that distributors of pictures would recognize the independents, and funnel top films their way. At one point in his career, he sued several of the large distributors because they refused to exhibit in independent theatres, seeking out the chains instead. That matter was settled prior to the trial with the large distributors, afraid of the antitrust noises that my father was making, settling with him so that the independents would get access to the top films.

Unfortunately, the belief that my father had that independent exhibitors would be more receptive to the public sentiment in their communities is not shared by the larger chains. My father, and others like him, felt that their businesses were a part of the community, and that they not only had to be responsive in what they showed, but they had to be responsible to the community for the content of the pictures. In addition, my father and other independents have closer ties to the community, and always tried to provide support in the community for fundraisers, etc. The big chains simply do not do this.

I saw in the Washington Post over the weekend that the merger had been okayed by the Justice Department, and so I guess that it's too late to do much else about this particular merger. However, I felt that I should respond to your letter on my father's behalf, as I am sure he would have if he were still alive. Good luck to you in your endeavors.

Beverly Petersen Jennison,

13408 Bingham Court, Silver Spring, Md. 20906, jennisons@msn.com, 301–871–7949.

June 12, 1998.

Allen P. Grunes,

United States Department of Justice, Anti-Trust Division, 1401 H Street, N.W., Suite 4000, Washington, D.C. 20530

Re: United States of America et al v. Sony Corporation et al 98 Civ. 2716

Dear Mr. Grunes: The New York City Commission on Human Rights (''Commission'') is the principal local civil rights law enforcement agency in New York City committed to ensuring that people with disabilities have access to and enjoy the facilities of New York City's movie theaters. The Commission has an interest in insuring that all theaters in New York City—including those covered by the above Final Judgement and Consent Decree—are accessible to disabled persons. We submit these comments accordingly and for the record.

Under New York City's Human Rights law, owners and operators of places of public accommodation may not ''refuse, withhold from or deny'' to a disabled person ''any of the accommodations, advantages, facilities or privileges thereof.'' [1] ''Reasonable Accommodation'' to the needs of persons with disabilities is required to be made when such accommodation ''shall not cause undue hardship in the covered entity's business.'' (Administrative Code, Title 8, Chapter 1, §§ 8–107.4(a), 8–107.15(a), 8–102.18).

In the past few years, the Commission has received complaints about inaccessible movie theaters. Most of these theaters are in Manhattan and most were owned and operated by Cineplex Odeon. In response to these complaints, we initiated an informal survey of Cineplex Odeon's movie theaters in Manhattan to ascertain whether the theaters were in compliance with the local and federal laws.[2] In November 1996, we contacted Cineplex Odeon and informed them about the complaints.[3]

In December 1996, the New York City Council published a study which confirmed that many of the city's existing movie theaters were not accessible to the disabled.[4] It was apparent to us that this was an industry-wide issue. We subsequently contacted all the major movie theater companies operating in New York City, including Sony Loews.

As a result of the recent merger between Cineplex Odeon and Sony Loews, we are aware that the newly formed corporation—Loews Cineplex—must divest itself of most of the former Cineplex Odeon Theaters in Manhattan. The theaters being divested are all sites for first-run movies in Manhattan. Moviegoers, as mentioned in the federal complaint, ''do not want to travel far from their homes to attend a movie, particularly in urban areas.'' Moreover, moviegoers expect to view first-run movies in top quality facilities. Disabled moviegoers are no exception. However, we believe that these theaters are not in full compliance with all applicable codes. The accessibility issues include, but are not limited to, the following:

1. Inadequate number of wheelchair seats;
2. Inadequate number of companion seats;
3. Inadequate or improper wheelchair seat dispersal;
4. Barriers to access (no ramps, lifts, elevators);
5. Excessive door pressure;
6. Inaccessible or improperly designed bathrooms;
7. Inaccessible or improperly designed service counters;
8. Inaccessible or improperly designed amenities (e.g. public telephones, drinking fountains, etc.);
9. Lack of hand rails;
10. Improperly designed ticket counters.

We understand there is a time frame during which Loews Cineplex is to divest itself of most of the Manhattan theaters previously owned by Cineplex Odeon. We recommend that prior to the sale of these theaters to a third party, Loews Cineplex be required to allocate the necessary resources to bring the theaters into full compliance with the applicable local and federal codes and civil rights laws. It would be an unfortunate and unintended effect of the above consent decree if these theaters—which as a group are highly visible first-run theaters—are not given the priority and attention they deserve.

Very truly yours,

Randolph Wills,

Deputy Commissioner, Law Enforcement Bureau.

By:

Rockwell J. Chin,

Supervising Attorney, Law Enforcement Bureau, (212) 306–7455 (tel), (212) 306–7514 (fax).

[FR Doc. 98–29223 Filed 10–30–98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4410–11–M

[1] It shall be an unlawful discriminary practice for any person, being the owner, lessee, proprietor, manager, superintendent, agent or employee of any place or provider of public accommodation because of the . . . disability . . . of any person directly or indirectly, to refuse, withhold from or deny to such person any of the accommodations, advantages, facilities or privileges thereof. . . . [New York City Human Rights Law, Administrative Code, Title 8, Chapter 1, § 8–107.4(a)].

[2] In New York City, theaters must comply with the federal ADAAG Standards and the Local Law 58 of the New York City Building Code. Local Law Number 58 of 1987 was enacted to amend New York City's Administrative Code in relation to providing facilities for people having physical disabilities. (Administrative Code, Title 27, Chapter 1, § 27–123.1 et seq.). Incorporated into the New York City Building Code, Local Law 58's provisions apply to buildings constructed, altered or changed in occupancy or use since September 1, 1987. Where there are differences between ADAAG and ANSI, the Commission will adopt the stricter of the two standards. ANSI generally requires a greater number of wheelchair spaces and dispersal of those spaces for all auditoriums, regardless of capacity.

[3] We have since been working with attorneys from the Department of Justice (United States Attorney's Office, Southern District of New York) in an effort to co-ordinate federal and local law enforcement efforts regarding movie theater companies in New York City.

[4] See *Admit Some: An Examination of Movie Theater Accessibility in New York City for Persons Who Are Disabled*, a report and survey published by the Council of the City of New York, Committee on Consumer Affairs in co-operation with students from Columbia University's School of International and Public Affairs/Graduate Program in Public Policy and Administration (December 1996).

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Antitrust Division

Notice pursuant to the National Cooperative Research and Production Act of 1993—Bell Communications Research, Inc. (''Bellcore'')

Notice is hereby given that, on December 18, 1997, purusant to Section 6(a) of the National Cooperative Research and Production Act of 1993, 15 U.S.C. 4301 *et seq.* (''the Act''), Bell Communications Research, Inc. (''Bellcore'') has filed written notifications on behalf of Bellcore and Siliscape, Inc. (''Siliscape'') simultaneously with the Attorney General and the Federal Trade Commission disclosing (1) the identities of the parties and (2) the nature and objectives of the venture. The notifications were filed for the purpose of invoking the Act's provisions limiting the recovery of antitrust plaintiffs to actual damages under specified circumstances. Pursuant to Section 6(b) of the Act, the identities of the parties are Bell Communications Research, Inc., Morristown, NJ; and Siliscape, Inc., Palo Alto, CA. The nature and objectives of the venture are to engage in cooperative research related to virtual imaging

displays and technologies and applications related thereto.

Constance K. Robinson,

Director of Operations, Antitrust Division.

[FR Doc. 98–29215 Filed 10–30–98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4410–11–M

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Antitrust Division

Notice Pursuant to the National Cooperative Research and Production Act of 1993—Center for Emissions Control, Inc.

Notice is hereby give that, on December 30, 1997 pursuant to Section 6(a) of the National Cooperative Research and Production Act of 1993, 15 U.S.C. 4301 *et seq.* (''the Act''), Center for Emissions Control, Inc. has filed written notifications simultaneously with the Attorney General and the Federal Trade Commission disclosing changes in its membership status. The notifications were filed for the purpose of extending the Act's provisions limiting the recovery of antitrust plaintiffs to actual damages under specified circumstances. Specifically, the members of the Center for Emissions Control, Inc. have authorized the dissolution of the corporation. The officers of the corporation intend to file dissolution documents with the District of Columbia prior to the end of this year.

On May 13, 1991, the Center for Emissions Control, Inc. filed its original notification pursuant to Section 6(a) of the Act. The Department of Justice published a notice in the **Federal Register** pursuant to Section 6(b) of the Act on May 31, 1991 (56 FR 24843–01).

The last notification was filed with the Department on May 6, 1996. A notice was published in the **Federal Register** pursuant to Section 6(b) of the Act on June 12, 1996 (61 FR 29768–01).

Constance K. Robinson,

Director of Operations Antitrust Division.

[FR Doc. 98–29212 Filed 10–30–98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4410–11–M

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Antitrust Division

Notice Pursuant to the National Cooperative Research and Production Act of 1993—Center for Waste Reduction Technologies (''CWRT'')

Notice is hereby given that, on June 11, 1998, pursuant to Section 6(a) of the National Cooperative Research and Production Act of 1993, 15 U.S.C. 4301 *et seq.* (''the Act''), Center for Waste Reduction Technologies (''CWRT'') has filed written notifications simultaneously with the Attorney General and the Federal Trade Commission disclosing changes in its membership status. The notifications were filed for the purpose of extending the Act's provisions limiting the recovery of antitrust plaintiffs to actual damages under specified circumstances. Specifically, National Renewable Energy Laboratory, a division of Midwest Research Institute, Inc., Kansas City, MO; Oak Ridge National Laboratory, Oak Ridge, TN; Owens-Corning Fiberglas Corp., Toledo, OH; Salutia, Inc., St. Louis, MO; Celanese Ltd., a subsidiary of HNA Holdings, Inc., Bridgewater, NJ; Camp Dresser & McKee Inc., Cambridge, MA; and Environmental Protection Agency, Washington, DC have been added as parties to this venture. Also, Air Products and Chemicals, Inc., Allentown, PA; AM–RE Services, Inc., Princeton, NJ: Bechtel Group, Inc., San Francisco, CA; The BOC Group, Murray Hill, NJ; Gas Research Institute, Chicago, IL; Hoechst Celanese Corporation, Bridgewater, NJ; and Mobil Research and Development Corporation, Pennington, NJ have been dropped as parties to this venture.

No other changes have been made in either the membership or planned activity of the group research project. Membership in this group research project remains open, and Center for Waste Reduction Technologies (''CWRT'') intends to file additional written notification disclosing all changes in membership.

On March 14, 1995, Center for Waste Reduction Technologies (''CWRT'') filed its original notification pursuant to Section 6(a) of the Act. The Department of Justice published a notice in the **Federal Register** pursuant to Section 6(b) of the Act on April 24, 1995 (60 FR 20119).

The last notification was filed with the Department on April 18, 1996. A notice was published in the **Federal Register** pursuant to Section 6(b) of the Act on May 14, 1996 (61 FR 24331).

Constance K. Robinson,

Director of Operations Antitrust Division.

[FR Doc. 98–29208 Filed 10–30–98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4410–11–M

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Antitrust Division

Notice Pursuant to the National Cooperative Research and Production Act of 1993—Center for Waste Reduction Technologies (''CWRT''): Novel Reactor Design Project

Notice is hereby given that, on June 11, 1998, pursuant to Section 6(a) of the National Cooperative Research and Production Act of 1993, 15 U.S.C. 4301 *et seq.* (''the Act''), Center for Waste Reduction Technologies (''CWRT''): Novel Reactor Design Project has filed written notifications simultaneously with the Attorney General and the Federal Trade Commission disclosing changes in its membership status. The notifications were filed for the purpose of extending the Act's provisions limiting the recovery of antitrust plaintiffs to actual damages under specified circumstances. Specifically, ARCO Chemical Co., Newton Square, PA; Saudi Basic Industries Corporation, Riyadh, SAUDI ARABIA; and Procter & Gamble Co., Cincinnati, OH have been added as parties to this venture. Also, Air Products and Chemicals, Inc., Allentown, PA; Olin Corporation, Lake Charles, LA; and Rhone Poulenc Inc., Newton Square, PA have been dropped as parties to this venture.

No other changes have been made in either the membership or planned activity of the group research project. Membership in this group research project remains open, and Center for Waste Reduction Technologies (''CWRT''): Novel Reactor Design Project intends to file additional written notification disclosing all changes in membership.

On December 19, 1995, Center for Waste Reduction Technologies (''CWRT''): Novel Reactor Design Project filed its original notification pursuant to Section 6(a) of the Act. The Department of Justice published a notice in the **Federal Register** pursuant to Section 6(b) of the Act on February 12, 1996 (61 FR 5409).

Constance K. Robinson,

Director of Operations, Antitrust Division.

[FR Doc. 98–29209 Filed 10–30–98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4410–11–M