to internal and external management of personnel and resources.

3. Discuss how information collected or products/tools developed under this project could be disseminated to promote the implementation of community policing and problem-solving approaches in the future. Discuss how police practitioners, community members, and others with an interest in crime prevention could access the products developed under this project.

4. Describe your understanding of and experience with community policing and problem solving. Describe your background and experience in developing tools or other products aimed at facilitating the use of new approaches to crime reduction by policing agencies.

5. Describe your understanding of policing agencies and their culture, as it applies to the focus area addressed in your proposal.

6. Based on your experience with the evolution of community policing and problem solving, please describe the primary organizational obstacles to the implementation of community policing, and how your proposed deliverables would assist COPS grantees and other agencies in institutionalizing community policing and problem solving.

Timeline

7. Provide a detailed one-year task time line to describe the activities included in your project plan.

Budget

8. Prepare a detailed budget and budget narrative for a one-year agreement. Awards are expected to range from $50,000 to $350,000, depending on the scope of the initiative and proposed deliverables. The budget may include travel and per diem costs related to collaborating with policing agencies, mailing or telephone costs for information collection, and production, pilot testing, and dissemination costs for all deliverables.

The Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance (CFDA) reference for this program is 16.710.

Dated: August 6, 1999.

Mary Lou Leary,

Acting Director, Office of Community Oriented Policing Services, U.S. Department of Justice.

[FR Doc. 99–21452 Filed 8–17–99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4410–AT–M

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Executive Office for U.S. Attorneys

[Docket No. 97592]

Waiver of the Data Encryption Standard; Federal Information Processing Standards Publication (FIPS) 46–2; ''Data Encryption Standard (DES)''

AGENCY: Executive Office for U.S. Attorneys, Department of Justice.

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: The Federal Information Processing Standards Publication (FIPS) 46–2 entitled ''Data Encryption Standard (DES)'' requires that a notice be published in the **Federal Register** whenever a waiver to the DES standard is approved.

DATES: The waiver was approved on June 9, 1999.

ADDRESSES: U.S. Department of Justice, Executive Office for U.S. Attorneys, 600 E Street N.W., Suite 6004, Washington, DC 20530.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Harvey Press (202) 616–6442.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: FIPS 46–2 ''Data Encryption Standards (DES)'' requires a notice be published in the **Federal Register** whenever a waiver is granted. The Executive Office for U.S. Attorneys (EOUSA) of the Department of Justice (DOJ), because of our concerns that single DES has been shown vulnerable to attack, we intend to utilize Triple DES. Therefore, the EOUSA, to provide stronger security, will utilize Triple DES as its encryption algorithms for its Virtual Private Network (VPN)/firewall implementation.

Harvey Press,

Assistant Director for Telecommunication and Technical Development Staff.

[FR Doc. 99–21367 Filed 8–17–99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4410–07–M

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

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

Notice is hereby given that a consent decree in *United States* v. *A&D Recycling, Inc., et al.,* Civil Action No. 1:CV–99–1332 (M.D. Pa.) was lodged with the court on July 28, 1999.

The proposed decree resolves claims of the United States against 120 defendants under Sections 106 and 107 of the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act, as amended (''CERCLA''), 42 U.S.C. 9606 and 9607, for response costs and actions at the Jack's Creek Superfund Site in Mifflin County, PA. The decree requires 40 of the defendants to perform the EPA-selected remedial action to address hazardous substance contamination at the site. That remedial action includes, inter alia, excavation and off-site disposal of certain contamination and on-site consolidation and capping of other contamination. The remaining 80 defendants are accorded de minimis treatment and required to pay a total of $3.05 million toward cleanup of the site.

The Department of Justice will receive, for a period of thirty (30) days from the date of this publication, comments relating to the proposed consent decree. Comments should be addressed to the Assistant Attorney General for the Environment and Natural Resources Division, Department of Justice, Washington, D.C. 20530, and should refer to *United States* v. *A&D Recycling, Inc., et al.,* Civil Action No. 1:CV–99–1332 (M.D. Pa.), DOJ Ref. #90–11–2–911. Commenters may request an opportunity for a public meeting in the affected area, in accordance with section 7003(d) of RCRA, 42 U.S.C. 6973(d).

The proposed consent decree may be examined at the United States Department of Justice, Environment and Natural Resources Division, Consent Decree Library, 1120 G Street, NW., 3rd Floor, Washington, DC 20005, (202) 624–0892. A copy of the proposed consent decree may be obtained in person or by mail from the Consent Decree Library, 1120 G Street, NW., 3rd Floor, Washington, DC 20005. In requesting a copy, please refer to the referenced case and enclose a check in the amount of $27.50 (25 cents per page reproduction costs), payable to the Consent Degree Library. A copy of the exhibits to the decree may be obtained from the same source for an additional charge of $50.00

Joel M. Gross,

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

[FR Doc. 99–21466 Filed 8–17–99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4410–15–M

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Notice of Lodging of Consent Decrees Under the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act

Notice is hereby given that on August 4, 1999 two proposed consent decrees in *United States* v. *Greenwood Chemical Company,* Civ. Action No. 97–0147 (W.D. Va), were lodged with the United

States District Court for the Western District of Virginia.

In this action, the United States is recovering past and future response costs, pursuant to the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act (''CERCLA''), 42 U.S.C. 9601 *et seq.* in connection with the Greenwood Chemical Company Superfund (''Site''), located in Albermarle County, Virginia.

The consent decrees that were lodged would resolve the United States' claims against two of the four defendants. One defendant, High Point Chemical Corporation, will pay $4 million to settle claims against it. The second defendant, Clarence Hustrulid, will pay $100,000 to resolve claims against him. In both cases, 90% of the money will be paid to the United States and the remaining 10% to the Commonwealth of Virginia, which is a co-plaintiff in the case.

The consent decrees include covenants not to sue by the United States under sections 106 and 107 of CERCLA, and under section 7003 of the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (''RCRA''), 42 U.S.C. 6973.

The Department of Justice will receive for a period for thirty (30) days from the date of this publication comments relating to the proposed consent decrees. Comments should be sent to the Assistant Attorney General of the Environment and Natural Resources Division, Department of Justice, Washington, D.C. 20530, and should refer to *United States* v. *Greenwood Chemical Company*, D.J. Ref. 90–11–2–679. Commenters may request an opportunity for a public hearing in the affected area, in accordance with section 7003(d) of RCRA.

The proposed consent decrees may be examined at the Office of the United States Attorney, Thomas B. Mason Building, 105 Franklin Rd., SW, Suite One, Roanoke, VA 24011; at US EPA Region III, 1650 Arch Street, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19103–2029; and at the Consent Decree Library, 1120 G Street, NW, 3rd Floor, Washington, DC 20005, (202) 624–0892. A copy of the proposed consent decrees may be obtained in person or by mail from the Consent Decree Library, 1120 G Street, NW, 3rd Floor, Washington, DC 20005. In requesting a copy, please enclose a check in the amount of $14.50 (25 cents per page reproduction cost) payable to the Consent Decree Library.

Joel M. Gross,

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

[FR Doc. 99–21366 Filed 8–17–99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4410–15–M

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Antitrust Division

[Civil Action No. 3–99CV1398–H]

United States of America, and the State of Texas v. Aetna Inc. and The Prudential Insurance Company of America 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, Stipulation, Hold Separate Stipulation and Order, and Competitive Impact Statement have been filed with the United States District Court for the Northern District of Texas (Dallas Division) in *United States of America and the State of Texas* v. *Aetna Inc. and The Prudential Insurance Company of America,* Civil Action No. 3–99CV1398–H. On June 21, 1999, the United States and the State of Texas filed a Complaint to enjoin defendant Aetna's proposed acquisition of certain health insurance-related assets of the Prudential Insurance Company of America, an acquisition which would have violated section 7 of the Clayton Act, 15 U.S.C. 18. The proposed Final Judgment, filed with the Complaint requires Aetna to divest its interests in NYLCare Health Plans of the Gulf Coast, Inc. and NYLCare Health Plans of the Southwest, Inc., providers of health insurance in the Houston and Dallas areas, respectively. Copies of the Complaint, proposed Final Judgment, Hold Separate Stipulation and Order, and Competitive Impact Statement are available for inspection at the Department of Justice in Washington, DC in Suite 200, 325 Seventh Street, NW, and at the Office of the Clerk of the United States District Court for the Northern District of Texas (Dallas Division).

Public comment on the proposed Final Judgment is invited within 60 days of the date of this notice. Such comments, and responses thereto, will be published in the **Federal Register** and filed with the Court. Comments should be directed to Gail Krush, Chief, Healthcare Task Force, 325 Seventh Street, NW, Room 404, Antitrust Division, Department of Justice, Washington, DC 20530 (telephone: (202) 307–5799).

Constance Robinson,

Director of Operation & Merger Enforcement.

United States District Court for the Northern District of Texas (Dallas Division)

[Civil Action No.: 3–99CV1398–H]

United States of America, and the State of Texas, Plaintiffs, v. Aetna Inc., and The Prudential Insurance Company of America, Defendants.

Stipulation

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

(1) This Court has jurisdiction over the subject matter of this action and over each of the parties hereto, and venue is proper in this Court.

(2) The proposed Final Judgment attached hereto may be filed and entered by the Court, upon the motion of any party or upon the Court's own motion, 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 the plaintiffs have not withdrawn their consent, which they may do at any time before entry of the proposed Final Judgment by serving notice thereof on all other parties and by filing that notice with the Court.

(3) Defendants shall abide by and comply with the provisions of the proposed Final Judgment pending entry of the Final Judgment by the Court, or until expiration of time for all appeals of any Court ruling declining entry of the proposed Final Judgment, and shall, from the date of the signing of this Stipulation, comply with all the terms and provisions of the proposed Final Judgment as though the same were in full force and effect as an order of the Court.

(4) This Stipulation shall apply with equal and effect to any amended proposed Final Judgment agreed upon in writing by the parties and submitted to the Court.

(5) In the event the plaintiffs withdraw their consent, as provided in paragraph (2) above, or in the event that the Court declines to enter the proposed Final Judgment pursuant to this Stipulation, the time has expired for all appeals of any Court ruling declining entry of the proposed Final Judgment, and the Court has not otherwise ordered continued compliance with the terms and provisions of the proposed Final Judgment, then the parties are released from all further obligations under this