

dialogues and the development of research strategies.

In 1985, EPA's Office of Enforcement piloted the use of ADR to assist in the resolution of enforcement actions. In 1987, EPA issued a "Guidance on the Use of Alternate Dispute Resolution in EPA Enforcement Cases" establishing the review of all enforcement actions for the potential use of ADR processes and the use of ADR whenever such use may lead to a prompt, fair, and efficient resolution of disputes.

In 1996, the Office of Solid Waste and Emergency Response initiated a program to use ADR professionals to facilitate the resolution of hazardous waste site disputes. Also in 1996, the Office of Civil Rights piloted the use of ADR processes to support the resolution of Equal Employment Opportunity complaints.

In October 1998, as partial fulfillment of the requirements of the ADR Act and in response to the Presidential Memorandum on ADR of May 1, 1998, EPA appointed a Dispute Resolution Specialist. In November of 1999, the establishment of a Conflict Prevention and Resolution Center was announced. The Center will be part of the Agency's ADR Law Office that will serve as EPA's national ADR policy and coordination office. In addition, the Agency has established ombuds programs in several Regional and headquarter offices and is currently developing programs for the use of ADR in contract and claims disputes, and in programs that invite public participation.

The Agency's capacity for accessing outside professional facilitation and mediation support has significantly increased through a series of contracts managed by the Agency. In 1988, EPA issued a contract authorizing up to \$1,000,000 in neutral services over three years. The most recent contract, issued in 1999, has a ceiling of more than \$41,000,000. The growth in demand for outside dispute resolution services reflects the breadth of ADR activities that have been supported by the Agency.

Additional Steps

An internal Agency workgroup is preparing a final Agency ADR policy and is determining the need for practice-specific guidances on the use of ADR in certain EPA programs. The final policy and/or guidelines will address Agency activities and issues cited in the Administrative Dispute Resolution Act ("ADRA") as well as other issues deemed important to the appropriate practice of ADR at EPA. Activities that will be considered during EPA's policy development process include:

- (1) Formal and informal adjudications;
- (2) Issuance of rules and regulations;
- (3) Development of policy and guidance;
- (4) Enforcement and compliance actions;
- (5) Issuing and revoking licenses and permits;
- (6) Grants administration and Memoranda of Understanding;
- (7) Contract placement and administration;
- (8) Interactions with the public and regulated community;
- (9) Legal actions brought by or against the Agency;
- (10) Employment related actions.

In addition, the policy and/or guidances will address salient issues such as confidentiality, the use of binding arbitration, and guidelines for providing appropriate ADR training. In developing the final policy, the Agency will take into account any comments received on the interim statement of policy published in this document. The Agency also plans to issue a draft of the final ADR policy for public review and will seek comment at that time.

Coordination With Public Participation Policy Review

On November 30 of last year, EPA's Regulatory Steering Committee published a document in the **Federal Register** seeking public comment on the Agency's 1981 Policy on Public Participation, including the question of how the Agency can best engage the public in an effort to revise that policy (and other related EPA policies and regulations). (See 64 FR 66906, Nov. 30, 1999) Because interaction with the public and regulated community is one of the areas to be addressed in the final ADR policy, the Agency will be using the feedback received in response to that document to inform the final ADR policy as well.

Request for Public Comment

The Environmental Protection Agency invites public comment on issues that the internal Agency workgroup should consider in developing a final ADR policy. In particular, the Agency would like to hear the views of stakeholders regarding how EPA can best encourage the acceptance and use of ADR techniques in appropriate circumstances. Comments should be received by May 12, 2000.

Dated: March 7, 2000.

Carol Browner,
Administrator.

[FR Doc. 00-6097 Filed 3-10-00; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560-50-P

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

[FRL-6560-2]

Carolina Creosoting Corporation Site, Leland, Brunswick County, North Carolina; Notice of Proposed Settlement

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency.

ACTION: Notice of Proposed Settlement.

SUMMARY: Pursuant to 122(h)(1) of the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation and Liability Act (CERCLA), the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) proposed to settle its claim for past response cost incurred at the Carolina Creosoting Corporation Site (Site) located in Leland, Brunswick County, North Carolina with Mr. Edward Theobald. EPA will consider public comments on the proposed settlement for thirty (30) days following the date of publication of this notice. EPA may withdraw or modify the proposed settlement should such comments disclose facts or considerations which indicate the proposed settlement is inappropriate, improper or inadequate. Copies of the proposed settlement are available from: Paula V. Batchelor, U.S. EPA Region 4, Waste Management Division, 61 Forsyth Street, SW, Atlanta, Georgia 30303, 404/562-8887.

Written Comments should be sent to Ms. Batchelor at the above address and should reference the Carolina Creosoting Corporation Site.

Dated: February 28, 2000.

Franklin E. Hill,

Chief, CERCLA Programs Services Branch, Waste Management Division.

[FR Doc. 00-6096 Filed 3-10-00; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6570-50-M

FEDERAL RESERVE SYSTEM

Sunshine Act Meeting

AGENCY HOLDING THE MEETING: Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System.

TIME AND DATE: 10:00 a.m., Thursday, March 16, 2000.

PLACE: Marriner S. Eccles Federal Reserve Board Building, 20th and C Streets, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20551.

STATUS: Closed.

MATTERS TO BE CONSIDERED: 1. Personnel actions (appointments, promotions, assignments, reassignments, and salary actions) involving individual Federal Reserve System employees.

2. Any matters carried forward from a previously announced meeting.

CONTACT PERSON FOR MORE INFORMATION: Lynn S. Fox, Assistant to the Board; 202-452-3204.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: You may call 202-452-3206 beginning at approximately 5 p.m. two business days before the meeting for a recorded announcement of bank and bank holding company applications scheduled for the meeting; or you may contact the Board's Web site at <http://www.federalreserve.gov> for an electronic announcement that not only lists applications, but also indicates procedural and other information about the meeting.

Dated: March 9, 2000.

Robert deV. Frierson,

Associate Secretary of the Board.

[FR Doc. 00-6191 Filed 3-9-00; 1:08 pm]

BILLING CODE 6210-01-P

FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION

[File No. 991-0278]

Michael T. Berkley, D.C., and Mark A. Cassellius, D.C.; Analysis to Aid Public Comment

AGENCY: Federal Trade Commission.

ACTION: Proposed consent agreement.

SUMMARY: The consent agreement in this matter settles alleged violations of federal law prohibiting unfair or deceptive acts or practices or unfair methods of competition. The attached Analysis to Aid Public Comment describes both the allegations in the draft complaint that accompanies the consent agreement and the terms of the consent order—embodied in the consent agreement—that would settle these allegations.

DATES: Comments must be received on or before April 6, 2000.

ADDRESSES: Comments should be directed to: FTC/Office of the Secretary, Room 159, 600 Pennsylvania Ave., NW, Washington, DC 20580.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: C. Steven Baker or Nicholas Franczyk, Federal Trade Commission, Midwest Region, 55 E. Monroe St., Suite 1860, Chicago, IL 60603-5701. (312) 960-5633.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: Pursuant to Section 6(f) of the Federal Trade Commission Act, 38 Stat. 721, 15 U.S.C. 46 and Section 2.34 of the Commission's Rules of Practice (16 CFR 2.34), notice is hereby given that the above-captioned consent agreement containing a consent

order to cease and desist, having been filed with and accepted, subject to final approval, by the Commission, has been placed on the public record for a period of thirty (30) days. The following Analysis to Aid Public Comment describes the terms of the consent agreement, and the allegations in the complaint. An electronic copy of the full text of the consent agreement package can be obtained from the FTC Home Page (for March 7, 2000), on the World Wide Web, at "<http://www.ftc.gov/ftc/formal.htm>." A paper copy can be obtained from the FTC Public Reference Room, Room H-130, 600 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW, Washington, DC 20580, either in person or by calling (202) 326-3627.

Public comment is invited. Comments should be directed to: FTC/Office of the Secretary, Room 159, 600 Pennsylvania Ave., NW, Washington, DC 20580. Two paper copies of each comment should be filed, and should be accompanied, if possible, by a 3½ inch diskette containing an electronic copy of the comment. Such comments or views will be considered by the Commission and will be available for inspection and copying at its principal office in accordance with Section 4.9(b)(ii) of the Commission's Rules of Practice (16 CFR 4.9(b)(ii)).

Analysis of Proposed Consent Order to Aid Public Comment

The Federal Trade Commission has accepted, subject to final approval, an agreement from Michale T. Berkley, D.C., and Mark A. Cassellius, D.C., to a proposed consent order. The agreement settles charges by the Federal Trade Commission that Drs. Berkley and Cassellius have violated Section 5 of the Federal Trade Commission Act by conspiring between themselves and with other chiropractors to fix prices for chiropractic services and to boycott the Gundersen Lutheran Health Plan ("Gundersen") to obtain higher reimbursement rates for services. The proposed consent order has been placed on the public record for thirty days for reception of comments by interested persons. Comments received during this period will become part of the public record. After thirty days, the Commission will review the agreement and the comments received, and will decide whether it should withdraw from the agreement or make the agreement and proposed order final.

The purpose of this analysis is to facilitate public comment on the proposed order. The analysis is not intended to constitute an official interpretation of the agreement and proposed order or to modify in any way

their terms. Further, the proposed consent order has been entered into for settlement purposes only and does not constitute an admission by Drs. Berkley and Cassellius that the law has been violated as alleged in the complaint.

The Complaint

Drs. Berkley and Cassellius are chiropractors with their principal places of business in La Crosse, Wisconsin. Except to the extent that competition has been restrained as alleged in the complaint, Drs. Berkley and Cassellius have been, and are now, in competition with each other and with other chiropractors in and around La Crosse, Wisconsin.

Since at least January 1997, and continuing until at least June 1997, Drs. Berkley and Cassellius conspired among themselves and with other chiropractors to fix prices for chiropractic services and to boycott Gundersen, a third-party payer doing business in and around La Crosse County, Wisconsin. The purpose of the boycott was, among other things, to obtain higher reimbursement from Gundersen for chiropractic services. Drs. Berkley and Cassellius organized at least two meetings of La Crosse area chiropractors to discuss their concerns about Gundersen. A central concern raised at these meetings was Gundersen's purportedly low reimbursement rates. During these meetings, the chiropractors agreed that Gundersen should increase its reimbursement rates and determined that a majority of the chiropractors were willing to leave the Gundersen network if it did not address their concerns. Dr. Berkley, acting on behalf of the group of chiropractors, communicated to Gundersen the chiropractors' concerns and the implicit threat of a boycott. The threatened boycott was successful: Gundersen, fearing the loss of a substantial number of chiropractic providers and the disruption of its network, acceded to the chiropractors' demands and increased its reimbursement rates by 20%.

Drs. Berkley and Cassellius and the other unnamed chiropractors have not integrated their practices in any economically significant way, nor have they created any efficiencies that might justify this conduct. Had they done either of these, under some circumstances, the agreement on price might not have been unlawful. Their actions have harmed consumers by increasing the prices that are paid for chiropractic services and by depriving consumers of the benefits of competition among chiropractors.