

marketing, and development of Alpha products. The Proposed Consent Order requires Digital to enter into or to continue certain licensing arrangements and alliances with Advanced Micro Devices, Inc. ("AMD"), Samsung Electronics Co., Ltd. ("Samsung"), or some other Commission-approved licensee, and to begin the process of certifying International Business Machines, Inc. ("IBM"), or some other Commission-approved company, to become an Alpha foundry. The purpose of these provisions is to establish two licensees and another foundry as providers and developers of Alpha devices, independent of Intel.

The Proposed Consent Order binds Digital to comply with the terms of agreements it already has entered into with Samsung. Under those agreements, Samsung will obtain an architectural license and technical support. Furthermore, Digital will grant to Samsung a non-exclusive AlphaPowered trademark license and the assistance and support necessary to enable Samsung to enter rapidly and expand the merchant market segment for Alpha products.⁷ Under the current version of the Samsung-Digital agreement, Samsung will be creating a U.S. subsidiary, to be known as the Alpha Volume Company, that plans to market Alpha chips to the merchant market segment. Furthermore, Digital has committed to purchase substantial volumes of its Alpha products needs at a competitive price from Samsung, thus reducing its reliance on Intel.

The Proposed Consent Order also requires Digital to enter into a broad license with AMD, or a Commission-approved licensee, that includes a license to the Alpha architecture and software tools that enable AMD to develop microprocessors compatible with the Alpha architecture. Digital must provide technical and engineering support until AMD is capable of independently developing and producing products based on the Alpha architecture, but in no event for more than two years.

The licenses with AMD and Samsung (or two other Commission-approved companies) are architectural licenses, meaning that the license is to the Alpha architecture, as defined by convention in Digital's official reference manual.

Under such license, the licensee is free to create its own implementations and derivative works—that is, to design original chips around the architecture—with the one caveat that it maintain backward compatibility with the existing Alpha architecture.⁸ In this way, a licensee will have every incentive to develop the merchant market aggressively because it will have the ability to create Alpha-derivative innovations that can give it profitable "design wins"—that is, agreements with computer system manufacturers by which the computer system manufacturers will design a computer line around the licensee's chip. These architectural licenses also provide assurance to customers who commit to the Alpha architecture because the licenses provide independent sources of supply and innovation for these microprocessors.

The Proposed Consent Order also requires Digital to enter into an agreement, subject to Commission approval, with IBM or some other Commission-approved company to evaluate that company as a potential foundry for Alpha parts and to inform that foundry partner of the steps necessary to become a qualified supplier of Alpha products. Submission of that agreement is required within six months of Commission approval of the Proposed Consent Order. Alternatively, the Proposed Consent Order permits Digital to demonstrate why such an agreement is unnecessary.

Samsung is a leading supplier of DRAM technology, is considered to have excellent manufacturing quality, and will receive marketing assistance from Digital. Samsung is already in the merchant market and the Order should empower Samsung to further its marketing efforts in this important segment. AMD is the leading challenger to Intel for x86-compatible microprocessors and already a major merchant market supplier, with excellent design capabilities. Though AMD does not yet produce Alpha chips, it should have every ability to do so. AMD is a major supplier of microprocessors and should have significant incentives to develop an Alpha-based business because it does not otherwise have a 64-bit architecture capable of challenging the upcoming

Intel IA-64 architecture. IBM is an established high-performance microprocessor foundry, likely to be capable of producing Alpha products. All three of these companies, or other licensees, help to ensure adequate and independent supplies of Alpha microprocessors.

V. Opportunity for Public Comment

The Proposed Consent Order has been placed on the public record for sixty (60) days for receipt of comments by interested persons about both the appropriateness of the relief provided herein as well as the suitability of Samsung, AMD, and IBM as licensees who can ensure alternative sources for the manufacture, marketing, and development of Alpha products. Comments received during this period will become part of the public record. After sixty days, the Commission will again review the Proposed Consent Order and the comments received and will decide whether it should withdraw from the Proposed Consent Order or make it final.

By accepting the Proposed Consent Order subject to final approval, the Commission anticipates that the competitive problems alleged in the Complaint will be resolved. The purpose of this analysis is to invite public comment on the Proposed Consent Order, including the proposed licenses and alliances, to help the Commission determine whether to make final the Proposed Consent Order contained in the agreement. This analysis is not intended to constitute an official interpretation of the Proposed Consent Order, nor is it intended to modify the terms of the Proposed Consent Order in any way.

By direction of the Commission.

Donald S. Clark,
Secretary.

[FR Doc. 98-11798 Filed 5-1-98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6750-01-M

GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION

Notice of Availability (NOA); Record of Decision (ROD); Immigration and Naturalization Service (INS) Lease Construction and Consolidation, Dade County, Florida

April 23, 1998.

This is the Record of Decision (ROD) for the GSA Proposed Action, which is to lease a building to be constructed at 9300-9499 NW 41st Street in Western Dade County, Florida. This building would consolidate the INS District

⁷ The Proposed Consent Order also includes provisions for an "Interim Trustee" (i.e., an auditor) and a licensing trustee. The Interim Trustee provision assures early assessment and monitoring of Digital's agreements with the licensees and continuing monitoring and reporting to the Commission of how the provisions are working. The licensing trustee provision is triggered if the parties to a licensing agreement fail to agree within the requisite time.

⁸ An architectural integrity provision in the Order preserves backward compatibility for existing applications written to exploit the architecture, and to make designing easier for applications developers that have not yet ported applications to Alpha. If Digital fails to innovate and improve the performance of the Alpha architecture, however, the Order allows AMD to modify the base architecture without Digital approval.

Office, the Executive Office for Immigration Review (EOIR), and the Asylum Office. This is the GSA preferred alternative.

The purpose of this project is to consolidate the INS into one facility to accommodate their legislatively mandated growth. INS needs a consolidated facility to better accommodate this growth, to better coordinate its functions, and to meet the need to locate closer to the Krome Service Processing Center, and to its operation at the Miami International Airport (MIA). This consolidation would improve the overall efficiency of the INS operations. Current inefficiencies result from separated functions at their existing facilities that can not accommodate projected INS requirements. Employees and clients must often travel over an hour between locations. Separated functions require duplicate functions transportation of records and personnel around Metro Dade County. This lengthens the time it takes the INS to administer its case load. The distance between the District Office and the Krome Center has caused serious administrative and security problems. A consolidated facility located closer to the Krome Center and west of the MIA would provide more effective coordination of functions, including the INS Foreign Inspection Service located at MIA.

The current District Office at 7880 Biscayne Boulevard can not accommodate the projected growth. The building has small floor plates, inadequate waiting areas, and elevator and building systems that are not adequate to service the requirements of the current and projected INS space needs.

Pursuant to Section 102(2)(C) of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) of 1969, the Council on Environmental Quality Regulations (40 CFR part 1500-1508), and GSA Order PBS P 1095.4B, GSA prepared an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for the Proposed Action. The purpose of the EIS is to:

- Identify the alternatives considered including the Proposed Action;
- Solicit public comments and incorporate response into the analysis;
- Identify potential impacts of the alternatives considered;
- Disclose potential impacts resulting from the alternatives considered;
- Identify measures to mitigate adverse impacts;
- Incorporate the impacts and mitigation into the decision process.

This ROD will communicate GSA's decision on implementing the Proposed Action, the basis for that decision, and

identify mitigation measures to be implemented as part of the decision. The Draft and Final EIS documents are incorporated into this ROD by reference, and are available upon request from GSA.

This EIS was prepared because of the level and intensity of public response received by GSA during the final comment period after GSA had completed an Environmental Assessment (EA). GSA completed an EA in July 1996 and executed a Findings of No Significant Impact (FONSI). GSA provided 30-days of final public comment prior to taking action. Because of the level and intensity of the public responses received, GSA determined that there were "potentially significant" issues associated with proceeding with the Proposed Action. GSA therefore elected to elevate its environmental analysis to an EIS, the highest level of analysis. GSA then began the environmental process a second time with the publication of a Notice of Intent (NOI) to prepare an EIS in the **Federal Register** on September 27TH. Notice was also placed in the Miami Herald and letters were mailed to all potentially impacted parties as part of a second public scoping process.

The EIS examined the impacts for both the Proposed Action and the No Action. If GSA proceeds with the Proposed Action, there are potential impacts to both the "Doral" area from the relocation of INS, and potential impacts to the 7880 Biscayne Boulevard area that would result from INS vacating the current location. Conversely, in the case of the No Action, there are potential impacts to the 7880 Biscayne area from the INS remaining at their current location and potential impacts to the INS from continued operations in their current facilities.

GSA released the Draft EIS with publication in the **Federal Register** for a 45-day public comment period that began on January 24, 1997. A Public Meeting was conducted in Miami on February 12TH. The Final EIS was released for a 30-day public comment period with publication in the **Federal Register** on March 28TH. The final comment period closed on April 28TH. GSA provided written notices of availability for these documents in the **Federal Register**, the Miami Herald, through the Metro-Dade Library, and through direct mailings to interested parties and using a mailing list provided by the West Dade Federation of Homeowners Associations (WDFHA). GSA distributed approximately 150 copies of the Draft and Final EIS to Federal, State and local governments, elected officials, neighborhood

associations, the business community, and to all interested parties identified during scoping process.

GSA made diligent efforts to solicit input from all potentially impacted parties, and GSA also made diligent efforts to keep the community fully informed during the NEPA process. This was accomplished using newspaper Public Notices, direct mailings, written correspondence, a Public Meeting, and through keeping an open dialogue with representatives of the WDFHA. GSA communicated regularly and openly with the WDFHA, to keep all parties fully informed during the environmental process. GSA provided factual information to interested parties in a timely manner. GSA also extended the comment periods several times, when requested to do so, so as to provide additional time for those wishing to provide comments.

Alternatives Considered

GSA spent over three years exploring and analyzing alternatives to meet the requirements of the INS consolidation within the Delineated Area (DA). In 1992 the INS provided GSA with the Delineated Area (DA). This DA was outlined by the INS as a 95 square mile area surrounded by Flagler Street on the South, 135th Street on the North, LeJeune Road on the East, and 107th Avenue on the West.

The DA was selected based on the accessibility of major thoroughfares including the Florida Turnpike, the Palmetto and Dolphin Expressways, and LeJeune Road. The requirement was that the DA to be in a more centralized portion of Dade County with access to major roadways, MIA, and the Krome Facility. The survey conducted as part of the EIS concluded that during the survey period, 25.4% of the INS client visits originated from outside Dade County. A 1991 INS survey indicated that 78% of clients who filed petitions with the INS lived either west of LeJeune Road or north of Flagler Street. Demographic forecasts predict that the majority of future residential and commercial growth will occur in the western side of Miami.

During the period from 1993 until April 1996, GSA analyzed and considered over 20 alternative locations and delivery options within the DA. This included leasing existing building(s), building(s) purchase, and the consideration of lease construction alternatives at various sites that would be either donated to GSA or made available through a no cost purchase option.

GSA conducted financial analysis on the methods available for delivering the

needed space to meet the INS' requirements. This was done to determine the most economical and cost effective delivery method. As part of the Prospectus submittal process, GSA used both the Net Present Value and an Income/Expense approach, to compute the lowest cost to the taxpayer. This analysis concluded that leasing was the most cost effective method and the lowest cost to the taxpayer. In April 1995 GSA received Congressional approval to lease 214,607 occupiable square feet of space within the DA to meet the requirements of the INS. Only lease acquisition was authorized by Congress under this Prospectus approval. The Draft and Final EIS contain a complete and comprehensive explanation of the alternative development and screening processes followed by GSA for this project from 1992 to date.

After GSA Congressional approval of the lease Prospectus in April 1995, a market survey was initiated by GSA to identify lease alternatives and to identify prospective offerors. On December 1, 1995, GSA issued a Solicitation for Offers (SFO), an open market competitive request for offers to provide leased space that would meet the requirements of the INS consolidation as outlined in the SFO. A total of seven initial offers were received by GSA. Best and Final Offers (BAFO) were due by April 28, and all but one offeror withdrew their offers prior to BAFO. Only one offer remained open at BAFO.

Therefore, the EIS analyzed the two alternatives remaining open and viable to GSA. These alternatives are the Proposed Action Alternative and the No Action Alternative. All other alternatives were either withdrawn prior to BAFO, or were initially screened from consideration by GSA based on economic, technical, or operational criteria.

No Action Alternative

Under this alternative, the INS would continue to be housed at its current locations, and would meet its increased space requirements through a series of ad hoc leases. The INS would continue to operate at dispersed locations and in overcrowded conditions at the District Office. INS would meet its growth needs by leasing additional space in close proximity to its current locations.

Proposed Action

Under this alternative, the GSA would execute an agreement with a private developer, already selected by GSA through an open and competitive procurement, for the lease construction

of a building to house the consolidated INS. The building would be 214,607 osf, would employ about 500 persons in 1998 increasing to 763 persons by the year 2005. The building would provide 885 parking spaces. Approximately 1,100 persons would visit the facility daily to transact business with the INS. The building would be constructed with three floors and a parking garage in rear. The building would be designed as a modern office building to fit the style and character of the commercial buildings that currently surround the vacant site. The building would be designed to efficiently accommodate the unique requirements of the INS. This is the GSA preferred alternative.

Environmental Consequences and Mitigation

Based on the analysis contained in both the EA and the EIS, there were no potentially significant environmental impacts from either the Proposed Action or the No Action except for those discussed in this ROD. These impacts were associated with public controversy and land use issues, and not with impacts to the natural environment. Therefore, neither alternative was considered to be environmentally preferred over the other. Additional potential impacts to the natural and human environment were considered and found to be minor or not significant. This is documented in both the Draft EIS and the Final EIS by reference.

The Proposed Action

The issues that were identified during the scoping process fall into one of the following general categories: Impacts to streets and traffic; impacts to property values (primarily residential), impacts to the character and economic stability of the neighborhood and surrounding community, and impacts to the area from increased crime.

The Proposed Action would result in the construction of a building to suit facility to house the INS, and would require a lease agreement to be executed between GSA and a private developer. GSA would assume a leasehold interest in the building for a period of 10 years. There would be no Federal ownership of the facility. The developer would be responsible for obtaining all local and state approvals prior to beginning construction. These would include all zoning approvals, Concurrency Review, land use approvals, and all building permits that require conformance to various local, State, and Federal statutes.

The approval and permitting process would be the responsibility of the developer, and thus obtaining permits

and Concurrency review would serve to mitigate many of the impacts that have been identified.

Concurrency is the process by which Dade County examines proposed projects and determines whether the necessary public facilities and infrastructure capacity is available. Seven agencies are involved in the review process for Concurrency in Dade County and they are: Building and Zoning; Department of Environmental and Resource Management (DERM); Fire Department; Metro Dade Transit Authority; Parks and Recreation; Public Works; and Solid Waste.

Concurrency is part of the permitting process. The infrastructure and service capacity must be available before a developer is granted a Final Development Order. The analysis of potential impacts undertaken in the EIS is based on the Standards for Concurrency required by Dade County. The Concurrency review and a Final Development Order application takes place at the County level, and these permitting decisions are based on the available capacity at the time of the application by a developer.

Traffic

A traffic study was undertaken by traffic consultants Carr-Smith Associates, to determine the potential impact of the Proposed Action on the roadways around the potentially affected area. To determine the number of vehicle trips that would be generated, an internal survey was conducted by the INS to determine the origin and destination of all employees and visitors during a five day period (October 23-29, 1996). This was considered a typical work week. Employees located at the District Office and at other INS offices that would be part of the consolidation were included in the survey. A total of 438 current INS employees would move to the proposed facility. A total of 1092 client visits per day were identified for the survey week.

All employees would not be onsite everyday, and the arrivals of the clients occurred throughout the business day. These factors were considered in the formula for computing the number of the vehicle trips generated. Levels of Service (LOS) standards were provided by the Metro-Dade Planning Department for the surrounding roadways. Current traffic counts were taken. LOS levels were computed using the current data collected and using the projected growth rates provided by Dade County. The LOS levels with the Proposed Action were calculated and found to remain within acceptable Dade County LOS Standards.

Based on the findings of this traffic study, the impact of the proposed INS facility is within Metro-Dade County's Concurrency requirements. In addition, planned expansions in the transit service to the area and soon to be implemented changes in the INS application and processing procedures, will serve to mitigate some of the resulting traffic impacts of the new facility. Because of technology improvements in the processing procedures, and because of expected reductions in both staff and applicants in the Citizenship USA program, INS projects that the number of daily client visits to be less than the 1,092 persons who visited the current INS facilities during the survey period of October 23-29, 1996. These anticipated reductions, coupled with anticipated route alterations of the mass transit system, will serve to mitigate some of the increased traffic projected to be associated with the INS facility.

A copy of the traffic study, will full analysis and conclusions and methodology, is contained in the EIS. The developer would be required to meet Concurrency Review for traffic prior to permitting any proposed construction.

Mass Transit

Metro Dade transit Authority does not alter bus routes until a project has established a completion date and demonstrates a need for additional service. GSA and INS will contact Metro Dade Transit Authority at the appropriate time in this process, and formally request that additional service be provided to the facility based on the need and date of occupancy. GSA anticipates no difficulties in increasing the service levels once the need is demonstrated to the Metro Dade Transit Authority. Increased levels of public transportation to the facility will serve to mitigate some of the vehicle trips generated by the INS.

Metro-Bus service is available directly in front of the site. However, there is currently only one bus in the morning and one in the afternoon serving the site. Busses currently service 84th Avenue (No. 87 Bus) every 30 minutes during peak hours, and every hour during non-peak hours, from 6AM to 9PM. This route provides direct service from Dadeland and the Metrorail to the south, from the Okeechobee Metrorail Station to the north. The route also has connections at Flagler Street from Downtown (Route 11, running every 10 minutes, all day). This route runs about one mile east of the proposed site. Alteration of this route west to 97th Avenue would provide regular bus

service to the facility throughout the day.

Other potential mitigation measures would be the INS promoting ride sharing, staggered work hours, and subsidized public transportation for employees. Still others include the addition of express busses, and private jitney minibus service as regulated countywide by the 1985 Jitney Ordinance.

The Proposed Action would be required to under go Concurrency review for by Metro-Dade Transit Authority.

Parking

The proposed facility would include 885 spaces. Dade County requires one space for every 300 osf or 715 required spaces. The Proposed facility exceeds the Dade County parking requirement.

Land Use/Zoning

The Proposed Action is in substantial compliance with Land Use and Zoning Comprehensive Plans for the area. The developer would be required to obtain Zoning and Land Use approvals prior to construction and as part of the Concurrency review.

Impacts to Property Values

The site of the Proposed Action is surrounding by commercial office buildings on both the east and the west and the proposed use is in conformance with Dade County land use plans.

GSA's contractor, Radian International, secured a professional opinion from a Licensed State Certified Appraiser familiar with the area around the proposed site. The Appraiser did not provide data or render an opinion that the proposed INS facility would have any direct or unique impacts on the surrounding property values. Other private and government buildings, of similar size and use in the area, have not had any detrimental impacts on property values. No cause-effect relationship was established between the location of the INS Offices and surrounding property values.

The proposed site is located on Section 28, Range 40, Township 53. Section 28 is 640 acre (one mile square) area surrounded by four major roadways: 41st Street on the north; 25th Street on the south; 87th Avenue on the east; and 97th Avenue on the west. There are other government and commercial uses on the contiguous 640 acre Section 28 including: Metro-Dade Police Headquarters, an FAA lease for a radar tower, the Federal Reserve Bank of Miami, and the just completed US Army Southern Command Headquarters Administrative facility (SOUTHCOM).

This Army relocation of the SOUTHCOM from Panama to Dade County will be completed by May 31, 1998. This new facility has been leased by the Army for a 10-year term, is approximately 154,000 square feet, and will employ about 900 persons. The Proposed INS location is located just northeast of the SOUTHCOM facility (about three quarters of a mile) on Section 28. The WDFHA did not oppose this relocation of SOUTHCOM to the Doral area. The Appraiser retained by GSA stated that none of the aforementioned and varied government uses on Section 28, demonstrated any negative impacts to the surrounding property values.

Crime

Western Dade is projected to develop both commercially and residentially by the Dade County Comprehensive Development Master Plan. As this growth occurs, an increase in crime is projected, with or without the INS consolidation.

The INS facility would be designed to accommodate the INS needs. These design factors would include a larger floor plate, adequate parking, faster processing times for clients and fewer people at the site at any one time, required security procedures, and assigned waiting areas. These measures will serve to process INS clients efficiently at the facility.

The Metro-Dade Police Station is located on Section 28, (less than one mile south of the proposed site), and its presence, would serve to deter crime in the area. There was no cause-effect relationship found that would uniquely link the INS presence to increased crime rates in the area.

Neighborhood Impacts to the Doral Area

The residents of the Doral area strongly oppose the proposed INS location. The Doral area is seeking to become an independent municipality, separate from Dade County. The proposed site in the center of the proposed City of Doral. The WDFHA has suggested that the proposed INS location would be the preferred location for the new "Village of Doral" municipal complex. If the Doral Incorporation is successful, the proposed action would negatively impact the goals of the community as stated in their Incorporation Petition.

The Doral community, through its representative the WDFHA, is on the record stating that they oppose the INS locating at the current site, or at any other site in the same general area. There has been no previous opposition by WDFHA to the other government

uses on Section 28, including the recent lease construction of 150,000 square foot building for SOUTHCOM Headquarters.

Other land use on Section 28 include several large office buildings (former Eastern Doral Computer Center and Headquarters Carnival Cruise Lines), an FAA radar facility, the Metro-Dade Police Headquarters, the 80 acre Miami West Park, and light industrial and warehouse buildings. Given the mix of uses, including other substantial government facilities on Section 28, the INS at the proposed lease construction would not be out of character with other surrounding land uses. Included in the Police Station complex on Section 28 are four buildings totaling over 300,000 square feet including the Metro-Dade Police Headquarters, Police District #3 Doral West, maintenance and vehicle storage, and detention facilities.

The INS facility at the proposed location would be in substantial zoning compliance and would conform to land uses on other surrounding properties. The building would be designed as a commercial office building of similar size and appearance to other nearby buildings. The above are mitigating factors demonstrating that the proposed facility is not out of character to other land uses in Section 28, and therefore should have no unique impact on the surrounding community.

A Final Development Order will be required by Dade County at the conclusion of the Concurrency review. This review will determine if public services and infrastructure are available to support the proposed project. If the capacity is not available, then permitting would not be available to the developer, or alterations to the proposed development would be required by Dade County in order to meet Concurrency Standards. This process would serve to mitigate potential impacts this project would cause to the infrastructure and public services in the area.

No Action

INS relocation to Western Dade County cause would a small negative impact to the area around the 7880 Biscayne Boulevard location due to potential loss of retail and service business. However, due to the high crime rates in the general area, most INS employees do not patronize nearby retail establishments.

Some of the nearby businesses generate income from the INS clients who often spend hours waiting in line due to the inefficient layout at the current facility. Mitigating factors to these impacts would include the two-

year lead time the property owner would have to find a replacement tenant, and the two-year lead time period the existing business would have to make appropriate adjustments in their business plans. Efforts are underway by the Biscayne Area Chamber of Commerce to promote Downtown Development Initiatives and obtain grants to stimulate the economy in the area.

There would be serious adverse impacts to the INS if they remained long term in their current facilities. There is no opportunity for expansion. Continued operation of physically separated functions will continue to hinder the INS in performing its mission. INS performs an important function for the United States with the administration and enforcement of US Immigration Laws. Operating in inadequate facilities and separated locations would negatively impact the INS' ability to effectively service its clients as well as the public.

Rationale for Decision

1. The proposed action was found to fall within the Dade County Concurrency Standards for traffic based on a traffic study conducted as part of the EIS.

2. Public transportation is available at the proposed location. Based on the existing route system, the capacity exists to increase the level of public transportation to the proposed facility. GSA will contact Metro-Dade Transit Authority at the appropriate point in the process to facilitate route and service alteration at the proposed facility to accommodate the public transportation needs.

3. The proposed facility is in compliance with local zoning, land use and comprehensive plans, contains more than the required parking, and would be subject to Concurrency review as part of the permitting process. The developer would be required to obtain permits and local approvals.

4. There are currently other substantial government facilities located on Section 28, including the FAA radar tower, the US Army Southern Command Headquarters (SOUTHCOM), and the Metro-Dade Police Station and Doral Substation including detention facilities. There was no evidence found that any of these other public uses have caused negative impacts to property values, nor any evidence that the INS would negatively impact property values. SOUTHCOM has just leased a new 150,000 square foot building, less than a mile southeast of the proposed site, to house 900 federal employees for occupancy June 1, 1997. In the opinion

of an Appraiser retained by GSA, the INS facility would not constitute a stigma development.

5. The INS facility will be designed to accommodate the needs of the INS and to provide a secure building that will be visually and functionally compatible with other nearby commercial and public use buildings.

6. There was no evidence presented to indicate that this project would uniquely contribute to increased crime in the area.

Therefore, having given consideration to all of the factors discovered during the 13 month environmental review process, it is GSA's decision to proceed with the Proposed Action: Lease construction of a building of 214,607 occupiable square feet of space, to house the INS consolidation on a 7.3 acre site is located at 9300-9499 NW 41st Street in Miami.

Dated: April 23, 1998.

Phil Youngberg,

Regional Environmental Officer (PT).

[FR Doc. 98-11719 Filed 5-1-98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6820-23-M

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES

Office of Public Health and Science Region, VI; Announcement of Availability of a Grant for a Family Planning Information, Education and Clinical Services Linkage Innovations Research Project

AGENCY: Office of Family Planning, Region VI.

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: The Office of Family Planning (OPF), Region VI, requests applications for a new research grant in family planning services delivery improvement.

DATES: To receive consideration, applications must be postmarked or delivered to the Office of Grants Management no later than June 15, 1998.

ADDRESSES: Completed applications should be sent to: Office of Grants Management, U.S. Public Health Service, DHHS Region VI, 1301 Young St., Suite 766, Dallas, TX 75202.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Evelyn Glass, Family Planning Unit Chief—214-767-3088, for assistance on technical and program aspects; Maureen Pickett, Grants Management Officer—214-767-3401, to answer questions about the preparation of grant applications.