may include service as the Secretary's representative in meetings with leaders of research universities, scientific societies, professional associations, and industrial organizations involved in biomedical, behavioral, or social-science research or in the delivery of health and human services.

In all of these areas, OSP staff coordinate their activities as appropriate with those of other components within OASPE, with other components of the Office of the Secretary, and with the Operating Divisions of the Department. The Director, OSP consults regularly with the Assistant Secretary for Health in his/her role as the Secretary's senior advisor on public health and science.

Dated: January 17, 1997.

John J. Callahan,

Assistant Secretary for Management and Budget.

[FR Doc. 97-2085 Filed 1-28-97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4110-12-M

Office of the Secretary

Federal Financial Participation in State Assistance Expenditures; Federal Matching Shares for Temporary Assistance to Needy Families, Medicaid, and Aid to Needy Aged, Blind, or Disabled Persons for October 1, 1997 Through September 30, 1998

AGENCY: Office of the Secretary, HHS.

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: The Federal Percentages and Federal Medical Assistance Percentages for Fiscal Year 1998 have been calculated pursuant to the Social Security Act (the Act). These percentages will be effective from