Review and Evaluation

5. The mediation program should incorporate an after-the-fact agency review of settlements reached in mediation to examine their enforceability, consistency with the ADA, and whether the process reduces the time needed to resolve individual cases (both elapsed time and person-hours). This review should not result in overturning individual mediated settlements, nor should it impair the confidentiality of the mediation process or otherwise discourage participation in it.

6. In designing the program, the joint committee should establish program objectives, evaluation criteria, and a system for collecting the data necessary for evaluation. The evaluation process should be designed to provide data and analysis that will enable (i) a determination of the circumstances under which mediation is appropriate and effective for resolving ADA cases and (ii) the identification of any systemic problems that are not addressed by mediated settlements. The following issues should be included in the evaluation:

(a) in what types of cases is mediation most effective?

(b) at what point in the investigative process is mediation most effective, taking into account the costs of any investigation that precedes mediation?

(c) does mediation reduce the cost of processing cases for the parties and/or the government?

(d) what is the effect of mediation on processing time of cases, including whether mediation adds to processing time where it is unsuccessful?

(e) what is the impact of mediation on the investigation and case backlog?

(f) what is the satisfaction level of the participants in mediation, including separate measures of satisfaction for complainants (charging parties) and respondents?

(g) what are the best sources of qualified mediators?

(h) is the use of a common group of mediators for various types of cases effective, taking into account costs, settlement rates, settlement results, and mediator performance?

(i) how are the costs of using mediators to be financed?

(j) are the results of mediated settlements, settlements reached through other processes, and litigation in similar cases comparable?

(k) does the mediation program impact systemic litigation?

(l) is agency review of mediated settlements effective and necessary?

(m) is the process equally fair and effective for represented and unrepresented parties?

(n) are individuals with disabilities disadvantaged in mediation?

(o) does availability of technical expertise affect settlement rates?

(p) what is the rate of compliance with mediated settlements?

Additional criteria deemed necessary and appropriate should be added by the joint committee designing the program.

7. The joint committee should review the mediation program regularly pursuant to the evaluation criteria and in consultation with the advisory committee, modifying the program as suggested by the results of the evaluation to ensure its continued effectiveness and consistency with statutory goals.

Consideration of Other ADR Techniques

8. The ADA enforcement agencies should jointly continue to study and evaluate other alternative dispute resolution techniques for disputes arising under the ADA.[6]

[FR Doc. 95–20560 Filed 8–17–95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6110–01–W

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Forest Service

Klamath Provincial Advisory Committee (PAC)

AGENCY: Forest Service, USDA.

ACTION: Notice of meeting.

SUMMARY: The Klamath Provincial Advisory Committee will meet on September 7 and September 8, 1995 at the Oregon Institute of Technology, 3201 Campus Drive, Klamath Falls, Oregon. The meeting will begin at 10:30 a.m. on September 7 and adjourn at 5:00 p.m. The meeting will reconvene at 8:00 a.m. on September 8 and continue until 3:00 p.m. Agenda items to be covered include: (1) forest health and salvage opportunities in the Province; (2) coordination with other existing groups within the Province; (3) research and monitoring opportunities for coordination; and (4) a public comment period. All PAC meetings are open to the public. Interested citizens are encouraged to attend.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Jim Anderson, USDA, Klamath National Forest, at 1312 Fairlane Road, Yreka, California 96097; telephone 916–842–6131, (FTS) 700–467–1300.

Dated: August 11, 1995.

Robert J. Anderson,

Land Management Planning Staff Officer.

[FR Doc. 95–20506 Filed 8–17–95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3410–11–M

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Agency Form Under Review by the Office of Management and Budget

DOC has submitted to the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) for clearance the following proposal for collection of information under the provisions of the Paperwork Reduction Act (44 U.S.C. chapter 35).

Agency: Bureau of the Census.

Title: Survey of Income and Program Participation – 1996 Panel.

Form Number(s): SIPP–16003.

Agency Approval Number: None.

Type of Request: New collection.

Burden: 105,800 hours.

Number of Respondents: 105,000.

Avg Hours Per Response: 30 minutes.

Needs and Uses: The Bureau of the Census conducts the Survey of Income and Program Participation (SIPP) to collect information from a sample of households concerning the distribution of income received directly as money or indirectly as in–kind benefits. SIPP data are used by economic policymakers, the Congress, state and local governments, and Federal agencies that administer social welfare and transfer payment programs such as the Department of Health and Human Services, the Department of Housing and Urban Development, and the Department of Agriculture. The SIPP is a longitudinal survey, in that households in the ''panel'' are interviewed at regular intervals or ''waves'' over a number of years. The survey is molded around a central ''core'' of labor force and income questions, health insurance questions, and questions concerning government program participation that remain fixed throughout the life of a panel. The core questions are asked at Wave 1 and are updated during subsequent interviews. The core is periodically supplemented with additional questions or ''topical modules'' designed to answer specific needs. This request is for clearance of the Core questions and the topical modules for Waves 1 & 2 of the 1996 Panel. Topical modules for waves 3 through 13 will be cleared later. The topical modules for Wave 1 are Recipiency History and Employment History. Wave 1 interviews will be conducted from February through May 1996. Wave 2 topical modules are Work Disability History, Fertility History, Education and Training History, Marital

[6] See Recommendation 86–3, ''Agencies' Use of Alternative Means of Dispute Resolution,'' and the ADA, 42 U.S.C. § 12212.