

Repatriation of the seven strands of beads, nine pipestone pipes, two pipe tampers, and one eagle bone whistle to the Santee Sioux Tribe may begin after that date if no additional claimants come forward. Repatriation of the two pipestone pipes, six pipe bags, four rattles, one eagle bone whistles, and one webbed shield to the Cheyenne River Sioux Tribe, Rosebud Sioux Tribe, Standing Rock Sioux Tribe, and Oglala Sioux Tribe may begin after that date if no additional claimants come forward.

The National Park Service is not responsible for the determinations within this notice.

Dated: February 26, 1997.

Francis P. McManamon,  
*Departmental Consulting Archeologist,  
Manager, Archeology and Ethnography  
Program.*

[FR Doc. 97-5212 Filed 3-3-97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4310-70-F

---

**Notice of Inventory Completion for Native American Human Remains From Mummy Island Cave, AK, in the Possession of the University of Alaska Museum, Fairbanks, AK**

**AGENCY:** National Park Service

**ACTION:** Notice

Notice is hereby given in accordance with provisions of the Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act (NAGPRA), 25 U.S.C. 3003(d), of the completion of an inventory of human remains in the possession of the University of Alaska Museum, Fairbanks, AK.

A detailed assessment of the human remains was made by University of Alaska Museum professional staff in consultation with representatives of the Chugach Heritage Foundation on behalf of the Native Village of Eyak.

In 1964, human remains representing one individual were recovered from a cave on Mummy Island located at the mouth of Orca Inlet near Cordova, AK. There is no further information in the museum's records regarding the collection of this individual. The human remains were donated by Bobby Benson and given to Dr. Ivar Skarland of the Anthropology Department at the University of Alaska, Fairbanks. No known individual was identified. No associated funerary objects are present.

Historical documents and archeological evidence indicate the caves on Mummy Island are traditional burial areas of the Native Village of Eyak based on manner of interment and associated funerary objects. Oral tradition presented by the representatives of the Chugach Heritage

Foundation also states Mummy Island is a traditional burial area.

Based on the above mentioned information, officials of the University of Alaska Museum have determined that, pursuant to 43 CFR 10.2 (d)(1), the human remains listed above represent the physical remains of one individual of Native American ancestry. Officials of the University of Alaska Museum have also determined that, pursuant to 25 U.S.C. 3001 (2), there is a relationship of shared group identity which can be reasonably traced between these Native American human remains and the Chugach Heritage Foundation on behalf of the Native Village of Eyak.

This notice has been sent to officials of the Chugach Heritage Foundation and the Native Village of Eyak.

Representatives of any other Indian tribe that believes itself to be culturally affiliated with these human remains should contact Gary Selinger, Special Projects Manager, University of Alaska Museum, 907 Yukon Drive, Fairbanks, AK 99775-1200; telephone: (907) 474-6117, before April 3, 1997. Repatriation of the human remains to the Chugach Heritage Foundation on behalf of the Native Village of Eyak may begin after that date if no additional claimants come forward.

Dated: February 24, 1997.

Francis P. McManamon,  
*Departmental Consulting Archeologist,  
Manager, Archeology and Ethnography  
Program.*

[FR Doc. 97-5214 Filed 3-3-97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4310-70-F

---

**Notice of Inventory Completion for Native American Human Remains From the Area of Teller, AK, in the Possession of the University of Alaska Museum, Fairbanks, AK**

**AGENCY:** National Park Service

**ACTION:** Notice

Notice is hereby given in accordance with provisions of the Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act (NAGPRA), 25 U.S.C. 3003 (d), of the completion of an inventory of human remains from the area of Teller, AK, in the possession of University of Alaska Museum, Fairbanks, AK.

A detailed assessment of the human remains was made by University of Alaska Museum professional staff in consultation with representatives of the Native Village of Teller and the Bering Straits Foundation.

At an unknown date, human remains representing three individuals were recovered from unknown sites in the Teller, AK area by unknown

individual(s). The human remains were donated to the Anthropology Department at the University of Alaska, Fairbanks, and accessioned by the University Museum in 1993. No known individuals were identified. No associated funerary objects are present.

Archeological and ethnographic evidence indicates the general region of Teller, AK, shows a continuity of cultural occupation from around 900 A.D. to the present. Oral history presented by representatives of the Native Village of Teller supports this cultural continuity between this region and the present-day Native Village of Teller. Oral history evidence provided by Teller elders says that this area was used for Teller burials.

Based on the above mentioned information, officials of the University of Alaska Museum have determined that, pursuant to 43 CFR 10.2 (d)(1), the human remains listed above represent the physical remains of three individuals of Native American ancestry. Officials of the University of Alaska Museum have also determined that, pursuant to 25 U.S.C. 3001 (2), there is a relationship of shared group identity which can be reasonably traced between these Native American human remains and the Native Village of Teller.

This notice has been sent to officials of the Native Village of Teller and the Bering Straits Foundation.

Representatives of any other Indian tribe that believes itself to be culturally affiliated with these human remains should contact Gary Selinger, Special Projects Manager, University of Alaska Museum, 907 Yukon Drive, Fairbanks, AK 99775-1200; telephone: (907) 474-6117, before April 3, 1997. Repatriation of the human remains to the Native Village of Teller may begin after that date if no additional claimants come forward.

Dated: February 24, 1997.

Francis P. McManamon,  
*Departmental Consulting Archeologist,  
Manager, Archeology and Ethnography  
Program.*

[FR Doc. 97-5216 Filed 3-3-97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4310-70-F

---

**DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE**

**Civil Rights Division**

**Office of Special Counsel for Immigration Related Unfair Employment Practices; Immigration Related Employment Discrimination Public Education Grants**

**AGENCY:** Office of Special Counsel for Immigration Related Unfair

Employment practices, Civil Rights Division, U.S. Department of Justice.

**ACTION:** Notice of availability of funds and solicitation for grant applications.

**SUMMARY:** The Office of Special Counsel for Immigration Related Unfair Employment Practices (OSC) announces the availability of funds for grants to conduct public education programs about the rights afforded potential victims of employment discrimination and the responsibilities of employers under the antidiscrimination provisions of the Immigration and Nationality Act (INA), 8 U.S.C. 1324b.

It is anticipated that a number of grants will be competitively awarded to applicants who can demonstrate a capacity to design and successfully implement public education campaigns to combat immigration-related employment discrimination. Grants will range in size from \$50,000 to \$150,000.

OSC will accept proposals from applicants who have access to potential victims of discrimination or whose experience qualifies them to educate employers about the antidiscrimination provisions of INA. OSC welcomes proposals from diverse nonprofit organizations such as local, regional or national ethnic and immigrants' rights advocacy organizations, trade associations, industry groups, professional organizations, or other nonprofit entities providing information services to potential victims of discrimination and/or employers.

**APPLICATION DUE DATE:** May 5, 1997.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Patita McEvoy, Public Affairs Specialist, 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).

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** The Office of Special Counsel for Immigration Related Unfair Employment Practices of the Civil Rights Division of the Department of Justice announces the availability of funds to conduct public education programs concerning the antidiscrimination provisions of INA. Funds will be awarded to selected applicants who propose cost-effective ways of educating employers and/or members of the protected class, or to those who can fill a particular need not currently being met.

#### Background

On November 6, 1986, President Reagan signed into law the Immigration Reform and Control Act of 1986 (IRCA),

Public Law 99-603, 8 U.S.C. 1324b, *et seq.*, which amended the INA. Additional provisions were signed into law by President Bush in the Immigration Act (IMMACT 90) on November 29, 1990. IRCA and subsequently, IMMACT 90, makes hiring aliens without work authorization unlawful, and requires employers to verify the identity and work authorization of all new employees. Employers who violate this law are subject to sanctions, including fines and possible criminal prosecution.

During the debate on IRCA, Congress foresaw the possibility that employers, fearful of sanctions, would refuse employment to individuals simply because they looked or sounded foreign. Consequently, Congress enacted Section 102 of IRCA, an antidiscrimination provision. Section 102 prohibits employers of four or more employees from discriminating on the basis of citizenship status or national origin in hiring, firing, recruitment or referral for a fee, and prohibits employers from engaging in document abuse in the employment eligibility verification process.

Citizens and certain classes of work authorized individuals are protected from citizenship status discrimination. Protected non-citizens include permanent residents, temporary residents under the 1986 amnesty, the Special Agricultural Workers (SAWs) or the Replenishment Agricultural Workers (RAWs) programs, and refugees and asylees who apply for naturalization within six months of being eligible to do so. Citizens and all work authorized individuals are protected from discrimination on the basis of national origin. However, this prohibition applies only to employers with four to fourteen employees. National origin discrimination complaints against employers with fifteen or more employees remain under the jurisdiction of the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission pursuant to Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, 42 U.S.C. 2000e, *et seq.*

In addition, under the document abuse provision of the law, employers must accept all forms of work authorization and proof of identity allowed by the Immigration and Naturalization Service (INS) for completion of the Employment Eligibility Verification (I-9) Form. Employers may not prefer or require one form of documentation over another for hiring purposes. Requiring more or specific documents to prove identity and work authorization may constitute document abuse.

On October 1, 1996, Congress passed the Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act of 1996 (IIRIRA). IIRIRA will expand the existing electronic employment eligibility pilot programs being carried out by the INS, and will reduce the number of documents that employers can accept to verify an individual's work eligibility. These changes are expected to take place October 1, 1997.

OSC is responsible for receiving and investigating discrimination charges and, when appropriate, filing complaints with a specially designated administrative tribunal. OSC also initiates independent investigations of possible Section 102 violations.

While OSC has established a record of vigorous enforcement, studies by the U.S. General Accounting Office and other sources have shown that there is an extensive lack of knowledge on the part of protected individuals and employers about the antidiscrimination provisions. Enforcement cannot be effective if potential victims of discrimination are not aware of their rights. Moreover, discrimination can never be eradicated so long as employers are not aware of their responsibilities.

#### Purpose

OSC seeks to educate both potential victims of discrimination about their rights and employers about their responsibilities under the antidiscrimination provisions of INA. Because previous grantees have developed a wealth of materials (*e.g.*, brochures, posters, booklets, information packets, and videos) to educate these groups, OSC has determined that the focus of the program should be on the actual delivery of these materials to educate further both potential victims and employers. More specifically, in keeping with the purpose of the grant program, OSC seeks proposals that will use *existing materials* effectively to educate large numbers of workers or employers about exercising their rights or fulfilling their obligations under the antidiscrimination provisions.

#### Program Description

The program is designed to develop and implement cost effective approaches to educate potential victims of employment discrimination about their rights and to educate employers about their responsibilities under INA's antidiscrimination provisions. Applications may propose to educate potential victims only, employers only, or both in a single campaign. 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). Proposals should outline the following key elements of the program:

#### *Part I: Targeted Population*

The educational efforts under the grant should be directed to (1) work authorized non-citizens who are protected individuals, since this group is especially vulnerable to employment discrimination; (2) those citizens who are most likely to become victims of employment discrimination; and/or to (3) employers. The proposals should define the characteristics of the work authorized population or the employer group(s) targeted for the educational campaign, and the applicant's qualifications to reach credibly and effectively large segments of the campaign targets.

The proposals should also detail the reasons for targeting each group of protected individuals or employers by describing particular needs or other factors to support the selection. In defining the campaign targets and supporting the reasons for the selection, applicants may use studies, surveys, or any other sources of information of generally accepted reliability.

#### *Part II: Campaign Strategy*

We encourage applicants to devise effective and creative means of public education and information dissemination that are specifically designed to reach the widest possible targeted audience. Those applicants proposing educational campaigns addressing potential victims of discrimination should keep in mind that some of the traditional methods of public communication may be less than optimal for educating members of national or linguistic groups that have limited community-based support and communication networks.

Some grantees who are implementing citizenship campaigns, have, in the past, combined those efforts and resources with the INA antidiscrimination education campaigns in order to maximize the scope and breadth of the project and to reach a larger number of individuals in the targeted population. If an applicant proposes to combine these efforts, please discuss how the programs will interact and how the budgets will be administered.

Proposals should discuss the components of the campaign strategy, detail the reasons supporting the choice of each component, and explain how

each component will effectively contribute to the overall objective of cost-effective dissemination of useful and accurate information to a wide audience of protected individuals or employers. Discussions of the campaign strategies and supporting rationale should be clear, concise, and based on sound evidence and reasoning.

Since there presently exists a wealth of materials for use in educating the public, proposals should include in their budgets the costs for distribution of materials received from OSC or from current/past OSC grantees.

To the extent that applicants believe the development of original materials particularly suited to their campaign is necessary, their proposal should articulate in detail the circumstances requiring the development of such materials. All such materials must be approved by OSC to ensure legal accuracy and proper emphasis prior to production. It should be noted that proposed revisions/translations of OSC approved materials must also be submitted for clearance. All information distributed should also include mention of the OSC as a source of assistance, information and action, and the correct address and telephone numbers of the OSC (including the toll-free and TDD toll-free numbers for the hearing impaired).

#### *Part III: Evaluation of the Strategy*

One of the central goals of this program is determining what public education strategies are most effective and thus, should be included in future public education efforts. Therefore, it is crucial that the methods of evaluating the campaign strategy and public education materials and their results be carefully detailed. A full evaluation of a project's effectiveness is due within 60 days of the conclusion of a campaign.

#### *Selection Criteria*

The final selection of grantees for award will be made by the Special Counsel for Immigration Related Unfair Employment Practices.

Proposals will be submitted to a peer review panel. OSC anticipates seeking assistance from sources with specialized knowledge in the areas of employment and immigration law, as well as in evaluating proposals, including the agencies that are members of the Antidiscrimination Outreach Task Force: the Department of Labor, the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, the Small Business Administration, and the Immigration and Naturalization Service. Each panelist will evaluate proposals for effectiveness and efficiency with emphasis on the various factors enumerated below. The panel's results are advisory in nature and not binding on the Special Counsel. Letters of

support, endorsement, or recommendation will not be accepted or considered.

In determining which applications to fund, OSC will consider the following (based on a one-hundred point scale):

#### 1. Program Design (50 points)

Sound program design and cost-effective strategies for educating the targeted population are imperative.

Consequently, areas that will be closely examined include the following:

a. Evidence of in-depth knowledge of the goals and objectives of the project. (15 points)

b. Selection and definition of the target group(s) for the campaign, and the factors that support the selection, including special needs, and the applicant's qualifications to reach effectively the target. (10 points)

c. A cost effective campaign strategy for educating targeted employers and/or members of the protected class, with a justification for the choice of strategy. (15 points)

d. The evaluation methods proposed by the applicant to measure the effectiveness of the campaign and their precision in indicating to what degree the campaign is successful. (10 points)

#### 2. Administrative Capability (20 points)

Proposals will be rated in terms of the capability of the applicant to implement the targeting, public education and evaluation components of the campaign:

a. Evidence of proven ability to provide high quality results. (10 points)

b. Evidence that the applicant can implement the campaign, and complete the evaluation component within the time lines provided.

Note: OSC's experience during previous grant cycles has shown that a number of applicants choose to apply as a consortium of individual entities; or, if applying individually, propose the use of sub-contractors to undertake certain limited functions. It is essential that these applicants demonstrate the proven management capability and experience to ensure that, as lead agency, they will be directly accountable for the successful implementation, completion, and evaluation of the project. (10 points)

#### 3. Staff Capability (10 points)

Applications will be evaluated in terms of the degree to which:

a. The duties outlined for grant-funded positions appear appropriate to the work that will be conducted under the award. (5 points)

b. The qualifications of the grant-funded positions appear to match the requirements of these positions. (5 points)

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,