

Note: If the grant project manager or other member of the professional staff is to be hired later as part of the grant, or should there be any change in professional staff during the grant period, hiring is subject to review and approval by OSC at that time.

4. Previous Experience (20 points)

The proposals will be evaluated on the degree to which the applicant demonstrates that it has successfully carried out programs or work of a similar nature in the past.

Eligible Applicants

This grant competition is open to nonprofit organizations that serve potential victims of discrimination and/or employers.

Grant Period and Award Amount

It is anticipated that several grants will be awarded and will range in size from \$50,000 to \$150,000.

During evaluation, the panel will closely examine those proposals that guarantee maximum exposure and penetration in the employer or potential victims target populations. All things being equal, a campaign designed to reach a very large number of employers (or potential victims) in the state of Texas might score higher than a campaign designed to reach a more limited number of employers (or potential victims) nationwide.

Publication of this announcement does not require OSC to award any specific number of grants, or to obligate all or any part of available funds. The period of performance will be twelve months from the date of the grant award, in most cases beginning October 1, 1997.

Application Deadline

All applications must be received by 6:00 p.m. EDT, May 5, 1997, at the Office of Special Counsel for Immigration Related Unfair Employment Practices, 1425 New York Ave., NW., Suite 9000, P.O. Box 27728, Washington, DC 20038-7728. Applications submitted via facsimile machine will not be accepted or considered.

Application Requirements

Applicants should submit an original and two (2) copies of their completed proposal by the deadline established above. All submissions must contain the following items in the order listed below:

1. A completed and signed Application for Federal Assistance (Standard Form 424) and Budget Information (Standard Form 424A).
2. OJP Form 4061/6 (Certification Regarding Lobbying; Debarment,

Suspension and Other Responsibility Matters; and Drug-Free Workplace Requirements).

3. A Standard Form LLL (Disclosure Form to Report Lobbying).

4. An abstract of the full proposal, not to exceed one page.

5. A program narrative of not more than fifteen (15) double-spaced typed pages which include the following:

a. A clear statement describing the approach and strategy to be utilized to complete the tasks identified in the program description;

b. A clear statement of the proposed goals and objectives, including a listing of the major events, activities, products and timetables for completion;

c. The proposed staffing plan (NOTE: If the grant project manager or other professional staff member is to be hired later as part of the grant, or should there be a change in professional staff during the grant period, hiring is subject to review and approval by OSC at that time); and

d. Description of how the project will be evaluated.

6. A proposed budget outlining all direct and indirect costs for personnel, fringe benefits, travel, equipment, supplies, subcontracts, and a short narrative justification of each budgeted line item cost. If an indirect cost rate is used in the budget, then a copy of a current fully executed agreement between the applicant and the cognizant Federal agency must accompany the budget.

Note: Program budgets must include the travel, lodging and other expenses necessary for at least one, but not more than two, program staff members to attend the mandatory OSC grantee training (2 days) held in Washington, DC at the beginning of the grant period (late Autumn).

7. OJP Form 7120/1 (Accounting System and Financial Capability Questionnaire).

8. Copies of resumes for the professional staff proposed in the budget.

9. Detailed technical materials that support or supplement the description of the proposed effort should be included in the appendix.

In order to facilitate handling, please do not use covers, binders or tabs.

Application forms may be obtained by writing or telephoning: Office of Special Counsel for Immigration Related Unfair Employment Practices, 1425 New York Ave., NW., Suite 9000, P.O. Box 27728, Washington, DC 20038-7728. Tel (202) 616-5594, or (202) 616-5525 (TDD for the hearing impaired).

Dated: February 27, 1997.

James S. Angus,

Acting Special Counsel, Office of Special Counsel for Immigration, Related Unfair Employment Practices.

[FR Doc. 97-5304 Filed 3-3-97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4410-01-M

Notice of Lodging of Consent Decree Pursuant to the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation and Liability Act of 1980

In accordance with Departmental policy, 28 C.F.R. § 50.7, and 42 U.S.C. § 9622(d)(2), notice is hereby given that on February 12, 1997, a Consent Decree was lodged in *United States v. James Maxwell, et al.*, Civil Action No. 97-WY-286-AJ with the United States District Court for the District of Colorado.

The Complaint in this case was filed under Sections 106 and 107 of the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation and Liability Act of 1980, as amended ("CERCLA"), 42 U.S.C. §§ 9606 and 9607, with respect to Clear Creek Superfund Site located in Gilpin and Clear Creek Counties, Colorado against James Maxwell, Argo Town, U.S.A., Inc., and Argo Tunnel Recovery Co. Pursuant to the terms of the Consent Decree, which resolves claims under the above-mentioned statute and under Section 7003 of the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA), 42 U.S.C. § 6973, the settling defendants will provide the United States with property upon which a wastewater treatment facility will be built.

The Department of Justice will receive comments relating to the proposed Consent Decree for a period of thirty days from the date of publication of this notice. Comments should be addressed to the Assistant Attorney General, Environment and Natural Resources Division, Department of Justice, Washington, D.C. 20530, and should refer to *United States v. James Maxwell, et al.*, DOJ Ref. No. 90-11-3-1553. Commenters may request an opportunity for a public meeting in the affected area, in accordance with Section 7003(d) of RCRA.

The proposed Consent Decree may be examined at the office of the United States Attorney, District of Colorado, 1961 Stout Street, Suite 1100, Denver, Colorado. Copies of the Consent Decree may also be examined and obtained by mail at the Consent Decree Library, 1120 G Street, N.W., 4th Floor, Washington, D.C. 20005 (202-624-0892) and the offices of the Environmental Protection Agency, Region VIII, 999 18th Street,

Suite 500, Denver, Colorado, 80202. When requesting a copy by mail, please enclose a check in the amount of \$12.25 (twenty-five cents per page reproduction costs) payable to the "Consent Decree Library."

Joel M. Gross,

Chief, Environmental Enforcement Section, Environmental and Natural Resources Division.

[FR Doc. 97-5247 Filed 3-3-97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4410-15-M

Antitrust Division

United States v. Delta Dental of Rhode Island; Proposed Final Judgment and Competitive Impact Statement

Notice is hereby given pursuant to the Antitrust Procedures and Penalties Act, 15 U.S.C. Section 16 (b) through (h), that a proposed Final Judgment, a Stipulation, and a Competitive Impact Statement have been filed with the United States District Court for the District of Rhode Island in *United States of America v. Delta Dental of Rhode Island*, Civil Action No. 96-113P.

The Complaint in the case alleges that Delta Dental of Rhode Island ("Delta") entered into so-called "most favored nation" agreements with its panel dentists in unreasonable restraint of trade, in violation of Section 1 of the Sherman Act, 15 U.S.C. § 1. Delta, a broad-panel plan contracting with over 90% of Rhode Island's dentists, required that participating dentists offer no lower price to competing dental plans. The agreements effectively restricted the willingness of panel dentists to discount fees for dental care and blocked competition from narrow-panel, lower cost dental plans.

The proposed Final Judgment eliminates Delta's most favored nation clause and enjoins Delta from engaging in other actions that would limit future discounting by its participating dentists.

Public comment on the proposed Final Judgment is invited within the statutory 60-day comment period. Such comments and responses thereto will be published in the Federal Register and filed with the Court. Comments should be directed to Gail Kursh, Chief; Health Care Task Force; United States Department of Justice; Antitrust Division; Liberty Place; 325 7th Street,

NW., Room 404, Washington, DC 20530 (202/307-5799).

Rebecca P. Dick,

Deputy Director of Operations, Antitrust Division, United States Department of Justice.

United States District Court for the District of Rhode Island

[Civil Action No. 96-113P]

United States of America, Plaintiff, vs. Delta Dental of Rhode Island, Defendant.

Stipulation

It is stipulated by and between the undersigned parties, their respective attorneys, that:

1. The Court has jurisdiction over the subject matter of this action and over both of the parties, and venue of this action is proper in the District of Rhode Island.

2. The parties consent that a Final Judgment in the form attached may be filed and entered by the Court, upon the motion of either party or upon the Court's own action, at any time after compliance with the requirements of the Antitrust Procedures and Penalties Act (15 U.S.C. 16), and without further notice to any party or other proceedings, provided that Plaintiff has not withdrawn its consent, which it may do at any time before the entry of the proposed Final Judgment by serving notice thereof on Defendant any by filing that notice with the Court.

3. If Plaintiff withdraws its consent, or if the proposed Final Judgment is not entered pursuant to the terms of this Stipulation, this Stipulation shall be of no effect whatsoever, and the making of this Stipulation shall be without prejudice to either party in this or in any other proceeding.

4. Defendant agrees to be bound by the provisions of the proposed Final Judgment pending its approval by the Court.

Dated: _____.

For Plaintiff

Joel I. Klein,

Acting Assistant Attorney General.

A. Douglas Melamed,

Deputy Assistant Attorney General.

Rebecca P. Dick,

Deputy Director, Office of Operations.

Gail Kursh,

Chief, Health Care Task Force.

David C. Jordan,

Assistant Chief, Health Care Task Force, Antitrust Division, Department of Justice, Washington, D.C. 20530.

For Defendant

William R. Landry, #494,

Blish & Cavanagh, Commerce Center, 30 Exchange Terrace, Providence, R.I. 02903-1765, (401) 831-8900.

Steven Kramer,

William E. Berlin,

Mark J. Botti,

Michael S. Spector,

Richard S. Martin,

Attorneys, Antitrust Division, Department of Justice, 325 7th Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20530, (202) 307-0997.

Sheldon Whitehouse,

United States Attorney, District of Rhode Island.

By: Anthony DiGioia,

Ass't. U.S. Attorney, 10 Dorrance Street, Providence, R.I. 02903, (401) 528-5477.

William G. Kopit,

Espstein Becker & Green, 1227 25th Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20037, (202) 861-9000.

United States District Court for the District of Rhode Island

[Civil Action No. 96-113P]

United States of America, Plaintiff, vs. Delta Dental of Rhode Island, Defendant.

Final Judgment

Plaintiff, United States of America, filed its Complaint on February 29, 1996. Plaintiff and Defendant, by their respective attorneys, have consented to the entry of this Final Judgment without trial or final adjudication of any issue of fact or law. This Final Judgment shall not be evidence against or an admission by any party of any issue of fact or law, nor a determination that any violation of law has occurred. Therefore, before the taking of any trial testimony and without trial of any issue of fact or law, and upon consent of the parties, it is

Ordered, adjudged, and decreed, as follows:

I. Jurisdiction

This Court has jurisdiction over the subject matter of this action and over each of the consenting parties. The Complaint states a claim upon which relief may be granted against Delta under Section 1 of the Sherman Act, 15 U.S.C. 1.

II. Definitions

As used herein, the term:

(A) "Defendant" or "Delta" means Delta Dental of Rhode Island.

(B) "Participating Dentist's Agreement" means Delta's agreement with dentists for the provision of dental services to Delta's subscribers, including Delta's Rules and Regulations referenced in the agreement, and all amendments and additions to any such agreement.

(C) "Participating Dentist" means any dentist who has agreed to comply with the terms of the Participating Dentist's Agreement.

(D) "Most Favored Nation Clause" means: